

The Nationalists are finding parliamentary democracy a hindrance. "What was once a convenient mantle for deception is now a straitjacket," say the writer of this article on this session of Parliament.

THE Nationalists in Parliament have entered a period of what can be described as galloping fascism. The outstanding feature of this Parliamentary Session is not the Government's arrogance and viciousness — which is nothing new — but the way in which the last pretences of "Parliamentary democracy" are being dropped.

Parliament is an alien institution to the purified Nationalist mind. To him it is a British-Jewish-Liberal institution designed to promote the interests of the enemies of Nationalism. In the halycon war years, when the Nationalist Party brought its planning up to date with the New Order in Europe, these things were said openly: Mr. Strijdom and Mr. Louw shouted it from public platforms.

One no longer hears this kind of talk, not because the Nationalist leaders have had a change of heart, but because they have learnt the simple lesson that behind the Parliamentary facade they can get up to almost as much evil as they could in their one-party Republic.

I say "almost" advisedly, because *a stage has been reached now where the system of "Parliamentary democracy" is becoming a hindrance.* The essence of the Parliamentary system is that it relies on the participating political parties observing the customs, the conventions, the trimmings.

Keeping Up Pretences

Look at it this way: A Government under the Parliamentary system is entitled legally to abolish the Opposition, but if it did so it would no longer be a Parliamentary Government. Now, the Nationalist Government is advan-

cing as far along this path as it can without breaking finally with the Parliamentary system. It has sought, at all costs, to maintain the facade of Government and Opposition. But there comes a time when no further progress can be made by this method, and the dictators-in-all-but-name have to ponder on the next step — they have to accept the name "dictator" as well.

I recall reading an article in which this theory was put forward in respect of the Group Areas Act: that what was aimed at under the Group Areas Act was so fundamentally undemocratic and in conflict with the whole framework of our existing law, that the Act could never be made to work properly without some additional fundamental changes.

The Group Areas Act started off with a promise by the Minister of the Interior that it would be administered with justice to every section. But with every shift forward along its bumpy course it has moved farther and farther away from this promise; and before long, without doubt, the Nationalists will toss aside the mask and stand up and scream: "Throw the coolies on to the veld!" It is the logical, inevitable conclusion.

And so it is with Parliament. This institution has served as the formal, pious place where laws are manufactured—laws to eliminate opposition. But somehow this law-manufacturing has not kept pace with the rebellious human spirit, let alone outstripped it. What now? I cannot see that Mr. Strijdom has any alternative than to stand up and scream: "Shut up!" to the entire nation, and to try to enforce this directive with all the machinery of his

A HIGHER POLL TAX

THE poll tax is to be raised. This was announced last month by the Governor-General in his opening speech to Parliament.

He spoke only of the "general tax paid by Bantu males." In September, 1956, however, official quarters in Pretoria gave out the news that women as well as men would have to pay in taxation "for the welfare services they receive."

The strength and unity of the bus boycotters may have induced the Government to drop any intention it had of taxing the women. This article will therefore deal only with the proposed increase in the existing tax. This, we know, consists of a general tax of £1 paid yearly by men between 18 and 65 years, and a hut tax of 10s., paid by married men whose homes are in the reserves.

Reasons

level of income has been attained in the meantime."

THE official explanation is that the tax has not been changed since 1925, whereas a "considerably higher

Another factor is the strong and growing pressure in the Nationalist Party (and among some United Party adherents) for a policy of making Africans "pay for their own services," particularly education.

A third purpose, seldom mentioned but probably the most decisive of all, is the relief of the chronic shortage of workers on the farms, whose demands are not satisfied

even by the drafting of hard labour prisoners and men denied permits in the towns.

Taxes and Incomes

Workers are certainly paid more in money than 20 years ago. This is so even on farms. Labour tenants in the Transvaal-Orange Free State maize belt, for instance, are being paid an average cash wage of from £12 to £15 a year, which is about three times the amount paid in £1938. The average wage of Africans employed in industry increased from £45 in 1938 to £137 in 1955.

But prices also have gone up. The purchasing value of the pound is less than half of what it was in 1938, according to the government index of retail prices. Actually, the working class has suffered much more from inflation than the index suggests. It does not allow for the steep rise in rents and transport charges, or the heavy cost of fines and unpaid days spent in jail, that apartheid imposes on urban Africans. The real value of their pound is surely far below the official figure.

Both official and private investigations show that the majority of workers—69 per cent. in Johannesburg in 1952—get an income that is below the minimum needed for good health. In that year more than two families in every five had an income of less than £15 a month, which is the point where the Native Affairs Department expects tenants of municipal houses to pay the full or economic rental.

The bus boycott is a clear indication that the people will not accept any addition to their economic burden.

Other People's Taxes

The argument that taxes should go up if incomes increase will appear logical to some people. I don't think it is logical, when applied to people who are so poor that

THE BUS BOYCOTT: ROUND 2

By L. BERNSTEIN

HOW many angels can dance on the point of a needle? The problem, it is said, can be debated learnedly and long by unworldly theologians. So too, no doubt, could the Alexandra bus boycott settlement. Can this be victory, it is asked, when the people pay the old fare of 4d., but the denomination "5d." appears printed on the ticket? Can this be victory, it is asked, when the duration of the settlement is dependent upon the Chamber of Commerce's £25,000 fund, with no guarantees for what happens thereafter? The debate can well be left to garrulous old men in wheel-chairs, for whom verbal exercise is all-important and the hard realities of life of no consequence.

The reality is that the people have returned to the buses, and still pay fourpence. The reality is that the employers as a class have been forced to give back to the African workers some part of the profits they obtain from their labour. This the talmudic theorists cannot dispute. But still some argue. The settlement, it is said, is not perfect. The "5d." symbol on the ticket, it is said, is the beginning of a softening-up process, preparing the people to pay fivepence in future. The limited duration of the Chamber of Commerce fund, it is said, gives PUTCO and the Government time to assemble its forces for another offensive against the people tomorrow. Perhaps so. The settlement is not perfect; the reality of life seldom conforms precisely to the perfect blue-prints of what-might-have-been prepared by ivory-castled planners.

The Next Round

But this is not the issue. The real issue, vital to Alexandra, and perhaps to all South Africa, is not the debate on the perfection or imperfection of the settlement reached. This is a red herring. *The real issue now is how best to use the breathing space provided by the settlement to prepare the people's forces for the second round of struggle* which will come to full maturity when the Chamber of Commerce Fund runs out.

It is in this light that the activities of those who denounce the settlement as less-than-perfect must be judged. Theologic hair-splitting removed from the scene of struggle and organisation is perhaps tolerable for those with patience. But brought into the arena of the people's politics it is intolerable and disruptive. This needs to be said, now and strongly. Those perfectionists who still, to this day, denounce the settlement and those who engineered it, may well act from sincere and honest motives. And yet they are wrecking all chance of turning the present, partial gains into a thorough-going and stable victory. Their sniping opposition, however well meant, has served only to rob the boycotters of the flavour of victory which they have won, and to lower their morale, hope and courage for the new stern battles which lie ahead to consolidate that victory.

Morale, hope and courage might seem insubstantial matters to those whose political armoury consists only of agitational phrase-mongering and "purer-than thou" denunciations. But they are now the heart and soul of the Alexandra and Witwatersrand problems. There can be none, even amongst those who engineered and accepted the present settlement, who can doubt that even more strenuous battles lie ahead. There is the battle to keep the fares to fourpence even after the £25,000 fund runs dry. But over and above that, there is the battle to win substantial all-round increases in wages for every worker and

a minimum wage of £1 per day, without which the matter of bus fares will be an eternal running sore, symptomatic of the poverty of the urban people. Only fools can seek to enter into these battles by destroying the people's confidence in the gains with which they have just emerged, by raising their doubts as to whether it was worth while, and by raising their suspicions against those who led. Men who would be generals must understand that substantial gains have been won; and that the confidence in their own strength which the people draw from such gains is the stepping-stone to new and greater gains in the battles that lie ahead. Unity, determination, courage won the gains of yesterday; tomorrow's battle, if it is to be won, must start from the pinnacles of self-confidence and high morale which can grow from such victories, but only if initiative amongst the people can be taken from the disruptive critics, and returned to those who can understand that even partial, temporary victory becomes a weapon to advance new conquests.

Giddy Slogans

Every people's struggle, it is said, is rich in lessons for those who take part in them. In this respect the bus boycott is no exception. In many areas "perfectionism" damped the flavour of victory and in some the settlement was, at first, rejected "until a minimum wage of £1 a day is achieved." No doubt the leaders meant well. But they became giddy with their own success, imagining that a boycott could bring not just PUTCO but the whole national body of employers to its knees. Setting the sights this high and raising the people's hopes so unrealistically could only make the settlement seem a let-down. There is a moral in this. Not the moral that leaders should not fire the imagination of their people with the wonders of the life that can be theirs when they find the ways to reach for it; this, the vision of a world filled with "singing to-morrows" is the star to which every people's dreams and strivings must be hitched if they are to go forward as far as their strength will carry them. Not that. But rather the moral and political leaders can only lead successfully while their feet are planted firmly on the ground of reality; that a struggle cannot be dragged beyond the limits of the people's strength, understanding and willingness to fight, no matter how radical and militant the slogans advanced by the leaders; that *leadership consists not only in knowing how to go forward, but equally in knowing when and how to stop, or to retreat in good order and in unity.*

Adventurers' Gamble

There are times—and the thirteenth week of the boycott was surely one—when it is impossible to go forward any longer without a pause to regain lost breath or recover balance; times when one step back is an essential condition for taking two steps forward. These are the times when leaders show their qualities. Hotheads, adventurers and those concerned only with their own reputations for militancy will continue to cry "Forward! Forward!" even while conscious that their own forces are being steadily pressed back, even though they lose control of the very fortresses which they stormed and conquered before the tide began to turn. A leader is not just a demagogue, a rabble-rouser, a fire-eater on a public platform. A leader needs to be a statesman, capable at every turn of the struggle of keeping close links with the people he seeks

to lead, sensitive to their needs and their instincts and their capabilities; a leader needs deep inner conviction, not of his own "superiority" to the masses, but of the overriding importance of the cause for which they struggle, which will enable him, when he must, to face the taunts of the adventurers and firebrands, if need be to "lose face," in order to take a step backward before all is lost. When that testing time came in Alexandra, the real leaders revealed their true mettle, while the adventurers cried "Forward!" even when it was apparent that their bitter-end actions could only result in the whole struggle being frittered away and lost.

It was in this testing hour that the central leadership of the African National Congress showed its quality and its statesmanship. The adventurers now claim that the A.N.C. "sold us out." The barren formalists, even in the ranks of the A.N.C. itself, claim that their leadership should not have intervened to win the people for the boycott settlement, because the boycott was the concern of the united-front People's Transport Committee and not of the A.N.C. It is a familiar spectacle, this seeking for scapegoats when the real progress of the people's movement falls short of the "what-might-have-been" dreams of visionaries. Never has it been less justified than now. No serious organisation can ever be bound, by the formality of a united-front committee's existence, to sit idly by and watch that committee fritter away the substance of people's victory, and fail to give leadership when leadership is needed. The united front is a means to unite the people for the advancement of their cause. And when some of the parties to it, because of wrong ideologies, because of adventurism or because of personal ambitions, misuse it to obstruct the people's advance, then those whose first loyalty is to the people's cause must serve the people where they can and as best they can, outside of it.

Congress Statesmanship

The first loyalty of the A.N.C. leadership was to their people, not to the Alexandra boycott committee. Only those on the inner leadership of the boycott will ever know the real, painstaking statesmanship which guided the A.N.C. leadership during this period; the self-

less efforts which were made to keep the united front together and united, to keep its links with the walking people close and indivisible, to broaden it out to represent every shade of opinion amongst the 70,000 people of the township. If there is credit attaching to the boycott committee for its determined and skilful handling of the boycott in all its earlier period, then much of that credit attaches to the A.N.C. which guided and influenced its direction. And if, in the end, it appeared that the gains of the boycott would be lost by adventurous calls for greater sacrifices than the people were then ready to make, it is to the credit of the A.N.C. leadership that it reacted as people's leaders should; that it pocketed its pride in order to recommend careful consideration and acceptance of the settlement.

Leadership is tested, not on paper, but in action. And the leadership of the A.N.C., which intervened directly in the boycott at the eleventh hour, has been vindicated by the people, who considered the settlement offer, used their own good sense to weigh up the possibilities of further resistance, and then accepted it. And in doing so, they rejected the adventurers who still cried "Forward! Forward!" That the acceptance of the settlement was disorderly and ragged—first Alexandra, later Moroka, and with Pretoria left outside the area of the settlement—is the result not of the A.N.C. intervention, but of the fatal divisions amongst the boycott leaders themselves, who failed to rise to the historic moment and seize the settlement and victory when both were there to be taken.

There are lessons to be learnt. There will always be lessons to be learnt. Such lessons serve to illuminate the path that lies ahead. We are face to face with the second round—the round of decisive, country-wide campaigning for an all round increase in wages, and for a national wage of £1 per day. The leadership is there and able; the energetic shock-workers of the people's movement are there, with more experience and understanding than of yesterday. The people are there, inspired by the simple Alexandra lesson of the power that is theirs, if they unite to organise and direct it. *The lessons have been recorded as armour for the future.*

The Press and The Boycott

By C. W. M. GELL

I think there will be general agreement that, within the inevitably restricted framework of its lack of really representative contacts among the African population, the Rand's English-language press did better than was to be expected over the bus boycott. For the first ten days or so both newspapers evidently tried their best to do an honest job of reporting. One paper continued to attempt this, at least as far as the "contemptuous" refusal of the Chamber of Commerce's "ingenious" refund offer on March 1. After that it rather "lost sympathy."

But the other paper lost its balance after the first ten days. Its reports thereafter were frequently travesties of the facts. When reporters of the paper, known to have been present at the events caricatured in the press, were taxed, they were sometimes able to produce their reasonably accurate

"copy," which had been discarded in favour of a version sucked out of some editor's or sub-editor's thumb.

Now I am aware that writing anything like this at a time when all manner of threats against the freedom of the press are blowing about, opens me to a charge of "consorting with or comforting the enemy." I, therefore, want to make it quite clear that whatever the defects of our present daily English-language press—and they are considerable—it is infinitely preferable to the even more glaring faults of the Afrikaans press or to the sort of press we should have were the Nationalists able to establish the "control" they want.

Playing Safe

The defects of the English-language press stem mainly from lack of real

competition. Our "conurbations" and their hinterland are so far apart and the potential reading public so small that each centre can support at most one morning and one evening paper, sometimes not even that. Since no press in the world is really free in any absolute sense—free, that is, from the predilections, prejudices or preferences of those who control or compose the papers — the best safeguard against suppression or distortion of news comes from the possibility of a rival presenting an obviously more authentic account. It is a very inadequate safeguard. But it carries with it the threat of readers changing over to the alternative that best satisfies their thirst for information, amusement (one is bound to admit it), the bolstering of their prejudices. Unfortunately, not only is there virtually no alternative English organ in most centres — the morning

NURSING APARTHEID

By a Correspondent

THE Government is this session introducing a Bill for apartheid in the nursing profession. Evidence on the subject, given before a parliamentary Select Committee, has been published. Dr. Eiselen, speaking as Dr. Verwoerd's mouthpiece, wanted Bantu nurses for Bantu patients, a training which "would fit them for their particular task," lower wages and a separate Non-White nursing organisation. That insidious "cultural" body, the F.A.K., advocated separate registration of White and Black nurses, different uniforms and insignia, and it has sponsored the Afrikaans Nurses' League as a pressure group within the S.A. Nursing Association "to concentrate on the things that really matter"—i.e. "standing together against integration" and encouraging wider use of Afrikaans.

Squeezing Non-Whites Out

The 1944 Nursing Act created a Nursing Council, to which all members of the profession could be elected, and a Nursing Association to which all qualified nurses must belong. According to Mrs. Searle, Transvaal Director of Nursing Services, Non-White nurses were admitted on an equal basis because there were then too few to constitute "a problem" and large scale training of others was not foreseen. "If we had known that this would be Provincial policy, I, for one, would certainly not have agreed to the 1944 Act. We would have fought it to the last ditch." It was largely at the instigation of Mrs. Searle that Dr. Stals, the Nationalist Minister of Health, in 1948, drafted administrative regulations to keep Non-White Nurses off the Nursing Council and the Board of the Nursing Association.

One may well ask why? Facts and figures are virtually unobtainable except in the carefully selected form published by the Nursing Council. It says that in 1954 there were 2,100 Non-White nurses out of a total of

TAUNG STORY (Continued)

discharge they had committed some petty theft. The employer was, of course, loath to bring this matter before the law. The law, as the father well knew, could take a serious view of such matters. Perhaps the parent and the employer could reach some agreement satisfactory to both parties. If the children could be made to work for another three months on the farm, the farmer would be quite prepared to let the matter rest there. . . ."

* * *

I stayed just a little over two days in Taung. But what I saw and learnt in that time gave me a good idea of what a defenceless people could suffer at the hands of the unholy alliance of Native Department officialdom, arrogant White farmers and unscrupulous traders.

13,309. It will not publish comparative figures of passes and failures by race groups on the formal ground that "our single register does not state the nurse's race." But a member of the Nursing Council, Adv. Van Reenen, told the Select Committee that "in 1953, 27 per cent. of the European and 51 per cent. of the Non-European entries were re-entries" (i.e. previously failed), that "for the last three years" European percentage passes had been 72 per cent., whereas Non-Europeans began with 82 per cent. in 1952, fell to 46 per cent. in 1945 and to 35.5 per cent. in 1953.

In order to meet this "situation" Adv. Van Reenen requires powers to "effect separation in all aspects of the nursing services, to differentiate in the training between the different races, keep separate registers, to differentiate in respect of the training according to existing needs, *in other words, for skilful and less skilful nurses, with regard to both race and duties.*" Adv. Van Reenen, Mr. Van Schalkwyk, Miss C. A. Nothard (all of the Nursing Council) recommended "a basic and practical syllabus which will be of help to the Non-European as such" (echoes of Bantu Education). Since their "outlook on life" was different, their training must be different "if in the end we want them to have the same sense of responsibility." But "once you train them differently you must register them differently," which precludes their exercising the same responsibilities and thus learning (in the only practicable way) "a sense of responsibility."

There appears possibly to be some ground for the contention that on average it may take an African nurse longer to qualify than a European. This is not (as the F.A.K. said) due to "centuries of tradition, culture and civilisation which determine the European nurse's superior status." It is due primarily to unequal opportunities in general education (now aggravated by its Bantuisation) and in facilities for nursing training. Mr. Van Reenen, Miss Nothard and Mrs. Searle all regard any joint training as wrong and "put a stop to it" whenever they can; the training staff for Non-White nurses is often inadequate and less experienced than for Whites; there are no facilities in the Union to train Non-Whites for fever, mental or orthopaedic nursing, theatre technique or mothercraft ("we allow Non-Europeans to practise midwifery within the hospital grounds provided they do it in the same way as it is carried out in their kraals"—Adv. Van Reenen.)

Keeping Control

That these considerations of the Non-White nurses' "own good" were not the only or even paramount reason behind the move for nursing apartheid clearly emerges from other parts of the evidence. Mrs. Searle said that one of her greatest difficulties in recruiting White nurses was the fear that they might at some time come under the "control in any sense" of a Non-White nurse or doctor. "It is not for me to indulge in ideologies. I have to be practical."

Miss M. G. Borchards, Chairman of the Nursing Association, and Miss Nothard were very averse to allowing Non-White nurses to have a separate organisation, as suggested by Dr. Eiselen. "We want the Non-Europeans to have the *guidance* of the European nurse, who will *advise* and keep them on the right road. We have to retain

control over the Non-Europeans, to keep them in order and, by doing so, allow them to develop." Therefore they wanted to keep the Non-White nurses in subordinate "groups" within the Association, "represented" on the Board by one White member (out of 16) and able to submit proposals only if approved by the White branches. Miss Borchards and Miss Nothard agreed with the Transvaal Provincial Administration that a separate body might develop "as a Non-White trade union" and become "political" or "Communistic." It would have the additional disadvantage of disqualifying the Association from its international affiliations, though whether the proposed hardly disguised colour bar gets round that difficulty is very doubtful.

A similar dichotomy of purpose was very obvious in Mrs. Searle's lengthy evidence. After a long dissertation on "my idea of nursing" which envisaged every nurse having "a deep understanding of the psychological, sociological, physical and mental factors in illness"—a very worthy and seldom perfectly attained ideal—she described "the Non-White nurse as a good technician at the most, unable to discharge, either through training or in the care of the sick person, these functions of a nurse, viz. the psychological and sociological care of a patient" (except, of course, "to her own people"). We have, therefore, to choose between "a professional service to the people of South Africa or just a technical service on the lowest possible level as it exists today in all countries where nursing services are run by Non-Whites."

Unequal—Yet Competition

One might have supposed from this that the superior virtues of all White nurses over all Non-White nurses would obviate any question of competition for their services. Not a bit of it! Mrs. Searle hardly paused to draw breath before expounding the necessity of a colour bar, not merely to prevent Non-Whites obtaining supervisory posts but also to prevent "completely free competition which could wreck the nursing services." Mrs. Searle described with horror ("it only lasted for half an hour after I arrived on the scene") how she had thrice found Non-White staff nurses supervising non-White wards in which White student nurses also worked. "It was during a time of great shortage and they did it to keep the Non-European wards open." In future are they to shut in similar circumstances? And then she warned that the private employment of Non-European nurses "must be stopped" or else these "mere technicians" will undercut and debar the White nurse from private duty nursing altogether!

Finally, it was interesting to find Mrs. Searle and the Transvaal Administration at one about the danger of "swamping" in an "integrated" service. The Hospital Boards of such enlightened places as Wolmaransstad, Lydenburg, Krugersdorp, Klerksdorp (see their Group Area records) had embarked on a correspondence about swamping, enjoying refreshments together, attending meetings and social functions together and the "obviating of all irregularities such as, *inter alia*, equality." So the Transvaal Executive Committee endorsed "the traditional South African way of life, viz. that the European must hold his own separately." But the imposition of a legislative nursing colour bar and a ban on the private employment of Non-White nurses by Whites is one of the most explicit admissions yet made that "the European can hold his own" only by erecting artificial barriers to keep the "inferior" Non-White out.

THE SUEZ DEBACLE

THE merit of Paul Johnson's "The Suez War" lies not in any new light it sheds on the British action against Nasser, but on the clarity with which all the public and widely known facts are assembled together to produce a devastating indictment of the British Government. Here are recorded the acts of blundering imperial reaction which led Britain to its greatest military fiasco, and accompanying economic and political debacle. It is written, as so many press reporters' books are, in order to drive home a single, simple point. "Our leaders are guilty men. So long as they go unpunished, all of us are accessories after the fact." Johnson, assistant editor of the *New Statesman and Nation*, hits hard at Eden and the Tories. "The ablest of his generation," he writes of Eden, "had been killed in Flanders; he soon won preferment in the Tory Party." And, as is to be expected from an experienced reporter, he makes the story

spring dramatically alive and gripping.

But, as so often happens with books by reporters rather than historians, the story is told on a rather shallow, superficial level. There is, for example, no explanation offered for the United States' policy towards Nasser and Suez, other than the personality and petty finaglings of John Foster Dulles. Dulles' dyspepsia, it would appear, is the reason for the sudden withdrawal of the U.S. offer to finance the building of the Aswan Dam, which set in motion the whole trail of events leading to the Suez War. In the same strain is the childish story that "... reading a copy of the British weekly 'Illustrated' (Hussein) saw an article entitled 'Glubb Pasha — Uncrowned King of Jordan. . . .' In a moment of childish anger after reading the article, Hussein ordered his dismissal." This piffling nonsense may serve the Sunday newspapers, but it is not to be expected in a supposedly serious study by a

serious writer. Nor can one condone the failure to mention, even in passing, the feelings and outlooks of the Egyptian people and government about events which, after all, concerned them more than anyone. This glaring omission serves to underline the insidious anti-Egyptian, anti-Nasser, flagwagging Britishism of Johnson's views, coupled with anti-Soviet prejudices which weakens Johnson's desperate and sincere attempt to indict the British Government, and so restore the honour and prestige of the British people, who, by and large, opposed Eden in his great adventure.

THE SUEZ WAR. By Paul Johnson. Published by MacGibbon & Kee. (With foreword by Aneurin Bevan.) 12s. —L.B.

have endured." Probably so. It is difficult to write from such close quarters. And nowhere is this more apparent than in the final chapter of the story, which Fast himself describes as having "... a degree of melodramatic implausibility." For this chapter is based not on the generalised experience of life as interpreted through the artist's eyes, but on an actual incident which happened to an American Communist war hero, Robert Thompson. In this final lunatic act of a mad age, Thompson was brutally assaulted in prison by a fellow prisoner, a Croatian charged with a breach of the immigration laws, who hoped thus to demonstrate his thorough "Americanism," as it is defined by McCarthy mania. Perhaps there is, in the Lola Gregg version of this horror, validity. But certainly there is no greatness.

"The Last Supper," like most collections of short stories, is both good and bad in patches. At its best, as in "Christ in Cuernavaca," and "My Father," it is very good, producing all the great compassion and humanity of Fast at his best. Perhaps, significantly, both these stories keep off the well-trod path of the witch-hunt obsession. From this it does not follow that all the many stories about the witch-hunt fall short. Some do. But others, and, significantly again, those which are not so close to the reality of Fast's own life and agony, come close to his very best work. "Upraised Pinion" tells the tale of a former Communist who decides to make a deal with the F.B.I. at the expense of his comrades, while "A Walk Home" reverses the pattern to a profoundly moving story of the simple worker who refuses to deal in human lives with the F.B.I. because he places too high a value on his manhood.

Like everything he writes, this collection of Fast's short stories will help to "end this long period of insanity," and so restore the conditions of life in America in which Fast will once again produce the works of greatness and validity which were his before the insanity became endemic.

HOWARD FAST: General Washington and the Water Witch—a play in three acts, 11s. The Last Supper and Other Stories. The Story of Lola Gregg—a novel, 10s. 6d. All published by The Bodley Head. L.B.

HOWARD FAST TRIO

Howard Fast, at his best, is very, very good. But not even his most ardent admirers will be able to claim that his most recent works are anywhere near his best. That he is versatile is shown by the fact that his three most recent works are a play (General Washington and the Water Witch), a collection of short stories (The Last Supper), and a novel (The Story of Lola Gregg). But in none of them does he approach the great writing of which he is capable, and which reveals itself only in his historical novels.

Not that one can brush aside any of these recent works as worthless. They are far from that. But they are, perhaps, unworthy of the talent which created them. Of the play there is little to say. It is a fantasy, woven around that fateful moment at which Washington decided to lead the beaten, broken and battered remnants of the revolutionary army back across the Delaware River, to attack a vastly superior force of imperial troops—the moment which turned seemingly certain defeat into a crushing revolutionary victory. "My opinion," writes Fast in a foreword, "is that (in this work) he is a more truthful Washington than I presented in 'The Unvanquished.'" Perhaps so. Certainly he is more human, more given to human weaknesses than the cold, aloof character of 'The Unvanquished,' published at the beginning of World War II. But he is also a less heroic figure, a less historic figure than the earlier Fast portrait of the great bourgeois revolutionary leader. And therefore, it seems to me, a literary portrait of less validity and power than Fast's earlier one. The fantasy links the revolutionary past with the witch-hunt of revolutionary ideas of the present, making of Washington

not only yesterday's revolutionary hero, but also the symbol of today's revolutionary martyrs.

The theme of witch-hunting appears to have become something of an obsession with Fast. I say this not in criticism so much as in sorrow. The theme runs powerfully through the majority of the stories in "The Last Supper," and is the whole theme of "Lola Gregg." That it is so is understandable; Fast has been persecuted, hunted and imprisoned by the American witch-hunters. Such a life as his in the past ten years, such an hysteria as America's in the past ten years, cannot fail to leave deep-etched scars upon a writer of sensitivity and courage. But the witch-hunt is not—and never will be—the whole of life in America; it is the bitterest and the blackest part, but only part. An obsession with the dark, dying and decadent is an unlikely field for literature to flourish, especially when that literature is to be born from the pen of a man like Fast, whose whole mind and outlook seeks out the growing, living and flowering side of life.

Fast is too large an artist not to be aware that his latest work falls short of his strivings. "This little tale," he writes in an epilogue to "Lola Gregg," "suffers from the author's own experience. The making of literature is, in my opinion, a matter of reflection, contemplation and objectivity—but for more years than I care to recall, all of these have been denied me. The literature of agony, written at the moment of agony, has validity but not greatness. . . ." "Lola Gregg" is literature of agony, the tale of a Communist hunted by the F.B.I. and of the agony of his wife and family and friends, which ends in his own crucifixion at the altar of McCarthy Americanism. It is told in words of stark terror and tragedy: "The story . . . suffers," writes Fast in his epilogue, "because I know it so well and so currently; but perhaps the telling of it will help to end this long time of insanity we

J U N E 2 6

Cold skies and drizzle. The closed shops in Market street. The closed stalls at the Indian market. The solitary watchman at the closed factory gate. An air of desolation hangs over the city. Not the bustling morning crowds leaving the city stations and the bus stops. Not the coffee drinkers at the coffee carts. But empty trains and empty buses. The workers have stayed at home.

It is June 26, 1957 and Protest Day. It is a day of protest and demand — protest against the intolerable pass laws and the monster of apartheid, and for a minimum wage of one pound a day. There are holidays in the country marking some event or other but June 26 is the truly national day, a day that has come to mean so much in the lives of the people of the country. It is the day of “prayer, mourning and dedication.” It was on this day in 1950 that the general strike against the Nationalists took place. It was on this day in 1952 that the first batch of volunteers went into action and launched the Defiance Campaign that shook the citadel of apartheid to its very foundations. It was on this day that the Congress of the People meeting at Kliptown adopted the Freedom Charter and laid the foundations of a just South African society of the future. Later generations will remember June 26, 1957 as the day on which the workers stayed at home in the year of the bus boycott, in the year of the treason trial, in the year when the people hit back. June 26 is the peoples’ day, born of travail and tempered in the heat of struggle. On that day the people dedicate themselves anew to the struggle for freedom.

* * * *

One pound a day for the factory worker who today cannot buy what he makes. One pound a day for the miner who earns his phthisis and goes home broken and to die. One pound a day for the farm labourer who today ploughs the bitter furrow of misery. One pound a day for the builder of mansions who lives in a shack . . . A minimum wage of one pound a day for all the workers in the land. One pound a day. Five pounds a week. More food to eat, clothes, warmth. A little light in the deep night of poverty. Freedom from pass laws; freedom from the midnight police terror. Freedom from “ghost squads” haunting the street corners. Freedom from prisons and forced farm labour — the horned fingers and welts ploughed into sorry flesh. Freedom to walk without fear as the companion of the heart . . .

* * * *

It is now routine practice that whenever the people protest, the police rush in uninvited to “protect” them — with bullets, batons, handcuffs. Whenever the people protest it is seen as the work of agitators and trouble-makers. The bus boycott showed what the gratuitous police action means. Mr. Schoeman saw in the bus boycott a trial of strength between the government and the African National Congress. If, indeed, it was a trial of strength, then the people have scored a resounding victory.

And, like the Government that gave the cue, the Transvaal Chamber of Industries saw June 26 as a trial of strength. Like the government, too, it resorted to threats and intimidation and decided on a “tough” line against the workers. “Leniency and indulgence at this juncture would be followed by dire consequences”, the Chamber warned. Absence from work on June 26 would constitute a serious breach of contract; illegal absenteeism would be dealt with by way of summary dismissal, and banishment from urban areas would be visited on those guilty of misconduct and disregard of the law. These were no idle threats. Sackings and victimisations have followed in the wake of June 26.

The press did everything in its power to water down the peoples’ protest. It tried to sow nettles of doubt and despair in the ranks of the people — and failed. It appealed to a fictitious loyalty of the worker to his firm— in vain. For the worker owes no loyalty to a firm which pays him starvation wages—and can owe none. Nor does the worker belong to the bosses, though the Chamber may rail at those so-called agitators who would pollute “our labour force.” OUR labour force! The impudence of it. The worker is a worker in his own right, owing loyalty to his people and his fellow-workers. And so the workers stayed at home.

* * * *

By
ALFRED
HUTCHINSON

“How many came to work today?”
“Kuze — None”. Not One. The outspread hands of the watchman at the closed factory gate.

(Continued on page 14)

The granite hard facade of the Nationalists has begun to crack. Vigorous new forces are rising in the country, says this review of the last parliamentary session and the approaching elections.

THE RISING TIDE

By L. BERNSTEIN

Another evil and disastrous session of Parliament has ended. And with it has ended the second five-year term of Nationalist legislation. From here until early 1958, the verbal cut and parry between an undistinguished opposition and a fanatic Government shifts to the vote-gathering platforms of the forthcoming election.

Already, in the dying days of the recent session of Parliament, attempts have been made to shape the outlines of that contest. Already, all the hoary platitudes of Nationalist Party electioneering — of which even Parliamentary dotards grow tired between elections — have been dusted off and trotted forth for the multitudes to gape at. Already in his final and characteristically bloodless oration to Parliament, Mr. Strijdom has returned to the tried and tested 1953 formula of simultaneous United Party sabotage of South Africa and United Party plotting of Black-White equality, as the keynote of the coming months.

On the surface it would appear that once again the election is to be fought in an empty void of policy, parroting the victorious slogans of the 1953 campaign which have long lost their freshness and reappear now faded, lustreless and insipid. For such an election the stage is being carefully set by the Government, in the hope of producing only another, more tedious, more enervating repetition of the dreary contest of 1953. From such an election, with all the real and vital issues of South Africa's future confined like skeletons in a cupboard into which the public may not pry, there can result only a new Nationalist victory, with perhaps an increased majority.

A Break with the Old

If there is a lack of enthusiasm for the coming election amongst the supporters of the opposition it is because already the deadening possibility of such an election is paralysing their initiative, and giving rise to an air of pessimistic defeatism. There is a tradition in South Africa that electoral campaigns centre around trivialities and eschew deep issues of policy; and it is possible that those who are already gloomy of the future realise the difficulty of breaking that tradition while the United Party remains the cornerstone of the electoral opposition to Nationalism.

But if that tradition is not broken, the Parliamentary system in South Africa will continue to decline, until it passes quietly away into the history of the past. If it is to be broken, this is the time to do it, for during the past six months the apparent granite-hard facade of Nationalism has begun to crack, and the real weaknesses and instability of the house that Strijdom built have been revealed. The Wassenaar breakaway was a straw in the wind. Before that there had been the revolt of the Pretoria University Professors against the packing of the Senate; and after it there was the more significant dispute within the Dutch Reformed Church over the so-called "church clause" of the Native

Laws Amendment Act. These were the symptoms of the weakness, and not the source of it. By themselves these sporadic outbreaks of dissension amongst the former 'hard-core' of Nationalism changed little and accomplished little. Self-deceiving politicians sought to attach greater meaning and significance to them than they merited; but in doing so they glossed over the really significant process that has been going on, unremarked, in the thinking and outlook of South Africans of all kinds, which has created the atmosphere in which these minor revolts and about-turns become comprehensible pointers to a change that is growing to maturity.

New Life

There are many who think that South Africans, especially European South Africans, have become so ossified and fixed in their ideas that they alone, of all living creatures, are no longer capable of growth and change. How strongly the past six months have contradicted them.

Life has forced the most hidebound from the cast-iron shells of their former prejudices. August University professors lead demonstration marches through the city streets under a battery of Security Branch cameras. White nurses join with Non-White to strike a political blow against Government policy. General Selby and flag-waving Senator Heaton Nicholls join with Bishop and Race Relations Institute President to sponsor a Defence Fund for a varied collection of Congress leaders, trade unionists and Communists accused of treason. That venerable pillar of traditional South African liberalism, Senator Edgar Brookes casts aside a life-time of belief to proclaim that the "necessity of gradualness is now less important than the necessity for some immediate action" in regard to enfranchising Non-Europeans. Churchmen of many denominations, steeped in the tradition of "rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's" openly proclaim their intention of breaching the spirit of the Native Laws Amendment Act. The tiny remnants of a Labour Party, eclipsed and almost forgotten since 1948, discover again the militant crusading spirit of its early founders, and emerges with its tiny group of M.P's to become the real spearhead of the Parliamentary opposition, approaching close to the position of spokesmen for the Non-European liberation movement in the seats of the mighty. Secure, sheltered ladies from middle class homes proceed from their first cautious "sashing" of Cabinet Ministers to forthright denunciations of passes for African women, and stand tolling the bell in public demonstration against Nationalist apartheid legislation. Conservative European trade unions, mummified in an apartheid straitjacket of their own tailoring, find breath to make a stinging denunciation of the Native Labour Act and of the very sections of the Industrial Conciliation Act which they themselves supported two years ago. The Liberal Party members emerge from the ivory towers of academic debate about "qualifications" for the franchise, which

characterised their first three years of life, to take an active part in women's multi-racial demonstrations against pass laws and to support the Treason Trial Accused. From the heart of the seemingly changeless citadel of White South Africa, the United Party, Sir de Villiers Graaff breaks with the past to proclaim the United Party's intention of amending the Suppression of Communism Act (which his own party, under the leadership of Strauss, declared did not go far enough) of narrowing down the definition of "Communism" and restoring the right of everyone accused under the Act to trial before the courts. One of the pillars of Nationalist strength, the Dutch Reformed Church begins to talk of a multi-racial conference to reach basic agreement on fundamentals of policy; and thousands of nameless, unorganised European men and women change the brands of their cigarettes because the Congress movement has called for a boycott of an allegedly Nationalist controlled cigarette and tobacco manufacturing concern.

Sign of the Times

Cynics will claim — with some justification — that for all that, the burgeoning forth of new ideas and new outlooks has accomplished nothing and changed nothing. During the very period of this growth and development, the Nationalist Government has carried through perhaps its most sinister, far-reaching and reactionary legislative programme of any Parliamentary session. True. But that fact cannot obscure the other truth of this period; and that is that during this session, for the first time during their ten years of office, the Nationalist Government has been impelled to withdraw two major pieces of ideological legislation — the proposed steeply increased poll tax for Africans, and the section of the University apartheid measure which would have closed the doors of all existing "mixed" Universities to Non-White students. Whatever the technical explanations produced by the Government to explain these second thoughts, the fact remains that, like the outbreaks of dissension amongst the Nationalists themselves, *these are the first temporary results of the new directions in which South African citizens are beginning to seek the answers to their country's problems.*

It is this atmosphere of radical departures from the past that prepares the ground for dissension in the ranks of the Nationalist Party, for the opening of a minuscule breach between government and church, for the outburst in Parliament by Nationalist member Basson against the incompatibility of apartheid at home and good relations with African states abroad. And it is also in this atmosphere that the 1950 Nationalist dreams about "apartheid for the next five hundred years" begin to disappear into mist, and the Government comes face to face with the hard reality that already the tide is running the other way.

Playing Safe

If the Government now seeks to turn away from the deep controversies which have rocked the country during the past year, and to campaign on the safe and stultifying platitudes outlined by Mr. Strijdom, it is because they hope to divert the tide of new ideas, of awakened militancy and of democratic awareness which is rising throughout the land. There is officially inspired rumour that the most fa-

natic of the cabinet, Dr. Verwoerd, will be jettisoned to save the Nationalist ship. These are diversions, designed to trap the opposition and to lead the United Party astray. Already there are signs that they may succeed, and that the United Party will turn away from the vigorous new forces which are rising throughout the country, and fall back on the old, well-worn and eternally hopeless patterns of the past, the patterns of appeasing the most backward of the voters in their most backward outlooks. The markedly traditional, ultra-conservative tone of de Villiers Graaff's platteland speeches, contrasting so sharply with his Johannesburg attack on the Suppression of Communism Act and call for a "native middle class" with a modicum of property and legal rights, is signal of the danger that the United Party and the opposition may yet be induced to enter the election on the Government's terms. That way lies disaster, and the frittering away of the glittering possibilities of Nationalist election defeat which now exist.

There are some in the Congress movement, and many amongst the Non-White peoples, who disregard the elections and the whole electoral struggle as inconsequential and of no concern. From the right premise — that the history of South Africa cannot be made without the Non-White peoples — they draw the wrong conclusions — that anything not done by the Non-White people themselves is of no importance. It is time to knock that false conclusion on the head. *The truth is that the whole rising tide of new ideas amongst White South Africans has been engendered by the militant upsurge, the mass struggles and the uncompromisingly democratic claims of the Non-White peoples.* The liberation movement and its Congress-alliance spearhead has set the stage in which the new currents of White opinion have begun to run. It has produced the mass ferment in which the timid hearted amongst the White opposition have taken courage, in which the ideas which yesterday seemed wild-eyed and radical appear today sane and sensible, and in which the progressive and decent aspirations of White South Africans begin to take shape as the weapons of a possible victorious electoral assault on the Nationalist Government.

It is customary in these days for there to be talk of electoral "united fronts" against the Nationalist Government. Certainly, at the moment, there is room for some non-aggression pact between the United Party, Labour and Liberal candidates, or even for a unity agreement, based on an equitable division of seats. But for the Congress movement to think and talk, at this stage of South African development, of a "United Front" which will enfold Congress extra-parliamentary struggle and United Party electoral campaigns in a single camp, would be unrealistic and visionary. And yet this is not the time for Congress to fold its tents, and leave the scene to the electoral machines of the Parliamentary parties. The Congress movement has started the whole European opposition on a forward surge. This is its contribution to the possibility of electoral defeat for Nationalism. *And during the coming months, that unique contribution will be enlarged by the extent to which the Congresses carry the whole Non-European people forward into wider action against the Government, and in so doing, lift the European movement forward towards possible electoral victory, as the comet carries its flaming tail.*

ALGERIA

The Mollet Government in France was brought down by the very factor which kept it in power for so long: France's disastrous war in Algeria. A Socialist Government, it was maintained by the support of the right-wing parties, because early on it had surrendered to the settlers' policy of brutal repression. It was overthrown because France has become increasingly unable to pay the bill for this policy.

In this article, DESMOND BUCKLE, a frequent contributor on African affairs to this journal, describes the methods used by the French occupying armies in Algeria and the furore created in France by the exposure of these facts.

One night towards the end of May over 300 men of the Grande-Kabylie village of Melouza were massacred, and only a day later 37 Muslim farm workers of the Oranais district were brutally killed. These incidents were seized upon by the French Government to justify its army-occupation methods in Algeria, and to discredit all those Frenchmen calling for negotiations with Algerian leaders to bring the ghastly two-and-a-half year old Algerian war to an end.

The French Foreign Ministry claimed that the Melouza massacre confirmed what the French have said so often at the United Nations and elsewhere: that a French withdrawal from Algeria would lead to a "veritable blood-bath" in that country. (This did not explain however, how it was the Melouza blood-bath took place while 60,000 French troops were in Algeria!)

FLN-MNA Rivalry?

The killings have been attributed to two causes: intense and bitter rivalry between the FLN (Front de Liberation Nationale) and the only other important Algerian national movement, the M.N.A. (Mouvement Nationale Algerienne); and sanctions said to have been declared by the Liberation Army, the military force of the FLN, against all villages which rally to the French. These sanctions were said to be part of a directive which, very conveniently it seems, fell into the hands of the French forces six weeks before the Melouza massacre. According to the directive, the troops of the Liberation Army were to

"burn all villages seeking the protection of the French forces and destroy all males over 20 years of age living in them."

Le Monde made much of the rivalry between the FLN and the MNA, claiming that Melouza was situated in an area where MNA influence was strong. This paper claimed that the FLN had taken a decision to exterminate the forces of the MNA which were under the command of one Si Haoues. However, at a press conference in Tunis, two days after the appearance of this article, the FLN delegation in Tunisia dramatically produced Si Haoues who turned out to be a member of the Liberation Army operating in the Grande-Kabylie region.

This Melouza massacre has been used to divert attention from the charges of torture and maltreatment which have been laid against the French forces in Algeria, and which have rocked France over the last few months.

White-wash Commission

The charges were first made by *L'Humanite* last year and were dismissed by the Mollet Government and its supporters among the press as "Communist propaganda". However, other newspapers began publishing similar reports and soon denunciation of the behaviour of the French troops came, though in a more indirect but no less unequivocal manner, from the archbishops and cardinals of France. The matter could no longer be hushed up. So on October 26 last year the National Assembly appointed seven members of the Commission of the Interior to go to Oran and inquire into the alleged maltreatment of certain detained persons. No Communist was included in this commission although the Communist Party, with 150 seats, is the largest in the National Assembly. Reaction was, however, well represented in the person of M. Isorni, an unregenerate Vichyist.

For two months the commission, which was headed by the Socialist M. Provo, did not budge from Paris. Then it spent a few days in Oran and after another three months issued a truly remarkable report. Only 6 out of the 7 members of the Provo Commission signed the report. The seventh, the Radical M.P., M. Hovanian, re-

fused to support what he described as "a collection of facts . . . which appear to be proof of police methods incompatible with the true mission of the police."

Despite all the reports and statements made by reservists and others who actually witnessed the torturing of Algerian prisoners which were appearing daily in the French press, the Provo Commission claimed that there were no signs of torturing in Algeria.

The Provo Commission paid warm tribute to Robert Lacoste, the Resident-Minister, and the men under him. They were men upon whom circumstances had imposed a particularly harassing task. They had taken on very heavy responsibilities. Tell us of jobs serving the interests of the country which are carried on in equally atrocious conditions, was the Provo Commission's final challenging flourish on behalf of those operating the policy of "pacification".

The Provo Commission's report did not silence the protests about the methods of the French authorities in Algeria, nor did the confiscation of issues of French newspapers and the banning in Algeria of all except the publications of the extreme right.

Eye-Witness Accounts

Le Monde published extracts from a book by M. P-H. Simon in which the author gave eye-witness accounts of soldiers, officers, priests and of victims of the tortures. It included in all their horror details of beatings, of the application of fan electric current to the eyes, ears and sexual organs of the victims, and blows with a horse-whip on the soles of the feet and other tender parts of the body.

These revelations were confirmed by M. Servan-Schreiber, a journalist on the staff of *L'Express*, who had served his term as a reservist in Algeria. And General de Bollardiére, in command of a sector in Algeria approved Servan-Schreiber's articles after the Minister of Defence had ordered the latter to be prosecuted for "demoralising the army". For his own offence the General was ordered to be confined in a fortress for 60 days, after which he was to be sent to a remote command in French Equatorial Africa.

But that was by no means the

Thousands of Africans are rounded up, night and day, in the ever-lasting raids, stopped by the 'Ghost Squad', seized in so-called sweeps against crime, pulled from their beds. From this great human crop the harvest is reaped: under-paid, under-fed labour for the farms.

Press gangs operate in the year 1957. Forced labour exists in South Africa on a Vast Scale.

In olden days, sailing ships could not obtain sufficient men to work on them during their hard, long voyages that lasted for months, sometimes years. Because of this chronic shortage of manpower for a job that few wanted, gangs of men would go around "pubs" and bars in English coastal towns, and slip drugs into drinks; then drag the unconscious men on board ship. In the morning, when the victims recovered, the ship was already at sea and it might be years before they returned to their homes again.

Wives? Families? Nobody cared about them. All they knew was that their man had simply disappeared, and whether he was alive or dead they did not know and were not told.

The men who did the drugging were called "press gangs", and their victims were said to be "shanghai-ed". Press gangs used to search the drink and opium dens of the city of Shanghai for many victims. That was the origin of the term.

But that was long ago, and press gangs and shanghai-ing belong to less civilised times, when life was cheap and laws did not protect working men and poor people.

What would you say if I told you press gangs still operate in this year, 1957, still waylay victims and shanghai them away for badly-paid, rotten jobs that no one wants?

Press Gangs of 1957

Take a case like this: A man has a job as a cleaner for a town council. On his way home from work one afternoon he is stopped by some men in ordinary clothes who say they are police. He shows his work badge, but they tell him they are going to give him work to do. He is hustled onto a lorry and taken away — far away from the town where he worked; his family know nothing of what has happened to him.

Or this: A lad of fourteen goes on a trip on a lorry with a friend. The driver pulls into a town to see someone, leaving the two boys on the lorry for ten minutes. When he returns, they have disappeared. They have been "shanghai-ed", and the boy is already on his way to serve a term of forced labour.

Our Cover Picture:

Arrested in pass raids, these men are taken to the Native Commissioner's Court where they are pressed to sign on for farm work.

SHANGHAI-ED!

by HILDA WATTS

These are typical cases. Often the victims are deprived of their clothes when the destination is reached, ill-treated, beaten, half-starved. Sometimes they return to their homes months later, often emaciated, suffering from sores and the marks of whippings, always penniless. Some never return.

How do you think the British public, for instance, would react, if news of such cases trickled into the newspapers through an isolated court case here or there?

Can you imagine the type of editorial that might appear in a newspaper such as the "Times"? They would write: "Strange things are happening . . . they call for serious attention from the authorities and the public in the interests of humanity and England's good name". They would quote a particular case: Under affidavit a man working as a tradesman stated he had been arrested through some technical error in his papers. He had gone to the local employment bureau to register a youth as his assistant, and the two were seized against their will and sent to work on a farm "without any attempt being made to inquire into his circumstances or to inform his family of his whereabouts . . . This is not necessarily a typical example but no matter how rare or how frequent such cases may be they should be investigated and firmly dealt with if the English conscience is to be clear."

Yes, it is absolutely true. Press gangs operate in the year 1957. Men are shanghai-ed. They vanish, as they did two hundred years ago. Only it happens now not in England, but in South Africa. The newspaper editorial quoted above is from the Johannesburg Star of July 8th, 1957, except that I have changed 'South Africa' to 'England.'

SLAVERY EXISTS IN SOUTH AFRICA TODAY ON A VAST SCALE. The difference between our modern press gangs and those of the old days in England is that *our* press gangs are actually the police and government authorities. No bland denials can conceal the facts. There is a slave market, to provide labour for the rotten, under-paid farm jobs that no one wants. Men, boys — yes, children as well — are shanghai-ed every day, torn from homes and families. White South Africans who are occasionally stirred to uneasiness by a case they encounter directly, or read about if it comes to the courts, are completely unaware of the huge organised scale on which this takes place.

Official Version

Of course, officials deny there is any coercion. Their story is that these are pass law offenders who are given the option of farm work or gaol, and many

FARM WORK . . . OR POLICE PROSECUTION

A Government circular handed into court during the case of Nelson Langa, who alleged he had been arrested under the pass laws and then coerced to work on a Bethal farm, created a sensation earlier this month.

The document is headed "Scheme for the Employment of Petty Offenders in Non-Prescribed Areas."

It is addressed to all Native Affairs Department officials and magistrates, was issued on June 14, 1954, and approved by the Secretary for Justice and the Commissioner of the South Africa Police, as well as the Department of Native Affairs.

This circular says:

"It is common knowledge that large numbers of Natives are daily being arrested and prosecuted for contraventions of a purely technical nature.

"These arrests cost the state large sums of money and serve no useful purpose.

"The Department of Justice, the South African police and this Department (the N.A.D.) have therefore held consultations on the problem and have evolved a scheme, the object of which is to induce unemployed natives now roaming the streets in the various urban areas to accept employment outside such urban areas.

"The scheme has now been in operation in the larger areas for some time, and with certain exceptions necessitated by local conditions, the procedure described below is followed in dealing with Natives arrested for offences under the Natives Taxation and Development Act, the Urban Areas Act, and Labour Bureau Regulation (the relevant sections are detailed).

(a) Natives arrested between 2 p.m. on Sunday and 2 p.m. on Fridays are not charged immediately after arrest, but merely detained by the police.

(b) Natives so detained are removed under escort to the district labour bureau and handed over to the Employment Officer . . .

(f) The Natives must be offered such employment as is available in non-prescribed (rural) areas. Priority should be given to farm labour in this connection.

(g) Natives who on account of their declining to accept employment are not released are returned to the South African Police for prosecution."

What bare-faced, shocking lies! The picture of benign welfare officials carefully explaining to the Africans the choice that lies before them is completely untrue. The methods used by police and government, through their pass officials, to shanghai Africans to the farms put ancient press-gangers completely in the shade.

The things that happen are NOT isolated cases of a harsh or over-zealous civil servant. Not only must the authorities be fully aware of what is going on, not only must the officials of courts and pass offices be aware of it, but more — it is obviously official policy. They must have orders to do these terrible things.

Never-ending Raids

A few years ago they were a little more particular as to how their victims were selected. Long years of increasingly harsh apartheid and fascist laws have made them careless and arrogant. The victims may be unemployed; they may have permits to seek work; they may be in employment; they may be (as in a recent case of a Coloured youth arrested for being without a pass) wrongfully arrested; they may be men, or youths, or even children as young as ten years, seized while walking along country roads, or snatched out of schools.

Thousands of Africans are rounded up continuously, night and day, in the ever-lasting raids, stopped by the "ghost squad", dragged from their homes at night, scooped up in the streets, pulled out in hundreds in raids on hostels, seized in so-called "sweeps against crime", abducted when visiting wives or friends in flats and backyards, even arrested between the back-door of their own home and their lavatory. From this great human crop the harvest is reaped: under-paid, under-fed, maltreated labour for the farms.

They are taken to the police stations, and from there to one of the Labour Bureaux. Many have committed some minor pass offence. But many have nothing at all wrong with their passes, may be in good employment. Some have passes to seek work; some have contravened the pass laws through ignorance, as in the case of a Rhodesian I knew in employment in Johannesburg who was arrested in Alexandra for "entering an urban area"!

They are told, "We will give you work." Many in the past were told they were to be sent to factories in Germiston or Springs. They bother less and less these days with this type of deception. They are put in a queue, and their thumbs are pressed onto a document — their "labour contract" — which may or may not have been read to them in a language they understand. They are loaded onto troop carriers, or picked up outside by farmers with wire-meshed trucks. They may not communicate with employers, family, friends, lawyers. In some cases relatives have come to the jails where they have been confined with money to pay their fines, only to be told the man they are seeking is not there. Families who attempt to trace the vanished men come up against a blank wall. Police stations can't trace them; officials deny any knowledge, have no record.

They Seek Justification

The Star editorial quoted at the beginning of this article piously covers its rash demand for an investigation with these hypocritical words:

"Let us say at once that there is a strong argument for

choose farm work in preference to a term of imprisonment.

I quote here from official statements. The system, they say, serves to prevent them becoming habitual offenders, or hardened criminals in prison. Every morning "Natives are brought to court from the various police areas in which they have been arrested . . . on arrival each is interrogated by a European police constable aided by a Native interpreter." Some are in legitimate employment and have merely forgotten to take their passes with them. Once this is established, the official statements continue, the police contact the employers and the prisoners are discharged with nothing more than a caution.

"Natives not employed, obvious loiterers or vagabonds", have the law fully explained to them by a welfare officer, and they are asked if they will accept farm labour as an alternative to facing the charges against them. No coercion or persuasion is exercised at any time. "The Natives who elect to go to the farms may also choose the farming districts in which they would like to serve."

TREASON TRIAL
PROFILE:

Fish Kietsing: Robin Hood of Newclare

My attitude towards the story of Robin Hood of Sherwood Forest had hardened into that of a disillusioned grown up. Imagine my surprise when only the other day two policemen stepped into the witness box at the Drill Hall where the Treason trial has been in session for the last eight months and gave evidence about the "Robin Hood of Newclare."

This was their evidence: On November 24, 1956, these two policemen had taken part in one of those pre-dawn pass and permit raids in the Western Areas, in which the police behave like an army of occupation. Between them these policemen had accounted for some twenty-eight to thirty victims whom they huddled together in a street corner, while they waited for a "Kwela-Kwela" to pick them up. Fish Kietsing, Accused No. 15 arrived on the scene and calmly ordered the policemen to release their victims. When they had got over their surprise, the policemen carried out their instructions, and the last thing they allege they saw as they retreated in the direction of the nearest telephone booth, was Fish Kietsing, reading out the names of the jubilant victims as he handed back their pass books.

IN THE FORT

Apparently unmoved by the romantic features of this evidence, the Defence Counsel attacked its

admissibility; whereupon the Prosecutor (probably he, too, had in mind the patriotic exploits of the celebrated Robin Hood, who knows?, solemnly explained that the campaign against passes was one of those carried out by the liberatory movement in furtherance of the Treason plot, and that he would lead more evidence to throw light on the state of mind of the accused, Fish Kietsing.

Fish Kietsing was convicted for "rescuing" prisoners from the custody of the police and is serving his sentence of twelve months at the Johannesburg Gaol. Every morning he is led to the Drill Hall to face the further charge of High Treason. One of these bitterly cold mornings, I asked him about his life at the Fort. He smiled, and replied: "Life is hard at the Fort. But I have experience of a similar life. I used to work in the mines, you know, and the beastly life of the Fort is not so new to me."

MINER UNDERGROUND

Fish was born in the heart of Bechuanaland, in the village of Khane, in 1919, the eldest son in a family of six children. His father was a peasant. When he was a young man of 23, he tired of the monotonous life of the village, and yearned for the adventurous life of the Rand. He enlisted with the Native Recruiting Organisation, and worked successively at Durban

Deep Mine near Roodepoort, at Crown Mines, at Geduld, and East Champ D'Or. Fish and his miner comrades went down the mine at 2 a.m. and emerged at 4 p.m., working continuously without a break for rest or food. They worked for six days in the week, and earned 1s.8d. a day. It was during his days as a miner that Fish was drawn into the liberatory movement, when J. B. Marks spoke to them about the wealth they dug, and the poverty that was their lot. When he left the mines, he went to live in Newclare in 1949, where he joined the African National Congress.

When the Defiance Campaign opened in 1952, Fish defied the unjust laws and served 35 days at Leeuwkop Farm gaol. When he came back, he threw himself into his Branch work and was soon made volunteer-in-chief.

Today, wiry, tough and genial Fish Kietsing sits fifteenth amongst the 156. His warrant of arrest was served on him whilst he was awaiting trial in the Newlands Gaol for having freed those victims of the pass laws. One day when the millions of South Africa are freed from the chains of the pass laws, someone will tell the story of the Robin Hood of Newclare and the young children will marvel at him, whilst the grown-ups remain incredulous.

H. G. MAKGOTHI.

the policy of draining away from the towns as many as possible of the unemployed, unemployable and generally unwanted and undesirable Natives who infest the slums and provide a large part of the criminal element. No sympathy need be wasted on these persons . . . who could be turned to some productive use on the land."

The Government says the same thing. In their statement to the United Nations Committee that was investigating forced labour they had this comment to make on the section of the Natives (Urban Areas) Act under which most of this labour is obtained:

"The intention behind the Section is the removal of the unprincipled, vagabond type of Native who exists by preying upon or exploiting the fellow members of his community, often in such a way that he does not expose himself to criminal action, to some place where he will no longer be able to batten upon such community and will be under some form of discipline, preferably where habits of industry can be instilled into him . . . the Native may not be ordered to enter employment unless he voluntarily agrees to do so . . . there is no element of compulsion."

So thousands are forced into slave labour to protect Africans themselves, or to rehabilitate a possible handful of "unwanted and undesirable Natives." No, this will not stand the light of truth.

Banish the Pass Laws

The truth is these terrible crimes are made possible only by the oppressive pass laws. Only because of the pass laws can men (soon women too?) be stopped anywhere, any time of day or night, by a man in uniform or not, and ordered to produce papers. Only through pass laws can two thousand be arrested in one week-end in one town. Only through pass laws can this great mass of humanity be forced through the courts and Labour Bureaux and out again — criminals, to jails, to farms. Only through the pass laws can this incredible stream of arrests be perpetuated.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights says (Article 4): "No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms." And (Article 23): that every person has the right to "free choice of employment" and to "just and favourable conditions of work."

It is time steps were taken to implement these sections in South Africa; it is time U.N.O. investigated these things of which I have written — not a deputation shown around by officials, but one which can really learn the truth from the victims of the system. And it is more than time that South Africans combined to banish pass laws, on which forced labour stands, from our land.

Afrikaner Nationalism in Big Business

In 1938 when the Rev. J. D. Kestell started the Reddingsdaad movement it was far from his mind that it would become the instrument for the racialist schemers of the Broederbond to crash into the world of big business. The movement was originally conceived as a charitable scheme to relieve distress among and to rehabilitate the poor whites. A £500,000 fund was launched in conjunction with the Voortrekker centenary celebrations, and in 1939 the Volks Ekonomiese Kongres was called at Bloemfontein to decide how the proceeds should be spent. That was where the Nationalist politicians and ideologists took over.

The conference was dominated by men like the Doctors Dönges, van Rhijn and Verwoerd—all subsequently of course to become Nationalist Cabinet Ministers — Dr. M. S. Louw (who in time became a director of SANLAM, SANTAM, Saambou, SASOL, the S.A. Marine Corporation, the Industrial Development Corporation and the National Finance Corporation), Mr. I. M. Lombard, secretary of the Broederbond and Chairman of the F.A.K., and Dr. N. Diederichs, now a Nationalist M.P., who became the official organiser of the Reddingsdaadbond.

Such men had little faith in the idealistic and humanitarian ideas which had launched the Reddingsdaad fund. Instead of reaching out a friendly hand to the struggling bywoners and ruined farmers who, at that time, were flocking to the cities for jobs and often not finding them, they envisaged the development of a powerful financial and commercial Nationalist elite, who would become a power in the land.

"We must use the technique of capitalism as it is applied in the most important industry in this country — the gold mining industry. We must establish something like the big finance houses of Johannesburg."

Thus Dr. Louw, addressing the congress, which by a substantial majority adopted his point of view.

Suiwer Afrikaans

This conference marked an important turn in the development of Afrikaner nationalism, which had hitherto been dominated almost ex-

clusively by the wealthy farmers. From then on the rising financial, industrial and commercial bourgeoisie played a steadily more

by

ALAN DOYLE

weighty role in the Nationalist Party and its associated economic, cultural and other organisations. Unlike the conservative farmers, the new men were open to, and keen on, new ideas — especially those of the Hitler type.

The Reddingsdaadbond went all out, in the classic and familiar style of capitalist nationalism, to inflame a spirit of racial exclusiveness among the Afrikaner people. They must not, they were told, patronise "foreign" English or Jewish firms, banks, building societies, insurance companies, burial societies, etc. New "suiwer Afrikaans" institutions were established or given new impetus — SANLAM (insurance), Volkskas (bank), Federale Volksbeleggings (investment) and many other finance institutions along the lines suggested by Dr. Louw. They were extraordinarily successful: today they dispose of assets of tens of millions of pounds; they control important and developing interests in many fields, including liquor, tobacco, textiles, clothing manufacture, printing and publishing, tea and coffee, and coal mining. (So far their efforts to gatecrash the jealously-guarded preserve of gold mining, however, have not succeeded.)

The Boycott Spirit

The key to the rapid advance of these ventures was the Nationalists' sedulous cultivation of the propaganda of racial exclusiveness and the boycott spirit. "Buy Afrikaans — invest Afrikaans — patronise Afrikaners": these slogans carried with them the obvious implication: "Boycott the non-Afrikaner." The savage boycott of Indian shops in the Transvaal of some years back was initiated in many cases by their Nationalist business competitors. At a time when the Union was engaged with

her allies in the mortal struggle against the Axis, the leaders of Afrikaner nationalism were concentrating upon embittering racial relations and inflaming the racial spirit. Hundreds of English-speaking and especially Jewish country storekeepers in the Free State and the Transvaal were ruined and driven out of business.

Money to Capture Unions

Nationalist theoreticians were naturally hostile to organisations in which Afrikaners mingled with people of other races. Dual-medium schools, societies like the Masons, and above all multi-racial trade unions were the object of their particular hatred, for they negated and neutralised the spirit of chauvinism and exclusiveness upon which they based their plans for the political and economic domination of the country.

A special organisation was set up as a subsidiary of the Reddingsdaadbond — the Blankewerkersbeskermingsbond — with the especial object of winning Nationalist control over trade unions with a large Afrikaans membership and splitting them off from the organised trade union movement. Financed by the Bond, and by a £10,000 legacy from a wealthy widow, the "B.B.B." succeeded in capturing the biggest union of all, the Mineworkers. It is notable that two Ministers of Labour in Nationalist Cabinets were prominently associated with this subversive organisation. Schoeman was an executive member, and the present incumbent, de Klerk was its secretary.

One Hand Washes the Other

One cannot disentangle the Nationalist Party from its partner the Reddingsdaadbond, and its protégé firms. They are closely interwoven both in personnel and in aims. The one hand washed the other. The Nationalist politicians and party officials spread the chauvinistic propaganda which brought the money rattling into the cash registers of the Bond's financial, industrial and commercial ventures. The new-rich Nationalist bourgeoisie—made richer

(Continued on page 9)

THE BATTLE FOR THE FUTURE

If the fate of South Africa hung on the decisions of last month's United Party Conference at Bloemfontein, — as so much of the English press has worked so hard to prove it does — this would be an appropriate occasion for the anti-Nationalist camp to put on deepest mourning. For the first time since the war-time rush of democratic blood to the United Party head, the ground was ready and fertile for a programme of sweeping democratic reform.

Non-European mass agitation and militant struggle against conditions of life in Nationalist-ruled South Africa have shaken the profound, colour-ridden conservatism of every section of the electorate. Four years of vigorous and forthright public campaigning by a small but growing minority of Europeans against the concept of a colour-bar have brought the whole question of franchise rights for Non-Europeans from a heretic, hole-in-corner aberration, to the forefront of the thinking of every political group and party.

Too Little And Too Late

Perhaps it was expecting too much to imagine that this United Party pillar of traditional South African colour-bar conservatism would seize the opportunity of breaking with its dead past. There is a long party tradition that the safe way to electoral victory is to change nothing and venture nothing.

At Bloemfontein, that tradition, fatal in 1948 and again in 1953, triumphed. Mr. Oppenheimer's crusading hope "... that the United Party will have the courage to be the party of reform", and his ominous reminder that "... it is not in the countries which were prepared to institute reforms that there were revolutions", made little impression on the massed ranks of platteland farmer delegates, and Natal Indian-hating jingoes. In the end, the Conference was remarkable not for what it changed, not for the scope of its proposed reforms, but for the fact that — on the threshold of an election campaign — it dared to change at all.

The de Villiers Graaf "new deal" will set no worlds alight. The changes are too little, and too late.

There is at last a clear statement that the Coloured voters of the Cape will be restored to the common voters roll, marking a definite advance from the statement made by Mr. Strauss in 1955 that "... we will, in consultation with the Coloured people, set right the grave injustice done them, in the best way open to us at that time." But there is also the equally clear statement — a sop thrown in to appease the race-supremacists, that qualifications for future Coloured voters will be higher than hitherto. There is the clear statement that Africans will be given the right to elect a limited number of European Senators by direct vote, offset by the emasculating counter promise that European-elected senators will have a permanent, overriding veto, and by the sop thrown to the bitter United Party racials from Natal, that no such representation will be given to Indians.

Throughout, the Conference tried to be all things to all men. And in the attempt it failed miserably. Liberal, radical and democratic Europeans have

been sickened at the display of conservative reaction. Racialist, white-supremacist and fascist-minded Europeans have been repulsed by the display of timid, weak-kneed liberalism.

Yielding to Pressure

If the fate of the nation depended on Bloemfontein, it would be time for mourning. Fortunately it does not. The pace of history in South Africa is not being settled in either the United Party or the Nationalist Party conference chambers. It is being determined in the streets and factories and locations — in the Alexandra bus boycotts and the June 26th strikes, in the women's Anti-pass protest marches and the Zeerust and Mamatola reserves.

When the United Party conference moves forward at all, it does so not because Mr. Oppenheimer or Sir de Villiers Graaf has given birth to a brilliant new idea that they did not have last year, but because it is being pushed willy-nilly forward by the pressure of the people. If a United Party branch of North Rand seriously proposes giving the vote to every African with a University degree, it is reacting in its first fumbling way to the turmoil and upheaval in the streets outside. And if some thirty-five to forty percent of the Bloemfontein Conference delegates vote (as we are told they did) in favour of seating Africans and Coloureds in the Senate as direct representatives of their own people, they are moving, however reluctantly and however slowly, in response to the whirlwind which is growing up about them, and before which they must either bend or break.

The Siamese Twins

This first, reluctant, snail-pace bending before the storm is the really profound and significant feature of the Bloemfontein Conference. It is this, more than the detailed clauses of the U.P. Senate reconstitution scheme, which has called forth the bitter denunciations by Mr. Strijdom, and the violent Nationalist cries of 'treason' and 'revolution' levelled at de Villiers Graaf.

The Nationalist Party has been reared in the accepted, time-honoured South African parliamentary tradition, that Government and Opposition which fight tooth-and-claw against each other are bound together like Siamese twins to smash down every forward surge of the Non-White people. To that tradition, the United Party's timid offer of concessions is both treasonable and revolutionary. It has been possible in the past to brush aside the Labour Party's break with that tradition as insignificant. It has been possible to obscure the deep significance of the almost simultaneous emergence of the Congress of Democrats and the Liberal Party under a smokescreen of red-baiting and slander. But it is no longer possible to ignore the fact that now, for the first time, one of the Siamese twins of white domination has begun to turn towards concession and reform. Understandably, Nationalist confidence begins to ebb, and a note of hysteria to creep into its predictions for the future.

(Continued on page 9)

From Cetshwayo to Cyprian

By M. B. YENGWA

Paramount Chief Cyprian Bhhekuzulu Nyangayezwe, head of the Zulu nation, accepted the Bantu Authorities Act in June this year. The government claimed this as the turning point in the development of the Zulu people, and expressed the hope that the other Chiefs in Natal would follow the lead given by their Paramount chief.

The officials of the Native Affairs Department seemed to forget for once that the Paramount Chief is only the social head of the Zulus and administratively he is no higher than any other chief.

The Paramount Chief's administrative ward is a part of the district of Nongoma. The District has two other chiefs — Chief Pumanyova Zulu, the Chief of the Mandlakazi tribe who presides over an area larger than that of the Paramount Chief; and Chief Moses Zulu, chief of the Ematheni ward. Both these two chiefs are members of the Zulu Royal Household. They have not accepted the Bantu Authorities Act, so that with the exception of the Usutu ward, the district of Nongoma has not accepted the act. The district nearest to Nongoma is Mahlabathini and thus far not a single chief in this district has voted for Bantu Authorities.

Some time ago the government suggested that tribesmen in the Mahlabathini and other districts should go to Witzieshoek to see for themselves how "prosperous" the tribesmen in that area are after the acceptance of Bantu Authorities. It is not yet known what impressions the Zulu tribesmen formed of the Witzieshoek Bantu Authorities plan.

The Good Old Days

Hlabisa, another district adjacent to Nongoma and which has a large African population has also not accepted Bantu Authorities. One could enumerate one district after another where Bantu Authorities have not yet been accepted.

As in other parts of the country the N.A.D. Information Officer has been visiting individual chiefs trying to convince them that "the good old times" will return if they accept Bantu Authorities. The Chiefs have in the main shaken their heads in doubt, suspicious of the White Government's promises and, with typical chiefs' diplomacy, have asked for time to think over the matter.

So the N.A.D. trained its heaviest guns on the Paramount Chief, knowing well that though he is not officially the administrative head of the chiefs, he exerts powerful influence in Zululand, and the traditional loyalty to their King has not died among the Zulus.

The Native Affairs Department wanted an immediate and emphatic "yes" to their Bantu Authorities' scheme.

The Crown of King Cetshwayo

Confronted with these pressing demands of the N.A.D., the Paramount Chief called a meeting of all the Natal Chiefs at Dhlamahlaha, Nongoma in July 1955. The Chiefs conferred for over five days, examining the Bantu Authorities' Act. In Zulu Bantu Authorities are called "Uzibuse", which means "rule yourself." The Chiefs resolved that if the Government was sincere in its plans to bring self-government (Uzibuse), then before they accepted the Act, the government should return the crown of King

Cetshwayo taken from Cetshwayo after the Anglo-Zulu war of 1879!

The Native Affairs Department was not at all happy about the Chiefs' decision. In the first place, it was a bold stroke to expose the hollowness of the government promises and to show that the Zulu chiefs wanted genuine self-government and nothing less than the rights which King Cetshwayo had. Of course Verwoerd's "Uzibuse" does not envisage that type of self-government!

Secondly, time was running out for the government and there had to be some dramatic move on its part to impress upon the Zulu people that the Government meant business and insisted that Bantu Authorities be accepted.

Dr. Verwoerd's Indaba

So a great Indaba was then planned for October 1955 at Vuma Farm, Nongoma. This meeting was to be addressed by Dr. Verwoerd himself. It had to be the most representative ever, and all the chiefs were visited beforehand by Mr. Steyn, the Information Officer for Natal and the Rev. T. W. S. Mthembu, the government supporter.

These men had to do the groundwork: they had to probe the Chiefs' reactions to Bantu Authorities and then ensure that chiefs and councillors were given liberal travelling allowances to enable them to attend the meeting.

The Chiefs and tribesmen made free use of the opportunity presented them to see the Minister of Native Affairs.

They told him of the acute shortage of land and the terrible suffering brought about by the regulations that forbid them settling in their wards those Africans displaced from European farms. They told him that these people were their brothers and sisters and while they yet had ground on which to perch a hut, they could not be happy seeing them suffer without shelter. They asked if Bantu Authorities would mean the relaxation of these irksome regulations. They told the Minister of the suffering and hardships brought about by a new regulation banning all persons in most of Zululand's magisterial areas, who have never worked in Durban before, from entering that city. They asked whether Bantu Authorities would mean the abolition of these irksome regulations. Without these assurances, said the Chiefs, they could not accept Bantu authorities. But more than that, The Chiefs could not vote for Bantu Authorities because they had not consulted their tribesmen and therefore had received no mandate to accept the new law; and since the government said the Bantu Authorities were good for the countryside, the Chiefs would like to go and see for themselves how these Authorities were functioning in other areas, and whether the people really were happy and contented.

Calling the Bluff

The Indaba proved a grave disappointment for Dr. Verwoerd. He had heard for himself the people greeting the Paramount Chief with a rousing "Bathethe! Wena Wendlovu" (Ye! Elephant!) and himself with a mere modest "Wena Wakomkhulu!" (Greetings to you, from the Big Kraal!) He had seen one Chief after the other rise to speak feelingly about the sufferings of the people from pass raids, stock limitation, the ban on stock movement from

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.