

bound to express admiration. How could one deny the virtue of such admirable national unity? The feature which is not admirable is that it produces restrictive organisation. It cannot risk a truly out-going policy. It has to control most carefully education and public ideas by rigid censorship and propaganda.

For those of us who are none the less South Africans but who do not subscribe to the Nationalist tradition because our origins are different, so that we do not in fact by birth belong within it, and who moreover *do* subscribe to the principles of free association and enlightened social change, the situation is to say the least, uncomfortable and embarrassing, and in many ways quite absurd. Perhaps we could even laugh at the absurdity, but we can hardly do this in the face of the social injustices which accompany preservation of the myth and which bear so heavily on the social conscience of the whole country.

I do not suggest that social injustice derives from the Nationalist myth as its only or its main source. Obviously there are many elements which contribute to it. Among these of course are the myth of White superiority and the many residual prejudices and exploitation motives of colonialism which haunt our society. What I do suggest is that the Nationalist myth, which is in its effects far more dynamic than any of the other politically emotive influences in this country (at least at present), is at least something which has to be understood before the problems it poses can be squarely faced either by those who live within its tradition or by those who are naturally outside it. The question of whether or not the problems are soluble appears at the moment to be impossible to answer.□



Voortrekker Monument – Pretoria

NATAL INDIAN CONGRESS - THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ITS REVIVAL

by C. Sewpershad.

The revival of the Natal Indian Congress is of significance not only to the Indian community but to South Africa as a whole. It fulfills a need that has existed for some eight years in the political structure of South Africa.

The banning of the African National Congress, the Coloured People's Congress and the Congress of Democrats left the Natal Indian Congress as the only movement to voice the democratic views of the Congress Alliance.

During the early part of the 1960's almost all the leaders of the Congress Alliance were either jailed or banned. This left the way open for opportunists to step in and further their own selfish ends.

The widespread bannings of the leaders of the Natal Indian Congress led to a dangerous situation for the Indian community.

NO ORGANISATION

From about 1962 until the Congress was revived in October 1971 the Indian Community did not have an organisation

through which it could make its grievances felt and its voice heard. The government saw this as a golden opportunity to arrogate to itself the right to appoint Indian leaders. We thus saw the creation of the South African Indian Council.

The emergence of the South African Indian Council resulted in a strange situation for the Indian people. The Indian community now had to contend with the humiliation of having their representatives chosen by the very Government that had always shown them scant, if any, respect. We also had a group of people who were quite prepared to allow themselves to be nominated by an undemocratic government to speak on behalf of the Indian people.

This was a situation which was quite intolerable to our community. People throughout the country expressed their unqualified rejection of the Council. It was obvious that the

members of the Council lacked the support of the people. What was essential was an organisation through which the Indian people could express its views. The revival of the Natal Indian Congress fulfilled this long felt need.

The Natal Indian Congress is committed to the realisation of a democratic society in South Africa. It believes that only a government based on the will of all its people will be able to bring peace and racial harmony. In this regard our organisation has sometimes been criticised for restricting its membership to Indians although it advocates the democratic and non-racial idea.

PRACTICAL AND REALISTIC

The restriction of the members of Congress to Indians is not due to any racialistic or sectional beliefs. It is our belief that at this stage it is practical and realistic to limit our members to Indians. Because of Government policy, the different races in South Africa have been separated and have lived apart for a number of years. In view of this it would be difficult and unwise, at this stage, to form an

organisation representing all the races. It is unlikely that such an organisation would get massive support from the different races.

Although our membership is limited to Indians, we have always made it clear beyond any ambiguity that our aim is to create a society in which the idea of liberty, equality and justice will prevail.

Our rôle therefore is to inspire the Indian people to strive for a united democratic South Africa. The grievances of the Indian people are linked with the grievances of all the other oppressed people. It is the duty of Congress to drive home to the Indians that their problems cannot be divorced from the problems of other oppressed races. South Africa belongs to all who live in it. Congress will co-operate with the organisations of all other oppressed peoples and all democrats in its struggle for liberty and justice. Constant co-operation with people or organisations of other races will no doubt pave the way for the creation of a democratic organisation consisting of human beings and not a particular racial group.□

THE RULE OF LAW

(A review of Law, Order and Liberty in South Africa,

by A.S. Mathews)

by Edgar H. Brookes



Prof. A.S. Mathews

Professor Mathews, whose name will be known to many readers of "Reality" has in his "Law, Order and Liberty in South Africa" written a legal classic. This work, the result of full and painstaking research, will be studied for many years to come. It is divided into three parts. The first is an attempt to define what is meant by the Rule of Law. The second is a full study of South African internal security legislation. The third is an attempt to assess the rôles of freedom and order in a democratic society on the basis of the two previous studies.

Of these three parts, incomparably the most valuable is the second. It is not that the first and the third sections are poor. On the contrary they are most stimulating and thought-provoking; but they deal with theory, and it is possible for a liberal thinker to differ from Professor Mathews on theory. The second deals with facts, on which no man can challenge

Professor Mathews' reliability. The facts are given in full, legal cases are quoted and examined, and the results are devastating. Part II shows South Africa up as perhaps the most controlled country in the world, certainly in the world, of parliamentary democracy. This is what Professor Mathews says (p.300-1) :-