

ness, superstition and ignorance to light, human understanding, and full creative expression.

Peace brings with it a need to alleviate human suffering, to uplift and rehabilitate the downtrodden that they too may participate in the enjoyment of the fruits of the earth, and the warm, glad sun.

Peace above all renews our faith in man, for what greater experience is there than the full appreciation of the dignity of man.

As we look backwards through the ages, we cannot but be impressed by the remarkable potential of man; the great cathedrals, the great works of art, the mastery of nature, of the sea, of the earth and of the air. Deserts have been made to flower, unruly forests have been harnessed, and devastating pestilence controlled—all this, my friends, achieved in the face of hostility; can you imagine when all the people of the world are liberated, are allowed to understand each other, are given every opportunity to find full creative expression, what joy, what a spectacle of human achievement will spread over the face of the earth! We shall indeed witness the true glory of man. These are not pipe-dreams, these are the things that can come to be if you desire them.

As I think of Africa today, of that vast territory extending from the Sahara to Cape Town, with its African-Indian population of over 160 million, and of its 4 million whites; as I reflect on the plight of the people—of the one million lepers, of the millions of tuberculotics, parasite-infested human beings, of the millions of babies who are born into filth and degradation, and who never reach the age of 12 months, and when I reflect that there are vast expanses of land stretching from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic Ocean which if cultivated can feed easily the entire continent of Africa as well as Europe, then I know that there is a great, urgent task before us.

And that is why I talk of peace now. You have got to feel it, dream it, lest you be distracted by other nefarious desires.

Lest you feel alone here today, lest you feel that you are voices crying in the wilderness, I would assure you that there are at least 700 million people thinking the same way. Grasp the hand of your comrades, raise up your voices, that a great cry resound through the entire universe—for peace, and for the restoration of the dignity of man, and all that it means. For happiness!

THE LIBERAL PARTY REPLIES

By T. W. PRICE

AN article described editorially as “Mr. Mandela’s searching analysis of the Liberal Party” was published two issues ago in “Liberation.” Much of the article is the usual critical mumbo-jumbo, a sort of intellectual throwing of the ideological bones, used by Leftists everywhere in their “analyses” of Liberalism. It all supports a question, much the same as the famous one rapped out by Pistol.

another furious romantic: "Under which King, Besonian? Speak or die!"

Having asked the question whether the Liberals stand for Dr. Malan's version of the "people" or Mr. Mandela's, he uses his critical rigmarole to arrive at an astonishing answer, as amazing as any rabbit pulled out of the Marxian hat. The Liberals are only a species of subtle Nationalist. In fact they stand for "the acceptance of the Rehabilitation Scheme, Bantu Authorities, Group Areas, Public Safety, Criminal Law Amendment Acts and all the wicked policies of the Government."

The impetus of this fine frenzy carries Mr. Mandela even further. He declares, "In practice they (the Liberals!) acquiesce in the slavery of the people, low wages, mass unemployment, the squalid tenements in locations and shantytowns."

This sort of flat accusation can only be answered by a straightforward denial. The Liberal Party rejects completely the Bantu Authorities, Group Areas, Public Safety, Criminal Law Amendment and many other Acts and wicked policies of the present Government. This has been very clearly demonstrated by the actions, statements and congresses of the Liberals at present responsible for the leadership of the Party.

As for the Liberal Party's interest in maintaining underpayment, unemployment and squalor the following extracts from the summary of the Liberal Party's first congress will be of interest:

"Economic and Labour Policy.

"The Liberal Party recognises that one of the most urgent social and economic problems facing South Africa is Poverty, due primarily to the retarded development of its human and material resources. The Liberal Party accordingly bases its economic policy on the following fundamental points:

"(a) that the chief way to increase the wealth of the community and thereby raise living standards, is to raise the productivity of our people, whether employed in agriculture, mining, industry or commerce.

"(b) that productivity, and thereby the National Income, should be raised by increasing the skill and efficiency of the whole of the population by encouraging the stabilisation of the labour force in town and country and by permitting resources to move to where they can be most productively used.

"The Liberal Party is opposed to the Industrial Colour Bar, and among other things, recommends the deletion of that part of the definition of 'employee' in the Industrial Conciliation Act No. 36 of 1937, whereby African men are excluded from the terms of that Act.

"The Liberal Party maintains that the right of all persons to join or organise legally protected trade unions should be enjoyed by all."

Also:—

“The Liberal Party pledges itself to implement a housing programme on a national scale.

“It will base its programme on the recognition of the right of all individuals to buy and own property with security of title.”

The suggestion that the Liberal Party stands for the “slavery of the people” has already been partly met by the foregoing extracts. But possibly Mr. Mandela will maintain that because the Liberals do not support him in his demand for an immediate universal adult franchise, they are in fact anxious to preserve “slavery.” His argument is more or less like this. The present system of the Nationalists and their policy of shrinking the franchise is “slavery”. The Liberals are no better than the Nationalists because they only want to expand the franchise.

Incidentally the Liberals put no limit of pigment or class upon the expansion of the vote to South Africa's population. It only places an educational limit (Std. VI) or an economic limit, and then proposes a 20 year plan for universal literacy, plus another plan for raising the productivity and earning capacity of all.

Mr. Mandela relies heavily for his emotional case against the Liberals on the fact, unsubstantiated, that they tried to call off the Defiance Campaign. If certain Liberals did advise against the Campaign it was because they were aware that those in control were only very sketchily “in control”. It was apparent almost from the start of the campaign that it would be side-tracked by some incident or another in which the Africans would be the chief sufferers. And this did in fact happen, playing into the hands of the Nationalists, and giving them the excuse to put the African population more under the political yoke than ever.

The whole tactical conception of the Campaign was ill-advised, and the concentration of the demonstrations into the East Cape area showed no grasp of realities. It was remarkable that the African people showed up so well while acting under the hazy, romantic, and over-ambitious plans of their leaders. A good idea was ruined by poor administrative execution.

That the Liberals are not against the organisations themselves or even their leaders, but only very dubious of their tactics during the Defiance Campaign, must be fully apparent from the resolutions taken by them at their founding congress:

“The Party considers the existing policy of rendering Non-European leadership ineffective to be both unjust and dangerous to us all.

“The Party protests against the restrictions placed on the movements of the president of the African National Congress, ex-Chief Luthuli, and objects to the description of him as an inciter of feelings of racial hostilities.”

And much else besides.

When mob-murder became, however unjustifiably, associated with the Campaign in the public mind, the Campaign became a debacle. The present shaky control which African leaders have over their followers is no guarantee that any Campaign of this sort in the future can be carried out peaceably. No constitutional party, however sympathetic to Africans, can in any way encourage or contemplate a movement which, it seems inevitable, will end in useless tragedy for hundreds of Africans—or, for that matter, for Europeans.

Mr. Mandela still trots out the old, heart-warming clap-trap about "mass struggles" and "people's fights" which please the militant intellectual in his arm-chair but only ends in some bewildered worker being cudgelled in the city square. He dreams not in South African realities, but in terms of the rosy clichés born of the October Revolution. And he demands that we make an immediate choice between two political illusions—the Big Rock Candy Mountains of the Nationalists, and those of his own ideological ilk:

Just in case the Big Rock Candy Mountains allusion escapes Mr. Mandela, we offer him a verse from the famous song:—

"In the big Rock Candy Mountains
All the cops have wooden legs,
The bull-dogs all have rubber teeth,
And the hens lay soft-boiled eggs.
The farmers' trees are full of fruit,
And the barns are full of hay—
And I'm bound to go where there ain't no snow,
Where the rain don't pour, and the wind don't blow,
In the big Rock Candy Mountains."

All the tramp believed he had to do to arrive at this delectable spot was to walk down the road into the sunset, and all Mr. Mandela believes that he has to do to arrive in his Utopia is to have one real good mass struggle.

The Liberal Party is not fooled by these fond illusions. It believes that by argument, much organisation, and ceaseless constitutional action it can arrive at the objective of true freedom for all—and that without any storming of bastiles, barricade mounting or waving of tattered banners. And also with no tombstones as milestones.

Even in the editorial in support of Mr. Mandela's article there is a modicum of confused thinking. In an argument which presumably purported to show what a futile Party the Liberal Party is, the editorial states,—"If 43 years since the demise of Cape Liberalism has taught us anything, it is surely that the Non-Europeans will get nothing but kicks, disenfranchisement, and apartheid, until they are organised and determined and united enough to take their rights for themselves." But surely this is an argument for the revival of Cape Liberalism, for a return to the mode of progression which is the only one that leads forward at a good enough pace to a united nation and a whole democracy. It is the great middle way between the two great will-o'-wisps, the complete victory by force over the blacks by the whites that is the "ignus fatuus" of the Nationalists, and the complete victory by force of the blacks over the whites, which is that of Mr. Mandela.

(Reference is made to the above article in the Editorial of this issue of "Liberation")