

At all times and in all societies these rights may be threatened or infringed and people must feel free to assert them and support them without fear of punishment for their stand.

David Craighead in his work is an example of a man who exercised his rights to oppose the present Government and who did it lawfully. He also devoted himself to the cause of protecting the accused by giving him a defender when he stood before the judge.

Others, and especially younger people, may be inspired by this example, but will they act on it? They may be fearful that in following him they, too, will suffer the bans that now restrict him, and their parents likewise, in fear, may try to persuade them to safer conduct. If this should become the general manner of thinking, then conscience will die and with it will go these noble traditions.

Certainly the fear is abroad. What has happened to David Craighead does nothing to allay it. What has happened to the Liberal Party in recent months does everything to strengthen it.

The Party has not been declared an unlawful organisation, and there is nothing in its activities that could justify such a declaration, but recently 25 members have had imposed upon them the restrictions here described.

SILENCE

This has taken away from the Party most of its leadership, and if the Minister continues in this way, he will destroy it without declaring it unlawful.

It is idle to claim that there is freedom of expression of unpopular political views in South Africa when by a method such as this the Liberal Party is silenced.

David Craighead was not detained during the 1960 emergency, nor under the 90-day law. His premises have never been searched, nor has he ever been interrogated by the police. He has never been charged with any offence.

In the light of all this, the inference seems irresistible that he has been proscribed as a leader of the Liberal Party as part of a plan to destroy it and to intimidate its supporters.

ROYLE PUDDING

PASSIONFRUIT

An interesting and even passionate correspondence has been the fruit of what seems to have been a fairly explosive seed sowed by Mr. Peter Royle in our last issue. Mr. Royle

wrote on "The Challenge of Nationalism", and to sum up his article fairly thoroughly, the points he made were as follows:—

- (1) That European or "White" nationalism is a negative, destructive, irresponsible and "mindless" phenomenon;
- (2) That the main flow of African nationalism is a positive, creative, responsible and **intelligent** (in the sense that it can bear the probings of reason) phenomenon;
- (3) That this being the case, there is no reason why Liberals should not support African nationalism;
- (4) That it is a failing among Liberals that many do **not** support it; a **failing**, because to deny the existence or group feelings is to deny one aspect of the reality of human beings;
- (5) **Conclusion:** That Liberals should get rid of this **failing**, take the fact of nationality into account, and "ride the tiger of African nationalism."

BOUQUET

Before he submits himself to cross-examination, let us allow Mr. Royle to take a bow.

It was pure delight for me to read my own rough, ready and ill-expressed ideas metamorphosed into succinct, crystalline and (dare I say?) elegant prose.

I wish our Liberal ideology, expressed in an article of this high calibre, could be reprinted in at least one periodical with a wide circulation among White South Africans.

Is this wish impossible of fulfilment?

—Heather Morkill, Pietermaritzburg.

[Editor's comment: Periodicals with wide circulations among White South Africans are *Die Huisgenoot*, *Die Brandwag*, *Femina*, *Personality*, *Stage and Cinema*, and *Farmers' Weekly*.]

BRICKBAT

Miss Morkill seems to assume that Mr. Royle's article expresses "our Liberal ideology". Such is not the case, it appears, for the article was criticised by our National Chairman, who writes:

IDEALS

Peter Royle is a friend of mine, and it is a matter of regret to me to have to criticise him publicly, but I would be untrue to my own deep convictions if I did not say how very much I disagree with his arguments in favour of co-operation with African Nationalism. It is arguments of this kind which, I feel, led some of our younger people to take part in sabotage because a part of the African nationalist movement was doing so, and thus landed them in the misery which we all deplore.

In so far as African nationalists aim at African liberation we are bound to agree with them. In so far as they aim at African domination we are bound to disagree with them. Things which are wrong when done by white people do not suddenly become right when black people do them.

Peter Royle gives the impression that the old philosophies of liberalism are outdated. Does he regard people like Bertrand de Jouvenel and Jacques Maritain as Victorian "fuddy-duddies"? I am a Liberal because I believe in Liberalism—which is to say because I believe in human freedom and equality, with which I cannot equate a one-party African dictatorship, nor African nationalism thus understood.

—Edgar H. Brookes, Pietermaritzburg.

[Editor's comment: With all due respect, it seems that Dr. Brookes has slightly missed the point. Mr. Royle was saying that black people **don't** do the things that white people do, and that was his reason for suggesting the support of African nationalism. His idea of "riding the tiger"—the role of Liberals in supporting African nationalism—appears to meet the objections stressed by Dr. Brookes in his last sentence; though Dr. Brookes might have meant here that "group-feelings" such as nationalism are by nature incompatible with human freedom. We hope that Dr. Brookes will clarify and expand on his attitude on this point, for it is, we feel, a vital one; and Mr. Royle has given a good case for the view that the main stream of African nationalism—in which we take it he includes certain African one-party states but excludes African nationalisms of the "European" or Right variety, such as that of Kaiser Matanzima—is fully compatible with, and in fact an active agent of, human freedom.]

A letter from Dorothy L. Norman of Cape Town leads us to several interesting and important points:

Mr. Peter Royle's article urges that Liberals should give favourable consideration to the ideals of African nationalism, many of which are truly liberal. I believe that among the ideals of the South African Liberal Party are the following:

- (a) Freedom of speech, of religion and of political opinion.
- (b) The right of the Press to ensure that justice may be seen to be done.
- (c) An end of censorship save of pornographic publications of no conceivable merit whatsoever.
- (d) Equal pay for equal work.
- (e) Selection and promotion of employees on the basis of merit.
- (f) One man one vote—and, to prepare for this, universal compulsory education up to literacy.

[Editor's comment: It would be more correct, we think, to phrase (f) as "One man one vote—and, going hand-in-hand with this"]

- (g) Autonomy of universities.
- (h) No slanted school-histories or radio-propaganda.
- (i) School teachers not to teach politics.
- (j) No racial discrimination.

COMMUNISM

How many of these aims are the same as those of African nationalism? And how many of these are also those of Communism? Communism had a high and noble source—no less than the practice of the early Christians as described in the "Acts of the Apostles".

[Editor's comment: Perhaps not quite so elevated, Mrs. Norman.]

But Communism has earned a great detestation in non-Communist lands, and even—who knows how much?—in its own domains.

And how could the ideals set down above be realised except by a government that uses force? I was an out-and-out Pacifist till I saw films of Belsen and Auschwitz and then it seemed to me that only force, backed by God, could end such evil power. How was Hitlerism ended except by the use of force?

A great Liberal ideal, not listed above, is non-violence. Then I take it that Liberals would not countenance the making and use of war-weapons, and the upkeep of an army?

But without these would not a country invite invasion by "evil" forces?

CAN'T SLANT

How could we wean the un-Liberal elements from "wrong" ideas except by teaching "politics" in schools? And by propaganda by Press and radio (only we would call it "enlightenment")?

[Editor's comment: In the knowledge that all creeds call themselves "enlightenment", we believe that there is a rational, and indeed conclusive argument that we are enlightened. The one essential difference between **propaganda** and **education** is that the first is exclusive—it excludes certain knowledge—and the latter is inclusive—it includes all knowledge and debars none. That is the meaning of the word "universitas", for instance, and the word "Liberal" itself—giving credit where it is due, wherever it may be. By teaching Liberal "politics" in schools or over the radio we could thus only advance the cause of education, knowledge and enlightenment. In fact, they are one and the same thing.

To return to your fears on the subject of non-violence, this applies only to the technique of gaining political control of the country, not to the policies of a Liberal government in power. And though it is hard to visualise a Liberal government ever acting as a belligerent aggressor, it is just as hard to visualise it capitulating meekly to a "force of evil" or Hitlerist attacker.]

When would we give one man one vote? Now, or after we had reached general literacy?

[Editor's comment: Now.]

What would the "merit-basis" mean? Perhaps, as Peter Royle says, the Progressives understand it: as "proven ability to fit into WESTERN society?"

[Editor's comment: **Western** society is the framework of the modern world. Democracy, capitalism and communism are all Western concepts and creeds. The African States, by becoming such States, have elected to accept that framework and work within it.]

We leave the final readers' word to that great literary figure Anonymous:

While finding Peter Royle's article on the challenge of Nationalism extremely interesting, I feel very strongly that there is in it a very woolly application of labels.

The "mindless" European nationalism which Peter Royle describes only finds an example in National Socialism. It simply cannot be used as descriptive of all European nations. What will Peter Royle classify British nationalism under?

Also the African "nationalism" which he describes is simply not really nationalism. It is the sort of "nationalism" which would find favour with the most internationally-minded socialist.

MORE COMPLEX

In short, I feel that the various African nationalisms are going to be much more complex and divergent than the two extremes which Peter Royle describes.

What I most heartily agree with is that the influence of Liberalism must be brought to bear on whatever type of "nationalism" ever comes to fruition in this country. Liberals have far too long indulged in negative criticism. They have a positive role to play, they have a positive message to preach, and it is time that Liberals generated the same emotional drive that the Nationalist and the Socialist give to their causes.

—Anonymous, Pietermaritzburg.

[Editor's comment: Anon's differences with Mr. Royle seem to be largely verbal. What Anon points out in his third paragraph, for example, is just what Mr. Royle was saying; and Mr. Royle had no alternative than to use the generally applied label. It is not **his** label, it is the one in general use that is "woolly", and that is precisely what he was pointing out.

There was a great deal in British nationalism of the late Victorian era which resembled Nazism—manning the far-flung outposts of Empire against the wogs, etc.—but for the purposes of us here in South Africa, it matters not. The fact is that we must be aware of the nature of European nationalism present here, which is National-Socialist inspired, not British.]

Incidentally it seems to us that the Liberal Party even regardless of its present

circumstances, hasn't done at all badly in playing a positive role, getting things done, and preaching their positive message.

Lots of people who have not been doing any work are unaware of all the work that is being done.]

NOTHING NEW

It is with this background that one must view the "swing to the Nats" in the recent provincial elections, although it should also be remembered that the swing to the Nats is nothing new—it has been going on ever since 1943—since which time the United Party has lost about half of its seats in Parliament.

The Labour Party committed political suicide by following more liberal race policies and lost all its seats.

The Liberal Party has lost whatever Parliamentary influence it may have had by the abolishing of the African Representatives, and it seems likely that similar action will be taken in the near future to see that the Progressives are likewise eliminated. A one-party State would be the next logical step, although the Nationalist Government might wish to keep the United Party opposition just for the sake of appearances. The real struggle will then be extra-Parliamentary, as indeed it largely is now.

The Liberal and Progressive parties are the most effective opposition that the Government now has. The Progressive Party, by showing that it has the support of the Coloured voters in the Cape, has rather upset the Government claim that it is supported in its policies by the non-whites. The Coloureds have shown that they are not sufficiently politically mature, and that therefore they cannot have their own homelands. **It is probably not possible to estimate what part the Liberal Party has played in holding up the Bantustan Programme in Natal, but to judge by the amount of intimidation that goes on it must be considerable.**

TRANSKEI

In the Transkei the Government has had to rely on the preponderance of chiefs in the Legislative Assembly to uphold the fiction that the majority of Africans just can't wait to develop separately in their homelands under the paternal eye of Pretoria. **And even so, the Democratic Party, with majority popular support, is uncomfortably powerful.**

In Natal, the Government has fewer chiefs on which it can rely to support its line, and the attacks on prominent people like Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, who favour non-racialism, indicate that this is regarded as a serious threat. The Liberal Party has considerable influence among potential Bantustan voters in

ALL WE CAN DO IS MAKE SURE THERE IS SOMETHING TO KILL

Post-Provincial Election Comment by
a Student

BACKGROUND

Since the advent of the Republic in 1961, the Nationalist Government has become increasingly self-confident, and has taken steps to ensure that it can count at all times on the support of the majority of the white electorate.

It has achieved this by two methods—**firstly**, the Republic exposed the bankruptcy of the United Party policy, by making racial issues the only really important one in the political arena, now that the connection with the Crown had been severed.

Racialistic monarchists thus had the wind taken out of their sails, and their former opposition to the Nationalists did not seem to have much point any more.

The second step was to intimidate the white electorate with threats of Communist plots and sabotage, and the perils of black nationalism. This may be seen in such pieces of legislation as the 1962 "Sabotage Act". It is difficult to see that this was for any other purpose than to frighten the white electorate into voting Nat. It is a blatant piece of political legislation. Sabotage could quite easily have been dealt with by existing legislation, or some modification of the laws relating to wanton and malicious destruction of property, and murder, would have been adequate to deal with the situation. This would also probably have caused less unfavourable publicity to be given to the trial of saboteurs in the overseas Press.

It would also not have had the effect of causing a near-Nazi patriotic hysteria in the white electorate.