

FIGHTING TALK

ORGAN OF THE SPRINGBOK LEGION

VOL. ~~2~~⁷ No. 6. JUNE, 1953.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

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

BEHIND THE RAID

ON the morning of June 4th there arrived at the Legion's offices in Johannesburg a posse of detectives, armed with a search warrant, a courteous manner and a distinct aura of bonhomie. The Legion's office workers rose to the occasion and received the visitors with equal courtesy. Drawers, cupboards, shelves and files were looked through and, after ninety minutes, the officers of the law retired with a collection of minute books, welfare case-files, files on the Broederbond, the Nationalist Party, the Labour Party, the Peace Council and the World Veterans' Federation. They left behind the file on the United Party.

To the homes of four members of the National Executive Committee they proceeded and removed some pamphlets and some books, including, as everyone knows, three booklets on Moral Rearmament. Presumably the searchers were attracted by such titles as, "Fight for a New World" and "A World Force and a World Idea."

And what does it all add up to?

In the first place, the Springbok Legion is not plotting a revolution. In the second place, even if it were, it would not leave blueprints lying around public offices. Of course, so many books, magazines and pamphlets have been banned in recent months by the Minister of the Interior, that it should be possible to find at least one such item in most homes in South Africa. But possession of such material can hardly add up to 'treason'.

It becomes clear, then, that the raid had a purpose other than the ostensible one. That purpose was to intimidate the great mass of anti-Nationalists in South Africa. We have said in these columns many times before that the Nationalists have calculatingly employed the weapons of fear and intimidation in the political field. They have frightened the timid and credulous into believing that a network of saboteurs was ready to poison water-wells and to seize the broadcasting system: that the non-Europeans were determined to drive the white men into the sea: that the Torch Commando was a Communistic body, planning to take over the government of the country by a military coup d'etat: that the 'communists' had organised a school for firebugs in the Peninsula: that the Defiance Campaign leaders were in league with Kenya's Mau-Mau.

All so fantastic as to be scoffed at by sensible people, but frightening enough to leave in the best minds a sediment of doubt, a reluctance to run unnecessary risks.

Business men have been persuaded to play safe in the

realm of political activity by threats of suspended import permits, and a decrease in quotas. Civil servants have been edged up to toe the line by the rumours of political espionage throughout the service. Bishops have been attacked and judges threatened with the sack.

A number of people have been 'named' under an act of Parliament, the terms of which are so vague as to permit their application to any anti-Nationalist. The Riotous Assemblies Act has been twisted to penalise any speaker who seeks to improve race relations.

We can begin to see where the raid on the Legion's offices fits in, following, as it does, the most recent batch of banning notices, served on nearly all the leaders of the non-European peoples. The Government is determined ruthlessly to suppress all, but all, opposition to its fascist policies and programme.

We would be simpletons to imagine that the Government will stop at intimidation measures. It is not impossible that charges of treason and revolution will be prepared against the most militant anti-Nationalist fighters. We should be prepared to see organisations singled out for suppression and individuals deprived entirely of their civil rights and democratic liberties . . . more and more prohibited immigrants, more passports refused, more voters removed from the rolls, more newspaper suppressed and so on.

The pertinent question arises: BUT FOR HOW LONG?

The answer lies not in the stars but in ourselves. Our white people, born in freedom, carry the answer with them. Our black people, born in servitude, but given a picture of a free life, carry the answer with them. Not for ever, not for long can human beings remain emotional, intellectual, economic or physical slaves, however tyrannical the oppressors. The history of mankind is the history of man's successful struggle towards liberty. History continues to be written in South Africa.

The road to liberation is dark. One light from past years illumines our path—the established democratic right and duty of a people to reject its government, when that government descends to unethical, unconstitutional, un-democratic means to keep itself in power. Another light emerging in these days is the growing consciousness that freedom will be won for South Africa only by the combined forces of white and non-white democrats. Each man carries his own light. Our present duty is to let no man douse the glim; on the contrary to ensure an ever brighter flame for freedom.

BARRIS BROS.

WHOLESALE MERCHANTS AND
DIRECT IMPORTERS
120 Victoria Street — GERMISTON.
P.O. Box 146. Phones 51-1281; 51-3589.

**STANDARD
FURNISHING**

CO. LTD.

37a Prince's Avenue, Benoni.
"EVERYTHING FOR THE HOME"
Telephone No. 54-3359.

Telegraphic and Cable Address:
"PORTERGERM"

DRAPERS AND COMPLETE
OUTFITTERS

**HERBERT PORTER
& CO., LTD.**

At the Subway — Germiston.
Phones 51-466 (3 lines) Box 37.
And at Witbank, Standerton and
Malvern.

Bedroom Suites by

**ANGLO UNION FURNITURE
MNFERS. LTD.**

Stocked by
LEADING FURNITURE
STORES

Tel. 22-9977.

**Frederick Furnishers
(PTY.), LTD.**

COMPLETE HOUSE FURNISHERS
Metro Centre, Bree Street,
JOHANNESBURG

PARISIAN BAKERY

(PTY.) LTD.

— for —

QUALITY BREAD AND CAKES.

We Specialize in
WEDDING & BIRTHDAY CAKES
33/35/37 Macintyre Street, Jeppe
Phone 24-2460.

**SUPPORT THE ..
NATIONAL WAR
MEMORIAL
HEALTH FOUNDATION**

Phone 23-7134 P.O. Box 9598

**S. M. NUDELMAN & CO.
(PTY.) LTD.**

Ladies' Clothing Manufacturers

MAKERS OF

'MYRU'

Man Tailored Garments

40, SHERWELL STREET,

DOORNFONTEIN, JOHANNESBURG

APEX

SALAD AND COOKING

OIL

• • •

THE COOK'S BEST
FRIEND

Juno Furnishing Co.

64 KNOX STREET.

Phone 51-1106 - - GERMISTON.

FOR A SQUARE DEAL

CONTACT US

For All Your
JEWELLERY
and Fancy Goods Requirements

Consult

**WHOLESALE JEWELLERS
ASSOCIATION
(PTY.), LTD.**

Maitland Street,
BLOEMFONTEIN

**TRUMP CLOTHING
MANUFACTURERS**

(PTY.) LTD.

CENTRAL ROAD — FORDSBURG.

Phone 34-4529.

Makers of:

TREET'S TROUSERS

— and —
ACROBAT SUITS.**SUPPORT
the
RED CROSS****MAYFAIR ESTATE AGENCY**

(PTY.), LTD.

Sales of Property Negotiated.
Bonds Arranged. Insurance Transacted.

134 Central Avenue, MAYFAIR.

Phone 35-1191. Box 26, Fordsburg.

PROBLEMS ON PAPYRUS

By "ABACUS."

THE oldest mathematical manuscript in existence is a papyrus roll made by the ancient Egyptians of very thin longitudinal slices (each about a foot long) of a Nile River plant, the papyrus. The edges of the slices were overlapped then glued together and pressed. On such a strip, perhaps a foot wide and sometimes many feet long, the Egyptians traced the picture symbols, or glyphs, of their highly picturesque hieroglyphic system of writing. The long sheet was then rolled on a cylinder.

One day more than 3,500 years ago a learned Egyptian scribe sat down to copy a very useful old roll which was probably so worn that it had to be re-copied. With writing materials he inscribed on a new papyrus the title, date and his own name as follows:

"Rules for enquiring into nature, and for knowing all that exists (every) mystery . . . every secret. Behold this roll was written in Year 33, month 4 of the inundating season . . . (under the majesty of King of Upper) and Lower Egypt Auserre, endowed with life, in the likeness of a writing of antiquity made in the time of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Nemare. It was the scribe Ahmose who wrote this copy."

This old papyrus, 13 inches wide and 19 feet long, now lies preserved between two strips of glass in the British Museum.

By the names of the ancient kings mentioned in the title just quoted, Egyptologists have dated the manuscript earlier than the 16th century before Christ, and the older one the scribe was copying is definitely dated in the 19th century B.C. Thus we have a glimpse of mathematics as it was nearly 4,000 years ago.

Today I want to bring you glimpses of this segment of ancient culture, this page from the book of time, to show how closely, in its very infancy, mathematics was related to human affairs.

The first set of rules refer to the resolution of fractions. The Egyptian could comprehend only unit fractions, that is, fractions with one for the numerator, like $1/5$, $1/6$, $1/10$, etc. (The single exception was $2/3$). His only way to express 2 divided by 5 (which we call $2/5$) was to add unit fractions, thus: $1/5$, $1/10$, $1/10$ (placing the fractions next to one another meant adding them). He wrote no such thing as $3/4$, but 3 divided by 4 was written $1/2$, $1/4$. Voluminous tables were needed to show the quotient of 2 divided by the prime numbers from 5 to 101. For example, the expression for 2 divided by 29 is $1/24$

plus $1/58$ plus $1/174$ plus $1/232$. What a system!

One problem starts: "Estimate of the food of a poultry farm." The amount of food needed daily for fattening a goose is given and, of course the manuscript has not the word goose, but a picture of one! Another problem concerns an "Example of exchanging bread for beer." Problem 69 reads: "Three and a half hekat of flour made into 80 loaves. Let me know the content of a single loaf in flour. Let me know their strength." The "hekat" is a unit of measure equal to about $1/7$ of our bushel. The answer is laboriously worked out at $1/32$ of a hekat plus 4 ro. The "ro" is a smaller unit — $1/320$ of a hekat.

Problem 65 reads: "Example of reckoning out 100 loaves for 10 men, a sailor, a foreman and a watchman with double."

The meaning of it all (as shown by the solution) is that 7 men have single rations and 3 men (the sailor, foreman and watchman) have double rations. The solution is accurately, though laboriously, done. Each man is to get $7\frac{2}{3}$ plus $1/39$ loaves and each "officer" $15\frac{1}{3}$ plus $1/26$ plus $1/78$ loaves. We would say $7\frac{9}{13}$ and $15\frac{5}{13}$.

All of the problems are of a practical nature. No generalizations were made and no theorizing had been done. The rules were empirical ones, discovered through experience.

Occasionally, however, what seems to be puzzle problems were inserted, like Problem 67, which reads: "Example of reckoning the produce of a herdsman. Behold now this herdsman came to the numbering of cattle with 70 oxen: said this accountant of cattle to this herdsman, How few are the head of oxen which thou hast brought! Where then are thy numerous head of oxen? This herdsman said to him, What I have brought thee is two-thirds of one-third of the cattle which thou didst entrust to me. Count for me and thou wilt find me complete." The man had probably been instructed to bring on a certain day only a fractional part of the cattle, which had been entrusted to his care for a long

time, the cattle meanwhile having increased in number. Since $2/3$ of $1/3$ is $2/9$, it is easy for a school boy to reason out that if 70 is $2/9$ of all the cattle, the total number is $9/2$ times 70, which is 315. It is even easier to do it by using algebraic notation. But the Egyptian knew no algebraic notation and did not know how to use $2/9$. His solution is therefore very cumbersome.

Of particular interest is Problem 50. It reads: "Method of reckoning a circular piece of land of diameter 9 khet. What is its area in land?" ("Khet" is the name of a linear unit). The statement of the problem is accompanied by a crudely drawn circle. The solution begins thus: "Take away thou $1/9$ of it, namely, 1; the remainder is 8." "Make thou the multiplication, 8 times 8; it becomes 64. This is its area in land."

What the Egyptians did, then, was to square $8/9$ of the diameter of a circle to get the area. This is done in several other mensuration problems in the manuscript.

You recall that to get the area of a circle, we multiply the square of the radius of a circle by a number called pi, the value of which to 4 decimals is 3.1416—or, with less precision, $3\frac{1}{7}$, which many of you have used. If we compare the Egyptian's area with ours we discover this to be $2/3$ of one percent greater. If we use 3.1605 (instead of 3.1416 for pi), we get the same area. It is not surprising that his answer is wrong but it is astonishing that he came so close to the area in view of his general knowledge of mathematics.

I shall quote a few more problems from the papyrus.

"Example of calculating land. If it is said to thee, A rectangle of land of 10 khet by 2 khet. What is its acreage?"

"A container into which corn has gone to the extent of 25 hundreds of quadruple-hekat. What are its dimensions?"

"Example of reckoning out a square container of 10 in its length, 10 in its breadth and 10 in its height. What is the amount that will go into it in corn?"

Such problems as these are as old as civilisation.

From the manuscript we learn that the ancient Egyptians could lay off angles, compute simple areas and volumes; add, subtract, multiply and divide, whole numbers and fractions.

Written records show that for 4000 years mathematics has been of vital importance in human affairs. We know of course that this knowledge was accumulating in the hands and brains of mankind for many hundreds if not thousands of years before then.

FEDERAL FUTILITY

By L. BERNSTEIN.

"WE believe therefore, that a new movement, pledged to a realistic and courageous approach to South African problems, appealing to no narrow sectionalism or prejudices, and devoted to the pursuance of principle rather than expediency in our national life, will serve to rally those men and women of goodwill . . ."

The Federal Union Party's manifesto is a cry of deep despair at the pass to which the United Party has led the country — two Nationalist governments in five years, and exacerbated race relations reaching flash-point. As a symptom of that despair, it is significant; as a symptom of the wide-spread seeking for a change it is to be welcomed; and as a political programme it is pitiable, if not downright treacherous to the progressive seekings that gave it birth.

Federal Union overflows with good intentions, of the kind that pave so many roads.

There is the intention of "appealing to no narrow sectionalism or prejudices." Brave words that fail to square with the prejudices and narrow sectionalism which has seeped through the programme. The programme calls for ". . . unyielding resistance against any attempt at the domination of one group by the other." The groups referred to are the two language groups of Europeans. What is this but "narrow sectionalism," when coupled throughout the programme with the implicit and explicit acceptance of domination of the non-European majority by a European minority?

PREJUDICES.

And what is it but prejudices — the very prejudices which have elevated a National Party to government and reduced a United Party to splinters — which explains the whole "subject nation" approach of the programme to the political rights of non-Europeans? "The present system of group representation of Natives to be maintained . . ." This, after the whole Hertzog group representation system has been rejected by the only representative body of African opinion, the National Congress. "An interim period of group representation of Indians on a system similar to that recorded to Natives . . ." And this, after the Smuts government attempt to introduce such a system with the Ghetto Act was so universally rejected and boycotted by Indians as to be unworkable.

Nor is this relapse into the condemned "prejudice" merely an interim, short-term device, driven on the unwilling authors of the programme by the hard realities of South African life. ". . . The long-term policy to be taken in steps over a considerable period of years (My emphasis L.B.) is the ultimate placing of those non-Europeans who have passed suitable tests of a high standard on the common roll of voters." (My emphasis L.B.). Note in passing that there are no tests other than age, colour of skin and an ability to avoid conviction for treason that qualify Europeans to vote on this common roll.

But above that, this long term policy stretching away into the indistinguishable future is to be "subject always to the safeguard against the disproportionate representation of any one section of the Non-European population." (My emphasis L.B.). The majority shall remain a minority, always and forever; thus runs the credo of these new crusaders for the democratic way of life without prejudices, South African style.

PROGRESS BACKWARDS.

It is wilful self-deception which enables the framers of the programme to summarise their aim as ". . . a progressive rather than a repressive non-European policy in line with Western traditions and Christian teachings . . ." It is not, and never has been part of the Western tradition for men of any nation to accept second-class, subject nation status as "progress". Nor will South Africans, of any colour. It is part of the Christian teachings, which the Federal Unionists would do well to ponder, that there comes the phrase: 'I asked for bread, and you gave me a stone.' They will be hearing that phrase from the non-Europeans of this country yet.

If there is reference in the programme to the most pressing demands of the non-European people for the ending of the most unjust of laws, that reference is guarded and devious. "We believe that Natives who have attained a high degree of civilisation should be entitled to exemption from laws designed for the protection of backward peoples", says the programme.

It is a familiar phraseology, much beloved of native commissioners and Nationalist politicians. Every piece of repressive legislation devised by successive generations of white South Africa

has been passed off as "protection of the backward peoples" — pass laws and reserves; colour bars and martial law acts; vetoes, prohibitions and police tyrannies. An old language, sweetened up with sugar for the few natives that squeeze through the carefully erected fine-mesh of colour bars to progress and attain "a high degree of civilisation". Not the language with which to inspire a new forward sweep of the nation; not the language which will move mountains.

This much vaunted "realistic and courageous approach to South Africa's problems" is now on the surface only, like a "new model" American car. Underneath, the streamlining and 1953 remodelling, it is the same hoary model T that has been the undoing of South Africa's "progressives" from the rise of Onze Jan to the demise of the Torch Commando.

EMERGENCIES FOR EVER!

In terms of the Public Safety Act, the Government in a "State of Emergency" can make any laws it likes and can authorise any person to make any laws.

Not only can they make new laws; they can also sweep aside existing laws.

And they can fix penalties with maximums of five years' gaol, £500 fine, and the confiscation of goods and property.

President Hindenburg of the German Reich once signed an *Emergency Decree for the protection of the People and State*. It suspended the constitutional guarantees of personal liberties and property rights.

That "emergency" lasted from March 1933 until the downfall of the Nazi Dictatorship in May 1945!

Mr. Swart's Public Safety Act says that his "State of Emergency" may be declared for twelve months. But it can be renewed by the Government at the end of the twelve months, and again at the end of that! And so on, for ever.

This is Fascism!

(Extracted from "Rule by Sjam-bok", copies of which are obtainable from the publishers, the Democratic League, P.O. Box 4347, Cape Town.)

"LILIOM" AN APPRAISAL

By RONALD HARRISON.

I CAME away from "Liliom" emotionally stirred, artistically satisfied, intellectually baffled. It is an unusual charming play with some most effective moving scenes: it is excellently acted, produced, set and lit, but at a first visit I felt Molnar had diddled me somewhat. My thoughts are clearer now, but perhaps others will not agree with me.

"Liliom" is a play about a barker in a fairground in Budapest fifty years ago. Liliom is a tough, conceited, uncouth, brutal man, who nevertheless dimly resents his ignorance, his illiteracy, his inability to cope with human relationships. "It's all so dumb," he cries out on his deathbed.

He falls in love with Julie, a servant girl, who, equally illiterate and inarticulate, nevertheless has a primitive wisdom in her, which enables her to see through Liliom's crude exterior to the bewildered, sensitive, frustrated being inside.

After beating Julie — because of his own exasperated misery at her unhappiness — Liliom learns with touching joy that he is to become a father. In order to get money for Julie and the expected baby, he reluctantly partakes in an attempted hold-up, which misfires. He feels all the unfairness of life has descended on him and in his blind ignorance he commits suicide — a victim, if you like, to the society which permitted such poverty, such ignorance.

And at that point the play might have ended, but it doesn't. The next scene shows Liliom in heaven being interrogated by a Heavenly Magistrate, who sentences Liliom to "burn for sixteen years in the crimson fire," after which he will return to earth for one day in order to do some good deed for his posthumous daughter. The final scene depicts Liliom's desperate attempt to do a good deed, an attempt which fails when Liliom's old rashness, impatience and frustration burst out as strong and fresh as ever, despite the years of 'purification.' Liliom is still Liliom!

I don't know what I expected — some reconciliation, some success for Liliom? I realise now that such an ending would have been dreadfully untrue. I do not think the play has anything more to say than that environment produces the Lilioms and it is our job, realising this, to understand other people more sympathetically.

FINE PERFORMANCES.

Leon Gluckman played the title role with great skill and with great sincerity. He showed us the cocky, surly, irascible side of Liliom and conveyed with equal

conviction the feelings of frustration and rebelliousness, as well as the surges of tenderness and joy, which he cannot put into words. Mr. Gluckman is equipped with an ample technique which I thought he used judiciously and effectively. I admired particularly the way in which each new situation brought with it a new aspect or new mood of Liliom. How well Mr. Gluckman contrasted the boyish, stubborn Liliom in heaven with the pathetic, chastened Liliom back on earth. Altogether this was a splendid performance.

Molly Seftel played Julie with sensitivity and great charm. Full marks for maintaining simplicity without a trace of coyness in the early love scene! Miss Seftel has an excellent voice, which she used expressively throughout, nowhere more tellingly than in the last scene, after the lapse of sixteen years. The highlight of her performance was the heartmoving moment when, her inarticu-

lateness released, she tells the dead Liliom of her love.

It is a sign of good production when the members of the supporting cast achieve distinction. This was so of "Liliom". Madame Muskat (Maureen Chanani), Marie (Noreen Sterling, the Heavenly Magistrate (Michael Thompson), Louise (Bell McCallum) and the others were very well portrayed.

I was most impressed with the apt, suggestive and economic sets designed by Ronnie Philip. It remains a wonder how he contrived to extend the bounds of the little stage at the Library Theatre. His decor, complemented by Harry Ligoff's imaginative lighting, was modern in the extreme and yet completely in harmony with the romantic mood of the play.

The production by Cecil Williams was characterised by a sensitive approach to Molnar's stage people. In addition, Mr. Williams has an excellent command of pace-variations. There was an almost impudent challenge in the slowness of the concluding lines of the love scene in the park, which contrasted with the rapid pace of the earlier part of the scene. How well, too, he handled the crowds and the incidents in the fairground.

I am glad that the Regent Players gave us this opportunity of seeing so interesting a play so well performed.



THE KNIGHTLIKE IKE

Reprinted from "VET'S VOICE."

ON a white steed he came, clad in shining armour. There were those who were dismayed by his military mien, so his agents among the people whispered to the troubled ones: "It takes a man skilled with the sword to achieve peace. Who better can understand peace than one unsurpassed in waging war."

Thus were some of the doubts overcome. But there were still some doubters. To them the Great Knight made proclamation: "I will go to the field of battle. I will learn what must be done to obtain peace."

The doubts and the doubters were quelled. Hope arose in the bosom of the people. In one agonising moment they made him their leader.

True to his word, he visited the battlefield. Upon his return he proudly disdained the proffer of peace talk by another who said he desired peace.

To his side he called the wealthy and the powerful, the holders of the purse strings, and the captains of industry. Then, amidst much pomp and circumstance, the Great Knight assumed the leadership of the people.

Nor did they have long to wait before he showed them how simply he would attack the problem of peace. It was a simple solution: Attack!

First he released for battle those dis-

credited legions which had been protected by the armada. The armada of the sea and the armada of the air would now aid these legions in battle.

Next he let his agents make known the imminent despatch of additional armadas of the troubled waters, to offer additional aid and comfort.

To the world he proclaimed: "The Armada no longer will guard the mainland."

This apparent paradox was not misunderstood. The chroniclers of the world understood that these moves would serve to make the island legions our allies in battle.

To those whose dismay became apparent the Great Knight despatched his Minister of State. To all, the Minister revealed the plan for peace.

It was simplicity itself: No talk for Peace, but a Sword. No talk, but increased assaults on the enemy. The foe was to be harassed and assailed until he wanted peace.

For some reason the virtue of this "grand concept" escaped most of the people. To them it seemed simpler to talk than fight.

To the entreaties of the troubled people of the world, the Great Knight turned a deaf ear. When they asked for the lives of two condemned to die, he said them nay. When they asked parleys for peace, he said them nay.

Without humanity, wisdom or understanding, a Knight of Peace becomes a mercenary of Mars.

But the silvered Sword will break against the people's passion for Peace.

ON THE ROAD TO PEACE

REPRESENTATIVES of Italian, French and German ex-Service organizations and war victims met in Stuttgart on March 14 and 15, 1953.

Seventeen delegates came from France, 32 from Germany and six from Italy. They represented organisations of ex-Servicemen, war disabled, war victims, resistance and partisan groups, and political deportees.

These men, who had formerly fought against each other in the respective armies of their countries, examined the grave consequences that the Bonn and Paris Treaties presented to their peoples.

The ratification of these treaties would lead to the creation of divisions in West Germany which, under a foreign command, would be used against all who wish to live in peace and who desire to maintain their full national independence.

German Independence.

The "European Defence Community" will destroy the control exercised by Parliaments over the military forces raised by their countries and will place them under the command of an outside major power.

The Conference declared that the sovereign independence of all peoples is the surest guarantee of peace, and proclaim-

ed the vital need for a reunion of the four great occupying Powers to conclude a Peace Treaty with a unified, democratic and peaceful Germany, whose independence and sovereignty shall be specially assured.

That is why the ex-Service organizations and war victims, indeed all men and women who work tirelessly for Peace, support the aspirations of the German people for the unification of their country.

Appeal to Bonn M.P.'s.

The conference demanded that the members of all national parliaments concerned refuse to ratify the Bonn and Paris Treaties.

That demand was particularly addressed to the deputies of the Bonn Parliament, appealing to them to be the first to pronounce their opposition, whilst emphasising their responsibility towards the German people, the other peoples of Europe and towards Peace.

The conference decided to set up a Permanent Committee of ex-Service men and war victims from the countries of Western Europe.

Their task will be to bring about and extend friendly relations between all ex-Servicemen and war victims in all countries, the indispensable condition for the maintenance of Peace.



GOLD MEDAL CORSETRY

TRUCE TALKS TANGLE

THERE can be very, very few people left nowadays who suffer from the illusion that America is being fair and square with regard to the Truce talks at Pan Mun Jom. Suffice only to say that a very good case indeed can be made out against them from reports and newspaper articles which originated from conservative and right-wing sources only. For the purpose of this article I shall ignore other sources entirely.

The history of the Truce talks, now about 18 months old, is a heartbreaking tale of evasion, procrastination and downright dishonesty. It was only after terrific public and U.N. pressure that the Americans agreed to begin the talks at all. The somewhat reasonable request that hostilities should cease first was contemptuously rejected. The U.S. Generals, without even considering that other United Nations should be represented on the Truce team, went to meet the enemy looking for issues.

RED HERRINGS

The first and rather smelly herring dragged across the Conference table was the issue of allowing newspapers free access to the Talks. When the North Koreans objected on the grounds that the presence of foreign correspondents might jeopardise the Talks, the Americans stormed out of the meeting and declared that the "freedom of the Press" would be maintained. Owing to the over-strict censorship we never could understand how such an unprecedented demand came to be made in the first place. It was not until months afterwards that the American correspondents admitted frankly that they themselves had never insisted on being present at the Talks, having regarded such a request as being unheard-of and impertinent.

The next break in the Armistice Talks came over the site. Kaesong, declared the U.S. team, was unsuitable. The Communists agreed immediately on Pan Mun Jom, but it was not until about two months later that the Talks were resumed.

"In most of the gatherings observed" reported the *New York Times* (November 12, 1951) "the U.N. truce team has created the impression that it switches its stand wherever the Communists indicate they might go along with it." By the spring of 1952 the "U.N." team had a brand new issue — prisoners-of-war.

As many people as there are left who sympathise with the American cause, there are even fewer who have cause to

criticise the American Army for being soft with prisoners. A thought or two about Koje Island with its forced labour of prisoners (in defiance of the Geneva Convention) the shootings and the beatings, will disillusion even these. And yet, said the American Truce team, all P.O.W.'s have been screened and the Communists must drop their demand for the repatriation of *all* prisoners — only those who agree to return.

Let us look again at what the Geneva Convention (to which the U.S. is a signatory) has to say on this subject. Article 118 is specific. "Prisoners of War shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of active hostilities."

NO MAYBE'S

The U.S. spokesmen say this does not oblige a captor to send a prisoner where he does not want to go. Yet of course it does. Otherwise, surely, it would be open to every captor to disregard *any* part of the Convention and claim that the prisoner had agreed to it. As the *London Times* points out, 'Clause 118 is emphatically in the interests of the prisoners themselves. Before we lightly accept the American assurance of the infallibility of their "screening" methods let us have a look at them.

At that stage, remember, Koje Camp was actually in Communist hands. "How can there have been a proper enquiry from each prisoner about his desire to be repatriated?" asked the *Manchester Guardian* (May 28, 1952). And the *Times* of the same date had this to say.

"Unfortunately the chaos in the prisoner-of-war camps and the incompetence of some of the American officers in charge of them has inevitably thrown doubt on the efficiency with which the prisoners were 'screened' . . ."

The American Republican magazine *Time* was even more forthright. "Only one officer on the Koje staff can speak Korean or Chinese . . . we could have Mao Tse Tung and Kin In Sen both in the same compound and never know it." And yet, three months later, the

Americans were claiming that they had completed an "objective survey of the will of 100,000 prisoners." Hercules himself would have retired gracefully before including this task among his twelve.

TIME! GENTLEMEN.

At this stage, when everyone is heartily sick and tired of the Korean massacre; when not only European and Asiatics but Americans too are crying out for Peace, Vice-Admiral Jay and his cronies can still talk with disgusting hypocrisy, of "Communist obstinacy".

If President Eisenhower and his conferees are determined to prolong the War and to spread it, as is apparently the case, it is for us, with equal determination, to demand an end to this useless slaughter.

We are watching both sides at the Truce talks and we know who to blame for every hour and every day the Armistice remains unsigned.

ANOTHER SAFEGUARD GONE!

South Africa's common law states that a man is to be considered innocent until he has been proved guilty. But Minister Swart does not like the common law; he finds in it too many obstacles to his plans for repression and terrorism. He therefore abolishes the century-old rule which was laid down for the protection of the citizen against injustice.

The Government have created fear and suspicion in the people, and, using the defiance campaign as pretext, have prepared the ground for the elimination of political opposition. This spells dictatorship.

Only the people can prevent this disaster. This they can do by refusing to be frightened into silence and submission.

Let us fight against these laws with all our strength. Let us raise our voices high against Fascist dictatorship. Courage and unity are all we need to preserve our freedom. Let them not be wanting.

(Extracted from "Rule by Sjam-bok", copies of which are obtainable from the publishers, the Democratic League, P.O. Box 4347, Cape Town.)

HOW LIBERAL ARE THE LIBERALS?

THERE can be no doubt that the defeat of the United Party in the General Elections represented, paradoxically, a defeat for reactionary policies, particularly those pertaining to South Africa's non-white people. It is not surprising, therefore, that, with the elections out of the way, there has been a sudden burst through of new policies, which appear almost revolutionary, so far in advance are they of the old United Party policy-evasions.

Two new political parties have come into existence, the Liberal Party and the Union Federal Party. Each has declared its principles and there has been a spate of discussion, argument, polemics, such as has not been experienced for many years. Without doubt Springbok Legion members are engaged in analysing the new principles with a view to finding a suitable political home. In order to assist members at this time of flux, a few comments on the new developments will not be out of place.

Since the Federal Party's policies are analysed elsewhere in this issue, attention is here confined to the statement of principles published by the Liberal Party.

At the outset, let it be said that the L.P.'s Principles and Objects suggest a tremendous advance on the policies of the United Party and even on those of the Labour Party. They are to be welcomed for setting the issues of fundamental civil, political and economic rights squarely before the people. They will have the effect of causing many sincere people to examine anew the tenuous, mosaic structure of White Supremacy. They represent, at first sight, a call to accept the non-Europeans as ordinary people, a call that previously has been sounded only by the Springbok Legion, the Congress of Democrats and the defunct Communist Party, and a small number of courageous individuals.

Let us, however, not be blind to the contradictions and weaknesses of the Liberal Party's Principles and Objects. It is to be expected, of course, that the Party will become aware of ambiguities and obscurities in their published statement and will, perhaps, remove them, but Legion members should from the beginning understand the weaknesses inherent in the Liberal Party and understand exactly what they are being asked to support.

Principle (i) states that the Liberal Party subscribes to the essential dignity of every human being irrespective of race, colour or creed and the maintenance of his fundamental rights.

The fundamental rights which the Party envisages are set out below. In passing, it may be noted that the Liberals have not used the phrase 'equal rights',

which the U.N. Declaration is careful to use, viz., '... of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family' and '... all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights'. Perhaps the vital word will be inserted in the Party's Principles to avoid ambiguity.

The phrase 'maintenance of his fundamental rights' needs to be clarified to meet the South African situation, where the great bulk of the people have no rights to 'maintain' and where, under the existing laws, both white and non-white alike have already been deprived of many fundamental rights or are in danger of being so deprived.

Principle (ii) states that the Liberal Party subscribes to the right of every human being to develop to the fullest extent of which he is capable consistent with the rights of others.

In this context the query arises: does the Liberal Party envisage a genuine removal of the many 'rights' which by law and custom the white people have enjoyed for decades at the expense of the non-whites?

Principles (ii) and (iv) state that the Liberal Party subscribes to the maintenance of the rule of law... and... that no person shall be debarrred from participating in the government and other democratic processes of the country by reason only of race, colour or creed.

PROGRAMME

- (i) equal political rights based on a common franchise roll for all civilised persons;
- (ii) freedom of worship, expression, movement, assembly and association;
- (iii) the right to acquire and use skills and to seek employment freely;

- (iv) access to an independent judiciary;
- (v) the application equally to all sections of the population of compulsory, state-sponsored education;
- (vi) the right to own and occupy immovable property;
- (vii) the right to organise trade unions and other economic groups and associations.

The Party will employ only democratic and constitutional means to achieve the foregoing objects, and will oppose all forms of totalitarianism such as communism and fascism. A pursuit of these objects will evoke very pleasant feelings in men and women who are looking for that better South Africa. Item (i) for instance, restates the basic civil liberties, without which no democratic progress can be made. Item (vi) is a rejection of the Group Areas Act and all the other acts which have deprived Africans of freehold land tenure; Item (vii) is a negation of the whole principle of migratory labour and industrial colour bars.

DEFECT.

There is, however, in this statement of Objects one fatal flaw — the reference to 'civilised' persons. It is so reasonable a restriction, so small a compromise when compared with all the other genuinely progressive demands that the unsuspecting might fail to realise that in this one surrender the Liberal Party is negating all its other very fine principles.

Let us, therefore, examine this clause in detail.

Compare first of all this restricted

franchise with the definition of the franchise as used for instance in Great Britain and America. The franchise in those countries is: Universal, Equal, Direct and Adult. There you have the basis and the only basis of a democratic franchise. No restrictions whatever on the grounds of property and/or education. You must be an adult—that's all, except for restrictions on the insane and convicted criminals.

How liberal can you claim to be, if you reject the democratic franchise? How far are you removed from the white-supremacy, if IN ACTUAL FACT you debar groups of people from having the vote, because of their colour? Because that in effect is what the Liberal Party propose to do. Certainly, one recognises the attempt the Liberals are making to escape the accusation by insisting on equal educational facilities. But they cannot solve the problem by merely writing another clause into their Objects. The fact remains that, despite the education clause, the franchise clause, under the circumstances at present obtaining in South Africa, means that the Liberals do not seriously envisage the granting of the vote to the non-European people.

You might ask: is that really so serious? won't this ensure a gradual and peaceful change? To find the answer you must refer to the speeches made during the last six or eight months by the non-European leaders. Dr. Naledi, Dr. Dadoo, Chief Lethuli, Dr. Nongweni, Mr. Mgij, have all said that they reject any offer of a 'civilised' franchise. In other words, it would be foolish for us to imagine that the non-Europeans would

desist from political struggle on the promise that 50 or 100 years after the Liberal Party had achieved power all non-Europeans would have been granted the vote. On the contrary, we must expect intensified struggle in the very near future.

Then further: why do the responsible non-European leaders reject the 'civilised' restriction? They do so, because:

- (a) it is not democratic to restrict the franchise on any grounds whatsoever;
- (b) the granting of the vote would still be an unjustified prerogative of the white group;
- (c) without the full franchise no other improvements in general conditions can be won by the non-Europeans;
- (d) the 'civilised' qualification is a fraud: it guarantees nothing; witness, what the 'civilised' and 'educated' Germans did with their votes; witness, also, what 'civilised' and 'educated' white South Africa did with their votes in 1948 and 1953.

REPERCUSSIONS.

There are serious ramifications to this 'civilised' franchise clause. Although the Liberal Party invites members from all races and colours, it is highly unlikely that the non-Europeans will join a party, which from the beginning is committed to racial discrimination in the political sphere. In addition, such Africans as might join the Party, must remain second-class members, since, not having the vote, they cannot hope to influence either the policies of the Party or of the country. Political power will remain in the hands of the Europeans.

But more serious is the situation which must arise when the franchise policy of the Liberal Party is seen to clash with the franchise policy of the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress. The two congresses are striving for full democratic rights — including equal political rights — for ALL South Africans. The Liberal Party has a restricted demand. How can either group co-operate with the other, when there is such a vital cleavage in demands. There is a danger, therefore, that the Liberal Party will find itself forced to 'disown' the African National Congress and the Indian Congress. Perhaps, it will even have to publicly disapprove of some activity initiated by the two Congresses.

MEANS TO AN END?

The Liberal Party will employ only 'democratic and constitutional' means to achieve its objects. This phrase will have to be explained straightaway, for until we know what forms of activity are included and excluded in the phrase,

'we must remain in the dark as to the Liberals' true intentions. Do they, for instance, consider a stoppage of work constitutional? Do they consider a peaceful defiance campaign constitutional? (We know today under the Martial Law Acts that a defiance campaign is illegal, but does that make it undemocratic?)

One thing we have all to learn pretty quickly is that the Nationalists will never be defeated by the normal parliamentary means of struggle, in the Assembly the Opposition will always be outvoted. In a future general election the Nationalists will still have the advantages of what they have secured during the past five years, viz, the six seats from South West; the unfair loading of urban seats and off-loading of rural seats; the actual drawing of constituency boundaries; the amendments to the Electoral Act; the advantageous proportion of Nationalist-minded young people who will become voters each year, as they reach the age of 21; the possible enfranchising of 18-year olds. All these factors indicate that the Nationalists have entrenched themselves in power already to a point, where they cannot be removed by ordinary parliamentary procedures. We must anticipate further moves from the Government towards the same end, e.g. the removal of the Coloured voters, the abolition of the Native Representatives in both the Assembly and the Senate, the removal of M.P.'s under the Suppression of Communism Act, the disenfranchisement of persons or groups for 'political crimes'.

How then does the Liberal Party hope to achieve its objects? Will they initiate extra-parliamentary activities with a view to forcing the Government out of power? Will they lend aid to such activities or will they find themselves forced by their Constitution to oppose any such organised expression of the perils will of the great majority of the South African people?

These points and others are put forward for Legion members to consider carefully. There can be no doubt that the founders of the Liberal Party are motivated by a genuine desire to bring about better conditions in South Africa — political, economic and social improvements. Before progressives commit themselves to the new party and its principles, a careful but must be made of the PRACTICABILITY, the REALISM of the Party's policies and programme. Let us not at this crucial time board a ship that can never hope to reach port.

(On this page is reprinted the Aims and Objects of the Congress of Democrats. They are worth re-reading.)

"INALIENABLE RIGHTS" AIMS AND OBJECTS OF THE CONGRESS OF DEMOCRATS.

The Society shall work for the attainment for all South Africans of—

EQUAL CIVIL LIBERTIES

the freedom of thought, speech and press;
the freedom of movement and assembly;
the freedom of organisation.

EQUAL POLITICAL RIGHTS

the right to vote in and to stand for elections to state and local law-making bodies, i.e. universal, equal, direct, adult franchise.

EQUAL ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

the opportunity to qualify for and engage in all trades, crafts, occupations and professions;
the opportunity to acquire and own land and property.

EQUALITY OF SOCIAL STATUS

in every field of state and church, culture and recreation, public activity.

"HEARTBREAK HOUSES"

The Group Areas Act as it really is

THE late and unlamented Adolf Hitler set the pattern for the mass removal of populations, which the Nationalist Government has appropriately taken over into its Group Areas Act. The theorists of the Nationalist Party have claimed that the Act will provide for the painless shifting about of the different races, to bring about just and equal areas for each.

That was the propagandists' theory. The practice has been different. There was the case of the scheme for "group areas" in Lydenburg, which provided for the removal of some sixteen Indian families from their homes and stores in the village centre to the edge of a sewerage farm several miles away, there to contemplate their navels and trade with each other, while the local white speculators, headed by the 'Ko-operasie', take over their stores established in the days of Kruger.

And now there is Johannesburg. In essence the scheme is little different — only bigger, multiplying the numbers of the evacuees to tens of thousands, and the scale of uprooting, heartbreak and pauperising to the scale where it ceases to be mere hardship and becomes genocide.

CHANGING SPOTS.

In our colour-bar ridden country, with its monopoly of power for Europeans, it is almost unnecessary to say that scarcely any Europeans will be moved, deprived of homes or livelihood by the Johannesburg scheme. Like all apartheid legislation, they are to benefit at the expense of the non-Europeans, taking over valuable sites and businesses at "give-away" prices which must result from throwing thousands of such properties simultaneously on to an already overstocked market.

But that again is the theory; and the theory only. In practice, fear is beginning to creep into the hearts of even the self-seeking European speculators, as the prospects of social and political upheaval begin to loom large, if the attempt is really made to carry the scheme out by all the force of Government.

The blows of the Group Areas Act, in Johannesburg as elsewhere, will fall heaviest on the Indian population — hated by the Nationalists, for their steadfast opposition to fascism, and, in Nat-

ionalist eyes, ripe for extermination since they toil neither in farms nor mines, except in the British-owned sector of sugar farming. And on the Africans, from whose further impoverishment and further degradation in the towns the Nationalists hope to secure larger streams of cheap, docile agricultural labour.

NOTICE TO QUIT.

The Indians of Johannesburg, mainly concentrated in a predominantly Indian area around Fereirastown and Vrededorp are to be thrown out. Away out on the veld which surrounds Johannesburg, well to the west at Lenz, a "township" will be established for them. Outside of that area they will be allowed neither to live nor to trade, nor to own property. The prospects for a community such as this, accustomed almost exclusively to trade and commerce since their arrival in the Transvaal is of a creeping death from poverty. Or of mass resistance to their removal.

The Africans of Johannesburg fare no better. From Vrededorp they are to be evacuated to outside the "ten-mile-limit" in the vicinity of Orlando. From the whole of the Western Areas — Sophiatown, Martindale, Newclare and Western Native Township they are to be forcibly removed to the same barren strips of veld, either in terms of the City Council's scheme for Group Areas, or in terms of the "removal of black-spots" scheme. The difference to the people of which scheme they form the human cattle is negligible.

Into the African areas — Western areas — will come mainly Europeans; and to a lesser extent Coloureds, forcibly evicted from all the valuable industrial areas they now occupy in Vrededorp, City and Suburban, Doornfontein, Fordsburg and Jeppe.

Or so the theory has it. For with Johannesburg's present housing position — some 11,000 people squatting in cardboard and hessian shanties in municipal slums like Moroka, and with a further 15,000 on municipal waiting lists for houses — it is unlikely that either Africans or Coloureds will be enticed to accept docilely and to be herded where the masters order. For them too, the alternative, and one which already they

are saying they will take, is mass resistance.

CITY FATHERS?

It should not go without mention that both the Group Areas scheme, and its predecessor, the Western Areas Removal Scheme, have been drafted and accepted by a City Council which has an overwhelming United Party majority. In typical mealy-mouthed fashion, the party pundits have tried to shelter themselves from public anger, and from the opposition of a small but courageous group of opponents in their own party caucus, by blaming the Nationalist Government. "If we hadn't done it, the Government would have acted over our heads." So runs this cringing defence.

Typical too of these latter-day saints who express so boldly their "confidence" and their "trust" that neither the Government nor the Council will act save in the most just and humanitarian manner, that at the last moment their courage failed them. In an eleventh hour amendment, dressed up in all the democratic trimmings they could muster, the City Council "revised" the scheme to allow Indians to stay in their present areas under licence — that is under permanent threat of eviction without notice. Even this august body of big businessmen is not so dull witted as to imagine that this "concession" of life under the sword of Damocles will encourage anyone to accept the scheme, or take the protestations of good intent at face value. Judged by past action, neither the promises nor the pledges of Government or Council beneficence toward Indian traders will cut much ice with the Indian community. They have been bitten too often.

PERSPECTIVES.

Already there is opening up a campaign for the preservation of the rights of people to live unmolested by police and politicians in the areas they have always occupied. In Johannesburg, the Indian and African Congresses are beginning a campaign against any mass evacuations on the Hitler model. European democrats, slower to move, are none-the-less moving in the same direction. There is now an outstanding chance for black-white unity in action against the Nationalist Government, and its allies in the United Party City Council.

That unity, if it can be achieved, will be a pattern for all South Africa to follow, and set on foot a really united democratic alliance to end the Nationalist drive along the Hitler road to the extermination of subject races.



It is probably true to say that the more insecure a nation feels, the more political parties are born in it. In Israel, for example, an electorate of less than a million had a choice at its last election of no fewer than 17 parties. Here in South Africa we are feeling very insecure indeed. The emergence of the Liberal and the Federal parties brings our total to 5 for an electorate of just over a million. It is indicative of the tension and confusion which an unsettled international situation in addition to five years of Malanzism can bring.

In this situation it would be wise to recall what Mrs. Margaret Ballinger once said. "All South African politics are native affairs." So they are. Heaton Nicholls should remember that when he talks of the failure of the Union. What Union, in all truth, has there been? Unity of a handful of Whites for the purpose of exploiting to the full the vast natural resources represented by 10 million non-Europeans. The disagreement that has existed among the politicians has been largely over how best to tap these resources and this final break is virtually over the same question. No party, with the belated exception of the Liberals, has yet put forward a plea for more Native representation; not Mr. Nicholls nor Mr. Strauss, nor Mr. Strydom has ever suggested partnership instead of baasskap for the

Non-Whites. Naturally the Party with the best chances for baasskap will lose the "unity" with its not so fortunate partners. All other differences between the Nichollsites and Strydomites are superficial and flimsy.

* * * *

OUR SHIFTY COUNCILLORS.

Have you ever stopped to consider the number of national and local appeals that are going the rounds? Offhand I can think of Flood Relief, SANTA (recently ended), Polio Research, Queenshaven, Tornado Disaster — all worthy causes. Others not quite so pressing like Westminster Abbey Fund. If you live in Johannesburg you must have been confronted by some or all of these appeals. Also, if you are from Joh'burg you must be aware that the City Council is proposing to spend something like £10 million of our money to shift some thousands of African workers and their families a distance of about 10 miles!

Put like that the average Joh'burger will shake his head in dismay and bewilderment. I'm as dismayed and bewildered as you. With £10 million we could satisfy all the present appeals and a good dozen more besides. Yet Messrs. Gordon and Page would rather squander that money or at least a good part of it on moving African families from one spot to another. At the rate the City is growing they will have to be moved again in a few years' time.

For God's sake, let's kick Gordon and Page out before then!

LO AND WITHHOLD!

The time is fast approaching when self-respecting musicians and sportsmen from overseas will think twice before accepting our invitation to visit South Africa. Two such people, a pianist and a boxer, both prominent in their fields, have been refused entrance visas to the Union, although after a public outcry the pianist was admitted. The Department of the Interior under Donges, which has been so busily goose-stepping over the civil rights of the people will yet succeed in turning our country into an international pariah which all civilized people will shun.

PEACE AND PLENTY

by

PROF. FREDERIC JOLIOT-CURIE.

WE all recognise that economic problems play a fundamental role in international politics.

I would like to mention just one aspect of these problems which seems to me important and which especially concerns sources of raw materials.

At the present rate of growth of American production, which should double itself every 25 years, and in a world remaining split into blocs without economic relations between them, the United States could only with great difficulty procure the necessary raw materials otherwise than by totally depriving all its allies.

For example, in the case of oil, rubber, iron, zinc and manganese ore it has absorbed up to now more than half the world's production though it has less than 10% of the total population of the industrialised countries.

In the case of uranium ore, in which the territory of the United States is very deficient, it is almost the whole production of the Belgian Congo and of Canada that is being used and stockpiled on the territory of the U.S.A.

This fact spotlights the main aim of the Baruch plan for the abolition and control of atomic weapons. This plan foresees the transfer of all atomic activity to an international authority under the aegis of the United Nations. This international authority would thus be the owner of all the uranium deposits and atomic energy installations in the world. Such a plan, if accepted, would result in giving to the United States, by the well-known operation of automatic majorities, a veritable monopoly of atomic activities.

It may be highly praiseworthy to want to double production every 25 years, but it must not be done by creating poverty in other countries of the world and it must not be done at the cost of war, which is the logical end of this policy of crusade.

The truth is that by taking the crushing load of armaments off the back of the human race, turning the application of science to more peaceful ends, accepting the co-existence of different systems and the trade relations between them that this allows, the production of useful wealth could easily be doubled in 25 years, not only in the United States but in every country of the world!



THE FUTURE OF

FREE TRADE UNIONS

"THE Government will not interfere with the trade unions" is the statement made by Mr. B. Schoeman, Minister of Labour, when making public statements anent the policy of the Nationalist Government towards the trade union movement in South Africa. How this utterance can be reconciled with hard facts, defies description, for if ever there was a government that interfered with the trade unions, it is the present one in office in our country. Its treatment of the Garment Workers' Union, going as far as to appoint a Commission in support of discredited anti-trade union elements in order to further the attempt to split and smash the Garment Workers' Union, its removal of duly elected trade union officials from their posts under the Suppression of Communism Act, its constant threat of further spitting the trade unions on racial lines, are just a few of the steps which have detrimentally affected the whole of the trade union movement in South Africa.

Of course there are so-called "responsible" trade union leaders who, to curry favour with this reactionary government — just as there were so-called trade union leaders who were prepared to take orders and support fascist governments in Europe — will go the whole hog in trying to prove their support of the Government policy—provided it does not touch their skins. Such are the leaders who welcomed action against "communists" when the naming process was first started, and who have invited Mr. Schoeman to open trade union conferences.

But their sycophancy is of no avail; for the Government — out to entrench itself in the body politic of South Africa — is determined to make mince-meat of the trade unions, and then mould them into nationalist "fricadelles" with "pure" leaders of lilywhite organisations.

In the coming Session of Parliament legislation will be introduced that will further the onslaught on the trade union movement in two directions. Under the guise of "protecting white workers" steps will be taken, that may in the not distant future prove to be the very means by which the white workers' conditions will be rapidly undermined and driven down to a lower status.

What are the proposals of the Government for the coming session?

AFRICAN TRADE UNIONS.

Mr. Schoeman is to introduce, with Cabinet consent of course, a Bill for the regulation of Native Labour relations—a grandiloquent title that is nothing less than a further enslavement of the African workers, and will not help one jot to improve labour relations or raise living standards of the African workers.

The main principles of the Bill centre in a Board to be appointed by the Minister from government officials with probably one kosher "trade unionist"

and one employers' representative. It will deal with all disputes affecting African workers which are referred to it. The edict of this Board will be final and binding and there will be no right of appeal against any decisions taken by this Board. Regional Boards will function in a similar manner and to "safeguard" the interests of African workers, white inspectors will be appointed to keep an eye on their conditions.

All wages and conditions of African workers that have hitherto been included in industrial agreements, will no longer be permitted to be so included, but must be referred to the Board for its findings, and it is quite possible that we may have the position of wages being fixed for the same occupation at a lower scale for African workers than for other races of workers in South Africa. In this Bill there is a clause making illegal the existence of a co-ordinating body for African trade unions, and imposing so many restrictions on the organisation of African workers as to stifle the existing trade unions. Once again the Bill lays down heavy penalties with a fine of £500 and 5 years' imprisonment for Africans who go on strike — and just remember this — an African will not be permitted to strike under any circumstances, except on pain of the penalties which face him for this action.

When this Bill was first mooted, it so offended the right wing trade unions, that they responded by asking the Minister of Labour that, instead of his concoction labelled Native Labour Relations Regulations, he grants the Africans separate recognition under the Industrial Conciliation Act. What a hope they have got from such a Minister in such a Government.

ATTACK ON ALL.

Concomitant with the attack on African trade unions will be the Bill to

separate existing registered trade unions into racial organisations of Europeans, Coloured, and Heaven knows what else. For many decades a number of trade unions have by experience learned that even in a racially prejudiced country like South Africa it was beneficial for workers of all races to combine and unite into one organisation in defence of their common interests. Many old established trade unions have thus organised Coloured and Indian workers together with their white fellow workers into powerful trade unions with a great deal of success to all concerned.

When the Industrial Legislation Commission issued its report, it contained a recommendation (with a minority of the commission voting against) that such "mixed" trade unions be forcibly separated by legislation, notwithstanding the fact that almost the whole of the evidence tendered by both employers and workers organisations pointedly objected to such a course. But blessed with a voting majority Mr. Schoeman is now out to implement this proposal and enact it into law, so that the pattern of many trade unions in South Africa is going in the very near future to be changed, unless the workers concerned are determined enough to prevent such steps being taken. When such legislation is taken it will be done in defiance of the wishes of the entire trade union movement that is concerned with "mixed" membership and it includes some of the most conservative trade unions in South Africa.

Very recently a public statement signed by representatives of the S.A. Federation of Trade Unions, the S.A. Trades and Labour Council, the Western Province Federation of Trade Unions, and Joint Mechanics Executive (Engineering Unions) strongly condemned these proposals and asked the Government to leave the trade union movement alone to work out its own way of organisation. But in line with "no interference" with the Trade Unions, the Minister of Labour is going to lay down the line of how the Government wants the trade unions to be organised, and if carried out we are going to see the smash-up of some of the best organised trade unions in South Africa.

The pattern of "trade Union" organisation will then be separate kraals for White, coloured, Indians, and as for the Africans, no kraals at all — they must wander around in the wilderness. That is the Trade Union picture that is on the order of the day. One can imagine what will happen to the workers' condi-

(Continued on next page.)

IF THIS BE PROGRESS . . .

ONE of the most interesting things about the formation of the two new political parties in South Africa is the reception they have been given in the Press. Of the two, the Liberal Party has been accorded the warmer welcome. Even the Nationalist Press has referred to it as a "logical" development. The Nationalist reasoning is obvious: It sees White South Africans divided ultimately only on the colour issue — that is, a handful of ineffectual "liberals" on the one side, with the rest of White South Africans on the other, under the leadership of the Nationalist Party.

For the Nationalists, this is the ideal political division, because they do not anticipate that any colour policy, other than apartheid, will have the slightest chance of success. They anticipate the perpetual success of White "baasskap".

So much for the Nationalists' attitude. It is easy to understand. But what about the attitude of the United Party leaders and their mighty Press? This is what is really interesting.

The United Party, as such, naturally deplores the formation of both new parties. It cannot imagine why anyone should be dissatisfied with its own policies and behaviour.

But its Press has taken up a slightly more cunning attitude. Firstly, examine its criticism of the Federal Party.

There is not the slightest doubt that the Federal Party is trying, in a different way, to do what the United Party tried to do so unsuccessfully during the five years of Nationalist rule: Evolve a widespread policy that takes in everyone opposed to the Nationalists, whatever their real differences of opinion may be.

For instance, the doctrine that the Federal Party is hawking around is federalism. This means a complete change in the present constitutional system. But the strength of the Federal Party lies in the Natal Torch Commando — and the first aim of the Torch Commando is to uphold the present constitutional system. So the Federal Party announces that it intends to promote federalism within the framework of the Union. This is better tightrope walking than the United Party ever managed, and it is no beginner.

The Federal Party bases its appeal on two main policies: federalism and a slightly more advanced colour policy compared with the United Party's indefinable programme. Of these two policies, the only one which could give the new party a basis on which to build with some hope of progress is the colour policy; the federal side of the scheme is just fatuous. But I am prepared to predict that, of the two main policies of the

federal party, the one that is going to be abandoned first will be the so-called progressive colour policy.

The Federal Party wants Natal to govern itself; therefore the non-Europeans of Natal should be represented on that governing council. But has the new party suggested that the Indians of Natal should be given a place in the Government of Natal? No, they have generously offered them group representation in the *Union Parliament*, the very Union from which they want to break away.

The more one examines the Federal Party programme, the more jumbled it appears. It has been widened to bring in every possible recruit, with the result that its programme of principles—which is added to and subtracted from daily — is now quite as amorphous and inexplicable as the United Party's.

It will be a great day on which the Federal Party announces its policy in detail, particularly its non-European programme.

Most of the criticisms that have been made of the Federal Party by the United Party Press have been fairly sound. This Press is in a position to be fairly objective about the Federal Party, which is busy undermining the U.P. in Natal, and seriously so.

LIBERAL PARTY WELCOMED.

The United Party Press have welcomed the new Liberal Party because they see in it (a) no potential rival (like the Nats., they believe it is doomed to be small and ineffectual), and (b) an extremely useful safety valve.

From now on, the Press argues, the Liberal Party will bear the brunt of the Nationalists' anti-liberal campaign. The United Party has suffered it so far. Now the United Party will be able to argue that it is "purged" of all liberalism, and this will deprive the Nationalists of one of their main weapons. At least, this is the reasoning that goes on in the editorial columns of the erratic United Party Press.

Is there any function that the Liberal Party can perform except that of "safety

valve" for the United Party? It seems very doubtful. The Liberal Party, in framing its non-European policy, has not conceded what the situation demands — full franchise rights — but has allowed merely certain curtailed rights that it is prepared to concede.

The Liberal Party's programme means that a handful of fortunate non-Europeans will eventually share the common vote with their White fellow-citizens, but there will never be enough of them to make any difference to the system of a White-dominated Parliament. How far, then, does the Liberal Party take South Africa? Only a little further than the United Party takes it.

In spite of the formation of the two new parties, the situation in the Union remains largely unchanged. There is a lot of manoeuvring within the field of White politics, but there is little increased progressive thinking on the biggest issue in the country: the rights of the non-Europeans. That is why the non-Europeans have shown little excitement over the formation of either the Federal Party or the Liberal Party.

(Continued from previous page.)

tions when the labour market gets a little less stringent and there is no full employment. By being able to deal with separate organisations one can imagine what a harvest will be reaped at the expense of the working people of South Africa.

So inviting Mr. Schoeman to open trade union conferences and rushing like blazes to lend him support for attacks on militant trade unionists has not helped the "respectable" trade union leaders very much. The results have been as predicted — the trade union movement as a democratic structure of workers' rights and as a base of workers' unity must be destroyed.

The time is still not too late for workers to realise that they must unite their efforts in defence of their own existing trade union rights and for the extension of trade union rights to all workers in South Africa irrespective of race or colour. Otherwise the same thing as is happening on the political plane — the gradual filching away of democratic rights so that the Nat. Government can be entrenched — will be pursued on the trade union field. Only unity and action in defence of trade union rights can stop the rot.

PASSPORT PSYCHOSIS

WHEN the Government first started with passports, their actions were understandable, if hardly admirable. Their object at that time seemed to be to prevent prominent South African democrats from addressing bodies like the United Nations. Thus Dr. Dadoo's passport was confiscated when he wished to attend the UNO debate on South Africa's anti-Indian legislation.

Apparently the discovery of this power which he held over ordinary citizens of South Africa went to Dr. Donges's head. He decided that the refusal of passports was to become a regular instrument of Government policy. For the last few years he has been using this instrument in a manner which defies rational explanation.

Let us assume in Dr. Donges's favour that some harm might befall the State if a man who was once a Communist were to spend a week-end in Lourenco Marques. But what are we to say of the refusal of passports to a South African Indian soccer team who wanted to tour India, and to a group of coloured performers who wanted to put on "Coon Carnivals" in Britain and America. Perhaps Dr. Donges thought that the Indian footballers had not heard that India was independent, and did not want them to find out. Perhaps he did not want the "coons" to discover that Western Civilisation can exist without duplicate entrances to railway stations. Perhaps he did not want the people of India, Britain and America to see that our Non-European peoples are not a species of orang-outang.

Whatever may be the Government's ostensible reason for these astonishing decisions, there can be little doubt that they are manifestations of a completely irrational aspect of the Nationalist's psychology. When a Nationalist sees a Non-European showing any signs of good fortune, prosperity or independence, he is seized by a blind urge to put that Non-European in his place—to show him as forcibly as possible that he is still the white man's inferior. It is this urge that makes hooligans assault Non-Europeans whom they consider to be too well dressed. It is the same urge, toned down and sublimated, which makes officials put every possible obstacle in the way of any Non-European who wants to do anything out of the ordinary. Does a "kafir" or a "coolie" want to go to a university, become a skilled artisan,

travel overseas or build himself a good house in a pleasant neighbourhood? If he does, he must be stopped. That is the instinctive reaction of the Nationalist official mind. No prejudice to white interests need be demonstrated. It is sufficient that an untouchable is presuming to rise above his station in life.

So deep-seated and irrational is this desire to express mere hatred for the Non-European that it must be satisfied even at the expense of more calculating Government policy. One of the purposes served by the manipulation of passports is to intimidate people and discourage them from political activity. How often

one hears a well-meaning European liberal say "I'd like to join you, or attend your meeting or sign your petition, but I'm applying for a passport next month and I don't want to do anything rash at the moment." By refusing passports to Non-Europeans whether they are active in politics or not, the Government is throwing away this potent means of intimidation as far as the Non-European population is concerned. No Non-European will stay away from a meeting for the sake of his passport if he knows that the colour of his skin is sufficient reason for a refusal.

Like so many other aspects of Nationalist policy, the Nationalists' handling of the passport question has all the elements of farce, were it not for the fact that the ordinary people of this country are the sufferers from it.

" Their answer broke the whole of my heart "

Dear Sir,

Secretary,

I am really wondering where are you from, after such a long time. I thought they have killed you, you are no more in the world again. Your last letter I got it in 1949. Myself I am still at S. & B. Store Night Watch. But this year. On the 3rd March I wrote to to the Office of the War Records. So that I can be back to the Service again, but their answer broke the whole of my heart I don't understand what kind of service. Their answer is this.

In reply to your letter dated the 3rd March, 1953, I have to advise you that non-Europeans are not accepted for service in the S.A. Permanent Force, but if you so wish you can apply to the Inspector-in-charge, Auxiliary Service, Voortrekkerhoogte for employment in the Bantu Labour Service.

I can be glad if you can explain to me what is Auxiliary Service.

I am still your member even the money I will send it but now Dear Sir the 15th May I had an accident my wife got a birth of twins a boy and a girl. The babies past away the very same time. My wife was alone. She send one man to call a Nurse, a nurse refused to come out for this whole month she was going for clinic. At the last time the nurse refused to come. So the children got tired and past away. It was at night. The first twin is 1/2 past 12 the last 1 o'clock. When I came from the work in the morning I found everything hopeless even so God helped very much even my wife she cannot be still alive because she was alone nobody helped her. The nurse came on Saturday at 7 o'clock. I am in the new Location (5 rooms for £2 10s. a month). She found that the children are dead. She never report to the Office. I went to the Office to get the Burial Order. I found that nothing was reported. I went up and down looking for that nurse at last I found her she gave me some papers. The Rev. of the C. Mission refused because nobody signed the papers. I came back again at last I got the permissions. The paper was signed on Monday. The case would have gone to the Doctors as it was said on Saturday at the Office. Now I don't know what had happened. On Monday we went to the Office nothing was said they just spoke with the nurse and we came back again.

Thanks very much.

Your servant.

SIMON.



Dear Sir,

I have been a member of the Legion for many years, but am now resident in England and feel that no useful purpose is served by my remaining a Legion member. Will you therefore kindly accept my resignation?

In these troubled times in South Africa there are very great tasks to be undertaken in the struggle for democratic government. The Legion has always been in the forefront of this struggle and I have always been proud to be a member. Let me wish you every success in your efforts. I am enclosing a postal order for £1 ls. I should like to give more, but funds are very short here.

Yours etc.,

R. KITAI.

Cambridge, England.

* * * *

Dear Sir,

I cannot help writing a brief comment on the election results. You may not say so yourselves, but I will say it for you: "We told you so!" It is quite remarkable how an analysis of the results prove the wisdom of the analysis you gave the country in last year's pamphlet, "Action Stations", in which you said that at all costs the Nats. had to be got out BEFORE the delimitation commission was appointed. I believe we might well have scraped home, had it not been for the recommendations of the Delimitation Commission, which accidentally or not, loaded the dice against us.

I hope you will give your readers a clear analysis of what we may expect in the coming months and a clear statement of what must be done to save South Africa.

Yours etc.,

F. R. ROUX.

Palmyra Road, Newlands.

Dear Sir,

If you look at the cheques paid in in March, you will find I have already paid my subscription.

What a blow the Nats. getting in again! I wonder how soon they will start closing down the Springbok Legion and any other democratic organisations? It is a pity, I think, that an open-minded democratic institution such as the S.L., should take on quite a religious fervour of belief in Stalin, etc., as is apparent in "Fighting Talk" . . . I know . . . I do feel that a more unbiassed attitude to world affairs would be better and be more convincing to intelligent readers of "Fighting Talk." I do not enjoy criticising "Fighting Talk" at this juncture, when to appear communistic is a punishable offence. I am sure you will see my point of view.

Yours etc.,

FANIA POCOCK.

Main Road, Muizenberg.

(This letter has been abridged.—Ed.)

* * * *

Dear Friend,

It was nice to hear from you again, even though your letters always bristle with a score of subjects that would require volumes to discuss exhaustively.

You refer in general terms to a "more unbiassed attitude to world affairs." Can anyone be credited today with having an "unbiassed attitude?" Do the Americans credit Churchill with an unbiassed attitude, when he calls for a meeting of the Big Three? The U.S. accuses him of 'appeasing the Communists'. Did you think Attlee unbiassed when he attacked certain sections in the U.S.A. and said that they did not want peace? Perhaps you would reply, "Ah yes! but Churchill and Attlee also slate the Russians." And yet, Churchill even rejected the U.S. claim that the Russians were responsible for the war in Laos. He said in effect that we must not be so foolish as to blame Russia for all natural, inevitable nationalist-liberatory movements. (He didn't mention in that context Malaya and Kenya!)

But still, where do these differences of opinion leave you and me in relation to the present situation in South Africa? United, I believe, on the necessity of getting rid of the Nationalist Government: united, too, on the fundamental principles which we believe ab-

solutely essential for the achievement and maintenance of democratic government in South Africa. To my way of thinking, we have in common all that is necessary to ensure that we make a worthwhile contribution to the continuing struggle.

Yours etc.,

EDITOR.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

The article, "How Liberal are the Liberals?" was written by C. G. Williams of Somerset House, 110 Fox Street, Johannesburg.

* * * *

The article, "Heartbreak Houses," was written by J. Podbrey of Somerset House, 110 Fox Street, Johannesburg.

* * * *

The article, "Free Trade Unions," was written by P. J. Hodgson of Somerset House, 110 Fox Street, Johannesburg.

* * * *

The article, "If this be Progress", was written by R. Cousins of Somerset House, 110 Fox Street, Johannesburg.

Woburn Pharmacy

Henry Moss, M.P.S.

17 Wanderers St., JOHANNESBURG.

Telephone 22-8324

P.O. Box 4018

Amper Alles vir Motor Voertuie — Almost Everything for the Motor Vehicle

MILLERS UNITED MOTORS (PTY.) LTD.

WHOLESALE FACTORS TO THE MOTOR TRADE

104 Marshall Street, Motortown, JOHANNESBURG.

Telephone 33-1319

P.O. Box 5462

Tel. Address: "MUMILA."



MEET YOUR FRIENDS

— AT THE —

**BROADWAY
HOTEL**

The Sportsman's Rendezvous



CYMA
ON TIME ALL THE TIME

UNDERWEAR MANUFACTURERS

(EDMS.) BEPERK.

•
INTERLOCK WOL- EN KUNSSY
ONDERKLERE.

•
Telefoon 33-6477 Posbus 1487
JOHANNESBURG.



FOR CHILDRENS' WEAR
WHOLESALE ONLY

P.O. Box 2996, Johannesburg

Day Phone 25-3963.
Night Phone 25-3796.

Malvern Pharmacy

CHEMIST AND OPTICIANS

Jules Street, Malvern,
JOHANNESBURG.

Support the . . .

**POLIO
FUND**

Support your
EX-SERVICE MEMBERS

LET
PROMPT

PRINTING CO. (PTY.), LIMITED
Print it For You.

BETTER — PROMPTLY AND AT
NO EXTRA COST.

7 Harris Street, Westgate,
JOHANNESBURG.
P.O. Box 2225. Phone 33-7671

DELICIOUS AND REFRESHING

**KILTY
FRUIT TABLETS**

in 3d. Packets.

Each tablet is individually wrapped.
IN ALL POPULAR FLAVOURS
KILTY MEANS QUALITY

**STEWART'S
REXALL PHARMACY**
S. Joffe, M.P.S.

DISPENSING CHEMIST
PHOTOGRAPHIC SPECIALIST

280a, Louis Botha Avenue,
ORANGE GROVE

Day Phone 45-1810 Night Phone 45-1576

**W. NISSEN
(PTY.), LTD.**

Manufacturers' Representatives.

Transvaal and O.F.S. Branch:
P.O. Box 1326, Johannesburg.

Natal Branch:
P.O. Box 2420, Durban.

•
P.O. Box 1665, CAPE TOWN.

Phone 5-3493.

Locomotive Hotel

SALT RIVER

FAVOURITE
RENDEZVOUS

Unless otherwise stated, J. Podbrey, 5 Somerset House, Fox Street, Johannesburg, is responsible for all political matter in this issue.