

# BANNED

Eight South Africans have been deprived of the most basic human rights. They are no longer able to study at University, or to speak to more than one person at a time. They may not work in factories or in any building where a newspaper is published. They are forbidden from working for Nusas. They may not speak to any banned person. They may not enter any harbour area or leave the magisterial districts of Cape Town and Wynberg. They may attend no social gathering at which social intercourse takes place. For example, Mrs. Sheila Lapinsky will have to apply for permission to eat with the other two occupants of her home. Paul Pretorius and Paula Ensor, friends for many years and living in the same house, may no longer speak to each other. Dr. Rick Turner is deprived of his livelihood as a University lecturer. Most of the careers open to the eight are now closed to them.

The commission that reported on NUSAS was composed of Members of Parliament whom, in Sir de Villier's Graaf's own words, are politicians not judges. They are not qualified to ultimately conduct a fair and objective trial. The accused have been condemned without knowing what the charges against them are; forbidden to see their own evidence and denied the right to cross examine their anonymous accusers. In fact, in the one case where Mr. Pretorius was able to see some evidence, it was riddled with falsities and inaccuracies. We submit that the commission was nothing more than a political inquisition setting itself up as a court of law.

The government is to set up a permanent "internal security committee". This committee reeks of McCarthyism and suggests that critical debate in opposition to the government and outside the two opposition parties will be repressed. The atmosphere of intimidation and fear that the McCarthy committee created in the United States will soon be surpassed by this committee. Every South African must see his freedom threatened. The government claims there will be no witch-hunting. The witch-hunt has already begun.

The Nationalist party is not known for its concern for civil liberties, but the United Party has always claimed it stands for Western civilised values. It has now revealed itself as a party of doubletalk as the black people of this country have said for many years. The United Party has openly agreed that the students are not communists - but they, nevertheless, endorsed the report that resulted in the eight banning orders. A report based entirely on vague insinuations, innuendo, half truths and plain errors of fact! The commission has been totally unable to prove that anyone has engaged in illegal activities and yet the United Party can only say that they are 'unhappy' about the bannings. In light of previous action by the government, what action did they expect the government to take if but to ban? The United Party have given a greenlight for these bannings and now attempt to escape the consequences

The Nationalist Party will not oppose the bannings. The United Party will not oppose the bannings. We call on you, the public, to oppose them.

issued by S R C

U N I V E R S I T Y O F C A P E  
T O W N.

We, students of the University of Cape Town, ask you, the citizens of Cape Town, to support our petition calling on the United Party to explain its stand on the banning of eight persons, seven of whom are or were office bearers of the National Union of South African Students and the eighth of whom is a University lecturer.

It is contrary to the whole spirit of democracy for the rights of any individual to be undermined without recourse to the law. It is commonly accepted by all civilised nations that before any action which deprives persons of their rights is taken, those individuals concerned be given the opportunity of a fair and open trial, so that they may hear the evidence against them, and prepare their defence. These principles have long been subscribed to by the United Party. However, it now appears that the United Party has sacrificed its former strong stand on these issues in the interests of political expediency. (If the banned individuals are indeed guilty of crimes against our nation, let them be brought to trial at once.) The United Party's stand on the issue is becoming more and more confused. We know that they unanimously supported the Select committee recommendation that action be taken against the eight. We also believe that after 25 years they should know the Nationalist hierarchy well enough to anticipate the kind of action which would be taken. Chaos now reigns in the U.P. ranks with statements and counter statements on the issue of the bannings. The reason for this can be none other than the fact that the United Party is moribund with expediency. They are swaying back and forth in an attempt to please and appease their electorate. What we say to them is this: "We want a clear statement of your position on the question of the rights of individuals in South Africa. We resent this ridiculous situation in which you sway back and forth in an attempt first to identify where potential support lies, before committing yourself. We want a courageous stand! Make it, and we will judge you on the basis of it. We want clarity and positive action".

We, the students, call upon you, the constituents, to challenge your local U.P. M.P. to a debate on the issue of the bannings. We call upon you to sign this petition, and get your M.P. to attempt to justify the United Party's stand. This shilly-shallying should be exposed for the disgrace it is.

issued by the UCT SRC