

31. AUG 1956

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY
COPYRIGHT SECTION



LIBERATION

ONE SHILLING

No. 20. August, 1956.

**First Attacks Of Colonialism
On African Society**

—by H. LAWSON

**Towards A Cultural Boycott
Of South Africa**



A JOURNAL OF DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION

LIBERATION NEEDS YOUR SUPPORT!

Do you agree with everything you read in **LIBERATION**? Of course you do not. Everybody has something to say on the vital issues discussed in the pages of this magazine—why not express your views on paper, and write to **LIBERATION**? Contributions in the form of letters or articles are welcome. Contributors are invited to write on subjects that appear in **LIBERATION** or any other topical issues which interest them.

LIBERATION is a journal of **discussion**. Only **discussion** keeps it alive. Read and discuss our articles. Pass your copy of **LIBERATION** on to others. If you do not already do so, subscribe to **LIBERATION**. (See form below.)

SUBSCRIBE TO "LIBERATION"

LIBERATION is published ten times a year. Send ten shillings for one year, or five shillings for six months to:—

**LIBERATION,
P.O. BOX 10120,
JOHANNESBURG.**

Fill in this form:

NAME

ADDRESS

To **LIBERATION**. Please send me **LIBERATION** for one year/six months. I enclose 10 shillings/five shillings (cross out that which does not apply).

LIBERATION

A Journal of Democratic Discussion

No. 20. August, 1956

One Shilling

CONTENTS

Editorial—Violence Breeds Violence	1
The Capitalist Crisis and South Africa (Part 2)	4
Gold Coast Independence	9
The Role of Capitalism in South African History	11
Towards A Cultural Boycott of South Africa	16
Bantu Education	19

Editorial

VIOLENCE BREEDS VIOLENCE

WHEN rioting breaks out in the streets of Johannesburg, all our wise men of the Government and the Police and the City Council can talk about is the need for still more repressive measures, stricter "control," possible closing of the Mai Mai Beer Hall. It does not seem to occur to them that the rioting itself is the result of all their "control," their police measures, their utter failure to consider the needs of the African as a human being and a citizen. The other day, the Johannesburg City Council's Non-European Affairs Committee introduced a draconic new set of location regulations banning almost any sort of meeting among the tens of thousands of voteless Africans who live in the apartheid townships under the city's control. It took the combined protests of the Black Sash women, the Labour and Liberal Parties, the Congress of Democrats and other European organisations before the Committee would even recognise that there was something wrong. In

the end they agreed to reconsider the regulations, but only after their ex-Labour Party Chairman, Dr. Boris Wilson, had heatedly defended them.

How often, within recent months, have violent clashes taken place between Africans and the police! Every time Minister Swart is asked to appoint a judicial enquiry into one of these incidents, he scoffs at the idea. He does not link up these clashes with his own instructions to the police to shoot first. He regards them as a normal feature of life in South Africa and feels it would be absurd to hold an enquiry into each incident.

Crimes of violence are becoming more and more common in our cities. Every African knows it is not safe to walk in the townships at night. Hundreds are assaulted and robbed every week-end. The police offer additional protection—but only to householders with telephones in the White suburbs.

Every new repressive measure announced by the authorities can only serve to aggravate this situation. The resentment and frustration born of white baasskap, and intensified by eight years of fierce Nationalist rule; the endless acts of violence by police, foremen, officials and farmers; the intolerable threat to extend the passbook system to women, all these form the background to the flare-ups which are becoming more and more widespread and frequent. It has been said often enough (even, in its saner moments, by the United Party) that Nationalist rule is making South Africa into a prison. Prison is a rough school; we should not be surprised when the pupils show that they have learnt their lesson well.

THE MINISTERS CALL A CONFERENCE

The Government remains deaf and blind to all these lessons. Their plan is simply to go on piling up mountains of repression, until the country becomes an armed camp. And Strijdom and other spokesmen keep on telling the world that it is quite mistaken about South Africa; the "natives" are really quite happy and contented. The African National Congress? A lot of agitators. The delegation of the Advisory Boards? Also agitators. Perhaps Dr. Verwoerd imagines that the sickening adulation from N.A.D. officials and Bantu school inspectors which he prints in "Bantu-Bantoe" is the real voice of the African people?

If so, perhaps the conference which has been decided upon by the African Interdenominational Ministers will wake him up. The ministers are to be congratulated in taking this step, for with the support of Congress, Advisory Boards and other bodies, the conference promises to be the most broadly representative of all shades of African opinion ever held.

Many important results may be hoped for from this conference. In the first place it is to be hoped that it will express such a complete and unambiguous rejection of apartheid, the Verwoerd system of legislation (including the Bantu Authorities Act, passes for women and Bantu Education) that it will be impossible for the Government ever again to

claim that its laws have African support, and impossible ever again for any Chief or other stooge to support them without exposing himself as a Quisling. Secondly, the Conference will render a tremendous service if it can arrive at an effective plan of action to unite all Africans in defence of their future and their very survival. Thirdly, it would be a splendid thing if the entire Conference could be persuaded to throw its support behind the Congress policy of inter-racial harmony and liberty and equality for all, as expressed in the Freedom Charter; though we are convinced, of course, that Congressmen present will not make such support a condition for co-operation with non-Congress Africans.

TRADE UNIONS—WHAT NEXT?

Very significant, too, in another field, is the proposed all-in trade union conference suggested by the S.A. Congress of Trade Unions to consider the pressing economic problems facing the workers, and the proper reply by the Unions to the new Industrial Conciliation Act. The Act, which has been published but will only come into force on a date to be announced by the Government, is the death-warrant of the free trade union movement as we have hitherto known it in South Africa, as it affects unions of White, Coloured and Indian workers. African workers' unions, of course, have never enjoyed any legal status or recognition. Government policy is to kill these unions; they survive in spite of the Government. But unions without African members have been, to some extent protected. Once "registered" they could insist on the employers meeting them to reach industrial agreements, and these agreements had the force of law.

It must be admitted that in accepting this form of recognition, the non-African unions voluntarily crippled themselves. Excluding a large number of workers—the Africans—they were like a man who agrees to have an arm or a leg cut off. That is why these unions have been unable to resist all the Nationalists' anti-labour legislation, culminating in the terrible new Act. The Act now faces them with a most painful new decision. If they want to stay registered and recognised they will either have to accept White baasskap in the trade union movement or else split up into separate unions for Whites and Coloured workers. Is a union which is run by the White members alone really a trade union? Seeing that all the employers are Whites it is more likely to degenerate into a sort of company union! But on the other hand if the unions are split along racial lines this will merely play into the bosses' hands. They will be even more crippled than under the old I.C. Act.

But is there not a third alternative? Suppose that the great majority of the registered unions should refuse totally to co-operate in the implementation of this hateful law! Suppose they decided to have nothing to do with registration and the Labour Department until this Act has been repealed! The Act would not work for a day without the co-operation of the registered trade unions. And if they were joined in such a common struggle for the repeal of anti-labour legislation, this would at once put an end to the wretched suspicion and antagonism between White and non-White workers which this Act was designed to

bring about: each section fearful that the other will break away and collar part of the accumulated funds and assets of the organisation; each contemplating running to see the Minister to try and get him to reserve certain classes of skilled work for "their own" racial group. What a sorry spectacle!

Yet it could all be ended overnight if the majority of unions would wake up to the true function of their organisations, would realise that a worker is a worker and the only hope in standing together, would reach out a helping hand to organise the myriads of unorganised African fellow-workers, would join hands in a common resolve to **refuse to work the I.C. Act.**

That is why it would be a major tragedy for the working class if the T.U.C. and other co-ordinating bodies refuse to accept the invitation to join in convening this conference and if their affiliated organisations stand aside from it. For the icy breath of the world crisis of the capitalist system has already reached this country; already in the clothing and other industries unemployment is spreading fast. And how are the workers to meet this crisis if they continue divided into water-tight race compartments, White, Coloured, Indian and African workers jostling and fighting over the few crumbs that fall from the rich man's table?

The true strength of the workers lies not in a scrap of Government paper—the registration certificate—but in the unconquerable unity of men and women of every race and colour, in factory, shop and mine, expressed through powerful industrial trade unions embracing every employee in each industry, from the labourer, the machine-minder and the operative to the skilled journeyman or artisan.

THE CAPITALIST CRISIS AND SOUTH AFRICA

(Part 2)

By "ECONOMIST"

The first part of this article appeared in the June issue of **LIBERATION**. We regret that owing to printing difficulties and delays in the appearance of the magazine it was not possible to print this article complete at the time it was written—now some months ago. The writer predicted various trends which have now developed along the lines he indicated.

IF crisis is latent in America, it is much closer in Britain. But here the problem is inflation, not deflation—too few goods to meet the demand, not too many. The contradictions of Britain's economy express themselves in what is known as "the balance of payments" problem—the problem of paying for essential imports with a lesser total of

exports. (For reasons for this, see R. P. Dutt: Crisis of Britain and the British Empire.) Traditionally, these payments have been met from the additional income obtained from colonial exploitation, as well as by the export of capital. Today this "solution" becomes more difficult; many of the best foreign investments have been lost to British capital, taken over by Britain's American "partner," who takes eager advantage of every British weakness. British capitalists have attempted to overcome these difficulties by increasing still further their exploitation of the colonial lands that remain. This is the reality that lies beneath the talk of "welfare" and "development schemes." And yet it is not enough. Britain is today unable to pay for vital imports.

This perpetual dilemma of British capitalism grows more acute as new factors come into play. The United States economy has expanded rapidly, and Germany and Japan have reappeared as serious competitors of Britain on the world markets, with especially fierce rivalry in textiles, machinery and motor-cars. Consequently, Britain's share of world trade has been declining for the past five years, and is now less than it was before the war. In addition there is what is politely called the "unfavourable movement in terms of trade"—meaning that the colonial countries, after centuries of exploitation as producers of primary products, are beginning to insist on and obtain higher prices for their raw materials. Britain's despairing reaction to events in the Middle East which presage the day when Britain's oil will have to be bought from the Arabs where formerly it was extorted by the oil monopolies, symbolises the process. Added to these troubles there is a continual inflationary process internally, which has reduced the purchasing value of the 1938 pound to less than 7s. 6d. today.

COLD WAR

Such a position, bad enough in itself, has been aggravated by the senseless policy—self-imposed under heavy pressure from the United States—which prevents trade between Britain and the countries of Socialism. Thus, while there is unemployment in Britain's motor industry, China seeks to place an order for almost a million and a half tractors, but American-inspired "embargo" policy prevents its acceptance. **But the main aggravating factor in Britain's crisis is the £1,500 million which is being spent each year on armaments production and "overseas military expenditure"—colonial wars, and colonial military bases.**

Though all classes, even a section of the capitalist class itself, are awakening to the reality that war production and preparation is producing a state of chronic crisis, the Tory Government are attempting to meet the crisis not by a change in policy, but by making the working class meet the deficit. In February, 1955, Butler first raised the Bank Rate to 4½ per cent; but the step proved completely ineffective, for imports continued to rise more rapidly than exports. There followed the autumn budget; still no good. Butler gave way to Macmillan; and in February 1956, the Bank Rate was again raised, this time to 5½ per cent; subsidies to keep food prices down were reduced; expenditure on

nationalised industry was reduced; rents were increased; purchase tax on many goods was increased; expenditure on school and house building was reduced.

Clearly these are measures aimed at reducing the standard of living of the working population. Imports are too high; so the Tory solution is to lower working class incomes and thus reduce the demand. They have begun to talk about a "pool" of 800,000 unemployed as a means to "restore mobility and flexibility to the labour market,"—or in simpler English, as a means towards the lowering of wages and the breaking of trade-union standards. Already the middle classes, especially those with fixed monthly incomes, have been severely hit by inflation; this is reflected in the unusual militancy now being shown by such normally respectable groups as bank and insurance clerks, and by school teachers. While the Tories are attempting to reduce inflation at the expense of the working people, there is serious danger that they will only aggravate still further the factors that are driving Britain towards depression. The first indications are already present in the motor, electrical goods and furniture industries, in all of which workers were already being dismissed or placed on "short-time." Toryism feeds on Britain's economic crisis but cannot solve it. That solution needs drastic and radical measures to change the basis of Britain's economy; and such measures can and will be taken only by a working class government.

REFLECTIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

How do such critical conditions as those now current in Britain and the U.S.A. (see Part I of this article, 'Liberation' June issue) affect the economy of South Africa? It is clear that a crisis of the economy of Britain and America cannot fail to cause severe shocks in South Africa, no matter how apparently stable and secure are the purely internal foundations of our economy. It is fruitful to compare the present position with that of 1929, when the New York Stock Exchange crash took place in October. This crash began a catastrophic decline in production, in employment and in income from which overseas capitalism never really recovered until World War II. In South Africa, prices of farm produce began to fall early in 1929; and in August the Reserve Bank raised its discount rate. In 1931, Britain abandoned the Gold Standard, but in South Africa the ruling Nationalist Party decided to remain on gold. This meant that the South African pound was artificially kept at too high a level.

The depression in South Africa lasted till 1932 and was marked by the following features; a continuous fall in the value and the quantity of our exports of farm produce; the collapse of the diamond market; a loss of capital estimated at approximately £15 million; depression in industry, reflecting the reduced purchasing power of the farming community; an unrealistic Government policy which not only failed to act to relieve the depression, but actually took measures which accentuated it. In December 1932, South Africa was eventually forced off the Gold Standard. Immediately this had the effect of raising the price of gold (as in the devaluation of 1949) and setting in motion a

speculative boom in gold mining, which lifted the whole economy out of depression and led to the renewed expansion of industry.

But in today's position there are significant differences. The depth and severity of the overseas crisis is likely to be substantially less than in 1929. (While we have argued above that a crisis is inevitable, it seems probable that Government expenditure will prevent any prolonged period of depression; but here a great deal depends on the strength and actions of organised labour in Britain and the U.S.A.) In addition, the South African Government of today is better equipped to understand its own economic problems, and is unlikely to repeat the errors of the past; but this factor is qualified by the possibility that Nationalist insistence on apparent "independence from Britain" could well lead to wrong and unsound decisions. Then again, the importance of agriculture in South Africa's economy has declined since 1929 as a result of the extensive development of secondary industry. From this fact it is sometimes argued that South Africa will, this time, be completely unaffected by an overseas crisis. But this is not tenable. Though their share has been reduced, farmers still form a large part of the total consumption, and in 1954, agriculture accounted for some £260 million or 20 per cent of our national income.

It seems apparent that the effects of an overseas depression cannot but be felt through our imports and exports, and through the flow of capital. How would these factors operate? The following tables* compare the composition and direction of South African exports and imports in 1954.

1. COMPOSITION.

Imports	Percentage of imports	Exports	Percentage of exports
Food and Raw materials	14%	Agricultural produce	19%
Oils and Petrol	15%	Wool	14%
Textiles and Piece goods	21%	Diamonds and Base	
Machinery, Vehicles, and other manufactured items	50%	metals	9%
		Manufactured goods	18%
		Gold and Uranium	40%
	<hr/> 100%		<hr/> 100%

2. DIRECTION.

	Percentage of imports	Percentage of exports (excluding gold)
United Kingdom	35%	34%
Rest of Commonwealth	17%	29%
United States	20%	9%
Europe	20%	25%
Others: Asia, Mid. E. etc.	8%	3%
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%

* Source: "The Commonwealth and the Sterling Area. 75th Statistical Abstract."

The second table shows the extent to which we are dependent upon the United Kingdom and other countries of the Commonwealth. But more important is the first table, which reveals the vulnerable character of our exports. **Over 40 per cent of our exports consist of primary (i.e. raw material) products, whereas imports are predominantly manufactured articles—over 70 per cent of the total imports. It is an invariable characteristic of depressions that the prices of primary products such as wool, diamonds etc., fall much more than the prices of manufactured goods. Thus it must be expected that, with the onset of a depression, there will be a sharp fall in the income we derive from our export trade. Here we have the first danger spot.**

GOLD AND PROSPERITY

There is, however, the possibility of a rise in the price of gold. At the moment, the Americans, with whom the decision on this matter rests, adamantly refuse to agree to any increase in price; the effect of such an increase, it is argued, would be highly inflationary in the United States. In times of depression, however, this argument loses much of its force, and an increase in the price of the gold at such a time is quite possible, even likely. Much as the Union Government spokesmen might argue about the necessity for such an increased price, it would not offset the loss of income which depression brings to the agriculturists, since the increased profits of the gold mines would accrue to a very small portion of the population—the shareholders.

But insofar as a higher gold price increases the profitability of production, it will have a beneficial effect on the rest of the economy; it can, accordingly, lessen both the impact and the duration of the depression in South Africa.

Finally, there is the question of the inflow of foreign capital. Although domestic savings are higher now than in 1929, South Africa is still greatly dependent on the inflow of capital from abroad. Yet in 1955, the nett inflow of capital into the Union fell to the low level of £8 million. Much of the inflow was in the form of Government loans; but in the field of private capital enterprise, the outflow of capital actually exceeded the inflow by £3 million. The explanation for this must be sought in the unfavourable reaction of investors to the present South African Government and the uncertainty as to the future in South Africa; in the high level of interest rates in England, and in the operation of the "credit squeeze" on the London capital market. This trend if it continues, cannot but be extremely dangerous for the future, since a drying-up of capital from abroad will impede and restrict the development of South Africa's economy. The main source of overseas capital is still Britain; but there have been significant increases in American investment in the Union. A depression in either of these countries is likely to lead to a sharp reduction in their export of capital. In the depression of the 'thirties, for example, British capital subscribed to Overseas Loans fell sharply from £59 million in 1930 to £14 million the following year; and by 1932, the flow was completely reversed, with £11 million flowing back to Britain in excess of the amount of new

loans.* There is no reason to believe that another and similar depression would not have similar results. And here then, in the threat to our economic expansion, lies the second danger sign.

As we stated in the first part of this article, it is not the function of this article to prophesy, but rather to assess the facts. And the facts are clear. A crisis is patently developing in the economies of the great citadels of capitalism overseas. From that crisis, the capitalist world is passing into a period of depression which may well be severe, but whose duration and depth will be determined in part by political action against armament drives, cold-wars and military adventures, and by political action to ensure large-scale measures of social welfare and the expansion of East-West trade. South Africa, cushioned though it may be by the gold mining industry, assisted though it may be by a rise in the price of gold, cannot fail to be affected by such a depression. And those who will feel its effects most sharply in South Africa will be, as always, the unorganised sections of the working class, who are least able to protect their own interests.

If there are morals to be drawn then, they are these. Capitalism in the year 1956 is unable to control the great genie of industrial and economic might which it has developed. A change in the social order is on the agenda everywhere in the capitalist world, South Africa included. But until that change is made, let the working people look to their own organisation, to their trade union solidarity and strength. For that is their only defence against the cold winds of depression that are beginning to blow. The writing is on the wall!

* Sir Robert Kindersley: "British Overseas Investment." Economic Journal 1935.

GOLD COAST INDEPENDENCE

By KOFI BATSA (Gold Coast)

ON April 20, 1956, the Gold Coast Government issued a White Paper which "embodies the proposals of the Gold Coast Government on the final constitutional arrangements to be made to enable the Gold Coast to achieve its independence."

The Gold Coast Government envisages the following legal measures:

"(a) An order in council removing the Governor's reserve and discretionary powers;

(b) an act of the United Kingdom Parliament conferring upon the Gold Coast Legislature law-making powers which cannot be conferred by order in council;

(c) Letters Patent creating the office of Governor-General; and

(d) Royal Instructions to the Governor-General to replace the existing Royal Instructions to the Governor."

The White Paper sets out in detail the matters which must be considered in drafting the proposed amendments to the existing Gold Coast Constitution.

The Government proposes that at independence the Gold Coast should become a member of the British Commonwealth and its name should be changed from "Gold Coast" to "Ghana."

It must be mentioned that before this White Paper there had been negotiations between the Gold Coast Government and the United Kingdom Government and the present White Paper was designed for "the limited transitional period which was necessary in order that the requisite constitutional and administrative arrangements for independence could be made."

In the introduction to the "Constitutional Proposals for Independence," the Gold Coast Government states: "It is gratifying to observe that with the full co-operation of His Excellency the Governor and the Secretary of State for the Colonies it has been possible to effect, during the present transitional period, most of the constitutional and administrative arrangements which must precede Independence."

A study of the White Paper shows clearly that the Gold Coast Government has already completed its negotiations in chambers with the British Government.

But it must be mentioned that there is a lack of "general agreement" on the Government White Paper in the Gold Coast.

There is the right-wing view that the White Paper does not command that "measure of general agreement in the Gold Coast which is a prerequisite for granting independence."

This view is clearly reflected in the editorial of the British Conservative "Daily Telegraph" of the 20th April, 1956. The "Telegraph" thinks that because the Gold Coast Government feels that in the present temper of the country elections would lead to violence, "it acknowledges the Gold Coast's disunity and unreadiness for independence at the pace Dr. Nkrumah plans."

The Left-wing view is that since 1951 there have been agreements between the present leaders of the Gold Coast Government and the British Government to determine the pace at which Gold Coast should advance to independence. A lot has been given out to Britain through these agreements.

The extent to which the Gold Coast Government is committing itself to the Volta River Project which gives away 168 million tons of aluminium to British and American interests as "Gold Coast's contribution to world peace" must be mentioned in this respect.

The fight of the Government against progressive movements and honest and sincere trade union and youth leaders must be cited further.

The willingness with which Britain has been dishing out constitutional concessions to the leaders of the Gold Coast Government on a "silver platter" without any friction of any sort, must be stated.

In this wise Dr. Cheddi Jagan should be quoted: "If power is likely to be transferred to honest, sincere leaders, the constitution is

designed to place effective control with the Colonial Office. But if leaders can be found who will stooge to, and do the dirty work of the imperialists, then 'advanced' constitutions will follow."

If the Gold Coast Government's White Paper should be credited with any seriousness as a genuine document on independence for the Gold Coast, the negotiations during the "transitional period" should be made clear.

The demand of the Gold Coast is that full independence should be achieved right now. It must be independence without strings. The masses and the youth of the Gold Coast have been paying dearly for this independence and they are not prepared to accept selling out of any kind.

THE ROLE OF CAPITALISM IN SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY

First Attacks of Colonialism on African Society

By H. LAWSON

**The first two articles in this series appeared in previous issues
of LIBERATION**

BOER CATTLE STEALING

The wealth which enabled the nations of Western Europe to develop capitalist industry was to a large extent drawn from the peoples of Asia, Africa and America by the most ruthless methods of robbery and violence. We have illustrated some of these methods of "primitive accumulation" by quoting some of the practices of the Dutch East India Company (See Liberation, Feb. 1956), and we have also indicated how the white settlers at the Cape applied these methods to the Hottentots whom they robbed of their land and their cattle. (See Liberation, No. 17.)

The economy of the Boers was of such a primitive nature that theft constituted almost the only means known to them of increasing their herds. When the trekboers reached the eastern parts of the Cape towards the latter part of the eighteenth century they turned their attention to the vast herds and lands possessed by the African people. These they tried to obtain by the same methods of robbery, treachery and violence that had defeated the Hottentot tribes.

In 1770 the boundary of the Colony was officially established a'

the Gamtoos River where Africans and Boers had met fifteen years previously. But the Boers soon invaded the African lands in search of loot. Early in 1780 two Commandos made a cattle raid and murdered many defenceless people. In 1781 a Commando took 5,330 cattle in two months. In 1788 a Graaff-Reinet official wrote to Cape Town that "some of the inhabitants here have already for a long time wished to pick a quarrel with this nation (the Xosas) in order that, were it possible, they might make a good loot, since they are always casting covetous eyes on the cattle the Kaffirs possess." In 1793 they obtained their object. The first Commando of that year took 1,800 cattle and murdered the owners, another Commando took 2,000 cattle and murdered 40 people, while the third and largest Commando under the "Liberal" Maynier took no fewer than 10,000 cattle and also 180 women and children as prisoners for slave labour. The Boers told outsiders that they were merely recovering cattle that had been stolen from them; but that truthfulness was not one of the Boers' outstanding characteristics may be seen from the fact that the total number of cattle shown on their tax returns was only about one-eighth of the number they claimed to have lost.

It is an absurd distortion to describe these cattle raids as "wars." As a matter of fact, in these "wars" there were no Boer casualties! The methods of the Boers were those of the sneak thief; their cowardice was as great as their appetite for loot. Thus Maynier writes of the Boer Commandos: "I have always found that when there was not a considerable number of Hottentots with them to be placed in the front, and the first exposed to danger, they never succeeded. An instance in proof of this may even now be seen in a late Commando, to form which 300 inhabitants were summoned but of whom only 80 appeared, and according to the accounts no more than 12 ventured to attack a kraal, mostly filled with women and children."

In 1799 war did break out. The oppressed Hottentot servants of the Boers threw off their yoke and made common cause with the Africans. On the causes of the war Governor Young writes in 1800 "that neither the Hottentots nor the Caffers have been the aggressors but the savage and oppressive conduct of the Dutch Boers, more uncivilised even than the others."

The decisive action of the war was fought in June 1799, when a Commando of 300 Boers under van Rensburg was defeated by 150 Xosas and Hottentots on the east bank of the Sundays River. After this the Boers fled in panic. However, they tried to make up for their military defeats by redoubling their efforts to rob the Africans of their cattle. In 1802 they captured no less than 15,800 in a single year. In these efforts they were soon decisively supported by a power infinitely greater than their own, the power of British Imperialism, which had reasons of its own for desiring the destruction of African society.

INTERVENTION OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

At the time she gained possession of the Cape Britain was engaged in a life and death struggle with her great rival, France. Britain had lost

a large part of her American colonies as a result of the successful war of liberation which some of the latter had waged. The centre of the British Empire now lay firmly in the East. Britain's eastern trade increased more than three times between 1790 and 1817. It was the necessity of protecting these commercial interests that determined British policy at the Cape in the first place.

In their occupation of the Cape the British rulers found themselves with an alien and largely hostile population. In order to deal with this situation they adopted a policy which was a typical mixture of oppressive and conciliatory measures. Politically, they destroyed what little freedom had existed in the Company days. The British Governor had far more autocratic powers than his predecessors, and the abolition of the Heemraden meant the end of any semblance of democracy for the white settlers.

Having stifled the possibility of any political opposition the Colonial rulers proceeded to win over certain sections of the white community. They abolished the trade restrictions that still operated and so ensured the support of the local budding capitalists. At the same time the frontier boers were helped against the Africans. By these means Britain sought to create a social basis for her colonial rule among a section of the local inhabitants.

As far as the African population was concerned, the new rulers brought calamities compared to which the cattle raids of the Boers had been mere flea bites. In the first place, the British army was not composed of cowardly cattle thieves but of ruthless and dehumanised mercenaries whose profession was destruction. Moreover, they appeared in their thousands where the Boers had mustered only a few hundred. When they attacked the African people the damage they were able to inflict was tremendous. In the very first campaign against chief Ndlambe 23,000 cattle were taken, but this was only a foretaste of greater horrors to come.

In any case, cattle were a subsidiary consideration with the British. They were more interested in trade, for example. As British industry expanded British Imperialism had to find markets for British manufactures. Thus trade fairs for the African trade were started in Grahamstown in 1817. The volume of this trade gives some idea of the economic wealth still commanded by the African people at this time. Thus, in one seven-month period in the eighteen-twenties for which records are available the Africans exported 15,000 skins to Grahamstown.

The effects of this trade on African society will be more fully *discussed in our next article*; at present let us *merely note* that it introduced a completely new factor into the relations between African tribes. Thus Gaika, for example, was given a sort of trade monopoly by the British which he used for his own enrichment. It was this which drew upon him such fierce retribution. The fight against Gaika was not just a "tribal squabble"; it was a struggle against a new force that was fast tearing the fabric of African society to shreds.

Another British interest was in African land. While the African people were still strong, land was obtained by all sorts of trickery, but later, when their strength had been broken, simple annexation was

resorted to. After the end of the Napoleonic War in 1815 the British began to look around for space on which to dump people whose livelihood had disappeared in the great economic depression that followed the war. The frontier regions of the Cape seemed to offer possibilities, so the Africans were persuaded to evacuate a strip of territory on the grounds that it was to be a "neutral" belt between the Colony and themselves.

This seemed to be a proposal in the interests of peace, but, no sooner had the Africans departed, than Governor Somerset writes to his superior: ". . . the country thus ceded is as fine a portion of ground as is to be found in any part of the world and . . . might perhaps be worthy of Your Lordship's consideration with a view to systematic colonization." His Lordship was only too agreeable, and so in 1820 the British settlers were dumped in the "neutral" territory, now called "ceded" territory. The indignation of the African people at this piece of trickery was great—they were not yet accustomed to "civilized" methods of statecraft.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMODITY PRODUCTION IN AGRICULTURE

The first third of the nineteenth century was marked by the first substantial accumulation of capital within the Cape Colony. The reasons for this development lay in the robbery of the wealth of the African people, the expenditure of the large British garrison (war profiteering was common), the increase of activity at the port of Cape Town and the opening up of new export markets for Cape products in England. The capital accumulated could only be invested in trade or agriculture. The former was a limited field, and so we find in this period the first development of a new type of capitalistic agriculture directed towards the production of commodities for local and overseas markets. This new type of agriculture slowly replaced the methods of slavery and nomad pastoralism. Its great opportunity came with the expansion of the British textile industry which created an insatiable demand for such raw materials as wool. Between 1822 and 1862 wool exports from the Cape increased from 20,000 lbs. to 25 million lbs.

The new type of farmer soon began to make profits which showed his system to be a much superior form of exploitation than slavery. For example, a handbook printed in 1868 reproduces the accounts of two representative wool farmers, one showing a profit of £2,860 in three years from an initial investment of £1,250, and the other a profit of £8,065 in seven years. This was a big change from the days when many white farmers hardly knew the use of money.

But to make these profits the farmers needed an army of wage labourers to exploit. This labour was needed not only on the farms themselves, but also on the roads and docks, for without these the wool could not be exported. Now, at the beginning of the new period there existed in the Cape no free wage labourers suitable for capitalist exploitation. The period covering roughly the second quarter of the

nineteenth century was therefore given over to the **creation** of such a class of labourers, for without this the accumulated capital was as unproductive as buried treasure. In order to make a profit the capitalist must use some of his money to purchase the labour power of workers who must sell their labour power in order to live. Where the capitalists do not find such a class of workers in existence they will do all in their power to create one.

In the Cape there were three distinct sources of labour power which might be converted into reservoirs of wage labour; these were, the Hottentot serfs on the farms of the trekboers and of other backward elements, the slaves and the Africans beyond the border. The first group were the smallest and the most easy to deal with, the last group were the most difficult but promised the greatest gain.

The conversion of the Hottentot serfs into wage labourers was completed by the well-known Ordinance 50 of 1828. This "freed" them from their dependence on the more backward farmers in order to deliver them into the hands of the new capitalistic farmers who could teach the trekboers a thing or two when it came to the exploitation of labour. The slaves were similarly freed a few years later, an event which was immediately followed by a tremendous wave of prosperity at the Cape. The point was that the dissolution of an outworn system had set free new economic forces of tremendous power.

Reactionary historians who long for the good old days of slavery have claimed that the freeing of the slaves was a great economic blow for the colonists. But any examination of the economic statistics of the period will show exactly the opposite to have been the case. Even the Nationalist Prof. Schumann is forced reluctantly to accept this fact. Of course, slavery was not abandoned for philanthropic reasons, either at the Cape or anywhere else. This step had become an economic necessity in the era of industrial capitalism. Slavery is a most inefficient method of production, and the short-sighted methods of the big West Indian slave plantations were seriously threatening the profits of British capitalists. In the early years of the nineteenth century sugar exports from the West Indies greatly decreased owing to the exhaustion of the soil, and hundreds of sugar planters went bankrupt. The freeing of the slaves with liberal compensation came as a welcome financial relief to many of them.

The amount of wage labour that became available in the Cape Colony as a result of the alteration in the status of serfs and slaves was insufficient for the growing needs of the capitalist farmers. The African territories therefore had to be converted into labour reservoirs. This process we will deal with in our next article.

(The fourth and last article in this series will appear in "Liberation" shortly.)

The writer of this article puts forward his point of view regarding a cultural boycott of South Africa. Since this matter is arousing much discussion and interest, we invite any readers who would like to put forward a different point of view to write their views for "Liberation."

Towards A Cultural Boycott Of South Africa

By A. M. KATHRADA

THE progress towards maturity of a national movement brings with it new problems, new tasks and new issues, often requiring new policies, or rather, precise policies in ever-increasing spheres of life. Whereas a decade ago the national organisations could have been satisfied with a purely political programme, their development in recent years has had an increasing influence and effect on a wider strata of people.

Although there have been occasions in the past when the people's organisations have been called upon to declare their attitudes on questions not dealt with in their programmes, essentially their main interest was restricted to the political field. So that today they find themselves in the position where they have no clearly defined policies towards several important questions. Such a question for instance is the cultural relationship between South Africa and the outside world, a question which of late has evoked much interest and some spontaneous action abroad.

In the years since the end of the Second World War our country has been visited by scores of foreign artists—theatre groups, dance and cultural ensembles—and scores more are scheduled to come. While ninety-nine per cent of their performances have been restricted to European audiences, a few shows have been organised for the Non-White people. South African cultural groups also have visited foreign lands. There have also been a few token protests on the part of foreign artists against racialism in South Africa. Notable of these was the refusal of Jazz Band leader Ted Heath to come to South Africa and the resolution of the British Musicians' Union.

On both these actions of definite political significance, the national organisations in South Africa have remained silent. Naturally this gives rise to important questions. Should we continue to remain silent? Do we agree with Ted Heath's action, and if so should similar action not be encouraged? If foreign artists do come to South Africa should we not arrange for them to appear before Non-White audiences? Isn't a greater

cultural, sports and economic exchange in line with the international trend for peaceful co-existence?

On these questions three distinct schools of thought seem to be apparent in this country.

Firstly, there are those who are for maintaining the status quo: i.e. foreign artists should continue to come and it is immaterial whether they perform to Non-Whites or not.

Secondly, there are the people who would like to see more and more foreign artists visit this country provided they could be made to undertake to perform for Non-Whites as well. This group falls into line with the attitude taken by the British Musicians' Union, and also, the writer believes, by the Union of Southern African Artists.

The third school of thought maintains that it should be the policy of the progressive movement to work towards an international cultural boycott of South Africa as a protest against racialism.

We have to consider which one of these courses would most contribute towards the progress or enhance the cause of the oppressed people of South Africa.

The first course we could eliminate without any discussion.

Briefly the protagonists of the second course take the stand that:—

(a) With the very restricted opportunities open to Non-Whites in the field of culture, regular performances by overseas artists would go a long way towards filling the vacuum. "We would rather see Dame Sybil Thorndyke even if she appears at the Bantu Men's Social Centre than not see her at all."

(b) Politically, the movement could benefit immensely if artists of the stature of Sybil Thorndyke could after first-hand experience return to their countries and espouse the cause of oppressed South Africa.

(c) If artists such as Paul Robeson were to perform in this country it would help to explode the myth of race superiority, and finally

(d) Being believers in peaceful co-existence between peoples, cultural exchanges between countries would greatly enhance our cause.

The third school of thought, to which the writer subscribes, naturally dismisses the protagonists of the first course. As for the second school, the writer believes that while the arguments advanced are worthy of consideration, they have to be rejected in the light of the peculiar conditions existing in South Africa.

To obviate possible misunderstandings and unnecessary argument it should be clarified at the outset that the believers of the international boycott base their premise on the point of view that at this stage of development international pressure against South Africa's racial policies coupled with the local struggle, will greatly further the cause of freedom. This stand is not to be confused with local questions such as Non-Whites being forced to accept segregation in various walks of South African life. They base their stand primarily on the view that the perpetrators of racialism in this country derive strength and courage from the closeness that they (the racialists) feel to the outer world; indeed from the almost tacit consent and recognition that they receive from particularly the Western countries in the form of cultural and sports contact, economic and military association. The writer believes

that racist South Africans must be made to feel more and more that they stand alone in the whole world in their belief of racial superiority. They must be made to feel the pinch of isolation from the civilised world in the spheres of culture, sports, etc.

When viewing the reasons advanced by the Second school against this background all the merit in their arguments falls away. No freedom loving South African can disagree that South African racialism must be isolated from the world. And the most effective way open at the present time is for the outside world to make known its antagonism to what is happening here.

Let us weigh the arguments of the Second school from the point of view of their political value to the freedom struggle. Foreign artists come to South Africa and perform to a few Non-White audiences. Good. Some of them go back to their countries and speak out against racial discrimination and for the people's struggle. Very valuable. But, what impact does all this have on the day-to-day struggle of our people? The few thousand Non-Whites who manage to attend performances rendered by Dame Sybil Thorndyke or Yehudi Menuhin are very impressed. For them it's been the opportunity of a lifetime—absolutely unforgettable. For them there will remain a lasting memory of great cultural figures of distant lands. But as far as the overwhelming majority of the people are concerned, they remain quite unaffected by the visit of these distinguished guests. All right, one in a hundred of these artists goes back and makes statements or appears on public platforms to condemn racial discrimination. This gives rise to a furore in the White press and accusations are levelled about abuse of hospitality, about incompetence to judge a country by a few weeks' visit, etc. etc. But all this is momentary. While they have a good effect, in a few days it is forgotten; life returns to normal and the plight of South Africa once again fades away from people's minds and press columns. All is quiet until there is a repetition and again the same process.

All this is becoming too monotonous. The time has come when we must move forward. The chain of criticism, the pinch to racist South Africa must become continuous, unending, until they are made to think; until they are made to realise that each unit in society has its responsibilities to the greater whole; until they are made to appreciate the indispensability of inter-dependence.

We are told that artists such as Paul Robeson, Ram Gopal and other Non-White cultural figures would help to explode the myth of racial superiority. We agree entirely. But in the conditions existing in our country such a possibility must remain a dream. Definitely not in the foreseeable future can one imagine Paul Robeson being allowed to come here, or to perform before audiences of Whites and Non-Whites.

Finally, there is the very important question of peaceful co-existence. Non-White South Africans, like the common peoples all over the world, want to live in peace and harmony with other peoples. But it is entirely erroneous to use the argument of peaceful co-existence to offset an international cultural boycott. One can talk of promoting co-existence when talking of the French and Russian people or the Chinese and Indian people or for that matter of any people in the world. But as far

as South Africa is concerned, here again we have our peculiar conditions. Peaceful co-existence between whom? Between the Soviet people and a minority of the people of South Africa who rule the country and who solely enjoy all the rights to culture, education, etc? What would be more beneficial politically? An artiste troupe coming to South Africa from the Soviet Union and leaving behind wonderful impressions among a tiny fraction who partake of the country's cultural life? Or the Soviet troupe refusing to come to this country and thereby winning the admiration and gratitude of the overwhelming majority of the peoples?

One cannot just pick on a popular demand of the time and apply it mechanically to any country and to any situation. Of course, everyone would love to see Madame Ulanova or the Janacek Quartet, Yehudi Menuhin and the other great artists of the world. But the times demand a sacrifice in favour of the greater long-term benefit to the cause of the people's struggle. The continued performances by international cultural figures in South Africa will leave behind fine memories for a comparatively few people. The greater majority of the people will remain indifferent. But, let the artists and actors of the world boycott South Africa and thus help further the cause of progress and freedom.

BANTU EDUCATION

A COMMUNICATION

SIR,—The Government of the day has repeatedly told us that Bantu Education is not inferior in standard to that of the European child in this country, and that this was merely different because a "Bantu child" was "a child trained and conditioned in Bantu culture, endowed with a knowledge of a Bantu language and imbued with values, interests and behaviour patterns learnt at the knee of a Bantu mother." The fallacy of this contention will at once dawn on the mind of the reader for it is axiomatic that education, like the breath we breathe and the sunshine that warms us alike irrespective of race, country or colour, is one and indivisible.

The type of education which is intended to "function only in South Africa because it exists and can function only in and for a particular social setting" is clearly a hideous thing, a hydra-headed gorgon aimed at destroying the child's instinct for self-respect and to leave it a submissive, cringing, fear-ridden creature. What in effect is the social setting Bantu Education is intended to serve? Let us see what the "Bantu Education Journal" March 1956 has to say on this question:

"... but it must be recognised that in areas which are the scene of the conflicting interests of different racial groups the opportunity for the Bantu for unfettered development is severely restricted." Hence the

African's abject poverty and inferior position in industry due to being denied administrative jobs by successive Union governments. Prohibitive measures are increasingly piling up on the shoulders of the African to "restrict him severely" from responsible and lucrative posts in factories and industrial concerns. Bantu Education prepares the African child for menial and manual labour. Further, as to areas in which the interests of racial groups clash, not only the Proclaimed Urban or European areas but also the entire surface of the Union of South Africa constitutes a terrain of constant contradictions. Ever since our forefathers met the White man on the banks of the Fish River the struggle for land ownership has been waged ceaselessly, and with the Africans' loss of land ownership has gone hand in hand also the loss to him of his Freedom.

From the time of Union, and even before the four member Provinces were incorporated to form the Union of South Africa, signs have not been wanting of a tendency on the part of the powers that be to formulate an inferior, freak type of education for some time known as Native Education but which with further deterioration under the present Government became Bantu Education.

This is what the "South African Native Affairs Commission" 1903, Para. 343 has to recommend for the education of the African: "... it is urged that industrial training and instruction in manual work are of particular advantage to the Native **in fitting him for his position in life.**" How very like the utterances of some Ministers and officials of the present Government. But to quote the "South African Native Affairs Commission" further: "Nor must it be forgotten that the great demand of South Africa at present is **for the unskilled or partially skilled Native labour.**" (My emphasis.) In Para. 342 we find "The Commission is of opinion that regular moral and religious instruction should be given in all Native schools." What are the results of 50 years educational work carried on along the lines recommended by the Lagden Commission? That many Africans who are products of the Native Education Policy of 1903 lack that virile sense of patriotism which is a primary prerequisite in the struggle for the amelioration of the lot of their fellow Africans. They have become struggle-shy, literary snobs and warriors of the fountain pen. Their attitude to the liberation struggle connotes a mixture of conceit and fatuous timidity which must eventually bring them into disrepute with their less enlightened fellowmen.

We are in the grip of something many Africans don't understand; namely a clash of interests, a set of contradictions unavoidably destined to bring about continued friction between oppressor and oppressed, between the ruler and the ruled. In this struggle there can be no neutral midway camp. It's either you are with the Liberation Movement or against it. And how can man serve better than "facing fearful odds, for the ashes of his fathers, the temples of his gods," and the discovery of his true self through service for his own people.

LEPHEANA ALF. RAKAUOANE.