

Mitchell defends UP role on commission

THE CAPE TIMES

31 MAY 1975

AP1975-1-5-31

Cape Times
Political Staff

THE UNITED PARTY hit back at Reform and Progressive Party criticism yesterday over the Christian Institute affair, and declared its agreement with the principle that local political bodies should not receive aid from foreign financial sources to promote their activities.

In a statement, its Justice Group chairman,

Mr Mike Mitchell, MP for Durban North, said that the Minister of Justice, Mr J T Kruger, could have declared the Institute an affected organization only if he had received an independent factual report from three magistrates.

"Such a report was received by the Minister, and the magistrates found as a fact that the Christian Institute had political objectives and was financed mainly by

foreign sources," Mr Mitchell said.

Attempts were now being made by interests hostile to the United Party to create the impression that the participation of UP commissioners on the Schlebusch/Le Grange Commission was responsible for the Institute being declared affected, and for a breach of the law.

"The United Party stands for the maintenance of the rule of law, and the United Party commissioners have con-



Mr Mitchell

sistently supported this principle. The United Party initially demanded that the inquiry into the organizations concerned should be a judicial one," Mr Mitchell said.

It was unable to persuade the Government and it had felt obliged to ensure that it, as the official opposition, should be represented on the parliamentary commission.

This attitude, Mr Mitchell said, was wholly consistent with the established conduct of parliamentary democracy, and was vindicated when, in the Commission's fourth interim report, the UP commissioners had published a minority report demanding that the freedom of any individual affected by the inquiry should be safeguarded by independent judicial procedures.

The various sections of the commission's report were intended to be considered as a whole but, to remove any doubts caused by the fact that their attitude was not restated in the sixth interim report, the United Party commissioners "again publicly confirmed that their demand applied to the report as a whole."

Kidgloves on

Six-point plan for power transfer

THE RAND DAILY MAIL

31 MAY 1975

By RICHARD WALKER

NEW YORK.

SOUTH AFRICA must agree to "an orderly transfer of power" in South West Africa by "solemnly declaring her intention to withdraw" and accepting a United Nations role in a fair national election, the Security Council was told when the long-awaited debate began yesterday.

In what could be a breakthrough speech with few fiery phrases, Mr Rupiah Banda, Zambia's future Foreign Minister, appeared to drop any demand for an immediate South African exit.

But Mr Banda, who is also head of the Organisation of African Unity committee charged with tackling the "Namibian" situation, made a

SWA

These were:

- "Accept unequivocally self-determination and independence for Namibia (South West Africa).

- "Accept Namibia's territorial integrity and 'prescribe a solution that will retain the unity of the territory as a whole'.

- "Allow the South West African People's Organisation political freedom of movement 'so as to demonstrate that its support does not merely lie within the Ovambo tribe as is often alleged'.

- "Immediately abandon aspects of the extension of apartheid in the territory — 'including police brutality'.

- "Implement 'with integrity and honour' and 'not grudgingly' the decision to give independence to Namibia.

- "Accept a 'United Nations role to ensure a fair national election'."

Mr Banda handled the delicate role of Swapo with kid gloves, but voiced the official OAU line that it was the only body with which South Africa must deal.

He seemed to suggest Swapo must be given the chance to prove itself.

And he appeared to accept South African warnings that an immediate South African withdrawal would be dangerous.

UP under fire for 'aiding Government'

THE CAPE TIMES

31 MAY 1975

Cape Times Political
Staff

THE United Party came under heavy fire yesterday from the Progressive and Reform parties for allegedly aiding the Government to have the Christian Institute declared an affected organization.

Both the United Party MPs on the commission, Mr Lionel Murray and Mr Bill Sutton, said yesterday: "The report on the activities of the Christian Institute reflects in our opinion the evidence made available to the commission."

Mr Murray added later: "I am not surprised that the three magistrates came to the decision that it was a political organization." He did not elaborate.

COLLEAGUES

The Progressive Party's Mrs Helen Suzman said yesterday that after the commission's report, it "was obvious that the Government would seize the opportunity to try to put out of action one of its most courageous opponents."

"Dr Beyers Naude and his colleagues in the



Mrs Suzman

Christian Institute have long been subjected to the grim disapproval of the Nationalist Government. What an opportunity was provided for them by the official opposition conspiring at strong action against the institute.

"The blank cheque given to the Government by the United party has been used. Of all the many disastrous failures to uphold the rule of law in which the United Party has been involved, the signing of the death warrant of the Christian Institute must rank amongst the most despicable."

The Reform Party's Mr David Dalling, MP for Sandton, accused the Gov-

ernment of totally disregarding the rule of law. The United Party, he said, by associating with the recommendations "are wholly implicated in this latest by-passing of the courts."

"No amount of rationalization will convince the public that they intended otherwise. If they wanted to see the due process of the courts being used, why did the United Party commissioners not say so?"

Mr Horace van Rensburg, Reformist MP for Bryanston, added that the United Party's action was a precise repetition of its ignominious performance two years ago when it also collaborated with the Nationalists, which resulted in the banning of students, and brought the United Party to its knees.

"The fact of the matter is that the United Party have not blundered. They support the Nationalist government... for the frightening... but indisputable reason that the right-wing reactionaries who are now in control of the United Party do not respect the rule of law and are not prepared to uphold the rule of law."

CI's greatest mischief

THE CAPE TIMES

31 MAY 1975

DIE BURGER

OVER THE Le Grange Commission's report on the Christian Institute, the usual and expected dialectical ping pong has broken out on the side of the English-language press and everything to the left of the United Party. The case has not been proved, the commission is not a court, the institute was not heard (its people refuse to give evidence) etc.

We ourselves believe that the report argues too much and too long to prove the obvious. Elementary common sense tells us that an organization practising politics on an intensive scale in South Africa, and which is dependent on foreign income sources to the tune of 80, 90 percent of its annual budget of half a million rands is a bad and unpatriotic thing whose wings should be clipped in every available and sensible way. If the CI had been a political party with

such a financial basis, it would have been smashed at the polls at the first opportunity on this evidence alone as a potential fifth column, so that it would have never stood up again.

Whether it tries to prevent or promote a violent solution in South Africa with all its ambiguous religious talk about revolutionary change, is to us a subordinate question next to the hard fact that eight or nine rands of every ten it spends, are contributed by a motley variety of foreigners who were so buttered up about our country and our group relations by its canvassers overseas, that they opened their purses in this measure. With the kind of talk in Europe and America with which the flow of money was kept going, the Christian Institute did immense harm to South Africa, which to our mind exceeds the damage it did, or can ever do at home.

Such a slandering and disparagement of one's fatherland is not an evil to be measured or punished by a court. It is a political action that should be combatted with the available political means.

However, when we come to the CI's attitude on violence, we still believe that those trying to tear the Le Grange report to

pieces, should once again look at the judgment of the most eminent member the CI ever had in the South, the late Professor Andre M Hugo. Last year on August 6, he wrote in the Burger with reference to the notorious Ham-manskraal decision of a conference of the South African Council of Churches where leaders of the CI, played a significant role:

"An important matter mentioned by the Council of Churches, is the so-called 'institutional' violence that is part and parcel of the present South African government system. Each of us who is prepared to be honest will I think, admit that this internal violence exists and that it is an ugly and dangerous thing. On the other hand, we should remember that the term 'institutional or built-in violence' forms part of the revolutionary jargon or fashionable language with which leftist-minded and anarchist agitators throughout the world these days try to justify their own acts of outrageous violence, including arson and murder.

It is an extremely questionable and dangerous weapon to handle, and very definitely in a situation as explosive as ours. With such an argument anything can be explained away".

This was a voice of patriotism and reflection from the CI itself. Let all self-appointed champions of the CI take note of it.

31 MAY 1975

Schlebusch— Vorster's aim

THE latest report of the Le Grange (Schlebusch) Commission is a singularly unimpressive document which is unlikely to damage the standing of the Christian Institute in the eyes of people whose respect is worth having.

As the Institute is now to be prohibited from receiving funds from overseas, the scale of its activities will have to be considerably reduced. The Institute will be thrown back on its own local resources.

But Dr Beyers Naude, the Rev Theo Kotze and their brethren are not the kind of people who are deterred by setbacks. They have achieved much in preparing public opinion for the radical change that is inevitable in South Africa. They have helped to create the climate in which Mr Vorster's détente policies could become viable.

The whole Schlebusch exercise must also be seen in the perspective of party politics. From the start, it has been notable as an example of Mr Vorster's political skill. One of the Prime Minister's objectives is to secure bipartisan parliamentary support for an assault on the radical element in South African politics.

UP split sought

At the same time, Mr Vorster has wanted to split the United Party into its conservative and progressive elements so that he could look to the former, in due course, to bolster his own position against right-wing Nationalist extremists.

Mr Vorster's strategy so far has been remarkably successful. Internal United Party tensions over its attitude to the Commission have already led to Mr S J Marais Steyn crossing the floor to the Nationalist benches. And it will be most surprising if Mr Steyn is not followed by others.

On the other flank, the Schlebusch tensions have shoved Mr Harry Schwarz and his young men into the arms of the Progressives.

Meanwhile, Mr Vorster is looking on with great satisfaction as the United Party goes into another series of internal convulsions.

Political survey

By GERALD SHAW

Vorster is having increasing difficulty in containing his right wing, a political realignment may be closer than now seems likely. The right wing has had to absorb a series of shocks — South West Africa, the Nico Malan, sports policy, the cool Vorsterian attitude to Ian Smith — and may be near its breaking point. Against this, it must be noted that Mr Vorster's sense of just how far he can go without a split has been unerring. If he was seriously prepared to risk such a split, it may be argued, the pace of reform would have been much faster than it has been.

Fusion discussed

For whatever reasons, people who move in political circles are now discussing the possibility of some sort of National Government — on the traditional pattern of fusion or coalition.

It is a fact of history that South Africa has never changed a government simply by voting a single party into the majority at an election. Even in 1948, Dr Malan's Nationalists took over power in association with Mr Havenga's Afrikaner Party. And earlier decades saw the Smuts-Hertzog Fusion and the Hertzog-Labour Pact.

If the Southern African situation deteriorates, the pressures for another Fusion-type exercise might become irresistible.

The question will then be which MP's of the United Party are likely to go in with the Nationalists and which of them would stay out, joining the Prog-Reform alliance in opposition.

More than anything else, perhaps, the question of attitudes to civil rights could be the deciding factor.

The Leader of the Opposition himself, Sir De Villiers Graaff, might feel that his duty lay in a National Government with Mr Vorster. And the Natal English-speaking conservatives — Messrs Radclyffe Cadman, Vause Raw and Bill Sutton — might also find themselves drawn in the same direction.

problems. It is a commendable ambition.

But the facts of South African political life suggest that Mr Vorster's approach to civil liberties and the attitude traditionally upheld by the United Party are poles apart. If there is to be a "bipartisan" approach to security, it could only be on Mr Vorster's terms.

The attachment to civil liberties is strong in the United Party, a historical thread that runs back to the Cape liberal tradition of John X Merriman, whose political battle for constitutional liberties in the Cape Colony at the turn of the century is a glorious chapter in Cape parliamentary history.

Rule of Law

So it was not to be expected that the United Party could equivocate on the Rule of Law without considerable pain and suffering — of the sort which it has experienced since Schlebusch started and which it seems destined to endure until the exercise reaches its inglorious end.

No one is suggesting that the question of civil liberties in times of crisis is a simple one; there are certainly times when law and order is obviously breaking down and emergency action is necessary. But there must be clearly defined safeguards, the emergency must be of defined duration and the authorities must be fully accountable to the legislature for everything they have done.

There are very good reasons why absolutely watertight safeguards are essential when officialdom — and particularly military officialdom — is given sweeping powers over individuals.

This is not because of some abstract theory. It is because of the very concrete fact that such power is ALWAYS abused. There are examples enough in South African history, notably the application of martial law in the Cape Colony under Kit-chener in 1900-1901.

You cannot do this sort of thing without paying the consequences. When citizens lose confidence in the forces of law and order, when security considerations are made a pretext for bloody-minded political repression, the devil is loose in the land.

The whole matter is to be thrashed out in caucus, we are told. Whatever the outcome, the internal debate will intensify the remarkable fluidity in political allegiance that has been apparent for some months. If, as some believe, Mr Schlebusch Commission, there is nothing wrong in an attempt to achieve a bipartisan approach to security.

What is Graaff's political future?

THE CAPE TIMES

31 MAY 1975

SIR DE VILLIERS GRAAFF'S political future has for some time been a matter of intense speculation. Reports of his impending departure have so far been wrong. Since he turns 62 this year and the biennial UP national congress takes place in November, there will naturally be a renewal of interest. He will be nearly 64 when the next congress takes place; and 65 or 66 at the next scheduled general election. This is past the retiring age in most businesses — although South Africa is more indulgent towards its political leaders.

Sir De Villiers is certainly fit. On health — and to a lesser degree age — grounds there is little to commend the belief that he might be preparing to go now. Yet there are other factors.

He has seen his party splinter to the right and left — and now faces as many opponents on Opposition benches as he did when the Progressives first broke in 1959.

He has been sharply attacked by newspapers which traditionally supported him — though the clamour has subsided.

There is no immediate prospect of the UP making the electoral breakthrough necessary to become even a formidable opposition force, let alone the government of the land.

And there is a wide belief that Sir De Villiers's statements, however well reasoned, excellently researched and fully quoted in newspapers, tend to make little impact.

These and other problems do exist — but the party managers despair of finding a person who could do this difficult job better. It is a thankless task, involving Herculean hours of work, little public appreciation, and plenty of criticism. Sir De Villiers has conducted his political life with a good temper and a charm given to few politicians. This, of course, might be part of the problem; many people say "Div is too much of a gentleman".

playing a role when things start moving. This could still be as Leader of the Opposition (if, of course, the Schwarz/Eglin forces do not succeed in their plan to supply the man for the job); or conceivably as a member of a new, broad-based government formed in a crisis atmosphere.

Future toenadering in a different political era could thus be a factor.

SUCCESSOR: WHO COULD IT BE?

That prospect apart, he can reasonably be expected to indicate more clearly who his chosen successor is. To leave the problem in the lap of the national congress could tear the party into an incalculable number of pieces.

In Marais Steyn he had the ambidextrous use of a *de facto* deputy. Now he has a group of advisers, with no one figure dominating.

The front runners appear to be Messrs Cadman, Jacobs and Basson — the last most favoured in the view of many political observers and the Press.

Yet it is unlikely that Mr Basson could command the support of the national congress, where country constituency representation is formidable. Even Sir De Villiers's personal blessing might not be enough to clinch it for him. But clearly Mr Basson has stuck with the UP in the hope that, eventually, it will turn to him.

Mr Cadman, the man with the "fretsaw mind", from Natal, is regarded as too sectional and not sufficiently fluent in Afrikaans — though he is highly respected by the Prime Minister as an able opponent in the House. Mr Jacobs's stock has never been high among those who rate politicians' performances.

The succession problem is obvious.

MOZAMBIQUE — TWO STORIES

TWO stories are coming out of Mozambique, where the first potentially Marxist state bordering on South Africa achieves independence on June 25. One has it that President Samora Machel will almost immediately adopt a totally hostile attitude to both South Africa and Rhodesia — cutting transport links, mine labour and future Cabora power. The other — which seems more likely — is that he will do all he can to destroy Mr Smith's Rhodesia but will defer a confrontation with South Africa, at least until he has established Frelimo control throughout the country, a major problem.

South Africa will be watching the historic events over the border with more than usual interest, and alertness.

Many Whites in Mozambique with South African connections are expected to be conveniently absent from the territory for the festivities.

HAZLITT

Faced with similar circumstances, others might have disappeared quietly from the scene — particularly if they were men of means, and when even some sympathetic quarters were gently hinting that perhaps it's time to go.

But Sir De Villiers has always shown a remarkable degree of tenacity. When in a jam, he is least likely to falter. And his fighting reaction this week to the Progressive-Reform merger plans and his announced trip to Black Southern African states are indications that he intends to stick to his guns — or at least to do nothing to give rise to contrary rumours.

Good reasons, too

There might be compelling political reasons for this, too.

The country is approaching a crisis-point in international and internal relations. To bow out now might mean that after all the years of hard slog Sir De Villiers will be robbed of

4 The Cape Times, Thursday, May 29, 1975

**Cape Times
Chief Reporter**

CERTAIN activities of the Christian Institute of Southern Africa "constitute a danger to the State", says the final re-

port on the Institute submitted by the Le Grange (formerly Schlebusch) Commission of Inquiry into certain organizations.

The 180-page report was tabled in Parliament yesterday.

It says the Christian Institute, including its director, Dr C F Beyers Naude, and the planners of SPROCAS — Study Project on Christianity in Apartheid Society — have



Dr Naude

tried to achieve objectives regardless of the possibility that their actions might lead to the violent overthrow of the authority of the State.

"In fact the leaders of the Institute and, in particular, the publication Pro Veritate, have consistently conditioned public opinion to accept a possible, even an inevitable, violent