

# Pursestrings Before Principles

Dagbreek Pers among his long list of companies. Tobacco king Mr. A. E. Rupert is a director of Dagbreek Pers.

A new battle for the freedom of the press and the integrity of journalists must begin as editors try to decide how far they can go in doing the work of the Foundation, which will in turn do the work of the Nationalists. How many editors will withstand the new winds blowing from the direction of the Foundation? It has been an old Nationalist argument that South Africa has a bad name not because of her record but because the press has documented it. Inevitably this must become a Foundation stock-in-trade. How many publications will buckle under the argument that South Africa's interests are those of her mining and finance magnates, and that what is good for business and investment must be good for South Africa as a whole, even those millions languishing under the rule of the Nationalists?

## Axe in Chamois Leather

Already there has been a suspicious similarity in the anti-boycott arguments adduced by South African papers. The boycott can only harm the African and Coloured people, is the cry used (by people who have never before shown the least twitch of sympathy for the plight of the Non-White people. This argument has made its appearance in too many editorial columns to avoid the impression that there has been some concerted pressure group at work on editors and leader writers here.

One of the first jobs the Foundation tackled was the appointment of a press and news man as head of its team of public relations officials. Three members of the team will sell South Africa abroad, in the United States, in Britain and Europe, and on the continent of Africa. Director of the team is to be Mr. A. M. Van Schoor, head of the South African Broadcasting Corporation News Department who has been seconded to the Foundation for a year — like a transfer from one government department to another!

Mr. Van Schoor who has been a working journalist on the staffs of the Burger, the Vaderland, Fleur and Huisgenoot, did spare time work for the Foundation for some months prior to its formation. This is yet another pointer to the suspicion that the government itself and the State Information Office, headed by Mr. Plet Meiring, had more

than a little to do with the early shapings of this body.

The State Information Office outpourings are distrusted because the Office grinds an ugly axe for the Nationalist Government. The Foundation will grind away at much the same thing, but the axe will be concealed in chamois leather. The Nationalists could not have wished for any better service than the one the Foundation offers.

## Nationalist God-Fathers

Nationalist sponsors form a minority among the Foundation's twenty-five but its policies will clearly be dominated by them and their experience in trying to sell the Union abroad.

Mr. Charles Te Water was one of the earliest members of the Nationalist Party, was Union High Commissioner in London in 1929, and S.A.'s representative at the League of Nations. In 1948 when the Nationalists came to power he was appointed the Union's first Ambassador-at-Large to counter misrepresentation about the government's aims. He resigned as High Commissioner when the Union declared war on Germany in 1939.

Dr. William Nicol was a DRC Minister for 35 years and Transvaal administrator for ten years.

Dr. A. L. Geyer, close friend and confidant of Dr. Malan, was Union High Commissioner in London in 1950 and has always had the inner confidences of his party.

Dr. M. S. Louw is the recognised leader of Nationalist finance and business opinion, director of a good two dozen finance, mining and other companies.

Mr. A. E. Rupert, Dr. F. J. du Toit; Dr. F. Meyer (chairman of ISCOR) and Dr. M. H. de Kock (governor of the S.A. Reserve Bank) are four other influential Nationalists among the Foundation's trustees.

## A Business Coalition

This strong merger of Nationalist and Opposition captains of finance and industry must inevitably cause an upsurge of coalition hopes in certain circles, even though the Prime Minister's announcement of a Referendum on the Republic takes coalition off the agenda for some time to come. The right wing of the United Party has revived hopes of coalition periodically as its chances of winning elections have become steadily gloomier. These overtures have been re-

peatedly rebuffed by the Nationalists for Dr. Verwoerd's government has been strong enough not to need coalition.

But a toenadering in the business field which undertakes to sell the Union abroad non-politically, and in so doing ignore the political crimes of the Nationalists, must delight Dr. Verwoerd's Cabinet.

## Opposition Embarrassed

Both the United Party and the Progressives must be embarrassed by this Foundation.

The United Party sees some of its wealthiest backers pledged to promote international understanding of the "South African way of life," but a South African way of life a la Dr. Verwoerd. What price opposition, however half-hearted, in Parliament now, when every fight fought by the United Party has been damned by the Nationalists as un-South African . . . ?

After his sharp differences with De Villiers Graaff, Mr. Harry Oppenheimer financed the breakaway of the Progressives from the United Party, perhaps in the hope that a genuine Opposition in Parliament might curb the Nationalists.

Unfortunately for the Progressives the new party had hardly been born when Mr. Oppenheimer became a Foundation trustee, in this very act helping to create an atmosphere highly unfavourable for the flourishing of the Progressive Party.

This Party was established because the Opposition to the Nationalists has been too feeble. Yet the Foundation will tell the world that South Africa does not deserve her bad name, and that the Nationalist Government is not as bad as it seems. Then why worry about a strong Opposition?

Oppenheimer's one new baby seems to have half strangled the other at birth.

The dilemma of businessmen who have traditionally been supporters of the Opposition but are now Foundation sponsors is: **How do you attack the government at home, and yet defend it abroad?**

"My country right or wrong" might be a fine slogan for businessmen but it removes the ground from under the feet of the White Opposition groups. Have the Nationalists at last succeeded in forging this false South African patriotism that puts purse-strings before principles?



# South West Africa: The 14th Year

"Thirteen years is a long period indeed. But my people are still confident and they are still entertaining hope that the United Nations will help them. But if they are let down, the next question they will ask themselves will naturally be,

what are we going to do now . . . ? Patience and good faith are not limitless and once they disappear the situation may become irrevocably critical." P. J. Kozonguizi, before the UNO Committee on South West Africa, May, 1959.

For thirteen years there has stood on the agenda of the United Nations Organisation the item: 'Question of South West Africa.' Through the years, delegates to the UN have canvassed the question back and forth in all its aspects, — the legal questions of whether the UN inherits the mandates of the old League of Nations; the formal questions of whether South Africa is required by mandate to submit reports on her administration; the fanciful questions of whether the country can be partitioned between South Africa and the UN; the constitutional questions of whether the UN can refer its dispute to the World Court — all these and many others have been chewed over till they are now old bones.

None of these questions really strike at the heart of the matter as it affects the people of South West Africa themselves. For them the issue at stake in the whole UN dispute with South Africa is the simple issue of their own emergence from subject status to independent nationhood. This is the essence of the matter, whether the UN sees it that way or not. Every other country in Africa which was a League of Nations Mandated territory during the second world war is now either already independent, or the date for its independence has been fixed and progress towards that date is being supervised by the UN. This is what the UN trusteeship has meant elsewhere. This is what has inspired the people of South West to carry on the fight for that trusteeship for thirteen years, in the face of tremendous opposition from the South African authorities.

## Where Are They Getting?

It would be easy to dismiss these thirteen years of UN deliberations as completely ineffectual. On the surface, perhaps, UN debate has achieved nothing. South African governments, United Party and Nationalist, have proceeded as they like to draw South West Africa closer and more fully into the oppressive, restrictive and poverty-bound framework of the Union. After thirteen years, what is left of the UN's efforts? An advisory opinion from the World Court that South Africa should submit reports on its mandate to the UN (1950);

a report of a sub-committee describing the detailed tragedy which South African administration has created for the African inhabitants; a decision to persevere in its attempts to reach an agreement with the South African government. That is almost all the minute books will show.

## By L. BERNSTEIN

But those thirteen years have made great changes in South West Africa — in the minds and outlook of the African people if not in the conditions of their daily lives. Thirteen years ago there were few bold enough to believe that their independence and nationhood was possible in their own lifetimes. Today, clearly, there are many, and their numbers grow rapidly. Thirteen years ago there were a few lone voices speaking out at UN in the name of the African inhabitants, but yet far ahead of their people in their political views. Today those few petitioners and spokesmen at UN, are leaders of public opinion in South West itself, and the accredited and recognised voice of the masses of their country. For these changes, UNO can claim the credit.

If South West Africa stands closer to independence and nationhood now than it did then, it is because the UN has inspired the people with hope and confidence in the future, shown them that they do not stand friendless and alone against the overwhelming strength of South African reaction.

## The Point of Crisis

Can UN now take the matter further more effectively than it has? It seems that, after thirteen years, a crisis point has been reached. Every attempt at UN action has proved ineffectual. Every attempt to soften the hearts of the South African government has failed. There are now, it seems, only two ways ahead. Either UN proceeds to drastic action — sanctions against South Africa perhaps; or it seeks a face-saving formula whereby the honour and prestige of UN will be preserved, while the fact of South African control of the territory remains unimpaired. A realisation that this crisis point has been reached seems to have

been present at the recent UN session in New York.

"Almost as soon as debate opened this year it was apparent that the atmosphere had subtly changed," writes one correspondent. For the first time in many years, the South African government, represented by Mr. Eric Louw took part in the debate, breaking a long boycott of the debates on South West. Partly, no doubt, this sudden change was inspired by the fear that UN might this year come forth with a resolution "with teeth." But partly it was inspired by the feeling that a gesture of reasonableness and co-operation by the Union Government might, at this stage, forestall or postpone UN's shifting from pleas to drastic action."

Equally significant was the shift of India's delegate, Mr. Krishna Menon, from his former position. For thirteen years India has been amongst the most outspoken of critics of the South African government, and amongst the first to call for strong UN action. This year, faced with a resolution sponsored by the African States together with Pakistan and the Phillipines, which encouraged former members of the League of Nations to take legal action against South Africa in the International Court, India's delegate faltered. He pleaded for UN to accept only the other resolution, sponsored by India and twenty-three others, which once again asked South Africa to respect the mandate, and to negotiate with UN to place the territory under UN trusteeship. Mr. Menon pleaded for Mr. Louw's hand of "co-operation" to be taken seriously.

Equally new was the attitude of the United States whose delegates in the past ". . . piously reiterated its position against sin in general and segregation in particular, and then abstained on resolutions expressing more than the gentlest of disapproval", as one reporter phrases it. This year the United States supported both resolutions. For them, too, this session marked the end of a thirteen-year tradition. In this new atmosphere the Union delegate took the new policy of appeasement further. The Union government, he promised, would take part in debates again next year; it would make information about South West Africa available to the UN; it would en-



# PETITIONERS AT LAKE SUCCESS

For many years the Rev. Michael Scott was the only petitioner at the United Nations for the people of South West Africa. (Though he was prevented by South Africa from entering the Union or South West).

into discussions with "an appropriate UN ad hoc body that may be appointed after prior consultation with the Union government." Too little, and too late. In the end both resolutions were adopted, India — finally — voting for both.

## From New York to Windhoek

And so we come to the fourteenth year. The UN crisis does not abate; it grows sharper. Before the year is out, further great parts of the African continent, formerly conquered colonies, formerly "trustees", will be independent, giving new spurs to the claims of the South West people. Steadily the centre of the struggle around the future of South West has been shifting from the UN to the territory itself. Steadily the centre has shifted from the well-meaning delegates of other countries to the spokesmen of South West Africa themselves — to Mburumba Kerina and Jariretundu Kozonguizi, petitioners from South West; to Chief Hosea Kutako of the Herero tribe, on whose behalf Reverend Michael Scott has spoken so long and so forcefully; to Hans Beukes, and others. Steadily, in South West Africa, the people have begun to organise their strength, to take up for themselves the fight which opened at Lake Success thirteen years ago.

It would be too much to claim that all this results from the work of UN. That has played a great part. But as the centre of the fight for South West's future shifts to the people themselves, new factors come into play. South West Africa moves towards the future under the inspiration of the world-wide wind of liberation which blows so fiercely through the old colonial world. It moves under the inspiration of the Pan-African Peoples Conference at Accra, and under the inspiration of the gathering national liberation alliance of the Union of South Africa itself. Already, in the violent clash at Windhoek, the people of South West have wrested the centre of world attention from the UN Committee to themselves, and shown that inside the territory too, the conflict of the South African government versus the people moves towards a crisis.

This is the beginning of the fourteenth year. Who can dare say where it will

In 1956 Scott was joined at U.N. by a young Herero, MBURUMBA KERINA, who had managed to get a passport to study in the United States. He was authorised by his people to speak for them at the United Nations.

The world body several times asked that certain South West Africans be allowed to leave their country to testify at Lake Success. Passports were invariably refused by South Africa.

In 1957 one was denied a Herero, FANUEL JARIRETUNDU KOZINGUIZI (who is the only South West African other than KERINA to have a university degree.) In 1959, however, KOZONGUIZI managed to leave South West and to make his way to the United Nations where he testified before the Committee on South West.

At the end-1959 session these two young Africans were joined by a third petitioner direct from South West, HANS BEUKES the young student refused a passport to take up a scholarship in Oslo, but who was smuggled abroad nevertheless.

## STOWAWAY FROM SOUTH WEST

LEONARD GEBLIEL, a 27 year old contract labourer from South West Africa tried to represent the Ovambo people at U.N. He stowed away in a ship to the United States, and this statement was taken from him in the U.S. Immigration detention headquarters in November 1959.

I went to school with Toivo\* at St. Mary's. I informed Toivo about my coming. He thought it was an excellent idea to have a member of the Ovamboland Peoples Organisation out of the country. First I worked in Ochiwarongo as a contract labourer. Then I went back to Ovamboland. Then I went to Omaruru from there and proceeded to Swakopmund and from there to Walvis Bay. I worked there about eight years in the hotels.

I came by myself to the harbour. I concealed myself in the cargo hold in the boat (of the Lykes Brothers Steamship Company). I remained inside there for six days and came out on the sixth day through the ventilation hole. When they saw me, they asked me where I came from. I told them. They kept me in a small cabin and tied my arms to a pole. During the daytime they allowed me to join the crew in painting the boat. At night and on Sunday I had to remain tied to the pole.

When we arrived in New Orleans they handed me over to other police (apparently the Danners Marine Guard Service). Those transferred me to a boat bound for Cape Town. I don't remember how many days I was there because they used to keep me tied on my bed. One day when the police left my cabin I took my belt and tied it to the ceiling of my cabin. I tied it around my

neck. One of the police came and rescued me. During that time I was on a hunger strike and they decided to send me (on October 20th) to a hospital in the city (Galveston, Texas).

The boat people told me that they were taking me back to Walvis Bay. I went on a second hunger strike. Then they decided to handcuff me on my legs and arms. I used to sleep handcuffed on my legs and arms. After that the immigration men informed me that they were taking me to New York on my way back to South Africa.

I couldn't flee because I didn't have the opportunity. I was always tied or in the handcuffs, but I did try to commit suicide rather than go back to South West Africa. I decided to commit suicide because I know that once I return to South West Africa I would be placed in prison indefinitely. If I were ever released, I would be taken back to Ovamboland never to come out again. Going back to Ovamboland is just like declaring yourself dead alive because there is no employment. You cannot get money to buy food or clothes. You are not allowed to meet with those who return from their contract labours, nor are you allowed to meet with anyone in a group of three. If you are seen in a group of three or four young men, you can be arrested by the Native Commissioner.

At the present time what I can say about South West Africa is this. It must be freed from the South Africans to make it a country worth living in for both white and black. My own brothers are as if they are in chains in South West Africa.

\* A leader of the Ovamboland people who has been approved as a petitioner by the United Nations but who has never been permitted by the Union of South Africa to come to New York City to testify.



# BACKWARDS TO BANTUSTANS

by G. MBEKI

Under the 'Bantustan' policy the Nationalist Government aims to force more and more Africans back into the overpopulated Reserves.

How?

Africans are permitted to own only 12½ per cent of the country's land. The Government is not only blocking their acquisition of new released areas, but is reducing some of the present reserves by group areas proclamations like those affecting Peddie, Fort Beaufort, Victoria East, East London and Queenstown.

Economic conditions in the reserves have worsened and productivity has declined.

The Tomlinson Commission found that "nearly one-fifth of children born alive die before they reach their first birthday . . ." Average African life expectation is 36.4 years.

Life in the Reserves is one of dismal poverty.

What sort of 'development' scheme have the Nationalists in mind? It is based on four main pillars.

ONE: the reduction of the number of people dependent for their livelihood on small scale farming, and the creation of 'land barons'.

TWO: the fostering of a middle class of professional men and traders.

THREE: the creation of a ruling aristocracy of hireling chiefs.

FOUR: the removal from the land of all those who have no arable allotments, and their placing in settlements for the landless and the dispossessed.

## 'From A Few Small Fish . . .'

It has happened before, after all. From a few small fish four thousand people ate and were filled, and the remains still filled seven baskets. There is no need for more land, argue the Nationalists. All that is necessary is that the reserves should support an increased population.

The Nationalists propose to start by a revision of the practices governing the holding of arable land. According to the Tomlinson Commission Report an African family in the Reserves "requires, on the average, 52.5 morgen of land to make a gross annual income of £70. (In contrast it is estimated that 500 morgen is the minimum to enable a European to engage in grain production.) On the basis of this calculation the Reserves could carry about half of their present number.

So already the Nationalist Government has issued instructions that married men who have no arable allotments should not be granted residential sites in the farming areas of the reserves. In addition men who own stock and have no arable allotments are being denied opportunities to rear and graze stock on the communal pasturage.

The Government goes further and dispossesses some peasants of the arable allotments they hold if they have not adequate means to work the land. Their allotments are turned over to those who have sufficient means to work them. In this way the Government is hopeful that in time it will have developed a class of small scale farmers who will concentrate on farming. In time it expects to make a show piece of this class. This will be the answer to anyone who wants to know what progress apartheid has contributed in the development of the reserves.

The more enlightened and the comparatively well-to-do have not been slow

to see their chances of acquiring more land. And the Government has anticipated this human weakness for acquisition by demanding maximum collaboration from them, as it makes promises of increased crop yields from extensive lands (not yet obtained), and the creation of a closed market for the disposal of their farm products.

### The Chiefs

The Chiefs, without whose participation the apartheid plan cannot work, are conscious of the importance of their role. And one of the first moves to get from the Government more than mere promises of "vast powers", has been to strive to get tangible material gains. A resolution taken at the 1958 session of the Transkei Territorial Authority reads thus:

"That a special extra allocation of arable land be made to each chief and headman, the better to enable him to provide hospitality which is expected from him by persons attending meetings called at his kraal for administrative purposes."

When the resolution was referred to a Select Committee it was amended so that finally it read as follows:—

"That a special extra allocation of arable land be made to each chief and headman in stabilised or reclaimed areas as a consideration for the additional responsibility and duties devolving upon them."

It will be observed how the Select Committee, which works under the guidance of a Native Commissioner, wants to make the granting of additional land dependent on the fulfilment of certain conditions. The main condition is that a chief or headman can only qualify for an extra allocation of arable land if he has seen to it that the residents of his location have accepted the soil reclamation measures.

The Government will clearly try to de-

fraud people with claims of economic progress. Any increase in output shown for the Reserves will be an increase per head of a considerably reduced population. As for the land barons who benefit from the scheme, these people, the Government calculates, will ally themselves with it to defend interests acquired as a privilege from a "benevolent" Government.

### Settlements for the Landless

What is to happen to the millions of people who, according to this arrangement, are to be thrown out of the farming areas in the reserves? And what of the people the Government endorses out of the urban areas under influx control measures?

The Nationalists have announced with a fanfare of trumpets that the Government has earmarked certain sites for rural townships inside the reserves. The inhabitants of these townships will depend entirely on the earnings of the menfolk who are to work in the industries set up on the borders of the reserves.

In the original 1944 plan which was set out in a Government White Paper called — "The New Era" — the settlements were to be established near afforestation schemes to provide these with labour, and at convenient spots along railway lines to facilitate transport of labour to the mines and other enterprises which were to depend on this highly mobile labour. The chief weakness in these Smuts Government plans was that they did not offer any group of Africans a stake in the plans so that they would be actively interested in their development.

The Nationalist Government has dressed up this plan differently. It refers to these settlements as townships in which will reside workers who will supply labour requirements of the small in-



# THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY AND THE VOTE

by L. BERNSTEIN

What is a 'responsible' citizen? This is the sixty-four dollar question which was posed by the Progressive Party Conference over a year ago, when it came to consider which South Africans should be entitled to vote when the party comes to power. The question was referred to a Commission presided over by Donald Molteno Q.C. and comprising, we are informed by the party's leader, Jan Steytler, "... members eminent in many fields ... and some of the country's most brilliant constitutional lawyers." If this ungrudging praise is well merited, their combined talents have proved incapable of rising above the shallow and shoddy levels of typical white South African muddle-headedness.

## 64 Dollar Question

The extension of voting rights is the central question of South African politics. From its inception, the Progressive Party recognised the need for such extension. But to who? On this question the Molteno Commission's hands were, to some extent, tied in advance by the party conference, which rejected the idea of universal adult suffrage. It set the Commission the task of defining only suitable qualifications which would "entitle a South African to be considered 'responsible', and hence worthy to vote on the common roll." (Steytler's summary.) Here is where the muddle-headedness creeps in. Is an illiterate 'responsible'? Is a pauper 'responsible'? How does one judge within this restricted and somewhat academic framework?

The Commission, reasonably enough, decided that the test of 'responsibility' in voting should be whether the vote will be used to maintain democratic institutions. "We have kept in mind" they report "the general conditions which historical experience indicates are likely to favour the effective functioning of democratic institutions." Fair enough — if true. But this leads only to the next problem; what is this historical experience? Is it for instance, the experience of Germany in the twentieth century? If so, the moral is that education is no guarantee of the 'effective functioning' of democracy; the best educated population of Europe produced the worst excesses of dictatorship. Is it the experience of America in our time, where the most prosperous and highly-paid nation provides some of the worst examples of militarism, hysteria and corruption in the seats of government? Perhaps — since this is South Africa — it should be South African historical experience; here both high educational standards — compulsory for voters and coupled with a comparatively high school-leaving age — and high standards of living — at least for voters — have brought to power a government which effectively stifles the functioning of democratic institutions.

## Lip Service

The Molteno Commission in fact relies on none of this historical experience. It pays lip service to experience, but quotes no experience of any country whatsoever. Instead, it repeats — and takes over as though it is the gospel, an extremely pompous, ex cathedra statement by Mr. John Strachey — one-time Mosleyite, one-time radical socialist, one-time Labour Party minister, and now heaven-only-knows-what.

"It is foolish and unfair to expect a high degree of sophistication from communities which have not long possessed a real measure of social welfare and economic stability ... Whenever the standard of life of the mass of the population is below a certain level of human welfare ... the masses either remain indifferent and sub-political ... or there will emerge a party of total opposition — in practice today a communist party."

Vox Strachey, vox dei. The Commission takes over and adapts this piece of philosophical twaddle. "Qualifications" it reports, "should embrace those elements of the po-shown that the entire white South African electorate has

sophistication such as to enable them to feel sufficient identification with society as a whole — to possess sufficient 'stake in the country' — not to fall prey to totalitarian illusions. This is the only real test of 'civilisation' that we can conceive of."

## Too Big A Stake

So then what is that 'economic level', and that 'degree of sophistication'? By now the Commission's views have been widely publicised. Standard IV education plus an income of £25 per month or occupation of property worth £500; alternatively a Standard VIII education; alternatively, bare literacy plus an income of £500 per year.\* Here is where reflection on 'historical experience' was needed. It would have shown that the entire white South African electorate has attained this degree of sophistication and affluence. It would have shown that the overwhelming majority of our 'civilised' electorate had fallen prey to totalitarian ideas. It would have shown that this 'qualified' electorate has elected a Prime Minister, a cabinet, a senate and a parliament committed to the destruction of democratic institutions and practices, and based entirely on totalitarian — better fascist — principles. It would have shown that the 'totalitarian illusions' of the main political representatives of white South Africa do not arise because they have too small a stake in the country, but because their stake is too big, and can only be maintained by the colour-bar, by cheap non-white labour and by race oppression, which is the particular South African form of 'totalitarianism.'

Of this there is no glimmer in the whole report. Are these people serious? Or is the whole thing a gigantic hoax? Perhaps it is just that white South Africans cannot dare to look at themselves for a moment without blinkers; they cannot dare to look at reality, but have to fall back on mystical beliefs that 'they know the native' without having to look and study. No doubt the Commission will protest that this is unfair. Let us consider the rest of the evidence.

"In the circumstances of South Africa" reports the Commission, "with its considerable and developed White minority, non-White movements thus inspired (by nationalism, L.B.) can lead only to a racial clash with unpredictable consequences. For non-White nationalism, from its nature, must seek to dominate the White minority, just as White nationalism, from its nature, must and does seek to dominate the non-White majority."

Where were they looking when they produced this immutable truth? Certainly not at South Africa or South African reality. For here reality throws their reasoning back in their teeth. There is no "must" about it at all. Non-White nationalism, in this country has distinguished itself from many other nationalisms — and in particular from White, that is Afrikaner nationalism — by its steadfast refusal to seek domination over whites. Through the years, the African National Congress has been the only substantial, large-scale and popular voice of non-white nationalism; it has proclaimed, over and over again, the aim of non-white nationalism here — equal rights for all South Africans, equal rights for all national groups. It has set out, in the very first paragraph of the Freedom Charter "That South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white." On this policy it has made itself, in fact, the voice of non-white nationalism.

Why then must non-white nationalism seek to dominate the white minority? Because Luthuli and the A.N.C. must inevitably fail to carry the majority of the African people? No; in Tanganyika Nyerere and the National Union have proved it can be done. Because the A.N.C. has stopped fighting for its policy? No; because even now, illegally, it

(Continued on page 20)

\* Even these qualifications were raised by the recent Party Conference.



The Declaration of the 69 — the gilt-edged S.A. Foundation campaign — the United Party's activities overseas are part of a move to shore up the sagging defences of

# THE WHITE SUPREMACY LAAGER

A new "peace with the Nationalists" offensive is being mounted by Big Business and the United Party.

The aim: a solid English-Afrikaans bloc to defend white paramourty in the Union.

This is clear from:

1. The "Sixty Nine" movement to promote unity between the two white language groups.

2. A gilt-edged campaign by the S.A. Foundation to bring English and Afrikaans speakers closer together.

3. Appeals by business leaders, such as Mr. L. Lulofs, president of the Federated Chamber of Industries, for the "immediate elimination" of differences between the two European sections.

4. The United Party's "constructive" aid for the Nationalists by negotiating overseas for Dr. Verwoerd's republic to stay in the Commonwealth.

All these moves have a common inspiration: to fortify the crumbling bastion of White rule while there is still time.

They express the same neurosis which breeds the "laager complex" in the Nationalists. This is a sense of isolation, the impulse to close ranks, and to mobilise forces in the face of massive external and internal pressure.

Above all, these moves reflect a realisation that the rising tide of non-White liberation imperils all who have a stake in the South African social and economic system.

## Crisis Call

In its zero hour crisis, the call has gone out to white South Africa: forget your differences, stand together, offer sacrifice in the cause of unity.

In political terms this is already leading to an appeasement of the Nationalists — the acknowledged champions of White supremacy.

Ultimately it could lead to total surrender to Dr. Verwoerd.

These indeed are Dr. Verwoerd's terms for "white unity" — his jackpot winning referendum slogan. Twice since October 5 he has declared: "We shall not surrender our principles for unity."

Whether the new appeasement phase will result in total capitulation is doubtful; for the sake of form differences will be preserved.

## Safe Climate

But it is abundantly clear that business, mining, industry are seeking a *modus vivendi* with the Nationalists as a basis for reducing political differences between the whites and creating a safer economic climate for investment.

Prosperity and the removal of "frictions", said Mr. L. Lulofs, president of the F.C.I., go hand in hand.

"The most important and essential step to be taken right now by all of us is the immediate elimination of the so-called differences which are alleged to exist between the two sections of our European community", he told delegates representing £2,200,000 of manufacturing industry.

South Africa, he warned, would have to prepare itself for an "agonising period", and to weather storms in the near future.

For Mr. Lulofs, white unity is not only essential for prosperity, but also to defend European interests.

That this concept involved appeasement of the Nationalists is evident from the fact that the F.C.I. — so vocal after Sharpeville — has virtually ceased to criticise the Government.

## The 69

But for a real insight into the new alignment between big business and the Nationalists one has to examine trends revealed by the movement of the Sixty Nine and the S.A. Foundation — two movements which lauded campaigns immediately after the referendum.

The 69 — a movement based on the signing of a high sounding Declaration of Beliefs — consists of financiers, businessmen and industrialists, as well as high ranking Nationalists.

Although it claims to be non-political, its main plank is that whites should accept the republic.

To this end, bilingual study groups have been established throughout the Union, to promote unity.

"Our prime aim," according to Mr. H. Goldberg, secretary of the 69, and a U.P. right-winger, "is the fostering of white unity."

That leading Broederbonders, like Dr. W. Nicol and Professor Rautenbach, principal of Pretoria University, should lead the 69 is ample proof of Nationalist endorsement for the movement.

Nor is this surprising. The 69 are doing valuable propaganda for the Nationalists in dampening the forces of opposition — such as those in Natal — against a republic.

## Millionaire Foundation

Big Brother to the 69 is the "Millionaires Club," or the S.A. Foundation, whose members are worth over £900 million.

This body has also its heavy representation of high ranking Nationalists

ers, a former Moderator of the D.R.C., —three Nationalist High Commissioners, the president of the Handelsinstituut, SABRA leaders and others.

Its director is South Africa's most senior Nationalist journalist, Mr. A. M. Van Schoor, who has worked on the Transvaal, Valerland, Burger and was recently head of SABC news.

It has two objectives — promoting better understanding along the two White groups, and telling the truth about S.A. overseas.

The Foundation enjoys Nationalist patronage too, as can be seen from the large numbers of directors of State-financed enterprises who are among its Trustees.

But it is not only business which has rallied to defend the interests of the White elite as represented by the Nationalist Government today.

## The Opposition

The United Party — whose leader was recently leading the anti-republican forces, and refused to accept a republic under any circumstances — is now collaborating with the Nationalists in trying to keep the republic inside the Commonwealth.

Sir de Villiers Graaff and other U.P. leaders flew overseas immediately after the referendum on a diplomatic mission to persuade Mr. Macmillan not to kick the Nationalists out.

His ambassadorial activities on behalf of white South Africa fit into the same pattern as the efforts of business to unify English and Afrikaans people.

Both express a need to preserve the fortress intact and to shore up its sagging defences.

Yet another aspect of the same trend is the pressure from SABRA, the United Party and others for a "new deal" for Coloureds.

They are calling for the admission of Coloureds to Parliament in order to ally the 1,500,000 Coloureds to the Whites.

Again the inference is clear: The small white community must be strengthened by securing the loyalty of the "brown Afrikaners" — a term which is becoming popular.

These moves to consolidate the White laager are dangerous because the price which anti-Nationalists are prepared to pay is the sacrifice of their opposition.

But however far they go, they cannot succeed: the more White South Africa refuses to abandon its privileges, the sharper its conflict is going to be with the forces of the 20th century.

There is no question which side will win.



happened in Costa Rica. What resulted from Costa Rica was not a condemnation of the United States, or the government of the United States — and I do wish to avoid any misunderstanding about our feelings: we regard the government of the United States and the people of the United States as two completely different entities. The government of the United States was not condemned in Costa Rica for the 60 overflights by pirate aircraft. The government of the United States was not condemned for the economic and other aggression of which we had been the victim. No, the Soviet Union was condemned. That was really bizarre. We had not been attacked by the Soviet Union. We had not been the victims of aggression by the Soviet Union. No Soviet aircraft had flown over our territory. Yet in Costa Rica there was a finding against the Soviet Union for interference.

The Soviet Union only said that, figuratively speaking, if there was military aggression against our country the Soviet Union could support the victim with rockets. Since when is support for a weaker country, support conditioned on an attack by a powerful country, regarded as interference? In law there is something called an impossible condition. If a country considers that it is incapable of committing a certain crime, then it need only say that such a possibility is unheard of. If there is no possibility that Cuba will be attacked, then there is no possibility that the Soviet Union will support Cuba.

History will judge that sad episode in Costa Rica.

My people have learned in the school of these recent international events. They know full well that, even though their right to vindication has been denied, even though aggressive forces are marshalled against them, they still have the final and heroic resource of resisting. Even when their rights are not guaranteed by the Organisation of American States, they can fight.

We are a whole people, firmly united, a people with a revolutionary conscience, defending our rights. This should be written in capital letters for the enemies of the revolution in Cuba to read clearly. For if they are still unaware of this fact they are most lamentably mistaken.

The Revolutionary Government, in but 20 months, has created 10,000 new school-rooms. In this brief space of time, we have doubled the number of rural schools — schools that had been set up in 30 years. In this brief period of time, the Revolutionary Government has built 25,000 houses in the rural zones and also in the urban areas. Fifty new townships are being built in these moments. The most important military fortresses today house tens of thousands of students. In the coming year, our country intends to start its great battle against illiteracy, with the ambitious goal of teaching every single inhabitant of the country to read and write. Thus, org-

anisations of teachers, of students, of workers, are going out—the entire people is preparing itself for an intensive campaign to wipe out illiteracy.

Today our people are receiving the assistance of hundreds of doctors who have been sent out to the field to fight against the endemic sicknesses, wipe out parasites and improve the sanitary conditions of the nation. We have planted close to 50,000,000 trees.

Youths who were unemployed, who were unlettered, have been organised by the Revolutionary Government and today are being gainfully and usefully employed by the country, and at the same time they are being prepared for productive work. We have increased our agricultural production, because, first of all, the Revolutionary Government turned more than 100,000 agricultural workers into landowners, and at the same time preserved the large-scale production by means of agricultural co-operatives.

At this moment, the Revolutionary Government is carrying out a programme of industrialisation of the country, and the first plants are already being built in Cuba.

We have reasonably and sensibly utilised the resources of my country. Previously, for example, \$35,000,000 worth of cars were imported into Cuba, and \$5,000,000 worth of tractors. We have turned this fraction upside down, and now we are importing seven times more tractors than automobiles.

In view of the tremendous reality of underdevelopment, the government of the United States now comes out with a plan for social development (elsewhere in Latin America). Naturally it is something that it is concerning itself with some of the problems of Latin America. Thus far it has not cared very much. Is it not a coincidence that now, at this juncture, it is worried about these problems? Is the fact that this concern has emerged after the Cuban revolution purely coincidental? Surely they will label it as a coincidence.

Why does the United States government not wish to speak of economic development? The answer is clearcut. Because the government of the United States does not want to quarrel with the monopolies, and the monopolies need natural resources. They need investment markets for their capital. That is the paradox.

The case of Cuba is the case of all underdeveloped countries. It is, as it were, the case of the Congo; it is like the case of Egypt, of Algeria, of West Irian; it is like that of Panama, which wishes to have its Canal; it is like that of Puerto Rico, whose national spirit they are destroying; like that of Honduras, a portion of whose territory has been taken away. In short, although we have not made any reference specifically to other countries, the case of Cuba is the case of all the underdeveloped colonial countries.

The problems which we have been describing in relation to Cuba apply perfectly well to all of Latin America. The

control of Latin American economic resources by the monopolies — which, when they do not directly own the mines and take charge of the working of them, as in the case of copper in Chile, Peru and Mexico and in the case of zinc in Peru and Mexico, as well as in the case of oil in Venezuela — when this control is not exercised directly it is because they are the owners of the public service companies, which is the case with the electric services in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Ecuador and Colombia, or of the telephonic services, which is the case in Chile, Brazil, Peru, Venezuela, Paraguay and Bolivia. Or, if they do not exploit our products, as is the case with coffee in Brazil Colombia, El Salvador, Costa Rica and Guatemala, or with the exploitation, marketing and transportation of bananas by the United Fruit Company in Guatemala, Costa Rica and Honduras, or with cotton in Mexico and Brazil, that economic control is exercised by North American monopolies of the most important industries of the country, dependent completely on the monopolies.

Woe betide these countries on the day when they too shall wish to carry out agrarian reform! They will be asked for immediate, efficient and just payment. And if, in spite of everything, they carry out agrarian reform, the representative of a Sister nation who comes to the United Nations will be confined to Manhattan; they will not rent hotel space to him; insults will be poured upon him and he may even, possibly, be mistreated, in fact, by the police themselves.

## BRIGHTER CLEANERS

229, 2nd AVENUE  
WYNBERG

(opp. PUTCO)

Also at 15th AVENUE  
ALEXANDRA TOWNSHIP

## Juno Furnishing Co.

64 KNOX STREET

Phone 51-1106 GERMISTON

For A Square Deal

Contact Us

Printed by Pacific Press (Pty.) Ltd.,  
302, Fox Street, Jeppe, Johannesburg.



## The Progressive Party and the Vote (cont. from p. 3)

carries on the fight for its line against the bought opponents in the Bantu Authorities, against the Nationalist hirelings of apartheid and against the Johnny-come-lately Pan-Africanist Congress. Because the fact of South African white racialism must inevitably turn the non-whites to counter racialism? No; because an increasing number of whites have taken up the fight against white racialism, and proclaim their support for non-white liberation and thus their fitness to live as equals and partners in a South Africa where the majority of votes are cast by non-whites.

### Starting Point

There is only one reason for the Commission's blind insistence that history must work to defeat the policy of black-white co-existence in freedom. That is because only thus can they support their own conclusion that 'qualifications' for voting date not be set so low as to enfranchise the whole adult population. **The Commission sets this down as its conclusion; but in reality it is the starting point.** Whether they are conscious of it or not, this is the process of the Commission's reasoning.

### Minority and Majority

So, too, on the second task set the Commission by the Party conference — "To promote means of protecting the various racial groups in our country from domination, and to ensure this for all time." In Cloud-Cuckoo Land, no doubt, this would mean safeguarding minority rights. But this — did the Commission recall the fact? is South Africa. The first question here is not the safeguarding of the rights of minorities, but the establishment of the rights of the majority. Until the majority of the South African people have voting and political rights, there are no minority rights to safeguard. But this brings us back to the question of voting rights. Will the Commission's proposals in fact give the majority of the population a majority of votes?

"As a matter of fact" they say in self explanation, "the recommendations as to qualifications have been made without any evidence as to the numbers of persons of the various national groups who would initially be enfranchised. Assuming however, that White voters would initially be in the majority, the minority safeguards (proposed) should effectively protect the non-White peoples against discrimination or oppression."

Curiouser and curiouser. The minority safeguards should effectively protect the majority of the population against the

majority rights of the minority. Are they serious? Is it really necessary to consider in detail the "minority safeguards" proposed, an elaborately elected Senate in which every Senator would have to gain a portion of the votes of all races in his constituency, when this muddle-headed formulation is its basis?

In justice to the Commission, let me add that they too saw the dilemma into which this type of reasoning was leading them. They try to talk their way out of it: "It is impossible to have constitutional safeguards for individuals or groups or both, and, at the same time, to give free rein to the "democratic" majority principle. For the latter principle is the antithesis of the former and automatically defeats it." Unconvincing, even to the Commission itself; for having said it, they immediately embark on the task of providing individual and group safeguards, by producing a Bill of Rights which they seek to have entrenched in the South African constitution. Here is the most valuable and important contribution made by the Commission.

The Bill of Rights is the Progressive Party counter to the Freedom Charter of the Congresses. In another article at a later date, I hope to compare these two documents section by section; they show some remarkable similarities — but also some remarkable differences. But the most significant difference is this. In the Bill of Rights there is no right to vote, no right to stand for or be elected to any state or government body! Here, in this vital field, in the very centre of South African politics, the dilemma of the Progressive Party reveals itself. It is trying, desperately, to have its cake and eat it; to uphold democratic institutions while rejecting the basic democratic concept of the right to vote; to safeguard fundamental civic rights while denying the only right which can bring those safeguards into operation.

The report is a classic piece of South African muddle-headedness. And yet it does a service. It opens up for serious discussion amongst the white electorate the question of an alternative electoral system to the dark dictatorship of Dr. Verwoerd. It raises for consideration — and sooner or later it must be considered by the whole democratic movement — the question of minority rights, which will become a real problem after the first question of securing majority rights has been won. It raises afresh the question of legal guarantee — but not the most important question of political struggle for — basic human rights for all South Africans. Perhaps now that the door has been opened on these matters, a ray of light may be shed by other minds to light up the maze into which the Commission has led the Progressive Party.

### STEWART'S REXALL PHARMACY

S. Joffe, M.P.S.

CHEMIST & DRUGGIST  
PHOTOGRAPHIC SUPPLIES

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

### Standard Furnishing (Pty.) Ltd.

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

For The Best In Furniture

### Perfect Writing Instruments



Your friend  
for life!

R. First of P.O. Box 1855, Johannesburg is responsible for all political matter in this issue.

FINEST VALUE IN PIPES

DR. MACNAB

FILTER

SELECTED  
BRIAR



TELMA  
SOUPS  
are  
TASTIEST



**Collection Number: A3299**

**Collection Name: Hilda and Rusty BERNSTEIN Papers, 1931-2006**

***PUBLISHER:***

*Publisher:* **Historical Papers Research Archive**

*Collection Funder:* **Bernstein family**

*Location:* **Johannesburg**

**©2015**

***LEGAL NOTICES:***

**Copyright Notice:** All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

**Disclaimer and Terms of Use:** Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of the *Hilda and Rusty Bernstein Papers*, held at the Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.