

After the service was over these, many other Africans and one or two Europeans were found to be sitting in a group on one of the lawns in the square. Europeans coming from worshipping their God and hoisting their flag stood around jeering, calling racial abuse. One man had the wit to purchase a supply of monkey nuts and with these he pelted his fellow citizens. Police soon ordered the seated crowd to leave and though it was dispersing quietly, police dogs were used to chase the departing demonstrators.

THIS DEMONSTRATION HAS grown into the most appalling insult to every sacred feeling, if we judge by letters written to the European Press. This year it has been announced that no longer will the Governor attend the Pioneer Day service, and the responsibility for the arranging of this service will no longer belong as heretofore to the Salisbury Municipality but to the Rhodesia Pioneers and Early Settlers Society. Immediately the Press and the Leader of the Opposition protested that this was because of last year's demonstrations, a surrender to hooliganism. Sir Edgar Whitehead replied with touching irrelevance "The time has come when there are no longer any of the original settlers left and it is now a question of their descendants."

But the real answer is obvious. Sir Edgar Whitehead's government is committed to a multiracial state, and although apparently he cannot yet reveal this openly to his white supporters, he can no longer give official sanction to the celebration of the European arrival as a national event and symbol of national unity.

The pioneer tradition is not only no longer valid but it is no longer possible to pretend that it is valid. The celebration of September 12th becomes a matter for antiquaries and the family piety of the descendants of the pioneers. What the National occasions of the new Southern Rhodesia—of Zimbabwe—will be, we do not know. They will be the commemoration of events which have not yet happened, but which are even now perhaps imminent. ●

---

## ZAPU'S Witness

---

### A. K. BROOKS

*Chapupu* [Independent Monthly—Southern Rhodesia] Vol. 1, Nos. 1 & 2, August-September 1962.

IT IS FASHIONABLE at present to describe Southern Rhodesia as a 'Police state.' As a term of abuse, the phrase is no doubt useful; as an instrument of analysis it tells us little. *Chapupu* tells us a good deal about the erosion of liberties and the suppression of African nationalism in Southern Rhodesia, and in doing so it adds useful detail to the hazy outline suggested by the notion of 'Police state.'

*Chapupu*, (which means "Witness"), is clearly the organ of the Zimbabwe African People's Union

---

A. K. BROOKS, a Rhodesian, is a student at the University of Cape Town.

(ZAPU), despite its pretence of independence. It is an articulate, outspoken and at times eloquent witness, but those who hope to find in its pages constructive thought about economic, social and cultural policy for the future will be disappointed by the first two issues. Perhaps this is a built-in weakness of an extra-constitutional nationalist movement, its negative formulation of attitudes. 'One-man-one-vote' is a slogan, not a policy. 'Down with Whitehead' and 'Repeal the Land Apportionment Act' may well be necessary cries for the moment, but when Whitehead falls (as he might, in trying to repeal the Land Apportionment Act), what then? On this *Chapupu* has nothing to say.

In other respects, however, the magazine is of great value. It reminds us that six men are still languishing in detention at Gokwe, that the B.S.A. Police are an active aggressive arm of the United Federal Party regime, that the Government's propaganda campaign is crude and dishonest. An article by the students of Epworth Theological College shows that the missions have played their unwitting part in equipping African nationalism for its struggle.\* The possibility of the African church militant lined up against the white church reactionary is as real in Central Africa as is the possibility in the Republic of a massive rejection of Christianity by a rebellious black majority. The mission students write:

"The great encouraging thing is that all those who fight for a just cause will conquer without weapons. This is clearly shown in the Old Testament Bible History and also in world history."

The radical reader on seeing this may begin to wonder whether religion is not an obstacle to change after all, but the next few lines should reassure him. They contain a demand for power, the demand of a dispossessed people couched, with superb irony, in the political and religious language of the imperialist culture which imposed itself on them:

"We know that a person must struggle against sin, and must struggle for education, so we fail to see why he should not struggle to establish a government running under a democratic principle of majority rule. So if we are to follow democratic ways we find that it is the majority who should rule, and according to Christianity it is the owners of the land . . . We fail to see why it is only Mr. Nkomo who should use democratic and Christian tactics when the founders of democracy and the propagators of the Gospel fail to use them."

IN SHORT, THE FAMILIAR pattern of colonialism in decline is being repeated in Southern Rhodesia. Why else the increasing frequency of violent outbursts, the alliance of ZAPU with the radical wing of African Trade Unionism, the introduction of more repressive legislation, the £4-million Police Vote, the ill-disguised concessions made five years too late? It all points towards a crisis.

But the leaders of ZAPU would be wrong to think that they have merely to huff and puff in order to blow the ruling class down. They have made bad tactical mistakes in the past, and are prone to lean heavily on the uncertain props of British intervention and United Nations pressure. They could do no better than to study the efficient organisation of the Malawi machine

---

\*This is a theme developed by a man who admirably illustrates it himself—Rev. N. Sithole, chairman of ZAPU—in his work *African Nationalism*.

in Nyasaland, and adapt its techniques in building up the loose-knit coalition of urban and rural dissidents which at present constitutes the nationalist movement in Southern Rhodesia. ●

---

## South African Trade Unions Division Under Law

---

LUKAS MOKOENA

THROUGHOUT THE WORLD workers are organised into trade unions in their own industries and united in national trade union co-ordinating bodies. In no country but South Africa are they organised on racial, sex or colour lines. Although employers and Governments have always combined in opposition to the organisation of workers into trade unions there have been no legal enactments to divide them into separate unions. Thus the unity of the workers is purely and entirely left to the workers themselves and they have found ways of uniting in spite of stratagems and tactics adopted by employers.

In South Africa conditions are entirely different. Workers are divided by law into racial groups. In terms of the Industrial Conciliation Act, separate trade unions or separate branches of a trade union are required for white workers on the one hand and Indian and Coloured on the other. African workers are expressly excluded from the definition of "employee" in terms of the Act. Coloured and Indian branches of a Union must have an all-white Executive. Although African trade unions are not as yet illegal, the State makes it extremely difficult for the Africans to be organised. Under the Group Areas Act, the African unions have no right to occupy premises in an urban area. Under the Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act, the heavy penalties for strike action militate against the formation of a Union.

It is not only the fact, however, that workers cannot unite together into one Union which is a major barrier to working class unity, but that legally and conventionally certain categories of work are reserved mainly for white workers. In terms of the Mines and Works Act, blasting certificates can be obtained only by whites. The Job Reservation Determinations made in terms of the relevant section of the Industrial Conciliation Act have so far reserved jobs for white workers only. Although there are no legal barriers to any worker becoming an apprentice (with the exception of the building and printing industries) traditionally only white workers have apprenticeship training. This is slightly different in the Cape Province with regard to Coloured workers, but the over-all situation is that the majority of non-whites cannot qualify as skilled workers.

African workers are deprived by statute of the basic

---

LUKAS MOKOENA is a trade union organiser in Johannesburg.

rights of freedom of movement and the freedom to sell their labour to the highest bidder and this hinders their economic advance.

The labour aristocracy of white workers thus created is not unique to South Africa. It is a well-known employer tactic to divide the workers. But, as stated above, nowhere else does this have the force of law.

The interaction of legal compulsions which separate workers, and the creation of a skilled and privileged force of white workers has led to the present disunity of the labour movement in South Africa. Certain emotional attitudes have become deeply entrenched and make it difficult to break through the barriers to unity.

THE WHITE WORKERS GENERALLY regard themselves as workers only when issues affect them as white workers. They regard the non-white workers generally and the African workers in particular as a threat to their economic security. Thus consciously and unconsciously they are opposed to the organisation of African workers into trade unions. Many of them support "Job Reservation" in the mistaken belief that it will *protect* their jobs.

African workers, struggling against a mass of legislation, open intimidation, persecution and prosecution to maintain their unions, place no reliance whatsoever on the support of their fellow-white workers. In too many cases have white workers "scabbed" on their fellow African workers in the same factory when the Africans have gone on strike. To the African workers, therefore, the white worker is identified with the employer.

But it is not only in the major issue of strikes where the white workers "sell-out" the African workers. In wage negotiations, where the privileged whites negotiate on behalf of the unrepresented and unconsulted Africans, the latter fare very badly.

In day-to-day contact at work there is often underlying hostility between the two groups. White workers actually use their positions to disorganise African trade unions. They have been known to tell African workers that their Unions are not legal. Active trade union shop stewards have lost their jobs not because the director of the company concerned does not want them but because the white foreman does not like their trade union activities. In other words, while the laws of the country are designed to prevent the African workers from organising into trade unions, the white workers, in addition, act as a stumbling block in the formation of such unions.

These attitudes of white workers are even found among trade union secretaries or industrial council agents. Some secretaries of white trade unions do not hesitate to recommend the expulsion of an African shop steward to his boss, if the shop steward is a militant trade unionist. If the latter asks a white trade unionist to explain trade union procedure which he does not understand well, the answer is usually to have the African sacked. One can imagine what resentment this creates in the minds of African workers.

In many industrial councils, African trade unionists are treated as "boys." They are spoken to contemptuously, bossed by the agents, typists or secretary in

*Continued on page 10*