

3 JMK W 136 I

COMMUNISM WILL FREEDOM OUTLIVE THE NATS!

A Communist Bi-Monthly
New Series Vol. 2, No. 9
May 15, 1950 Price 1s.

Statement issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party on the Unlawful Organisations Bill.

The Government is bringing in Fascism under the pretext of fighting Communism. That is the real intention behind the Unlawful Organisations Bill.

If it becomes law, no opponent of the Government will be safe from persecution; no organisation that stands for the democratic way of life will be secure.

To advocate Communism will be a crime. But Communism—the social ownership of productive goods—is a form of Socialism. Therefore to advocate Socialism will be a crime. Therefore the Labour Party, having Socialism as its objective, will be unlawful.

To bring about any kind of change by means that involve disturbance will be a crime. A strike is a disturbance promoted to bring about economic change. Therefore strikes will be illegal and trade unions that organise strikes will be unlawful.

To bring about any kind of change in co-operating with any foreign institution will be a crime, where one of the purposes "professed or otherwise" of the institution is to promote the establishment in the Union of any kind of system (political, industrial, social or economic) similar to any system operating in any foreign country.

Under this formula, almost any branch of an international organisation—the Catholic Church, for instance, the United Nations Organisation, or a missionary society—could be declared unlawful.

To promote the interests of any foreign institution or the interests of all persons of a particular class will be a crime. This provision will establish the illegality of all societies promoting friendship between South African citizens and a foreign people: the Sons of England, Caledonian Society, Netherlands Society, Friends of France, Friends of the Soviet Union, Zionist organisations—all could be declared unlawful. Any class or sectional organisation could be similarly dealt with: trade unions,

the Labour Party, the African National Congress, the S.A. Indian Congress, the African Peoples' Organisation, Farmers' Associations, Chambers of Industry and of Commerce, the Teachers' League—all could be declared unlawful.

Even though the organisation were not banned, a person would be liable to five years' imprisonment without the option of a fine for advocating, advising, defending or encouraging Socialism, strikes, political, social, economic or industrial institutions and methods existing in other countries, the interests of a foreign people or the interests of a particular class.

A newspaper or other publication could be banned if it were held to serve mainly as a means for spreading news or views calculated to further any of the purposes defined as unlawful.

On the same ground, that is, to prevent the achievement of one of the defined purposes, the Minister could prohibit the holding of any meeting or forbid any person to attend a meeting.

No organisation, newspaper, meeting or individual opposing government policy will be secure against prohibition and the infliction of savage penalties.

No person will be secure in his private life. For the Bill authorises the Minister to prohibit a member or active supporter of an unlawful organisation from belonging to any specified organisation (including a church, golf club, or political society) or from becoming a member of Parliament, a Provincial Council or Municipal Council. And the Minister, if satisfied that any person advocates, defends or encourages the achievement of an unlawful purpose, may prohibit him from living or being in any defined area.

These are the ingredients of the police state.

There is to be no appeal to the Courts. The Cabinet or the Minister alone, and without having to satisfy a Court or to produce evidence tested and proved, may

ban organisations, publications and meetings, take away a person's livelihood, divest him of civil rights, and deport him from any area.

Remember that this Bill is being introduced by the Government responsible for the Citizenship Act, the Population Registration Bill and the Group Areas Bill, the Government that has interfered with passports, trade union rights, and the freedom of the press, the Government that has openly declared sympathies with Nazi ideas and institutions, and has recently expressed the desire to recognise Franco Spain.

With typical Nazi effrontery, the Government asks for power to ban organisations that advocate a one-party system while it itself advances rapidly towards the establishment of such a system.

Incapable of reducing the cost of living, preventing unemployment or providing housing, unable to attempt a solution of the Union's pressing problems, responsible for increasing inter-racial tensions to breaking point, the Government wishes to divert public indignation from its vile misdeeds and to entrench itself in power by destroying all effective opposition.

It is the Government, and not the Communist Party, that is a menace to democracy. To urge the removal of restrictions on a class or race, to press for equality of political rights, to work for the socialisation of the mines, industries, the banks and the land—is the fulfilment of democracy. These are the things that the Communist Party stands for and these are the aims that the Government would make unlawful in order to entrench the special privileges of a small section of the population.

For over a hundred years dictatorships and autocracies have been trying by force to suppress the Socialist doctrine. They have failed. Today the countries with a Socialist system embrace nearly one-half of the earth's surface area.

Continued on page 4

THE GROUP AREAS BILL

There is about this Bill a quality of fanaticism, a kind of grotesque distortion of perspective, such as is displayed by egotistical maniacs who see the rest of the universe in a relation of utter subjection to their own selves. Who but a madman, one is impelled to ask, could conceive of a sorting out of the South African peoples into innumerable small groups—Whites, Indians, Coloured, Malays, Xhosa, Zulu, Sotho, Venda—each living in its own paddock in every town, each forbidden to live anywhere else except (and is the exception not itself a complete exposure of the Bill's absurdity?) as a servant of a legitimate resident.

What makes the Bill hideous is that it has been planned, not by an irrational, irresponsible madman, but by a class that in cold blood is determined to sweep aside all vested rights other than its own, of course, to ignore all principles of justice, in order to maintain its own privileged state. It is this disregard of human rights and dignities, this deliberate denial of values to anyone who does not belong by birth and conviction to the inner, sacred circle, that our world has learnt to associate with fascism. A class capable of producing a measure such as the Group Areas Bill is innately, essentially fascist.

That description applies to the Nationalist Party, but not to it exclusively. The United Party, which produced the Asiatic Land Tenure Act and the Natives (Urban Areas) Act, prepared the way for the Bill. All those people who accepted and condoned segregation when it was directed against someone else bear a part of the responsibility. The Bill is but another stage on the road along which South Africa has been led for many years now, a road leading eventually to endless, bitter inter-racial war, open and concealed.

-The Minister's Discretion

Assume that the Bill were to become law in its present form. Immediately, no agreement would be valid under which a European sells land to an Indian, African or Coloured person. Unless the Minister authorises the sale. And who tells the Minister when to grant or refuse a permit? No one: his discretion is free and unfettered, not subject to supervision by a Court, not limited by any standards laid down by Parliament.

Not only inter-racial sales, but also leases would be prohibited. Non-Europeans will be able to continue living in houses which they hired from European owners before the law came into force. But if the tenant leaves, the house cannot be rented to another Non-European. And a European-

owned house not occupied by a Non-European at the time when the law begins to operate may not be leased to a Non-European. Unless, again, the Minister grants a permit.

The prohibitions could be relaxed; "concessions" could be made. For instance, it will be possible to suspend the restrictions on occupancy—though not on sales—in any given area, or to define specified areas in which European-owned houses, if occupied at a declared date by a Non-European, might be hired to another Non-European of the same group. But who is to make the concession? The Governor-General—in other words, again the Minister.

Who is this Minister who will have the power to tell people where they may or may not live, who alone can authorise sales of land? A Dönges, a somebody else, a member of the class that has a monopoly of political power, a representative of the privileged minority. What is there to make him deal "justly" with the voteless, the unrepresented majority, the "Kaffirs", the "Kooies" and "Hot-nots"?

A Country of Locations

Here, at long last, is the racialist pipe-dream realised, a separate location for every section of the people with a skin-colour one or two shades darker than "white". Not enough to prevent the Non-Europeans from "penetrating" farther into "white" areas; those there now must out! Unless, of course, they are servants.

So, "group areas" are to be marked out, as many as the Minister wants—one each for every shade of colour, one each, if he thinks fit, for every tribe and sub-tribe. Three kinds of group areas can be introduced for every racial group. In a White area, for instance, Non-Europeans might be prohibited from occupying a house, those of them who are already tenants being forced to leave the area. Or they might be prohibited from buying and inheriting land and buildings—so that on the death of a Non-European owning a house, it could not be inherited by his son, daughter or other member of his family, but would have to be sold to a European. Or both ownership and occupation might be prohibited. When all the Non-European owners have died or sold out, the area would be lily-white.

As before, the Minister might give a Non-European a permit to buy, hold or occupy land or premises in a White area, but, in this case, only if he thinks that to refuse a permit would cause "undue" hardship, or that to issue one would be in the interests of the White group. Is a hardship suffered by a Non-European

ever "undue"? Would it ever be held that a White group would benefit by having a Non-European living in its midst?

Restrictions on All?

Oh! it is all so "fair", this Bill. Doesn't it put everyone in a location, white as well as black and brown? Isn't the European to be prohibited from buying or owning property or occupying a house in an African, Indian or Coloured area?

True, all very true. Until we consider the Bill, not as a set of rules in the abstract, but as an instrument of policy wielded by a class having a monopoly of power and, very nearly, of wealth. If anyone is going to suffer restrictions it will not be this class.

How is the country going to be divided up—that's the question. And we know how. The 13% of the Union's area set aside for the African peasantry is the answer. The overcrowding of Indians in the hopelessly small areas set aside for them is the answer. The answer has been given by the locations under the Natives (Urban Areas) Act, the slums in the heart of every big town and the shanty towns on the outskirts.

This is not a law to divide land and housing "equally" between black, brown and white. The Bill does not say that this is the intention; it does not even say that in making the division, the Minister must take into account the relative needs of the different groups. It gives him the power to divide but does not tell him how, on what basis, the division is to be made.

The "how" is a political issue, to be decided in terms of pull, influence, votes—all the factors that go to the making of political decisions. The Minister, in short, will not risk losing a single vote. It is the voteless Non-European who will be sacrificed to the god of apartheid: it is he who will have to pack up and go, out of the high-class suburbs, out of the "good" residential areas, out of the business centres, to the surrounding "black belt".

No Compensation

Nothing is to be given in exchange. This is not a Bill to provide homes for the homeless, land for the landless. No obligation rests on the Minister or on the State which he represents to see that housing and land are available for the families that are made to pack up and go. "There is your area; live there as best you can". That is all.

Who is to pay for the cost of removal? The family that moves. Who bears the loss in property values. The

Continued on page 4

May 15, 1950

FREELOM

Page Three

SMUTS'S NEW POLICY

By a Correspondent.

(Continued from our last issue)

Mr. Oppenheimer: "Manufacturing industry will only be able to serve as a substitute to the wasting asset of our mining industry if it is able to increase substantially its contribution to our export trade."

How is this to be done? Mr. Oppenheimer replies: "Industry must reduce costs, and in order to reduce costs the principal requirements are greater efficiency of labour and a larger internal market. These two points interlock, because the small internal market in many cases limits the scale of manufacture to a degree that prevents the most economic use of labour. And both points bring us back to the status and skill of the Non-Europeans who make up the great bulk of our labour force."

Industrial Colour Bar

"In considering both points we will find ourselves face to face with the fact of the industrial colour bar. The widening of our internal market must depend principally on raising the standard of living of Non-Europeans, but that in turn will only be practical if the productivity, that is, the efficiency, of labour can be increased. It cannot be done unless the Non-European is capable of increasing his production and is allowed to increase his production."

It is interesting to note in passing the reasoning of capitalists: the standard of living of the Non-Europeans must be raised to benefit industry (i.e., the employers), there is no suggestion of developing secondary industry to improve the conditions of Non-Europeans.

Mr. Oppenheimer is aware of the difficulties obstructing the abolition of the colour bar. He sees these difficulties in "the determination of the skilled and highly paid European workers to protect their standards of living . . . against the competition of labourers willing to work for much lower wages".

European Anxiety

"I am convinced", he says, "that the removal of this understandable anxiety of European workers (that Non-Europeans will undercut them) is a necessary concomitant of the industrial progress of the Non-European. You may perhaps think that I am asking for the impossible. I do not believe so. In any case, if it is impossible, then so is the continued industrial progress of South Africa."

"We must set about improving the industrial status of Non-Europeans in such a way as to obtain the co-operation of the European workers and their unions. I suggest that we should not worry about the existence of the colour bar. What we should worry about is its rigidity. [My emphasis.] That is the chief impediment to our national progress."

"We must bring home to the European workers the fact that his prosperity, along with the prosperity of all South Africans, Europeans and Non-Europeans, depends on raising the national income to the maximum, and that that cannot be done unless everyone, whatever his colour, is allowed and encouraged to give of his best."

"I plead therefore for flexibility in industrial labour organisation. We must not allow the dead hand of convention, whether expressed in a colour bar or an outmoded technique, to impede development. Far from looking to some ultimate end we should move step by step."

The Thin Edge

Mr. Oppenheimer concluded his address to the Institute by quoting a hymn: "I do not ask to see the distant scene; one step enough for me". Translated into less poetical terms, this means that the thin edge of the wedge is as effective as an outright attack on the colour bar, even more so.

With what purpose in mind does an employer of labour in South Africa urge the abolition of the colour bar? To raise the standard

of living of Non-Europeans and increase national productivity? To a certain extent and for his own ultimate benefit, yes, but immediately to make available a big mass of human labour, competing for employment and forcing down wages in the process. Capitalists in South Africa have decided that highly paid European workers are a luxury they cannot afford any longer.

Mr. Oppenheimer's association with the South African Trust explains why, from among the country's capitalists, he was selected as the spokesman of industrialists. His influence is already noticeable. There are some back-benchers in the United Party who advocate steps similar to his proposals. Turn back in this article to where he discusses the urbanisation of Non-Europeans and compare what he says with the following remarks by Mr. Marais Steyn, United Party Member of Parliament for Alberton, made in Parliament this session soon after the Newclare riots:

"It is no use living in the idle and fond dream that you can reverse the stream of Natives who are flocking to our cities. We have to accept the presence of these Natives in our urban areas as a fact, an irrevocable fact, and we have to prepare our policy accordingly."

Final Proof

The final proof, if any is needed, of the impact of the new policy on the United Party is provided by General Smuts, in his speech when he opened the Rand Easter Show on April 1, 1950.

He remarked that "We farmers are amazed at the country's industrial progress". He described the "tremendous switchover from town to country". He was particularly confident that mechanisation would help to solve the problem of the shortage of farm labour—a clear warning that farm labour would continue to be scarce, because agriculture cannot pay the wages obtainable in industry.

Some persons, said General Smuts, believed that the growth of secondary industry should be slowed down, so that mining and agriculture could obtain labour.

"This would be fatal", he said. "The development of manufacturing industry is going forward by leaps and bounds. That must continue. The rap may be turned off today, but it will be turned on again tomorrow.

"Our mining potential is based on a wasting asset. Manufacturing industry should be pushed as far as possible. This will involve a great forward move and the better disposal of our labour resources. South Africa must not be afraid to make the passing from the old to the new."

European Miners' Fears

Not only industry, but the gold mines as well have been working towards the abolition of the colour bar. The president of the Mine Workers' Union alleged recently that the mining houses were creating an artificial shortage of European mine workers with the object of grinding existing conditions of

...of the abolition of colour bar... these two interests... there will always be a disparity in wages, and industry will offer more attractive conditions.

The struggle between the so-called "primary" industries of mining and agriculture and secondary industry is real and serious. The Minister of Finance, Mr. N. C. Havenga, said in Parliament on February 15, 1950: "In my opinion, in future the Government will have to be more critical in regard to applications for the establishment of new secondary industries, because a labour position might develop which would be detrimental to the two primary industries—mining and agriculture." Mr. Havenga said that "the establishment of all sorts of secondary industries... were not of sufficient importance to warrant the drawing away of labour from our two primary industries."

O.F.S. Mines a Failure

Mr. Oppenheimer has extensive

interests in the Orange Free State gold fields. Why should he plead for more industrialisation? The answer lies in the fact that both Mr. Oppenheimer and General Smuts refer to the O.F.S. gold fields and the Rand in general terms as a wasting asset. There is very little talk lately of a new Witwatersrand arising in the O.F.S. Is it that the O.F.S. gold fields will never attain the heights of productivity which have been claimed for them? It is known that the famous Oppenheimer scheme to reduce migratory labour on its mines in the O.F.S. to a minimum is so much moonshine.

If the O.F.S. gold mines are not going to produce as much gold as the country has been led to believe, then Mr. Oppenheimer's interest in industrialisation is understandable.

A more important question has now to be asked: In what light must the development of industry, along the lines suggested by Mr. Oppenheimer, be considered? Is it a progressive move?

...is very important

...of industrialisation... develop a more class conscious proletariat, which will be better organised to fight for its rights.

But more so, the abolition of the colour bar in industry will sow the seeds of future unity between all races of workers in South Africa.

COMMUNISM WILL OUTLINE THE NATS

Continued from page 1

and contain nearly half of the world's population. A movement that has grown in such proportions cannot be checked by the suppression of liberties, or the persecution of individuals. Communism will survive the Nationalist Government.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party calls on the people to mobilise their forces in defence of democracy.

...from becoming a Fascist State.

...Organisations

THE GROUP AREAS BILL

Continued from page 2

results of forced sales and compulsory evacuations? The property owners. Yes, the bourgeoisie, who shout to high heaven when the working class expropriates in the interests of society, have no compunction in breaking their own rules in their own interests.

And what do their interests demand? That the Non-Europeans should remain cheap labour, never competing with the privileged class for living space, for trade, for markets, for jobs.

Fight or . . . !

There is much else in the Bill that is vicious; few of its sections are not. The way in which the racial groups are defined, the effect on Non-Europeans trading in White areas, the position of companies, which, like individuals, will be White, Native or Coloured, the powers of inspectors to pry into the lives and affairs of people—every one of these provisions is an offence against accepted democratic standards, against human decency.

No section of the Non-European people can by now have any illusion as to the intentions of this Government. Neither for the Coloured nor for the Indian will there be a privileged status. It is a matter of sink or swim together.

When this realisation has spread, one of the great obstacles to unity, one of the great handicaps in the struggle for equality, will then have been removed. In the past each section tended to stand aloof while attacks were being delivered against the others. In particular, the Coloured people, encouraged to believe that they were god's stepchildren, felt themselves above the African and even the Indian—or at least were indifferent to their fate.

Now we know. There is to be no privileged Non-European. Which means that all that the Non-Europeans can hope to achieve will have to be gained through determined, ceaseless, united political struggle.

The Government will try to prevent this struggle from developing. It will try to prevent the Communist Party from leading the way. But ideas, convictions, the cry for justice—these cannot be baffled by ministerial decrees.

Published at Room 15, Lloyds Bldgs, 59 Burg St., Cape Town, by the proprietor, Moses Maseko, Room 45, Mount St., Cape Town, and printed by the Pioneer Press (Pty.) Ltd., 27 Oxford St., Woodstock, Cape.

Collection Number: AD1812

RECORDS RELATING TO THE 'TREASON TRIAL' (REGINA vs F. ADAMS AND OTHERS ON CHARGE OF HIGH TREASON, ETC.), 1956 1961

TREASON TRIAL, 1956 1961

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand

Location:- Johannesburg

©2012

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of the collection records and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a private collection deposited with Historical Papers at The University of the Witwatersrand.