

PRESS SUMMARY

This is the thirty-fifth issue of a regular bulletin giving a factual resume of the proceedings of the Treason Trial.

SACU 3 86

Period Covered: 1st - 21st June, 1960

After cross-examination lasting one month and an adjournment of a week, Chief Luthuli's re-examination by Adv. D. Nokwe (who is conducting his own defence) began on 1st June.

Adv. Nokwe: "Does this statement about the White electorate imply that the White electorate has no role to play in changes that will be brought about?"

Chief Luthuli: "No, not at all, far from it. I have already indicated that the White electorate has a role to play, and to the extent that this White electorate changes, it has a very important role to play."

RIOTS: CAUSE AND BLAME

Adv. Nokwe then questioned Chief Luthuli on the view held by the A.N.C. as to the basic cause of riots.

Chief Luthuli: "The general view, My Lords, is that these unfortunate periodic outbreaks came about as a direct result of the policy of the Government. When examining each, whether you agree with the people or not, you will find that people are objecting to some aspects of government policy."

Adv. Nokwe: "How would the A.N.C. allocate the blame for these disturbances?"

Chief Luthuli: "Whilst not condoning the resort to violence by people, the African National Congress felt that so long as there were these pin pricks, there would always be possibilities of such outbreaks, until people came to have fully the view of the African National Congress."

Adv. Nokwe: "How did the A.N.C. feel towards the people who lost their lives in these disturbances?"

Chief Luthuli: "The A.N.C. sympathises with the people who lost their lives."

Adv. Nokwe: "Talking the general pattern of the disturbances which occurred from 1950 to 1956, have you any general impression of the number of police casualties compared with the number suffered by the African people?"

Chief Luthuli: "I couldn't be specific but I think more African people suffered as a result of police action."

STRIKES AND THE A.N.C.

Adv. Nokwe then asked Chief Luthuli to explain A.N.C. policy in regard to strikes.

The A.N.C., Chief Luthuli replied, would embark on a large scale strike only if it was reasonably certain that its instructions would be obeyed.

It would also urge the people to observe a policy of non-violence.

Adv. Nokwe then recalled the A.N.C.'s struggle against the Government's Western Areas Removal Scheme, which began in February 1955. He read from an A.N.C. statement issued at the time which registered "our strongest protest against this despotic action."

After asserting the A.N.C.'s "unshakeable determination to oppose and fight the removal scheme", the statement continued:

"This struggle, like all others, will be conducted in a disciplined and peaceful manner and the people are called upon to remain calm in the face of all provocations."

Chief Luthuli agreed that this statement expressed the A.N.C.'s attitude in regard to the removal scheme.

Re-examination of Chief Luthuli ended on 1st June.

ROOM FOR CONSOLIDATION

On the following day, June 2nd, Mr. Mandela asked the Court if the accused could continue to use the Courtroom for consultation in the afternoons, as they had done while Chief Luthuli was in the witness box. He explained that it was the only place where all the accused could consult together and that they could not take exhibits away from the Court to their place of detention.

Mr. Justice Rumpff replied that the Bench would consider the matter.

MRS. JOSEPH IN THE BOX

Mrs. Helen Joseph, only White woman among the accused, began her evidence on 2nd June. The second of the accused to give evidence for the defence, she was called as a witness by "accused Number One", MR. FARIED ADAMS.

He began by warning Mrs. Joseph of the relevant provisions of the Emergency Regulations, and by reminding her that one of these, concerning evidence given in a criminal trial, had been amended since the emergency was declared.

As a result the Court had judged on 26th May that "the position of a witness today is as it was before the regulations were passed."

NO CONFIDENCE

Mr. Adams: "Are you now prepared to give evidence in this trial?"

Mrs. Joseph: "My Lord I'm aware of the amendment to the regulations and I am also aware of the judgement of your Lordship in this Court. I am also aware of the assurance that was given by the Crown that the Minister would neither detain nor arrest any person on account of having given evidence in this trial, and I am aware also that the Attorney-General has given a similar assurance.

I have, however, listened carefully to the argument put forward by counsel for the defence on the effects of this amendment. I was struck particularly with the examples given by Mr. Maisels which showed how this amendment and its protection could be rendered negatory.

In view of the dangers therefore which have been put forward by Counsel I must say that I am reluctant in the circumstances to give evidence. I have no confidence whatsoever in the bona fides

of the Minister of Justice, and I do not accept his assurances.

There are two alternatives before me. Either I must close my case at this stage or I must give evidence in peril of being further detained. My Lords, I am compelled to the latter choice."

MRS. JOSEPH'S CAREER:

Mrs. Joseph then began her evidence by stating that she was born in England in 1905. She was educated in England, and took her English Honours Degree at the University of London.

She obtained a teaching post in India when she finished at the University. She left India in 1930 to come to South Africa where she obtained a teaching post in Durban at the Clifton Preparatory School for Boys.

In 1939 she took up a part time and an honorary appointment as the Organiser of an Indian Womens' Club which had been started in Durban.

She served in the Womens' Auxilliary Air Force from 1942 to 1946 as a Welfare and Information Officer.

After she was demobilised, she took up a position as supervisor of a Community Centre in Fordsburg among low income groups -Europeans, and as part of that post she had to deliver a course of lectures at the University of the Witwatersrand in Community organisation. She also studied and obtained a post-graduate diploma in Social Studies from the Witwatersrand University in 1946 and 1947.

At this time she was not a member of any political organisation, because as a social worker she was precluded from being identified with any particular political party.

ENTRY INTO POLITICS

Mr. Adams: "When did you become interested in politics?"

Mrs. Joseph: "I first became interested in politics as such when I was an Information Officer in the Air Force, because it was part of my duties to give lectures on political education.

When I became a Social Worker, both amongst the Europeans in Johannesburg, and particularly amongst the Coloured people when I took up another position as supervisor of a Community Centre in Cape Town, it became clear to me then that social work in itself is nothing more than a palliative for the ills which beset so many people. It was then that I began to turn my attention to the causes of these ills, and that I became convinced that I could no longer be satisfied merely with social work, but that I must play an active part in the political life of South Africa."

In 1951, Mrs. Joseph continued, she was appointed Secretary of the Transvaal Clothing Industries Medical Aid Society; — She took up that position because she wished to be free to take part actively in politics. As a social worker employed by the National War Memorial Health Foundation she was not free to play any part politically.

Mr. Adams: "Did you join any political party?"

Mrs. Joseph: "I joined the Labour Party, — I think it was in 1951.

Mr. Adams: "In January 1953 did you join any other political organisation?"

Mrs. Joseph: "In January, 1953 it wouldn't be correct to say that I joined a political organisation, as such, but I was invited to join a Committee which was engaged in forming what afterwards became the Congress of Democrats. -- As soon as the South African Congress of Democrats was formed, at the end of 1953, I was elected to the National Executive."

Mrs. Joseph said she had been Transvaal Regional Secretary of the Federation of South African Women since the Transvaal region was formed in July, 1954, was elected as National Secretary in August 1956, and had held both these positions ever since.

Mr. Adams: "Are you banned, Mrs. Joseph?"

Mrs. Joseph: "I received two banning orders on the 23rd of April, 1957. -- The first banning order was served on me in terms of the Suppression of Communism Act and prohibited me from attending gatherings of any sort for a period of five years as from that date. The second ban was in terms of the Riotous Assemblies Act, and prohibited me from being anywhere else in the Union of South West Africa other than the Magisterial District of Johannesburg for a period of five years."

EQUALITY AND JUSTICE:

Questioned about the Defiance Campaign which the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress launched on the 26th of June, 1952, Mrs. Joseph replied:

"I was very deeply influenced by the Defiance Campaign. At that time I was already a member of the Labour Party, but I cannot say that I was really playing a very active part. I had however, for some years been deeply moved by the hardships and sufferings of the millions of non-white people in South Africa.

"When the Defiance Campaign was launched, I followed it with deep interest, although I must say, to my sorrow, at a distance. I observed the thousands of people who were prepared to suffer the hardships of imprisonment in order to prove the hardness of their life, in order to show the injustices under which they were suffering.

"As the campaign went on, I became more deeply impressed with the courage and determination and what appeared then and still appears to me as the justice of this cause. I was particularly struck by the Defiance Campaign, because of the years that I had myself spent in India, where I had become very deeply conscious of the passive resistance campaign in that country.

"Towards the end of the Defiance Campaign, I felt that I could no longer stand aside from the struggles of the non-white people, and that I must align myself with them. It was therefore, My Lords, in this mood, that I so willingly accepted the invitation to join the provisional committee to establish the Congress of Democrats, for in the Congress of Democrats I found an organisation that stood uncompromisingly for equality and for justice for all people."

CONGRESSES AND VIOLENCE:

Mrs. Joseph said that to her own mind non-violence has always been
Page 5/.... implicit

implicit in the Congress Movement. The programme of the Congress Movement is that which is outlined in the 1949 Programme of Action of the African National Congress. That is the Programme which has been accepted as laying down the method of our struggle, not only for the African National Congress itself; but also for the other Congresses who have allied themselves with the African National Congress.

It had sometimes been suggested that the Programme of Action did not say in so many words, we are pledged to non-violence. "But My lords, I want to emphasise that the whole concept of the Programme of Action is one of non-violence. To my mind, such a Programme set against the background of the African National Congress and its history of struggle, could have no other meaning but that of non-violence."

"It may well be that our own Constitution in our organisations, for example, the South African Congress of Democrats, or the Federation of South African Women, don't use the word 'non-violence', but non-violence is implicit in those Constitutions. All our campaigns, together with those of the African National Congress, have been campaigns of non-violence; they have all followed the methods outlined in the Programme of Action.

"The Defiance Campaign was perhaps the first, perhaps the most dramatic; it set the seal of non-violence upon the programme that followed it."

Mr. Adams: "How would you explain the insistence of Congress speakers and writers on resistance to provocation?"

Mrs. Joseph: "Although our struggle is non-violent, we must always realise that violence may be inflicted upon the non-violent people. This has happened in other countries as well as our own".

BATONS AND BAYONETS

Mr. Justice Bekker: "You have heard of the saying that it takes two to make a party. Now what I can't quite follow is in what circumstances were the people warned that although your struggle is non-violent, it may be that violence is inflicted on non-violent people?"

Mrs. Joseph: "My Lord, it can come about, for example, if a crowd of people are given an order to disperse. The authorities giving that order may think the people are not dispersing quickly enough and there may be shooting, baton charging, and bayonet stabbing.

"To say that these things can happen does not mean that we plan any activity or any campaign expecting it to happen. But it means that we warn the people that non-violence in itself cannot be a sort of armour against ever having any physical hurt inflicted upon you."

Mr. Adams: "Mrs. Joseph, was there ever any intention by any of the Congresses to subvert the existing state?"

Mrs. Joseph: "There was never any intention by any of the Congresses to subvert the existing state. By subvert I understand 'to overthrow violently, or to destroy'. That was never the intention of the Congresses.

"The Congresses believe in and support the parliamentary system."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "The two-party system? Or multi-party system?"

Mrs. Joseph: "I don't know, My Lord, that I have ever analysed it quite so deeply as that. When I speak of the Parliamentary system, I really mean the system of electing the parliament of the country through the vote. It might be two party or multi-party. I find it difficult myself to accept one party."

Mrs. Joseph said that the real objective of the Congresses was a state which really belonged to all the people in South Africa. "We want to modify it, to effect sweeping radical changes, but we want those changes to be effected through the parliamentary system itself. That is why we say that there must be universal franchise."

Mrs. Joseph envisaged a state which was very much in form what it is today - in other words, there would be the legislature, judiciary, police, army. But they would no longer be confined to one racial group only.

EXTENDING THE VOTE:

Asked whether a non-violent programme could bring about a universal franchise, Mrs. Joseph replied:-

"I think that in this country the universal franchise can be brought about and I hope very much that it will be brought about through a non-violent programme. I have already outlined the methods and the way in which I think this can happen. It will happen through both moral and economic pressure being brought to bear on the present white electorate to concede that the vote must be extended to the non-white people.

"The attitude of the Congress to the existing state and its apparatus is that while we accept its form, we condemn its composition. We condemn its composition because it is confined to one racial group only.

Mr. Adams: "When do you envisage this change might come about?"

Mrs. Joseph: "It is impossible to put it into any term of years. This yielding of the white electorate to the pressure that I, together with many others, foresee may not come for some time. But as I see other countries in Africa obtaining their independence, so I see that in South Africa the time is also coming.

"To say that we were bent upon no legitimate constitutional struggle is to imply that we had in mind violent and forcible revolution. I want to say that nothing has ever pointed to that, but in fact to the very opposite. Our policies and our programmes have pointed all the way through to the fact that we hoped and intended to achieve our ends by peaceful methods, by the methods of moral and economic pressure on the white electorate.

"We hoped to achieve our ends through parliament itself. And I deny further this suggestion that we must have known that our course of action would inevitably result in a violent collision with the state, resulting in its subversion. My Lords, we know no such thing. Our activities, our campaigns were planned and carried out in order to avoid violent collision. We have taken particular care to see that our demonstrations, that our conferences were carried out in a legal manner.

At this stage Mr. Nelson Mandela, on behalf of the accused, again asked whether they could be given more time to examine exhibits.

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "You will have to look at the exhibits in the time available. If you require more time at any given date, you can put your case to us."

NON-VIOLENCE AND DEATH

Continuing her evidence on 3rd June, Mrs. Joseph said that it was considered necessary for the Congresses continually to warn the people that they must be prepared to suffer, even to face death. She gave examples of how people when engaged in non-violent activities are liable to have violence inflicted upon them, even unto death.

In Benoni and in Sophiatown during the 1951 Stay At Home people were fired upon by the police because they failed to comply quickly enough with orders to disperse. The most extreme form of violent action was taken against them, and people died as a result.

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "Were you present on those occasions?"

Mrs. Joseph: "No, My Lords, I am speaking now from what is, I think, common knowledge. There were other examples, My Lord.

"There was an occasion in East London where a prayer meeting was held for which permission had been obtained from the authorities. The police force arrived at this meeting, rightly or wrongly assumed that the meeting was not in fact a prayer meeting, and gave an order to disperse. The period stipulated was five minutes. It was afterwards admitted by the police that the order to shoot was given after three minutes, and people died as a result. I have just two more examples, My Lord, which fall into the period of the Indictment.

"The first was in March, 1956. It took place in Klerksdorp, where a large number of people gathered at the office of the Location Superintendent, where they had expected the officials to meet them there to discuss some grievances. The officials, however, did not meet the people assembled there. The police arrived and called upon the people to disperse, and once again the failure to disperse within a very limited time led to the opening of fire, and people were injured as a result.

"My last example, My Lords, is in Vlakfontein, towards the end of 1956, when a large crowd of African women also gathered at the office of the Location Superintendent to express their resentment at being called upon to take out reference books. A similar incident occurred, and the women were fired upon. It was afterwards stated to the women that the Location Superintendent had called upon the police to take this action, and a clear impression was given to the women that the Location Superintendent had gone beyond his duties and he was in fact immediately removed from that Location.

"I quote these examples, My Lords, because they do appear to me to give a clear reason why we do consider it necessary to explain to the people that even although our methods are non-violent and our whole struggle is non-violent, the people must realise that personal sacrifice may be entailed and that there may be occasions when despite all

precautions there is a possibility of physical violence being inflicted upon the people."

BUS BOYCOTTS AND REVOLUTION

Mrs. Joseph went on to reject the Crown's allegation that Congresses used every grievance or local issue such as bus boycotts, to achieve a violent revolution.

"We have always attempted not to exploit grievances, but to take them up to try and see that these grievances should be redressed. The very examples which the Crown has quoted, the question of bus fares, is something which plays an enormous part in the lives of thousands of people."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "We know the grievances, Mrs. Joseph. We heard them and we know how important they may be. The question was whether grievances were used by the Congress Alliance to achieve the change of state, not merely to redress the grievances."

Mrs. Joseph: "I was trying to show that such issues were not used in the sense of exploiting, but because they are fundamental to the condition of the people, they are part and parcel of the struggle for freedom. Therefore, the question of using them or exploiting them to my mind falls away."

Mr. Adams: "Could you tell us in what way the Defiance Campaign had an effect upon the white electorate?"

Mrs. Joseph: "It made a great many white people, think seriously, possibly for the first time, about the position of the non-white people in South Africa."

CLOSING THE FACTORY

Mr. Adams: "Would it be correct to compare extra-parliamentary activity with collective bargaining?"

Mrs. Joseph: "There is a very direct relationship, particularly in the case of the Defiance Campaign as an example of parliamentary activity. The Defiance Campaign can be compared to activity, for example, in a factory or in an industry, where the workers themselves decide that they must take some action to improve their conditions, and so a strike results."

"In such a case neither the employer nor the workers sees the end of the strike as being the bankruptcy of the employer or the closing down of the factory. Both sides know that, after strong opposition from both sides, either or both sides will have to make concessions in their own interests."

"My comparison with the Defiance Campaign lies in this, that I do not concede that the Defiance Campaign would ever, even if it had been carried on uninterrupted, have reached the point where the country would have been plunged into chaos. Long before this point could have been reached it would have been realised that concessions of some sort would have to be made, and negotiations would have started."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "Is the position in this case as far as the state is concerned, that the workers in the factory intended to take over the factory?"

Mrs. Joseph: "No, My Lords."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "And to work it for their common interests?"

Mrs. Joseph: "No, My Lords, but the workers in the factory are struggling for improvement in their conditions."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "I am really putting it on the basis of the Freedom Charter?"

Mrs. Joseph: "The Freedom Charter, My Lords, is a long term objective. The Defiance Campaign was waged against six specific Acts and was for their repeal."

THE THREE LECTURES

Questioned about the importance of the three lectures, "The World We Live In", "The Country We Live In" and "Change is Needed", Mrs. Joseph replied:-

"It is not my recollection in so far as my own organisations are concerned, i.e. the S.A. Congress of Democrats and the Federation of South African Women, that we attached an enormous amount of importance to these lectures. They were accepted as a basis for discussion in the branches, but I am not aware of any profound significance they attached to them.

Dealing with the lecture "The World We Live In" Mrs. Joseph said she disagreed with several statements in it. Commenting on the second lecture, "The Country We Live In", Mrs. Joseph said:-

"I would, my Lords, disagree with the statement that the laws of South Africa grow out of the needs of rulers of the country, the Imperialists and their allies, the big farmers. I agree the laws grow out of the needs of the rulers of the country, but I would interpret that as being the white rulers of the country and I would not describe them as imperialists, or if I did, it would be only in a very limited sense. Stress ought to have been laid on the purpose of laws to keep the white people in their privileged position.

"I wouldn't accept that the keeping of wages low and profits high would be the only motive for the Acts that have been quoted here. I would not agree that the bolstering up of European workers on a privileged wage system really flows from the profit motive of imperialism. I see it in terms of the maintenance of white supremacy."

Mrs. Joseph then described the contents of the third lecture, "A Change is Needed", and went on:-

"Certain suggestions are made which the writer considers would be essential for a People's Democracy. These suggestions would be found in any Bill of Rights. They have essentially bias but I maintain that they are normal demands which could be framed by a people seeking independence, and multi-racial democracy."

ARMS AND THE CHARTER

Mr. Adams: "What is the significance of the adoption by the Congresses of the Freedom Charter?"

Mrs. Joseph: "It provided a long term objective which would be considered as the ultimate goal of the Congress Movement. It crystallised the desires of the people."

Mr. Adams: "Would the realisation of the demands set out in the Freedom Charter necessarily involve the complete smashing of the entire State apparatus in its present form?"

Replying that this was not the case, Mrs. Joseph continued:-

"We believe these demands can be achieved through our non-violent methods, by parliamentary and extra-parliamentary activities and by pressure on the white electorate itself."

Mr. Adams asked Mrs. Joseph whether, in their struggle for political reforms, the Accused contemplated criminal violence or military operations on some considerable scale. Mrs. Joseph replied:-

"No, my Lords, I cannot admit that we ever contemplated violence, and as for military operations on some considerable scale that appears to be beyond the realms of possibility. As far as I am aware the organisation to which I belong has no militia, no arms, no plan, no planes. I find it a totally unrealistic and incomprehensible suggestion My Lord. The Congress Movement is a non-violent movement."

Mr. Adams: "For what purpose were volunteers required?"

Mrs. Joseph: "Primarily to assist in the organisation of the people, but also to assist in the campaign against the Western Areas Removal Scheme."

Mr. Adams: "Were the Freedom Volunteers to your knowledge a semi-military shock brigade?"

Mrs. Joseph: "Far from it. The volunteers as I know them, both through being one and through having worked with the volunteers in other congresses, were not at all formed in the sense of a shock brigade."

Mr. Adams: "What formalities did you go through to become a Freedom Volunteer?"

Mrs. Joseph: "The only formality that I complied with was that at a branch meeting of the Congress of Democrats I signed a form which contained the Volunteers' pledge."

SALVATION AND LIBERATION

Questioned about a speech by Mr. Kathrada - one of the accused - dealing with volunteers, Mrs. Joseph answered:

"It's a speech dealing with the tasks of the volunteers, to prepare for the Congress of the People. It speaks of them as the top brigade of the army of national liberation in this country, but the whole context of the speech does not imply that that use of the phrase 'the army of liberation' has any military connotation at all."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "Is it correct to say that in some countries the Army of Liberation has a military connotation?"

Mrs. Joseph: "Yes, My Lord, I would say that it does in countries where there is a militarised trouble, an armed conflict, but here we speak of a peaceful, non-violent army."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "It has the same name?"

Mrs. Joseph: "It has the same name, my Lords, but so has the Salvation Army."

MURDER AND DISCIPLINE

Referring to a speech by Accused 17, Mr. Resha, in November 1956, Mrs. Joseph said:-

"There is, I'm aware, one passage in this speech which might call for comment. In this passage the speaker is emphasising the importance of discipline. He points out that the key of the volunteer is discipline.

"The speaker then goes on to draw a contrast:- 'When you are disciplined and you are told by the organisation not to be violent you must not be violent; if you are a true volunteer and you are called upon to be violent, you must be absolutely violent - you must murder, murder'.

"My Lords, I find this an extremely violent contrast to use by way of example, but read into the framework of the whole speech it does not convey to me anything more than a violent illustration of discipline."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "What do you mean by a violent illustration?"

Mrs. Joseph: "I mean a violent example; using violent language."

Mr. Justice Bekker: "There would be no room at all for a violent illustration in a policy of non-violence?"

Mrs. Joseph: "That is so, but I also wanted to make the point that the speaker was addressing not a public crowd, but volunteers who must have been well aware of the policy of the Congresses. Those volunteers could be expected to see no more in this than an extremely forceful example.

"Taken in the context of the whole speech in which there is no other suggestion of violence, I don't find in this paragraph an incitement to violence."

Dealing with Bantu Education, Mrs. Joseph gave the reasons for the Congress objections.

"That objection really flows from the statement made by Dr. Verwoerd which implied the limitation of education to fit the African for performing certain tasks only."

Mrs. Joseph went on to say that the Congresses were opposed to teaching Africans just enough English and Afrikaans to allow them to understand orders given in either of these languages.

The emphasis in Bantu Education was to be on the mother tongue. This would have a serious and adverse effect upon education of children who were becoming urbanised and whose families had intermarried.

POLICE AND PROVOCATION

Replying to a question by Mr. Justice Bekker, who asked Mrs. Joseph whether there was not a contradiction between her statement that she considered the use of hundreds of armed police in Sophiatown on the day of the removal to be provocative, and the phrase in the document "Report of the Secretariat on the Western Areas", which said "The aims should be to make it necessary for the authorities to employ ever more and more forces to effect the removals", Mrs. Joseph replied:-

"This statement in the Report of the Secretariat does not necessarily refer to armed forces at all. It simply says 'the aim should be to make the authorities employ ever more and more forces. I do not think My Lords that it would be correct to assume that forces meant armed forces. It could be, and I think was used in

the sense of force in the sense of compulsion."

Mr. Justice Bekker: "What is the act of provocation? The fact that a policeman is armed or the fact that a policeman is present?"

Mrs. Joseph: "The number of police and that they were armed, and that there was a display of armed force on the day of the removal. I think it is correct to say that a policeman is always armed to some extent in South Africa."

WAR AND THE PEACE COUNCIL

Mrs. Joseph was then cross-examined by several other accused persons, including Mr. Levy, who prefaced his questions by telling the Court that "the Peace Council was never part of any organisational conspiracy with other organisations mentioned. The Peace Council was basically concerned with the general question of peace and war, and not with social, political or economic change. It did not embrace any exclusive political ideology save its aim of obtaining maximum support from all sections in favour of world peace, and was not part of a conspiracy to overthrow the Capitalist system in South Africa."

Under cross-examination by Mr. Levy, Mrs. Joseph said that the Congress Movement supported the struggle for national liberation and opposed imperialism "because it believes that all people have a moral and social right to govern themselves and to determine their own future." She said the S.A. Peace Council's interest in the national liberation and its criticism of imperialism were connected because oppression by force of the subject people was a threat to peace. It was the view of the Peace Council that as long as there was foreign rule over colonial countries there was a possibility of violent conflict. This might in turn lead to the extension of that conflict, possibly between the major powers - which could result in a world war.

The South African Peace Council at no time adopted any policy that the Government should be destroyed. It was not concerned with the Government other than in relation to peace. It never expressed any opinion upon how the South African Government should be fought.

SUPREMACY AND SOCIALISM

On the 15th June Mr. Liebenberg, for the Crown, cross-examined Mrs. H. Joseph.

Mr. Liebenberg: "Did White supremacy arise in South Africa as a result of the socialist system?"

Mrs. Joseph: "My Lord, I was not aware that there was a socialist system in South Africa. I don't really see how White supremacy could therefore arise from it in South Africa."

Mr. Liebenberg: "I would like you to say whether the Congress of Democrats had any definite view about the existence or otherwise of capitalism in South Africa?"

Mrs. Joseph: "My Lord, as far as I can recall the Congress of Democrats never expressed any policy in relation to capitalism. I do not recall that we did. Our policy was for racial equality, and for the universal franchise, and although I think there was an acceptance that capitalism played its part in the creation of the situation in South Africa, I don't recall that we ever had any expressed policy either for or against capitalism."

Mr. Liebenberg: "We can get on a lot more quickly, Mrs. Joseph,
Page 13/.... if you

if you make this concession, that the capitalist system is the cause of the colour bar system in South Africa?"

Mrs. Joseph: "My Lords, I have already said that it is regarded as a contributory cause. I have made that concession."

Mr. Liebenberg: "What do you suggest are the other causes which contribute to the existence of the colour bar system?"

Mrs. Joseph: "My Lords, that would involve me in a very long discussion. I think one of the main causes is the desire of the white group to maintain their position of privilege."

CHANGE OR ELIMINATION

Mr. Liebenberg: "Mrs. Joseph, let me get it clear. Did you envisage economic changes in South Africa in the sense that you wanted an elimination of the capitalist system?"

Mrs. Joseph: "My Lords, I wanted to reduce the economic inequalities, I don't know whether it is possible to eliminate them altogether; I have never tied myself to the elimination of the system of capitalism. In fact I think I have said that I believe in a certain amount of free enterprise."

In reply to another question Mrs. Joseph said that she wanted full political, legal and social equality and full opportunities for economic equality in South Africa for all races.

Mr. Liebenberg: "May I suggest to you that full voting equality would not have solved your problems on your views?"

Mrs. Joseph: "My Lords, I can't accept that suggestion. I believe that the extension of the franchise to everybody will eventually solve our problems. I don't foresee an immediate solution."

Replying to Mr. Justice Bekker, Mrs. Joseph said that the three lectures were intended as a basis for discussion. The questions asked at the end of each lecture went further than the lectures; they were thought-provoking questions.

Mr. Liebenberg: "From 1953 onwards at any rate, you found yourself in contact with members of the former Communist Party?"

Mrs. Joseph: "That is so, my Lords, although that was never anything that was in my mind at the time. In our organisation, My Lords, we were really not concerned with the individual ideologies of our members. We were united in a common purpose."

Mr. Liebenberg: "And do you honestly say that you never discussed Communist theory with any of them?"

Mrs. Joseph: "I can honestly say My Lords, that I did not ever discuss Communist theories with the members of the Congress of Democrats."

Mr. Liebenberg: "To put it mildly, Mrs. Joseph, I suggest that you were not very kindly disposed towards the government of the country?"

Mrs. Joseph: "That is so, My Lords."