

contact



FOR UNITED NON-RACIAL ACTION

3c

Registered at the G.P.O. as a newspaper

Vol 8 No 5 May 1965

'UNHOLY THINGS'

TEDIOUS AS IT may be, a useful hour or so can sometimes be spent examining some of the wilder statements made by members of the Government in Parliament. There was, for example, the tirade this month against Patrick Duncan by Bantu Administration and Development Minister de Wet Nel.

Although Mr Duncan has been out of South Africa for three years, he still seems to haunt this minister and his colleague the Minister of Justice; again and again he is displayed by them as a favourite bogeyman.

This time it was during the debate in the House of Assembly on the Bantu Administration and Development vote. Mrs Helen Suzman (Progressive Party, Houghton) suggested that in the Transkei "a territory which allegedly enjoys all the wonderful advantages of full civil rights", the emergency regulations under Proclamation No 400 had no place.

Replying on 7th May, Mr de Wet Nel felt that Mrs Suzman had said an ugly thing: "She said that this government imposes its policy by force."

Proclamation 400 had been introduced in the Transkei because "Mr Patrick Duncan and his kindred spirits were doing unholy things there". Mr Duncan, he alleged, incited people on a large scale not to accept development works in the Transkei. He went further and encouraged them not to accept the government policy of Bantu Authorities.

This seemed mild enough, but the Minister then added: "When he did not achieve much success along those lines, he participated in the hatching of plans to commit murders in Pondoland. I accuse him to-day of the fact that his hands are full of blood. We had the phenomenon that, wherever that gentleman slept at night, as regularly as clockwork a murder took place the next day. This Proclamation was issued and within 12 hours Mr Duncan had left the Transkei. The tragedy of the matter was that he made the plans out the poor Bantu had to pay the price."

Challenged on these statements by Mrs Suzman, the Minister said he had been informed "by certain Bantu" that when murders took place in the Transkei Duncan had been there Mrs Suzman: "Why did you not charge him?"

The Minister: "It is not so easy".

It was apparently easier to "get at certain Whites in Pondoland" by proclaiming an emergency through the whole of the Transkei. That was in November 1960. Since then hundreds of Africans and a handful of Whites have been detained without trial for periods of a few days up to several months. And the irony of it all is that the man now alleged by the Minister to be a substantial cause of the Proclamation was never active in Pondoland; was in 1960 a fervent believer in non-violence; and in six or seven visits to the Tembuland area - from August 1960 until months after the date of the Proclamation - merely did what in any normal civilized country would be regarded as the work of a peaceful political organiser.

The most charitable view that can be taken of Mr de Wet Nel's outburst is that somewhere down the

line he is being grossly misinformed.

Mr Duncan was banned in April 1960; a year later he received an order confining him to the Cape Peninsula. Soon after that he left South Africa for Basutoland. Until that time he was an executive member of the Liberal Party and he endorsed its belief in non-violence. While in Basutoland he changed his views and he resigned from the Liberal Party. But throughout his active period in the Transkei he was never once heard to advocate or even remotely suggest that violence be used to relieve the territory and its people of their Nationalist rulers.

He was in fact only one of many Liberals who found their desire for a democratic non-racial government for all of South Africa was shared by the most able of leaders in the Transkei and by the vast majority of the people behind them. These Liberals helped to give direction to political thought in the territory and their work gained wide support for the policies of the Liberal Party.

The fruits of those efforts can be seen to-day in the strong Democratic Party, which has grown independently and which is no offshoot of the Liberal Party, but which in many ways reflects the links its leaders have had with South African Liberals.

When the government's Bantustan experiment led in 1963 to elections in the Transkei, 1, 297, 000 Africans voted for the Democratic Party and only 445, 000 voted for Chief Kaiser Matanzima's Transkei National Independence Party. But the party

wanted by the people does not rule. While elected members are in a minority as against the chiefs, said Mr Gray Hughes (United Party, Transkei) in the debate on 7th May, the Minister cannot pretend that the present Assembly is a democratic body. If it was there might be a quick demise of Proclamation 400. Moreover, we have the spectacle of Minister de Wet Nel trying to justify an ancient emergency with accusations which become more grotesque each time they are made.

Contact Needs Your Help

MANY READERS WILL remember our appeal for funds of 18 months ago. Your generous response at that time has enabled us to keep Contact going.

We have faced many difficulties, among them the banning of editors and contributors and the raiding of our office by both police and thugs. We have been charged in court. Unable to find a printer, we have had to print Contact ourselves. We are amateurs, and the appearance of the paper over the last six months has not been all that we could desire and we hope that readers will continue to bear with us in this respect.

Unfortunately, the deterioration in the appearance of the paper has not been matched by a reduction in production costs. It now costs nearly twice as much to print an issue of Contact as it did two years ago.

We believe that the continued appearance of Contact is, if anything, more important than ever before. Despite the risks and despite the difficulties, we are prepared to continue to produce it. It is one of the very few voices of freedom left to the country, and we are determined, as far as it depends on us, to survive.

But we need money and we need it urgently. We need money quickly in order even to produce one more issue. We need R1000 within a few months if we are to stand a chance of survival.

This is YOUR paper. Will you enable it to live on?

Please send your contribution by return of post to the Business Manager, Contact, P.O. Box 1979, Cape Town

THE LONG VIEW

- by Alan Paton

Ham-handed Hildegard

OUR NATIONALISTS ARE as clever as anybody in the world. Editor

Cillie of "Die Burger" can write a most convincing defence of separate development, so that no one would dream it had an ugly and cruel side. But a couple of weeks later Dr. Hildegard Muller can destroy all these gains by his blundering action over the U.S. Air Carrier "Independence".

I myself wonder what Editor Cillie must think when, after he has so convincingly expounded separate development, Coloured people are being turned away from entertainments, Africans are ex-

cluded from sporting events, Indians are ejected from occupations which they have graced for many years. I wonder, too, why such a clever man does not see that these recent cruelties are not regrettable incidents but are part and parcel of separate development.

I am not sure whether it was Editor Cillie who invented the term "petty apartheid" to describe these cruelties. There is nothing petty about them: they are of the very essence of the policy. What is more, they reveal a terrible truth about separate development: that it is not really a beautiful and noble aim, but a rejection of one's fellow humans and an indifference to their happiness.

It is to Dr. Verwoerd that the credit must be given for giving an idealistic content to a policy which his predecessor Dr. Malan described as apartheid, and his predecessor Mr. Strijdom described as baaskap. There was a real danger at one time that Nationalist intellectuals and churchmen might revolt against the harshness of these policies, but Dr. Verwoerd saved the day, and won them all back by preaching the idealistic quality of separate development.

I do not wish any of my readers to imagine that I believe that separate development has no idealistic quality. It is the finest blend of idealism and cruelty that the human race has ever devised. It is the idealism that enables the idealist to stomach cruelty, and the cruelty that enables the cruel to stomach the idealism.

Dr. Muller's recent action illustrates perfectly the schizophrenic nature of Nationalist politics. If there is one country in the world that could save white South Africa in a crisis, it is the United States of America. Yet white South Africa presumes to dictate to the United States what policy its armed forces should observe on South African soil.

Dr Muller was appointed to set forth our policies in an urbane and cultured way to a world antagonised by Mr Eric Louw. I myself have no doubt that Dr Muller is an urbane and cultured man, but unfortunately separate development is not an urbane and cultured policy. Sooner or later, Dr Muller had to blunder. It is an inevitable consequence of his schizophrenic creed.

Why are Negro airmen not wanted at Ysterplaat airfield? The answer is simple. It is because their skins are not white. And that is what separate development is. It is a rejection of people who are not white. One can cry out till

the cows come home that it means a just share for all, but it does not. And who understood the heart of the matter better than President Kruger? When two brothers disagreed about the division of their late father's farm, he made the elder brother divide and the younger brother choose. I do not say that the President would have done the same thing in politics: but that is another evidence of the schizophrenic mind which is the inevitable product of ultra-Nationalist indoctrination.

Dr. Muller's blunder dramatically exposes the ugly side of separate development. It reveals clearly, in spite of Dr Verwoerd's cleverness, that separate development is essentially something done by someone with power to someone without it. Even if it be perfumed to high heaven, the smell of the polecat is still there.

Footnote: We regret that in last month's issue the words "The Long View by Alan Paton" were omitted above the article on John Harris.

Trials Go on: Many Banned in Court

THE STATE CASE has been closed in the trial of four men who are charged in Cape Town with recruiting guerilla warfare trainees. They are Kwedi Mknalipi, Jack Jaxa, Sonkongo Maleka and Wilson Mketsnane, all of whom have pleaded not guilty. (More than 150 people appeared in Eastern Province courts, early in May, on charges under the Suppression of Communism Act.)

Sylvia Neame, convicted in the Johannesburg Communist trial, is among many to have appeared in or near Port Elizabeth on charges of membership or furthering the aims of the African National Congress. Others are M. Magxaki and Douglas Mtalana, who were each found guilty on five counts and sentenced to ten and nine years' imprisonment respectively, and Tommy Charlieman. Mr. Charlieman, who had previously spent 19 months in 90-day detention and had threatened to sue the Minister of Justice for loss of wages, was charged with sabotage. He was found guilty of A.N.C. activities, and sentenced to eight years' imprisonment.

Ten men alleged to be members of the Pan-African Congress were acquitted and 13 found guilty of sabotage in the Supreme Court,

Grahamstown, early this month. Those convicted received sentences varying between five and 15 years' imprisonment. Harry Mathebe, described as "the leader of the movement" was convicted on four counts of plotting violence and taking part in the activities of PAC and Poqo, was sentenced to 15 years.

The Maseru trial of eight PAC men alleged to have plotted against South Africa has been remanded to 31st May.

A number of people have appeared in court this month, charged with infringing their banning orders. Terence Beard was convicted in Grahamstown of having attended a social gathering by being in the kitchen of a house in which a party was being held. He was sentenced to one year's imprisonment, suspended for three years. In Cape Town, Elijah Loza, who is under house arrest, was found not guilty on a charge of absenting himself from his house, but was convicted of receiving a visitor. He was sentenced to one month's imprisonment, suspended for one year. Ann Tobias was convicted, also in the Cape Town Regional Court, of attending a social gathering by holding a braai with two friends. Wilfred Brutus has been similarly charged, but no evidence has yet been led.

Convicted this month for being in possession of banned literature was Samuel Malkinson of Cape Town, who was found to be in possession of copies of Fighting Talk and New Age. He was sentenced to 30 days' imprisonment suspended for three years. In Zeerust, Theo Moatse was cautioned and discharged after pleading guilty to a similar charge. He had been found in possession of "South Africa - Yesterday and Tomorrow, the challenge to Christians" by Bishop Ambrose Reeves.

contact

206 Burleigh House, Barrack Street, Cape Town.
P.O. Box 1979. Telephone 3-4043. Telegrams
CONTACT, Cape Town.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS:

African Postal Union: R1.00 (10s.)

Airmail: R2.00 (£1)

Rest of the World: R1.50 (15s., \$2)

Airmail: On application. Half for six months.

Printed and Published by Granite Publications (Pty) Ltd at the above address

More Liberals Get Banning Orders

FIVE YEARS BANNING orders have been served on a number of leading people in recent weeks.

Among them were three more

Liberals, David Craignead, National Vice-President of the Party and Transvaal Divisional Chairman, Sam Dick, a member of the Party's Cape Executive Committee, and John Aitchison, Natal Secretary and a member of the National Executive. Mr. Craignead's ban under the Suppression of Communism Act has aroused considerable comment and protest throughout the country. Respected as he is, in Johannesburg as a sober and responsible businessman as well as a quietly outspoken critic of Government policies, few will believe without absolute proof to the contrary that he has been guilty of anything other than open and legitimate opposition to the Government. Mr. Dick, who has not been active since a magisterial warning last year and whose ban therefore came as a complete surprise has also been a widely respected and prominent member of the Party.

The banning orders are seen by Liberals as further attempts to destroy the Liberal Party by attacking its leaders rather than taking outright action against the Party as a whole.

Another ban, in this case including 12-hour house arrest, which has aroused considerable protest, is that on Mr. T.F. Bosch, formerly secretary of the Cape Town Municipal Workers Association. Mr. John Gomes, also a former Trade Union man, is another Capetonian recently placed under 12-hour house arrest, while in Johannesburg, Mr. St. Leger Pillay, former executive member of the A.N.C., has also been served with a 12-hour house arrest order.

Role of Transkei Chiefs

THE TRANSKEI LEGISLATIVE Assembly session is well under way, and is proving quite as stormy as it was expected to be.

At the start, a number of important personalities were missing. Both the Democrat leader, Paramount Chief Victor Poto, and his deputy, Paramount Chief Sabata Dalindyobo, were absent due to illness, and the notion of no-confidence in Chief Matanzima's government was put to the House by Chief Sandy Majeke. Democrat hopes that enough chiefs would cross to their side to enable them to win proved sadly mistaken. The line-up remained much as before.

If they were disappointed, the Democrats did not show it. Both during the no-confidence debate and after, it they attacked with vigour and spared Matanzima's men no punches. On the Education issue, the Government was taken severely to task for allowing "meddling" white officials from Pretoria to dictate to them. For the Opposition, Rev. B. Rajnili wanted to know why the Assembly's wishes had not been carried out. He received no clear reply. Tempers flared over "Emergency" proclamation R400. Minister of Justice, Mr. George Matanzima, claimed that it was being retained for the protection of the innocent, who had nothing to fear. It was true that suspects were detained for interrogation but "only the guilty are charged."

The chieftainship as an issue featured largely in the debates, and the incidents gave added point to the question. On one occasion the constant interruptions of a Government-supporting chief, who appeared to be under the influence of liquor, made coherent debate difficult. Then there was an uproar over the position of Chief Siyoyo, who had crossed the floor to the Opposition side last year and who, earlier this year, had been suspended for alleged misconduct. The Government claimed that he had no right to his ex-officio seat in the Assembly and he was ordered to leave.

It has been stated frequently both inside and outside the Assembly that the dignity of the chiefs would be better preserved if they formed an Upper House of review, away from the "mudslinging" of the Assembly. Certainly it has become blatant that, while some of the chiefs have the qualifications and abilities of modern political leaders, others are, through no fault of their own, lacking in these. It is also evident that comparatively few Government-appointed and Government-paid men will have the courage to turn against the hand that feeds them, even though their subjects have made their wishes

plain. But their position is not to be envied and it is possible that Democratic victories in the two forthcoming by-elections may influence some of them.

The Democrats are pressing for additional action against the entrenched power of the chiefs. They have given notice of a motion asking that the people be allowed to reject and replace chiefs who do not represent their wishes. Another motion asks that the power chiefs have to deport their subjects be curtailed.

The Democratic Party has made very clear that it is not against the chiefs as individuals or against the institution of chieftainship. They feel, however, that the most useful and most dignified role for chiefs to play has not been honestly sought, and they believe that they have the answer. It is however, doubtful whether either the Republican or the Transkei Governments will give their plan fair consideration, for the removal of the appointed chiefs to an upper house would open the way to something close to democracy. The lower house would then consist of elected members and the Democrats would be in power.

And where would separate development be then?

Political Apathy at University

A GREAT POLITICAL apathy at the University of Cape Town is proving detrimental to the radicals and conservatives alike.

At the recent protest meeting against the banning of Professor Jack Simons many chairs were empty. The hall had been packed for past protest meetings.

Mr. Marais Steyn and Mr. Japie Basson, two United Party members of Parliament, addressed a meeting of the Conservative Students' Association earlier this year. About 70 students attended.

The first meeting of the Radical Students' Society attracted 30 students. The meeting was not prominently advertised on the campus and the speaker was not as well known as those who addressed the conservative meeting.

The Modern World Society, the only other anti-apartheid group, has this year published another issue of its Modern World Journal - the publication of which is its

main function. The 1963 issue of this publication was banned by the government. It contained material relating to allegations of torture.

NUSAS functions, many of which have been non-political, have not drawn packed houses. A film of the civil rights march on Washington in 1963 drew a few hundred students.

First year students have been partly responsible for this apathy as there is strong feeling against any involvement in politics.

Some students feel that the swing to the Right by the White electorate is the cause of this apathy. There is a view held that it is useless to oppose the government.

At a recent by-election for the Students' Representative Council the Conservative candidate was defeated - at an 18% poll.

The Coming Labour Crisis

TODAY WHEN THE government is facing a period likely to prove the toughest it has yet suffered in international relations apartheid is running into severe practical difficulties at home. Under the impact of the great economic boom that has been spreading over South Africa for the past few years, Job Reservation - that very cornerstone of Apartheid - is beginning slowly to disintegrate.

The theoretical background to this development is easy enough to understand. The first lesson of economic theory, and the first fact of economic experience, is that work creates wants and those wants, in turn, create work. The labourer uses his earnings to buy the food, clothing and other commodities that he wants; in buying these things, he creates work for other people, who must produce them. These people, in turn, spend their earnings on satisfying their wants and so create even further employment opportunities. Once this reciprocal process reaches a certain point, it becomes a chain-reaction that draws into the economy an ever-increasing number of people and provides a rising standard of living for them.

In South Africa, unlike most other African States, this chain-reaction has already started and is proceeding and spreading with gathering speed. And here, for

the Nationalist Government, arises a cruel dilemma - a situation containing the germs of destruction for Apartheid. Why is this? Because this process must necessarily lead to the drawing of millions of non-Whites into a single, integrated South African economy which will in the foreseeable future irrevocably involve virtually every South African citizen, regardless of race or colour.

There is very little that Dr. Verwoerd can do to prevent this. Every new factory that goes up requires labour; the white group is already fully employed and cannot conceivably continue to satisfy the country's growing skilled and semi-skilled labour requirements; therefore non-whites will have to fill these jobs, no matter that the theoreticians of the Nationalist Party suffer real pain at the thought. It is theoretically

possible, of course, that the Government can at some point in the future decide to forcibly withdraw African labour from the South African economy in a desperate attempt to avert this situation. But the consequences will be disastrous. The withdrawal of every hundred thousand workers from the economy means also the withdrawal of a hundred thousand consumers. Every factory that is closed down ceases to be a user of materials, power and equipment and so causes other concerns to close down as well. Once this downward spiral starts, the real alternative to integration will come into sight: not Apartheid but Disintegration. And the white voter will share in the suffering.

This situation cannot be averted by mass-immigration, as some Nationalists profess to believe. First, acceptable immigrants in sufficient numbers simply are not available. The latest figures show that booming Western Europe's labour shortage is now becoming acute. West Germany has over half a million jobs going begging; Britain a third of a million; France, Sweden and the Netherlands a further quarter million between them. No large-scale immigration from these areas is feasible. There is also a second difficulty: during those periods in the past when large numbers of immigrants have entered South Africa, there has, in direct consequence, been a great speed-up of economic growth and that has in turn increased the demand for African

workers. Even if they were available, therefore, immigrant workers would not really solve the problem of our labour shortage; their additional spending power would simply create even more employment opportunities, which would have to be filled by non-Whites.

The practical consequences of continued economic growth and the inevitable gradual breakdown of Job Reservation must, as seen in the much publicized mine experiment, place an unprecedented strain upon Apartheid.

When non-Whites play a preponderant role in the South African economy, both as workers and consumers, dissatisfaction with a second-class social and political status among this vast rising middle-class will reach breaking point. Simultaneously, this dissatisfied middle-class will possess enormous economic power and, through economic power, also political power. In conditions of full employment, trade unionism will in South Africa become the force for social justice that it has been in Britain and the United States and Europe. The weapons of labour-withdrawal and selective purchasing will become effective.

Assuming that apartheid still exists at that time (we don't think it will!) the stage will then be set for real and probably irresistible pressure to be brought to bear from within, upon whatever regime is practising this discriminatory policy. However bad the short-term prospects for apartheid look today, therefore, the long-term prospects look even worse.

the Democrats were in favour of a qualified franchise, he must have been putting forward only a personal point of view. Mr Nakana denying that there was any split in Party ranks, said that members were entitled to their own ideas, but that representatives of the people were nevertheless bound by the wishes of the people. He added that rumours of the origin of a third party in the Transkei were, he believed, unfounded. He knew of no lawyers or intellectuals who were considering such a move.

Silencing the Coloureds

THE SEPARATE REPRESENTATION of Voters Amendment Bill moves steadily towards its inevitable enactment. Except for the extension of the principle of apartheid, it appears on the surface to be an innocuous measure which seeks to fix at five years the term of office of the four White Parliamentary Representatives of Coloured voters, regardless of when White general elections are held.

Yet even the United Party has had no difficulty in plumbing, at least partly, the hidden depths of meaning. And Mr. Japie Basson expressed the Opposition's strong disapproval of the measure by moving that it "be read this day six months"

He failed to stop the Bill. So did all the warnings and pleas of Progressive M.P. Mrs. Helen Suzman and the South Coloured Representative, Mr. Graham Eden. They pointed out that not only was this measure buying the time which the Government needs in order to try to prevent the election of Progressives to represent the Coloured voters in Parliament, but it was in itself a diminution of the few rights left to the Coloured people. In separating the elections, Coloured people were being further isolated politically. The last shred of opportunity for effective comment on major issues was being removed.

There can be no doubt that the opponents of the Bill are right. Nationalist spokesmen warned, when it was clear that the Progressives were on the road to victory in the Provincial elections, that they would not allow what they chose ironically to call White intervention in Coloured politics. Now, by the

Democrats want One Man One Vote

DEMOCRATIC PARTY LEADERS appear to have come down firmly in favour of universal adult franchise. Following an article in the March issue of Contact, the Umtata newspaper, Umthunywa, approached a large number of leading members of the Party for their views on the franchise. Among them was Paramount Chief Victor Poto. Without exception, all stated that the Party continued to stand for one man one vote. If Mr. Guzana had told visitors to the territory that

same twisted process of reasoning, the Progressive Party is told that it is leading the Coloured people to destruction because its success cannot fail to produce a White "reaction". Therefore, it seems, the Progressive Party is directly responsible, not only for this Bill and whatever will be designed to follow it, but for any White unwillingness to put into practice Minister Botha's schemes for the "uplift and development" of the Coloured people.

It is not the Progressives who are using the Coloured people for their own ends but the Government which, in a manner typical of totalitarian regimes, cannot tolerate any real or effective opposition. And there is absolutely no doubt what the Coloured people think. For anyone who did not know before, the provincial elections provided the answer.

The Government is understandably sensitive. In the Transkei, snow-place of separate development, it is finding it harder and harder to create any kind of illusion that it is giving the people what they want. If the Coloured people are now allowed to demonstrate their complete rejection of the separate development which, the Government asserts, is not only desirable but desired, it will be harder than ever to convince the outside world that South Africa is a democracy and a much misunderstood and maligned country.

He is a Human Being

The place: House of Assembly, Cape Town. The time: 7th May, 1965. The subject: the Bantu Administration and Development vote. Mrs Helen Suzman (Progressive, Houghton) is speaking.

Mrs Suzman: The African is neither an ox nor is he a piece of machinery. The African is a human being.

Mr. G.F. van L. Froneman (Nat., Heilbron): Nobody denied that. You should be ashamed of yourself!

Mrs. Suzman: I should be ashamed of myself! One cannot divorce labour from the man who produced the labour; one cannot divorce labour from hands that perform the labour; one cannot divorce labour from the person that embodies the labourer.

Mr. B. Coetzee (Nat., Vereeniging): Why not?

Mrs. Suzman: Because the good Lord has decreed otherwise. The good Lord has decided that where a pair of hands comes to work in White South Africa that pair of hands is accompanied by a black body, whether the Hon. member likes it or not. He is not a machine nor an ox.

Mr. Coetzee: So what!

Letters

Separate Voters Bill

Dear Sir,

IT IS EXTRAORDINARY that Mr. A. Bloomberg, Coloured Representative for the Cape Peninsula, should collect signatures of some Coloured people to a statement to the effect that the Separate Representation of Voters Amendment Bill does not curtail their rights. One can understand an attitude of apathy. One can sympathize with the man who says: "I lost my vote when I was taken off the Common Roll and I am not prepared to accept a second-class vote." But this Bill further curtails the rights of the Coloured people. When a general election is called to test the feelings of White voters on a matter of national importance, Coloured voters will not be voting. To give prominence to the views of a handful of people, who possibly did not realize this, is to do a disservice to his constituents, as Mr. Bloomberg should have known. And the remarks made by him in the course of his exchanges with Mrs. H. Suzman have made him appear in an even worse light.

The National Party has a tradition of childish interjections and red-herrings in debate. Mr. P.W. Botha's reply to the third reading debate included the suggestion that the Progressive Party had won its two seats in the Cape Provincial Council by buying the votes of Coloured voters. If there were any truth in the suggestion, there is no doubt that the Progressive Party officials would have been prosecuted. Mr. Botha is naive if he expects Coloured voters to vote for second-class citizenship. In a contest between the United Party and the Progressive Party it is only natural for Coloured voters to vote for the Party which believes in full citizenship for all South Africans and has steadfastly opposed the Nationalists undemocratic measures.

BYSTANDER