



LIBERATION

ONE SHILLING

NOVEMBER 15

THE NATAL SOCIETY
COPYRIGHT SECTION
SOUTH AFRICA

AFTER THE NATIONALISTS

16. NOV. 1957

Patrick Duncan ● Walter Sisulu



A JOURNAL OF DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION

Liberation

A Journal of Democratic Discussion

No. 28, November, 1957.

One Shilling

EDITORIAL

A NEW ERA

"With the launching of the Soviet earth satellite yesterday, the history of man entered a new era."

S.A.B.C. announcer, October 5, 1957.

"The first issue of *Liberation* makes its appearance at a time of profound world crisis. The first half of the twentieth century has been marked by a dizzy acceleration in the rate of scientific discovery and technical advance. Man's stature has been raised, his horizons boundlessly expanded. Yet, for the most part, social and economic systems have not kept pace with man's ever-increasing conquests over nature.

"The overwhelming majority of mankind still lives in grinding poverty, ignorance and disease. Over Africa, and large parts of Asia and America, the wanton ravages of imperialism lay waste vast human and material resources.

"Our times are marked by continuous wars and revolutions . . . All these upheavals are symptoms of the modern crisis — the contradiction between advanced science and antiquated forms of social organisation.

"The greatest single danger that today faces humanity is that these tensions should be allowed to explode into a catastrophic world conflict; a vast and terrible intercontinental war in which the secrets man has wrested from nature will be used to destroy him, to bury his proudest achievements and his glorious hopes."

— From the first *Liberation* editorial, February, 1953.

MAKES you think, doesn't it? That is the profoundly sane and correct reaction of the ordinary man to the first Sputnik as, watched with tremendous awe, pride and enthusiasm by countless millions of people in every inhabited part of the globe, the earth's new companion wings its way at the fantastic speed of five miles a second in its orbit about our ancient and surprised planet.

Indeed, Sputnik must make us think. And we must think deeply, wisely and well about the meaning and consequences of this newcomer among the stars if we are to realise its far-reaching consequences for our human race.

Thus far, much of the thinking, especially as expressed by leading statesmen of the West, has been pathetically shallow, dangerously out-of-date, incredibly vulgar and narrow. The reactions of the MacMillans, Eisenhowers and Dulleses have revealed nothing but their own invincible ignorance and backwardness, their stubborn and inveterate anti-socialist prejudices, their meanness of spirit and their utter blindness to the grandeur and majesty of the future which is opening up before mankind.

When the heads of the British and American Governments, instead of hailing this new wonder of science and congratulating those responsible, bemoan their own failure to get in first, and make panicky efforts to pool their resources to catch up, they betray a petty national and political narrowness lamentably out of keeping with the wonder of this new portent that has appeared in our sky.

For, let it be said with all the gravity and emphasis at our command, Sputnik is far more than a victory for "Russian" science and Soviet technology. It is above all, and in the first place, a glorious achievement of mankind. Those daring spirits in the Soviet Union who have vied with the gods and placed a new star in the firmament have become great as giants reaching up into the skies because they stand upon the shoulders of all the heroes of science, famous and unknown, of all nations, who went before them. Ptolemy and Galileo and Copernicus, Democritus, Lao-Tze, Confucious, Darwin, Marx, Newton, Tsiolkovsky and Einstein, all these and countless others, wise men of Asia and Africa and Europe, have played their part in opening up man's road into space. And all those countless nameless millions who have toiled and suffered and sacrificed since the dawn of humanity to create the culture, the civilisation and the wealth which had to go before this momentous first step in the conquest of the universe.

To mature, thinking people Sputnik is not "someone else's" possession, to be regarded with fear, unconcealed envy, and snarling jealousy. It is a thrilling victory for us all. It must make us proud to be human. It must make us exclaim with Hamlet:

"What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason; how infinite in faculties, in form and moving; how express and admirable in action; how like an angel in apprehension; how like a god!"

SOME LESSONS

The advent of Sputnik has many lessons to teach us. Not all of them are new, but they have been brought home with such dramatic force and irresistible power that none but the blindest and most bigoted can long continue to ignore or deny them.

The other day from London it was reported that the British Prime Minister was still, incredibly, holding forth in public about the nuclear weapon remaining the "great deterrent" against alleged "Soviet aggression," and in defence of "the free world" — those stale empty slogans of the day before yesterday.

Now all this thinking belongs to the far-off period when, secure in the belief that "the West" (i.e. the United States) held the sole and exclusive patent of nuclear weapons, Sir Winston Churchill could announce from Fulton in America that the American monopolists could and should use that fancied monopoly to blackmail the whole world, especially the Soviet Union, and impose their capitalist way of life everywhere. It was imagined, and said, that the Soviet Union was too backward, scientifically and technically, ever to produce an atom bomb. And when, not long afterwards, the first Soviet nuclear explosions took place, two unfortunate, innocent American parents were barbarously done to death, human sacrifices to fortify the illusion that Soviet science could only produce an atom bomb because the "secret" had been stolen from America.

This line of thinking, which has continued to dominate the whole of imperialist foreign policy for more than a decade, had already been shaken to its foundations by one demonstration after another of Soviet scientific and technical advancement. It has now been utterly demolished. The first earth satellite, with its obvious proof of the Soviet announcement about the perfection of the inter-continental ballistic missile, has made such glaring nonsense of all the empty chatter about the "great deterrent" that one can only assume that Mr. MacMillan keeps repeating the words without thinking, like a parrot which has been taught to recite phrases without the slightest understanding of the words it is saying.

To understand this extraordinary behaviour it is necessary to go back a little in history.

Forty years ago, on November 7, 1917, when the booming guns of the battleship "Aurora" heralded the ending of capitalism in Russia and the birth of the Soviet Republic, the statesmen of the West looked upon this new, unnatural, thing with unbounded fear and horror. The workmen and "lower classes" taking power; the factories, land and mines being taken away from their lawful owners; the dark-skinned races being proclaimed as equals — these terrible things could not be! British, French, German, Japanese, American armies, that had been till then locked in mortal strife, joined forces to strangle the Russian revolution. When Lenin and his men held firm, and their own workers at home threatened rebellion, the imperialists had perforce to withdraw their armies; but they did not cease for a day, by slander, subversion, blockade, by every means they could lay their hands upon, fair or foul, to destroy the workers' state. Week by week, year after year, the prostitute writers and anti-Soviet experts proclaimed in the newspapers the imminent ruin, bankruptcy and downfall of the Soviets; Hitlerite Germany, the vilest regime that ever defiled the earth, was created and built up with the specific object of attacking the U.S.S.R.; and when that monster turned upon its Frankenstein creators and Russian blood flowed like water in defence of democracy and civilisation, these same gentry continued to intrigue and scheme for the "next" war — against the Soviets, after the Soviets had carried out the task of saving them.

It is because for forty years the imperialists have wished themselves into believing that the Soviet Union was weak, backward and on the verge of collapse; because with their arrogant class prejudice they are incapable of understanding or accepting that common working people are able to govern as well as or better than themselves; because, like children closing their eyes in fear, they have refused to acknowledge the fantastic industrial upsurge which in forty years (more than half of them absorbed in unwanted warfare) has transformed Europe's most backward country into her foremost — it is for these reasons that the imperialists have so stubbornly and intransigently refused to see and to understand that socialism exists as a world system, that it is making phenomenal progress, that it cannot be destroyed by blackmail, propaganda or force of arms.

We have to live in the same world with the Soviet Union, China and socialist East Europe.

We cannot defeat them in war. To attempt to do so would be the final lunacy.

We cannot intimidate them by a technical superiority which we do not possess, nor can we blackmail them by threats which we are not able to implement.

There is no alternative to peaceful co-existence.

These are the lessons which must be learnt, and quickly too, by our rulers. And those who are unable to read them, must make way for others who can. If the Soviet Union was able to sacrifice a man like Molotov, with all his past great services to the cause of peace and socialism, because his mind was not sufficiently flexible for the Sputnik era, then the U.S.A. must summon the elementary wisdom to drop its misguided missile Dulles who possesses the flexibility of a poker and is manifestly no more fit to guide the external policy of the world's foremost industrial nation today than he is to pilot a space-ship.

The marvels of ingenuity and construction with which the U.S.S.R. has astonished the world would have been unthinkable forty years ago. True, Russia has never lacked scientists of genius, but the vast engineering and technical resources essential to such mighty achievements simply did not exist in the ramshackle empire of the Tsars.

It is not simply the extent, but above all, the pace and drive of Soviet advancement which must cause all thinking men deeply to ponder. Before the first World War, American industrial output per head of population was fourteen times that of Russia. Since then, despite two world wars in which the U.S.A. prospered while Russia was devastated, the gap has fantastically narrowed. America retains her lead, but her output per head today is only two-and-a-half times that of the Soviet Union.

And, despite this remaining advantage, it is the Soviet and not the American Republic which has taken the lead in scientific-technical progress.

Why?

It may well be, as President Eisenhower has said, that the American scientists were concentrating too exclusively on the practical military

aspects of rocket development (though they do not seem to have been too successful in that direction either.) It may be true too that if the Americans had not been so obsessed with secrecy and security and had co-operated more with their British and other colleagues, they would have made greater progress.

But to get the real answer to our question we must probe deeper, and examine the fundamental differences between the respective approach to science in the two countries.

In the United States, science is largely at the service either of the military, or of vast (and often conflicting) private capitalist interests, who are solely concerned with the rapid commercial exploitation of the fruits of research. Big business wants to sell science; sometimes even, in the interests of an existing monopoly it wants to suppress new discoveries.

In the Soviet Union, science is organised and planned as a whole, and developed by all the vast resources of a State.

We should not be surprised that a civilisation which could find no better use for the marvel of television than to advertise a special brand of toothpaste, or of the miracle of nuclear fission than to destroy the innocent civilians of two Japanese cities, should fall behind in the race to put a girdle round the earth.

American capitalism has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. The precise path formulated by Marx and Lenin and followed by the Russian people may not be the one that all countries will choose to follow; indeed, we may be sure that every country will find its own road ahead according to its own peculiarities of historical circumstance and background. But of one thing we are convinced beyond reasonable doubt: man's road ahead lies in a socialist rather than in a capitalist direction.

OTHER LESSONS

There are many other weighty consequences of the new era which we lack the time and space to enlarge on here.

The new starlet in the heavens has a message of hope and promise to all who are oppressed, and heavy laden, to all who suffer hunger and fear.

The petty ideologies of racialism, the miserable greed and selfishness which makes millions labour in ignorance, poverty and dirt so that a few may bask in the sun of luxury, the narrow bigotry and superstition which seeks to close men's minds to new ideas — all these pale into insignificance beside the sublime horizons which are opening up to the human race. Science is opening the door to an abundance which will conquer poverty; it will emancipate mankind from the dungeon of ignorance and hatred.

To these and similar themes, including the meaning of the new era for those who struggle for freedom and justice in our own beloved and tortured South Africa, we hope to return in future issues of this magazine.

Problems of the MULTI-RACIAL CONFERENCE

by BRIAN BUNTING

THE decision of the Congresses to take part in the forthcoming multi-racial conference has naturally aroused a great deal of discussion in democratic circles in South Africa. There have been those who have welcomed the multi-racial conference as a beacon marking out the road to a united anti-Nationalist front in which all sections of progressive opinion could participate and which could generate the strength to bring the Government to its knees. On the other hand, there have been those who look upon the multi-racial conference with suspicion, fearing that it will prove merely a trap for the unwary, and the militancy of the masses will be drowned beneath the calm waters of liberal complacency.

Contradictory though it may seem, both views of the conference are correct. The conference possesses great possibilities, but also great dangers. To ensure that the democratic cause achieves the greatest possible impetus from the conference, it is essential that all Congressmen and progressives who take part in it should be absolutely clear about what they are doing, and about the tactics of the united front.

Let us first make it clear that in the struggle against the Nationalists a united front is absolutely necessary. For what is the purpose of the united front? It is the mobilisation of the masses of the people in active struggle against the apartheid tyranny. What do we mean by the masses of the people? We mean in the first place all the millions of Non-European oppressed who suffer under the lash of the colour bar, who are hounded by the pass laws, deprived of the right to live a normal life by section 10, the victims of the police terror, the disfranchised — in fact, the majority of the South African people. But side by side with them we must aim to mobilise also all other sections of the people, European and Non-European, who are prepared today, for a variety of reasons, to oppose particular aspects of Nationalist policy. Why do we emphasise the mobilisation of the masses of the people? Because it is only when the masses of the people are mobilised and organised that a weapon will be forged in South

Africa which is strong enough to defend the people against the attacks of the Government, to win for them the rights enshrined in the Freedom Charter.

The Europeans alone cannot put things right. Those Europeans who are opposed to the policies of the Nationalist Government, and who yet restrict their political activity to taking part in and preparing for elections, have become the prisoners of the Nationalists just as much as the Non-Europeans. The restriction of the franchise to "Europeans only" is the basic reason for the United Party's ideological capitulation to apartheid. Therefore the solution must be sought outside Parliament and outside the electoral system, because it is only through extra-Parliamentary struggle that the mass of the people can make their voices heard.

Spearheading the extra-Parliamentary struggle against the Nationalist Government and for equal rights for all is the Congress movement — the alliance of the national organisations of the African, Indian and Coloured people with European progressives and trade unionists who have identified themselves completely with the Congress movement. Those who decry the need for a united front should recognise that the Congress movement itself is a united front. It is also instructive to remember that this united front was born of the great Defiance Campaign, where it proved itself as the only effective vehicle by which the protest of all sections of the people against the unjust laws could be organised. No united front, no defiance campaign — and the defiance campaign was perhaps the greatest organised demonstration of the people against the tyranny of white supremacy that this country has ever seen. The unity built up in the defiance campaign was strengthened during the campaign for the Congress of the People in 1955, at which the Freedom Charter was adopted, and was sealed by the treason arrests of December 1956.

THE BEDROCK

The unshakeable unity of the Congress movement, all should realise, is the bedrock on which all effective opposition to the policies of the Government is based. It was the foundation of the bus boycott and one of the factors which guaranteed the victory of the thousands who marched 20 miles a day rather than pay the fares increase. It is the foundation of all organised political activity by other sections of the population as well. Had it not been for the defiance campaign and the coming into existence of the united front, the Liberal Party would never have been born. Had it not been for the unity of the accused in the treason trial, the massive national and international support for the Treason Trial Defence Fund would never have materialised — and it is essential to appreciate that the Fund has not won support on this scale merely because it is a worthy charity, but mainly because it has provided an opportunity for thousands of people to do something concrete to express their hatred of the Nationalist Government and their fellow-feeling for the accused and the cause they stand for. The courage and spirit of the treason accused has not only inspired the thousands of rank-and-file Congressites to reach new heights of militancy in political action (against passes for women, the Mamathola removal etc.), but has also been the underlying factor which induced the clergy to protest against the Church Clause, the nurses against apartheid, the press against the threat of censorship, and even the United Party to come forward with its new Senate plan, feeble though it is.

Maybe not all those who are emboldened to speak their minds against the Government are conscious of this, but it is a fact all the same. What would be the picture in the country if the Congress movement did not exist, if the people simply accepted their fate without protest, took out passes, moved at the crack of Verwoerd's whip, were subservient and demoralised and made no claim for equal citizenship rights? Who then would dare to criticise apartheid? It is precisely the resistance of the mass of the people which is the basis of almost all opposition to the Government.

The Congress movement is an alliance of all sections of the people in the liberatory movement. At the moment, for historical reasons, each national group is organised in its separate national organisation, but there can be no doubt that, with the passage of time and ever-closer co-operation in active political struggle, with the growth to political and organisational maturity of each group, the tendency will be for the barriers to break down and ultimately for full political and organisational cohesion to be brought about. Each group at the moment still fears to abandon the protection of its own organisation, and, in view of the special situation facing each group it would be wrong to do so.

Not only inside the organisations themselves, but also among the masses of the people who are not yet organised there are still feelings of racial exclusiveness and antagonism which hinder the fullest and freest co-operation, and which make impossible the creation of one, united, all-in-Congress body as is advocated in some quarters. To deny this is to fly in the face of the facts. The existence of Africanists inside the A.N.C., the recent tribal clashes in Johannesburg and elsewhere, the separation in the trade union movement — these and many other proofs of surviving disunity can be adduced.

But the time will undoubtedly come — the sooner with each joint campaign, with each shared disaster or united victory — when the fullest possible unity inside the Congress movement will become a reality.

But the Congress movement is not only in process of building unity between people of different races. It is also a uniting of people belonging to different political and class groups within each national group. Inside the premier national organisation, the African National Congress, for example, we find working together for the achievement of common aims the worker and the businessman, the lawyer and the intellectual, the communist and the nationalist. They do not see eye to eye on all issues, but they do agree to work together in defence of their rights as Africans, against the oppressive policies of the Nationalist Government, and for the achievement of the aims of the Freedom Charter. What unites them most strongly at the moment is their participation in the work of their national organisations as Africans.

But what gives the A.N.C. its distinctive and almost unique militancy in the present situation is its overwhelmingly working-class character, in the sense that the workers make up the bulk of its membership and are in a position to determine the nature of its policies to a far greater extent than was the case (and still is) with, say, Gandhi's Congress in India, or

the national liberatory movements in most other countries (Ghana, Egypt, Indonesia the Sudan etc.), where the rising national bourgeoisie were (and still are) the dominant factor.

The position is different with the Indian Congress in South Africa, for example, which has a larger middle-class element, and again with the Coloured Peoples' organisations, many of which are entirely dominated by intellectuals (though SACPO has made a conscious effort to base its activities on the organised strength of the working class). But it is the A.N.C. which, by virtue of its leadership and initiative and its greater membership, sets the tone and the pace for the whole Congress alliance, and it is the unique role of the A.N.C. to demonstrate that the national struggle in South Africa is inextricably bound up with the class struggle.

FIRST PRIORITY

The unity which has already been achieved within the Congress alliance, then, based on the Freedom Charter, must be seen as the first priority in all our political efforts in the immediate future. Why? Because it is this alliance, and only this alliance, which has shown itself capable of mobilising the widest section of the oppressed peoples in effective political action.

No single one of the organisations could have achieved so much by itself, nor even attempted it. For it is precisely the spectacle of the growing unity between the different national groups which has been the most inspiring feature of the political scene during the last few years.

It is necessary to emphasise the word "growing", for the whole Congress alliance is all the time in process of developing — the ties become stronger, the unity deeper, the separatist tendencies weaker with each campaign in which they participate together. But the unity is not complete and will not come to fruition by itself. It must all the time be fought for consciously and with determination. The need to deepen the unity between the Congresses must always be in the forefront of our political calculations.

In view of the fact that the Congress alliance exists, is growing stronger and has already achieved country-wide recognition as the leader of the mass opposition to the Government, what is the need, many people ask, to broaden the front? Why should we work with the liberals and the bishops? How can they help us? Will we not merely be forced to water down our policy and capitulate to their opportunism? Most of those who will be attending the multi-racial conference cannot be expected to agree with or accept the Freedom Charter as a basis for action. What, then, can be hoped for from this conference and from working with these people?

To answer these questions correctly, we must take another look at the general political situation in the country. The Nationalist Government is in power and, as far as can be judged, still firmly in the saddle. Many people are predicting that in the elections next year they will win with an even greater majority than ever before. But, win or lose, Nationalist Party or United Party, the plain fact is that the forces behind the maintenance of colour-bar policies in this country are still strong, while the forces be-

hind the Congress alliance are still comparatively weak. Great though are the achievements which stand to its credit, the Congress alliance is still not in a position to draw into political action the vast majority of the Non-European peoples, let alone the Europeans. The Freedom Charter lays down a very fine programme of principles to fight for, but the Congress organisations, while potentially capable of achieving them, have actually not quite measured up to them. There is a long way to go before we can say we are in sight of our goal.

Meanwhile the Government continues with its ruthless and inhuman attacks on the people. Daily people are suffering, homes are broken up, men and women endorsed out of town, beaten up by the police. New and more vicious legislation is promised for the next session of Parliament. With the growth of opposition against it, the Government is driven to adopt ever more drastic means of maintaining itself in power. As more and more people are drawn into the fight against it, the Government responds by widening still more the area of the conflict. Where, in 1950, it was the Communists and the Congress leaders who were their main target, today the ranks of the victims have been swollen to include members of the Liberal and Labour parties, non-conformists of all types, the Anglican clergy and many others.

NATIONALIST FAILURE

In fact, one of the most convincing portents of the coming Nationalist defeat is their complete failure either to isolate and destroy their enemies or to win friends and influence people outside the ranks of the "bitter-einders". It is stock Nazi technique to pick off your opponents one by one and, while the bystanders hold their breath and hope they won't be touched this time, wipe them out. Ever since they came to power the Nationalists have been trying to do the same thing, but all they have succeeded in doing has been promoting ever-deeper unity in the ranks of the opposition against them. Meanwhile their own failure to win adherents to their cause from the other sections of the population has been startling. Today it is the Nationalist Government and its apartheid policy which are execrated not only in this country but throughout the world.

At the same time, though there is widespread opposition to Nationalist policies amongst both Europeans and Non-Europeans in South Africa, the Nationalists remain in power for the sole reason that their opponents are disunited. Outside of the Congresses, there is no agreement as to what should be done and how it should be done. As between the bishops and the Liberals and the Labour Party and the Unity Movement and the various organisations and individuals who profess to abominate Nationalist policies (not to mention the United Party, which is almost unmentionable), there are few points of contact and almost no measure of understanding. That is precisely why the multi-racial conference is so important.

At the multi-racial conference there will be gathered together for the first time practically all shades of anti-Nationalist opinion — for though the formality has been gone through of inviting Nationalists to attend, it is doubtful if any will, apart from the Special Branch.

(Continued on page 17)

Beginning a New Series

SOUTH AFRICA AFTER THE NATIONALISTS

WITH this issue, *Liberation* launches a new series of discussion articles by writers of varying shades of democratic and progressive opinion.

The writers have been given an entirely free hand in dealing with the theme under discussion. But they have been requested in the course of their articles, to suggest answers to the following questions:

What political changes do you consider desirable in South Africa?

Do the social forces exist in our country to bring about such changes?

Is the accomplishment of a universal franchise feasible at the present time?

What immediate economic changes are likely to be found necessary?

Is racialism so deeply rooted that special measures would be needed to eliminate it? And, if so, what measures?

READERS are invited, in addition to the invited contributors, to submit their own views and comments on the subject, or on the contributions printed.

At the close of the series, the Editor will sum up the debate and put forward our own conclusions.

South Africa After

By PATRICK DUNCAN

Mr. Duncan is a leading member of the Liberal Party. Son of a former Governor-General, he was jailed as a volunteer in the Defiance Campaign.

What political changes do you consider desirable in S. Africa?

The elimination of all colour discrimination. A consequence of this is that all adults should have the vote.

Do the social forces exist in our country to accomplish such changes?

Emphatically. All the social forces in my view are working for an elimination of the colour bar, and for fair shares.

What basis for unity exists between the racial groups?

Firstly, the economic system, which brings all races together in partnership. It is today the best guarantee for the Africans that there will be no partition, no extrusion of Africans into Bantustan. Tomorrow it will be the best insurance for the White minority against their being pushed out of the country. Neither the Whites nor the Africans could make the economic system work alone. Secondly, the spirit of the times. This spirit, especially among young people, is in favour of greater friendship between peoples of differing origins. Thirdly the fact that all of us are South Africans, and that our country, which belongs to all of us, is big enough for all and to spare.

Is the accomplishment of universal franchise feasible at the present stage?

Most certainly. It works in places, such as the West Indies, where somewhat similar racial difficulties exist. Winston Churchill put it in a nutshell when he said: "Democracy is the worst form of government . . . with the exception of all the others." That seems to me correct. Human beings with power are not a pretty sight, anywhere in the world. But governments are necessary, and rather than look for utopia, let us settle for the least harmful.

It is sometimes said that a "primitive, uncivilised" person is irresponsible, and cannot be trusted with the vote in a modern society. I am afraid I do not know what the words "primitive" and "uncivilised" mean. They mean nothing to anthropologists. If they mean "brutal", then as I

The Nationalists

By WALTER SISULU

Mr. Sisulu was, until he was banned, Secretary-General of the African National Congress. A foundation member of the A.N.C. Youth League, he is at present among the Treason Trial accused.

South Africa urgently needs political changes of a far-reaching character. The strained relations between various racial groups; the sharp increase in crime and violence; the constant upheavals in every field, social, educational, political and economic — all these are the signs and proofs that things cannot continue as they are. The country's whole future happiness and prosperity depend upon a new deal being brought about.

The most important and essential change of all is that the present autocratic system of government should be replaced by a South African democracy. What I mean by this is that the people shall govern. All adult citizens, irrespective of race, colour, sex, income, property or educational level should have an equal share in government, exercised through their duly elected and accredited representatives meeting as a sovereign assembly of equals.

There can be no substitute for such a political arrangement, and nothing less will suffice if the aspirations of the oppressed majority of South Africans are to be realised, and our country to advance in peace, prosperity and harmony. Only thus will our people attain the goals they have expressed in the Freedom Charter; only thus can the rights of all national groups to equal opportunities, a fair share in the fruits of national wealth and labour, justice, language rights and national aspirations, be guaranteed.

Universal suffrage is not only the sole solution to the antagonisms, poverty and low cultural levels and other problems which face us today. It is also fully feasible and practical plan for South Africa. This is only doubted by people whose political perspective is bounded by the narrow confines of our present racially-confined electoral system.

It is, of course, inconceivable that either the Nationalists, or even the United Party if it wins the next general election (which we all hope it will do) would dream of "granting" a democratic franchise to the Non-Europeans. But if the right to vote were only to be conceived as a gift from a ruling aristocracy, there would not be a nation in the world enjoying democratic government today. There are some people whose political thinking has entered a dead end. They cannot imagine Parliament, as at present

SOUTH AFRICA AFTER

DUNCAN (continued)

look round the world I see that the worst brutality has happened among the most educated peoples. Just think of Himmler. If they mean "emotionally immature", then I would say that in South Africa some of the soundest people emotionally are those furthest from the cities and industries. Of course we have people who cannot read, and people who have no idea of the time. They are unfitted to play a part in a modern industrial system. But they are none the less people in the fullest sense of the term, better in some things, and worse in others, than their brothers in industry, but no less responsible, no less valuable. In my view they would use the vote in South Africa just as well as any other South Africans.

What immediate economic changes are likely to be found necessary?

The good things of life will have to be shared much more fairly. This will be more difficult, and slower, than the political changes mentioned above. The standard of living of a people depends on one thing only — the habits of that people. It is easy, and glib, to think that if the poor rob the rich they will be rich too. It is also superficial to think that industrialisation, by itself, will enrich the common people. Many peasants, such as the Danish, are more prosperous than most industrial wage earners in every country outside the United States.

For a population to be prosperous it is necessary that the people have most of the following habits. They must enjoy work, be interested in science, be thrifty and punctual, and be reliable. They must be intelligently able to cope with machines. They must favour mechanisation, and be reasonably obedient to those in control of industry. Those in control of industry must have available capital to constantly modernise that industry. There must be a thriving scientific education. There must be political security.

These habits are not to be switched on overnight. But they are the precondition of wealth. They were found in Europe a hundred years ago, and are still found there. They are found in the USSR today. They are found in the highest degree in the United States, and it is there that the common people enjoy the highest standard of living that human history has seen.

They are not to be switched on, but they can be nurtured, and the nurturing of them is, in my view, the highest duty ahead of our future non-racial government.

What should the relations be between the ownership of industry and the common people? Here is perhaps the thorniest problem for the future. We already have a rapidly developing industrial machine, that has given Union Africans the highest standard of living of Africans anywhere on the continent. At the same time, compared with the Whites who own the system today, they are politically weak, and therefore shockingly underpaid. Assuming that Africans achieve political power, which is inevitable and will happen soon, how is the problem of this poverty to be dealt with? What are to be their relations with the controllers of industry?

Nationalisation is an easy word to say. But nationalisation has helped the British working folk not one whit. Under nationalisation Russian industry has not expanded at the pace at which Japanese industry expanded under a private enterprise system. The British railways are far worse

THE NATIONALISTS

SISULU (continued)

elected, conceding democracy; nor can they imagine any other way in which democracy can be attained. Hence they resign themselves to hopelessness. They have forgotten the lesson of history: that behind every vote lies some past bitter struggle against jealous privilege. Nor can they understand the plain facts of the past ten years in which hundreds of millions of African and Asian peoples have wrested from their former European overlords the right to govern themselves.

All the social forces exist in our country which can bring about the changes we need so badly. They exist in the millions of working people of town and country, black and white, together with the middle and professional classes, who are finding the present despotic government increasingly savage, intolerable, ruinous and intellectually contemptible, and are finding the organisation, the determination and the courage to compel changes. Today the Non-European majority of our people, though voteless, have become a mighty and formidable force, which is making itself felt in many ways. There is also a powerfully growing section of Europeans, among the workers and in Church, commercial, industrial and professional sections, which is not only vigorously resisting the racial follies of the Nationalists, but is also increasingly tending to make a common cause with the Non-Europeans.

This trend towards a multi-racial democratic political front is based upon a common love for our country, which belongs to us all. In the growth of this front lies the best guarantee for a speedy and peaceful transition to democracy. It is also the best guarantee for racial harmony in the free South Africa of the future.

Because of their privileges, and the inferior status of the Non-Europeans politically and economically, Europeans tend to look down upon the other races of our country with arrogance and contempt, as a master upon slaves. These attitudes of arrogance and contempt cause resentment and indignation among the Non-Europeans. The Europeans on their part, as a minority, are afraid of Non-European advancement. They fear that White domination will be replaced by Black domination, and that we will serve them as they have served us.

These racial attitudes of contempt, resentment and fear are rooted not so much in "the consciousness of the people" as in the present social, political and economic conditions in South Africa. By changing those conditions we shall eliminate the causes of racialism, and our people of various national origin will learn to look upon one another not as enemies and rivals, but as partners and allies in the glorious enterprise of building a nobler and a happier South Africa.

No doubt, in a country with a background such as ours, we shall require some laws to prohibit racial discrimination and incitement, to protect

SOUTH AFRICA AFTER

DUNCAN (continued)

now they are nationalised than they were in the old private-enterprise days. The South African nationalised telephones are a disgrace: the Bell Telephone System of North America is a marvel. No, I do not think that nationalisation will help our industry to produce more, and more production is what we need. What is needed is, in my view (a) a wholesale raising of wages by wage determinations, and (b) much heavier taxation on profits, to finance welfare and education schemes. Subject to these burdens, I would like to see industry free to develop in a manner not controlled by civil servants or doctrinaires.

The human race is growing in power faster today than ever before. Daily new techniques are invented. Do not let us tie ourselves down to outmoded theories, many of them dating back one and two hundred years. Let us be imaginative, and determine to free the man with vision and enterprise from all unnecessary shackles.

Is racialism so deeply rooted in the consciousness of the people that special measures would be required to eliminate it — if so what measures would you suggest?

Beyond encouragement in school I do not think that any such measures would be necessary. In the United States the Fair Employment and School Integration programmes are necessary because there it is the politically dominant Whites who suffer from racialism. They have to be curbed. But here, when the colour-bar goes, the political power of the Africans and other races will be such that the Whites will not even consider the possibility of race discrimination. Those that have the disease so deeply ingrained in them will leave, but they will not try to practise colour discrimination in South Africa.

SPEEDING LIBERATION

Readers have commented favourably on the larger LIBERATION — in fact, they tell us that there can never be too much LIBERATION for them.

We feel much the same way, except that our continual financial struggle imposes strict limits on the extent to which we can expand.

However, every reader and supporter of our journal can help bring out LIBERATION so that it appears with unfailing regularity, and with the extra pages which make it possible for us to have additional articles.

Yes — a lot of it is up to you. LIBERATION is a journal drawing its life-blood from its readers. We depend on you both for donations (however small), contributions, and comments, and to help build our circulation and influence by introducing LIBERATION to your friends.

THE NATIONALISTS

SISULU (continued)

minority and language rights, and education in common citizenship. But the fundamental measure to eliminate racialism is the replacement of the present distorted racial social structure with a new one founded upon justice, equality and respect for the dignity of man.

Democrats of various shades of opinion may differ as to the economic structure that will take shape in a free South Africa. Some are socialists, other are not.

But we should all be able to agree on certain essential questions.

The oligarchic and racial structure of South Africa, its poverty and oppression, are closely related to the monopoly control of certain key industries, their exploitation of cheap chattel labour, and to the landlessness resulting from the forced expropriation of the Africans.

Our greatest industry, mining, has under private monopoly control developed a vested interest in poverty and oppression. This great natural resource of our South African nation must come under public control if it is not to be a standing menace to all free institutions, and if its fruits are to be made available to all who have toiled and suffered to develop them.

The soil of South Africa must be restored to the people if emancipation is to have any real meaning to the masses. Equitable redistribution, involving giving land to the millions of landless peasants, must form part of any realistic programme of fundamental reform.

It goes without saying that all racial barriers to technical, commercial, industrial and other economic advancement would have to be removed. This is necessary not only in the interests of justice and equity, but also in order to raise the productivity and efficiency of our manpower.

Beyond sketching the broad main outlines, it would be fruitless to draw up a detailed blueprint for the free South Africa of tomorrow. Much will depend upon the course of the struggle between the forces seeking liberty and those which seek to oppress us and drive us back to slavery. We shall become wiser and draw closer to one another during that struggle. In the end, the people will decide.

For the present, we have an overriding common task: to remove the reactionary, fascist Government that bars the road to all progress.

MULTI-RACIAL CONFERENCE: Continuing Brian Buting's article from page 10.

Congressmen will be able to mix with men and women belonging to other groups, many of whom have in the past been their political opponents, but all of whom are now brought together because they face a common danger.

"But", it is objected by some, "the Congresses share a common programme, the Freedom Charter. Those who will be attending the multi-racial conference with them do not accept the Charter, cannot be expected to accept the Charter as the basis for unity. Many of them have not even abandoned the last traces of white chauvinism, and speak of giving us rights 'when the time is ripe'. Many of them are our class enemies, whose

real motive is to perpetuate the power of the ruling class by buying us off with a few concessions. We should go to the conference only if others accept our programme, otherwise we will have betrayed our cause."

Others ask: "How can you expect the lion to lie down with the lamb? The Liberal Party is merely the new face which is being presented to the people by the more enlightened wing of the industrial and finance capitalists. If we co-operate with them, do we not merely help to strengthen our enemies, lend them our mass backing to strengthen the institutions of the ruling class? Should we not rather concentrate our attention on destroying the whole capitalist system which is the root of all the evils from which we suffer? At what point can it be said that our interests coincide with theirs?"

There are several points to be made here. First of all, there is no ideological unity in the Liberal Party, there are only Liberals and Liberals. One wing of the Liberal Party can almost be described as reactionary; but another wing is moving ever-closer to the Congress point of view, and already works closely with the Congresses in some centres.

Secondly, may not co-operation with others also help to strengthen us? Given a correct approach, there is no reason to fear that we must necessarily get the worst of the bargain. Thirdly, it is not true to say that we and they have no interests in common. Granted, the time may come in future when our policies and interests may conflict with theirs; and of course our long-term perspective is quite different from theirs. But meanwhile, now, if the industrialists and finance capitalists are against the pass laws, should we not welcome their co-operation in a campaign to abolish them?

It may be true that their motives in wanting the pass laws to go are different from ours, but let us ask: would we rather have them with us or against us on this issue? If there is division in the ranks of the ruling class over things like these, why should we not take advantage of such divisions? Is it good tactics to help unite the ruling class, and bring about a united front against us?

SECTARIANISM

To adopt such an attitude is to misread the possibilities of the present situation in South Africa, and to betray sectarianism of the worst order at a time when the needs of the struggle demand the creation of the broadest unity amongst anti-Nationalists. Granted many people cannot accept the Freedom Charter. We don't ask them to. Did Stalin insist that Churchill and Roosevelt accept Communism before he accepted their help during the last war? Did he refuse their co-operation because he was afraid of what they would do to him after the war? Of course not. The first principle of the unity of the Allies in the war was united struggle against the monster of Hitler Germany, which threatened equally capitalist Britain and America and Communist Russia, and indeed the whole world. In the same way, the first principle which should be put forward and accepted at the multi-racial conference is condemnation of the apartheid policy of the present Government, and the need to forge some sort of unity in action against it. Not all who are present at the conference may even accept this, but it is likely the majority will.

However, it would be unwise to hope for too much. The conference is a first attempt. Many of the participants will be meeting one another, hearing one another's point of view for the first time. It is even a triumph in itself that, in the year of the law designed to end all contact between Black and White except on the basis of master and servant, such a conference is being held at all. We shouldn't risk ruining the conference by demanding a fully-fledged united front at the end of it. Many more meetings and many more shared political experiences will be required before that becomes a possibility.

Yet great opportunities will still exist and must be fought for at the conference. During the last year we have already seen both Congressmen and others shedding their prejudices to work together for a common objective. Congressmen, Liberals, Labourites, Black Sash and others have taken part in joint demonstrations against the Group Areas Act in Johannesburg. Congressmen (including COD, against whom many liberals seem to have a particularly violent and unreasonable prejudice), Liberals and others have appeared on united platforms in many centres in Natal in protest against the Group Areas Act and the pass laws. The CATAPAW demonstration against passes for women in Cape Town also succeeded in bringing together for the first time a wide range of opinion, from the A.N.C. to the Mothers' Union. Did the Congresses suffer by securing the co-operation of others in these protests? They didn't ask us to give up the Freedom Charter. We didn't ask them to give up their principles. Yet both sides found they could work together and thereby mobilise wider mass support for the struggle against Nationalist policies.

The great possibilities opened up by this sort of co-operation must be placed before the conference. Others may dither and philosophise, but Congress should indicate, at least, that it hopes to see some sort of action flow from the multi-racial conference. It is time to talk, yes, because we must understand one another; but it is also a time to act, before we are all destroyed by the common enemy.

Mao Tse-Tung once remarked that "the tactic of the united front and the tactic of closed door sectarianism are tactics diametrically opposed to one another.

"The one is to accumulate large forces so as to surround our enemies and annihilate them. The other is to rely on a single horseman to wage a desperate fight with a formidable enemy."

The purpose of a united front, he said, is to mobilise millions and millions of people and all potential friendly forces to advance and attack the centre-most objective. Failure to build a united front, insistence on keeping our principles pure and not defiling them by contact with others, means that we shall set up diverse objectives and consequently our bullets would hit the lesser enemies or even our allies rather than the principal enemy. This means that we shall be unable to pick out the right enemy and shall waste our ammunition. In this manner we shall be unable to drive the enemy into a narrow isolated position. In this manner we shall be unable to draw over from the enemy's camp and his front all those who have joined them under compulsion, those who were our enemies yesterday but may become our friends today. In this way we shall be actually helping the enemy, retarding and isolating our own movement, causing it to dwindle and decline, and even to take the road to defeat.

THE STRAIGHT AND NARROW

The other would say: all such arguments are erroneous. Our forces must be pure and absolutely pure and our road must be straight and absolutely straight. Only what is recorded in the "Bible" is correct. The national bourgeoisie is destined to be entirely and eternally counter-revolutionary. Not a single inch must be yielded to the rich peasants. As regards the yellow trade unions, we should fight them tooth and nail. Has there ever been a cat that does not love meat or a war-lord who is not counter-revolutionary? The intellectuals can remain revolutionary only for a day or two, and it is dangerous to recruit them. Hence the conclusion: closed-door sectarianism is the only magic wand, and the united front is the tactic of opportunism."

Mao concluded by re-emphasising his preference for the tactic of the united front. "Three-year-old tots may have many correct ideas", he said, "but cannot be entrusted with serious affairs of state and the world, because they do not yet understand them . . . Those who insist upon the tactic of closed-door sectarianism are merely spreading a series of such infantile disorders"

In conclusion, it should be emphasised that all political movements, while in the course of their development, are in the process of changing. As they grow stronger, their character alters, their power of attraction increases, their responsibilities become more heavy. Only those do not change who are isolated from the main stream of political development, like the Trotskyites and our own Unity Movement, who are being left behind by history. As we enter the doors of the multi-racial conference, let us be prepared to discuss with those who think differently from us, let us try to win them to our point of view, let us by all means canvass the virtues of the Freedom Charter and never betray a single clause of it; but let us not be rigid and unbending, or unwilling to meet others half-way if by doing so we can advance our cause. Without losing sight of our goal, let us realise it may not be possible to reach it at the first attempt. Let us be determined to register some progress, rather than retire empty-handed and frustrated. Let us, above all, recognise that if we are true to our principles, we cannot fail to make an impact on those who meet with us. Out of the war-time co-operation of the great powers emerged the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter and the Charter of Human Rights, which are the foundations of our own Freedom Charter, and the goal of millions of people throughout the world fighting for their freedom. We too live in a period of history in which the minds of men are open to new influences on a scale that was never before possible.

Already new political currents are flowing in South Africa whose direction and ultimate destination we can only guess at. Within the last year great cracks have appeared in the Nationalist facade, while strong new bonds of friendship have grown up between some sections of the opposition. By taking part in the multi-racial conference with goodwill and good faith, we can help to usher in a new era in South African politics, break down the barriers which divide our peoples, win new recruits to our own army, and bring closer the reality which is embodied in the slogan "Freedom in our lifetime."

ANOTHER PROFESSION UNDER FIRE FROM THE GOVERNMENT

NURSES FACE APARTHEID

by "SISTER X"

The last session of Parliament brought many new vicious and discriminatory laws. And among them — the Nursing Act, 1957. With this piece of legislation the Nationalists have launched their attack on the professions.

It is disgusting that a humanitarian profession such as nursing has become the target of their political attack. A nurse's work is arduous; her hours are long — sometimes 24 hours a day — but she must remain at her post, ministering to the sick, comforting the dying, assisting in the birth of humanity.

All the nurses of South Africa, black and white, have belonged to one association, and since 1944 have met together to discuss their mutual problems and to further their knowledge and skill through lectures and discussions.

Nursing is one of the few professions open to young African women. With much sacrifice and effort some have entered the medical and teaching professions. But because nursing does not require the financial burden of university fees, and because the learner nurse earns while learning, it has been possible for many young African women to become nurses.

In 1942 the nurses moved to form a trade union, because student nurses had no organisation, being excluded from membership of the S.A. Trained Nurses Association.

To dispel what they considered to be the "threat" of Trade Unionism among the nurses, a nation-wide campaign organised by leading nurses took place, which resulted in the 1944 Nursing Act.

This Act made provision for (1) A Nursing Council which was empowered to keep a register of all nurses and midwives, both trained and in training, to set the syllabus for the exams, to issue certificates, approve

of training schools prescribe uniforms and insignia, and exercise disciplinary measures over nurses and midwives to a limited extent. (2) A Nursing Association, membership of which was compulsory, and whose objects were to raise the status, maintain the integrity and promote the interests of the Nursing Profession.

This Nursing Act of 1944 had no discriminatory clauses, for:

- * there was one register for all nurses, irrespective of race;
- * all nurses had the right to vote for or be elected to the Nursing Council or Association Board or Branch Committees;
- * the syllabus, examinations, uniforms and insignia were the same for all nurses regardless of race.

Despite this, there was, needless to say, a certain amount of racial discrimination, in tune with the rest of racial discrimination in South Africa. For example, (1) all Non-European nurses are paid only three-fifths of the salary of White nurses; (2) For Europeans there is one holiday homestead and there are four homes for aged and incapacitated nurses (run by the Nurses Trust Fund), while there are no homes for Non-European nurses, although all nurses, irrespective of race, support the Nurses Trust Fund which is controlled by the Nursing Association; (3) Assistance given to Non-European nurses is lower than that given to Europeans, as for example in the case of a Non-European sister who was unable to work for a year because of T.B., and who was assisted by the Association to the extent of £4 a month — obviously inadequate; (4) Europeans have more access to and better training facilities for post-graduate courses than their Non-European colleagues.

In 1948 the S.A. Nursing Council requested an amendment to the 1944 Act, and the Minister took the opportunity of adding his own amendment, which was welcomed by the Council: —“that membership of the Nursing Council and the Board of the S.A. Nursing Association be restricted to persons of European descent.”

A badly-conducted so-called referendum took place in which only 28% of the nurses voted, with a 15% majority in favour of apartheid. Nurses of all races in both the Witwatersrand and the Cape strongly opposed this move, and in April 1957 when the second draft Bill was introduced by the Minister, resolutions of protest were passed by many branches of the S.A. Nursing Association, including Durban, Witwatersrand, Cape Western, East London and Port Elizabeth. These branch meetings, except for the Wits branch, were attended by a predominantly white membership.

During this period, the nurses were becoming increasingly aware of what the Nationalists intended to do, and a multi-racial vigilance committee was established in Cape Town. Shortly after this an action committee of all races was elected on the Witwatersrand. Four demonstrations of protest took place — in Durban, Cape Town, and two in Johannesburg, and these demonstrations were held despite specific instructions that provincial employees were debarred from taking part in such demonstrations. The nurses were NOT to be intimidated. They were well aware of the implica-

tions of the new Act, and they were alive to the link-up with the insulting Bantu Education Act.

The Nursing Act of 1957 introduces racial discrimination into the profession. It provides that:—

(1) No Non-White person may vote for or be elected to the Nursing Council or Board of the Association.

(2) Separate branches of the Association must be established for the different racial groups, i.e., for Europeans, Africans, Coloureds and Indians.

(3) Membership to the Association is compulsory.

(4) The decision of the European branch shall be the decision of the Association.

(5) The Council may prescribe different syllabus, uniforms and insignia in respect of white or coloured persons or Africans.

(6) The Council shall keep a separate register for white, coloured and African nurses.

(7) That race particulars are to be sent to the Council within a year of notification from the Council. Failing this, the nurse's name will be removed from the register, thus making it illegal for her to practise.

(8) An Advisory Board shall be established for Africans and Coloureds.

(9) It is a criminal offence with a maximum fine of £200 for a Non-White nurse to be employed in a supervisory position over a white nurse.

(10) The Council is empowered, under the heading of discipline, to inquire into any complaint or allegation against a nurse "whether or not in regard to such a person's profession or calling." Not only will unethical behaviour be punishable now, but the nurse's private life will be open to interference by the Council, particularly if her political views don't happen to coincide with theirs.

Thus we see how the new Act humiliates the Non-European nurses and robs them of every right that they have hitherto enjoyed, ably assisted by the Nursing Council which was established (inter alia) to maintain nursing standards, and the Nurses' Association, which was formed to serve the nurse's interests.

The Industrial Conciliation Act, which divides Trade Unions on racial grounds, provides for autonomy within the Non-European Trade Unions, but the Nursing Act has gone even further and given the Non-European nurses no voice whatsoever in their affairs.

The nurses' reply to this Act has been — we don't want apartheid! Throughout the Union the Non-European nurses have refused to form their apartheid branches. They no longer attend the Branch meetings together with the Europeans because the Association has stopped this, despite the

fact that it is no offense under the Act for nurses of all races to attend a meeting together.

The nurses are on the march. A national conference of nurses has been called by a Non-European nurses committee, to be held in Johannesburg on the 2nd and 3rd of November, to discuss the implications of this Act. (In the meanwhile, every effort is being made on the part of the enlightened European and Non-European nurses to maintain contact.)

An important item on the agenda of this conference is the possibility of the formation of a non-discriminatory nurses organisation, which will seek direct affiliation to the International Council of Nurses. The Nursing Association fears a complete separation such as this, for it will lose its affiliation to the I.C.N., which requires affiliated bodies to be governed by their own members. Already requests have been made by overseas nursing organisations from countries such as Holland and Jamaica that South Africa be disaffiliated when the Act was passed.

To maintain racial contact prior to the formation of a democratic association a Rand Nurses Professional Club has been established by Witwatersrand nurses, where nurses will meet together to maintain the status of nursing in South Africa; to hold regular professional meetings and keep its members informed of recent developments in the theory and practice of nursing; and to further the interests of nurses, and fight for the improvement of nursing in South Africa.

The nurses are determined to see that nursing — and as a result, medical services for Non-Europeans in South Africa — do not deteriorate because of the Act. To introduce an inferior training for Non-White nurses, for instance, would now be quite simple, and in line with Nationalist policy and Bantu Education. The result would be disastrous, not simply for the Non-White nursing services. The nursing and medical professions are ones in which the basic wrongness and stupidity of apartheid are most apparent. A broken leg, T.B., measles or cancer are the same for any race, in any language! The medical treatment and the nursing that a sick person gets must always be based on the highest possible standards according to the latest knowledge. Any deviation from this will drag down all medical and nursing services, for all races. There cannot be two standards, either in theory or in practice.

The conference that the nurses are to hold must show the government and all the world that the nurses of South Africa are prepared to safeguard their own rights and the good of their profession.

Once more, through their reactionary legislation, the Nationalists have aroused the anger and hate of yet another section of the people. The nurses were for long a group without any political direction. Now they too are taking their place in the struggle to achieve a democratic South Africa.

SUBSCRIBE TO "LIBERATION"

"LIBERATION" is published ten times a year. Send ten shillings for one year, or five shillings for six months to:

"LIBERATION",
P.O. Box 10120,
JOHANNESBURG

Fill in this form:

Name

Address

.....

To LIBERATION: Please send me "LIBERATION" for one year/six months, I enclose 10 shillings/five shillings (cross out that which does not apply).

CONTENTS

	Page
Editorial: A New Era	1
Multi-Racial Conference, by Brian Bunting	6
After the Nationalists	11
Nurses Face Apartheid, by "Sister X"	21