

LIBERAL OPINION

LIBERAL OPINION is sent free of charge to newspapers, in South Africa and overseas, to representatives of foreign governments, to libraries and universities, to various organisations, and to all individuals and organisations who want to receive it.

EDITOR:

Room 1, 268 Longmarket Street,
Pietermaritzburg.

PRODUCTION & CIRCULATION:

P.O. Box 66, Wynberg, Cape.

IN THIS ISSUE:

- 1 Reply to Mr. Vorster
 - 4 Why Liberalism is not Communism
 - 6 Removal of Africans from Western Cape
 - 7 Life in "Free" Bantustan
-



Reply to Mr. Vorster

(Text of a speech delivered at a Liberal Party public meeting in Durban by ALAN PATON.)

ALL OF YOU know that Liberalism has been under severe attack these last few weeks, especially from our Minister of Justice Mr. Balthazar Vorster. He uttered an epigram which even his enemies agree, was worthy of a cleverer man. He was reported to have said: Communism kills, but Liberalism leads into ambush in order to kill. He probably was speaking in Afrikaans, and probably said: Communism kills, but Liberalism leads one into ambush in order that one might be killed. Apparently some Liberals do this wittingly — they are the bad fellows — and some do it unwittingly — they are the stupid fellows.

If ever a Party in the history of South Africa played on the fears of white people, it was the Nationalist Party. That is how it got into power. That's how it hopes to stay in power. Now that it is in power, it is playing on the fears of white people who are not Nationalists. They are smearing the Liberal Party, and Liberalism in general, in hopes of frightening white people into the all-white camp.

According to Mr. Waring, there are no Liberals in South Africa, only pseudo-Liberals. I may say that Mr. Waring's knowledge of Liberalism is

exactly nothing. Rugby was his strong point, and he's never had another one since. He says he fought in the last war when some of us were wet behind the ears, but for all he understood what he was fighting for, he might as well have been wet behind the ears too.

Let me tell Mr. Waring what he was fighting for in the last war. He was fighting to save the world from an unspeakable doctrine of race superiority, and an unspeakable doctrine of State divinity. Doesn't he know that he was fighting to defend us from that? And if he does know, why does he today belong to a Party that also has an unspeakable doctrine of race superiority, and gives to the State totalitarian powers over the lives and freedom of those who disagree with the Party, giving them no right to trial in the courts. And this is the man who is defending Christian civilisation. He hasn't a notion of what Christian civilisation is. Nor has his colleague, Mr. Trollip. Mr. Trollip says he is proud of the work he did on the Sabotage Act. Imagine a man being proud of making that contribution to Christian civilisation.

Anti-Communist phobia

Let me say that we in the Liberal Party have no intention of jumping on the anti-Communist bandwagon. Just because Mr. Vorster says we are practically Communists, we are not going to spend all our time proving we are not Communists. We have no intention of crawling round on our bellies just to show Mr. Vorster what we really are, because the moment you go down on your belly, you are no longer what you really are. We have no intention of making anti-Communism the sum and substance of our Liberalism. It is dangerous to any democratic creed when it succumbs to anti-Communist phobia. If only Afrikaner Nationalists had their eyes open and their minds open, they would know that Afrikaner Nationalism is in danger of becoming nothing more than anti-Communism. This anti-Communist phobia is being whipped up because Afrikaner Nationalism is in danger of dying down. There is a real danger that white Christianity will also become corrupted by anti-

Communist phobia, and that it won't matter much if you love God and your neighbour; what will really matter will be if you hate Russia and China.

In fact I would say no more about Communism but I am compelled to by the Communist Party itself. This month the Communist Party of South Africa launched a fierce attack on the Liberal Party in their nameless, faceless periodical that comes unwanted and unpaid for to certain chosen South Africans. This month the Communist Party accuses the Liberal Party of pathological hostility to Communism. Our hostility is not pathological. Our hostility is based on our hatred of dictatorship and our devotion to the rule of law; we believe that citizens have rights that no State should infringe. The Communist Party, does not, and it has a notable ally, Mr. Balthazar Vorster.

The Communist Party condemns us for condemning sabotage and violence. By what argument in heaven or earth should we not condemn sabotage and violence? We don't believe in it, and that's flat. We understand well why people do it. We understand well why people should want to vent their resentment and hatred against a government that denies them freedom in the land of their birth. But it isn't our way, and it can't be. There is one thing the Communist Party has never been able to understand, and that is that there are people who by temperament and conviction do not believe that violence can turn wrong to right, and that killing people can turn injustice to justice. Here the Communist Party has a lot in common with the Ossewabrandwag, which was prepared to overthrow by violence the elected Government of the day. And one of the most determined members of the O.B. was Mr. Balthazar Vorster. With that kind of philosophy we will have nothing to do.

The Communist Party makes several more charges against the Liberal Party, but I shall deal with only one of these. It charges that we are against revolution. If this means a revolution of our whole way of life, especially our economic life, we are not against it. If it means the burning of houses, the looting of shops, the shooting down

of workers, the killing of policemen doing their duty, the destruction of hospitals and clinics, the sowing of a million seeds of fear and hatred, we are against it. We believe it would bring no good to our country. It is impossible to see at this moment even what change it would bring about, except to deepen the fear and the hatred. The Communist Party is not asking us to be more courageous or more outspoken or more honest; it is simply asking us to be something which we are not, and which we shall never be. Now let me drop the subject. Let me rather turn to the other kind of totalitarianism we have over us today, the totalitarianism of Mr. Balthazar Vorster.

Nazi-like laws

Why does he equate Liberalism with Communism? Why does he equip himself with these totalitarian laws? Why does Mr. Waring come here and promise us even heavier punishments? (And why does he get clapped for it?) Why does a gentlemanly-looking man like Mr. Trollip boast of his part in making Nazi-like laws? Why is the respectable Progressive Party so smeared? For one reason, and one reason only. Because Mr. Vorster fears change. He fears any change in the present system, in a system which entrenches white supremacy and chases African people out of Charlestown and Dannhauser and Kumaloville,* which promises security to one section of our nation and threatens the other with insecurity. He fears any change in the present political institutions. He fears any move to throw Bantu Education on the dust heap and give people a modern technological education. He fears any move to scrap the Group Areas Act and the Urban Areas Act and the Prohibition of Interdicts Act. Mr. Vorster fears change; he fears not only the Communists, he fears also the Liberals and the Progressives and indeed all humanitarians. All of them become smeared with Communist tar, because Mr. Vorster knows that fear of Communism is the greatest fear of all. But fundamentally he fears change. And the change he fears most of all is the abolition of the colour bar. That is why he fears all these

organisations. The only one he does not fear is the United Party, because he knows that some of the leading members of the U.P. are the stoutest defenders of the colour bar, and can speak even more offensively about people of colour than Mr. Louw.

It is a terrible thing to fear change, for all life is change. But there is a more terrible fear than that, for any man or woman of honour, and that is to fear those who fear change, and to be silent because of them, and to contribute to the catastrophe that will overtake us if all change is for ever resisted.

Mr. Vorster wants a nation that will think one way, cheer one way, feel one way; it is the one-way street of death. It astonishes a student of Afrikaner history to think that this is what a proud Afrikanerdom has come to. It astonishes a student of British history to think that this is what a proud Anglicanerdom has come to.

Mr. Vorster thinks these laws and these actions will intimidate his opponents.

Does he think he is the only man who can't be intimidated?

Does he think he could stick it out, and we can't?

Does he think that when he could stick so courageously to wrong principles, that we can't stick courageously to right ones?

We say to Mr. Vorster from this meeting:

The Liberal Party stands for the abolition of all discriminatory laws.

The Liberal Party stands for the abolition of all discrimination in sport and entertainment.

The Liberal Party stands for a Parliament representative of all.

The Liberal Party stands for the abolition of the segregation of land, opportunity, and occupation.

The Liberal Party stands for freedom of speech, movement, religion, opportunity.

Last, but not least, the Liberal Party stands for the restoration of the RULE OF LAW, and the appointment of a Minister of Justice who does not put himself above the rule of law.

*"Black-spots" in Natal, where Africans at present enjoy freehold.

Why Liberalism is not Communism

There has recently been considerable controversy in the *Rand Daily Mail* over the Nationalist attempts to make "Communism" and "Liberalism" indistinguishable. Through the courtesy of the *Rand Daily Mail* we reprint part of the third in a series involving Prof. Pistorius of the Progressive Party, Nationalist Senator J. H. Grobler and Walter Hain, Pretoria Branch Chairman of the Liberal Party.

SENATOR J. H. GROBLER'S explanation of why his party "will not compromise on the race issue" (*Rand Daily Mail*, November 13) was little more than the inevitable inventory of local White prejudices and superstitions which one has come to expect from the racial politician on such an occasion.

His attempt to refute Prof. Pistorius's assertions that "Nationalism is more like Communism" and that "Nationalist policy encourages the growth of Communism" is in the form of a countercharge that Liberalism is like Communism. In support of this charge he offers two attitudes which both share — one man, one vote, and an acceptance that the South African nation consists of all the people who inhabit the Republic of South Africa.

The rule not the exception

Now if one wishes to establish an identity of interest between two beliefs it is axiomatic that the evidence which one presents must establish an area of agreement between them which is peculiar to them, which they do not share with others and which therefore sets them aside from the general run.

This Senator Grobler has conspicuously failed to do: the universal franchise is a policy shared by Conservatives, Socialists, Democrats and Republicans, etc.; it is the rule, and not the exception, among parties and ideologies.

Similarly the concept that a nation consists of all the people who inhabit the country is a universal one. Dr. Verwoerd's quaint notion that *he* decides which South Africans belong to the nation and which do not, is no more than an Hitlerian-type fantasy.

The aspect of a party which indicates the true character of that party is its attitude towards the individual *vis-a-vis* the State, for it is essentially this attitude which determines whether the party is democratic or totalitarian in character. And it is in this aspect that the National Party shows such a strong affinity with, and the Liberal Party such a strong divergence from, Communism.

For both Nationalists and Communists share a tendency to exalt the State at the expense of the individual, to restrict individual freedom in the interests of easy administration, to circumvent the courts in order to hamstring difficult opponents, to silence unanswerable criticism with drastic and far-reaching laws (both share almost identical Sabotage Acts), to regard as treason any criticism of their policies, to disregard basic human rights; in short, to act in a totalitarian manner as opposed to a liberal (or democratic) manner.

Ideology of discontent

As to the charge of "furthering the aims of Communism" with which the Government is so ready: this accusation must surely be judged against the conditions which breed Communism.

In essence Communism is an ideology of discontent; it has never flourished except in conditions of social, political or economic injustice. The question whether the aims of Communism are promoted by the Liberals, whose policies are designed to make political, social and economic injustice merely a bad memory in South Africa, or by the Nationalists, whose apartheid policies are an attempt to maintain the very White privilege and non-White underprivilege which result in ideal conditions for its promotion, is therefore easily answered.

Similarly the Nationalist prattle of "racial suicide" is an insult to the intelligence of those to whom they address it; for the fact is that if a racial group really wishes to maintain its identity it will do so independent of the political situation — the Jewish people offer outstanding proof of this.

Senator Grobler's rhetorical question "What has been accomplished by 'compromise' in Kenya, Tanganyika and the Federation under a system of Partnership?" can best be answered with another question: "Well, what has? Have the Whites been exterminated? Has there been enforced racial 'mixing'? Have Whites been subjected to Pass Laws, Influx Control, Job Reservation, Group Areas, etc.?"

Since the answer is in the negative in each case one wonders whether the Senator is conversant with conditions in those countries. It is clear that the Afrikaner Nationalists are not content merely to maintain their identity, but that they interpret "racial

survival" as a perpetuation of the privileged status for the White man.

Their true quarrel with the emergent African States is simply that the White man has lost his privileged position there.

The Nationalist ethos depends upon the existence of barriers between people, and barriers require constant maintenance if they are to endure. It is an historical truism that succeeding generations show themselves to be increasingly less concerned with maintaining the barriers which their forefathers have erected.

The question then is not "WILL apartheid go?" but rather "HOW and WHEN will it go?" The increasing hysteria of the National Party seems to indicate that it is aware of the position.

AD. HAIN: Democracy Safe in Her Hands — Peter Brown

MRS. ADELAINE HAIN, Pretoria Secretary, of the Liberal Party, has received a "warning" to desist from her political activities from the Magistrate of Pretoria. The Minister of Justice maintains that these activities are furthering the aims of communism.

When Mrs. Hain asked the magistrate what activities the Minister objected to he said: "You should know." She has now written to the Minister to ask him if he can answer her question. She has also announced that she intends going on with her political work in exactly the same way as she has always done.

On the occasion of her warning the following statement was made by Peter Brown, National Chairman of the Liberal Party.

If anything were needed to show up the fraud of the Suppression of Communism Act, and the cynical manner in which Mr. Vorster uses it, this threat to Mrs. Hain should do it. Nobody could be less of a communist than she is; nobody could be more positively opposed to violence in any form.

Why then does the Minister warn her?

The reason is that, in the Nationalist hot-bed of Pretoria, she and her fellow-liberals have consistently and with great courage set out to expose apartheid as the shabby attempt to entrench white privilege at the expense of non-white rights which at bottom it is. They have done this by opposing

the loss of African freehold rights in Lady Selborne, by publicising Pretoria's vicious Group Areas plans and in a hundred-and-one other ways. In addition they have tried to give a balanced picture of apartheid to overseas visitors to Pretoria by showing them this seamy side of Government policy.

Adelaine Hain's real offence is that she has made things uncomfortable for the smug Pretoria administrators of apartheid. So, although she has neither committed nor been found guilty of any offence, she must be "warned" and her freedom threatened.

These warnings and threats are cowardly acts of a powerful Government which dares not have the true effects of its policies advertised by people who really know what they mean.

Adelaine Hain's struggle against apartheid has been a magnificent example to all South Africa. Her fighting response to Mr. Vorster's warning is another. Democratic principles in South Africa would be quite safe in her hands.

They certainly are not in those of Minister Vorster, whose actions will only ensure that when his particular totalitarian system collapses, it will be succeeded by another at least as bad.

Removal of Africans from Western Cape

IN 1955 DR. EISELEN, who was then Secretary for Native Affairs, announced that the Government intended ultimately to remove all Africans from the area south of the Orange River and west of the magisterial districts of Richmond, Murraysburg, Aberdeen, Willowmore, Uniondale and Knysna. This policy was the first long term application of apartheid aimed at eventual total segregation.

According to Minister de Wet Nel, between 1959 and 1962 some 26,000 Africans were endorsed out of the Western Cape. However, due to natural increase and an influx of labour between 1955 and 1961, the actual African population in the affected areas continued to increase in spite of the removals.

These removals were carried out under Section 10 of the Natives Urban Areas Act, which gives Africans right of permanent residence in urban areas under very limited conditions.

Latterly, over-zealous officials have pursued and often exceeded the letter of the law and today removals are being accomplished at an ever-increasing rate. The people being endorsed out are for the most part being sent to the Transkei. This area is already seriously over-populated and many of the people concerned are urbanised Africans who have little contact with life in rural settlements.

Reliable population statistics for the Western Cape are not available. Estimates of the number of people affected vary from 241,000 (Minister P. W. Botha) to 150,000 (comprising 65,000 men, 35,000 women and 40,000 children). Of these some 50,000 are registered as workers in the Cape Peninsula and as such form an important and integrated portion of the working population.

The government has repeatedly stated that removals are aimed at (a) an experiment in total apartheid; (b) as a safeguard for those classified as "Coloured" from "unfair" economic competition from the African, and (c) to ensure that there is a minimum of miscegenation between Coloured and African. In this policy the Nationalists

have received support from their own press and from SABRA who originally conceived and propagated the idea of complete racial separation.

Opposition to the removals has come from the leaders of business and commerce, from, surprisingly enough, sections of the rural population and, of course, from Liberals and Progressives. It is, however, disturbing to note that this opposition has not for the most part been directed against the inhumanity and indignity of the break-up of family life and the intrusion on the civil rights of the people concerned, but rather focused on the economic consequences of the removals.

Little reaction

The Coloured population, save for a few individuals, has not reacted to the removal threats. This is disturbing for it is this population group which will be expected to fill the gap left by the exodus of African labour. Unquestionably, even allowing for increased mechanisation which we are told must accompany the removal, this will lead to a lowering of the income of the Coloured population and as such is a retrogressive step which one would have hoped they would have opposed if only because of the economic consequences.

The Africans themselves, intimidated as they have been by police terror (in 1960 thousands in Cape Town were unmercifully and often publicly beaten up by the police) and the threat of the removals, have made little protest. The Liberal Party and SACTU have both on a limited scale tried to organise active opposition but have met with little response. And yet this issue, charged as it inevitably is with tensions and human feelings, is a vital one. Many people in active opposition to the removal policy doubt that the government seriously intends pursuing its stated objective. Yet during the last year removals have been increased, a cabinet committee has been appointed to supervise removals, and a committee of non-government persons has been appointed to advise the government on certain aspects of the scheme.

Finally, and of greatest importance, public

opinion among the white electorate seems recently to have hardened in favour of the removals. This has largely been a reaction to the highly successful 1960 PAC campaign, the 1961 strike and more recently to the Paarl riots and the emergence of POQO as a dangerous movement in the Cape Province. It is interesting to note the large number of cabinet ministers who have been touring the Western Cape and selling the idea of the removals to the Nationalist Party rank and file.

This is a brief background to the removals. No detail concerning the heartbreak, the indignity or the misery these removals inflict has been given. Enough to say that those members of the Black Sash who regularly attend the daily court sessions at Observatory, where so many Africans are "endorsed out" of Cape Town, leave the courts in tears and that the Advice Office, run jointly by the Institute of Race Relations and the Black Sash at Athlone, has thousands of stories of misery in its files.

The question is "What to do?" First and foremost what is most needed is a commission, not necessarily government sponsored, to collate all the statistical details concerning the removals and to investigate the effects both in the Cape Peninsula and in Transkei of the economic and sociological implications of forcibly removing 200,000 people. An authoritative document of this nature might then stir industry and commerce into active opposition and lead to more than the few memoranda they have drawn up.

Details on the human side must continue to be brought to the public's attention and a continued effort must be made to organise active African opposition, one hopes eventually on a vast scale.

Many Africans still have a legal claim to remain in the Western Cape. However, suggestions of a change in Section 10 of the Natives Urban Areas Act have been made. The policy of removals from the Western Cape is the thin edge of the wedge. Apartheid is inevitably going to fail and to ensure it has a secure laager to retreat to, white South Africa may demand complete partition and once again the Eiselen line will be pushed back — at who can say what price?

Life in "Free" Bantustan

UNHERALDED by the Press and unnoticed by the public 66 pages of Government Gazette Extraordinary arrived on November 16th, 1962, to swell the flood of rules and regulations which direct and circumscribe the lives of South Africa's African people. These particular 66 pages comprise the "Regulations for the Control and Administration of Townships in Bantu Areas". Any innocent who believes the myth about Africans being free "in their own areas" should read them.

The regulations are interesting not for the fact that they are so very different from regulations we have seen before but for the fact that they are so very like them. What gives them their specially interesting flavour is that they are *not* regulations for a Municipal location (as one might begin to think after reading a few sections) but for a township in Bantustan — a place where African people, we are assured, will enjoy rights not materially different from those their white neighbours enjoy over the border from Bantustan.

A few minutes' reading shows that the people who will wield the real power in the townships in free Bantustan will not be the "Bantu" but the same people as now wield the power in the urban locations and the reserves. They will, in descending order of importance, be the Secretary for Bantu Administration and Development, the Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner, the local Bantu Affairs Commissioner, the "Manager" and the "Superintendent". This is the same hierarchy with which every urban African in "white" South Africa is so painfully familiar.

Between them these officials will decide whether a man is a fit and proper person to reside in or to "own" land in a Bantu Township. They will decide where, how and in what kind of house he will live, whom he may have to stay with him and for how long they may stay. In a township in free Bantustan anyone who wants to pay a visit lasting more than thirty days had better get himself a "lodger's permit".

A "certificate of occupation" in a township may be cancelled by the manager if in his opinion a person holding a certificate ceases to be "a fit and proper person to reside in the township". Under certain circumstances a "deed of grant" of "ownership" may be declared forfeit by the Minister.

Section 1 of Chapter 6 lays down that "The Bantu Affairs Commissioner shall have the right to control, supervise, restrict or prohibit any meeting or assembly of Bantu persons within the township". Applications to hold a meeting will have to state what business is to be discussed. "A meeting or assembly shall, if circumstances warrant it, be under the supervision of the police and authorised employees, who shall have absolute power to control such meeting or assembly and whose instructions and directions shall be obeyed".

As if as an afterthought Chapter 8 on Page 43 allows the Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner when he "deems it expedient to do so" to establish Township Councils. The members of these Councils will be people *elected* by the residents and others *selected* by the Commissioner. *Selected* members may not exceed *elected* members, although there seems no reason why their numbers should not be equal. There may, in addition, be another member of the Council, a "Chief's Representative". The Chief Bantu Affairs Commissioner may "direct" the Chief to appoint such a representative to the Township Council. If the Chief appoints somebody the Bantu Commissioner doesn't like, the Commissioner can veto the appointment. If the Chief fails to make the appointment the Bantu Commissioner may "himself appoint a suitable person".

The Township Council is "responsible for the local administration of the township". Its powers are petty ones of local administration, some of those which the Bantu Commissioner would otherwise exercise — such as the disposal of nightsoil and the control of livestock.

Even within these narrow limits it seems that the authorities fear the Council might get out of hand. They have taken steps to prevent it doing so. The Bantu Commissioner may veto any order

or direction given by it, he may tell it what to do and, if it fails to do it, do it himself in the name of the Council. He may decide that in future a council should only have advisory powers.

Briefly these are some of the facts about life as it is to be in a township in Bantustan. Anyone who has grown up in an urban location should feel quite at home there. Except for the occasional bit of window-dressing the one will be no different from the other. Final control and authority will rest firmly with Pretoria. If anyone has illusions about that, better forget them quickly.

Intimidation

THE LAST FEW MONTHS have seen concerted attacks on liberalism by cabinet ministers and the SABC, the publication of the list of "named" communists, the banning of *New Age*, "house-arrests" and bannings get into full swing.

All these recent steps of the Government are part of a softening-up process designed to persuade people who do not support apartheid not to oppose the Government. Make no mistake: the campaign is already achieving results. Fewer and fewer people publicly protest against what the Government does.

The Liberal Party has been quite unequivocal in its criticism of every single one of these recent Government actions. Within the Party their main effect has been to rally and consolidate the membership. This is just the opposite of what the Nationalists hoped for. It is important that rank-and-file Liberals responded without hesitation in this way. On them rests the responsibility of seeing that civilised standards of public life are maintained in South Africa in the days ahead.

‡ Published by the Liberal Party of S.A., Room 1, 268 Longmarket Street, Pietermaritzburg, and printed by Lincey & Watson (Pty.) Ltd., 364 Voortrekker Road, Maitland, Cape Town.