

---

## To the Editor

---

### "The Collaborators"

SIR,—As one of those who helped collect background material for the Anti-Apartheid Movement pamphlet "The Collaborators" I should like to reply to the attack on it by your London correspondent in the May *New African*. If, as I suspect, this pamphlet is banned in South Africa, your readers will have no opportunity of judging its contents for themselves. Nor have they been assisted to do so by your correspondent for he does not attempt to outline the basic arguments or to criticise them on rational grounds. Instead, he falls into the Vorster trap of smearing the authors as "dedicated communists" and then resorts to emotional terms such as "awful" and "full of contemptible malopropisms" (such as?).

Here is a brief outline of the pamphlet's contents: The authors argue that, to prevent a race war developing in South Africa and engulfing the whole continent, total economic sanctions should be imposed through the United Nations. Such action would obviously be impossible without the support of the United States and Britain. The writers believe that the extent of British trade and investment in South Africa prevents this country from backing fully U.N. resolutions on South Africa. Using a mass of statistics and quotations from speeches and statements, they show how businessmen and Members of Parliament who have commercial interests in South Africa form a lobby at the House of Commons which defends apartheid at every opportunity.

Thus, contrary to your correspondent's opinion, it is not businessmen in general who are attacked but the "collaborators" who are shoring up apartheid by investing in border industries and helping to perpetuate iniquities such as job reservation, endorsing out of "surplus" Africans and starvation wages. As to the allegation that the pamphlet is written by dedicated communists, I believe that this is totally irrelevant. It should be judged not by the political opinions of the authors but by the soundness of its contents. Your correspondent expresses fears that the freedom movement will collapse because of communist support. My own belief is that the greater danger comes from those like your correspondent who would advocate the

conducting of McCarthy-type witch-hunts among its members.

JAMES H. WHITE  
22 Stanley Crescent, London W11.

### Nonracialism and Youth

SIR.—There is, we are informed, a military threat to South Africa from the African states—a military threat from the same African states that are in "a state of chaos and mismanagement". We are further informed that Africans are planning "subversion" and sabotage against "South Africa"—these sinister acts of planning are the brainchildren of "uncivilised savages" who "cannot govern themselves".

The contradictions are obvious—and tragic when one considers that nearly two million are utterly taken in by this type of nonsense. They are even worse when it is noted that among the most gullible are the racialist youth. This youth is prepared to swallow all the klatsch put out by their own "cultural" bodies; to believe in their divined, God-sanctioned mission (so typically accepted)—blindly and docilely.

For those who don't know: the average White youth is certain that South Africa will be invaded from the North; he is positive that this will happen within the next few years. The "black savages" will cross the border in hordes, with no discipline and (as one may guess) they will not have the Almighty on their side.

The uninitiated may not realise it but the black man with a degree is less civilised than the White labourer—the reason being (there are numerous anecdotes told on any suburban train) that the "centuries" of "civilisation" behind the White labourer make him better.

Thus, the rebel, who defies all this, who wants no part of this sham system, who may prefer to judge men as men with merit the only yardstick is labelled as a "Kaffir-

boetie", "muntlover"—or is called names even less likely to be printed.

But the people with this view have their opponents. Foremost among these are those believing that it is wrong to "ill-treat the natives", "Give them food and houses and clothing and a slight increase in pay but they can't have the vote—maybe in a hundred years' time". These gentlemen are found among "the English-speaking" and are often of the "sporting type"—but "one can't play rugby with them, you may as well shake them by the hand".

We are left with two groups. The first accedes that the "educated ones" should be allowed the vote—they will even let a few come to their parties and dances in order to show their democratic outlook—and (perhaps more accurately) just "for kicks".

This leaves the outcasts, the smallest group amongst White youth, the most hated group. This is the group that believes (in some cases albeit only for a short while) in genuine democracy. Those who maintain this belief for a longer period are even fewer.

With democrats, among the Whites of tomorrow, few and far between, the future looks tough from the non-racial point of view. Too few will brave the hostile isolation, the cold lack of popularity, the rifts that may develop between hitherto friends and numerous other unpleasantnesses.

But with the non-racial press struggling, with non-racialists of every race and age keeping their heads high amongst all the indignities they have been forced to suffer there should be no barrier to young non-racialists of today defying the massed might of the state and contributing of their talents for as long as they are able to.

Unfortunately there are not enough people to do so which places a greater burden and responsibility on those remaining.

TWO NON-RACIALIST THINKERS  
Cape Town

---

## COMMENT

"To Russia  
with Love"

THE DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION has achieved the impossible! An advertisement in a recent edition of the British weekly, the *New Statesman*, "proves" that the Whites constitute the majority population group in South Africa. Those of us poor dimwits who believed that Africans were the majority group must hastily mend our ways and absorb the truth that there is no such thing as a "Bantu population": only Xhosas, Zulus, Vendas, Tswanas, etc. . . . and Damaras another day. We will also have to forget that there are deep cleavages in the White population between Afrikaners, English—and Jews, as the skirmish in the House of Assembly on the 18th March, 1964, so vividly showed. For purposes of external consumption and internal fortification we Whites constitute a nation—and don't forget it.