

FIGGETING

Vol. 14.



No. 4.

TALK



CONGO DIARY:

WHAT NEXT?

THE REFERENDUM and THE NAT. REPUBLIC

SOUTH AFRICA AND UNO:

Villain on the World Stage

London Letter from Ronald Segal

Price : 6d.

A JOURNAL FOR DEMOCRATS OF ALL RACES, AFRICANS, INDIANS,
COLOURED AND WHITES, IN SOUTHERN AFRICA.

Annual subscription : 7s.6d.

Overseas subscription : 15s.

Produced by the FIGHTING TALK Committee, P.O. Box 1355, Johannesburg.

EDITORIAL

GHANA, BOYCOTTS AND LOYALTY OATHS

The Ghana government's latest acts have taken the world boycott of South Africa a stage further. Up to now, the world's disgust at our Government and its apartheid policies has been expressed in trade boycotts — in refusal of shoppers to buy South African goods, in refusal of workers to handle South African goods, or even in the refusal of Governments to allow South African goods into their countries. Now the boycott has taken a fresh turn. South African travellers wishing to pass through Ghana must sign a sworn declaration of their opposition to apartheid. Thus in a way, opposition to apartheid and racialism have become the passport which South Africans need to be recognised as fit travellers through a neighbouring country.

The Nationalist Government has reacted in characteristic fashion. Striking out blindly, it has threatened reprisals — not against Ghana, but against any South Africans who dare sign the anti-apartheid declaration. Such people, Dr. Verwoerd has said, will be regarded as "disloyal", and will not get South African passports. In this way, the South African government is helping to increase the difficulties of any South African who wishes to travel abroad, while not — as far as we can see — affecting Ghana in the least.

This is significant of the situation to which the boycott is leading. There is and can be no effective South African counter to it, no matter how much threat and bluster of "retaliation" Dr. Verwoerd's henchmen promise. What, for example, can the Nationalist Govern-

ment offer in reply to Mr. Nyerere's suggestions that the flow of foreign contract labour for the mines be cut off at its source in Tanganyika? What counter is there to the suggestions, now under consideration in the Middle East, to cut off oil supplies to this country?

In the long run, of course, there are only two ways out. Either this country will be driven back on itself, its industries working at half-pace, its shop-windows stripped of all imported goods, and its whole economy returning slowly to the backward and poverty-stricken level of the Boer Republics. Or — the government which has earned us the title of "the pole-cat of the world" will give way to the combined force of world and

local opinion, and be pushed out of power to allow a civilised, democratic government to take over, end the apartheid system of race discrimination, and so restore South Africa and South Africans to a place of equality in the world community of nations.

For ourselves, we are prepared to be regarded as "disloyal" by Dr. Verwoerd. We make a solemn declaration here and now that we oppose the whole system of race discrimination and apartheid on which his Government is founded.

Our Cover Picture:

THE CONGO CRISIS: THE PERSONALITIES. From left to right: United Nations Secretary-General Mr. D. Hammarskjöld, M. Patrice Lumumba, Congo Premier, M. Kasavubu, Congo President.

IN THIS ISSUE

	page
<i>EDITORIAL: Ghana, Boycotts and Loyalty Oaths</i>	2
<i>The Referendum and that Nat Republic</i>	3
<i>South Africa and the United Nations: Villain on the World Stage</i>	4
<i>Oil Embargo Against the Union over South West: London Letter from Ronald Segal</i>	5
<i>Emergencies are Bad for Business</i>	6
<i>Trip to the Turfloop Tribal College</i>	7
<i>THE CONGO: The Crisis and the United Nations</i>	8
<i>The British Stake in the Belgian Congo</i>	8
<i>Congo Diary — July 23 to August 18</i>	9
<i>Bayonets in Bulawayo</i>	10
<i>STUDY ARTICLE: Land Ownership in Africa</i>	11
<i>Censor in the Theatre</i>	14
<i>Ring the Curtain Down — Book Review</i>	14

**WHERE'S THE
NEXT MEAL
COMING FROM?**

Only when you are deprived of good food, do you realise how sick you can get without it, how feeble in spirit, how weary in heart. We are talking, of course, of the food of the mind, not the body: the articles that stimulate and inform, the news that reveals the truth.

FIGHTING TALK is your mental diet — but where's the next meal coming from? Out of your pocket, friend, or else you, too, will starve.

Dig deep, send quickly. There's starvation in this land of ours. FIGHTING TALK can help keep the wolf from the loor — but YOU must help keep FIGHTING TALK.

SEND YOUR DONATION TODAY (SPEED COUNTS) TO: P.O. BOX 1355, JOHANNESBURG.

Some say: 'Give the Nats. their Republic — and then we'll get some peace from Afrikaner Nationalism.' This illusion must be nailed on the head. The Nats. will not — can not — stop after the Referendum, even if they win a Republic. For the Republican issue is part of the overall drive to build Nat. power and unite White against Black. A 'NO' vote on October 5 COULD mean the tide begins to turn.

THE REFERENDUM AND THAT NAT. REPUBLIC

South Africa's big shadow-boxing match — the republican contest — is now in full swing.

Nearly £1,000,000 is being squandered by both sides to persuade the White electorate to vote "Yes" or "No".

12 million on the sidelines

Nobody, however, is bothering about the opinions of 12,000,000 Non-White citizens who will have to live in the "Republic of Good Hope" — as the Nats are fond of calling it.

They will be side-line spectators while 1,750,000 White voters debate whether to replace the Queen with a President.

Of course, this is expected under the Union's "Blanke alleen" voting laws. But there is more than usual significance in the "Whiteness" of the referendum campaign.

For Dr. Verwoerd is seeking two tactical advantages:

- ★ To unify all Whites in a republican citadel against the Blacks;
- ★ To distract attention from the failure of his race policies.

Only the Progressive Party, COD and the Liberal Party have attacked the hollow fraud of an "election" which ignores five-sixths of the population.

To his credit, Dr. Jan Steytler — a republican — has rejected the republic because it will enshrine race discrimination into a permanent way of life.

This, of course, is the central issue — one that Dr. Verwoerd deliberately tries to disguise.

Verwoerd's Red Herring

The contest is not — as the Nats claim — between republicanism and royalism.

Quite falsely, he has labelled all his opponents monarchists. Some probably are.

But the theoretical merits of a republic versus a monarchy are an irrelevant side-issue at the present time.

What matters is not the FORM of the South African state — but its CONTENT.

As Japie Basson so aptly pointed out: "You can just as well have a dictatorship under a republic as under a monarchy."

The question we must ask is: "Will Verwoerd's republic turn South Africa into a democratic state observing human rights?"

No prizes are offered for the correct answer.

It is clear that the whole vicious paraphernalia of a herrenvolk police-state — the colour bar, passes, group areas, votelessness, denial of free speech — will be stimulated by a republic.

Within 24 hours after the referendum date was released, Mr. Jim Fouche, so-called "moderate" Defence Minister, announced that he would set up an internal civil militia.

"Ons Eie Republiek"

The proximity of the two announcements was no accident. Since the late 1930's the Nationalists have campaigned for a fascist-type republic.

"Ons eie republiek" was to be Christian-National, totalitarian, run exclusively by Afrikaners and headed by a Calvinist president, responsible only to God.

This is still the goal of Dr. Verwoerd — one of the Broederbond's 12 Apostles — and an advocate of the 1942 Draft Constitution.

The draft constitution embodies the final programme of the secret Broederbond — and its tool, the Nationalist Party.

For 12 years, the Nationalists have been fulfilling — step by step — its fascist provisions.

Significantly, the Nationalists have never repudiated this document.

The reason is simple: They hope to achieve it piecemeal and by stealth.

And the "painless" republic proposed by Dr. Verwoerd is merely the thin edge of the wedge of the ultimate Broederbond republic.

It is the big leap forward to laying foundations for total Afrikaner baaskap.

Vote-Catching

Of course, Dr. Verwoerd has altered his tune somewhat. Instead of preaching an anti-British and anti-Jewish republic, he now proclaims: "Our republic is based on love."

He poses as a sincere advocate of Commonwealth membership and releases "peace doves." But this is sheer window-dressing.

Verwoerd is out to catch English cotes — not only because he will lose the referendum without them; but because he genuinely wants a solid White base for his tin-pot republic.

There can be no effective ganging-up against the Blacks unless the English-speakers play ball.

Some naive souls argue: "Give the Nats their republic — and then we'll get some peace from Afrikaner nationalism." This illusion should be nailed on the head.

Keeping the Pot Boiling

Let it never be forgotten that Dr. Verwoerd and his henchmen must always keep nationalism at fever pitch; in an harmonious society there would be no role for the Nationalist Party.

It is crucial to the party's survival that the republican pot is kept boiling at all costs.

Therefore, once the Nats get their "painless" republic, a "spontaneous" Resign-From-The-Commonwealth move will be launched, on the grounds that the Commonwealth is a British creation.

And when this is played out, the party will demand the elimination of "foreign, imported and un-South African" elements from the Parliamentary system.

The Nationalists are plugging republicanism for all they are worth — as a way out of their internal and international difficulties.

Nat. Rearguard Action

Dr. Verwoerd is fighting desperately to hold his position in the face of massive world-wide opposition.

By October 5, another eight African states will be independent; in September the Afro-Asian group will ask UNO for trade sanctions against the Union; the world boycott of S.A. goods will be stepped-up.

In the Union itself, the Nationalist Party has not fully recovered — and never will — from the blows of the April stay-aways, and is ruling with emergency powers.

Dr. Verwoerd urgently needs an emotional, blood-and-soil tribal issue to rally wavering Afrikaner supporters and to distract attention from his police state.

But the referendum is not only an artificial diversion from the failure of his colour policy. It is, in a sinister way an attempt to solve the "Native problem."

The solution "White-unity-through-a-republic" is a barometer of Nationalist bankruptcy, and measure of the Nationalist menace to South Africa.

IT IS CLEAR THAT THE NATS HOPE TO SOLVE SOUTH AFRICA'S MULTI-RACIAL PROBLEMS BY ORGANISING THE WHITES AGAINST THE BLACKS.

(Continued on page 4)

VILLAIN ON THE WORLD STAGE

Giving the annual Reserve Bank report the other day, Dr. de Kock harped on the old theme that people abroad do not know anything about this country. True enough there was a time, not so long ago, when most of the outside world knew and cared little about what went on in South Africa. But those days are gone.

Today there can hardly be a politically literate person anywhere in the world who doesn't know all about Dr. Verwoerd and apartheid, Chief Lutuli and the treason trial, Sharpeville and the Boycott.

THAT REPUBLIC

(Continued from page 3)

The Desperate Gambler

In doing so, Dr. Verwoerd is prepared to wreck the economy — the certain result if South Africa is kicked out of the Commonwealth and loses the imperial preference.

He is prepared to set the seal on South Africa's international isolation — if South Africa is expelled from the Commonwealth, she loses her last, tenuous overseas link.

He is even willing to gamble with the Nationalist Party's future — if the referendum vote is lost his party must suffer and his own position will be gravely jeopardised.

But the Nation to the wall. And like a desperate animal it is prepared to take any reckless gamble to survive.

Therein lies the hope — and the danger — for South Africa.

But one thing is, however, clear: The republic is part of the overall Nationalist drive to aggrandise their power.

A Verwoerd republic is intended to give permanent expression to organised herrenvolkism in the Union.

Those who want to rid South Africa of racism — and are enfranchised — must do all in their power to prevent a republic. A defeat for Verwoerd will strike a heavy blow for a better South Africa.

What is at stake is not the nature of the external constitutional trappings of the South African State. These can be adjusted — if necessary — at the right time.

The only issue on October 5 will be the policy of apartheid, of human humiliation and political repression, of the 20th century barbarism of which Verwoerd is the symbol.

It is vital that Verwoerd be defeated in the referendum. If he is, it could well mean the turning of the tide in South Africa.

From de Kock's point of view, the trouble is that they know too much, and they don't like what they know. Ever since the end of World War Two the limelight has been shining more and more intensely on the South African scene; and the world audience is expressing its disapproval more and more actively. From booing and heckling they are moving to the stage of pelting the villain with rotten eggs and tomatoes.

When UNO was established, the Union was quite a respectable foundation member. It had been a part of the anti-Axis alliance which founded the U.N. The late General Smuts, as a senior statesman, played a not unimportant part in framing the Charter.

But even at that stage voices were heard murmuring that the caste system in South Africa was in contradiction with the Charter.

India Sets the Pace

India came to the General Assembly, newly independent and in crusading mood. She began raising with increasing impatience the innumerable examples of discrimination against South Africans of Indian origin. When the Union proved unwilling to negotiate on this matter, as decided, India broke off trade and diplomatic relations.

Official reaction here was to play

alternative supply sources, were found for jute bags and other former exports. Life went on much as usual.

But more far-sighted people saw the real significance of the "Indian-South African dispute" less in its immediate effects than in its long-term implications. India was among the first of the countries of Asia and Africa to achieve independence; clearly, she would not be the last.

It would not be long before there would be very many independent African and Asian states, more and more important in numbers in the United Nations. And, for that matter, in the "Commonwealth", upon membership of which the Union Government relied to shield it from isolation.

The astute and experienced Smuts perhaps had a premonition of these implications. While taking a strong stand in public against "outside interference in our domestic affairs", he at the same time called a number of African leaders to Cape Town, and began making tentative overtures towards concessions and reforms of the more blatant aspects of apartheid — then known as "Segregation". Of course these proposed reforms were very timid and mild. More powers for Advisory Boards, an enlarged Natives' Representative Council . . . But

even these tiny gestures were too much for White South Africa. Smuts' Party found itself thrown out of office at the next election, in 1948: replaced by the Party of Baasskap.

You know the rest: Group Areas, Suppression of Everything Acts, Bantu This and That Acts, a dismal tale ranging from the "versuivering" of Parliament to Sharpeville, the Emergency and the Republic.

The Changing World

And world reaction inside and outside U.N. has been growing sharper year by year. It's not merely that under the Nationalists, South Africa has been moving steadily further away from the Charter. It's also that the world and the United Nations is changing year by year, and very rapidly, too.

When Mrs. Pandit first moved her resolution about this country she had to struggle for a two-thirds majority — and even then she had to tone it down to get Scandinavian support. America and the West voted against it.

These days, the resolutions are infinitely sharper in tone. They don't deal only with the Indian question and South West; they go quite explicitly to the root of apartheid and race discrimination.

The reason is clear.

command almost two-thirds of the total U.N. votes. And whatever differences of outlook may exist among the Afro-Asian bloc, they are absolutely united and unambiguous about one thing: they detest colonialism, and most of all what they regard as a particularly offensive and intolerable form of it practised by White South Africa.

More — the bigger this group grows (and nowadays hardly a week seems to go by without its quota of successful applications for U.N. membership from yet another African republic) the more attention has to be paid to its views by the other nations.

In the international war of ideas, the "West" has suddenly realised it cannot afford to go on letting Krushchov and Mao score all the points with their outspoken policy of anti-imperialism and anti-racialism. Hence, the pro-South African vote has shrunk, year by year, at the General Assembly. Last December only Britain, France and Portugal stood up to be counted on Verwoerd's side.

When Macmillan came here he made it clear that we couldn't count on Britain's vote in future. And in fact when it came to the Security Council meeting on March 30 both Britain and

France abstained from casting a vote which would have been a veto against the very strong resolution which was passed — none opposing. (Portugal has no seat on the Security Council.)

UNO Has Teeth

Nor can the S.A. Government reasonably comfort itself with the thought that UNO is toothless, or that resolutions never did anyone any harm. For one thing, the last resolution was not like all the previous General Assembly ones, at which Mr. Louw could thumb his nose with impunity. The Security Council has teeth.

When the Secretary-General returns from his much-postponed visit to this country, he will have to report what has been done to implement the post-Sharpeville resolution. After his unhappy experience in the Congo, it is probably not to be expected that he will make any further attempts at diplomacy, or that he will be able to reach any acceptable compromise with Mr. Louw and Dr. Verwoerd. What then?

African and Asian nations have announced that they will move for sanctions against the Union, in the form of an international trade embargo.

Economic Sanctions

Many are not waiting for the Security Council. Consumer boycotts are being conducted in Britain and the Scandinavian countries and in Africa. The Addis Ababa Conference of African states outlined even more drastic action. We are only just beginning to feel the pinch.

It is useless to try to keep up the pretence that all these measures are of little significance, or to imagine that we can replace our rapidly yshrinking African and Asian markets with others.

The Soviet Union has no trade relations with this country, and if it is correct, as Government sources claim, that a large quantity of Union wool — perhaps through an indirect agency—found its way to that country recently, it is not unreasonable to suppose that this will not happen again next year.

And as for the advanced industrial nations of the West, from which we draw most of our capital and manufactured imports: their capitalists appear to be becoming as reluctant to invest in the Union as their workers are to buy South African goods.

The Nationalist Government maintains that all these demonstrations constitute an unwarranted interference with the internal policy of this country, which should be resisted by all patriots. If their policy were a true reflection of the wishes of the people and their freely-chosen representatives, there would be much merit in this argument. But, in that case, the United Nations and the African states would have no complaints about South Africa.

RONALD SEGAL, Editor of "AFRICA SOUTH in EXILE" writes from abroad

Oil Embargo Against the Union Over the South-West Issue?

The noise of protest at Sharpeville died down soon after the sound of the bullets fired there, but the great revulsion persists, quietly in the minds of all those who read the press reports or saw the figures of the dead sprawling over the front pages of the newspapers. Africa itself was convulsed by the event; and even societies as smug as Tanganyika and Nigeria stirred furiously and vowed to act one day so as to make further Sharpevilles impossible.

The response of Africa is already embodied in the resolution of the Independent African States at their Conference in Addis Ababa last month.

The nations there not only protested against apartheid in the strongest terms, but launched a continental attack against the South African Government on economic, diplomatic, and geographical fronts.

One resolution pledges independent Africa to cease all trade with South Africa, another pledges the Union's continental isolation from any diplomatic contact, and a third calls upon all African countries to withhold air and port facilities to South African traffic.

Ghana has already reacted, by its declaration of a Government boycott against South Africa from August 1, and refusing Ghana dock and airport facilities to all but those South Africans prepared to sign a declaration against apartheid.

Egypt and the Sudan have months ago banned South African goods.

Tanganyikan independence, effective in all but name from next month will undoubtedly lead to similar action in Dar es Salaam.

Patrice Lumumba, Prime Minister of the Congo gave me an undertaking when I saw him in London that there would be neither diplomatic nor commercial contact of any sort between the Congo Republic and the Union of South Africa.

In Asia, Malaya and India are alone conducting a boycott. The election of a new Government in Ceylon might add support and place the President of Pakistan in a position where his platitudes will become politically unprofitable.

The group that has not yet reacted as one would have thought has been the Soviet bloc. When I led a deputation in London to various embassies, the Chinese informed us that they intended going into the matter very closely, while the Russian Embassy denied having any trade with South Africa at all. When we produced the trade figures for the previous year we were told that the matter would be carefully considered.

I do not myself doubt that it can be very long before the communist world finds it necessary to respond to African demands and join the boycott.

When this happens, the West may find that economic action against the Government of the Union can be no longer delayed.

Within the west itself, it is industrial action that is likely to accomplish the quickest effects. Members of the I.C.F.T.U. Executive told me in Brussels that their organisation might be prepared to call for industrial action if there was any support for this from British trade unions, and those organisations involved in anti-apartheid work in London are attempting at the moment to influence as many trade unions as possible towards industrial sanctions.

It is possible that a resolution supporting such action will be introduced at the T.U.C. Annual Conference next month, though it is too late to expect any real action this year. The issue, however, must be canvassed continually within the trade union movement and the Labour Party itself during the coming months.

The consumer boycott in Britain began with a trickle of progressive support, but soon enough became officially sponsored by both the Liberal and Labour Parties. In achieving industrial action one would doubtless have the inevitable stupidity of the South African Government to assist.

Ultimate action to bring down the dominion of apartheid will, however, doubtless be taken through the United Nations. As influential a newspaper as the London "Observer" has already called for an oil embargo, and it may be along this pipe line that disciplinary action over South Africa's continued aggression against South West will be taken.

One Asian Prime Minister told me in London that while United Nations intervention was unlikely over apartheid itself, the whole South West African issue was clearly not a domestic affair of the South African Government and likely to accomplish wide support from other delegations as well as those in the Afro-Asian bloc.

Action this year is not certain. Next year it may be.

There can be no doubt that the world is growing increasingly impatient with Nationalist insanity. It cannot be long before it decides that eliminating it will be less dangerous than attempting to contain it.

EMERGENCIES ARE BAD FOR BUSINESS

The political emergency has intensified the economic problems of South Africa. Only the unrepresentative, colour-blind Nationalist rulers seem not to know how serious the situation is.

Their approach stems from their fear of facing the logical changes that must follow from any objective analysis.

What are the facts? What are the direct economic results of the emergency?

The Union's external reserves have dropped by £50 million in six months. The Stock Exchange has lost over £500 million in market capitalisation values. In the first six months of the year there has been a decrease of £72 million in gross capital formation. Private investment accounts for £38 million of this.

The boycott of South African goods by independent African and Asian states is being intensified.

Of what significance are these facts to us?

Flight of Millions

They are signs of a lack of confidence in this country by local and overseas investors. Behind the drop in foreign exchange reserves lies the heavy selling of overseas-held South African securities to Union residents. This accounted for possibly £40 million being paid from this country to people who had lost faith in South Africa's immediate future. Investors require security and stability and this is just what they cannot see here.

Mr. Charles Engelhard spoke for the overseas investor when he said that confidence in the Union would not be restored unless "a world-accepted policy of co-existence among the races living in South Africa" was developed.

One-way Money Traffic

So long as a high percentage of dividends from local industry still goes out of this country to non-South African owners, this country is dependent on foreign capital coming into the country to maintain its rate of economic growth.

This present one-way money traffic must have repercussions on the growth rate of our economy.

Aggravating this trend is the extraneous factor of the increase in the British bank rate. There is now obtainable overseas a higher return on money. Funds lent by parent companies in London, New York, Zurich, and Munich to their subsidiary companies in South Africa are being recalled.

Trying to stop the rot

The government is well aware of some of the immediate ill-effects of these developments.

by
ECONOMIST

The business world has already been given a warning that the Government may re-introduce import control. This would prevent money flowing out of the country as payment for foreign merchandise. It would also protect local industries from overseas competition and compensate for losses resulting from a trade recession inside South Africa, or from an external boycott of South African goods.

Another tactic that has been threatened is the restriction of credit, which would lead to a sharp rise in interest rates. This would theoretically make it worthwhile for the investor to employ his money in this country.

At the same time it makes money more expensive to borrow and tends to reduce capital expansion programmes. Building construction plans — already badly hit — would be particularly affected. Business confidence would be even more depressed and a further contraction in the country's economy is certain to follow.

The old troubles

These problems have aggravated the basic economic difficulties of this country.

The results of white supremacy policy are well-known. Pass laws, influx control, the migratory labour system, job reservation, Bantu education and the restriction of technical training and opportunities — all these barriers are responsible for the wastage of South Africa's labour resources.

The cost of maintaining these barriers rebounds on all sections of the population. The results are crippling poverty, wasted productive effort and the slow industrial advance of the African population.

The Government says it is little worried by these problems.

Again and again it emphasises its satisfaction with its policies and plans to carry them still further by starting big industries on the fringes of the Reserves. There white capital and black labour will combine to start the perimeter industries that are supposed to solve the problem of the grossly over-populated eroded reserves and the ever increasing numbers of urban workers driven to the towns by the poverty of the reserves.

Against the advice of the business world the Government carries on with the Bantustan myth, its eyes tightly closed to all warning signs.

Formula for explosion

Rarely has a government been so unrepresentative of a country's dominant economy, trends and requirements.

One can see from the recent disturbances in Rhodesia the results of insufficient employment opportunities for those seeking work, and, secondly, inadequate political outlets through which these economic grievances can be expressed. Nothing is more calculated to produce an explosive situation and yet this is just where the policies pursued at the present time are likely to lead.

Even before the emergency there were too few job openings in relation to the numbers seeking jobs in industry. Even at the pre-emergency rate of economic expansion it is probable that the African population would grow faster than industry would be able to absorb them. This in itself would lead to dissatisfaction.

Unemployment is now an even graver threat as a result of the emergency and the intensified trade boycott.

The lifting of the emergency as a preparation for the referendum is unlikely now to make the United Nations and the world change their opinion that "the situation in South Africa is one that has led to international friction, and, if continued might endanger international peace and security."

The boycott will continue and will grow and will hit the South African industrialist increasingly hard.

One has only to read the official reports of the Chamber of Industry over the past few years to realise this. Repeated stress has been laid on the need for expanding African markets in order to increase the profitability of South African production. With stiff competition in European markets it was logical to turn to expanding Africa. Now these outlets will be closed.

Our economy will weather some of the difficulties that arose during the Emergency. But there will not be an upswing in the rate of growth to what it was before the Emergency.

We will have a static economy. And this means unemployment and underemployment. To continue in this way is to bring us repeatedly to the edge of the volcano that has already erupted once this year.

AFRICAN SUMMIT TALKS

President Nkrumah of Ghana hopes to stage a summit conference of independent African states in Leopoldville from August 25 to 30. He discussed this with Premier Lumumba recently.

Main items on agenda will be motions condemning "Balkanisation" of African territories and criticism of colonial powers.

TRIP TO THE TURFLOOP TRIBAL COLLEGE

I found it so difficult to get any information about the new tribal universities that I decided to visit the one nearest to Johannesburg — Turfloop, which is a collection of quickly thrown up buildings in the veld outside Pietersburg.

An Anglican professor at Johannesburg University who has been trying for two months to visit Turfloop told me that I would be wasting my time going there.

He said that the most strictly enforced rule there was that no student may speak to a visitor without permission, and that no student had ever been permitted to speak to a journalist.

It meant two uncomfortable nights on slow trains and three days arguing about permits, and I nearly decided not to go.

But thanks to the courage of one African student, who risked expulsion in a bid to tell me the truth about Turfloop, my journey was not wasted.

They Suspect

As soon as the 90 students knew I was on their campus they decided to find an opportunity to break the rule and speak to me.

They suspected that the staff would give me too rosy a picture and they were right.

First the registrar, deputising for the absent rector, spent an hour telling me how delighted the students were to have a university that was really their own.

"They'd much rather be here than at a white university, where they would be a minority group," he said. "You can ask any of them. Here they feel they are the boss.

"We plan eventually to take about 1,000 students here and teach them in their own tribal tongues as soon as we have invented Bantu terminology for science subjects. They are very keen on this.

"At the moment we have to teach them in English, as they don't know enough Afrikaans and we don't know enough Bantu."

I asked if I could attend the lecture in English literature that the senior lecturer in English, a Mr. Smuts, was about to give. It was as I was leaving this lecture that the student stopped me.

"Some of us want to speak to you," he said. "Could you meet us in the dining hall at 1.30?"

"I'd love to," I said, which is what I would have said anywhere in the world.

But life is not that simple in South Africa. My request to keep the appointment sent the entire staff into a tizzy.

All the smiles that had been turned on for the past two hours vanished. I was told, frigidly but firmly, "You cannot speak to our students."

I fought this because it seemed to me important not to break faith with a student who was risking expulsion by approaching me.

They Run

The verbal battle that ensued, and lasted nearly an hour, must surely rank

This visit to one of Dr. Verwoerd's tribal colleges is described by RHONA CHURCHILL, whose account appeared in INDIAN OPINION.

as one of the stupidest conversations ever indulged in by the senior staff of a university. It ran around in circles, repeating itself, something like this.

They: How do we know you aren't a Communist? Why do you want to lecture to our students?

Me: I don't. They want to speak to me.

They: Why in the dining hall? We can't control what they say to you there. What do they want to say to you? They will tell you lies about us. You'll believe all they say."

As a final resort, they said: "You'll get no lunch if you insist on talking to the students."

When I said I felt lunch was relatively unimportant, Mr. Smuts cried caustically, "Huh! The dedicated type."

We were getting nowhere fast, so I said, "Let's forget the whole thing. I'll simply write in my paper that your students asked to speak to me and that you refused to let them. That'll look a little odd in print, but if that's the way you want it . . ."

That did the trick.

The entire staff vanished to their belated lunches and an African porter took me to a room where four students were waiting.

They still had no official permission to speak to me. They were exceedingly nervous and kept glancing at windows and doors. They talked in whispers and when, after a few minutes, they saw the registrar's car coming up the drive, they cried: "There he is," and fled from the room like frightened rabbits.

Their state of fear told me more about the atmosphere between staff and student at Turfloop than could any words they uttered. But they did paint a grim picture of student life at Turfloop and it was much nearer the truth than that given to me by the registrar.

They Ban

"We want you to print the truth about our life here even if we get expelled for telling you," they said.

"We all hate this place. We know we can't get a proper education here. The Afrikaner staff do not speak good enough English to train us for degrees."

I had plenty of evidence that this was true.

"We have no freedom of speech," they said. "We aren't allowed to express our opinions. We have been forbidden to form a students' representative council. We have a debating society, but they

tell us what to debate and supervise the debates.

"We asked if English-speaking lecturers could visit us, but this was turned down. We aren't allowed to form any clubs or societies without the rector's permission or to publish our own magazine.

They Despise

"We cannot leave the campus or receive visitors without permission. We might as well be in prison. We feel that the Afrikaner staff hate and despise us.

"We aren't allowed any contact with other universities. We are forbidden to join their students' union. We are made to feel like small children."

Most of the Turfloop students come from Johannesburg where but for the current law they could be studying at Witwatersrand University under first-class English-speaking professors.

They know what they are missing and feel full of bitterness. "We'd all much rather put up with apartheid restrictions at Wits, than be here," they said. "There we would get a good education and better treatment than we get here."

I asked them how far their views represented those of all the students.

"The entire student body demonstrated its dislike of tribal universities by boycotting the big Inauguration Day ceremony held here in June", they said.

They Spy

"We have also staged hunger strikes and have all refused an order that we should prepare a games field. As a result we are all being sent home one week before the end of term."

I was able to verify most of what they said. They also told me that the few black lecturers on the staff were just as unhappy as they were.

I had discovered this myself when I found two African lecturers drinking their mid-morning coffee segregated from the white staff, though the registrar told me such segregation did not occur.

They were loyal to Turfloop, but one had known Fort Hare when it was an African university run by British missionaries.

"There was no apartheid practised there. We got the same pay as the white staff and had houses next door to theirs. We were treated in every way as their equals," he told me.

At Turfloop the black staff are paid much lower salaries than their white colleagues. Their houses are smaller and set apart from the white houses.

The Turfloop students told me they dared not discuss politics, even in their hostels, because they did not yet know which students were the police spies.

I left them, sick at heart. I was given a promise that they would not be expelled for having spoken to me, but I have no great faith that that promise will be kept.

THE CONGO CRISIS AND THE UNITED NATIONS

As we go to press the Congo issue again dominates the special emergency sessions of the United Nations, and the attention of the world. The Security Council of UN.. empowered its secretary-general Mr. Hammarskjold to send United Nations troops into the Katanga province, which under pressure from the Belgians, is trying to secede from the new Congo state and so dismember it, and to "refrain from any action which might undermine the territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of the Congo."

Mr. Hammarskjold says this means that the world organisation must remain neutral in the internal political and constitutional struggle between the Central Congo government headed by M. Patrice Lumumba and the Katanga which is trying to wreck this central government by breaking away.

Mr. Lumumba says the resolution means nothing of the sort. He says Mr. Hammarskjold's acceptance of the Katanga regime under the puppet premier M. Tshombe is in fact undermining the territorial integrity and unity of the Congo. The Congo Prime Minister has charged the U.N. secretary-general with accepting in fact the Belgian demands for the Congo by acceding to Mr. Tshombe's stand, for the latter speaks with the voice of the Belgian Government.

The Congo Government demands are clear and emphatic. They include: (1) the immediate take-over by the Congolese Army from the United Nations of all Congo airfields, (2) the immediate dispatch of non-White U.N. troops and Congolese troops into Katanga and the withdrawal of White troops from Katanga, (3) the immediate seizure by the United Nations of all arms and ammunition distributed by the Belgians in Katanga to 'rebel' partisans.'

Would the United Nations be interfering in the 'internal affairs' of Katanga if it took these steps and carried out its own Security Council resolutions?

The Security Council resolutions were adopted to defend the independence and unity of the new Congo, OF WHICH KATANGA IS A PART.

From the start the tactic of the Belgian Government was to quit the Congo in name only, but to hold on to its rich inheritance there, and to do this by getting the Katanga Province to detach itself and go it alone.

The Daily Telegraph correspondent in Katanga wrote on the eve of the crisis that the Tshombe regime "depends entirely on Belgian arms, men and money. Without this, his Government would in all probability be quickly pulled down from within and without."

Interference in Congo domestic affairs? Certainly there is interference — by the Belgian Government. If the United Nations move into the Katanga Province to get the Belgian troops out it will not be interfering in the Katanga's domestic affairs, it will be stopping Belgian interference there.

The Security Council took a firm stand against the Belgians trying to stay on in the Congo.

An official statement from the Ghana Government said: "It would be absolutely intolerable for the destiny of a newly independent African State to be dictated by the financial interests of expatriate mining companies, and any attempt by these companies to influence events in this way would have the most profound effect on African affairs."

This is the importance of the Congo crisis to the nations of Africa and Asia, and the anti-imperialist forces. Powers will take their stand on this clear issue. Those who use the Tshombe manoeuvres for independence as a pretext for leaving Belgium's forces there are undermining Congo unity and the resolutions of the Security Council. Those who press for United Nations troops to go into Katanga immediately to get the Belgians out and to reinforce the power of the duly elected Central Government headed by M. Patrice Lumumba are on the side of the forces of independence in Africa.

THE BRITISH STAKE IN THE BELGIAN CONGO

Mr Macmillan told the British House of Commons that the Government was carefully watching the situation in the Belgian Congo "from the point of view of the safety of British subjects and property." It was simultaneously reported that most British subjects had already been evacuated from the Katanga province, but the property is another matter. In Katanga British interests are heavily involved.

The Katanga province of the Belgian Congo borders on Northern Rhodesia, and the border lies along Central Africa's great copper belt. On one side of the border huddle the great Rhodesian copper mines. On the Katanga side of the border stretches the territory of the Union Miniere du Haut-Katanga, the huge concern which dominates the territory of the Belgian Congo and which owns a copper area of about 7,700 square miles containing also cobalt, zinc, radium manganese, silver and — most important — uranium, and, in addition, a tin area of about 5,400 square miles.

The original exploration of Union Miniere's territory was started in the last century, before the Belgians annexed the colony, by one of Cecil Rhodes' followers who founded the British company, Tanganyika Concessions. Today Tanganyika Concessions (known as "Tanks" to the initiated and with an issued capi-

tal £9 million) holds a large slice of Union Miniere's capital, is entitled in addition to substantial royalties on the minerals produced, and moreover owns the Benguela Railway which links Union Miniere's copper mines with Portuguese Africa and the outside world in general.

Three of the Belgian directors of Union Miniere sit on the Board of Tanks; 3 of the British directors of Tanks sit on Union Miniere. They include: The Earl of Selborne, Conservative Peer, deputy chairman of Boots Pure Drug and director of The National Provincial Bank. The Earl is 73; he is a member of the Central Council of the Economic League, and before the war was a member of the Committee of the Committee of the United Christian Front; an organisation which supported General Franco at the time of the Spanish War.

The other directors of Tanks (apart from those who also sit on Union Miniere) include:

* Captain Charles Waterhouse who is chairman; he was formerly a Tory M.P. on the extreme right. ("I glory in the word 'Empire'", 17.12.53). He led the revolt of diehard Tory backbenchers against the evacuation of British troops from Egypt. He is now on 12 other companies besides Tanks, with Rhodesian and other interests.

* Lord Robins of Rhodesian fame

("Why should it be supposed that a black African, just because he washes, speaks English and wears European dress, must of necessity be accepted in the society of white men of the top grade?", "Times", 3.3.59). He is President of the British South Africa Co. (which thrives on copper royalties in Northern Rhodesia), is on the Board of African Explosives, the great I.C.I. subsidiary, on Barclays Bank D.C.O. and many other companies with South African and Rhodesian interests.

* Sir Robert J. Hudson, also on the Standard Bank of South Africa, and chief justice of Southern Rhodesia 1943-1950.

* Harry Oppenheimer, the South African magnate, chairman of De Beers Consolidated Mines, the diamond concern and director of about 44 other companies. Mr. Oppenheimer has other interests in the Belgian Congo, apart from his connection through Tanks. He and Philip Oppenheimer are both directors of Societe Miniere du Beceka, a diamond concern deep in the interior.

On April 22nd, 1960, the "Stock Exchange Gazette" reported that a higher dividend was to be paid by Union Miniere and said: "The biggest beneficiary will, of course, be Tanganyika Concessions, which holds not only 180,000 shares but will receive a proportionate increase in royalty income."

CONGO DIARY

Our last Diary covered the period June 15—July 22.

July 23. American multi-millionaire J. Edgar Detwiler discloses a \$714,000,000 plan to manage and exploit the Congo for 50 years. He claims Congo Government approval. "We have snatched the Congo from under the noses of the Russians," he says. The World Bank plus big American and British bankers and other international financiers, are included in this historic deal." De Beers and others are quick to deny this claim.

Mr. Harry Oppenheimer says: "What the Congo example shows is that primitive, uncivilised people cannot be trusted with the running of a modern state, and that an independent democracy is only possible if the electorate has reasonable standards of education and civilisation."

July 24. Mr. Kwako Boateng, Ghana Information Minister says he understands that only "exploratory talks" have taken place between Detwiler and the Congo Government.

July 25. Premier Lumumba arrives in New York from London to attend a United Nations meeting. He says "Peace depends upon the immediate withdrawal of Belgian troops." He demands the recall of the Belgian Ambassador at Leopoldville.

The Ghana Government warns the Congo that the Detwiler Plan is a bait "to dupe independent African states with a bogus agreement."

July 7. The Secretary-General of the United Nations promises Mr. Lumumba to "spare no effort" to get Belgian troops out of the Congo.

Mr. Lumumba says: "The Congo is no longer territory for 'get-rich-quick' people from abroad."

General Victor Lundula, head of the Congolese army, is released after United Nations protests to Katanga.

July 28. In the Katanga Parliament there is disunity on the recession issue. Tshombe fails to form a National Government, Katanga's second largest party, the Cartel Party, holding 30 of the 69 seats, votes in favour of the central government.

July 29. Mr. Hammarskjold arrives in Brazzaville and then crosses the Congo River to Leopoldville. He is greeted with placards: "Down with Tshombe. UNO for Katanga."

July 30. Mr. Hammarskjold announces the establishment of a Congolese Commission to carry out the Security Council resolution on the Congo, more particularly with reference to Katanga.

The Belgian Government agrees to withdraw 1,500 troops from the Congo. No date was set for their withdrawal, however, and this would still leave 8,500 Belgian troops in the country. Mr. Lumumba told a press conference in Washington that messages from the Congo

showed that Belgian troops were still attacking Congolese citizens. United Nations troops were disarming Congolese soldiers "while making no effort to disarm Belgian troops." Mr. Lumumba added "I insist again that Belgian troops must leave the Congo otherwise my people, at the end of their patience . . . may revolt against the Belgian troops, in which case there may be massive massacres, which would be regrettable."

Mr. Lumumba also tells this press conference that the Belgians had managed to get the press of the western countries to hush up as much as possible the things the Belgian troops were doing in the Congo.

He says the Soviet Union, alone of the Great Powers, supported the Congo struggle from the start, and only its position on the Congo crisis corresponded to "the will and wish of my people."

August 1. The Soviet Government warns that it will take decisive action in the Congo if aggression against the Congolese people does not end immediately. The Soviet government statement announces readiness to consider giving the Congo "extensive economic assistance" with no strings attached, to help the return to normal economic life.

August 3. Three hundred people are reported killed and many injured in tribal fighting between the Lulua and Baluba in the Kasai province.

August 3. Mr. Hammarskjold cancels his projected visit to the Union on account of the deteriorating Congo situation.

August 4. Katanga is reported as having 500 'Loyal' troops led by 100 White officers. Forces are mobilised in Katanga to oppose the entry into the Province of United Nations troops. "The Katanga will oppose with force the entry of troops . . . We are ready to die. . . ." — Tshombe.

August 5. Premier Tshombe says Katanga forces will prevent the arrival of UN forces. A planeload of UN officials is refused permission to land at Elizabethville and returns to Leopoldville.

Mr. Lumumba describes M. Tshombe's order for mobilisation to resist the entry into Katanga of U.N. troops as "black-mail" and said: "Peace can return to the Congo only by the total withdrawal of Belgian troops. The secession of Katanga cannot be permitted. We must think first of the unity of Africa."

August 6. Mr. Hammarskjold asks the Security Council to give UN troops authority to enter Katanga. He threatens to resign. President Nkrumah offers troops to the Congo to enter Katanga if the United Nations fails to find a solution to this problem.

(Continued on page 16)

CONGO SHORTS

It's an ill wind of change . . .

Largely unreported in the Congo crisis is the amount of debts left behind by fleeing Belgians. The total, according to a well-informed bank director in Leopoldville, will be several million dollars.

U.S. Magazine Newsweek.
(August 8.)

The Capture of "Leo"

An observer who left Leopoldville on the morning of July 6th and hearing of the mutiny, contrived to be back there on July 9th, found the city changed out of recognition. This was not because the fears prompted by exaggerated Portuguese stories in Luanda were confirmed. On the contrary, there were no signs of violent disorder, few mutineers to be seen, no evidence of a sack; indeed, columns of Africans on bicycles were tranquilly returning to work even though no work awaited them . . . Yet even before one heard the kernel of unpleasant truth that lay under the sillier rumours, it was impossible to doubt that "Leo" had been conquered by the Africans, had at last changed hands and ceased to be a white man's town.

. . . What the formal ceremonies of independence, even the fierce speech of M. Lumumba, had failed to do, the mutinous force publique had achieved.

London Economist.
(July 16.)

Katanga Uranium made the Hiroshima Bomb

The Hiroshima Bomb was probably made from Katanga uranium. During the war the American Government concluded secret negotiations with Union Miniere to buy all the uranium ore the Katanga uranium mines could supply. From then on the Katanga uranium mines were put under close security. Ten years ago the American 'Leader Magazine' tried to investigate conditions in Union Miniere's uranium mines — and failed. Their reporter wrote:

"Casualties from mining accidents are believed to be heavy. For mining the highest priced raw ore in the world — selling for several thousand dollars a ton — the native workman is paid less than 3 shillings a day. He is barred from any effective labour organisation and he and his family are subjected to company laws, tried by company judges and sentenced to company punishments. At the base of the atomic pile there is an industrial serfdom involving thousands of Africans who in fact are voiceless. No glimmer of public light is admitted, and any act of oppression may go undetected behind the miserable excuse of 'security.'" — (February 4th, 1950).

BAYONETS in BULAWAYO

"Bayonets in Bulawayo" headlined the Star at the end of July in a very inadequate description of the culmination of a week's events in Salisbury and Bulawayo. But there was more than inadequacy in the reports of both South African and Rhodesian press; there was political exaggeration and obscurity.

Generally the press painted a picture of rampaging, irrational race riots successfully crushed by a determined government. At the same time the press failed to give any emphasis to the sudden and eruptive nature of the events and their working class character.

These are certainly the most remarkable features of the Rhodesian events.

For the first time in the history of the country mass action was seen; and so strong was this action that for the first time troops in Southern Rhodesia were called up in support of the police and the first lives in the struggle for freedom were lost.

The other distinctive feature was that it was African workers who dominated events to the exclusion of all other groups.

In Salisbury the strike was one hundred percent effective in all factories and eighty percent effective in other industries.

In Bulawayo the workers seized control of the industrial area and factories.

The government found itself off balance. Despite the closest police attention to African political movements, they did not expect mass reaction to the arrests of African leaders and even less did they expect to have militant support. After a day's delay reinforcements were flown to Salisbury to deal with the situation, and meetings were banned in that city. The government was confident that Bulawayo would remain unmoved by events to the north.

However before the week was out, the troops had been flown back to Bulawayo and the Prime Minister appeared personally in order to deal with the situation.

How are we to account for the suddenness of the Rhodesian campaign in July and the nature of the support that it attracted? An answer can be approximated in tracing the development of a number of facts, political and economic.

ECONOMICS:

Farmers and Workers

Southern Rhodesia is a self-governing colony with primarily an agrarian economy based for the most part on the tobacco farm.

None the less, the economy is being industrialised at a rate which in 1958 was the highest in the world. This economy however has not proved viable and it was for this reason, more than any other, that Southern Rhodesia linked up with the North in Federation in 1953.

In return for a degree of political security for the north, the south obtained a measure of economic security from the revenue of the copper mines.

The arrest of three leaders of the National Democratic Party sparked off fresh crisis in S. Rhodesia. Our SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT traces the background to these events.

Over the past eighteen months Southern Rhodesia has been hard hit by a recession which started with the fall in the price of copper at the end of 1958. All of a sudden economic growth has come to a standstill.

There is a lack of detailed information on the extent of this decline and its effects especially in terms of rising costs and unemployment. However, the recession has been a major cause of the extent and militancy of the campaign.

Southern Rhodesia differs from South Africa not only in that it is more backward and unstable economically but also in terms of its social structure and government policy.

Firstly, the reserves of Southern Rhodesia are much larger in area than in South Africa and also are more prosperous. African farmers supply 80 per cent of the total agricultural output (excluding tobacco) for the market.

A labour supply has been insured by the Land Apportionment Act which functions much as the various Land Acts in the Union.

However, in 1951, a new policy was formulated in the Native Land Husbandry Act. This measure, unique in Africa, provided for the institution of individual land tenure in the reserves, improved methods of farming, and the limitation of one family to one plot of a minimum size, which could not be sub-divided.

By this means an increase in the flow of labour to the towns would be achieved (farm labour is mainly foreign), and a permanent settled urban African population formed which would have no ties with the land.

By June this year this act had been effectively applied to 75 per cent of the reserve area.

At the same time the wage level in Southern Rhodesia has always been far lower than in South Africa. Due to the prosperity of the reserves it was a widespread practice in the past for the family in the reserves to make an appreciable contribution to the support of those members temporarily working in the towns — notably in the way of food parcels.

The Native Land Husbandry Act has ended this practice by making a marked division between the rural and urban African, and surplus production in the reserves has become almost wholly orientated to a market. The result has been a drop in income for Africans in the towns and this gap has not been filled from any other source. These factors

have been cumulative and led to the situation in which the urban African population was ready for action.

POLITICS:

The Rise of the N.D.P.

Southern Rhodesia was without an organisation representing Africans until 1958 when in August the A.N.C. was founded by Guy Clutton-Brock at his mission station. It grew rapidly, but before it could adopt a clear programme or conduct a campaign a state of emergency was declared at the beginning of 1959, the A.N.C. banned and some two hundred leaders detained.

The government took this action not so much in the light of a threatened campaign, but to ensure security in the South while troops were moved to Nyasaland to deal with the situation which had developed there.

At the beginning of this year the National Democratic Party was formed after a year of political uncertainty and defection, due no doubt to the loss of leadership.

At the onset of the July events the N.D.P. was relatively small but growing rapidly.

As yet it had not formulated a detailed policy and programme of action, but it is a non-racial party which stands opposed to tribalism, racialism and imperialism. It aligns itself with the Pan-African independence movement and fights for political and economic equality for all. It differs from the still-banned Southern Rhodesian A.N.C. in that it concentrates its work more in the urban than in the rural areas, where the A.N.C. made its main impact.

From the first moment the N.D.P. was harassed by the police. Political work became increasingly difficult. Finally, three members of the national executive were arrested and charged under the Preventive Detention Act (an act which originated under Todd's premiership). The charge was an attempt to identify the N.D.P. with the banned A.N.C. and thus give grounds for the banning of the former.

Meanwhile the Congo had gained its independence and Rhodesia found itself for the first time with an independent African state on its borders. The national stay-at-home in South Africa, the release of Dr. Banda and other leaders from the Bulawayo prison due to pressure from Nyasaland, added to the feeling that the time had come for action.

The campaign which followed was quite spontaneous. The N.D.P. had neither the organisation nor the intent of planning mass action. For the same reasons the government too was caught unawares in the quick violence of the campaign.

Rather it was the N.D.P., finding themselves in a critical situation, who decided to give a lead and it was due to political and economic factors, some of

(Continued on page 16)

African Independence Movements have not studied Africa's land problems in detail, says V. PILLAY, in this article. Is individual tenure the way out? Africa cannot go back to the village life of the past. Which way forward?

LAND OWNERSHIP IN AFRICA

Of all the problems that have resulted from two centuries of European occupation in Africa, none occupies so central a position as that relating to land ownership and distribution. For in this question, there is present the immense problem of minority rights and the even greater problem of African land rights in those regions possessing a substantial and powerful European settler minority.

Land Alienation

The history of Europe's relations with Africa has largely been a history of land alienation and labour control.

Following the 19th century scramble for Africa, the principal European powers pursued a policy of broadly declaring all the land under their domain to be "Crown" or government land and so converting what was a traditional African right to land (according to conventional methods of land-use) into a system of occupation subject to the dictates of the occupying authorities. Gradually parts of this "Crown" land were alienated or removed from African occupation for use by immigrant populations so that in the course of time, land hunger became a fundamental problem for the indigenous peoples and a basis for complaint, agitation, political organisation and a wakening of national consciousness. This was particularly true in East Africa, Central Africa and South Africa.

In the Union the formation of the African National Congress in 1912 was the result of the African protest against the Land Act which set up pockets of African reservations outside of which land ownership was confined to Europeans. Similarly the rise of the Kenya African national movement under the leadership of Mr. Jomo Kenyatta arose from a Kikuyu demand for a restitution of the land alienated arbitrarily by the British authorities.

The degree of land alienation was particularly sharp in the South though the process in Algeria was by no means insignificant. In the 1956 edition of Lord Hailey's *African Survey* the African's loss of land as a result of alienation was estimated as follows: In the Union of South Africa land reserved for European occupation amounted to 89 per cent; in Swaziland 49 per cent; Southern Rhodesia 54 per cent; Belgian Congo 9 per cent; Kenya 9 per cent; Nyasaland 5 per cent; South-West Africa 5 per cent; Ghana 5 per cent; and North Rhodesia 3 per cent. By contrast, the white population in South Africa formed 20 per cent of the total and in the rest of the territories, no more than 1 per cent.

African Reserves

These figures by themselves do not tell the whole tale of the process of land alienation and the consequent land hunger. In Northern Rhodesia, for example, the density of the African population is no more than 4.7 per square mile — a ridiculously low figure. But much of the greater part of the country is poor soil. Further there is a marked lack of irrigation facilities which compel the cultivators to crowd into a few areas favoured with water supply. These few areas however are the ones which have been most subject to alienation laws. In South Rhodesia, where white settlers are in greater numbers, a recent writer refers to official policies "which reflect a desire not to put into Native Reserves any land which might yield profits especially mineral wealth to European settlement." (Colin Leys, *European Politics in S. Rhodesia*, 1959).

It is of course in South Africa that the aim of land alienation is most explicit. Here the African reserves are acknowledged to be unsuitable for human settlement; of the total land surface, 11 per cent are now reserved for African settlement and according to the most recent legislation under the policy of Apartheid, this 11 per cent of unsuitable land is to be converted into "Bantustans" in which Africans will be permanently confined. Though an African will be required to sell his labour in the all-white areas, he will have no rights whatsoever except in these "Bantustans."

The position in Kenya demands special mention for it was here that the land question gave rise to violence and war which today divides the different races as no other issue does. The process of what the Africans call the "great land grab" began here in the early years of this century. In 1901 there were only 13 settlers but already by 1904 some 220,000 acres of land had been alienated for European settlement. Between 1905 and 1914, a further 4.4 million acres were alienated. This process went on until "about half the land in Kenya that is worth cultivating" passed into European hands.

In 1939, under an order in Council, the fertile rich plateau below Mount Kenya going by the name of the Kenya Highlands and totalling 16,700 square miles was reserved for European occupation only. These "white" Highlands, probably the richest lands in all Africa, were as a result handed over to two thousand European settlers leaving the inferior land on the edge of this plateau to some 4 million Africans. Thus in a particu-

larly large territory with a not too large population, land hunger was aroused, creating what the East African Royal Commission (1935-55) called "an African sense of insecurity in his land holding, notwithstanding the statements of policy and the complicated machinery designed to assure him."

Hostility to White Settlements

The deep hostility of the African in these areas of white settlement arising from land alienation is clearly understandable and this has been the dominant note in all the programmes of the African nationalist movement. The intense feeling which land alienation generates in African politics is well described in Lord Hailey's monumental *African Survey* (1956) and is worth quoting:

"This feeling is general and is by no means confined to those communities whose land has been taken (for European occupation). There is certainly no one feature of colonial policy which has had an equal influence in determining the character of the relations between the indigenous people and Colonial Administration. Whatever other reasons may exist for the estimate made by Africans of the character of a Government, the fact that a considerable area of Native lands has passed permanently into the hands of non-Natives will always tend to colour any judgment of it."

West Africa

The policy of land alienation in West Africa has been as perverse and discriminatory as in East, Central and South Africa, though not so sharp as to create a land hunger. West Africa has been subject more to the pressure of plantation farming and mineral concessions to British companies than to the demands for special land privileges for settlers. Land alienation in this region has therefore followed the import demands of the metropolitan economies for raw materials and plantation crops. This characteristic of West African land policy necessarily makes the land question there less urgent and serious. On the other hand, the Belgian Congo has been subject to a most ruthless land alienation policy. Whole provinces were ceded to Belgian enterprises, simultaneously with the grant of African land to European settlers.

Protective Legislation!

The colonial authorities have invariably defended their land policy as being

protective of African interests. The declaration of whole areas as "Crown" land is usually coupled with statements that the official policy is designed to "protect African land from further encroachment by Europeans". This may very well have been the policy, though in practice the actual development has been markedly different, i.e., towards the greater insecurity of African land rights and wider European encroachment.

J. Nkomo, the President of the South Rhodesian African Congress explained recently that the Land Apportionment Acts of 1931 and 1941 were "ostensibly passed for the protection of what land had been left under African control, but was in fact used for the purpose of dispersing and impoverishing the African population and retaining political and economic power in the hands of the settlers." In May 1959, it was announced that 80,000 Africans in South Rhodesia were being forcibly removed from their traditional areas to give effect to the Land Acquisition Acts and another 9,000 were to be removed before the "apportionment of land" was completed.

It is as well to examine the content and implications of the African complaint that land alienation has had the purpose of "impoverishing" the African people. Arguments are often advanced by the authorities that African methods of cultivation are wasteful of land and engender soil fertility. This is indeed the contention of the Royal Commission which examined the land question in Kenya and similar statements are found in other official British publications. It is also claimed that the advanced and capitalistic methods of agriculture introduced by white settlers has not only increased agricultural productivity but has created employment for Africans and introduced a monetary incentive to work and imparted a money value to land where none existed previously. Against the background of the shifting system of cultivation practiced for centuries by the indigenous African peoples, these claims may sound convincing and are therefore likely to be easily accepted.

The Urge to Usurp

For the occupying powers, the urge to usurp land is an objective factor; it is simply part of the process of "primitive accumulation" — to acquire land because of the minerals it contains and the crops that can be grown on it. But this is by no means the only reason for the land policy pursued in Africa, particularly in South, Central and East Africa. What impresses the student of African problems is that in all these regions only a very small proportion of the land alienated for European occupation, has in fact been cultivated and effectively used.

The famous Pim Commission, appointed in 1938 to examine the North Rhodesian economy, discovered that "large areas from which natives were evacuated are practically empty of inhabitants . . . Of the 2 million acres alienated, the area under European cultivation is approximately 70,000 acres". In the Union of South Africa, of the 89 per cent of the

total land area reserved for the whites, possibly no more than half is actually occupied or cultivated by them. In Kenya only 6 per cent of the 16,700 square miles of "white" Highlands is cultivated and in South Rhodesia only one million out of the 47 million acres of alienated land is occupied by European settlements. This phenomenon of African land hunger existing side by side with uncultivated land is equally present in the Belgian Congo, Tanganyika, Nyasaland and other territories.

It is the presence of this phenomenon over a large part of the African Continent that provides justification for African complaint on two fundamental grounds. First, the policy of land alienation has had the effect, if not the aim, of preventing the African peasant from becoming a serious competitor to the European farmer or plantation owner. Secondly, the creation of a land shortage, by removing substantial chunks of land from African occupation has had the effect, if not the aim, of driving the African peasantry into becoming wage-labourers in European areas and so providing for an abundant supply of cheap-labour to meet the demands of a generally labour-intensive system of European farming and mineral mining. For these reasons, the land alienation policies of the colonial authorities and those of the white settlers are looked upon by the Africans as cornerstones of the European settler and the metropolitan companies and of the deliberate impoverishment of the African peoples.

To Curb African Competition

The European settlers in South, Central and East Africa as well as the authorities of these countries have gone to some lengths to prevent African competition in agriculture. In one area where legislative barriers were absent, i.e. Uganda, the African farmer has become an industrious farmer and an important factor in the economy. Elsewhere, however, the barriers are hard to cross. One important barrier to African competitiveness is the discriminatory way in which economic facilities — the infrastructure of transport and communications — are permitted to be used by the local population. Where railways were already built, the white settlers were given the land adjacent to the railways. Similarly new railway lines were laid with due regard to European interests. The Pim Commission reported that the North Rhodesian Reserve Commission had laid down that African reserve areas were in principle "to be laid down in country away from the railway line." The Pim Commission went on to comment that "this might be considered as conflicting with the principle of equal economic opportunities for Europeans and natives", (though the Commission itself was not able to recommend a change). This principle of inequality is followed in the provision of irrigation facilities and road construction as well.

Equally significant in this system of unequal opportunity is the official agricultural policy. The Pim Report refers to the Maize Control Ordinance of North

Rhodesia, whereby European growers received 7/9d per bag of maize while 5/- a bag was the price paid to African farmers. This was the situation in the 1930's. The policy of differential pricing has not changed. According to the Rhodesian Institute of African Affairs, the European producer in South Rhodesia received 40/- for a bag of maize from the 1957 harvest, while the African producer received 27/-. The official justification for this discrimination is that, "it is reasonable that the African should be required to maintain financially the market facilities organised for him by the Government." One can reasonably ask, why not the European as well? In Kenya, the principle of removing African competition was pursued in a no less blatant manner. To make it impossible for the Africans to compete with white farmers in coffee growing, an annual licence was required of every coffee producer which could only be obtained at a cost prohibitive to most Africans. In the Union of South Africa, the whole of the annual agricultural price subsidy of about £40 million is available only to European farmers.

White Farming Not Efficient

Any claim that European farming is more efficient than African must therefore be taken with some reserve. A study of European farming methods reveals that there is in fact little efficiency of cultivation in the alienated land areas. This is particularly true of the Central African Federation, though it is easy enough to come across cases of absolute inefficiency and land waste in Kenya and South Africa also.

In 1950, the Land Husbandry Act was passed in South Rhodesia. This was accompanied by considerable Government publicity; the importance of this Act for the African people was explained to foreign visitors. The aim of the Act was "to provide for reasonable standard of good husbandry and for the protection of natural resources by all Africans using land". In other words, the Act left untouched the methods of cultivation in European areas. The typical European farm consists of thousands of acres. An official survey carried out on 240 such European farms in 1955 showed that about 10 per cent was under permanent cultivation, another 12 per cent for cattle stocking and the rest permanently uncultivated. This was officially suggested as indicating the pattern of European land-use in South Rhodesia.

By contrast, the Land Husbandry Act is regarded by the African as fundamentally a bad law. It entrenches and legalises the practices of centralisation and continuous cultivation on soils which are generally unsuitable. It merely hastens soil erosion. It limits each man's plot to 8 acres, thus making it difficult to maintain cattle, as well as crops. There is in fact too little land for the African. By its passage the Act removes whatever rights the African possessed in what are now the white areas. Recently an agricultural officer in the South Rhodesian Government reported that the maximum net income from working an 8-

acre plot set aside under the Act will amount to £50 a year. The cost of a bare minimum standard of life for the average African was £88 per annum. Clearly then, as the South Rhodesian Government readily admits, the Land Husbandry Act aims at forcing the African either to "farm properly in the Reserves or to go to work in European industry and agriculture". Since in practice the proper farming of land under these conditions is made financially impossible, the African has no alternative but to swell the ranks of the cheap labour force.

Cheap Labour

The demand for cheap labour appears to be at the heart of the land policies pursued in all parts of South, East and Central Africa.

When gold and diamonds were discovered in South Africa at the end of the 19th century and railways began to open up the Continent, the most pronounced need was not only capital but also labour. Necessarily, then, policies were devised almost everywhere to control the movement of the African people and for the breaking down of the African's agricultural self-sufficiency. Except possibly in West Africa — and even there, this is doubtful — the occupying countries gradually destroyed the conditions for the existence of a stable African peasantry who could live a life independent of the European farms and mines. The African labour problem was, therefore, tackled by a three-pronged attack through:

- alienating African land,
- African taxation, and
- the control of the movement of African labour.

In a study published in the *International Labour Review* (July 1958) this was described as follows:

"Early African economic development faced employers with a problem of great labour scarcity — Pressure amounting to compulsion was applied to obtain labour which the offer of wages alone could not attract in sufficient numbers. In different areas and at different times there was a resort to such various means as slavery, direct statutory compulsion, pressure through imposition of personal tax, the curtailment of native lands, assistance given by administrative officials to the efforts of private recruiters and the use of chiefs to recruit their people as labourers".

It is clear then that the "great land grab" was part of a vaster process of compulsion to bring the African into the net of a cheap labour system which even today is a basic characteristic of the African economy. Only in West Africa and Uganda, where large scale European settlement did not take place, was it possible for the African to escape the fate of the inhabitants of the rest of colonial Africa.

Individual Tenure No Solution

The consequence of the policy of land alienation is hence seen to be associated with the poverty and misery that characterises life and labour in the African reserves throughout Africa. There is an overstocking on the land only paralleled by that of over-population. The soil is denuded since the traditional African method of shifting cultivation is no longer possible because of the land shortage. Moreover the able-bodied men are away in the European areas and this promotes family insecurity and a host of social problems alien to African life prior to the coming of the European.

There exists a theory, particularly in Britain, that much of the problems in the African reserves could be removed, if not solved by introducing a system of individual land tenure to replace "tribal" or communal systems of land ownership. Probably this is one of the aims of the Land Husbandry Act in South Rhodesia. This was also recommended by the Royal Commission on Kenya and some form of European controlled and authorised African individual land tenure for the Kenya Highlands is now being mooted.

It is not easy to understand how this will in fact solve the problem of land shortage; in none of the territories of South, Central and East Africa are there any real efforts to enlarge the size of the African reserves. This prospect for the commercialisation of African land should however be seen in perspective. In theory, individual land tenure and the leasing of land against rent payment may foster greater African productivity and possibly a greater sense of security. In practice, especially in under-developed countries, individual land tenure produces that dreaded Asian symbol — the hopeless debt-laden peasant who invariably ends up as a landless pauper, and is driven to seek employment in the towns.

In the rich cocoa growing region of Ghana where individual land titles of a form exist, peasant indebtedness is known to be a growing problem. Hancock in the 1942 edition of *Survey of British Commonwealth Affairs*, reports that "the best the peasants could hope for was that their creditors would let them stay on their land as caretakers under a share-cropping arrangement."

Policy Fosters Poverty

On the other hand the mailo system in Uganda has worked relatively well — this applies to the registered ownership of land in the Buganda province — but the success of this scheme is wholly attributable to the absence of a land alienation policy and of a white settler minority. The African there does not suffer from land shortage. In Kenya, a "land consolidation scheme" was launched in the African reserves but this, as was to be seen, was designed to develop a more contented African "middle class" at the expense of the small holders and as a

result, this scheme has contributed to a further embitterment of racial feeling.

Basically, the aim or unintended effect of official policy in most of colonial and semi-colonial Africa is to prevent African rural areas from becoming prosperous centres of agricultural production. Rural poverty has been the most effective of all forces to maintain an ample supply of migrant labour always available. And this poverty is to a large extent created by the policies of land alienation.

The similarity of the problem of land in most parts of Africa expresses the underlying unity of the vaster problems of colonisation in Africa. In some areas land has been less subject to the pressure described here and where this has been so, independence has followed with ease. Elsewhere the immigrant populations wielding power and influence over the authorities have been able to create a land problem of such magnitude for the African people that it has become the focal point of their nationalist movement and yet this very land problem makes independence so difficult of attainment.

African Nationalism has no solution Yet

The African nationalist movement is not always explicit in its attitude to the land question, especially in the formulation of demands. There is, of course, the demand for the restoration of African land rights and for the abolition of the system of alienation but beyond that, very little in the way of a solution is advanced. The programme of the African Congress in South Africa demands that "restriction of land ownership on a racial basis shall be ended and all the land redivided amongst those who work it, to banish famine and land hunger." This is probably the least vague of the statements on land that come from any of the African national movements. It suggests some system of land reform so as to grant land titles to the tillers. On the other hand, while the Kenya African elected members are demanding the opening of the Highlands to Africans, they fight hard to maintain their own land in tribal control. In Kenya, then the African is very much on the defensive when asked for a solution to the land question. The "tribal" control on land is invariably submitted for want of a more adequate solution.

No African independence movement today would seriously argue in favour of a return to the village life of the past. There is a recognition that traditional African tribal life contained the seeds of its decay. It could sustain the people but provides no possibility for development. A part of the solution clearly lies in the reduction of European land control and ownership. But this is only a part. The other equally vital part of the solution has hardly received the attention it deserves from the leaders of the African national movement.

Censor in the Theatre

In the Publications and Entertainments Bill, submitted to Parliament during the last session, and now before a Select Committee, the Nationalist government is turning its mania for "controlling" everybody and everything to the live theatre. If the bill becomes law, it will strangle not only the press but the theatre.

The Bill states:

"The Board may in writing or by telegraph . . . prohibit the giving of any public entertainment, provided the Board is satisfied that such public entertainment . . .

- (a) can have the effect of . . .
 - (i) giving offence to the religious convictions or feelings of any section of the inhabitants of the Union; or
 - (ii) bringing any section of the inhabitants of the Union into ridicule or contempt; or
- (b) is contrary to the public interest or good morals."

The Board is to be appointed by the Minister of the Interior. It will be empowered to delegate to a single member of the Board its functions and authority in any area determined by the Board.

This could mean that one day Brian Brooke might receive a wire from someone representing himself as 'the Board' instructing Brooke to close down a new show because the show "is in my opinion contrary to the public interest." It would be too bad that Brooke will have invested a few thousands in the show!

The bill is one further step in the Nationalists' inexorable process of regimenting our MINDS, WHITE as well as BLACK.

Something could perhaps be said for powers to prevent the exhibition or dissemination of obscene material.

Democrats would abhor the publication in South Africa of racialist filth; the importation of degrading comics for children and pornographic novels for teenagers.

But we must not lose sight of some paramount facts about censorship.

Censorship cannot be based on the judgement of one individual or a few individuals. It would depend now, on the presence or absence of taste, learning, breadth of experience, religious convictions, wholesomeness of personality of a small number of people.

There would be a grave danger of warped, distorted judgements, based on personal, obsolete, neurotic prejudice, controlling what the people read and see on the stage.

The only satisfactory, lasting safeguard against undesirable stage and film shows is the power of educated public opinion.

This present bill could give one person power to close down a live theatre show. Supposing that person were a rigid Calvinist. One can easily picture such a person condemning and banning quite a few shows that have recently been pro-

vided — to the public's delight — by our professional managements. Should we have seen 'Look Back in Anger', 'View from the Bridge' and 'Tea and Sympathy'?

Supposing such a person were a supporter of 'Apartheid'. How quickly 'in the public interest' might he have banned 'Deep are the Roots', 'The Respectable Prostitute', 'The Kimberley Train', 'Try for White'?

The bill lays down that any person in charge of a cinema or theatre must admit 'free of charge any policeman or any

Ring the Curtain Down

The publisher's blurb describes Garry Allighan as a journalist with "pungent style and descriptive phraseology." Maybe. But it requires something more than that to cover up the triviality of his much-publicised, glossy volume, "Curtain-up on South Africa." Mr. Allighan's prologue — pardon me, 'Proscenium' — is at great pains to explain that herein he deals with facts, only facts and nothing but the facts. Unlike all those, at whom he sneers so glibly, who have held up a distorting mirror to the South African scene ". . . with the benefit of no more than two weeks' stay in the country," (Page 13, middle of page) or "some for as long as three whole weeks." (Same page last line.) Mr. Allighan's facts may, perhaps, best be judged by his potted reference to the Sharpeville shooting, which contrasts so strangely with the facts produced to the Commission of Inquiry: "25,000 Bantu" says the pundit, "besieged 100 policemen in the police station to defy the Pass laws and, when faced with that huge mob of screaming Black people, the police opened fire out of what might be regarded as rather natural fear for their own lives." The rest of his facts are as fancifully coloured by his theories.

One of Mr. Allighan's facts, stated over and over again is that the Bantu people were 1000 miles north of the Cape Peninsula when the first White settlers established their community there and began spreading northwards. At that time, more or less, "the blood-fevered Bantu were on the war-march south." Later, "they advanced on the scattered (Dutch) farm settlements like hordes of crayfish in crustaceous armour brandishing fiercely-waving pincers." By publishers' standards this may be pungent; by mine it stinks. The imagery is false and deliberately misleading; the language is overcoloured like glorious Technicolor. But to continue: ". . . There were constant and murderous attacks on isolated farmsteads as they (the Bantu) sought mindless satisfaction of their animal desires."

". . . Xosas crossed the river nightly to raid the Boers' farms and capture their cattle. The first Kaffir war resulted and the Bantu were driven back across the river. For the following twenty years

person carrying a prescribed authority for admission'. It must be assumed that the policeman — as in the brothel cases — will not be sent to the theatre for pleasure but for duty as an agent of the Board, to which he will submit his report on the show. Will we see the day when a show will be banned on the recommendation of a constable?

The provisions of this bill for the control of live theatre must be thrown out in their entirety. Live theatre has led a precarious existence in South Africa for over a century and a half. I challenge anyone to prove that it has ever functioned 'contrary to the public interest or good morals'. Then let it carry on as it always has done.

the Boers kept the Bantu at their distance and a state of peaceful co-existence existed." Thus Allighan sets right the facts of history which others only distort.

It might appear from this that Allighan's technique is one of crude partisanship. Not so. His is a tricky technique, whereby he lashes out impartially at everyone, but draws a veil of utter silence across those facts which do not substantiate his "savage Bantu" theories. Thus there is no mention — no word whatsoever — of the causes of the clashes between Moshesh and the trek-ers, no mention of the conquest of the Western and fertile valley areas of Basuto territory, no reference to the European conquest and annexation of Natal, the O.F.S. or the Transvaal. On the subject of the Western Areas Removal Scheme, there is much blood-curdling local colour about the sink of iniquity and filth that was Sophiatown, much lavish praise of the cleanliness of Meadowlands, much sneering at Father Huddleston and those who opposed the removal — and not a word about the fact that Sophiatown was a freehold township where Meadowlands is not; no word that Sophiatown was "free" while Meadowlands is ringed by barbed wire fences, permit regulations and restrictions on freedom of movement; no word to indicate that if the aim were only slum-clearance houses could have been rebuilt in Sophiatown; no word of mention that the whole scheme was part of a Government plan to erase "black spots" from what is said to be a "white area." There is also a great deal about education for Africans and not a word about Bantu education.

But why go on? If these are 'facts', then I prefer to stick to fancies from a more honest — if less lengthily domiciled reporter. The publishers would be doing a service to themselves and the journalistic profession generally if they quietly rang 'Curtain-down' on Mr. Allighan's ham acting, before he gets given the bird. And for 21/- too!

Curtain-up on South Africa. By Garry Allighan. Published by Purnell. Price 21s.

SOUTH AFRICAN PROTEST TO THE OLYMPIC GAMES

The South African Sports Association, representing more than 70,000 sportsmen in South Africa who are opposed to racial discrimination in sport, has formally charged the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association with racial discrimination in violation of the Olympic Charter.

SASA's letter to the International Olympic Committee says:

"We request that this charge be placed on the Agenda

of the meeting of the International Olympic Committee in Rome, and that the Association be required to answer the charge.

"We wish to point out that in no code of sport was an open unsegregated, non-racial trial conducted to determine the composition of the South African Olympic team, despite the efforts made by the various non-racial sporting bodies such as Weightlifting, Athletics, and Boxing to secure fair trials for the Olympic Games.

The Class Cheered When Ex-Detainee Professor Returned

KGOSANA, LIBERALS AND LEFT AT CAPE TOWN UNIVERSITY

(By a Special Correspondent at U.C.T.)

The recent spectacular emergence from obscurity to international notice of Philip Kgosana, leader of the P.A.C. anti-pass campaign in Cape Town, has focussed attention on political trends at the University of Cape Town. It has been asked whether the fact that he was a student there had any influence on his political development. The answer to this question is probably no, though it is probably more than a coincidence that Nana Mahomo, "Minister of Culture" in the P.A.C. shadow cabinet and the "master mind" of the Cape Town anti-pass campaign, who escaped from South Africa in March and who is now engaged in propaganda work overseas, was also a student at U.C.T.

Until the beginning of this year Kgosana was not known as a political figure on the campus. His only activity was the selling of "Contact" — which he said he did because he needed the money.

Though it is unlikely that students in this country will in the near future play a leading role in the democratic struggle, unlike students in Turkey, Korea and Japan, for example, political activity at the U.C.T. is by no means insignificant. Like most of the White population many of the White students are uninterested in politics and are worried only about their own careers. But there are, however, a large number of students who are politically conscious.

No Nats

Nationalist support at U.C.T. is so slight as to be negligible. The few students who do support Verwoerd keep very quiet about it! Most of the "non-political" students were passive supporters of the U.P. but recent events in South Africa have forced even these students to take an interest in politics and many of them are now supporters of the Progressive Party and can be seen running round the campus putting up posters urging the white electorate to reject the republic.

Left and Liberal

By far the most active groups are the liberals and the socialists. The socialists strive for more than the abolition of racial discrimination as such and are by far the most militant group in opposing apartheid. Their total support is far less than that of the liberals — who are the dominant group on the campus — though their greater activity results in their having considerable influence. The general pattern when it comes to activity is that it is the left students who take up issues first. The liberals counsel caution and often oppose them at first but are forced later on to follow the lead of the more militant leftists. Examples of this pattern are the bus boycotts, the graduation ball demonstration, and the demonstration in town during the anti-pass campaign.

Many of the Non-White students have, in the past, been firm supporters of the various sections of the N.E.U.M., but its negative approach and the constant squabbles among its leaders have resulted in most of its supporters leaving it and

joining more dynamic and militant groups such as the Congress Movement and P.A.C.

Bus Boycott

In September of last year apartheid was introduced, by government order, on a bus service operated by City Tramways specially for students to get to university. Left-wing students immediately called a protest meeting and a boycott of the bus service was decided upon. This boycott was so successful that within a couple of weeks the bus company withdrew the service owing to lack of passengers. The students organised a lift service whereby those students with cars gave lifts to the students and staff who had previously used the bus. This was a case where the socialist group took the initiative and were first opposed but later followed by the liberal group.

The boycott lasted until the beginning of this year. Only when all efforts to obtain a non-segregated bus-service failed, was the boycott called off and the bus returned.

Dance Picketed

At the end of last year about 20 students of all races picketed a Whites-only dance held on the campus to celebrate graduation. They held placards with the slogans: "Away with all Apartheid" and "EQUAL STUDENT RIGHTS". For this they were ordered to appear before the Principal. They were not, however, disciplined. Mr. Duminy, the Principal, merely told them that he was hurt that he had been made out to be an apologist of apartheid. He said that he was against apartheid but that time was necessary to break it down. The students obviously thought that the time was now!

Professor Cheered

During the anti-pass campaign in March this year, the students were by no means inactive. Six students (two Africans, one of whom was Mr. Kgosana, and four Whites) were arrested under the Emergency Regulations for their alleged political activities. Prof. H. J. Simons, one of the most popular lecturers at the university, was also arrested. The arrests caused widespread protests and when Dr. Simons returned to take his class he was greeted with cheers from his students.

Several mass meetings were held to protest against the police brutality at Sharpeville and Langa. One speaker told the students: "The time has come for students to show their support for the African people." This statement was greeted with cheering, and on Monday the 28th March — the Day of Mourning — businessmen going home in the evening saw nearly a hundred students standing on street corners in the centre of Cape Town with placards protesting at the shooting at Langa and Sharpeville.

At the present time there is little political activity at U.C.T. but this does not mean that the students have forgotten the events of March.

CONGO DIARY

(Continued from page 9)

August 8. Lumumba discusses the Congo situation with Guinea. He protests at the U.N. refusal to enter Katanga. He is assured of support from Ghana, Tunisia and Morocco. The Abako Party, led by President Kasavubu is reported to be sliding out of its alliance with Lumumba.

August 9. The Security Council votes for a speedy withdrawal of all Belgian troops from the Congo. The Abako Party revives its pre-independence call for a Federal Congo.

August 10. The U.N. Secretary-General wants to freeze the position in Katanga until a new constitution for the Congo can be worked out. Tshombe claims that the Belgian Government has 'let me down'. He will continue to oppose the entry of UN troops, he says.

Lumumba calls for the "total liberation of the Congo."

August 11. Premier Lumumba is reported stoned and injured by a mob of Congolese rioters who attack his car. Later reports deny this. Lumumba announces that arrests will be made of those "plotting against the Congo."

August 12. There is more division between Lumumba and the Abako Party which continues to call for a federal government. Some Abako Party members are arrested.

August 15. A compromise agreement is reached between Mr. Hammarskjold and Mr. Tshombe which 'upholds the principle of non-interference by UN troops in the affairs of Katanga.' Mr. Tshombe interprets this as meaning that "All police tasks devolve on Katanga. U.N. contingents are here only to assure the security of persons and goods." The Katanga police and army would keep all their equipment. Katanga police continue to screen all Africans arriving from other parts of the Congo at the Elizabethville airport.

Financiers are discussing the Congo's Central Bank into which a balance of £14 million offered by Belgium earlier this year is to be paid. The World Bank "expresses a preference for this amount to be handled by Belgian Government agencies."

August 16. Mr. Hammarskjold flies back to report to the emergency session of the United Nations Security Council. He refuses to allow a Congolese deputation to travel with him in his UN aircraft, though the Congolese deputation will attend the Security Council meeting.

N. Levy of P.O. Box 1355, Johannesburg is responsible for all political matter in this issue.

Mr. Lumumba says that the Congo government has lost confidence in Mr. Hammarskjold's handling of the situation. He calls for a 14 nation group of neutral observers from the Afro-Asian group to be sent by the Security Council to ensure "the immediate and integral application" of its resolutions on the Congo.

Mr. Hammarskjold says: "The Security Council itself must judge the value of Mr. Lumumba's allegations."

August 17. The Soviet representative on the Security Council charges that Mr. Hammarskjold acted "in clear contradiction of the spirit and the letter" of all three resolutions on the Congo problem.

The United States State Department says Mr. Hammarskjold has the complete support of the United States in his "tremendously difficult task" of restoring peace in the Congo.

Mr. Hammarskjold proposes a delay of the Security Council session so that Mr. Lumumba can present his country's case in person.

August 18. The African states take part in behind the scenes discussion at UN headquarters to try to find a solution to the Congo problem.

Bayonets in Bulawayo

(Continued from page 10)

which have been outlined above, that the N.D.P. found itself a mass base prepared for militant action. Support from other quarters was notably absent. The Central Africa Party failed to partake in the campaign, and Garfield Todd, one of its leaders, made an appeal to Britain requesting the suspension of the constitution. The appeal was ignored.

What of the future? The N.D.P. is undoubtedly in a stronger position than ever: political consciousness among the masses is at an unprecedented level. We can expect a more experienced leadership with a clearer view of its aims to emerge from the events. It should be stressed that the N.D.P. sees the struggle ahead as extra-parliamentary. They view themselves as a predominantly mass organisation and consider that a constitutional struggle, at least under the present franchise laws, which exclude the vast majority of workers and peasants from the vote, would be in the interest of only the emergent African middle-class. For this reason formal co-operation with the C.A.P. would be difficult, for the C.A.P. attempts to work exclusively in the parliamentary sphere and attracts no mass-following. Finally, the N.D.P. unreservedly supports and will do all it can, to work with the South African liberatory movement, in the fight for a free and independent Africa.

Perfect Writing
Instruments



Your friend
for life!

FINEST VALUE IN PIPES

DR. MACNAB

FILTER

SELECTED
BRIAR



STEWART'S
REXALL PHARMACY

S. Joffe, M.P.S.

CHEMIST & DRUGGIST
PHOTOGRAPHIC SUPPLIES

—o—
280a, Louis Botha Avenue,
ORANGE GROVE
Phone 45-6243/4

Standard Furnishing
(Pty.) Ltd.

30d, 30e, Voortrekker Street
and 35a, Prince's Avenue

BENONI

For The Best In Furniture

Juno Furnishing Co.

64 KNOX STREET

Phone 51-1106 GERMISTON

For A Square Deal

Contact Us