



LIBERATION

ONE SHILLING

MARCH, 1958

**CONGRESS — the Struggle
for Unity**



WILL THERE BE WAR ?

by D. N. Pritt, Q.C.



A JOURNAL OF DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION

Liberation

No. 30. March, 1958.

ONE SHILLING.

IN THIS ISSUE:

- Editorial: THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE 1
- BANTU AREAS, by Duma Nokwe 9
- WILL THERE BE WAR? by D. N. Pritt, Q.C. 15
- EVERY WHITE MAN A GENTLEMAN, by Eli Weinberg 19
- A NEW MENACE IN AFRICA, by Nelson Mandela 22

Editorial

THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE

A SOUTH African General Election is a remarkable phenomenon. In one sense, it is a formal acknowledgment of the democratic principle. All the trappings are there: candidates address the electorate about their respective policies; there is a secret, direct ballot; the people's representatives, duly elected, proceed to Parliament and legislate. And all of this is a tribute to the great idea that has swept through and conquered most of the world since the French and American revolutions: the idea of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity; the idea that government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall not perish from the earth; the idea that the People Shall Govern.

Yet it is all a bitter mockery — dust and ashes in the mouths of the millions of voteless dispossessed who are supposed to stand and look on in respectful silence while they, the White Masters, debate and decide how we are to be governed; with exactly what degree of severity, or hypocrisy, the White aristocracy is to be maintained in its privileges and monopolies; in what proportions the loot derived from our exploitation is to be divided among the slave-drivers who have taken our farmland, those who have seized our mines, and those who own the industries built up by our labour. Those are the issues being discussed in this election. Not a word about the great matters which engage serious people everywhere in this Sputnik Age, when the very survival of humankind hangs upon the averting of war. Not a word about the gaunt starvation that stares into the tiny, crowded location homes or the huts of most South Africans; of the bestial savagery which Verwoerd's Chiefs and Swart's police have unleashed in Zeerust; of the cynical theft which is Group Areas; of that ruthless and inhuman persecution which is the Pass Laws — the Terror that walks by Night.

At the slightest suggestion that the African National Congress — whose members cannot vote or stand as candidates — should find other means to obtrude its views, aspirations and policy into the election, the leading Parties react with equal horror and disgust. The very idea! What has this election got to do with them? The Nationalist Party newspapers become near-hysterical and accuse the United Party of being responsible. Sir de Villiers Graaff denounces the A.N.C. and calls upon the Government to take serious measures to stop it.

On the one hand: lip-service to Democracy, observance of its outward forms; on the other hand: the reality of a harsh autocracy, claiming all-but divine right, regarding any challenge from the people as blasphemous and treasonable. Here is the essence of the contradiction, the deep unreason and illogic upon which our country's institutions are founded, which makes them essentially unstable, indefensible, incapable of survival.

WE SHALL NOT BE SILENCED!

By the time this article appears in print, the great National Workers' Conference which the Congress movement has been building and preparing for over many months will have met in Johannesburg, the delegates

back in their home centres and places of work, actively implementing the Conference decisions. We do not, of course, know what steps will be decided upon there to implement the will of the people.

But one thing is already quite clear — it has emerged unmistakably from the February Regional conferences — and that is what the will of the people is. The people want an end to pass laws and apartheid. They want higher wages and a national minimum wage of £1 a day, guaranteed by law. They want a say in the affairs of their country.

What remains is to see that these profound needs and aspirations of the great majority of our people do not remain unvoiced and unheard at this crucial time, of all times, when our rulers are going through this solemn farce (to the true democrat, an act of blasphemy) of pretending to ascertain that sacred thing, the People's Will, of passing off the result to South Africa and the whole world as the genuine article.

By mass action in support of their most urgent demands at this precise time, the voteless majority will be doing two things.

They will be staking their claim for higher wages and the ending of pass-terror and apartheid in the post election period: irrespective of whether the packed electorate returns the Nationalist or the United Party.

And they will be showing the world, in the clearest and most emphatic manner what the will of the South African people really is.

As against these vital considerations there are some who counsel inaction at the present time, because a mass demonstration of the voteless people now might embarrass the United Party in the eyes of the electorate and panic the voters into the arms of the extreme party — the Nationalists. It might be well argued, against this, that if nothing else will show the voters the folly of continuing with the Swart-Verwoerd line of merciless repression, such a demonstration will; that it will bring home to them, in the only possible way, the extreme danger to South Africa of permitting the Nationalists a further term of office.

But, in the last analysis, both arguments — based, as they must be, on mere speculation — are irrelevant to the deeper issues which are involved. The real opposition to the Nationalists in this country is not and never has been the United Party. Had it depended upon the resistance of the cowardly leaders of the U.P., the country would long have been transformed into a jackboot republic, modelled upon the Reich of the German National Socialist Party, which the present leaders of the Nationalist Party used to admire so greatly and so openly — when they thought Hitler was going to win the war. And if this has not yet happened, though we have gone so far along that road, if it is still possible, though difficult, for the voice of opposition to make itself heard in South Africa (including the voice of the U.P.), then it is no thanks to the men who stood up in the House and the Senate and voted with the Nats for the Public Safety Act and the Criminal Laws Amendment Act. It is thanks to the thousands of heroic men and women, named and nameless, who in the Congress movement have faced prison, banning, deportation, unemployment, physical violence and even death itself, rather than submit to tyranny.

It is this Opposition which is the sole shield of the people and their hope of freedom. And its activity must not be relaxed, but intensified precisely

because it is election time; the time of the highest political consciousness and activity in the country for all sections of the people; the time of the greatest danger of Fascist reaction (as anyone who saw and heard the hysterical crowds at Strijdom's Johannesburg meeting would testify); also the time of the greatest opportunity for democratic advance.

Already, as we write, the mere preparations for the National Workers' Conference are compelling the leaders of the political parties to pay heed to the voice of the people; to speak about their demand for a £1-a-day minimum and other needs. The high and mighty Prime Minister stoops to utter crude threats, warning the people of punishment by "the full might and authority of the State" if they go on pressing this very moderate, even beggarly demand. The masses will not be frightened by such contemptible talk, or intimidated from taking lawful action within their rights. They will make their voice heard in this election time — they know, with the sound instinct of the common people, that their future depends upon it.

But effective action, in these testing conditions, depends in no small degree upon the preparedness and the will of the people's organisations to give sound and united leadership. While Graaff and Strijdom — safe in the knowledge that there is no Congress representative present to answer them — lash the African National Congress verbally in their political meetings, they are paying unwilling and unconscious tribute to the fact that the A.N.C. is the acknowledged leader of the majority of the people of the country. And the people themselves are looking eagerly and with confidence for Congress to reply.

Congress is not replying as vigorously and as loudly as it could. The reason must be sought in the difficulties that have arisen within the organisation, and we make no apologies for returning to this urgent theme in this issue of "Liberation."

THE A.N.C. CRISIS AGAIN

It is tragic that in these circumstances in the two biggest provincial organisations of the African National Congress — the Cape and the Transvaal — disunity and confusion still prevail.

What are the sources of this disunity? And what should be done to put matters right? We cannot answer the second question until we understand the answer to the first.

And here we must distinguish very clearly between two distinct types of disagreement that have arisen:

1. There are frictions and disputes between groups of honest and loyal Congressmen, all of whom support the present policy and National leadership of Congress;
2. There is a definite organised faction which calls itself "Africanist", and which seeks to oust the present National leadership and policy in favour of one of crude racialism.

Let us, first, deal with the second type of disagreement. There is room, as we have said before in this magazine, for people of different viewpoints under the broad roof of the African National Congress. We cannot and should not expect all members of a broad emancipatory organisation to

share identical views on every subject. But we can and must expect every member of Congress to give loyal support to the elected leadership; to support Congress policy as laid down in the Constitution and as decided from time to time by National Conferences; to refrain from activities harmful to Congress. What then shall we do with an organised conspiracy which disregards all these conditions of membership?

That there is such a conspiracy, we can no longer be in any doubt. At the special conference held recently in Cape Town a private letter was read out which created a great sensation. It was from the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Tshunungwa, to one of his supporters in Congress. And the letter made it quite clear that he, Tshunungwa, was using his official position as Secretary, in an attempt to fight Congressmen who oppose his "Africanist" faction. He is not interested in building Congress, but in building up his anti-Congress group. And this is not just a little clique in the Cape, it is nation-wide conspiracy attempting to seize Congress and change its policy.

This now notorious letter informs his friend, Mr. Mbengo, that — having successfully intrigued his way to the Provincial secretaryship — he, Tshunungwa, was "appointing" Mr. Mbengo and six others as a Provincial working Committee. (Since when, may we ask, do the rules permit a secretary to "appoint", without the approval of the Executive, a Working Committee?) Even more interesting are Mr. Tshunungwa's "reasons" for this strange step — and strange it is indeed, for he is intending to shift the Working Committee from Port Elizabeth, which is the storm-centre of the Cape and a Congress stronghold, to the relatively quiet backwater of Queenstown. And why? Not because he thinks it is a more appropriate place, in Congress interests, but because he does not like the people in Port Elizabeth, he thinks they are "leftist" and "mad". "I have now written to that mad Working Committee in Port Elizabeth demanding all the Provincial matters . . . I have silenced them for good now".

In the course of this silly letter — all puffed up with egotistical self-conceit — Mr. Tshunungwa claims the "approval" of some of the senior Cape Congressmen for some of his antics. We shall spare them the embarrassment of quoting their names here, for we are sure they did not know what he was up to, and that — now the cat is out of the bag — they will lose no time in repudiating him.

What is truly disturbing is not just the exposure of this shabby intrigue, or even the appearance of black-shirted "Africanist" thugs at the Cape Town conference. It is the plain evidence that what we have here is a Union-wide conspiracy — concentrated on just these two centres whose correct leadership in recent years has made them the pride of the whole progressive movement: Port Elizabeth and Johannesburg.

In the Transvaal we find similar behaviour from people like Mr. Madzunya and Dr. Tsele. Mr. P. Leballo is one of the leaders of this anti-Congress group in the Province. He gives interviews to anti-Congress newspapers in which he makes the most wild, untrue and treacherous allegations against respected leaders. He openly says that it is the aim of his clique to capture the Transvaal leadership and use this as a stepping stone to gaining National control.

Now we should be misleading our readers if we gave them the impression that this anti-Congress group of so-called Africanists represent any

sort of powerful or important section in Congress. It does not; and all the attempts of such papers as "The World" and "The Sunday Express" to blow up their stature and give them prominence are, intentionally or otherwise, thoroughly misleading.

At National Conferences of the A.N.C. this anti-Congress group of "Africanists" has made repeated attempts to get Congress to repudiate the Freedom Charter. On each occasion they have failed miserably. They received a tiny handful of votes against hundreds who voted for the Charter. They have made repeated attempts to disrupt the alliance, which has been built up in the course of common struggle and sacrifice, between the African National Congress and the Indian Congress, the Congress of Democrats, the Coloured Peoples' Organisation. They have tried, in these efforts, to make use of the lowest racial prejudices. They have said, falsely and lyingly, that the A.N.C. is "controlled by", "dictated to" or "subsidised by" its sister organisations. (What a servile mentality it reveals of these people, who cannot imagine any relationship between Africans and other racial groups except one of master-and-servant; who really believe, or pretend to believe, that the respected and elected senior leaders of Congress, who have not feared to face all the terror and persecution of the fascist-inspired National Government, are men who are going to "take orders" from anyone except the membership of Congress itself! People like that, we fear, are just incapable of understanding the truly equal and fraternal relationships that exist between the different Congress organisations, which are an inspiring preview of the free South Africa of tomorrow, as we have all seen at the Drill Hall and elsewhere!

The anti-Congress group of "Africanists" has also failed miserably in these efforts to drive a wedge between Congress and its allies. The average African, never mind the average Congress member, is not mad. He understands perfectly well that Congress will fight more effectively for its goal of democracy and equality if it joins hands with other organisations which have exactly the same aims. The masses of the African people are hungry for freedom in our lifetime: they are not likely to be influenced by people who only want freedom if it is won by "ourselves alone" — even if that means waiting for another generation. And the people have too much respect for and confidence in their beloved leader Chief Lutuli and his brave and respected colleagues to believe the Africanist slanders that the Congress leaders are "selling" the people.

By itself, then, this self-styled "Africanist" anti-Congress group is nothing but a discredited and contemptible clique of office-seekers, disruptors and careerists who enjoy no backing or support whatever from the rank and file, inside or outside of Congress. Indeed, looked at objectively, their activities are most suspicious. Why, at this very time, when the A.N.C. and the Congress movement is the main target of the reactionary forces, when the U.P. is shouting for the Government to "deal with" Congress, and Strijdom is threatening merciless action, à la Zeerust, against Congress, when many of the leading Congress figures have been committed for trial on a capital charge — why, we ask, at this time is it that the "Africanist" group is directing all its venom and spite, not against the Government . . . but at the Congress leadership? Who does it benefit? Who wants Congress split and confused at the present time? It would pay the Government very handsomely if someone would do this dirty work for it. As soon as one begins to look calmly and objectively at this anti-

Congress group, one begins to realise there is something very sinister about it. It says openly that it prefers the Nationalists. Some of its policies sound very much like those of the Nationalists. And it shows the same hatred of Congress leadership as the Nationalists do. Sooner or later honest Congress members are going to start asking themselves: In whose interests are these people working?

UNNECESSARY DISPUTES

But, at present, honest Congress people are not asking these questions because they are too busy conducting unnecessary, trivial disputes among themselves. And the anti-Congress "Africanist" group is glorying over these disputes, revelling in them, and making hay while the sun shines. Because of the disputes they are able to join one or other side and play a role as some sort of "leaders" which, by themselves, they would never be able to enjoy. In the course of the disputes, some people become so blinded by factional passions that they are ready to seize the hand of the devil himself if only it will help them to score a cheap victory over their fellow-Congressmen: a hollow victory too that can only weaken our Congress movement.

It all reminds one only too painfully of what happened in Hungary, not so long ago. The workers' socialist Government, led by Rakosi, made certain mistakes. In criticising these mistakes, and in working for reforms, some people, honest workers and socialists, became so carried away by factional passions that they were prepared to join hands with actual Fascist elements, bitter reactionary elements, who were using the dispute not to achieve reforms but to destroy all the gains of the Hungarian working class and the basis of the socialist State.

When honest men fall out and begin quarrelling, that is when crooks come into their own.

That is what has been happening in the Transvaal.

We wish to make it quite clear that we have the greatest confidence in the integrity and honesty of the members of the Transvaal Executive Committee of the African National Congress. We said, in our last issue, that we thought that they had made a mistake in not adhering to the usual election procedure at the November Conference, and we still think so. But that does not mean that we associate ourselves with all the silly accusations that have been levelled against them by the "Africanists" and others. We know perfectly well that they did a good job in organising the Province, and that they did not mishandle any Congress funds. That is precisely the sort of wild and irresponsible accusation that is likely to be made by enemy agents, seeking to sow disruption.

We are fully convinced, also, that the majority of the branches which petitioned for a special Transvaal Conference were and remained honest and loyal Congressmen, supporters of the Charter and the Alliance, anxious only for the advancement of the movement.

But, looking back on it, we shall see that serious mistakes were made by both sides. On the one hand the petitioners should never have joined hands with the disruptive "Africanist" group, who — as they must have known perfectly well — were not sincere but merely trying to fish in troubled waters. And even if they did not know it to start with, they

should have seen it as soon as this anti-Congress group went running to the offices of the "World" saying it was a big "Africanist revolt" in Congress. They should, there and then, repudiated the "Africanists" and thrown them out.

On the other hand, some members of the Executive were equally at fault. They immediately pretended to believe the "World" story — although they knew perfectly well that many of the leaders of the petitioning group were staunch supporters of Congress policy and of the Charter. They labelled the whole thing as "an Africanist plot." They talked airily about "a few disgruntled elements" — although it was perfectly obvious that dissatisfaction, or at any rate, misunderstanding was widespread. Looking for a scapegoat, they started blaming the National Executive. And they stubbornly refused to consider any compromise, while the situation grew worse and worse.

We all saw what happened: the sorry exhibition at the Special Transvaal Conference, when hooliganism and mismanagement brought the whole thing to an end in chaos and confusion. Only the Government (and the "Africanists") were pleased, and rubbed their hands in pleasure.

What happened there made many Congressmen suddenly wake up and realise what was happening. While people were quarrelling over who should hold the steering-wheel, our bus had left the road and had come to the edge of a cliff.

We do not propose, here, to go into all the details or to sit in judgment upon the rights and wrongs of the events following upon that terrible Conference. It has not been without its value. It has led to intervention by the National Working Committee in a situation where all could see and understand that intervention was necessary and inevitable. It has led to the dissolution of the Requisition Committee, and the isolation of the anti-Congress "Africanist" conspirators with only a few of their more short-sighted or irresponsible collaborators. But, at the same time — while there was obviously need for prompt action — we cannot help feeling that some aspects of the Working Committee's intervention were somewhat over-hasty and ill-considered. In particular, the abrupt "suspension" of the Transvaal Executive has given the impression that somehow the Executive was being penalised, or held responsible for the position which had developed in the Province. And this has created a new source of friction and dispute: this time between the Provincial and National leaderships.

Nevertheless, there can be no acceptable explanation or excuse for the intemperate and undisciplined reaction of the Provincial leaders: and we sincerely trust that by the time these lines appear wiser counsels will have prevailed. Loyalty and obedience to the National leadership is a first essential for our whole struggle; and never more so than now, when the whole movement is under the fiercest attack of the enemy.

The present situation should never have been allowed to develop, and no doubt there will be many useful lessons to draw when this emergency is over.

But when we find that our bus is heading for the edge of a cliff, our first task is not to start arguing exactly whose fault it is that is went off

the road. Our first task is to get the bus back on the road: the broad Congress road to Freedom.

Our first and immediate necessity is that the quarrelling should stop and that every single Congressman and Congresswoman should get down, all out, to the vital job of implementing the decisions of the National Workers' Conference. Every member and friend of Congress has a plain duty at the present time. We must NOT and we shall NOT tolerate a position where different "parties" (ALL of them supporters of broad Congress policy and of the Lutuli leadership) are running round to the Branches, trying to canvass support for themselves

While vital Congress work remains neglected;

While Strijdom, Verwoerd and Swart are preparing an all-out attack on Congress and on the people;

While the anti-Congress "Africanist" group is carrying on its dirty work unnoticed, and preparing to walk in and destroy the proud organisation we have spent the best years of our lives working for and building up.

We appeal to — more, we demand of — every single honest Congress member and leader, whether at Branch, Provincial or National level, that he or she reconsider his or her position in the light of this desperately earnest situation, calmly and reasonably, without emotion or anger; that we all put any false pride aside, any unworthy suspicions and accusations; that we put an end to all clique-building, intrigue and factionalism, and all pull together for the good of the Congress.

This is not an argument about policy. If it were, we should say: go ahead with it; it is good and healthy; let each one have his say, using the methods of reason and fair, democratic debate, until the issue is decided at National Conference. But all of us here, at present, are agreed about policy: everyone, that is, except the "Africanist" group of disruptors, whose weapons are lies and slander and statements in the enemy press, and whose proper place is right outside the Congress.

Therefore this is an unprincipled dispute, and we have a right to demand that you must stop it. All the main leaders who support the Freedom Charter and the Freedom Alliance must urgently be brought together — and we appeal to the senior officials to do so without delay — NOT to discuss the rights and wrongs of past disputes (a Special Congress Commission of Enquiry could perhaps be set up to do that, and to report in due course); NOT to bandy recriminations and cast doubts on people whose sincerity we know, in our hearts, cannot be doubted; BUT to find a way for the Movement to work with the utmost devotion, enthusiasm and effectiveness in the present emergency.

And if any leader thinks he is too big to sit down with people on the other side of the dispute, then we say that such a person is not too big but too small to be any sort of a leader in the people's struggle.

We say, we have a right to demand these things be done. What is it that gives us that right? Only one thing: our faith and our knowledge that the immediate future of fifteen million human beings now depends on our Congress movement — the only truly human and sane force in the country — upon its unity, solidarity and integrity.

BANTU AREAS—

the Machinery of Oppression

by DUMA NOKWE

WHEN the Nationalists came into power in 1948, they were faced with the 'grim reality' which threatened white supremacy — nay the very existence of the white race. The previous governments had mismanaged the country. Chaos was rapidly developing. Those who were only interested in lining their pockets with profits had allowed this serious situation to develop in the country. At least 85,000 Africans were trekking away from the farms, and reserves to the towns, leaving the farmers destitute without labour, and thus undermining South Africa's most basic and vital industry. Further this exodus from the farms and 'Bantu Areas' not merely created a concentration of a large recalcitrant group of Africans who were susceptible to agitation and upon whom the agitators preyed, but it also undermined that tribal discipline, which is the only type of authority the 'primitive native' knows and understands. That wonderful culture of the 'Bantu' was being destroyed by this artificial process of westernisation. The 'Bantu' were beginning to imitate the Europeans and had abandoned their traditions. They were now completely dependent upon Europeans for everything and were losing all sense of responsibility towards themselves. Many of them had adopted the European Areas, the towns as their homes and have abandoned their true homes the 'Bantu Areas'. They were even now beginning to demand rights in areas to which they did not belong.

This process must be stopped or else the traditional position of the white man as baas, the white man's identity, the white man's civilisation will be destroyed. The 'Bantu' will begin by invading the white man's territorial preserves, and end up by invading his political preserve. That will be the end of western civilisation in South Africa.

How to protect the traditional supremacy of the whites; maintain sufficient labour for the farms and mines; keep the 'Bantu' away from longing for the "green pastures of the Europeans, in which they are not allowed to graze"; keep the 'Bantu' contented with their present position in the country both economically and politically and maintain them under their traditional rigid tribal discipline away from the pernicious influence of agitators who clamour for democratic rights, were the problems which faced the theoreticians of the Nationalist Party.

If all these problems were created by the fact that the "Bantu" were beginning to regard the 'European Areas' as their homes and 'European development' as their development then surely reasoned the Nationalist theoreticians they can be resolved by defining the 'Bantu Areas' as the home of the 'Bantu' and insisting that the 'Bantu' develop "along their own lines". Residential, social and all the other traditional forms of segregation were not enough. The 'Bantu' must be taught that his 'roots were in the reserves', that in the towns — the European Areas, he was temporary and not permanent.

That was the problem as the Nationalists saw it and there was their solution. The Nationalists wasted no time in getting the legal, administrative, and the educational machinery set for their task of turning the clock of history back and redirecting it along the path of separate development.

The Bantu Education Commission was appointed in 1948 to investigate the suitability of Native Education for the Bantu. The Nationalists were of the opinion that 'Native Education', had ill effects on the Bantu and was responsible for the frustration and hostility amongst educated 'Bantu'. A formula for education had to be found which would be in line with the policy of binding the intellectuals to their community and its status and which will have its roots according to Verwoerd in "the Spirit and Being of Bantu Society".

In 1951 two commissions were appointed, one to investigate and recommend on Industrial Legislation, and the suitability of Trade Union Organisation for the 'Bantu' employment in Industrial Areas and the other was a commission for the Socio-Economic development of the Bantu Areas within the Union of South Africa. The latter commission was to present to Nationalists with the Blue Print for Separate development, and the enhancement of the National homes of the Bantu. During the same year, the Nationalists passed the Bantu Authorities Act, which as they would have the world believe was designed to give the 'Bantu' greater powers in the administration of their own affairs in their areas, and was a step in extending political rights, independence and responsibility to the Bantu under the Supervision of the Native Affairs Department. In terms of that Act the Governor-General may after consultation with the Native people establish Bantu tribal authority which shall consist of a chief and a number of councillors who are appointed by the chief and the Native Commissioner. Regional authorities may also be established which are empowered to make representations to the Minister on behalf of the people, establish schools, hospitals, construct roads, dams etc., suppress diseases of stock, improve farming methods and generally such matters as may be assigned to them by the Governor-General.

The Bantu Authorities Act is regarded by the Nationalists as the heart of their policy of apartheid and separate development.

In order to stop the chaotic flow of the Africans to the towns — the European Areas—stricter control was necessary and so in 1952, Section 10 of the Urban Areas Act was passed which tightened the qualifications for the right to be in towns. And in 1952 the Natives Abolition of Passes and Co-ordination of Documents Act was passed which extended the passes to women. In 1952 the Bantu Education Act, and the Settlement of Disputes Act were passed. The stage was now set for the great Opera of the Century, the most "unique composition, Apartheid" to get under way.

The Native Affairs Department with outstanding zeal geared its machinery to popularise all the apartheid laws. Pamphlets, booklets, sycophants, and all forms of broadcasting were employed throughout the country to win the loyalty of the Africans in the rural areas to the great benefits, unfettered advancement, and revolutionary self-government which was being bestowed upon the "Bantu" in their own areas through the Bantu Authorities and the Bantu Education Act. They dangled the Bantu Authorities Act in front of the Chiefs as a restoration of their ancient powers over their own tribes. To the tribes they said the Act was the key to self development, self realisation and the enrichment of their poverty-stricken areas. Poverty, ignorance, disease, and dependence on the Europeans

would be banished forever. To the Europeans they said that the Bantu Authorities would guarantee the safety of white supremacy forever, to the farmers they whispered confidentially that their labour problems would be solved. To the caustic and unsympathetic world the Nationalists said that separate development and the Bantu Authorities Act were clear evidence of the 'honest and Christian intentions' of Nationalists, an attempt not merely to confer upon the Africans human rights, but opportunities of developing their abilities to the full.

As a practical demonstration of the fact that the Africans have no home in the cities, the Nationalists ushered in an era of the most ruthless persecution of the Africans, mass arrests under Section 10 of the Urban Areas Act, and the pass laws, and forcibly deported people to farms. In towns therefore, there was and still is the most ruthless control of every aspect of the lives of the worker, and in the "Bantu Areas" the benevolent promise of self-government. In the towns the pitiless rubber stamps of the labour bureaux drive the Africans mercilessly to the farms; in the 'Bantu Areas' a promise that the Africans would be allowed to apply themselves to 'development along their own lines'. That was the intended contrast, designed to turn the clock back.

The difference in attitude of the Nationalists towards the African in the towns and in the "Bantu Areas" is more apparent than real. The fundamental policy of the Nationalists towards all Africans is one of rigid, stifling control. The Bantu Authorities Act does not mean a relaxation of that control, nor does the so-called policy of self-development usher in a period of independence for the Africans. The Bantu Areas are not intended to be the lands of Canaan for the Africans. Every aspect of the development of Nationalist Policy points towards more ruthless control, not merely of the Africans, their lives and thoughts, but the lives and thoughts of the people in South Africa. The Nationalists, have exerted themselves in an attempt to win the support of the chiefs for their policy. Evangelical missions have been sent by the Native Affairs Goebbels department, armed with sweet talk and threats to the chiefs. The Minister of Native Affairs has himself attended gatherings of chiefs throughout the country, and tried to explain the benevolence of his department in idioms and parables. When the chiefs and tribesmen have failed to respond to the coquettish smiles of the Native Affairs Department, the smiles vanish, leaving only the bare familiar wolf-teeth of the Department. Then follows the swift deportation of recalcitrant chiefs and "trouble-makers" of the tribe.

When Dr. Verwoerd declared that, "There is no place for him (the Bantu) in European communities above the level of certain forms of labour", he meant every word he used. The policy of the Nationalists of "keeping the native in his place", means simply keeping the "Bantu" at the level of those forms of labour that the Nationalists have determined for them. The "forms of labour" for which the Africans are required in European communities are primarily on the mines and on the farms. The reserves or "Bantu Areas" remain, even in the Nationalists elaborate schemes of "self-development", the primary source of cheap labour for the mines and the farms. In order, however, to solve the acute shortage of farm labour, caused by the attraction of secondary industry, the Nationalists have perfected a labour bureau system. The Native Affairs Department frankly admits that the function of the Labour Bureau is to divert labour from those places where there is a surplus to those places where there is a shortage. All over the towns secondary reservoirs of labour have been

created, and the pass offices, the Native Commissioners' Offices, and the so-called labour bureaux have become one vast machine to pump labour to the farms. Those Africans who try to avoid the machine ultimately find themselves in the hands of the farmers via the police and the farm jails — which are now growing in numbers. There is no way of escaping the insatiable lust of the farmers for serfs.

The Nationalists are determined to keep African labour in a perpetual state of insecurity and flux. It must circulate through rigidly defined channels from the "Bantu Areas" to the farms and mines, and a small trickle into industry and commerce; from the Labour Bureau to the farms. Dr. Verwoerd says that the Africans are temporary in European Areas. The truth is that they are "temporary" wherever they are in the country. They are driven out by hunger and taxation; they are temporary on the farms where they are driven out by hunger and taxation; they are temporary on the farms where they are driven away by semi-feudal conditions of employment; they are temporary in towns from which they are hounded by the agents of the Labour Bureau. All this is by design. The Nationalist policy of self-development is a feeble attempt to cloak the operation of their fascist labour policy. And what is the place of their glorified "Bantu Areas" in the scheme? Apart from being the primary source of labour, these areas are also designed to be the cemetery or refuse bins for used and unwanted Africans. As Dr. Verwoerd stated when he opened the first Transkeian Territorial Authority: "There is a lot to do in other connections, for instance, Welfare Work and Health Services. Must the white men conduct these services, or should you serve your own people? In Bantu Areas it will be the duty of Bantu Authorities to look after their own people — the blind, old and poor. Control over one's own affairs is the roof over your building. The institution of Bantu Authorities gives you an opportunity to control your own affairs. To put the foundations and the walls and roof goes quickly, but furnishing takes a long time."

"The white man also has had his tree of separate development planted a long time ago. Already it has grown big and bears fruit. You have seen it. The white man knows what separate development means for his people. For progress the Bantu must also have that tree. They must not be jealous, when they look into another man's garden. While one leans over a fence and looks, one forgets to water one's own tree and the day of punishment must come. The man who tends his own tree becomes prosperous and has the trust of his own people. Tend your little tree, and it will become big."

If we escape the forest of words and parables in which Dr. Verwoerd wishes to plunge us, and we strip his tree of the artificial leaves and flowers, we are left with the bare trunk and branches of the South African cheap labour system. The statement that the white man has long planted his tree of separate development, and is enjoying its fruits, and the warning that the Bantu must not be jealous, confirms the view that the Nationalists have no intention of disturbing the conditions that have created the vast wealth of the mine magnates and farmers.

The Nationalists are attempting to perfect and make of general use the instruments of migratory labour that the mines have applied over the past half century.

When the Nationalist farmers and the rising Afrikaner capitalist class, therefore, endorse the policy of apartheid based on separate development, which envisages the Bantu developing along his own lines, they have in mind the traditional lines that have been imposed upon the Afri-

cans ever since labour became a problem in the country. These lines are the lines that guarantee an abundance of cheap labour. The farmers and mine magnates would revolt against any attempt to deprive them of their cheap labour by locking it up in "flourishing" reserves. "Keeping the native in his place" simply means to them, keeping him under such conditions that he is forced to accept work under their conditions.

The Bantu Authorities are charged with the task of collecting taxes, these Authorities will find themselves in the position of the Labour Bureaux — pumping labour to the farms and mines. That is the control the Nationalists invest in the Bantu Authorities. The propagandists of the Native Affairs Department are going to invent more idioms and parables for the imposition of this vicious duty on the Bantu Authorities.

The attempts to issue reference books to African women in the countryside is a clear sign of the future duties of the Bantu Authorities and Chiefs. The evangelists of the Native Affairs Department have already indicated that they expect the Bantu Authorities to exercise a rigid control over their people, not only in the so-called "Bantu Areas", but wherever they might be.

Dr. Verwoerd said in the Transkei: "The chiefs are the soul of Bantu Authorities, the source from which the river flows. The river which flows from the chiefs must not stop at the boundaries of the Bantu Areas. Its influence must spread wherever his children may be. They must all accept the leadership of the chief and abide by his authority." Mr. de Wet Nel, Chairman of the Native Affairs Commission, said in Tzaneen: "You must be careful of the wolves, because when they are hungry, they attack the weak goats. Keep the wolves away from your areas because they will achieve nothing for you."

The Nationalists clearly contemplate using the Bantu Authorities not merely to implement their policies but to suppress all forms of resistance, to curb the 'agitators' and 'troublemakers', both within their own areas and in the secondary kraals which the Nationalists are creating in the urban areas through ethnic grouping.

Bantu Authorities and chiefs are going to be increasingly answerable for the activities of their unruly subjects. Dr. Verwoerd said in the Transkei: "Now there are big plans to build houses for the Bantu Authorities outside there (in the towns) where your representatives can stay, and where the heads of the tribe can go so that the leaders at home can maintain the bonds with the children there, in order that they should not be misled by incorrect ideas." The incorrect ideas Dr. Verwoerd fears are: "jealousy of the white man's tree" and the desire "to graze in the green pastures of the European", democratic rights, the right to decent conditions of work and a fair wage.

The chiefs and their councillors, therefore, will not only be required to enforce Nationalist policy, but will be expected to suppress any resistance and growth of "wolves". The power of the chiefs is the power to carry out the will of the Native Affairs Department. The control of their own affairs is really the control of those affairs which are regarded by the Native Affairs as essential to maintain a docile cheap labour force.

The success of Dr. Eiselen's campaign to win the confidence of the African in the "Bantu Areas" can now be assessed. Despite the self-adulation which is so characteristic of the Native Affairs Department, the Department has met with considerable opposition to the acceptance of Bantu

Authorities. The Africans in the 'Bantu Areas' have been seething with discontent caused by cattle-culling, the rehabilitation scheme and the land-hunger which has been their plight. The Nationalists adhere faithfully to the theory that this discontent and resistance amongst the tribes is caused by outside influence. The N.A.D. does all in its powers to deport the "trouble-makers", depose chiefs and to insulate the tribes by throwing a barbed wire of police around the tribal settlements to deny even legal advisers access to the tribes. But still the discontent continues and the resistance grows fiercer. Even amongst those Chiefs who pledge loyalty to apartheid, or coerce their people to accept passes for women, the facade of loyalty crumbles after a short while, and the passes go up in smoke.

The sustained resistance of the Mamathola tribe against their removal from their land is an instance of the growing determination of the peasants to struggle against nationalist tyranny. Dr. Verwoerd has attempted to use all forms of intimidation to compel the tribe to move, he has removed the school, the post office, and refuses to pay our pensions in their area. In spite of all this, the Mamathola remain. The situation in Zeerust, Lichtenburg, Ventersdorp, Sekhukuniland etc. confirm the growing restlessness in the countryside.

There are very clear reasons why the Nationalists' plans are bound to fail and to inflame the people. The Nationalists regard the people with scornful contempt, as inferior beings, incapable of seeing through a fraudulent scheme. That is their most serious mistake — their warped conception of the people. Secondly, after the sugar-coating on all their schemes and laws has dissolved there remains the bitter inhumanity which the people feel and revolt against. Finally the Nationalists cannot have their cake and eat it, the vast masses of the people in the rural areas must and do come to the urban areas to work as designed. Thousands of the so-called tribesmen who appear in the rural areas in primitive garb are in fact semi-urbanised men, who may have been involved in the Mine Workers' Strike, or have been members of the Railway Workers' Union or the African National Congress and so have shed their peasant backwardness. Then, of course, there is the message of the Liberatory Movement which overshadows the little Goebbels and sycophants of Dr. Verwoerd, and is penetrating the rural areas, even though this could be done more rapidly and systematically than is the case now. The rural areas are vitally important and there is no room for complacency in the Liberatory Movement the control of the rural areas by Congress must yet be taken as seriously as Dr. Verwoerd has taken it.

The Nationalists are in a dilemma. Their attempt to keep the Africans in a state of flux and backwardness by driving them back to the "Bantu Areas" has the opposite effect of raising the political consciousness of the people and creating a unity of outlook and purpose between the rural Africans and the urban African, not for the purpose of abiding by the dictates of fascism, but to conduct a vigorous and determined struggle against it. The destruction of all democratic principles through the Bantu Authorities Act, has sharpened the demand for democratic rights among even the most backward peasants. They can never resolve this dilemma, even with their latest dreams of transplanting industries to the borders of the reserves. The clock moves on inexorably.

WILL THERE BE WAR?

by D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

I hold the prospects of the peace struggle in 1958 to be good. They are good in spite of the present lunacy of endlessly growing armaments, of the day-and-night patrols of British-based U.S. aeroplanes carrying live nuclear bombs, and of the plans to set up more and more launching bases all over Europe for 'ballistic missiles' — in ordinary English, nuclear rockets — and in spite above all of the rejections of any and every offer to negotiate for a *détente*. In fact, the very intensity of the lunacy is a demonstration of the progress that the peace forces are making; if this were not so great, the 'brinkmen' would not be so hysterical.

But why, in the face of this lunacy, do I hold the prospects to be good? And am I not alarmed by the risk that some paranoiac high commander, some mistaken code message, or some misinformed or bewildered commander of a patrol, may bring about some irrevocable step to war?

I do regard the risk of the outbreak of an undesigned or unintended war as greater at the moment than that of the deliberate launching of a war; but this is largely because I think the danger of a deliberate war is now much smaller. And I think that at present even the most bellicose of Pentagon or State Department managers must be taking every precaution against the danger of an unintended war.

Let me state realistically my reasons for optimism, provided that it be vigilant. I start my reasoning on the basis that the U.S.S.R. has no intention of beginning war. I do not need to develop this point, which is conceded by nearly every anti-Soviet politician and commentator in both the U.S.A. and Great Britain, and is indeed the basis of much of the patent confusion of N.A.T.O. I only add, for myself, that the U.S.S.R. not only does not want war but is not in the least likely to be provoked or misguided into starting one. It is thus safe and correct to base our thinking on the thesis that whatever danger there is comes only from the 'brinkmen' at the head of the American ruling class. The evidence that some of them actually want war, and that virtually all of them want to maintain the armaments race and the cold war which make war more likely to come, is again in need of no elaboration; it is provided both by their public statements and by their lunatic activities just described. So, the answer to the question whether peace can be maintained is to be reached by analysing the forces operating on the minds of the 'brinkmen', whether in favour of peace or in favour of war and of their reactions to those forces; and it will be safe to assume that, hysterical though they be, a substantial number is still able to estimate the strength of these forces, and act in response to them.

Let me consider these forces and their probable effects one by one. I take first the force of public opinion in Western Europe and in Britain,

with which of course the rulers in Washington have to reckon. It is growing in strength, in clarity, and in anger. It started too slowly; it accepted, for example, the installation, under fraudulent misrepresentation, of an American army of occupation in England, and the construction of air bases for U.S. bombers; for a time, it accepted as inevitable the appalling burden of the armaments race, and the ostentatious fixing of Britain's arms budget by a foreign power; and it was very slow to see the direct connection between that burden and the long string of financial crises that bedevils its life. But it began to grow restless when it realised that the bombers would soon carry nuclear bombs; it grew really angry when it learned that bombers had in fact been cruising over England for many months, without any notice or warning, let alone consent, on a war basis, twenty-four hours a day, with nuclear weapons ready to be dropped. And more angry still at the proposal that the Americans should have launching bases, for nuclear rockets directed against the U.S.S.R., constructed in Britain, for which the British taxpayer will pay with his money when they are under construction and with his life when they are finished.

Public opinion is sick and tired of armaments races, scares, tensions and crises. It is beginning to hate not just the American ruling-class but the whole U.S.A. and all that therein is. It is swinging around once again to respect and admiration for the U.S.S.R. It hates war; it wants peace; and it believes that peace can be got and that its rulers are not trying to get it. More important still, it is itself now prepared to insist actively on its government taking steps to negotiate for peaceful co-existence.

This public opinion is a formidable force for Washington to take into account.

Nor is it only for that reason that the 'brinkmen' must regard their prospects of winning a war as small. In addition to the hopes of having allies at their side vanishing in this way, the new developments which they regard as necessary — the building of rocket sites all over Europe, the main topic of the N.A.T.O. meeting — was regarded by most countries invited to take part in thus qualifying their peoples for instant destruction at the outbreak of war, as unacceptable. The meeting served to emphasise to us that N.A.T.O. has in truth long been a ridiculous failure; most of its members welch on their obligations to maintain troops in Germany, finding 'better' uses for them in colonial wars; and its original dual purpose, of pretending to be a line of defence against a Soviet invasion which everyone knew and many confessed would never take place, whilst really designed for attack against the U.S.S.R., becomes increasingly unreal from month to month as military science develops.

Its difficulties do not of course end there. Its notions of 'push button' war, on which it spends hundreds of thousands of millions, and based its whole strategy for itself and its satellites, have not just dwindled; they have in effect been turned round 180 degrees; the buttons are in other hands, and the targets are American overseas bases and American home ports. The Sputnik is no weapon of war; but it is a quiet and cogent demonstration, by inference, that in any war that anyone starts Science will be on the side of the Really New World.

POINT OF DANGER

The main danger is not that the United States leaders would under present conditions be likely to embark deliberately on the gamble of a full-scale nuclear war. This is not how world wars arise. World wars arise from the extension of local and regional conflicts when the world is divided into opposing armed camps. That is why the refusal of negotiation, of a summit meeting, of peaceful co-existence, and the insistence instead on the theory of 'massive retaliation', 'nuclear deterrents' and 'limited nuclear wars', leads inevitably to the ever present danger of major wars arising from any one of a thousand particular incidents or moments of tension. The vast machine for launching nuclear war with bases spread over the world, and with H-bomb-loaded planes in the air day and night, stands ready to come into action at a moment's notice. Only, we are told, in the event of 'Soviet aggression.' But what is 'Soviet aggression'? Past experience has shown that any uprising of the people anywhere in the world, although not a single Soviet soldier has been moved, has been described as 'Soviet aggression.' Therefore any such local or regional development, any tense situation, without any question of military action by the Soviet Union, may give rise to a position when the United States government may decide that the crisis calls for an immediate firm response, for a demonstration of strength, for the use of nuclear weapons.

Then, Washington must also reckon that, at the very best from its point of view, any such war would bring incalculable devastation to its own property and citizens, and it must reckon, too, that the various forms of political development towards popular power which it labels 'Communism' would advance by great strides in and after the war.

In short, they must reckon that the game is as good as lost. Today, they cannot risk a war, for they cannot win it; it is too late even to accept the advice of some of their loud-mouthed extremists to start it at once because they might win if they start now but will certainly lose if they wait. They

ist renounce it, and they must take every step to see that it does not start by accident.

Those are the forces against war in America; what are the forces working in its favour? They are not small, but they are obviously not enough. The vast anti-Communist obsession that has been built up at a terrible price in human decency, freedom, and intelligence, cannot really be counted as a force for war; it can prepare the public mind for war, of course, but it cannot help the rulers to win a war; it is no more than a propaganda weapon, and is genuine only to the extent that its authors are genuinely terrified of the advance of the socialist world and of their own working-class.

The forces still tending to support a war policy in the U.S.A. are two. Firstly, the fact that the ruling class is determined to resist all socialist and working-class advances, if it can; secondly — and more important — the supposed need to maintain the armaments race, for the double purpose of enriching the powerful rulers of heavy industry and of postponing for a time the slump which has to no small degree been held off in the past years by arms expenditure.

These forces, I say, are not enough; they cannot outweigh the fact that the U.S.A. cannot hope to win a war. And everyone now realises that the armament races constitute no sort of defence or security, and are no more than a costly short-term means of putting off another kind of evil day; everyone who runs such a race knows that his race-horse is really a tiger, and that he will have to let go of its tail one day.

Thus, Washington is in a great and growing quandary; it must be asking itself: How do I get out of this? There is a practicable alternative: negotiation — sincere, and not sabotaged in advance by Dulles's orders — for peaceful co-existence. If it embarks on this and succeeds, it will be out of many horrors, and the only loss it will suffer is that it will have to find some less wasteful work for its heavy industry, and abandon its witch-hunt against 'World Communism' which it cannot in any case win. That is why the continued and logical requests of the U.S.S.R. for a summit meeting are so difficult to side-track. Sooner or later Washington will be forced to accept such an offer. If it is stubborn enough to refuse this time, it will be faced by another, in a situation still more difficult for refusal. And so, peace will prevail. But not automatically. It will prevail when world opinion has successfully forced a real summit meeting of East and West to ease international tension and prepare concrete steps for disarmament and peace.

JOB RESERVATION — PART I.

“EVERY WHITE MAN A GENTLEMAN”

by ELI WEINBERG

“EVERY white man shall be a gentleman”, is a slogan which epitomises the traditional policy of successive South African governments to preserve for the white man a position of privilege as against the Non-European. This policy is dictated by the need to maintain a class of privileged supervisors, whose interests would to some extent coincide with those of the exploiters and who would act as a bulwark between the white masters of the land and the mass of the exploited Non-Whites.

In earlier South African industrial history the tendency to ensure a dominant position for whites was successful and encouraged by the fear of the white workers of encroachment on their hard-won trade union rights and standards on the part of the mass of cheaper paid Non-European workers. Thus the early English trade unionists, whose skill and experience was necessary to establish the Mining Industry, succeeded in entrenching certain occupations on the Mines as European strongholds “never” to be penetrated by cheap black labour. This position was ultimately legalised by the Mines, Works and Machinery Act (1926). In time and with the industrial development in South Africa similar principles were applied, by custom if not by law, in every new industry springing up. These job reservations were enforced by means of co-operation between the highly organised white workers and their white employers.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENTS

However, these artificial barriers have not been able to stand up against the onrush of capitalist industrial development. The growth of new industries, accompanied by the introduction of new techniques of production, have tended to break down the tight preserves of Europeans, who in any case have been too few in number to fill the enormous demand for labour arising out of industrial expansion.

The last thirty years have brought this development to a point where large groups of frustrated employers and production experts are beginning to translate the practical position into forceful demands to open up avenues of skilled employment for Non-Europeans. These “progressive” employers have, of course, uppermost in mind the considerably higher profits to be made out of cheaper African labour. The point is that this trend has in the past two or three decades completely altered industrial relationships in South Africa. An illustration of this is, for example, the position in the Engineering Industry, formerly mainly a maintenance industry designed to keep the machinery of the Mines going, but now one of the major

basic industries in South Africa. Some twenty years ago the labour force in this industry was made up roughly of half Europeans and half Non-Europeans. The European labour force consisted entirely of highly-trained artisans, journeymen with expensive skills, the Non-Europeans were almost entirely labourers, whose work was limited to "drawing of water and hewing of wood".

ADVANCE OF NON-WHITE LABOUR

Now there has been a complete quantitative as well as qualitative change in this labour force. Europeans now constitute roughly only 23% of the labour in the Engineering Industry, the balance being Non-Europeans. But more important is the fact that only about 10% of the labour force is made up of highly skilled white "technicians". Some 13% of the workers are white operatives and machine minders in semi-skilled, repetitive occupations. A very large proportion of the African labour force, estimated roughly at about 50% of the total labour force, are still largely labourers, but the remainder are now engaged as operatives on many semi-skilled and comparatively skilled operations.

This revolution is even more pronounced in many secondary industries, which being comparatively young never had the opportunity to establish strict racial lines of demarcation in skilled positions. In the Clothing Industry, for instance, the number of European employees between 1938 and 1953 rose from about 11,000 to 13,000, but the number of Non-Europeans in the same period rose from about 7,500 to almost 35,000. Non-Europeans, in fact, predominate in many skilled occupations.

These examples are illustrative of a general trend equally pronounced in most other industries.

It is clear that this radical change in the South African labour force must have a profound effect on the traditional racial barriers. The Non-European workers themselves, having acquired a heightened political consciousness, are also beginning to clamour for the right to do any skilled job and are increasingly staking their claims for recognition of the role they play in industry. As already indicated they are supported in this by the progressive employers and production managers, who see in the old relationships a barrier to economic development.

It is also clear that this does not suit the book of the advocates of the "old order". They argue that this is a threat to the privileged position of the white man and that "white supremacy" is being undermined by the penetration of Non-Europeans in positions of industrial responsibility. This, they say, must lead to the highly undesirable acquisition of the Non-Europeans of a sense of their importance in society and, consequently, to a strengthening of their claims for equality. Moreover, the occupation of identical positions in industry leads to the identification of interests of white and Non-white workers and in such circumstances what remains of the traditional purpose of keeping the white worker as a bulwark between the exploiters and the exploited? The white workers might so easily make common cause with the exploited, a fact which indeed has found expression in many industries in the formation of multi-racial trade unions or, at least, frequent co-operation between white workers and Non-white workers in industrial disputes.

These fears led some rich members of the Nationalist Party in the 1930's to finance the establishment of the so-called Blankewerkersbeskermingsbond. This organisation, financed largely by rich farmers, and led by

such men as the present Minister of Labour, was set the task of preventing any further collaboration between white and black workers, of weaning the white workers away from the multi-racial trade unions and generally of preserving the white workers as an ally of Afrikaner Nationalism, i.e. the economic aspirations of the rising Afrikaner farmers and capitalists.

Although tens of thousands of pounds were spent by this organisation on paid organisers, publications and campaigns, the Bond made little headway at first. This was due to the fact that many white workers and many trade union leaders could not so easily be weaned from the commonsense idea which had developed in their mind, that they were facing the same exploiters as the Non-White workers and that the sensible answer to low wages and bad working conditions was workers' unity. Forceful Afrikaner workers' leaders, such as Jan Venter, Johanna Cornelius, Anna Scheepers and others were advocating this with a considerable measure of success.

As a further weapon in the struggle against this advance of workers' unity, the Bond began to develop a "new" ideology, a complete philosophical textbook. What white workers needed for their protection was not trade unions at all. The idea of collective bargaining was foreign to the "Afrikaner soul" and should be replaced by the responsibility of the "State", a State which of course should be controlled by the Nationalist Party. Such a State would see to it, by means of a Supreme Economic Council, that the conflicting interests of employers and employees are reconciled, that the workers' wages and conditions of employment are safeguarded (having paramount regard to the employers' profits) and that the white workers' privilege, so sadly undermined by capitalist development, is restored to its former glorious pedestal. And so the idea of job reservation was re-born.

This article will be continued in the April issue of LIBERATION.

SOUTH AFRICA AFTER THE NATIONALISTS

As you see, this issue of LIBERATION is crowded from cover to cover with important articles, which we felt we just could not leave out. They deal with vital issues at present confronting every progressive person in South Africa.

So we just could not find room for the continuation, this month, of our series — South Africa After The Nationalists. Further contributions to this series will appear in future issues.

We also had no room for our usual subscription form and appeal for funds. The fact is, our magazine is just too small to print everything that should go in. We therefore make a short, urgent appeal to all readers to send us donations, to obtain new subscribers for LIBERATION, and to increase the influence of our magazine.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

A NEW MENACE IN AFRICA

by NELSON MANDELA

FOR several centuries the maritime nations of Europe exploited the peoples of Asia and Africa and interfered in numerous ways with their cherished freedoms. For several centuries the governments of Spain, Portugal, Holland, Belgium, England, France, Germany and Czarist Russia have at different historical periods created vast and mighty empires in Asia and Africa. Through armed invasion and conquest they forced the people of Asia and Africa to surrender to the expansionist policies of European capitalism. Through military plunder the people of India, Ceylon, Burma, Malaya, the East Indies and other territories lost their national independence and became colonies of foreign powers. Through force, fraud and violence, the people of North, East, West, Central and Southern Africa were relieved of their political and economic power and forced to pay allegiance to foreign monarchs. By means of unequal treaties the conquered countries were transformed into profitable fields for the investment of foreign capital. The economic wealth and resources of these colonies were exploited by and turned over to the imperialist powers for use not in the interest of the indigenous populations, but for the benefit of the metropolitan people.

In this way the spices of the East Indies, the rubber and rice of India, the gold and diamonds of South Africa, the cocoa and manganese of the Gold Coast, all found their way to the ware-houses of Europe. By means of forced labour and extremely low wages the native populations were reduced to poverty and misery whilst the metropolitan populations flourished out of the raw materials seized from the colonies. To the people of Asia and Africa imperialism meant, and still means, the exploitation of the mineral and agricultural wealth of their countries by foreign powers without their consent and without compensation. It means the destruction of the economic power of the indigenous populations through the imposition of trade monopolies and excessive taxes. It means low wages and long hours of work. Above all it means the denial of political and economic rights and the perpetual subjugation of the people by a foreign power.

In exploiting the mineral and agricultural resources of a colonial country the imperialists have always tried to avoid making the issue appear one of an open clash of interests between themselves and the colonial people. Both in Asia and Africa imperialism consistently sought to divide the indigenous population by allying itself with the most reactionary elements amongst the very population it wishes to exploit. In India the feudal princes, the big landlords and industrialists became the most faithful and loyal friends of British imperialism. A similar pattern prevailed in China, the East Indies, Malaya and in other colonies. In South Africa where there were no vested interests amongst the indigenous people the position was somewhat different. British imperialism allied itself with the big farming

interests, secured the support of the European section of the population by imposing a rigid colour-bar and by elevating the Europeans to a higher political and economic status. In practice imperialism is, therefore, a kind of alliance between a foreign ruling power and local reactionary elements for the exploitation by the former of the mineral and agricultural resources of a colonial country. It is precisely because of this fact that imperialism has always sought to prolong reactionary institutions in the colonial countries long after such institutions have ceased to be useful.

Concessions granted to these elements for supporting foreign rule as well as developmental schemes designed primarily to facilitate the exploitation of the natural wealth of the exploited country, have frequently been cited to highlight the so-called benefits of imperialism to the colonial people. The buildings of seaports and harbours, the construction of communications, the building of hydro-electric plants, of conservation and irrigation schemes, the mapping of mineral resources, have been specifically mentioned as some of the positive steps adopted by imperialist powers to raise the living standards of dependent peoples. In point of fact these projects all serve to facilitate the exploitation of the dependent country and its people, and the export of its wealth to Europe.

THE DECLINE OF EUROPEAN IMPERIALISM

Quite naturally the colonial people all over the world have in various ways waged ceaseless battles against foreign domination. In many areas this battle has been decisively won whilst in others it still rages. The imperialist countries have been driven out from practically the whole of Asia and the Pacific regions. China, India, Ceylon, Burma and the United States of Indonesia have won their national independence. In Africa a large number of territories have thrown off the imperialist yoke and are now independent states. Egypt, the Sudan, Ethiopia, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia and Ghana are no longer dependencies of foreign powers. In Algeria, Nigeria, Somalia and Uganda self-government in the near future is anticipated. All over the world the people are astir and the struggle for political progress is gathering momentum by the day. Imperialism has been weighed and found wanting. It has been fought and defeated by the united and concerted action of the common people. Its decline and fall was sealed by the Afro-Asian conference which was held in Bandung in April, 1955, where twenty-nine independent countries of Asia and Africa, which had recently emerged from colonial oppression, pledged themselves against colonialism and proclaimed the unity of the people of Asia and Africa in the struggle against this menace.

A NEW DANGER

Whilst the influence of the old European powers has sharply declined and whilst the anti-imperialist forces are winning striking victories all over the world, a new danger has arisen and threatens to destroy the newly-won independence of the people of Asia and Africa. It is American imperialism which must be fought and decisively beaten down if the people of Asia and Africa are to preserve the vital gains they have won in their struggle against subjugation. The First and Second World Wars brought untold economic havoc especially in Europe where both wars were mainly fought. Millions of people perished whilst their countries were ravaged and ruined by the war. The two conflicts resulted, on the one hand, in the decline of the old imperial powers.

On the other hand, the U.S.A. emerged from them as the richest and most powerful state in the west, firstly, because both wars were fought thousands of miles away from her mainland and she had less casualties. Whereas the British Empire lost 1,089,900 men only 115,660 U.S.A. soldiers died during the first world war. No damage, whatsoever, was suffered by her cities and industries. Secondly, she made fabulous profits from her allies out of war contracts. Due to these factors the U.S.A. grew to become the most powerful country in the west.

Paradoxically, the two world wars, which weakened the old powers and which contributed to the growth of the political and economic influence of the U.S.A. also resulted in the growth of the anti-imperialist forces all over the world and in the intensification of the struggle for national independence. The old powers, finding themselves unable to resist the demand by their former colonies for independence and still clinging desperately to their waning empires, were compelled to lean very heavily on American aid. The U.S.A. taking advantage of the plight of its former allies, adopted the policy of deliberately ousting them from their spheres of influence and of grabbing these spheres for herself. An instance that is still fresh in our minds is that of the Middle East where the U.S.A. assisted in the eviction of Britain from that area in order that she might gain control of the oil industry which prior to that time, was in the control of Britain.

Through the Marshall Plan the U.S.A. succeeded in gaining control of the economies of European countries and in reducing them to a position analogous to that of dependencies. By establishing aggressive military blocs in Europe, the Middle East and in Asia, the U.S.A. has been able to post her armies in important strategic points and in preparing for armed intervention in the domestic affairs of sovereign nations. The North Atlantic Treaty organisation in Europe, the Baghdad Pact in the Middle East, and the South East Asian Treaty Organisation are military blocs which constitute a direct threat not only to world peace but, also to the independence of the member states.

The policy of placing reliance on American economic and military aid is extremely dangerous to the "assisted" states themselves and has aggravated their positions. Since the Second World War Britain, France and Holland closely associated themselves with American plans for world conquest and yet within that period they have lost empires in Asia, the Middle East and Africa, and they are fighting rear-guard actions in their remaining colonial possessions. Their salvation and future prosperity lies not in pinning their faith on American aid and aggressive military blocs but in breaking away from her, in repudiating her foreign policy which threatens to drag them into another war, and in proclaiming a policy of peace and friendship with other nations.

U.S. OFFENSIVE IN AFRICA

American interest in Africa has in recent years grown rapidly. This continent is rich in raw materials. It produces almost all the world's diamonds, 78% of its palm oil, 68% of its cocoa, half of its gold and 22% of its copper. It is rich in manganese, chrome, in uranium, radium, in citrus fruits, coffee, sugar, cotton, and rubber. It is regarded by the U.S.A. as one of the most important fields of investment. According to the "Report of the Special Study Mission to Africa, South and East of the Sahara", by the Honourable Frances P. Bolton which was published in 1956 for the use of the United States Congress Committee on Foreign Affairs, by the end of World War II United States private investments in Africa amounted

to scarcely \$150 million. At the end of 1954 the total book value of U.S.A. investments in Africa stood at \$664 million.

Since then the American Government has mounted a terrific diplomatic and economic offensive in almost every part of Africa. A new organisation for the conduct of African Affairs has come into existence. The Department of State has established a new position of Deputy-Assistant Secretary for African Affairs. The Bureau of African Affairs has been split into two new offices, the office of Northern African Affairs and that of Southern African Affairs. This reorganisation illustrates the increasing economic importance of Africa to the U.S.A. and the recognition by the governing circles of that state of the vital necessity for the creation and strengthening of diplomatic relations with the independent states of Africa. The U.S.A. has sent into this continent numerous "study" and "good-will" missions, and scores of its leading industrialists and statesmen to survey the natural wealth of the new independent states and to establish diplomatic relations with the present regimes. Vice-President Nixon, Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic Party candidate for the American Presidency in the last elections, and scores of other leading Americans, have visited various parts of the continent to study political trends and market conditions. Today, American imperialism is a serious danger to the independent states in Africa and its people must unite before it is too late and fight it out to the bitter end.

IMPERIALISM IN DISGUISE

American imperialism is all the more dangerous because, having witnessed the resurgence of the people of Asia and Africa against imperialism and having seen the decline and fall of once powerful empires, it comes to Africa elaborately disguised. It has discarded most of the conventional weapons of the old type of imperialism. It does not openly advocate armed invasion and conquest. It purports to repudiate forces and violence. It masquerades as the leader of the so-called free world in the campaign against communism. It claims that the cornerstone of its foreign policy is to assist other countries in resisting domination by others. It maintains that the huge sums of dollars invested in Africa are not for the exploitation of the people of Africa but for the purpose of developing their countries and in order to raise their living standards.

Now it is true that the new self-governing territories in Africa require capital to develop their countries. They require capital for economic development and technical training programmes, they require it to develop agriculture, fisheries, veterinary services, health, medical services, education and communications. To this extent overseas capital invested in Africa could play a useful role in the development of the self-governing territories in the continent. But the idea of making quick and high profits, which underlies all the developmental plans launched in Africa by the U.S.A., completely effaces the value of such plans in so far as the masses of the people are concerned. The big and powerful American trade monopolies that are springing up in various parts of the continent, and which are destroying the small trader, the low wages paid the ordinary man, the resulting poverty and misery, his illiteracy and the squalid tenements in which he dwells, are the simplest and most eloquent exposition of the falsity of the argument that American investments in Africa will raise the living standards of the people of this continent.

The American brand of imperialism is imperialism all the same in spite of the modern clothing in which it is dressed and in spite of the sweet

language spoken by its advocates and agents. The U.S.A. is mounting an unprecedented diplomatic offensive to win the support of the governments of the self-governing territories in the continent. It has established a network of military bases all over the continent for armed intervention in the domestic affairs of independent states should the people in these states elect to replace American satellite regimes with those who are against American imperialism. American capital has been sunk into Africa not for the purpose of raising the material standards of its people but in order to exploit them as well as the natural wealth of their continent. This is imperialism in the true sense of the word.

The Americans are forever warning the people of this continent against communism which, as they allege, seeks to enslave them and to interfere with their peaceful development. But what facts justify this warning? Unlike the U.S.A. neither the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic nor any other Socialist state has aggressive military blocs in any part of the world. None of the Socialist countries has military bases anywhere in Africa, whereas the U.S.A. has built landing fields, ports and other types of strategic bases all over North Africa. In particular it has jet fields in Morocco, Libya and Liberia. Unlike the U.S.A. none of the Socialist states has invested capital in any part of Africa for the exploitation of its people. At the United Nations Organisations the Soviet Union, India and several other nations have consistently identified themselves unconditionally with the struggle of the oppressed people for freedom whereas the U.S.A. has very often allied itself with those who stand for the enslavement of others. It was not Soviet but American planes which the French used to bomb the peaceful village of Sakiet in Tunisia. The presence of a delegation from the Chinese People's Republic at the 1955 Afro-Asian conference as well as the presence of a delegation from that country and the Soviet Union at the 1957 Cairo Afro-Asian conference show that the people of Asia and Africa have seen through the slanderous campaign conducted by the U.S.A. against the Socialist countries. They know that their independence is threatened not by any of the countries in the Socialist camp but by the U.S.A. who has surrounded their continent with military bases. The communist bogey is an American stunt to distract the attention of the people of Africa from the real issue facing them, namely, American imperialism.

The peoples of resurgent Africa are perfectly capable of deciding upon their own future form of government and discovering and themselves dealing with any dangers which may arise. They do not require any schooling from the U.S.A., which — to judge from such events as the Little Rock outrage, and the activities of the Un-American Witch-hunting Committee — should learn to put its own house in order before trying to teach everyone else.

The people of Africa are astir. In conjunction with the people of Asia, and with freedom-loving people all over the world, they have declared a full scale war against all forms of imperialism. The future of this continent lies not in the hands of the discredited regimes that have allied themselves with American imperialism. It is in the hands of the common people of Africa functioning in their mass movements.