

422.111

16  
NC

"VISTA",  
2, BUCHAN ROAD,  
NEWLANDS:  
CAPE TOWN.

FILE

16th March, 1968.

Our dear Alan,

I received yours of 26th Feb. and of course it was a pleasure to address your letter and send it on to Vic. In case they haven't replied to you and you want their address, it is :-

716, Lombard Street,  
Philadelphia,  
Pennsylvania,  
U.S.A.

It's a house provided by their church, and in a ghastly quarter, overlooking a large neon sign which says "SHAPIRO'S MONUMENTS" (the American way of death). Cathy says they are dying to find something better, but it's part of their duty to live right there. Did you ever meet her? They are two fine people. I miss them like hell.

Talking about missing people, I've just said goodbye to Bill, though they only leave by air from here on 28th. But we are going to near Mossel Bay for a few days from 23rd March, so thought would get farewells said early. Farewell! Gosh, how inadequate we all are - I mean I am, not you.

Alan, there is something I must say to you and to Leo when he comes back (I see he has gone away for a couple of months). I had lunch with our friend. We had a lovely bottle of white Cape wine, a great anaesthetic (as you may know). Having been quite close in the past (and present), being of an age, my being female, it was not very difficult for us to convey to each other some of the strength of feeling which our friendship has brought. But what I want and must pass on to you and Leo is that he said, in a very moving way, that you and Leo were two of the best humanbeings he had ever known, that you were two such superlatively excellent humans, and that he regretted that he had never managed to say this to you; his relationship with you was such that on seeing you he might manage to say "Hello Alan, you old drunk", but he could never get any closer than that. This was a block caused by the limits we place on our responses to fellow creatures. I mean, it wasn't a fault in either of you, but a shyness or reserve or selfdiscipline. Dammit, do you know what I am trying to say to you? He loves you both.

Have you ever received any letter/s from Eddie? His brother tells me that Eddie says he has written to you in the past and assumes you have never received the letters. I suppose he would not expect you to reply, but I have been asked just to ascertain whether you got the letter/s. I think they feel the letters may have gone astray en route to you.

Affectionately,

Mrs Dot. Cleminshaw



File

422(i)  
"Vista"

2, Buchan Road,  
Newlands: Cape  
21-5-69.

My dear Alan,

How good to be on the receiving end of a request from you, for a change! This is just quickly, so you'll know I'll be attending & sending as full & direct a reply as soon as poss.

About A., he wrote me 23.1.69 "rec'd a letter from Alan - nice" & again 6.4.69 "had a letter from AP, to which I don't really know how to reply. I live from day to day, keeping as busy as I can & try to keep the bogys of conscienceness out. What else? For the moment nothing". In my reply I urged him to write you, no matter how difficult, and I hope he will try. You suggest two possibilities in your letter, but I feel a third is more likely, namely that he does care desperately to reply, but he is devastated by the gulf between his conduct and his love & respect for you & your conduct. Given so matter of fact about yourself, you don't seem to realise that to us you are a great man.

Yes, I do correspond with A., though it took me months to make a start & he had sent me

several letters. I had first to get over my hatred for what he had done to himself, let alone the others. And then when I did write it seemed so damn inadequate; so I was grateful, very, to be given a passport & the chance to see him again. I know many don't approve of my writing to him & the visit, eg. Bill, but "love is not love that alters when it alteration finds". And I did/do love him. What if he had been my son? He is having psychiatric treatment - I hope it helps.

We had a magnificent evening when Jean v. Riet visited L.I. recently; dinner with several good friends & Jean's warm & funny stories. How he combines all the best qualities of the finest Afrikaners one has known. He played his tape of your speech at the "farewell" to L.P. Thank you for that, Alan, we were all - how can I convey it to you? - overwhelmed.

The Newland's sun has gone behind the mountain that Smuts used to plod over - 4.30 p.m., a lovely sunny winter's afternoon is over, & I am trying to get me bloody hair dry. Better go in before I get pneumonia.

And how I'll note your new address.  
Love to you both.

Dot



CAPE TOWN. 422 (1)  
24.5.69

Dear Alan,

In reply to yours of 16th May in re the letter dated 29th April from Prof. Hughes, I yesterday saw Mr. Michael Richman of Messrs. Ress & Richman, Attorneys (who acts for Dr. Neville Alexander and whom I know as a conscientious, concerned individual) and he confirms that he received a letter from Prof. Hughes, also dated 29th April.

This letter had arrived in his office while he was absent on holiday in England and so had to await his return a week ago. On 13th May he wrote to Prof. Hughes, explaining that there is a certain formality to be adhered to in such matters, namely that he would have to consult his client as to his attitude and wishes. A visit to Robben Island takes a while to arrange, but he has now done this and Mr. Richman will be writing fully to Prof. Hughes.

I think, however, that it may be helpful to Prof. Hughes to receive a reply from you, so I am sending this to you in duplicate, in case you wish to send a copy to him. However, use contents of this reply as you think fit.

Briefly this is the position: Dr. Alexander is pleased and flattered with the proposal to offer him an academic position in New York university and would like Prof. Hughes to make the approach; but he is not optimistic of the outcome. Mr. Richman, as his attorney, will be making a separate application for Dr. Alexander's release, based on Prof. Hughes' offer of the job, but he too holds out very little hope.

I think you will agree they are realistic in their pessimism. The reply of the Minister of Justice to an application about a year ago for the release of Eddie Daniels (a much lesser political personality) namely, that the Minister's experience in allowing other politicals to leave the country did not encourage him to think that if Daniels were released he would "cease to work against South Africa". There was the Minister's reply to Mr. Gray Hughes, M.P. a couple of years ago, when the bill for Robert Sobukwe's post-imprisonment detention came up for its annual renewal. It had been suggested by Mr. Hughes that instead of keeping Sobukwe on Robben Island (and thus losing face abroad) the Minister might use his powers to banish him to an isolated part of S. Africa. The Minister's reply was that if he were to banish Sobukwe to an isolated place, he would easily be able to slip across the border, to continue his political work outside the country (as Potlako Leballo did).

One can quite see that any Government would be placed in this predicament, and the assessment of pro's and cons for releasing must take into account the leadership potential of the political prisoner, and this is a matter for the Minister's judgment.

I think if Dr. Alexander were willing to agree to remain in South Africa under the usual restrictions of banning from meetings, no writing for publication, confinement to a small area and house arrest for 12 hours a day, subject to constant surveillance by the Security Police (as in the case of Robert Sobukwe) then he would have a better chance of being allowed off Robben Island than if he applied on the basis of wishing to take up a post abroad. What his chances of getting out of the country, say, some years later would be, is another incalculable, depending on the political situation then.

We must also bear in mind that (and I think I am correct) there has not been a single case where a political prisoner has been given remission of sentence. Dr. Alexander was sentenced /to 10 years'



to 10 years' imprisonment in 1964, so he still has another 5 years to serve.

In regard to the general picture, Dr. Alexander was arrested in June, 1963 in terms of the 90-day law (detention on suspicion, without charge or access to legal advice, usually in isolation and subject to prolonged interrogation) along with several other young Coloured people, mostly teachers.

Their trial commenced on 4.11.63 and their offence seems to have been that they had formed a study group, which discussed politics and, feeling completely frustrated by the closing of constitutional channels, they discussed the possibilities of guerilla warfare in South Africa.

They called themselves the YU CHI CHAN, and because of this, the prosecution (very sensitive to violence and sabotage in the country) alleged that there was a link with Chinese Communism. This kind of allegation brings a smile to one's lips, but the prosecution took it very seriously.

Later this group changed its name to National Liberation Front, a title already in use by other groups which had decided that the only solution in South Africa was to overthrow the Government by extra-Parliamentary activity, presumably of a violent nature, seeing that this could not be done by the ballot-box. The YU CHI CHAN did not actually carry out any sabotage or acts of violence.

Dr. Alexander was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment in 1964, by which time he had already spent a year in gaol. There was an appeal which failed.

Recently he was convicted in a trial held on the Island for contravening prison regulations by being rude to one of the warders. I have seen a copy of the alleged remarks and can only wonder that so much time and money can be spent on such trivialities. I cannot recollect the sentence, but suffice it to say that it was set aside on review, on an application by Mr. Richman.

I thought you might also be interested to know that Dr. Alexander's parents now live in Middelburg, Cape. Mrs. Alexander had been teaching in Cape Town, but suffered a stroke and had to stop. However, she has made a good recovery and is now teaching in Middelburg. Her husband is a cripple, having had both legs amputated.

Finally, I think the really important thing to say to Prof. Hughes is, please go ahead and make the approach for Dr. Alexander. I do not think it can succeed (not unless the "influence" he speaks of is of the order, say, of securing a rise in the price of gold), but believe it is essential that the request be made. Let the onus be on the Minister to refuse. There is just the faintest possibility that he might not refuse, and while there is life there is hope.

Yours sincerely,

*Det. Blumhardt*



422(i)

"VISTA",  
2, BUCHAN ROAD,  
NEWLANDS: CAPE TOWN.

18th November, 1969.

My dear Alan and Anne,

Thank you for two separate letters. Firstly, Anne's of 8th November: I have ordered another, larger copy of the photograph for you, and I'm enclosing two 6" x 4", because it (belatedly) struck me that David and Jonathan ought each to have one. I'll fetch the large one from the C. Times on Friday. I have struck up quite an acquaintance with the \*woman who takes the orders, which makes for lightning recognition of what I require! I told her what you said, Anne, about wishing you had had it when you were looking for photos for illustrating extracts from "KONTAKION" - and she immediately volunteered that there was another photo, of Dorrie alone, in their records. I saw her take out a plastic pouch and I could see there were 4 photographs, apparently all taken at the same time. Two of Dorrie alone and two of A. & D. The one I have been getting is the nicer of the couple, because both are smiling (we feel). Similarly, there is a smiling and an unsmiling version of D. alone. Well, I have therefore also ordered two 6" x 4"'s of the smiling D. and I will also fetch these on Friday and post them to you with this letter, which I'll leave open now.

Yes, I'll do my best to get you an unmarked copy of the critique. I'm afraid I did assume you would have seen it already, and I'll remember in future that this is not necessarily the case. In fact, I ordered a copy of that paper last week, and have just phoned the C.N.A., Claremont about it, but it hasn't been delivered to them yet. They are not the most efficient firm in the world, so I'll keep on at them.

I'm glad Alan did not make you copy out Richard Rive's letter and reply - and am taking care to return this to you. Well, my dears, I must apologise for any embarrassment or annoyance I have caused by poking my nose into this matter, and the Archbishop's one. You are quite right, I do this from affection. You must regard me as having more heart than head. I remind myself of those great, hairy apes who accompany the top crook in American gangster films, and as soon as the hero gets a bit cheeky, the apes jump up and brandish their fists and say: "Let me moider him for you boss."

It was <sup>very</sup> ~~earn~~ nice of you to let me see Richard's letter, which I think is a jolly sweet one. I wondered at the time he said he would write you, just how on earth he would put things. ~~This~~ <sup>That.</sup> ~~is~~ is a horribly difficult sort of letter to write. And he is (on the surface) quite a fiery and prickly sort of gent. But I'm sorry he hasn't replied - yet. I haven't set eyes on him since I visited him in September, and if I do, I won't raise the subject, or - of course - tell him what you have told me. But I'll be surprised if he doesn't.

You also wrote him a good letter. Ha ha. This just strikes me as funny. I'm telling you. I'd better offer myself ~~to~~ the OBSERVER as a literary critic.

What I mean is: I care very much that you and Richard should be friends, and I think the way is a little clearer now than it was. If I come out of it with a black eye, too bad.

I wish I could say the same about the Archb. I have heard a good deal more about the behind-scenes activities than I had before I wrote you last (I mean in re Stephen McBride). I had dinner with Clive recently and heard strange things, which I suppose come under the heading of "highminded jiggery-pokery". I always felt pretty sure which way the Archb. would have voted. What hurt and still does is that he decided that his formal duty to the Committee/Council was more important than the need to publicly reaffirm his belief in the principle of non-racialism, in circumstances where the Coloured people, represented by Stephen, had just received one more slap down.

/This is ...

Filed MTP  
Enclosed  
21/11/69

Got!  
two more  
copies of  
Times  
photo.  
woman!  
Filed MTP



This is a question of "leadership". So I am not at all sure whether the Archb. is capable of "making his own choices" as you put it. You called him wise (last time I saw you). This must be so, if you say it. I also think he can be weak and further that he is wrongly advised (hence my attempt to put him right!). I must say I marvel at my presumption.

I don't know what is the matter with me, but I do often find myself in situations where I mutter "what the hell are you doing here - you ought to be at home cooking the dinner". I suppose it is that 1/8th Irish blood, which you assured me once, I can never get away from ...

Even tho' he/she makes you wish he/she would not (ah, it is a he), I am GLAD you have another friend like me in Pinetown.

Thank you for telling me about "Norman" and if he should be going to Oxford via Cape Town and I can be helpful, I should like to know the details which would enable me to make contact.

I'll be visiting the Marquards this week and will add a bit before I close.

21-11-69; I couldn't make it yesterday, & today when I called they were out. So I phoned just now, & Leo says they are both well; Nel has her voice back; and I am to see them soon. We spoke about your forthcoming prize-giving and I think Leo is quite looking forward to it. In case you are looking for a joke to introduce him with, about 3 years ago I was present at the Langa High School Prize-giving, where Leo was the guest of honour and gave the speech. He was introduced by the History Master, then Mr. S.M. Lindleni, who thanked him for coming, especially, as he pointed out to the audience, as anyone could see that Mr. Marquard had seen better days. Leo smiled appreciatively but Nel, who was sitting in the front of me, was convulsed.

Lots of love,

Det

If my gift of photos has also given you pangs of sorrow, forgive me both of you.  
D.



42201  
"VISTA", 2 Buchan Road, Newlands, Cape Town.

17.12.69

Dear Alan,

Thank you for your lovely Christmas card - please thank Anne too. Also, I will take Eddie's to his brother, so it can be sent on to him.

I am sorry I missed Leo's going. I had been intending to be very efficient and wound up a day late on the phone to Nel. Blame work and the current rush.

What I wanted to convey was that the news about Eddie is not promising. His case was put in the hands of a sympathetic and able young attorney, who approached Mr. Justice Steyn, Chairman of Social Services who seemed sympathetic, but said he would want to assure himself that E. had turned from violence before he could make any approach to the Minister.

(I feel able to tell you about this because I was shown a letter E. was allowed to write to his brother, for passing on to the attorney, in which E. described the Judge's visit.)

Eddie said the Judge came accompanied by a fellow judge (witness, I guess). He said he came from the Minister of Justice (and this puzzles me, so perhaps E. misunderstood). His first question was whether, if E. was released on an exit visa he would be prepared to leave S.A. and live abroad. Eddie said he would. His next question was whether if E. was living abroad he would become involved in violence against South Africa, or advocate it. Eddie said he did not honestly know what he would do if he were to be suddenly pitchforked out into the great wide world. He had lived so long with a small group of people, that if he had to go suddenly abroad, he might go to one extreme or another - he could not say what he would do. At this the interview ended. Eddie subsequently wrote a letter to the Judge, thanking him for his visit, and saying that if the Minister wished to release him, he could do this and keep him in the country under restrictions.

E's brother and I are pessimistic about any chance of a recommendation that he be released. We feel his answer was honest, we know it was the only answer Eddie could have given and retain his integrity. I don't think the Judge will realise what an honest person he has been dealing with. I tried to comfort his brother by saying that E. was right in drawing attention to the small group he lives with. His morale is high, his health is good and he is studying. It would be silly to imagine him not disappointed, but possibly we outside are more hurt in some way - the way which says we would like to have succeeded in helping



Eddie to get out of prison.

What puzzles me about Eddie's report that the Judge said he came from the Minister is that some months ago the Minister of Justice refused to consider an application for E's release, saying that his experience with others who had been allowed abroad on exit visas did not encourage him to think that if he allowed E. to go he would cease to "work against South Africa". So why ask him now if he would accept an exit visa?

Also, it seems unfair to me that they even asked E. that question about violence. I am pretty sure none of the other Cape Town ARM prisoners were asked that, so why should Eddie be treated differently?

You once said if Eddie needed any money, you had some for this purpose. There is an account from the attorney for R50.00. Do you want to pay part of this anyway? I am asking you quite baldly, because that is how I am with money. I can pay some of it and someone else I know has said he will give something. There must be others in Cape Town and I can go and find them. Let me know soon, please.

I was so glad to see you take up the matter of Albert Hertzog and the telephone tapping and the criticism of the BOSS law. At a Civil Rights meeting I tried to suggest that this should be taken up, but they misconstrued me thinking I intended a purely personal attack on Albert. Which is not so, though I don't admire him. What I was after was the dereliction of responsibility on the part of a law-maker, who agrees to a law which is rotten in principle because he believes at the time that it is going to be used only against his political enemies. The end justifying the means. I will take this up again at our January meeting.

Since I sent the photographs to you by registered post I am assuming they reached you. Doubtless Leo has a message for me, but I have not seen him yet.

On Friday I stop my job at Zonnebloem for a few weeks and am looking forward to the break.

Harry and I and the children send you both our best wishes for a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

love,

Dot

Vic carpenter has sent me a large red & blue lapel button, which says:-

"If you are not part of the solution

You are part of the problem"

bleaves.



422 (j)

"VISTA" etc.

Fri. 9th Jan., 1970.

My dear Alan,

I've just received your letter dated 1st Jan., postmarked 3rd., but as its a 2½c stamp and holidays, doubtless this is o.k.

I acknowledge receipt of your cheque for R25.00 and thank you very much for it. Norman, E's brother, has already paid the account (at least that was our arrangement when I last saw him) so that the attorney would be promptly dealt with, as he deserved. I undertook to Norman to go among friends to try to reimburse Norman. I also said I would write to Adrian to ask him if he would like to pay all or some of this. I know it will help him to feel he can do this small thing. There has not been time for Adrian to reply to me. If he sends money I will inform you and you must then instruct me what to do with your cheque. I can return it to you or keep it in trust for future efforts for E., or add it to the "nestegg" of R300 (I think that is the right figure) which Randolph gave E's Mother for him. Norman would use up this nestegg if he had to, but wants to keep it against the time of E's coming out. Many of us may not be available in 10 years' time to help E, supposing he has to serve every last day of his sentence.

I will write and keep you properly informed about any money that comes in for E. and you can instruct me about your R25.00. I hope I am acting wisely and in E's best interests, but if you think I am wrong, please tell me.

Seeing you type your letters, can I take it you have a carbon copy of yours under reply? If so, I must comment on your second para. I missed seeing your informant because I was away from C.T. when his ship was here, but in any case we might not have got on to the points he made to you. Dave did see him, however, and I'll be seeing Dave this evening - he leaves on Sunday for USA, to our sorrow.

I take it that your informant can only rely on hearsay and possibly he has also read Brokensha and Knowles "The 4th of July Raids". But I was in court and I heard Adrian and Lyn give evidence in the case against E. And I was and am a close friend of Adrian, and though it seems presumptuous to say so, I think I have a better inkling of how he felt and thought and responded, than quite a few. Also, since the publication of that book, and since so many, including Bill, hold/held it against A. that he "seemed unable to do anything in mitigation" for E., whereas he did for the others, I have taken up this aspect with Adrian, both in letters and when I visited him in England, and I hold firmly to the immediate impression I received in court that the advocate who appeared for E. was a) the wrong man for the job and b) used wrong tactics with Adrian.

Alan, this is going to be a long letter, so you had better sit down.

In support of a) I met and observed Jimmie Gibson when he was an early member of the L.P. and a friend of Peter Hjul, and disregarding his ability, intelligence etc., I did not like what I saw. He struck me as supercilious and self-important. I also heard from a mutual friend that he looked down upon his father, a man of humble origins. I am not enjoying saying these things, which I say in confidence to you. I am trying to explain why it did not surprise me that when certain members of the L.P. broke away from the Party when it went for 1 man 1 vote, Jimmie G. was of their number.

If you think now of the gulf which would separate a man like that, trying to maintain respectability in a fast deteriorating situation politically which is drawing younger and more radical people into the vortex of violence (gettin' quite poetic ain't I?)



- the gulf between him and Adrian was wide indeed. There was a mutual despise. Despising. Despication.

I experienced this sort of thing myself with Gibson. I stood with a large placard, proclaiming that Advocate Sachs had been in 90 day detention for 1 hundred-and-something days, outside No. 1 Dorp Street from 1.45 p.m. till about 2.15 p.m. one day, timing it to catch all the advocates returning to office (they are all at that address) after their well-earned lunches. Many passed me by, a few greeted me, one even stayed to give moral support until I gave up. But Mr. Gibson came past quite fast, saw me, recognised me and said in passing "Huh - that is not going to do any good." I said: "Who the hell are you to say what will, or will not, do any good?" He did not answer me. Obviously he was very superior and thought I was wasting my time. And I must say if he had stood up in Court to question me in place of Adrian (which heavens forbid) I would have answered him exactly as Adrian did. Which I'll now try to recall :-

If you will look at the top of Page 116 of the book I mentioned ("4th of July Raids) you will see that "Leftwich's attitude underwent a slight, almost imperceptible, change." I say part of that was due to Leftwich's opinion of Gibson as a conservative, rather smug, "progressive", who would never take any action in support of his political views which would endanger his safety/position in society, and who was about to rub his nose in the dirt.

(A's)

Mid. page 117: "But Leftwich, like van der Riet before him, would not concede that E.D. played but a minor part in the workings of the planning committee ..." and so on (incidentally I regard this as the most despicable part of this whole book, which is useful as a record, and typical of those journalists who make money out of other people's agony)

May I just leave A's evidence for a moment and go back to Lyn's ?

On Page 105: (last para.) "His cross-examin. (of Lyn) was directed chiefly towards the object of showing that E.D., a man with a Standard 6 education, one-time "spare-jerk" on the fishing trawlers was a minor figure in the ARM, a stooge in the intellectual company of men like Rubin, Leftwich and Schneider, with whom D. served on the planning committee. But L. v.d. R. would not concede that Daniels's intellectual capacity put him at a disadvantage vis-à-vis his committee colleagues."

Lyn's response and mine in court at that moment of questioning was identical. As people who believe there should be no educational or property qualification for the franchise, we had long discarded the idea that a man without formal schooling must necessarily be inferior in intellect.

To get back to Adrian, Gibson tried the same tack with him. When I wrote to A. about this, he replied :-

12th June, 1967: "You have put the hammer on the nail head in your analysis of my reply to Gibson. I have been checking through the report of the proceedings in the Brokensha/Knowles book - which is distinguished only in its total disregard for certain crucial facts and a monstrous interpretation of the ARM .."

Again on 11th October, 1967: "As far as I'm aware the only other reference in court to E's non-participation was that made by Lyn v.d. R., when she spoke of the question of E's intellectual capacity. I still think that this was a stupid tack of Gibson's ..."

I am making such an issue of this because the right advocate would have seen that Lyn and Adrian could never and would never say that a man with Std. 6 was somehow less responsible than they. What Gibson should have done was to ask outright: "Did E. turn



against the idea of sabotage? Did he try to dissuade the rest of you? If he could not succeed in dissuading you, I take it whoever insisted on carrying on had greater influence with your Committee? And so on.

In fact (P. 111 of the book, bottom of page) Leftwich said that Daniels specifically asked to be allowed to attend the Johannesburg meeting in January, 1964 to speak against the continuation of sabotage.

Top of Page 119: "But he (Gibson) was not successful in getting Leftwich to recall that D. had tried to pull out of the organization. The most that L. would concede was that D. expressed a desire to quit the planning committee."

I think Adrian was telling the truth. E. had decided sabotage and violence were achieving the opposite objects from what they intended. But he is a very loyal person and I am sure it was his loyalty to them in the mess they were all in that kept him with them. I know there were threats against individuals in the ARM, not only from Watson, as to what would happen to anyone who fell out, or betrayed the others. But I don't think threats would have weighed with E. He did not leave because he had joined them and had participated and was now smeared and did not wish to leave them in the dirt, so to speak.

I think another advocate, someone like Albie Sachs (or definitely someone like Alan Paton) would have handled this whole aspect properly and have been able to convey to the judge the calibre of a man like E.

Please do not miss A's sneer at Gibson in 6th para. on P. 121.

I do not accept that Gibson was discomfited. He went into court intent on making Adrian break down, this was part of a concerted plan with other counsel and I have been told of it by them. (I don't blame them for that either. I would have done it had I been an advocate.)

To get on to E's long sentence. I think the judge could only judge in terms of his views and opinions. I don't think he is other than a very conservative white man. It does not appear in the book, but I have gone to the Supreme Court and spent some time re-reading the judgement, which I had also heard, and this is something he said to E., in front of E.'s Mother, and which she will never forget or forgive: "Daniels, in your statement you expand at length upon the skolly menace. What on earth your actions had to do with the skolly menace ... and HOW YOU WERE GOING TO CURE IT BY BECOMING A SUPER SKOLLY YOURSELF and instead of the knife use high explosives, I have no idea."

E. deserved a better advocate than he got. Also a better judge. And better friends.

The Judge held E. responsible for each act of sabotage because he was on both the Planning and Regional Committees and therefore jointly responsible with the others. He seemed to take little notice of Adrian's statement that Daniels went to Johburg and tried to dissuade the others. The Judge clearly regarded E. as a "ringleader" in the conspiracy - and I am sure he was not that.

I am enclosing a copy of an early draft letter which Adrian offered to make into a sworn statement (it was Adrian's letter, he composed it) and send to the Minister. But we have not yet asked him to do this, judging the time not ripe up to now. However, we will be re-discussing this. What do you think? From it you will see that Adrian could have been made to say quite a lot that would have helped the Judge to make up his mind about E.



4.

I must end now. I guess you are as exhausted as I am from all this.

Finally, can I take it that you did receive the large photo of you and Dorrie plus 2 small ones, one for Jonathan, one for David and also the clean copy of the critique of KONTAKION? I posted these to you some weeks ago but you haven't acknowledged receipt. I asked Leo if you got them, but you had not spoken of them. I am only asking in case they have gone astray in the post.

We had a lovely Christmas, keeping everything very cool and simple and managed to go away from C.T. twice into the countryside, with dear friends, and play at an ideal society for a short while.

With love to you both,

*Det*

P.S. So please, if you now see <sup>is evidence</sup> A<sub>1</sub> as I do, could you let your "informant" know - I feel this is vital.

*D.*



**Collection Number: AD1169**

**Collection Name: Alan Paton Papers, 1952-1988**

***PUBLISHER:***

*Publisher:* Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand

*Location:* Johannesburg

©2016

***LEGAL NOTICES:***

**Copyright Notice:** All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

**Disclaimer and Terms of Use:** Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document forms part of the archive of the South African Institute of Race Relations, held at the Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.