

29 APR 1959

A large, stylized, white-outlined letter 'L' is positioned on the left side of the cover. The 'L' is bold and blocky, with a thick white outline and a solid black interior. It is set against a background of a dense, white, geometric pattern of overlapping lines on a black field.

LIBERATION

ONE SHILLING.

No. 36, May, 1959.

"BANTU SELF-GOVERNMENT"

**MANDELA EXPOSES
VERWOERD'S
GRIM PLOT**



A JOURNAL OF DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION

Liberation

A Journal of Democratic Discussion

No. 36.

MAY, 1959.

ONE SHILLING.

IN THIS ISSUE

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Editorial | 1 |
| "Bantu Self-Government", by N. R. Mandela | 7 |
| Concepts of Apartheid II, by H. J. Simons | 18 |

NEW AFRICA and the UNION

THE All-African People's Conference in Ghana last December, as we confidently predicted in our editorial written on the eve of that Conference, spelt out large the meaning that "we are living in the closing stages of the era of European domination over Africa." The Conference registered a mighty advance in the struggles of the peoples of this continent for freedom from alien control, for self-government and independence. Inspired by the example of Asia, where hundreds of millions of people have in a brief decade won the right to political independence, by the Charter of the United Nations, which promises equality, democracy and human rights to all men, the people of Africa, across the length and breadth of this mighty Continent, have built up determined national liberation movements. These movements have joined hands across the artificial boundaries which the imperialists set up in their "scramble for Africa" seventy or eighty years ago. They are building a powerful alliance to free Africa from the twin evils of colonialism and racial discrimination.

The imperialist powers are being forced to understand the reality of this great alliance, this unconquerable will for freedom, that has grown up in Africa. Just as Britain has been compelled to give way, step by step, in Asia — in India, Burma, Ceylon, Malaya — so she is being compelled to concede self-government step by step in Africa. Egypt, Ghana, the Sudan have already escaped from the Empire; tomorrow Nigeria will be

self-governing, even Basutoland — in the heart of Apartheidia — has gained far-reaching concessions; soon there will be nothing left of Britain's great African Empire.

France, too, is being compelled to swallow the bitter lessons she learnt in Indo-China and the Middle East. Though French soldiers and white Algerian colonists continue to wage an incredibly cruel — and hopeless — struggle against the Algerian national liberation front, far-reaching concessions have been won in France's other "possessions" in Africa. Guinea has broken away altogether, and far-reaching concessions towards self-government and political independence have been won in West Africa, Madagascar, and elsewhere in what is left of the so-called "French Union."

Britain and France are the two main colonial powers in Africa. They are not leaving willingly, and bloody battles and repressions are continuing in the French Congo, Nyasaland and elsewhere. But they are at least showing signs of realising that the answer to the demand for freedom is not and cannot be repression alone. They are trying to buy off, or at any rate postpone, the demand for full freedom and independence by various schemes for "partial self-government within the Commonwealth (or French Union)", "limited independence", "reservation of certain powers, and veto rights for the Colonial Office" (or the Governor, or High Commissioner, etc.

BELGIUM AND PORTUGAL

The Government of Belgium has long rested secure and happy in the possession of its vast and rich Colony in the Congo. True, they appointed African "Mayors" in various locations. But these so-called Mayors were only appointed after they had satisfied the Belgian authorities that they were "loyal" supporters of imperialism. What was the surprise of the colonial rulers when one of these "sound elements" returned from Accra and started talking about independence for the Congo! Quickly they locked him up: but the masses streamed out into the streets of the capital in protest. The Belgian Parliament was summoned in an emergency session, and came out with a document promising widespread reforms and concessions to the African people of the Congo.

The Fascist dictatorship of Portugal, alone among the European powers with colonies in Africa, appears to be blind and deaf to the vast changes sweeping this continent. It continues with its regime of cruel repression, exploitation verging on, sometimes actually, slavery, and complete denial of democratic and human rights. The Salazar regime is living in a fool's paradise if it imagines that it is going to last very much longer in undisturbed domination over seven million Africans in Angola and Mozambique.

Finally, we come to the position of the African people in the Union of South Africa. (We may remark in passing that the position is very similar in many respects in Rhodesia). Here the problem is not merely or mainly that of independence from political domination from Britain. The problem of the African people here is to gain freedom from domination by the

organised minority of Whites who have settled down and live in their midst, and who behave towards Africans exactly the same way as the imperialists do in their colonies.

The delegates to the All-African People's Conference recognised that this struggle of the African people in the Union, led by the African National Congress, is part of the general struggle for freedom all over the continent. The resolutions passed can leave no doubt in the mind of any reader as to how matters in the Union are viewed by our neighbours North of the Limpopo. One resolution called for a united front of "the workers, the peasants and other sections of the toiling masses, together with the intellectuals . . . in common action of a final attack on discrimination and racialism.

Another resolution declared that the permanent Secretariat, elected by the Conference, should

"urge any African independent states which conduct trade relations with South Africa to impose economic sanctions against the latter country as a protest against racial discrimination which the European minority are practicing to the humiliation of the Non-European minority. Such sanctions should urge the boycott of South African goods."

Even more significantly, for the great mining interests which dominate this country's economy, and which might hope not to suffer overmuch from a boycott of Union manufactures, the Conference went on to resolve:

"that all African countries which supply South Africa with migrant labour should organise their reservoir of workers for their own use and thus withhold such labour from South African industry, which has become the instrument of oppression."

Finally, and of considerable interest in view of Mr. Eric Louw's continuous evasions on the question of diplomatic relations with African States, the Accra conference resolved:

"That no African state should have any diplomatic relations with any country on our continent that practices race discrimination."

The point does not need to be underlined. The country which practices race discrimination, more than any other in Africa, is the Union. The Nationalist Government, after years of consistent condemnation and criticism by the General Assembly of the United Nations, is not particularly popular in any part of the world. Nowhere is it more unpopular than among our closest neighbours. The concept of freedom cherished by the Accra Conference does not stop short of the Limpopo River — nor at the Zambesi either for that matter.

THE POLICEMAN OF AFRICA

It is not only solidarity with the ten million non-White victims of Apartheid in South Africa that led to so strong a revulsion against South Africa's

ruling caste on the part of our African neighbours. It is true that the Government's theory and practice of white baasskap is a standing insult and outrage to every dark-skinned person in Africa, Asia and America — as the visiting Brazilian footballers found to their indignation the other day. And it is also true that African people throughout this country ardently hope for the day of freedom to dawn for their brothers who are oppressed in the Union.

But there are also other reasons why Africa hates the Union Government and stands united with the struggle of the masses of our people for freedom. Among the most important of these reasons is that the Union Government is a standing threat to freedom in every other part of the continent.

When Welensky wanted military help to suppress the Nyasa people, he appealed in the first instance to the Union Government. And the Union Government replied that it was prepared immediately to furnish such help. Welensky said he appealed to Pretoria and not to London because it was nearer at hand. We do not believe it. We believe he appealed to Pretoria because he felt more sure of a sympathetic reception from Verwoerd and because the time is coming soon — if it has not arrived already — when English lads will refuse to go out into Africa, as they did in Kenya, to shoot down African lads whose only "crime" is that they desire in their own countries the same rights which Englishmen enjoy to govern themselves.

Another fact which has leaked out into the newspapers is that the Union Defence Minister, Erasmus, has made repeated attempts to get the Union established as the headquarters of a so-called "African NATO", a military alliance of the colonial powers with African "possessions" whose purpose will be "to fight Communism."

What sort of "Communism" does he want to fight? It is not difficult to guess. Every time an African people stands up against its colonial masters for liberty it will be called Communism, just as Roy Welensky was prepared to label Nyasaland's opposition to Federation as Communism on the ridiculous basis that a Nyasa delegate was seen talking to a Russian at Accra, and just as Swart and Rademeyer and their jackals and stooges keep labelling the anti-Apartheid movement in the Union as Communism.

Minister Erasmus does not appear to be enjoying much success with his plan. The reason is not far to seek. The imperialists of Europe are not anxious to associate themselves with the Union. They have learnt over the past decade in Asia and the Middle East and North Africa the hard lesson which the Nationalists refuse to learn, that brute force no longer serves to keep an oppressed people in subjection, that concessions and an increasing measure of self-government must be granted if they are to retain any prestige and influence whatever among the peoples over whom for so long they reigned supreme. They now want to appear in the role of benefactors, kind donors of the blessings of independence and democracy.

Association, particularly military association of the type envisaged, with the Union Government would be fatal to any hopes of making a convincing appearance in such a role. This Government is becoming increasingly an embarrassment rather than a help to its friends.

Verwoerd's government threatens to become in this century and in this continent what the Tsarist government was during the revolutionary-democratic upsurge which swept the continent of Europe in the last century. At that time, the history books tell us, Russia was known as "the policeman of Europe." Before committing itself to such a course, however, the Union Government would do well to recall the ultimate fate of the Tsarist regime.

SOUTHERN AFRICA MUST CHANGE

Verwoerd's Union and Welensky's Federation have no place in the Free Africa which is so dramatically and powerfully being shaped by the turbulent and irresistible forces of history. They must change and give way to free democratic states governed by the will of the masses of the people themselves. And, though outside criticism of the white baasskap serves to encourage the freedom fighters of Southern Africa, this great democratic change will be brought about by the hands and the will of the peoples of this sub-continent themselves.

The charge is sometimes made, regretfully by its friends, or exultingly by its enemies, that the liberation movement of this country appears to make but little progress as compared with that of its sister-movements further to the North. They point to the fact that Nkrumah rules in Christianborg castle, Nigeria is on the verge of self-government, even in Basutoland, Congress government seems to be not far off, while in the Union, Congress is a persecuted and hunted movement, its leaders and members treated like outcasts and criminals. And from these facts they draw a false conclusion, that the leaders of the liberation struggle in this country lag behind their colleagues to the North in patriotism, political wisdom and ardent determination to win freedom.

They forget, these sideline critics, that in this country we are faced not merely by a handful, a few thousand, of officials and traders from Europe or Britain, as is the case in the colonies of central and northern Africa, other than Algeria. Freedom in South Africa is opposed by a powerful well-entrenched local ruling class, which has contrived, through extending privileges and by the inculcation from childhood of the crudest forms of racialism, to draw to its support the majority of the permanent white population of three millions, who mistakenly believe that it is in their interests to "keep the Black man down." Freedom here is opposed by vast financial interests, both local and overseas, who have invested millions and made millions out of cheap labour, and who will do everything in their power to see that labour remains cheap.

To win freedom in the face of this bitter and powerful opposition, with all the methods of mass terror, repression and intimidation which it has at its disposal, and which it uses so inhumanly and ruthlessly — this is no easy task. It is, indeed, an extraordinarily difficult, long drawn and complex task, almost without parallel in the world. And in this task, our South African liberation leaders have shown, and continue to show, a measure of determination, skill, vision and courage of which any nation could be proud, which has indeed won the admiration of all the world.

There are even more bitter trials ahead of us.

The Nationalists have modified their language, they go in for fancy talk about "self-government", they talk in public about "the Bantu" and only in private about "the Kaffirs." But behind the fancy talk, their action are even worse than ever. Mass evictions and deportations, passes for women, higher taxes, more political persecution, dearer bread, lower wages, the unseating of African representatives Ballinger, Lee Warden and Stanford: such is the miserable prospect they hold out before the country.

But their days are numbered. The great demonstrations that marked Africa Week in the Union showed that the masses have not been intimidated; every act of persecution has only rallied them more strongly behind Congress than ever before.

Even the ranks of the Nationalist Party have begun to waver; the expulsion of a du Plessis is but a surface manifestation of the revolt that is gathering against the lunatic inflexibility of Doctor Verwoerd.

It is worth bearing in mind that our struggles are as much a spur and inspiration to other parts of the Continent as theirs are to us. Each time we batter against the wall of reaction in South Africa, we are helping to make a breach that will ultimately let the tides of freedom surge over the whole world.

A READER'S COMPLAINT

A reader of LIBERATION has written to complain of our "infuriating" practice of splitting up important articles, such as the recent contributions of Professor Pothekin and Dr. Simons, and keeping readers waiting for two months for the conclusion. We have thought it over, and we agree. That is why we have devoted the bulk of the present issue to Mr. Mandela's devastating exposure of the "Bantu Self-Government" Bill. Alas, that has meant holding over for our next issue stimulating contributions from Mr. Joe Matthews and Mr. Lionel Forman. There's only one solution to the difficulty — a bigger LIBERATION. But that would need more money, which we haven't got. What about helping us, dear readers?

The writer examines the new "Bantu Self-Government" Bill, and discloses behind it

VERWOERD'S GRIM PLOT

By NELSON MANDELA

"South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white."
— The Freedom Charter.

"All the Bantu have their permanent homes in the reserves and their entry into other areas and into the urban areas is merely of a temporary nature and for economic reasons. In other words they are admitted as work-seekers, not as settlers.

— Dr. W. W. M. Eiselen, Secretary of the Department of Bantu Administration and Development.
(Article in "Optima", March 1959).

THE two statements quoted above contain diametrically opposite conceptions of this country, its future and its destiny. Obviously they cannot be reconciled. They have nothing in common, except that both of them look forward to a future state of affairs rather than that which prevails at present. At present South Africa does not "belong" — except in a moral sense — to all. 97 per cent. of the country is legally owned by members (a handful of them at that) of the dominant white minority. And at present by no means "all" Africans have their "permanent homes" in the Reserves. Millions of Africans were born and have their permanent homes in the towns and cities and elsewhere outside the reserves, have never seen the reserves and have no desire to go there.*

* According to the 1951 census, trust land locations and reserves accounted for only two and a half million out of a total African population of, at that time, eight and a half million. A further two and a half million, nearly, were on European-owned farms. The rest were mainly in urban areas, with the Witwatersrand alone accounting for over a million Africans. (Official Year Book 1956-57, p. 718).

It is necessary for the people of this country to choose between these two alternative paths. It is assumed that readers of "Liberation" are familiar with the detailed proposals contained in the Charter. Let us therefore, as calmly and objectively as we can, study the alternatives submitted by the Nationalist Party.

PARTITION

The newspapers have christened the Nationalists' plan as one for "Bantustans". The hybrid word is, in many ways, extremely misleading. It relates to the partitioning of India, after the reluctant departure of the British, and as a condition thereof, into two separate States, Hindustan and Pakistan. There is no real parallel with the Nationalists' proposals, for

- (a) India and Pakistan constitute two completely separate and politically independent States,
- (b) Muslims enjoy equal rights in India; Hindus enjoy equal rights in Pakistan,
- (c) Partition was submitted to and approved by both parties, or at any rate fairly widespread and influential sections of each.

The Government's plans do not envisage the partitioning of this country into separate, self-governing States. They do not envisage equal rights, or any rights at all, for Africans outside the reserves. Partition has never been approved of by Africans and never will be. For that matter it has never been really submitted to or approved of by the Whites. The term "Bantustan" is therefore a complete misnomer, and merely tends to help the Nationalists perpetrate a fraud.

Let us examine each of these aspects in detail.

"BANTU SELF-GOVERNMENT"

It is typical of the Nationalists' propaganda techniques that they describe their measures in misleading titles, which convey the opposite of what the measures contain. Verwoerd called his law greatly extending and intensifying the pass laws the "Abolition of Passes" Act. Similarly, he has introduced into the current Parliamentary session a measure called the "Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Bill." It starts off by decreeing the abolition of the tiny token representation of Africans (by Whites) in Parliament and the Cape Provincial Council.

It goes on to provide for the division of the African population into eight "ethnic units" (the so-called Bantustans.)* These units, it is declared, are to undergo a "gradual development to self-government."

* They are: North and South Sotho, Swazi, Tsonga, Tswana, Venda, Xosa and Zulu.

This measure was described by the Prime Minister, Dr. Verwoerd, as a "supremely positive step" towards placing Africans "on the road to self-government" (in his policy statement of January 27). Mr. De Wet Nel, B.A.D. Minister, said the people in the reserves "would gradually be given more powers to rule themselves."

THE WHITE PAPER

The scheme is elaborated in a White Paper, tabled in the House of Assembly, to "explain" the Bill. According to this document, immediate objects of the Bill are:—

- (a) The recognition of the so-called Bantu National Units and the appointment of Commissioners-General whose task will be to give guidance and advice to the units in order to promote their general development, with special reference to the administrative field;
- (b) The linking of Africans working in urban areas with territorial authorities established under the Bantu Authorities Act, by conferring powers on the Bantu Authorities to nominate persons as their representatives in urban areas;
- (c) The transfer to the Bantu Territorial Authorities, at the appropriate time, of land in their areas at present held by the Native Trust.
- (d) The vesting in territorial Bantu Authorities of legislative authority and the right to impose taxes, and to undertake works and give guidance to subordinate authorities;
- (e) The establishment of territorial boards for the purpose of temporary liaison through commissioners-general if during the transition period the administrative structure in any area has not yet reached the stage where a territorial authority has been established.
- (f) The abolition of representation in the highest European governing bodies.

"FURTHER OBJECTS"

According to the same White Paper the Bill has the following further objects:—

- (a) The creation of homogeneous administrative areas for Africans by uniting the members of each so-called national group in the national unit, concentrated in one coherent homeland where possible;
- (b) The education of Africans to a sound understanding of the problems of soil conservation and agriculture so that all rights over and responsibilities in respect of soil in African areas may be assigned to them. This includes the gradual replacement of European agricultural officers of all grades by qualified and competent Africans;
- (c) The systematic promotion of diverse economy in the African areas, acceptable to Africans and to be developed by them;

- (d) The education of the African to a sound understanding of the problems and aims of Bantu Education so that by decentralisation of powers, responsibility for the different grades of education may be vested in them;
- (e) The training of Africans with a view to effectively extending their own judicial system and their education to a sound understanding of the common law with a view to transferring to them responsibility for the administration of justice in their areas;
- (f) The gradual replacement of European administrative officers by qualified and competent Africans;
- (g) The exercise of legislative powers by Africans in respect of their areas, at first on a limited scale, but with every intention of gradually extending this power.

A HEAVY PRICE

It will be seen that the African people are asked to pay a very heavy price for this so-called "self-government" in the Reserves. Urban Africans — the workers, business men and professional men and women, who are the pride of our people in their stubborn and victorious march towards modernisation and progress — are to be treated as outcasts: not even "settlers" like Dr. Verwoerd. Every vestige of rights and opportunities will be ruthlessly destroyed. Everywhere outside the reserves an African will be tolerated only on condition that it is for the convenience of the Whites.

There will be forcible uprooting and mass removals of millions of people ("homogeneous administrative areas" — see (a) under "Further Objects" above.) The reserves, already intolerably overcrowded, will be crammed with hundreds of thousands more people evicted by the Government.

In return for all these hardships, in return for Africans abandoning their birthright as citizens, pioneers and inhabitants of South Africa, the Government promises them "self-government" in the tiny 13 per cent. that their greed and miserliness "allocates" to us. But what sort of self-government is this that is promised?

WHAT SORT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT?

There are two essential elements to self-government, as the term is used and understood all over the modern world. They are:

1. **Democracy.** The organs of Government must be representative. That is to say they must be the freely-chosen leaders and representatives of the people, whose mandate must be renewed at periodic democratic elections.
2. **Sovereignty.** The Government thus chosen must be free to legislate and act as it deems fit on behalf of the people, not subject to any limitations upon its powers by any alien or internal authority.

Now neither of these two essentials are present in the Nationalist plan. The "Bantu National Units" will be ruled in effect by the Commissioners-General appointed by the Union Government, and administered by the B.A.D. officials under his control. When the Government says it plans gradually increasing self-government, it merely means that more powers in future will be exercised by appointed councils of Chiefs and headmen. No provision is made for elections. The Nationalists say that Chiefs, not elected legislatures, are "the Bantu tradition."

There was a time when, like all peoples on earth, Africans conducted their simple communities through Chiefs, advised by tribal councils and mass meetings of the people. In those times the Chiefs were indeed representative governors. Nowhere, however, have such institutions survived the complexities of modern industrial civilisation. Moreover, in South Africa, we all know full well that no Chief can retain his post unless he submits to Verwoerd, and many Chiefs who sought the interest of their people before position and self-advancement have, like President Lutuli, been deposed.

Thus, the proposed Bantu Authorities will not be, in any sense of the term, representative or democratic.

The point is made with pride by the B.A.D. itself in an official publication:

"The councillors will perform their task without fear or prejudice, because they are not elected by the majority of votes, and they will be able to lead their people onwards . . . even though . . . it may demand hardships and sacrifices."*

A strange paean to autocracy, from a department of a Government which claims to be democratic!

NO SOVEREIGNTY

In spite of all their precautions to see that their "Territorial Authorities" — appointed by themselves, subject to dismissal by themselves, under constant control by their Commissioners-General and their B.A.D. — never become authentic voices of the people, the Nationalists are determined to see that even these puppet bodies never enjoy any real power of sovereignty.

In his notorious (and thoroughly dishonest) article in "Optima" Dr. Eisele draws a far-fetched comparison between the relations between the future "Bantustans" and the Union Government, on the one hand; and those between Britain and the self-governing Dominions on the other. He foresees:

"a co-operative South African system based on the Commonwealth conception, with the Union Government gradually changing its position from guardian and trustee to become instead the senior member of a group of separate communities."

* "Bantu Authorities and Tribal Administration." Issued by the N.A.D. Information Service, Pretoria, 1958.

To appreciate the full hypocrisy of this statement, it must be remembered that Dr. Eiselen is an official of a Nationalist Party Government, a member of a Party which has built its fortune for the past half-century on its cry that it stands for full and untrammelled sovereignty within the Commonwealth, that claims credit for Hertzog's achievements in winning the Statute of Westminster, which proclaims such sovereignty, and which even now wants complete independence and a Republic outside the Commonwealth.

It cannot be claimed therefore that Eiselen and Verwoerd do not understand the nature of a Commonwealth, or sovereignty or federation.

What are we to think, then, in the same article, when Dr. Eiselen, comes right out into the open, and declares:

"The utmost degree of autonomy in administrative matters which the Union Parliament is likely to be prepared to concede to these areas will stop short of actual surrender of sovereignty by the European trustee, and there is therefore no prospect of a federal system with eventual equality among members taking the place of the South African Commonwealth . . ."

There is no sovereignty, then. No autonomy. No democracy. No self-government. Nothing but a crude, empty fraud, to bluff the people at home and abroad, and to serve as a pretext for heaping yet more hardships and injustices upon the African people.

THE ECONOMIC ASPECT

Politically, the talk about self-government for the reserves is a swindle. Economically, it is an absurdity.

The few scattered African reserves in various parts of the Union, comprising about 13 per cent. of the least desirable land area, represent the last shreds of land ownership left to the African people of their original ancestral home. After the encroachments and deprivations of generations of European land-sharks, achieved by force and by cunning, and culminating the outrageous Land Acts from 1913 onwards, had turned the once free and independent Tswana, Sotho, Xhosa, Zulu and other peasant farmers of this country into a nation of landless outcasts and roving beggars, humble "work-seekers" on the mines and the farms where yesterday they had been masters of the land, the new White masters of the country generously "presented" the few miserable areas that were left to remain as reservoirs and breeding-grounds for black labour. These are the reserves.

It was never claimed or remotely considered by the previous Governments of the Union that these reserves could become economically self-sufficient "national homes" for 9,600,000 African people of this country. That final lunacy was left to Dr. Verwoerd, Dr. Eiselen and the Nationalist Party.

The facts are — as every reader who remembers M. Mbeki's brilliant series of articles on the Transkei in "Liberation" will be aware — that the reserves are congested, distressed areas, completely unable to sustain their present populations. The majority of the adult males are always away from home working in the towns, mines or European-owned farms. The people are on the verge of starvation.

The White Paper speaks of teaching Africans soil conservation and agriculture and replacing European Agricultural Officers by Africans. This is merely trifling with the problem. The root problem of the reserves is the intolerable congestion which already exists. No amount of agricultural instruction will ever enable 13 per cent. of the land to sustain 66 per cent. of the population.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

The Government is, of course, fully aware of this fact. They have no intention of creating African areas which are genuinely self-supporting (and which could therefore create a genuine possibility for self-government). If such areas were indeed self-supporting, where would the Chamber of Mines and the Nationalist farmers get their supplies of cheap labour?

In the article to which I have already referred, Dr. Eiselen bluntly admits:

"In fact not much more than a quarter of the community (on the reserves) can be farmers, the others seeking their livelihood in industrial, commercial, professional or administrative employment."

Where are they to find such employment? In the Reserves? To anyone who knows these poverty-stricken areas, sadly lacking in modern communications, power-resources and other needed facilities, the idea of industrial development seems far-fetched indeed. The beggarly £500,000 voted to the so-called "Bantu Investment Corporation" by Parliament is mere eyewash and window-dressing: it would not suffice to build a single decent road, railway line or power station.

"RURAL LOCATIONS"

The Government has already established a number of "rural locations" — townships in the reserves. The Eiselen article says a number more are planned: he mentions a total of no less than 96. Since the residents will not farm, how will they manage to keep alive, still less pay rent and taxes, and support the traders, professional classes and civil servants whom the optimistic Eiselen envisages as making a living there?

Fifty-seven towns on the borders of the reserves have been designated as centres where White capitalists can set up industries. Perhaps some will migrate, and thus "export" their capital to sources of cheap labour and land. Certainly, unlike the reserves (which are a monument to the callous indifference of the Union Parliament to the needs of the non-voting African

tax-payers) these towns have power, water, transport, railways, etc. The Nationalist Government, while it remains in office will probably subsidise capitalists who migrate in this way. It is already doing so in various ways, thus creating unemployment in the cities. But it is unlikely that any large-scale voluntary movement will take place away from the big, established industrial centres, with their well-developed facilities, available materials and markets.

Even if many industries moved, or were forced to move, to the border areas around the reserves it would not make one iota of difference to the economic viability of the reserves themselves. The fundamental picture of the Union's economy would remain fundamentally the same as at present: a single integrated system based upon the exploitation of African labour by White capitalists.

Economically, the "Bantustan" concept is just as big a swindle as it is politically.

SELF-DETERMINATION

Thus we find, if we really look into it that this grandiose "partition" scheme, this "supremely positive step" of Dr. Verwoerd, is — like all apartheid schemes — merely a lot of high-sounding double-talk to conceal a policy of ruthless oppression of the non-Whites and of buttressing the unwarranted privileges of the White minority, especially the farming, mining and financial circles.

Even if it were not so, however; even if the schemes envisaged a genuine sharing-out of the country on the basis of population figures, and a genuine transfer of power to elected representatives of the people, it would remain fundamentally unjust and dangerously unstable unless it were submitted to, accepted and endorsed by all parties to the agreement. To think otherwise is to fly in the face of the principle of self-determination, which is upheld by all countries and confirmed in the United Nations Charter, to which this country is pledged.

Now even Dr. Eiselen recognises, to some extent, this difficulty. He pays lip-service to the Atlantic Charter and appeals to "Western democracy." He mentions the argument that apartheid would only be acceptable "provided that the parties concerned agreed to this of their own free will." And then he most dishonestly evades the whole issue. "There is no reason for ruling out apartheid on the grounds that the vast majority of the population opposes it," he writes. "The Bantu as a whole do not demand "integration, a single society. This is the ideal . . . merely of a small minority."

Even Dr. Eiselen, however, has not got the audacity to claim that the African people actually favour apartheid or partition.

Let us state clearly the facts of the matter, with the greatest possible clarity and emphasis.

NO SERIOUS OR RESPONSIBLE LEADER, GATHERING OR ORGANISATION OF THE AFRICAN PEOPLE HAS EVER ACCEPTED SEGREGATION, SEPARATION OR THE PARTITION OF THIS COUNTRY IN ANY SHAPE OR FORM.

At Bloemfontein in 1956, under the auspices of the United African clergy, perhaps the most widely-attended and representative gathering of African representatives, of every shade of political opinion ever held, unanimously and uncompromisingly rejected the Tomlinson Report, on which the Verwoerd plan is based, and voted in favour of a single society.

Even in the rural areas, where dwell the "good" (i.e., simple and ignorant) "Bantu" of the imagination of Dr. Verwoerd and Dr. Eiselen, attempts to impose apartheid have met, time after time, with furious, often violent resistance. Chief after Chief has been deposed or deported for resisting "Bantu Authorities" plans. Those who, out of shortsightedness, cowardice or corruption, have accepted these plans have earned nothing but the contempt of their own people.

SERIOUS MISSTATEMENTS

It is a pity that, on such a serious subject, and at such a crucial period, serious misstatements should have been made by some people who purport to speak on behalf of the Africans. For example, Mrs. Margaret Ballinger, the Liberal Party M.P. is reported as saying in the Assembly "no confidence" debate on March 2:

"The Africans have given their answer to this apartheid proposition, but of course, no one ever listens to them. They have said: 'If you want separation then let us have it. Give us half of South Africa. Give us the Eastern half of South Africa. Give us some of the developed resources because we have helped to develop them.'" (S.A. Outlook, March 1959).

It is most regrettable that Mrs. Ballinger should have made such a silly and irresponsible statement, right towards, one fears, the end of a distinguished Parliamentary career. For, in this instance she has put herself in the company of those who do not listen to the Africans. No Africans of any standing have ever made the proposals put forward by her.

The leading organisation of the African people is the African National Congress. Congress has repeatedly denounced apartheid. It has repeatedly endorsed the Freedom Charter, which claims South Africa "for all its people." It is true that, occasionally individual Africans become so depressed and desperate at Nationalist misrule that they tend to clutch at any straw, that they tend to say: give us any little corner where we may be free to run our own affairs; but Congress has always firmly rejected such momentary tendencies and refused to barter our birthright, which is South Africa, for such illusory "Bantustans."

CORRECTING "THE WORLD"

In *The World* of April 4, 1959, Mr. Duma Nokwe, Secretary-General of the African National Congress, was made to appear to support the division of the country into African and European areas provided there is consultation. Under the heading "What leading Africans think of the Bantustan Proposal" he is reported to have said: "The Congress view is that if the Government desires a division of the country, it should be done in consultation with the African People."

Mr. Nokwe has denied making this statement. According to him he was asked by a reporter of this paper for his comments on suggestions made by Professor du Plessis that a federation of Bantustans be established. Mr. Nokwe totally rejected the plan put forward by Professor du Plessis as unacceptable.

He informed the reporter that the correct approach would be the extension of franchise rights to Africans. Thereafter a National Convention of all the people of South Africa could be summoned and numerous suggestions of the democratic changes, that should be brought about, including the suggestions of Professor du Plessis, could form the subject matter of the Convention. The reporter was then referred to a statement released by the Congress setting out its attitude in full on these proposals.

LET THE PEOPLE SPEAK!

Here, indeed, Mr. Nokwe has put his finger on the spot. There is no need for Dr. Eiselen, Mrs. Ballinger or *The World* to argue about "what the Africans think" about the future of this country. Let the people speak for themselves! Let us have a free vote and a free election of delegates to a national convention, irrespective of colour or nationality. Let the Nationalists submit their plan, and the Congress its Charter. If Verwoerd and Eiselen think the Africans support their scheme they need not fear such a procedure. If they are not prepared to submit to public opinion, then let them stop parading and pretending to the outside world that they are democrats, and talking revolting nonsense about "Bantu self-government."

Dr. Verwoerd may deceive the simple-minded Nationalist voters with his talk of Bantustans, but he will not deceive anyone else, neither the African people, nor the great world beyond the borders of this country. We have heard such talk before, and we know what it really means.

Like everything else that has come from the Nationalist Government it spells nothing but fresh hardships and sufferings to the masses of the people.

SINISTER DESIGN

Behind the fine talk of "self-government" is a sinister design.

The abolition of African representation in Parliament and the Cape Provincial Council shows that the real purpose of the scheme is not to

concede autonomy to Africans but to deprive them of all say in the government of the country in exchange for a system of local Government controlled by a Minister who is not responsible to them but to a Parliament in which they have no voice. This is not autonomy but autocracy.

Contact between the Minister and the Bantu Authorities will be maintained by five Commissioners-General. These officials will act as the watchdogs of the Minister to ensure that the "Authorities" strictly toe the line. Their duty will be to ensure that these authorities should not become the voice of the African people but that of the Nationalist Government.

In terms of the White Paper steps will be taken to "link" Africans working in urban areas with the territorial authorities established under the Bantu Authorities Act by conferring powers on these Authorities to nominate persons as their representatives in urban areas. This means in effect that efforts will be made to place Africans in the cities under the control of their tribal chiefs — a retrograde step.

Nowhere in the Bill or in the various Proclamations dealing with the creation of Bantu Authorities is there provision for democratic elections by Africans falling within the jurisdiction of the Authorities.

In the light of these facts it is sheer nonsense to talk of South Africa as being about to take a "supremely positive step towards placing Africans on the road to self-government" or of having given them more powers to rule themselves. As Dr. Eiselen clearly pointed out in his article in "Optima", the establishment of the Bantustans will not in any way affect white supremacy since even in such areas whites will stay supreme. The Bantustans are not intended to voice aspirations of the African people; they are instruments for their subjection. Under the pretext of giving them self-government the African people are being split up into tribal units in order to retard their growth and development into full nationhood.

THE CHIEF TARGET

The new Bantu Bill and the new policy behind it will bear heavily on the peasants in the reserves. But it is not they who are the chief target of Verwoerd's new policy.

His new measures are aimed, in the first place, at the millions of Africans in the great cities of this country, the factory workers and intellectuals who have raised the banner of freedom and democracy and human dignity, who have spoken forth boldly the message that is shaking imperialism to its foundations throughout this great Continent of Africa.

The Nationalists hate and fear that banner and that message. They will try to destroy them, by striking with all their might at the standard bearers and vanguard of the people, the working class.

Behind the "self-government" talk lies a grim programme of mass evictions, political persecution and police terror. It is the last desperate gamble of a hated and doomed fascist autocracy — which, fortunately, is soon due to make its exit from the stage of history.

CONCEPTS OF APARTHEID

(Concluded)

By H. J. SIMONS

THE crusade began at Stellenbosch in 1940 with the publication of *Die Oplossing van die Naturelle-vraagstuk in S.A.* by Coertzee, Language and van Eeden, all members of the Bantu Studies Department. It was pursued by P. J. Schoeman, then Professor in Anthropology at Stellenbosch ('Territoriale Segregasie', Wapenskou, 1941) and by G. Cronje, professor in sociology at Pretoria University, in a series of books published between 1945 and 1948. ('n Tuiste vir die Nageslag, 1945; Afrika sonder die Asiaat; 1946; Regverdige Rasse-Apartheid, 1947; Voogdyskap en Apartheid, 1948).

Adherents of this school, and in particular Cronje, were race determinists. He asserted a causal relationship between race and culture; claimed that Africans were inherently inferior, that the offspring of inter-breeding between colour groups were degenerate, physically and mentally, that race divisions were divinely ordained; and excluded Jews from his conception of the white or West European race. The 'Boerenasie' was exceptionally fitted, by reason of its biological and cultural heritage, for survival in Africa and had a special mission to perform on the continent. Like the African, the Boerenasie was the victim of imperialism and capitalism, and it could not carry out its historical mission until it had broken the imperialist connection, incorporated the High Commission Territories into the Union, and formed a united front with English-speaking whites on the basis of economic as well as social equality.

Cronje's 'positive' policies envisaged:

- (1) Total separation for Africans; their 'development along own lines', under White trusteeship;
- (2) The development of a separate Coloured nation under the guidance and protection of the Whites;
- (3) Repatriation of all Indians, whose slogan 'Asia for the Asians' had as its logical corollary, 'Africa without the Asian'.

He did not assert, however, the parallel couplet: Europe for the Europeans, Africa without the European!

In the first half of this fine study, which appeared in the last issue of LIBERATION, Dr. Simons wrote that the concept of Separation had originated with the liberal, Alfred Hoernlé. The racist took over the concept of Separation . . . translated it into Afrikaans as Apartheid, and turned it into a slogan of action."

The doctrine of total separation acquired a great urgency from the results of the war. The spread of socialist equality in Europe and Asia, the collapse of imperialist rule, the rise of independent states with an inveterate hostility to foreign domination and colour discrimination, the composition and constitution of the United Nations, the proclamation of the Declaration of Human Rights, heralded the end of the epoch of white supremacy. These events, and the effects of industrial growth, intensified the demand of the dispossessed within the Union for equality, and, at the same time, vested the idea of separation with a political significance.

Apartheid, as a party slogan, made its first appearance in the National Party's programme of 1948. This was based on recommendations of committees appointed by the Party's Federal Council in 1947, and presided over by Mr. Paul Sauer, to formulate a policy of apartheid with regard to African, Coloured and Asian population groups, and their relations to the white population, in accordance with the following requirements:

"the application of the apartheid-principle in political, industrial and residential spheres, must be capable of being realised in practice, and must be positive and constructive with regard to the interests of both whites and non-whites, as well as negative and separatist (skeidend) in character." (van Rooyen, Die Nasionale Party.)

Information on the discussions in committee that led to the formulation of the apartheid-programme is given by Edwin Minger, an American specialist on Africa, who has close contacts with Stellenbosch. He writes:

"Dr. Malan has privately claimed on several occasions that he really initiated the idea of apartheid as used in the 1948 election. He tells of a small group of N.P. leaders who met to hammer out the party's strategy for the 1948 election. The anti-war and pro-republican platform was discussed and discarded as unsuitable for major emphasis and because it would not attract support from the pro-war and Anglicized Afrikaners outside the N.P. fold. An economic blueprint for S. African development was considered but did not strike the politicians as sufficiently concrete and exciting for the average voter. Then, as

Malan tells the story, he took the floor to argue that the U.P. must be attacked primarily on its 'native policy'. He argued that apartheid was an election-winning slogan that would draw voters away from the U.P.

"A N.P. committee under the leadership of Paul Sauer found that the theoreticians who later formed SABRA had ideas which could be quickly tailored to a platform that would appeal to the electorate as an honourable and Christian way out of moral dilemmas, while at the same time it would keep them mindful of European fear of Africans." (Africa Special Report, 1957.)

At this point a divergence developed between the party's and the intellectual's conception of apartheid, which has persisted to the present time, with undoubted advantages to both. Let me first deal with the party interpretation.

It was defined by Dr. Malan in an election speech at Stellenbosch on March 4, 1953. He followed a familiar line of argument: the 'colour question' was the big issue; the choice lay between equality and apartheid; no middle course existed; the forces against us had multiplied; the communist was active underground; and lastly;

"The fact is that there is absolutely no difference in meaning between 'segregation' and 'apartheid'. Segregation was originally the term generally in use, and Genl. Hertzog was its chief advocate. Genl. Smuts, though not an enthusiast, did not oppose it, but later changed his attitude and finally declared openly that it was impracticable. When the N.P. pressed for a stricter application of the policy of segregation, Genl. Smuts objected that segregation would mean 'af-hokking' (fencing off). It was then that, to prevent misunderstanding, the Nationalists began to feel the need of a term that would not have this implication. Without looking for one, the word apartheid, which could even mean equality, but for each in his own sphere, came into use as the obvious expression." (Van Rooyen, op. cit., 275).

Dr. Malan has, on more than one occasion, distinguished the Nationalist Party's conception of apartheid from the idea of total separation. In a letter written in 1954 to an American, he said that 'though theoretically the objects of the policy of apartheid could be fully achieved by dividing the country into two States, with all the Whites in one and all the Blacks in the other, this was simply not practicable politics for the foreseeable future.' We must leave it to the future to decide if some such division, say on a federal basis, will be possible. (Cape Times, April 1, 1954).

This is still the government's policy. It does not claim to work for total separation, and has made no effort to check the absorption of Africans in the Union's economy outside the reserves.

The doctrine of total separation has, on the other hand, received a formal, institutionalized shape since 1948, largely through the activities of SABRA. Its formation, mooted in 1947, was given impetus by a controversy over the

findings of the Native Laws (Fagan) Commission of 1946-8, which, making the usual review of 'alternatives', reached the old conclusion that equality and separation were impracticable, and that the only course open was differentiation within a common society. The Stellenbosch critics rejected the possibility of a 'middle course', but this time for a reason not previously put forward by the advocates of white supremacy.

Mr. Justice Fagan, like Hoernle, had suggested that in spite of their numerical inferiority, the Europeans would continue to govern the country. This, said his critics, was an assertion from the Herrenvolk standpoint, which they repudiated. Secondly, it was false:

"We for our part simply do not believe that white civilization can maintain itself in S.A. for long on the basis of the complete economic integration of the Native, coupled with an attempt to discount his legitimate desire for political responsibility 'by not counting heads'."

It was contrary to the experience of industrialised countries to suppose that the Whites could morally and physically withhold from the African for any length of time, measured in terms of two or three generations,

"the full fruits of that civilization as enjoyed by us — a civilization which flowers in freedom of speech, freedom of occupation, freedom of association, and the civic equality of all adult men and women." (Cape Times, June 17, 1948).

At this point we find ourselves facing the old 'moral dilemma' that worried the liberal advocates of separation 30 years ago. Let me try to put the position simply. The country is ruled by a government that has been returned to office at three elections on the strength of its apartheid programme. This government rejects, just as did Hoernle, Brookes, and Fagan, the concept of total separation for the foreseeable future, and as an actual objective of policy. We therefore have a common society that will continue for, I repeat, the foreseeable future, that is, indefinitely. In this society the White group is determined to remain supreme. We describe the power relations between it and other groups as white domination, baasskap, or herrenvolkism. Both those who desire equality and those who want total separation condemn this social order as immoral, unjust, and untenable.

It is, of course, open to the advocates of total separation to preach their cause, and win over the population to their point of view. But what have they to say about the practice of white supremacy in the present society if it is regarded — and the government does so regard it — as a permanent order?

On this the advocates of total separation tend to be silent or evasive. Let us turn again to the definition of apartheid in the Woordeboek. It has this to say:

„In sy praktiese toepassing sluit die beleid reelings en pogings in wat o.a. omvat maatreels om 'n mate van bloot plaaslike skeiding te bewerkstellig, bv. ten opsigte vermaaklikheid, ens.: maatreels i.v.m. politieke regte, bv. aparte kieserlyste, aparte verteenwoordiging in die Parlement en Provinsiale Rade; verder territoriale segregasie, bv. die opsetting van betreklike groot gebiede in die uitsluitende gebruik van een bevolkingsgroep, bv. die naturellegebiede.”

The measures referred to may be called 'differentiation' or 'discrimination' according to the standpoint of the observer, but they cannot be said, in terms of content, effects, or the basic postulates regarding the relations between colour groups in the common society, to provide equal opportunities for the different groups.

On what ground can they be defended? Professor Olivier can be quoted to advantage here. Addressing the first conference of SABRA in 1950 he said:

“It has become the practice in certain circles to label as 'negative' any white measure that differentiates between native and white. Any measure that the whites may adopt to secure their position and prevent unpleasant complications, is condemned at the outset as 'unchristianlike' and 'oppressive'.

“Every privilege or service conferred on the whites which in any way is more favourable to them than to the native is regarded as another example of the policy of race-domination or of a herrenvolk mentality, but the differences in background, standards of living, and needs between white and native are conveniently overlooked.” (SABRA, *Die Naturellevraagstuk*, 1950.)

It seems to me incontestable that measures to strengthen the White group's position, or increase the range of its privileges, must widen the gap between it and the African population, and therefore support white supremacy. Does Professor Olivier justify this state as a permanent condition? How does he reconcile it with the principle of self-determination which, he asserts, is as valid for Africans as for the Whites?

It is not my purpose to discuss here the content of the differentiating or discriminating laws and administrative acts that have proceeded from the government in ten years of apartheid rule. There are, however, two aspects of the system which I think call for comment.

One is the use of migratory labour. The most fervent adherent of total apartheid does not contemplate its elimination at any price. The Tomlinson Commission, which was remarkably reticent on this matter, estimated that if the reserves were developed to their full capacity, they would accommodate 10 million Africans by 1987, of whom two million would be dependent on wages earned in the European territory by 500,000 migrant workers. But, according to a press interview given by Dr. Tomlinson, six

million Africans would still be living in the White area by 1987, and of them at most three million would be on the farms. He did not say whether he expected the remaining three million in urban areas to be migrant workers. (Cape Times, March 29, 1956).

This date, 1987, has apparently a mystical significance in the prophecies of Nationalist soothsayers. The Prime Minister told the country on September 18th that "1987" would be the "turning point" and that the migration of Africans to the towns would diminish from then on. He did not predict whether he would be in office to press the button for the change over.

Professor Olivier in a recent article predicted that

"the migratory labour system will no doubt — in the interests of both groups — remain an integral part of the economic set-up in the White State; no one could object to this, as long as compulsion is absent." (Cape Times, June 9, 1958).

Two objections do arise. One concerns the status of these workers, and their aspirations. Would they not form a part of the 'labouring classes' which, said the critics of the Fagan Report, had risen to power in nearly all industrialised countries? (Cape Times, June 17, 1948).

The other objection was stated by Hoernlé.

"To assume that Native workers will continue to come out in the large numbers required, is to concede implicitly that even the enlarged Reserves will be insufficient to make possible an economically self-contained life for their Native inhabitants. Hence, secondly, the fatal divorce between the place of residence and the place of work will continue to undermine Native family life and the cohesion of the tribes, and destroy the dream of Native communities as healthy 'areas of liberty'. And, in third place, the temporary workers will, both as aliens and as Natives, be treated in the White areas as subject to discriminatory legislation and measures of control, thus continuing the essential features of a caste-society." (S.A. Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit.)

My other observation concerns that eloquently worded plea of the Stellenbosch dons for the right of all colour groups — albeit in separate communities — to the full fruits of civilization: freedom of speech, freedom of occupation, freedom of association.

Whatever differences of opinion there may be over such measures as Bantu Authorities Act, Bantu Education Act, Group Areas Act, Population Registration Act, Separate Amenities Act — all of which I, for one, regard as serving to secure white supremacy —, no one can deny that there has been a disastrous invasion and curtailment of those rights and

freedoms in the past ten years. The documentary evidence is listed in Donald Molteno's recent survey, *The Assault on our Liberties* (S.A. Institute of Race Relations, 1958). He points out that 'the progressive invasion of the fundamental freedoms of the Non-European communities is, though in less degree, menacing those of Europeans also'; and he foreshadows a nemesis that will overtake us as a result of 'the general and increasing denial of fundamental liberties to our people'.

It is my opinion that the idealists who embrace total separation as their creed, bear a large measure of responsibility for this decline in the standards of our public life. Firstly, by concentrating attention on the unattainable, they have diverted attention away from real and considerable grievances. Secondly, and more significantly, they have provided a semblance of justification for what, by their own showing, is morally unjustifiable. They have justified present injustices by reference to an hypothetical moral, but illusionary, order.

They will plead, in their defence, that such restrictions are a painful but necessary means to the end of apartheid. That, indeed, is what Professor Cronje urged in 1945, and his words acquire added meaning in the light of the recommendations of the commission over which he presided on the censorship of literature.

„Alle agitators wat nie-blankes teen die deurvoering van die apartheid-beleid aanhits of opstook, moet die swye opgelê word.

„Die deurvoering van die apartheid-beleid sal so 'n geweldige onderneming wees en vir die witman is daar soveel op die spel, dat kwaadwillige ondermyning nie toegelaat kan word nie. Die algemene volks- en rasse- belang sal die deurslag moet gee." ('n Tuiste vir die Nageslag.)

The 'agitators' and 'malignant disrupters' would include, under existing conditions, those people who have protested the loss of traditional political, property, occupational, and educational rights, who have objected to loss of status and privilege, who have defended the relatively meagre but important liberties which they possessed ten years ago, and who have replied to these attacks with the cry of equality. Is that protest and this cry to be denounced and punished as acts of treason?

The adherents of total separation have been placed in a false position. They can extricate themselves, and regain a reputation for clear, honest thinking only by doing two things. One is openly and systematically to expound and criticise the National Party government's failure both to accept their ideal as a working basis of policy, and to implement immediately the programme for developing the African areas. Secondly, they can join in the protest against the invasion of civil liberties and vested rights, openly dissociate themselves from the pursuit of white supremacy as an end in itself, and defend the right of those who wish to advocate equality.

The latter include, I believe, the overwhelming majority of Africans, Coloured and Indians. Their reaction to total separation was stated 25 years ago by Dr. Seme, in his closing address to the annual conference of the A.N.C.:

"If the advocates of segregation are sincere, let them come out and give the Natives enough land for all their reasonable requirements. Let them draw up a dividing line from North to South or from East to West. Then let the Government order every White man to cross the line and go to his own corner and the Native to go to his own likewise. 'I beg to ask', Dr. Seme concluded, 'is there any Government in this country which would dare to put such a policy into practice.'"
(Umteteli, April 29, 1933).

SUBSCRIBE TO
“LIBERATION”

MAKE sure of getting every copy of LIBERATION (it is published approximately every two months) by filling in the form below and sending it to us together with your postal order:—

To "LIBERATION",
P.O. Box 10120,
Johannesburg.

Please send me every issue of Liberation by post
for the next

FIVE issues: I enclose 5s.

TEN issues: I enclose 10s.

(cross out what does not apply.)

NAME

ADDRESS

.....

.....