

# LIBERAL

# OPINION



---

**LIBERAL OPINION** Subscription is  
75 cents (7/6) for 6 issues.

EDITOR:

Room 1, 268 Longmarket Street, Pietermaritzburg.

## IN THIS ISSUE:

- 1 Banning
  - 2 Royle Pudding
  - 3 Something to Kill
  - 4 James Bond
  - 5 A Master Plan for Unity
- 

**HOW TO DESTROY FREEDOM WHILE  
KEEPING ITS NAME STILL FLYING PIOUSLY  
AT THE MASTHEAD**

## BANNING

(From a letter by Jack Unterhalter published in  
the Rand Daily Mail, 3/5/65.)

On April 13 the Minister of Justice signed at Cape Town banning notices addressed to David Craighead in terms of the Suppression of Communism Act, and these were served by the Security Police at Johannesburg on April 28.

The Minister has so acted because, as he says in the notices, he is satisfied that Mr. Craighead is engaged in activities which are furthering or may further the achievement of any of the objects of Communism. This being the opinion of the Minister, it cannot be challenged in any court of law, because no judge may investigate the facts that led the Minister to this conclusion.

The Minister has formed this opinion on reports that have been given to him, and Mr. Craighead has not seen these reports, nor has he had any opportunity of challenging the correctness or giving an explanation of the facts in the Minister's possession. He has, therefore, in effect been deprived of valuable personal rights without charge and without trial.

We who know him are stunned by what the Minister has done. We know David Craighead as a quiet, unassuming person, completely opposed both to the theory and the practice of Communism as that word is ordinarily understood.

### CATHOLIC

Even if the definitions in the Suppression of Communism Act are read, and these are very wide, we know of nothing that he has done that could bring him within the ambit of the statute.

He was a student at the University of the Witwatersrand during the period 1936 to 1938, and his activities at that time showed clearly that he was a trenchant critic of Communist theory and practice.

He has been active in the Roman Catholic Church for many years, and if it were permissible today to quote what he wrote in Catholic magazines, his attitude would there be seen to be manifest and unequivocal.

He was the Rhodes Scholar for Kimberley, studied at Queen's College, Oxford, and was with the South African Air Force during the war for about five years. He joined the Liberal Party in 1955 and has been its chairman in the Transvaal for the last two years.

Here again his every action, as also his membership of the Catholic Church, showed us that he was not a Communist, whether statutory or otherwise.

In November of last year he became the chairman of the Defence and Aid Fund in South Africa. This is a body that has been responsible for providing accused persons with lawyers to defend them in the courts of law, more especially on charges of committing political offences. His services there as an organiser were invaluable, and as he may now no longer work for it, it has been dealt a crippling blow because there are few people today who have the courage to take over work such as this.

### CIVIL RIGHTS

David Craighead studied and understood the problems of the Defence Aid Fund in each centre where it worked in South Africa.

He helped its committees to protect the basic civil rights of people alleged to have committed offences because of political beliefs. The case for the defence was thus adequately

presented. When matters were taken on appeal with the assistance of the fund, sentences were sometimes reduced.

Together with other organisations the fund helped the families of political prisoners—wives and children who had lost the support of husbands and fathers.

This work has been questioned by some, but in a civilised society the principle of a fair trial for every man must prevail, no matter how grave the charge against him. It is this principle that David Craighead has upheld. Has he been banned because of this?

With a record such as I have described, and bearing in mind that both the Liberal Party and the Defence and Aid Fund are lawful organisations, it should be understood why his colleagues are dumbfounded. But the social implications of this ban must also be understood, because they are grave indeed.

There are woven into our institutions noble traditions which we have inherited from a great civilisation. Thus, we are proud of our courts and the independent judges who preside over them to safeguard the individual citizen from the wrongful acts of his fellow or of the State.

We point to our Parliament, where our laws are debated and where an opposition may speak.

We enjoy a Press that is outspoken and critical and that informs a public in order that authority may be aware of public opinion and respond to it.

It is also said that anyone can oppose and criticise a doctrine such as apartheid, and the outside world is referred to the fact that a political organisation such as the Liberal Party is permitted to exist in the Republic, even though it espouses the policy of universal franchise for all people, whether Black, White, Indian or Coloured.

These are aspects of our public life to which our ambassadors refer when they reply to criticism of the Republic: and these are relied on by individuals and organisations when they defend the country's good name.

### GUARDING

These traditions must be guarded, and some of the ways of guarding them are in the exercise of the right to oppose the Government of the day by lawful means and by taking care to see that a person is adequately defended when he is charged with a crime.

At all times and in all societies these rights may be threatened or infringed and people must feel free to assert them and support them without fear of punishment for their stand.

David Craighead in his work is an example of a man who exercised his rights to oppose the present Government and who did it lawfully. He also devoted himself to the cause of protecting the accused by giving him a defender when he stood before the judge.

Others, and especially younger people, may be inspired by this example, but will they act on it? They may be fearful that in following him they, too, will suffer the bans that now restrict him, and their parents likewise, in fear, may try to persuade them to safer conduct. If this should become the general manner of thinking, then conscience will die and with it will go these noble traditions.

Certainly the fear is abroad. What has happened to David Craighead does nothing to allay it. What has happened to the Liberal Party in recent months does everything to strengthen it.

**The Party has not been declared an unlawful organisation, and there is nothing in its activities that could justify such a declaration, but recently 25 members have had imposed upon them the restrictions here described.**

### SILENCE

This has taken away from the Party most of its leadership, and if the Minister continues in this way, he will destroy it without declaring it unlawful.

It is idle to claim that there is freedom of expression of unpopular political views in South Africa when by a method such as this the Liberal Party is silenced.

David Craighead was not detained during the 1960 emergency, nor under the 90-day law. His premises have never been searched, nor has he ever been interrogated by the police. He has never been charged with any offence.

In the light of all this, the inference seems irresistible that he has been proscribed as a leader of the Liberal Party as part of a plan to destroy it and to intimidate its supporters.

## ROYLE PUDDING

### PASSIONFRUIT

An interesting and even passionate correspondence has been the fruit of what seems to have been a fairly explosive seed sowed by Mr. Peter Royle in our last issue. Mr. Royle

wrote on "The Challenge of Nationalism", and to sum up his article fairly thoroughly, the points he made were as follows:—

- (1) That European or "White" nationalism is a negative, destructive, irresponsible and "mindless" phenomenon;
- (2) That the main flow of African nationalism is a positive, creative, responsible and **intelligent** (in the sense that it can bear the probings of reason) phenomenon;
- (3) That this being the case, there is no reason why Liberals should not support African nationalism;
- (4) That it is a failing among Liberals that many do **not** support it; a **failing**, because to deny the existence or group feelings is to deny one aspect of the reality of human beings;
- (5) **Conclusion:** That Liberals should get rid of this **failing**, take the fact of nationality into account, and "ride the tiger of African nationalism."

### BOUQUET

Before he submits himself to cross-examination, let us allow Mr. Royle to take a bow.

It was pure delight for me to read my own rough, ready and ill-expressed ideas metamorphosed into succinct, crystalline and (dare I say?) elegant prose.

I wish our Liberal ideology, expressed in an article of this high calibre, could be reprinted in at least one periodical with a wide circulation among White South Africans.

Is this wish impossible of fulfilment?

—Heather Morkill, Pietermaritzburg.

[Editor's comment: Periodicals with wide circulations among White South Africans are *Die Huisgenoot*, *Die Brandwag*, *Femina*, *Personality*, *Stage and Cinema*, and *Farmers' Weekly*.]

### BRICKBAT

Miss Morkill seems to assume that Mr. Royle's article expresses "our Liberal ideology". Such is not the case, it appears, for the article was criticised by our National Chairman, who writes: