

1963 DAY OF AFFIRMATION—SPEECHES BY ARCHBISHOP DENNIS HURLEY AND JONTY DRIVER

**ACADEMIC  
FREEDOM  
AND  
HUMAN  
FREEDOM**



## FOREWORD

Ever since 1959, when the Extension of University Education Act and the Fort Hare University College Transfer Act became law, NUSAS has looked for ways in which to continue its public witness of the belief in academic freedom. Although the long struggle of NUSAS, and of staff and students of Universities and University Colleges in NUSAS to preserve what academic freedom did exist in South Africa came to nothing we felt that our struggle was not a short term one it must go on as long as NUSAS existed.

However, in our public witness, we did not wish to mourn merely the lost remnants of academic freedom, for we knew the full academic freedom could never exist in an undemocratic country and we knew too that to mourn something that had never really existed was pointless.

We decided instead to affirm our belief in academic freedom in anticipation of its achievement but at the same time we knew that it was not enough to affirm our belief in academic freedom without affirming our belief in human freedom because we realised that without human freedom we could not have academic freedom.

On 16th May 1963 the first Day of Affirmation of Academic Freedom and Human Freedom was organised. During the days preceding the national event centres affiliated to NUSAS held individual events on each campus. Then on the 16th the President of all University Student Representative Councils affiliated to NUSAS, the President of Student Representative Council of the Johannesburg College of Education and a representative of the students of the Fort Hare University College, together with the the NUSAS President assembled at a mass rally the Durban city hall.

The guest speaker that evening was Archbishop Dennis Hurley, chosen by us to speak because he represented so much more than political commitment or intellectual involvement. The chairman of the meeting was Mr W.T.Mhlambiso, then Chairman of the Joint Board of the Student Representative Councils of Natal University and sometime Vice-President of NUSAS. The other speaker was the President of NUSAS.

In this booklet we publish the speeches made by the Archbishop and by the NUSAS President as well as the Declaration signed by the student representatives.

The organisation of such a national event was perhaps only a minor step towards the achievement of a South African in which academic freedom could exist. It was however public witness by a few people where too many have lost their courage even to say in public what they believe.

NUSAS is resolved that it will continue its public witness, this year, next year and the years after, until we in South Africa have gained what we must fight for continually; a democratic society in which we can have true education.

MAEDER OSLER  
Vice-President

JONTY DRIVER  
President

DECLARATION  
OF ACADEMIC AND HUMAN FREEDOM  
IN SOUTH AFRICA

WE, meeting here as representatives of students of universities, university colleges and teacher training colleges throughout South Africa, wish to affirm our belief in academic freedom and human freedom.

WE believe that academic freedom is the right of students and of the institutions at which they study. We believe that it is the right of a university to decide for itself whom it will teach, who will teach, what will be taught and how the teaching will be done; that it is the responsibility of a university to ensure that no unjust discrimination is practised in academic life on the grounds of race, religion or politics; that it is the duty of a university to guarantee the rights of unconditional participation in the opportunities and privileges made available by belonging to the university,

that the responsibility of the university to the academic world, and through the unprejudiced pursuit of truth, has a value far more important than the transitory aims of party-politicians, or temporary fears of electorates.

WE pledge ourselves to work for the attainment of this ideal, within the realms of all freedoms, of association, of speech and of movement, for we realise that true academic freedom can exist only in a democratic South Africa; whose society is based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and on the highest regard for the integrity of educational and human freedom.

SIGNATORIES :

ARCHBISHOP DENNIS HURLEY

THAMI MHLAMBISO

President of Students' Representative Council, University of Natal (Non-European Section)

JONTY DRIVER

President of NUSAS

HUGH KOWARSKY

President of SRC  
University of Witwatersrand

ROGER JOWELL

President of SRC  
University of Cape Town

CLIVE ACTON

President of SRC  
Johannesburg College of Education

ANTHONY LEVY

President of SRC  
University of Natal (Durban)

MAEDER OSLER

President of SRC  
University of Natal (Pietermaritzburg)

E.K. MOORCROFT

Vice-President of SRC  
University of Rhodes

# "ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN SOUTH AFRICA"

by

Archbishop Dennis Hurley

\* \* \*

A legitimate question that must occur to the audience this evening is: What right has a Catholic Archbishop to talk about academic freedom? It is a good question and the answer is not a simple one, for as you know, in its long and turbulent history, the Catholic Church has not found the question of freedom an easy one to solve. In the early years of the Church its members died for the right to practise their religion freely and have been doing so at regular intervals ever since.

One who died at the hands of the Nazis in 1945, a German Jesuit priest, wrote the following letter :-

"Whether or not this is to be a farewell letter I do not know. This is something we never know these days. I do not know whether or when these lines will reach you, but I am not writing them as my "last" greeting to you. Somehow I have a fixed and certain belief in life and in a new mission, but I must also admit that with human eyes I see little possibility for it.

"You ask me how I am? There's not much to say. Do not be afraid. I will try to remain calm even in the face of the

gallows; for the strength of God goes with me in all my ways. But it has been difficult at times. Frequently Georg was reduced to little more than a bloody, whimpering mass. While I've been writing, evening has come. We don't get to write very often since we're handcuffed most of the time. But over and over again Georg has tried to fit his whimpers into the framework of the only two realities that give any value at all to our existence - adoration and love. Everything else is an illusion. Believe me, these vigils are a bitter and inexorable judgment on one's past life. Yet one's life is not really past. It looms there like a great question demanding the ultimate answer, the answer that impresses upon one's life an ineradicable character. If I would only be allowed once more ...

"Ah yes, if I could only have one more chance! Is there no way out of the situation in which God has placed me? All that I have undertaken has failed. One door after another has slammed shut - even those I was sure would always be open for me. No help came to me from the outside. So now I am put to the test: bound and locked in a narrow cell. There are only two ways out: one the road of the gallows that ends in the glorious light of God, the other the road of the miracle that terminates in a new mission. In which do I believe?

"The Kindergarten of Death". Every day we are taken outside for an hour and led around stiffly in a ring, well guarded by armed attendants. Then we walk the circle, all of us in chains - civil servants, labourers, officers, diplomats and business men. Only when we come to the corners of the wall can we speak so that the prisoner behind can hear. This is the way to carry on our conversation in the "Kindergarten of Death". Yesterday I asked a Protestant colleague whether he thought we would ever hold religious services again ...

"May God protect you all . . . ."  
Georg.

The writer who called himself Georg was Father Alfred Delp. He wrote of the only two realities that give any value to our existence - adoration and love. He refers with obvious affection to a Protestant colleague (Eugen Gerstenmaier).

Yet the Church that nourished that deep, affectionate and indomitable spirit has been deeply involved in the course of its history in the violent suppression of heresy. It had had its Inquisition. It still has its Index of Forbidden Books. Countries that have been deeply influenced by it have not been among the greatest promoters of religious freedom and democracy. It would dearly love to sweep the name and the memory of Galileo under the carpet; but seems destined to live with it until the end of time - a salutary reminder.

It is no good our saying that other organisations and institutions have a far worse record, that we have suffered more martyrdoms than we have inflicted. That we should have inflicted any is a nightmare for any religion to have to live with, especially a religion that educated the barbarian of Western Europe and helped him to build a civilisation with the Faith of the Bible, the philosophy of Greece and the jurisprudence of Rome.

Most of our difficulties with freedom belong to history now. But history leaves its legacy and there are a number of points that we have still to clear up. One of the toughest debates in the Second Vatican Council may well be on religious authority and freedom. A religion that represents the divine and claims to deliver a message from God cannot but assert



authority. Its problem is how to relate that authority to the freedom of the human conscience. The last word will probably never be said on the subject but many of us hope that the Council will arrive at much more positive and constructive formulation than we have ever reached in the past.

All that by way of an apologia - a justification of my presence on the platform this evening talking to you about academic freedom.

The Catholic Church is not unique in experiencing difficulties about freedom. Freedom is always a problem, for freedom is in the very marrow of the human mystery. Freedom is the necessary concomitant of intelligence. Once you have an intelligence which, like the human one, rises above the level of sentient image and reaction to the sphere of interpretation, assessment and judgment, you must have freedom. Intelligence makes it possible to transcend the limits of the concrete impression that impinges on the senses and to consider a variety of aspects of reality - to analyse, tabulate and codify. A capacity that interprets, assesses and judges requires a power of decision, a mysterious dynamism that puts a stop to the inquiring and debating and says unequivocally "This must be done". This is freedom, the capacity for choice and decision. It is, so to speak, the other side of the coin of intelligence. Intelligence and freedom differentiate man from brute animals. They make him what he is. No wonder he should identify them with his very being and find in them the essentials of his human dignity.

But this is only one aspect of the mystery of man. Another aspect is the social. Man by the necessity of his being seeks his perfection and fulfillment in community. He cannot do otherwise, for alone he is not much good to himself. His intelligence remains rudimentary, his freedom frustrated, unless he finds their development in contact with

his fellow-men. Human growth is dependent upon a multitude of men mingling their intelligence and freedom and finding inspiration and enrichment in the encounter.

The encounter, however, immediately raises all sorts of problems for freedom. For society cannot function without authority and it is never easy to find the balance between the two, and to establish the safeguards necessary to prevent authority from becoming raw and oppressive power.

There is the added complication that freedom is never found in a pure and unadulterated abstract form. It is found as a number of concrete freedoms embedded in a particular society. And that society is a living and developing thing carrying within it a multitude of historical memories and characterised by the mental and emotional habits that have grown out of its experience. You cannot graft a system from the outside on to a human community. You may succeed for a while in imposing the semblance of conformity by force, but the tendency will always be present to shake off that force and grow from within. We are witnessing at present how the newly emancipated African societies are going through the process of absorbing what they can from their encounter with the West and of discarding what they find unassimilable. They will only keep what they can absorb into their being and mould into their own internal growth.

It is for this reason that it is dangerous to be doctrinaire about what form freedom should take in a given society. Each society must work out that problem for itself unless the problem overflows and expands into a threat to others. Freedom in society is not a ready-made plan that descends from the skies and moulds human society in its image. Freedom in society is a multitude of personal freedoms seeking

accommodation with one another and the most practical cultural and political expressions of this accommodation in the light of developing experience.

The freedom we are considering here this evening is academic freedom and the context in which we are considering it is the contemporary South African scene. Academic freedom has a wide connotation. It concerns those who teach and those who learn both at pre-university and at university level. It concerns the right of parents in regard to the education of their children, and the right of the citizens as a whole to have a say in regard to public teaching institutions and access to them, to found institutions independently of the state if they so wish, and to demand that some of the public monies be made available to them if they are doing a public service.

All these things and many others are involved in the idea of academic freedom but we are not here to make a searching study of the topic. We are here to consider one particular aspect of academic freedom as it concerns South Africa, namely, the right of the university to admit whom it likes and the right of all citizens academically qualified to seek admission.

The context in which we are discussing this issue is of a South Africa that is trying desperately to give definite and concrete expression to a theory of territorial separation. There is a bill at present before Parliament, the Bantu Laws Amendment Bill, which is in a certain sense the coping stone of apartheid because it will effectively deprive Africans of the last vestige of economic rights outside the Bantu areas. The Bantu areas are about 13% of the total extent of the country. The non-Bantu areas are 87%. When this Bill is law, Africans will not have the shadow of a right to domicile, movement and work

in that 87% of the country. Every step they take, every hour they remain, every cent they earn can be governed by permit.

The Bill provides that the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development can declare any part of South Africa which is not a Bantu area a "prescribed" or "designated" area. Once he has done that the presence of an African in the area is dependent on the possession of a work permit. There is a distinction between exempt and non-exempt persons but it seems to amount to this: a non-exempt person without a work permit must be out of the area inside 72 hours or face penal consequences. The exempt person without a work permit and his dependents may hang around until a formal order to go is issued. The basic implication of this Bill is that the Government will have the power to declare that our eleven million African citizens have absolutely no rights except in 13% of the country, a 13% which according to reliable estimates is incapable at the present time of supporting more than half its present population of three-and-a-half million or thereabouts. If it was not for the money earned by migrant workers there would be whole-sale starvation in the African areas. Nevertheless, once the new Bill is through they are the only places where an African will have the right to set his foot except by the grace and favour of the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development and the hierarchy of labour bureaux about to be set up.

The Bill is intended to be a very important step towards finalising separate citizenship for Africans, a citizenship attached solely to the African areas and enjoying no rights whatsoever in other areas, not even the right of immigration conceded to people in other lands and continents. If we take this in conjunction with what is going on in the Transkei we are expected to believe that the separate Bantu homelands are on their way

endowed with the right to evolve towards whatever degree of independence changing circumstances will render possible.

The circumstances here are all important. I have already mentioned the circumstance that the African areas are at present incapable of supporting more than half their present population. They could be developed of course. In the light of scientific advance there seems to be no really insoluble production problem. But the solution of them requires not only science, and capital, but as Russia and China have learned, the free and vigorous co-operation of the people concerned. It is not easy to give free and vigorous co-operation to plans that, despite their intrinsic merits, are associated with policies derogatory to one's freedom and dignity.

The policy of apartheid is apparently not to be applied as yet in the same degree to Coloured and Asian citizens, though obviously it will continue to be pushed as far as it can go short of arrangements on a territorial basis.

Another circumstance of the utmost importance is the one that inspired the "No Trial Act". This Act placed our security measures on a war-time footing. We are now living in a permanent state of emergency owing presumably to the fact that there are determined opponents of the present South African policy both outside and inside the country capable of inflicting serious damage unless the country's security is keyed to war-time pitch of efficiency and precision.

It is not likely that this situation will ease within the foreseeable future. On the contrary there is every likelihood that the security measures will become more severe as the threat grows in intensity. Nothing that South Africa can do in the line of separate development will ever convince Africans that the policy is not a slur upon the man of colour. This Continent will never rest until that slur is removed.

The Continent, I say, for no man of colour, and particularly no African, will ever concede that apartheid is an internal affair of South Africa. It hurts him too deeply no matter where he lives. How long it will take to remove the slur no one knows but we can be assured that the emergency will go on as long as any form of apartheid remains.

For this reason it is difficult to imagine anyone seriously believing in effective independence for the Bantustands unless the "border industry" which we are most interested in promoting is the erection of block-house and police-posts.

This is, in broad outline, the South African context in which we are making our affirmation of academic freedom, our belief in the right of the university to admit anyone it wishes to lecture or learn or pursue research within its walls and the right of any citizen, academically qualified, to be admitted.

It is appropriate that university people should be doing such things for, among all the institutions of the country, it is certain of the universities that have the finest record in practical racial justice. When these universities were legally able to do so they threw their doors open willingly to non-white students. Now that they are forbidden to admit them, their representatives continue to profess their faith in academic freedom and to protest against the limitations imposed on it.

This is a splendid gesture in a country where most of us in a position to do so seem to have grown too tired or too discouraged or too frightened to make our act of faith and register our protest - frightened if not of the Government then of what is taking place in the rest of Africa.

Your affirmation and protest are an act of faith in the spiritual quality of freedom. South Africa's greatest failing is that it looks upon freedom as a measurable quantity, as if it were some material commodity in short supply. It is quite true that, in the case of material commodities, what is given to one person cannot be given to another.

But this is not true of spiritual realities. In fact one of the chief criteria of distinction between the material and the spiritual is that the former is governed by quantity, and subject to measurement, and the latter is not. An idea has no quantity and cannot be measured. Nor has freedom.

If I share my idea or my freedom with another I am not the loser. I still have as much as before, even more; for my idea and my freedom grow by being shared with others. I have heard it said that scientists hope one day to be able to measure the force of ideas and decisions by counting brain and nerve impulses. If this is true, I am afraid they are wasting their time. Brain and nerve impulses may be subject to measurement but the mysterious realities of which they are the corporeal expressions, vehicles and messengers will no doubt continue to evade all attempts at measurement.

It is a pity that we cannot accept this conviction in South Africa - that things like ideas and freedom and rights and civilisation and friendship are not commodities bound by quantitative considerations and likely to run out if we are too lavish with them. The history of mankind is one long reminder that the more you share the gifts of the spirit the more you enrich mankind and the more that enrichment redounds to your own benefit. One shudders specially when one hears that all the restrictions and oppressions

of apartheid are necessary to preserve "Christian civilisation". The Founder of Christianity said:

"He that will save his life shall lose it; and he that shall lose his life for my sake shall find it". (Mt. 16: 25)

This Affirmation of Academic Freedom and Freedom generally is a splendid thing, but it has its implications.

It cannot be made in abstraction from the total South African scene. If we believe in freedom we must believe in all the concrete freedoms in which it is realised, including the freedoms shortly to be abolished so finally and drastically by the Bantu Laws and Amendment Bill. We must include in our act of faith, a renunciation of the sneaking hope that perhaps after all the Bantustans may be the answer.

I believe that this sneaking hope is growing in South Africa, and that increasing numbers of our white citizens, appalled at the prospect of a Congo or a Kenya, are saying: "There is no other way out; we must give the Bantustans a trial". To be able to say that with a good conscience one must be reasonably optimistic about two conditions: that the Bantustans can succeed and that they can be established without injustice. By succeed, I mean provide a situation in which Africans can advance to the full enjoyment of cultural, economic and political rights, including the right to a sense of individual and social dignity and self-respect.

Those of us who find the Bantustans unacceptable do not believe that these conditions can be realised.



In regard to the first condition, reasonable hope of success, I have already referred to the economic problem, the difficulty of securing the wholehearted co-operation of the people and the political impossibility of granting effective self-government to Bantustans which must inevitably gravitate into the camp of African Nationalist hostility to South Africa.

Then there is the question of justice.

If the Bantu Laws Amendment Bill is any indication, justice cannot be done in the pursuit of the Bantustan policy. It never can, when people have to be callously uprooted and deprived of their most sacred and fundamental rights. There is also another aspect to this question of justice.

If the establishment of Bantustans is to be looked upon as a just sharing out of the country between the races, a fundamental rule of justice must be observed; that no one should be the judge in his own cause.

Yet that is the prerogative that the white race is claiming in South Africa.

Under these circumstances I do not know how anyone with a sense of justice can say that the Bantustans should be given a trial run. It is like proposing that a bandit should be given a trial run to see if good can come of his efforts.

What else remains? If the Bantustans are ruled out then the white man is doomed in South Africa. Why doomed? It can only be a question of doom if the most important thing about the white man is that he is white. Being white puts him in the same category as tick-birds and white elephants, and it is of course up to him to decide whether or not it means more to him to be in that category than to share intelligence and freedom with Africans, Coloureds and Asians.

No one can offer a quick and easy solution to the South African problem because it is a problem involving the intractable and explosive stuff of human emotion that can prove so frightfully irrational. But we are here this evening to make our Affirmation of Academic Freedom and Freedom generally, and this Affirmation brings us face to face with the context in which we make it. It is in many ways a painful context, but we cannot make our act of faith without looking at the context squarely and deciding on our own personal attitude to it.

There is, perhaps, little that any of us can do except remember that when we talk of freedom we talk of men and women and children for whom freedom was intended and who cannot live the life that God gave them without it nor develop the rich gifts He bestowed on them.

We talk too much about groups and categories and plans and policies in this country and not enough about human beings.

This is probably because the white man's prejudices forbid him to meet the human being in the person of another race.

The ogre that he fears does not exist, the ogre of non-white inhumanity ready to pounce and rend and destroy his economic well-being, his freedom and his "Christian Civilisation".

The white man seldom gets to know the warm humanity and friendliness of the Coloured people, the unity, discipline and affection of the Indian household, the courtesy, respect and good humour of African life. It is mortifying as a white man to hear a venerable African commenting with a sigh that the white man "has no manners". It is doubly mortifying because it is true. The white man has no

manner because he does not realise he is dealing with human beings.

How we white men shall ever learn manners I do not know. Things look pretty black at the moment, but perhaps in God's mercy we shall be spared the worst. Perhaps by some miracle of His grace all of us who believe that there is a just and human solution to South Africa's problems shall manage to get together - university people, church people, business people, family people, people like the very brave ministers of the Dutch Reformed Churches and professors of the Afrikaans Universities who dare to swim against the stream - get together and learn from one another the vision and the courage necessary to transform our country.

Perhaps, too, (and this is a very big perhaps), the rest of the world, including our African neighbours will be impressed by our good will and renounce their boycotts and embargoes, so that even before we achieve anything substantial, we may have the benefit of their sympathy, their fraternal support and their economic co-operation. This co-operation would be valuable to both sides. South Africa has much to offer. And whatever we receive that contributes to our economic prosperity must inevitably be spread among all sections of our population. An economically expanding South Africa will be incapable of perpetrating all the follies its apartheid laws empower it to. And the extension of economic wellbeing to the oppressed sections of our population will be but the prelude to their enjoyment of other rights.

These suggestions may constitute no more than dreamy musings inspired by the idealistic atmosphere of your Day of Affirmation. They certainly provide no concrete and detailed proposals. But perhaps one may be forgiven one's musings if they can contribute to a new mood, and a new mood in South Africa would make anything possible.

\* \* \*

# "O N F R E E D O M"

by

C.J. Driver : President of the  
National Union of  
South African  
Students, 1963-64.

\*  
\*  
\*

There is a song, sung by Africans in the pass offices of Johannesburg, which is really the series of questions asked by the little bureaucrat who sits at his little window:

"Who is your chief ?  
Who do you work for ?  
Where do you come from ?  
Whose river do you drink ?"

and which ends with the refrain:

"We mourn for our country"

It is one of the terrible things about this Day of Affirmation that, as we affirm our belief in academic freedom and human freedom, we mourn for our country, mourn for what is being done to it in the name of "white civilisation", by those who think of themselves as the custodians of all that is good and proper. We are here to tell them what we think is good and proper, what we believe is the basis of civilisation.

For this reason, I hope I shall be forgiven if I address the first part of what I have to say to the white South Africans in this audience. I do

this, not because of any sort of racialism, but because, since people in this country have been divided into black and white, one is sometimes forced to speak directly to white or to black. I wish that what I have to say could be heard by all white South Africans, because I would like to tell them what I think they have done to themselves by their stupidity of race superiority, what hatred they have created, and what they have done that makes it necessary for us to mourn for our country.

What I want to say has already been said, in 1858, by Abraham Lincoln, a greater President than I am, but a man who was, in many ways, what I am: an agitator - he said to white America then:

"When you have succeeded in de-humanising the Negro, when you have put him down, and made it impossible for him to be but as the beasts of the field, when you have extinguished his soul in this world and placed him where the ray of hope is blown out as in the darkness of the damned, are you quite sure that the demon you have roused will not turn and rend you?"

"If you make yourselves familiar with the chains of bondage, you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustom yourself to trample out the lives of others and you have lost the genius of your independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you....."

So I say now, to white South Africa:

You have made yourselves familiar with the chains of bondage, and you will have to wear them, just as all other people in this country wear them. You have lost the genius of your own independence, and you are become subjects of a cunning tyrant. You

fill your own stomachs, but do you know that seventy percent of the people in this country are hungry? You talk of the horrors of the British concentration camps during the Boer War, where the child mortality rate was 400 in every 1,000, but do you know that the rate among Africans, here and now, 60 years later, ranges from 100 to 400 in every thousand? You may blame this on ignorance, yet are you satisfied with the kind of education which white South Africa, in its wisdom, provides for black South Africa?

And if the demon you have roused turns and rends you, who will you blame? Will you blame black savagery? Will you blame the cunning tyrant himself? Or will you realise that you yourselves have created the demons that may attack you? Do you mourn for your country?

It is too late for warnings. We are not here to warn the white people of what their cruelty, selfishness and stupidity have caused, nor to warn them of the demons they have roused. Neither are we here to explain to the black people of South Africa that we understand what has been done to them; that their lives are made miseries; that their work is slavery; and that their humanity has been forgotten.

We are here to tell you, all of you, that the oppression of three-quarters of the people in this country will become, and is becoming, the oppression of all people, but the cunning tyrants themselves. We are all bound to the prison that our country has become; the gaoler is no more free than the gaoled. How long do you think it will be before the police come knocking on your doors at two o'clock in the morning? How long will it be before your children are hungry? How long will it be before you realise what is being done to your schools and universities? How long will it be before you mourn for your country?

But we are here, not only to say this, but also to

affirm our belief in academic freedom and in human freedom - not to commemorate something that has been lost, because these freedoms have never really existed in this country, even before our present cunning tyrants came to power - but to affirm.

What exactly is it that we wish to affirm?

It is, to some extent, contained in this document that we shall be signing this evening. It is contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is contained in the cry of the French Revolution

"Liberty, Equality, Fraternity".

It is contained in the Declaration of American Independence, when it says:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government . . . ."

It is contained in the demand for "Uhuru", and in the psalms that the people of Israel sang during their exile in Babylon:

"By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept; when we remembered thee, O Zion.

As for our harps, we hang them up; upon the trees that are therein.

For they that led us away captive required of us then  
a song and a melody, in our heaviness;

Sing us one

of the songs of Sion.

How shall we sing the Lord's song; in a  
strange land?"

We are here to sing the Lord's song in a strange land. And if it seems irony that the people who once, when they trekked into the interior compared themselves to the people of Israel, are now the gaolers of Babylon, remember what they have done, that they lost the genius of their own independence. They have become the salves of this slavery that they have made. In taking the freedom of others, they have destroyed their own freedom.

Some may argue that the cunning tyrants are bound by necessity to curtail freedom in this country; but remember that even William Pitt said:

"Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves."

We cannot afford to argue this necessity, for our necessity is freedom.

Let no one pretend that it is easy to sing the Lord's song, to talk of freedom, in this strange land. At this very moment, there are probably spies of our cunning tyrants who are taking down what I say - although I would prefer to give them my own typed copies, since these would at least be accurate. But remember that what we are saying has been believed for thousands of years, and that no cunning tyrant has ever stopped all belief in these freedoms, no matter how many people he put in gaol - because, no matter what the present government and its electorate may think, you cannot imprison an idea; nor can you ban it; nor can you confine it to any place, whether that place is defined as:



"Any place, whether or not it is a public place and includes any premises, building, dwelling, flat, room, office, shop, structure, vessel, aircraft, or vehicle, and any part of a place."

The idea of human freedom is not liable to 90 days' detention without trial; nor can it be sentenced to death for desiring to bring about social, political and economic change in this Republic of Babylon; nor can it be forbidden to speak. It is the Lord's song, and even if it is not sung very loudly, it will be remembered.

There are people who will say that we students are interfering with politics, that human freedom is nothing to do with us, that we should stick to our studies, that we are immature, idealistic, too young to judge. To them I say:

"We are students, and we study ideas - now we are bringing from our studies an idea that is good - the idea that all people must be set free, from oppression, from ignorance, from exploitation, from poverty, from hunger, and from captivity."

It is this idea that we are here to affirm - this the Lord's song that we must sing in a strange land, in this country that we mourn for. Whether the Devil that we fear is the Anti-Christ, or the cunning tyrant, or exploitation, or ignorance, or hunger, we are here to speak against the Devil, and to speak for human freedom in South Africa and in the whole world.

The may ban us, but they can never ban this.

\* \* \*

# THE NATIONAL UNION OF SOUTH AFRICAN STUDENTS

## N U S A S

NUSAS was founded in 1924 to foster co-operation among South African students. Today NUSAS has over 18,000 members.

Any student studying in South Africa, regardless of his race, colour or beliefs may become a member of NUSAS. It is because NUSAS does not draw racial distinctions among students that it is the only student organisation in South Africa which can rightfully claim to represent South African students. It is also the reason that NUSAS is the only internationally recognised South African National Union of Students.

The legislative body of the National Union is the Student Assembly. It is composed of representatives from student elected Student Representative Councils from the affiliated universities and colleges. The Assembly elects an administrative agency - the National Executive - which is responsible for implementing the decisions of the Assembly. The Executive is assisted, on the local level, by NUSAS Local Committees, which are appointed by and are responsible to the Student Representative Councils.

### AIMS :

To represent the students of South Africa nationally and internationally and to maintain their co-operation with the students of other countries.

To defend democracy in student affairs and in the universities.

To maintain and further genuine co-operation, in a spirit of tolerance, goodwill and mutual respect, among all students.

To uphold the right of all students to meet, assemble and study together on a basis of equality.

To promote the educational and general interests of students.

## BASIC POLICY

NUSAS has adopted as its basic policy the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, and this is reflected in all the policy decisions of the National Union.

FOUR OF THE MAJOR ENTRENCHED CLAUSES OF NUSAS POLICY ARE -

NUSAS shall aim to encourage the promotion of equality of educational and economic opportunity for all in South Africa to ensure that university and college education is not the privilege of a class.

NUSAS shall aim to ensure that the knowledge and culture of the universities and colleges are used in the interests of the people as a whole.

NUSAS shall conduct objective research, particularly into the problem of school and higher education in South Africa.

NUSAS shall aim to further student rights and student independence by maintaining in every possible way and extending the rights of freedom of speech, press and organisation of all students.

\* \* \*