

this limited greatness. Cassius found in himself, not in his stars, the fault that limited him. But of Hendrik Verwoerd the opposite was true. He could have been great under different stars, but he was born into a society whose definition of greatness is not accepted anywhere else, except in those societies and those minds dedicated to the same ideals of White security, White survival, and, inescapably, White supremacy, by whatever grand name they may be called.

(With acknowledgements to "The Daily News" and its associated newspapers.)

Dr. EDWARD ROUX SCHOLARSHIP

THE LATE PROFESSOR EDDIE ROUX was an active member of the Liberal Party for many years. At the same time he served as Chairman of the Rationalist Association of South Africa. He was active in other spheres as well, and was a popular public speaker. His academic achievements in the field of botany are well known and at least one of his books on this subject is a standard university textbook. His political history, banned in South Africa, was entitled "Time Longer than Rope — the struggle of the black man for freedom in South Africa".

Professor Roux was listed as a Communist and as a result had to resign from the Liberal Party in the early '60's. At the end of 1964 he was banned, and prohibited from teaching in or entering a university. This edict of the Minister of Justice, Mr. Vorster, forced Eddie Roux to relinquish his position as Professor of Botany at the University of the Witwatersrand. He retired to his home in Melville, Johannesburg, where he died a year later.

A scholarship has been set up to honour Dr. Roux's service to his university and his country. Administered by the Students' Representative Council of the University of the Witwatersrand, it is called the "Dr. Edward R. Roux Scholarship in Bio-Ecology". Contributions are requested from Liberal Party members and the general public.

This is a constructive way to remember a man who contributed a great deal to his coun-

try and made many sacrifices for his beliefs. Please make out cheques and postal orders to the "Dr. E. R. Roux Scholarship" and address all contributions to:—

The Dr. Roux Scholarship Committee,
Students' Representative Council,
University of the Witwatersrand,
Milner Park, Johannesburg.

THAT BILL AGAIN

(some disrespectful comments by a member)

EXIT THE IMPROPER INTERFERERS . . .
ENTER THE PROPER INTERFERERS

TIDINESS is one virtue we have learnt to expect in those who, like our rulers, are authoritarian-minded. How they love to cross the "t's" and dot the "i's"! We Liberals, who are improper interferers par excellence, were perhaps less astonished than others at the Prohibition of Improper Interference Bill.

We have come to recognise and expect the psychopathic logic this Bill represents. In its high-sounding moments it postulates a South Africa which does not exist; a South Africa of four distinct population groups merrily developing along their own lines, without let or hindrance to one another. How justified to frustrate those who would upset this chain of order, peace and tidiness!

Under this froth of words, however, we see this Bill for what it really is — not a chain of orderly, peaceful coexistence, but a shackle to contain those who question the political controllers of South Africa.

Liberals refused

Many observers believed that the Government would deal with its radical opponents less directly. The bannings and propaganda onslaughts on the Liberal Party had set it reeling, and, so these observers reasoned, a knock-out blow was unnecessary: Liberals would limp from the encounter. These observers misjudged the situation because their analysis was too sophisticated.

This interference Bill is aimed as a knock-out partly because the Liberals have refused to leave the field and partly because the Govern-

men' simply must. There is a dynamic force in Nationalism urging it on. It is irrelevant to question the logic and ask: "Is the Bill really necessary?" Was the ban on the Maori rugby players essential to the well-being of Afrikaner Nationalism? It, like this Bill, is a mechanical product of the driving power behind Nationalism which is its goose-step to the right; the most powerful force at work in South African politics.

Impelled by this logic, the Nationalists see the body politic as a neat equation, $p=x-y$. P is peace and good order; X is the National Party; Y is its opponents. The Liberals and Progressives are very much minus Y in the scheme of things.

Perhaps the worst feature of this Bill is its sanctimonious hypocrisy which is nowhere shown in better light than in the preamble, with its talk of "the traditional way of life", in which all develop "independently", reaching a sickly crescendo in which the whites as the guardians of the other population groups "accept their mission" to lead the non-white population groups to "self-realisation".

Serfdom

How does the Coloured man realise himself? He has no homeland and must face serfdom in perpetuity in his own country because of his race and colour. Would anyone deny it? And the Indian? Would anyone deny it? And the African — the majority of us — did he appoint the white as his guardian to deprive him of a say in his future?

How paltry is this "inalienable right" to live according to your lights, spoken of in the preamble! The Coloured people's franchise was alienated by packing the Senate and the separate representation given them is to stay provided they do not exercise choices of which their rulers disapprove.

This prissy atmosphere pervades the Bill from the very word "Improper", with its girls' high school tone, to its last word.

The occasion for the Bill is the certainty that the Coloureds in a free election would elect Progressives and not Nats. or U.P.'s to Parliament. This Bill is primarily aimed at stopping that. So independent are the Coloureds that they are to be denied free choice of candidates. Could there be a more improper interference than that? If this Bill deserves a slogan to put it across at the hustings, may we recommend: "No one shall interfere, but some shall interfere less than others."

Extraordinary

Saying precisely what the Bill means is an extraordinary and impossible exercise. Some of the sections drafted by the Parliamentary Mrs. Malprop, defy interpretation, even with the aid of the explanatory memorandum. In fact, nothing is more clear than the improper interference with the long-suffering English language, seen in such gems as: "These provisions do not prohibit any member of any population group to criticise the actions of the government of the day."

Through all the wrong prepositions, however, we get the message: "Mixed parties is something up with which we will not put." The explanatory memorandum does say so — "no mixed political parties will be allowed". The text of the Bill, however, is very obscure, especially in this regard. Section 2 (1) b reads: "No person shall directly or indirectly take part in or give assistance with regard to the establishment or organisation of any political party, or any group or other form of organisation the objects or any of the objects of which are to propagate, discuss, study or encourage political views to which members of such a population group belong."

One has heard of being identified with one's opinions: this conundrum confirms it! Those who are quite mystified need not hope to find the key in the Afrikaans text: it reads equal gibberish.

Intention

The intention is, however, plain, as the explanatory memorandum makes clear, and, in its present form, the Bill means the end of the Liberal Party, the Progressive Party and perhaps NUSAS and the Institute of Race Relations as well. It also means that the Coloureds must find their representatives among the political chorus girls. Stripped of its verbiage, that is what this Bill seems to be trying to say.

There are, however, other gems which must not be overlooked. Criticism of "the government of the day" (the longest day!) is permitted, "provided such criticism if delivered by a member of a population group other than the population group out of which the government is constituted, does not refer to the political party of which members of the government are members".

We Liberals, of course, had long regarded it as an unspeakable party!

With a singular lack of faith in the draftsman, a clause empowers the Minister to prohibit any-

thing he pleases which he thinks might defeat the objects of this Act! And as a "P.S." there is a pig-iron clause to allow the Minister to grant exemptions from the Act. The Liberals do not anticipate permits!

Select Committee

A select committee is to consider the Bill. For this we must thank Sir de Villiers Graaff, who, Mr. Marais Steyn tells us, saved the Liberal Party. Let us be thankful, but while thinking of Sir de Villiers, has it struck him that the Improper Interference Bill is Race Federation carried to its logical conclusion? Or has the U.P. abandoned this policy en route?

The public response to the Bill was predictable. At least it did cause a stir in Parliament. In a right-wing atmosphere in which opponents feel helpless, it is hard to expect mass uproar.

The Liberal Party goes on. We will not continue on a segregated basis, for to segregate would be to forgo any meaning in our existence. If this Bill is passed we shall disband as an organised party, but let us serve notice on our rulers that our principles will survive them and will be the basis of a new South Africa.

To end: How will Carel de Wet put this across in the U.K.? At least we shall be spared that uncomfortable feeling we always had when he used our existence as proof of South African democracy.

Political comment in this issue by: E. Brookes, A. Paton, E. Wentzel and M. Dyer, all of 268 Longmarket Street, Pietermaritzburg.

Published by the Liberal Party of S.A., Room 1, 268 Longmarket Street, Pietermaritzburg, and printed by L. Backhouse, 91-93 Church Street, Pietermaritzburg. — 65349