The development of Angolan nationalism was greatly influenced by the rapid political evolution in the Congo, and the ideas of independence filtered through to the Bakongo peoples, north and south of the Angolan-Congolese border, stimulating nationalist feeling among people who had long been isolated from the mainstream of news and events in Africa. These ideas frightened the Portuguese into increasingly oppressive measures.

When the well-loved and world-renowned poet and MPLA leader, Dr. Neto was arrested, together with Fr. Pinto de Andrade (brother of the MPLA president), most of the other MPLA leaders fled the country, many going to Conakry, where they established an office. When the uprising broke out, UPA had the advantage of being located in Leopoldville, which strengthened their position among the people, and MPLA only set up headquarters in Leopoldville some six months later.

It is probably correct to say that neither the UPA nor MPLA commands influence over the majority of Angolans, three-quarters of whom live south and east of the war-affected areas. The UPA is supported by the Kikongo-speaking peoples who live in the war areas, and compose most of the refugee population. Holden is accused of trying to force all Angolans to accept the supremacy of his own tribe (Bakongo), of his own religion (Protestant), and of French as Angola's official language of the future.

They accuse MPLA of being a party of mulattoes and Portuguese, with a leadership consisting solely of doctors, philosophers and engineers, reference to the fact that a large proportion of MPLA leaders are university-educated. The UPA also suggest privately that MPLA has been 'infiltrated by Communists'. UPA have support in the United States.

Popular support of the UPA is not significantly augmented by joining in the so-called national front with the PDA, who themselves admit that their own support is limited to the Zombo peoples living in the Bakongo region.

However, these divisions within the movements in Angola may appear to be more serious to the outsider than they will prove in the future. Unity of purpose and action is a fundamental need for pursuing the struggle. The Angolans are short of arms, ill-clothed and ill-fed, and their guerilla units often isolated from each other. But there are areas near the Congo border completely under their control (mostly UPA). And the Portuguese government cannot long bear the strain of drawn-out military action, involving tens of
thousands of troops. The mass exodus of Angolans from the Northern province to Congo together with continued guerrilla action seriously affects coffee exports. Portuguese economy, based very much on what it has been able to extract from Angola, cannot stand serious diminution of this base together with greatly increased military expenditure. Neighbouring African countries will undoubtedly increase assistance when the UPA - MPLA positions become clearer, for they do not wish to assist with arms that may only be used by UPA in fratricidal strife.

The war will undoubtedly be pursued, however great the obstacles. And the escape of Dr. Neto, who is probably by now in Leopoldville, may greatly influence the building of a true united front. The divisions between the organisations may become more marked when the war has been won and they face the enormous issues of economic development and reconstruction.
The origins of racial discrimination in South Africa go back to the earliest days of White settlement.

The Pass Law was first introduced to control the movement of slaves in 1760 by the Dutch settlers of the Cape. This most hated of today's weapons of oppression therefore originated fundamentally as a slave measure deeply rooted in the economic system of South Africa. In 1809 it was extended by a proclamation under which all African tribes required passes when moving from one area to another. This is the very beginning of South Africa's forced labour system, for the pass laws are used to maintain forced labour, to maintain the migratory labour system, and regulate economic relations between Black and White.

The White colony in the Cape was established by the Dutch East India Company 300 years ago as an inn for ships trading between Holland and her colonies in Asia; colonists remained to become a farming community. As they expanded, they encountered the African tribes in occupation of the land, and a series of frontier wars took place. In the unequal contest between rifle and spear, the White farmers gradually occupied the whole of Southern Africa to the border of Mozambique in the East, and the German colony of South West Africa in the West.

White settlers set the pattern for ruthless robbery and exploitation of the African people. First they took as slaves the small, harmless Khoi-Khoi (Bushmen) and Hottentots, the indigenous peoples of the Cape. They then subdued by superior arms the African tribes that they encountered in occupation of the land they wished to expropriate. White settlement conquered these tribes by force, drove the people from their tribal areas, seized their land and cattle, and forced them into service.

When the colony passed from the Dutch East India Company into British control, conditions did not change fundamentally, although the British administration, subject to pressures from within Britain itself, was less crude in its treatment
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treatment of non-whites. In 1828 they gave Hottentots and all other non-slaves the same civil and legal rights as whites. In 1831, they instituted regulations for the treatment of slaves, limiting their punishment. In 1833, slavery was abolished in the British Empire, with a huge money award as compensation to slave-owners.

Two years later there began the Great Trek that opened up the interior of Southern Africa and spread the influence of the Dutch settlers into a vast area of land that was to insulate and isolate them from the ideas and developments of the contemporary world.

The reasons for the Great Trek were political, social and racial, but it was also an economic manifestation. The Dutch settlers were pastoralists, not agriculturalists, requiring ever larger stretches of land to feed their cattle. The settlers turned their ox-wagons, loaded with their families and all their possessions, towards the great spaces of the North, where they could annex land seemingly without limit, and subdue the African tribes that resisted, and treat them as they pleased, without the interference of the British administration.

In these Treks, some 10,000 people left the Cape, dispossessed the Africans they encountered, and absorbed them as squatter labourers into their large and wasteful agricultural system.

From the earliest days, the history of the African people of South Africa has been one of steady appropriation of their lands. What the trekking Boers did not occupy, the British annexed. What was not won by force of superior arms was taken by trickery. On this basis of force and fraud rests the title deeds to the land today.

What really changed the pattern of life in South Africa, however, was the discovery, first of diamonds, then of gold, in the second half of the nineteenth century. Within a few years, capital from abroad began to pour into the country, together with a stream of settlers, miners, business men, adventurers.

By this time, the Boer trekkers had established their own Republic in the
the Transvaal under President Kruger, who refused to grant the franchise to the new immigrants, who now outnumbered the free Dutch settlers, for fear that they would gain control of the Transvaal.

Nothing could stand in the way of Britain adding this new, potentially rich area to the Empire. War broke out between the British Empire and the two Republics - the Transvaal and the Orange Free State - in October 1899. The outcome was never in doubt. But the Boers continued guerilla action for two years after the regular warfare was over. The war scarred people and land alike. Lord Kitchener dealt with the guerillas by burning farm-houses and scorching the land, and crowding the women and children and prisoners into concentration camps. The scorched earth policy created a bitterness between the two White groups in South Africa, the English-speaking and the Afrikaans-speaking (the descendants of the Dutch settlers) which has only lost its significance in recent times, with the achievement in most fields of the aims of Afrikaner nationalism, and with the rise of a newer, fiercer nationalism - that of the Africans.

The four provinces of South Africa, the Cape, Natal, the Orange Free State, and the Transvaal, became the Union of South Africa in 1910, and with the capital produced by gold and diamond mining, South Africa began to industrialise and expand and develop economically. The Act of Union consolidated power in the joint hands of the two groups which constituted the White minority.

So the two conflicting groups, those representing British Imperial interests, and those representing the one-time Boer independence movement, found common ground. The basis for their cooperation: control of African land and African labour.

Land and labour were needed both by the farmers and the mining houses. Difficulties in obtaining sufficient cheap labour run through the reports of the Chamber of Mines (the association of mining magnates) like a well-worn song. In the early days, these reports were more outspoken and revealing than they are
are today.

In 1890, for instance, the Chamber appointed a special committee to formulate schemes for obtaining labour, and this committee proposed "some legislative provision", such as raising the tax on huts to an appreciable amount. From 1890 onwards, the Chamber made repeated representations to the Parliament of the Transvaal Republic for two measures: better "control" of Africans through the pass laws, and an increase in the hut tax as an incentive to make Africans work.

An Industrial Commission investigating this problem in 1897 was told by a mining magnate (George Albu) that native wages were far too high and must be lowered. When asked what he would do if the workers went back to their kraals, he replied he would make labour compulsory, and without using force, by levying money taxes.

Such measures assisted the flow of labour for a while, but as long as so many Africans still lived as independent peasants, and with the rapid expansion in mining and subsidiary industries, the labour shortage became acute. They could not be pressed into service, except by the offer of wages and amenities better than the mine-owners were prepared to give.

The outcome was the 1913 Land Act, which completed and legalised the process of driving the African from the land. This Act prohibited Africans from acquiring or hiring land outside areas scheduled in the Act. The land thus prohibited was for Whites only: 87 per cent of the land of South Africa; leaving for African occupation "Native Reserves" that were, at that time, 7.3 per cent of the total land area (when the Act was passed, Africans constituted 78 per cent of the total population.) The total amount of land set aside for Native Reserves under this Act will eventually not exceed 13 per cent (it is today a little less.)

This Act brought about the tragic uprooting of hundreds of thousands of families settled on their land for generations. Now they had nowhere to go; they became landless wanderers. The confinement of the Africans to areas too small
small and too poor, and completely unfit for small-scale peasant farming, was the means to establish the migratory and cheap labour policy that has been in force ever since, to this day.

With the exception of the Transkei and Pondoland, the Reserves "were on the whole, regions of only medium or poor fertility, many of them left for Native occupation after the better land in the vicinity had been taken over by White farmers." (Dr. E. Roux, Wits University.)

These scattered bits and pieces of land, over-crowded, under-developed backwaters over which the tide of industrial development was to wash leaving them completely untouched - these rural slums have now been elevated to Dr. Verwoerd's Bantustans, the natural Bantu homelands; an extraordinary piece of fiction by which poverty-stricken, primitive Reserves of cheap labour become the basis for the Nationalist Bantustans, and are now described as the hereditary tribal lands of the African people!

The Land Act was the basis of ensuring the labour supply. The Reserves were the means of keeping that labour cheap. Families maintain a bare existence from the produce of their land in the Reserves, and then must still find cash with which to pay taxes and purchase additional necessities (often food, to supplement their subsistence economy.) The men, therefore, are compelled to seek work in gold mines, in industry, or on a farm, to earn money. A considerable percentage work on the mines or White farms almost continuously, with only short breaks with their families every few years. Up to 50 per cent of all able-bodied men are away from the Reserves at one time, leaving the women, the children, the very young or very old, the disabled and ill. These supplement the wages their menfolk earn with the small produce of their land. The mine-woners, therefore, do not have to pay a wage sufficient to support the man and his whole family.

The result of this migratory labour system, quite apart from its evil social effects, has been that Africans in the Reserves could never become real farmers.
Even so, the insatiable appetite of the Mines for cheap labour cannot be satisfied by drawing on South Africa alone. Two-thirds of the mine-workers on the Witwatersrand today come from territories outside the Republic of South Africa. The largest percentage come from Portuguese East Africa (26 per cent in 1958) - something to be borne in mind when Portugal and South Africa present a common front to the world. The British Protectorates of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland supply 20 per cent, and 19.76 per cent come from tropical areas (Uganda, Nyasaland, etc.) Over half the able-bodied men of Basutoland leave the territory every year; from southern Mozambique as many as 75 per cent of adult men are away from home for protracted periods. Villages in Nyasaland lose up to 70 per cent of their menfolk. Thus, the effects of migratory labour, the break-up of family life, the instability, the destruction of production in the countryside, are felt far beyond the borders of South Africa.

The gigantic mining monopolies of Southern and Central Africa, backed by South African, British, American and Belgian capital, share a common sweated labour policy; and though the political boundaries are marked on the map, the common economic needs of imperialism transcend these boundaries.

As there is ever-closer identity of interest in matters of labour supply, in keeping Africans quiescent and subservient, so Verwoerd, Salazar and Welensky draw ever closer to one another as political partners.

The rest of Africa is slipping from the imperialist grip; so ever more desperate is their hold on Southern, Central and East Africa. Hence Portugal's stonewall attitude to African claims in Angola, and complete suppression of any political opposition in Mozambique; hence Welensky's threats and capers; hence the frantic arming in South Africa today for the last-ditch stand.

White settlers from Kenya, feeling the coming of independence to that country, are moving out, some in the direction of South Africa which plans to welcome them, posing as the last stronghold of the colonialist, and parading as the policeman of Africa south of the Equator. This is a stand without compromise.
And as the racial fanatics in South Africa prepare themselves for the last, desperate defence by arming themselves and the White population, it should be remembered just who is served by their apartheid. Its isolation and defeat is the concern not only of South Africa's freedom-fighters, but of all freedom-loving Africa, - and of the world.

Ends

NEXT ARTICLE: THE LAWS OF APARtheid
THE GENERAL ELECTION IN SOUTH AFRICA

At the precise moment that the nations of the world were delivering to South Africa the most unanimous and overwhelming vote of censure it has ever received (67 to 1, with 20 abstentions), white South Africans were busy re-electing into office the same reactionary Nationalist Government responsible for those policies, and even presenting it with a slightly increased majority.

The Nationalist Party now holds 105 seats out of a total of 156 in the South African parliament - the House of Assembly. They previously had 102.

The House of Assembly is elected for a term of office of five years, but these elections were held after only three years of its last term had elapsed.

In explaining why he had decided to hold the elections two years early, the Prime Minister, Dr. Verwoerd, said he wished to forestall "efforts to disturb law and order", believing that non-white organisations were planning large-scale demonstrations in 1963; and to show the world that South Africa has a "stable and strong government in power", able to deal efficiently with the country's racial problems.

The real reasons for the election, say opponents of the government, are that economically and politically, the South African government is fighting a battle against time. The economic situation is deteriorating steadily, with growing unemployment and business failures, and little prospect of improvement. While political difficulties are mounting as South Africa's racial policies come under increasing fire both internally and from the nations of the world.

Only the white minority (3 million out of a 15 million population) have the right to vote for the House of Assembly. Twelve million non-whites, African, Indians and Coloureds, do not have the vote.

The two main parties contesting the election were the government party - the Nationalists - and the opposition - the United Party. The United Party governed South Africa from 1910 to 1923, and from 1932 to 1948. It is dominated by powerful gold-mining monopolies closely associated with British and other imperialist interests. Though it took part with the United Nations
in World War 2, it refused to make any concessions to non-whites, and since 1948, as the opposition party, has drifted steadily towards a policy of retreat and surrender of principle, voting with the government on crucial occasions for anti-democratic legislation. In many respects its policy is indistinguishable from the Nationalists.

The elections provided one surprise, however, in the substantial vote (70,000; the Nationalists received 370,400; the United Party 302,900 with another 35,903 cast for a coalition party; with another 20,000 for smaller parties;) cast for the twelve candidates of the Progressive Party. Only one was returned to the House of Assembly, but others lost their seats by small minorities.

The Progressive Party is a group that left the United Party because of its steady drift towards Nationalist policy. This is the first time it has actually contested the elections - its 12 previous Members of Parliament were originally elected as United Party members. It enjoys support among certain business and mining groups; the head of the huge Anglo-American concern with gold and diamond mining interests, Sir Ernest Oppenheimer, came out in open support of the Progressives, who obviously enjoy substantial financial backing; and the influential daily newspaper, the Rand Daily Mail, ran a strong campaign on their behalf.

The Progressives stand for the extension of franchise rights to non-whites subject to certain educational or property qualifications (which would effectively exclude the majority of non-whites.) In an eve-of-election address, its leader, Dr. Jan Steytler, stated that "the days of race discrimination in South Africa are over." Declaring that "merit not colour" must be the test of citizenship, Dr. Steytler promised that his party would remove the pass laws and influx control (1), remove the industrial colour bar, abolish Job Reservation (2), and abolish the controversial Immorality Act.

To people of other countries, these statements may appear as simple, representing obvious, even limited attitudes. To white South Africans they are startling and revolutionary. This is the first time that an all-white political party has entered the field of parliamentary politics with even a limited non-white franchise as its aim.

(1) Nearly 100,000 Africans are jailed each year for pass offenses - the most hated law of all.
(2) A law by which certain jobs are reserved exclusively for different races - used so far to provide jobs for white workers at the expense of non-white
The Progressive Party vote has had a shock effect on thousands of whites, and now that it has shown itself to have considerable support, it will undoubtedly attract more support in the future.

The attitude of the majority of non-whites in the election was summed up by Chief Lutuli in a pre-election message, in which he stated that South Africa's problems can only be solved by the framing of a new Constitution based on a non-racial democracy. He therefore called on all South Africans to use the elections as an opportunity to press forward the calling of a truly representative Convention, with sovereign powers to draw up such a Constitution.

Although they increased their vote and have hailed the results as a great victory, the election proved a disappointment to the Nationalists. They had obviously expected that since the establishment of a Republic last May, they would receive the overwhelming support of the white voters. There was in fact no point in holding the election unless they could obtain a greatly increased majority. In effect, the results show little change, as the increase in the Nationalist vote is mainly, if not entirely, due to the enfranchisement of 18-year-olds during the past year (previously only whites of 21 and over had the vote.)

The fact that they have not drawn large numbers of new voters to their side is partly the cumulative effect of sharp criticism from abroad, together with trade boycotts, exclusion from certain international sporting bodies, United Nations talk of possible sanctions, increasing pressure about South-West Africa, and the refusal of many famous artists from other countries to perform in South Africa to colour-bar audiences. All this has caused many whites, previously arrogantly impervious to suggestions of change, to become uncertain of their policies.

The Nationalists, however, declare that the election results are a justification of their policies, a mandate to implement them to the full. As they have a clear majority in the House of Assembly, South Africans may now expect the last vestiges of democratic rights to be taken from them, as apartheid policies are ruthlessly and relentlessly pressed forward. As the Minister for Justice puts it: "rights are getting out of hand." The next Parliamentary session will pass new
laws to silence opposition; one is likely to be directed against all independent newspapers and periodicals; another is expected to introduce a form of house arrest for so-called 'agitators.'

But the confidence that the Nationalists display is tempered today by the knowledge that not only the majority of South Africans, but the whole world, is against them. "We have our backs to the wall," their leaders constantly declare. "Mobilise for the struggle ahead," the Minister of Bantu Administration told an audience of young Nationalists in a post-election address. "We must will die, each and every one of us, every son and daughter of South Africa, rather than give up our nationhood."

Against this background must be viewed the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Albert John Lutuli, former leader of the now-banned African National Congress, and still called 'Chief' throughout South Africa by the men and women of the liberation movement. (He was deposed from his position as Chief of his tribe by the Nationalists when he refused to resign his position in the African National Congress.) Under his leadership the liberatory movement adhered to non-violent methods of struggle, but year by year has been met with increasing violence on the part of the authorities, culminating in the shootings at Sharpeville in March of last year, and the unprecedented arrests and display of force at the time of the proclamation of the Republic in May of this year.

Every opportunity that white South Africans have had of averting violent struggle has been rejected, as in these last elections, so that an explosive situation is brought nearer day by day.

At the time when its leader is receiving the 1960 Peace Prize, the liberatory movement is approaching a radically different position at this time, the end of 1961. An article in the London Observer recently correctly summed up the situation as being the end of one period of struggle, the non-violent period. "Dr. Verwoerd is creating a classical revolutionary situation. Throughout South Africa there is talk of violence among the 13 million non-whites." There has already been a hint of possible sabotage: the destruction of a power-line, a fire in a government office, unusual and persistent fires in the sugar-cane plantations of Natal, reported to be the
work of saboteurs. In country areas, among the peasants, the situation has gone further. Chiefs and headmen who act as stooges for government policy go in constant danger of their lives, their homes are burned, and many have died.

The intransigent attitude of the government and of the majority of white voters in this election has closed the door on peaceful methods of struggle. A change in South Africa, while speeded and assisted by world pressure, can only come from within, not from abroad. The people as a whole realise this, and today they are preparing themselves for that change, stripped of the hopes and illusions of the past.
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ENDS.
THE SABOTAGE MOVEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Police throughout South Africa have been mobilised following several sabotage attacks on government installations on December 16th, by a newly-formed underground body 'UMKONTO WE SIZWE' (Zulu for 'SPEAR OF THE NATION'.)

Simultaneously with the explosions caused by nitre-glycerine bombs and dynamite, posters appeared on the walls of buildings in Johannesburg, Durban and Port Elizabeth announcing that units of the new underground body would "carry on the struggle for freedom and democracy by new methods, necessary to complement the actions of the established liberation organisations."

The poster said "The people's patience is not endless. The time comes in the life of any nation when there remain only two choices: submit or fight. The time has now come to South Africa." Violence from the government, says the new organisation's poster "will no longer be met by non-violent resistance alone." The poster claims that it will be "the fighting arm of the people against the Government and its policy of race oppression." Its actions will be a blow against the Nationalist Government preparations for civil war and military rule.

The targets of the sabotage acts included government pass offices in Johannesburg, where every African has to register for work and permission to be in the towns; government administration buildings in African townships; a court where Africans are tried for offences under the pass laws; and an electric sub-station in Port Elizabeth. The poster that appeared declared that acts of sabotage would be directed against Government installations, "particularly those connected with apartheid and race discrimination."

One African was killed and another seriously injured in Johannesburg, by the blast of the explosions, and one man has been arrested in Port Elizabeth.

The morning after the explosions the police raided the homes of numbers of prominent members of the Congress movement of all races. Police headquarters are threatening dire steps against saboteurs.

GOVERNMENT FORCE.

The significance of these acts should not be under-estimated. They
mark, in fact, a turning point in South Africa. This is the first time that the struggle has erupted in such a form, in a long history of anti-government activity that has been mared in the past by its emphasis on non-violent methods.

The attacks are not entirely unexpected and appear as a logical development of what is becoming an increasingly foreboding position. Since its accession to power in 1948, the Nationalist Government has launched a continuous process that has closed up all avenues of peaceful protest. As more and more individuals were banned from organisations and public meetings, or exiled, or confined to certain areas and prohibited from belonging to organisations; as it has become more and more difficult to hold public gatherings and demonstrations; as increasing methods of intimidation were used against individuals, together with mass trials on charges ranging from high treason; so the Congress movement, the premier liberatory body in South Africa, has sought different ways of goicing its opposition to repressive government acts, and of organising the people against them.

But the problems of methods of struggle in an authoritarian, police-controlled state has become a dilemma facing all in South Africa. The prospects of peaceful mass pressure exercising its will on the government has been whittled away by the growing weight of military apparatus and fascist laws which the government assembles against them. Every peaceful protest has been met with increasing violence, of which the massacre at Sharpeville was the most outstanding example, but by no means the last. Following Sharpeville, the African National Congress leading organisation of the African people, was banned in May 1960, and this marked an end of an era, but even at this stage there was no marked departure from the emphasis on 'non-violence' in Congress circles. It was another year before people's attitudes underwent a change.

The change came about in May, 1961, on the declaration of the Republic of South Africa. The previous year had seen a five-month State of Emergency, during which 20,000 people, including 2,000 political 'activists' were held without charges, and the whole army was mobilised. (The State of Emergency in the country area of Pondoland has not yet been lifted, after more than a year, with an unknown number of people, probably thousands, in jail.)

In May 1961 the Congress movement called for a nation-wide 'stay-at-
home', a form of public strike in which people stay in their houses and don’t go to work, as a mark of protest against the establishment of Dr. Verwoerd's Republic. While all the emphasis from Congress leaders was on 'peaceful protest' and non-violent methods, to such an extent that even picketing was not undertaken on the day of the stay-at-home, this was met with unprecedented acts of state terror, continuous police raids, mass arrests, a tremendous display of military force, with tanks parading the streets of the townships, flashing searchlights into people's homes, while military planes flew overhead.

From May 1961 there has been a ferment of discussion in the Congress movement. For the first time there was talk about 'other methods of struggle.' The lessons of the police and army mobilisation had become clear; that it is now impossible to call any peaceful protest, whatever its form, without calling out the full military might of the armed state.

**BLOOD RIVER.**

Some newspapers have suggested that the bomb explosions were timed to coincide with the return of Chief Lutuli from Oslo after receiving the Nobel Peace Prize. But December 16th is a significant date in South African history, and one that has particular meaning for the African people.

On December 16th in 1838, the Voortrekkers defeated the main armies of the Zulus under their chief, Dingaan, at the Battle of Blood River in Natal. The day is commemorated as a public holiday throughout South Africa, and was known as Dingaan's Day. A few years ago the Nationalists changed the name to the Day of the Covenant, and declared it a religious holiday when all public entertainment and sport is prohibited. (The Boer leader prayed to God for victory before the Battle of Blood River, and pledged to build a church to God if victory was won.) On this day, each year, Nationalist leaders make the most violent and provocative attacks upon the African people, turning it into a demonstration of their white supremacy and **baaskap.** It is their day of triumph over the defeat of the African people, the day for beating the big racial drums. That this new organisation declared itself and began its activities on December 16th cannot be coincidence.

**MAYIBUYE AFRIKA!**

One more point is of interest. The posters that appeared ended with the words *Mayibuye Afrika! (Come back, Africa)*, which is the slogan of
the banned African National Congress. While it appears to be an entirely new organisation, the inspiration seems to come from the African National Congress, and not from the rival, extremist, Pan-African Congress. The wording of the posters tends to confirm this, and also the fact that the main explosions took place in the former ANC strongholds of Johannesburg and Port Elizabeth.

Has Congress turned its back on the non-violent methods that won it acclaim throughout the world, and the Nobel Peace Prize for its banned leader? The posters say: "We hope - even at this late hour - that our first actions will awaken everyone to the realisation of the disastrous situation to which the Nationalist policy is leading. We believe our actions to be a blow against the Nationalist preparations for civil war and military rule."

It is the government itself that has brought about this situation. When oppression over the majority is maintained by armed might, there is no longer peace among the people.

ends.
The South African underground fights on.

Numerous arrests have not smashed the resistance movement.

When South African police recently arrested Walter Sisulu, former Secretary-General of the banned African National Congress, together with other well-known political leaders, they claimed that they had smashed what they believed to have been the African National Congress underground headquarters in South Africa. “This is a major break-through,” claimed the Commissioner of Police, General Keevy, “in eliminating subversive organisations. Minister of Justice Mr. Vorster declared that he was confident that every subversive organisation would be run to the ground — and smashed.

Yet only a few days later a leaflet issued by the African National Congress was being widely circulated in the townships, passed surreptitiously from hand to hand, and received in towns throughout the country through the post.

The A.N.C. is alive, the leaflet declares boldly. It says:

“The police say they have smashed the African National Congress. We reply: the A.N.C. shall never die! Our underground organisation is at work, tirelessly meeting, organising, planning. Our secret forces are with the people all the time, in the buses, in the factories, in the townships. We shall strike the oppressor government when we are prepared.

“The A.N.C. is ready for anything! Some of our bravest leaders have been arrested. But while the heroes of the people suffer brutally in Vorster’s jails, the people do not despair. The people will never run out of leaders. We have trained deputies, new leaders, a second wave of militant young men. The police know nothing about them. Does Vorster think the people are barren? Does he imagine we have not prepared ourselves?

“WE ARE NOT ALONE! The African people are not alone in the struggle. The Indian youth is now with us, and the Coloured people are learning to fight.
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