



LIBERATION

ONE SHILLING.

No. 35, MARCH, 1959.

MASS TRIALS AND ARRESTS

by AN ADVOCATE

WHAT IS APARTHEID ?

by DR. H. J. SIMONS

THE "BANTUSTAN" FRAUD



A JOURNAL OF DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION

IN THIS ISSUE:

Editorial	1
Mass Arrests and Trials	6
Concepts of Apartheid, by H. J. Simons	12
The Formation of Nations in Africa: II, by I. Pothekin	18

LIBERATION BY POST

LIBERATION is published approximately every two months. Make sure of getting every copy by sending us a postal order for 10s. We will then send you the next ten issues post free. (Or 5s. for 5 issues.) Our address: P.O. Box 10120, Johannesburg.

OUR EDITORIAL CRITICISED

To the Editor, Liberation.

While so much of 'War Against The People' (Liberation, December) is correct, and so many of the facts struck home, the entire impression left by the editorial seems wrong; not because of what was said, but because of crucial omissions. The editorial was timely and urgent; no-one will disagree with its central theme: 'new thinking and new plans are needed'. Never was it more necessary to stress the fact that a new survey must be made of the struggle of the people against the tyranny of the oppressors in South Africa; never was 'relentless work . . . in town and country . . . systematic and thorough-going education . . .' more vital to the movement than now. This is the hallmark of every organisation, anywhere in the world, that undertakes to fight oppression.

And yet a wrong impression was created. Perhaps a more detailed perusal of the article would suggest where you erred; but the fault is not in what was said, but in what was left unsaid.

You are convinced that 'to persist with 1952 tactics' would be disastrous and that 'a plan not based upon emotional platform appeals and heroic gestures (as if this is all that the Defiance Campaign involved—V.S.G.) but upon absolute efficiency, punctuality and scrupulous honesty be evolved. We are told that the tactics of 1952 are not applicable to 1959 because 'the mass political trial has become a familiar pattern of Government policy.'

Continued on page 24)

THE "BANTUSTAN" FRAUD

"The bluff of giving these people (the Africans) political development and in reality taking it away, is not only deluding the White people of South Africa that there is a solution, but is angering immeasurably the Africans both within the Union and outside."

Mr. W. P. Stanford, in the House of Assembly
(Reported in "Contact", February 21, 1959).

For many years the Government of the Union of South Africa has been acting and behaving as if the changes which are going ahead so rapidly up North did not exist, or at any rate as if they did not affect this country at all. In fact the Government has been trying feverishly to put back the clock, to reverse here the currents which are flowing so strongly elsewhere, to destroy every vestige of democratic rights and freedom which might have existed in South Africa.

All of a sudden the leaders of the Nationalist Party seem to have realised that we are living in Africa, in 1959, and that they can no longer close their eyes to the tremendous spectacle of a whole continent undergoing a vast birth of freedom.

During their Dingaan's Day speeches at the end of 1958, Nationalist leaders seemed in a state of utter panic. They went about stirring up a "backs to the wall" spirit, warning their followers of terrible dangers, instilling the "Laager Mentality" to the best of their ability. Their theme-song was "White Civilisation is in Danger."

But by the time that they assembled in Parliament in January the Nationalists had thought over the sterility and hopelessness of any such approach, and changed their tune accordingly. Dr. Verwoerd announced himself to a startled world as the liberator of the African peoples in the Union. He and his party were going to lead Africans towards self-government and independence.

When it came to the actual details of what the Government was going to do, however, it was found that Dr. Verwoerd was merely presenting the old well-hated policy of apartheid in a new guise. The "Autonomous Bantu Areas" he is talking about are simply the old Reserves — overcrowded, eroded, starving, occupying just over ten per cent. of the Union (for eighty per cent. of the population).

And what does this "autonomy" amount to anyway? It simply means that the Chiefs are allowed to administer, under the supervision of the BAD, the laws of the Union of South Africa, passed by our All-White Parliament. The Chiefs are not elected by or responsible to their people. They are

responsible to the Bantu Administration Department. If they do not behave as the BAD wants them to then they get the sack, like any other Government employee.

Dr. Verwoerd is supposed to be an intelligent man. Surely he is capable of realising that no one in Africa or anywhere else in the world is going to be deceived by this stale, watered-down version of the Tomlinson Report,

which was itself utterly condemned and rejected by every African leader of any consequence at the IDAMF-convened conference in Bloemfontein two years ago. It is an insult to the intelligence of the public to expect that any but the greatest simpletons and political infants will accept this wretched scheme as a contribution to African self-development. We do not know what to be the more amazed at — Dr. Verwoerd's audacity in presenting the scheme as being in line with developments in the rest of the Continent; the miserly contribution of £500,000 to the "Bantu Development Corporation" with which Verwoerd seems to imagine he can bribe the whole African nation; or the incredible depths to which certain jackal-like members of the United Party were prepared to sink in accusing the Nationalists of having become kafferboeties.

The Nationalist Party will have to do a great deal better than that if it seriously seeks to come to terms with the African people. Certain Nationalist professors have recently been throwing out feelers towards "negotiations" with African leaders. We welcome this glimmering of sanity, and no one could object to talks between people of different viewpoints if that will help them better to understand one another's views.

THE STARTING POINT

At the same time, certain fundamental facts ought to be clearly understood by the Nationalists, whether of the Verwoerd wing or the allegedly "liberal" group of SABRA, by the United Party, and indeed by everyone else who is seriously concerned with the peaceful solution of the problems of our country.

Firstly, and most importantly, White South Africa must get it firmly and clearly fixed in its head that no plan or scheme whatsoever decided and dictated by the present exclusive electorate alone will ever be voluntarily accepted by the African people, or by any self-respecting and representative spokesmen of theirs. This basic and elementary concept, without which there can be no serious thought or discussion about "negotiations" or "peaceful solutions", seems to be the most difficult to get any sizeable group of White South Africans to understand and accept. The Nationalists, even while Dr. Verwoerd announces the awakening of the African giant, go on talking nonsense about "White baasskap"; the United Party seems to have got itself into a state of drivelling impotence where it is unable to do any serious thinking at all, but keeps mumbling "White leader-

ship" in its sleep; even the Liberal Party — though it has come a long way in the last few years — still argues in its sillier moments as to whether "we" should or should not "give" an unqualified franchise to the non-Whites.

Yet, this is not a very difficult proposition to explain and to grasp. No people on earth could agree to have their future decided for them by others; it runs counter to the principles of self-determination and natural justice. One-sided solutions cannot be negotiated, they can only be imposed by force, and maintained by force. Such solutions can never be "peaceful" or stable: they will be met by those upon whom they are imposed either by sullen submission, for the time being, to superior force, or if they get the chance, by active revolt. These are the simple truths which, if they would only open their eyes and use their intelligence, our rulers would see have faced every ruling Power in Asia and Africa over the past ten years; we can think of no reason why they should imagine they should not apply in this country as well.

Moreover, in stipulating that the White minority alone should be the sole deciding factor in determining the future of our country, the exponents of "White leadership" are overlooking the fact that this minority is vitally interested in preserving and even extending the privileges and vested interests which it has hitherto usurped. It is a well-known principle that you cannot make a man a judge in his own case. If you do so, you cannot expect a fair judgment, unless you presuppose in the judge superhuman qualities of generosity, nobility and self-denial. Such qualities can hardly be ascribed to the electorate of the Union of South Africa. We of LIBERATION are no racialists. We do not believe that any national group is inherently evil or inferior. We can understand the historical factors — complex, but not unique by any means — which have led this electorate to think and behave in the way it does. And we pay unstinting tribute to that minority of South Africans of European descent which has always existed and which has the courage to stand up, whether from humanitarian, Christian or Socialist principle, for right and justice for all, irrespective of colour.

LOOK AT THE RECORD

All the same, when European spokesmen, be they salesmen of the B.A.D., SABRA Professors, or well-meaning liberals try to convince African leaders that they should place their trust in the verdict of the White electorate, in its justice, fairness and generosity, then we must look to the record of this electorate. Look at the Native Land Acts which have robbed the Africans of all but a fraction of their land. Look at the Group Areas laws and regulations, which seek to deprive Africans, Indians and Coloured people of the little they have managed to possess. Look at the innumerable colour bars, of laws and customs, culminating in the incredible "job reservation", designed to preserve for Whites only every educational or occupa-

tional opportunity above the level of "unskilled" drudgery. Look at the one and a half million pass arrests each year. Look at the disgracefully low wages paid by European employers to non-European workers, and at the vicious laws to prevent Africans organising or striking. All these things have been done by successive governments elected by this same electorate, each one worse than its predecessor, each more callously disrespectful of the rights, needs and interests of the non-White majority, more blatantly greedy, selfish and unscrupulous. The SABRA Professors may tell the Congress leaders that they, personally, have undergone a change of heart, and Mr. Justice Claasen may publicly apologise to the Basuto nation for the past wrongs he has done them. But who speaks for the White electorate: they — or Dr. Verwoerd and Sir de Villiers Graaff?

We raise these questions now, not because we doubt the bona fides of those who talk of negotiations, or because we reject the possibility of peaceful solutions in South Africa. On the contrary. We accept that the Professors are sincere, and think that are a good deal more far-sighted than most of their colleagues. And we would infinitely prefer to see the inevitable transition to a free South Africa come about by peaceful agreement, than through bloodshed, bitterness and hatred. But — and we cannot emphasise this too strongly — the first, most essential step towards a peaceful transition is an understanding and acceptance by the White minority that it cannot hope to decide the future of our country by itself, and that any attempt to do so must inevitably lead to a clash which must be disastrous and may be suicidal for itself.

Let us, by way of illustration, take the question of "apartheid," the whole concept of which is the subject of Dr. Simons' devastating and scholarly analysis beginning in this issue. Now, as he points out, if it means anything beyond a mere election catchword, apartheid must in the last analysis be a scheme or plan for the partition of the country into separate independent States, each inhabited by a national group. We are by no means in favour of any such plan, we should add, and doubt very much whether anyone outside SABRA really takes it seriously. But — and this is the point — no such plan could possibly succeed unless it was agreed to and endorsed by all sections of the South African population, or by their mandated and elected representatives meeting on a basis of full equality in a National Convention or Constituent Assembly. Otherwise — who is to draw the boundaries? Who is to say that the great industries and sea-ports and cities of this land, built up, let us remember, by the skill and the hard, tireless labour of all our people, should henceforth become the exclusive preserve of this or that national group?

Let us suppose that, on behalf of the present electorate, Dr. Verwoerd undertakes the task, and that with characteristic magnanimity he assigns to "the Bantu" the various barren, eroded Reserves scattered about the country as their "national homes." In the "White State", the Africans from these areas will be treated as foreigners. But each "Bantu State"

will be like a little Ghana, enjoying full independence, including its own Government, army and air force. Now, how secure do you think Dr. Verwoerd will feel, sitting with his followers in the nine-tenths of the country they have allocated to themselves, while across the boundaries, in the outer darkness to which, without their consent, they have been consigned, millions of Africans look across to see the wealth they have created and the green pastures of their forefathers? The whole idea merely needs to be expounded to appear as what it is: a grotesque, fantastic nightmare, the product of a sick brain.

TIME TO AWAKE

We do not think Dr. Verwoerd himself believes this nonsense. He cannot, either, seriously believe that this "Bantustan" fraud will deceive public opinion north of the Limpopo or anywhere else abroad. Nor, unless he is madder than we think, and mistakes the plaudits of his paid clique in the Bantu Administration Department for genuine expressions of African opinion, can he imagine that any non-Whites take his talk of independence seriously. Why, then, does he bother with this talk at all? Whom does he hope to impress?

The answer was given, in a phrase of fine penetration, by Mr. Stanford, the Liberal Party M.P., in Parliament. "The bluff is . . . deluding the White people of South Africa." And there is the true wickedness, the real treachery of men like Verwoerd and Graaff. The whole future of the White minority, for whom they claim to speak, depends on its facing the truth; on its abandoning the absurd illusion (which manifestly flies in the face of every present reality) that it can continue alone to dominate and dictate the future of this country. Instead of summoning the courage and the responsibility to express this truth, these men are wilfully and recklessly encouraging their people in their suicidal delusions.

What they are failing, so lamentably, to do must be undertaken by others. Let the SABRA Professors, if they are in earnest, go out among the Afrikaans-speaking people and jolt them into reality. Let the progressive newspaper editors, the public-spirited Churchmen, the courageous women of the Black Sash, the leaders of the Congress of Democrats, the Liberal Party and the Labour Party sink their differences and go out on a powerful and united crusade for democracy, freedom and a halt to apartheid. Let the African National Congress and the Congress of Trade Unions and their partners in struggle launch out in a great new campaign of massive political action, a campaign that will make it clear beyond doubt that the people are determined upon change.

Thus, and only thus, can the democratic forces of our country hold open the road to a peaceful transition to freedom, and wrest the initiative from those who are steering straight towards disaster.

MASS ARRESTS AND MASS TRIALS

by AN ADVOCATE

MASS arrests have become traditional in our country. In 1956, 1,760,237 Africans were convicted of petty statutory offences, the majority of which included contraventions of the pass and curfew laws. The total number of arrests is much higher than this. About 200,000 had the good fortune to be acquitted and an unknown number vanished between the charge office and the courts because they were given Hobson's choice, either to appear in court or to undertake farm labour. It is therefore no exaggeration to say that annually one-fifth of the African people are arrested for crimes which are peculiarly South African. The processions of manacled men; the congested charge offices; the overworked court officials and superficial trials are features of these mass arrests.

An analysis of the evils of this irritating practice of arresting Africans for petty offences has been the subject of Government Commissions and numerous articles and need not be repeated here. Two aspects, however require consideration. Firstly, what is the purpose of this obnoxious practice? And secondly, what are its effects on the courts and the right of the accused to a proper defence?

These mass arrests are the government's reply to the revolt of the Africans against the feudal labour conditions which prevail on the farms. The dragnet is an attempt to prevent Africans from escaping from farm labour to comparatively better conditions in the urban areas. There is very little which distinguishes these raids and arrests from the barbaric practice of raiding primitive communities for slaves. The purpose is the same: to satisfy the greed for cheap labour, of a heartless, selfish, and mean farming class. A large proportion of those who are convicted and cannot pay their fines end up in the 30-odd farm prisons which have been erected by Farmers' Associations with the blessings of the government. The official Year Book states that:—

"With this system the department achieves three objectives: Firstly, the employment of non-White prisoners in congenial (!) occupation; secondly, relieving the congestion in its larger urban prisons and gaols, and thirdly, removing the native from the environment which led to his downfall."

The Department has been so successful in its objectives that the number of farm prisons have doubled over the last four years, and its coffers have been swelled by a handsome income of £400,000 per year.

Mass arrests have corroded the judicial process. When the courts have to deal with an unending stream of accused every day, it is not surprising that justice tends to be administered with feverish impatience. The 'trial' of the accused is reduced to neat snappy formulae, which are exchanges between the prosecutor, the magistrate, and the accused. The charge is recited — the accused pleads guilty — the magistrate asks him if he has anything to say — whilst he is saying it the magistrate completes his entries — then comes the standard sentence.

These courts believe in brevity and economy of words from the accused. If the accused pleads not guilty, he upsets the routine, and the prosecutor invariably asks for a remand, to search for the policeman who arrested the accused. This might mean a few more days in prison for the recalcitrant accused. Later he might be recalled by the prosecutor and asked if he still persisted in his plea, by this time of course, the prospect of spending a number of fruitless days in jail might have made him more co-operative, and he changes his plea to allow the routine to take its course.

So alien are the normal practices of justice becoming in these courts, that the appearance of a lawyer to defend an accused is regarded as an attempt to waste time and an interference with smooth routine. Usually the prosecutors are keen to get rid of properly defended cases by withdrawing against the accused. These mass arrests have imposed upon some of the courts, a style of work, and a duty which is foreign to them, the duty of becoming the administrative machines of fascist labour schemes.

In any other country, these huge figures of people arrested, the abuse by the government of those convicted, would be sufficient to create an outcry, loud enough to require the government to make radical changes, or suffer at the polls for not doing so. Not so in South Africa. These figures are vote-catchers and demonstrate the efficiency of the Government.

ARRESTS FOR STRIKES

Since 1953, new forms of mass arrests have emerged and share the cloak of tradition. The Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act prohibits strikes by African workers, and it ushered in a period of mass arrests and mass trials of workers. The statistics of these trials are not easy to find, but according to the Annual Survey of the Institute of Race Relations, in 1956 there were 21 trials in which strikers were prosecuted and in 16 cases, 524 Africans were convicted. In 1957, there were 20 trials involving 539 workers. The following figures will give an indication of the sizes of mass trials in some of these industrial cases:

- 1956 — 30 workers from a factory, Peanut Products.
 - 2,000 workers from Amato Textile.
 - 28 workers, Bus drivers and Conductors.
 - 50 workers from African Lamps.
- 1957 — 65 workers from West Rand Dry Cleaning.
 - 60 workers from Lecol Products.

1959 — 212 mine workers in Ventersburg.

289 workers employed by H. Jones (Canning).

This is by no means an exhaustive list. The Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act has a clear purpose, to outlaw collective bargaining and to strangle and destroy Trade Unions among African workers. It is designed to render the worker defenceless against exploitation and dependent upon the "benevolent" intercession of Government arbitration. The Act is an adaptation of fascist and nazi forms of control over the workers. The trials are a means of persecuting and intimidating the workers to make them accept this fascist relationship between employer and employee.

POLITICAL TRIALS

The technique of mass trials is also being employed to stifle political resistance in the country. The Treason Trial in which 156 persons were arrested has received so much publicity that it is not necessary to deal with it in detail. But it is not the only mass political trial.

In the last few years there is no government scheme which has been so vigorously opposed as the extension of the pass laws to women. The history of that scheme is full of the heroic demonstrations, processions and other forms of protests by women particularly those in the rural areas. Many of these demonstrations took place despite the presence of a large number of well-armed police. The Nationalists were shaken by the growing resistance of a group which they had regarded as docile. The government then decided to smash this resistance. The following indicate the places where demonstrations were held and the mass arrests which followed:—

LICHTENBURG: During November 1956, 1,000 women protested against passes — 15 alleged leaders were and arrested and tried.

STANDERTON: July, 1957 on the day of the issue of reference books 914 women marched to interview the Mayor, they were arrested and appeared in court in groups of 39.

BALFOUR: Reference books were destroyed in July, 1957 and a number of women were arrested and tried.

ZEERUST:

Linokana: Reference books were destroyed and a large number of women arrested.

Gopane: Reference books were destroyed and 266 women were arrested.

Witkleigat and Motsoedi: Reference books were destroyed and 30 women were found guilty.

In addition to these arrests at Zeerust there were some 200 men and women who were charged with various offences arising from disturbances which occurred as a result of the tension created by the issue of reference books in the Reserve.

These all awaited trial in the Supreme Court and some had to wait as long as 10 months in prison before they were ultimately brought to trial in groups varying from 5 to about 45.

In Johannesburg in November, 1958 the government began to issue passes to women. Demonstrations took place as a result of which some 2,000 women were arrested in batches ranging from 50 to 650. The women were brought to trial in various batches.

Apart from the struggle of the women against the passes, two other issues have given rise to mass trials. The one was the stay-at-home which was organised during election week in 1958, and the other is the imposition of the Bantu Authorities Act and the resultant resistance of the Bapedi in Sekhukhuniland. In regard to the first, after the stay-at-home over 40 men and women were charged in Johannesburg with inciting workers to strike illegally. In this trial a new feature was revealed: the citing of numerous "co-conspirators" against the accused for whose actions and utterances the accused were held responsible.

In Sekhukhuniland 289 men and women are awaiting trial on capital offences for disturbances which arose from tensions created by the attempt to impose Bantu Authorities.

Mass arrests and summary trials for pass, poll tax and similar petty offences have long been a familiar feature of the South African scene, but these new big industrial and political trials are not. They represent the Nationalist Government's attempt to suppress the mounting resistance of the people to its intolerable practices and laws.

They also represent a major challenge to the great majority of the South African people of all races who reject and despise the despotic outlook and practices of the Government. The mass political trial can be a terrible weapon in the hands of the government to stifle and suppress any criticism or protest. Irrespective of whether he is guilty of breaking any law or not, and indeed while he is still presumed in theory to be innocent, an arrested person is subjected from the moment of his arrest to heavy penalties and disabilities. He is removed, even while awaiting trial (and as we have seen this can be as long as a year) from his family and his employment. Unless bail can be secured, this can mean ruin and starvation for his dependants. To pay for adequate legal defence is usually far beyond the means of those being accused in this sort of trial, workers and peasants. If heavy fines are imposed, as they often are, this can mean that the victim, unable to pay, may spend years in jail and emerge a broken man.

It is clear therefore that the friends of South African freedom, both in this country and abroad, have a responsibility towards those who are accused in this type of case. In the treason trial, the tremendous publicity which attended the arrests and proceedings resulted in an inspiring response to the appeal for financial assistance, an act of solidarity and human sympathy which will never be forgotten by the national liberation movement and the people of the country. Unfortunately this has not always been the case.

ZEERUST TRIALS

It must be admitted that in some cases the public has not carried its full share of this responsibility. In the Zeerust trials for instance a little more could have been done to save those courageous peasants from waiting in prison for 10 months. During the trial itself the question arose of bringing more than 40 witnesses for the defence a hundred miles from Zeerust to the Rustenburg court, finding suitable accommodation for them, and feeding them. This "social welfare" task became the personal responsibility of the lawyers. The witnesses had to survive on a 25 lbs. bag of mealie meal and a few cabbages and loaves of bread for three days. They were at the trial for about a fortnight. They accepted these conditions with very few complaints.

In one case 43 accused were charged and the preparatory examination record of some 600 pages could not be purchased by the defence for the purposes of trial because they could not afford it. Fortunately, in that case two copies were obtained because the same record was necessary in another case in which counsel appeared pro deo. Were it not for this coincidence, the defence would have had to be conducted without a record. There are a few Zeerust trials in which appeals have been noted but it became impossible to prosecute them because the defence could not afford the record.

I refer to the problems of the Zeerust cases because these are going to be the problems in the multiplicity of mass trials which will confront the National organisations and their well-wishers as well as the resistance against the Nationalists mounts. Let me list some of them:—

- (1) Securing for the accused adequate defence in what are usually lengthy and complicated proceedings.
- (2) Securing bail for all or some of the accused and social welfare for the dependants of the accused.
- (3) Securing the attendance of witnesses from distant parts of the country, accommodating them, feeding them, and organising the social welfare of the dependants of the witnesses during their absence.
- (4) At the end of the trial, purchasing a record for the purposes of appeal.
- (5) Paying the fines if any are imposed.
- (6) Finding employment for the accused after the trial.

It may seem to some readers that it is not the function of the national liberatory movement to assume the responsibility for all these items. Our real task, they may say, is to build up the mass resistance movement to such a formidable degree as to make it impossible for any government to rule by such undemocratic measures as the mass political trial. In any case, they add, the task is far beyond our small financial resources, and any attempt to meet it would merely impose a crippling burden upon us.

There is a measure of truth in such arguments, but it is not the whole truth. Even if we cannot afford to pay bails and fines, the very minimum necessity is to see to it that wherever possible legal defence is secured

for the accused. Apart from the principle that an accused man is entitled to adequate defence, the very appearance of a lawyer in such cases has the immediate effect of raising the morale of those charged, and showing them that others outside their local area stand shoulder to shoulder with them.

As for the question of where the money is going to come from, the treason trial defence fund has shown that there is an enormous reserve of goodwill and solidarity for the victims of apartheid in South Africa. The extension of the magnificent spontaneous organisation that sprang up over this case, to cover the whole field of the defence of civil liberties, should be seriously considered. The national organisations cannot and must not stand aside from this task, for it is a part of their whole struggle for freedom, equality and justice in this country.

Mass trials have their problems, just as Hitler's mass executions of resistance workers had their problem. These problems are big problems because they are the problems created by popular resistance in a fascist country. The growth of mass trials is an admission by the Nationalists of the fact that their regime is hated, bitterly hated, by the workers in the cities, and the peasants in the countryside. These mass trials are a desperate attempt by the Nationalists to extinguish the fires of resistance which are beginning to burn in all parts of South Africa.

It is an attempt which must fail. Experience in other countries has proved that this sort of persecution does not crush the spirit of the people: it steels and fortifies them, and unites them in resistance to the oppressor.

W A N T E D

You want **LIBERATION** to become a better and more effective journal. We want your help to make it so. We want :

- * **WRITERS:** Send us your ideas in the form of articles or material on which articles can be based;
- * **AGENTS** to sell **LIBERATION**. Write to us for details and terms;
- * **DONORS:** If you can't afford much yourself, what about having a social or jumble sale.
- * **SUBSCRIBERS:** For rates see inside front cover.

WHAT IS

APARTHEID?

by H. J. SIMONS

In this penetrating analysis — delivered recently as an address to the Studies Committee of the University of Cape Town — Dr. Simons has examined the various concepts of apartheid advanced by the exponents of that theory themselves.

THE word serves many purposes. It is used as a political slogan, a catch-word for voters. It purports to describe existing institutions and policies. It serves as a justification of policy. In addition, it describes an imaginary future society. A speaker who uses the term may reasonably be asked to explain his particular concept, and its relation to the other usages or meanings.

Ambiguity is also a quality of others words or phrases by which people have tried to express the nature of the relations between Africans and non-Africans, the actual content of the State's policy towards them, and the ultimate aims of that policy. The most familiar expressions are:

White supremacy (heerskappy), white domination (baasskap), the preservation of white civilisation, trusteeship, segregation, discrimination, differentiation, separate development, parallel development.

Much of the political history of the past half-century is wrapped up in these words. Each has undertones, acquired in the endless debate on our colour and class divisions. The shades of meaning that distinguish one from the other can be defined only by relating each to its appropriate historical setting.

They have, however, one element in common, and that is the denial, either as reality or ideal, of equality between the colour groups within a single social framework. Some expressions, such as trusteeship, differentiation, and parallel development, leave open the question whether inequality is to be a permanent condition, or whether it is to apply also to the relations between separated ethnic communities; but all assert or assume the supremacy of the white group within a common society.

Does Apartheid also assert inequality, as an ideal, in the existing society? Fortunately, the word begins with the letter A, and so finds a place in the published volumes of the great Afrikaanse Woordeboek. It is a long definition — probably the longest in the dictionary — and I shall quote only a part:

'n Staatskundige beleidsrigting in S.A., gegrond op die breë beginsels van

(a) differensiasie, ooreenkomstig verskille van ras en/of kleur en/of beskawingspeil, in teenstelling met ASSIMILASIE;

(b) die handhawing en bestendiging van die eiesoortigheid (identiteit) van die verskillende kleurgroepe wat die bevolking uitmaak en die aparte ontwikkeling van hierdie groepe volgens eie aard, tradisie en aanleg; in teenstelling met INTEGRASIE.

GEDEELTELIKE APARTHEID, apartheid slegs ten opsigte van sekere terreine, bv. op politieke, maatskaplike en kerklike gebied. ALGEHELE APARTHEID, die volledige, aparte ontwikkeling op al die verskillende terreine, bv. van die verskillende Bantoegroepe.

Die regering pas 'n beleid van apartheid toe ten opsigte van blankes, Kleurlinge, Asiate en naturelle. Die oorweldigende meerderheid van die blanke bevolking begeer apartheid (Eiselen). Apartheid beteken eenvoudig dat elke mens sy eie plek moet hê (H. F. Verwoerd).

The definition is conspicuously silent as to the nature of the relations between the colour groups. They are to be separated; that is made clear. But are they to be separate and equal? The issue is raised, by implication, in Dr. Verwoerd's statement. For 'place' may mean a point in space, such as that occupied by a social unit in an autonomous region. Or, it may mean a status within a hierarchical order. Reserving this aspect for later consideration, I shall concentrate on the notion of separation in terms of geographical, as distinct from social, space.

The origin of the idea of physical separation must be looked for in contributions made by English-speaking South Africans, most of whom would be called 'Liberals' today. It was foreshadowed, though only crudely and partially, in the report of the S.A. Native Commission of 1903-5, which was given the task of working out the principles of a uniform policy in preparation for unification. The Commission urged a system of land reservation for Africans, for if they were scattered throughout the White population, and owned 'the land of the country equally with them', many administrative and social difficulties would be created, 'feelings of race prejudice and animosity' would be accentuated, and it would be 'far more difficult to preserve the absolutely necessary political and social distinctions' (para. 192).

These recommendations were put into effect by the Botha-Smuts ministry in the Native Land Act of 1913.

A theory of separate development was more systematically elaborated by Maurice Evans, a prominent Natalian, in his book *Black and White in South East Africa*, published in 1910. He rejected the idea of the 'absolute segregation of every black man on one side of a given line, and every white man on the other' (p. 275). Instead, he proposed three 'fundamental principles':

1. The white man must govern.
2. Parliament should delegate the 'administration of native affairs to a permanent council of experts, combining the functions of the Native Affairs Commission, which was set up under the Native Affairs Act of 1920, and the African Advisory Board of the Rhodesia-Nyasaland Federation.
3. The 'separation of the races as far as possible' so as 'to prevent race deterioration, to preserve race integrity, and to give to both opportunity to build up and develop their race life' (p. 310).

Segregation was put into operation in the towns by the Natives (Urban Areas) Act of 1923. This was introduced by the Smuts government, and embodies a principle formulated by a Commission on Local Government in the Transvaal. Its Chairman was Stallard, later leader of the pro-British Dominion party. The Stallard Commission said that, "The Native should only be allowed to enter urban areas, which are essentially the white man's creation, when he is willing to enter and to minister to the needs of the white man, and should depart therefrom when he ceases so to minister."

General Hertzog, when he took office in 1924, raised the edifice of segregation, which had been laid by his predecessors to a higher level. In this work he was influenced by the views of Evans and another English-speaking liberal, Edgar Brookes, then a young professor in public administration in Pretoria and the author of *The History of Native Policy in South Africa*. Brookes, like Evans, renounced 'complete, immediate and compulsory segregation'. A 'certain type of politician' who advocated it was either a fool or a knave, and a great hindrance to progress, for he drew attention away from detailed and urgent problems to the contemplation of a Fool's Paradise. Differentiation, he said, was the way out between the Scylla of identity and the Charybdis of subordination (p. 344-497).

Segregation had become, by this time, the official designation of the State's policy. As Brookes's caustic reference to 'a certain type of politician' shows, the concept was being used by party speakers to describe 'total' separation, as well as 'differentiation' or outright discrimination. A still-born 'Republican Party' issued a draft constitution in 1932, which urged 'segregation of the Native, socially, political, industrially, and as far as possible, territorially'. It also asserted that the incorporation of the

High Commission Territories into the Union was essential for a 'final solution' (The Star, Sept. 2, 1932).

A more emphatic assertion of 'total' segregation appeared in the Labour Party's election manifesto of 1938. It proposed the 'complete segregation' of Africans from Europeans, territorially, socially and economically, by setting aside and providing a portion of the country in which the African population could 'develop along its own lines' with all necessary advice and assistance. (Forward, April 14, 1938).

The other parties of 'white supremacy' were more restrained. The Hertzog-Smuts formula, adopted by the United Party at its inaugural conference on Dec. 5, 1934, proclaimed 'as paramount the essentials of European civilisation', and the 'recognition of the Natives as a permanent portion of the population of S.A. under the Christian trusteeship of the European race', 'together with the definite avoidance of race intermixture'. (Native and Coloured People's Policy of the U.P.) This formula closely resembled the principle adopted by the National Party when it was founded in 1914: 'the supremacy (oorheersing) of European civilisation in a spirit of Christian trusteeship, with strict disapproval (wraeking) of every attempt at race intermixture'. The Party's election manifesto of 1938 elaborated its policy for 'the application of the principle of segregation' by undertaking to introduce legislation for:

1. separate (aparte) residential areas, trade unions and, where practicable, separate places of work;
1. reservation of jobs in defined spheres for white labour and/or a specified and equitable quota for whites and non-whites;
3. separate (aparte) representation in legislative bodies for the Cape Coloured voters;
4. extension of the Immorality Act of 1917 to all non-whites, the prohibition of mixed marriages, and a ban on the employment of whites by non-whites.

This is the programme that the present Government has been implementing since it took office in 1948, under the name of Apartheid. It did not envisage total separation, nor was this aim asserted by the Party's Union-wide congress in 1938, which it regards as one of the most important in its history. In his address to the Congress, Dr. Malan spoke of the determination to keep S.A. a 'white man's country', and outlined the threats to this ideal coming from population growth, the spread of education, communism, liberalism, foreign churches, imperialism, the idea of equality, and, behind that, the mighty and ever-growing power of international Jewry. The resolution adopted by Congress merely reiterated, however, the principle of White supremacy in the spirit of trusteeship, preservation of race purity, and the creation of a healthy relationship between white and non-white races. (Die Groot Beslissing, 1938, p. 5).

A direct outcome of the Congress was the presenting to Parliament of a petition signed by 230,619 White adults, and affirming the principle of white supremacy in the spirit of trusteeship, by means of legislation to, inter alia, prohibit mixed marriages, the 'mixing of blood' (bloedvermenging), and mixed residential areas (deurmekaarwonery), and bring about economic as well as political segregation. (J. J. van Rooyen, *Die Nasionale Party*, p. 265).

What the petitioners demanded was, in effect, an extension of laws already on the statute book, such as the Native Land Act, Native (Urban Areas) Act, Immorality Act, Mines and Works Act, and Representation of Natives Act, to all colour groups.

The growth of racial intolerance was reviewed by a liberal philosopher, Alfred Hoernlé, in the Phelps-Stokes lectures, delivered before this University in 1939. The 'fundamental fact' in S.A., he said, was the domination of Whites over Blacks; the 'deepest aim' of the State's policy was to maintain this domination (p. 1). Trusteeship might be permanent, as an aspect of permanent domination. Or it might aim at common citizenship and total assimilation. This was compatible with 19th century liberalism, but 'must be ruled out as impracticable in the present state of racial feeling.' Thirdly, trusteeship might prepare the wards for independence in their own self-governing communities (p. 99). Considering all the possibilities, he felt that 'Total Separation should be the liberal's choice', because it was the choice most acceptable to 'those sections of White South Africa which are anxious to justify White domination by genuine concern for the welfare of the dominated non-White groups' (p. 181). As for the Africans, 'it should be clear that there is no escape from White domination by way of Parallelism or Assimilation, but only by way of Total Separation' (p. 183, *S.A. Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit*.)

This was not a new thought, but if anyone has a claim to the invention of Apartheid, it is Hoernlé, and this for two reasons. Firstly, he deliberately chose 'separation' (which in Afrikaans is apartheid) as a substitute for 'segregation',

'because "Segregation" stands for a policy offensive to all non-Europeans in S.A., viz., for a policy of exclusion, forced upon them by the White group, from the status and privileges which the White group insists upon reserving for itself. This is segregation as an instrument of domination; segregation which retains the segregated in the same social and political structure with the dominant White group, but subjects them to the denial of important rights and keeps them at a social distance implying inferiority.

'By "Separation", on the other hand, is meant literally a sundering or dissociation so complete as to destroy the very possibility of effective domination' (p. 168).

Secondly, Hoernlé pointed out the way to be followed by those who, while adhering to the doctrine of White supremacy, recognised the injustice and impermanence of White domination.

'And that section of White public opinion which is thinking along the lines of "territorial segregation", is, as we have seen, moving in the same direction and would, if it pursued its line of thought to its logical end, arrive at a policy of Total Separation as the one way of freeing Whites and Blacks from an entanglement with each other which is bad for both, but worse for the non-Whites. Separate areas of liberty for separate racial groups seem the only alternative to domination in a racial-caste society' (p. 183).

This conclusion was vitiated, however, and, therefore, also the whole chain of reasoning that led to it, by the further assertion that Total Separation was a chimera.

'As hard-headed realists, we must confess to ourselves that Total Separation is as unrealisable in practice as are its alternatives'. 'No new order of race relations is possible in S.A., except on the initiative and with the consent of the White group; and the White group as a whole cannot be conceived as agreeing of its own motion to the sacrifices of power, prestige, and, not least, of economic advantage and convenience, which would be involved in Total Separation' (p. 183).

The assertion that significant changes cannot be made 'except on the initiative and with the consent of the White group' will be more widely disputed today than it was 20 years ago. If the premise is accepted, however, what do we have? The reality of white domination, which is unacceptable; and two alternatives, which are impracticable: Equality within a single socio-political order, or Total Separation.

The situation is worse than a dilemma; it is a nightmare. On this plane of reasoning, the claim to Equality is not less valid than the demand for Total Apartheid. Indeed, if the common society is to be permanent, Equality, however unrealisable, is the only goal for the liberal and socialist, the two champions of equality in the modern state. Hoernlé's conclusion should have led him to retrace the argument, and end with a plea for a crusade for equality. Men do not campaign for the unattainable, however, and the adoption of equality as the only satisfactory solution would have ended in an assertion that it was practicable as well as desirable.

The upholder of white supremacy could not and would not accept this conclusion. The only alternative for him was to embrace the other, equally impracticable, objective of Total Separation. This is what actually happened. The racist took over the concept of Separation from the liberal, translated it into Afrikaans as Apartheid, and turned it into a slogan of action.

(The second part of this article will appear in our next issue.)

THE FORMATION OF NATIONS: II

by I. POTHEKIN

In the first part of this article ('LIBERATION' No. 34) Professor Pothekin discussed the development of African societies from tribes to nations. He described an intervening stage, in which communities have ceased to be tribes but not yet become nations. Such a community he terms, using the Russian word, a "narodnost"

I WILL now look at the methodology of the investigation of this process which I used as a guide in my work.

The first criterion of a nation is a common territory. That is why a study must start by working out the frontiers of the territory of the emergent nation, which must itself be based on the linguistic classification of the peoples. Here we find an obstacle that is difficult to overcome because there is not yet any unified and universally recognised classification of African languages. Each linguist puts forward his own classification, and I rather think that each seeks to outdo the other in producing a classification as complicated and imposing as possible. Johnston estimates that there are 226 Bantu languages; Van Bulk discovered 518 in the Belgian Congo alone, and it is further estimated that there are 700 or even 800 in the Sudan.

The linguistic map of Africa bears thousands of names indicating different languages. I am not a linguist but an historian, sociologist and anthropologist. It is difficult for me to criticise existing language classifications. I would, however, assure you that the real linguistic map of Africa is simpler than the linguists have tried to suggest. It is true that the linguistic divisions are a fact, and one which no scholar can deny or ignore since it is an irrefutable proof that for most of Africa neither nations nor narodnosts have yet emerged. The linguistic divisions reflect the tribal divisions of the people.

However I am equally certain that the picture of linguistics divisions given by the language specialist derives from their conventional linguistic approach to the work of classifying languages and their ignorance from the historic point of view. The development of languages follows the evolution of the tribal languages, then those of the narodnost and finally of the national languages. At a particular historical stage in the evolution of society the tribal languages become territorial dialects of the language of a particular narodnost, which later becomes the language of a nation.

I don't think that the linguists take this important transformation sufficiently into account and continue to consider tribal and territorial dialects as independent languages.

At all events the assistance of linguists is essential in working out the territorial community of the nation. We can say here in general that any serious study of the formation of nations requires the co-operation of various specialists — historians, ethnographers, linguists and economists.

A further difficulty in defining the territorial community of a nation is that colonial frontiers do not correspond to ethnic frontiers. Many peoples, speaking the same language or languages so similar to each other that they can be considered as dialects, are cut in two by colonial frontiers, and different groups of the same people can be found in different colonies. This artificial division of the colonial frontiers is an especially great obstacle in the way of nations in formation, and especially in the case of neighbouring colonies belonging to different countries pursuing a different policy concerning the development of language and of culture. The most striking example is probably that of the Somalis who live in Somaliland under Italian, French or British domination or in that part which is included in Ethiopia. It is obvious that such a people cannot form a nation as long as the colonial frontiers which cut them into several pieces remain. The fact must not be excluded that the prolonged existence of such frontiers can divide a people into several related nations, i.e. separate nations can emerge in each portion formed by these frontiers. The history of mankind gives examples of a narodnost divided into several nations by reason of peculiar conditions. My own country is one. A long time ago, between the eighth and twelfth centuries approximately, there was a single old Russian narodnost with a common territory, language and culture. Later, different conditions determined by history and external factors in particular saw it divided into three parts, from which emerged three nations: Russia, Byelorussia and the Ukraine. Now each has its own national state.

There is another question in connection with the determination of a common territory. Following their policy of indirect government, the colonial powers keep the divisions into kingdoms, sultanates and chiefdoms. This is a particular form of feudal division which does not divide the common territory as it does not hamper the popular relations or the moving of people from a kingdom or sultanate to another. However, it prevents other criteria of the nation from maturing, and as a result is an obstacle to its formation.

A COMMON LITERARY LANGUAGE

Another characteristic of the nation is the community of language, the existence of a common literary language.

The object of the study of these criteria is to find the lines following which the languages develop, their structure becomes simpler and the tribal languages become territorial dialects.

The language of a narodnost or national language comes into existence when one of the neighbouring tribal languages, for a number of reasons, succeeds in spreading more widely than the others, becoming an inter-tribal language which supplants displaced languages. Through its triumph over the other tongues, this language becomes the literary language.

The course taken by this process is, due to historical conditions, very long, and wholly new in the African countries.

The major obstacle in the path of the creation of a single national literary language derives from the fact that the "official" language of the country is the language of the metropolitan country, English, French etc., and not the vernacular tongue. This is the language used for communication between people of different tribes speaking various tribal languages. This is the language of all gatherings, newspapers, radio stations etc. Scientific and dictional works by African authors are written in this language. An African wishing to make his way in the world beyond the confines of his tribe must firstly know the official language.

There are a good number of other difficulties confronting the formation of a national language. One is the ignorance of the mass of the people and thus the absence of a need for a literary language. A further difficulty derives from the feudal divisions which I have described earlier based on tribal particularism, the rights of the oldest tribesmen, an excessive devotion to local factors and sometimes a suspicion of anything concerning other tribes.

All these reasons show that the diversity of languages is of no value, since it holds up the development of a single national language based on one of the tribal languages.

Can a metropolitan language become a national language? Theoretically one cannot exclude such a possibility. Several English- or French-speaking nations can emerge. This does not contradict the interpretation of the term nation which I have put forward. Every nation must have a language common to all its members, but there is no reason why every nation should speak a different language.

The theoretical possibility therefore exists of the African nations being formed on the basis of European languages. This is, however, no more than a possibility which can scarcely become a reality.

As I have already said language is the mirror of the soul of a people. It is only in his mother tongue that man can fully express his real self. Language is an aspect of the culture of each people. Even the most perfect translation is no more than an imperfect copy of the original.

It is quite natural that the people should zealously conserve the right to speak their mother tongue.

I have dealt so far with the difficulties in the way of the development of African languages. There are, however, numerous other circumstances which help this development. In the first place there is the growth of the

towns and the concentration therein of people belonging to many different tribes. A mass movement in search of urban employment influences the development of the languages by bringing them in contact and by mutually enriching their vocabulary and lessening the phonetic divergences.

In the last few years one has seen a growing interest amongst African intellectuals in linguistic problems. Associations for the development of African languages have been established. In some regions the question of standardising the writing of related languages has already been discussed. All this shows the extent of the national awareness, which reflects the objective process of national formation in the minds of the people.

COMMUNITY OF CULTURE

The third criterion of a nation is community of culture. The African peoples have created their own original culture for centuries — music and dance, songs and stories, sculpture and painting — their own clothes, buildings etc. The cultural heritage of past centuries is great and remarkable. This heritage represents a very rich store-house for the formation of national cultures.

Colonialisation has brought together in Africa two very different cultures — African culture and European culture. In some ways European culture was more advanced than the African. The Africans have assimilated something of this culture, and they should not reject the good elements which it contains.

However, this has come about in conditions wholly unfavourable to the development of African culture, which has been pushed into the background. Certain forms of African art and, in particular, certain artisan occupations have been forgotten and allowed to perish, while others have been adapted to European taste.

At the present time there are three different opinions amongst African intellectuals concerning the future paths of the development of African culture. Some would like to make European culture the basis of African national culture and forget the cultural heritage of the people. They describe themselves as progressive although to tell the truth I see nothing very progressive in it. Others would like to develop traditional African culture and assimilate nothing of European culture. This group calls itself traditionalist. Finally, the third group which describes itself as neo-traditionalist proposes to establish a national culture on the basis of a reasonable combination of elements from both African and European culture, taking the traditional African culture as a basis.

This reminds me of the controversy around the Russian national culture in the nineteenth century. One section of the Russian intelligentsia considered the original Russian culture as backward and almost barbarian—preferring even to speak French rather than Russian. They suggested imported Western culture and their representatives were called “zapadniki” (Westerners) as a result. Another part of the Russian intelligentsia praised everything which was originally Russian and Slav in general, in-

cluding the backward aspects of Russian culture of the time. They suggested closing the door against Western influence and constructing a wall separating the country from the rest of the world. This group called themselves the "Slavyonophiles". The Russian people did not take either of these two ways. It built its national culture on the basis of its cultural heritage, and took from the West what it considered worth while.

The national culture of the African peoples is developing in incomparably more difficult conditions, especially in the countries where a policy of artificial assimilation is in vogue. There the peoples have to defend their right to a free development of their culture.

Anyone studying the cultural community of a nation in formation encounters complex problems. Culture itself is a complex and many-sided phenomenon. It includes everything that is created by the hand of man as well as his brain. National culture includes many local characteristics. These local peculiarities exist even in the culture of old nations formed a long time ago. They have their origin in the local characteristics of the economic activities and the geographical situation and are therefore inevitable. It is natural they take an important place in the culture of nations in formation.

The tasks connected with the study of the process of formation of the cultural communities of the African nations are particularly complicated by reason of the specific conditions in which these nations are formed. The task of the scholar consists essentially in the necessity to isolate from the immense variety of forms taken by the culture of a particular people those which have already become the property of the whole people and which have lost their local character. This task includes determining what forms of the European cultures are already firmly rooted in the customs and awareness of the people, and which are only a temporary and superficial pastime of a part of the population.

Here I am touching on a critical question. Is it possible to speak of the existence of a national culture if there is no more or less developed literature in the national language and if there is not as yet any graphic art, music or professional theatre? I do not think that is possible. The absence of these expressions of culture shows that the national culture is not yet in existence. There is a popular culture and a folklore. There are the materials which will serve to build a national culture. But the culture itself does not yet exist.

Only literature (novels and poetry etc.) and its more or less wide popularity amongst the masses completes the process of formation of a national language as the main expression of the national culture. Only the creation of professional art gives the national culture its perfection of form, its specific colouring and its truly national characteristics. If we try to estimate the level of development of the African on this criterion, we will have to recognise that the national culture of a good many of the African peoples is still at a certain stage of its development in spite of all the richness of its cultural heritage.

THE ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Let us look now at the methodological considerations in connection with

the last criterion of the nation, the economic community. The economic community of a nation comes into existence at the same time as a national market makes its appearance; if there is no national market there is no nation. In consequence study of this criterion comes back to the study of the national market. It is a purely economic problem. The main conditions needed for the formation of a national market are the geographical division of labour and the existence of developed exchanges on a profit basis within a capitalist mode of production.

Even a superficial knowledge of the economy of the African countries will show the presence of these conditions although not everywhere developed to the same extent. For example, capitalist exchanges in the African world are still relatively few and in some regions are still only at their beginning.

To my knowledge it can be said that the question of the formation of the national market is still completely unexplored. I do not know of any books devoted to this question. We know what is produced and where it is produced. We know what products and in what quantities are exported abroad. We know fairly well the foreign economic bonds but we know nothing practically of internal economic exchanges. It is to be hoped that economists will eventually study these internal relations.

As sparse as our information may be we can say that most of the African countries have no national market as yet or at the most they are only beginning to have one. To determine the degree of development of the national market it is necessary first to find the answers to two questions: 1. What part of the production is sold, i.e. what part takes the form of productive links giving rise to profit? 2. What part goes to the internal market and what part is exported? The economists of U.N.O. have made approximate calculations for some countries and I will mention the book *The Enlargement of Exchange Economy in Tropical Africa*, 1957. From these calculations one can see that in certain countries a considerable part of production is already transformed into profit, but it is mainly exported abroad. This is one of the characteristics of colonial economy. The colonies have become suppliers of raw materials for the metropolitan countries. This fact holds back the formation of a national internal market and thus hinders the development of the process of the formation of a nation.

* * *

The formation of the nations is accompanied by the development of national consciousness of belonging to the same people, and an awareness of national interest. Where nations have already taken shape each person is aware of belonging to a nation and is proud of it. The feeling of national pride is one of the deepest human feelings; an insult to national dignity is always taken as a personal insult.

The study of the process of national formation should include the study of national consciousness. One should point out how the consciousness of belonging to a large ethnic community; how the people realise themselves to what nation and people they belong, how strong is the feeling of national dignity etc. But this is essentially a special and scientific problem which calls for special methods which I have no room to explain here.

(Letter to the Editor—continued from inside cover)

The fact is correct, but is the deduction?

Until an army in the field has been completely and utterly defeated, it does not break off contact with the enemy. Even whilst retreating it constantly harasses, snipes at and worries the superior forces, at the same time regrouping its own forces, preparing all the time to turn defence into attack, in addition to studying and surveying the terrain. Congress (I use the word to denote the movement as a whole) has suffered setbacks; but Congress has not been routed. Its influence today—an influence that extends to all sections of the population—is stronger and wider than it was in 1952.

Are not bannings, persecutions, the mass political trial, etc., the stock-in-trade of the ruling class, to be utilised whenever a determined challenge is launched against the status quo?

For the Government (the agent of the ruling class — let this not be lost sight of) — only the status quo is legal; are not all attempts to modify or reform, let alone transform, the status quo 'illegal', or as Strijdom declared, 'treasonable'?

If the Government fails to prove 'treason' in the Treason Trial, need we not expect Parliament to enact a new definition of the word?

Surely, this is one of the reasons why Parliamentary session after session passes new legislation and amendments to existing legislation?

Of course, the Government is out of step with the general interest; but how often and under what circumstances does the particular interest of the ruling class conform or coincide with the general interest of the community in a class-ridden society?

Surely it is because the dominant section of the ruling class' rise to and retention of power was based on and demands a rigid, doctrinaire fanaticism that no flexibility, or relief for the oppressed, can be expected from the Nationalists?

Is it not obvious therefore that only the further application and development of non-violent resistance can lead to Congress achieving liberation?

For years, 'work', 'efficiency', 'honesty', 'punctuality', and 'education' have been advocated as essential for the waging of a consistent and successful struggle, but never, until now, that is, has it even been suggested that 'mass action', as expressed and reflected in the forms of struggle adopted by the people — protests, boycotts, stay-at-homes, go slow, non-collaboration, demonstrations (the Johannesburg women completely outwitted the South African Police with their novel form of demonstration on the City Hall steps) etc., should be halted.

Surely this is not really new thinking? How does it make for any additions to our ability to campaign? What you have done is to elevate to forms of struggle, qualities essential to the running of any organisation that seeks to realise its aims. There is and can be no alternative to mass

action. This, however, needs not only acknowledgement, but even more, it must be translated into practical activity.

No one can doubt that Congress is in urgent need of study classes. The education of the movement has lagged sorely behind, and far too many members are unaware of the contents of the Freedom Charter. Endless education must proceed in order to enlighten the people. Study circles, pamphlets and rallies must be used to help raise the consciousness of the people. In fact, far too many speakers have been using Congress meetings to hurl abuse against the Government, without in any way adding anything new to the peoples' understanding. But, none-the-less, 'a skilful, courageous and utterly determined leadership' is not created from study classes alone. Understanding is essential, but understanding divorced from activity might just as well not have been garnered.

What Congress requires is a spirit of self-sacrifice amongst its members, for without such a spirit there can be no stimulus to the masses to follow the movement. Volunteers completely devoted to the struggle and dedicated to the people are required in Congress! a group of people (thousands strong) who will be in a Zeerust or Sekhukhuniland when required, to give strength to the persecuted, to provide organised leadership to the struggle of the people; a group of people who are of the soil and of the blood of the people — this is what Congress needs.

Such people, too, are not created by study classes alone, but from the examples set them by leaders imbued with the same spirit — Gandhi and Mao spring immediately to mind. The Defiance Campaign showed that we had such people, but what has happened to them? Where are they now? Why did we lose them, or if we have not lost them, why are they not active today?

These are the questions which demand our attention; for it is in the finding of answers to problems such as these that we will understand why there is an 'unhappy position' in Congress, the Africanist breakaway, the suspensions, expulsions, resignations, from executive positions, the simple 'dropping out of activity', etc. Here, surely, is the crux of the problem? Part of the answer lies in the way in which the problems confronting us are presented.

Your editorial, for example, when describing the falsity of the 'clash of colour' picture drawn by the Nationalists, poses the 'correct picture' as follows: "Instead they (the African people under the leadership of the A.N.C.) have seen the picture as it really is: a clash of principle: on the one side, the Nationalists principle of racial domination, autocracy and repression . . . on the other side the principle of democracy and human rights . . ."

I agree, no one will argue with this formulation, as far as it goes; but does it go far enough? Is it the whole picture? Are we not only skimming the surface if we limit the issues involved to expression in these terms? Elsewhere in the editorial, you do go further (cf 'as long as there is a penny to be made out of sweated labour') but only in passing.

Why is there racialism in South Africa? What are the socio politico-economic forces that breed this scourge? Whence do they stem? Why is the liberatory movement in the forefront of the struggle for 'democracy and human rights' — surely not simply because it calls itself the liberatory movement?

Of course the Nationalists stand for 'racial domination, autocracy and repression'. But then so does the United Party. Is the principle of white domination any different from that of white leadership? What are the factors common to the N.P. and the U.P. which make them support basically similar policies, and yet, at the same time, what is it that makes for there being differences in their approach to their common problems?

But more importantly for the liberatory movement, can 'white domination' be eliminated without it being challenged at its source — the drive of all sections of the ruling class to make that 'penny out of sweated labour', to make profits (whether average or maximum need not concern us here)?

These are the questions which require debating in Congress; and if they are debated I am convinced that none will argue, that only through the emancipation of our productive forces will 'democracy and human rights' be achieved. Without Congress going to the people with a programme based on such an approach — the Freedom Charter approach — no amount of 'work', 'efficiency', etc. will convince them of the correctness of the Congress cause; and unless our activity is directed towards achieving this end, quite obviously 'mass action' must fail, for no strengthening of our organisations — the individual Congresses and the Trade Unions in S.A.C.T.U. — will have been attained.

Again, these are only a few of our problems; such matters as the relationship of certain sections of the ruling class, which have similar demands (for different reasons), higher wages for African workers, the ending of the 'industrial colour bar', etc. to the Congresses, and vice versa; the present make-up of the movement itself, events in Africa, etc., also require discussion; but the points I have raised do require debate to obtain clarification and decision, and are, I believe, a more satisfactory way of presenting our problems than that in your editorial.

V. S. GOLDBERG.

[As a discussion journal, LIBERATION welcomes criticism from readers of all articles, including editorials, and we invite further discussion on the points raised by Mr. Goldberg. We must say, however, that it was never our intention to suggest that mass action, in the various forms listed by him "should be halted." If Mr. Goldberg, and perhaps other readers, gathered that impression we must have expressed ourselves inadequately. Nor of course did we disparage the heroic defiance campaign of 1952, and here there is no justification for Mr. Goldberg's suggestion that we did so.—Editor, "LIBERATION."]