

FIGHTING TALK

Vol. II. No. 2.

Price 6d.

APRIL, 1955

Our cover picture is of Paul Robeson,
who writes of Africa on page four.

THE SOCIETY
COPYRIGHT SECTION

IN THIS ISSUE :

- Dr. H. J. Simons on Apartheid Theory
- On Olive Schreiner
- What Next in the Western Areas?
- Ghetto Plans for Durban
- Molotov to Hearst



GETTING IT STRAIGHT **COMMENT**

IT is difficult to know which decision of the African National Congress is the more unfortunate: the decision of last December's conference to call all African children out of school from April 1st, in protest at the Bantu Education Act. Or the decision of last month's National Executive Committee meeting to defer the withdrawal *sine die*. If the original decision was arrived at with the sober consideration that is expected of what is, today, South Africa's leading "opposition," then the reasons advanced for the postponement of the action make little sense. If, on the other hand, the original decision was taken in a spirit of bravado, on the spur-of-the-moment impulse, and proved, on more serious consideration, to be unworkable, then it is fortunate that the National Executive called a halt before it was too late to retrieve the situation.

Inevitably, the now-on, now-off position has caused confusion amongst Congress supporters.

Such a situation, if not tackled seriously and put right, can lead to a decline of the Congress movement, which is exactly what the Government, through incessant banning of experienced Congress leaders, has been working for. There is little to be gained from trying to apportion blame. What is more appropriate is to uncover the errors which have led us to this situation. In large part, in our opinion, the errors stem from a tendency to take ultimate objectives and turn them into immediate slogans of action; to ignore the long, and hard path of education, agitation and organisation of the people which lies between the day an objective is decided upon and the day it is realised. There are no easy roads to the high objectives which the Congress movement holds; attempts to find short cuts, to speed up progress by calls for spectacular action before the hard road has been traversed, can end only in confusion and a loss of popular confidence. The Congress movement needs to be imbued with this understanding, and to take its decisions within this framework, soberly, and with a sense of the tremendous responsibility it bears for the future of the South African people. Liberation is like fire. Those who *play* with it get burnt.

IN the midst of the furore the American Government raised by publishing its own account of the wartime Yalta Conference, no one seems to have asked the most pertinent question: What is in the record that needs to be kept buried from the public eye?

BLOWING THE GAFF

From the somewhat inadequate press reports printed in this country, it seems that the self-appointed saviours of Western civilisation have several skeletons in their cupboards, which it serves their present purpose to hide. France, it appears, was sneered at in cynical fashion by the leading Western statesmen, regarded as a "has-been" in 1945. What bitter damage this revelation must be doing to a French ruling class, whose support for German rearmament has been bought at such a heavy expenditure of praise, flattery, "guarantees" and dollars. Germany, it appears, was such a menace to "our way of life" that its physical dismemberment into separate states was seriously under discussion ten years ago. How difficult it is to explain all that away, when today it has become the western statesmen's catchword that Germany—rearmed Germany—is the only substantial guarantee

that we have for the survival of "our way of life." And how embarrassing for the American Government to justify its occupation of Formosa and Chinese coastal islands at the same time as the American State Department is blazoning to the world the agreement, ten years old, that Formosa shall be returned to China as an integral part of her territory.

No doubt, the decision to publish was motivated by two desires. On the one hand, the Republican Party's desire to boost its election prospects, by painting the Democratic Party and its former President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as the big red devil, responsible for all America's troubles. And, simultaneously, the desire to divert some of the tremendous anti-American feeling of Europe into anti-Churchill, anti-British passion. As usual, such manoeuvres, tend to boomerang. Few people anywhere in the world can be missing the real moral; that it is America and her allies who have, in practice, repudiated the Yalta agreements; that the blame for present world troubles can therefore not be laid at the door of the Soviet Union, but at the door of those who have shifted their ground, repudiated their own undertakings, and precipitated troubles with new, unilateral policies. Realising that his stink-bomb has turned to a boomerang, Mr. John Foster Dulles departed, conveniently, for Canada. But fools, as always, rush in where even club-footed American officials fear to tread. Senator Joseph McCarthy has introduced a motion in the American Congress, calling for official repudiation of the wartime treaties arrived at by President Roosevelt. If anyone has so far failed to understand the real meaning of the American disclosures, trust Jos McCarthy to ram it down their throats.

PITY Johannesburg's poor City Fathers. Municipal transport to the Southern Suburbs, it seems, runs at a loss, because not enough people use the "Europeans Only" trams. Solution? Trams for all races, the City Council said, in applying for a licence to run such a service—on a strictly segregated, Whites here, Coloureds there, Indians there and Africans there basis. But in case too many non-Europeans use the service, fares will be a penny higher for them on the all race service, than if they ride on "non-Europeans only" trams. Europeans who are unwilling to rub shoulders with their darker compatriots will still be able to travel on "Europeans only" trams. The all-race service will, of course be slower than the segregated service, because there will be three separate queues at the termini, with suitable air-space between queues to satisfy the most prurient of white supremacists. All trams will stop at each queue in turn.

We may be simple, but the economy scheme seems to us to imply putting three tram services on a route where two fail to pay their way; and to attract more customers by giving them more expensive and slower transportation. No wonder the leader of the Johannesburg Nationalist City Councillors managed to detect the hidden hand of communism, and race integration run riot in the scheme.

And then, from time to time, people ask us why we don't write more satire about South Africa!

GETTING IT STRAIGHT

COMMENT

IT is difficult to know which decision of the African National Congress is the more unfortunate: the decision of last December's conference to call all African children out of school from April 1st, in protest at the Bantu Education Act. Or the decision of last month's National Executive Committee meeting to defer the withdrawal *sine die*. If the original decision was arrived at with the sober consideration that is expected of what is, today, South Africa's leading "opposition," then the reasons advanced for the postponement of the action make little sense. If, on the other hand, the original decision was taken in a spirit of bravado, on the spur-of-the-moment impulse, and proved, on more serious consideration, to be unworkable, then it is fortunate that the National Executive called a halt before it was too late to retrieve the situation.

Inevitably, the now-on, now-off position has caused confusion amongst Congress supporters.

Such a situation, if not tackled seriously and put right, can lead to a decline of the Congress movement, which is exactly what the Government, through incessant banning of experienced Congress leaders, has been working for. There is little to be gained from trying to apportion blame. What is more appropriate is to uncover the errors which have led us to this situation. In large part, in our opinion, the errors stem from a tendency to take ultimate objectives and turn them into immediate slogans of action; to ignore the long, and hard path of education, agitation and organisation of the people which lies between the day an objective is decided upon and the day it is realised. There are no easy roads to the high objectives which the Congress movement holds; attempts to find short cuts, to speed up progress by calls for spectacular action before the hard road has been traversed, can end only in confusion and a loss of popular confidence. The Congress movement needs to be imbued with this understanding, and to take its decisions within this framework, soberly, and with a sense of the tremendous responsibility it bears for the future of the South African people. Liberation is like fire. Those who play with it get burnt.

IN the midst of the furore the American Government raised by publishing its own account of the wartime Yalta Conference, no one seems to have asked the most pertinent question: What is in the record that needs to be kept buried from the public eye?

BLOWING THE GAFF

From the somewhat inadequate press reports printed in this country, it seems that the self-appointed saviours of Western civilisation have several skeletons in their cupboards, which it serves their present purpose to hide. France, it appears, was sneered at in cynical fashion by the leading Western statesmen, regarded as a "has-been" in 1945. What bitter damage this revelation must be doing to a French ruling class, whose support for German rearmament has been bought at such a heavy expenditure of praise, flattery, "guarantees" and dollars. Germany, it appears, was such a menace to "our way of life" that its physical dismemberment into separate states was seriously under discussion ten years ago. How difficult it is to explain all that away, when today it has become the western statesmen's catchword that Germany—rearmed Germany—is the only substantial guarantee

that we have for the survival of "our way of life." And how embarrassing for the American Government to justify its occupation of Formosa and Chinese coastal islands at the same time as the American State Department is blazoning to the world the agreement, ten years old, that Formosa shall be returned to China as an integral part of her territory.

No doubt, the decision to publish was motivated by two desires. On the one hand, the Republican Party's desire to boost its election prospects, by painting the Democratic Party and its former President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as the big red devil, responsible for all America's troubles. And, simultaneously, the desire to divert some of the tremendous anti-American feeling of Europe into anti-Churchill, anti-British passion. As usual, such manoeuvres, tend to boomerang. Few people anywhere in the world can be missing the real moral; that it is America and her allies who have, in practice, repudiated the Yalta agreements; that the blame for present world troubles can therefore not be laid at the door of the Soviet Union, but at the door of those who have shifted their ground, repudiated their own undertakings, and precipitated troubles with new, unilateral policies. Realising that his stink-bomb has turned to a boomerang, Mr. John Foster Dulles departed, conveniently, for Canada. But fools, as always, rush in where even club-footed American officials fear to tread. Senator Joseph McCarthy has introduced a motion in the American Congress, calling for official repudiation of the wartime treaties arrived at by President Roosevelt. If anyone has so far failed to understand the real meaning of the American disclosures, trust Jos McCarthy to ram it down their throats.

PITY Johannesburg's poor City Fathers. Municipal transport to the Southern Suburbs, it seems, runs at

PLEASANT MADHOUSE

a loss, because not enough people use the "Europeans Only" trams. Solution? Trams for all races, the City Council said, in applying for a licence to run such a service—on a strictly segregated, Whites here, Coloureds there, Indians there and Africans there basis. But in case too many non-Europeans use the service, fares will be a penny higher for them on the all race service, than if they ride on "non-Europeans only" trams. Europeans who are unwilling to rub shoulders with their darker compatriots will still be able to travel on "Europeans only" trams. The all-race service will, of course be slower than the segregated service, because there will be three separate queues at the termini, with suitable air-space between queues to satisfy the most prurient of white supremacists. All trams will stop at each queue in turn.

We may be simple, but the economy scheme seems to us to imply putting three tram services on a route where two fail to pay their way; and to attract more customers by giving them more expensive and slower transportation. No wonder the leader of the Johannesburg Nationalist City Councillors managed to detect the hidden hand of communism, and race integration run riot in the scheme.

And then, from time to time, people ask us why we don't write more satire about South Africa!

Robeson "Discovers" Africa

I "DISCOVERED" AFRICA in London. That discovery—back in the Twenties—profoundly influenced my life. Like most of Africa's children in America, I had known little about the land of our fathers. But in England, where my career as an actor and singer took me, I came to know many Africans. Some of their names are now known to the world—Ankwa, and Nkrumah, and Kenyatta, who has just been jailed for his leadership of the liberation struggles in Kenya.

Many of these Africans were students, and I spent many hours talking with them and taking part in their activities at the West African Students Union building. Somehow they came to think of me as one of them; they took pride in my successes; and they made Mrs. Robeson and me honorary members of the Union.

Besides these students, who were mostly of princely origin, I also came to know another class of Africans—the seamen in the ports of London, Liverpool and Cardiff. They too had their organizations, and much to teach me of their lives and their various peoples.

As an artist it was most natural that my first interest in Africa was cultural. Culture? The foreign rulers of that continent insisted there was no culture worthy of the name in Africa. But already musicians and sculptors in Europe were astir with their discovery of African art. And as I plunged, with excited interest, into my studies of Africa at the London University and elsewhere, I came to see that African culture was indeed a treasure-store for the world.

Those who scorned the African languages as so many "barbarous dialects" could never know, of course, of the richness of those languages, and of the great philosophy and epics of poetry that have come down through the ages in these ancient tongues. I studied these languages—as I do to this day: Yoruba, Efik, Benin, Ashanti and the others.



A Thousand Years?
No — Now's the
Time for African
Freedom, says
PAUL ROBESON



I NOW FELT AS ONE with my African friends and became filled with a great, glowing pride in these riches, now found for me. I learned that along with the towering achievements of the cultures on ancient Greece and China there stood the culture of Africa, unseen and denied by the imperialist looters of Africa's material wealth.

I came to see the root sources of my own people's culture, especially in our music which is still the richest and most healthy in America. Scholars had traced the influence of African music to Europe—to Spain with the Moors, to Persia and India and China, and westward to the Americas. And I came to learn of the remarkable kinship between African and Chinese culture (of which I intend to write at length some day).

My pride in Africa, that grew with the learning, impelled me to speak out against the scorners. I wrote articles for the *New Statesman* and *Nations* and elsewhere championing the real but unknown glories of African culture. I argued and discussed the subject with men like H. G. Wells, and Laski, and Nehru; with students and savants.

Now, there was a logic to this culture struggle, and the powers-that-be realized it before I did. The British Intelligence came one day to caution me about the political meanings of my activities. For the question loomed of itself: *If African culture was what I insisted it was, what happens then to the claim that it would take 1,000 years for Africans to be capable of self-rule.*

YES, CULTURE AND POLITICS

were actually inseparable here as always. And it was an African who directed my interest in Africa to something he had noted in the Soviet Union. On a visit to that country he had travelled east and had seen the Yakuts, a people who had been classed as a "backwards race" by the Czar. He had been struck by the resemblance between the tribal life of the Yakuts and his own people of East Africa.

What would happen to a people like the Yakuts now that they were freed from colonial oppression and were a part of the construction of the new socialist society?

I saw for myself when I visited the Soviet Union how the Yakuts and the Uzbeks and all the other formerly oppressed nations were leaping ahead from tribalism to modern industrial economy, from illiteracy to the heights of knowledge. Their ancient cultures blossoming in new and greater splendour. Their young men and women mastering the sciences and arts. A thousand years? No, less than 30!

So through Africa I found the Soviet Union—a beacon, a tried and tested way for whole nations, peoples, continents, to revive the mother-roots of culture, to flower in freedom.

A thousand years? No, Africa's time is now! We must see that and realize what it means to us, we American brothers and sisters of the Africans. We must see that we have a part to play in helping to pry loose the robbers' hold on Africa. For if we take a close look at the hands that are at Africa's throat, we will understand it all: see these *hands*.

THE PASSIONATE MATERIALIST

By HILDA WATTS

THE thread that runs through the life and writings of Olive Schreiner is her unparing, passionate search for the truth; her search for the design that gives life its purpose; for the pattern of growth and development that could change and perfect our society.

From this search she emerged a materialist, though one who followed no set path, but developed steps all of her own, so that her writing bears a surprising and happy freshness of expression and originality of thought that has significance for us today.

She wrote that it was this "passionate desire to penetrate into the nature of all things and know them exactly as they are which makes us feel so infinitely more removed from the worthy Christian fathers and the sometimes gifted writers and thinkers of the Middle Ages (save a few heretics), and even from the mass of men of our own time... persons who belong yet to the past which, accepting all things, found virtue in faith and not in a keen unending questioning of the facts of life."

It was her "keen unending questioning of the facts of life" that led her to a rejection of the philosophy of idealism. Her explanation is worth quoting:

"According to the old Christian conception, the Universe was a thing of shreds and patches and unconnected parts. Outside all we see and touch was the great individual Will, which had called into being mind and water, man, planet, star, stone, beast and plant, by the arbitrary action of its power, and which at any moment might return to nothingness, even the life that moves in animals having no permanence, and only that life in man which they called the soul having any future, though it had no past, and rose into being at an arbitrary fiat, like a stone and plant."

For the man intellectually holding this view to be true, the Universe could resemble only the heap of toys which a child gathers about it on the floor: doll, bugle, brick, book, having no subtle, living connection with each other, being there together only because the will of the child has brought them there.

"Solemnly to study each toy because, when you understood its structure, it might throw light on that of all the others, and closely to study their relation to one another—this doll lies at such an angle to that bugle—would be the work of a fool, when any moment a kick of the child might disturb all their relations..."

She found the idealists had deliberately suppressed the truth to suit their own theories. For them "truth can be of no value, it may even be a positive duty to misrepresent or repress the knowledge of facts, if they bear on or seem to have a bearing injurious to the relations of the individual man and the all-powerful individual... The suppression of Galileo's discovery that the world moved, the habitual suppressing in art of certain aspects of life, the habit of continual questioning within oneself, not 'Is this thing true?' but 'What will be the effect of such knowledge of such a statement?' is not, in the man holding this old view of the Universe, a sign of low morality and anti-social feeling; it is simply

the logical out-come of his view of the Universe...

"For us, all this has changed.

"For us once again the Universe has become one, a whole, and lives in all its parts. Step by step advancing knowledge has shown us the interlocking lines of action and reaction which bind together all that we see and are conscious of."

Each object, she declared, living or dead, has bearing on others, nowhere is there a sharp dividing line, nowhere an isolated existence. Holding this view, we cannot nurse false conceptions any more than a highly organised body can allow the intrusion of a foreign substance without causing disorganisation and disease. For the man dominated by this outlook, "the existence of an extraneous will dealing arbitrarily with the things of existence was inconceivable, and the true revelation of the unseen and unknown beyond was to be found in the study of the seen and knowable about us."

* * *

"All life is one!" she cried... "I want to say to all the great dead, to all the men and women who have been before me whose names will never now be known, without whom I could never know what I know, or understand as I understand, or think as I think—Be Thanks!"

And because civilisation has been built by many different nations and peoples, there were to her no "superior" and "inferior" races. The White South Africans, in fact, were likened to a "parvenu" who surrounds himself with the rich and beautiful things that others created. Only yesterday, when our White forefathers wandered naked in their woods and on their steppes, staining their bodies with coloured juices, "the Hindu had already built his great palaces and written his great books; the Chinaman had long wrapped his body in soft silken robes, and in delicately furnished rooms was sipping tea out of China cups so delicate we cannot even now imitate them. The Medes and the Persians and Egyptians and nations whose names we do not know had had their great empires and their civilisations and had passed away..."

She went on: "You will hear people talking often of Inferior Races and how superior we are—the people who may be speaking; but for me I know this, that, if you took from me bit by bit all I have gained and learned from other races and other peoples in whom my blood never flowed, I should go back and back, and you would find me at last only a little cave mother with her baby tied by a skin on her back, peeping out at the door of the cave to see if the man with his bone hook or flint arrows was coming home with game, while a dog who was not yet quite able to bark howled at the door."

Then she searches for the answer as to why advanced civilisations have never lasted, and comes to the revolutionary conclusion that "permanent human advance must be united advance." One fragment of humanity cannot move too far in advance of the mass without ultimately

being drawn back. All civilisations of the past had been but "the blossoming of a minute, abnormally situated, abnormally nourished class, unsupported by a vital connection with the classes beneath them or the nations around..." They resembled long thin, tender, feathery green shoots which our small rose trees sometimes send out in spring, rising far into the air, only to fall back because they have grown to a height that the whole tree cannot attain, too far from their fellow-branches to make permanence possible; without support, wind and weather snap them off or wither them. But next year a dozen rich young shoots may sprout from the snapped stem and survive.

Not only did she believe that all human beings within society must be brought up to the level of the most advanced, she also understood that there was no real advance, nor freedom, nor happiness, as long as there were exploited people. "Is it not a paradox covering a mighty truth that not one slave toils under the lash on an Indian plantation but the freedom of every other man on earth is limited by it?"

She knew that revolutionaries were "the new pathfinders of the race... men who rise as high above the laws and conventions of their social world as the man who violates them fall below, are yet inextricably bound with them in the stream of souls who walk in the path of resistance to law. From the monk Telemachus, who, springing into the Roman arena to stop the gladiatorial conflict, fell, violating the laws and conventions of his society—a criminal, but almost a god—up and down the ages man has been on earth, there have been found these social resistors and violators of the accepted order, the saviours and leaders of men on the path to higher forms of life."

* * *

What happens if you try to get rid of these defiers of the existing social order? South Africans know the answer: "... You could in every land exterminate the resistors of social law, you might at last produce a race on earth in which even the wish or the power to resist social institutions will have died out. But what would you have done? Seeking to cut out humanity's corns, to remove its cataract, to amputate its diseased limbs, you would have put out its eyes, cut off its tongue, maimed its legs; unable to see move or express, its heart would

beat slower and slower and death would come. For you would have captured the hero, the prophet, the thinker, the leader—the life of the world!"

"As the oak tree cannot grow unless, with each new ring it adds, its old bark cracks and splits, so humanity cannot develop without the rupture of its old institutions and laws."

Today such ideas are considered dangerous, though they stemmed from this woman born one hundred years ago. And no more dangerous than in South Africa, with its racial contempt and hatreds, its government that seeks to exterminate "the resistors of social law," its backwardness towards women. How then, can our country do honour to the writing and ideas of Olive Schreiner? Many would rather not. Better far to speak in general terms of the brilliant young governess who wrote the one novel they are prepared to remember, and to keep the burning passion of her materialist ideas "out of print."

Yet in Olive's own words we find the answer to this. Writing of the destructive element that seeks to mutilate artistic creations, she said: "To attempt to explain and sum up life by considering this element (the destructive element) only, is like the man who should attempt to represent a great musical symphony by playing its lower base notes alone, like a man who should try to reproduce a great composer's masterpiece by striking all the dissonants in it without any of the harmonies into which they resolve themselves and with reference to which alone they have any meaning."

But then she also wrote: "I think no artist need fear to give his work to the world because there are none who can understand. No human soul is so lonely as it feels itself, because no man is merely an individual, but is a part of the great body of life; the thoughts he thinks are part of humanity's thoughts, the visions he sees are part of humanity's vision; the artist is only an eye in the great human body, seeing for those who share his life: somewhere, sometime, his own exist." And she goes on to describe the mother giving birth to a child she may not have wanted, yet the thought flashing in her with sudden joy: "Perhaps it will live on when I am gone, and be the beautiful and good to others."

These last words are the only epitaph I would write for Olive Schreiner.

(Continued from page 7)

bases was unfriendly. He felt that if a beginning were made by the removal of bases in Austria, which were located near to the Soviet Union, in time this could spread to other areas.

Hearst: A beginning had to be made somewhere.

Molotov: How did Hearst picture the possibility, by beginning in one area, of removing military bases in other areas?

Kingsbury Smith: It might prove infectious.

Molotov: If one were to base him-

self only on that hope, it would hardly be adequate. There were no Soviet military bases or any other Soviet bases near the United States. As for the United States, it seemed that her security required, for example, bases in Norway, a country bordering on the Soviet Union; in Turkey, also bordering on the Soviet Union, and even in Pakistan, to say nothing of other areas in Europe and Asia. It now appeared that the United States must also have Taiwan to ensure her security. If one interpreted United States security as widely as that, it was possible to go

so far as to say that she needed bases in all countries for her security's sake. It was hardly likely that such plans would meet with sympathy and understanding of other peoples. In the Soviet Union, the opinion had grown stronger that the United States could achieve nothing good with all those bases, either from the viewpoint of her own interests, or from the viewpoint of the interests of peace. "The removal of those bases, and the transition to the position that usually exists between states maintaining normal relations with one another, would go far to improve relations between our two countries."

STRAIGHT FROM THE SHOULDER

MOLOTOV TO HEARST

A recent interview was granted by Y. M. Molotov, Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, to two American journalists, W. R. Hearst and Kingsbury Smith. In the course of the interview, many questions were put by the American journalists, especially with reference to the present Far Eastern and Formosa situation. We publish below extracts from the interview, which has gone unrecorded in the South African Press.

Hearst: Did Mr. Molotov consider the situation in Formosa to be a serious threat to universal peace?

Molotov: The situation constituted a threat of violation of peace, a threat of war. He could not help adding his opinion that the United States bore the responsibility for the situation, in view of its interference in China's domestic affairs. "We regard Taiwan as an integral part of China."

Kingsbury Smith: China, as such, had had no control over Formosa for many years.

Hearst: "It seems to me, around a hundred years."

Molotov: drew attention to the Cairo declaration signed by Britain and the United States, and also to the Potsdam declaration, and the agreement on surrender of Japan. In all these basic international documents Taiwan was described as Chinese territory to be handed to the Chinese people. "What we know is that the island was first seized by Japan, and now by whom? By the United States. Thus first one country deprived China of her national territory—and now another."

Hearst: At the Geneva Conference, the Soviet Government had striven successfully to prevent the extension of the Indo-China conflict. Was the Soviet Government prepared to act in the same way with regard to Formosa?

Molotov: Although there were great differences between the situation in Indo-China and in China, in one respect the attitude of the Soviet Government was identical to both areas, and in fact to any area; namely, the Soviet Government was concerned to ease international tension. But it was necessary that measures proposed should really be aimed at easing such tension. Interference by one state in the affairs of another could not contribute to the achievement of that purpose.

Kingsbury Smith: The urgent thing was to find a solution, even if only a temporary one, which would prevent

the danger from extending and becoming a conflagration threatening universal peace.

Molotov: China threatened no one. It would be a good thing if no one threatened her. That more than anything else was required for the strengthening of peace.

Hearst: If the American Government used its good offices to advise its Chinese friends to seek a peaceful settlement, would the Soviet Government be prepared to act similarly with regard to its Chinese allies?

Molotov: The Government of the People's Republic of China and the so-called Chiang Kai-shek government were not equal parties. The Government of the People's Republic had every ground for demanding that China's lawful rights should be established with regard to Taiwan. And it was time for the Chiang Kai-shek "government" which had been rejected by the Chinese people, to remove itself to another place, and no longer damage the relations between states as it was doing at the moment by remaining, with the help of the United States, in a place where it should not be. Everything that would help to solve this problem would get the support of the Soviet Government.

Kingsbury Smith: What would the attitude of the Soviet Government be to a temporary cease fire of say a month, in order to assist the withdrawal of Chiang's troops from some of the islands near the coast of China?

Molotov: "If Chiang should wish to withdraw his forces from any islands, hardly anyone will prevent him from doing so."

Kingsbury Smith: Did this mean that if Chiang decided to withdraw his forces, the Chinese troops on the mainland would not attack him during the withdrawal, and would not attack the ships used in the withdrawal?

Molotov: He was not authorised to speak for the Government of the People's Republic of China, and the

question should be addressed to them.

Kingsbury Smith: Would the Soviet Government be prepared to place that question before the Government of the People's Republic of China, on behalf of the United States?

Molotov: "Does the United States Government ask us to do this?"

Hearst: Neither he nor Kingsbury Smith could speak or make any proposals on behalf of Chiang Kai-shek or the United States Government.

ON PROBLEMS OF EUROPE

Hearst: Prime Minister Malenkov had said that the chief reason for the tension in relations between the USSR and America lay in the establishment of a network of American military bases around the Soviet Union and the countries associated with the Soviet Union. With the aim of moving towards disarmament, through the gradual reduction of armed forces, would the Soviet Government be prepared before the conclusion of a peace treaty with Austria, to remove its military and air bases from its occupation zone in Austria, if the Western powers did the same in their zones?

Molotov: The question of American military bases round the Soviet Union and the people's democracies was indeed a question that complicated the entire international situation was much as these bases went to show that one of the sides, the United States, held an unfriendly position to the Soviet Union, and, by creating these bases near the Soviet frontier, threatened the Soviet Union. It was obvious that this question prevented the settlement of many other questions besides the question of Austria, since the establishment of these bases was proof that, while the Soviet Union was striving to improve relations with the United States, the opposite activity was to be observed on the part of the United States.

Kingsbury Smith: He and Hearst could not agree that the actions of the United States on the question of

(Continued on page 6)

THE REALITY OF MYTH

An analysis of SABRA'S Theory of Apartheid by

DR. H. J. SIMONS

THE annual Marathon debate on *Apartheid vs. Integration* does not rouse the public to great enthusiasm and is regarded by some people as a variety of the verbal shadow-boxing typical of parliaments where the parties agree on essentials.

The discussion is supposed to be concerned with the destinies of the African, Coloured, and Indian people. Since, however, their opinion has not been solicited, let alone taken into account, their lack of interest is easy to understand.

It would be a mistake, however, to dismiss the matter summarily. However convinced one might be that the Union will never be divided into racial zones, each inhabited exclusively by a single national group, this concept of the future does influence the attitudes of many people, and shapes legislative and administrative practice.

The usual line of approach adopted by critics of the concept is to examine its practicability in the light of economic and social tendencies. This is a very necessary kind of enquiry and should be continued more vigorously than in the past, in view of the large-scale propaganda conducted by advocates of apartheid.

In addition, the purpose of the apartheid idea should be examined with some care. In terms of South African social realities, the concept is an illusion, a mythical reconstruction for the future, but the myth itself has a blinding effect on the minds of a large section of the European population.

A PASSING ORDER

The aim of apartheid is to provide a justification for a social system which is not justifiable in terms of prevailing standards of morality, whether ethical, religious, political, or economic. The recognised and socially-approved version of South African society is that it belongs to the "western democracies" characterized by free competition, democratic governments, the rule of law, and Christian fellowship. This is the orthodox version of the capitalist society of which the Union is supposed to be a part.

In fact, all capitalist states depart from these standards to a considerable extent. Nowhere, however, is the departure so great as here, where competition is severely limited so as to safeguard the dominant position of the white population; four-fifths of the population are excluded from the parliamentary system; individual rights have no protection against arbitrary administrative and police powers; and Christianity itself is governed by the principles of race discrimination.

These features have existed in South Africa, or parts of it, for a very long time. Indeed, they can be traced back almost to the beginnings of white settlement. Never, however, has there been so prodigious an effort as now to explain these features as necessary and desirable, and to give them a moral basis.

Men usually find it necessary to account for and defend a social system when it is in a state of decline. All this activity on the ideological front by the defenders

of the existing order is symptomatic of the stress to which the South African society is being exposed.

The pressures are both external and internal. On the one hand with the gradual disappearance of colonialism and the rise of the great non-Western powers, the old balance of world forces is upset and the universal domination of Western Europe comes to an end. Not even South Africa's allies find it possible to justify its colour bars.

Even more important is the resistance set up by the African, Coloured, and Indian people of the Union to these colour bars. The European has lost the unqualified cultural and technical superiority that gave him the upper hand in the early period of colonization. The master and servant relationships no longer conform to the relative positions of the white and non-white groups. As the material basis for white domination crumbles, the governing class makes increasing use of force, as we see in the emergence of the police state.

"COMPLETE DILEMMA"

The government has taken over the fascist methods of forceful repression, but is unable to emulate the fascist demagogic appeal. The great majority of non-white South Africans are immune to apartheid propaganda, and the Whites themselves have no abiding faith in their social order. In this respect the situation here is probably unique. It would certainly be difficult to find another society in which the rulers so openly confess the impermanence of their rule, and its intrinsic injustice.

These admissions do not come from cabinet ministers, party hacks and editorial writers. Ideological formulas are left to the High Priests of Afrikanerdom, the religious and academic sections of the brotherhood, making their pronouncements through the medium of the *Suid-Afrikaanse Buro vir Rasse-aangeleenthede*.

SABRA was founded in 1948, one of the aims being the separate development of whites and non-whites "along their own lines." The founders made a highly successful intervention on the side of the Nationalist Party during the 1948 elections in the argument over the Native Laws (Fagan) Commission Report. Since then the organization has been the interpreter, adviser and mentor of government policy concerning race discrimination.

The SABRA case is that no "middle" course exists between complete "integration" and complete "apartheid"; that in a multi-national society the Whites can remain superior only by ruthlessly oppressing the Africans; and that, in spite of repression, the Africans by sheer weight of numbers will eventually supplant the Whites as the *Herrenvolk*. Therefore, to save themselves, the Whites will be forced, no matter at what cost, to bring about total apartheid.

The argument should be read in full as originally given. There is room here, however, only for a few quotations, the extracts being taken from one of the statements issued in 1948 by the SABRA group with re-

ference to the Fagan Report.

The statement acknowledges (and tacitly approves) the twin principles of "the right of self-determination of nations" and "the rights of man" but claims that "the races are so intermingled here that neither principle can be applied forthwith without resulting in the complete balkanisation of the country, and relapse into a state of barbarism." Failure to apply them, however, will also lead to eventual balkanisation, as well as ostracism by the United Nations and possibly outside interference in the Union's affairs. "Our dilemma is therefore complete."

On the other hand, White domination can be maintained in a multi-national society only by Herrenvolkism, and then only for a limited period.

"With the trek of the Native to the town the semi-feudal system of the past is disappearing here much faster than it disappeared in Europe... He adopts the ways of Western civilisation.

"Can we morally and physically withhold from him for any length of time... the full fruits of that civilisation as enjoyed by us—a civilisation which flowers in freedom of speech, freedom of occupation, freedom of association, and the civic equality of all adult men and women?"

"Has not the rise to power of the labouring classes in nearly all industrialised countries... taught... that even repeated recourse to *force majeure* is powerless in the end against the force of numbers?"

"And do not the Native labouring classes in South Africa outnumber the Europeans by some three or four to one?"

The SABRA view, it should be emphasized, rejects "what has been called the Herrenvolk concept on both moral and practical grounds, as in the following revealing passage:

"We for our part simply do not believe that white civilisation (read 'white domination') can maintain itself in South Africa for long on the basis of the complete economic integration of the Native, coupled with an attempt to discount his legitimate desire for political responsibility by not courting heads."

OPINIONS

SABRA does not conclude from the rigid logic of its analysis that what is wrong must be put right; that the Africans and other Non-Europeans should be admitted to the "full fruits" of civilisation; and that systematic efforts should be made now to prepare the whites for the inevitable "rise to power" of the labouring classes.

The conclusion drawn is different. It is that the Whites must admit defeat, and beat a strategic retreat from the multi-national society which they foisted on the Africans. The ultimate goal is to be total apartheid.

We are not concerned here with the validity of this "long-range" view but with its effect on current policies. Seen in this light, the significant thing about the theory is its use in justifying, as a temporary phase, a state of affairs which is condemned as a permanent condition.

More specifically stated, the African is being told to endure the admitted hardships and injustices of his present state so that he may at some future, indefinite time be admitted into the delights of the apartheid utopia.

The Whites, on the other hand, are told that anything which entrenches the African in the multi-national society is undesirable, and everything that makes his position there insecure is good. The Africans must not be allowed to acquire vested interests outside the Reserves,

since these will have the effect of creating further obstacles to the realization of the dream world. The net effect has been to increase enormously the insecurity of the African population in the non-tribal areas—that is to say, the great majority of the African population—without arresting in the slightest degree the process of absorbing the Africans in the general economic and social life of the multi-national society.

THE WESTERN CAPE

SABRA theorists are driven by their own logic to make increasing demands on the Government to vindicate the apartheid concept. Cabinet ministers, contending also with the pressures of employers and the Treasury, have to balance the ideology against the harsh realities of economic needs.

A specific instance of the resulting conflict came to light in the recent SABRA conference held at Stellenbosch with the position of the Coloured population as the main item on the agenda.

It is consistent with the general SABRA viewpoint that the presence of Africans in the Western Cape should be regarded as highly undesirable. Firstly, because it leads to "integration of the kind which is regarded as disastrous, and secondly, because, so it is alleged, the Coloured who are displaced by this "intrusion," are diverted to other parts of the country where they create additional problems of adjustment between White and Non-White groups.

SABRA has consequently for many years used its influence to exclude where possible Africans from the country towns of the Western Cape and from the Peninsula itself. There is probably no town with a more rigorous restriction on the right of Africans to enter and reside than Stellenbosch, where SABRA influences are strongest.

When therefore Dr. Eiselen, one of the founders and chief spokesmen of SABRA, announced that it was government policy to expel all Africans from the Western Cape, he was giving expression to the theory of total apartheid in a limited geographical field. The Minister of Native Affairs, when challenged on this point, had to choose between repudiating his Secretary and the whole of SABRA, or treating the pronouncement as a statement of official Government policy. He chose the latter course.

Eiselen's declaration has no more validity than any other formulation of total apartheid. There is no more likelihood that the migration of Africans will be stopped in the Western Cape—where it has been going on for a hundred years—than anywhere else.

But location superintendents, municipal councils, police and Native Affairs Department officials—the whole of the enormous bureaucracy concerned with Africans—will know that they are expected to get tougher.

Pass law controls will be tightened; fewer women will be allowed in to live with husbands and fathers; there will be less housing for African families, and more "bachelor" quarters; housing standards will be depreciated; and Africans will not be allowed to acquire land in leasehold or freehold.

SABRA will remain acquiescent in the atrocities of the bureaucracy and the repressive police measures required to enforce it upon a hostile people. Its role is to divert the attention of the Whites to an imaginary and unrealisable future, which it holds justifies present oppression. In so doing, it unfits the Whites for the changes that must come, and diminishes the prospect of an orderly and constitutional change.

GHETTO PLANS FOR DURBAN

By M. P. NAICKER

"A law which is manifestly unjust cannot be applied justly."

THIS statement appeared in a memorandum submitted by the Natal Indian Congress to the Land Tenure Board when it met in terms of the Group Areas Act to discuss plans for the establishment of racial zones in the City of Durban.

It is necessary to destroy the argument advanced by those in favour of apartheid measures who appeal to high-sounding principles. Their main argument in favour of Group Areas to separate the various racial groups in South Africa into "water-tight" compartments is that racial conflict and tension are brought about when members of different races live in juxtaposition to each other, and that it is in the interest of racial peace that points of contact should be eliminated.

Leaving aside the moral aspect of such an argument, this view-point has no scientific backing whatsoever.

The United Nations Economic and Social Council (UNESCO) published a statement in 1951, drawn up by twenty internationally famous experts on race problems. The following extract from this statement exposes the myths created by racials in South Africa:—

"There is no evidence that race mixture as such produces bad results from a biological point of view. The social results of race mixture whether for good or ill are to be traced to social factors.

"Biological studies lend support to the ethic of universal brotherhood; for man is born with drives towards co-operation, and unless these drives are satisfied, men and nations alike fall ill. Man is born a social being who can reach his fullest development only through interaction with his fellows. The denial at any point of this social bond between man and man brings with it disintegration. In this sense, every man is his brother's keeper, for every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main, because he is involved in mankind." (My emphasis—M.P.)

So much for the argument that racial integration causes racial conflict.

EFFECT ON HOUSING

Although there is an acute shortage of housing for the Non-European peoples, 119,633 Africans, 106,076 Indians and 13,475 Coloureds will be uprooted from their homes in terms of the Durban City Council's plans for the establishment of Group Areas in Durban and its environs. It is the declared aim of the Council that Durban should be an "all-white" city. This will mean that eventually the entire Non-White population, numbering 294,689, will be moved outside the Durban borough boundaries.

The number of Europeans that will be affected by these plans is 3,462!

The City Council of Durban is notorious for its criminal neglect of Non-European housing needs. It is estimated that over 80,000 Africans live in shack settlements and many thousands more have been forced, because of the lack of houses, to hire rooms illegally from members of other races. The position of the Indian and Coloured people is not as bad, but several thousands of families are living in slums or are without homes, and those without houses are forced to live with relatives and friends in over-crowded conditions.

The Council has also failed to provide proper civic amenities in those areas where the Non-European people predominate. For instance, in the Clairwood area where Indians have been living for half-a-century, roads, lighting and other civic amenities are in a scandalous state of neglect. In African areas the position is even worse.

One can imagine the conditions one would find in Non-European areas when Group Areas are established.

MILLIONS OF POUNDS INVOLVED

Indians in the City own a total of 10,323 acres of land valued at £24,541,060, and Africans own 105 acres of land valued at £112,180. (It should be noted that Africans are virtually debarred from owning land in terms of the "Native" Land Act of 1913, and from acquiring property from non-Africans in terms of an amendment to the Urban Areas Act in 1937).

If the plans of the City Council are put into effect, even those meagre land holdings of the African people will be completely lost and the Indians will lose 9,832 of the 10,323 acres of land they own. The value of the land lost will be £15,683,765.

A conservative estimate shows that the Indian people apart from losing the major portion of their land will also lose 7,741 homes valued at £7,778,640. To these losses must be added the amount of over £3,000,000 which will be lost in properties and land in the Clairwood area which, in terms of the Town Planning Scheme in the course of preparation, is to be declared an industrial area; and several million pounds constituting the value of business and properties in the Durban Central Area which will be coming up for discussion before the Land Tenure Board soon.

The Board has already decided that the Durban Central business area is to be a European Area. All permits and applications for new buildings are issued for a limited period. Recently the Board refused to grant a permit for occupation to an Indian in this area.

The valuations made above have been estimated by doubling the municipal rate value. However, the present market value of land and property in Indian areas is at least 25 per cent. above these valuations.

TRANSPORT PROBLEMS

The areas suggested for African and Indian occupation in the plans that have come up for discussion before the Land Tenure Board are so far removed from the city that workers employed by industry and commerce will have to shoulder increased transport expenses.

Figures submitted by the Durban City Council in their plans to the Land Tenure Board show that almost the entire Non-White labour force require a bus or a train journey to and from work. It is estimated that at least a third of this labour force will have to make two separate journeys to their places of employment.

The Non-European people are, with few exceptions, poor. It is estimated that over 90 per cent. of the African people and about 70 per cent. of the Indian people in

Durban live below the bread line. The extra cost of transport will be a further drain on their low incomes.

BUSINESSES AFFECTED

According to 1936 figures which are the only ones available, over 20,000 Indians and several thousand Africans were occupied in 7,000 wholesale, retail and general dealers businesses in Natal. The large percentage of these businesses are situated in Durban.

The Group area plans envisaged by the Durban City Council must lead to the utter ruin of these business undertakings.

In the plans before the Board, the whole of the seafront in the Borough of Durban is zoned for Whites only, with the sole exception of a very small area about 10 miles away from the centre of the City and many more miles away from the proposed African and Indian areas.

EFFECT ON EDUCATION

According to Mr. Haveman, Manager of the Durban Municipal "Native" Administration Department, over 30,000 African children are

without schools. Over 35,000 Indian children are also without any school accommodation at present.

Added to this total of 65,000 children, we have 29,351 Indian and about 4,000 African children (1941 figures) attending schools.

In terms of the plans suggested concerned will have to be accommodated in new schools built in the proposed African and Indian areas.

It might be mentioned that the majority of the school buildings at present in use have been provided for by contributions from the people and by Christian Missions. The Education Administration has failed to provide adequate schooling facilities for Non-White children and one can safely say that it will fail even more miserably in the proposed group areas for Indians and Africans.

THE FIGHT MUST CONTINUE

This gigantic crime against the Non-White peoples is being perpetrated in the guise of racial harmony.

The apartheid "master-plan" to destroy the economic and social life

of the Non-White peoples must be totally opposed. There are some who derive satisfaction from the fact that this process of destruction is a long drawn-out one. Such an attitude may lull the Non-European peoples into a false sense of security. It is dangerous for unless organised opposition and resistance is offered against the unjust and humiliating plans that are being submitted by local authorities to create ghettos for the Non-White peoples of the country, the process will be accelerated.

The form of opposition adopted by the progressive movement at present is correct. It is that we shall not assist in our own expulsion by participating in any zoning plans; that we shall not acquiesce in our own humiliation and economic disruption. On the contrary we shall do everything possible to expose the unjust and iniquitous nature of proposals made under the guise of racial harmony.

The people must organise in preparation to resist any attempt to establish Group Area ghettos in South Africa.

(Continued from page 3)

THE WESTERN AREAS

of the worse-off slum dwellers for a decent home; many saw in Meadowlands the only chance they would ever have to occupy their own home, whatever their other objections to the scheme.

Yet even then tenants on the first removal lists refused to go to Meadowlands. Some were opposed to the screening procedure which would have meant that children over a certain age might not have been allowed to live in the new Meadowlands house as registered tenants. Others refused to move because, they said, they were not told by the officers of the Resettlement Board what rent they would have to pay in Meadowlands. Others saw they would be moved into homes, but homes in a ghetto-like location with all its irksome restrictions.

Propaganda more individually directed at different households would have shown tenants the real meaning of the removal scheme and that what they might win on the swings, they would certainly lose on the roundabouts.

The campaign against the removal of the Western Areas, whatever impression it might have given in the past, must make it clear that it is not against people getting better homes. The fight for the eradication of slums (and there are slum properties in the Western Areas!) must go on, and there is nothing inconsistent in demanding home-building for Africans, and struggling against the removal, wholesale, of the Western Areas, because the latter, after all, is being carried out to satisfy Nationalist apartheid lunacy. The fight against the restrictions on people's rights in Meadowlands must go on unceasingly.

By refusing to go willingly, by taking part in the monster protest campaign against Removal the people won substantial concessions, as we have pointed out, and

the refusal now to move willingly, if extended on a mass scale, can win much more.

At the same time, tenants and landlords, at loggerheads for years over rents, water-taps, repairs and so on, have to be shown that while their differences have not evaporated, a common struggle faces them all with the government's attack on their right to live and own property where they pleased.

Of the 2,500 odd properties in the Western Areas barely a few hundred appear to have been sold to the Resettlement Board. Scores of property owners are firm that they will not sell. Expropriation of these properties is going to be a battle in itself. If the landlords hold out firmly the tenants will rally to their support, and the cause of the overwhelming number of first removals—that with the properties in which they lived being sold, the tenants felt they had no home in which to make a stand—will not obtain.

The opposition to removal is as strong as ever. It will grow stronger, not weaker as the people in Meadowlands see what the scheme really means, as the Government intensifies its attacks on the people's rights, as unity against apartheid and tyranny grow. The Government has taken only the first steps on the long road towards the total removal of the people of the Western Areas. The first steps of the people have been hesitant, but their legs are strong and their spirit good.

No purely local fight against removal can fell apartheid at one stroke but the growing resistance of the people, ever-greater consciousness and militancy, the considered use of which means of struggle to bring into play in a given situation—all these will carry the movement to new heights of achievement, which will begin to turn the tide in the struggle for democracy.

MIKE MULLER gives his views on
TRADE UNION TASKS

THE S.A. CONGRESS OF TRADE UNIONS, formed in Johannesburg on March 5th, is today the only South African trade union federation which admits to its ranks trade unions representing workers of all races. It is also the first South African trade union federation ever with an executive consisting of Africans, Europeans, Coloured and Indian members. These two simple distinctions emphasise that March 5th, 1955, may prove to have been a turning point in our trade union history. But it is childish self-deception to give out that the mere fact of the formation of this new trade union body is in itself such a turning point.

The supporters of the S.A. Congress of Trade Unions have consistently and for many years criticised the failure of the now disbanded Trades and Labour Council to take a firm stand on matters of principle, to draw all workers into active campaigns on vital political issues, to organise the many thousands of unorganised workers. Now they are in the unenviable position of having to show that a trade union federation can not only DO these things, but that it can rally the workers to it while doing so, and that, above all, it can survive the attacks of the police state which it will, as a result, certainly draw upon itself.

Of all these tasks, the easiest is that of taking a stand on principles. We can be confident that such a stand will be made. But the first principle, and main task, is not only the most difficult, but one which may, in a mood of excessive militancy and personal resentment, be lost sight of: the principle of trade union unity. It is not that offspring of the "Unity" conferences of 1954, the S.A. Trade Union Council that stands for trade union unity. The Trade Union Council cannot, and does not, defend its colour bar against African trade unions on grounds of principle. It is the founders of the Congress of Trade Unions who have consistently fought for unity. The creation of one trade union federation, giving equal rights and treatment to all trade unions, must remain their aim.

Until this can be achieved there are many issues on which the Trade Union Council and the Congress of

Trade Unions and the rank and file of the unions they represent can, and should, work together. This is especially so as regards the Industrial Conciliation Bill and the Native Labour Amendment Bill now before Parliament. Everything possible must be done to bring about united action on such issues. This does not mean that errors and deviations of the leadership of the right-wing Trade Union Council must be ignored. Where they are wrong, they must be attacked and shown up to the workers. But let it always be them, and not the progressive trade unionists, who refuse to unite in the face of attacks on workers' rights.

TRADE UNIONS AND POLITICS

In his opening address to the Conference, Mr. P. Beyersveld, who was later elected as President of the new body, said:

"You cannot separate politics and the way in which people are governed from their bread and butter, or their freedom to move to and from places where they can find the best employment, or the houses they live in, or the type of education their children get. These things are of vital concern to the workers. The Trade Unions would, therefore, be neglecting the interests of their members if they failed to struggle for their members on all matters which affect them. The Trade Unions must be as active in the political field as in the economic sphere, because the two hang together and cannot be isolated from each other."

These views were emphatically endorsed by the Conference. By doing this, the Conference made yet another distinction between itself and all other trade union federations.

This task of political action is an exceedingly difficult one. It is an aspect of trade unionism about which the progressive person with no actual experience of trade union work is an incurable romantic and a menace. It is not political action by itself to pass reams of resolutions on political questions of the day. The best test of political leadership in a trade union is the extent to which the members associate themselves with political action outside of trade union activity.

Workers test their trade union leaders by results. The weight of the

pay packets, the condition of the cloak-room, the curbing of a tyrannical foreman, these things count. Even a financially and morally corrupt leadership will be tolerated if it can lighten the day-to-day burden of wage slavery in factory, workshop and mine. None is more keenly aware of this fact than the Nationalists themselves.

Because a man of the wide experience of Moses Kotane has said that our trade unions must not be "complaints offices" many ignorant people of lesser or no experience now believe that it is almost reactionary to take up a grievance. This is nonsense. What Kotane meant was that trade unions must not be "post offices" for referring complaints within the narrow limits of wage determinations and agreements to the Labour Department and to Industrial Councils. But to take up a grievance, to lead the workers themselves to act on it unitedly, that is the life-blood of trade unionism. To teach the workers by their own experience that they can change their own life is at the root of the conception of the political role of trade unions.

By all means let us take a political stand and take political action. But, please, not through the wordy statement of policy and the flowery phrase only. Let us show the workers, on the basis of their own experience of life that a democratic South Africa is the only solution to their problems, and that this is something within their means to achieve.

This involves a great knowledge and understanding of the conditions under which people work and live. It requires sympathy and not the lofty and impatient bureaucratic attitude that even some progressive trade union leaders adopt. It means getting to know your members as people. If we wish to learn about political activity, let us learn from the lives of two great workers' leaders. Speak to an old man in a pub about Bill Andrews and he will speak to you about Comrade Bill with deep affection. Speak to any Cape worker—White or Non-White—about Ray Alexander and he will give Ray a medal that banning orders have merely polished to shine more brightly. Their work shows that

marriage between the fight for better conditions now and the political problems of the day, which alone is the basis for rallying the workers politically.

THE UNORGANISED

At the inaugural conference of the Congress of Trade Unions 42,000 workers were represented. The Trade Union Council represents three times as many workers. The potential membership of the Congress of Trade Unions is limited only by its means and ability to organise the unorganised workers. Besides this one task, all other tasks are of no consequence. It can stand on principles until it drops, it can campaign politically until it is winded, but if it fails to bring into the trade union movement a large proportion of the nearly one million

unorganised workers, then its very survival is doubtful.

This great task has to be tackled under the most adverse conditions. Many experienced and able organisers are banned. Many more will be banned. Repression and terror tactics are going to be stepped up. Spies and stooges will increase.

Two things are obvious. Firstly, large numbers of organisers must be drawn from the ranks and trained. Secondly, the available organising force must be used economically; that is, must not be squandered on the small and unimportant industries and factories, but must organise the large units in the major industries.

IT SPEAKS FOR ALL

The Congress of Trade Unions has

been formed to protect the rights and to improve the living standards of all workers. It does not speak only for the members of unions affiliated to it. It speaks also for workers who do not yet enjoy the benefits of trade unions. And it also serves those workers whose own trade union leaders have betrayed its true trade union principles. This fact must be made known to the rank and file of all trade unions.

If by its deeds the Congress of Trade Unions speaks for all workers, then they will rally to it. Repression and reactionary leaders will not stop them. But if its deeds are to speak well of it then they must be responsible acts, and closely allied to the needs and the understanding of the workers.

LONDON LETTER

from SIMON ZUKAS

IN accepting the terms of the African miners for ending the two-month strike the mining companies of Northern Rhodesia had, I am sure, to take into account the likely repercussions wholesale victimization might have in Britain. The British miners supported the strike not only with expressions of solidarity but with some £3,000. What is more, this support came not only from branch and regional levels but also from the National Executive. Expressions of solidarity came even from as far afield as the executive of the National Union of Vehicle Builders. I am convinced that if it were brought home to the British dockworkers that they were handling "black" copper very little of the copper mined by the European scabs would have been offloaded here. Wholesale victimization on the Copperbelt would have had the same result.

If the African miners were unsuccessful in achieving their demands the European miners' double-cross benefitted no one but the bosses. It is true the Europeans have been paid a bonus of 12 per cent. on their basic monthly pay during the strike for betraying their African fellow workers but this is hardly likely to outweigh their loss of face in the eyes of the British and World trade union movement. And there is

no doubt that this loss of face has taken place. The donation by the Miners' International Federation of £1,000 to the strikers is evidence of this, for the European union is also affiliated to this body.

It is less than a year since Lawther on behalf of the M.I.F. got the European union to resolve to help the African Union better the condition of their members. Now that the hypocrisy of their promise has been exposed, the European miners will no longer be able to fool a section of the British trade union movement that their attitude to African advancement in industry is based not on racial prejudice but on sincere fear of "dilution," and it is partly because they realise this that they run to the South African European miners for support. Lawther came off pretty badly in this whole affair: before the strike he was about to leave for the Copperbelt; he did not go, and if he goes now—I doubt whether he will—he will be forced to ignore the European union or be ignored by the African union. Placitudinous formulae can be dangerous: they can come home to roost.

Evidently the European miners — with some honourable exceptions — had hoped that by scabbing they would smash the African union and thus delay the relaxation of the industrial colour bar. Many of them are

now complaining that the companies have let them down. Since the companies require the pressure from the African union to help them in their case for this relaxation, the European miners were rather naive in expecting the companies to attempt to smash the African union at this juncture. Perhaps they will now realise that the game of the mining companies is to play off one side of the working-class against the other — to keep them at each other's throats.

It's now the turn of the European miners. I am willing to bet that the companies will, within the next few weeks, return to the attack on the European miners' positions. With the threat from the African miners to the companies weakened, the scabbing value of the European miners is reduced and the companies can now afford to proceed against them more than before the strike. It will not be long before they will see that their betrayal has not saved their own skins.

"Few issues have so deeply troubled the conscience of people in this country as has the Bantu Education Act," commented the *Sunday Observer* recently. That this is no exaggeration is evident from the vast attendance at the exhibition of Brian Henseltine's photographs of African life in Cape Town which was organised by The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel at St. Martin-in-the-Field—a few steps from South Africa House; by the well-attended meetings the Bishop of Johannesburg has been having and by the thousands of pounds collected by him for his proposed community centres.

IN PARLIAMENT

By
PETER MEYER

ON February 9, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Strauss, moved the adjournment of the Assembly on "a definite matter of urgent public importance." This is the prescribed procedure for securing debates on urgent matters. Mr. Strauss wanted to discuss the ban that the Minister of Justice, Mr. Swart, had placed on all gatherings in the Johannesburg and Rodepoort magisterial districts. What followed was very revealing.

In passing, it is worth mentioning that, under the new Parliamentary rules that came into force this year, urgent debates—if the Speaker allows them—are not taken as soon as the Assembly meets at 2.15 p.m., but at 8 p.m. or, if there is no night sitting, at 4 p.m. This new rule takes some of the urgency out of the situation.

Requests for urgent debates are made as soon as the Assembly meets in the afternoon. The Speaker then decides whether a debate is warranted or not. If he decides against a debate, then that is the end of it. If he accepts the motion, he asks the Members supporting it to rise in their seats. If fewer than 15 Members rise, the motion falls away. The three Native Representatives and the five Labour M.P., therefore, cannot secure a debate on their own. They need at least eight other Members to rise with them—either Opposition or Government Members.

As far as Mr. Strauss's request was concerned, it is clear that the United Party was in its usual dilemma. According to Dr. Verwoerd, the U.P. had heard that the Labour Party had intended moving the adjournment of the House to discuss the ban and had decided to steal Mr. Heppel's thunder. Whether this is true or not, there is no doubt that the United Party was more concerned with letting its supporters know that it was watching over their freedom than with the actual defence of that freedom.

Mr. Strauss was openly apologetic for having raised the matter at all. His speech abounds with phrases like: "There can be no question at this stage of any criticism of the Government" (laughter) and "the Minister will always have from me the use of our influence to see that the laws of the country are carried out." Quite clearly, Mr. Strauss has committed the United Party to supporting the rule-by-force that the Nationalists

are applying.

The reaction in other sections of the Opposition was also interesting. The Bekker group, as expected, went even further than the Nationalists. But it is Mrs. Ballinger's behaviour that arouses most interest. Her speech, as reported in Hansard, shows that her main accusation against Mr. Swart was not that he was being dictatorial and tyrannical, but that "this is a case of bad government and bad administration."

To quote Mrs. Ballinger: "That is the real issue. In no circumstances does this Government ever get the Native population behind them when it is applying Native policy... There is only one saving grace in the situation and that is that this ban applies not only to Africans but to Europeans."

What an extraordinary argument! Mrs. Ballinger, presumably believes that with a little tact the support of the Africans could have been obtained for the Western Areas removal scheme, and she regards the all-embracing nature of the ban as a virtue not a vice.

The Labour Party was the only group in the Assembly that approached Mr. Swart's ban sensibly. Mr. Heppel showed that it was a piece of trickery. "We know very well," he said, "that it has not been secret subversive groups protesting against the removal of the Natives from the Western Areas. It has been a public organisation operating in the open, holding meetings openly and openly declaring what its aims are."

But now for Mr. Swart's speech. If you have the Hansard report, I recommend that you should read the whole debate. Spotting the contradictions in Mr. Swart's speech becomes almost a game.

Mr. Swart began by saying that when he was overseas he saw reports that "there was trouble." But since when does Mr. Swart believe the British newspapers, and particularly on such a serious matter? Surely he did not allow the reports in the British Press to influence him?

Then, says Mr. Swart, he was met at the airport by his police chiefs, and "I was told that the greatest threat of danger came from a group of idle, lawless totis who, unfortunately, were incited by certain people who pretend to be responsible persons, among others, I am sorry to say,

certain clergy, and among them, Father Huddleston." But if there were "idle, lawless totis" loafing around, must we believe that this benevolent police force left them undisturbed? "Idle" Africans, as everyone knows, are rounded up smartly by the police, and "lawless" ones even quicker.

Mr. Swart contradicted himself further. On the one hand, the trouble-makers were only a small group of "totis" who were being incited by "agitators." But they were potentially so powerful that a surprise move at dawn, backed by 2,000 police, was considered advisable!

Most of Mr. Swart's speech was taken up with police "reports" of what happened at "subversive" meetings. Two points need explaining: how did the police always gain access to these "subversive" meetings, and why was no one charged for preaching sedition and revolt? Pointing out that Robert Resha had declared that no violence would be used, Mr. Swart commented: "The police have information that the volunteers will indeed use violence." But if the police knew there would be violence, they must have heard someone say it, and incitement to violence is an offence. If the police merely heard it at second hand, then it is pure hearsay, and the ban on the Rand was imposed then on a basis of hearsay evidence.

Mr. Swart admitted as much. He said: "Whether all these things are true or whether they would have occurred, is difficult for me to say." What an incredible statement. First, Mr. Swart goes into the most elaborate details, and lists individually the various types of firearms and explosives allegedly in the possession of Western Areas residents, and then he adds that it is not all necessarily true.

If Mr. Swart had said that the police believed that some Africans had guns or other weapons, he might have got away with it. But he explained what kind of guns, what kind of explosives, and what methods would be used. Surely, with all this information, the police should have been able to make an arrest? But no one was arrested and not a single gun or home-made bomb has been found.

This is not the end of the con-

(Continued next page)



"And everybody praised the Duke who this great fight did win,"
 "But what good came of it at last?"
 quoth little Peterkin:-
 "Why, that I cannot tell," said he,
 "But 'twas a famous victory."
 (From "After Blesheim,"
 by Robert Southey.)

The members of Her Majesty's Opposition have really covered themselves with glory during this present session. Refreshed and invigorated by their recent Native Policy (First Folio, unearthed at Bloemfontein A.D. 1954, entitled "A Shot in the Arm," by J. G. N. Strauss) they have these past weeks been opposing like anything. I oppose, you oppose, thou opposest, he, Mr. Douglas Mitchell (U.P. South Coast) opposes. The last-named flatly opposed the right of an African constable, as distinct from any other sort of constable, to enter his house—a prospect in store for him under the Criminal Procedure and Evidence Amendment Bill. Earlier the resident comedian, Mr. Harry Lawrence, had opposed the introduction of the Bill written in English only.

(Continued from previous page.)
 traditions in Mr. Swart's speech, but I shall let it rest there. The whole thing is a pack of inaccuracies and distortions.
 Finally, there is Dr. Verwoerd's intervention in the debate. He produced a commentary on the trek to Meadowlands, and if you are wondering where the Press got all those phrases about the removal "picnic" and the laughing, singing Africans, just turn to Dr. Verwoerd's address. It's all there. The Press dutifully took it over.

Mr. Strauss himself had recently taken the Labour Party severely to task for daring to suggest an increase in the number of Native Representatives in both Houses. And hadn't the United Party objected in no uncertain manner to the shipping of meat to Russia?

Yes, verily has Mr. Strauss lived up to his title, recently bestowed on him by a normally phlegmatic observer, as "the greatest leader the United Party has had since Smuts went." You all of course remember his Speech at the Bloemfontein Congress in November last and you will recall no doubt how the local English press went hoarse with hosannas, singing the praises of this new policy, ("courageous in its broad principles, cautious and conservative in practical detail"—a minute from the *Sunday Times*). Who will lightly forget the stirring tribute paid to it by the *Uppington Dispatch*, by ignoring Mr. Strauss' speech entirely and published instead a lengthy article entitled "Censorship Flogging in Eastern Namaqualand."

However, there may be some people who have, for a variety of reasons, either not yet absorbed the main essentials of the Policy, or else have forgotten them. Here then we present in capsule form the *leit motif* of the main essentials of the broad outline of the United Party's Native Policy (1954). The reader should study these points so that he may flatten his political opponent next time he is called (a) a Kafferboecic, or (b) a blooming Nat. Each clause, you will notice, has been cunningly devised so as to qualify not only the one preceding it, but also the one following. This is Unity at its most adhesive.

EDUCATION: Yes, why not?—providing the African doesn't run away with the idea that the Bantu Education Act isn't all it's cracked

up to be. The Bantu Education Act isn't all it's cracked up to be.

TRADE UNIONS: Some form of factory organisation might, under favourable circumstances, be encouraged. *De facto* recognition of some future form of trade union might be sufficient, provided of course, that strict control is enforced. Take a glee club, for example....

PASSES: All Africans owning property with a municipal valuation of over £27,000 may be granted exemptions. This figure may, under favourable conditions, be decreased if the African has been appointed Head of a University Faculty or has reached the rank of Mine Captain. Otherwise exemption from exemptions must be rigidly enforced.

FREEHOLD: Ah, now, that's rather a tough one to wrestle with. Possibly some form of temporary freehold might be the answer. On the other hand it might not.

POLITICAL RIGHTS: What do you think?

This, we believe, is more or less the complete list proposed by Mr. Strauss and accepted by an audible majority at the Congress. It remained only to roll out Senator Barbel, who moved a motion of thanks and confidence to and in the Wizard from Germiston District. It might be as well to mention that both the Right and Left wings of the United Party were eliminated in the semi-finals.

We look forward eagerly to future United Party Congresses, where Mr. Strauss will give out on foreign affairs. "A New Deal for Tristan da Cunha" is expected to figure largely in his proposals.

Medici Gowns

**AGENTS
wanted to sell**

"Fighting Talk"

on commission
Write to P.O. Box 1355

Here are some extracts from Dr. Verwoerd's report, just as he read them: "Rain delaying removal, spirit excellent. Families co-operating beautifully and plead to be allowed to use their own conveyance to Meadowlands."

"Many Bantu in streets are in picnic mood. Last group being loaded 4 p.m. Will be large group."

"Everything still peaceful. Those removed enthusiastic."

Yes, the removal went "peacefully" while 2,000 police stood by.

Phone 5-3493
Locomotive Hotel
 SALT RIVER
 FAVOURITE
 RENDEZVOUS

Standard Furnishing
 (Pty.) Ltd.
 30d, 30e, Voortrekker Street
 and 35a, Prince's Avenue,
 BENONI
For The Best In Furniture

Bedroom Suites by
**ANGLO UNION
 FURNITURE
 Manufacturers Ltd.**
 Stocked by
 LEADING FURNITURE
 STORES

**Trump Clothing
 Manufacturers**
 (PTY.) LTD.
 1 Central Road - Fordsburg
 Phone 34-4529
 MAKERS OF
 TWEETS, TROUSERS
 AND
 AND ACROBAT SUITS

Juno Furnishing Co.
 64 KNOX STREET
 Phone 51-1106 GERMISTON
For A Square Deal
 Contact Us

Day Phone 25-3963
MALVERN PHARMACY
 CHEMIST AND OPTICIANS
 619 Juba Street, Malvern
 JOHANNESBURG

EXPERT WATCHMAKERS
 Reasonable prices and guaranteed
 workmanship. For Cycles, Watches
 and Jewellery come to Kliff's Cycle
 Works, 82 Harrison Street, Johan-
 nesburg. Fighting Talk readers will
 receive a special discount on all new
 watches bought. Managed by Ioy
 Heyman.

BARRIS BROS.
 WHOLESALE MERCHANTS AND
 DIRECT IMPORTERS
 128 Victoria Street Germiston
 P.O. Box 128. Phone 51-1281; 51-1289

A Boon to Cigarette Smokers
The NO-NIK
 CIGARETTE HOLDER
 with CRYSTAL FILTERS
 The NO-NIK absorbs
 the Nicotine but does
 not affect the flavour
 ● GET IT FROM YOUR
 TOBACCONIST
 Trade Enquiries:
L. FELDMAN LIMITED
 JOHANNESBURG

Perfect Writing
 Instruments

Burnham
 PENS
 NO. 1000
 Your friend
 for life!

For All Your
JEWELLERY
 and Fancy Goods Requirements
 Consult
**Wholesale Jewellers
 Association**
 (PTY.) LTD.
 BLOEMFONTEIN
 Maitland Street

**STEWART'S
 REXALL PHARMACY**
 S. JEFF, M.P.S.
 CHEMIST & DRUGGIST
 PHOTOGRAPHIC SUPPLIES
 280a, Louis Botha Avenue,
 ORANGE GROVE
 Phone 45-6243/4

Unless otherwise stated, NOTICE FIRST OF P.O. Box 1355, is responsible for all political matter in this issue.

Published by "Fighting Talk" Committee, Care of P.O. Box 1355, Johannesburg.