

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

Vol. 12. No. 6.

Price 6d.

SEPTEMBER, 1958

DICTATOR VERWOERD CLIMBS INTO THE SADDLE



Rule By

God's Will!

says Dr. Verwoerd

Dr. Verwoerd said: "In accordance with His will, it was determined who should assume the leadership of the Government in this new period of the life of the people of South Africa."

The Poll Tax

By MOSES KOTANE

'Africa for the Africans'?

DAN TLOOME on AFRIKANIST POLICY

Lifting the Colour Bar in Sport

Stanley Uys on Nadine Gordimer

A MONTHLY JOURNAL FOR DEMOCRATS

This month's
writer:
L. BERNSTEIN

I must confess that the outpouring of hypocritical praise and adulation that follows on the death of a prime minister, makes me feel somewhat sick on my stomach. If anything, on this occasion it is even more nauseating than usual, since it is less deserved.

AFTER STRIJDOM Hans Strijdom has presided over one of the most shameful periods of South African history — the period of the Group Areas Act's translation from apartheid theorising into large-scale public robbery of the Non-European people; the period of the destruction of Non-European education and the substitution of Bantu Indoctrination; the period of the diminishing of civil liberties, and the simultaneous flourishing in numbers and powers of the police; the period of the Whipping Act, the Hanging for armed robbery Act, of passes for African women. 'By their deeds ye shall know them.'

In the midst of the crocodile tears that are being poured forth in flood, it is apparently being forgotten that only four months ago, at the height of the election campaign, the public was being assured by Nationalist Ministers that the Premier was in fine fettle, fit for another ten years. Clearly they lied, knowing they were lying; clearly the holding or winning of a few thousand votes is more important for them than the truth. Perhaps their lies should be regarded charitably. With two such contenders for Prime Ministerial honours as Mr. Cat-'O-Nine-Tails Swart and Great White Chief-of-the-Bantu Verwoerd, they can perhaps be forgiven for wanting to conceal from the voters the real truth of Mr. Strijdom's illness, and the bleak prospects of his successor in a Nationalist Cabinet.

It is surely time for White South Africans to sit up and take notice, when they reach the stage that they may not hold open-air political meetings without the prior permission of the NATIVE Commissioner! That was, until recently, the position in Johannesburg, where Black Sash protests were stifled.

THE RIGHT TO SPEAK The development of this situation is interesting. It goes back over a number of years — almost as long as the Nationalist government. It started off — as these things usually do — with the Congress movement being refused a meeting on the "advice" of the police to the City Council. From that there has grown up a tradition that the Johannesburg City Council does not grant such permission to anyone unless "permitted" to do so by the police. The police, with uncharacteristic bashfulness, seem to be permanently afraid of their ability to maintain public peace, and regularly veto meetings.

During the period of the "emergency" ban on meetings of more than ten Africans in Johannesburg, to exercise his right to speak, a man had to pass through the twin needle-eyes of the Police and the N.A.D. Not surprisingly, the right to free speech in the open air was on its death-bed in Johannesburg, and this time, at least, that frightening death rattle focussed attention on the old truth that civil liberties are indivisible, and rights taken from one section slide out of the grasp of all.

Until the very last day of the votes for Teenagers Debate in Parliament, I was intending to award my weekly prize for outstanding inanity to the honourable member of the United Party, who saw in the Bill a dastardly backstabbing plot against the ex-servicemen. Since today's teenagers were

born during the war years, reasoned this contender for the prize, the Bill would favour those who were disloyal during the war, and penalise those loyal men who were 'Up North' and thus unable to raise their full quota of teenagers. But at the last moment an honourable Nationalist member came from behind to take the trophy. His contribution should be framed and hung in the Africana museum. This member supports the Bill because it debars teenagers who are awaiting trial for a crime from voting; the Bill, he says, will be a serious deterrent to crime, since the duck-tail gangs will now realise that if they break the law, they might even lose their right to vote!

"Fighting Talk"

Published monthly by the
"Fighting Talk" Committee,
P.O. Box 1355, Johannesburg.

::

Annual Subscription: 7s. 6d.

::

Editor: RUTH FIRST.

IN THIS ISSUE

	Page
FROM THE SIDELINES, by L. Bernstein	2
DICTATOR VERWOERD IN THE SADDLE, by George Irwin	3
THE POLL TAX INCREASE, by Moses Kotane	5
"AFRICA FOR THE AFRI- CANS? — 2nd Article on the Africanists, by Dan Tloome	7
TREASON TRIAL DIARY: "A Time to Think", by Alex La Guma	8
VOTES FOR TEENAGERS, by Duma Nokwe	11
"THE KIMBERLEY TRAIN" LIFTING THE COLOUR BAR IN SPORT, by John Player	12
THE NEW GHANA, a Book Review by Michael Harmel	14
Nadine Gordimer's "A WORLD OF STRANGERS", by Stan- ley Uys	15

From 'Emperor of the Bantu' to Prime Minister

IN this assessment of Dr. Verwoerd as the Union's new Prime Minister the writer says the former Minister of Native Affairs was the key man in the Nationalist Government and to have denied him the Premiership would have been illogical.

NATIONALIST AFRIKANERDOM, or a sizeable section of it, is for the first time feeling apprehensive at the immense implications of the apartheid task. Apartheid has its own irresistible momentum . . . and the day of reckoning must come.

THE FUTURE of AFRIKANER NATIONALISM has now been entrusted to one man: Dr. Verwoerd. The rest of the Cabinet will become his underlings. Never has a Nationalist leader wielded as much power as Dr. Verwoerd will wield.

IF VERWOERD'S 'MASTER-PLAN' is the plan of the hour of the Nationalists, the liberation movement must make its Freedom Charter the plan-of-the-hour on its side.

Dictator Verwoerd in the Saddle

by GEORGE IRWIN

Nationalist Afrikanerdom has made no attempt to conceal its apprehension over Dr. Verwoerd's election as Prime Minister. *Die Burger*, mouthpiece of the defeated Dönges faction, is shaking its head ominously; SABRA, and ex-Premier Malan, have coldly refrained from sending congratulatory messages, only *Die Transvaler* has exulted.

The lack of enthusiasm over Dr. Verwoerd's success is not due to his callous treatment of Mr. Swart: the Nationalist Party has a tradition of callous treatment of its leaders. Indeed, Mr. Swart is hardly one to complain. He was primarily responsible for General Hertzog's humiliating withdrawal from political life; and, in company with Dr. Verwoerd and Senator De Klerk, helped to engineer the campaign in 1954, that resulted in Dr. Malan's nominee, Havenga, being ousted, and Mr. Strijdom becoming Prime Minister. No, Mr. Swart cannot complain.

Nationalists' Last Lap

Nationalist Afrikanerdom's fears strike deeper. Its whole future has been entrusted to one man: Dr. Verwoerd. If Dr. Verwoerd fails, Nationalist Afrikanerdom fails. Dr. Verwoerd is only 58, and apparently in excellent health. He is tireless, dedicated and determined. The circumstances are classic in their perfection. Nationalist Afrikanerdom is on the march to its final destiny. This is the last lap.

That is why Professor P. V. Pistorius (one of "the thirteen") went astray when he wrote recently that another, more extreme, leader would follow Verwoerd, because, he said, that was the leadership pattern in Nationalist Afrikanerdom. Professor Pistorius wrote (in the *Rand Daily Mail*): "To many it may seem that Dr. Verwoerd represents the most extreme form of Nationalism, the absolute rock bottom, but that is not so. There is not only no change in the trend towards extremism: there is not even a lessening of the rate of acceleration. Dr. Verwoerd (however impossible it

may seem now) will in his turn be rejected for an even more extreme leader. The leader who will win, will be the one who can outstrip or at least keep abreast of the mob."

The theory is correct; but the fallacy of Professor Pistorius's argument is that he assumes that Nationalist extremism must go on and on. It would, indeed, go on and on, if the 1,500,000 Nationalist Afrikaners are permitted to impose their will, without hindrance, on the 13,000,000 other inhabitants of the country; but it will not be permitted. It is reasonable to expect, therefore, that the climax of the struggle for freedom in South Africa will occur during Dr. Verwoerd's regime. The signs all point that way.

And that is why Nationalist Afrikanerdom, or at least a sizeable section of it, is having its moment of apprehension. For the first time, perhaps, it is beginning to feel the pressure of history on its shoulders, and the immense implications of the apartheid task. It has discovered, too, that apartheid cannot be checked and released at will, like water in an irrigation furrow: it has its own irresistible momentum. Nor will Nationalist Afrikanerdom be entitled to plead, when the day of reckoning arrives, that Dr. Verwoerd was the product of a "coup d'etat", arranged by an "extremist" group. This "extremist" group was merely the midwife: the birth was from within the Nationalist Party itself. The whole party is responsible for Dr. Verwoerd.

No Revolt among the Nats — Yet

There is talk, of course, of a "revolt" within the Parliamentary caucus of the Nationalist Party. The United Party pins all its hopes on this possibility. Admittedly, there is disunity, friction, and plenty of back-biting in the caucus, but to anticipate that the Nationalist Government will be destroyed now by a convenient split within its ranks is to dangerously simplify the task of the Opposition. Dr. Verwoerd will manoeuvre himself into a situation where the Nationalist Party swims or sinks with him; the chances of a revolt, therefore, big enough to shake him, are slender. The revolt will come, one day, but only after the people of South Africa have struck their blow first.

Professor Pistorius is right, of course, when he declares that the logic of the situation resulted in Dr. Verwoerd's election. Mr. Swart would have represented a compromise between the Donges and Verwoerd factions, and the caucus (although only by a small majority) was in no mood for compromise. Dr. Donges would have represented something even more removed from Verwoerdism. The point of view characterising the Donges group is that the survival of the Nationalist Party depends on flexibility and "moderation" (one hesitates to use the word, but it is the correct one in relation to Verwoerdism).

A 'Tool' of the Nazis

Verwoerdism is what the caucus wanted, and it got it. Here is a man whose whole life has been tainted with the philosophies of Nazism. He studied at German universities during a significant period, and subsequently (during World War II) a South African judge charged him with knowingly having made *Die Transvaler* a "tool" of the Nazis. Before the war, he was one of South Africa's leading anti-Semites, surpassed only by Eric Louw himself who, it is interesting to note, was the only other Cabinet Minister, besides De Wet Nel to ally himself in the caucus with Verwoerd).

South Africa's Nazi Constitution

Verwoerd was one of the chief planners of the war-time "Draft Constitution for a Republic" and it was his newspaper, *Die Transvaler*, which first published this Nazi document. The "Draft Constitution" contained the famous Article 3: Citizenship rights to be conferred only on those who could be expected to act as "builders up of the nation." Article 3 continued: "The State makes a call upon the consecrated national service of every citizen, in any capacity whatever, and has the power to make sure that the individual citizens, as well as the organs of public opinion, such as the existence of Parties, the Radio, the Press, the Cinema, shall not be allowed, by their activities, to undermine the public order or good morals of the republic, internally or externally."

Verwoerd's 'Bantu' Empire

Dr. Verwoerd's rise to prominence within the Nationalist Party was spectacular, but his most important contribution was in respect of apartheid. When the Malan Government came to power in 1948, on the apartheid slogan, it had no clear idea what apartheid it envisaged. The first fumbling two years of the administration of the Native Affairs portfolio, under Dr. E. G. Jansen, testify to this uncertainty. It was only when Dr. Verwoerd took over the portfolio that apartheid began taking shape. At a time when the Nationalist Party was asking itself "What is apartheid?" Dr. Verwoerd came forward to declare reassuringly "Leave it to me — I know!"

In its biographical sketch of Dr. Verwoerd, *Die Transvaler* wrote: "The immense responsibilities placed upon him by Native Affairs (and he was in charge of the portfolio longer than anyone else) were undertaken by him with an ardour and zeal that astonished even his opponents. Within a short time, he had brought about an entirely new set-up within the Department; established Bantu Authorities; revised Bantu Education and placed it on a sound foundation; tackled the Native problem in the cities in order to apply the apartheid pattern; canalised Native labour through labour bureaux; removed 'slum-spots' on the platteland and in the cities; and worked out a policy for the development

of the Reserves. He took vigorous action against hostile individuals and organisations who tried to hinder him in his work. He thrust aside organisations who claimed to speak on behalf of the Bantu, and he traversed the Bantu areas of the Union and South-West Africa himself, talking personally to the Bantu."

Builder of the 'Bantu' Empire

This eulogy is not without justification. The modern "Bantu Empire" is Dr. Verwoerd's almost singlehanded creation. He is the key-man in the Nationalist Government, and to have denied him the Premiership would have been both illogical and evasive. As Prime Minister, of course, he will rule as a dictator, but that is the price the Nationalist Party must pay for a leader who is as confident, as resolute, as implacable, and as incorruptible as Verwoerd. The rest of the Cabinet will become his underlings; and whoever takes over Native Affairs (probably the Verwoerd-trained De Wet Nel) will have to abide strictly by the guiding principles of Verwoerdism. Never has a Nationalist leader wielded as much power as Verwoerd will yield. Here, indeed, is the "magsposisie" which the Nationalists are always taking about. As Verwoerd proceeds, every Nationalist leader and Government official will be reduced to the status merely of someone who accepts delegated authority: independence of mind and Verwoerdism are mutually exclusive.

Verwoerd v. the Freedom Charter

What will Verwoerdism mean? Everyone agrees that, ultimately, Verwoerd will destroy the Nationalist Party. That is not the point. What matters is: how much damage will be done before Nationalism is destroyed? Some people seem to think that it does not matter much whether it is Verwoerd or Swart or Donges at the helm of affairs, that the outcome is the same. I disagree. Verwoerd, precisely because he represents the Nationalist Party in its most vicious mood, is capable of causing greater havoc than anyone else. The State machine in South Africa is still powerful and, to make matters worse, the Parliamentary Opposition is inert. In the hands of Verwoerd who is not only a fanatic, but an indefatigable and efficient one into the bargain, the State machine can become a formidable weapon. Look at Meadowlands, Zeerust, Sekhukhuneland, the stay-at-home . . . the ultimate outcome is not questioned, but what about the suffering meanwhile?

The theory is held, particularly in United Party circles, but also outside Parliament, that Verwoerd is the best thing that could have happened in the circumstances, because the conflicts in the Nationalist Party will crystallize out now, and the end will come sooner. This is our local version of the old formula that the greater the travail, the quicker the liberation. But think of the travail! Will the United Party survive the period between now and liberation? I submit this thought to the U.P. leaders for their consideration. And what about the liberatory movement itself? It dare not view the situation with the same equanimity. If the Nationalist Party "extremists" have sensed the historical significance of the period, the liberatory movement must do the same. If Verwoerd's Maste-Plan is the plan-of-the-hour on their side, the Freedom Charter must be plan-of-the-hour on our side. If Verwoerd is efficient, resolute and implacable — we must be the same. We must be ready to take up the challenge!

THE POLL TAX INCREASE

by MOSES KOTANE

The decision of the Nationalist Government to increase African taxes and, for the first time ever, to tax African women has deeply shocked and horrified democratic South Africa and stirred and agitated the minds of the African people throughout the country.

According to the press (The Star, July 17, 1958) from January 1, 1959 the poll tax payable by all African men will be £1.15.0 a year instead of £1 and from January 1960 the tax will be on a sliding scale, according to income. From 1960 and for the five years that follow the rates will be:

TAXABLE INCOME	MEN	WOMEN
Up to £180 a year	£1 15 0	Nil.
£180-£240	£2 0 0	£1 0 0
£300-£360	£3 10 0	£3 0 0
£300-£36	£3 10 0	£3 0 0
£360-£420	£4 5 0	£4 0 0
Over £240 — £4.5.0 plus £1 for every £60 or portion thereof above £420. Any income tax payable to be deducted from the portion of the general tax which is in excess of £1.15.0.		

The examples below will give you an example of how the sliding scale will work from 1960.

African men earning nothing or up to about £3.9.3 a week, £1.15.0; those earning over £3.9.3 and up to £12.3 a week, £2.0.0; those earning over £4.12.3 and up to £5.19.3 a week, £2.15.0; those earning over £5.19.3 and up to £6.19.9 a week, £3.10.0; those earning over £6.19.9 and up to £8.1.6 a week, £4.5.0; those earning over £8.1.6 a week, will pay the basic tax of £4.5.0 plus £1 for every £60 or portion of £60. This means that an African who earns £665 a year will pay £9.5.0 in tax: £4.5.0 basic plus £5.0.0 in what may be called "excess income tax."

Opposition to the Taxation System

We are not opposed to taxation in principle, nor do we believe that there is any sane person who is. After all, taxation in one form or another is as old as organised society itself. However, we are most decidedly against taxation as applied to Africans in this country. There are many reasons for this opposition.

- The system of taxation is oppressive and exceedingly unjust in that it extends the vicious principle of race discrimination and differential treatment, to the sphere of taxation, and the people who are compelled to pay these taxes have no say whatsoever on how their money is spent.
- The majority of those who are forced to pay the taxes are too poor to do so.
- As it is Africans are already overtaxed.
- Like the pass laws and permit regulations the taxation of Africans is imposed essentially for labour compulsion purposes.
- Non-payment of the tax or failure to produce a current tax receipt on demand by any police officer at any time is regarded as a criminal offence for which the defaulter is immediately flung into jail.
- The taxation system is based on the false and dishonest theory that the contribution of the African community to the country's revenue and to the national income consists of the amount paid by him in direct taxes, and of that alone.

It is not disputed that the African community is the most exploited section of our multi-racial population. Econo-

mists, industrialists and leaders of commerce, trade unionists, social workers, politicians and the press are agreed that the wages of most African workers are below the estimated minimum required to maintain an African family above the bread line. While the average wage for the European worker in the main cities and towns of the Union is about £12 a week, that of the African worker in the same areas is about £12 a month! Despite the disparity in the earnings of the two sections of workers, both have to pay the same prices for the essential things they buy.

The position is even worse on the farms. A survey conducted in 1953 showed that the wage of the European was £25.2.5 per head a month, and that of the African workers was only £2.2.10 per head per month.

From whatever point of view one looks at them the wages of £2.2.10 and £12 a month are scandalously low.

And in spite of the fact that all agree that the wages of the African workers are far too low, the Wage Board is still shamelessly fixing wages at 37/6 a week for unskilled African workers!

The Congress Movement demands a national minimum wage of £1 a day and that there should be a general increase in wages of all workers, especially workers in the lower income groups.

The Load of Taxes

Though Africans are the poorest and the most ruthlessly exploited section of the population, yet they are, at the same time, the most heavily taxed. In terms of the Native Taxation and Development Act of 1925, every male African between the ages of 18 and 65 years, who is domiciled in the Union or who has resided in the Union for a continuous period of 12 months is required to pay a tax of £1 a year. This tax is to be paid regardless of whether the person liable has earned anything during the year or not.

Apart from this general tax, however, Africans have to pay a lot of direct and indirect provincial and local taxes such as hospital tax, 2/6; local tax, 10/-; education tax 2/- a month; services levy, 3/- a week; pass fees, 2/- a month; dog, bicycle and motor licences, fines and compound fees. In addition the Bantu Authorities are empowered to levy taxes for the erection and equipment of school buildings,

Petition Against Higher Taxes

A nationwide petition against an increase in the poll tax and the extension of the tax to African women is shortly to be launched.

Addressed to the Speaker and the House of Assembly, the petition will state the increased poll tax

- ★ Violates the constitutional principle that there should be no taxation without representation
- ★ Imposes an intolerable burden on the underprivileged section of the community living below the breadline.
- ★ Is based on the dangerous principle of taxing persons on grounds of race only, whereas taxation should be evenly distributed and based on the ability to pay.

construction of dams and bridges, improvement of water supplies, provision of clinics, roads, pounds and dips.

It is estimated that between 150,000 and 200,000 Africans are imprisoned annually for their failure to pay the old poll tax of £1 to £1.10.0 a year. It is obvious that the new taxes will be a tremendous hardship and cruelty for the already suffering African people. Realising this, some employers are even suggesting that the employers should pay the taxes of their employees.

Other sections also pay taxes. But their taxation is based on an entirely different basis. There are two recognised forms of taxation in modern society: direct and indirect. In South Africa, however, there are two fundamentally different and contradictory systems of direct taxation, one for Non-Africans and the other for the Africans.

Direct Taxation

The direct taxation for the Non-Africans is based on the sound and progressive principle of the wage-earner's "ability to pay." All persons whose incomes exceed a certain figure are liable for income tax. There are 968,000 income tax payers in the Union, among them some Africans. At present, an unmarried person who can claim no rebates, and has no dependants or insurance policies, is taxed when his or her income reaches £302 a year. A married person who can claim no rebates commences to pay on the £481 income level. If rebates can be claimed, the level at which income tax becomes payable is correspondingly higher. Thus a married man with two children is not required to pay income tax until his income is about £80 a month or £960 a year.

Whites, Asiatics and Coloured men and unmarried women between the ages of 21 and 60 are also required to pay personal and provincial tax. African income tax payers pay the provincial tax, but in their case the general (or poll) tax is substituted for personal tax. In the Transvaal and Cape personal tax becomes payable by an unmarried person when his income reaches £150 a year, at which level the basic tax is £1.10.0. The corresponding income level for a married person is £250 a year. In Natal and the Free State all White, Asiatic and Coloured men and unmarried women within the age limit mentioned are required to pay personal tax unless they can establish that they are indigent. In all cases the rate of taxation varies progressively according to the income.

It will be seen from the above that the Government and some provinces do not tax persons earning below certain stipulated incomes. But though the individuals affected do not pay anything in direct taxation at all, they are nevertheless entitled to all services the state provides, including free provincial education. Yet nothing is heard about these people battenning on the taxpayers nor are they called upon to finance their services.

The Tax as Pressure for Labour

But when it comes to the Africans the principle of taxing those who are able to pay is discarded. Perhaps the reason for the radical difference in the basis of taxation for the Africans is that the poll tax, unlike taxes paid by Non-Africans, is a labour tax imposed as a form of pressure to compel Africans to leave their areas to go and work for Europeans. It was never intended for amenities and social services. In some provinces (before Union) Africans who worked for Europeans for stipulated periods each year were either exempted from paying the poll tax that year or required to pay only a portion of the tax. Africans are still driven by the tax out of the reserves to the farms and to the towns and off the farms to the towns.

As early as 1930-1932 the Native Economic Commission said of African taxation:—

"The present burden of taxation on the Natives, direct

and indirect, is very heavy. It is quite impossible, without serious consequences to Native welfare, to increase it. As it is, they are the only section of the community which is paying school fees for primary education."

In spite of this wise warning, it is now proposed to steeply increase this already onerous and unjust burden of taxation. Economic pressures on the African people are heavier than ever today. The purchasing power of the £1 has fallen catastrophically to something between 9/8 and 6/6 since 1938, and the Africans are hard hit by the steep rise in rents and transport charges, the high prices of food-stuffs, coal, paraffin, clothing, cigarettes and tobacco.

Our hardships have been added to and aggravated by the wicked administration. The Nationalist government has set itself the impossible task of barring our political, economic, social and cultural development and progress. It has systematically dispossessed, uprooted and impoverished African communities; deprived them of even that little inferior education which they had and closed all doors to opportunity and advancement. Now we are to be made to pay heavy taxes in order to finance repressive apartheid measures and our own oppression!

As usual this policy is wrapped in pious statements. Here are rulers who profess Christianity and who piously open every sitting of their Parliament with prayer. They claim to be the creators and guardians of modern civilisation, yet they fail lamentably when judged by the ethical and moral standards of those civilisations. "Do unto others as you would have done unto you" and "Love thy neighbour as thyself" are two cardinal principles of Christianity, and making the rich pay for the services of the poor is a principle that has been adopted by all civilised nations.

In recognition of the fact that the cost of living has gone up, Cabinet Ministers and other M.P.'s have generously increased their own salaries and daily allowances. Yet they resist any increase in the wages of those living on the mealie-pap level.

On Our Backs

It is acknowledged that African cheap labour is the key factor in the amassing of fabulous profits which make possible the income taxes paid by upper income groups in the Union. Yet our exclusion from benefits is justified on the ground that we do not contribute towards them, or that our contribution is negligible. South Africa has been developed jointly by the Europeans and Non-Europeans. It is dishonest to ignore the contribution of the Non-Whites and to measure the African contribution only by the direct taxes they pay. Our labour has made this country what it is and no juggling with facts and figures can destroy this truth.

We are cheated of our share and our rights. It is a swindle to pretend that the Africans are being financed and "carried" by the European population. The opposite is true: it is on the backs of African labour and poverty that our national wealth is accrued.

We reject the poll tax system and the proposed increase, and the extension of the tax to African women. We demand that

- ★ Taxation for all sections, irrespective of race or colour should be based on the principle of the ability to pay.
- ★ The rich should be taxed in order to finance the services of the poor.
- ★ Discrimination on grounds of colour and race should be abolished in taxation.
- ★ The Government should finance African education and all other African social services from general revenue on the same basis as for the Europeans. The Bantu Education Act should be repealed and all children, regardless of race or colour should be given the same type of education.

'Africa for the Africans?'

There are two sorts of lie. Some lies are believed by those who tell them, because they are ignorant. For example, when a Nationalist politician gets up at the U.N. General Assembly and tells the world that the "Bantu" in South Africa are quite happy and contented and support apartheid, he may well imagine, in his ignorance and prejudice, that he is telling the truth. Similarly, when the "Africanists" keep repeating that the African National Congress is being "dominated" by the much smaller Congress of Democrats they are merely repeating a silly slander begun two years ago by Jordan Ngubane — and squashed pretty effectively by Chief Lutuli at that time. If they actually believe this nonsense they are stupid and ignorant, but not necessarily dishonest.

But there is a second sort of lie which cannot possibly be believed by the person who tells it: because it involves a matter of fact, not of opinion, and because he has invented it himself. Inability to distinguish between this sort of lie and the truth is a mark not of ignorance but of insanity. In the absence of a medical certificate of lunacy, we must assume that a person who publishes such statements is a deliberate liar, dishonest with the intention to deceive.

A remarkable example of such a lie appears in "The Africanist" for June/July 1958, in an article headed "Africanist Statement", dealing with the summary expulsion of Messrs. Madzunya and Leballo. The article states (p. 6) that the National Working Committee of the A.N.C. was "instructed" to expel these two by a "committee." "We know" says this statement issued by the Africanists that this committee "was composed of eight (8) Europeans, three (3) Indians and four (4) Africans. We also know that of these Africans only two voted for the expulsion."

The Facts of the Expulsion

Now, the anonymous "we" who issued this "Africanist Statement" could not possibly "know" who was on the "committee" which they say "instructed" the A.N.C. to expel their two friends, or how the voting went, for the simple reason that there is not and never was any such committee. This is not the sort of statement which can be excused by

The first article in this series dealt with African National Congress cooperation with other bodies; the slander of so-called Congress of Democrats domination of the A.N.C.; and the 'inverted racialism' of the Africanists.

This month the writer discusses the Leballo-Madzunya expulsions, Africanist attacks on 'NEW AGE', and opposition to the Freedom Charter under cover of a false slogan.

ascribing it to ignorance or mistaken opinions. It is a pure invention.

The decision to expel Madzunya and Leballo was taken by the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress following a lengthy post-election review covering, among other matters, the setbacks of National Protest Week and the role played by certain Congress members therein. It can hardly be said that these expulsions came as a surprise. Both of these men, as leaders of the "Africanist" sect, had for a long time been openly and publicly flouting established Congress policy, particularly with regard to the Alliance and the Freedom Charter. In fact they had practically been asking for expulsion, and many Congress members had long been demanding that the leadership take action against them. The "Africanist's" open sabotage of the stay-at-home campaign was the last straw; it overcame the understandable reluctance of the N.E.C. to use disciplinary sanctions as long as there may be a hope of saving individuals for the movement and led to a unanimous decision for their summary expulsion.

Obviously, the N.E.C. did not need any "instructions" to expel these strike-breakers.

The men who have been elected to the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress have been put there because they have earned a reputation for fearless and uncompromising opposition to White Supremacy. They have not hesitated to face police violence, deportation, prison, victimisation in the cause of African rights and freedom. Yet the "Africanists" ask us to believe that men like this take "instructions" about Congress matters from others who are not members of the A.N.C.!

"The Africanist" says the Committee which decided the expulsion of Leballo

and Madzunya was composed of Europeans, Indians and Africans. Now the only committee where national A.N.C. representatives ever meet Indians and Europeans to discuss matters of common concern is the National Consultative Committee (the N.C.C.). Because the N.C.C. consists of representatives of all five organisations it could not possibly have had the composition described by "The Africanist." But leaving that aside, and more importantly, it could not possibly have "instructed" the A.N.C. to expel anyone —

1. Because, as a consultative body, the N.C.C. cannot issue "instructions" to any of the constituent bodies; it can only advise, and then only on matters of common concern;
2. Because the N.C.C. cannot and does not ever discuss or consider the internal and domestic concern of any of the Congresses.

In order to grasp this point fully, we should recall the fundamental nature of what for convenience we often call "the Congress movement", which is in reality not a single organisation at all, but a voluntary free alliance of several perfectly distinct and autonomous and independent bodies.

But I shall return to this point later.

"New Age" and the Congress of Democrats

The Editorial in "The Africanist" refers to "New Age" as "the business journal of the firm of C.O.D." This, I suppose, is meant to be insulting, but the insult is so far-fetched as to be hardly worth consideration. If the term "business journal" implies that the object of "New Age" is to make money it is so far removed from the plain facts as to make the angels weep.

Everybody with the slightest knowledge of South African realities knows perfectly well that "New Age", appearing practically without advertising revenue, the mainstay of every other newspaper, only manages to keep up publication by some sort of miracle, by the self-sacrificing voluntary financial support of readers of the paper. The talented journalists and overworked administrative staff of the "New Age" are, without exception, making personal sacrifices to work on the paper, accepting salaries well below what they would

(Continued on page 10)

Friday Aug. 1: Dreamed I was back home eating a bathful of periwinkles. The Lord only knows why it should have been periwinkles. Why not beans stew or peaches and cream? But it was periwinkles and halfway through the banquet, shhhush, boom, the lift in the block of flats wakes me up and there's the dirty grey sunlight coming through the chinks in the curtain like a bum sneaking into a parish tea. D-day, comrade. Rise and shine. T-day, you mean. It's as chilly as an ice-cube's belly outside. Give me the sunny south. Orders of the day: All accused to assemble outside the Congress office and therefrom to march in open order to the point of embarkation, namely Leyd Street. Spit and polish to be applied to all shoes, and hair combed according to regulations. There's a breeze up that cuts like a razor. They should've held this trial in Durban, somebody grumbles. All aboard! Hey, why's that bus got a hump on its back? Special with soft seats, with the compliments of the Minister of Justice, in case any of the fair White accused want to avail themselves of apartheid as prescribed in the million-and-one regulations, legislation and proclamations that make this sunny land of ours such a nice place to live in *Everybody's got cigarettes. Miraculous!* The famous PUTCO buses. Guaranteed to take you where you want to go, provided you don't mind arriving with addled brains and your ribs around your neck. Pretoria. *Everybody's singing in the buses.* Pretoria stares. The peace and quiet of this centre of reaction has been drastically impaired.

Is this the Synagogue? Nah, wait until you see a lot of cops standing around and that's it. Here we are. Afrika! Mayibuye!

How long do you think this will last? Guess we'll sit right through now, month, two months, year

All seats please! For goodness sake, it's Sergeant Davidson of the Drill Hall. Handshakes, grins, laughs. *Will you all please be seated?* Well, this place looks like something. Nice white paint on the ceiling with the sun coming through a skylight of stained glass. Polished woodwork. Balconies of the public overhead, black on the right, white on the left. We're all here. P.W.D. brown and cream. Hey, look at all

'A Time to Think'

those law books. *Words, your fate depends on words.* How many million words in the English language? The Concise Oxford Dictionary has 1498 pages of words, excluding the addenda and abbreviations, beginning with the letter A, and ending with zymotic. The tables around the defence counsel look like the gathered loot from several libraries. I suppose there'll be a lot of talking. A trial in Japan, it was estimated would last fourteen years. Fourteen years of words. *How many words can be spoken in a court case lasting fourteen years?* Listen, this treason trial right here has gone on long enough for me. Say, when I got home nobody recognised me. And another five years to come? Well, you ought to worry. All your creditors might be dead and under by the end of it.

Silence in court. Here come the judges. All red and grey, bowing formerly. That's Rumpff in the middle. On the other side is Justice Ludorf. Seems a friendly looking chap. Smiling. The defence team are lined up, their sights whetted. That's Pirow himself over there. Heard he's not going to talk much. Got a cold or something. So his voice is like breaking bottles. The registrar of the court is reading the official appointment of the court. A hush falls. It's on. *A million words of copy for umpteen newspapers.* Overhead, behind us the pressmen are ready, working out the headlines. The Accused Henry Magothi has been hospitalised for six months. The Crown withdraws the charges against him. Somebody cracks: Lemme out of here. I've got a stomach ache. The spectators hang over the crowded galleries. Maisels, number one defence counsel is on his feet, big, easy, an old hand. *Bombshell.* The accused have reason to believe that they will not have a fair trial. The judges Ludorf and Rumpff are asked to recuse themselves. Argument continues. The law books are unlimbered, quotations, quotations, judgement in this trial and that trial. Maisels goes on, pulling everything out of the bag. *Steady and controlled as an axe cutting into a tree.* The crown looks blank. Beyond them the "experts"

Father Bochenski and Professor Murray, probably waiting for the cue, sit patiently. It never comes. Justice Rumpff: Have you anything to say, Mr. Pirow? Milord, (like a creaking door), I am precluded from saying anything. I wish I were not! The court adjourns until Monday to consider the defence application. Everybody troops out amid a hubbub of comments. The reporters flee for the telephones. Outside the court the accused are assailed by photographers. No pictures can be taken in the limits of the court so the cameramen hang over the green railing after they've been put out by the cops. Will you hold it please? I'd like to have a picture of the Professor talking to Chief. Thanks awfully. Do you think they'll recuse themselves? I don't think Ludorf has any alternative . . . I don't know about Rumpff . . . I don't think Rumpff will recuse himself . . . Ludorf, sure. Well, we'll see. I've been speculating about this case for nearly two years now, and it's never turned out the way I thought it would. All the way back to Johannesburg. Headlines: *Treason Trial's Dramatic Start.*

Saturday and Sunday: Do you think they'll recuse themselves? Do you think Rumpff will step down? Do you think Ludorf will? What happens when a judge recuses himself? Do you think . . . ? Do you think . . . ? Do you think . . . ? Celebration. Get out that old guitar, boy. What'll I sing? *If I Had the Wings of An Angel.* Sunday papers, Treason Trial, Treason Trial, Buck Rogers, Mapula Roodt.

August 4: Back to Pretoria. How'd the week-end go? So-so. Did some reading. Finished *Candide* and *Quiet Flows the Don*. Some reading, that. Jokes on the bus and roars of laughter. Outside the court the photographers are waiting like hawks. The spectators are queueing. It doesn't look as if they'll all get in. Got a cigarette? Oh, oh, it's starting. Damn this cold. *All seats please.* Sergeant Davidson is no longer with us. The new officials stagger through the business of check-

ing everybody in. Somebody missed the bus because the trains from Orlando went the wrong way or something. Please refer the matter to Minister Schoeman. Tension. The red-gowned judges. *The tree falls.* Mr. Justice Ludorf reads carefully from his script and ends: I recuse myself. Mr. Justice Rumpff: I was not consulted by the Minister regarding the appointment of my brothers, neither did I recommend their appointment . . . The suspicions of the accused are without foundation, and I can only obey the dictates of my conscience. I cannot recuse myself. Mr. Maisels replies politely for the defence that the accused greatly appreciate the explanation given. There is a slight argument about the position of the court now that one of the judges has recused himself. Court adjourns until next Monday when it is hoped the Minister will have appointed another judge.

August 5 to 10: Time to think. Ninety-one of us. Single, married, divorced, black, white, brown, male, female, mothers, fathers, democrats, Ghandi-ists, Christians, communists, socialists, all the ists and the isms to which the liberatory movement gives rise. *To the interest of the nation as a whole, all lesser interests are subordinate, whether of Right or Left, whether they be employer's federation, trade union, banking or professional interests . . . All those who pursue a sectional and anti-national policy will be opposed by the might of the organised State.* Who said that? Strijdom? No. That was the other Oswald. Moseley. They haven't established the true fascist state. I don't think they can do that. But they're on the right track, brother. They've got the idea. All this concerning us, and the other Whites, those Union Jack, flag-waving chaps, and the kids shunted out of schools, Afrikaans only. Die Taal. Ein Volk, Ein Reich, Ein Fuhrer. I wonder what the other ninety think about. Politics, home, the affairs of the branch and the organisation, how to raise money for the T.T. Defence Fund, most of all when this damn thing will be over. But nobody has regrets. Since to each man has been given but one life . . . There are some hard boys in this trial. Tough organisers from the slums and the townships, and the mob who went through the Defiance Campaign, and who can go through this, too, I'm sure. They and the others. Comrades. The spirit of the struggle.

August 11 to 22: The weather's getting warmer. The Durban boys haven't shed their overcoats yet, but they don't keep their hands in their pockets so much. The European gallery has thinned out, but the N.E.s are steady. House full every day. Leaning over and listening intently. This case has certainly produced some sea lawyers. Somebody jokes: When I'm through here I'm going to apply for my Q.C. Everybody's got an explanation, a way out. A new judge. Mr. Justice Bekker. Mr. Maisels is on his feet again. His gown's going to fall off. Oops, just in time, and it's back on his shoulders. Bombshell. The defence will apply for the quashing of the indictment. A war of attrition. The marathon speech begins. Twelve hours of words spread over two days. A giant saw cutting into an old redwood tree. *Milords . . . this mass of rot and rubbish . . . the defence is expected to read through the entire record of the preparatory examination . . . twenty-six volumes of the selected works of Lenin . . . this trial can go on for years . . . further particulars . . . exhibits, a Russian recipe book (recipes for what, Mr. Maisels?) for poisoning wells, I suppose, m'lud . . . a school magazine, . . . take the case of Heyne (or did he say Heimie?) . . . S.A. Law Reports, 19 . . . , at page . . . further particulars.* The voice of Maisels goes on, relentlessly, the saw sinks deep. Lunch in the grounds of the rectory with Father Nye as host, tall, lean, smiling, passing around the cigarettes. Would you like some more bread and butter? Orange squash? The committee has done sterling work. The stew and the curries, not too hot, to suit everybody's taste. Somebody even donated ice-cream. Like a garden party. Should've worn my morning pants and top-hat. Maisels continues. *Thousands of words are reduced to inches in the columns of newspapers.* Mr. Kentridge. Smooth, precise and devastating as a scalpel . . . *this indictment should be quietly buried.* Do you find no movement in it at all, Mr. Kentridge? If there is, m'lud, I suggest that it should be quickly put out of its misery. Advocate Fisher, quiet, confident, exact. Advocate Nicholas, shatteringly expert, arguing with experienced ease, answering each question without hesitation. The saw cuts into the tree, deeper, deeper. The crown replies. *The indictment shows with absolute clarity the charge*

against each of the accused. What is the position of each accused? Each person wants to know the details of the conspiracy and his part in it. Why can't you give them those facts? . . . Any manifestation of a hostile state of mind renders a person guilty of treason. Trengrove and Hoexter wade on. Surprise. Pirow wishes to hold discussions with the defence about the possibility of limiting the scope of the trial. The loudspeaker has broken down, anyway. Court adjourns until Monday. More time to think. Reflections upon the political situation in the country and the financial situation of the accused. Got a cigarette? Here we go again. *No agreement between the defence and the crown, but we assure your lordships that no time was wasted.* The crown struggles on. Take the case of Heyne. Who is this Heimie, anyway? It's Hymie Barsel and the case he's always carrying around with him, somebody jokes. It's hot. Some of the accused are nodding. The fans whirr ineffectively. Somebody has received a *Darling Dear* and reads it surreptitiously, smiling. The crown grinds to a finish. Reply by the defence. Mr. Justice Rumpff would like Mr. Trengrove to answer questions with reference to misjoinder. These law books are like the Bible, says Accused Mgugunyeka, anybody can quote from them and each gives his own interpretation. The last stages of the replies grind to a stop. We hope to give our decision on Wednesday. Not our reasons, however. Those we will only be able to give at a later date. Court adjourns.

Ninety-one people wait to hear the outcome of the clash of the giants. More time to think.

August 27: This is it. Twelve talking days, twelve days of law books and marathon argument, listening and waiting to hear. On the bus to Pretoria it is the morning again of the sea lawyers. When Wilson Conco dishes out the pocket money there is a rush for the cafe opposite the court. *Stilte in die hof!* All eyes on Mr. Justice Rumpff. The first part of the alternative charge quashed. The rest stays but Mr. Pirow and his team are ordered to supply umpteen further particulars — many of them asked for by the Defence in the first place. That was one month ago. Now the court adjourns for a month. The whole business to start all over again on September 29 — Heyne's case, misjoinder, prejudice to the accused? Time to think. The months go by.

'Africa for the Africans?'

(Continued from page 7)

expect from any purely commercial undertaking, and on top of it facing the continuing and very real danger of State and police victimisation every day of their lives.

If ever there was a paper which no-one in his senses could possibly call "a business journal", that paper is "New Age."

There is no paper in South Africa which is so much loved and respected by the downtrodden and oppressed people as "New Age." Why? Because, like the papers which went before it and which were banned, "New Age" has consistently exposed the crimes and misdeeds of the South African Government against the voteless majority of the people. It has fought against low wages and pass laws and group areas and Bantu Education. It has stood side by side with the people in every struggle: in the bus boycotts and the rural struggles and in every one of the trials and tribulations of the Congress movement. Although it is not and never has been an official Congress organ, there is not a single loyal and sincere Congressite who does not appreciate and value what this paper has done and is doing for the movement and the people. By their cheap sneers at "New Age", the "Africanists" expose themselves as assistants, willing or unwilling, of the oppressors.

It is not true that "New Age" is the organ of the Congress of Democrats. It is an independent newspaper. Certainly it supports the policy of the Congress movement. It gives more information about Congress activities than any other newspaper. If one reads the paper regularly one cannot help being struck by the fact that, in proportion, very little appears as a rule, about the Congress of Democrats. By far the greatest amount of space is devoted to the activities and statements of the African National Congress. This fact is not very remarkable, for the A.N.C. is of course a much bigger and stronger organisation. It would be hardly worth mentioning, but for the unwarranted slurs of "The Africanist."

The Dirty Stick

So far, I have been dealing with some of the more gross mis-statements of fact which the "Africanists" keep repeating, and which I am sorry to see are thoughtlessly taken up by the United Party press and even by elements within the Liberal Party, who seem anxious to find any stick with which to beat Congress — even if the stick is so dirty that it is bound to soil their hands.

It is not a very pleasant task to have to wade through and reply to these conscienceless fabrications. Nevertheless, it has to be done. Many new members and supporters of the Congress movement do not know the truth about these matters. If people are not aware of the facts they will swallow mis-statements which are repeated over and over again, unless those who know the truth are prepared to expose the lies and nail them in public for all to see.

An Africanist 'Ideology'?

The "Africanists" do not restrict themselves to spreading far-fetched slanders about inter-Congress relationships. They claim to have an "ideology". This so-called ideology finds its clearest expression in their abuse of the Freedom Charter, which they refer to contemptuously as "the Kliptown Charter", which they say "emanated from the Vodka Cocktail parties of Parktown and Lower Houghton." They profess to find some conflict between the Charter and the resolution (the Programme of Action) adopted at the A.N.C. Conference in December 1949. They keep repeating that the present Congress leadership has "abandoned" the 1949 resolution.

A detailed examination of their allegations against the Charter, of the alleged conflict between the Charter and the Programme of Action, and of the steps taken by Congress to implement the 1949 programme, will show that the "Africanists'" case is as untrustworthy and ill-founded in the field of ideas as I have already proved it to be in the field of facts.

"Africa for the Africans"

The main complaint of the "Africanists" against the Freedom Charter is the profound and challenging statement with which it opens:

"That South Africa belongs to all who live in it, Black and White."

The "Africanists" deny that they are racialists. But, in fact, their attitude towards this clause of the Charter shows beyond doubt that they are racialists; that they are unable to emancipate their minds from the petty racial confines in which the ideologists of apartheid and "White domination" seek to imprison all of us.

They claim that the Preamble to the Charter is contrary to the slogan (which although they "claim" it, was not invented by them and does not belong to them) "Africa for the Africans."

It is time some fresh thinking and analysis was applied to this slogan. Slogans are not Bible texts; they must not be treated as shibboleths which are

holy and sacrosanct for all time and in all contexts, otherwise we shall not be rational political thinkers but mystics and mumbo-jumbo men.

In a certain sense and in a certain context, "Africa for the Africans" is a sound, militant and correct slogan. The continent of Africa is and has for a long time been the prey of foreign sharks, financiers and exploiters who have seized its natural resources and even its people, by force and by fraud, who have planted alien flags and administrations, carved up the continent among themselves, and sent their garrisons and settlers here to lord it over us and exploit our labour. When we say "Africa for the Africans", with a view to the Continent as a whole, we mean of course that this wicked and unjust state of affairs must come to a speedy end, that the peoples of this Continent must — as is already happening in some parts of it, and as has already happened in most of Asia — have restored to them their inherent human right of self-government and enjoyment of their own natural resources.

When we cry: "Africa for the Africans!" we are demanding that foreign powers, like Britain, France, Belgium and Portugal must quit Africa and allow its people to conduct their own affairs. We mean that the land and natural resources which have been seized by these imperialist powers must be restored to their rightful owners. We mean that no special rights and privileges should be conceded to aliens in this continent. And these are all legitimate and proper demands.

But we cannot take this legitimate and proper general slogan and turn it into a sort of magical formula which is going to solve all of the problems of each of the countries and territories of this vast continent. And when people try to use the slogan in a purely racial sense, as the Africanists want to do, they destroy the value of the slogan and obscure its meaning. For, applied to particular countries, the slogan becomes, for example, "Ghana for the Ghanians!" or "Nigeria for the Nigerians!" Quite correct. And — South Africa for the South Africans!

And — who are the South Africans? They are the people who live in this country, who have made it their home, and who know no other home.

It is true, and most regrettably so, that one section of the population, through the imposition of a wicked and unjust form of government and social structure, dominates the rest, secures to itself a monopoly of all political, economic and other rights and privileges, and

(Continued on page 13)

Votes for Teenagers

by DUMA NOKWE

Dr. Donges, the Minister of the Interior, has caused a stir by extending the franchise to the 18-year old European youth. In some circles the Government has been condemned and ridiculed for extending the vote to "immature youth", "schoolboys", "ducktails" and what-have-you. This type of criticism serves no purpose. It merely reveals an adherence to the archaic and feudal doctrine of the inherent inferiority and irresponsibility of youth.

No one can validly quarrel with the principle of stimulating and encouraging the youth to take an active interest in the affairs of state to the extent of participating in the institutions of government. In a normal state whose government is of the people, by the people and for the people, it is not only desirable but necessary that the youth should, from an early age, be made conscious of, and interested in their duties as citizens. After all, 'the youth of today are the men of tomorrow' and the sooner they become acquainted with the machinery of government the better.

When must youth be granted the right to participate in the government of their country? The question can be answered by asking another question. When is any person entitled to share in the regulation of the affairs of the country? The answer must surely depend on that which is the primary function of the government to regulate: the material and cultural welfare of its citizens. Whoever contribute to the material and cultural wealth of the country is fit, responsible enough and entitled to share in the regulation of the affairs of his country. This is the basis of the cry "No taxation without representation." That must be the test, and not the mythical inferiority of this or that group of persons, which results in the denial of the franchise to large sections of the population despite the fact that they make their full contribution to society. The 18-year old youth in ever growing numbers can and do make contributions to the material and cultural wealth of the country. As far as our country is concerned, however, this does not end the matter.

South Africa is not a democratic state. It is a state which is a fort, a laager, against the majority of the people, the Non-White people. The dominating function of the South African state is to thwart and suppress the interests of the majority of its people. It is from this point of view that any apparent extension of the franchise should be examined.

The history of the franchise in our country is characterised by the extension of the franchise to those who are potential recruits for the maintenance of White supremacy and domination, and a deprivation and denial of the right to vote to those who might constitute a danger to that principle. The fitness of persons to vote is determined by their contribution to the strengthening of the fortress of domination rather than their contribution to the material and cultural welfare of the people. It is therefore no accident that White tramps are entitled to vote while African factory workers remain voteless, and also that White thieves and other anti-social elements (except those convicted of High Treason and murder) have the right to share in the government whilst Non-European university lecturers and teachers are regarded as unfit to participate in the government.

Dr. Donges stated quite candidly in Parliament that the purpose for which the vote is being extended to the European 18-year old was to consolidate the fortress of White domination. After all, he suggests, these boys are prepared to defend their traditional way of South African life by enlisting with the A.C.F. If they are old enough to fight then they are old enough to vote.

The majority of the Europeans have allowed the institutions of government to be abused to protect their temporary racial domination. The Nationalists have systematically undermined the democratic process of government to guarantee Nationalist domination. Their victory during the last election has given them the confidence to consolidate and fortify the Nationalist laager by recruiting the 18-year old on to the voters' roll. These are the youth who know no government other than the Nationalist government; who know no policy other than callous apartheid and who know no education other than Christian-National education.

The danger of extending the vote to the 18-year old does not lie in their "youthful irresponsibility" but in the grave probability that they have had their minds warped and their conscience blunted by a ruthless system of racial oppression. Under these influences this generation is becoming the force for fascist nationalism.

The danger lies not in the granting of votes to "immature schoolboys", but in the system which makes them, and others older than they, a menace as voters. The only way of defeating the sinister schemes of the Nationalists is by fighting for the right to vote of all persons, irrespective of their colour, who contribute to our material and cultural welfare, and for the establishment in our country of a government of the people, by the people and for the people.

THE KIMBERLEY TRAIN

A theatrical event of unusual interest takes place in Johannesburg this month when a South African written play, 'The Kimberley Train', is presented by Cecil Williams at the Library Theatre. The play is set in Johannesburg, Killarney and Malvern, and deals with the tragedy of a love between a young couple, which founders when the discovery is made that the pretty 'White' girl is the 'fair' offspring of Coloured parents.

The play is not a 'political' document, but in presenting the very real human situation the author cannot avoid a compassionate sympathy with the lovers, caught in an apartheid dilemma, and a condemnation of the system which creates such unnecessary frustration and grief. Mr. Williams has a warm feeling for this new work, because, unlike some previous South African plays, 'The Kimberley Train'

starts off, not from theories, but from the practical problems of real people.

A first class cast has been assembled. Playing the White father and mother are Bruce Meredith-Smith and Valerie Philip, popular stars of the Johannesburg stage and radio. The part of Aunt Paula, bibulous and garrulous, who reveals Elaine's secret, is in the hands of Jennifer Gray, who scored such a success in 'The Rope Dancers'. The parts of the young lovers will be taken by Ann Aldred — in the Union from Northern Rhodesia where she has been living since marriage interrupted her career in England — and John Whiteley, a Grahamstown man, who has recently returned after four years training and repertory work in England.

The play will interest all who appreciate good "theatre."

**'There is a frenzied note in the roar of the crowd'
as politics invades the sports fields, says the writer**

LIFTING THE COLOUR BAR

The roar of a crowd is part of the South African scene. Even those who spend their Saturday afternoon lounging at the beach or in the park are seldom out of earshot of some full-throated roar. Perhaps it is merely fanciful, but it has often been remarked that there seems to be a special earnestness about the cheers of a South African sporting crowd: as if they sought to lose themselves wholly in the event and to forget the unpleasant realities of the South African scene.

Bliss in Sport

Our emphasis on sport is surely not explained merely by the favourable geographical conditions of abundant space and sunlight and outdoor living. Nor is it correct to speak of rugby — or even sport in general — as our national religion. We do not approach sport with the intricate rites of the Spanish aficionados before a bullfight, or Brazilians at a soccer match. It is more true to say that our addiction to sport is largely the result of a desire to forget in blissful absorption in a sporting spectacle, the problems of the South African situation.

Two other reasons have been offered lately by sports administrators for our concentration on sport: the idea of character-building — though this has never received the emphasis it has in — say — an English public school — and the upholding of national prestige. But they are hardly adequate to explain our almost obsessive interest in sport.

Frenzied Note

If it is true that sport has provided a diversion — almost a sedative — for White South Africa when faced by its problems, then it is understandable that some of us think we begin to detect a slightly frenzied note in the roar of the crowd. For the problems of South Africa — and none are more acute than the bolstering of the colour-bar structure — are beginning to evade the very field which in the past provided welcome escape. Indeed there are few fields where, in the immediate future, White South Africa is more likely to find the colour-bar structure challenged and even undermined.

by
JOHN PLAYER

This challenge is both within the country and outside, but especially in the field of international sport, where the world bodies and their affiliates have questioned, or have been asked to question, the policy of South Africa which is in direct defiance of the principles of international sport. The Charter of the International Olympic Committee, for instance specifies that there shall be no discrimination against any person or country on grounds of colour, race, religion or politics. South Africa clearly discriminates against her Non-White sportsmen, and it is only a matter of time before this policy is queried in many quarters.

Sharp Scrutiny

The problem is not a new one — the question was raised in weight lifting ten years ago, — but recent events have brought it into sharper focus. The discussions of South African soccer at Lisbon and again this year at Stockholm by the world body, the Protest Meeting during the Games at Cardiff in July of this year, and the attempt to get the position of our Non-White weightlifters discussed at the Assembly of the Games Federation, the visit of a cricket team from Kenya and the return visit this year, and tentative inquiries by other sporting bodies, such as athletics and cycling have all combined to make White South Africa feel that its policy may be exposed to sharp scrutiny. And there is always the unsettling precedent of the Table Tennis body which was expelled because it was for Whites-only and made subject to the non-racial Table Tennis board which has sole control of the sport in South Africa.

This important decision may set the pattern for developments in other sport, though the Non-Whites have constantly avowed that they have no desire to see any section of our population excluded from international contests.

But the possibility is becoming acute. Curiously, there is no clearer

indication of this than the assertion, repeated with increasing frequency of late, that it will not happen — the latest example being the statements by Frank Braun, manager of the team to the Commonwealth Games, on his return to the Union.

A further indication is the grossly distorted reports of what has taken place in international bodies. An interesting sidelight is the connivance of most of our English press in this deception. The Cardiff Protest Meeting was widely described as a flop and it was reported that only one hundred and fifty had attended. The "Times" and the "Observer" both gave an attendance of five hundred and corrections sent to South Africa by Ken Forbes were not printed by any papers (except a small paper in Durban, the 'Graphic').

The F.I.F.A. Story

The events at the F.I.F.A. at Stockholm Conference were equally misreported. When South Africa's non-racial soccer body applied for membership of the International Federation, the Chairman ruled that before they could be accepted, it would be necessary to vote for the expulsion of the racial body which at that time enjoyed membership. For this it was necessary to secure a two-thirds majority of the sixty-odd members present. He then called for votes in favour of the retention of the racial body. Twenty three voted for it (just about the closest they could come to avoiding expulsion) and the Chairman then declared the motion lost since it was impossible to get a two-thirds majority for the expulsion. He did not call for a vote in support of this and thus it is not possible to assess the amount of support for the non-racial body. Some countries did in fact vote for expulsion even before the Chairman had declared the motion lost, and thus the South African press was able to report that the racial body had received almost unanimous support and that only three or four countries had voted for the non-racial body. It may be seen that this was far from the truth and that South Africa's soccer racialists are in for a hard fight next time. There will be a next time for the Chairman of F.I.F.A. declared that the matter would receive further attention — a statement

which has not been published in South Africa.

At the Commonwealth Games in Cardiff four countries undertook to speak in support of a Welsh motion "That South Africa should cease to discriminate against her Non-White weightlifters." The executive of the Games Federation has been accused in the Welsh press of evading the issue by deleting the item after it had been placed on the agenda. An official of the Welsh Council, Mr. Cyril Howell subsequently stated to the Daily Herald "We have pledged ourselves to pursue the matter. And we have four years before the next Games to put this thing right."

Weight-lifting Precedent

Weight-lifting has played a leading role in the struggle of the Non-Whites for international recognition. This is due to various factors. The sport received its initial impetus from Non-White lifters, and for many years clubs were multi-racial and Whites and Non-Whites served together on the national executive. The sport also produced the only acknowledged Non-White to be selected to represent South Africa. Milo Pillay was selected for the Berlin Olympics but was unable to travel. Later he represented South Africa in an international match at Lourenco Marques. Ron Eland, unable to find a place in the South African team, represented Britain in the 1948 Olympics and Empire Games and was placed second in the British Empire. The present Chairman of the non-racial body, G. K. Rangasamy, won national titles in open competition with Whites and Non-Whites. Recently the Afrikaans press revealed that there had been Non-Whites in the South African team at the 1956 Olympics in the boxing and weight-lifting sections. Thus there has always been evidence that Non-White lifters could match or even surpass their White compatriots.

The weight-lifting application to the Commonwealth Games will affect all other sport contested at the Games and South Africa's colour bar will be exposed to severe criticism. And the application for membership of the World Weight-lifting Federation which will be submitted shortly is likely to be referred to the International Olympics Committee-supreme body for many sports — and thus lead to a general examination of the position in sport. Already the weight-lifting body has been informed that the International Olympic Committee has called for a report from South Africa.

There are other sports in which the colour bar will be challenged in the near future, among them lawn ten-

nis, boxing, athletics and cycling. And White South Africa is aware of this. Soon the choice will be either to let in the Non-Whites or to get out themselves. The problem grows bigger daily. No wonder their cheering has taken on a frenzied edge.

And there are still other actions which have to make their impact. The table tennis body, for instance, agreed in July to become a member of a Pan-African Table Tennis Federation; the American Committee on Africa has asked that South Africa's position be cleared up

before the Rome Olympics in 1960; a Campaign Against Racial Discrimination in Sport has been launched in Britain; twenty prominent British sportsmen sent a letter to the Times on the eve of the Cardiff Games, protesting against South Africa's colour bar; and public figures everywhere, as well as sportsmen, are beginning to take a lively interest in South Africa's export of Apartheid on the field of sport. South Africa — and not merely White South Africa — may yet have a great deal to cheer about.

'Africa for the Africans?'

(Continued from page 10)

seeks to make the African, Coloured and Indian majority outcasts, pariahs and aliens in their own country. It is precisely this wicked system and these unjust privileges and monopolies which the Freedom Charter challenges and seeks to eradicate.

But the people of South Africa do not want to destroy one form of injustice, one form of racialism, and replace it with another. To do so would fatally weaken the overwhelming moral justice of our cause — and also make it infinitely more difficult if not impossible of realisation.

That is why the Freedom Charter makes it quite clear that by South Africans we mean all the people who live here, Black and White. Through this clear formulation the Charter makes it plain, once and for all, that we who support it fight for universally accepted human rights, not for narrow sectional privileges. We cut the ground from

under the feet of those so-called Nationalists — whether of the Afrikaner or "Africanist" variety — who are so obsessed by differences of nationality that they can see nothing in our country but the "clash of race and colour." That is why both of them hate the Charter so much.

I call them so-called Nationalists because they are not really Nationalists at all. A real South African Nationalist would be one who strives to build a real South African nation. But the tribalists and racialists, whether of the Swart-Verwoerd variety or the Leballo-Madzunya variety, do not want to do this at all. They want to keep our various population groups apart, to accentuate their differences and hostilities.

The touchstone of a true South African patriot is his attitude to the Charter.

(In his next article, Mr. Tloome deals with further "Africanist" criticisms of the Freedom Charter, and analyses "the myth of the 1949 Programme of Action.")

MORAL INERTIA

*Thick the tacit armour
That bids no arrow seek
Its spot of infamy;
To involve with powers of dark
Above the unchivalrous earth,
Is to pull the whisper
From the teeth
Yet shout no word.*

*No birding herald from the
tongue
Nor ardent-visored throat
cries out
Its thunder in the phlegm.
Nor tongue fenced,
Wage in sharp review,
To wit the raving knight in
battle.*

*No shining light stirs up the fires
Nor does that once benevolent star
Lead wise men into tenderness.
For the skinny heart
Prised out the too pale wish
Plucked from the barren valve
Its own rebuke
And trembled for life
Faint at the sight of this sick land
That lies like a wound
Upon His raw and savaged hand.*

JEAN LIPKIN.

The New Ghana

A Book Review by MICHAEL HARMEL

The achievement of political independence by the people of Ghana last year has naturally stimulated intense interest throughout the African continent, and it is natural that Africans everywhere should be keen on finding out information about Ghana. Two books about Prime Minister Nkrumah have already appeared, the first by Bankole Timothy¹, and the second Nkrumah's own autobiography.² Because of their biographical nature both of these books, though extremely interesting, focus too much attention on the personality of an individual and leave too wide a gap in our knowledge of the country itself, its history, problems and future.

Many people will turn to a new book, "The New Ghana" by J. G. Amamoo³ in the hope that it will fill this gap. It has the advantages of being cheap (it is a paperback, selling at 3s.3d. in this country) brief (it contains 145 pages) and readable. And, indeed, Mr. Amamoo gives us many facts about the history, population, economic background and problems of his country, as well as a brief review of the thrilling decade 1947-1957 during which Ghana, under the leadership of the Convention People's Party, advanced with giant's strides to independence. These virtues make Mr. Amamoo's book well worth reading for those interested in African liberation from colonialism.

But, having said so much, one must immediately issue a sharp warning against certain shortcomings in Mr. Amamoo's approach which might be very misleading for anyone who comes to his book in search of a recipe for freedom. He gives us, it is true, a number of important facts about the emancipation of Ghana. But his comments show that he does not

himself understand the significance of those facts, and he misinterprets them.

The main trouble with Mr. Amamoo is that he tries to depict the bloody and determined struggle of the people of Ghana for freedom from British imperialism as if it were not a struggle; as if a kind and benevolent Britain presented independence as a free gift upon the people of Ghana.

He prettifies the ugly story of British conquest and domination in his country in the conventional manner of imperialist historians. He says that the European powers started by "trading" on the Gold Coast (but does not mention that their "trade" was in slaves.) The British he writes (p. 4) "gradually extended their jurisdiction" as "the inhabitants became more aware that the British, apart from being fair traders, were good soldiers and could be firm friends." "The Chiefs" (p. 5) "were given British protection." The long and sickening story of British treachery, brutality and greed towards the Ashanti (some of which is given in Leonard Barnes' "Empire or Democracy" (1939) is dismissed in a sentence as "a long series of wars between the British and their native allies and the Ashantis" which went on "until in 1902 Ashanti was finally annexed as British territory."

Similarly the notorious Burns Constitution of 1946, against which the C.P.P. launched the all-out struggle which culminated in a decade of mass struggle leading to independence, is called "the greatest political advancement", which "gave the country a considerable measure of self-government", "was heartily welcomed by all sections of the people" and "the British Government was praised for its magnanimity." All this for a so-called Constitution which provided for the country to be ruled by a sort of Advisory Board, consisting mostly of British-appointed nominees and leaving

an overriding veto in the hands of the Governor.

In writing about the dispute between Dr. Danquah, the reformist leader of the former United Gold Coast Convention and Nkrumah, Mr. Amamoo says "it was a most unfair fight," because Nkrumah had the support of the masses and Danquah did not, and this in turn is ascribed to the personal qualities of Nkrumah — "youth, vigour, fearlessness, scholarship and brilliance . . . personality, charm and good looks." There is not the slightest recognition by the author of the plain facts which his own book reveals: that the difference between "the Nkrumah group and the Danquah group was fundamentally not over personalities but over policy."

The C.P.P. policy was fundamentally revolutionary in its nature. They demanded immediate self-government, independence and democracy. Their method was to arouse and organise the masses for militant struggle for self-emancipation.

The policy of the "old guard" of the U.G.C.C. was fundamentally reformist in character. They sought to beg concessions and privileges for the upper stratum of Chiefs, middle classes and intellectuals alone. Their method was to negotiate with the British behind closed doors. They feared and avoided militant mass action.

The masses chose the C.P.P. policy and rejected the policy of Dr. Danquah and his friends. That — and not Nkrumah's scholarship and good looks — is why he won and Danquah lost mass support.

And that is why the people of Ghana won their fight for political independence.

Mr. Amamoo is unwilling to accept these truths. He is always ready to condone and justify British brutality and repression, and to excuse the local "good boys" and sell-outs who supported the British. The massacre of February 28, 1948, when British police opened fire on an unarmed procession, is described as "a characteristic display of the effectiveness of British arms." The officer, Imray, who

¹ Allen and Unwin, London, 1956.

² Nelsons, Edinburgh, 1957.

³ Pan Books, London, 1958.

ordered the shooting, is excused as "fearing that an attempt might be made on the Governor's life and anxious to frustrate it," and as opening fire "after due warning." After that massacre, naturally, disturbances spread throughout the country. The Governor, Sir Gerald Creasy, replied with a reign of terror, proclaiming a state of emergency, imposing strict censorship, deporting Nkrumah, Danquah and other political leaders.

Mr. Amamoo calls these fascist measures of Creasy, "facing the situation realistically," and taking steps "to restore peace and tranquillity," measures which "helped to mitigate the situation."

One last, and crowning example of this blindness of Mr. Amamoo to the real nature of the bitter struggle of his people for freedom from ruthless imperialism: his comment on Ghana Independence Day, March 6, 1957:

"Britain's pride on that historic day was more than justified, for it had led, patiently and calmly, a collection of warring, divided tribes and states for 113 years, to make out of them a progressive, modern African nation."

Ghana has won freedom, not because of, but in spite of Britain, in struggle against Britain. Like all colonial powers, Britain has not helped but retarded the progress of the people of Ghana. And if, in a certain sense, Britain has contributed towards the unity of the tribes of the Gold Coast, it was only because she provided them with a common enemy. The British did not come to this or any other part of Africa to help the African people but to exploit them and grab their treasures. They are getting out not voluntarily but reluctantly, in the face of united mass resistance to their rule.

The failure of Mr. Amamoo to appreciate or express these crucial realities very much lessens the value of his book. Indeed if it is going to be swallowed uncritically his book can even be harmful, for it helps to spread the illusions which are the greatest allies of imperialism in Africa.

Stanley Uys on

Nadine Gordimer's Worlds

Miss Gordimer is one of those unfortunate novelists who are both a great success and a great failure at the same time.

Everyone acknowledges her skill. Her softly scratching pen leaves a trail of imagery that verges on the luxuriant. She thinks, too: watching us in our familiar poses, and then playing it back. She should be stopped!

Nevertheless, after reading "A World of Strangers," I was angry — angry with the author for being so meaningless. Of what value is literary talent if it never dips below the surface?

The basic ingredients for a powerful novel are present in "A World of Strangers": the phony world of Johannesburg's northern suburbs, and across the tracks the vibrant life of the African sophisticate. What a magnificent mixture! Miss Gordimer, however, is afraid to stir it around.

Perhaps the fault lies with her main character, Toby Hood, a scruffy, repressed little Englishman, just on the hunt for thrills. This is the Oxford undergraduate slipping away excitedly for a night on the loose in the East End. What is the difference?

Shebeen Crawl

My complaint against Hood is that, in spite of his insistence that he feels perfectly at home with his African friends, he is always observing them surreptitiously as if they were a fascinating form of pond life.

If the book were entitled "Adventures of a White Butterfly-Hunter in Search of Black Specimens," I would have no quarrel with it: I could take it then at its face value. It presumes, however, to be more profound. It claims to show us how Toby Hood, White, captures moments of truth in the company of his friend, Stephen Sitole, Black. Therefore, we are entitled to expect more from it than a breathless shebeen crawl.

The dust-cover gives the game away: "She (Anna Louw) takes him to one of those rare parties in Johannesburg in which Blacks and Whites mix rather self-consciously together." Toby Hood does just that — mixes self-consciously. Every situation in Sophiatown or Alexandra is invested with a special thrill — because it is Black; every conversation

in a shebeen is savoured with just that extra pleasure — because it is Black.

If Toby Hood thinks that he is proving thereby that Black men are just the same as White men, he is wrong. His behaviour points instead to an ineradicable difference. Toby Hood is always whispering to himself: "I am White and they are Black. How exciting!"

Miss Gordimer, apparently, does not believe that there are parties, social functions and plain evenings-around-the-fireplace where White and Non-Whites meet without being self-conscious. She should broaden her social circle.

After all, what is so exhilarating about drinking in a shebeen? The surroundings are more squalid than in the White man's pub, and the liquor is often adulterated (and always more expensive).

'Private Life'

As for Stephen Sitole — surely here is a figure of pity, rather than glamour? He is not even tragic; merely pathetic. Very well, he doesn't want to be "bothered with Black men's troubles," he wants a "private life." He sneers: "Sam and Peter and all those others, yap-yap all the time, chewing over the same old thing, this they've taken from us, that they've denied our children, pass laws, injustice — agh, I'm sick of it."

What is Miss Gordimer trying to prove? Artistically, her problem is an impossible one. If Stephen Sitole had the means to purchase a "private life", and exemption from the apartheid laws to ensure that, once purchased, he enjoyed it, he might be a subject worth writing about; but he has neither. As soon as he steps out into the street (and even before that), he confronts the realities of the colour-bar: the humiliations of the Pass Laws being only one of them.

Nor are his ambitions noteworthy. He drifts from shebeen to shebeen, from party to party, from one mysterious group to another. Is this a "private life?"

When a White man does this sort of thing, his friends call him "unstable", "neurotic", "frustrated" and "unreliable." Why, when a Black man does it, must a novel be written about it?

The point I am trying to make is that, if Miss Gordimer is contemplating

writing another novel on "township" life, she should recognise that Blacks are not that different from Whites: they can be just as profound, as amusing, and as perceptive as Whites; and just as idiotically drunken, too.

Toby Hood revolts me. Whenever I think of him, I see him giggling in Stephen Sitole's ear, "Isn't it fun? You Black men can be just as degenerate as we White men!"

Sitole's death in a car accident is appropriately meaningless. Miss Gordimer could just as well have left him lying on one of those garbage heaps in the townships, with an ulcerated stomach and a befuddled mind — utterly useless to himself or to his people.

There are many tragedies in the lives of the African people, but Stephen Sitole is not one of them, and an artist like Miss Gordimer should know when to distinguish between a tragedy and a pathetic spectacle.

Dissection

As for Toby Hood's "other world", it is merely fatuous. Miss Gordimer satirises the wealthy idlers in their bleak estates with extraordinary skill, but the satire is personal, not social. Miss Gordimer does not satirise her characters for what they represent, but for their individual idiosyncracies. The latter tactic might be amusing; it is the former, however, that makes great novelists.

Miss Gordimer puts her specimens on the laboratory table and dissects with slender, probing fingers. A work of precision! But it is dissection for the sake of dissection. When the taking-apart process has been completed, the pieces are thrown into the garbage-can, and we stand around wondering whether it was worth the effort.

The final exposure of Toby Hood's character is the ease with which he commutes between the two worlds of the novel. He mingles uncomplainingly in the Alexander set, accepting their inanities uncritically. He even goes off on a shooting expedition with what must be the most classic collection of ineffable bores ever to crowd into a station-wagon.

Finally, he slouches into the bed of one of the "fast" set, and we are obliged to endure one of the shabbiest, most furtive and least exciting sex relationships in contemporary literary history.

Two Worlds

Surely, if Toby Hood is intended to illustrate the contrast between the two

worlds of the novel, he must reveal some sensitivity? He cannot blunder oaf-like from one group to the other, taking what he finds, and contributing nothing, beyond a lament that the world has become such a hot-bed that the "private livers" are forced to become "public livers."

And that "affair" with Anna Louw! Utterly unnecessary, and so casual as to be almost gruesome. Anna Louw performs the purely mechanical function of conveying Toby Hood to "township life." It is not necessary for him to sleep with her. It is like tipping your taxi-driver with an invitation to come upstairs.

However, it was not my intention to write a review of Miss Gordimer's book. I wanted simply to appeal, as one of her readers, for something better next time. The ability is there: ". . . I felt myself moved to a kind of disgusted pity, as I always am by the sight of one of these old bulls of finance, still sniffing the sawdust, with the broken shafts of money tussles, overwork, over-eating, over-drinking stuck fast in their thick necks." Anyone who can write like that is adequately equipped to deal with Johannesburg's northern suburbs and all they represent.

Miss Gordimer's problem, of course, is to take up a standpoint of her own. To observe is not enough: detachment is a naive technique. As one of her readers, I would like to see Miss Gordimer get down among the people she writes about.

What about it, Miss Gordimer?

FINEST VALUE IN PIPES

DR. MACNAB

FILTER

**SELECTED
BRIAR**



BARRIS BROS.

**WHOLESALE MERCHANTS AND
DIRECT IMPORTERS**

120 Victoria Street Germiston
P.O. Box 146. Phones 51-1281; 51-3589

**Perfect Writing
Instruments**



**Your friend
for life!**

Juno Furnishing Co.

64 KNOX STREET
Phone 51-1106 GERMISTON
For A Square Deal

Contact Us

**STAR CYCLE
WORKS**

1a GUSTAV STREET
ROODEPOORT

Stockists:
Raleigh, Rudge, Humber
Cycles

**Standard Furnishing
(Pty.) Ltd.**

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

For The Best In Furniture

**STEWART'S
REXALL PHARMACY**

S. Joffe, M.P.S.
CHEMIST & DRUGGIST
PHOTOGRAPHIC SUPPLIES

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