

contact



FOR UNITED NON-RACIAL ACTION

3c

Registered at the G.P.O. as a newspaper

Vol. 8 No. 6 June, 1965

"SECURITY" LAWS COVER POLICE ACTIVITIES

SO-CALLED SECURITY laws rushed through the South African Parliament year after year already give the Minister of Justice and his political police almost all the power they need to silence those who too vigorously oppose the Nationalist Government and to destroy their organisations and newspapers. But there were some restraints. Until the suspension early this year of the 90-day detention clause of the 1963 General Law Amendment Act, a person suspected of sabotage could be held without trial for long periods in solitary confinement. But the terms of the clause made it necessary to have, even remotely, some suspicion that the detainee had knowledge of or might be involved in sabotage activities. Also, news of his arrest could be published and he was not usually allowed to vanish forgotten into some police cell.

A radical opponent of the Government could be silenced, but to do this it was necessary to ban him. This may not seem very difficult when all that is necessary is a Ministerial signature under some sheets of duplicated typescript. But bannings raise protests and banned people need to be watched. Now, however, the last restraints have gone. One new amendment to the Suppression of Communism Act enables the Minister to start another list, this time of people whose statements may not be published in South Africa. Such people might be an embarrassment if they were consigned to the twilight existence of a banned un-person. But a Government experienced in devious ways of silencing its opposition has found a simple answer to its problem. Soon, any statement by a person whose views in this country are regarded as radical

will set off an anxious scanning of lists by newspaper sub-editors.

Even more anxious will be their reception of information concerning any activity involving the political police. It will now be an offence, carrying penalties of a heavy fine and/or up to seven years in prison to reveal (by publication or by the passing on of information to another person), what the police are doing to people they consider enemies of the Government and its race-sated fantasy of apartheid.

This comforting curtain has been drawn over the activities of the political police by a slight amendment to the Official Secrets Act. And another amendment, this time to the Criminal Procedure Amendment Act gives an ominous indication of what may happen behind the curtain.

The Minister of Justice has now been given the power to detain "State witnesses" in certain cases which include, not only alleged sabotage, but also conspiracy, incitement and charges under the Suppression of Communism

Can Contact Survive?

LAST MONTH WE said we needed money badly if we were to produce one more issue. Well, we are still here. But our financial position remains desperate and, while we wish to express our gratitude for support already received, we need a great deal more. Please send your donation to the Manager, P.O. Box 1979, Cape Town.

Act. This amendment is, in fact, a more drastic version of the suspended 90-day clause. When it was debated in Parliament it became apparent that a "witness" could be detained before a case had been prepared or anyone charged. As under 90-days, he will be removed from the protection of the courts, he cannot see a lawyer and no one outside will have access to him.

There have been allegations enough of bad treatment of 90-day detainees to cause concern over what will happen to people held as "witnesses" under 180-day detention. In addition, these detainees need not be suspected of knowing anything about sabotage. They can be questioned on the movements of banned people, or on the activities of legitimate political organisations; they need not know how their information will be used or against whom.

Using the protection of the Official Secrets Act, political police will be able to whisk them quietly away from their homes and their work. They will vanish and no one will be able to say where they have gone. When they are released months will have been plucked from their lives and their loss and their suffering will be obscured and forgotten in the fog that is now completely enveloping this police state.

Long View

by Alan Paton

Defence and Aid

THE BANNING OF Mr. David Craighead, the deportation with ten days' notice of Mr. John Blundell, and the decision of the Dutch Government to donate R20,000 to Defence and Aid, has focussed attention on this organisation. This is the time to remind people what Defence and Aid is, and what it stands for, but before I do that let me thank David Craighead and John Blundell for their work on behalf of justice and political prisoners, and wish the Blundells on behalf of the Liberal Party, and many other people also, all good things for the future.

Luckily it is not my duty to attack or defend the Dutch Government. But one can derive a little pleasure from the fury of DIE BURGERS and DIE TRANSVALERS. Let them writhe.

Is it true, as these and other papers allege, that the Dutch Government and Defence and Aid want to see subversive action, and that they encourage it by providing defence? I consider the allegation quite laughable.

Do people commit sabotage, and go abroad for military training, and continue political activity after their organisations have been banned, because they have a hope that they will be defended in the courts? I cannot believe it. They do these things for far deeper reasons, over which a Defence and Aid Committee has no control at all.

Is Defence and Aid committing an offence by defending political prisoners? Legally, no. Is it perhaps committing a moral offence? Some people say, yes. These are the people who do not want a man defended if the offence with which he is charged is repugnant to them. They say that if a man is charged with sabotage, then simply let him not be defended. One cannot pay attention to the views of such people.

I have been closely connected with Defence & Aid for many years. It so happens that all Defence & Aid Committees have been overwhelmingly composed of people to the right of those charged with offences. (This was almost 100 per cent true until 1964, when some members of the Liberal Party were charged with sabotage). This fact is interesting, and there are profound psychological reasons for it, into which I cannot enter now. But it caused hysterical newspapers and hysterical persons to call the Defence & Aid Committees catspaws of the Communists, and fellow-travellers, and "unwitting" dupes, and a good deal else. Therefore I ask the question why Defence & Aid does the work it does, and why people came forward to do it, and what their attitude is towards these hysterical accusations. Of course I can only answer the question for myself.

I went into Defence & Aid for two simple reasons. The first is, that whatever else has been eaten away in South Africa, I should like to preserve the administration of justice from erosion as much as possible. I am a layman, but it appears to me that a prosecutor presses the charge, and that a defending counsel endeavours to rebut it, and that the judge is there, aided by these two officers of the court, to come to a just conclusion as to the guilt and degree of culpability of the accused person. It seems to me that this, what I call majestic, conception of justice is brought to nothing if the defence is absent or inadequate. It is to me a duty owing not only to the accused person, not only to the judge, but supremely to our society, that adequate defence should be secured in a society where passions are so intense, and where many white South Africans regard security as far more important than justice.

My second reason for going into Defence & Aid is also simple. Though I myself am not temperamentally attracted to sabotage and violence, and though I do not believe they will make our problems simpler, yet I understand why some people feel it their duty to act thus under the present circumstances.

Furthermore, I regard the Government and its laws as the primary cause of such action. Therefore, there is to me a strong desire to see that such persons are as justly - and as mercifully - dealt with as possible. I do not find such a desire reprehensible.

It is my recurrent thought that the political struggle of these South Africans bears a strong resemblance to that of the Afrikaner Nationalists. If there is more violence today, it

is because Vorster is in charge, not Smuts. Vorster can thank his lucky stars that he was detained under Smuts, not Vorster. Now and then he alludes darkly to his sufferings, but he was never subjected to 90-days or kept standing for many hours on end, or compelled to rat on his friends. It is to preserve the pre-Vorsterian kind of justice that Defence & Aid exists, and it will carry out that task as long as it is able.

Assault Alleged in Cape Trial

ELECTRIC SHOCKS, KICKS, beatings and other forms of torture and assault were alleged by witnesses in the Supreme Court, Cape Town, to have been used by police interrogating them. One State witness alleged that, in addition to being hit and threatened with a firearm, he was made to stand on bricks in a slanting position while a paraffin tin was placed over his head and beaten. Smoke was then introduced into the tin and caused him to choke. Other State witnesses denied that such tactics had been used against them, but several Defence witnesses made similar detailed allegations.

These statements were made during the trial of four men, **Kwedi Mkhaliipi, Jack Jaxa, Sonkongo Maleka and Wilson Mketanane**, on charges of recruiting people for guerilla warfare training. This trial is one of several such cases being heard in different centres. Four men, Joe Gqabi, Henry Makgothi, Samson Fadane and Michael Manlanga, have appeared at the Rand Criminal Sessions charged with attempting to undergo military training outside the country. In Pietermaritzburg, thirteen men were convicted of a similar offence. Eleven of them were each sentenced to seven years' imprisonment, while two, Samson Nene and Anthony Xaba, were sentenced to eight years' because of previous convictions. The judge said he would take into account the fact that they had already served two years' imprisonment for leaving the country illegally.

Conflict in the evidence of State witnesses led to the acquittal and discharge of Harold Strachan, who had been charged in Pietermaritzburg with assisting in training for sabotage and with furthering the aims of the ANC. Also charged under the Suppression of Communism Act are several people accused of infringing the terms of their banning orders. Among these are Mountain Qumbela and Wilfred Brutus, both of Cape Town.

Some of the witnesses in the Cape Town guerilla warfare trial are among the accused in a trial at Goodwood Regional Court, where they are facing charges of belonging to an unlawful organisation and furthering its aims.

Widespread interest has been aroused in the Humansdorp trial in which Sylvia Neame is appearing, charged with being an office-bearer of the ANC and encouraging or participating in activities which furthered its aims. She is also charged with contributing funds to the ANC. Witnesses already serving sentences for offences under the Suppression of Communism Act have testified to her presence at ANC meetings.

Miss Neame is one of many people who are appearing in Eastern Cape courts charged with membership of the ANC or participation in its activities. Two groups of five people were charged in the Port Elizabeth magistrate's court in the middle of May and were remanded to 29th June.

Two sabotage case appeals heard in Bloemfontein this month failed. The appellants were Sedick Isaacs and two others from Cape Town, and Snock Matibela, who had been convicted in the Transvaal. Mr. Isaacs had been sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment, the other three to five years' each.

Two more South African members of PAC are now being tried in Maseru, Basutoland, on charges of conspiring to commit acts of violence against South Africa. This brings the total number of men charged to ten.

A Spreading Disease

IT IS NOT only the Liberal Party, together with some residual members of non-white trade union or political movements, which is being hounded and harried by the Government and the Security Police. Recently, a few organisations which, though in opposition to present Government policies, have been considered respectable enough to be safe, have also been attacked and their members are beginning to fear that they too may soon be in for a dose of the stronger medicine beloved of authoritarian regimes.

Last year, Progressives discovered that they were not immune from dawn raids on their homes. Later, they were warned that their participation in the Coloured Provincial Elections was seen in Government eyes as interference by white politicians in non-white politics. After the Progressives had won both Coloured seats the Government tried unsuccessfully to find a formula to prohibit Progressive 'meddling' in these and parliamentary elections without prohibiting its own. It has managed, it seems, to produce a Bill to prevent "interference" by its white opponents in elections and policy-making of non-white bodies, and has bought time as far as itself is concerned by introducing a Bill to divorce the election of Coloured Representatives from the white general election.

This manoeuvre was accompanied by much mud-slinging and smearing of the Progressive Party, techniques to which Liberals have become accustomed. The implication of a few frustrated Liberals, including two or three banned ones, in acts of sabotage was used to smear the whole Liberal Party and to enable more Liberal Party leaders to be banned without much public protest. Even the Progressive Party was hesitant to condemn the banning of Liberal Party Chairman, Peter Brown. At what is still a somewhat different level, Progressives are now suffering in the same way. A few individuals were found guilty of tampering with the Postal vote system, and the result has been a number of wild allegations, made under privilege in the House of Assembly, that the Progressive victories were won by the wholesale buying of votes.

Also typical have been the scarcely veiled threats in Minister Botha's assertion that the Progressive Party is leading the Coloured people to destruction. Not only is it responsible for measures taken by the Government to curtail what little voice is left to the Coloured people in political affairs, but its actions will lead to a white 'reaction' against material benefits for the Coloured people.

This is a kind of twisted reasoning which Liberals have long had to fight. It can, with reasonable certainty, be predicted that the Progressives will soon feel themselves as hopeless and frustrated in the face of this kind of reasoning and high-handed action as Liberals have been. Perhaps it will not be long before Progressives become Progressivists as Liberals have become Liberalists, opening the way to Liberal dangers as Liberals are alleged to open the way for Communism. Perhaps, too, it will not be long before Progressives will be learning what it is to be banned. If they fail to win a seat in the next election, all the qualifications in their policy will not save them from what has been the Liberal fate.

It is possible that they will not be alone in treading this road. Even the Christian Institute is learning the same hard lesson. Hurt today that its word is not trusted, it may have to learn the hard way that this is the least of Nationalist oppressive and suppressive measures.

Totalitarianism is a disease which spreads slowly throughout the body it attacks. It is probably already too late to root it out of South African life. But the surgeon does not despair till the moment of death, for, even in medicine, the miraculous sometimes happens. And the same is true of politics. The lesson to be learnt, however, is that divisions amongst those who are seeking a just solution to South Africa's problems are essentially irrelevant to the situation in which we find ourselves. Liberals, Progressives and others working in the same general direction must learn to trust each other and work together. In this way all can make their maximum contribution to the ultimate victory of what is just and right.

Bonteheuvel - Town of Crime

WHEN WILL A police station be built in Bonteheuvel? This cry from the heart of the residents of Cape Town's new Coloured housing complex by the side of the Settlers Way has been heard for over two years. Recently, however, as the Courts fill up with crimes of violence committed in Bonteheuvel and the townships nearby, the cry has been increasing in volume. Police reservists, who, with the aid of police patrols, have desperately tried to counter the stream of lawlessness, have met together with church and other leaders to discuss ways and means of dealing with the situation. Mr. Justice Steyn, sentencing four men found guilty of several crimes of violence, said that a police station in the area was vitally necessary. He commented that, if a coat of arms were to be drawn up for Bonteheuvel, it would have to consist of an open knife with the word 'violence' beneath it.

Residents, who have to band themselves into groups for safety in order to walk two or three blocks to the bus-stop in the early hours of the morning, feel that a police station is only one of the many needs, but definitely the most urgent. This was already overwhelmingly the general attitude when a group of Liberals undertook a survey of Bonteheuvel and Netreg a little under a year ago. Because of the difficulties caused by Government measures taken against the Party, their results have only just come to hand. Bonteheuvel is now one year older and therefore one year more mature. But few facilities have been provided in the meantime, and conditions and attitudes can safely be assumed to be very much the same.

Most of the residents interviewed were happy to have a roof over their heads which they could call their own. Some were young people who had moved at last from the crowded homes of their parents. Others were families rehoused after living in slum conditions in Cape Town or Goodwood Acres, forced to move because of Group Area regulations. Critical though many were of the locality, facilities or housing provided, they were quick to add that at least they now had a home of their own and, even if they had been pushed out of the best parts of the town to the outskirts, into what the politically conscious have described as a Coloured 'ghetto', at least they were now settled and could expect to be pushed no further.

Many complained about the lack of cinemas and sports grounds. After finding the additional fares for journeys to work, they could not afford fares for entertainment, they said. Most agreed that the cost of transport, especially for

those near the railway stations, was as reasonable as could be expected for the distance, but was nevertheless a big addition to their expenditure. A frequent complaint was that food was too expensive. All who could do so shopped elsewhere on their way to and from work. Other complaints concerned the roads, most of which consisted of narrow concrete blocks, laid end to end and barely wide enough for one vehicle. Mothers said that children walked in the middle of the roads to avoid the sand, for there were no pavements. Street lighting, they added, was poor.

Favourable comments concerned mainly the schools. A large number had been provided and there were few complaints about them. One parent said that this was really the only facility which had been fully catered for in advance.

Some of those interviewed were pleased with their houses. They were the people who came from crowded and slum conditions to the 'fresh air' of Bonteneuwel, pleased to find themselves living in more than one room, with somewhere for the children to play. One mother said that people complained about the lack of guttering, but, 'after all, when it rains I don't stand under the dripping water - I come inside!' Others, however, felt that the houses were shoddily built. Cracks were appearing in the walls from lighting the stoves too soon after building, several explained. The walls were too thin, said some, and a conversation next door could be overheard.

The floors were cold. No mats were provided, and there were no internal doors except for the toilet, so that children and parents had no privacy from one another.

Biggest complaint, apart from the roughness and lack of police control, was the high cost of living in Bonteneuwel. Not only did distance add to the cost of food and transport, but many had not paid rents as high as these before. They varied between 95 cents per week, lights included, for the tiny 'dual occupancy' dwellings to R2.70, lights excluded, for better, larger houses. This represented a large increase on R1 per month, for example, for a single room or shack in Goodwood.

Asked whether they expected the drawbacks to improve, many said yes. Others felt that the drawbacks caused by distance would always be there and one man asked: 'How can you expect these Coloured townships to improve much?' This general discontent with a woman's comment that community facilities should have been provided in advance, built at the same time as the houses. In Pinelands, she said, the residents would never have been permitted to come to so barren and unready a locality.

Few dared to voice their criticism fully or in general terms. Most would criticise a particular feature and then draw back, asking for assurance that their names would not be used or reiterating how wonderful it was to have a home of their own.

There was a strong tendency to identify the Council with the Government, to voice the fear that criticism of their housing would land them in gaol for 90 days or that criticism of Government policy would result in their eviction. "What can you do?" many said, shrugging their shoulders helplessly. "It is no use criticising when you can't do anything about it," others said.

A few, who were critical of the Government policy which had brought about the Group Area features of Bonteneuwel, its isolation and its distance from town in particular, said that they appreciated that the Council was making the best of a bad job. "Bonteneuwel is necessary", said one. But they criticised the Council's strictness in enforcing some rules and lassitude over others. It turned a blind eye to the snebeening which caused a lot of the roughness, they alleged but it was strict about eviction for non-payment of rent. One man described as a "sin" the fact that neighbours, who tried to help anyone evicted would also be thrown out. And a woman said that housing officials expected a house full of young children to be tidy even in the early morning. She commented that white railway tenants do not have to tolerate the same amount of prying into their affairs and interference from officials that Coloured Council tenants did.

An overlay of contentment with a house and even a garden of their own hides a number of particular dissatisfactions which can be expected to improve with time and, except among the most simple, some more general unhappiness which most have had no difficulty in attributing to "the system". To a few, Bonteneuwel has given them what they wanted in life, and they are content to look no further. Most, however, are that they are being deprived of a great deal that they want in life, feel helpless to do anything about it and are trying to accept their position. It takes little to uncover their deeper feelings, no more than a few searching questions from a stranger. But those people, never confident of the future, never hopeful of political change, never militantly active, now have something to lose. Now they fear even to criticise.

What of their Children? Drinking is on the increase in the townships, for it drowns thoughts of the struggle to live and it drowns the frustrations of an inhibited existence. But it breeds crime, already the only outlet for many a young man deprived both of sport and of politics. The establishment of entertainment and recreation facilities will help. The establishment of a police station will help. But the frustrations of a group of people caught somewhere between the elite and the suppressed in a sick society, twisted and divided, will remain. And this, together with the natural toughness born in the slums from which the poorest of the Bonteneuwel residents come, will make the stamping out of crime a difficult task.

Interference Bill Will Fail

'I THINK IT'S going to develop into a straight fight between us and the Progressive Party,' said Mr. Tom Swartz, interviewed recently by DRUM. Mr. Swartz, leader of the pro-Government Coloured Peoples Federal Party, was discussing his chances of becoming the Republic's first Coloured 'Prime Minister' - Chairman of the Executive of the proposed Coloured Representative Council.

He rated his chances high. The Progressives, he admitted, were likely to take most of the seats open to election, but he pointed out that 16 of the 46 Council members were to be appointed by the Government. Even if the Federal Party failed to win the necessary eight seats to give them an overall majority, the Chairman of the Executive had to be appointed by the Government, and was therefore certain to be a Federal Party man.

Mr. Swartz need not have taxed his brain with this sort of reasoning. The Progressives are not likely to be in the race. Mr. Vorster has announced that the expected legislation to prevent the 'interference' by whites in 'non-white politics' is at last to hand, but, as it has taken time to prepare and it is late in the session, it will be held over till next year.

The Bill will make it an offence for any white person, as a member of a political party or as an individual, to interfere in the elections of the Coloured Representative Council, the Transkei Legislative Assembly, a Bantu Authority or the South African Indian Council. Interference means financial assistance, drafting of propaganda or organised activity in support of candidates. It will also be an offence for a white person to participate in a campaign to influence members of these bodies to adopt a policy in conflict with the aims of an Act of Parliament. Maximum penalties of a R200 fine or six months' imprisonment are laid down.

Some of the measures originally predicted appear to have been omitted from the Bill.

But the scope of the Bill is nevertheless extremely wide. It will now be an offence for any white person other than an employer to transport a voter to a polling booth in an election for any of the bodies to which the Bill refers. Public transport is excepted.

Like the Coloured Representative Council, the Transkei Legislative Assembly is already firmly in the strangle hold of the Government.

Here there is even less pretence at democracy than in the case of the Council, for appointed chiefs far outnumber the elected representatives of the people.

Yet the Government is not satisfied. It must limit not only the sources of financial assistance but also the influences to which Members of the Assembly are open. Though fit for what the Government is pleased to call 'self-government', the rulers of the Transkei are apparently unable to assess for themselves what courses of action to follow in the interests of their people. Or perhaps it is just because they are fit to do this that the Government fears for the sort of decision they will make if allowed to mingle with others who think democratically.

It will be interesting to see in detail how the Government proposes to define or control such 'influence'. Will it be illegal for this paper to comment on the affairs of the Transkei? Will it be illegal for Mr Alan Paton or Dr. Steytler to criticise Government policy there. What will be the position of oversea visitors to the Transkei? Will they be unable to comment critically at all? What will be the position of the white lawyer or other expert whom Mr. Guzana might wish to consult? How will 'a campaign' to influence be defined?

However limiting the detail definitions may turn out to be, it is clear that this Bill in itself constitutes 'interference' by whites in the political affairs of non-whites of a particularly gross and blatant sort. It is in effect a Bill to allow only the Government to participate in elections and the making of policy, and to prevent whites who think differently from organising or influencing non-whites politically.

But we believe that the Government has failed to reckon with the calibre of its non-white opponents. The opposition of the Transkei Democrats, for example, is not white-instigated. It is born of hatred for an oppression personally felt and a determination to do all within their power to fight for the recognition of the basic rights and human dignity of non-white South Africans.

contact

206 Burleigh House, Barrack Street, Cape Town.
P.O. Box 1979, Telephone 3-4043, Telegrams
CONTACT, Cape Town.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS:

African Postal Union: R1.00 (10s.)

Airmail: R2.00 (£1)

Rest of the World: R1.50 (15s., \$2)

Airmail: On application. Half for six months.

Printed and published by Granite Publications (Pty) Ltd at the above address