

SOUTH WEST AFRICA

Annexation or United Nations Trusteeship?

By

DR. A. B. XUMA

*President General of the
African National Congress*

Published by

H. A. NAIDOO AND SORABJEE RUSTOMJEE
Delegates of the South African Passive Resistance Council

Headquarters:
SOUTH AFRICA
2 Saville Street
Durban Natal

Temporary Office:
NEW YORK
Room 969
Hotel Commodore
New York, N. Y.

FOREWORD

South West Africa—Annexation or United Nations Trusteeship?

This question now confronts the United Nations and upon its solution depends whether or not the peoples in the dependent territories are to realise the basic aims contained in the United Nations Charter.

The South West African territory belonged to Germany before the 1914-18 World War. With the defeat of Germany in that war this territory was placed under mandate of the League of Nations and entrusted to the trusteeship and care of South Africa. It was never, at any time, contemplated that this trusteeship meant ultimate annexation of this territory by South Africa.

The South African Government, by now demanding annexation of this territory, is pursuing a policy of aggrandisement, quite out of accord with the aims of both the League of Nations and the present United Nations. Aggrandisement, whether by force of arms or by peaceful means, is in conflict with the United Nations Charter which promised "to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence..."

Apart from the purely constitutional aims of the Charter, South Africa, by reason of its own internal policy of race and colour discrimination, has forfeited all claims to trusteeship, let alone open annexation.

The contents of this pamphlet represent a memorandum presented to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by Dr. A. B. Xuma, President-General of the African National Congress. Dr. Xuma, as head of the African National Congress, can therefore speak with much authority on this subject. He gives reasons why the proposed annexation is not accepted by both the African peoples of South West Africa and South Africa. A careful perusal of the contents of this pamphlet will show that the South African Government has lost all claims to speak in the name of the African people in both these territories.

H. A. NAIDOO

SORABJEE RUSTOMJEE

New York,
November, 1946.

MR. TRYGVE LIE

*Secretary-General, United Nations
Lake Success, New York*

Sir:

I forward herewith copies of a memorandum which I beg to have the honor to submit through you to be placed before the General Assembly of the United Nations, its Committee on Trusteeship Council and on Economic and Social Council and their Sub-Committees, the Commissions on Social, Economic and Human Rights, respectively, on behalf of the African people in Southwest Africa, the Union of South Africa and those who hold the same views with us in the British Protectorates of Bechuanaland, Swaziland and Basutoland.

I am the President-General of the African National Congress in the Union of South Africa. This organization is the recognized mouthpiece of the 8,000,000 Africans. I have corresponded as such with the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, although I have failed to induce him to meet a deputation of Africans in the last six years. I have appeared before select Committees in the House of Parliament and before Government Commissions in that capacity. I have called National Conferences, such as the National anti-pass Campaign Conference for abolition of the pass laws, and more recently I called an Emergency Conference on October 6th and 7th, 1946 at Bloemfontein, Orange Free State, to discuss the situation arising from the recent adjournment of the Natives Representative Council. The Conference at short notice of less than 14 days, was attended by 510 delegates from all over the country, including the Members of the Natives Representative Council. No one can question the official and statutory position of the Natives Representative Council, which recognizes the African National Congress as the people's mouthpiece, and their mass liberation movement against discrimination and repression.

Hoping to receive, Sir, your esteemed and favorable consideration of my request in the interests of justice, fair play and world peace.

(Sgd.) **A. B. XUMA**
*President General
African National Congress*

THE MEMORANDUM

Memorandum outlining the Views of the Africans in the Union of South Africa, South West Africa and Bechuanaland Protectorate concerning the Incorporation of the Mandate Territory of South West Africa and its Bearing on the Treatment of Non-Europeans in South Africa.

As President-General of the African National Congress, I cabled in January 1946 to the President of the United Nations Organization in London a statement of our protest, opposition and refutation of the argument advanced by the Union High Commissioner in London, the then leader of the South African Delegation to U.N.O., in favor of incorporation of South West Africa into the Union. I sent copies of the text of the cabled message to some of the Delegations at U.N.O., including the then head of the South African Delegation.

Since then I have kept in close touch in various ways with some leading native Africans in South West Africa who urged me and my organization to carry on the opposition against incorporation, as they were also strongly opposed to it. They sent for the Constitution of our organization, as they hoped to carry on their campaign of opposition through a branch of the Congress in their territory.

FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT

I may mention that it is difficult for the native African in South Africa to get his views and aspirations known by the outside world. The views represented by the Government of the Union of South Africa, generally represent the interest of the ruling European minority. The interests of the non-Europeans are often sacrificed because, South Africa practises a policy of racial and colour discrimination politically, economically, socially and educationally.

The freedom of movement of native Africans is restricted by pass laws at home so that today a Native African may not get a railway ticket without the authority of a Native Commissioner or a magistrate and/or another authorized person who must be a European or White. Recently, Paramount Chief-Regent Tshekedi Khama of the Bamangwato and his advisors, representing five other Chiefs in Bechuanaland were denied transport priority by the British Government. Thus the British Government and the people of Great Britain were robbed of an opportunity of first-hand information from this African Amba-

sador of his own country. They preferred to depend upon the British official communications only. I also had an interesting experience. My transport arrangements to America were not interfered with. I submitted my application for a passport on 27th July 1946, for a recuperative holiday and medical treatment in America. I was told that ordinarily I should get my passport in a week. However, on 9th August 1946 I was asked to report to Pretoria on Saturday morning August 10th, 1946, to see the Secretary of Native Affairs, Mr. Gordon Mears. Mr. Mears told me that he spoke on behalf of the Minister of Native Affairs and the Minister of the Interior. He said, "The government has been concerned about your political activities and now you have applied for a passport to go overseas for medical reasons. I saw no reasons for objection when you first mentioned the matter to me, but the Ministers want to know in the event your passport were granted would you refrain from attacking the Union Government overseas?" "What would be the penalty if I continued my activities as I am doing here at home?" I asked. "Well, I don't know, perhaps you might never be granted another passport to leave the Country," replied Mr. Mears. "I shall abide by the Government's wishes if I am dead. Why don't you endorse my passport with the undertaking on it?" I asked. "No, we want you to make a gentlemen's agreement," he replied. "There can be no gentlemen's agreement where the freedom of my people is concerned. My people have faith and confidence in me and they believe that I would never sell out. I have my children to consider. They also have faith and confidence in me and I want them to live a full life with greater freedom than I have enjoyed. The confidence and faith of my people in me is worth more to me than anything at the gift of the Government. I shall take the first opportunity that offers itself to champion the cause of my people if my health permits, as I am continuing to do so here at home, notwithstanding my present condition of health. I refuse to be muzzled. That will be a betrayal of my people and their cause. I prefer to suffer any penalty the government is prepared to impose upon me. I am, however, very glad to know that the Government fears the exposure of its treatment of the non-European. That proves to me that our cause is just and even my life will be a reasonable price if that will help bring freedom and justice nearer for my people," I concluded.

My statement was not made in opposition to the Government as such or against the white people of South Africa. Some white people, both Afrikaans and English speaking in South Africa, are with us in spirit. What we are definitely fighting against are injustice, appropriation and abuse of State authority for the benefit and advantage of the small but strong and dominant European minority at the expense of the well-being, the progress and advancement of the weak and depressed non-European majority. We have struck our tents

against domination and Nazism not only in Hitler's Germany but wherever it raises its head. The blood of the so-called backward people has been spilled in common with others so that all humanity may be free to develop and progress to the full stature of which they are capable by natural endowment. To this we invite the United Nations, to stand with us and to live up to the obligations imposed upon them by the spirit and letter of their own Charter.

GOVERNMENT'S ADVICE TO INTERESTED BODIES

A few months ago the Government of the Union of South Africa informed the South African Institute of Race Relations in Johannesburg and other interested bodies like the Bantu Welfare Trust (of which I am a member) that it was considered inadvisable that anyone else should try to ascertain the attitude and views of the Native Africans of South West Africa on incorporation until the Government of the Union of South Africa had completed its "consultations" with the Natives, in order to avoid confusion in the Natives' minds. The above mentioned organizations decided to abide by the advice of the Government and did not send representatives into South West Africa as had been planned in order to sound Native opinion on the subject of incorporation.

DIVERSE METHODS

I have, however, through diverse methods continued to keep in close touch with the Native Africans in South West Africa and have received direct information from the Africans themselves from time to time during the "consultation" period contrary to the Government's expectations and wishes. They are attached as exhibits, as listed below:

1. Copy of cable from Festus Kandjan to the Secretary of the United Nations.
2. Copy of letter from Assistant Native Commissioner, Thaba-Nchu to A. Kenke, of the 29th July, 1946.
3. Copy of letter from Chief Hosea Kutake et al to Dr. A. B. Xuma of the 18th August, 1946.
4. Copy of letter from Z. Thomas et al to Dr. A. B. Xuma of the 24th August, 1946.
5. Copy of letter from G. Mears—Secretary for Native Affairs—to Dr. A. B. Xuma of the 2nd September, 1946.

These statements are the voluntary, unequivocal and freely expressed views of the people themselves against incorporation of

their country as a fifth province of the Union of South Africa. They are perhaps crudely stated but the crudeness itself makes them their own expression and not one drawn up for them by a trained foreign mind and influence.

THE STATUS OF THE NATIVE CHIEF UNDER NATIVE CUSTOM AND UNDER THE UNION

A word of authority must be made here on this subject to make it possible for the Delegates to see the distinction between the status of a Native Chief under customary law and his status under the Union Natives Administration Act.

Under customary law the African Chief is hereditary, with few exceptions. His powers are not arbitrary. He is not a dictator (although Chaka was a dictator and went the way of all dictators). He draws his powers and authority from the people, his Subchiefs headmen and the members of his tribe with a manhood franchise. The Chief does not enter into discussions or argument but may have one of his Counsellors, not he himself, ask questions for clarification of a point. He sits and follows the trend of the discussion and merely sums up what appear to be the majority voice and consensus of opinion, because there is no vote. The discussion might take days or weeks, in different places without any influence or intervention from the Chief. When he speaks and sums up, the debate is thus wound up. He conveys the decision of his people and ends by saying, "So my people have spoken," which speaks volumes to an African's mind.

He is therefore merely the depository and the expression and mouthpiece of his people's will. He is the spiritual bond of tribal solidarity.

However, under the Natives Administration Act of 1927 as amended, the Chief might be anybody appointed, recognized or selected by the Administration; he may be a hereditary Chief. However, the Native Commissioner, and the Native Administration, are a higher power over him. Under this system some of the Chiefs, who are generally illiterate, have acted in support of the Native Commissioner to the detriment of their tribes and people because the power to appoint, to recognize and to depose is at the pleasure and the discretion of the Native Affairs Department. Under these circumstances one finds very few Chiefs who have minds of their own. I state this from no hearsay. In other words, with the influence and pressure of official advice and suggestion, even without obvious coercion, few Chiefs have strong enough will and character to resist and oppose the desires of the Administration.

BECHUANALAND CHIEFS AND THEIR PEOPLE

South West Africa has a continuous boundary with almost three-quarters of Bechuanaland Protectorate. Bechuanaland wants a "good neighbour" and desires a direct land route with an outlet to the outside through a port on the West Coast for her agricultural and mineral export, once the country is fully developed. There are also in the Bechuanaland Protectorate thousands of Africans who are alleged to have run away from German oppression and, since 1921, from fear of the South African Native Policy. These people, we are informed, are prepared to return to South West Africa if that territory is brought under the international system of the Trusteeship Council under Article 76 of the Charter of the United Nations. Further, the Bechuanas themselves fear that the annexation of South West Africa into the Union of South Africa will be the thin end of the wedge for their subsequent incorporation through physical encirclement leading to their economic strangulation and ruin. Finally, they fear that the extension of the Union's repressive Native Policy permanently into the territory of South West Africa may have undesirable influence over their territory.

Thus, this talk of incorporation of South West Africa has caused fear and anxiety in the minds of hundreds of thousands of Africans in Bechuanaland, and incorporation will spell doom to their aspirations. Of course, the United Nations have ideals and principles in their own Charter and the test of their sincerity and good faith will be determined by the vote they give on this question of incorporation.

THE NATIVES OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

We, the Natives of South Africa, with long experience of the Union's non-European policy, strongly oppose the incorporation of South West Africa into the Union because South Africa has a policy of racial and color discrimination which brings ruin to the victims, politically, religiously, economically and educationally. This policy denies equality of opportunity between whites and non-whites in South Africa.

POLITICAL RIGHTS

Non-Europeans, Coloured, Indian and African, are denied full political rights. The Constitution of the Union of South Africa deprived all of them of the right to sit as Members of Parliament. This right they had enjoyed in the Cape Colony on equal basis with the Europeans since 1853.

The present Constitution which brought into existence the Union of South Africa in 1910, states that Members of Parliament must be

Europeans. After the Union of South Africa the Non-Europeans in the Cape could still qualify as voters with an education and financial ability test imposed upon all, irrespective of race or colour. They could still sit in the Provincial Council in the Cape Province.

In 1931, however, an Act of Parliament was passed, granting franchise rights to European women, but this right was not extended to Non-European women. In 1936 through the Representation of Natives Act, the South African Parliament by a two-thirds vote of both houses sitting together amended the Constitution disqualifying the Africans as ordinary voters and putting new Native voters on a separate list where they vote for three members of the House of Assembly in the Cape Province and communally to vote for 4 Senators, one for each of the following areas, the Cape Province, the Transkei, the Transvaal, and Orange Free State Natal in a Parliament of 150 members in the House and 40 in the Senate, representing the 2,000,000 whites as well as Coloureds and Indians in the Cape Province. The total number of Coloured and Indians so affected is less than a million persons. So that today the 8,000,000 Africans have been rendered unable to influence Parliament directly through the recognized democratic and civilized channels. Whatever legislation is passed for them, it is passed by a despotic oligarchy from which they have no effective, civilized and democratic method of redress. The Africans may not represent themselves directly under the Representation of Natives Act 1936 as was their privilege in the Cape Province since 1853. In other words, South Africa has retrogressed in political rights of Africans since the Union. Yet Kenya and Northern Rhodesia, younger countries, have direct representation of Africans in their legislative Councils.

To salve their conscience, the legislature under the same Representation of Natives Act 1936, established a so-called Natives Representative Council to be composed of 16 Native African members, 12 elected by the Natives themselves and four nominated by the Government. Besides, five Native Commissioners who are white men notwithstanding the designation, are non-voting members, while the Chairman, also a white man, has a casting vote. Here it is clear that the Government sees to it that it controls all channels of free expression on the part of the African. This system cannot be correctly referred to as Representation of Natives. It is mis-representation of Natives. The interesting thing I wish the Delegation to note is that this assault on fundamental human right was made just about 16 months after General, the Right Honourable J. C. Smuts, in a Rectorial Address delivered at St. Andrews University, Scotland on October 17, 1934, had told the audience among other things, referring to South Africa's ideal of Government, that "*We both cherish and practise liberty as the fundamental rule of life . . . We decline to*

submerge the individual in the state or the group, and we base our organization of the state and society on the individual freedom and the free initiative of the citizen." Further in the same address, he said, "But to suppose that in the modern world you can dispense with freedom in human government, *that you can govern without the free consent of the governed*, is to fly in the face of decent human nature as well as the facts of history."

General Smuts was the Deputy Prime Minister of the Government that passed the Representation of Natives Act, in February 1936, which made it possible for the Government of the Union of South Africa to govern the Natives of South Africa "without the free consent of the governed." I may say, in passing, that the other non-Europeans in the Transvaal, Natal and the Orange Free State are in an equally bad position.

The Native Africans in South Africa have tested the segregated system under the Representation of Natives Act since 1937 and have proved that it leads to a blind alley and causes a sense of frustration because the Government has consistently ignored the representations of the Natives Representative Council.

ADJOURNED IN PROTEST

After trying to advise the Government for nine years, without appreciable results, the Natives Representative Council adjourned on the 14th of August 1946 indefinitely in protest to the Government's disregard of their advice and representations, after unanimously passing the following resolution:

"This Council, having since its inception, brought to the notice of the Government the reactionary character of Union Native Policy of Segregation in all its ramifications, deprecates the Governments postwar continuation of a policy of Fascism which is the anti-thesis and negation of the letter and the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter.

"The Council, therefore, in protesting against this breach of faith towards the African people in particular and the cause of world freedom in general, resolves to adjourn this session and calls upon the Government forthwith *to abolish all discriminatory legislation affecting non-Europeans in this country.*"

This resolution expressed a feeling of despair and frustration of a people who have no Court of Appeal because their government is a party to the cause of their complaint. To them, the United Nations, are the only logical Court of Appeal. Since the Government of the Union of South Africa is involved, the theory of sovereignty

of the State and domestic affairs seem unreasonable. Can one judge his own case?

I mentioned that both the Indians and Coloured people had either a pseudofranchise or were totally disenfranchised in the Transvaal, Natal and the Orange Free State.

In June 1945, the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa signed the Charter of the United Nations for his Government and was chiefly responsible for the preamble, we are told. This Charter contains Article 13 which states, "The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of:

"(b) promoting international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, educational and health fields, and assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."

By his signature to the Charter of the United Nations he bound the Union of South Africa and himself to the letter and the spirit of Article 76 of the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the purposes of the United Nations laid down in Article 1 of the present Charter, shall be: . . . (b) to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories and their progressive development towards self-government or independence, etc. . . .

"(c) to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world."

Upon returning home the Prime Minister, Field Marshal, the Right Honourable J. C. Smuts, piloted through Parliament "*The Asiatic Land Tenure and Indian Representation Act*" of South Africa, in less than a year after signing the Charter of the United Nations on fundamental human rights. There is something that seems to lift the Prime Minister's spirits abroad and depresses them at home.

The Indians have taken a serious view of this Asiatic Act which pegs and restricts their political and economic opportunities, and they have chosen to go to goal through a passive resistance campaign rather than submit to the economic degradations and political humiliation such as the Natives Land Act with its Amendments and the Representation of Natives Act have brought about to Africans in South Africa.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE ASIATIC ACT

To us in South Africa, the Asiatic Act has far-reaching effects and implications. It is an extension to the Indian Community of the same disabilities that have been imposed upon Africans. It is a part and parcel of the general discriminatory and repressive policy on all non-Europeans. Consequently, Indians and Africans have decided to make common cause against this piece of legislation. But inherent in the Act are aspects of international implication and bearing, to which your undivided attention is directed. The Act was wrongly timed. India is on the verge of attaining her nationhood and full independence. She takes the Act seriously as an assault upon the honor and dignity of the Indians and of India itself. The Government of India has brought the case up for consideration by the United Nations as the impartial International Court of Appeal against the Union of South Africa, a member of the United Nations and a signatory to the Charter of that body. If the United Nations reject India's appeal, the case may not end there. India might take a grave view of the situation and decide to use force upon South Africa as the only means left at her command with which to settle the grievance and maintain her honor and dignity. To many this might seem like silly speculation on the impossible and the unlikely, but it must be remembered that "great oaks from little acorns grow." All Nations have friends who will help them, right or wrong. India has her own friends and is likely to have more friends. May this not lead to another international conflict with a racial and color complex? Whether one agrees with this speculation or not, there is still time to correct what might develop into an ugly world situation if not taken seriously at present. This is the challenge to "the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations." It is no internal affair of any particular country. Remember Manchukuo and do not forget Abyssinia.

ECONOMIC DISABILITIES

In order to further unfold the picture of this well-planned and carefully thought out policy of dominating the non-Europeans in South Africa and also to prove that the "India Complaint" is only a small part of a modern world tragedy in human government, I shall now deal with a few of the economic disabilities of the Africans in South Africa and their implications.

Land Policy

The Native land policy of the Union tells a deeper story and design than mere demarcation of areas for occupation by whites and

blacks, respectively. It is no policy of mere separation or segregation of races and colonies. These terms, in South Africa, are used as euphemism for exploitation. It is essentially a policy of creating economic dependence and insecurity on the part of the African in order to make the "Natives' reserves" and "locations" reservoirs of cheap, exploited labour unable to support themselves in the areas in which they live.

Only about 13 percent of the land is set aside for the occupation of 8,000,000 Africans and the rest is left for the 2,000,000 Europeans and about 1,000,000 of other non-Europeans. These Native Reserves and Locations are with a very few exceptions not owned by Africans but are rented from the Government in perpetuity. A native African may not buy, lease or rent land outside the "proclaimed areas" for Native occupation; he may not buy land from a non-native without the Governor-General's consent to the transaction. The only land he may buy without the Governor-General's consent under the above mentioned statutory restrictions is a grave.

NATIVE RESERVES OVERCROWDED

The Native reserves are overcrowded, overpopulated. They are not able to meet the social and economic requirements of the people. The people are homeless in the reserves as well as in city and town locations where municipalities are responsible for the housing of the Native Africans under the Natives Urban Areas Act 1923 as amended.

When I left Johannesburg some weeks ago, nearly forty thousand Africans—40,000—were squatting in Hessian sacks and shanties on the outskirts of Johannesburg because of overcrowding in the municipal locations. African occupied houses carry 2 to 4 families where one was intended and yet Johannesburg was never bombed, suffering the destruction that England and Europe experienced. This is merely a result of land restrictions against the Africans and a denial of the right on the part of the African to acquire land and to build his own house.

The overcrowding and shortage of land and accommodations in Native areas, both rural and urban, have resulted in increasing poverty, chronic starvation, destitution, deterioration of normal physique, ill-health, higher morbidity and mortality rates among the Africans.

INDUSTRIAL DISABILITIES

Native Africans in South Africa are the workers of the country but they suffer great and disheartening industrial disabilities. By law and custom they are relegated to the unskilled pursuits both in mining and industry. Their pay is low and below the subsistence

level. Their wages are in a ratio of from 1 to 5 in certain industries and about 1 to 8 in the gold mining industry. They are denied apprenticeship and technical training and the existing technical colleges are closed to them.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND STRIKES

Under the Industrial Conciliation 1924, the Charter of trade Unionism in South Africa, an employee is defined to exclude the pass-bearing Native and yet the pass-bearing Native is *the worker* of South Africa. And to put it in the words of Fieldmarshall Smuts in his lecture "The Basis of Trusteeship 1942" . . . "If he (the native in South Africa) is not much more, he is the beast of burden; he is the *worker* and you need him. *He is carrying this country on his back.*"

Because the Industrial Conciliation Act defines a "trade union as a body of employees," Organizations of Native workers are not recognised and registered as trade unions under the Act, so that Native Africans have no legal means which offer them facilities for collective bargaining as the workers of other races in South Africa. Native workers, who are also pass-bearing Natives are also subject to the Masters and Servants Act "which makes failure to appear for work a crime." If they strike they are arrested and sentenced to pay a fine or to serve a term of imprisonment.

NATIVE SANITARY WORKERS' STRIKE

For instance, in 1918 in Johannesburg, white workers employed at the power station in Johannesburg struck for better wages and working conditions and forced the municipal authorities to accept the workers' terms. Copying their example, Native Sanitary workers in Johannesburg struck demanding better wages and better working conditions. Instead of getting a hearing or redress they were arrested under the Pass Laws and the Masters and Servants Act, and were sentenced to two months' imprisonment with the following order from the Magistrate who sentenced them: "While in jail they will have to do the same work as they have been doing, and will carry out employment with armed escort, including a guard of Zulus *armed with assegais and white men with guns.* If they refuse to obey orders they will receive lashes as often as may be necessary to make them understand that they have to do what they are told."

MUNICIPAL WORKERS' STRIKE IN PRETORIA

Some three years or so ago because of confusion and neglect about increase in their wages, the Municipal workers in Pretoria

struck. To quell this strike force was used. Not only the police were used but a squadron from the army under the command of a Major was called and the Commanding Officer gave order to fire and many Africans were killed or wounded. This was only 3 or 4 years ago.

COAL WORKERS STRIKE

Again during the last World War in 1943, about 700 coal workers struck in Johannesburg for better wages and working conditions. They were arrested and most of them sentenced to a £3 fine or a term of imprisonment.

WITWATERSRAND NATIVE MINeworkERS' STRIKE

The most recent strike was the Native Mineworkers' Strike which began on 12th August 1946. Over 50,000 African Mineworkers participated in the Strike. Police interference was brought into the strike. During and as a result of this interference 9 African workers died and 7 of them from gunshot wounds, and as the Johannesburg Morning Daily and the Rand Daily Mail put it, "There were selected targets." The police went underground in some cases to break up the sit-down on the part of those workers who went underground but refused to work. A group of miners began a march to the Chamber of Mines and the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association their employer in order to put their grievances. They were intercepted by the police and treated with severe violence on the allegation of a march on the City of Johannesburg.

My Congress Working Committee sent messages to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Native Affairs and the Minister of Labour "urged withdrawal of the use of force and calling for immediate opening of negotiations between the Government and the Chamber of Mines on the one hand and the officials of the Native Mineworkers' Union and the African National Congress on the other." I emphasized that "force will not solve the problem but will merely run it underground." I received a mere acknowledgment from the Prime Minister's Office and that of the Minister of Native Affairs, but no negotiations were opened.

In the press, Field Marshall Smuts was reported to have told his Party Congress that he was not unduly concerned as this strike was not due to a sense of grievance on the part of the native workers but was the work of agitators.

The strike broke down in about five or six days without any negotiation. It was the victory of lead over human flesh.

The following tables will help give a picture of the Comparative rate of wages paid the Europeans and non-Europeans especially

Africans. These figures were collected by Professor Herbert Frankel of the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

“Table XVI Investments, Dividends and Wages on Gold Mining 1937 (Witwatersrand Area Alone) Round Figures

“Capital Invested from abroad	£43,000,000
Capital invested from the Union	£28,000,000
Total Capital Invested	£71,000,000
Dividends paid out	£15,000,000
Rate of dividend on all capital	21%
Rate of dividend on issued Capital only	28%
Annual Wages and Salaries paid	£27,000,000
Annual Wages paid to 36,000 European workers	£14,000,000
Annual average wage per European head	£ 390
Annual wages paid to 280,000 non-Europeans (Chiefly Bantu)	£13,000,000
Annual average wage per non-European	£ 47

“N.B. The figure of £47, shown on the last line includes a cash valuation of housing and food, at £12 per year.”

I shall reproduce two other tables from the same authority Professor S. Herbert Frankel showing the relations between European and non-European wages elsewhere.

“Tables XVII

“Salaries and Wages on Mines and Allied concerns in the Union (1937).

“Europeans employed	50,211
Total Annual Wages for Europeans	£18,511,486
Average Wages per European (Approximate)	£ 369
Non-Europeans employed	£ -402,888
Total Annual Wages for non-Europeans	£12,999,368
Average Wage per non-European (approx.)	£ 33

“N.B. Since Coloured and Asiatic wages are included in the term “non-European,” and since they are higher than Bantu wages, the average wage for the latter is about £31 per year. To the figure of £31 must be added the annual value of housing and food, estimated at about £12.

“The following table shows that in industries other than Mining and Allied concerns much the same state of affairs exist:

"Table XVIII

"Salaries and Wages in Privately owned Factories (1936-1937)

"Europeans employed	£ 140,203
Total Annual Wages Europeans	£25,260,336
Average Wage per European (Approx.)	£ 242
Non-Europeans employed	£ 192,265
Total annual wages for non-Europeans	£ 9,342,754
Average wage per non-European (approx.)	£ 48

"N.B. In this case the item on the last line *included* the value of food and housing in industrial compounds; where these are not provided by the employer the cash wage is correspondingly increased."

We have taken pains to quote these tables because of the Authority behind them to prove our case, namely—*that the wages of Africans to that of Europeans in privately owned factories and mining concerns are in the ratio of 1:5+ and 1:8+ respectively.* As a result the Native African lives below subsistence level and cannot maintain his family in "decency, health and happiness." No wonder Field Marshall Smuts in his "The Basis of Trusteeship" says "Leaving aside, tonight, the rural areas, the farms, and looking merely in the position in the big towns, all the evidence goes to show that, in general, the African cannot support his family in most places on the wage he is getting."

Social Service: Health and Housing

In matters of health and housing it will suffice to say the poverty, the landlessness, the restrictions on land acquisition by Africans both in rural and urban areas and his depressed economic status, influenced by the discriminatory colour and race policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa, have caused the deterioration of the physique of the African, his chronic starvation and malnutrition leading to high mortality and morbidity rates, chronic ill-health and perhaps decreased efficiency of the people. This state of affairs has also affected housing, to such an extent that when I left Johannesburg on October 21, 1946, about forty thousand Africans (40,000) were living as squatters on the outskirts of Johannesburg as a result of overflow and overcrowding of accommodations in Johannesburg locations. Because the Native Urban Areas Act 1923 makes it obligatory upon the City or Municipality to provide housing accommodations for African workers as tenants of the municipality, acquisi-

tion of land and building of their own homes by Africans are discouraged as they might tend to develop a sense of security and independence on the part of such natives. On this question Field Marshall Smuts in the lecture above quoted, in 1942, said, "Let us take some other matters, such as health and housing. Now these are matters in regard to which we have done practically nothing."

OLD AGE AND BLIND PENSIONS

Here I propose to make a brief reference to Old Age and Blind Pensions in order to show the comparative expenditure on this aspect of Social Service between Europeans and non-Europeans. I shall leave out reference to Invalidity grants, which, although on the same basis as Old Age Pensions and Blind Pensions, are applicable only to those who, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Pensions, are incapacitated by reason of their disability from earning their own living.

Blind Pensions

Under the Blind Pensions Act the following are some of the facts of interest for this memorandum:

1. BLIND PENSION:

	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Means Test</i>
European	£60 p.a.	£90
Coloured and Indian	£30 p.a.	£60
Africans (a) Cities	£12 p.a.	£18
(b) Towns	£ 9 p.a.	£13. 10. 0
(c) Rural Areas	£ 6 p.a.	£ 9

The following points in the Administration of the Blind Pensions Act are of interest and are instructive.

(a) In assessing the amount of the pension to be paid to an applicant, the Commissioner may disregard the means test and fix the pension at a figure which seems "reasonable and sufficient." As a result of the operation of this clause in the Act (Section 5(1)) only 30% of the non-European pensioners receive the pensions they are entitled to under the Act.

(b) The Africans and Indians were excluded from the provisions of the original Act passed May 1936, but the Amendment to the Act in 1944 brought them within the scope of the Act. The grants which blind Africans and Indians had previously received through the Native Affairs Department and the Department of the Interior respectively were then converted into pensions. A member was put up in the House in May 1936 to ask why Africans and Indians were excluded. The reply given was that "it was not South African policy

to legislate for Indians and Africans in general legislation but that, they could be assisted through the channels of the Department of the Interior and that of Native affairs respectively.”

(c) Africans moving from a rural area to a town or city do not benefit from the higher rate of pensions applicable to towns and cities until they have completed a five years' residence in the area where the higher rate operates.

(d) Statistics for the financial year 1944/45 show that the average pension paid to a blind European was £47 p.a. to a Coloured or Indian £23 p.a. and to an African £7 p.a.

2. (a) Augmentation of wages for blind workers.

Section 9 (b) of the Blind Pensions' Act provides for the payment by the Government of an augmentation allowance to blind workers employed in sheltered workshops conducted by Societies for the Blind. This allowance is paid in recognition of the fact that a blind worker is slower than a sighted worker. But whereas the ceiling wage recognised by the Government for augmentation purposes in respect of European Coloured and Indian workers is 1s.3d. per hour, the ceiling wage fixed for Africans is only 6d. per hour. Normally a 40 hr. week is worked so that whereas the maximum wage for a European Coloured or Indian worker is £2.10.0, for the African it is £1.0.0 per week.

(b) Salary Scales for qualified instructors.

Although instructors in any particular craft are expected to have the same skill and experience, regardless of race, the salary scales are:

European Instructors: Qualified	£270—£15—£450
Unqualified	£270—£15—£360
Coloured Instructors: Qualified	£150—£20—£300
Unqualified	£150—£10—£240
Native Instructors: Qualified	£ 96—£ 6—£144
Unqualified	£ 72—£ 6—£ 96

3. OLD AGE PENSIONS.

The maximum Old Age Pensions paid are the same as for blind persons whilst the administration of the Old Age Pensions Act is more or less the same. In 1945 £3,343,000 were paid out in Old Age Pensions. For 1946 the estimated expenditure is:

Europeans	£4,003,000
Coloured and Indians	£ 690,000
Africans	£ 800,000

EDUCATION

Although there has been an increase on the amount spent for the education of the African from £340,000 in 1923 to £3,000,000 in 1946, and the Government has done the commendable thing of providing five medical scholarships a year for African students, the finance, and state of education provided for Africans is still in a deplorable state. This amount does not begin to satisfy the needs, and requirements of the African child educationally. The amount is just enough to pay for the salaries of teachers and the administration. It is not sufficient to provide for school building or for the education of all African children of school-going age. As a result only about 40% of the African children can be accommodated in schools and building, provided and run not by the State but by missionary bodies. But for missionary efforts one wonders if there would have been any schools for Africans at all. A small sum is just now being offered for secondary school buildings. The result of this state of affairs is that African teachers are paid less than the ordinary labourer and about 60 per cent of African children of school-going age are not receiving education of any kind. Even the 40% who do attend school receive education of the most elementary type. Whereas the European child receives free compulsory education, the African child education is not free. They have to pay towards it.

In other words, the Union Government in South Africa does not recognise that the African child, like other children, has a right to be educated and that his education is the responsibility of the State. In support of this statement I shall quote the "Official Year Book of the Union of South Africa No. 21, 1940," page 323, which states "*European education is mainly public state education i.e. administered and financed by the State, private or local enterprise playing a diminutive roll while non-European education is mainly state aided education, that is partly supported and controlled by the mission enterprise. The relative contribution of the State, therefore, for the non-European education is very small in comparison with that for European education.*"

The following figures on page 324 "Union Year Book No. 21—1940," mentioned above put the above quoted statement beyond any shadow of doubt. We shall quote figures for three years only, but the ratio will be about the same in the other years:

*From the Summary of Table Showing Growth of
State Aided Education in South Africa*

Year	Population	Total No. Receiving Education	Percent. Tot. Pop-ulation Rec. Edu-cation	Tot. Per-cent. of Educ. in Post Prim. Classes	Total	Cost per Hd. of Popula-tion	Cost per Hd. of Educand
(a) EUROPEANS							
1936	2,008,700	391,599	19.8	19.8	£ 9,228,227	£ 4.5.9	£23. 5. 6
1937	2,043,700	398,130	19.5	20.3	9,819,804	4.8.	24. 6. 6
1938	2,081,400	407,648	19.6	18.6	10,118,600	4.8.6	24. 8. 2
(b) NATIVES							
1936	6,617,700	362,506	5.5		744,400	2.3d	2. 1. 1
1937	6,744,300	398,612	5.5		835,883	2.6d	2. 1.11
1938	6,870,000	428,553	6.2		902,153	2.8d	2. 1. 1
COLOURED AND INDIANS							
1937	1,000,000	148,199	14.7	2.51	812,325	16.1d	5. 9. 7
1938	1,027,600	157,890	15.4	3.29	887,981	17.3d	5.12. 6
1936	990,800	140,069	14.1	2.48	746,004	15.1d	5. 6. 6

On the basis of the above quoted, the neglect and disregard of the education of the African child is made abundantly clear. The ratio of "Cost of education per educand" is in round figures £2 to £24, or 1 to 12 for Africans and Europeans respectively. It is, however, when we consider the "cost of education per head of population" that something near the true state of affairs is reflected. The ratio of expenditure is that of 2/- to £4 or 1 to 40 for Africans and Europeans respectively. This indicates firstly that, as we stated above, not all African children of school-going age attend school: Secondly, that the amount spent per educand is in any case much lower. The cost for Coloured and Indians is much lower than that for Europeans.

No wonder Field Marshall Smuts has this to say about the education of Africans: "We Europeans on the African continent have done something for Native education. Missionaries have made a point of it for generations now, and they have done a great deal. We recognise with gratitude the good work done by them. *The Government has slowly, tardily, and haltingly*, followed and done its bit. But if we honestly and sincerely ask ourselves the question "*Are we doing our duty, are we fulfilling our duty as trustees, are we discharging our sacred trust? I do not think we can lay our hands on our hearts and say we are doing it.*"

FURTHER RESTRICTIONS

There are further restrictions and discriminations imposed, upon the African under the pass laws, Native's Land Act, The Natives Administration Act 1927, the Natives Urban Areas Act 1923 and Emergency Regulation 145. Through these acts and regulations, the African has restricted and controlled freedom of movement, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly and freedom of residence. He may not go where he likes whenever he likes without the permission of a magistrate or native commissioner and may not be abroad after certain hours in pass-bearing areas without a special pass under the Pass Laws. Under the Natives Land Act he may not buy, lease, rent or occupy land in rural areas from any one other than a native without the Governor General's consent to the transaction. Similar restrictions are imposed in urban areas under the Natives Urban Areas Act with this strange regulation that a man working in a municipal area may not bring his wife and family to reside with him unless he has been employed continuously in the area for 2 years, and that only with the permission of the municipal authority. The Natives Administration Act of 1927 gives power to the Governor General, in practice to the Minister of Native Affairs, to move any native from any place to any other place, and the Governor General may move any tribe from any place to any other place in the interest of good government. These things are done without recourse to law. The Government is law and authority and the native has only to obey.

Under the Emergency Regulation 145, no meeting of more than 10 persons except for religious purposes may be held without the permission of a magistrate or Native Commissioner, or other authorized persons in certain areas. This was passed in order to undermine our anti-pass Campaign, because the writer was approached by Detective Sergeant Boy, Johannesburg, and questioned about the activities and plans of the Anti-pass Campaign. The writer disclosed everything. Four or five days later the Emergency Regulation was proclaimed. It virtually killed our campaign and ran it underground.

Here is one indication of restrictions on freedom of speech or expression and of assembly. My branch of the African National Congress was refused permission to hold a meeting by the Assistant Native Commissioner, who was supported in this by the Secretary for Native Affairs, as the attached correspondence shows, (Exhibits).

MASS ARRESTS OF AFRICANS

Not only do we have the restrictions just mentioned, in South Africa there are so many discriminatory laws and regulations which create crimes for Africans only so that the police now and then have a pastime of mass arrests of Africans under these laws. There being

so many of them, each African is perhaps contravening one or the other daily and many are found guilty under them annually to such an extent that in 1939, according to Official Year Book of the Union of South Africa No. 21, 1940, the following lists of convictions and the offenses committed are recorded:

Illegal possession of native liquor	77,582
Location regulations	20,655
Masters and Servants Act	18,066
Native Pass Laws	101,309
Native Taxation	48,668
Natives Urban Areas Act	7,517
Trespass (chiefly mass raids)	20,000

These are crimes for Natives only. As a consequence, of the Africans who are in gaol at any time, 95% of them are in for these technical offences and less than 5% are in for any serious crimes. Through their experience in gaol for these technical offences many Africans have been initiated into criminal careers. In other words, these regulations are factories of crime and criminalisation of Africans, besides the heavy economic and social disabilities in loss of income and disorganization of family arrangements.

Conclusions

This memorandum is submitted as further evidence in support of the cable I sent to the President of the General Assembly, United Nations Organization, London, in January 1946. Certain detailed statements are made of conditions and happenings in South Africa in order for the facts to speak for themselves about the treatment of non-Europeans in South Africa. This has been done in order to show that if in the Union of South Africa the non-Europeans do not enjoy equality of opportunity, it is not very likely that the 300,000 almost inarticulate and backward people of South West Africa would be treated better. We have given enough evidence to show that the Union of South Africa denies full political, economic, educational and social opportunities to her non-Europeans.

We have exhibited the views direct from the Africans themselves in South West Africa in order to establish the fact that the results of the Union's "consultations" in South West Africa do not give convincing and conclusive evidence. For instance, in a population of 300,000 odd, how could one get 280,000 votes for or against incor-

poration unless he was dealing with male soldiers at the front line. Were children and infants also voting in South West Africa—a practice that is not permitted even among white South Africans, the most privileged of the privileged?

Further, the attention of the United Nations must be called to the fact that the South Africa Institute of Race Relations in Johannesburg through its Director, Mr. J. D. R. Jones, was refused permission by the Prime Minister of South Africa from sending three representatives to “ascertain all facts relevant to the Union Government’s proposal to annex the territory (South West Africa) and also to ascertain the opinion among both Europeans and non-Europeans in the territory.” This was to take place after the Government’s plebiscite at the end of April. The Prime Minister replied that he feared the visit by other bodies would cause confusion in the Natives’ mind and, Field Marshall Smuts added:

“As I have to bring the question of South West Africa before the U.N.O. Meeting next September, I myself consider these visits should be postponed until after that meeting.” What impression does this statement give about the “consultation” of a people who were declared to have given their unequivocal and freely given expression for the incorporation of their territory into the Union of South Africa?

Anyway, were not the Native Aboriginal population the “sacred trust” of civilization? All the Nations who were parties to the Mandate system and their successors, the United Nations, under San Francisco Charter are under obligation to discharge their “sacred trust” to the inhabitants of the territory. Did not the “sacred trust” principle imply minority on the part of the people of South West Africa since these people were considered unable to stand alone on their own feet? Did not the statement “the well-being and development of such people will be a sacred trust of civilization” imply the promotion of full economic, educational, social and political development and subsequent independence for the ward?

To us it seems that because of the undeveloped state and backwardness of this sacred trust the United Nations were duty-bound to see to it that the consultations were conducted in a manner satisfactory to all concerned including the United Nations themselves. These people should have had a curator ad litem, whose duty it would be to protect their full rights and privileges and to see to it that whatever change of control takes place their equal rights and privileges are fully protected until they are able to stand on their own feet and can speak for themselves.

Were the Whites or Europeans in South West Africa also the "sacred trust" of civilisation? What difference does it make then if they ask to be incorporated in the Union of South Africa? Incorporation is to their advantage and not so for Native Africans. The Natives have no political rights and therefore have no share in the Government of the territory and the legislature is in no way representative of their opinion. They will have none in the Union of South Africa. The Union of South Africa and Europeans in South West Africa it seems to us are using this mandate territory as an office of profit or a position of private advantage for herself and for her nationals.

Yet General Smuts said in 1918 in his "The League of Nations a Practical System," that "The Mandatory State should look upon its position as a great trust and honor, not as an office of profit or a position of private advantage for it or its nationals." We understand that many of the Europeans are "Union Nationals." Are not Field Marshall Smuts demands before the United Nations contrary to his declaration?

The Africans of South West Africa, the Africans of the Bechuanaland Protectorate and those of the Union of South Africa most respectfully wish their views to be heard by the United Nations on this question and other questions affecting them.

The Native Africans of the Union of South Africa have no means of effective influence over Parliament through normal democratic channels. The Union Government carries on a policy of racial and colour discrimination against the non-Europeans. They feel that an impartial Court of Appeal is essential and the United Nations are such a Court. Their case cannot be an internal affair under these circumstances, because the Union of South Africa is one of the parties concerned. In fact non-Europeans in a country like South Africa are a Non-Self-Governing territory requiring special treatment and attention of the United Nations.

We oppose the incorporation of South West Africa and the British Protectorates of Bechuanaland, Swaziland and Basutoland into the Union of South Africa because such incorporation would facilitate the extension of South Africa's colour and race discrimination and domination. It would bring under this policy more hundreds of thousands of innocent victims.

The Native Africans in South West Africa, in Bechuanaland, and in the Union of South Africa most respectfully request the United Nations to establish during this Session "the Trusteeship Council under Article 76 of the United Nations Charter, and place South West Africa under the International System of Trusteeship as a buffer

against the extension and the expansion of the non-European policy of South Africa.

Africans in South Africa also support the Indians in their opposition against the Asiatic Act now before the United Nations. They consider this treatment of the Indians as part and part of racial and colour domination which they uncompromisingly oppose. The Africans National Congress at Bloemfontain Orange Free State on August 5th, 1946, passed the following resolution: "This National Executive of the African National Congress assembled in Bloemfontain on August 6th, 1946, strongly protest against the Asiatic Act and fully support the Indian Community in South Africa in their opposition to the Act."

I have taken the liberty to give an outline of some of our views and their underlying reasons to show that there is a strong case against the annexation of South West Africa into the Union to the end that the United Nations will be facilitated in its disposition of this matter. It has been the only way to indicate to the United Nations that there is another side to this question. Finally, I want to emphasise that it is impossible for me to see how justice can be done in this matter as *the material* witness in the case, the African himself is not represented and has not been called to give this essential evidence before the United Nations.

To Native Africans the case of incorporation of South West Africa and the Asiatic Act against the Indians in South Africa are a test of the seriousness and sincerity of the United Nations towards the so-called backward peoples and non-Self-Governing territories. If incorporation of South West Africa is supported by the United Nations, a dangerous precedent, which if followed by other mandatory powers may nullify all efforts towards the establishment of the Trusteeship Council. In fact, to us, both incorporation and the rejection of the Appeal of the Indians in South Africa will be tantamount to the repudiation of the letter and spirit of the Charter itself by the United Nations. The United Nations thereafter will be a strong body in a political, economic and military sense with no moral or ethical basis. In other words, it will be a body without a soul.

Implicit and childlike faith and hope are placed upon the United Nations by countless millions of simple folk all over the world.

The question now is, Will the United Nations adopt as their motto: "Might is Right" or "Right is Might"? Which? . . .

(Sgd.) **A. B. XUMA**
President-General, African National Congress,
Union of South Africa

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dr. R. T. BOKWE
Middledrift, Cape Province, S. Africa

Professor Z. K. MATHEWS
Fort Hare College, Alice Cape, Province S. Africa

Mr. A. W. G. CHAMPION
19 Old Dutch Road, Durban, Natal, S. Africa

Mr. C. S. RAMOHANOE
Rosenberg Arcade, 58 Market St., Johannesburg, S. A.

JACOB NHLAPO
P. O. Wilberforce, Evaton, S. Africa

J. JACOBS
Bochabela, Bloemfontein, O.F.S., S. Africa

G. M. PITSO
Johannesburg, S. A.

R. V. S. HEMA
Bantu World, New Clare Rd., Johannesburg, S. A.

S. P. MORETSELE
19 Pritchard St., Johannesburg, S. A.

Secretary General REV. JAS. A. CALATA

P. O. Cradock, C.P., S. Africa
Treasurer General R. G. BALOYI
P. O. Bergvlei, Johannesburg, Tvl. S. Africa

OVERSEAS TELEGRAM—BUITELANDSE TELEGRAM

TO AAN

THE SECRETARY UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION

NEW YORK.

Please record that the whole Herero Nation of South West Africa do not wish this Territory to be incorporated with the Union of South Africa. We desire to be placed under the Trusteeship of Great Britain.

(Sgd.) **FESTUS KANDJAN**

For the Herero Nation.

Signature of Sender

Handtekening van afsender **Festus Kandjan**

Address Native Reserve Aminuis P. O. Gababis

Adres Box 298, Windhoek.

Z.14B.
GELIENE IN U ANTWOORD TB
VERWYS NA
IN REPLY PLEASE QUOTE

No. 2/10/3/2

UNIE VAN SUID-AFRIKA—UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

KANTOOR VAN DIE—OFFICE OF THE

Assistant Native Commissioner,
Thaba'Nchu.

29th July, 1946.

A. Kenke,
Modutung Location,
P. O. Steynspruit.

APPLICATION TO HOLD A MEETING OF THE
AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS AT PETRA: SELIBA RESERVE

Greetings,

I have to inform you that after careful consideration it has been decided to refuse your application to hold a meeting of the African National Congress as Petra on the 7th August, 1946.

Greetings,

(Sgd.) **ACTG. ASSISTANT NATIVE COMMISSIONER**

Aminuis Reserve,
P. O. Gobabis
18th August, 1946

Dear Dr. A. B. Xuma,

We have much pleasure in informing you, sir, that we did receive your delegate.

We appreciated the purpose you sent him for.

Enclosed herewith please find a copy of our Cablegram we sent to U N O in opposition to incorporation of S.W.A. into the Union.

When the representative of the Prime Minister approached us in connection with the incorporation of S.W.A. into the Union we told him the following:

1. S. W. A. is inhabited by four main non-Europeans
 - (a) The Hereros
 - (b) The Hottentots
 - (b) The Hottentots
 - (c) The Ovambos and
 - (d) The Namas.
2. So this country was taken away from us by the Germans through faulty means.
3. The Allied Nations fought the last war, and their main object was to instal lasting peace and liberation of all Nations irrespective of colour.

Seeing that this country belonged to the four main non-Europeans, we therefore want our country to be given back to us.

We all want this country to be placed under the Trusteeship and not to be incorporated with the Union.

The following are our reasons for non-incorporation with the Union.

1. Since 1915 this country was placed under the care of the Union Government. From 1915 to 1946 is 31 yrs.
2. During this period of 31 yrs. we have not yet seen any good that the Union Governments has done to us.
3. Instead of progressing we are retrogressing in all human ways.
4. Today we have no place of our own. We are being moved from one place to another. We cannot build decent houses, because we have neither dwelling nor resting place.

We are just like a flock of sheep which graze from hill to hill.

in Kalahari are also against the incorporation. Besides the above the country belongs to us, and we want it to be placed under the Trusteeship of the U. N. Organisation.

The above points are some of our reasons, although, not all and we hope that same will serve the purpose.

With kindest African greetings,

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) Z. THOMAS
J. G. S.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA
UNIE VAN SUID-AFRIKA

DEPARTMENT OF NATIVE AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT VAN NATURELLESAKE

No. 7/326

P. O. BOX 384
POSBUS

PRETORIA

2 SEP 1946

Dear Dr. Xuma,

With reference to the attached letter which you left with me, I am not prepared to vary the reply given to Mr. Kenke by the Assistant Native Commissioner, Thaba Nchu.

Yours sincerely

(Sgd.) G. MEARS

SECRETARY FOR NATIVE AFFAIRS

Dr. A. Xuma,
85 Toby Street
Sophiatown,
JOHANNESBURG