

Sane Nationalists?

IN NOVEMBER the Prime Minister informed the Transvaal Congress of the National Party that 'no sane Nationalist' would endanger White self-determination.

This, of course, begs the obvious question: Are Nationalism and sanity compatible? South Africa, over the past thirty years, has become increasingly aberrant.

Paranoid secrecy is not compatible with complete sanity. In this issue there is an edited version of a paper by Professor William Gutteridge. Professor Gutteridge sounds like a moderate academic, certainly not 'anti South African', who is deeply concerned about our future. However, under the Defence Act **SASH** was not allowed to publish his definition of the 'operational area' or his approximate estimate of the number of men serving on the border. The authorities refuse to allow the adult men and women who voted them into power to know how many of their sons are endangering their lives, and where.

Another sign of psychological disturbance is the Government's constant self-justification and transference of blame. It is the spiteful media which have made our country a universal outcast and not the Government's actions. Squatters were not at Nyanga because they wanted to earn a living in the Western Cape, but because agitators put them up to it. The majority of Indians did not vote in the elections for the SA Indian Council because they saw through the whole charade, but because they were intimidated.

Of course such reasoning is patently tragi-comic. But the very tragedy lies in the fact that the Government does not see its absurdity. And it is here that its behaviour verges on the psychotic. A neurotic is at least very conscious that he is ill. A psychotic does not know that he is irrational and sees nothing wrong with his behaviour and beliefs.

Recently Pik Botha said that in South Africa one is innocent until proved guilty by the courts. Such a statement denotes a divorce from reality and a refusal to acknowledge facts in view of the almost weekly detentions by the Security Police of people held without charge or trial, and in view of the special provisions of the Internal Security Act, the Sabotage Act and the Terrorism Act, all of which cast an onus on the accused to prove his innocence.

Insanity in the body politic leads to a perversion of individual humanity. Eighteen years of detention without charge or trial have bludgeoned the general public's natural reactions of horror into apathy. The recent formation of a support group by the parents of some of the detainees is a courageous, outstandingly healthy reaction to the cancerous, tentacle-like growth of the absolute power wielded by the police, and the Security Police in particular. If only this sort of sanity could be restored to our body politic, and to our people, so that our old men could once again realise their dreams and our young men be legally permitted their visions, there would be hope for South Africa.

ON STANDING

STANDING in silent protest, holding a placard and wearing a black sash, has been this organisation's way of expressing dissent for the past nearly 27 years.

For all of that period I have been one of those who have stood, in rain or sunshine, heat or cold, night or day, deriving personal satisfaction from the knowledge that my poster has expressed a viewpoint I endorse, and feeling grateful for the opportunity to join my colleagues in the unceasing battle of the Black Sash for justice and fair dealing for all in our country.

I have had my share of public abuse and of public support, of tomatoes or eggs or approbation. But never before have I experienced such an almost tangible wave of anger and hatred surging towards me from passing motorists as on the morning I shared a stand with SHEENA DUNCAN

against the re-imposition of a banning order on WINNIE MANDELA.

Taking it in turns we held posters saying, 'WINNIE MANDELA and Hundreds More Banned or Detained' and 'Justice Is Dead!' It is hard to know what it was that so infuriated the public. Was it the name of 'Mandela?' or was it the unpalatable truth about justice? or was it simply the evidence that there are still people who dare defy Government Policy or question the morality of its actions?

It is, of course, not surprising that those who support a Government that can perpetrate institutionalised violence against its citizens should in turn have scant regard for the rights or the dignity of those who dissent, and should express their disregard in so violent and unedifying a fashion. Such behaviour does no credit to the society which engenders it

JOYCE HARRIS