

All of Asia and all of Africa, with the exception of an utterly insignificant smattering of European settlers, regards the claims of the non-white South Africans with the warmest sympathy, and indignantly rejects the arrogant racial theories of the Nationalist and United Parties. Russia and East Europe adhere to principles of proletarian internationalism which are incompatible with any theory or practice of white supremacy. And all the best people of West Europe and of North and South America find the whole conception of autocratic rule by representatives of a "master race" disgusting.

Those are the realities of the world in 1956: a world in which the minority rule of a self-chosen group in South Africa cannot for long survive. The political leaders in this country who close their eyes to these realities, who preach in the name of "the survival of the White man," are false prophets, false saviours. The dangerous road they travel leads to destruction, not survival.

The true road to survival and to a happy future for South Africans of European descent, as for all the groups of our population, lies in renouncing all claims to a special status, in joining in fraternal co-operation to build a society of equals, where the measure of the worth of the individual is not in his pedigree, but in the value of his contribution to the common welfare.

To awaken them to this robust reality is the urgent and honourable task of that enlightened minority, within and outside the Congress of Democrats, who have the vision and character to break out of the mental prison of racial ideology.

---

# CAN THE CONGRESS OF DEMOCRATS WIN MASS SUPPORT?

By C. GOLDBERG

**"I am a newcomer to the Congress of Democrats," says the writer of the following letter; and he therefore expresses his views with a certain amount of diffidence. LIBERATION is pleased to publish this further short comment.**

**BOTH** Johnson— ". . . (C. O.D.) must act in European affairs as an independent organisation . . ." and Press— "We must . . . proclaim our organisation and our aims fearlessly and independently" agree, that C.O.D. must present "an independent policy and programme" (Johnson). Their analysis of the class forces reveals however, that at the moment

there is no mass base amongst white South Africans, on whom, and to whom we can direct our programme.

Johnson does see in the "Covenanters, the Women's League for the Defence of the Constitution, the Anti-Republic League, etc." an indication "that some of the anti-Nat whites are beginning to look for a new political home," but Press tends to discount these organisations as potential allies in the fight for national liberation, because "we cannot expect those sections of the Europeans who get the sticky end of the fascist bargain to come over to the side of the Non-Europeans, where they would lose those economic privileges which they are fighting to preserve from fascism."

Seeing therefore that there is no economic base for a white mass movement, and as long as the Nats can assure the capitalists, big and small, their profits and the European workers employment—both attainable at the expense of, and through the intensified exploitation of the Non-European peoples—there does not seem much prospect of that base arising in the immediate future, what role must The Congress of Democrats play in the struggle against fascism?

We represent neither a class force nor a people's movement, yet we stand in the forefront of European thought and activity, alongside the vanguard of Non-European thought and activity as represented by the A.N.C., the S.A.I.C., and the S.A.C.P.O. The Congress movement has assigned us an independent role, yet our strength is derived from the magnificent struggles being waged by the national liberatory movements. The role demands of us, that we render maximum support to our allies in the Congress movement, for it is they who represent the advancing forces, the forces for progress and democracy.

To rally all possible white support we must take the message of the Freedom Charter into every European home in the Union. At the moment we are not likely to find a sympathetic audience, but as the contradictions of fascism become more economically apparent, and provided we have consistently put our policy and programme before them, we will inevitably find an increasing number of white South Africans drawn into our ranks.

We must constantly point out the consequences of Nat rule for all the people, black and white: its urge to expansion, for example, reflected in the annexation of South West Africa and the demand for the Protectorates, whilst of benefit to white South Africans at the immediate moment, must be shown to lead to war as a means for solving the contradictions of fascism and the Socialist challenge presented by the development of the U.S.S.R., the People's Democracies and the Chinese People's Republic. In this we can no doubt support the Peace Council in their work, and they in turn ours, pointing the way to peace and friendship not only in international affairs, but also in South Africa. The danger, therefore, of South Africa entering into an alliance similar to NATO, SEATO or METO, must be brought home to the people.

Press says we must be "consistent, staunch and fearless," I would add the quality of alertness. Did we, for example, fully utilise the opportunity of presenting the Freedom Charter as the way forward for

South Africa, provided by the Nats' "rape of the Constitution?" We allowed the initiative to pass to the Black Sash, a movement, which because of limitations inherent in its make-up, could call for nothing more than a return to the Constitution, or for a new National Convention attended by the representatives of those entitled to the vote. Only after the new Senators had been appointed did we call a public meeting, and its lack of success can only be attributed to the fact that by then public interest had dissipated itself on periods of "mourning" and calls for the "honouring of our Constitution." We know that the Freedom Charter points the way forward to a new Constitution for South Africa, but we lost the chance of letting the people know whilst the Senate Act was still a source of apprehension and anger at the Nats to white South Africans.

Press says: "When freedom is won, when democracy is achieved, we shall inherit the leadership of white South Africans." We shall only be entitled to that inheritance, if we prepare ourselves in the struggle being waged now, if we show by example, that we are entitled to that leadership not only of white South Africa but alongside African, Indian and Coloured South Africa as well.

---

# THE SOCIAL BASIS OF THE EUROPEAN POLITICAL GROUPS

By D.H.

This article is yet another contribution in the discussion started in the pages of **LIBERATION** by the article 'Can the C.O.D. Win Mass Support?' Further contributions are invited.

**T**HE articles by Johnson and Press in recent issues of Liberation are interesting and useful. But they demonstrate that while it is widely recognised that some sort of social, economic or class realities underlies the two big parties there is little real knowledge of what these realities are. This article outlines some facts about the historical development of the Nationalist movement. It concludes with a few remarks about the social bases of the U.P. and C.O.D.

The Afrikaner nationalist movement was originally based on the farmers and intellectuals. Farming in African-inhabited areas was based on the labour tenancy system. In exchange for a certain amount of labour (usually 3 to 6 months in early days) the African was "given" a plot of land on which to grow food and build a house and