

LIBERAL OPINION



LIBERAL OPINION is sent free of charge to newspapers, in South Africa and oversea, 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 National Congress
1962
 - 3 The Lost Generation
 - 5 Our Traditional Way
of Life . . .
 - 6 Liberalism and
Democracy
 - 7 Subversion Charges
against Liberals
-

Non-Racialism at Work

THE 1961 National Congress of the Liberal Party in Durban was concerned primarily with redrafting Party policy to introduce a more radical note, and more of the "welfare state", into it. This year's Congress was not so much concerned to introduce new matter into the Party's programme as to restate its fundamental beliefs.

Since July 1961 there have been repeated calls from the Nationalist leadership for "white unity". This has been especially marked at the recent series of Nationalist Party congresses. It is an effective cry and many white non-Nationalists are seduced by it into believing that apartheid is their only hope. Many others conclude that opposition to Verwoerd is hopeless. Better to go along with Big Brother than to get in his way. In this context a Liberal Party Congress has a very special importance. It is a visible example of nonracialism at work and, as such, a challenge to all racialism and a sign of hope.

In apartheid South Africa it is some achievement to get together, from all corners of the country, 150 delegates prepared to stand up and be publicly counted as completely rejecting everything for which the present regime stands. This year this happened under the shadow of the two-month-old Vorster Act.

One of the main purposes of the Vorster Act

was to cow apartheid's opponents into silence. To this naïve hope of Mr. Vorster the public meeting with which the Congress opened—both audience and speakers—gave a straight answer.

Jean van Riet, isolated and undaunted Liberal from the depths of the Free State, spoke in simple terms of the suffering inflicted on African children in his home area by the Bantu Education Act. Then there was Selby Msimang, 75-year-old foundation member of the now-banned African National Congress, and later of the Liberal Party. Undeterred by 50 years of opposition to every Government South Africa has ever had, he committed himself once more to strive for a new South Africa in which all her people will live together as members of a single community. Finally, Alan Paton, undismayed by the recent attentions of the Special Police, emphatically reaffirmed his complete rejection of white supremacy and stated once more the Liberal creed—complete rejection of race as a yardstick of anything; belief in individual liberties guaranteed to all persons; committal to a democratic form of government; support for the rule of law.

Congress held in sad setting

In case any of the delegates might forget, the closed sessions of the Congress were held in a setting designed to remind them of what the practical effects of apartheid can be. They took place at Christ the King Priory, Sophiatown, Johannesburg, the old headquarters of Father Trevor Huddleston. In the Huddleston era "Christ the King" was the centre of a teeming community.

Now it stands alone, in a vast and uninhabited expanse from which the African people of Sophiatown, whose presence there was an affront to apartheid, have been cleared. Around the Priory the foundations of demolished homes push up through the earth, mounds of rubble lie here and there, potholed strips of tar show where the roads once ran. It is a dismal scene of senseless waste. Against this sad background the Priory struggles to survive.

Here the delegates to the Liberal Party Congress met, on September 1st and 2nd, in the old school buildings. The simultaneous translation

system, which the Natal Congress of the Party pioneered in South Africa, handled speeches in English, Zulu, Sesotho and Afrikaans and was responsible for the work of Congress being disposed of much more smoothly and quickly than in the past. From the discussions certain tasks emerge for the next year.

Firstly, Liberals must go on stating their principles clearly and often, Vorster Act or no Vorster Act. They will do this at public and private meetings and, when it is thought suitable, in elections.

Secondly, the training of members in the basic principles of democracy and political organisation must be maintained and, resources permitting, extended. The Nationalists are steadily circumscribing the political rights of those who have them and are making sure that those who have not, don't get them. If there is to be any democratic experience and tradition left when the Nationalists go, it will have to be built by their opponents. Liberals, with access to every part of the community, have a special function in this field.

We must continue to resist the implementation of apartheid at all levels. This means exposing and opposing the Transkei "independence" proposals, the "black spot" removals and the plan to eject all Africans from the Western part of the Cape Province. At the local level it means job

A survey undertaken by the Natal Liberal Party Youth Group into the unemployment of the Coloured community in Pietermaritzburg shows that of the persons interviewed 71% were unemployed. Of these, only 48% qualified for benefits, while 27% had been unemployed for longer than one year.

reservation, group areas removals and the transfer of control of education from the Provinces to the central Government.

We must publicise the economic effects of race discrimination. Surveys into rents in the African townships of Johannesburg by the Party were largely instrumental in having the whole system of rent prosecutions changed last year. A survey

into unemployment in Pietermaritzburg revealed the terrible waste of talent which the building recession has inflicted on the Coloured community.

We must get people to stand up for their rights, both black and white people. Black South Africans have been subjected to a system of white supremacy for so long that many of them accept humiliations without question. White South Africans have in many cases been drained of the will to oppose anything the Government does.

Finally, we must build a growing and organised following committed to the non-violent defeat of apartheid. We must develop techniques of resistance which can be used under the increasing difficulties with which we expect to be met in the future. Non-violence must be regarded not simply as a negative rejection of violence but as the only positive way to put an end to apartheid, while laying foundations for a nonracial future.

THE following Liberal Party office-bearers were elected

- (a) at the National Congress:
National President: **Alan Paton.**
National Vice - Presidents: **Jordan Ngubane, Jack Unterhalter, and Jean van Riet.**
- (b) at the National Committee meeting following the Congress:
National Chairman: **Peter Brown.**
National Deputy-Chairmen: **David Craighead and Randolph Vigne.**
National Treasurer: **Elliot Mngadi.**

The Lost Generation

By Professor Leo Kuper

(Former Chairman of Natal Coastal Region
of the Liberal Party)

AFRICAN education in South Africa has now collapsed. Few African students qualify from the schools for admission to the African tribal universities, and the tribal universities

themselves are a travesty of academic training.

All this was predicted by the critics of the Government's Bantu Education policy. The consequences were so obvious that it is difficult to believe they were not intended. Still, motives are difficult to analyse. In some circles an equality of education between whites and Africans was deeply repugnant, indeed almost sacrilegious.

In other circles, there was no doubt a sincere belief that Africans could be educated within the framework of apartheid policy. Or the policy itself was rationalised in many ways—that it is frustrating to educate Africans for positions which are not available; that in the present stage of African education, literacy for the masses is more important than the quality of higher education. In any event, whatever the motives, the system of apartheid education was an essential element in the blueprint for white domination.

The necessity arises from the disproportion in number between the Afrikaners and the Africans. If Africans could be fragmented into tribal groups, then the Afrikaners would be the largest group and invulnerable, holding as they do the command positions in state bureaucracy and army.

Tribal fragmentation is attempted under the system of Bantu Authorities. This involves the revival, at the level of propaganda, of the powers of the chief. The local authority is built round the chief, and local authorities are linked into regional and territorial authorities. An elaborate comic opera is staged in this process.

Beneath the superficial comedy lies the deep tragedy of Bantu Authorities. The powers of the chiefs are illusory. They are assimilated to the lower levels of the civil service, a sort of *lumpen* bureaucracy. If they oppose the Government, they face exile and destitution. If they act as agents for the Government in implementing the hated policies of apartheid, then they arouse the anger of their fellow tribesmen.

Much of the fragmentation into tribal groups rests ultimately on force, and some of the repression applied in such rural areas as Zeerust, Sekhukuniland and Pondoland dwarfs, in its horror, the more dramatic violence of Sharpeville. This is one aspect of the implementation of policy.

The other aspect is an attempt to mould consent to tribal idealisation and fragmentation through the educational system. It is for this reason that the school population is based on a separate tribal entity, taught through the vernacular, and that the tribal universities are based on different linguistic groups. The teaching of social studies in the schools is so designed as to indoctrinate African children in obedience to authority and to mould them into tribal petrification.

Fortunately, the Government has quite a false conception of the possibilities of indoctrination. It is one thing to indoctrinate white children in an ideology of domination, quite another to indoctrinate subordination. And the many disturbances in the schools testify to the failure of the policy, but also impede education.

There is a second major reason for the imposition of apartheid in the educational system. At the open universities there was a free contact not only between Africans of different tribes but also between Africans and members of other racial groups. Here lay the possibility of non-white unity, or of an interracial opposition to the Government. Moreover, white and non-white met on a basis of equality, and in this equal meeting was a threat to domination, since it undermined the sense of colour and of racial superiority.

Masquerading as universities

In this context, educational apartheid must be seen as one aspect of a series of laws designed to ensure that white and non-white should not meet as equals. Systematically, every social situation has been subjected to control. Laws, enforced by criminal penalties, govern marriage, sex relations, contact between neighbours and traders, education, trade union activity. Powers have been assumed to prevent, if the Government so desires, interracial partaking of refreshments, common interracial worship involving Africans, interracial welfare organisations, clubs and so on.

Since a change had to be made in the system of education for ideological reasons, it was inevitable that the sacrifices should be demanded from the non-whites. And now Africans, Coloureds and Indians are relegated to moulding

centres in the shape of elementary training colleges masquerading as universities.

The final reason for the imposition of educational apartheid is that the Government's ideology is of a totalitarian type. All aspects must be integrated so that they support Afrikaner domination. This involves control of educational opportunities and, above all, the control of ideas. African education in particular rested upon the work of missionaries, and mostly English missionaries. Africans were trained as free persons and exposed to a universal system of ideas. Against the background of the education they received from these schools, they could only react to the ideology of apartheid as a reversion to Neanderthal man. Inevitably they were contemptuous of the men who propagated the concept of apartheid, and the minions who disseminated it more widely. Moreover, they were attuned to English culture.

The destruction of the English mission schools was a high priority for the Afrikaner nationalists, and in eight years they have destroyed institutions built with great sacrifice and devotion over generations. In theory, there is now an equal emphasis on English and Afrikaans in the African schools. In practice, Afrikaans is replacing English. Regrettably, Afrikaans cuts off the students from access to a world literature and a world civilisation. And censorship is designed to insulate them from ideas incompatible with apartheid, which is to say from many ennobling ideas.

It is a debasing process, debasing both to the whites who impose it, and the Africans who suffer the deprivation. And nothing could have been more stupidly designed, even to achieve the purpose of indoctrination in apartheid. But if the policy has failed in its objectives, it has succeeded all too well in depriving Africans of education. Even if the Government fell tomorrow, at least one generation of African students would have been denied fulfilment through education. Indeed, it would be poetic justice if it were this generation, indoctrinated in apartheid, which brought about the downfall of the system.

With kind permission reprinted from "The Student", Vol. VI, No. 5, May 1962, and slightly shortened.

Our Traditional Way of Life . . .

Liberal crayfish nicer

● *Mr. M. Viljoen, Deputy Minister of Labour and Immigration, said in the Free State that the arranging of mixed dinners and dance parties for whites and non-whites was part of an effort to overthrow the present order in the country. To the liberalists the crayfish not only tastes much nicer if white and non-white sit alongside each other, but they enjoy it to feel that such mixed dinners and dances are undermining the recognised South African way of life.*

Against domination

● *The Minister of Education, Arts and Science, in explaining the Government's attitude to mixed sport, said that the apartheid policy "is aimed at avoiding unnecessary friction between the races and ensuring that one race is not dominated by another. This policy has always worked well, and the question now arises why it will not also work well in the future."*

Exception to the exception

● *In "The Licensee's Guardian", we find some simple instructions on whom a South African barman is supposed to serve and whom he isn't. An Asiatic is any Turk and any person whose national home is in Asia, provided he is not a Jew or Syrian, or of a class excluded by proclamation, which lets the Japanese out. An Egyptian can enter white bars for he is white in terms of the Liquor Act. Japanese and Chinese may stay or have meals in any licensed hotels provided the license does not require separate facilities for non-whites. Neither Chinese nor Japanese may enter a licensed restaurant owned or occupied by whites. Although a Japanese can drink in a white bar, he must go to the non-white bar if a licensee has both premises. Foreign Chinese may get liquor in any white bar, but local Chinese must patronise non-white bars. A letter of exemption may be obtained by any Chinese, but it is not available to a Japanese, while any Japanese or Chinese who is in diplomatic service is treated as a white.*

Ambassador Newton Thompson

● *An ex-mayor of Cape Town, Mrs. Joyce Newton Thompson, while on tour in the United States, told the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Mr. G. ("Soapy") Mennen Williams, that "one-man-one-vote in South Africa was nonsense" and that, in her opinion, "90 per cent of the white people in South Africa intended to keep South Africa white". She also told Mr. Mennen Williams that she was "totally opposed to the non-whites getting political power of any kind". Mrs. Newton Thompson's wise words must have caused a swing of opinion in the States, for according to her, "South Africa's image in America has improved considerably".*

For pet-lovers

● *Advertisement: "Pet-lovers: Fresh, wholesome mince, three lbs. for 2/3; fresh veal 1/- lb.; servants beef 1/3 lb.; save money and have contented staff and pets. Telephone 443974 for daily deliveries."*

Party and Special Branch

SINCE the last issue of *Liberal Opinion* appeared a number of members have enjoyed(?) the attentions of the Special Branch.

Most prominent were Alan Paton and Jordan Ngubane, both of whom were asked questions which implied that they might be being considered for "house arrest".

In Durban the homes of John Laredo and David Evans have been visited twice and in Pietermaritzburg Dempsey Noel and Talbot Appollos were two of three leading members of the Coloured community whose homes were searched.

There is no doubt that these visits are part of a planned policy of intimidation.

Liberalism and Democracy

By JACK LEWSEN

CRITICS of the Liberal Party (be they Nat., U.P. or Progs.) make the common (and, from their point of view, convenient) mistake of assuming that the Liberal Party's acceptance of the unqualified franchise is the *be all and end all* of our policy. This is a drastic oversimplification. Our aim is a full nonracial democracy for South Africa. This, of course, must include universal franchise, but it also includes those parliamentary procedures and those legal, constitutional and traditional safeguards for individual personal liberties, without which universal franchise can

This article, though written by a leading Party member, is not an official statement of Liberal Party views. We hope it will provoke discussion in these columns.

become the path to dictatorship, totalitarianism and, in a multiracial society, racial domination and chauvinism.

In fact the real difference between our policy and the policies of the three other political parties is that, while we place our faith in democracy in the framework of law and civil liberties — as well as in equal political rights — our opponents fear it, and would thus honour it in name only while so evading it by rigging its procedures as to ensure that effective power would, for at least the foreseeable future, remain in the hands of the white minority.

The Nationalists would retain merely the skeleton form of parliamentary democracy by rigidly restricting voting rights to the minority of whites in the vast mixed areas (ficticiously called "white areas") and by promising (as compensation) exclusive voting rights for Africans in the Bantustans — which are so utterly dependent economically on the white areas as to render any political power nominal.

The United Party offer only token representation to non-whites, but go on to allege that they would expand these rights to something less than equal rights under a racially demarcated federal system.

The Progressives, while claiming to uphold democracy, in fact restrict it to its antiquated form of a class oligarchy where only privileged groups — comprising the better educated and wealthier — would exercise full franchise. They claim of course that by making education compulsory all persons would ultimately qualify for the vote, but they overlook the fact that for many years to come the white sections of the population would retain effective power by being the preponderate majority of the privileged voting class. Moreover before equality of voting strength between white and non-white is reached, the whites could use their voting strength to postpone any further sharing of power.

The reasons for preferring the democratic to the oligarchic or authoritarian forms of government are summed up in simple terms by E. M. Forster in his essay *Two Cheers for Democracy* as follows: Democracy, he says, "is less hateful than other contemporary forms of government . . . (because) it does start from the assumption that the individual is important and that all types are needed to make a civilisation. It does not divide citizens into bosses and the bossed . . . and people get more of a chance under democracy than elsewhere." These are not considerations which the Nats., United Party or even the Progressives are prepared to acknowledge in a practical manner. In fact they even reject the classic political definition of democracy — which is *government of the people for the people by the people*. For this definition *cannot in practice be restricted to government of the people by a section of the people for the benefit of that section*.

Yet this is precisely what is implicit in the policies of these three major parties. They do not accept that the whole of the people should govern; they are in agreement that certain groups and sections in South Africa are not fit to participate in government, and by their different disenfranchisement techniques ensure that these be excluded. In doing so they divide the people into "bosses and the bossed", and the right to govern becomes the monopoly of a privileged section. Each of these parties would indignantly deny

that their motive is "baasskap", but what other purpose can they have in limiting the power of government to privileged groups if it is not to protect the interest of the privileged, i.e. *the whites*? Their fear is that under a total democracy the established privileges and rights of the present ruling group would, in the process of sharing, be jettisoned; and their power to boss eliminated. They, therefore, devise policies which would keep the bosses in power for the foreseeable future.

Unlike the Nats., the United Party and the Progressives are prepared, however, to dilute the ruling group with some admixture of "reliable" (i.e. politically conservative) non-whites. They are not prepared, however, to risk total democracy which they neither trust nor understand. They infer that because the white minority in South Africa have used political power to dominate over the non-whites, full enfranchisement would reverse the procedures and pass the tyranny of government from the minority of whites to the majority of blacks. This, of course, could never happen under the safeguards of a true democracy, because the virtue of democracy is that it is the only form of government evolved by man which does not permit either minority or majority tyrannies. It is irrelevant to cite the happenings in Ghana and the Congo. Where a Government can lock up its opposition, as in Ghana, freedom is destroyed and there is no democracy despite universal franchise. Likewise there was no democracy in Lumumba's Congo Government, where universal franchise was used to bring about mob-rule to pay off old scores against the previous ruling white minority.

In its proper and full form, democracy is *government in the open by free people through discussion*. Democratic institutions must, therefore, ensure that all the people are free; i.e. free to participate in government, free to criticise and free to change the government in power. Universal franchise is thus only one of the freedoms guaranteed under democracy and is no more important than the other freedoms; i.e. freedom of speech, assembly, criticism, movement, association; freedom from arbitrary arrest, etc. — which

together constitute democratic "civil liberties" under "the rule of law". Whatever people may call their government, there is no democracy if these freedoms are not guaranteed. In most democratic countries the liberty of the individual is enshrined in and guaranteed by the constitution itself, while in England it is as effectively guaranteed by the long-established practices, conventions, institutions and traditions of a freedom-conditioned people. In any true democracy, the right to invade these freedoms lies beyond the sovereignty of parliament or the powers of the executive and the only time they are ever restricted is in times of genuine national peril or disaster — such as war — and then only by consent of parliament for the minimum period of time necessary to combat those perils.

So long as individual freedom exists there can be no danger whatever of either a majority or minority tyranny, and the people are never divided up into bosses and the bossed. *In fact the right of the majority to make laws is no greater than the right of the minority to criticise them, and government is thus not simply government by the majority, but government by the majority with the consent of the minority — for consent to be governed is only given to a majority by people whose freedom is ensured.*

Transkei Subversion Charges Against Liberals

ON SEPTEMBER 4, 1962, Peter Hjul, Chairman of the Cape Division of the Liberal Party, was fined R200 (£100) in the Umtata Magistrate's Court, on being found guilty of subverting or interfering with the authority of the State or its officers. Mr. Hjul was prosecuted in terms of the Proclamation 400 of 1960, the "emergency regulations" introduced in the Transkei at the time of the East Pondoland disturbances. As a director of Selemela Publications (Pty.) Ltd., owners and publishers of the fortnightly independent news-review *Contact*, Mr. Hjul was held responsible for an article that had appeared in *Contact* on 28 December 1961. It

was headlined "Homeguard Terror" and claimed that deep division existed in the Baziya Mission Location in the Umtata District of the Transkei, as a result of measures taken by the headman, Absalom Yengwa. Mr. Hjul's appeal will be heard in the Eastern Districts Court, Grahamstown, on 29 October.

Mr. Patrick Duncan, editor of *Contact* and also a prominent member of the Liberal Party, was Mr. Hjul's fellow accused. Before summons was issued, Mr. Duncan had, by moving to Basutoland, defied a banning order confining him to the Cape Peninsula. On his non-attendance at the Umtata court, a warrant was issued for his arrest.

Uncivilised and restrictive law

The article in question concerned conditions in the Transkei, the activities of "homeguards", locally recruited units maintained under police supervision to protect Government-appointed or recognised chiefs and headmen believed to be in need of such protection. It also brought before the public eye Proclamation 400, which Mr. Hjul's defending counsel, Mr. L. R. Dison, described as "a law which severely restricts the freedom of people . . . an uncivilised and restrictive law which should be restrictively applied". Mr. Dison also said that it offended against his constitutional sense of rightness that a local law could be passed that in effect took away the freedom of the press.

Local interest in the case was clearly evidenced by the fact that the court was packed on each day of the hearing. Special seating had to be arranged for the crowds, who came long distances on lorries, trailers and buses.

The "Homeguard Terror" case having been accepted by the Attorney-General as a "test case", trial under a second charge was postponed indefinitely. In this second case, which will be heard in the event of Mr. Hjul's appeal being lost, Mr. Hjul, Mr. Patrick Duncan and Mr. Randolph Vigne (a national Deputy-Chairman of the Liberal Party) will be tried for a similar offence, based on the publication of a report entitled "Transkei Tyranny", which listed what it called

"some examples of suspension of the rule of law in the Transkei", under Proclamation 400. It reads in part:

"In Matanzima's Tembuland . . . emergency imprisonment is only a small part of the legalised tyranny. The chief's court continually extorts fines of up to R40 (£20) for 'disrespect', 'disobedience' . . . I have seen the criminal summonses for these 'crimes'. An unknown number of such appellants and others have been deported to distant locations without their stock. Their homes were knocked down. . . . The prisoners (under Proclamation 400) are mostly illiterate peasants, unaware of the fate of their families, stock and crops after long unexplained captivity".

Messrs. Hjul and Vigne may thus be tried under Proclamation 400 for having allegedly circulated in the Transkei a report "intended to have the effect of subverting or interfering with the authority of the State or one of its officers and/or a chief, namely Chief Kaizer Matanzima".

As Chief Kaizer Matanzima is the present presiding chief of the Transkeian Territorial Authority and has been the most consistent supporter of the Government's "self-government" plans for the Transkei, the case may be of particular interest.

FOOTNOTE.—At its Provincial and National Congresses in 1961 and 1962, the Liberal Party passed resolutions condemning Proclamation 400 and has repeatedly attacked it from its platforms. Such condemnations apply equally to an amending Proclamation, No. 413 of 1960, which grants to Native Commissioners, commissioned and non-commissioned officers of the South African Police the power of arrest and detention without warrant in certain circumstances, persons detained to be held until they have answered all questions "fully and truthfully". Section 20 of Proclamation 400 states that no person so detained shall, without the consent of the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development or a person acting with his authority, be allowed to consult with a legal adviser concerning his arrest and detention. No cases have yet been reported in which such consent has been obtained.

‡ 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.