

THE BLACK SASH



DIE SWART SERP

Registered at the G.P.O. as a newspaper.

Vol. III, No. 18

MAY 1959

Price 6d.

THE BAN ON RUSSELL

THE banning of Bertrand Russell's collection of essays published under the title "Why I am not a Christian" was an event of grave significance, a curtailment of religious freedom and an act of tyranny. Pledged as we in the Black Sash are to uphold moral principles in Government, we must deplore it as an abuse of power. Even if the ban should be rescinded, the attitude of mind that gave rise to it, and that led a Cabinet Minister to defend it, unhappily remains.

It would be a mistake simply to dismiss the banning orders of the Minister of the Interior with amused contempt. There is certainly a ludicrous aspect to the solemn listing of numerous trashy publications in the *Government Gazette*, a process that reached the peak of farce when the classic "Black Beauty" was included in error. It may also be possible to find a grim humour in the Government's pathetic attempts to suppress ideas by banning serious studies of Marxism and works on race relations, some of which have been published under international auspices. But the banning of these works is something that should not be tolerated by a community of free men and women.

The banning of Russell's essays carried censorship into the religious field. Asked why the book had been banned, the Minister, who is under no statutory obligation to give reasons, graciously consented to explain, through his deputy, that the book violated the principles

DIE VERBOD OP RUSSELL

DIE verbod op Bertrand Russell se versameling onder die titel „Why I am not a Christian" was 'n besonder betekenisvolle gebeurtenis, 'n inkorting van vryheid op gebied van godsdienst en 'n tiranedaad. Ons in die Swart Serp wat plegtig onderneem het om sedelike beginsels by regering te handhaaf, moet dit afkeur as 'n misbruik van magte. Al sou die verbanning herroep word, bly nog, ongelukkig, die lewensaanskouing wat daartoe gelei het en wat selfs 'n Kabinetminister genoodsaak het om dit te verdedig.

Dit sou 'n fout wees om die verbodopdragte van die Minister van Binnelandse sake eenvoudig met 'n glimlag van veragting te laat vaar. Daar is wel ongetwyfeld 'n belaglike aspek aan die sedige benoeming van etlike prullerige boeke in die *Staatskoerant*, 'n proses wat die hoogtepunt van belaglikheid bereik het toe die klassieke verhaal „Black Beauty" foutief daaronder verskyn het. Dit mag ook moontlik wees om 'n onverbiddelike humor te vind in die patetiese pogings van die Regering om gedagtes te onderdruk deur 'n verbod te verklaar op ernstige studies van Marxisme en verhandelinge oor rasseverhoudings, sommige waarvan onder internasionale beskerming uitgegee is. Maar die verbod op hierdie boeke is iets wat nie deur 'n gemeenskap van vrye manne en vroue geduld moet word nie.

Die verbod op Russell se verhandelinge bring sensorskap tot die gebied van godsdienst. Toe

of Christianity upheld in South Africa. It was Godless in content.

The insult to Russell, who is a great philosopher and an honoured defender of the ideals of Western civilization, is of small importance. We are much more concerned about the implications for South Africa of this tyrannical edict.

If a ban is placed on Russell, it is only logical that it should be extended to all literature that offends the Government's peculiar religious susceptibilities — and that embraces a vast field. Was the banning of Russell a sort of trial run for a thorough-going policy of religious censorship? We fear so. We already have the policy of Christian National Education which is grounded in religious intolerance; we have noted the dropping of the "conscience clause"; and since this Government is nothing if not consistent, we may expect the policy to be carried to its logical conclusion, in easy stages.

WHAT of the public's reaction to the ban on Russell? There have been the usual isolated protests from a few brave people, and the usual tame acquiescence on the part of the majority of the intellectual supporters of Nationalism. South Africans, on the whole, appear to have accepted a situation in which protests are unavailing. That is bad enough. It is far worse to have to conclude that the public conscience is nearly dead. We have become accustomed to the suppression of freedom in defence of the colour bar; we have sold our birthright as a free people for a mess of apartheid pottage. Why should the great principle of religious tolerance remain intact when other human rights are trampled upon in the name of White civilization?

The inherent dignity of the individual, his status as an end in himself and not as a means to the ends of others, is a basic tenet of the world's great religions. How ironical that *our* Government, with its long record of transgressions against this precept, should pose as the upholder of the principles of Christianity . . . If this comment should give offence in any quarter, let it be remembered that censorship of the kind that the Government is now attempting to impose kindles a deep resentment in the minds of those that were reared in, and have remained faithful to, the liberal traditions of Western civilization.

dit hom gevra is waarom 'n verbod op die boek verklaar is het die Minister, wat onder geen wetlike verpligting staan om redes te verstrek nie, goedgunstelik ingestem om te verduidelik, deur sy Onderminister, dat die boek die beginsels van die Christelike geloof skend wat in Suid-Afrika gehandhaaf word. Die inhoud was goddeloos.

Die belediging aan Russell, 'n vooraanstaande filosoof en 'n geëerde verdediger van die ideale van die Westerse beskawing, is van betreklik minder belang. Ons is veel meer besorgd oor die implikasies wat hierdie tiraniese gebod vir Suid-Afrika inhou. As 'n verbod verklaar word op Russell, is dit niks meer as logies nie om dit uit te brei tot alle letterkunde wat die Regering se eienaardige godsdienstige gevoelens seermaak — en dit behels 'n ontsaglike terrein.

Was die verbod op Russell 'n soort voorlopige proefneming vir 'n volledige godsdienstige sensorskap? Ons is so bevrees. Ons het reeds die beginsel van Christelike Nasionale Onderwys, wat op godsdienstige onverdraagsaamheid gegrond is; ons het gesien hoe die gewetenskousule verwyder is; en aangesien hierdie Regering niks indien nie konsekwent is nie, kan ons verwag dat die beleid geleidelik tot sy logiese eindpunt uitgevoer sal word.

WAT van die publiek se reaksie op die verbod op Russell? Daar was die gewone enkele proteste van 'n paar moedige mense, en die gewone mak inwilliging deur die meerderheid van die intelligentsia onder Nasionale-ondersteuners. Suid-Afrikaners oor die algemeen het skynbaar 'n toestand aanvaar waarin proteste geen verskil maak nie. Dit is erg genoeg. Om tot die gevolgtrekking te moet kom dat die gewete van die publiek feitlik dood is, is veel erger. Ons het gewoon geraak aan die onderdrukking van vryheid ter verdediging van die kleurslagboom; ons het ons geboortereg as vrye volk prysgegee vir 'n pot apartheid. Waarom sal die groot beginsel van godsdienstige vryheid ongeskonde bly terwyl ander menslike regte in die naam van Blanke beskawing vertrap word?

Die onafskeidelike waardigheid van die individu, sy status as 'n doel op sigself en nie slegs as middel ter bereiking van die doelstelling van andere nie, is 'n grondbeginsel van die



“. . . and solemnly dedicate ourselves to the uprooting of foreign influences and the establishment of bigger and better national traditions.”

[Courtesy Cape Times.]

groot godsdienste van die wêreld. Hoe ironies is dit dat ons Regering, met sy lang geskiedenis van oortredings teen hierdie beginsel, hom moet voordoën as die verdediger van die beginsels van die Christendom . . . As hierdie kommentaar êrens aanstoot gee, kan daar onthou word dat sensorskap van die tipe wat die Regering nou probeer oplê 'n diepe wrewelighheid laat ontstaan by diegene wat in die liberale tradisie van die Westerse beskawing groot geword het en daaraan getrou gebly het.

“It is not thy task to complete the work, yet thou mayest not desist from doing it.”
—The Talmud.

OUR SOUTH AFRICA

“It is significant that the South African Bantu rarely asks for a passport to leave the Union and make a living elsewhere.” — Mr. C. W. Prinsloo, Chief Information Officer, Department of Native Affairs.

* * *

“Three of our best non-European university students have been refused passports to take up bursaries offered to them at Oxford, Cambridge and London universities.”

—Sunday Times.

* * *

“There is a complete collapse of the moral code in South Africa, and slovenly fashion habits are to blame.”

—Viktor (milliner), as reported in the Sunday Times.

The Attack on the CONSCIENCE CLAUSE

SPEAKING in Parliament on the subject of liberty of conscience in our universities, the late Dr. D. F. Malan (then Minister of the Interior, but later to be Prime Minister) said in 1932:

"I have always been in favour of the retention of the Conscience Clause, in connection with the Potchefstroom institution as well, and I have not changed in a single respect with regard to that attitude. I consider the Conscience Clause as necessary in the interests of science, and I am of opinion that it is just as much in the interests of religion . . . I regard the Conscience Clause as a protection not only of the liberty of thought and inquiry in our higher educational institutions, but, at the same time, as a protection of their honesty."

Quite so. The case for liberty of thought and belief in higher education could scarcely be put more clearly; and it is in support of Dr. Malan's erstwhile opinion that this article is being written.

What it says

The successors of Dr. Malan have since adopted a different view, so that we have the published authority of Prof. F. J. M. Potgieter, Chairman of the Vereniging vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys, for saying that shortly before his death Mr. Strijdom solemnly promised to have the Conscience Clause abolished. (*Die Transvaler*, 3/10/1958.)

The clause which is to be got rid of has been incorporated in Acts of Parliament establishing the various universities, and has been a part of the Education Ordinances of the various provinces. It lays down that "No test of religious belief shall be imposed on any person as a condition of his becoming or continuing to be a professor, lecturer, teacher or student or of his holding any office or emolument or exercising any privilege in, any college, nor shall any preference be given to or advantage be withheld from any person on the ground of his religious belief."

By

W. D. TERRY

Dr. Terry, of Rhodes University, Grahamstown, formerly lectured in English at Potchefstroom University and the Teachers' Training College, Heidelberg. He is a convocation member of the University of Cambridge. This article expresses his personal views.



The late Dr.
D. F. MALAN

★

A defender
of the
clause

The Conscience Clause is a comparatively modern thing. In Oxford and Cambridge it was unknown for 500 years; it was only last century that any save members of the Established Church were at last allowed to enter those famous halls. Liberty of conscience and freedom of inquiry, freedom from the obligation to hold and propagate any kind of dogma is a product of the democratic belief in the rights of the individual and the conviction that a man's religion is his own private affair.

Potchefstroom

The first to assault the Conscience Clause was Potchefstroom University, where it held good — officially, and in a manner of speaking — until 1950, when Act No. 19 of that year (Section 31) altered it.

The Education Ordinance of the O.F.S. has lately rather similarly whittled things down. It provides that religious instruction in schools shall be given only by members of the teaching staffs, who must be prepared conscientiously to give the instruction required, unless the Director of Education has exempted him from such obligation . . .

In the days when the old clause still applied at Potchefstroom, I was appointed to a teaching post in that university. I was far more closely quizzed on my religious beliefs by the Principal (who sat below a portrait of John Calvin which lives with me to this day) than on my academic qualifications, and it was clear that if I were not a Protestant I was no use at all. The Clause counted for nothing.

Some years later I was appointed to a provincial training college for teachers, when once again my religious views were closely looked into, and where it was a standing joke among the students that there

"A University should be a place of light, of liberty and of learning."

"Upon the education of the people of this country the fate of this country depends."

—Benjamin Disraeli.

were many jobs in the public schools for which members of the "wrong" Protestant denominations or the "wrong" branches of the Dutch Reformed Church need not apply.

It was equally fatal for applicants for lecturing posts to have picked the wrong denominational allegiances—dominees who sat on the Council saw to that . . .

More recently the University of the Orange Free State, also a centre of "Christian-National" education, but still bound by the old Conscience Clause (which it heartily dislikes) has taken to requiring prospective members of its staff to state their religious affiliations.

Calvinism

Now there is a determined effort to get rid of the Conscience Clause altogether. The consequences for Jewish teachers, benighted agents of *die Roomse Gevaar*, agnostics and the "wrong" kinds of Protestants, need not be elaborated.

They are evident to anybody with half an eye. You cannot be a true South African if not a Calvinist. It is as simple as that.

No other consideration really matters — not learning, nor academic eminence, nor intellectual integrity, professional skill, humane understanding of students, nor even the *refraining* from doctrinal opinion.

So there we are. We note next that the Conscience Clause has been entirely omitted from the Bill to establish the new "Apartheid" tribal university colleges for non-Europeans, which, however, are to be "religious in character" in keeping with the Christian philosophy of this country.

One notes an implication that truth will not have to be *pursued* in these places; it has already been discovered by the Government, which picks the teachers who know what it is. But there is more to it than this. We are here dealing in part with a "security" measure as well as with a "Christian-National" political one. The teachers appointed are going to have the right ideological and religious qualifications all right, but (more important) they are not going to be "liberals."

The Government is afraid of "agitators" operating among the non-Europeans in schools and colleges. This is not without reason, but the method of excluding them, and of putting in safe Christian-Nationalists, should not deceive anybody about the full implications.

Even though I abominate Communism even more than the Black Death, I cannot go far with them in this. In 33 years as pupil, undergraduate and

teacher, in schools, colleges and universities here and abroad, I have never encountered anybody abusing his office by teaching Catholicism, Judaism, agnosticism, atheism or any sectarian doctrine in any classroom.

On the other hand I have heard plenty of racial and party politics, in institutions supported by the taxes, and always in the guise of being "Christian-National."

Frankly, I do not expect the abolition of the Conscience Clause to result in the exclusion of students anywhere, whatever their beliefs. But I do know that students were being got at while the clause was still officially intact, and teachers often discriminated against; and I expect that its removal (whatever the plausible excuses, such as that "every university may determine its own norm") will entrench these practices and help to undermine that honesty in religion, in teaching and in research, which once seemed so important to Dr. Malan.

THE BLACK SASH Is Purely South African

MISUNDERSTANDINGS appear to have arisen in the public mind over the use by women overseas of the black sash symbol. The South African Black Sash movement is a purely South African movement, membership of which is open only to women on the South African parliamentary voters' roll. The Black Sash movement confines its protests to matters within South Africa. The fact that others in countries beyond our borders from time to time adopt our emblem in order to express their own moral indignation at actions which they believe to be unjust or undemocratic, is a tribute to the fact that the Black Sash movement has always based its stand on moral principles. However, it should be clearly understood that the South African Black Sash is in no way associated with any protest movements or demonstrations outside the borders of South Africa.

Gallop to the Guillotine

By OWEN WILLIAMS

THE real business of the session started after the Easter recess, to the ring of the division bells and the chop of the guillotine. In between, two vital and far-reaching measures have been forced through, inadequately discussed in the House itself, and with the usual complete, blind, Nationalist obliviousness to the tremendous volume of protest from without.

The measures were the two university apartheid Bills, and the Industrial Conciliation Amendment Bill, which entrenches job reservation and gives the Minister of Labour, Senator De Klerk, complete and dictatorial power over labour and also, in many respects, over employers too.

All these measures demonstrate clearly the essential inhumanity and cruelty of the Nationalist Government, its contempt for opposition views, no matter how large and influential, and its dislike of democratic processes of Government.

The first measure to startle the House after Easter was the guillotine motion. This effectively created a travesty of parliamentary form, the whole structure of which is moulded on the concept of government by discussion.

The complete contrast between the theory of parliamentary government and the Nationalist practice was sharply delineated in the committee stage of the so-called Extension of University Education Bill, which limits non-White education to tribal colleges under the control and subject to the whim of the responsible Minister.

Assembly Line

The committee stage is probably the most important halt in the progress of a Bill from draughtsman to assent. It occurs after the principle has been adopted at the second reading, and is meant to be devoted to the detailed examination and improvement of the clauses of the Bill by way of amendments.

In this instance there were 42 clauses. The guillotine fell and 39 went undebated. They not only went undebated, but all the Opposition amendments fell away. In the report stage, to which the same criteria apply, there were 43 amendments and, when the guillotine dropped after an hour, 39 of them were undiscussed.

This assembly-line manner of producing legislation was not, to put it mildly, the intention of the many



★

The Hon.
Senator

J. DE KLERK

★

Unemployment
— for Non-
Whites only?

★

people who helped to evolve the parliamentary system.

And, to make it curiously and curiously, this procedure was justified by the Prime Minister, Dr. Verwoerd, by analogy with the British Parliament, and talk of "democracy."

By this stratagem, university apartheid was hacked through—in time for members, as Mrs. Ballinger said, to get home to their farms without being too much bothered by the winter rains.

The Nationalist arguments in favour of the measure were ridiculous, and not worth discussing in detail. Ignoring the principles of university freedom and autonomy, the main argument boiled down to the claim that the non-Whites should have their own "national culture"—whatever that might mean—and consequently should imbibe this strange thing at their own colleges.

Perhaps the most revealing words on the subject were spoken by Mr. D. J. J. Mostert. He said:

"The trouble is — and this the honourable members must understand — that the non-White colleges (not universities, as the member for Houghton says) will only develop gradually. I have a great ideal for a university for these people, but you can't institute a university for them now. There is no suggestion of a university for them now. . . ."

Continued on page 7

AN OPPORTUNITY MISSED

THE great success of the inter-party discussions on the Constitution organised in Cape Town, Pietermaritzburg and Durban by the Black Sash shows that the political apathy of which we continually hear is more apparent than real.

It is true that, except at election time, a meeting called by a political party is not likely to attract much public attention. But this is probably not because of public indifference to political questions. It is more likely to be an expression of a general feeling that meetings called by a single party are stage-managed, and offer no serious challenge to thought. The inter-party meetings organised by the Black Sash have enabled the thinking members of the public to note the answers made by political leaders to questions addressed to them by an independent question-master, and to compare the answers given by one party with those given by another.

The public appetite for genuine political discussion is shown by the large numbers of people who failed to gain admission to the meeting in Pietermaritzburg, and by the readiness of so many to listen to the discussion from the corridor outside the hall, and from the kitchen behind the platform. A similarly keen interest was shown by the audience in Durban. The Black Sash is to be congratulated for its enterprise in arranging these discussions, and we hope that more will follow.

The value of such meetings depends, however, on their being as representative as possible of various shades of political thought, and for this reason we must express our regret that the United Party was not represented, at least in Natal. In Cape Town, it is true, an unofficial representative put the United Party's views, but in Natal the Party left the field

clear for the Nationalists, Federalists and Liberals.

We do not, of course, pretend to know the reason for this, but we believe that the Party might have made a useful contribution to the discussions, and we must therefore regret the decision. It was particularly unfortunate that so distinguished a member of the Party as Dr. Cochran should have found it necessary to withdraw his acceptance of the invitation to speak after his initial acceptance had been publicly made known. The incident calls to mind an occasion not so very long ago when Mr. Ray Swart, Member of Parliament for Zululand, also withdrew from a meeting organised by the Black Sash without any explanation to the public.

The conclusion to which we are compelled to come, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, is that the United Party in Natal exercises an unusually close supervision over the political activities of its members, and that even Members of Parliament are subject to a strict discipline.

No doubt this discipline is accepted with a good grace by those who are subjected to it; but it is scarcely in accordance with sound democratic principles for highly respected members of the Party to be silenced when questions of the greatest interest are being discussed. Nor can we believe that the reticence shown by the Party leadership is in the interests of the Party itself.

It is no doubt true that even the highly successful Black Sash meetings attracted only a minority of the electorate; but it is, after all, the thinking and politically active minority of today that makes the opinion of tomorrow. A political party cannot for ever exist on the loyalty of its members, and it is in the interests of the United Party itself to take advantage of every opportunity of putting its case to the public.

—*The Natal Witness*, 16th March, 1959.

GALLOP TO THE GUILLOTINE — Continued

Quite explicitly, therefore, what the Nationalists intend to do is to substitute inferior, tribal education for the Universities of Cape Town and the Witwatersrand.

"There is no suggestion of a university for them." So all the pious talk about culture and education in their own spheres turns out, as usual, to be humbug.

From this injustice, galloping to the tune of the division bells, the House went on to accept the principle that the best jobs should be determined by skin-colour.

This principle had been accepted before, but two of the determinations of the Minister, Senator De Klerk, were upset by the courts. Through a limitation on the power of the industrial councils—made up of workers and employers—this Bill entrenches job reservation beyond the powers of the courts.

The Minister is given tremendously sweeping

powers to determine the labour forces of whole industries in whatever proportion or manner he sees fit.

All this is done to "protect the White worker."

What Senator De Klerk does not seem to realize, however, is that this Bill, by artificially limiting the expansion of employment, and by creating sheltered and therefore inefficient employment for able-bodied people, can only lower productivity and consequently the standard of living of the very people whom he seeks to protect.

It is a truism that the way to greater prosperity is the relaxation of the colour bar in employment, with the consequent increase in productivity.

Senator De Klerk spoke for hours, but all he really said was that it was his mission to protect the White worker, and that if this Bill proved unworkable he would come back and amend it again.

So we may expect to see a few more Industrial Conciliation Amendment Bills in the future.

A DAY AND A NIGHT TO

By NANCY LE FEUVRE



[By courtesy of the *Cape Times*.]

ON Wednesday, April 8th, Parliament re-assembled after the Easter Recess, and the second reading of the so-called Extension of University Education Bill began. About 75 women of the Cape Western Branch of the Black Sash stood from 1.45 to 2.15 p.m. on the pavement opposite Parliament, facing a line of 200 students who were also protesting against this iniquitous Bill.

I should like to pay a tribute here to the University of Cape Town students, who not only staged several mass stands, but also organised a day and night vigil (week-ends included) outside Parliament for three consecutive weeks.

The brilliance of the Black Sash stand on Wednesday paled a little in comparison with the "All Night Stand" on Friday which, let me hasten to say, came to an end only at 2 p.m. on Saturday after the last division had been taken.

There was a wonderful turnout of women, who by their endurance, determination, unselfishness and comradeship made of the stand a thing to be remembered. About fifty women stayed all night, and stood in shifts of half an hour on and an hour off, though some stalwarts reversed the procedure!

On their "off times" many women went into the House to hear the debate; others went to a nearby hotel which had kindly allowed us to use the lounge, and where we were able to order coffee and sandwiches. Many women were able to rest there far

MEMBER

Two Sashers Tell the Story of the All Night Stand

more comfortably than in the House, where the watchful eye of the Clerk of the House observed any nodding head in the Public Galleries and sent appropriate messages to the offenders. Thus one of our "beautiful dreamers" was rudely awakened in the early hours of Saturday morning, when even M.Ps. were lying full length on the cross-benches at the back of the Chamber, smothering their snores with towels and pillows!

When the All Night Stand started, nobody was able to say definitely when it would end, but at daybreak, when some of us were given steaming cups of coffee in the House by thoughtful M.Ps., we realised that the sitting would go on well into Saturday. So we made contact by telephone with fresh Sashers, who immediately came to the rescue of the All Night Standers. Some came from as far afield as Somerset West (bless them!) and many put off engagements in order to keep a more important appointment at the Gates of Parliament.

ENDURANCE TEST

By Mary Birt

DURING the night there were few diversions. Two fire engines roared past in full cry, and Sashers watched the M.Ps. arriving with their bedding. By Saturday morning many had spent some hours listening to the debate within and were very depressed in consequence. The uncertainty about how long it would go on made the stand a dreary endurance test, but, to our amazement, three of those who had taken a major share of standing through the night, turned up again to take part in the finale. In spite of our remonstrances they declared that they must see the end. By 2 p.m. these women had stood for a total of 11½ hours each.

After it began to rain steadily one of the hardest parts of the stand was watching from our partly sheltered position the two University students who were fully exposed. The Sash knows how to dress for such an undertaking, but in cotton frocks and undergraduate gowns the students were soon so wet as to trouble every maternal breast across the road. We longed to pop them into bed with hot drinks and hot water bottles to prevent their catching pneumonia.

We were amazed that Mrs. Verwoerd could sit in

Quotes

From the Stand

DURING the Sash stand outside Parliament a White woman passed down the line shouting angrily, "Hoekom het julle nie Kaffir-manne saam met julle nie?" Shortly afterwards an African passed by doffing his cap respectfully.

* * *

"In there they are making the laws that their children will pay for."

—Comment of a Coloured man to his friend.

* * *

Mr. Eric Louw, Minister of External Affairs, stepped out of his car and observed: "No Coloureds? Well, well, well . . ." In fact there were a number of non-Whites among the students protesting outside Parliament.

* * *

In the House during the all-night stand Mr. Jack Basson said that the Hon. the Minister of Finance had sent his daughter to a University where 25 per cent. of the students were non-European and that she had emerged without blemish (or words to that effect). In fact he had sent her to the Sorbonne.

Voice from Government benches: "Waar is dit?"

the Prime Minister's best Cadillac for half an hour under the immediate gaze of this pair of drowned ducks. She read the paper from beginning to end, then back again. Only when she moved into another car and drove away did the Sash realise that it was no good waiting to catch the Prime Minister's eye and we disbanded at 2 p.m. It proved a merciful decision, for at that moment the heavens poured such floods that the Peninsula suffered severe damage. We were wet through just running to our cars.

Sash Repartee

It was a great shame that the Sash continued to "stand" — especially in the rain, a member was told by her host at a dinner party. "Just what effect are you having on the Nats.?" he asked plaintively, while the other guests smiled in that patronising way we all know so well.

Our Sasher replied sweetly but crushingly, "Oh! We are not only trying to have some effect on the Nats. We are hoping to have some effect on people like you who are doing nothing at all!"



Why Liberals Hate Communism

By *GERALD GORDON, Q.C.*

(Author, lecturer, a patron of the Civil Rights League and one of the founders of the Institute of Citizenship.)

★
The second
of two
articles

★

IN the first part of his article "Liberals and Communists are Poles Apart," published in last month's issue, Mr. Gerald Gordon pointed out that Liberals and Communists were both opposed to race discrimination and race prejudice, but that this was the only point of similarity. He analysed the meaning of Communism, showing that it was an authoritarian creed, that it rejected the rule of law, and that it was based on the doctrine that the end justifies the means. The Communist state is a one-party state and the franchise is a mockery.

Mr. Gordon turns now, in the second part of his article, to an examination of Liberalism, showing that it is the antithesis of Communism, and therefore implacably opposed to it.

WHAT of the "Liberal"? Liberalism developed in the last century in England as an economic philosophy which rejected any form of government control over private enterprise. This was the doctrine of *laissez-faire*. But just as the Liberal rejected government interference in economic affairs, so too he abhorred government invasion of private civic rights.

Accordingly the Liberal is essentially a democrat who believes firmly in both the separation of powers and rule of law. It is of the essence of Liberalism that everyone's point of view must be respected, and accordingly freedom of speech and freedom of belief are fundamental. Likewise freedom from fear must be guaranteed by the state—by the full authority of independent courts.

There is thus no place for imprisonment without trial or for concentration camps. The principle of *habeas corpus*, whereby anyone imprisoned must be brought into open court for full ventilation of his case at the earliest opportunity, and not be allowed to languish indefinitely in gaol without trial, is a basic tenet. There can be no Bastilles in the Liberal state, no Dachaus or Buchenwalds, no salt mines of Siberia. With Voltaire, the Liberal says, "I may disagree with everything you say, but I shall fight to the death for your right to say it."

It is correct that today Liberalism admits of the necessity of some degree of state-planning in the affairs of men, for the modern state has become such a highly organised machine that it would be impossible to co-ordinate its multifarious departments without some form of centralisation. The *laissez-faire* Liberalism of the 19th century is impossible in the modern state. At the same time the Liberal demands that this planning must be based in the first place on making scientific use of human resources, in the second place on the abolition of poverty, illiteracy and ignorance, and in the third place upon the full development of the material resources of the country in the interest of all population groups.

Race Prejudice

I said earlier that the one point of similarity between Liberalism and Communism was in the opposition of both to colour prejudice, but the reasons for such opposition are very different. Liberal opposition is based on the principle that the dignity of human personality and the preservation of human rights should be the fundamental aim of all political endeavour and that race prejudice and colour bars are inhuman, undemocratic and unjust.

The Communist attitude is different. The Communist says that race prejudice and discrimination are tools in the hands of the capitalist, whereby a member of one racial group may eliminate members of other rival groups from competition; this he does by exploiting racial prejudice and turning the public away from his racial adversary. This is the Marxist

explanation for anti-Semitism — that it is basically motivated by economic greed. Yet in the Soviet Union, where capitalist competitiveness is supposed to have been eliminated, anti-Semitism is at present rife.

Liberalism Defined

THE most comprehensive definition of Liberalism today that I could find, is from Collier's Encyclopedia:

Liberalism puts major emphasis on the freedom of individuals to control their own destinies. Individualism is its creed; collectivism and tyranny its enemy. The state exists to protect individuals from coercion by other individuals or groups and to widen the range within which individuals can exercise their freedom; it is purely instrumental and has no significance in and of itself. Society is a collection of individuals and the whole is no greater than the sum of its parts. The ultimate values are those of the individuals who form the society; there are no super-individual values or ends. Nations may be convenient administrative units; nationalism is an alien creed. In politics Liberalism expresses itself as a reaction against authoritarian regimes. In economic policy Liberalism expresses itself as a reaction against government intervention in economic affairs.

Compare the definition of Liberalism with the tenets of Communism and it will be seen that the two philosophies are poles apart. Thus one could say of Communism:

Communism puts major emphasis on the supremacy of the state to control the destinies of individuals. Individualism is its enemy; collectivism and tyranny its essence. Individuals exist to serve the state and their freedoms must be subservient to the state which must remain all-powerful; there can be no opposition to those that control the state and no party other than the Communist party. Society is the state which is more than a collection of individuals, and the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The ultimate values are those that serve

BROEI-EIERS van die Kommuniste?

Uittreksel van die toespraak van Min. M. D. C. de Wet Nel by Vegkop op 16 Des. 1958:

„Spreker noem twee omvattende verskynsels: die eerste is die ontstaan van 'n blanke barbaardom in Suid-Afrika, wat hom reeds laat voel in dinge soos misdadbendes, eendert-bewegings en liberale bewegings wat in werklikheid die broei-eiers van die Kommuniste is. Dit vind nog nie op grootskaal plaas nie, maar ons durf nie ons oë sluit vir die feit dat hierdie vernietigende magte sy slagoffers ook onder ons volk begin tel nie.”

—Die Transvaler, 17 Desember 1958.

the end to which the state is directed; all means are justified by the end. Nations may be convenient administrative units; nationalism is an alien creed. (This is the one point where the definitions coincide.) In politics Communism expresses itself in an authoritarian regime; in economic policy Communism expresses itself by way of government intervention and control in all spheres.

The differences between Communism and Liberalism may be summed up as follows:

The Differences

- i. Communism rests upon rule by fear. Liberalism rests upon freedom from fear.
- ii. Communism has no room for the rule of law. The rule of law is fundamental to Liberalism.
- iii. In Communism the state is omnipotent. In Liberalism the state is purely instrumental to serve the rights and happiness of the individual.
- iv. In Communism there is no real separation of powers. In Liberalism the executive is kept in its place by a legislature to which it is truly responsible, and by separate and entirely independent courts.
- v. In Communism there is only one party. In Liberalism there are as many parties as men desire to form.
- vi. In Communism the franchise is exercisable in the way decreed by the Communist party and is therefore of no value. In Liberalism the franchise is one of the most treasured freedoms and privileges and is exercised according to the citizen's conscience and by secret ballot.
- vii. In Communism there is no room for private enterprise or capitalism, the means of production being owned by the public through the state. In Liberalism private enterprise may flourish and be encouraged, though there is today a certain measure of state-planning.
- viii. In Communism race prejudice is supposed to be a crime. (Yet anti-Semitism flourishes.) In Liberalism race prejudice is anathema since it violates civic rights and human dignity.
- ix. In Communism the way of life is communal, i.e. collective. The individual counts for nothing (unless, of course, he is at the head of the Kremlin!). In Liberalism the individual is a free man. (Latin *liberalis*, as opposed to *servilis*, in slavery.)
- x. A Communist state is a police state — the police are above the law. A Liberal state is the very opposite — the law is above the police.

It will be seen from this analysis what vast differences there are between Liberalism and Communism, and how in fact the Liberal is the natural enemy of the Communist. It will thus be understood why, whenever the Communists have seized a state, among the first to be liquidated are the Liberals.

Political Reform is Urgent —and the Public is Waking Up

TWO facts of tremendous importance have emerged from the series of "Brain Trusts" that the Black Sash has organised in various parts of the country. The first is the clear evidence of a conviction among responsible people of all races that some form of non-racial government for South Africa is not only inevitable but desirable, and that it can be made to work.

The second significant fact is that there is a great awakening on the part of the general public—the hitherto apathetic, confused, White voter—to the urgency of bringing about political reform.

The truth of the foregoing was again demonstrated at the Brains Trust organised by the Natal Coastal Region, in Durban, on the topic of "Whither South Africa?" and also at the forum on Constitutional Reform organised in Grahamstown by the local Branch.

In Durban, four of the panel of five speakers (Mr. Alan Paton, Major-General A. R. Selby, Mrs. Fatima Meer and ex-Chief A. Luthuli) agreed that race relations had deteriorated steadily in South Africa during the past ten years and that the franchise must be extended to non-White people soon. Even the fifth member of the panel, Dr. C. J. Jooste, who said that

race relations had improved, expressed himself in favour of universal franchise—although he added that the Whites should vote for their own Parliament and the non-Whites for theirs in their own areas!

The panel met before a large multi-racial crowd which overflowed the hall. Questions were put by Mr. A. Goldberg, a former M.P. Asked for their opinions on separate universities, the four other speakers again differed with Dr. Jooste, who favoured segregation. Mr. Luthuli said that separate universities would stress the divisions among the people, when what was needed was a "broad South Africanism."

There was a similar division of opinion on the question of a Republic. Mrs. Meer said: "The basic thing is not the form of Government but the content." Mr. Luthuli made a similar comment in different words when he declared that we really needed a change of heart, and should achieve that before taking the next step.

Mrs. Meer struck an optimistic note when she pointed out that despite Government restrictions there was a growing degree of political association among the races and that two multi-racial congresses had recently taken place.

ABOUT 50 people attended the Grahamstown forum on Constitutional Reform. It started at 2.30 p.m. and was held in two sessions. At 11 p.m. the audience was still interested and lively!

Speaking in support of a Federal constitution, Mrs. Hope Struben said: "We need a constitution which will safeguard the rights of all peoples. The big point in favour of federation is that it divides and provides a balance of power.

"It allows for unlimited expansion and the natural voice of the different backgrounds and culture of our country. The richness and variety of our population is not being allowed to find expression," Mrs. Struben said.

Mr. A. T. Slee, lecturer in Political Science at Rhodes University, said that the South African constitution did not represent the people.

"It could be called a democratic tyranny. This evil could be very easily remedied by an amendment to our electoral laws," Mr. Slee said.

Mr. J. D. Lardner-Burke, a retired politician, said that the constitution should be more rigid, but Mr. Slee said that the only way this could be achieved was through another National Convention.

"Talking of a National Convention is like talking of a distant Utopia."

Mr. Slee said people tended to lose sight of the real issue in South African politics. It was regarded

as a game played between the White groups with the non-Whites merely observers on the touch line. He said people should take this into account rather than thinking in terms of reconciliation of the existing White political parties.

Mr. T. V. Beard, senior lecturer in Philosophy and Politics at the University College of Fort Hare, said that if the Union's unitary system of government has failed, it has not failed because it is unitary but because the Union achieved Dominion status 30 years too soon.

"It is feasible to argue that a Federal system would not have been any more successful," he said.

"The present form of constitution in South Africa does not sufficiently recognise the rights of the African section of the population, treating them not as a permanent part of the community, but as a thing apart," said Mr. S. B. Ngcobo, senior lecturer in economics at Fort Hare University College.

"It is possible to maintain that the political marriage between the English- and Afrikaans-speaking sections of their community in South Africa has not been a success," he said.

"An agreed constitution in which all sections of the country have equal rights is what is needed. The new constitution should be sufficiently rigid so as not to allow any one racial group to control the country's affairs."

South Africa Needs A NEW DEAL

THE South African Constitution which came into force on May 31, 1910, was drafted by a National Convention, composed of delegates appointed by the four colonial parliaments.

It was approved by overwhelming majorities in the parliaments of the Cape Colony, the Transvaal, and the Orange River Colony, and by a three to one majority in a referendum of the Natal voters. It was then enacted by the British Parliament, at the request of the South African parliaments, exactly as it had been approved in South Africa except for a few verbal changes.

The most important parts of the Constitution were determined by J. X. Merriman, Prime Minister of the Cape Colony, and J. C. Smuts, Colonial Secretary of the Transvaal, who corresponded on the subject for several years before the Convention met.

Federation or Union

The problem which gave them most concern was whether South Africa should be a federation or a union. Only incidentally did they devote attention to the more fundamental problem, whether there should be legal limitations upon the powers of the rulers of South Africa.

Merriman was well read in British history and deeply impressed by the British constitutional achievement, but he was poorly informed about American history and had little real understanding of the American achievement. South Africa, he considered, should have a unitary and flexible Constitution, like Britain. Limitations should certainly be imposed upon the powers of our rulers, but this should be done by convention (as in Britain) and not by law (as in America). It would be for people like himself, who were well accustomed to standing up for the liberty of the individual and opposing any vestige of arbitrary government, to ensure that the Cape tradition triumphed over the Transvaal tradition in the supreme Parliament of South Africa.

Smuts, who had studied constitutional law at Cambridge, also had a British outlook upon such problems and he agreed with Merriman that the Constitution should be unitary and flexible.

Outside the Convention there were a few South Africans who thought otherwise. J. G. Kotzé, the former chief justice of the South African Republic, declared that if the Constitution was not modelled on the American example the government of the

By
**Professor L. M.
THOMPSON**

**Professor of
History
at the
University of
Cape Town**



day, supported by a subservient parliamentary majority, might subvert the whole machinery of government. Likewise Olive Schreiner, who wrote that South Africa should become a federation, because a federal constitution would present "a far greater obstacle to the undue dominance of any interest, class or individual" than a unitary one.

Inside the Convention, however, the only delegates who opposed Smuts and Merriman on these points were the Natal delegates, but none of them was able to handle the case for legal limitations upon the powers of rulers with enough knowledge, cogency or skill.

Consequently the South African Constitution contains no Bill of Rights. It concentrates all real power in one body, Parliament; and from the outset the entire Constitution was amendable by bare majorities of both Houses of Parliament, except for a few sections which were not to be altered in the first few years, a few others, amendments to which were to be reserved for the decision of the King, and the sections concerning the franchise rights of the Cape Province non-Whites and the equal official treatment of the Dutch and English languages, which were only to be amended by a two-thirds majority of both Houses of Parliament sitting together.

By 1934 most of these exceptions had vanished as a result of the lapse of time and the acquisition by the Union of the status of a sovereign independent State; and one of the two remaining exceptions was expunged in 1956 when, after several false starts, a means was found to destroy the safeguard for the Cape franchise.

Today, therefore, the only legal limitation upon the powers of the politicians who have acquired a

Continued on page 16

NEWS FROM REGIONS AND BRANCHES

SOUTHERN TRANSVAAL:

THE March general meeting was the last general meeting to be held in Mrs. Sinclair's house at 11 The Valley Road and, most fittingly, there was an unusually large attendance. With members sitting on cushions and crowding into the doorways and windows, the meeting brought back nostalgic memories of the enthusiastic early days of the Black Sash, and of nearly four years of meetings in that familiar room. There have been peaceful meetings and stormy ones, we have been happy and we have been sad, buoyed up with hope or sunk in despondency, but those four years have greatly enriched our lives. For the hospitality she so unstintingly gave as well as for her part in giving us the Black Sash, we offer Mrs. Sinclair our sincerest thanks.

The last few general meetings have been considerably enlivened by Mrs. Fisher's excellent reviews of current political events in South Africa, and it is hoped that members will attend regularly to hear these vividly presented accounts which she will give each month.

Black Sash protest at University Apartheid

Members of the Johannesburg branch of Black Sash stood in protest against university apartheid outside the City Hall, Johannesburg.

A centre-piece, a mammoth-size waste-paper basket, was a mute protest against Dr. Verwoerd's comment that all petitions and protests were likely to end up in such a place.

Appeal from African Self-Help Association

Two African women, Mrs. Khali and Mrs. Silgee, of Orlando East, were taken to a Regional Committee meeting as they wished to appeal for the help of the Black Sash. The women of the township had received notices informing them that reference books would be issued to all women over the age of 16, on a certain date, and it was alleged that they were being forced by all kinds of threats and intimidation from official sources to accept the books (which are not compulsory and which they dread having to carry). Instances of such intimidation are that unless they produced reference books they were threatened with eviction from their homes, they were refused attention at the clinic, the rent was not accepted, they could not obtain work. Mrs. Khali herself had been refused a temporary driver's licence. An African photographer who had attempted to take a picture of the reference book queue was arrested, people were being prevented from entering the township, and all publicity was being suppressed—the authorities were obviously trying to create the impression that the reference books were being accepted willingly. This was not the case, reported Mrs. Khali—the women were most unhappy about the whole

situation, but as a result of the Council's tactics most of the women had had to take out reference books. All they hoped for now was that the manner of demand would be more lenient than in the case of the men. A particular grievance was that a male "guardian" had to be named, and as most of the women were completely urbanised, and had lost touch with their tribal chiefs, those women who were widowed or single very often had no close male kin.

The committee promised to help as much as possible by taking a deputation to the Non-European

ASK YOUR FRIENDS TO SUBSCRIBE TO THE BLACK SASH MAGAZINE

Send 6s. for a year's subscription to
The Editor, Estella House, 47a Main
Road, Claremont, C.P.

Affairs Committee of the City Council, if they were provided with affidavits to prove the authenticity of the reported cases of victimisation. As much publicity as possible would be given to these cases, and legal opinion would be taken to determine the possibility of bringing a test case, where women had been evicted from their homes for non-payment of rent, when such payment had been refused because of non-production of reference books. Mrs. Davidoff arranged for the two women to be interviewed by the Press.

BORDER:

Stutterheim Branch

(Taken from the Chairman's Report, 1958/1959)

THE Sash movement is travelling a hard road at the present time. Many members have fallen by the wayside and it behoves those of us who are left to plod along with increased determination.

I cannot agree with the view that, because our sphere of activity in the small branches is so limited, we might just as well cease to function. Remember that the bigger branches are infinitely more active because their sphere is so much greater, and at least give them your moral support.

We joined the Sash and pledged ourselves to fight for its noble principles surely realizing that the fight would be a long and a bitter one—and surely understanding, too, that we cannot *all* be front-line troops. How then can we, through the boredom of inactivity, tamely give up and desert our gallant leaders? To my mind it were better not to set hand to plough than to till only the first few yards of the row. "Faint heart never won fair lady"—nor for that matter "Fair" Government! I sympathise

with the feeling of discontent which some of you have, though I venture to suggest that it is forgotten at times how much easier it is to sit in the body of the hall and criticise in between animated and audible conversations with one's neighbour, than to be responsible for the business, or worse still, the *lack* of business, of the meeting.

Perhaps during the coming year we can formulate a plan of action which will re-vitalise our Branch. I would suggest that an Action Committee be appointed by you as soon as possible to go into the matter.

I am determined to establish closer contact with the Regional Executive and hope to arrange for our Chairwoman to attend their next meeting. Personal contact with the real hard core of the Sash cannot fail to imbue one with admiration and enthusiasm.

I deeply regret the resignations which we have received, but I say with the utmost conviction that those of us who honestly believe in the principles of the Black Sash *cannot* desert the movement now. Some say: "We are doing so little. What is the use?" But if we deny our moral support to those who *are* doing and accomplishing, we will be doing less than nothing. To those few who form the hard core of our little Branch, and particularly the several who so kindly allow us to have our meetings at their homes, I say a very sincere "thank you."

CAPE WESTERN :

WITH Parliament busy with gag and guillotine after an all-night sitting on the University Education Extension Bill, April has been a month of much activity with four protest stands and much propaganda in the Press.

Protest Stands

At the Second Reading of the University Education Extension Bill (April 8th) there was a good turnout of Sashers who lined Marks Building while U.C.T. students were posted round the railings of Parliament.

On April 10th/11th during the all-night sitting on the same Bill a Black Sash all-night vigil was maintained. (A full report is given elsewhere.)

PEN FRIENDS WANTED

SMALL COUNTRY BRANCH would like to know about doings and happenings in other Town and Country Branches.

Write in first instance to :

Mrs. Gillian Litchfield (Branch Secretary),
Rockdale,
P.O. KEI ROAD, C.P.



Charlotte Blackburn

Sashers in Hermanus are sorry to say goodbye to Charlotte Blackburn, who left for the Transvaal during April. She was one of the organisers of the meeting held to start a branch of the Black Sash in Hermanus; she was the first secretary and has acted as Chairwoman. Charlotte is an able and ardent worker, a fearless speaker and a woman and friend who will be sorely missed.

Job Reservation

On April 20th 90 Black Sashers stood in protest, and for the first time every Sasher held a poster, which made an impressive display.

University College of Fort Hare Transfer Bill

On April 25th 75 Black Sashers stood in protest, each again carrying a poster, while two "specials" stood at the entrance to Marks Building.

Country Branches' Protests

Somerset West and Hermanus Branches both organised stands on the University Apartheid and Job Reservation Bills. Thus the country branches are keeping Sash activities vividly alive where conditions are not always as easy as in the Peninsula.

Propaganda

Our Regional Council, through its Chairman, Mrs. M. G. Roberts, has been most alert in bringing to the notice of the public, through letters to the Press, current instances of the hardships and suffering caused by the implementation of unjust legislation.

The *Cape Times* (4th April) published a letter calling for an inquiry by a judicial commission into **Police Assaults** following a public statement by the Commissioner of Police that he had issued urgent instructions to all members of the S.A. Police Force not to ill-treat prisoners (*Cape Times*, March 21st).

The *Cape Argus* (6th April) published a letter giving clear examples of how much damage **Apartheid Legislation** is doing to both Whites and non-Whites, the specific cases quoted being (a) the removal from the Register of over 3,000 **registered nurses** who had failed to supply the prescribed information for the Nursing Council's separate registers for White, Coloured and African nurses, and (b) the prohibiting of **non-White taxi-drivers** from conveying White "fares" in the Cape Peninsula.

The *Cape Times* (21st April) published a letter in which under five clear headings it was stated in what manner the **Industrial Conciliation Amendment Bill** would aggravate the injustices of the Industrial Con-

NEWS FROM THE REGIONS — Continued

ciliation Act of 1956 by striking further at the democratic principle of industrial self-government "which is basic to the whole system of collective bargaining and industrial conciliation that has been enshrined in South African legislation for more than a third of a century."

General

Our very small branch at Wellington/Paarl is doing valuable work in helping African women with pass problems (five have been helped with bail money), and they are now taking action to secure for a new Coloured village near the town the required fresh water supply which had not been provided.

At our April meeting Mrs. Stott gave a vivid account of her visit to Johannesburg, Kimberley and

Bloemfontein on behalf of the Central Executive and told of her efforts to win the support of Nationalists in alleviating hardships caused by unjust legislation.

CAPE EASTERN :

Grahamstown Branch

FORTY members of the Black Sash movement stood in silent protest in the main street of Grahamstown as part of a nation-wide demonstration against the Extension of University Education Bill. They carried placards which said: "Let universities govern themselves" and "No discrimination in education."

Women came from Port Elizabeth, Walmer, East London, Port Alfred, Salem, Bushmans River, Alexandria, Addo and Kirkwood to take part in the demonstration.

SOUTH AFRICA NEEDS A NEW DEAL

(Continued from page 13)

majority of the seats in Parliament is the one which concerns the two official languages. Moreover, the quality of the legislation enacted by those politicians, of which the Senate Act may be taken as an illustration, shows that there has been a rare economy in the evolution of conventional limitations.

In copying the form of the British Constitution the members of the National Convention failed to understand that a system of government which works passing well in Britain — and for very special reasons — would work extremely ill in a country with the group tensions of South Africa.

It is now apparent that they made an egregious error. The Union has come to resemble not Britain but the South African Republic of the last century, and the resemblance increases year by year. Unlimited power rests in the hands of a party which calls itself National but is in fact sectional, and is used in such a way as to antagonize the rest of the population. There is no real compromise with the Opposition, no real consultation with the unfranchised.

The time is long overdue when we should have a new constitutional deal in South Africa, under which neither the Afrikaner nor any other element in the population need feel insecure or oppressed, because the personal liberties of all individuals and the reasonable aspirations of all groups will be protected by law.

Let us honour the promising precedent of the Orange Free State above the dangerous precedent of the South African Republic. Let us prefer the relevant example of America to the unattainable example of Britain. Let us have what a distinguished American has described as "government limited by the terms of a Constitution, not government limited only by the desires and caprices of those who exercise power."

FROM OUR POSTBAG

WE have seen a copy of your "Black Sash," Vol. III No. 16, of March, 1959, and we have read the article by Dr. Wollheim — "A Labourer Dead or Alive?" We wish to comment on his statement that "it is not practicable to agitate for better wages, because African Trade Unions are not recognised and the other unions have been too concerned with the wages of the skilled worker to bother about the unskilled one, who is largely illiterate and inarticulate anyway."

The South African Congress of Trade Unions, which has among its affiliated unions, unions of skilled, unskilled and semi-skilled workers — unions that are registered under the Industrial Conciliation Act and African unions that are not registered — has led the campaign for £1 a day minimum wage. Not only has our organisation campaigned for £1 a day but our affiliated organisations have obtained through their union's efforts, higher wages not only for the members of the registered unions but also for the workers of the un-registered unions.

A. SIBEKO,

Secretary, S.A. Congress of Trade Unions.

[It was not possible to mention in a short article everything which has been, and is being done, in this field. The main purpose of the reference in the article was to focus attention on the difficulties of Trade Unions which have been split by the Industrial Conciliation Act. Under these circumstances the Trade Unions do a fine job of work but can hardly be expected to produce the results they might otherwise have done. The reference to "other unions" which are concerned more with the wages of skilled than unskilled workers was really a reference to the old established craft and artisans unions and certainly does not refer to S.A.C.T.U. — Ed.]