

PCC/11(9/57)1



Beware of Melancholy

COC Nov 1 '65

ALAN PATON

We are pleased to share with our readers once again the views of the distinguished South African novelist Alan Paton. This column is reprinted from the July issue of *Contact*, to which he contributes regularly. This journal "for united nonracial action" was the first paper in South Africa to charge the Government with brutality and torture. Because of its forthright stands since its inception in 1958, five *Contact* editors, including the able Patrick Duncan, have been banned. We called attention to its plight in our November 16, 1964 issue ("Contact With South Africa"). The staff itself is forced to print the paper since more than 35 printers proved too intimidated to do so. *Contact's* life still hangs in the balance; contributions and subscriptions (\$2) may be sent to *Contact*, P.O. Box 1979, Cape Town, South Africa.

THE EDITORS

ALL THE VISITORS ask me—the American, the British, the Scandinavian—what is the future? They ask me as though I had some special knowledge. South Africans ask me too. Experience has taught me the answer, and the answer is, "I do not know." At the moment it is possible to believe that nothing will change, that Afrikaner nationalism will never consent to any change that threatens its own position of power, however remote that threat may be. In its treatment of its enemies, it is becoming quite merciless. Those who openly oppose apartheid (or separate development, to give it its sweeter name) are going to suffer more, not less.

It is plain to me that the only opposition that will be allowed to continue will be an opposition that differs only in respect to the way apartheid is implemented. It is plain to me that ex-members of the banned organizations are going to face punishment even if they meet together as friends to discuss the events of the times. It is plain to me that the Government, believing that it has crushed subversive action, is prepared to move more ruthlessly into the field of ideas.

In the eyes of the Government, if you are a member of a political organization and that organization is banned, it is your plain duty to stop thinking politically. It is your plain duty, in fact, to change your character and personality; and if you do not, you will be put in prison. I have no doubt whatever that if the Government were to bring in a bill making it an offense to speak of separate development in a way considered by the Minister to be contrary

to the public interest, it would be passed by a large majority, Helen Suzman and a few others opposing.

There is another thing that is plain to me, and it is not a pleasant thing either. Any person who, at the expiration of his or her ban, picks up public life where he or she left it off will be banned again immediately. This person, too, has to change his or her character and personality, or has to accept a life cut off from the life of society.

The full meaning of a ban and the full legal implications of a ban have not yet been clearly established, but there is the shocking possibility that judicial interpretations will become stricter and stricter, and that ultimately a ban will be interpreted as meaning a complete severance of all personal relations outside the immediate family, if the banned person has one.

These facts are shocking. Much more shocking than the facts of Stellenbosch sex and municipal corruption. In a way I hesitate to write them down, but write them down I must, and look at them we all must, for this is the immediate future that I see.

For how long will this future last? My answer is, "I do not know." To me there is another question: how long can I last? and there is still another question: is it worth trying to last?

People answer this question in different ways. Some leave the country. Some leave politics. Some stick to their course, even if they expect certain consequences. And even this last group is diverse, for some would face *any* consequences and some would not.

What is my own answer to this question? I must give my own answer, because I would not dare to answer it for anyone else. I think it is worth trying to last. It is worth something to me, even if it apparently achieves little.

If someone were to ask me, "What would you and your wife do if you had young children?" I would answer—"We would have two choices, to stay here and to give our children a father and mother who put some things even above their own children's safety and happiness; or to leave, and give our children a father and mother who put their safety and happiness above all else." Which would I choose? They are both good courses, are they not? I hope I would choose the first.

To those who want to stay, whether out of love or duty or plain cussedness, I direct these words.

Stand firm by what you believe, do not tax yourself beyond endurance, yet calculate clearly and coldly how much endurance you have, don't waste your breath and corrupt your character by cursing

your rulers and the South African Broadcasting Corporation. Don't become obsessed by them, keep your friendships alive and warm, especially those with people of other races, beware of melancholy and resist it actively if it assails you, and give thanks for the courage of others in this fear-ridden country.

Asian Views on the Indo-Pakistani War

We print the following article as an indication of responsible Christian sentiment in India regarding the current episode with Pakistan. The writer is Juhanon Mar Thoma, the respected Metropolitan of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church. THE EDITORS

The undeclared war between India and Pakistan, which has come to an end with the good offices of the United Nations, poses a problem to the Western countries as well as to India. The present conflict was born in 1947 when the Maharaja of Kashmir opted to join the Indian Republic and Pakistan laid claim to it as a Muslim country and marched in the army. A full-scale war was halted when a cease-fire line was accepted through UN mediation.

At that time Pundit Nehru agreed to a plebiscite. But it was not worked out because of Pakistan's refusal to withdraw its army of occupation. This was necessary to pave the way for a plebiscite under proper conditions. The Pakistan-occupied area came to be known as Azad Kashmir. The rest, called Jammu Kashmir, became Indian territory. Ever since then there has been small-scale infiltration of Pakistanis into Indian territory and constant bickering between the two countries.

Now Pakistan has taken up the plebiscite cry and India will not accept this time-worn agreement because of a completely changed situation. Nehru himself made it clear that to accept this principle of self-determination at this late hour would create problems, since there are Muslim and Sikh majority areas in the Indian Republic. If a plebiscite is good for one part, it will seem reasonable to apply it to other parts also. Would the United Kingdom allow a plebiscite in Scotland and Wales?

If this cease-fire will help Pakistan to accept the principle of coexistence with its neighbors, the question may perhaps find a settlement in the division of Kashmir, however sad a solution that may be.

During the past few years Pakistan has been strengthening itself as a great military power with liberal purchases of arms of all descriptions from the United States. Kindhearted and Communist-fearing America thought she was strengthening Pakistan against Communist attack. India has rightly pointed out that Pakistan was in league with China and that the arms and ammunition supplied were meant to be used against India to settle the Kashmir question. The US, satisfied with the promise of Pakistan that they were not to be so used, made it plain that

its aid was to strengthen Pakistan against Communist attack.

Events have now substantiated India's fear. Unfortunately this is not the first time that American aid, however well intentioned, has been used for purposes not to the credit of the donors. The aid to Chiang Kai-shek went to fatten feudalistic war lords, and China became Communist. Now the US Navy has its hands full protecting Formosa and Chiang. In Indonesia and Vietnam also American aid is not serving its purpose.

To continue the Pakistan story, President Ayub Khan and others were hoping that after the removal of the strong hand of Nehru the attitude of the Indian Government might change. But the strong stand taken by the Shastri Government, declaring that there was no Pakistan problem for India because Kashmir was definitely a part of Indian territory embarrassed Pakistan authorities. The result was an armed infiltration into Kashmir, through passes not protected by UN observers. It was hoped that there would be an insurrection in Kashmir to be followed by revolts all over India where the Muslims were strong. In this calculation Pakistan was completely mistaken. The entry of Pakistan's army into Indian-occupied territory made it necessary for India to move its army to Pakistan—not for conquest or retaliation but to prevent further violation of Indian territory by controlling probable approaches.

India for the first time has experienced what a war means. Her soldiers acquitted themselves well. By the time of cease-fire the Indian Army had occupied 490 square miles of Pakistani lands and the Pakistani 250 square miles of Indian land.

One question worries India and pains Indian Christians. It is widely believed that the United Kingdom is anti-Indian and that the US is pro-Pakistan. Minister of Foreign Affairs Bhutto and Ayub Khan have successfully managed to win the sympathy of Western nations by harping on the principle of self-determination and by picturing themselves as a small country being bullied by its big neighbor.

Some Western people ask why India should lay claim to a Muslim country. Is religion to determine the boundaries of national states? And remember India has 50 million Muslims living in amity with Christian and Hindu neighbors. India is strong in its stand because it cannot allow a Chinese-allied country along its borders. India does not want an