

ings called for a new National Convention.

The demand from the Claremont Conference was specifically for a "sovereign" National Convention, in other words for a law-making body. This is a completely sensible aim. How else are conflicting interests in South Africa to resolve their differences in peace in the long run if it is not by sitting down, Nationalists and all, at a new National Convention?

Nevertheless there is a large body of anti-Nationalist opinion which would recognize a new National Convention as a wonderful ideal, but which would not, at this moment, be prepared to attend something which could be regarded as a revolutionary challenge to the Government.

The Claremont Conference went some way to meet this view by proposing a preliminary national conference of all those interested in the Convention movement. This, surely, is the first practical, and urgent, step to be taken? To be effective this conference must be widely representative. To ensure this its terms of reference must not be such as to frighten off potential support.

From it may then come the beginnings of a pressure group and a movement whose demands for a new deal, thrashed out at a new National Convention, the authorities will eventually have to meet. Such a movement would be something behind which every non-racialist could throw his full weight.

SOUTH WEST AFRICA

Liberal Opinion has criticized the United Nations Committee on South West Africa before, and it does so again, this time for the exaggerated picture of conditions in the territory contained in its report to the Trusteeship Committee of the General Assembly.

Its exaggeration gave Mr. Louw just the chance he needed to put up some defence against the Committee's indictment and to appear as the injured representative of a badly-done-by Government. Why did the Committee have to do this? Conditions in South West are bad enough not to need exaggeration. All one need do is quote facts, and apartheid is shown up for what it is.

We wish the South African Government's overseas critics would stick strictly to the facts. It would make our job in South Africa just that much easier.

DR. VERWOERD AND THE JEWS

South Africa has few friends in the world. Israel is no longer one of them. First apartheid forced her to turn her back on S.A. at UNO, now Dr. Verwoerd has done his best to see that she does not turn back again.

In a letter to a Mr. East in Cape Town, Dr. V. dropped a few dark hints about the Jews. Perhaps Mr. East should not have revealed the contents, but he has and its threatening undertones are now known. We object to them strongly.

Since then the Prime Minister has tried to reassure local Jews. We hope that he means what he says. His reaction to Israel's UNO vote was reminiscent of Mr. Louw's petulance in the face of criticism. Is this not a sign that he too is beginning to feel the strain under which the apostles of apartheid labour in their impossible attempt to sell an indefensible policy to a hostile world?