

This is the sixteenth issue of a regular bulletin giving a factual resume of the proceedings of the Treason Trial.

Period covered: 31st August to 18th September 1959.

THE TIME HAS COME, THE LAWYERS SAID, TO SPEAK OF MANY DOCUMENTS.....

THE FIFTH WEEK OF THE TRIAL began with the cross-examination of Head Constable von Papendorff, of the Special Branch, by Defence Advocate S. Kentridge. The witness, who explained that the Special Branch of the Police was concerned mainly with the safety of the state, had taken documents from the offices of the S.A. Congress of Democrats, the S.A. Peace Council, and from various accused and co-conspirators.

In the raid on the Peace Council offices he had taken the documents relating to the activities of the Council; he agreed that he had extracted a few documents from each pile of documents. "Irrespective of the contents?" "Yes".

Mr. Kentridge then pointed out that in a document Africa for Peace certain portions had been read out but others, dealing with the development of peace moves at high levels, omitted - e.g. statements by Winston Churchill and Mr. Attlee urging four-power conferences and negotiations for peace between the big powers. In another document, South Africans for Peace, the section relating to the celebration of great cultural anniversaries had been omitted. When the Crown had read in portions of the aims of the Cape Town Peace Council, stating colonial slavery and imperialist aggression to be the causes of war, the following statement had been omitted: "Our task is not to judge but to see how differing systems can live in peace."

Several more documents, omitted by the Crown, were then read in, including circulars and news bulletins relating, inter alia, to efforts to secure peace in Korea, to a Pacifist conference in Japan, opposing the atom bomb, and to a speech by the President of the S.A. Indian Congress on self-discipline in volunteers.

The Congress of the People

The witness was cross-examined closely on his attendance at Peace Council meetings and particularly his attendance at the Congress of the People in 1955, which he described in detail, testifying to the orderly crowd of people, and their disciplined behaviour during the intrusion on the second day of hundreds of uniformed armed police and the searching of delegates. He agreed that many of the documents and pamphlets found in the search could have been purchased there by the delegates.

Dealing with messages to the Congress of the People, Head Constable von Papendorff agreed that amongst those omitted by the Crown, were messages from British M.P.'s, the Prime Minister of India, and Churchmen including Canon Collins, who referred to "your devotion to the principle of non-violence". A message from Chief Luthuli at the time of his banning in 1954 was read in, wherein he called for 50,000 volunteers "an army of non-violent organisers and propagandists for the Congress of the People to educate people against apartheid".

Head Constable von Papendorff agreed that in the raids on the offices of the Congress of Democrats, he had seized thousands of documents; he had been looking for specific evidence relating to the bus boycott, and the Congress of

the People.

Questioned on a report of a Conference called by the Federation of S.A. Women in 1954 on increased rentals in non-European townships, the witness admitted that the organisations represented at this conference had included the Anti-Rents Committee, the Services Committee, the B.E.S.L., the S.A. Institute of Race Relations, various Churches, the Garment Workers Union of African Women and the National Council of African Women.

Dealing with the attitude of Africans to the pass laws, Head Constable von Papendorff claimed that "mine natives praised the pass laws as being helpful for identification in accidents" and that he never heard any but the African National Congress speak of arrests in connection with pass laws.

Portions of exhibits omitted by the Crown were read in by Advocate Kentridge, dealing with the demand of Non-Europeans for political rights and including a quotation from William Porter, Attorney General of the Cape Province in 1852 "Why should you fear the franchise? We apply the stimulus to fight unconstitutionally by refusing the right to fight constitutionally."

The S.A. Peace Council

More than two hundred documents taken from the offices of the Congress of Democrats and from the offices of the S.A. Peace Council were then handed in which, with the reading of extracts, continued throughout the rest of the day and for most of the next two days, September 1st and 2nd. A letter from Chief Luthuli, the President-General of the A.N.C., was read in which he said "I have given deep thought to the suggestion of attending the Peace Congress in Europe." Acknowledging that this would "strengthen the bonds of friendship" he continued "but my overriding concern is to organise our strength on the home front, and especially in Congress. Attendance at the Peace Congress could be used disastrously amongst our people, particularly amongst those susceptible to propaganda and not so well informed".... I am not yet a member of the Peace Council, but I am in sympathy".

A typescript of a speech by Ruth First, an accused in the second group, now awaiting trial, was read in, referring to uranium production and the recognition of South Africa as the "arsenal for Commonwealth defence", urging that uranium be used for constructive purposes.

International Communist Discussions

A further batch of documents was handed in, on some of which the Crown relied for their contents and on all for the actual possession of the documents. The Crown read the whole of an undated, apparently written in 1949, Communique on the Conference of the Information Bureau of Communist Parties held in Hungary under the headings: The defence of peace and the struggle against the war mongers; the forces of peace grow stronger; Imperialist war preparations; Imperialists overestimate their strength; We must not underestimate the war danger. The second part of the document dealt with "Working Class Unity and the tasks of the Communist Parties and Workers' Parties". The remainder of the documents in this group were listed with a brief description and were admitted by the Defence on the basis of possession only and without relation to the contents.

Cross examined by Advocate Fischer on these Peace Council documents, established that the Congress of the People had not been sponsored by the Peace Council. Police Sgt. Koekemoer, a Crown witness, agreed that there were more than 20 tin boxes, measuring three feet by two feet and one foot deep, containing books and documents seized in searches but not put in to the Court.

Summary Attempts

During the morning of Wednesday 3rd September, 84 documents taken from the offices of the S.A. Congress of Trade Unions by Sgt. du Preez were handed in.

When Crown Advocate van Niekerk was asked by the Court to summarise instead of read the Chairman's opening address by the Inaugural Conference of S.A.C.T.U., he replied that he appeared "to have been wrongly informed not to summarise."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "Not by us. We invite summaries"!

To Mr. van Niekerk's protest that the Defence would object, Mr. Justice Rumpff replied "No. If you summarise and the Defence wants to put in more, they will do so."

When the Crown proposed to hand in and read a series of ten lectures, Mr. van Niekerk was cut short by Mr. Justice Rumpff, who declared "I for one am not going to listen to them! I want summaries. If you want the Court at the end of the case to infer something from, say, D.49, you say 'This was supported by S.A.C.T.U. and then quote from document D.29'. We will not listen to it now and then again at the end of the case. We will give you an opportunity to make these summaries." Mr. van Niekerk agreed to prepare a summary of one lecture, while Mr. Fischer insisted that the Defence must see this summary, and that the summary must replace the document.

When the Court resumed on September 3rd, Mr. van Niekerk reverted to the summarising of the lectures, submitted that the summary would not be evidence. Mr. Justice Bekker agreed that a summary would not reflect the phraseology and suggested that the Crown give a cross section of the document.

Mr. van Niekerk: "I have tried with one lecture. It is very difficult."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "The summary must take the place of the lecture or else we shall listen to two documents instead of one."

The documents seized at the S.A.C.T.U. offices included not only correspondence, minutes and reports relating to that organisation, but also a considerable amount of S.A. Peace Council and Transvaal Peace Council documents, similar to those already handed in. After these had been handed in, the summarising of the lectures was discussed again.

Mr. van Niekerk: "Unless the Defence will admit an assessment of the document together with the summary, the whole document must be read in. The summary cannot replace the evidence without such an admission."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "Why not the summary?"

Mr. van Niekerk: "We can't substitute. There is no authority to say that the summary can replace the evidence."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "You've been doing it verbally."

Mr. van Niekerk: "Only in respect of some documents. The experts will have to testify on the contents of these documents."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "Why not lead the experts on the summary?"

Mr. van Niekerk: "My lord, that would be entirely wrong! The lectures are the evidence."

Still No Agreement on Documentary Method:

Mr. Justice Kennedy suggested that the lectures be put in for reading at a later stage.

Mr. van Niekerk agreed but emphasised that four of the lectures listed in the policy schedule would have to be read.

Mr. Justice Rumpff then suggested that more time should be given to consideration of this matter.

The trial then continued with the handing in of documents taken from the homes and offices of individual accused and co-conspirators, and also from them at the Congress of the People. Documents relating particularly to the South African Coloured People's Organisation and to the Federation of South African Women were handed in from searches related to the Secretaries, Stanley Lollan and Helen Joseph (both accused).

At one stage Mr. Fischer said: "The defence has ceased protesting, but we do object to the vast bulk of the evidence being handed in. For example, the protest against the closing of the Soviet Consulate. How can it be used in argument?"

Mr. van Niekerk continued with the handing in by police witnesses of documents taken from various accused and co-conspirators.

Remembrance of Raids Past

Mr. Fischer then proceeded with the cross-examination of Det. Sgt. du Preez, who was unable to recall incidents at the time of the search relating to the identity of the offices searched, particularly that some documents had been taken from an office and then returned and retaken with a new warrant. The witness was unable to explain the fact that the majority of the documents taken related to the Peace Council and not to S.A.C.T.U., and reiterated that Mr. L. Levy (an accused) had told him that it was the S.A.C.T.U. office. Questioned on the number of searches he had conducted, the witness stated that he had been involved in only one of the occasions of general police searches, the one in question. Asked if he had not also searched the house and office of Helen Joseph (another accused) in March 1957 in addition to the search in question, the witness said at first that he did not remember and then that he was only present at that search; many things had happened since.

Advocate Fischer then read in a document calling people to a South African Peace Congress endorsed by, inter alia, Professor Gluckman, Mr. C. Rehlin (a trade unionist), Mr. Leon Gluckman (an actor), Mrs. Phyllis Altman and Mr. Cope (authors), Mr. Dawie Cozyn and Miss Johanna Cornelius (a trade unionist).

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "How are we interested in who signed?"

Advocate Fischer: "It is suggested in some strange way that these are treasonable documents. If they are not, we do not know why they are put in."

"To be Read Later"

As the handing in of documents continued, Mr. Justice Rumpff protested from time to time that certain documents had already been read in and requested the Crown merely to refer to the first copy of the document. The Crown adopted the procedure of bracketing all copies of such periodicals as Fighting Talk and Liberation to be read at a later stage. Detectives who had searched the houses of individual accused and co-conspirators handed in numbers of books extracted from their libraries in addition to the documents. These books were almost exclusively the works of Marx and Lenin and publications relating to or emanating from the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

South Africa at the Crossroads

Seized from the residence of L. Bernstein, a co-conspirator, and handed in on September 4th, was a typed document headed "South Africa stands at the Crossroads". Lengthy extracts were read in, relating to reviews of the situation in South Africa and in the international context. Under the heading What Must Be Done it was pointed out that the Nationalists, United Party, Liberals and Conservatives would not accept the Freedom Charter. The aim of progressives should be to create a united front of the progressive, women's and youth organisations headed by the working class, which would work towards

a people's democratic government.

To a suggestion by Mr. Justice Rumpff that this document had been read in before, Advocate Trengrove replied that it was the only one of its nature.

Cross examined b Mr. Fischer on the first batch of nearly 200 books and documents taken by him, Det. Sgt. Visser stated that he had not taken more material because he had only a small Anglia car and would not have had room for more books and documents.

The Women's Federation

At the beginning of the sixth week of the trial, the reading of documents taken from L. Bernstein was continued with extracts from an undated unsigned document headed Boycott as a political weapon.

Cross examining Sgt. Coetzee, who had searched the premises of Mrs. Helen Joseph, Mr. Fischer put in additional correspondence. Dealing with the campaign against passes, it was established that the Federation had sought legal opinion as to the proposed campaign for pledges to be obtained by women concerning reference books and had modified the plans accordingly.

Defence Advocate Plewman, in cross-examining the witness who had seized documents from A.M. Kathrada, read in the messages stressing non-violence to the Seventh Annual Conference of the Natal Indian Congress, omitted by the Crown.

The witness agreed that during the 1956 demonstration of women to the Union Buildings they had marched up to the Union Buildings and settled themselves in the amphitheatre. They had then sung songs and after attempting to present a petition to the office of the Prime Minister, had stood in silence for 30 minutes. That was all that had happened. Advocate Plewman explained that he had asked these questions because the Crown had referred to this demonstration, in a document submitted to the Defence, as the outstanding example of "extra Parliamentary militant action."

The handing in of documents and books continued throughout the week. At one stage Mr. Justice Bekker interjected: "Aren't we building up a mountain?" when documents were handed in for reading at a later stage.

Questioned on his arrest of M. Moolla and the searching of the flat where he lived, Det. Sgt. Swanepool admitted that he had not carried out his standing orders requiring the recording of all important incidents, but insisted that M. Moolla had volunteered that the documents seized were his when asked whose the documents were.

Lt. du Preez testified to the search at the home of the Rev. D.C. Thompson and to taking a vast mass of books, pamphlets and documents from his very large library, containing a large variety of books and papers on religion and journals of every conceivable type, filed and arranged in good order.

The Pleasures of Bucharest

Captain Loots then handed in the documents and books seized from the residence of Advocate P.D. Nokwe (an accused), beginning with the documents taken from him by the Customs officials at Jan Smuts Airport on his return from overseas in 1953. These documents included political pamphlets issued by the Communist Party in London, and others published in the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China. A brochure on Bucharest was also handed in. Cross examining the witness on his own behalf, Advocate Nokwe established that the documents covered a wide field of subjects and that the Sketch map of Bucharest advertised some 26 entertainment halls, 23 picture halls, 4 parks, 9 sports bases and 12 exhibitions in addition to the advertisements relating to the World Youth Festival.

Documents taken from Advocate Nokwe at the time of his arrest included African National Congress Conference Minutes and reports, roneoed documents and some manuscript and typed notes. Portions of a typed memorandum on the 1949 Programme of Action of the A.N.C. were read in, dealing with the extent of the implementation of that programme, the desirability of the methods used and the relationship between the Programme of Action and the Freedom Charter. The memorandum pointed out that prior to 1949 it had been believed that change could be brought about through constitutional methods and approach to government authorities. The organisational machinery of the A.N.C. had been weak and there had been little contact with the masses. The end of the Second World War had seen the people moving towards mass action, such as the mineworkers strikes, squatters movements and the bus boycott. The deadlock reached in the Natives Representative Council had been a blow to constitutionalism. The Programme of Action had specifically proposed the setting up of National Funds, the boycott of government institutions and had urged the demand for direct representation. The object was national freedom from white domination.

The Nationalist Government had made the A.N.C. "virtually illegal". The A.N.C. should not be rigid, but must not be unprincipled. The Programme of Action and the Freedom Charter were neither redundant nor mutually conflicting.

Legal argument arose concerning the handing in of a document taken at Jan Smuts Airport which could not be identified.

Mr. Justice Rumpff announced that the Court would give judgement on this point on Monday, September 14th.

COURT ADMITS DISPUTED DOCUMENT

The seventh week of the trial opened with the Court judgement on the document to which an objection had been raised by the Defence in the previous week. The Court held that at the preparatory examination when the document had been handed in by consent the Defence had clearly admitted the physical fact that the document had been taken on 1.12.53 by the witness at Jan Smuts Airport. There was no necessity to consider the motive of the admission at the time of the preparatory examination. The document could therefore be handed in at the trial.

The document, headed "Report of the S.A. Delegation to the World Youth Festival", was accordingly read in. Reference was made to the representative delegation (all of whom had served terms of imprisonment during the Defiance Campaign), the Coloured Youth Day Demonstration in support of the World Federation of Democratic Youth which had been attended by 9,000 young people, and to assistance from the International Solidarity Fund.

Whose Documents?

Det. Sgd. Helberg and Det. Sgt. Dirker were then cross-examined on their seizing of documents, particularly in relation to the suggested "claiming" of documents by the accused and co-conspirators. Det. Sgt. Dirker denied that the detectives of the Special Branch had been discussing this point amongst each other prior to giving evidence, but agreed that he had made no notes of the claiming at the time and that "claiming" had been seldom, if ever, mentioned at the preparatory examination. He asserted that he stood, through thick and thin, by his statement that P. Nokwe had claimed the documents, despite the fact that one document was not in P. Nokwe's handwriting and another consisted of shorthand notes, although Nokwe could not use shorthand.

Det. Sg. Laurence, cross-examined by Mr. Fischer, agreed that the ownership of the documents seized was important but admitted that he had not made a note of it.

Dealing with books and documents taken from Nelson Mandela (an accused), Crown Advocate Trengrove read in the editorial of a journal Congress Voice,

containing an analysis of the National Executive Committee's Report to the 42nd A.N.C. Conference held in 1955. Typed documents read in included instructions to organisers for the Defiance Campaign, a copy of an address by Chief Luthuli to the Peace Convention held in Johannesburg in October 1956, and a memorandum on the "Fight for Democracy in South Africa", referring to Non-European political organisations. Another typed document read in was the detailed report of the South African delegates to the Fourth World Youth Festival, which denied the accusation that the World Federation of Democratic Youth was a Communist organisation. Details of speeches and broadcasts by members of the delegation followed.

Some Speeding Up

Many of the documents taken were handed in without reading as they had already been dealt with in respect of other accused, but one document read by Adv. Trengrove drew a protest from Mr. Justice Rumpff: "Why do you read that? We've heard it quite often that the A.N.C. was a party to the Defiance Campaign."

Adv. Trengrove: "But not in connection with this accused as an individual. The Defence admissions cover only organisations and not any of the accused."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "Why not just say the document relates to the Defiance Campaign?"

Proprietors of two printing firms then testified to the printing of the journal "Fighting Talk", stating that approximately 2,000 copies a month were printed. It was agreed between the Defence and the Crown that the witnesses need not be present for the reading of extracts from copies of the journal, but Mr. Justice Rumpff insisted that the reading must be limited to what was absolutely necessary.

During cross examination of the witnesses on the documents taken from Nelson Mandela, the Defence read in material omitted by the Crown.

Manuscript notes taken from Nelson Mandela and handed in during the cross examination commented on the draft constitution and contained the criticism that the drafter had been trying to show how much he knew and gave the impression of currying favour with the 'left'. It was pointed out that the Communist Party organisational structure could not be applied to people joined together only by oppression and a common desire to be free.

"Fighting Talk"

The whole of the rest of the day was taken up with the reading of extracts from a number of issues of the journal, Fighting Talk, covering a very wide range of subjects. In some cases the Crown indicated that it relied only on the name of the author and the descriptive title of the article, while in other cases portions of the articles were read to the Court. Readings were made from an article by Robert Resha (an accused) in February 1954 on the A.N.C. Conference; an article "The United Party Peters Out"; another article on the politics of atomic warfare: "From Here To Eternity", and an eyewitness account of the Congress of the People. Reference was made to the Western Areas Removal Scheme in an article "Ons Bou 'n Nasie" and the statement read in that "Verwoerd, Mentz and Co. must be responsible for any bloodshed that might arise from this fantastic piece of planned injustice". In the July 1954 issue of Fighting Talk appeared a letter by M. Kotane saying that Mau Mau was not to be confused with our purely non-violent passive resistance movement.

Considerable portions of an analysis by J.B. Marks of the opposition to the Western Areas Removal Scheme were read in, including the discussion of the slogan "We shall not move." Portions were read in from a series of articles by Ruth First on her visit to the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. Reference was made to an article by Helen Joseph "women against Passes", mentioned in Schedule D of the Indictment, and portions read in.

In addition to the authorship of several articles, the names of L. Bernstein and Ruth First were read in as being responsible for the political matter and as the editors of "Fighting Talk". Further readings from "Fighting Talk" included lengthy extracts from an article on the Report to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the criticism of the cult of the individual. From the same article portions were read in of a reply to the question "Does not former acceptance of Stalinism and the present acceptance of the criticism of Stalinism prove that Communists everywhere accept as law the line and policy of the U.S.S.R.?"

Extracts were quoted from an article by Lionel Forman, entitled "Why do we write and argue so little about Socialism?", in order to illustrate the previous differences between the Labour Party and the Communists. The Labour Party believed that socialist reforms could be brought about by Parliamentary means, while Communists believed that there could be no socialism while capitalists controlled the state machinery, and that therefore socialism could only be achieved by the seizure of state power.

Documents and Protests

On the conclusion of reading from "Fighting Talk", the handing in of books and documents seized from various accused and co-conspirators continued, with relatively little reading, as very many of the documents were duplicates of those already handed in.

From time to time Mr. Justice Rumpff protested at the reading of a document, and urged the Crown once again to produce summaries wherever possible, while at intervals the Defence cross examined the police witnesses on their search procedures, laying particular emphasis on their almost routine declaration that the accused had 'claimed' the documents taken from them.

In portions read from the Presidential Address to the Transvaal Conference of the A.N.C. in 1955, the speaker said "the Union Government was not invited to the Afro Asian Conference in Bandoeng, because it doesn't represent South Africa. Moses Kotane and Cachalia are our real spokesmen". "Let them call the Freedom Charter treason and sedition if they want to; it embodies our dearest aims for a South Africa for our children to grow up into." Reference was made to former members of the Communist Party as hard-working sincere members of the A.N.C., "who stand by the aims of the A.N.C."

"For Bertha's Information"

Abrupt questioning by Mr. Justice Rumpff arose when the Crown handed in and read from a typed itinerary taken from Bertha Mashaba's office and headed "For Bertha's information". "How are we interested in this document?"

Adv. Terblanche: "It gives the names of persons, a copy was given to Bertha Mashaba; it was an itinerary for certain purposes."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "What purposes? How is this document sinister? How is it relevant?"

Adv. Terblanche: "It was for Bertha's information."

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "What does it matter? How is it relevant? Why worry about a little thing like this?"

The document was withdrawn by the Crown.

Cross examining a Crown witness on documents taken from Dr. A.E. Letele, Adv. Fischer read in part of the Secretary's Report on the Cape Province, which regretted that the report was not as full of activity as it ought to have been and urged the necessity for training branch officials in such matters as correspondence. Mr. Fischer explained to the Court that this was being read in to show the organisational weakness of an organisation which the Crown was trying to suggest was organising for revolution!

Mr. Justice Rumpff: "Even revolutionary movements have their administrative difficulties!"

Advocate Fischer: "Some have such administrative difficulties that they can't become revolutionary!"

From a statement by the Provincial Executive of the A.N.C. Youth League taken from Robert Resha, portions were read relating to the Africanists in the A.N.C. and the former's "rabid Chauvinism". Lengthy portions were read in from documents dealing with the role of the Youth Action Council in relation to the A.N.C. Youth League and the World Federation of Democratic Youth.

CROWN SUMMARIES OF KEY LECTURES

On Friday, September 19th, Advocate Hoexter returned to the vexed question of the ten lectures which the Crown had been requested on a previous occasion to summarise. The Crown had in fact summarised one lecture and submitted it to the Defence, but nothing further had come of it. The Crown had then analysed the lectures and proposed to read only brief extracts.

Lecture 1. Our Modern Society and how it arose. The need was stressed for workers to study society in order to understand it and change it into a better society. The existence of classes in society had led to a continuous struggle between them. The Capitalist system had produced the working class, the Capitalist class, the peasantry and the middle class. The basis for changing the capitalist system already existed in class relationships; the new class must wrest the means of production from the capitalist class and have three qualifications to succeed; it must have nothing to lose, i.e. it must be a revolutionary class, it must be a productive class and it must be able to act together in large numbers. The working class had the noble historic role of transforming society, and one of the ways of achieving it would be by the building of Trade Unions.

Lecture 2. What are Trade Unions? This lecture dealt with the history of Trade Unions, the 1914 strikes and deportations of strike leaders, the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union and the S.A. Trades and Labour Council. In the economic crisis of 1929, the Government took steps to split the unity of workers by giving white workers privileged treatment. The outbreak of the second World War deepened the split in the trade union movement, and the swing to the right was continued much further when the Nationalist Government came to power in 1948. After the dissolution of the Trades and Labour Council, the S.A. Congress of Trade Unions became the only national organisation with no colour bar.

Lecture 3. Short History of the International Trade Union Movement. This traced the history from the First International (famous also for the fact that its inaugural address and constitution were drafted by Karl Marx) through the Second International to the establishment of the I.L.O. and ultimately to the World Federation of Trade Unions (W.F.T.U.) after World War 2.

Lecture 4 dealt with the Trade Unions as a weapon in the struggle of the workers, and Lecture 5 with Trade Unions in the struggle for Liberation in South Africa. Lengthy portions from this lecture were read in relation to the lack of political rights for workers in colonial countries, and the moulding of the trade union movement in South Africa by the special conditions prevailing here. The necessity was stressed for the rejection of the false slogan "no politics" and the aim shown as the replacement of the present cheap labour colonial structure by a democratic people's structure as envisaged by the Freedom Charter.

Lecture 6 dealt with the organising of unorganised workers and Lecture 7 with the problems of the S.A. Trade Union Movement, particularly the lack of experience and knowledge, which could only be spread by means of an organisation such as S.A.C.T.U.

In Lecture 8 the workers solidarity was stressed as the heart and core of the Trade Union Movement. Lectures 9 and 10 on the Relationship between workers and their Union were handed in for the title only.