

LIBERAL

OPINION



LIBERAL OPINION Subscription is
75 cents (7/6) for 6 issues.

EDITOR:

Room 1, 268 Longmarket Street, Pietermaritzburg.

IN THIS ISSUE:

- 1 Banning
 - 2 Royle Pudding
 - 3 Something to Kill
 - 4 James Bond
 - 5 A Master Plan for Unity
-

**HOW TO DESTROY FREEDOM WHILE
KEEPING ITS NAME STILL FLYING PIOUSLY
AT THE MASTHEAD**

BANNING

(From a letter by Jack Unterhalter published in
the Rand Daily Mail, 3/5/65.)

On April 13 the Minister of Justice signed at Cape Town banning notices addressed to David Craighead in terms of the Suppression of Communism Act, and these were served by the Security Police at Johannesburg on April 28.

The Minister has so acted because, as he says in the notices, he is satisfied that Mr. Craighead is engaged in activities which are furthering or may further the achievement of any of the objects of Communism. This being the opinion of the Minister, it cannot be challenged in any court of law, because no judge may investigate the facts that led the Minister to this conclusion.

The Minister has formed this opinion on reports that have been given to him, and Mr. Craighead has not seen these reports, nor has he had any opportunity of challenging the correctness or giving an explanation of the facts in the Minister's possession. He has, therefore, in effect been deprived of valuable personal rights without charge and without trial.

We who know him are stunned by what the Minister has done. We know David Craighead as a quiet, unassuming person, completely opposed both to the theory and the practice of Communism as that word is ordinarily understood.

CATHOLIC

Even if the definitions in the Suppression of Communism Act are read, and these are very wide, we know of nothing that he has done that could bring him within the ambit of the statute.

He was a student at the University of the Witwatersrand during the period 1936 to 1938, and his activities at that time showed clearly that he was a trenchant critic of Communist theory and practice.

He has been active in the Roman Catholic Church for many years, and if it were permissible today to quote what he wrote in Catholic magazines, his attitude would there be seen to be manifest and unequivocal.

He was the Rhodes Scholar for Kimberley, studied at Queen's College, Oxford, and was with the South African Air Force during the war for about five years. He joined the Liberal Party in 1955 and has been its chairman in the Transvaal for the last two years.

Here again his every action, as also his membership of the Catholic Church, showed us that he was not a Communist, whether statutory or otherwise.

In November of last year he became the chairman of the **Defence and Aid Fund** in South Africa. This is a body that has been responsible for providing accused persons with lawyers to defend them in the courts of law, more especially on charges of committing political offences. **His services there as an organiser were invaluable, and as he may now no longer work for it, it has been dealt a crippling blow because there are few people today who have the courage to take over work such as this.**

CIVIL RIGHTS

David Craighead studied and understood the problems of the Defence Aid Fund in each centre where it worked in South Africa.

He helped its committees to protect the basic civil rights of people alleged to have committed offences because of political beliefs. **The case for the defence was thus adequately**

presented. When matters were taken on appeal with the assistance of the fund, sentences were sometimes reduced.

Together with other organisations the fund helped the families of political prisoners—wives and children who had lost the support of husbands and fathers.

This work has been questioned by some, but in a civilised society the principle of a fair trial for every man must prevail, no matter how grave the charge against him. It is this principle that David Craighead has upheld. Has he been banned because of this?

With a record such as I have described, and bearing in mind that both the Liberal Party and the Defence and Aid Fund are lawful organisations, it should be understood why his colleagues are dumbfounded. But the social implications of this ban must also be understood, because they are grave indeed.

There are woven into our institutions noble traditions which we have inherited from a great civilisation. Thus, we are proud of our courts and the independent judges who preside over them to safeguard the individual citizen from the wrongful acts of his fellow or of the State.

We point to our Parliament, where our laws are debated and where an opposition may speak.

We enjoy a Press that is outspoken and critical and that informs a public in order that authority may be aware of public opinion and respond to it.

It is also said that anyone can oppose and criticise a doctrine such as apartheid, and the outside world is referred to the fact that a political organisation such as the Liberal Party is permitted to exist in the Republic, even though it espouses the policy of universal franchise for all people, whether Black, White, Indian or Coloured.

These are aspects of our public life to which our ambassadors refer when they reply to criticism of the Republic: and these are relied on by individuals and organisations when they defend the country's good name.

GUARDING

These traditions must be guarded, and some of the ways of guarding them are in the exercise of the right to oppose the Government of the day by lawful means and by taking care to see that a person is adequately defended when he is charged with a crime.

At all times and in all societies these rights may be threatened or infringed and people must feel free to assert them and support them without fear of punishment for their stand.

David Craighead in his work is an example of a man who exercised his rights to oppose the present Government and who did it lawfully. He also devoted himself to the cause of protecting the accused by giving him a defender when he stood before the judge.

Others, and especially younger people, may be inspired by this example, but will they act on it? They may be fearful that in following him they, too, will suffer the bans that now restrict him, and their parents likewise, in fear, may try to persuade them to safer conduct. If this should become the general manner of thinking, then conscience will die and with it will go these noble traditions.

Certainly the fear is abroad. What has happened to David Craighead does nothing to allay it. What has happened to the Liberal Party in recent months does everything to strengthen it.

The Party has not been declared an unlawful organisation, and there is nothing in its activities that could justify such a declaration, but recently 25 members have had imposed upon them the restrictions here described.

SILENCE

This has taken away from the Party most of its leadership, and if the Minister continues in this way, he will destroy it without declaring it unlawful.

It is idle to claim that there is freedom of expression of unpopular political views in South Africa when by a method such as this the Liberal Party is silenced.

David Craighead was not detained during the 1960 emergency, nor under the 90-day law. His premises have never been searched, nor has he ever been interrogated by the police. He has never been charged with any offence.

In the light of all this, the inference seems irresistible that he has been proscribed as a leader of the Liberal Party as part of a plan to destroy it and to intimidate its supporters.

ROYLE PUDDING

PASSIONFRUIT

An interesting and even passionate correspondence has been the fruit of what seems to have been a fairly explosive seed sowed by Mr. Peter Royle in our last issue. Mr. Royle

wrote on "The Challenge of Nationalism", and to sum up his article fairly thoroughly, the points he made were as follows:—

- (1) That European or "White" nationalism is a negative, destructive, irresponsible and "mindless" phenomenon;
- (2) That the main flow of African nationalism is a positive, creative, responsible and **intelligent** (in the sense that it can bear the probings of reason) phenomenon;
- (3) That this being the case, there is no reason why Liberals should not support African nationalism;
- (4) That it is a failing among Liberals that many do **not** support it; a **failing**, because to deny the existence or group feelings is to deny one aspect of the reality of human beings;
- (5) **Conclusion:** That Liberals should get rid of this **failing**, take the fact of nationality into account, and "ride the tiger of African nationalism."

BOUQUET

Before he submits himself to cross-examination, let us allow Mr. Royle to take a bow.

It was pure delight for me to read my own rough, ready and ill-expressed ideas metamorphosed into succinct, crystalline and (dare I say?) elegant prose.

I wish our Liberal ideology, expressed in an article of this high calibre, could be reprinted in at least one periodical with a wide circulation among White South Africans.

Is this wish impossible of fulfilment?

—Heather Morkill, Pietermaritzburg.

[Editor's comment: Periodicals with wide circulations among White South Africans are *Die Huisgenoot*, *Die Brandwag*, *Femina*, *Personality*, *Stage and Cinema*, and *Farmers' Weekly*.]

BRICKBAT

Miss Morkill seems to assume that Mr. Royle's article expresses "our Liberal ideology". Such is not the case, it appears, for the article was criticised by our National Chairman, who writes:

IDEALS

Peter Royle is a friend of mine, and it is a matter of regret to me to have to criticise him publicly, but I would be untrue to my own deep convictions if I did not say how very much I disagree with his arguments in favour of co-operation with African Nationalism. It is arguments of this kind which, I feel, led some of our younger people to take part in sabotage because a part of the African nationalist movement was doing so, and thus landed them in the misery which we all deplore.

In so far as African nationalists aim at African liberation we are bound to agree with them. In so far as they aim at African domination we are bound to disagree with them. Things which are wrong when done by white people do not suddenly become right when black people do them.

Peter Royle gives the impression that the old philosophies of liberalism are outdated. Does he regard people like Bertrand de Jouvenel and Jacques Maritain as Victorian "fuddy-duddies"? I am a Liberal because I believe in Liberalism—which is to say because I believe in human freedom and equality, with which I cannot equate a one-party African dictatorship, nor African nationalism thus understood.

—Edgar H. Brookes, Pietermaritzburg.

[Editor's comment: With all due respect, it seems that Dr. Brookes has slightly missed the point. Mr. Royle was saying that black people **don't** do the things that white people do, and that was his reason for suggesting the support of African nationalism. His idea of "riding the tiger"—the role of Liberals in supporting African nationalism—appears to meet the objections stressed by Dr. Brookes in his last sentence; though Dr. Brookes might have meant here that "group-feelings" such as nationalism are by nature incompatible with human freedom. We hope that Dr. Brookes will clarify and expand on his attitude on this point, for it is, we feel, a vital one; and Mr. Royle has given a good case for the view that the main stream of African nationalism—in which we take it he includes certain African one-party states but excludes African nationalisms of the "European" or Right variety, such as that of Kaiser Matanzima—is fully compatible with, and in fact an active agent of, human freedom.]

A letter from Dorothy L. Norman of Cape Town leads us to several interesting and important points:

Mr. Peter Royle's article urges that Liberals should give favourable consideration to the ideals of African nationalism, many of which are truly liberal. I believe that among the ideals of the South African Liberal Party are the following:

- (a) Freedom of speech, of religion and of political opinion.
- (b) The right of the Press to ensure that justice may be seen to be done.
- (c) An end of censorship save of pornographic publications of no conceivable merit whatsoever.
- (d) Equal pay for equal work.
- (e) Selection and promotion of employees on the basis of merit.
- (f) One man one vote—and, to prepare for this, universal compulsory education up to literacy.

[Editor's comment: It would be more correct, we think, to phrase (f) as "One man one vote—and, going hand-in-hand with this"]

- (g) Autonomy of universities.
- (h) No slanted school-histories or radio-propaganda.
- (i) School teachers not to teach politics.
- (j) No racial discrimination.

COMMUNISM

How many of these aims are the same as those of African nationalism? And how many of these are also those of Communism? Communism had a high and noble source—no less than the practice of the early Christians as described in the "Acts of the Apostles".

[Editor's comment: Perhaps not quite so elevated, Mrs. Norman.]

But Communism has earned a great detestation in non-Communist lands, and even—who knows how much?—in its own domains.

And how could the ideals set down above be realised except by a government that uses force? I was an out-and-out Pacifist till I saw films of Belsen and Auschwitz and then it seemed to me that only force, backed by God, could end such evil power. How was Hitlerism ended except by the use of force?

A great Liberal ideal, not listed above, is non-violence. Then I take it that Liberals would not countenance the making and use of war-weapons, and the upkeep of an army?

But without these would not a country invite invasion by "evil" forces?

CAN'T SLANT

How could we wean the un-Liberal elements from "wrong" ideas except by teaching "politics" in schools? And by propaganda by Press and radio (only we would call it "enlightenment")?

[Editor's comment: In the knowledge that all creeds call themselves "enlightenment", we believe that there is a rational, and indeed conclusive argument that we are enlightened. The one essential difference between **propaganda** and **education** is that the first is exclusive—it excludes certain knowledge—and the latter is inclusive—it includes all knowledge and debars none. That is the meaning of the word "universitas", for instance, and the word "Liberal" itself—giving credit where it is due, wherever it may be. By teaching Liberal "politics" in schools or over the radio we could thus only advance the cause of education, knowledge and enlightenment. In fact, they are one and the same thing.

To return to your fears on the subject of non-violence, this applies only to the technique of gaining political control of the country, not to the policies of a Liberal government in power. And though it is hard to visualise a Liberal government ever acting as a belligerent aggressor, it is just as hard to visualise it capitulating meekly to a "force of evil" or Hitlerist attacker.]

When would we give one man one vote? Now, or after we had reached general literacy?

[Editor's comment: Now.]

What would the "merit-basis" mean? Perhaps, as Peter Royle says, the Progressives understand it: as "proven ability to fit into WESTERN society?"

[Editor's comment: **Western** society is the framework of the modern world. Democracy, capitalism and communism are all Western concepts and creeds. The African States, by becoming such States, have elected to accept that framework and work within it.]

We leave the final readers' word to that great literary figure Anonymous:

While finding Peter Royle's article on the challenge of Nationalism extremely interesting, I feel very strongly that there is in it a very woolly application of labels.

The "mindless" European nationalism which Peter Royle describes only finds an example in National Socialism. It simply cannot be used as descriptive of all European nations. What will Peter Royle classify British nationalism under?

Also the African "nationalism" which he describes is simply not really nationalism. It is the sort of "nationalism" which would find favour with the most internationally-minded socialist.

MORE COMPLEX

In short, I feel that the various African nationalisms are going to be much more complex and divergent than the two extremes which Peter Royle describes.

What I most heartily agree with is that the influence of Liberalism must be brought to bear on whatever type of "nationalism" ever comes to fruition in this country. Liberals have far too long indulged in negative criticism. They have a positive role to play, they have a positive message to preach, and it is time that Liberals generated the same emotional drive that the Nationalist and the Socialist give to their causes.

—Anonymous, Pietermaritzburg.

[Editor's comment: Anon's differences with Mr. Royle seem to be largely verbal. What Anon points out in his third paragraph, for example, is just what Mr. Royle was saying; and Mr. Royle had no alternative than to use the generally applied label. It is not **his** label, it is the one in general use that is "woolly", and that is precisely what he was pointing out.

There was a great deal in British nationalism of the late Victorian era which resembled Nazism—manning the far-flung outposts of Empire against the wogs, etc.—but for the purposes of us here in South Africa, it matters not. The fact is that we must be aware of the nature of European nationalism present here, which is National-Socialist inspired, not British.]

Incidentally it seems to us that the Liberal Party even regardless of its present

circumstances, hasn't done at all badly in playing a positive role, getting things done, and preaching their positive message.

Lots of people who have not been doing any work are unaware of all the work that is being done.]

NOTHING NEW

It is with this background that one must view the "swing to the Nats" in the recent provincial elections, although it should also be remembered that the swing to the Nats is nothing new—it has been going on ever since 1943—since which time the United Party has lost about half of its seats in Parliament.

The Labour Party committed political suicide by following more liberal race policies and lost all its seats.

The Liberal Party has lost whatever Parliamentary influence it may have had by the abolishing of the African Representatives, and it seems likely that similar action will be taken in the near future to see that the Progressives are likewise eliminated. A one-party State would be the next logical step, although the Nationalist Government might wish to keep the United Party opposition just for the sake of appearances. The real struggle will then be extra-Parliamentary, as indeed it largely is now.

The Liberal and Progressive parties are the most effective opposition that the Government now has. The Progressive Party, by showing that it has the support of the Coloured voters in the Cape, has rather upset the Government claim that it is supported in its policies by the non-whites. The Coloureds have shown that they are not sufficiently politically mature, and that therefore they cannot have their own homelands. **It is probably not possible to estimate what part the Liberal Party has played in holding up the Bantustan Programme in Natal, but to judge by the amount of intimidation that goes on it must be considerable.**

TRANSKEI

In the Transkei the Government has had to rely on the preponderance of chiefs in the Legislative Assembly to uphold the fiction that the majority of Africans just can't wait to develop separately in their homelands under the paternal eye of Pretoria. **And even so, the Democratic Party, with majority popular support, is uncomfortably powerful.**

In Natal, the Government has fewer chiefs on which it can rely to support its line, and the attacks on prominent people like Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, who favour non-racialism, indicate that this is regarded as a serious threat. The Liberal Party has considerable influence among potential Bantustan voters in

ALL WE CAN DO IS MAKE SURE THERE IS SOMETHING TO KILL

Post-Provincial Election Comment by
a Student

BACKGROUND

Since the advent of the Republic in 1961, the Nationalist Government has become increasingly self-confident, and has taken steps to ensure that it can count at all times on the support of the majority of the white electorate.

It has achieved this by two methods—**firstly**, the Republic exposed the bankruptcy of the United Party policy, by making racial issues the only really important one in the political arena, now that the connection with the Crown had been severed.

Racialistic monarchists thus had the wind taken out of their sails, and their former opposition to the Nationalists did not seem to have much point any more.

The second step was to intimidate the white electorate with threats of Communist plots and sabotage, and the perils of black nationalism. This may be seen in such pieces of legislation as the 1962 "Sabotage Act". It is difficult to see that this was for any other purpose than to frighten the white electorate into voting Nat. It is a blatant piece of political legislation. Sabotage could quite easily have been dealt with by existing legislation, or some modification of the laws relating to wanton and malicious destruction of property, and murder, would have been adequate to deal with the situation. This would also probably have caused less unfavourable publicity to be given to the trial of saboteurs in the overseas Press.

It would also not have had the effect of causing a near-Nazi patriotic hysteria in the white electorate.

Natal, which is no doubt the reason why its members are watched, followed and threatened by members of the political police.

The action taken by the Government to eliminate effective opposition has been two-fold—legislative and administrative. The legislative action has taken the form of the banning of political parties, such as the Communist Party, the African National Congress and the Pan African Congress. There has also been action to prevent trade unions from affiliating with any political party, which had the effect of killing both the Labour Party and the trade union movement in South Africa. There has also been the banning of individual members of political parties and organizations, which is a mixture of legislative and administrative action.

COMMON

Administrative action is becoming increasingly common, where civil servants, no doubt with the instructions of the Minister concerned, have placed obstacles in the way of the effective opposition parties. Examples which readily come to mind are the case of the Transkei election candidates who were well known for their opposition to Government policies, who were detained under the 90-day clause in the heat of the campaign, which could not but have influenced their chances of election. **One of the Progressive Party candidates in the Cape Provincial elections was not allowed to address meetings in some areas, whereas his opponent experienced no such difficulty, because the Minister said that he was the elected representative of the Coloured people.** The intimidation of members of the Liberal Party is well known. The Government is obviously reluctant to ban the Liberal Party at present, but it is almost as effective to ban those members of the party who are active in promoting its policies. Police have threatened many of the ordinary members of the party, particularly in the rural districts of Natal.

FOOLS ?

I cannot believe that they are quite such fools as to seriously believe that the Liberal Party as such is a threat to the internal security of the State. However, it is a serious threat to the security of the Nationalist Party, and it should be fairly obvious whose interests the police are protecting. For some time past—

about the last 18 years—loyalty to South Africa has been regarded as synonymous with loyalty to the National Party, and so other parties are regarded as "un-South African" and thus a threat to the internal security of South Africa.

This is the kind of fascist mentality that leads to a one-party State—a mentality that is not peculiar to South Africa, but which can also be seen in Franco of Spain, Nkrumah of Ghana, Sukarno of Indonesia and Salazar of Portugal.

A General Election is due next year. The result is practically certain to be another overwhelming Nationalist victory. It will probably mark the elimination of the Progressives in Parliament. More action can be expected against the Liberal Party, which will probably be banned shortly before, or shortly after, the General Election. The idea of an opposition in Parliament will be seen as un-South African—they don't have such an anomaly in the Free State Provincial Council. Even the United Party will eventually be too much, and the one party State will be heralded as the next great step for our nation after the Republic. **The United Party would be the last to think of going down with the flag flying—it lost the flag in 1961 anyway—and would more likely unite with the Government, so we could all live miserably ever after.**

NOTHING SHORT OF A WAR

Nothing short of a war will remove the present Government. It took a war to get rid of the Nazis in Germany, and it will need a war to remove the Nationalists here. The white electorate have gone too far along the road to change their course now—so elections will not remove the Government. Boycotts and sanctions, whatever else they may do, will not change the hearts of the white electorate of the Nationalist Government, but only harden them.

John Harris lived long enough after the Provincial Elections to see that his bomb did not cause the massive revulsion against Government policy which he had hoped for. Sabotage will thus do not good. An internal revolution cannot succeed, because the Government is far too strong, and can count on the unquestioning support of the army and police force. A war might remove the Government, but the cure might well be as bad, if not worse than the disease.

What can be done?

Politically, very little. The opposition parties will be dead or underground before long. The United Party will die by itself, the others will have to be forcibly killed. Strangulation is already being tried on the Liberal Party.

SOMETHING TO KILL

Possibly the most important thing is to make sure that there is something to kill.

The Liberal Party should put up candidates in the next election, in the Coloured seats, and even in the Free State, to go down with the flag flying.

But above all, what is most important, it should continue its work of political education, and make an all out effort to disseminate its policies and ideas as widely as possible.

It should make a maximum effort to persuade as many people as possible to accept these ideas, by holding meetings where questions can be asked by those who doubt or disagree.

In, this way the party can ensure that, though the Nats may destroy the Liberal Party, they will never destroy the idea of freedom, which may one day emerge from the chaos intact to play a part in shaping the new South Africa.

JAMES BOND

007's LAST RIDE

Agent 007 glanced at his watch, but it was no use, he couldn't tell what the time was. It was too dark in the bush in which he was sitting. The luminous points were no good to him because he could never tell which one was at the top, from which to start counting. There was a streetlight near the bush to his right, so he cautiously stuck his hand out through the leaves into the light. But—something was still wrong—he still couldn't see the time. Then, in flash, it came to him—he realised that the rest of him was still totally enclosed by foliage, so he could not see the dial! Slowly and soundlessly, 007 raised himself up, so that his head gradually emerged through the leaves. It seemed to take an age. At last sweating with strain, he was in a position to see his wrist.

"Haai, nee man. Vervlaks!"

He had stuck out the wrong arm.

Gradually, silently, 007 submerged like a U-Boat into the bush again. The latest Order from the Minister, which was "Never let your right hand know what your left hand is doing", had its drawbacks, thought 007; but then he censured himself for thinking this: "Voetsak is always right", he muttered to himself, repeating another Order. But what was he to do? His position was desperate. A team of Government scientists had been working for years to ascertain at what precise time people were deepest asleep, and thus would be most intimidated and discomforted when awoken. They found that this was at exactly 4 a.m. (with one minority opinion of 3 minutes past 4 being sent to Robben Island). A minute before or after this precise time and some of the effect of his visitation would be lost. 007 sweated anew when he thought of the responsibility which lay on his shoulders. People of his own skin colour were relying on him not to let this happen!

And his left, wristwatch arm was on the side of the bush opposite the streetlight—outside of which lay an area of Stygian darkness.

"Wat gaan ek nou maak?" muttered 007. He laid his hand on the regulation copy of Mein Kampf in the pocket over his heart and mumbled a prayer. This book had saved his life on one occasion when he had stood too near the dartboard in the canteen.

VOICES?

007's meditations came to an abrupt halt when he heard voices approaching the bush. He froze and listened, his ears tingling. Suddenly his blood chilled, then it boiled, curdled, fizzed, bubbled and turned to vodka. (Unfortunately, it did not clot.) The voices were speaking Sotho! Bantoe!

007 galumphed out of the bush like a runaway jabberwock.

"Haai, you Kaffers!" he screamed in a falsetto that was delirious with rage. "What are you does-ing yere at night now, hey?" (007 always spoke English to Kaffers.) "I arrest you for contempt of court." With split-second timing he punched them both simultaneously in the face and handcuffed them. He then battered them senseless and left them

there. He felt a glow of happiness spread through him—this work had its compensations. He then noticed that the house he had been watching was ablaze with light. Oh, well—they still had five minutes to go to sleep again.

Five minutes later, 4 a.m. op die kop (the lights went out just in time) Agent 007 knocked at the door. This was a job he really enjoyed. He battered away with both fists until they were sore. He was only really at home when he was battering at someone else's door. It satisfied his soul.

007 FOOLED ?

The door was opened by a man in pyjamas and dressing gown.

"You are a blabby disgrace to your own skin," 007 told him. "I arrest you for crime and injuria." He noticed a suspicious bulge in the man's pocket. "Trying to be clever, hey?" he said. "What is that?" The man showed him a strange metal object that looked like a pineapple.

"I'll take that," said 007. "Oh, no you doesn't—and that too. Trying to fool me, hey?" He had noticed the man removing a pinlike rod from the object. 007 put the object in his one trouser pocket and the pin in the other pocket, for safe-keeping. "Go and pack your clothes," said 007, and began to search the hatstand for subversive literature—or, even perhaps, bombs. You never knew with these Communists.

* * *

They got the man in the dressing gown all right—for sabotage. Blowing up his own house.

As for 007, they eventually put him down as "missing"—which in the canteen was tacitly (and sympathetically) understood to mean having fled the country or committed suicide after contravening the Immorality Act.

A MASTER PLAN FOR UNITY

by ALICE

I believe that a women's organisation in the Free State once put forward the suggestion that there should be two types of money—one for Whites and the other for non-Whites. Apart from being glad to hear that there were women in the Free State (glad for the sakes of the Free Staters, that is) and apart from the vague thought that these two types of money did already exist, the one type buying Chevrolet Impalas and the other type mealimeal, I found this a fascinating suggestion.

Particularly fascinating in view of the recent great strides made in the sphere of separate development, Bantustans, Zulustans, etc., which have some claim to the possibility of existence have become *passé*. The latest thing is have Dream-o-stans, like the Coloureds and Indians are getting. This is the type where you should have a stan but you don't. You are beautifully separately developed on paper with Coloured education and Indian education, getting your Ph.D. in curry and rice making, etc., but you don't actually have a stan at all. It's all in your mind, put there by education and various racial authorities. This is the Dream-o-Stan, whereby every man carries his own stan around with him inside his head. Much cheaper, and portable; more lebensraum for the Free State, where all those Women are.

And for concocting all these Dream-o-stans, Government officials, policemen and other refugees from the Free State Women get paid top salaries. In preparation for National Dream-o-stan Week, where the winner gains as prize the Directorate of Dream-o-stan services and a free excursion ticket on a baton charge, I have whiled away the idle hours preparing my entries.

ART FORM

And I have found that we in South Africa have stumbled on a new Art Form. Our Government have already laid the foundations

with a Traditional School such as the Transkei, a Classical School such as the PACostan (nothing to do with Indian Border disputes) on Robben Island, a Surrealist School (the Weatherstan on Marion Island), a decadent School (Immorality Act-breakerstans in various "tronks"), a Futurist School (Policeostans in Saracen armoured cars), a Beatnik School (lunaticstans in the Houses of Parliament) and even a Wild West School (Women in the Free State).

But these all have a tenuous connection with geography, if not with reality (any connection with this factor immediately disqualifies a stan). New ground altogether has been broken with the introduction of the Dream-o-stan, which has not the remotest connection with anything at all. The scope is enormous. No territorial tracts are required, no industries, no politicians, no organising—just an acre or two for a University and hordes of Government officials which provide jobs for your pals (if you have any—if not any otherwise unemployable White man will do) and keeps the country booming—for the officials, that is, of course; the rest are provided with the priceless wealth of a Dream-o-Stan which are specially created for every possible group of any sort.

These are people's images of themselves which I have already created to further the cause of South African Unity.

A Scottish insurance man selling his wares would in his mind be firmly convinced that he was tossing the caber, swigging heather ale and comparing notes with Englishman and Irishmen.

An Anglican Bishop quietly preparing his sermon would be most surprised if you told him that he wasn't cutting his wives' heads off and eating pigs whole.

The German farmer ploughing his mealie lands would all the time believe incontrovertibly that he was in the act of roaring lieder in a Biergarten in between colossal gulps of sauerkraut and duels with Bismarck.

AL CAPONE

The Irish bricklayer's far-away expression would be due to his undeniable feeling that he

was a policeman in New York and that the bricks were bribes from Al Capone which he was quietly storing away in a potato sack.

The Englishman's harassed look over his morning paper might betray the fact that he was under the distinct impression that he was being chased all over the Free State by General de Wet, shot at Majuba, and burning babies at Slagter's Nek.

The Jew's furtive manner while giving his bus fare to the conductor would be attributable to his feeling that he was killing Christ, slandering Hitler and chiselling honest farmers on the Platteland.

The Roman Catholic's somewhat puzzled expression as he sat at his office desk would be the result of his deep conviction that he was worshipping the telephone as an idol and insulting the true God with the rabid sensuality of his cigarette smoke.

As for the Bantu, the Asiatic and the Coloured, our Department is really working on those. Man, they've got to be good!

KEPT HAPPY

In this way the entire population of the country is kept happy building on their own traditions—which have their place, of course—though, thank God, they are not ours, and developing all that is best in their heritage, all that is uniquely theirs. In this way we will have unity in diversity with every group knowing their place.

For while they are going about the occupations which keep the country going for us, the members of each group will be under the belief that they are doing those things best suited to themselves.

Why—I do believe I've even sold **myself** a Dream-o-Stan.