



LIBERATION

ONE SHILLING.

No. 38. October, 1959.



**PARTNERSHIP OR SELF-RULE IN
CENTRAL AFRICA?**

LUTULI: AFRICAN WOMEN IN NATAL

Editorial: PROGRESSIVES & THE U.P.



A JOURNAL OF DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION

Liberation

A Journal of Democratic Discussion

No. 38. October, 1959.

ONE SHILLING.

CONTENTS

Page

Editorial: THE GATHERING STORM 1

PARTNERSHIP OR SELF-RULE IN CENTRAL AFRICA 8

By H. J. Simons

UNCOMPROMISING STRUGGLE FOR THE FREEDOM CHARTER - 15

by Joe Matthews

THE AFRICAN WOMEN'S DEMONSTRATION IN NATAL 21

by A. J. Lutuli

THE GATHERING STORM

THE disturbances in Natal cannot be understood in isolation from other events. No doubt each incident had its proximate cause: the injustice of the beerhall system, the wickedness of "influx control" and in particular the extension of this aspect of the pass system to women; the wretchedness and inadequacy of wages paid to Africans, especially for farm labour; the people's rejection of Bantu Education, finding its expression even in the angry and apparently unreasonable destruction of a school; the incivility or brutality of B.A.D. and other officials in their treatment of Africans — all these and many other immediate "grievances" may be found as causes for the demonstrations of many kinds, ranging from peaceful and ordered protests to the gatherings of impis and acts of arson which have been reported in our newspaper columns over the past weeks.

There would be an element of truth in such findings, but it would not be the whole truth.

Even wider of the mark are those who seek, as usual, to ascribe the troubles in Natal to the work of "agitators." Already, inevitably, the senior police official has popped up to blame everything on Congress. This time it is Assistant Commissioner, Brigadier C. J. Els, who has anticipated his chief, Rademeyer, by announcing ("Rand Daily Mail", August 19) baldly that "the African National Congress is behind the Natal disturbances." His proof for this sweeping statement is, apparently, that it was "repeatedly" found that "some of the leaders" were "dressed in A.N.C. colours." By now it has probably occurred to the geniuses in charge of the Department of Justice that this "evidence" is somewhat thin, and we may not unreasonably suppose that the Special Branch will soon be out again raiding for something more substantial.

What is taking place in Natal, as it is throughout the country, is a people's upsurge against intolerable injustices and for freedom. True, people are turning more and more to Congress as the organisation of protest and the voice of their aspirations. Congress in South Africa is a symbol of resistance and struggle. It is understandable that those who are swept into one or other aspect of resistance—even though they are not members of Congress, and even though the methods they choose may not be those of Congress and even disapproved of by Congress—may well don the black-green-and-gold, raise their thumbs and cry "Mayibuy' i' Afrika!" That is an indication of the people's support for Congress, and the depth to which its message, its symbols, slogans and liberationist outlook have penetrated among the masses.

STUPIDITY — OR DISHONESTY?

But it is preposterous to adduce from these well-known facts that the African National Congress is "behind" every spontaneous manifestation of the people's disgust and resentment at the treatment they are receiving from this Nationalist Government: treatment so vile and savage that protests have risen against it from every corner of the world where men and women are free to raise their voices against inhumanity and injustice. The police seem to imagine, or to want the public to believe, that the Congress leaders sit somewhere in an office and work out a time-table: on such a date we shall destroy the dipping-tank here, on another the school there, or the sugar-cane somewhere else. If they really believe such trash it throws a pitiless light upon their lack of intelligence and understanding of the history that is in the making about us; and if they don't believe it they are guilty of trying to deceive the public. We need not exercise our minds debating whether they are stupid or dishonest; let us rather assume that it is the characteristic mixture of both stupidity and dishonesty which Mr. Swart's department has so amply demonstrated elsewhere.

The path of wisdom and sanity would have been for the Government to recognise that what is happening in Natal today — just as what happened in the Transvaal and Eastern Cape so recently—are symptoms and deep and heartfelt grievances, of intolerable tensions and strains which their administration and their policy has imposed upon the already sorely oppressed and suffering African people. To face these unpleasant truths — and then to take at least the first urgent steps to rectify the people's complaints, steps which they will delay yet further only at their utmost peril.

Alas, wisdom and sanity are not and never have been among the gifts of the Nationalists. Dr. Eiselen's statement ("Rand Daily Mail", August 21), is an almost unbelievably smug and silly document to have been produced in this year of grace, 1959. The Secretary of the B.A.D. says the people were "confused" by criticism of "everything the State does for the benefit of the Bantu" (like pass laws, mass removals and the prohibition of traditional home-brewing.) Eiselen does not recognise—what is as plain as a pikestaff to everyone else—that the Zulus are furiously angry with his Department and his Government. He speaks of "supposedly aggrieved persons."

Not a single concession is announced by this bad Secretary, not the slightest alleviation of the harsh pressures which called forth the disturbances. Instead he has announced a series of punitive measures, including recourse to collective fines, one of the few ugly features of colonial rule which, hitherto, has not been prominent in this country. Equally sinister is Eiselen's threat that pressure will be brought to bear on "Bantu communities" to become police informers on "agitators and wrongdoers" and that "it is expected that some of the detained misguided persons will divulge the names of the instigators."

DONT BURN THE BRIDGES!

What does Dr. Eiselen have in mind? Are we going to see in Natal, under the auspices of the police and the Bantu Affairs Department, a reign of terror, along "Kenya" lines, designed to break the spirit and the solidarity of the Zulu people? We trust earnestly that Eiselen and Verwoerd are not proposing to embark on any such ill-advised attempt. They may not be deterred by the wickedness and injustice of trying to reproduce in South Africa the worst excesses of British and French imperialism. But we would offer them the sobering warning that wherever such methods have been tried, whether in Africa or Asia, over the past ten years, they have resulted in humiliating defeat and disgrace for their instigators. Faced with the inglorious collapse of their colonial wars, the West European imperialists could at least retire to their own countries, and try to console themselves by painting, for those who cared to believe it, a flattering picture of themselves as magnanimous benefactors, conferring the gift of freedom on their former subjects. No consolations await the imperialists of Union Buildings, once they have burnt the last bridges to conciliation and concession. They should bear in mind the crude and homely wisdom of the saying that you should not mess on your own doorstep.

Whether they were influenced by such considerations we do not know, but the fact is that, prior to the ominous Eiselen statement, the authorities had acted with rare and astonishing restraint and caution in Natal, so much so as to earn a public and quite unprecedented "thank you" from the President of Congress. It is sickening to have to record that the one to step in with hysterical demands for draconic B.A.D. and police punitive measures against the Africans, to inflame the totally unwarranted panic of the Whites in Natal (there is no evidence whatsoever that a single one of the disturbances was directed, racially, against Whites as such), and in general to shout for the absolutely suicidal policy of civil war in Natal, instead of the sane path of reasoned enquiry and rectification of intolerable grievances—was none other than Mr. Douglas Mitchell, leader of the United Party in Natal.

WHITHER THE UNITED PARTY?

Now when Eiselen blathers about "supposedly aggrieved persons" and "everything the State does for the benefit of the Bantu", one may be charitable enough to assume that, with typical Calvinistic righteousness, he really believes that, in some devious way or other, all the hateful oppressions which the Nationalist Government loads upon the backs of the Africans are really intended "for their benefit." After all, the human mind has an infinite capacity for self-deception. During the Spanish Inquisition, the executioner-priests wept and prayed for the souls of those whose bodies they were burning at the stake.

No such charitable assumptions can be made in the case of the United Party. However half-heartedly and equivocally, the U.P. and its press opposed most of the outrageous oppressive measures of the Government which led directly to the Natal protests. They are perfectly aware that these measures are not meant to benefit the Africans, but are calculated

to drive them to desperation. Yet Mr. Mitchell and his colleagues do not point out to the Government how all their brutal measures are now coming home to roost. They do not demand an immediate reversal of apartheid policy in the interests of the well-being and safety of all the population of Natal. Instead Mitchell attacks the Africans for protesting against intolerable conditions, and actually incites the Government to take even harsher punitive measures.

This wicked and irresponsible act of cynical political opportunism is a true indication of the sort of behaviour which we can expect in the future from the "purged" United Party, with the Right Wingers firmly in the saddle. We must confess that we do not share the optimism which has seen in the exodus of the "Progressives" an encouraging major development in White politics in this country. The Steytler group did not break away from the U.P. in order to found a new and better political party, with a reformed platform and programme of its own. In fact, several weeks after their resignation, they have still failed to produce any programme at all, and when they do we doubt if it will differ significantly from that advanced by the United Party at the last election. It is true that they have said, and we must welcome even this timid beginning, that "the non-Europeans" should "be consulted." But which non-Europeans? Consulted about what? All is conveniently vague.

HOUNDED OUT

The truth is that the "Progressives" did not leave the United Party voluntarily. They were hounded out of the Party. Their departure does not mark a turning on their part to the Left; they stand where they stood before. It marks a turning by the dominant Party leadership to the Right.

We do not question the sincerity of the "rebels" — thus called by the newspapers. Indeed, they have rebelled, against the incredible depths of political immorality reached by their erstwhile colleagues, and all honour to them for so doing. Some of them — we do not recall Dr. Steytler among them — spoke out valiantly against the farm labour scandal at the last Session. In quitting the Party, they have jeopardised their Parliamentary seats and their political prospects, with not much prospect of any return save the intangible blessing of a clear conscience. In the morass of naked careerism and vulgar opportunism which distinguishes the Parliamentary political scene in this country, their behaviour shines out like a good deed in a naughty world. The "Progressives" themselves are not really a homogenous group; their delay in publishing any common statement of plans and aims is not the only indication of divergencies among themselves. It may well prove that we shall witness further regroupings and interactions between some of them and elements of the Liberal Party, perhaps, symptoms of the shifting political scene.

Yet the blunt facts of the matter show that the "Progressives" have taken their stand, and earned their title, in defence of the legislation and the plans adopted under General Hertzog in 1936 — and rightly regarded at that time as the most extreme move to reaction since Union. In that astonishing irony lies the true measure of the new situation. Today we have Hertzog Progressives; Malan Moderates; Dönges Liberals.

TO OUT-NAT THE NATS

Henceforth we shall witness a degrading attempt by the U.P. leadership to out-Nat. the Nats. We shall see an exhibition of political dishonesty the like of which even South Africa has never seen before.

Take the question of the "Bantustans." We know and Verwoerd knows that the Government has not the slightest intention of delegating any real authority to the Government-appointed Chiefs in the Reserves. It is a wretched bluff, meant to throw dust into the eyes of the world. It hasn't deceived anyone.

The "brilliant" new tactic of the United Party lies in *pretending* to be deceived by this bluff. They are going to rush to the voters screaming that the Nats. are handing over the country to the Blacks. They are going to run around the platteland opposing land purchases for the reserves and holding themselves up as the saviours of White domination against the wicked Nats. who are concealed kafferboeties. (The White electorate of this country have showed in the past that they will swallow almost any nonsense, but even they are not likely to swallow this!)

In stripping itself thus of the last shreds of political decency and principle, the United Party finds the Steytlers, the Suzmans and the Wilsons—the main targets of Nationalist abuse at the last Parliamentary session—nothing but an embarrassment. Hitherto the hope of ousting the Nats. in an election has kept together the miscellaneous assortment of people with widely divergent views which constitutes the United Party. The theory is that under a "two-party" system, sooner or later the pendulum will swing and the "outs" will become the "ins". That theory may work out under more or less stable conditions where both sides play the parliamentary game according to the rules. It doesn't work when the conditions are inherently unstable, and where the "in-group" keeps drastically changing the rules to its own advantage. The Nats. aren't playing cricket; they won't give the Opposition an innings; they prefer all-in wrestling, with no holds barred.

A belated recognition of this unpalatable truth is the real factor behind the disintegration of the United Party. And the appropriate solution found by Graaff, Mitchell and Co. is apparently to try and make themselves so like the Nationalists that the voters won't be able to tell the difference between the two Parties. A cheerless outlook for South Africa: as if one Nationalist Party wasn't bad enough, we now have to put up with two of them.

Without even such restraining influence as may have been exercised over the Nats. by the criticisms of the United Party newspapers and by such a doughty fighter as Harry Lawrence; with the "Opposition" vieing with the Government in corrupting the moral sense of the White electorate; with every protest against each new iniquity branded as disloyal and playing into the hands of the growing movement abroad to quarantine racialistic South Africa—what a picture of the immediate future of "White politics" in our country, drifting helplessly towards the horrors of a one-party police state!

ECONOMIC REALITIES

Yet the situation is by no means without its compensatory features. The logic of political events and economic realities may yet impel the "Progressives," or at least some of them, along paths more in keeping with the needs of a country in this awakening continent and this dynamic world than anything they have thus far said or done entitles anyone to expect. In his extremely interesting article "Why Oppenheimer Left the U.P." (New Age, September 10) Mr. Brian Bunting points out that the relative strength of manufacturing industry in the country's economy has grown steadily; its percentage contribution to the national income has gone from 17 per cent. in 1936 to about 25 per cent. now. Manufacture and commerce — unlike mining and farming — require a more skilled, stable and adequately remunerated labour force; Verwoerd is driving the country in precisely the opposite direction.

It is tempting indeed to hope that the emergence of the Progressives parallels in the political field the statements of organised commerce and industry (we only wish they were backed up by more substantial practical gestures to alleviate the desperate position of their starving African workers!) acknowledging that wage-levels are too low. No doubt the special interests of the manufacturing capitalists are one of the elements in an extremely complex situation. But we should do well not to underestimate the complexity of that situation. It is not their share of the national income alone which determines the relative weight of mining and farming in our political economy; indeed, manufacture and commerce are bound by a thousand invisible strings to the predominant mining monopolies. Hence the traditional timidity of these elements in advancing any radical alternatives to the characteristic South African labour structure — whose pillars are the colour bar, the pass system and the reserves — which cripples the development both of a trained, stable working population and of an adequate and expanding home market.

There are other and even more cogent reasons why we cannot really expect to find South Africa's white manufacturers and shopkeepers espousing the cause of freedom and democracy, or challenging the pass laws and the colour bar. It is true, and we have seen it happen in many colonial countries in recent times, that capitalists have joined with their people to win independence and the modernisation of the home economy. That is the classical path of capitalist development. We cannot forget, however, that our country is not "classical". Everything is twisted and distorted to fit the monstrous pattern of white domination, which has made the Union the target of outraged decency and humanity throughout the world; and frankly we do not believe that Oppenheimer and the Progressives have the slightest intention of doing anything which might disturb that highly-profitable pattern. They do not like Verwoerd and his Apartheid, but they do not like Lutuli and his Charter either; where they are going we doubt if they really know themselves.

TWO CHEERS FOR THE PROGRESSIVES

We have no doubt that these surly-seeming remarks will be found most unwelcome by many of our readers; who will regard them as a poor and churlish acknowledgment of a gesture by a group of men and women which (though in the interests of their self-respect they should have made it long ago) required some courage and moral fibre. We most cordially offer any such readers the hospitality of our columns, for we have never claimed a monopoly of political wisdom, and believe that out of genuine disputation comes enlightenment. Perhaps we underrate the rebels from the U.P. — we shall be most happy if that is so.

Yet, we cannot find it in us, at this stage, to offer more than two cheers for the Progressives. There are a thousand urgent challenges and causes for anyone in South Africa today who is truly progressive; the fight against passes, Bantu education, Bantu authorities, Group Areas, political persecution and censorship, apartheid, the "Immorality" Act, bigotry and indoctrination in the schools; the fight for a minimum £1-a-day wage, for democracy, for free speech . . . Let us see the Progressives meeting some of these challenges and fighting some of these causes, and we shall with goodwill and enthusiasm add the third cheer and many more.

We have seen too many demoralising disillusionments in South African politics. We have seen how, every time honest people's anger against the Nats. has risen in the past decade, the "progressive" aunties of the United Party and the Chamber of Mines have hastened to quell the storm, lest it rock the boat of White Supremacy. We have seen these selfsame Harry Oppenheimers and Strausses kill the Torch Commando movement stone dead; just as Auntie Joel Mervis of the Sunday Times now hastens to reprimand the Maritzburg students for being nasty to dear, democratic Dr. Verwoerd.

Of course, times have changed. We live in days when Man has learnt to shoot the moon. We may yet live to see the day when Harry Oppenheimer will call for the abolition of pass laws — or even, for a start, allow the Congress of Trade Unions permission to send organisers into his mine compounds.

Meanwhile, as stormclouds gather fast, history is being made out in the streets and the fields of South Africa, by the men and women who have seen in the Congress message and the Congress movement their sole hope for a better life for themselves and their children, who have been warmed and inspired by the vast tide of goodwill and solidarity that flows to their fight for freedom from all Africa, all the world.

Will history spare a chapter for those who stand outside the struggle, ignoring the struggle, pretending it does not exist? Or a page, or a paragraph?

Let them beware, lest it be only one phrase — "Too little — far too little — and too late!"

What has Federation really meant to the people?

Partnership or Self-Rule in Central Africa

by H. J. Simons

AFRICANS in Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia opposed the principle of federation long before it became a reality in 1953. To them it spelt domination by Southern Rhodesia, rule by White settlers, and racial discrimination. They wanted to stay under the Colonial Office, which had promised them a share in government.

Six years of Federation have strengthened their hostility. The Devlin Commission found that it was deeply rooted and almost universally held by Nyasas. "They want above all else, self-government for the black people of Nyasaland such as they have seen happening in other parts of Africa. They think that under the British Government they may eventually get it, and that under federation they never will." Some observers believe that resistance goes further, and that many Africans now also distrust the British Government and think of independence.

The Administration complains that the African attitude is unreasonable, and blames it on self-seeking politicians and "aggressive nationalism." It claims that discriminations are being removed step by step in the march towards full partnership. African gains are being widely advertised.

FRUITS OF PARTNERSHIP

Twelve seats are reserved for Africans in the Federal Parliament, as compared with six in 1953. An African holds ministerial rank in the Executive. Africans can get the same salaries as Europeans in the civil service. There are African doctors and Coloured and Asian teachers on these scales. Qualified African nurses can get the same salary as Europeans. Africans do skilled work in the copper mines and are said to be the most high paid African miners in Southern Africa. In some Southern Rhodesian engineering firms there are Africans able to earn the full grade wage of 5s. 4d. an hour. Southern Rhodesia's new Industrial Conciliation Act provides for open trade unions and apprenticeship schemes. Social as well as academic equality has been introduced into the University.

Some of the claims listed are promises, rather than actual performances. It is doubtful whether partnership has made much change in the life of the ordinary African. Federation may have speeded up development. The greater probability is that things would have been much the same, economically speaking, without it.

Nyasaland, though poor and backward, still offers her people more scope for advance in government service than does her far richer southern neighbour. No better test could be found than the state-owned railways, which are among the biggest employers in Central Africa. At the beginning of the year the Rhodesian Railways employed 6,190 Whites in the skilled and administrative grades (artisans, drivers, firemen, guards, clerks, foremen), but no Africans. Nyasaland Railways, in contrast employed in the same categories 962 Africans, 141 Asians and 61 Whites. The loaf is smaller, but the African's share is bigger.

South Africans, nevertheless, are inclined to feel that the Rhodesias no longer follow a course parallel to the Union's. There is a divergence, though its degree cannot be easily measured. The Union's rulers deny the reality of a common society. They treat Africans as aliens, and tell them to satisfy their ambition for progress and security in isolated, primitive reserves under tribal chiefs. No party of White supremacy has even contemplated a relaxation of colour bars. We have only apartheid. The Federation offers partnership as well.

SHOW DOWN WITH CONGRESS

It is not contradictory that repressive action should be taken in both countries against people who want equality. This is the standard strategy of colonial administrations in periods of political turbulence. The political elimination of uncompromising opponents is supposed to strengthen the influence of traditional and more amenable leaders over the masses. As much could be inferred from the reasons given by Sir Edgar Whitehead, Southern Rhodesia's Prime Minister, for declaring a state of emergency on February 26th. The African National Congress, he complained, had carried out a "campaign of intimidation and boycott against moderate Africans who openly supported racial co-operation." It had tried to draw away the loyalty of the people from the chiefs; but "it was absolutely vital that respect for chiefs should be maintained."

The idea of building up a leadership of chiefs and moderates by putting the Congress out of action rests on the mistaken belief that it expresses the thoughts of only a small group of self-seeking agitators whose suppression would leave the great mass of people unmoved. The assumption cannot be put to the test of an election in the absence of a general franchise. Should the people support extra-parliamentary methods of protest, such as boycotts and strikes, they are said to have acted under intimidation or to have been misled by false propaganda. When applying repressive measures, in other words, colonial governments cannot afford to admit that the people have political understanding or that their leaders are true patriots.

We now know from the findings of the Devlin Commission that the Administration has acted on false premises, at any rate in Nyasaland. "We do not think," remarked the commissioners caustically, "that all the Congress leaders have more than the usual share of personal ambition! The Congress is not a minority organisation. It had the support of most Africans, as well as of the minority who are "just as well equipped as the average European" for "making a reasoned and prudent decision."

A movement of this kind cannot be broken up and eliminated. It can be driven underground, but only by the use of methods such as we in the Union, unfortunately, know too well. The Devlin Report described the position bluntly. "Nyasaland is—no doubt temporarily—a police state, where it is not safe for anyone to express approval of the policies of the Congress party, to which, before March 3, 1959, the vast majority of politically minded Africans belonged, and where it is unwise to express any but the most restrained criticism of Government policy."

Opposition to government is treated as subversion in a police state. Opponents are imprisoned and deported without trial, political meetings are prohibited, organisations are banned. The authorities use intimidation to deter people from expressing their political feelings and to spy on one another. All these methods are being employed in the Federation. The Nyasaland Information Bulletin of May 6th, 1959, contains this revealing passage:

"Do you know of any member of Congress living near you who has not been arrested? Do you know of any group of Congress members near you who are plotting to cause trouble? If you do, you must tell the Boma, so that these wicked people can be arrested and removed from your area. Tell your District Commissioner or your nearest Government Officer the names of any Congress member who you know has not been arrested. You can either report personally to a Government Officer, or if you prefer to remain anonymous, send an unsigned letter to your District Commissioner or Police Officer, giving the name and address of any Congress member still at large. (There is no need to put a stamp on the letter.)

Arrests were made on the basis of informers' reports. 1,308 Africans were detained, of whom 622 were released by June 27th. Of those detained, 134 were sent to prison for periods ranging from six months to two years, many of them for being in possession of a Congress membership card, even though it had been issued when Congress was a lawful body. The cases of the 529 persons still detained (as at August 21st) will be reviewed at six-monthly intervals.

The Government's actions cannot fail to disrupt Congress, but will not stamp out of people's minds the things for which it stands. If some of the leaders, as the Devlin Commission found, advocated the use of violence in resisting unpopular laws and the police when enforcing them, the reason was that they suffered from "a feeling of frustration" because they lacked

adequate constitutional means for expressing their demands. Such means are even more meagre in a police state. The gulf between the people and the authorities will be widened.

CONGRESS GAINS GROUND

This being so, the police state cannot last long. If its mainstay is the White population, which numbers a bare 250,000, Federation will not be able to govern the seven million Africans against their will. There is also the Imperial factor. Colonial policies may not loom large in British politics, but the balance of public opinion seems to disapprove of old-fashioned colonial techniques. Britain must also take note of anti-imperialist sentiment in the rest of the world, not least of all in Africa, as expressed for instance by Prime Minister Nkrumah in Ghana's National Assembly:

"The Government of the Central African Federation by her actions in connection with present events in Central Africa, is causing Britain to forfeit to a large extent the goodwill and confidence of the people of Central Africa. This action of the Federal government also puts us in a most embarrassing position. For, although we are a member of the Commonwealth, how can we stand aside and condone repressive actions against unarmed and defenceless Africans with the purpose of strangling their efforts to free themselves from foreign domination?"

The pressure has already had important results. The British Prime Minister has announced that the constitutional talks which are scheduled to take place next year will not produce dominion status for the Federation. He also gave an assurance that responsibility for Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland would not be transferred to the Federation. As the British Government hands over power, it will be given to the governments of the two territories. The number of Africans in the legislatures will be increased more and more until they form a majority. Only then, when the northern territories "stand on their own feet," will the Federation move towards full self-government.

To give effect to these undertakings, constitutional advances will have to be made at a much faster rate than has been thought likely. The police state will have to be dismantled, the ban on Congress lifted and the release of Dr. Banda and his lieutenants ordered. Africans will have to be fully represented by leaders of their own choice at the constitutional talks.

The authorities are evidently not in a mood to restore political life to the territories. It is true that Nyasaland is to be given a new Legislative Council in which Africans will have a majority among unofficial elected members (though the officials will still form a majority) and two seats in the Executive Council. But Mr. Chipembere and Mr. Chiume, the two members of Congress in the legislature, have been deprived of their seats by decree. And the Governor is not prepared to allow political meetings "in the near future." The vendetta against Dr. Banda and Congress shows no signs of abating.

In these circumstances the value of the assurances given by the British Government cannot be assessed. Major decisions are likely to be postponed until after the British have had their general election, and may be affected greatly by the findings of the commission appointed to prepare for next year's review of the constitution. The composition of this body as announced, with its preponderance of official and White settler representatives, will not inspire Africans with confidence in its work.

The kind of assurance that would make federation acceptable to Africans has not yet been given. If it were promised, it might make federation unacceptable to Whites in Southern Rhodesia and, possibly, Northern Rhodesia. It has not yet been found possible to satisfy both groups in any part of Africa, and we cannot say whether Central Africa will find a way out of the deadlock.

REACTION IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

A possible working basis for a settlement, some Rhodesians think, is contained in the Moffat Resolutions of 1954. Briefly stated, the formula is: a policy designed to remove from each race the fear that the other might dominate for its own racial benefit; a common franchise for all races; a period of transition with safeguards to protect the interests of either race; equal opportunities to progress for all people without distinction of race, colour or creed. The adoption of these principles would put an end to White supremacy. But will Rhodesian Whites agree to a settlement on such a basis?

It seems not. They remain unrepentant. They have no difficulty in rejecting those findings of the Devlin Commission that are favourable to Congress and in seizing on the passages that confirm their prejudices. Now they have the report of the Review Tribunal headed by the Acting Chief Justice, Mr. Beadle, to justify the emergency. The terms of this report leave little room for hope of a more tolerant attitude towards Congress and nationalist aspirations in the south.

When announcing the state of emergency, the Prime Minister explained that it had become necessary because of the policy of violence pursued by the Nyasaland Congress, and the danger of it spreading southward. His criticisms of the Southern Rhodesian Congress were surprisingly temperate. He said that it began in the second half of 1957 as a "comparatively innocuous body," finding out and exploiting grievances many of which were perfectly genuine. But its character gradually changed until it embarked on a determined campaign of propaganda against land policies and the administration. He had decided to remove the people who were causing the trouble, but he had high hopes that it would not be necessary to detain them for more than a month.

The state of emergency was officially terminated on May 20th. In fact, however, it was made virtually permanent by four statutes, some of them with a life of five years. They name the four Congresses in the Federation as unlawful organisations, authorise the detention of persons likely to

endanger public safety or promote ill-will between races, make it an offence to behave contemptuously or insolently towards a government official, prohibit meetings of more than 12 Africans without written permission, and "protect individuals against intimidation and boycott."

The review tribunal was set up to examine the cases of detainees. It presented a report which was tabled on August 12th. The tribunal recommended one detainee for unconditional release, two men for transfer "to an area prepared for their reception," and 22, including the vice-president and organising secretary of the S.R.A.N.C., for further detention. The remaining detainees will be reported on later.

The tribunal was far more critical of Congress than the Prime Minister had been when speaking under the stress of the "emergency." Yet it admitted that "the most cogent evidence" relating to the alleged subversive objects of Congress was given secretly, and not subjected to cross-examination. On the basis of this dubious evidence, it found that Congress had tried to arouse disaffection with the aim of altering the constitution by unlawful means. Congress was "committed to a policy of disregarding lawful authority, exciting racial hatred, organising general strikes and boycotts, intimidation and violence." But all these activities had only been talked about: "plans had not yet advanced beyond a discussion stage and individual Congress leaders were expressing their own views of what form the final plan would take." The tribunal thought—but "this is an opinion, rather than a finding"—that the declaration of a state of emergency might well have nipped the plans in the bud.

Such assertions, though easily made, can never be proved. Detainees and members of Congress have not been allowed to reply to charges in public debate or open court. The Beadle report—like the Ridley report, which reaches much the same conclusions about the Zambia A.N.C. of Northern Rhodesia—will be used to justify the Government's actions and maintain the Whites in their state of complacency. But it will not remove the African's feeling of injustice, nor will it instill confidence in partnership under federation.

Nothing less than the abolition of racial privilege and a wide diffusion of political power will serve the purpose. But party politics and a narrow franchise rule out such a course in Southern Rhodesia. The present government is no apostle of liberalism, but it stands to the left of its rival, the Dominion Party, which missed being the government last year by a margin of four seats and the vagaries of the preferential voting system. As in the Union, the White racialists set the pace. Should the Government make a serious effort to break down colour bars—and it has not shown any such tendency—the effect would be to strengthen the Dominion Party.

The African vote is not a decisive factor in spite of the common roll. It operates on a two-tier system. To qualify at the higher level, a person must be able to speak and write English, and receive an annual income of £240 or be in occupation of property worth £500. For the lower qualification, one must have an income of £120, two years of secondary educa-

tion and two years of continuous employment. The number of voters registered under the special qualification may not exceed 20 per cent. of the number of ordinary voters registered. It was estimated at the time of the general election that between 6,000 and 8,000 Africans were eligible, but of the 55,000 voters registered only 1,696 were Africans.

BREAK UP OF FEDERATION

White supremacy is firmly entrenched. As long as it remains so Africans in the northern territories will oppose any transfer of power that would bring them under Southern Rhodesia's rule. They will insist on the fulfilment of the pledge contained in the Federal constitution, which reads: "The territories should continue under the special protection of Her Majesty to enjoy separate government so long as their respective peoples so desire." Alternatively, they will press for the break up of the Federation and a rapid advance to self-government with an African majority in the legislature.

The British Labour Party and progressive opinion seem to be committed to such a course. The extreme Right in Southern Rhodesia also want to pull out of Federation, but for the opposite reasons. They hope to insulate Southern Rhodesia from the waves of African nationalism that spread from the north. Some people think that the dissolution of Federation would extinguish the already dim hopes for African advancement in Southern and to a lesser extent in Northern Rhodesia. Welensky and his associates want to preserve Federation, partly for economic reasons, and partly to prevent what has often called "an orgy of nationalism" in the northern territories. In this confusion of cross-currents and clashing interests, the only thing of which one can be certain is that it will not be long before Dr. Banda and other Congress leaders in the north regain their liberty, and Africans come into their own in the government.

WILL AFRICA BE FREE?

Colonialism is being driven out of Africa. But formal independence, although it is an essential pre-condition, is not in itself the answer to Africa's needs. What economic path will Africa take? An examination of Ghana's Second Development Plan appears in the next issue of LIBERATION. Don't miss this important article. Introduce LIBERATION to your friends.

In the name of "unity", we cannot conceal differences that
must be brought into the open, says

JOE MATTHEWS

Uncompromising Struggle for the Freedom Charter

ON JUNE 26th, 1955, the Congress of the People of South Africa through their representatives gather at Kliptown, Johannesburg, adopted the Freedom Charter.

That great gathering ushered in a new era in the chequered history of the liberatory struggle in this country.

The power that lay in the simple unpretentious words of the Freedom Charter has been amply demonstrated, if only in the reactions it has aroused from the reactionaries on the one hand and the people on the other.

To the people it is a clear and noble expression of their aspirations which must be attained in our lifetime. To the Nationalist Government the Charter represented the most comprehensive and consistent programme that has so far been put forward in opposition to their own. Recognising this the Nationalist Party lashed out at the Charter and the organisations that gave rise to it. By making the Freedom Charter the centre of their attacks on the Congress Movement they endorsed its dynamic character and ironically enough made it probably the most famous document in South African history.

The very fact that the Charter represents the most progressive programme ever put forward by the national organisations of the oppressed in this country should have suggested that it would be opposed tooth and nail by all reactionaries. It should have been anticipated that this opposition would come not only from openly reactionary circles but also from other groups some of which claim to be "democratic."

The acceptance by the multi-national Congress of the People of the Charter sounded the death knell to all manner of political will-o-the-wisps that still find currency in our country. Hence an ideological and physical struggle, concealed and open, taking many different forms and from all

manner of groups and interests was to be expected. The physical attack came in the form of a Treason Trial. The war of ideas took this and other forms.

The question that arises is whether or not the Congress Movement has effectively dealt with this ideological war against the Charter. Have we sufficiently realised the need to wage an uncompromising struggle for the complete victory of the Charter in the ideological field? Have we succeeded to show by a close analysis of all the terms of the Charter that it is the only adequate answer for the problems that face South Africa today and is therefore the correct strategic objective of all progressive forces?

Have we placed all the necessary ideological weapons at the disposal of our people to enable them to repeal and defeat the attacks on the Charter in the field of ideas?

There is a tendency in the Liberatory Movement (using that expression in its broadest sense) to play down or even shy away from ideological differences. People feel the paramount need for a broad united front against the very real and overwhelming reactionary advance in our country. Keenly responsible, anxious always to maintain progressive forces intact as far as possible we are leaning over backwards to avoid any suggestions of sectarianism.

But the question is how is this being done? Are our methods correct? Are we not in our desire for unity on practical issues against Apartheid falling somewhat into the "marsh" ideologically?

A false way to unity is to place in the forefront the "reconciliation" of groups or persons. Differences are hushed up, their causes, their significance, their objective conditions are not elucidated. If there is no agreement on a common policy then it is given an interpretation that makes it acceptable to all. This leads to narrow-circle diplomacy and the adjustment of conflicts at all costs. In the long run it leads to confusion and disillusionment.

We are not suggesting that this is the position in so far as the Congresses are concerned although even there the full development of self-criticism in ideological matters has not been attained. We are primarily concerned with the relationship between the Congress Movement and potential allies in a broad anti-fascist united front.

The only true road to unity lies in thrashing out differences in the most open, clear and, if need be, ruthless way, so that at last the truth should be apparent to all. The situation in South Africa renders it particularly necessary for this principle to be observed. The fact that there are laws which place heavy restrictions on the manner and scope of such ideological discussions is no excuse but is a strong reason for even greater discussion.

The fact that the united anti-fascist front we seek to build is a broad movement merely affects the basis of unity and the degrees of unity upon essentials. Within the Congress Movement, for instance, a higher form of

unity upon essentials is required than in a broad united front which includes Liberals, Labourites, etc. And for Socialists an incomparably higher and more difficult form of unity is called for.

But the point is that whatever movement we are dealing with, points of difference must be understood and the basis of unity clearly stated.

There is relatively little difficulty in so far as the Congress Movement is concerned. All sectors of the Congress accept the Freedom Charter as their basic policy and programme. The Freedom Charter is a statement of objectives sufficiently comprehensive and long-term to lay a powerful foundation of unity for years to come. There may be those within the Congress movement who quite rightly see the need for even more fundamental changes in South Africa than are envisaged in the Charter. Such persons, however, know that such changes lie so far ahead that they cannot be made the subject of a struggle today. All progressives are obliged to fight unreservedly for the achievement of the aims contained in the Freedom Charter. That is the essential pre-condition for any further advance.

The Charter probably represents the maximum that can be accepted by ALL democratic elements in the present historical stage in S.A. On the other hand it is the minimum that can be expected of any person who wishes to be considered part of the Congress Movement. No person or group can possibly be considered to be part of Congress unless they accept all the fundamental aspects of the Freedom Charter without qualification. And the main efforts of the Congress Movement should be to secure the acceptance of the Charter by all groups in the country. This will be done not only by means of discussion but by convincing the people through active mass struggle that the Charter is the only way out.

Whilst the Charter represents the basis of unity in Congress it can hardly be expected to form the essential basis of an anti-fascist front directed against the Nationalist Party and its Apartheid ideology.

Many groups who are not part of the Congress Movement and who do not accept the Charter must be brought within the framework of a broad united front against the Nationalist Party . . . a Popular Front.

The aims of such a popular front will only coincide with those of the Congress Movement over a limited field and for limited objectives.

It is essential to define both for the benefit of Congressmen and for potential allies in a united front precisely how far the limits of the United Front extend.

The Congress Movement clearly does not expect that all groups with whom it is prepared to join in a broad front agree on all aspects of its policy. It insists that these groups or organisations will be prepared genuinely to participate in the practical struggle to defend the people from the attacks of the Nationalist Government and to secure the defeat of the Apartheid policy which has become the supreme menace facing all people in the Union today.

For its part the Congress naturally claims power of independent action ; the right to express its differences from others clearly ; to protect its programme and extend its influence at all times.

Our differences with temporary, partial and even vacillating allies must be stated clearly so that the people can be made aware of the basis of united front tactics being pursued at the present time.

It is particularly important to elucidate this problem as some of the groups or parties with whom the Congress Movement is urging co-operation are themselves engaged in furious campaigns against the Congress and its programme—the Freedom Charter. Some of these groups imagine that advantage can be gained out of the sincere manner in which Congress is carrying out a united front policy to undermine the Congress and its leadership.

With greater maturity and responsibility and because it is more sensitive of the dangers represented by the Nationalist Government the Congress Movement has not always retaliated against attack as it could.

It does become necessary to warn against the kind of campaign that has been carried on for some time now against the Congress Movement. The intensity of these attacks have increased during the period of the Treason Trial. As always when punitive measures are taken by the authorities against the progressive movement the opportunity is seized by all sorts of dissident groups to make “ideological” attacks on the Movement.

It is interesting to note the groups participating in this campaign on Congress. It is an unholy and motley audience which includes the Nationalist Party, the United Party, sections of the Liberal Party, the Africanists, various newspapers including the “Golden City Post,” “World,” “Contact,” “experts” on African affairs in the United States, etc.

It is impossible to deal with all the forms of this offensive which is being carried on by means of slander, gossip lies, through newspaper articles, interviews and comments. We should like to deal with some of the criticisms levelled at Congress.

One criticism against the Freedom Charter and shared by such apparently diverse groups as the Nationalist Party, Liberal Party and Africanists is that the Freedom Charter is a “communist” document.

One would search in vain for some feature that stamps the Charter as a “communist” document. None of the groups who level this criticism have ever tried to make their conclusions rest on an examination of the terms of the Charter itself. They never bother to state what exactly makes the Charter “communist.” One can only conclude that the word “communist” as used by these reactionaries is a kind of political swearword.

The Africanists have criticised the Freedom Charter for asserting that "South Africa belong to all who live in it, Black and White." They argue that the country belongs to the *Africans only*. This attitude must be noted by those misguided persons who are now engaged in a campaign of white-washing the Africanists.

The Charter is of course referring to the position as it should and will obtain in a democratic South Africa. This must be so because strictly speaking South Africa, today, belongs to a very tiny minority of mining magnates, industrialists and landlords together with overseas imperialist interests. It does *not* belong to the majority of people, white or black. These tiny few are prepared to prove and defend their present ownership with all the forces at the command of their state machine. The task of democracy will be to restore ownership to the vast majority in S.A. who have worked and slaved to develop it.

It has been alleged that certain sections of the Congress Movement are dominated by others. The Congress of Democrats has been most frequently mentioned as a dominating force. Before 1953 when the Congress of Democrats was not in existence it was alleged by these people that the A.N.C. is dominated by the South African Indian Congress. When the Congress of Democrats was formed at the instance of the A.N.C. the attack switched to the C.O.D. Incidentally it is never said that the Congress of Democrats dominates the Indian Congress. It is only the African National Congress that is so "dominated." The reason is that the criticism is basically racialist in its origins.

These people think that by accusing the Africans of being dominated by Whites they will the more readily succeed in their aim of discrediting the A.N.C. as a force among the African people who are suffering national oppression by a White minority. This allegation is not made in relation to the C.O.D. on the grounds that it is "communist." Even the most die-hard reactionaries know that communism cannot be attached to any race or skin-colour.

Another favourite ideological criticism is that the Congress Movement is multi-racial and not non-racial. Previously the claim was that the Liberal Party was the only multi-racial organisation in the country and that the Congresses were "racial." This was not too effective inasmuch as the Congresses had fought struggles as a multi-racial group virtually single-handed for the last decade whilst others stood discreetly away from the firing-line. The racialist Nationalist Government had by its actions shown that it too recognised this fact. When it banned a Congressman from participating in various organisations it included them all and treated them as one. It was and is gross impertinence for those who had done nothing to fight racialism to turn round now and pose as champions of anti-racialism as compared with the Congresses.

Today the criticism has become more sophisticated but no less ridiculous. The Congress is allegedly multi-racial and other groups claim to be non-racial. This is being screamed at the country . . . by whom? The "Golden City Post" and the interests behind it, the Pan-Africanist Congress, Mr. Jordan Ngubane, the Liberals! The Golden City Post and its backers go further and suggest virtually the dissolution of the Congresses and their replacement by a veritable hodge-podge that includes Liberals, Labourites, Black Sash, "left wing" U.P., Pan-Africanists, and dissenting Nationalist professors.

This is a policy of disruption of the freedom struggle and the creation of a debating society. In ancient times philosophers learnedly debated the problem of the number of angels that could dance at the point of a needle. The organisation advocated by the Golden City Post would probably debate the difference between "non-racial" and "multi-racial" before it finally split into a thousand fragments.

There are forces in S.A. genuinely working for a democratic society in which racialism would be impossible. These are forces which recognise that racialism stems from a definite source that lies at the root of South African state structure. These forces realise that state-power is the key to the solution to the problem of racialism. The core of those forces is to be found in the Congresses and it is from them that genuine and honest ideas for the formation of a single all-South African organisation will come. And when the Congresses at the right time call for such an organisation many of those who are shouting today in favour of such an organisation will oppose its formation tooth and nail. They are not in favour of a non-racial organisation. They are in favour of an anti-progressive policy under cover of a progressive idea.

These are merely some of the ideological attacks which must be met openly and boldly by Congress. We must make our leading freedom volunteers aware of this war against Congress and take the necessary measures. Our strength must be concentrated on securing closer ties with the masses through struggle. The reactionaries must be isolated. To those persons who are young in the movement, and whose mistakes are the result of lack of understanding and experience, we should extend the hand of friendship and teach them in order that they might turn out true leaders of tomorrow.

Only in this way can our movement be ready for the stern battles that lie ahead.

"WE ARE NOT WITHOUT POWER . . ." writes Chief A. J. Lutuli, exiled President-General of the A.N.C. This article is the report which he submitted to the Natal People's Conference on September 6th, 1959, organised jointly by the Congresses.

THE AFRICAN WOMEN'S DEMONSTRATION IN NATAL

By **A. J. LUTULI**

SINCE the middle of June, 1959 to date, August 31st, 1959, Natal has been witnessing widespread demonstrations throughout the Province. The demonstrations have been largely by women and have no precedent, at least, in Natal.

The political scene in Natal is very much alive and explosive as a result of these demonstrations. They are a natural reaction of an oppressed people to the growing suffering and misery they have long endured under White rule. The patience and trust of the people is reaching breaking point.

Our justified concern for the negative features that have accompanied most of these demonstrations should not cloud our assessment of their positive value, namely:

- (1) that the demonstrations have been largely spontaneous and are an index of the people's growing sensitivity to oppression and of the presence of a potential leadership among women at local level; they show how far and fast the Congress spirit of resisting oppression instead of passively accepting the status quo has permeated individual souls and is percolating to the masses.
- (2) that the liberation movement is fast assuming the desired character of being a *mass movement*.
- (3) that the women are increasingly becoming an important factor in the Liberation Movement and this we welcome since women have special gifts and attitudes that make them valuable assets in the struggle.

The demonstrations to the extent that they took a peaceful presentation of grievances to competent authorities is most welcome and should be encouraged as a first struggle-step, especially for politically immature

people and novices in the struggle.

Men should take a leaf from the women in this regard. Protest demonstrations coupled with demands to the authorities are the only so-called Constitutional action and channel of struggle non-Europeans have. It cannot win us freedom. But it can be valuable in forging a unity of the people at local level and in helping to throw up a leadership from latent local talent. It is a form of practical public education and of assisting to inform the world of the disabilities of the non-whites. The Zulus have it: "INGANE ENGAKHALIYO IFELA EMBELEKWENI," (a child that does not cry may die unnoticed carried by its mother on her back).

THE CONGRESS METHOD OF STRUGGLE

Congress has adopted the policy of using extra-parliamentary methods of struggle but strictly on the basis of non-violence. This policy has been adopted *deliberately*, following a profound study and experience of the South African situation. We believe that as conditions are in this country it is possible for the people by the use of overwhelming peaceful pressure to win all their demands for freedom. We are aware of the fact that people as a result of desperation at the terrible conditions under which they live and sometimes owing to deliberate provocative acts by the authorities may spontaneously resort to violence. But our task is to educate our people on the efficacy of Congress methods of struggle. We do not preach the use of non-violent methods for the benefit of our enemies but for the benefit of our own people and for the ultimate benefit of our multi-racial society. Under our conditions in South Africa violent struggle would probably leave a legacy of bitterness which would render it difficult to establish a firm and stable multi-racial democracy in the future. One point does deserve mention. By and large even where demonstrations in the past two months have contained a violent element it has not been directed against any persons or sections of the community but rather with institutions that appeared associated with policies that caused the people's suffering. It was fundamentally an attack on local or national government policies. I must emphasize however that demonstrator's must forthwith desist from violence, whether they be Congress members or not. Violent methods of struggle are inimical to the best interests of the struggle and are not a practical proposition in any case in our situation.

THE BIGGEST NEEDS OF THE HOUR

- (1) Unity of the people and the formation of broad struggle fronts.
- (2) A working knowledge of the policy and objectives of the African National Congress.
- (3) A determination to win, cost what it may.
- (4) To possess a progressive sense of values.

SOME LESSONS AND CHALLENGES POSED BY THE DEMONSTRATIONS

- (1) That political struggles do not always assume an atmosphere of careful planning and orderliness; often they are spontaneous and as such often untidy and tempestuous.

- (2) That the duty of the leadership is to discern the **POSITIVE** aspects of the struggle and give direction along lines that will lead to greater unity and strength and to discourage constructively evidences of action and attitudes that are patently unwise and detrimental to the cause, such as violence or sectionalism.
- (3) That it is unwise to allow the enthusiasm of the people to make them undertake actions that are beyond their strength at any given stage.
- (4) That human reactions do not always follow a set logical pattern especially when it is brought about by the strains and stresses of life. The tendency is to vent one's feelings directly on objects or persons one thinks are the cause or are associated with the cause of one's suffering. Leaders should be on the look out for situations likely to cause such reactions.
- (5) That a systematic and consistent appeal should be made to the public for financial support to help meet the overwhelming needs of the struggle such as:
 - (a) Engaging fulltime, paid workers. The work is too vast to be carried out effectively and efficiently by part-time or voluntary workers. Voluntary workers should be there but only as a supplement to full-time paid workers.
 - (b) Production of educational material to help politicise the people. Ignorance of Congress policy results in confusion and conflicts

WHY ARE THE WOMEN ALONE IN THESE DEMONSTRATIONS?

It is not uncommon for women to goad their menfolk to action by deriding them or by taking the initiative in acting.

Men should positively and constructively meet this women's challenge. But more to the point about women is that it is they, especially in African homes, who bear the brunt of facing daily the poverty of the home, since it falls on women to prepare food for the family and to see that children are clothed.

Why should Government circles be surprised to find African women in these demonstrations, concerning themselves with such issues as low wages, influx control regulations, increased taxation? Women are hit hard by poverty arising out of these. Men's silence and inaction to protest against these grievances is shaming us, men. Men are supposed to be the traditional protectors and fenders for their family's welfare. What about it, African men?

A REPLY TO SOME OFFICIAL CHARGES

It is idle for Government spokesmen to indulge in blaming the leaders of the Liberation Movement, especially the African National Congress leaders and workers as instigators of the present African women's demonstrations and the disturbances that have accompanied them.

The duty of the Government is to take steps to remove the causes of the grievances. The women have given them fully and clearly.

The African National Congress has no intention of abandoning its leadership of the African people in their struggle for freedom and

democracy. In a situation created by the present demonstrations of women it cannot be indifferent to these demonstrations. That is why the A.N.C. and its allies have come in to attempt to give guidance and direction to all Africans concerned with the demonstrations. To do otherwise the A.N.C. would be acting most irresponsibly.

The policy of maintaining White supremacy is incompatible with the official assertion that what the Government does is eminently in the interest of the African.

- (a) The pass system, in its wide ramifications, ensures the white Government full control over the Africans with the most tragic results to his welfare and progress:
 - (i) thousands of Africans a year are in some ways victims of the pass system.
 - (ii) influx control regulations deny him a free opportunity of seeking for work in urban areas. It canalises African labour to centres of cheap labour on the mines and farms.
- (b) How can underpaying African workers, to the point where 70% of them live below breadline, be in the African's interest?
- (c) A Bantustan system that:
 - ii (i) will throw 60% to 70% of the peasants off the land without providing them with any new sources of employment,
 - i (ii) will re-allocate land to peasant farmers with no prospect of a peasant making a gross income of over £120 a year at the very most,
 - (iii) will render millions of Africans in white areas, towns and farms, stateless and rightless,
 - (iv) will fraudulently put forward a so-called partition of South Africa that nobody wants,
 - i (v) institutes a system of tribal rule that makes African Chiefs, contrary to tradition, autocrats and virtually nothing more than instruments of their people's oppression.

In honesty, can it be said that such a Bantustan is in our interest?

What is wrong in principle cannot be right in practice! So all apartheid laws based as they are on the maxim: "Separate and unequal" in favour of the whites can never be in the interest of the non-whites.

WE ARE NOT WITHOUT POWER TO MAKE THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA A PLACE WHERE SUCH FRAUDS AS THE APARTHEID LAWS SHALL NOT BE.

We may have no rights to bring about the desired South Africa through the ballot box but if we marshal our buying power and labour power, we may induce white South Africa to mend its ways. **AFRICANS:** Sons and daughters of Africa, so long as there are such laws in the statute books of the Union, with much suffering and misery flowing from their operation, I invite you all to join the African National Congress and struggle for your Liberation. I pledge myself to be with you in the fight until Freedom is won.

Long live the African National Congress!

Afrika! Mayibuye!

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

.....