

DOCUMENT 1

DR H.F. VERWOERD'S STATEMENT ON THE POLICY OF SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT DELIVERED AT THE SAVOY HOTEL, LONDON, MARCH 17, 1961*

For South Africa and the United Kingdom and the other old friends this decision means: new opportunity. They must seek to develop in other ways (untrammelled by the former problems) great bonds of friendship and co-operation to their mutual advantage. We are already working on these lines. Perhaps it is better this way, since sources of possible clash in most difficult situations fall away. Our trade and bilateral agreements, *including the maintenance of the preferential trading arrangements*, South Africa's membership of the Sterling area, and the value of our gold production, defence agreements with regard to a common enemy, etc., etc., need undergo no change. They can be re-endorsed in what our experts find to be the correct manner. This is a comforting assurance. We need each other. With friendship unimpaired and so many interests so intertwined to our mutual benefit, this is wise policy, and will, I trust and have reason to believe, become wise practice. We will leave London satisfied that what happened had to be, and that our countries and their leaders remain better and more understanding friends than ever before.

RACE RELATIONS

For the purpose of what I have to say on race relations tonight I shall presume a fairly extensive knowledge of the details of the Government policy of separate development. Today it seems more imperative to deal with the wider background of this policy, its morality and purpose. My reason for this approach is that it seems to me that the world at large, and your own public, have accepted, even if reluctantly, that South Africa has done and is doing more for the welfare of its non-white peoples than any other state in Africa. In fact it seems as if it is already being realised that the Asiatic nations and even some in Europe or South America fall behind, sometimes far behind, the achievements of South Africa in this respect with regard to her Bantu.

South Africa has progressed very far indeed in the education and training for professions and trades of

all its peoples, in health services for all, in housing, in income per capita, in the scope of the services each group provides for its own people, including the provision of tradesmen, administrators and professional men of all kinds. Other countries would justifiably claim and receive great credit for creating such material benefits and great opportunity for the general advancement of their masses. It is only in the case of South Africa that all this is swept aside with the bland statement that all this is worth nothing as long as one looks upon the recipients as inferior beings to whom participation in the government is denied.

DIFFERENT - NOT INFERIOR

It is of no avail to emphasise that the Government's policy is *not* based on people being inferior but being *different*, or to point out that a member of an African State can scarcely be accounted fortunate if he is in rags, with little to eat, with low wages, little continuous employment and only a shack to live in, if the only compensation for all that he lacks and suffers is that he has the vote! Does the vote satisfy and aid the people particularly if the masses have to exercise this vote without much personal discretion because they know nothing of politics, or because a black near-dictator, or a politically minded, half educated clique demands blind allegiance to keep them in power? It is this distortion of values in the eyes of the prejudiced or blind critics from afar, judging according to their own privileged experience and advanced state, which makes for the unjust and undeserved condemnation of South Africa.

Lack of perspective leads to nonsensical statements like the following which I collected from your newspapers. South Africa discriminates unfairly and hates its coloured people! Government policy tramples on the rights of the black people whom they regard as inferiors! South Africa's assurances as to its aims and intentions for the development of its non-white people are dishonest! South Africa wishes to

*Published by the National Party's Information Service, Bloemfontein

retain white supremacy throughout black and white areas and is not prepared to grant the non-whites any political rights anywhere whatsoever! South Africa wants to keep the non-whites in the position of second-class citizens who will never participate in any form of government! South Africa must provide a blueprint for the future and this should contain no other ultimate object than domination by the black man which the white man must concede if he wishes to be allowed to live there in peace, even though he then loses the vote or its value!

A reply can be given to each of these, and many other, outrageous accusations and unjust criticisms, which in addition do not take account of one great fundamental fact, namely that the white man of South Africa has as much, or perhaps more, right to justice and fair treatment and self-government in his areas. To judge the morality of a policy it must be remembered that in all ethics a balance must be struck between different values, different rights. Absolute right for the one may mean tremendous injustice to the other.

I wish to deal with these contentions either directly or by implication and commence by stating the dilemma of South Africa.

UNIQUE PROBLEM

Its problem is unique. Nowhere in the world, and never in history, has a situation developed which is quite similar. The solution must therefore also be unique. And yet everybody, everywhere, whether knowledgeable or quite uninformed, would like to impose theoretical ideas and principles or solutions found to be, or thought to be, useful elsewhere, on this different situation. Allow me to put to you the factors involved, in very broad outline.

More than 300 years ago two population groups, equally foreign to South Africa, converged in rather small numbers on what was practically empty country. Neither colonised another man's country or robbed him by invasion and oppression. Each settled and gradually extended his settlements, and in the main each sought a different part to become his own. There were clashes and frontier wars, and border areas were conquered, but since then the white man has added, and is adding, more land than he took on to the Bantu areas out of what he himself settled and intended to be his own.

The first point is, therefore, that here there was no colonialism, only separate settlement by each, nearly simultaneously and each had the chance to develop his own, to serve his growing population, for more than three hundred years. The white man did this but not

the black man and the white man did not use his power to overrun and acquire black man's country. In fact only in South Africa the white man deliberately reserved it for him and endeavoured (mostly in vain) to train the black man to make the best use of it, as he did with his own to such good purpose that the black man came to him for employment, food and the good things of life - *not for political conquest.*

WHITE MAN'S RIGHT

The white man therefore has not only an undoubted stake in and right to the land which he developed into a modern industrial state from denuded veld and empty valleys and isolated mountains, but according to all principles of morality it was his, is his and *must remain his.*

It is true that, in the course of time, he received within his country growing numbers of black people. Some fled to him for protection, driven out of their own country by internecine strife and the heavy hand of tyrants. Many came to him seeking relief from hunger or attracted by the bright lights of cities or by the desire for money or the good things of life.

It is also true that elsewhere immigrants from one country to another could become full-fledged citizens with political rights under certain conditions. It must, however, not be forgotten that for that very reason such countries could, and did, and do, ration and restrict entrance to numbers which would not change the character of the nation or the control of its country, its culture and ideals or its very existence. South Africa did not need to exercise this control and could be very liberal in giving entry, providing aid and a better life to all who entered, even illegally, *because such consequences did not come into the picture on the South African scene.*

WHITES AS GUARDIANS

The non-whites who entered the white man's country or the urban areas, came solely to seek employment, safety, health, education (all of which were provided freely by the white man) and knowing nothing of, and not expecting, and not even thinking of political rights. There was no question of robbing the white man of his country by any political result of this entry in huge numbers, or by the natural increase of his population under the white man's protection and care. This was world-wide usage.

Particularly as the result of their stage of civilisation, it was never contemplated that their presence would one day cause pressure upon the children of the white pioneer settlers of empty land to hand over, without

protest or resistance, their whole heritage to such newcomers and protégés. In fact, it seemed then that for all time the whites would as guardians even have to rule the black man's country as part of their own in his interest because he could not be developed to do this properly for himself. The white man therefore allowed the influx to continue until he was outnumbered four to one. Even now, against his will, streams of illegal black immigrants flow across his borders from many parts of Africa, because of the better wages and way of life they find in this land of so-called oppression! What is the solution to be to this dilemma which history and the unexpected awakening of the black man has handed us?

JUSTICE FOR BOTH

Theorists and others who, far away, can remain unaffected themselves but philosophise gladly on the handing over of what is the possession of others, expect the white South African to give away gradually (and knowing that after the first step the pace will become uncontrollable) his country and his possessions and indeed ultimately his whole nationhood and existence.

Where does morality come in if this is demanded?

If there must be justice for the black man, there must be justice for the white man and the coloured too, who will both be affected and suppressed.

The British fought to the death for their very existence. Cannot you understand our doing so too? And yet we do not only seek and fight for a solution which will mean our survival, but we seek one which will grant survival and full development, politically and economically, to each of the other racial groups as well! We are even prepared to pay a high price out of *our* earnings for *their* future.

IN AFRICA

The moral problem just like the political problem is to find a way out of this extremely difficult and complicated situation, caused by the fact that no longer, like in the past, is the black man incapable or undesirous of participation in the control of his political destinies. Nor is there any longer anyone prepared to oppress him by refusing the fulfilment of such ambitions in a form fair to all. Again I ask: What is the solution?

In certain parts of Africa where the white man also ruled alone before, a solution is relatively easy. Those who find it easy there, and do not realise the great difference between the two situations, are unfortunately tempted to wish to transplant that

solution to South Africa. I refer to the countries of Africa which undoubtedly belong to the black man by settlement and inheritance, although they were taken over, administered and developed by different white nations. It is right that their land should now politically become their own.

Then there are in Africa other states where the political solution is not so straightforward or simple in spite of the fact that those territories were black-settled and at least theoretically not open space when whites originally moved in. The whites are also far in the minority in these areas and this seems to support the demand for making black states out of them as well. On the other hand, the main body of these white people were genuine settlers, many for generations, and the fact cannot be denied that the development and prosperity of these areas today are wholly the result of their initiative, investment, hard work and administrative capacity. In that sense it is their country too, or at least parts are, and they or their kin in the mother country have ruled alone until now. Have justice and the demands of morality nothing to say about the primary rights of these white people?

In the first planning it was accepted that their rights should be fully protected and the idea of partnership was born. This partnership was, for a long time to come, actually intended to be junior partnership for the blacks and the continued control as senior partner by the whites. Warnings made no impression on the rulers overseas that this theory would not work out that way, with the inevitable result that the black majorities soon demanded, and are quickly receiving, the right to what amounts to full control, with the white man pushed out of politics to all intents and purposes. He must furthermore expect to lose his possessions and see his hard-won farms, well-developed areas and businesses fall to pieces when he must go, as he realizes is inevitable. It is in such areas that the white settlers feel that they have been left in the lurch by parent countries.

WHITE OUTNUMBERED

Neither of these solutions would therefore suit the already described quite different South African situation. Not only are the whites less outnumbered than anywhere else, and not only do they claim the empty country settled by their forefathers as really theirs, but they know that if they gave way to some preliminary form of partnership it would become the end of white civilization in South Africa too. The lessons of the developments set out before are clear.

Forget the word "apartheid". Forget any term by which to describe a policy, and just ask yourselves what *you* would do under such circumstances.

There are three possibilities. One is that the white people of South Africa should sacrifice themselves, their possessions and the generations to come. They can do this by surrendering to black rule, even if it became a dictatorship, and evacuate the country of their forbears, or by remaining become an indistinguishable part of a black nation. Would you really choose that *if it were England of which we are speaking?*

Another way is to bluff yourself by making apparently smaller concessions, hoping to stave off the evil day, so that your children or grandchildren may suffer, but not you. This could be done by accepting some black people in Parliament and in every phase of life in the community, in the hope that their selfish satisfaction of own ambition will prevent them from developing and leading the ambitions of their masses.

And if this does not happen, what then? If junior partnership would quickly - very, very quickly - also lead in South Africa to the demand for black rule *alone*, must the white man fight or submit? And at what stage should he admit that his subtle attempt to retain power has failed?

In fact, this second method of solving the problem, solves nothing at all. It only means that the struggle for power goes on and on, while the white ruler of today lets things develop until he gives in as before, or finds himself at last fighting in the last, or nearly last, ditch for self-preservation.

LIVE AND LET LIVE

There is another method, however, *and that is to take your example from the nations: live and let live - apart*. Would anybody in the United Kingdom accept as his ideal for the Commonwealth that it should become one state with one central government, controlled solely by numbers and not by the merit of your country as a leader state, smaller in numbers but great in experience and knowledge? *That* one multi-racial state, including the province which Great Britain would then be, would of necessity be governed from India under the majority control of those hundreds and hundreds of millions of non-Europeans concentrated there, bolstered by others scattered over the earth.

Of course you thrust this aside as nonsense, *but why must South Africa accept just that for herself in a smaller way?* We prefer each of our population groups to be controlled and governed by themselves, as nations are. Then they can co-operate, as in a Commonwealth, or in an economic association of nations where necessary. *Where is the EVIL in this?* Or in the fact that in the transition stage the guardian must needs keep the ward in hand and teach him and guide him and check him, where necessary? This is separate development.

South Africa will proceed in all honesty and fairness to seek - albeit by necessity through a process of gradualness - peace, prosperity and justice for *all* by following *the model of the nations* which in this modern world means political independence coupled with economic interdependence.

DOCUMENT STUDY

Questions on document 1

1. What was the occasion of this speech? (2)
2. Was Dr Verwoerd deeply perturbed by the developments at the negotiations in London? (2)
3. Why does he claim that the policy of separate development was not based on racial ideas about inferiority or superiority? (4)
4. Why does he reject the claim that the South African government is a colonial power? (4)
5. What was the essence of South Africa's moral problem as seen by Dr Verwoerd? (6)
6. What was the essence of the political problem as seen by Dr Verwoerd? (10)

7. What was the motto of the policy of separate development? (2)
[30]
8. Now a real brain teaser. You should utilise the answers to the above questions to write a short critical essay on the following question:
- Does Dr Verwoerd's statement represent a fear of the future or a dream for the future? [20]

Vrae oor Dokument 1

1. By watter geleentheid is hierdie toespraak gelewer? (2)
2. Het die verloop van die onderhandelinge in Londen dr. Verwoerd ernstig verontrus? (2)
3. Op grond van watter oorweginge beweer dr. Verwoerd dat die beleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling nie op rasse-opvattinge oor minderwaardigheid of meerderwaardigheid gebaseer was nie? (4)
4. Waarom verwerp hy die aanspraak dat die Suid-Afrikaanse regering 'n koloniale mag is? (4)
5. Wat was die kern van Suid-Afrika se morele probleem soos dr. Verwoerd dit gesien het? (6)
6. Wat was die kern van die politieke probleem soos dr. Verwoerd dit gesien het? (10)
7. Wat was die slagspreuk van die beleid van afsonderlike ontwikkeling? (2)
[30]
8. Nou 'n ware kopkrapper. Jy moet die antwoorde op bogenoemde vrae benut om 'n kort opstel te skryf oor die volgende vraag:
- Verteenwoordig dr. Verwoerd se beleidstoespraak 'n vrees vir die toekoms of 'n visie vir die toekoms? [20]

DOCUMENT 2

**"PROGRAMME OF ACTION." STATEMENT OF POLICY
ADOPTED AT THE ANC ANNUAL CONFERENCE, DECEMBER
17, 1949***

The fundamental principles of the programme of action of the African National Congress are inspired by the desire to achieve National freedom. By National freedom we mean freedom from White domination and the attainment of political independence. This implies the rejection of the

conception of segregation, apartheid, trusteeship, or White leadership which are all in one way or another motivated by the idea of White domination or domination of the White over the Blacks. Like all

*Reproduced from Thomas Karis and Gwendolen M. Carter: From Protest to Challenge. A Documentary History of African Politics in South Africa, 1882-1994, vol 2, pp. 337-339. Hoover Institution Press, Stanford, 1973.

other people the African people claim the right of self-determination.

With this object in view in the light of these principles we claim and will continue to fight for the political rights tabulated on page 8 of our Bill of Rights such as:-

- (1) the right of direct representation in all the governing bodies of the country - national, provincial and local, and we resolve to work for the abolition of all differential institutions or bodies specially created for Africans, viz. representative councils, present form of parliamentary representation.
- (2) to achieve these objectives the following programme of action is suggested:-
 - (a) the creation of a national fund to finance the struggle for national liberation.
 - (b) the appointment of a committee to organise an appeal for funds and to devise ways and means therefor.
 - (c) the regular issue of propaganda material through:-
 - (ii) the usual press, newsletter or other means of disseminating our ideas in order to raise the standard of political and national consciousness.
 - (ii) establishment of a national press.
- (3) appointment of a council of action whose function should be to carry into effect, vigorously and with the utmost determination the programme of action. It should be competent for the council of action to implement our resolve to work for:-
 - (a) the abolition of all differential political institutions the boycotting of which we accept and to undertake a campaign to educate our people on this issue and, in addition, to employ the following weapons: immediate and active boycott, strike, civil disobedience, non-co-operation and such other means as may bring about the accomplishment and realisation of our aspirations.
 - (b) preparations and making of plans for a national stoppage of work for one day as a

mark of protest against the reactionary policy of the Government.

- (4) *Economic.*
 - (a) The establishment of commercial industrial, transport and other enterprises in both urban and rural areas.
 - (b) Consolidation of the industrial organisation of the workers for the improvement of their standard of living.
 - (c) Pursuant to paragraph (a) herein instructions be issued to Provincial Congresses to study the economic and social conditions in the reserves and other African settlements and to devise ways and means for their development, establishment of industries and such other enterprises as may give employment to a number of people.
- (5) *Education.*

It be an instruction to the African National Congress to devise ways and means for:-

 - (a) Raising the standard of Africans in the commercial, industrial and other enterprises and workers' organisations by means of providing a common educational forum wherein intellectuals, peasants and workers participate for the common good.
 - (b) Establishment of national centres of education for the purpose of training and educating African youth and provision of large scale scholarships tenable in various overseas countries.
- (6) *Cultural*
 - (a) To unite the cultural with the educational and national struggle.
 - (b) The establishment of a national academy of arts and sciences.
- (7) Congress realises that ultimately the people will be brought together by inspired leadership, under the banner of African Nationalism with courage and determination.

[signed by G.I.M. Mzamane and D.W. Bopape]

Questions on Document 2:

1. What was the purpose of the "programme of action"? (5)
 2. What were the specific political actions to achieve this purpose that was outlined in the programme? (10)
 3. What economic actions did the programme envisage? Do these actions represent a socialist or a free market programme? (8)
 4. Was this programme based on peaceful or violent actions? Give reasons for your answer. (2)
- [25]

Vrae oor Dokument 2:

1. Wat is die doel van die "Program van Aksie"? (5)
 2. Watter spesifieke politieke optredes om dié doel te bereik, word in die program uiteengesit? (10)
 3. Watter ekonomiese aksieprogramme word beoog? Verteenwoordig hierdie optredes 'n sosialistiese of 'n vryemark program? (8)
 4. Berus dié program op vreedsame of gewelddadige aksies? Gee redes vir jou antwoord? (2)
- [25]

DOCUMENT 3

LETTER REPLYING TO LETTER FROM THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE AND STATEMENT OF INTENTION TO LAUNCH DEFIANCE CAMPAIGN, FROM DR. J.S. MOROKA AND W.M. SISULU TO PRIME MINISTER D.F. MALAN, FEBRUARY 11, 1952*

Sir,

We, the undersigned, have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 29th January, 1952.

The National Executive of the African National Congress, at a special conference convened for the purpose, has given careful consideration to the contents of your letter, and has instructed us to address you as follows:

It is noted that exception is taken in your letter to the fact that the resolution adopted by the African National Congress at its 1951 Conference was directed to the Prime Minister instead of the Minister of Native Affairs and his Department. The African National Congress has at no time accepted the position that the Native Affairs Department is the channel of communication between the African people and the State. In any event, the subject of our

*Reproduced from Karis and Carter: Op.cit., vol 2, pp 480-482.

communication to you was not a Departmental matter but one of such general importance and gravity affecting the fundamental principles of the policy practised by the Union Government, and its effect on the relations between Black and White, that it was considered appropriate to bring these matters directly to the notice of the Prime Minister. The suggestion that we were actuated by a so-called "recent rift or purge in Congress circles" is without foundation and entirely beside the point in so far as the substance of our case is concerned.

In reply to our demand for the abolition of differentiating laws, it is suggested in your letter that there are "permanent and not man-made" differences between Africans and Europeans which justify the maintenance of these laws. The question at issue is not one of biological differences, but one of citizen rights which are granted in full measure to one section of the population, and completely denied to the other by means of man-made laws artificially imposed, not to preserve the identity of Europeans as a separate community, but to perpetuate the systematic exploitation of the African people.

The African people yield to no-one as far as pride of race is concerned, and it is precisely for this reason that they are striving for the attainment of fundamental human rights in the land of their birth.

It is observed that your Government rejects out of hand our claim for direct representation in Parliament and other Councils of State. This is the kernel of the policy of apartheid which is condemned not only by the African, Indian and Coloured people, but also by a large section of white South Africa. It is precisely because of this policy that South Africa is losing cast in international circles.

Your letter suggests that the policy of your Government is motivated by a desire to protect the interests of the African people in various spheres of life, e.g., land rights, and unspecified privileges not enjoyed by them in other countries. The Reserve land policy has always been designed to protect European rather than African land rights, and even within the so-called Reserves, Africans hold only occupancy privileges at the discretion of the Government. These Reserves are notoriously congested and overcrowded,

and the so-called rehabilitation schemes notwithstanding the protestations of just intention with which it is camouflaged, has aggravated the misery of the people and rendered thousands destitute and homeless, and has exposed them to vexatious regimentation by Native Commissioners and police Trust officials. In this connection we note that even the Native Laws Amendment Bill, which is now before Parliament, in spite of all its harsh and draconian provisions, has been described as a "protective" measure. There can be no doubt that like similar measures passed hitherto, this Bill

intended to protect and advance the interests of Europeans and not those of Africans. It is these discriminatory laws that are preventing the African people from developing their ambitions and capacities, and along lines satisfactory to themselves.

As far as the Bantu Authorities Act is concerned, it is clear that this Act is part of the policy to which we are opposed, namely, that "the Government is not prepared to grant the African political equality", and is not, as you suggest, "designed to give the African the opportunity of enlightened administration of their own affairs"! Nothing contained in the Bantu Authorities Act can be a substitute for direct representation in the Councils of State.

With reference to the campaign of mass action which the African National Congress intends to launch, we would point out that as a defenceless and voteless people, we have explored other channels without success. The African people are left with no alternative but to embark upon the campaign referred to above. We desire to state emphatically that it is our intention to conduct this campaign in a peaceful manner, and that any disturbances, if they should occur, will not be of our making.

In reiterating our claim for direct representation, we desire to place on record our firm determination to redouble our efforts for the attainment of full citizenship rights. In conclusion we regret that the Prime Minister has seen fit to reject our genuine offer of co-operation on the basis of full equality, and we express the hope that in the interest of all concerned the Government may yet reconsider its attitude.

Questions on Document 3:

1. List the arguments in defence of the policy of adopting separate laws for white and non-white and why the writers of this letter reject those arguments. (15)
2. What was the most important demand made by the writers on the government of the day? (4)

3. Why do the writers reject the policy of land reservation for Black occupation in the reserves? (4)
4. What campaign was planned against the government's policy? Was it planned as a non-violent campaign? (7)
[30]

Vrae oor Dokument 3:

1. Maak 'n lys van die argumente ter verdediging van die beleid om aparte wetgewing vir blank en nieblank te maak en verduidelik waarom die skrywers hierdie argumente verwerp. (15)
2. Wat is die belangrikste eis wat aan die regering van die dag gestel word? (4)
3. Waarom verwerp die skrywers die beleid om grond in die reservate vir swart bewoning te reserveer? (4)
4. Watter veldtog word teen die regeringsbeleid beplan? Word dit as 'n vreedsame veldtog beplan? (7)
[30]

DOCUMENT 4

"FREEDOM CHARTER", ADOPTED BY THE CONGRESS OF THE PEOPLE, JUNE 26, 1955*

PREAMBLE

We, the people of South Africa, declare for all our country and the world to know:-

That South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of the people;

That our people have been robbed of their birthright to land, liberty and peace by a form of government founded on injustice and inequality;

That our country will never be prosperous or free until all our people live in brotherhood, enjoying equal rights and opportunities;

That only a democratic state, based on the will of the people can secure to all their birthright without distinction of colour, race, sex or belief;

And therefore, we, the people of South Africa, black and white, together - equals, countrymen and

brothers - adopt this FREEDOM CHARTER. And we pledge ourselves to strive together, sparing nothing of our strength and courage, until the democratic changes here set out have been won.

THE PEOPLE SHALL GOVERN!

Every man and woman shall have the right to vote for and stand as a candidate for all bodies which make laws.

All the people shall be entitled to take part in the administration of the country.

The rights of the people shall be the same regardless of race, colour or sex.

All bodies of minority rule, advisory boards, councils and authorities shall be replaced by democratic organs of self-government.

*Preproduced from Karis, Carter and Gerhart: Op. cit., vol 3, pp. 205-208. Hoover Institution Press, Stanford, 1977.

ALL NATIONAL GROUPS SHALL HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS!

There shall be equal status in the bodies of state, in the courts and in the school for all national groups and races;

All national groups shall be protected by law against insults to their race and national pride;

All people shall have equal rights to use their own language and to develop their own folk culture and customs;

The preaching and practice of national, race or colour discrimination and contempt shall be a punishable crime;

All apartheid laws and practices shall be set aside.

THE PEOPLE SHALL SHARE IN THE COUNTRY'S WEALTH!

The national wealth of our country, the heritage of all South Africans, shall be restored to the people;

The mineral wealth beneath the soil, the banks and monopoly industries shall be transferred to the ownership of the people as a whole;

All other industries and trade shall be controlled to assist the well-being of the people;

All people shall have equal rights to trade where they choose, to manufacture and to enter all trades, crafts and professions.

THE LAND SHALL BE SHARED AMONG THOSE WHO WORK IT!

Restriction of land ownership on a racial basis shall be ended, and all the land re-divided amongst those who work it, to banish famine and land hunger;

The state shall help the peasants with implements, seed, tractors and dams to save the soil and assist the tillers;

Freedom of movement shall be guaranteed to all who work on the land;

All shall have the right to occupy land wherever they choose;

People shall not be robbed of their cattle, and forced labour and farm prisons shall be abolished.

ALL SHALL BE EQUAL BEFORE THE LAW!

No one shall be imprisoned, deported or restricted without a fair trial;

No one shall be condemned by the order of any Government official;

The courts shall be representative of all the people;

Imprisonment shall be only for serious crimes against the people, and shall aim at re-education, not vengeance;

The police force and army shall be open to all on an equal basis and shall be the helpers and protectors of the people;

All laws which discriminate on grounds of race, colour or belief shall be repealed.

ALL SHALL ENJOY EQUAL HUMAN RIGHTS!

The law shall guarantee to all their right to speak, to organise, to meet together, to publish, to preach, to worship and to educate their children;

The privacy of the house from police raids shall be protected by law;

All shall be free to travel without restriction from countryside to town, from province to province, and from South Africa abroad;

Pass laws, permits and all other laws restricting these freedoms shall be abolished.

THERE SHALL BE WORK AND SECURITY!

All who work shall be free to form trade unions, to elect their officers and to make wage agreements with their employers;

The state shall recognise the right and duty of all to work, and to draw full unemployment benefits;

Men and women of all races shall receive equal pay for equal work;

There shall be a forty-hour working week, a national minimum wage, paid annual leave, and sick leave for all workers, and maternity leave on full pay for all working mothers;

Miners, domestic workers, farm workers and civil servants shall have the same rights as all others who work;

Child labour, compound labour, the tot system and contract labour shall be abolished.

***THE DOORS OF LEARNING AND OF CULTURE
SHALL BE OPENED!***

The government shall discover, develop and encourage national talent for the enhancement of our cultural life;

All the cultural treasures of mankind shall be open to all, by free exchange of books, ideas and contact with other lands;

The aim of education shall be to teach the youth to love their people and their culture, to honour human brotherhood, liberty and peace;

Education shall be free, compulsory, universal and equal for all children;

Higher education and technical training shall be opened to all by means of state allowances and scholarships awarded on the basis of merit;

Adult illiteracy shall be ended by a mass state education plan;

Teachers shall have all the rights of other citizens;

The colour bar in cultural life, in sport and in education shall be abolished.

***THERE SHALL BE HOUSES, SECURITY AND
COMFORT!***

All people shall have the right to live where they choose, to be decently housed, and to bring up their families in comfort and security;

Unused housing space to be made available to the people;

Rent and prices shall be lowered, food plentiful and no one shall go hungry;

A preventative health scheme shall be run by the state;

Free medical care and hospitalisation shall be provided for all, with special care for mothers and young children;

Slums shall be demolished, and new suburbs built where all have transport, roads, lighting, playing fields, crèches and social centres;

The aged, the orphans, the disabled and the sick shall be cared for by the state;

Rest, leisure and recreation shall be the right of all;

Fenced locations and ghettos shall be abolished, and laws which break up families shall be repealed.

THERE SHALL BE PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP!

South Africa shall be a fully independent state, which respects the rights and sovereignty of all nations;

South Africa shall strive to maintain world peace and the settlement of all international disputes by negotiation - not war;

Peace and friendship amongst all our people shall be secured by upholding the equal rights, opportunities and status of all;

The people of the protectorates - Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland - shall be free to decide for themselves their own future;

The right of all the peoples of Africa to independence and self-government shall be recognised, and shall be the basis of close co-operation.

Let all who love their people and their country now say, as we say here: "THESE FREEDOMS WE WILL FIGHT FOR, SIDE BY SIDE, THROUGHOUT OUR LIVES, UNTIL WE HAVE WON OUR LIBERTY."

Questions on Document 4:

1. Who were the drafters of this document? Could they claim to represent the people? (5)
2. What position does this paper represent on political rights? (8)
3. What is meant by the statement that the mineral wealth, the industries and the land belong to the people? Does this imply that it must all be state-owned? What do we call a system where (15)

all major means of production are state owned? And a system where it is not state owned? Is there a system in between the two?

4. What position does the Charter take on language and cultural rights?
5. What promises are made with regard to education?
6. How would you interpret the meaning of the following: "The government shall discover, develop and encourage national talent for the enhancement of our cultural life".
7. What promises are made with regard to housing (5), medical care (3) and care of the aged? (2)
8. What is the Charter's position on individual rights, obligations and responsibilities?
9. What is the Charter's position on the implementing and financing of these principles and policies?
10. Would you describe the Charter as a statement of democratic principles or a set of promises? Give reasons for your answer.

Vrae oor Dokument 4:

1. Deur wie is hierdie dokument opgestel? Kan hulle daarop aanspraak maak om die "mense" te verteenwoordig?
 2. Wat sê die manifes oor politieke regte?
 3. Wat word bedoel met die uitspraak dat die land se minerale rykdom, nywerhede en grond aan die mense behoort? Beteken dit dat alles staatsbesit moet wees? Wat noem ons 'n stelsel waar al die belangrike produksiemiddele staatsbesit is? En 'n stelsel waar dit nie staatsbesit is nie? Is daar 'n stelsel tussen dié twee?
 4. Wat sê die manifes oor taal- en kultuurregte?
 5. Watter beloftes word ten opsigte van onderwys gemaak?
 6. Wat beteken dit dat die regering talent moet ontdek, ontwikkel en aanmoedig?
 7. Watter beloftes word gemaak ten opsigte van behuising (5), mediese sorg (3) en bejaarde sorg (2)?
 8. Wat is die manifes se standpunt oor individuele regte, verpligtinge en verantwoordelikhede?
 9. Hoe sal dié beginsels en beleid geïmplementeer en gefinansier word?
 10. Verteenwoordig die manifes 'n stel demokratiese beginsels of 'n reeks belottes? Gee redes vir u antwoord.
-