

10/19/19/20
23rd October 1962

Dear Neville,

Thank you for your letter of the 18th. In regard to the letters, you seem to have had them all. May I deal with points as you raised them.

1. Thomas. I will doubtless hear from you about the matter. You will note that the ICFTU in their letter to you mention a figure of £120 and they have confirmed that this is the figure which they are prepared to contribute. I must have misunderstood them, as I mentioned a figure of £150. I think there is little or no doubt further help can be got for Thomas's union and I do hope that he takes the job if possible. I have written to them to mention the possibility that he will not be able to do this, and the other gentleman as a possible substitute in case he should not be able to take the job on. I only hope this will not affect their attitude to the application, as I sold it to them really on the basis of Thomas's personality.

2. I saw a press cutting of Ernie's do with Vorster and it certainly seemed pretty good. I have written to your father about Ernie's visit and he writes in a letter received today to say that he will talk to Al, but he says "My own impression in the light of my enquiries last year and what I have been able to gather so far about attitudes here at present, is that prospects for a campaign for the party are poor." He goes on to say "On the other hand, I think that Ernie has ability and drive and I feel that if he could get here he would probably be able to do something useful for the cause in a general way both financially and by way of arousing interest. If money were not such a problem I should be inclined to say that he ought to come, because of the value of having someone here with the time to devote himself exclusively to this task." The kind of money which is available, as you know, would never compass taking him to America at a cost of £2,000. In regard to the money there is a total figure of £2250 ^{available} to come: you have had £1500 and £750 will come later. I will ask John Wilson to write to you as you suggest.

Lowenstein
*x

3. The Conference: I will be interested to hear your reactions about the conference. If it is not to take place in January we should need to give the ICFTU fairly convincing reasons for the delay. In other words, it would be wrong to give them the belief that our views were governed by self-interest. The organising of the conference, I am sure, will be paid for by the ICFTU. You will see that in my letter to Peter I asked him for your assessment of the cost, and this should include the cost of getting it going. Finally if the discussions with the ICFTU are to take place in various groups with one or more of our people present all the time to give a hand, do you think that we can possibly lose out? The ICFTU are not looking at this thing from the point of view of ignorance; they realise FOFATUSA's shortcomings; they understand the SACTU position; they are really looking for a vehicle to get into the field of trade union work and I think they would rather start with a group of people who have not cast their own organisation in too firmly defined a line. I await your comments.

4. Liberal International: Your reaction to the Liberal International documents is much as I expected. On the other hand, I think you would find that while the Socialist International is perhaps a little more equivocal on the subject of neutrality it is also committed to cold war attitudes. As you know, I personally think that most of the tenets of neutrality fall into the category of mumbo jumbo and witchcraft and the neutralists have not really been able to propagate a single coherent cohesive idea. I understand that the differences at the Belgrade Conference were so wide as to be almost irreconcilable. The Belgrade Conference was not even able to produce a resolution on Berlin as intelligent or as radical as that produced by the Liberal Party in Britain some weeks later, when it pleaded for a de facto recognition of the East German Government and the Oder Niese line. Secondly I think that many Pan-African attitudes having been painfully swallowed by the African nationalists are being rapidly regurgitated. In London not even the most brash of African leaders is prepared to condone Nkrumah's actions, not even Molotsi. In many other respects the Liberals have been much more radical on Africa than the Socialists.

5. I have read with some interest Evans' article "Direction or Destination" because it shows the old argument still goes on between those who would have the Liberal Party take up what they believe to be the correct attitude even if its membership is confined to themselves and the local dog and those who believe in being politic. It is not so much specific criticisms that I find difficult - with many of them I sympathise, and I do ~~find~~ think that the party's economic policy is so vague in certain of its aspects as to be dishonest and the mines and land represent very important questions upon which the Party should not equivocate - but it is Evans' general attitude in which I find a rather rosy-glow approach to politics in South Africa.

6. Bechuanaland: Your report on Bechuanaland is most interesting. Is this being done under the auspices of the committee which was set up last year and about which I have heard no more? I am quite happy to approach William Clark, but I am still in the position where I must go to him as representing a committee and sponsors. Is this a part of the general scheme or is it a specific proposition? We should get the proposition set out in some detail.

7. Freedom Fund: I have seen Ennals, who tells me that there would not be very much for us. As we were only approached because he hoped to pull in the British Liberals I did not commit myself either way. I simply said I had no mandate to express any view but in any event what view did he want us to express? I said that we were desperately short of money and could probably spend all that they could raise, and if he did set up such a fund we would like to feel free to apply to them. As the Liberal fund seems to be getting off the ground my own feeling is that we should see how that goes first, because I think it will raise more money.

8. Palley: Yes, I know about Palley's background, and I did know that he has been rejected by the whites. I have seen a fair amount of Sithole last week, he is the new chairman of ZAPU. He is a very impressive fellow and I took a great liking to him. He doesn't view Palley with distrust, although I do not think he would want to be associated with him publicly. I haven't seen Palley again but I understand that he is doing a fairly good job on ZAPU's behalf here.

9. Hepple: I agree with your suggestions about Leo Lovell. As you know, my main objection to him is that he is an anti-Semite, or at least he is so when he is with Kirchner.

Rep. Liberal Party & ANC.

* 10. The Common Market: I enclose a memorandum which was drawn up by Oliver T. and myself on the question of South Africa and the Common Market. We are launching quite a massive campaign here * through the Liberal and Socialist Internationals and ICFU, and by direct delegations to the embassies of the Six, as also by protests to the African countries. For your interest I enclose a copy of the memorandum, also a letter to Christopher Chataway which you may find of some interest.

Yours sincerely,



PS Please give Randolph the address you use for me

PPS When is the picture new? Time is getting rather short - JC has been on to me about it.

~~PPS~~