

Indicator **Publications Control**

We reproduce below some of the reasons given by the Office of the Directorate of Publications for banning a pamphlet, and a publication.

The pamphlet, entitled WHAT'S ON IN MODDERDAM dealt with the destruction of the squatter camp at Modderdam Road, and in view of the massive criticism levelled at the State for its handling of the squatter issue in the Western Cape, it is interesting to note the total vindication of those actions by the Director of Publications.

"1. The publication is issued by the Communities Commission of the UCT. It is in English and Xhosa, and is apparently intended for the students at UCT who are being subjected to this provocative type of language; as well as for the Xhosa and Coloured squatters who are illegally occupying a site at Modderdam.

2. The position at Modderdam is a delicate one, with the authorities doing their best to find an equitable solution. A pamphlet such as this only serves to inflame passions and hamper the government's task. Squatters are not a problem which is unique to South Africa. At present there are hundreds of thousands of squatters in the favelas of Rio de Janeiro, in Lagos, Nigeria and in socialist Lisbon - while every big Indian city has its shanty towns. To blame the existence of the camp solely on the authorities is to aggravate bitterness and frustration. The squatters are occupying the site illegally, and the government is acting within the law in trying to find alternative accommodation, and in returning illegal entrants to the homelands.

3. Section 47 (2) (e): (a). The police are accused of calling the squatters thieves and murderers. There are no grounds for such an accusation, and the police realise that there are very many decent families at Modderdam.

(b). The squatters are wrongly alleged to have been victims of the June 1976 attempts by the police to quell the disturbances started by agitators.

(c). In the last paragraph the dangerous impression is created that the Government has bowed to pressure of persons breaking the law. Should the Government attempt to uphold and enforce the law, the pamphlet says that "we" would fully support the squatters.

(d). The "we" are apparently the still immature youngsters at University. A pamphlet such as this can lead them to support the squatters actively in person, with the possibility of a confrontation with the police which could be disastrous for all concerned. Modderdam is not far from UCT. The persons putting out the pamphlet have acted irresponsibly. The pamphlet is prejudicial to the peace and good order under section 47 (2) (e).

The publication found to be undesirable was JUSTICE IN SA, INJUSTICE SA. The report by the Committee begins in Afrikaans, and switches to English midway. A note states that

"The chairman apologises for having switched languages in this report. It was done quite involuntarily, even absent-mindedly."

The nature of the report makes one wonder whether it was the change of language, or the report itself, to which the 'it' above refers. Extracts from the report are reproduced below.

"1. Die publikasie word uitgegee deur die Students for Social Democracy, 'n radikale, ver-linkse sosialistiese student-organisasie aan die Universiteit van Kaapstad. In die uitgawe van 'Z', 'n publikasie van die SSD, van September 1976, word die siening gehuldig dat onluste sal voortduur selfs al word alle rassediskriminasie afgeskaf, want dan sal Wit en Swart nog nie gelyk wees nie en ' a more strictly economic based reason for rioting would exist'. As 'revolution' vir 'rioting' in hierdie sin sou vervang, is dit suiwer Marxisme.

2. Hierdie uitgawe gee voor om die polisie- en regstelsel in Suid-Afrika as arbitrere en wreed voor te stel, na aanleiding van sterfgevalle en beweerde aanrandings van persone wat deur die polisie aangehou word. Die blote opstel van 'n lys gevalle van beweerde aanrandings, is per se nie ongewens nie. Wat wel ongewens is, is wanneer voorgegee word dat marteling staatsbeleid is, en niks gedoen word om dit te verhoed nie. Dit is hier waar die publikasie o.a. die wet oortree. Voorbeelde volg.

3.(a). Die titel op die voorblad verbind geregtigheid in SA met ongeregtigheid.

(b). Die onafhanklikheid en bevoegdheid van die hof word in twyfel getrek. Op p.1 word gepraat van 'the arbitrariness of the courts' en op p.2 word verklaar 'The courts are powerless to investigate conditions under which prisoners are held.' 'n Regter het wel die mag om te vra dat ondersoek na beweerde mishandeling ingestel word.....

(d). Wat die sake wat aangehaal word betref, word feite wat gunstig vir die Staat of die polisie is, dikwels weggelaat. In verband met die Mdluli geval (p.5) word nie gemeld dat van die wonde aan sy lyk toegedien moes gewees het na sy dood, en nadat o.a. van sy familieledede hom in die doodhuis besoek het. Onderaan p.5 word twyfel uitgespreek oor die egtheid van Mohapi se selfmoordbrief, en word nie gemeld dat 'n handskrif-deskundige in die getuiebank getuig het dat dit wel in Mohapi se handskrif was.....

(e).....Op p.2 onderaan word die oordrewe stelling gemaak that 'Literally hundreds of allegations of torture have remained unanswered by the security police.' Die stelling word op p.7 herhaal - 'Allegations of torture have been left unchallenged by those responsible' - en dit word sonder meer aanvaar dat die polisie verantwoordelik was. Die volgende bewering op p.3 is

