

Land and National Oppression

Editorial comment (October 1981): APDUSA is the only organisation involved in the struggle for liberation in South Africa which clearly and openly proclaims in its Constitution that 'the democratic demands and aspirations of the oppressed workers and peasants shall be paramount in the orientation of APDUSA in both its short-term and long-term objectives.' The struggle for political rights is indivisible from the struggle for land and only that organisation which unites the oppressed workers and peasants in a single national movement with a clearly defined programme and policy can successfully lead the struggle for national liberation. APDUSA draws on the experience of UMSA and its affiliated organisations and reproduces here ... a series of lectures by Dr Goolam H. Gool to the Society of Young Africa (SOYA) in May, 1954, on the question of land and national oppression. The late Dr Goolam Gool was a founder-member of the All-African Convention (AAC) and the Unity Movement of South Africa (UMSA), of which he was Vice-President until his untimely death.

PART I

I hope that the purpose of these lectures to SOYA is not merely an academic exercise; on the contrary they should provide our youth with a healthy approach to the problem of National Oppression. The struggle for Freedom, both of the individuals and of society is a painful process. Many promising movements in South Africa collapsed, despite the heroism, the sacrifice and the devotion of the masses to their leaders. I believe that this aspect of our past leadership will be dealt with in a subsequent lecture, so I shall not dwell upon it.

Before dealing with the subject of my lecture, we must in the first place be clear in our minds as to how human society has developed. The history of this development has been a history of the succession of various systems of economies, *each operating in accordance with its own laws*. From the economic bases arise the laws, the religions, the arts, the moralities, etc., and not the other way around. The law does not create the economic base, neither does the religion, the morality nor the arts. In the slow but constantly ascending scale, the decisive factor has been *Economic Science*. In other words, it is *what man does and how he acts*, and not what he himself may *think* about his actions. At the base of Society is not Religion, Morality and Law, but *Nature and Labour*. The relentless and bitter struggle of man with nature over millions of years forced him to learn from nature, and from nature to fashion better and better tools as he rises higher and higher to a greater conquest of Nature. The yield from nature becomes progressively greater. I feel that scientific terms

should become familiar to our young people. The greater yield from nature is called Increased Labour Productivity. The products of nature become less and less dependent on a chance act, but are the direct result of man's active intervention on nature. The products are the *conscious* act of Man on Nature, and less the blind unconsciousness of nature.

At this stage I feel it is important to point out that the evolution of human society did not take place in a straight line, i.e. that the various stages of Savagery, Barbarism, City States, Feudalism, Capitalism and Socialism did not follow hard on each other's heels. On the contrary, the natural law, the norm, has been that it was characterised by unevenness and accompanied by violent explosions. The highest form of capitalist development in Northern America followed the American tribal economy. Again, the Russian Soviet economy displaced through revolution an early form of capitalist production with a heavy agrarian backwardness; and the same holds good for Communist China. This is how history moves, unevenly and violently.

Now let us discuss briefly the contemporary capitalist economy. It produced profound changes in the relationship of human beings. Not only did it uproot and destroy the old primitive tribal economies, with its old inherited modes of labour, but it also shattered the pastoral-agricultural economies such as those of the old Trek Boer Republics. Revolutionary changes took place in the economic field. Cities, villages, provinces and nations were solidly linked together. The new division of labour went even further; it encompassed the world. The old traditions and routines of the past economic system were swept into the dustbin of history, never to rise again. As we said in the opening part of our address, *the particular economic needs* shattered the old tradition and the old routine. The new economic needs developed human consciousness and human forethought. It was not human consciousness and human forethought that determined the economic needs of a particular society. As an illustration let us move to the South African scene. When the British took possession of the Cape Colony, the area was 60,000 square miles. The Dutch population was 26,000. There were ¼ million Abatwa and Khoi-Khoi slaves, as well as an extra 30,000 slaves forced into service from Malaya, Java and elsewhere. The particular economic system prevailing was chattel slavery. It denied the ownership of land, the hire and the purchase of land by the Abatwa, Khoi-Khoi and others. The laws were the proclamations which regulated the employment of these slaves by the Dutch. Chattel slavery determined the law in the proclamations. Now you are all aware that the economic system from which the British invaders came was of a higher order. To introduce this new economy and to make it work it was first of all indispensable that the slave labour force which operated within chattel slavery be forcibly wrested. Now the British introduced an Ordinance called 50, 1828, which superficially

sounds very liberal and humanitarian. This Ordinance was enacted not for liberal and humanitarian motives but for the particular labour requirements of the new economy. Let me quote you a section of the preamble of this Ordinance:

'Whereas certain laws relating to and affecting the Hottentots and other free persons of colour residing in this colony require to be consolidated, amended and repealed, and certain obnoxious usages and customs which are injurious to these persons require to be declared illegal and discontinued...

Again, Section 2 of the Ordinance:

'That by usage and custom, Hottentots and other persons of Colour have been subjected to certain restrictions as to their residence, mode of life and employment, and to certain compulsory services which others of His Majesty's subjects are not liable, demands the removal of this compulsory service, and any hinderance, molestation, fine and imprisonment and punishment of any kind inflicted under the pretence that such persons have been guilty of vagrancy or any other offence, unless after trial in due course.'

Section 2 removes all doubt as to the competency of Hottentots and other free persons of colour to purchase or possess land in the Colony.

Section 4:

'Provides for the protection of ignorant or unwary Hottentots, etc. from the effects of improvident contracts of service.'

This Ordinance was confirmed on 15th January 1829, declaring:

'That all Hottentots and other free persons of colour lawfully residing in the Colony, are and shall be in most full and ample manner entitled to all and every, the rights, privileges and benefits of the LAW to which any other of His Majesty's subjects are or can be entitled.'

The important thing is to see the economic reason for this law, and to strip it of all its liberal, humanitarian and hypocritical trimmings. We must train our youth early to see the basic economic needs of the law and not to be misled and deceived by the sanctimonious phraseology. It is precisely here that our past leaders floundered, mistaking the language of the hypocrites and not realising the economic needs of the latter. They were side-tracked by this show of altruism without entering into a consideration of the basic needs of the society and the class that dominated that society. Let me repeat again: it is not Herrenvolk human consciousness and ingenuity that determines the economics, but it is economics that determines herrenvolk human consciousness and ingenuity.

One of the primary functions of the Liberals, most of whom have a legal

training, and who are drawn from the most articulate and most conscious section of the *Herrenvolk*, is to hide the *real aims* of the *Herrenvolk* and to clothe the law in such language for the purpose of deceiving the oppressed leadership. It is not accidental that South African history books are written by so-called Liberals: McMillan, de Kiewiet, Eric Walker and others. They would like us to believe that the great Trek of the Boers to the North was because they were hostile to the so-called liberal policy of the British. Actually it was the illiberal use of gunpowder of the new economy that forced the Boers North. Again we must understand that no new economic system comes into being quietly and unostentatiously, while the older retires graciously. The old economy is displaced violently. The change-over from the chattel slavery practised by the Trek-Boer republics to the modern capitalist economy was a murderous process.

The Cape - 1836

Municipal boards were created in the Cape in towns and villages in 1836 and due to the flight of the Boers, the British enlisted the more educated members of the Non-European people. Persons of colour participated from the outset (Ordinance 9, 1836) in the elections of Commissioners and ward-masters, and a few years after the promulgation of the Cape Town Ordinance, a person of colour was elected as a ward-master, a highly responsible administrative position.

We must understand that the Cape was a mere half-way house to the riches in India and the Far East. The Cape ports supplied the ships with fresh meat, vegetables, fruit and water. The developing exports at the Cape Colony were mainly wine in the Western area and wool in the Eastern Province. Wheat was coming from the O.F.S. The wars of land dispossession against the Africans were sporadic; the labour requirements were limited, and mainly centred around these activities. And therefore the law was liberal. The constitutional position in the Cape in 1871 was not based on colour but on class: (a) qualification for membership of the Upper House would be property valued at £1000 free from encumbrances; (b) qualification for franchise of both upper and lower houses was occupation for 12 months of a house valued at £25, without distinction of class or colour.

The Trek Boer Republics of Transvaal and O.F.S., of course, adhered to their old policy of "No equality between Black and White in Church or State" precisely because they were still carrying an economy of chattel slavery. Now in Natal, the British colony, the fact that the sub-tropical belts could hold sugar-cane, which became a very flourishing industry, operated through the technique of capitalist economy and demanding a large labour force, introduced the first statutory political colour-bar by a

colonial legislature in South Africa through the Law II, 1865. Africans by Royal instructions (1848) were subjected to SPECIAL LAWS, and were excluded from the operation of GENERAL LAWS. This was the Constitutional position before the discovery of diamonds and gold. As we said, the Wars of Dispossession against the African people were of a desultory nature. Large tracts of land were still in the possession of the African people, and even if they destroyed the whole basis of Tribalism, what on earth would they do with all the available labour from the shattered tribal economy?

Another very striking example of herrenvolk consciousness and forethought with regard to their economic needs happened in Natal before the discovery of gold and diamonds; the subtropical coast-belt of Natal was found suitable for the growing of cane-sugar. In Mauritius already it was a flourishing industry. Cane-sugar was to become king in the Natal Legislative Council. The real labour, the cheap African labour, was not yet available as the African still managed to earn a livelihood from the land. Cheap labour was their urgent requirement. They were prepared to look for it anywhere under the sun. In 1864 was started the Indian indentured labour system which supplied their needs. Here is a letter written from the office of Sir George Grey, 1860, to the Indian government:

I am directed by His Excellency, Sir George Grey, who has lately returned from Natal, to request that you submit to the Governor-General-In-Council, his views with regard to the importance of permission being granted by the government of India to the immigration of labourers from that country to Natal...

"There are some further features of the country to which His Excellency would call the attention of the Council in India, not only because they present peculiar advantages to the immigrant coolie, but because a reference to them will anticipate a question that may occur to the Council as to the need for the imported coolie labour, when there is so large a body of Native labourers in and on the borders of the Colony.

"There are a large number of Natives grouped today and called Zulus, who have been driven by the tyranny of their chiefs to take refuge in Natal, under the benevolent protection of organised government established there. A considerable proportion of these are by no means disinclined to labour or unwilling to render it to the planters, but *upon their own terms and at their own times*. These men *possess land for which they pay no rent* and they are settled with their families among their countrymen, in locations where they cultivate for their own

maintenance, for the supply of markets, and from which they are unwilling to remove *permanently* in order to take *regular employment*. They are ready to work for 2 to 3 months at a time, but insist upon returning to their locations and the planters can never count upon them again at any definite time. *Such irregular and unskilled labour* does not suit the planter and jeopardises the success of all his undertakings.

He requires the continuous labour of the same individual, or at least, as a very imperfect substitute, the means of replacing with certainty and without delay the labour of which he is deprived from month to month. Hence the demand for imported labour of a description and under an arrangement which will enable proprietors to count upon a regular and continuous service...'

This was the immediate policy, we shall call it the short-term policy, to satisfy the immediate requirements through cheap indentured Indian labour.

The long-term policy was directed towards cheap African labour which could not yet be obtained. The first step was that the Law II, 1865, was introduced, which laid down the first statutory political colour-bar enacted by a colonial legislature in a British Colony in South Africa. Already the Africans by Royal instructions, 1848, were, however, subjected to special laws and had not yet been brought under the operations of the general laws. The vicious Law II, 1865, was specially directed to exclude the Africans, who although they had the necessary qualifications, were still governed by the special laws of 1848. The Africans were put outside the pale of society as the first step towards enacting land acts that would eventually force them through starvation from the land. The Indians did not fall under these special laws. The 1856 Natal Charter made it a qualification which entitled a person to vote for a member or become a member of the legislative council, that he should be above 21 years of age and possess immovable property to the value of f50 or rent any such property to the value of £10 per annum. This Charter excluded the Africans but included the Coloureds and Indians of Natal.

Besides the land acts that were driving the Africans off the land, punitive military expeditions were also used when there were signs of resistance. Soon a steady stream of cheap African labour from the land flowed into the Natal sugar estates. Immediately they were certain that the stream of African labour would be continuous, they introduced Law II, 1896, which reads:

'By which persons shall not be entitled to become registered voters, who, not being of European origin, are Natives or descendents in the male line of countries which have not hitherto possessed the electoral franchise.'

It was directed especially against the Indians who before had been registered

voters. As we have said, this is a very striking example of laws flowing from labour requirements. Very soon, in 1924, the Indians lost the municipal vote in Natal.

Another illuminating illustration comes from Nosipho Majeke's "The Role of the Missionaries in Conquest", from which we now quote at some length: (pages 2 to 5)

"Wilberforce - Oppressor and Liberator"

'Let us take a look at Wilberforce with a view to learning something more about this group, whom he represents. The curious thing is that the would-be liberator of the colonial slaves and the sponsor of missionary activity throughout the British Empire, was a thorough reactionary and supported the Government in its repressive legislation against the British workers. He was an enemy of the workers. He supported the Corn Laws, by which the land owners taxed the bread of the poor, and the Combination Laws of 1799 and 1800, which made trade unions illegal. At this time the English rulers were greatly afraid that the liberatory ideas of the Great French Revolution would stir the English workers to revolt. 'Scratch a trade unionist and you will find a Jacobin,' they said, and those workers who combined to resist exploitation were condemned as agitators. Wilberforce denounced these trade unions as 'a general disease in our society.' When the people demanded the franchise and the repeal of these oppressive laws, he supported the notorious Six Acts which denied them political rights, freedom of speech or criticism of any kind; under the Seditious Meetings Bill, all assemblies aiming at 'changes in the Church or State', were declared illegal, and the penalty under any of these Acts was imprisonment without trial, or transportation or death. It is noteworthy that in the same year the British Parliament voted a million pounds for the building of churches. How, then, could a man be both liberator and oppressor?

"In one of his humanitarian speeches about the West Indian slave, Wilberforce referred by contrast to the 'free British labourer.' It was an unfortunate phrase, for the condition of the working class in England during this period has been well documented. England was becoming a great industrial power and was building up her empire and her trade. The classes who possessed power in the state were the rising industrialists and the landowners, who understood by government the protection of their power and of their property. They abhorred any demands on the part of the workers that stood in the way of the unlimited development of their industries and the accumulation of their wealth. In other words, their attitude to the workers at home was similar to the attitude of the slave owner to the slaves abroad. Could they then be both liberators and oppressors? Under the juggernaut of expanding capitalism men, women and children worked under appalling conditions in the factories, in the

mines and in the crowded, insanitary city slums, so that they seemed to be a race of degraded, brutalised human beings.

"Now those industrialists who supported the missionary movement and the emancipation of the slaves at the same time expressed great concern about the morals of the 'lower orders', as they called the workers. The Evangelical Movement became fashionable. When some ungodly employers objected to their encouragement of Sunday observance among the poor because it meant loss of labour one day out of every week, the Evangelicals pointed out that it was to their own advantage to have a religious and obedient body of workers. In the moral and religious control over the masses they saw the best guarantee for law and order. Wilberforce, in his pamphlet, 'A Practical View of the System of Christianity', made this point quite clear. Christianity, he indicated, teaches the poor to be diligent, humble, patient and obedient, and to accept their lowly position in life. It makes the inequalities between themselves and the rich less galling because, under the influence of religious instruction, they endure the injustices of this world in the hope of a rich reward in the next. It is significant that Wilberforce remarked to the Prime Minister, Pitt, whose government had passed the Six Acts and other oppressive legislation, that this particular section of his pamphlet was 'the basis of all politics'.

"This, then, was the outlook of the sponsor of the missionary activity throughout the British Empire. He was the spokesman of the English middle class. The picture serves to illuminate the social system, the civilisation, which these industrialists upheld with all their might and from which their so-called humanitarian movements sprang. When we see them describe as an expression of the new spirit of LIBERALISM, we must be clear as to what this liberalism was. Briefly stated, liberalism, with its ideas of liberty and equality, supplied the ideological weapons with which the English middle-class in the 17th century and the French middle class in the late 18th century threw off the shackles of feudalism and established capitalism. This freedom and equality, while they had been useful slogans for rallying the workers to assist the middle class to achieve victory, turned out to be valid only for the man of property, the industrialists and merchants, not for the workers. Likewise, the 'emancipation' of the colonial slave, together with christianising him, had nothing to do with his liberation, but on the contrary, his enslavement. It was part of a world-wide historical, moment, the expansion of capitalism. New methods of production demanded a new relationship between those who laboured and those who profited by that labour. The worker was now 'free' to sell his labour to one master or another, in order to exist. In other words he became a wage-slave. This served the interests of the industrialists better than the serf or slave who was tied to the land. Witness the situation in England where Wilberforce and his fellow 'Saints' (as they were ironically called) were making speeches for the emancipation of the slaves. Steam and machinery had revolutionised

industrial production; workers were streaming into the towns; the wheels of the industrial machine were turning faster and faster. Britain, well on the way to defeating her French and Dutch rivals in the colonies, was rapidly expanding her trade. She was searching for new markets, new raw materials, and a mass of new workers. The time for the old slave system was past. It had yielded great riches, but the new system and the new slave would yield even grosser riches. It was a search that made Britain - and her rivals - send their agents all over the world.

"This in the womb of the so-called humanitarian movements of the early 19th century. It is against this background of vast economic forces that the influx of missionaries to the colonies acquires meaning. The missionaries came from a capitalist Christian civilisation that unblushingly found religious sanctions for inequality, as it does to this day, and whose ministers solemnly blessed its wars of aggression. Men like Wilberforce had visions of extending this civilisation to the ends of the earth. They saw themselves as the chosen race."

"Britain had many agents of conquest, great and small, official and unofficial, conscious and unconscious: the military, the explorer, and the fanner-colonist; the missionary and the petty trader as well as the adventurer, the impoverished artisan or the vagabond - there was room for all of them. Some acted blindly in self-interest, while others, like Dr Philip, Superintendent of the London Missionary Society, were fully conscious of what they stood for."

"Yet the humblest and most well-meaning saver of souls, though he may never have seen the inside of an English factory where children died to enrich the English industrialist, nevertheless obeyed, like all the others, the laws of expanding capitalism. The middle classes knew when and how to make use of all their agents in their time and place."

Diamonds and Gold

The discovery of gold and diamonds revolutionized the whole scene. The hunger for labour to feed the mines was insatiable, and every inch of land still held by the Africans had to be taken from them, if not by force, then by cunning and stealth. We see an intensification of the Wars of Dispossession, and men of the calibre of Grey had to be enlisted, specially sent for by Cecil Rhodes, We are familiar with the words of Cecil Rhodes, the King of the mine magnates, who, while riding through the reserves and territories and beholding the great number of Africans there, was profoundly moved: "What a source of labour!" And again, during the introduction in the Cape Parliament of the Glen Grey Bill, 1896, he made his notorious remarks:

"It must be brought home to every black man that in the future

nine/tenths of them will have to spend their lives in daily labour, in physical work, in manual labour. "

The Glen Grey Act of 1894, fathered by Rhodes, introduced a system of INDIVIDUAL LAND TENURE and, also important, initiated a system of DUMMY NATIVE REPRESENTATION. Pay particular notice to the fact that the emphasis was on land tenure and not on Land Ownership, because Land Ownership would create a permanent rural African peasantry, which would defeat the main purpose of the Glen Grey Act, which was introduced to supply the gold and diamond mines with African labour.

The Over-all Plan of the Herrenvolk - for Cheap African Labour

Then followed the notorious Land Act of 1913, which was to prohibit Africans from buying land except in overcrowded reserves, and which made it illegal for them to occupy land on white farms on a rental or squatter system. The expansion of the mines and the auxiliary industries that it brought into being, demanded a still greater labour supply. Again note, that it is the economic needs that dictate the law. We have now the Native Development Act, better known to us as the Poll Tax. The latter did not at all satisfy the labour requirements and we had in 1936-37 the so-called native Representation Act and the so-called Native Land and Trust Act. There was neither "Development", "Representation" nor "Land". You see the continuation of the hypocritical language in the Acts. Even this did not satisfy the need for cheap labour. The 1945 Rehabilitation Scheme, the operation of which finds you here in the Cape, without land and without cattle, was to force the last remaining able-bodied African males from the land and then into the mines, the farms and the factories.

The Situation on the Land

The net result of these Land Acts has been that we have **700,000 RURAL WHITE FAMILIES** having the right of **ownership, purchase, lease and hire of 124,186,000 MORGEN**, and **7,000,000 AFRICAN FAMILIES** having **NO right of ownership, purchase, lease or hire**, and who are **contained on LAND TENURE BASIS on 16,750,000 MORGEN**.

It is the difference between the CITIZEN FAMILY and the NON-CITIZEN FAMILY ON THE LAND.

Let us now follow the landless Peasantry at the key points in productive activity. I quote from the NEUM conference minutes 1951 (page 31: Trade Unions and the National Struggle for Liberation - Dr G H Gool.):

Landless Non-Citizen

"As we have said, the flywheel of the national economy is the mines, in particular the gold and diamond mines. The non-citizens in the mines bear the main weight of the slave state on their shoulders. Moreover, they are the basic sector of the non-citizen workers in South Africa. They are landless peasants. They are the whole productive forces on the mines."

"They are under contract and herded in male compounds. The discussion on the land showed clearly how the people were driven off the land and converted into cheap, migrant landless peasants. Once in the towns these landless peasants are forcibly herded into compounds, completely divorced from a healthy family existence, and completely shut off from the amenities of urban life.

"This same landless, peasant, compounded, contracted, migrant labour runs the heavy sector of secondary industry (power, engineering, and chemical which is 33% of secondary industry.)"

"67% of mining, industrial, commercial and transport workers are landless peasants; and these peasants operate the basic sectors of the national economy."

The 'Settled' Non-Citizen Workers

"The remaining 33% are settled in the towns, in locations, with no freedom of movement, cut off from the cultural life of the town (libraries, universities, theatres, etc)"

"Even with the so-called workers there is, in the mass of the Africans, a section which is in continual movement between urban location and rural labour-reserve, i.e. there is even amongst the 'settled' Non-European workers a Section which is a floating population, having ties with the land. And it is from this section that the unregistered African unions have been formed. The membership of these unions is not a stable one. In addition the formation of an African trade union is virtually illegal. Despite non-recognition by the government, those workers have forced limited concessions from the employers."

Wage-Ratios of Citizen-Worker and Non-Citizen Worker

In the Mines the ratio of citizen worker to non-citizen worker is 20- 1

On the Landis 10-1

In Heavy Industry, Electricity and Transport.....is 7-1

In Secondary Industryis 4-1

In political language, it is the difference between having the franchise and being *within society* and not having the franchise and being *outside the pale of*

society. Clearly, the whole economic structure of South Africa rests on the broad and bent shoulders of the Landless Peasantry. National Oppression - the denial of political rights - is, in plain language, *intensified exploitation*; the colour bar being merely a smokescreen to hide the *real aims* of the ruling class.

After Gold and Diamonds

The recent developments in South Africa - the discovery of gold in the O.F.S. - calls for a still more urgent need for cheap labour. Inevitably there must follow an intensification of the Land Acts in order to obtain this labour. Let us now deal with the areas from which the labour of the mines are drawn. The Union of South Africa supplies less than 50% of the labour force, the rest being drawn from the Protectorates, the Rhodesias and Portuguese East Africa. A striking common factor exists in all these areas, i.e. that the African people have no political representation, and it is precisely this lack of citizenship rights that has denied them the right of ownership, purchase and the hiring of land, and that has rendered them defenceless to the constantly increasing demands of labour. Let us take the recent legislation, the purpose of which is to still further augment the labour requirements. The Native Trust and Land Amendment Act 1954 will revolutionize the lives of 3 million Africans. The significant and dramatic changes aim at eliminating the African rural squatters and restricting the number of African farm-labour tenants, and so turning as many farm Africans as possible into full-term labourers. In the words of the Minister of Native Affairs, Dr. Verwoerd:

"We aim at stopping the practice of kaffir farming."

Again, in the words of Dr Verwoerd:

"The purpose of the Western Areas Removal Scheme in Johannesburg was to refuse free-hold rights to the Africans."

According to Dr Verwoerd, there were 2 million Africans surrounding the cities of the Union, and therefore in the interests of a White South Africa, he would not hesitate one minute to intervene in the affairs of the city councils. Note again: the economic needs and the policy involved.

Let us give you the latest figures, the results of recent legislation and the recruitment of labour for the mines:

"The native labour force on the goldmines continued to grow last month, rising by 3,427 to 312, 332. At this level it was the highest for four years, and 26,769 (more than 9%) above the figures last April. Last April there was a decline of 724, and in April 1952 an increase of 142.

"Reflecting the improved trend in the Native Labour figures and the maiden production by President Steyn, the total gold production dropped by only 15,289 oz to 1,058,873 oz last month, in spite of the shorter working month for many mines. The drop in value was £180, 569 from the record March level of £13,306,182."

"Cape Argus" 11/5/54

The Native Trust and Land Amendment Act 1954 will affect the lives of 3 million African people. It is called the new Squatters Act. 2 million Africans, according to Dr Verwoerd, are in the urban and pen-urban areas of the various cities in the Union. These figures are very important to him. In the same way, how moved Cecil Rhodes was when he saw millions of Africans in the reserves in the Transkei 80 years ago. But the minister of Native Affairs is not in the happy position of Cecil Rhodes, because then the reservoir of cheap African labour was inexhaustible. Minister Verwoerd has to juggle with 5 million when actually he should have had 20 million in view of the expansion in the O.F.S. gold mines, and, more unfortunately from his point of view, since the investment of capital by Britain in the Rhodesias, and the Protectorates will hold down African labour there. Portuguese East Africa, realising the urgent needs of the mines in South Africa, are holding out for a better price for their cheap African labour.

It is in this light that we can understand why Verwoerd has to resort to Witzieshoek tactics in the country, and even in the "liberal" Cape, there have been constant raids in order to count how many able-bodied Africans will be available to flow into the urban and the rural bottlenecks and there be sorted out, first for the mines, then for the towns and secondary industry.

The ferocity with which these raids are being carried out, both in town and country, can only be understood in relation to the needs of the developing times. However, the militant mood of the people is even having an effect on the Quislings in the dummy councils of the Bunga. This is clearly brought out in a motion of the Umtata Bunga when even the Quislings asked that an alteration be made from the TENURE OF QUIT RENT ALLOTMENTS TO FREE HOLD IN THE SURVEYED AREAS OF THE TRANSKEI (Cape Argus: 7/5/54). Events are moving fast, even for the Quislings. The motion was lost by 45 votes to 25. But it is a political barometer that has very deep meaning.

The Ten Point Programme - Point Seven

I think we have arrived now at a stage in our discussion when we must deal with the very basis of the National Movement, the basis on which we will be able to draw the major section of the people, those who come from the land. You will remember that when Mr W.M. Tsotsi, President of the all-Africa

Convention, delivered his address on the national situation at the Anti-CAD Conference 1954, I asked him from the chair what the percentage of African people owning land was. His reply was: PROBABLY LESS THAN 1 PER CENT. Verwoerd, in denying the African in the Western Areas in Johannesburg free-hold rights, is merely doing what he had learned from Rhodes when the Glen Grey Act 1894 carved up tribal communally held land and fragmented it into individual land tenureship. And that is why we have always maintained that the Land Question, and a proper understanding of the Land Question, is the very core and the very heart of the National Movement.

Point 7 of the Ten Point Programme reads:

"The relations of serfdom at present existing on the land must go, together with the LAND ACTS, together with the restrictions upon acquiring land. A new division of the land in conformity with the existing rural population, living on the land and working the land, is the first task of a democratic state and parliament."

When we drafted this point of the Ten Point Programme, we took it for granted that it could only mean one thing and one thing only: THE RIGHT TO OWN LAND, TO BUY LAND AND TO HIRE LAND.

At this point I feel I must bring out what I raised at a SOYA meeting a few months ago, when I dealt with the National Movement. You remember I said that a National Movement, since it affects oppressed society as a whole, is a heterogeneous one, i.e. that there are many layers and gradations within these layers. It was in consideration of the heterogeneous character of the movement that we brought out the Ten Point Programme, the minimum basis that could make all these groups not only join together but fight together on principles. Point 7 of the Ten Point Programme can in no sense of the word be deliberately misconstrued to mean usufruct i.e. to work and to till without the right of ownership. Such an interpretation immediately lands them logically in the arms of Verwoerd and his Native Affairs Department. And, more important from the point of view of the masses who have been denied ownership, this is the ONLY interpretation that they will give to the idea of usufruct and they will equate these interpretations with the NAD. I hope that I have made myself clear on this point and also that the founders of the NEUM will fight tooth and nail for the correct interpretation.

PART II

The Ideas of Society are the Ideas of the Dominant Group

How was it possible that our people were reduced to this state, landless, without cattle, voteless, illiterate? I feel that at this stage we should attempt to diagnose the disease of social poverty. It is a known fact that the ideas prevailing in any given society are the ideas of the dominant group. The control by this group of *all channels* for the dissemination of their ideas is a necessary and indispensable prerequisite for their very existence. The particular ideas that must flow through the social system must be of such a nature that their impact on the minds of the members of society must produce results that will ensure the position of the dominant group and its continued rule.

In South African society, according to its most dynamic apostle, the late General Smuts, its life-span must be another 300 years, a pronouncement made before the Van Riebeeck Tercentenary Celebration in 1952. It was a conviction of his youth and a conviction that he consistently believed in and acted upon, even in his old age, and one that was buried with him. Whether history will dispute his prophetic claim is another question. What is of interest is the intransigent nature of his claim and the fact that his whole life was purposefully devoted to that end.

But as humble students of South African history we know that the real builders of the present South African nation were Milner and his colleagues. To Milner, the representative of the new social order at the turn of the century, both the Trek-Boer Republics of Transvaal and the O.F.S., as well as the tribal economy of the Africans, were anachronisms and therefore South African society presented itself to him as one of chaos. Among the Milner Papers there is a letter written to Sir Percy FitzPatrick, 28th March 1899, at the beginning of the British-Boer War. It contains the following statement:

"The ultimate aim is a self-governing community, supported by well-treated and justly governed black labour from Cape Town to Zambesi.."

The creation of a White Block was implicit in this statement. The Selbourne Memorandum (1905) officially rounded off this formulation when it stressed the White United Front against the "menace of the blacks".

In the same letter we read:

"A considerable amount of freedom should be left to the several 'states' with regard to native policy." (Our italics).

In the first place, what were the particular "states" to which Milner referred? They were the Trek-Boer Republics of the Transvaal and the O.F.S. Secondly, what particular "freedom" was to be left to these "states" in regard to the "native policy"? Every member, White and Black, is aware of the policy

pursued in these so-called "states" - the policy of No Equality in State or Church. The Volksraad of these "states" were adamant on this point.

The very fact that in 1894 the British colony of Natal had deprived the Indian settlers of the right of parliamentary representation and had passed special laws dealing with the African people in Natal, demonstrates this policy. These laws deprived the Africans of representation in the Natal Legislative Council and made them fall outside common law. Even in the so-called liberal Cape Colony, millions of Africans living on a land-tenure basis, and not owning land, were deprived of representation in the Cape Parliament. (1884)

"The considerable amount of freedom of the various states" that Milner referred to in his letter meant that, once the Boers were beaten and rehabilitated by means of loans and paying the victim reparations, which was an unprecedented post-war settlement, the old master-servant relationship of the Trek-Boer Republics would be carried over into Union. And this is precisely what occurred. The Trek-Boer doctrine of No Equality in State or Church was continued into the present society of South Africa.

We have referred to the loss of citizenship rights of the Africans and of the Indians in Natal in 1884 and 1894 respectively. The few remaining rights of the Africans, Indians, Coloureds in the Cape Colony, and direct representation, were matters which engaged much of the discussion of the National Convention prior to 1910. All parties agreed unanimously that a member of the future Union Parliament should be:

"A person of European descent who has acquired Union nationality whether by (1) birth or (2) domicile as a British subject or (3) by naturalisation."

The erroneous idea fostered in many quarters that only the present Nationalist government was introducing a Fascist police-state through the law-courts, is a fallacy. The Nationalist party is merely doing what the various British parties had done so well over a period of 70 years. And that is why we have from the very beginning of the movement maintained the consistent line of "a plague on both your houses!" The only conclusions are that the dominant group in the Cape Colony and Natal (British-controlled areas) and in the Transvaal and O.F.S. (Boer-controlled areas) were agreed on the exclusion of all Non-Europeans, African, Coloured and Indian from the state-councils.

Herrenvolk Creed - White Supremacy

To maintain their dominant position, a creed based on the superiority of the White races was indispensable. On the basis of this creed, the exclusion from both State and Church of the non-European peoples was justified in their eyes and in the eyes of their God. It is not surprising to find that Prime Minister, pressman, priest and even physician who have fed and nourished on this creed, propagate it continually. An extract of a letter from the Prime Minister's office

reads:

"You will realise, I think, that it is self-contradictory to claim as an inherent right of the Bantu, who differ in many ways from the Europeans, that they should be regarded as not different, especially when it is borne in mind that these differences are permanent and not man-made." (Cape Times 30.1.52)

And again, a speech he delivered at Stellenbosch was merely a repetition of the above in more voluminous tones.

The recent sessions of both English and Dutch synods emphasised the superiority of the white races, by reference to the Bible - indeed a case of the devil quoting scriptures! Words fail to give expression to such diabolical hypocrisy. We are familiar, also, with the daily outpourings of the *Herrenvolk* press with its stress on White Supremacy, *baasskap*, the Western way of life, preserving white civilisation, *ad nauseam*. We hear them even from a physician, a member of the most noble calling, the art of healing. A chief medical inspector of schools, Dr. J.C. Coetzee, in presenting a memorandum in 1950 to the Commission of Enquiry on School Feeding for the Africans, writes: *"The mental make-up of the Natives did not allow him to use up unnecessary energy; and at night he went to bed early and after adequate sleep was quite fit again, and therefore school-feeding for Natives was not necessary."* (Natal Mercury 12.2.52.)

I make no comments.

You will see now the extent to which the ideas of the dominant group have penetrated through every layer of white society, from Prime Minister to pressman, physician, pedagogue. It has penetrated like a cancer through the whole body politic of the white society. If it had stopped with them we would have been happy, but it has also penetrated through the whole body politic of Non-European people. Before coming to this I want to bring out two major points in my thesis: that consistently both British and Boer leaders acted on the necessity to strip the non-Whites of every vestige of political rights, and this is precisely because the lower your political position is, the greater is the degree of exploitation you undergo. The partnership that Boer and Briton entered into after Union (1910) merely strengthened the position of the Whites as against the Blacks. The vestige of political rights held by the Non-Europeans in the Cape was an anomaly which both felt must be removed so as to have a uniform Union policy. A Joint Session of both Houses in 1936 agreed to remove the African male vote from the common roll. And now the Coloureds and Indians in the Cape Province have hanging over their heads the sword of Damocles, the Separation of Voters Act. The consistent attacks that both ruling races have made over a hundred years against the political status of the Non-European people, have meaning only when we realise that the lower the oppressed are forced, from the point of view of citizenship rights, the more they are exploited. Take as a single striking example the 310,000 landless African workers drawn from the Union,

the Protectorates, the Rhodesias and Portuguese East Africa, and now working on the gold mines. In all these countries they had *no rights as citizens*; but the super profits per year on the mines amount to hundreds of millions of pounds! This is a point I cannot sufficiently emphasise. Later I shall give you a few examples in support of this.

The Acceptance of Inferiority

Our second point of discussion is that there is an overflow of the ideas of the Herrenvolk among the Non-Europeans.

ALL AFRICAN. CONVENTION BEFORE THE NEW ROAD 1943

Let us take the leader of the AAC, Professor D.D.T. Jabavu, the black interpreter of the Liberals, at the time of the formation of the AAC in 1935, when the two notorious Native Bills, i.e. Native Representation of Voters Bill and the Native Land and Trust Bill, hung ominously over the heads of the African people, and briefly discuss his threadbare pamphlet "Criticism of Native Bills". In the introduction, the Professor is "deeply stirred with the prestige of South Africa in the eyes of the world of Christendom". We can understand his turn of phrase, because Professor Jabavu was at that time considered by the Liberals and the Missionaries as their best Black product.

Then follow the mistaken conception of the deluded Professor of the "lesser evil":

"Whereas in the 1935 Bills of the Coalition Group, which we expected to be more sympathetic than those of the unadulterated Nationalist Party ..."

On Page 10 (you will notice that I am not commenting on these quotations) he says:

"The Land and Trust Bill IS A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECT!ON... THIS IS THE BRIGHT SIDE OF THE PICTURE."

The admitted "bright side" for the Herrenvolk, but the dark side for the African people.

In dealing with the Native Representation of Voters Bill, Professor Jabavu writes:

"The Native Representation of Voters Bill is an experiment already tried, as we have said, under the Native Affairs Act, and as such has its Good and Weak Features; viz., that it supplies a chance to the African to let off steam, even if its effervescence be ineffectual."

It became quite clear that an All African Convention with such a leadership could not possibly lead but only be led by the nose by the Liberals and Missionaries. Professor Jabavu, with the turn of the New Road

1943 which the AAC took, quite clearly saw the contradiction in his position as President of the AAC and Vice-President of the Institute of Race Relations. I believe you saw in the papers this week that Professor Jabavu has a Doctorate.

THE LAND FRAUD 1936

I want at this stage to quote in full a statement on the Land Fraud issued by the All African Convention Committee (Western Prov.):

Of all the frauds of the rulers in South Africa the Land Act of 1936 is the greatest. The people were hungry and starving for land, and the promise of land was too great a temptation for them. They fell for the bait to the extent of giving up their franchise without a struggle. It was the definiteness and solemnity of Hertzog's (the Prime Minister's) assurances of the millions of morgen of land that were to be given that gave him the victory over the African.

"We are now establishing a trust, and allow me to tell you that in the interests of the Natives as well as in the interests of the Europeans, we are going to be liberal towards the Natives in the future. We can be so, because the danger in connection with the franchise has been removed." (Hansard, 1936, page 4083)

The African knows today the value of these promises of land, of a Trust and of the assurances of liberalism. All the more repulsive to him therefore are the attempts to whitewash Hertzog. Senator Brookes, for example, made great play with another statement of Hertzog's at the time of the passing of the Land Act of 1936.

"The government wishes once more to give the assurance that it is their earnest desire to see that the obligations towards the Natives of the Union arising out of this Bill in conjunction with the Representation of Natives Act recently passed by the joint sitting of the two Houses shall be faithfully carried out, and trust that this statement will be regarded as sufficient guarantee of the same." (1944 Senate Debates p.1224)

From Senator Brookes' subsequent remarks one might deduce that this is the first time the Government has broken a promise! But to the African, who knows some of his own past history, European rule has been an uninterrupted chain of broken promises. Let those who are in need of factual evidence turn to any Hansard for any year and they will find it. The Vaal-Hartz scheme, the Loskop scheme of 1936 (p.4032), Col. Reitz's promises (1944 p.2337) or the promises of the Secretary for Native Affairs Smit, or Smuts's promises. The Makoba location affair of this year is a typical example of broken promises and how they are handled by the rulers; how little the breaking of a promise disturbs them. *"What I would like the Minister to realise is that one thing the Native cannot understand is a broken promise. A promise has been given to them (the Makoba tribe) that this ground*

was theirs for all time." (1944 p.2095)

But this doesn't disturb our rulers at all. They have an immediate and ready answer. For instance, in the case sighted above, the Minister for Native Affairs calmly interjected:

"Who gave the promise?" (Ibid p.2095)

In other words, "we" are not bound by promises made by previous governments - when Africans are concerned. With this very same answer they justify every broken promise. Besides, promise or no promise, Parliament has decided to chuck out the Makoba tribe from the land on which they had lived for 64 years, to chuck out the Tuana tribe from the land on which they had lived for 49 years.

The attempt of the Native representatives to make a saint out of Hertzog and push all the blame on to Van der Byl, is not only wrong but misleading as well. The latter is only a faithful follower and pupil of the former. V.d. Byl is proud to be entrusted with the execution of Hertzog's policy. It would be much more useful to expose the fraud of the Land policy - Hertzog's land policy - than to mislead by showing how Hertzog's promises have been broken by the present government because Hertzog's promises were never meant to be fulfilled. Hertzog's land policy is identical with that of the present government - it is an inseparable part of the whole scheme of segregation, a scheme to retain slavery in a modern capitalist society, to get rid of the "Natives", the old, the feeble, the women, the children, and make South Africa a white man's country, while at the same time forcing all the able-bodied Africans to work for the white masters as long as they are able-bodied and force them back into the reserves when they can be of no more use to the white rulers:

When Malcomess says:

"What I should like the Minister to realise is that what is driving the Natives from the Reserves into the towns is hunger, want of land and the Poll Tax. 40% of the Reserves do not own any land." (p. 1086)

or when Brookes complains that not only has no land been bought for the Natives, while it has been bought for Europeans throughout the last 5 years on the pretext of the war, but

"We have already got a great deal of the best land in Zululand taken away from the Natives, and now to take away what is left ..." (1228),
they both show a lack of understanding of the segregation policy.

Senator Basner came much nearer the mark when he stated:

"As we are situated at present, all our talk and all our promises of education of the Natives and of land for the Natives, is just so much talk and nothing else." (1153)

Because it was never intended by the rulers that the Land Act should be more than empty talk, more than a soap bubble.

"But the Government will not spend the money to improve the Reserves, because

if they improve the Reserves, they kill the gold mines ... And what is true about the Reserves is also true about the policy of buying land ... and the land they did buy they saw to it immediately that it would become a curse and a burden on the Native people instead of a benefit ... That was the 5 morgen policy - The Native must not get enough land on which to become a settled Native peasant. He must get only enough land to place his family but he must go out to work." (p.1154-6) After this, which shows that the Senator is beginning to see through the fraud of the Land Act, it is somewhat silly for him to try and exonerate and praise Hertzog. The 5 morgen policy referred to above is applicable to those squatters who are driven off their land by the provision of the Land Act, and who should receive compensation or Trust Land. But even this is a "curse and a burden" to the former Native squatter, for the land is limited to allotments of 5 morgen held on a rental basis, and the tenant is subject to innumerable restrictions, obligations, supervisions by N.A.D. inspectors and agricultural officers. The revolts that have broken out between these former squatters on the Trust farms, the innumerable arrests in the Petersburg district, the deportations, are a result of these intolerable restrictions and the arbitrary methods and behaviour of the agricultural officers of the N.A.D. as described in the following extract:

"But the moment they (the agricultural officers) get on the Trust farms, instead of being responsible people who should be carrying out the job of administering the trust farms, they think that at last they have a farm of their own and that there are hundreds of Natives who can work for them. They get the Natives to come and cultivate their gardens and land, and they treat the Native people not as responsible people to whom the land belongs, but as their servants. The first thing they do is to make it clear to the Natives that they have a right to the farm." (2535)

Only the stupid or simple-minded who do not understand the aim of segregation can think that this is all accidental and not the design of the Land Act. Indeed the curse and burden were the aim of the builders and designers of segregation. A happy, contented Native peasant would be no good for the gold mines or for the white farmers. Only the curse and burden of the "new" land can bring in a new supply of cheap Native slave labour. The Minister in fact admits it frankly:

"We do not buy this land for the Natives to settle down and become peasants. We buy it for the Natives to plough while they go out and work." (1159)

But to those who understand the meaning of segregation, this is nothing new. In fact the ominous last section of the ominous Chapter IV of the Land Act, dealing with the eviction and driving off the land of the Native squatters, says the same thing, although perhaps it is not so brutally outspoken!

"It shall be the duty of the Government in its Department Of Native Affairs to

make such provision as may be necessary and ADEQUATE IN THE OPINION OF THE MINISTER for accommodating in a scheduled Native area or a released area and on such conditions and terms as may be prescribed by regulation any Native displaced from land outside a scheduled Native area or released area by reason of the operation of this Chapter (IV) or of the Natives (Urban Areas) Act of 1923 or any amendment thereof."

If "new" land is bought it is for this purpose of accommodating temporarily the evicted Native squatters and redundant (i.e. used up) urban Natives, because they must be put somewhere until they can be forced to accept slave labour on the farms. That is why the provision for them has to be *what the Minister considers "adequate"* on his "terms and conditions". But even this provision of the Act, that the new land for the accommodation of the evicted squatters and redundant Urban Natives should become a curse and a burden to them, is still too "liberal" for the slave owners. Unashamedly they say:

"The intention was not to give land to Natives residing on land owned by European farmers ... Of what use would it be to remove squatters from farms and put them on land acquired by the government." (1191)

"I do not think that when these Native Laws were passed the intention was that land should be acquired in order to provide accommodation for these squatters. But then the question may be asked: What must become of them? Let me say immediately that there is lots of room for these people on the farms. There is a serious shortage of labour on the farms and if they would go to the farms they would get enough work there." (1253)

And what was the answer of the Minister to these outrageous statements? Did he rebuke the speakers? Did he shame them and tell them that their proposals and interpretations amounted to undisguised open slavery? No, because V.d Byl and the government are in full agreement with the views of the two slave-drivers quoted above. In fact the Minister for Native Affairs revealed in his reply that he had thought about it himself.

"I consulted the law advisers and they hold the view that it cannot be done." (1297)

He had thought about it, otherwise he wouldn't have consulted the law advisers, but "unfortunately" it cannot be done, because the law is too explicit on this point. Still, from the Minister's frame of mind, from his sympathy with those who propose this interpretation of the Land Act, as shown in this reply of his, we can guess that he is contemplating a "Land Act Amendment Bill".

The land policy of the rulers has its corollary in their cattle policy. It is surprising, or at least strange, that Senator Brookes should be puzzled about there being one cattle policy with regard to the Europeans and another exactly opposite one with regard to the Africans:

"I am still troubled in my own mind as to why it is that at the same time that the agricultural section of the N.A.D. is running a very strong campaign in order to substitute the cultivation of vegetables and so on for cattle ranching amongst the Natives, the Union Agricultural Department says that the European farmers are moving away from agriculture to cattle ranching." (123 1)

Why should this be puzzling to Senator Brookes, to a man who understands well the aim of segregation? He ought to know, unless he pretends not to know, that ownership of cattle, like ownership of land, is an obstacle to successful segregation. If he had listened to what was said about the cattle policy even in the Senate, he would not have been puzzled. The following rather lengthy quotations are important, because they throw light on the interconnection between land and cattle:

"When the Department of Native Affairs some years ago brought forward their recommendation with regard to limitation of stock, I saw the benefits that would accrue to the Natives if they followed this policy, and I gave the Department my full support. I went down to the reserves and met many of the leaders and I discussed with them this question very carefully. Several of these leaders, against the wishes of their followers, agreed to come in with the N.A.D. and agreed to a limitation of stock. I should like to tell the Minister that the objection of these followers to these leaders was that they were not sure what the N.A.D. would do when the Department got control. They felt that they were putting their necks in a noose and they did not know when the noose would be pulled light... Those Reserves that agreed to limitation of stock are very discontented today and there is a very bitter feeling amongst them. I would like to give an illustration of what is happening. An inspector turns up to cull the stock. He goes through the stock of a certain Native. Unfortunately he does not look for the cooperation of that Native and he does not consult him. He simply says: 'That animal must be removed'. If the Native protests then he is simply told he will be brought before the court and sued. No explanations or reasons are given. The next year a different inspector comes and he culls the very stock that the other inspector passed, and so the Natives are asking me today whether it is an instruction from the N.A.D. to cull quantity or quality. They cannot understand the attitude of the N.A.D.. I have seen a case where a Native had a type of shorthorn cow... which in my opinion gave about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a bucket of milk. The Native was told he had to get rid of that cow and he was threatened if he did not do so. What he did was he opened the gate leading into the Reserve that had not agreed to limitation. That cow is running there today, and every night it is brought to his fence and it gives him the milk he wants for his family ... I have a case in my area where the Natives agreed to limitation of stock but where they had been cut down to 3 morgen and where their stock had been cut down to 3 head, those to consist of either 3 head of cattle, or one cow, one horse and 4 sheep. I want to ask the Minister how can these people plough with one cow, one horse and 4 sheep, and

how can they possibly live? Unfortunately this master and servant attitude of some of the officials has caused a great deal of pleasure to those Natives who warned their leaders not to agree to limitation and they are watching with pleasure the trials and tribulations of those who agreed." Malcomess (1091-3)

One might expect, in view of what happened, some expression of regret from a man who advised the "Natives" to put their necks in a noose against their wish. But there is no remorse from this friend of the Africans. Instead he adds: *"I also feel that the leaders of the Natives who went against the wishes of their people and agreed to limitation of stock should have the fullest support of the officials of the Department and they should be consulted in every possible way."* (1093)

Most certainly! Because they go against the wishes of their people! Because through their collaboration with the segregation policies of the government, the people can be deprived of milk for their families or made to live on 3 morgen of land to be ploughed with one cow, one horse and four sheep! Another statement not less revealing comes from Natal. (The former came from the Cape.):

"The Natives had their cattle there to be dipped, and the inspector condemned hem without exception and did not approve of a single one. He immediately gave instructions to have them castrated. They immediately set to work to castrate the bulls and within a week the work was completed. Within 14 days the Natives received summonses from the inspector to the effect that they are keeping bulls which were not approved ... The Natives got a fright. Hundreds received summonses all of a sudden and all on one day. The attorneys sent out their "touts" among them to say that they would help the Natives. The Native thinks that he is guilty. The "touts" brought them together and told them that they had to pay £1 or £2 for 'vula majango' (to open the door) ... Approximately £400 was collected. The Natives went to court and said that they pleaded guilty. I knew nothing about it but the injustice lies therein that the Natives were summoned some 10 days or more after the bulls were castrated and they were fined £10 ... or 14 days imprisonment. This is apart from 'opening the door'." (1285-6)

The most unfortunate thing about these revelations is that they are presented as miscarriages of justice, as isolated exceptional cases. But these shocking outrages are not at all isolated cases. The injustice does not lie with this or that inspector, with this or that magistrate. It is a result of the deliberate policy of the ruling-classes and their government towards the Africans, designed and sanctified by the Native Land Act and by all the other so-called Native Acts. It is a result of a deliberate policy called "Segregation" or "Trusteeship" or "Development on Our Own Lines". Senator Brookes may pretend to be puzzled why there should be one policy regarding the cattle and land of the Europeans and another policy for the land and cattle of the Africans. But today the Africans are no more puzzled. They know the reasons. The Africans know today that the Native Representation Act was designed to rob them of any political rights they

may once have had, and that the Land Act was designed not to give them more land, but to force them off the land.

LET ME QUOTE FROM A LEAFLET ISSUED BY THE ALL AFRICAN CONVENTION COMMITTEE (W. PROVINCE)

The African youth had been boiling over with rage for a long time at the mouthings of Professor Jabavu. They found themselves completely ineffectual. However signs were that something was brewing in the Convention and they felt that those who belonged and had to carry out the struggle, had to bring a new set of ideas into the Convention. The organisational form was there in the Federal Structure which touched every layer of the people, but there were no ideas. It was an empty shell. People can only unite on the basis of ideas, and of Principled Ideas.

The A.N.C., a party to the betrayal of 1936, with the acceptance of the compromise proposals and with the disillusionment of the masses of the people, who had thought that at last the leadership would offer resistance, left the All African Convention. You will remember that in 1941 the African National Congress left the All African Convention and from that time the road it has taken has been the road of the wilderness; it accepted inferior representation and dummy councils, the N.R.C. and Advisory Boards. It became the happy hunting-ground for the avowed quislings of the ex-N.R.C., for black agents of the Liberals, the old white leader-goats (the Moltenos and Ballingers) and for the neo-Liberals, the young leader-goats, the Sam Kahn-Bunting clique. And very likely it will open its doors to a new teacher quisling class created under the Bantu Education Act. The A.N.C. and the South African Indian Congress are organisations of the people, not quisling organisations, but they have opened their doors to Quislings who accept political inferiority by working the Native Representation Act. All of them are united in their opposition to the N.E.U.M. This is not accidental; the ideas of the Herrenvolk have penetrated into this section of the Non-Europeans.

In this connection consider the standpoint of the Natal Indian Congress. I quote from their Memorandum on Civic Status, 25th September 1944.

"Finally we would record our continued agreement with and our adherence to the views laid down by the late Mr. Gokhale (and Gandhi) in 1912, in the following terms:

'There is no doubt that the European element must continue to predominate in this (and - that it must be made to feel that its position and its special civilisation were absolutely secure; the government of the country must be in accordance with Western traditions and modes of thought.'

And again from the same Memorandum:

"In order to implement the accepted principle that Indians are an integral part of South African Society, certain conditions must be fulfilled. These conditions

are:

1) *The fear of the Europeans must be allayed. In other words, means of representation must be devised by which Europeans' political supremacy will not be jeopardised.*

2) *The form the franchise must take must be consonant with adequate citizenship of Indians."*

And again:

"Our proposal is ... Adult franchise on the common roll with Europeans for Indian men and women having:

a) educational qualifications approximating Std VI. This can be ascertained by the ability of the applicant to fill in a form.

b) an economic standard to be determined by an annual income of not less than £150 per annum.

It will be observed that whereas the Indians did enjoy the franchise on the common roll, the qualifications were then much lower than what is now being suggested. We are of the opinion that the safeguards suggested here are a reasonable concession to European fears. The suggestion, if anything, is all too generous."

The Battle for the Franchise

The battle for the franchise is for us a Life and Death Struggle. That is why in the Ten Point Programme, the demand for the franchise is at the top of all the demands. Here are the figures to show you the significance of this battle for the Franchise. They speak more strongly than words.

Comparison of Rural land and Population

Total Rural Land Area in South Africa 140,936,000 morgen

Rural White Families 700,000 own 124,186,000 morgen

Rural African Families 7,000,000 occupy 16,750,000 (on a tenure basis)

You will see now why we stress the importance of the Battle for the Franchise.

Let me give you another example from the medical point of view

Life Span (Life Expectancy)

White Female 62 years

White Male 60 years

Coloured Female : 40 years

Coloured Male 38 years

African Female : under 30 years

African Male under 28 years

It is literally a life and death struggle, the struggle for the Franchise on the basis of the Ten Point Programme.

We can now understand what is involved in collaboration. If you collaborate it means that you are going to work the inferior institutions and the position of the people is going to deteriorate. Collaboration means widening the gap between the citizen and the non-citizen, between the life-expectancy of those who have the franchise and those who are deprived of it. Non-collaboration on the other hand, means that we are going to narrow this gap. It is a question of the first law of nature, self-preservation.

The corner-stone of the Unity Structure is, then, the Battle for the Franchise.

In this address I have attempted to deal with the major aspects of the National Movement and the ravages that have taken place, especially so after the discovery of diamonds and gold. In my opening remarks I told you that many promising mass movements in South Africa collapsed, despite the heroism, the sacrifice and the devotion of the people, which was almost an idolisation of the leadership. I remember in 1927 as a young medical student, when we read in the Times of London of the work of the I.C.U.. We were thrilled beyond measure. You see in London you meet oppressed students from the West Indies, West Africa, East Africa, Egypt, India, China, Arabia, etc, etc, where great things were already happening on the national front. We who came from South Africa were the Cinderellas. But when the I.C.U. burst on to the scene, they gathered around us to know, and we were accepted as a link in the Anti-Imperialist chain of Colonial Oppression. We knew that we were no different from any other human being. The collective will of the people has shown it on numerous occasions, both in the past as well as in our own life-time. We must not fail now. We dare not! For history must teach lessons that must not be repeated! In view of the mass tragedies that face us and the hopelessness that you see in the eyes of the people - they are looking for a Leadership. But the Leadership today will demand courage, fortitude and a determination to go on even in the face of great dangers. We must put an end to Bohemianism and to Dilettantism. We demand of our Youth vision and steadfastness.

Mr. I B Tabata, in his inaugural address to SOYA, particularly stressed the early cancer of bohemianism and dilettantism that was insidiously creeping into the movement. He recognised it and before it took an inoperable stage, he felt that it should be immediately incised and destroyed before it destroyed the healthy organism itself. We must produce more and more fighters in the cause of Freedom and fewer and fewer bohemians. Let us steel ourselves and measure up to the magnitude of our tasks.

Remember also that it is from life itself that you are going to learn many

a bitter lesson. A very noble lady said to us when we first entered the movement: "Very few people can match up to their ideas. Concentrate rather on sharpening your ideological weapons than on idolising or idealising people. There are neither Gods nor beasts, neither devils nor angels in the movement. There are just ordinary human beings, with the weakness and the strength, the foibles and the feelings of ordinary human beings. Nothing more and nothing less."

\You have been forearmed.

.....