

FIGHTING TALK

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

Vol. 16, No. 5.

Price: 5 cents (6d.)

JUNE, 1962



The Sabotage Bill and the



Fight for the Future



BANISHMENT

A-BOMB

TESTING

THE FIGHT FOR THE FUTURE

The Nats have been threatening the country with stricter press censorship for many years now. And long before the present Parliamentary session began they were talking about drastic new laws against Communists* and saboteurs**. So people were already mentally prepared for something nasty from Vorster; but it is a measure of

the savageness and ferocity of his Censorship and General Laws Amendment Bills that they nevertheless, and after 14 years in increasingly harsh repressive legislation, sent a shock of horror throughout the country. This has been followed by a wave of angry protest the like of which South Africa has not seen for many a day.

BEGINNING — OR THE END?

Smear Technique

With characteristic Hitlerite arrogance and contempt for the public, Vorster, in his reply to the second reading debate, attempted to smear and belittle the opponents of his monstrous brain-child. All of them, from the Bishop of Johannesburg to ex-Chief Justice Centlivres, were lumped together as Communists. And where even he realised that particular lie was too crude — as in the case of the Bar Council — he falsely stated that they had "supported the principle" of his Bill. The barristers gave him the lie direct, at once. But what does that mean to the Nationalist leaders? They are men without conscience, without principle, without morality . . . And it is men like these who are being given life-and-death powers over all who venture to disagree with them!

But belittle and smear as they did, there is no doubt that the Verwoerd gang was badly shaken by the breadth and depth of opposition to the "Sabotage" Bill; that is why they are in such a tearing hurry to rush it through Parliament before the opposition grows even more formidable. Opposition outside the House stiffened the sagging backbone of the United Party inside. That was one matter, at least, on which Vorster was correct: Graaff started out tamely enough practically apologising for criticising the Bill and recalling the U.P.'s ignoble support for the Public Safety Act and other fascist laws. But by the end of the debate Hamilton Russell and others were speaking up like men and democrats.

The Nats despise public opinion, especially that expressed by those who, not being white, have no votes. But they dare not ignore it completely. There is a limit to the power of any despot: that is, the extent to which the people will endure and put up with his tyranny. Beyond that limit dictators venture at their peril.

Frightened Men

Behind all their outward show of granite inflexibility, the Nationalist leaders — frightened men in their shrivelled little hearts — can and will manoeuvre and concede in their attempts to cling, at all costs, to power. We saw it in the world-wide wave of horror that

Those who had eyes to see, and who wanted to see, realised that once they were on the statute book, these measures spelt the beginning of a new era in South Africa, a new phase in the creeping paralysis of fascism which has been overtaking this country ever since the Nationalists took office in 1948. They spelt an end to the right to legal political activity, to legal publications other than those found unobjectionable by Nat-appointed censors.

Why Fight Back

Some opponents of these Bills have been saying: "What's the good of sticking our necks out to protest — when we know the Nationalist parliamentary machine will jam these laws through, regardless of public opinion at home or abroad?" It is easy enough to say that this sort of argument is escapism or cowardice, and so dismiss it impatiently out of hand. But it is terribly widespread — and I think it is terribly important that it should be discussed carefully and patiently, not only for the sake of the immediate struggle against the Bills, but also because it raises issues of fundamental importance for the whole future of the democratic movement under the shadow of the Verwoerd-Vorster dictatorship which is now being "legalised."

In the first place, in standing up and speaking out against these Bills, the opposition — the Congress supporters, the Black Sash women, the Progressive Party, the clergymen, barristers and students, the Rand Daily Mail and other newspapers — were doing something fundamental and significant. They were setting an example of moral and physical courage whose value and importance it would be difficult to overestimate. It threw the whole issue into dramatic relief. Who defends civilisation? The silent, dauntless women at their painful City Hall steps vigil — or the half-drunken foul-mouthed hoodlums, headed by Nationalist policemen in mufti who pelted them with garbage? The contrast, immortalised by Bob Connolly in one of his best cartoons, is a vivid unforgettable picture in the life of South Africa on the first anniversary of the Nationalist Republic.

FIGHTING TALK

Vol. 16. No. 5.

JUNE, 1962

Price per copy 5 cents.

Annual Subscriptions:
75 cents (7s.6d.)

Overseas subscription: 15s.

Published by

FIGHTING TALK COMMITTEE

P.O. Box 1355, Johannesburg

Registered at the G.P.O.

IN THIS ISSUE

THE NEW BILLS	P. 2
EDITORIAL	P. 4
THE HOOLIGAN GANGS	P. 5
FARMERS AND THE STATE	P. 6
CONTROVERSY — 'The Non-White African'	P. 8
BANISHMENT — A HISTORY	P. 9
EDUCATION	P. 11
A-BOMB TESTING	P. 13
NEW WRITING	P. 14

followed Sharpeville, when they suspended the pass laws. We see it in their "Bantustan" manoeuvre—the very idea which Verwoerd scouted as hopelessly visionary when it was first advanced by SABRA some years back. Sure, it is all for show: they hope to rule the Transkei as effectively tomorrow through the likes of Matanzima as they do now directly through Hans Abraham. But it is an expensive and risky business. Why do they do it all — if not to impress UNO abroad and to still the clamour for true freedom at home?

Even more to the point: let us examine the field of civil liberties, now being reduced legally to vanishing point in terms of the 'Sabotage' and Censorship Bills. It has been pointed out that

whether Vorster will be constrained to modify it in any significant respect. Judging by the tone of his reply to the Second Reading debate, there will not be many changes — unless the tide of public opposition rises to very much greater heights before the Bill becomes law. The Nationalist M.P.'s will steamroller through all the main provisions, in all their naked ugliness.

Will that mean an end to political life in South Africa, to democratic opposition and resistance? No, it will not.

Do not mistake me. The laws will be very bad indeed. Vorster has already expressed his intention of making use of the sweeping powers handed to him, to ban New Age and other anti-apartheid publications, to place individuals

Even within the framework of the Nazi legislation, freedom-fighters will find ways of making their voices heard; they will not surrender or neglect a single possibility that remains.

We must never forget that laws, the legal context, are not everything. Given a sufficiently militant and courageous people, the most draconic dictatorship and the most stringent decrees will be invalid because they simply will not work. We have striking current examples of this in the Iberian peninsula where under the most stifling dictatorships in Europe, the brave Spanish workers and Portuguese students have successfully defied the anti-strike laws of Franco and Salazar.

Verwoerd and Vorster can outlaw a

A FRANK DISCUSSION ON THE LAWS — AND THE PEOPLE

many of the drastic powers Vorster is now demanding he already enjoys in terms of the Suppression of Communism, Public Safety and other laws. The Nationalists could have banned New Age as they banned the Guardian and Advance. They could, in terms of existing legislation, have put outspoken democrats under house arrest or even in concentration camps. They could, by the stroke of the pen, under the Public Safety Act, have kept the whole country in a "State of Emergency", thus suspending all laws and governing solely by decree.

That they have not done so is not the result of any scruples on their part. It is a result of the tenacious defence of their rights by the people of this country; of the endless protests and exposures of each reactionary measure; of the fact that protests and struggles in this country unfailingly evoke a sympathetic response from the millions of friends of South African freedom beyond our borders and in the councils of the United Nations and other international organisations.

Had our people not fought back tirelessly, courageously, tenaciously against each and every Nationalist assault on human rights and freedoms, our country — now in the fourteenth year of their rule—would long since have sunk into the spiritual hell of Hitler's "New Order" so much admired by Verwoerd and Vorster, where the only organised bodies were the State and the Nazi Party; where individuals, terrorised and isolated from one another, shrugged their shoulders apathetically as they saw smoke pouring night and day from the chimneys of the mass crematoria.

After the Bills Are Law

I am writing just after the Second Reading of the "Sabotage" Bill, so I do not know just what effect the public outcry will have upon the final text, or

under house arrest, to step up the Special Branch intimidation and victimisation which has been a steadily growing feature of South African life for many years. We must expect new organisational bans too; the earlier outlawing of the African National Congress may soon be followed by bans on other organisations as well. One can anticipate a growth of "unofficial" fascism as well, a growing brazenness of Leibbrandt and other "K.K.K."-like organisations, with the organised hooliganism we saw in Johannesburg during the protests as a pattern. The way of the democrat in our country will, for a time, be dangerous and difficult indeed.

This They Can't Stop

But the will and the strivings of the South African people for freedom and democracy are like an elemental force that cannot be thwarted and checked by a minority-based dictatorship. The struggle will keep breaking out in new forms and in unexpected places. Encouraged by the justice of their cause, the superiority of their numbers and the sympathy and support of Africa and the whole world, the oppressed, exploited majority will continually find means of expressing their aspirations for freedom, until the struggle has been won.

South African Style DEFINITIONS

- * **COMMUNIST** — a person who believes in the United Nations Charter, like Chief Lutuli or Patrick Duncan. (From the Nats' New Political Dictionary.)
- ** **SABOTEUR** — an opponent of apartheid who does something illegal to show his opposition, all such actions having been declared illegal. (Ibid.)

handful of militant leaders and excommunicate them from the community by placing them under house arrest. But if thousands and tens of thousands of South Africans will speak out for freedom, they can not place them under house or any other sort of arrest; they simply have not the forces to do so.

The People — Not the Law

What is important, in the last analysis, is not the text of the laws on the statute book; it is the real balance of forces and the temper of public feeling. The fight against these and all the other Nazi laws passed by the Nationalists does not come to an end once the minority parliament goes through the farce of voting on them.

The laws are meant to terrify every upholder of national liberation and democracy into silence. They are a sign not of strength but of jittery fear of opposition. I am sure they will not succeed. Even if they do manage to stop up every channel for legal opposition to their rule and to white domination, it will mean that that opposition will take underground and illegal forms. And if they suppress every peaceful protest with terror and violence, then the time will come when they will be met in turn with violence and terror. Such is the law of history.

Immensely important in deciding how they will use their laws and with what morale and determination the democratic forces will resist, is the volume and spirit of the people's protest and reaction now.

That is why no opponent of fascism has the right to stand aside, cynically and fatalistically, from the protest movement. The fight against the Bills now will determine, to a very large extent, whether our country will be dragged through the degradation of fascism and the fires of civil strife before we are rid of the Nationalists.

OUR DUTY — AS WE SEE IT

By THE EDITORS

This journal was born out of a war against Nazism. It was called 'Fighting Talk'. It was, then, the voice of the democratically inspired soldiery of this country's army against Nazism. It dedicated its columns to the fight against Nazism, racial reaction and dictatorship. From that it has never wavered, though times have changed since the war ended and the army dispersed. First as the voice of full-time soldiers, later as the voice of civilians, 'Fighting Talk' has always been the journal of the advance guard of this country's anti-Nazis, the voice of the fighters with weapons or with words against the Hitler doctrines of supermen and master races.

This journal is today under sentence of death. At any moment after the "Sabotage Bill" becomes law, it may be closed down, without reason and without hearing, by order of a man whose political career started with support for Hitler and National Socialism, and ends, appropriately, in the Verwoerd cabinet. Until the executioners axe falls, our editor, our contributors and staff face punishment — imprisonment and fines — for almost every word they dare to write. A new crime has been created in this country — the crime of writing and publishing what the gauleiters of South African Nazism describe as "undesirable".

Thus, after twenty years of unbroken publication, we face the severest test of our history. The South African Nazis dominate the government and have taken to themselves the powers to terrorise us, or — if that fails — to close us down by decree. What course are we to follow now? The question does not confront only us. It confronts every journal, every organisation, finally every individual who does not bend the knee before the juggernaut of Verwoerd apartheid. What course are we to follow?

This problem faces the whole South African press; they are all finding differing answers for themselves. Patrick Duncan of 'Contact' has emigrated to Basutoland before the Censorship Bill becomes law, seeking refuge in advance from restrictions on his personal freedom which are far lighter than those imposed on many of our writers and staff. Lawrence Gandar of the 'Rand Daily Mail' by way of contrast, has forcibly climbed off the fence on which he has sat for a long time, and uses his pen with all the passion and force that he can muster in the battle to stop the Bill and bar the pass to its foul twin, the 'Sabotage Bill.' Is Duncan's way the way of caution? Or of cowardice? Is Gandar's that of heroism? or of recklessness?

The problem goes far beyond the ranks only of editors. Consider, for instance, the Johannesburg Liberal Party, which had advertised a meeting at the City Hall steps before the storm-troopers and bully-boys of the new dictatorship had got into their full stride. By the day before the meeting, the hooligan gangs had been given the freedom of Johannesburg's streets by the South African Police; from behind the police cordons they had gathered freely to abuse, assault and spit upon anti-government demonstrators. In this atmosphere, the meeting would certainly have been rough; it would have required much determination and courage to go through with it. Unfortunately, the organisers could not muster enough of either, and cancelled their meeting. Party chairman Alan Paton, who had fought courageously and well throughout the week in Durban, summed up the deed: 'Freedom of speech has lost a critical battle.' True.

But it was a battle in which the defense had failed to bring its weapons and ammunition into action. This was not caution; it was cowardice in the face of the enemy.

Nothing contrasts more strongly with this than the magnificent courage of the women of Johannesburg's Black Sash, who faced up to all the gutter abuse and the sewer-rat behaviour of the hooligan gangs, in order to maintain their vigil over their 'Flame of Liberty' on the very same steps of the City Hall. Here were courage and determination of the highest order. And yet clearly courage alone is not enough. The Black Sash vigil has been forced off those central steps, into the side streets and byways, where the demonstration is less significant and less inspiring. They have not been driven off by superior force; for anyone who knows Johannesburg, anyone who saw its common citizens in their fine silent march of protest against the 'Sabotage' Bill, will know that Johannesburg can still — even in the fourteenth year of Nationalist rule — muster an overwhelming majority of anti-fascists against the bully gangs and the government which inspires them. But the women of the Black Sash discouraged every offer of protection, rejected every suggestion that the answer to gang force is counterforce. They decided to face force and violence with a demonstration of moral superiority only. Their tactics failed. Certainly they were heroic; but were they not also, in this, mistaken?

Thus far we have spoken of courage and of cowardice. But it is necessary also to speak of treachery and betrayal. Consider first the case of the Trade Union Council, which is content to let the Censorship and 'Sabotage' Bills pass in silence, because they themselves have the assurance of the Minister that *their* trade unions will not be suppressed. Let us not ask what value such an assurance has; the Nationalist Party has never felt obliged to honour promises, or respect restraints imposed by 'the dead hand of the past.' Nor let us bother with the fact that while trade unions may be given immunity, their members, their leaders and their spokesmen fall just as surely within the shadow of the gestapo as anyone else in the country. Let the TUC look after itself in these matters. But we cannot ignore the fact that the assurance asked for by the TUC, and given by the Minister, affects only *their* unions, only the unions of white workers. They have given their silence, and their acquiescence to the Bills, in exchange for their own immunity. In doing so, they have shown themselves ready to sacrifice all other trade unions, especially the unions of non-white workers, without a murmur. This is not cowardice; it is treachery.

So too the behaviour of the press magnates, united in the press baron's association — the Newspaper Press Union. We speak here of the proprietors of the English language dailies; for the Afrikaans dailies are so completely part and parcel of the Nationalist Party that nothing they say and do — neither incitement to public violence nor gross racial incitement nor straightforward lying nor outspoken Hitlerism — nothing they do will be classed as "undesirable" in Nationalist South Africa. The proprietors of the English dailies have also fastened the gag upon themselves in exchange for their own immunity from censorship. They have traded their freedom to write as they please and as they think for the right to be excluded from the censorship bill; they have

retired from the battle before it is half fought, and in doing so they have thrown all other publications to the Nazi wolves — *Fighting Talk*, *New Age*, *Contact* and many more. This is not surrender; it is treachery.

We are not concerned at this moment, to pass judgement on treachery. In military circles, treachery is punishable with death. The demise of the TUC is a combination of free trade unions, the passing of the NPU publications as mouthpieces of a free people, is not far off. History will pass judgement on them soon enough. We are concerned, from all this, to chart our own course and determine our own future. If we put accusing fingers on the deeds of others it is only in order to underline our intention not to follow the fatal paths which they take.

We have tried, for twenty years, to live up to our name, '*Fighting Talk*.' Surrender without a fight, cowardice in the face of the enemy, treachery to our friends, our allies and our people is foreign to our whole tradition. They are the antithesis of everything

we have worked for and campaigned for through our whole history. We do not intend to change our colours now, nor to haul them from the mast-head.

We have dedicated ourselves to campaign against South African Nazism. We will continue to do so for as long as we are able. We have campaigned against Nazism's local representative, the Nationalist Party. We will continue to do so. We have fought for the new South Africa whose outline is drawn in the Freedom Charter. We will continue to do so. We have worked for the unity of all South African democrats and lovers of liberty, for the common cause of removing the present government and opening the road to democracy for all men. We shall continue to do so.

For as long as we are able. We neither retreat, nor surrender. We do not believe that a soft answer from us will turn away the Nazis' wrath. We will carry on the fight for as long as we are able. And if, in the future, they bring such force against us that we can no longer continue, then

we shall go down. But at least we will go down as we have lived, fighting. We know that in this approach we are not alone. This will be the path trodden by the majority of our people now and in the critical days ahead. Our special field has been "talk". But there comes a time when talk is not enough; when what is wanted is not just talk, but also deeds; not just ideas but also action.

We will try to match our actions in the face of Nazism to our talk over these many years. We are confident that this way lies victory for our ideas, and defeat for Nazism. Perhaps not now. Perhaps not for some time to come. But in the end it must be so, because governments can silence their opponents, but they can never destroy them while human courage and determination are kept alive. In the end of ends, it is not the government of this country which will crush the people; but the people who will crush the government. Whatever little we can contribute to that end, we will do, willingly.

The Face of the Fascists

Fascism — particularly when based on race-prejudice and fear — erodes all areas of human conduct. When it derives its motive force from a fear of people as people and when its mystique is based on a denial of the humanity of others then the area of human feeling must be one which suffers the greatest erosion.

The real horror of the violence offered in defence of the Sabotage Bill all over the country — with focal points outside Parliament and on the steps of the Johannesburg City Hall — is its brutishness. Newspapers have carried the image of snarling and catcalling hooligans into every home. The details are familiar: the taunting mob, fists flying, people being thrown to the ground and kicked, placards and banners of protest against the most savage Bill in our history being ripped from the hands of demonstrators — Congressites, students or Black Sashers — and torn to shreds. The image is sharpened by the contrast of the silent women who stood bowed around their symbolical guttering "Flame of Freedom" and weathered the welter of eggs, tomatoes, water-bombs and stale fish.

But it is brutishness that is the abiding underlying impression. Sometimes the mob charged at demonstrators with the jostling exuberance of a rugby scrum, sometimes they stormed with the berserk ferocity of a lynch-mob, but the real ugliness appeared when they thrust forward with the ruthless destructiveness of jack-booted stormtroopers. They crystallised then the Fascist-fanaticism which must, ap-

Thoughts on the hooligan mobs at the City Hall Steps By PAUL BELL

parently make them mad—and destroy them. Then one saw the tragic and terrible pass to which some of our countrymen have come: more than the Fascist apparatus the State is providing, it is the fascist mentality which possesses them which is so terrifying. For inevitably a component of this frame of mind is despairing and self-destructive.

There are revealing sidelights. That many of the hooligans were police in mufti: that the concerted onslaughts on Congressites or students or Sashers were only made when a large body of police was present; that brawls rarely took place in parts of the crowd where there was a large number of non-whites. And always there were shrill vapid and blunt-featured blondes — heirs to the wardresses of Buchenwald — inciting the police to heroic posturing and the louts to displays of maleness.

Personal observation reveals further how deeply humanity has been eroded. There was the large matronly woman who wrung her hands and repeatedly beseeched the heavens to tell her: Why hadn't the firms given the menfolk leave? If only the men had been there

they would soon have put an end to this demonstration nonsense. And the blazered junior schoolboy who looked longingly at a protest banner held aloft and wished that Mike Holt or Ski-Hi Lee (boxing and wrestling heroes) were there to rip it down. And the group of parcel-laden women who nodded their heads commiseratingly and agreed about the Black Sash: Poor things, they're not all there. They don't quite know what they're doing. ONS MOET DIE SWARTGOED REGMAAK.

Most Germans today claim the alibi of ignorance for the atrocities perpetrated under Hitler. Perhaps white South Africans will tell the same story. But for many it will not be true. They are completely behind Verwoerd and Vorster in their determination to blow sky-high whatever defences of law and justice have been available to those who oppose apartheid-fascism.

The nature of the Anti-Sabotage Bill is too well-known. Its origins in fear and repression are obvious. But the extent to which white South Africa is prepared to destroy its own standards of decency may not be fully realised. Nor may we be sufficiently aware of the extent their humanity has been eroded by their determination to preserve privilege by force and the mutilation of justice. Stripped of their belief in humanity, discarding their own humanity, their brutishness is exposed and brute force becomes the accepted method of dealing with opposition. Appeals to conscience, to reason, or even to enlightened self-interest can evoke no ans-

(Continued at foot of page 6)

THE STATE SUPPORTED FARMERS

By G. FASULO

The first two articles in this series described Oppenheimer's empire and foreign capital in South Africa. These were like monopolistic groups and foreign investment in any other capitalist economy. The group discussed in this article, however, is characteristically a part of white-supremacist South Africa and very unlike farmers in other countries.

In most capitalist countries the farmers, that is the agricultural capitalists, are not a powerful monopolistic group within the capitalist class. By comparison with bankers, industrialists and mining magnates, individual farmers own rather small amounts of capital. Overseas they are also relatively unorganised economically and compete with one another to the benefit of the monopolistic sections of the capitalists. That is to say they sell their produce at prices determined by the laws of supply and demand, but they have to buy the machinery, fertilisers, petrol, etc. that they need at high prices determined by the big manufacturing and financial monopolies. This pattern does not exist in South Africa.

Here, because of their disproportionate and even dominating political power, the white farmers have been able to organise themselves as a state-supported monopolistic group. Monopolies in the selling of agricultural produce have been established through the control boards. The position of farmers as buyers has been strengthened through the formation of co-operatives and the farmers have freed themselves of any great dependence on finance capital through the Land Bank, and a great variety of forms of state subsidies and assistance.

Government assistance to white farmers takes many forms. Railway rates are set so that farmers pay much less to transport their produce and supplies than do manufacturing or mining capitalists. High tariffs are charged to exclude various types of food imports. A great deal of irrigation, soil erosion control, agricultural education and research work is carried out by the government at the expense of all taxpayers and for the benefit of the farmers. In a variety of such ways the nation as a whole is made to subsidize the white farmers.

Control Boards

The most significant thing, however, has been the development of the Co-

operatives and the Control Boards, as has been well described by J. M. Tinley in his book "The Native Labour Problem of South Africa." The first step was taken in 1924 (about the time that the Nationalists first came to power) when an Act of Parliament vested in the Kooperatiewe Wynbouwers Vereniging full control over the sale of all distilling-wine or spirits. That is, K.W.V. was given by law a total monopoly in order to raise prices inside South Africa, to deal more effectively with middle men, to exploit consumers, develop exports, etc. As a result profits have been raised and stabilized, capital accumulated and exports built up until today K.W.V. is the third largest supplier of sherry to Britain.

In 1925 a Co-operative Societies Act was passed which provided for the centralized sale of products in a certain area if 66% of the producers were in favour thereof and if the Minister of Agriculture approved. This was applied in 1926 to the marketing of tobacco in all the important producing areas. In 1935 a Tobacco Industry Control Board was established further to control production and sales in the interests of the farmers.

Raising the Price

The protective tariff on sugar was raised from 4/- to 16/- per hundred pounds between 1926 and 1932. In 1936 a Sugar Industry Control Board was set up. One result was that in 1938 about half of South Africa's sugar production was exported to the United Kingdom where, after paying shipping and other charges, it was sold for less than the price charged to consumers in South Africa. In other words, the state-established sugar farmers' monopoly was able to force South African consumers to subsidize the dumping of sugar overseas.

Control was set up for wheat and dairy products in 1930, in 1931 for maize and for livestock in 1932. An indication of the monopolistic powers granted is given by the Wheat Industry Control Board which in 1940 established local buying agents, determined prices to be paid to producers, set the wholesale prices of wheat and flour, and the retail prices of bread. It also regulated imports of wheat! Today all important agricultural products are controlled by Marketing Boards acting to exploit consumers for the benefit of the white farmers.

The results of this system can only be regarded as extremely wicked. It has been estimated that about half of all African babies born in large urban centres die within the first year of life, basically of starvation although this is

Face of the Fascists . . .

(Continued from page 5)

wer. No answer is possible. Except force. Verwoerd can marshal the armed might of those in uniform. But behind them is a great mass of volunteers. Vorster, in expressing appreciation for offers of assistance from saboteur Robey Leibbrandt's private army, recognised their existence and anticipated their assistance. They are to be augmented by cowboys from Kenya and riff-raff from Algeria in search of the last pastures where white baasskap can still fatten. The gory record of the Algeria private army seems far off — machine-gunned cafes, dynamited hospitals and mutilated corpses. Yet we may have to say: O.A.S. is come again.

It is necessary to emphasise the intensified brutality. All democratic forces in the country must be clear about what now confronts them. The facade of justice and fair-dealing has been ripped down as surely as the banners were torn down on the Johannesburg steps. And when the mob lacked the courage, the police ordered the removal of the banners.

It is brute force that confronts us. Not merely legalised force from the police and the army but force from a large section of the white populace, led

by toughs, bully-boys and layabouts. We can take it for granted that a young man committed to Vorster's Nazi policy will support it enthusiastically whether in uniform or out of it. But we must also take for granted that all those who believe that this policy is the only way to preserve themselves will proffer their support on every conceivable occasion.

Is it surprising that those who saw these manifestations of the new brutality are inclined to react in the same way? That many of those who have fought peacefully for a free South Africa are tending to think of the use of force to meet force? That more and more accept that the showdown, when it comes, will be a violent one?

In a sense, there is a dreary sameness about our political struggle. It moves, like so many others we know, to bloodshed and a resolution by violence.

But perhaps there is a glimmer of hope even in this darkness that descends on us. There was the man who returned to the City Hall steps after a brawl to explain in earnest Afrikaans that HE HAD NOT DONE THE KICKING. It was true, he said, that he was a Nationalist. He believed that the Bill was a necessary one. But he was against such brutality and would never resort to kicking. HE SHOULD PLEASE NOT BE A MARKED MAN!

often politely called Kwashiorkor. Yet, for example, in 1942 the state aided Milk and Butter Scheme for supplying milk or cheese free to school children and at half price to poor families explicitly excluded Africans. This was during the Second World War, the period of the greatest progressiveness in the government. Today school feeding has been stopped by the government and skim milk, bananas, and other fruits have been destroyed by the Control Boards to keep prices up and above what most Africans and many others can pay. Vast tonnages of maize are persistently exported at a severe loss. This process is paid for by the high monopolistic price maintained within South Africa where the main consumers are the malnourished African people.

All this recalls to mind how Nazi soldiers and police used to search starving Jewish children at the entrances to the Warsaw ghetto to prevent them smuggling food in to their blockaded people.

The Double Exploitation

The farmers do not only exploit the non-Europeans as consumers. The way in which they exploit them as workers is even more important. Labour relations on the farms are the original source of the virulent race hatred and repression which poisons the whole of our society. The forms of exploitation on the farms have been various: chattel slavery in the old Cape; labour tenancy — a form of serfdom — imposed on the conquered Africans, indentured Indian labour in the Natal sugar areas, farm jails both private and public, shanghai-ed "volunteer" labour under the influx control legislation, compound labour as for example at Bethal, the tot system in the Cape, etc., etc. The striking feature common to most if not all forms is the viciousness of the relationships, frequently involving murderous assaults on the workers for trivial or imagined offences, and the complete lack of freedom on the part of the workers.

The relations in agriculture are still of decisive significance for three reasons. Firstly, one-third of the entire African population lives on white farms. This means that the numbers exploited by the farmers are larger than for any other section of the ruling class. Thus too conditions on the farms tend to set standards of living for the entire non-European population. Secondly, farm work was historically the first form and for a very long time the only form imposed on the original inhabitants of the country. Hence the attitudes and habits corresponding to such relations of production are the most deeply ingrained particularly in the customs and traditions of the Afrikaners. The "Kaffir Wars", the "Great Trek" and the imposition and maintenance of labour tenancy under which in return for the right to continue to live on a small plot of land the African tenants were required

to give usually 180 days labour a year (a form of serfdom and in particular of the labour rent of feudalism in Europe) this is the content of the *lekker lewe*, and *die boer en sy roer* mythology of the Nat propagandists.

A somewhat analogous development occurred in Germany. In the Middle Ages the Teutonic Knights conquered the slavish Borussians, imposed serfdom and established the state of Prussia. The ruling land-owners of Prussia called Junkers were the social base of militarism and reaction in Germany and provided the army officer caste. In a cruder form the farmers here are very similar. They have always been the military backbone of white supremacy within South Africa and a motive force in the conquest of African lands. In the third place agricultural relations are important because the farmers have used their political power to pass legislation to prevent people from escaping to the towns such as pass laws and influx control.

Force For Reaction

Politically farmers were the original basis of the Nationalist movement. Although this movement now includes large numbers of civil servants, dependents of state capital, Nationalist capitalists as well as reactionary white workers and urban middle class elements, the farmers are still probably the most influential section. The unusual monopolistic strength of the farmers in South Africa has enabled them to accumulate great wealth which provided the original capital for institutions like Volkskas and Sanlam. The increasing wealth of the farmers is shown by the rise in the number of tractors from 20,000 in 1946 to 110,000 in 1960, and by the rise in farm production of 5% per year (compared with a 2% per year rise in the total population).

It is clear that while the power of the farmers continues no basic changes in the economic or political set up are possible.

IN DEFENCE OF ANGOLA

"Shoulder to Shoulder With Our Brothers"

Extracts from the United Nations

General Assembly Debate

"Angola should be placed in its right perspective. It is the last crusade of the colonial powers against African nationalism." Thus Mr. Diallo Telli of Guinea, at the United Nations General Assembly debate. His delegation, he said had always felt that Angola was at one and the same time an example, and a symbol: a symbol of a martyred African population under Portuguese domination fighting for their total emancipation from the most cruel and most backward colonialism that Africa had ever known.

"In these circumstances" he said, "it will be perfectly understandable that in this debate there stands, on the one hand Portuguese colonialism, and on the other hand all the African peoples shoulder to shoulder with their brothers of Angola and of other parts of Portuguese Africa."

* * *

"Our Assembly cannot continue to abdicate before the obstinate and insolent refusal of a perjurer, who, after having signed our Charter with the hidden motive of safeguarding the profits derived from colonial exploitation — profits which are the very basis of its economy — realises that the Charter of the United Nations was not written to safeguard the interests which are fundamentally opposed to the objectives of the civilised people that we are." This was the follow-up speech of Ousman Ba of Mali. The peoples of the world who prize peace, he said, "expect of us firm measures against the overt rebellion of Portugal against the United Nations."

"What chance has a Non-white got?"

Certainly we stand in spirit with those who are ranged against racialism. But we also remember that racial divisions in Africa are not the black man's making; the white man started it all.

While non-whites and whites have been moving along separate tracks, the whites have been surrounding themselves with plebeian privileges and easy opportunity; and the black or coloured man continues to battle in his ill-lit, shabby house to try to say something on paper. If he writes in English, each line that he writes bleeds him. Who is there to give him a sense of fellowship, to look at his work and talk to him about it? Where is a library nearby where he can do reference work? Think of that other one whose field of reference and chances of encouragement are even thinner — the one in the village. Oh, need I go into detail recalling mere circumscribing conditions which you must know about? The question simply is: what chance has the non-white of winning a contest against a white writer who has been published or whom opportunity has given the basic equipment required for one's apprenticeship? Indeed the likelihood is that he will be too scared to enter a continent-wide competition in the first place.

Need I say that all this has nothing to do with relative intrinsic inferiority in the African. It is a question of culture, which is our business as it is that of the organisation that helps us like the Congress for Cultural Freedom. We have to try and bring him to a wider audience, to help him feel confident in himself. This means opening to him wide vistas of opportunity; when he has been jacked up, he will be ready to challenge all comers — from a position of self-confidence. You may rightly ask how we are to know this point has been reached. I don't know. We intend the contest to be a yearly affair and we shall draw out several hundreds. The rest will depend on the rate of education among whites and when they realise that they can help Africa on the road to the inevitable goal where they and non-whites will enter a common involvement in a common culture.

It does mean that we as a writers' club have to operate, as far as South, East, Central Africa and Kenya are concerned, within boundaries determined by someone else; colour discrimination; at any rate in the matter of a literary contest. I should not think there would be any other area where we would be compelled by similar considerations to work inside the context of apartheid. For instance music and theatre speak with a common language, and the need would not arise to fear that a non-white would be afraid to enter for a multi-racial contest.

The Mbari Writers' and Artists' Club of Ibadan, Nigeria, recently announced a short story competition. The announcement stated that all "non-whites" Africans would be eligible to enter.

The phrase "non-white Africans" caused a Johannesburg columnist 'The Horse' of the Golden City Post to accuse the sponsors of racialism in reverse. "Racial discrimination is an awfully smelly thing" wrote Horse.

To this, Zeke Mphahlele—once of Golden City Post's staff and

author of 'Down Second Avenue', now President of the Mbari Writers' Club — wrote a rejoinder which Post, for reasons lost known to itself, declined to publish. We are publishing below extensive extracts from Mphahlele's defence of the "non-white Africa" clause, together with a rejoinder by one of South Africa's "non-white African" writers whose initials D.A.S. appear quite frequently in these columns.

We welcome contributions from our readers to this controversy.

I would be wrong to conclude that everyone who operates within the framework of race discrimination is racist. We as a writers' club would also consider it unjust for anyone to compete for us racist motives because we are being realistic. Our club in Ibadan has African and white members and in the plays we produce from time to time we

enjoy the benefits of black-white co-operation. Our sponsors themselves are engaged in multi-racial projects elsewhere in Africa. Consider that an athlete can very well compete with whites for entry to the Olympic Games because his training facilities do not suffer by virtue of the fact that he is black. But preparation for a literary

"Racialism in reverse is still racialism"

ANSWERS D.A.S.

The roads to racial prejudice are many and devious. For the sophisticated they often appear in a highly plausible form. But their terminus remains racial prejudice. There is a superficial air of truth about Zeke's defence of race discrimination in literature, and many of those seriously interested in the politics of race could be prepared to support him. His contentions therefore deserve close analysis.

What does it amount to when a literary competition is run exclusively for 'black Africans'? Nothing can alter the fact that this is discrimination on the grounds of colour. Nor can we deny that a number of writers on the continent are excluded because their skins are the wrong colour. I do not think Zeke tries to disguise this — he makes the admission readily enough before going on to defend it. But it is well to reiterate this basic fact: whites are being excluded because they are white.

The facts which Zeke adduces in defence are not in question. Black Africans are denied access to most publications, labour under severe disabilities, and general lack of experience in the

competitive literary world. Is it true however that all whites are the reverse of this? Are they really all exempt? Even if it were true that all whites were privileged and all non-whites were underprivileged, this would not justify discrimination on the grounds of colour.

What we are dealing with is literary talent and creative ability. Zeke would be the first to admit that this talent transcends barriers of colour or race and that it can surmount social handicaps — he is himself an outstanding example. Yet he is prepared to make the dangerous assumption that social conditions can so blight the creative impulse that it is necessary to fence it with racial exclusiveness in order to nurture it. It is simply not true.

Some of his adventitious arguments do not deserve careful analysis. A cursory glance will show their hollowness: that we should practise race discrimination because it has been practised on us; that we should protect the non-white writer from the competition of the experienced white (a version of Dr. Verwoerd's special adulated 'Bantu Education'?)

ASKS ZEKE MPHAHLELE

contest does.

Long after all the flood gates to equal opportunity have been opened by Africans finally, we are going to have to become less doctrinaire in certain areas in try to reconcile the disparities in educational attainment. It may well be discrimination in the reverse, but then Africa is always full of paradoxes that have to be resolved and not barked at. Nor is the tone of smugness which tells us we are afraid of white competition going to help resolve them. We are also trying in West Africa to discourage the kind of smugness that independence often inspires in the attitude of free states towards the challenge with which the people of Kenya, Central and Southern Africa are faced with today.

Let us hope that the whites shall come to their senses one day and opt for cultural alignment with Africans and other non-whites and make our unpleasant exclusiveness unnecessary; indeed that the word African will one day be recognised as one that anybody can rightly claim who is born in Africa and has no other home to look for.

that the black writer needs to be jacked up (this is sometimes called by apartheidists "catching up on white civilisation") and so on. It is true that race discrimination is of the white man's making; but it is our proud claim that it will be of the black man's undoing.

One of his arguments — or rather, a better dictum — while not calling for analysis — evokes alarm: it is the suggestion that in the future we shall have to rethink our position on many issues to achieve a flexibility WHICH WILL ALLOW FOR MORE RACIAL DISCRIMINATION. A dismal prospect indeed. Does this mean that white Africans must look forward to living Down Second Class Avenue for many years? I hope not. That is almost as dismal a view as Zeke Mphahlele in retreat from the sanity and common humanity he projected in his 'African Image'.

Banishment

The South African Way of Life

We tend to associate repressive powers against Africans with the Nationalist government. True, no government has made such wide use of them as this one. But in fact, the Native Administration Act, under which more than 100 removal orders have been issued within the last decade, has its origins in the

eral, as Supreme Chief, to remove from Rustenberg and not to return there without his consent. They were, in fact, 'endorsed out.' They applied to the Court for a declaration that the order was null and void, but failed. They then appealed to the Supreme Court. Justice Innes, Solomon, de Villiers, Kotze and Wessels

Some Pages from the History of Our People

days of colonial administration in Natal. It is typical of colonial rule when governments were trying to subdue unwilling tribes. Natal's Law 44 of 1887 bestowed on the officer administering the Colony the designation of Supreme Chief with all the power and authority held by any supreme or paramount chief. Law 29 of 1891 gave the Supreme Chief the power to "remove any tribe . . . or any native, from any part of the Colony or location to any other part of the Colony or location upon such terms and conditions and arrangements as he may determine." In 1903, when moving an amendment to this law, the Secretary of Native Affairs, Natal, explained that these powers would be used not merely against stock thieves, but for political offenders and sedition as well. "It is a very useful power for the Supreme Chief to have. These people must be governed arbitrarily and these powers you must have." This was the British Colony of Natal.

In the Transvaal, Law 4 of 1885 also gave the Governor, as Supreme Chief, "the same powers as a paramount native chief possessed under native law and custom." Native laws and customs were to continue as long as they were not 'inconsistent with the general principles of civilisation recognised in the civilised world.'

The Legal Battle

In a modern, industrialised state, these laws are an anachronism. But what government repeals laws that give it power over its opponents? Instead, the laws have been so amended that today they are used not only against rural tribesmen, but against urbanised Africans who no longer recognise any chief.

But these powers have been challenged at every opportunity.

In 1904, before the enactment of the Native Administration Act, Mkhathle and nine other members of the Bafokeng tribe were ordered by the Governor Gen-

dismissed the appeal. They were guided by the old Natal and Transvaal laws and held that:—

- In terms of Act 4 of 1886 the Governor General had the same powers as those possessed by any paramount or supreme chief.
- The Supreme Chief did have powers to banish recalcitrant members of his tribe. (This was based on evidence given by members of the Bafokeng tribe.)
- Law 4 of 1885 declared that the expulsion of appellants if without investigation or trial, was not in conflict with the general principles of justice recognised by the civilised world.

Justice Kotze quoted the Natal code of 1887 saying that the Transvaal law was based upon it, and "Natal has always been regarded as a civilised country."

It is important to note that in this case, so long as these tribesmen left the location, they could live and work wherever they wished; today removal orders confine an African to a specific place, usually among strangers in another province, some hundreds of miles from his home and where there may be no offer of employment. Secondly, in Mkhathle's case, evidence was produced to show that the Bafokeng chiefs did have some 'customary' powers of expulsion; today the Minister banishes without regard to any such factor.

The Native Administration Act

The Native Administration Act, 1921, made the Governor General Supreme Chief over all Africans in the Provinces of Natal, O.F.S. and the Transvaal, gave him full powers to remove Africans from one province to another, and, in respect of tribes objecting to removal orders, provided that the order be not carried out without the consent of both houses of parliament.

The following year, Mr. Mphahlele of Louis Trichardt was ordered to remove

1 Mkhathle and Others v. Union Government, A.D. 1925, p. 71.

2 Mphahlele v. Rex, TFD, 1928, p. 669.

BANISHMENT Contd.

from his home to the Barbeton district, failed to carry out the order, was charged, convicted and appealed. Justice Krause declared that the powers to interfere with the liberties of the subject given to the Governor General under this Act were despotic. The least that he, as judge, could do would be to scrutinise the order extremely carefully so as to give the best possible protection to him. He found the order did not specify clearly the place to which Mpafuri must move and that Mpafuri had therefore been wrongly convicted. The conviction was set aside.

In 1935, Chief Mabi¹ was convicted for non-compliance with an order. He appealed. But this time Justice Fischer declared that, although Steenbokgat to which Mabi had been ordered to go provided neither water nor accommodation for him, nevertheless the Minister had sole discretion in selecting the place, regardless of what hardship it might cause. The appeal was dismissed.

Appeal — And the Act is Changed

In 1946, Sofazonke Mpanza,² who had agitated for housing for Africans on the Witwatersrand, was served with an order to remove from Orlando to Coldplace, Ixopo. He did not comply, was convicted and appealed. He carried a Letter of Exemption issued under the old Law, 28 of 1865 (Natal) dated 1908 which read:

"James Sofazonke Mpanza is hereby declared to be exempted from and taken out of the operation of Native Law: and shall be, and is, henceforth subject to the ordinary laws of the Colony." 15.9.08. Sgd. Governor Natal.

Justice Watermeyer said that the right to interfere with the personal liberty of the individual native to live where he chooses is not . . . a provision of the ordinary laws of the country. He said: "Restraint of personal freedom by executive action is foreign to the principles of our South African law. Mpanza therefore won his appeal because his Letter of Exemption placed him under the law of the land, not under Native law.

But the Government took steps to close this loophole, and in 1952 the Native Administration Act was amended by Sect. 5 (5) (b) which read:—

"The provisions of this section shall be of full force and effect in relation to any native who has been exempted, in terms of section 31 of this Act, or any other law, from any laws specially affecting natives."

Another Appeal — Another Change

In August, 1953, Joseph Hugo Saliwa³ of Glen Grey, was ordered by the Gover-

nor General to remove to Pietersburg, Transvaal, and not to leave there without permission. As he failed to go he was removed under escort. He applied to the Transvaal courts for a declaration that the Governor General's order be null and void, on the grounds that he had "not been given the opportunity of submitting any defence to the allegations that he was conducting a campaign of defiance against the administrative measures." His application was not granted and he appealed to the Supreme Court.

Justices Centlivres, Schreiner, Brink, Hall and Beyers held that the principle 'audi alteram partem' (to hear the other side) was applicable. Saliwa was entitled to make representations. Since he had been given no such opportunity his removal had been unwarranted. He won his appeal and the order was set aside.

So the Minister immediately moved another amendment to the Act. He took upon himself the position of Supreme Chief of all Africans throughout the Union, including for the first time, the Cape. The second amendment made it unnecessary to serve the removal order on the person himself; it would be sufficient to leave it at his home, or even just to affix it to the door. This made it clear that there was no intention of allowing representations to be made.

A further clause provided that the person, now removed, might ask the Minister, through the Native Commissioner for the reasons for his banishment and a statement of information upon which the Governor General had based his decision. The Minister would be obliged to disclose only so much as he deemed to be in the public interest.

One Day's Freedom

Acting Chief Mabe,¹ of the Bathlako tribe, was ordered in 1955 to remove from Rustenburg to Driefontein, near Vryburg. On the 5th June, 1956, his order was set aside by the Transvaal Court because, as in Saliwa's case, he had been given no opportunity to make representations in his defence. But on the 7th June, 1956, he was served with a second order under the newly amended Act. (The amendment was signed on the 29th May). Making use of the amendment, he asked for the reason for his banishment and was presented with a list of vague accusations including the following:

The tribe's non-compliance with the Bantu Administration Department. The tribe's affairs retrogressed under your Chieftainship. Plans to allow the tribe greater share in the administration of its affairs through the Bantu Authorities failed.

Mabe applied to have the order set aside on the grounds that the reasons for its issue were inadequate. The application was refused and he appealed. The Appeal Court of Justices Ramsbottom, Rumpff and Theron held that the Minis-

ter had acted in 'good faith' in issuing the order even if the information supplied him about Mabe subsequently was found to have been incorrect. The appeal was dismissed.

The Last Loophole

On the 14th May, 1958, Jongimfene alias Twalafene Gobinamba Joyi¹ was issued with an order to remove from his home in Umtata to the S.A. Native Trust Farm, Wesselsvlei, near Kuruman, to remain there and not to return without the written permission of the Secretary of Native Affairs.

Through his attorney, Joyi asked the reasons for this order. On the 22nd April, 1959 he was informed that the reasons were that his "presence in, or at any place within easy reach of, the district of Umtata was inimical to the peace, order and good government of the Natives residing in the district." The information on which the Governor General had acted included allegations that Joyi had stated he was against the stabilisation of the land, had threatened with violence persons who were in favour of the adoption of the system of Bantu Authorities in the Transkeian Territories and soil rehabilitation measures, and supported persons engaged in resistance against the peaceful administration of the Natives in the Umtata area.

But, wrote the Minister, "all the information which induced the Governor General to issue the order cannot be disclosed to you without detriment to the public interest."

Mr. Joyi asked for details — what persons did he threaten? When did he say he was against stabilisation? Which persons 'engaged in resistance' did he support? But the Minister refused to reply. Mr. Joyi appealed to Court.

Now if Mr. Joyi or any other person removed under this Act were really guilty of any crime or had broken any law, he would be brought before the Courts. And the Minister or anyone else would have to substantiate and prove the allegations against such a person, and the Court would have to be satisfied that these allegations were true before it could convict and before the person could be punished by being removed from his home etc.

But in the above case, the judges held that although the Minister ought to make as full a disclosure of his reasons for issuing the removal order as would be compatible with the public interest, nevertheless he was the sole judge as to how much he could withhold. The appeal was dismissed.

The 1956 amendment to the Act giving the banished person the right to the reasons for his order was thus shown to be virtually useless. The very information on which the Minister has acted, and which the removed person could prove to be false, can be withheld from him. He can be wrongly accused, and wrongly removed, and has no legal redress.

(Continued on opposite page)

¹ Rex v. Mabi and Others, 1935, TPD,

² Rex v. Mpanza, A.D. 1946. p. 763.

p. 408.

³ Saliwa v. Min. N/A 1956 (11) p. 310.

¹ Mabe v. Min. N/A. SALR 1957 (3) 293 and 1958 (2) 506.

¹ Joyi v. Min. BAD, SALR 1961 (1) 210.

THE DECLINE OF EDUCATION

PART TWO

I said last month that, by international standards, 'white' education in South Africa was backward and that, instead of advancing, its standards were further declining. That decline is due to the Nationalists' determination to implement its narrow ideology in the schools.

BANISHMENT Contd.

The Powers of the Chiefs

Proclamation 400 of 30th November, 1960, issued during the Pondoland 'emergency' gives similar powers of removal of subjects to Chiefs. Section 12 reads:

"It shall be competent for any chief authorised thereto by the Minister either generally or in respect of a particular native —

to order, without prior notice to any native concerned, a native to remove with the members of his household and any livestock and moveable property from a place within the area of jurisdiction of such chief to any other place specified by such chief within such area, either permanently or for such period as is specified by such chief; . . ."

Sub-section (b) authorises the chief to demolish the hut from which the African and his family have been removed, and (c) gives the Chief power to remove by force if necessary. It is, of course, also an offence not to comply.

Thus the wheel turns full circle. The Minister of the South African government now confers on the African tribal chiefs the very powers of banishment which White government claims to have inherited from "tribal law and custom."

Did the Chiefs of olden times have these powers of banishment which the Minister has first taken for himself as 'Supreme Chief' and now bestows on the present day chiefs? It is doubtful whether they ever had such powers, and if they did, the circumstances in which they exercised them were totally different from the circumstances today. The chiefs were ultimately responsible to their people, and retained their powers only so long as they were considered satisfactory by the people. The present government, on the other hand, is not 'responsible' to the African people, and its power over them rests on the strength of the police and military more than on the African peoples' acquiescence, while the present day chiefs are responsible not to their subjects but to the government which appoints them.

NANCY DICK.

But the deficiencies in 'White' education represent only the smaller part of the total problem in our country. Our major concern is the state of non-white education. We discussed white education first only because the constant demand everywhere for equal educational opportunities for every child invariably refer to the standards of white education as the desirable goal.

In our efforts to achieve education for all, however, we must strive for standards far higher than those of today. The decline of white education standards is the result of an overall, oppressive Calvinist nationalism that is intent on destroying all independent thought. This narrow nationalism, let us remember, will not tolerate even those teachers who accept a large part of the Nationalist ideology, but nevertheless believe in subtler methods to propagate the concept of segregation, separation or white trusteeship.

The Destruction of Mission Education

Today the era of mission education seems to belong to the golden days of freedom that have long since vanished. I do not wish to condemn the mission schools out of hand; they performed a useful purpose. They gave an education where no other was available and many Congress leaders emerged from the classrooms of St. Peter's High School.

But mission schools are not what we need. It is the responsibility of the government to provide education for every child. Since it does not, mission education is at best a charitable substitute for the government's failure to fulfil its duty.

Mission institutions in general were part of the pattern of the Hertzog-Smuts plan to maintain white control of society. Nowhere did the schools try to educate men to grow out of that society. In many cases they openly preached subservience to the 'rule of law' and the people's press often had cause to raise loud complaints against the methods of those who controlled these institutions. Mission schools were often the scene of student strikes, of riots, of mass expulsions — and so, too, was Fort Hare — long before the advent of the Nationalist government.

Yet, despite the fact that these institutions often educated for a colour-bar society, they were not subservient enough for the Nationalists. Therefore, they were removed by government edict.

The Pattern of Nationalist Control

Nationalist policy is uniform, if nothing else. It demands complete control of the child's mind. And the steps taken against African, Coloured, Indian and European scholars fit into the same

pattern — the construction of a racist society that will persist for all time.

To ensure that young, independent men and women should never emerge, the African schools had first to be controlled. Thereafter, 'Bantu' education was introduced before the systematic tampering with 'white' education began.

The effects of 'Bantu' education were devastating and have already been amply described. There is no single honest parent, teacher or child who cannot catalogue the disasters of this policy:

the pernicious use of home language to tie down the young mind:

the sudden transition in Std. III to

English and Afrikaans instruction: the wholesale sacking of good teachers:

the closing down of secondary schools: the introduction of badly trained teachers:

the weeding out of rebellious students: the changing of curricula to adapt the student to "his place in society":

the stopping of school-feeding: destruction of enthusiasm amongst teachers:

large drift of men and women out of the profession:

further depression of teaching and achievement standards.

These disasters are all features of the corrupt 'Bantu' education policy.

The consequences of the new policy have been catastrophic:

high failure rates:

reduction of the number of secondary school students:

paucity of matriculants:

As for the tribal colleges! They have turned out to be glorified high schools, providing a mere facade of higher education, designed to train a stooge generation of administrators. In times gone by we condemned Fort Hare for its inferior education. But today — so far have our standards been debased by fourteen years of Nationalist party rule — we recall Fort Hare as that 'great institution of yesteryear'.

The Young Children of Today

In considering the educational problem, we dig deeper and find the underlying sociological problem. We find the young child of school-going age half-starved, living in slums, without books, comfort, leisure, freedom of mind to speculate and dream. He comes to school physically unable to stand up to a day's hard work. And it is this youth who is denied school-feeding, who has to pay for his school books (do not the heavens open up and spit in contempt that this should be so?) who has to drag 20 miles and more to attend school.

This lad is tomorrow's citizen, stripped of his future, denied what his young

(Continued at foot of page 12)

"Lest We Go Mad..."

THE MYTH OF RACE PURITY

"Many white South Africans believe that they belong to a pure race; this assumption lies behind legislation designed to 'maintain the purity of the race'." What does science have to say on this score?

"The traditional approach of scientists in the past was to relate the living forms of man to idealised racial types. If a race of ideal types could be found, it would be a pure race. Thus, consciously or unconsciously, anthropologists have envisaged pure races existing either today or in the past. The quest for pure race has tended to elevate race-purity to a sought-after quality. . . . Thus under the Nazi regime, race purity became a fetish; history was rewritten to show the alleged part of the Nordic demi-gods in the advance of civilisation.

"But the magic shadow-show of race purity has not been confined to Nazi Germany. South Africans too have had this fetish drummed into their heads by the legislators, so that it is possible for a man to write to 'The Star' (6.3.1959) 'The undeniable fact is that the over-

This article is composed entirely of some short excerpts from a speech delivered by Professor Phillip V. Tobias on 8th May, 1961, in Johannesburg, on the subject:

THE MEANING OF RACE.

The excerpts seem to us appropriate and timely, when the purity of white South Africa is being upheld, heroically, by drunken hooligan gangs — the last hope of white civilisation.

The full text of the speech is obtainable in pamphlet form from the South African Institute of Race Relations.

whelming majority of people are without foreign admixture" . . . and even to say: "The evil is not race purity but in the oppression of one race by another, and in wanton destruction of this purity through miscegenation; for the pure-blooded types of human beings are the most excellent forms of life."

"Let us in South Africa beware lest we become race-purity drunk and go mad in search of the entirely mythical Eldorado of race purity.

"For we have no objective scientific evidence that "pure" races of man exist anywhere on earth today, nor that a "pure" race has ever existed.

"The boundary lines of race are vague and tail away into the territories of adjacent racial groups. Scientifically, it is impossible therefore to classify each single individual into a particular racial category. Especially is this true where the area of vague and blurred overlap between racial groups has been made so much bigger by the intensity of inter-racial crossing in South African history.

"No wonder we were told in 1957 that seven teams had to be created to classify the races in South Africa . . . No wonder too that it was reported in 'The Star' on the 13th January, 1958, that the special committee which the Minister of the Interior had appointed four years previously to co-ordinate the different (and often conflicting) definitions of races in various South African statutes had had to report that they found the task impossible. Unfortunately, the Minister's response was to re-appoint the committee and ask them to have another shot!

"At one time or another, every conceivable anatomical disharmony and social evil has been attributed to racial mixing. Recently we were treated to the spectacle of a white minister of religion expressing himself thus on the Coloured people, an example of a hybrid group:

'Here we have a people who came in to being through miscegenation with

the whites. And as a mongrel race they are, to us, the writing on the wall, a warning of what can happen with intermixture. They are Western in their code of living. They speak our language, sing our songs, live in our country, but they are a people notorious for their moral corruption. Lies are to them a second nature. They are absolutely unreliable in any matter, have little ambition and get their greatest pleasure from a bottle of wine and debauchery.'

Unthinkingly, all these features are attributed to results of mixing genes. And the good minister is guilty of a three-fold inaccuracy — firstly, there is no justification for attributing these characteristics to the Coloured people at large; secondly he is blaming the genes for features which science has shown are culturally determined, not genetically; and thirdly, he is lightly jumping to the conclusion that these particular effects result from the mixing of genes.

Not one of the components of this man's thinking could stand up to the cold light of scientific scrutiny; and they have a ring about them which is unpleasantly reminiscent of . . . one of Germany's leading racist-anthropologists, Günther.

The views he expressed are all too frequent amongst South Africans; even, one might be tempted to add, South Africans of different races. Yet by the same strange process of double-think . . . we find Professor D. F. du Toit Malherbe in his 'Stamouers van die Afrikanervolk' declaring approvingly: "Mixed marriages gave our population its unity!" Only he meant mixed marriages between White and White! He found it necessary to add:

"Nobody in South Africa need worry about a bit of non-white blood (mostly from Eastern people with a high civilisation)" — note again the confusion of civilisation and race — "which filtered in in the beginning as a result of mixed marriages. It has been diluted by pure blood from Europe, with the result that the few families in question today have some of the blondest people among them. The blood composition of the Afrikaner people as a whole is today purer than that of many of Europe's and America's peoples."

I think it is readily apparent that the writer has been guilty — in this short passage — not only of flying in the face of historical facts, but of perpetrating every single one of the unscientific howlers to which I have referred.

The tragedy for our young children, the South Africans of tomorrow, is that our school books on History and Race Studies are filled with this sort of thing. Small wonder that young people, nurtured on such pseudo-scientific fallacies, grow up to approve policies based upon these very fallacies.

EDUCATION Contd.

white neighbour gets as a right. In the face of these circumstances, education might seem almost a luxury that parents cannot afford to worry about. Their main problem, might seem to be one of bare survival, of keeping themselves and their children alive.

It might seem as if the care the Nationalists take to control education is wasted. While the people live in the abject conditions of 1962, how can their children acquire education? Why worry about the open universities, if there are to be no matriculants knocking at the doors?

But the Nationalists know better than to accept so crude an argument. They know full well that there is a burning desire for knowledge, that the young child will overcome the most damnable conditions to achieve education. The Nationalists know that many will forget the empty stomach, will overlook the tattered clothes, will find a way to education. And to take care of this they offer the eager students 'Bantu' education, doled out in schools that are regimented, watched, controlled.

The problem does indeed transcend that of education. In its magnitude it is the problem of breaking down tyranny and achieving for all people true human dignity. Nevertheless, while working to reach the higher and greater ideal, the struggle must go on unceasingly to free education from its fetters, to offer pure education to every child, to open all schools and universities on a non-racial basis. Above all, to educate the future citizens for life in a free South Africa.

A new series of A- and H-Bomb tests has been started by the United States of America, on a test site in the Pacific. The killing, maiming and crippling by-products of those tests are being set free on the winds and the ocean. They will strike down — in ways not even fully known even now to science — men, women and children of every country, of this generation and of generations to come.

The U.S. Government justifies these new tests on the grounds that no agreement to ban testing of such weapons can be reached with the USSR. Their talks on such an agreement have turned on one main issue: Can any nuclear explosions be detected by monitoring stations from afar? The U.S. representatives say No! And accordingly, they demand, as the price of a test ban, the stationing of inspection teams in Soviet territory. The USSR says Yes; explosions can be detected anywhere in the world. Therefore, the American proposal for inspection teams are not to see that the ban is observed, but for purposes of spying and intelligence.

Here are the facts. Let the ordinary people judge — for their lives depend upon it.

The Truth about the A-Bomb Tests

VIEW 1.

Academician Anatoly Alexandrov — Director of the Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy, and Soviet M.P.

The West claims that underground nuclear explosions cannot be distinguished from earthquakes, and that therefore every "suspicious" phenomenon should be studied by on-the-spot inspection. Experiments held to date, however, have shown that it is possible to detect underground nuclear explosions in any point on the globe with existing national equipment.

Moreover, a nuclear explosion can be distinguished from an earthquake or any other type of interference with a high degree of reliability.

The nature of the earth tremor resulting from an underground explosion differs sharply from tremors caused by earthquakes.

It differs in the direction of the initial earth displacement.

After a nuclear blast, the initial displacement at all points moves from the epicentre of the explosion outwards.

In the case of an earthquake, however, it moves in various directions — in some regions towards the centre of the earthquake, in others away from it.

Accuracy

These regions are clearly divided by a line along which earth displacement is equal to zero.

Owing to this difference, seismographic observation make it possible to distinguish an explosion from an earthquake with adequate accuracy.

For the purpose of verifying this, on February 2, 1962, the USSR set off an

underground nuclear explosion, which was studied by Soviet seismic stations.

In addition, it was registered by a considerable number of foreign stations, for instance in Upsala, Sweden, at a distance of 3,900 km. (over 2,400 miles—Ed.) from the site of the explosion, in Strasbourg and Besancon in France—about 5,000 km. (3,100 miles), in the Congo — 7,000 km. (4,350 miles), as well as in the United States.

All these stations registered the direction of the initial displacement from the centre of the explosion, while the French established that it was a nuclear explosion and located it.

The same conclusion was reached by seismographers in other countries.

Clarity

The instruments which registered that explosion had not been devised specially for the purpose. Neither were methods of eliminating interference used.

The most important result of those measurements was that the initial displacement in the direction from the epicentre of the explosion outwards was established also in the so-called shadow zone, at distances of from 1,000 to 2,000 km. (625-1,250 miles) and beyond that zone at distances of from 2,000 to 5,000 km. (1,250 to 3,100 miles) and more.

The measurements showed with absolute clarity that an explosion had taken place.

At a distance of 4,000 km. (2,500 miles) the amplitude of the initial displacement exceeded interference level three to four times over.

Interference can be cut by nine-tenths through comparison of the readings of several seismographs.

A slight improvement in the existing seismological stations, therefore, makes possible detection of underground nuclear explosions in any country.

The network of the national seismological stations of all countries of the world will not only detect reliably what is called "suspicious phenomena", but will also make it possible to decide with adequate authenticity whether an underground explosion has taken place.

Confirmed

This has been confirmed by the Americans themselves. On December 10, 1961 in New Mexico they set off a nuclear explosion called "Gnome", with a power of only 5 kilotons. That explosion was registered in Sweden, Finland, Japan and the USSR, at a distance of about 10,000 km. (6,200 miles) from the site of the explosion.

Everywhere the direction of the initial earth displacement was established, testifying that it was a nuclear explosion.

The instruments used were not at the level of the best interference-free devices.

Tests that have been held, therefore, show that control over nuclear tests with the help of national resources is sufficiently effective for underground blasts as well as with respect to surface explosions and those in and above water.

The western objections that national controls are "inadequate" have no scientific basis.

These objections stem from a desire to avoid the prohibition of nuclear tests, a desire to continue the nuclear arms race.

VIEW 2.

K. Zilliacus — Labour M.P., Great Britain

The British Government had drawn up a plan which their top atomic scientists, e.g. Sir William Penney and Sir Solly Zuckerman, had tried out for a year. It depended on a series of monitoring posts in Commonwealth territory from the United Kingdom to Australia, with the chief station in Pakistan. It had proved capable of detecting all the American and Soviet tests underground as well as in the atmosphere, and they were satisfied that nothing beyond a negligible minimum of one or two kiloton tests, even underground, could escape detection. They were sent privately to Washington to put their plan to the Administration. It deeply impressed U.S. atomic scientists. But the Administration turned it down on the purely political ground that no plan that did not provide for stringent international controls would be acceptable to Congress (that is, to the Pentagon-A.E.C. lobby in Congress).

If the British had stuck to their plan, put it forward at Geneva, published it, and argued for it, the already powerful opposition in the U.S. would have strengthened to the point where the Administration might have had to give ground.

The Neutrals Speak

In fact, the neutrals have already suggested what should be an acceptable procedure on this point: Let the monitoring stations be manned by "neutrals", and where a seismic disturbance was recorded which the national monitoring systems could not classify (i.e. could not decide whether it was a test or an earthquake) let a team be sent for an on-the-spot investigation. (The latest neutral proposal calls for an agreed network of stations to monitor all explosions, and if and when an unclassifiable

explosion is detected, for a neutral commission, in consultation with the country concerned, to decide how to find out what happened. With this might go the subsequent right of a party to the agreement to end the suspension of tests if not satisfied with the commission's decision).

Scientists Speak

Although the argument has time and again been proven hollow by scientists of stature, the U.S. has always fallen back on the premise that underground tests are undetectable. On April 22 the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, reported that despite three years of research, it had made "no material progress" toward detecting secret underground tests.

In a devastating joint rebuttal eight prominent scientists in the April 14 issue of the *Post* demolished the undetectability theory on underground tests. The scientists were Jay Orear, associate professor of physics, Cornell; William F. Schreiber, associate professor of electrical engineering, MIT; Gerald Holton, professor of physics, Harvard; Salvador E. Luria, professor of microbiology, MIT; Edwin E. Salpeter, professor of physics, Cornell; Philip Morrison, professor of physics, Cornell; Mathew Meselson, associate professor of molecular biology, Harvard; and Bernard T. Feld, professor of physics, MIT.

They wrote: "Dr. Teller has repeatedly attempted to 'prove' that the Russians could easily conceal underground nuclear tests. A couple of months ago a remarkable experiment, Project Gnome, was conducted by a laboratory recently headed by Dr. Teller. A small five-kiloton shot — one-fourth the size of the Hiroshima bomb, was fired deep in a bed of salt, material supposedly ideal to muffle and conceal underground bomb tests. Contrary to predictions, this salt-bed shot was picked up and identified as an underground explosion as far away as Finland and Japan. Based on published reports, one would estimate the muffling factor to be at least ten times smaller than the factor quoted by Teller in his articles."

In bland contrast, the Congressional report said: "For the next several years and possibly thereafter there could be a race between improved means of detection and identification (of underground shots) as against improved means of concealing and muffling nuclear explosions."

The whole argument, however, is irrelevant because underground tests are of no value without testing their effects in the atmosphere. In his testimony, Dr. Ruina said: "For the explosion effects you must test in the atmosphere. For actual bomb devices, I am told one can test some things underground on a small scale, but one is never sure until he has a full-scale test, and that takes the atmosphere."

NIGHTSONG — CITY

*Sleep well, my love, sleep well:
the harbour lights glaze over restless
docks,
police cars cockroach through the
tunnel streets;*

*from the shanties creaking iron sheets
violence like a bug-infested rug is
tossed
and fear is immanent as sound in the
wind-swung bell;*

*the long day's anger pants from sand
and rocks;
but for this breathing night at least,
my land, my love, sleep well.*

EROSION — TRANSKEI

*Under green drapes the scars scream,
red wounds wail soundlessly,
beg for assuaging, satiation;
warm life dribbles seawards with the
streams.*

*Dear my land, open for my
possessing,
ravaged and dumbly submissive to our
will,
in curves and uplands my sensual
delight
mounts, and mixed with fury is
amassing*

*torrents tumescent with love and pain.
Deep-dark and rich, with deceptive
calmness
time and landscape flow to new
horizons —
in anguished impatience await the
quickenings rains.*

D. A. Brutus

FIGHTING TALK, JUNE, 1962

BRIGHTER CLEANERS

229, 2nd AVENUE
WYNBERG

(opp. PUTCO)

Also at 15th AVENUE
ALEXANDRA TOWNSHIP

STEWART'S REXALL PHARMACY

S. Joffe, M.P.S.

CHEMIST & DRUGGIST
PHOTOGRAPHIC SUPPLIES

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

THE THING

New Writing

A STORY BY T. H. GWALA

The national road wound like a wriggling lazy snake and disappeared at a bend next to an unsheltered bus stop. The road shone dully in the struggling winter sun. Off the road was a huge cross of Christ with his head drooping on one side. A track led away from the road and gradually disappeared into the broken land, forming itself into different footpaths. A hillock overlooked a humble wattle and daub house. Here Violet and Ma-Ndlovu were conversing in suppressed but agitated tones.

It had spread like an epidemic in an overcrowded city. It had happened at Ndwedwe. It was happening at New Hanover and all over. Unemployment was a disease gnawing away into the lives of the people. *Imvume* and *umsendo**, had become a nightmare.

'We too have to do something about it', Violet suggested. 'You gather women of your area, auntie, and I'll do likewise in my area.'

After some argument Ma-Ndlovu expressed agreement. From Ma-Ndlovu's house your voice could be carried to kraals across Umngeni River, ten miles away. Th's land was kept aside in the old days when Sir Theophilus Shepstone was carving up the province. It was reserved, as it were, for the native people of the land.

* * *

On the appointed day, women gathered. In European dress, tribal dress, and a few in ritual dress. Few unmarried women — particularly amongst those in tribal dress. Ma-Ndlovu led her group to Violet's home. The number swelled as it passed other homes. By the time it reached the hill leading up to Violet's home it was like a cattle sale.

Another large group had gathered on the yard of Violet's home. A heated debate was going on between Violet's ageing mother and a women's *umanyano* leader.

'Violet is your only child. You allow her to go to these things. Don't you know that women are being killed at Ixopo, and New Hanover?'

The old girl drawled in her bass voice. 'Yes Ma-Shezi, I have been debating the matter with Violet. I would not like to lose her. But after all if Violet has to die she can't be saved here. If people die there they also die here.'

'Last time you asked me for money for those lawyers of yours. You didn't learn from that potato case.'

'Yes, we pay so much to the church, the church must also pay to us in our need.'

A chill came into Violet's stomach. She remembered the time of the potato boycott, and that white man who had driven a Native Affairs truck into the reserve. He had blown his hooter and invited people to come and buy potatoes.

'You can't pass here,' she had told him brandishing a fat stick. A crowd had gathered. It had become rowdy. The African assistant had pleaded with his knees buckling. He was mumbling something about starving children . . . only doing his work . . . being black like themselves. Most of his pleadings were lost in the din. Ma-Ndlovu was already in front barricading the way. Strongly built and powerful, the driver already knew fear.

'Please let me turn back,' he kept on saying. Before anyone answered, the wheels of his truck were spinning skywards, his legs juggling in the air. A number of boys had got round him with some open knives. One already had his figure bent over the petrol tank trying to set it alight. Ma-Ndlovu got this one by the scruff of his neck and gave him a hard push. 'Don't burn the lorry,' she shouted.

'Let me finish him off', one man said spitting a stump of tobacco from his lips. His brains being muddled up with liquor he weaved clumsily bumping against other people. 'I'll murder him', he kept shouting as Ma-Ndlovu held him by the lapel of his coat and lifted him up like a puppy so that his toes barely touched the ground. The man's lethal weapon consisted of a crumpling lump of earth.

The potatoes were in the grass and in the donga when a police van came. A number of women, the boys among them,

suddenly took to their heels. The boys being fleet of foot had disappeared by the time the police van pulled up.

The dipping clerk who had slipped away to call the police had identified about thirty women when he suddenly came upon Ma-Ndlovu and Violet. He stopped and looked away. 'Talk man,' the sergeant said. 'Were also these among them?' The clerk scratched with his boot showing his big toe. Yes, these too were trying to murder *inkosi*.

A lawyer from Durban had come to defend them. But the case left a pang in Violet. The humble fees of the lawyer remained unpaid. It was like death. It kept creeping into Violet's mind. Now here was Ma-Shezi. God.

* * *

There was a short conference among the women. At the intersection, three miles from the court, all women would assemble and proceed to the Native Commissioner, carrying a white flag. Women from the Valley of a Thousand Hills, women from neighbouring white farms, women from the reserves, women whose husbands held small free-hold plots among rocky sands. Women from all over. A long procession of over two miles marching out of step, just shuffling. Ma-Ndlovu and Violet were in front. About four paces ahead of them was a woman in tribal dress wearing headgear. She carried a white flag on a white staff.

The women came on slowly and without music. Passing cars on the main road pulled to the side and stopped, two long lines of them facing opposite directions as if they were attending a sports carnival. The women shuffling, some tripping on others, came nearer and nearer. The Native Commissioner, considering himself in a state of siege, barricaded himself in his office and waited.

The District Commandant, a diminutive man, had deployed all his forces ready to engage in battle. Some were brandishing their weapons, challenging attack. The head of the procession was just reaching the court yard with the tongue of the flag just kissing the branches of the trees on the edge of the yard when the Commandant came forward speaking fluent, ungrammatical Zulu.

'Stop where you are and tell me what you want quickly', he said putting his right hand forward like a traffic cop.

The woman in headgear was taken aback and jerked the white flag backwards. There was a general murmur among those women in front. Violet stepped forward and said, 'We have come to see *Ndabazabantu*.' The Commandant turned to his aide and said,

'Tell them the Native Commissioner is not in.'

When this had been conveyed the woman with the flag said pleadingly, '*Silethe izikhalo zethu enkosini*' (We have brought our grievances to the lord).

'I have told you the Native Commissioner is not here. I now give you five minutes in which to disperse.'

Ma-Ndlovu moved between Violet and the woman in the tribal headgear, putting her hand forward to present the petition to the Commandant. Women at the back and in the middle of the procession were still moving and shuffling when the thing exploded. There were tears in the eyes of the women in front and the middle. They started scattering in all directions. The white flag was torn and trampled upon, and the white staff changed hands and was applied on the women.

There was rumbling as they broke formation. Those at the back turned and ran without knowing what was happening. Blows were now raining on those who had been in front but were now the end of the tail. They passed Mfushane's shop in full flight. Some tried to seek shelter there. But Mfushane who, a short while ago, had displayed such personal verbal courage in support of the marching women, was so terrified that he bolted from the verandah into the shop and secured the door, adding his weight against it as reinforcement. Some of the police rushed onto the verandah and armed themselves with battle instruments displayed for sale, ranging from pick-handles to choppers and sickles.

Violet turned back and saw Ma-Ndlovu trying to fight her

(Continued on next page)

* Permit to seek work and endorsement out of town.

THE THING Continued

way out. 'Ibuya madoda!' (Stage a comeback ye men). A few women turned and rained stones on the police. Some picked up pieces of wood and applied them with some effect.

Ma-Ndlovu was stunned by a blow on her head. She stumbled on her knees and fought her way out. The District Commandant came straight for her. He aimed his baton at her head. She snatched the weapon, turned and landed it on his head. The Commandant spun round several times, then fell to the tarmac with his tunic covered with blood. A sergeant rushed at her. She felled him with a quick blow. A policeman came round with a spade and aimed at her head. She warded off the blow. The spade cut three of her fingers. A

hard blow from another policeman dazed her and she fell with her knees on the road. She was now bleeding profusely.

Violet was bleeding, blood pouring over her face and dripping down onto her dress. 'Ibuya madoda!' she shouted again. But the police had the better of them. Ma-Ndlovu was handcuffed and violently thrown into a pick-up van. Many women were bleeding, others were bruised. Those with no injuries were panting with terror. There was groaning and moaning all along the national road. Some took a rest under the cross of Christ to gather breath and search for their neighbours and relatives.

Violet arrived with half a page of the twelve page petition. It was covered with blood. One word stood out as Violet looked at it . . . poverty . . . Her mind was now with Ma-Ndlovu.

LISTEN TO AFRICA

Jazz

Jazz is undeniably the gift of Africa to the world, a gift that has filtered with incredible rapidity into the farthest corners — and its universal quality is proved by its universality.

The voice of Africa comes to us over the airwaves from thousands of miles away. Sometimes it is called 'The Voice of America'. But under the splutter and meretricious ornament, the authentic voice is Africa's.

The jazz voices of the world are many — a veritable Pentacostal babel. But they all began in that Mississippi delta: in the slums and brothels of Storyville and in the streets that are imperishable strands in the fabric of jazz — Rampart and Basin and 12th and all the others. The sad men who congregated on Congo Square once a week to beat a drum (during the week they were sometimes forced to beat it under a bathtub because it was illegal) are the same sad Africans who have sent their reverberations around the world: the accents of the Ivory Coast, the Gold

Coast have gone round the world from Congo Square.

Many of the voices today are garbled and unintelligible. Some speak in private dialects to the initiated or the insane. Others are so overloaded with the schmaltz of a popcorn culture that they make us queasy. But there are still voices in the mainstream of jazz. They speak with the old fierceness, tenderness, raucousness and sincerity. They are the unfailing springs of the old excitement and pleasure.

But the voice of Africa is also in Africa. And perhaps nowhere more authentic than in our own Southern Africa. Yet our ignorance is often colossal and always appalling.

There exists in South Africa today — you can hear it any night in any location — a music as vibrant and authentic and satisfying as anything to be heard in the world. But lots of us do not see or hear it.

It may be that we have been spoilt by the Voice of America — we can't

hear our authentic local music because we have heard too much Ellington and Sinatra. Even our own King Kong has helped the process, because it is certainly not great jazz (despite the fact that Todd Matshikiza's music has worn so well and satisfyingly in the years since we saw the production).

Great music we have. And great jazzmen: Kippie Moeketsi, Sol Klaaste, Dollar Brand. Great technicians, but also, sometimes, great artists. And every day there is good jazz being made, either as written or head music. And there is a multitude of unknowns.

It has a peculiarly South African — township flavour. No, this is not a defence of ethnic grouping but a recognition of its special qualities: its rhythms — especially in repetitious, riff-like phrases — in the subtleties of its rhythms and harmonies, and in peculiarities of scoring caused largely by instruments available or traditional here. The penny-whistle field has a very large corner all to itself.

Hits have come out of Southern Africa — dressed up versions of Wimoweh and Skokiaan come readily to mind — and have gone around the world. Evidence, if evidence was needed.

But most important for the jazz-lover: simply to be able to hear living jazz: and if he chooses, to watch it being made before his eyes.

We can do it most anywhere in South Africa.

COMMUNIQUE

Ambassadors Scipion and De Silva expressed their keen appreciation of all that had been done by their host and Mrs. Beelzebub to make their stay as comfortable and informative as possible in the circumstances. They had met many of the natives who were assured that they could speak freely to the distinguished guests without fear of victimisation, and had seen or heard no evidence of undue mistreatment. There had been a few allegations that the brimstone ration was inadequate and the Director undertook to investigate these allegations. The Ambassadors had suggested that the United Nations would perhaps be prepared to assist the more needy inhabitants with warm winter clothing, and the Director replied that if funds were provided he would consider making suitable use of them. The talks were held in a delightful atmosphere of cordial friendship and frankness and Mr. Beelzebub expressed confidence that his visitors would be returning for a longer stay in future in somewhat different circumstances.

