

to natural causes, a judicial inquiry would take place” (“*[d]ie dood van elke gevange word ondersoek, en as die lykskouing aandui dat dit nie as gevolg van natuurlike oorsake was nie, word ‘n geregtelike ondersoek gehou*”), and thus Mr Woods is undesirably portraying the legal procedure in a vile manner (“*[d]ie veragtelikmaking van die regsprosedure is ongewens*”) (Du Toit P78/5/214). The Board reiterated the fact that it was found that “the evidence showed that Biko’s death was caused by a head injury which occurred as a result of a struggle with the Safety police, but that no intentional unlawful act had been committed” (“*[d]ie getuienis toon dat Biko wel oorlede is as gevolg van ‘n hoofbesering toe hy in ‘n worsteling met die Veiligheidspolisie betrokke is, maak dat daar geen opsetlike onwettige daad gepleeg is nie*”), and that Woods’ claim that “the Safety Police tortured and murdered Biko” (“*die Veiligheidspolisie vir Biko gemartel en doodgemaak het*”) was incorrect and undesirable (Du Toit P78/5/214). Du Toit additionally referred to the fact that the thirteen days of detention that are depicted both in the play and in this publication are taken out of context in order for it to seem that the police did in fact murder Biko (“*verdraai en uit verband geruk, om te lyk of dit ooreenstem met die bevinding dat die polisie vir Biko vermoor het*”) and that the summary given of the way in which the other detainees who died in custody actually died, is false (“*opsomming van ander gevalle van persone wat in aanhouding gesterf het, is vals*”) (Du Toit P78/5/214).

In terms of Section 47(2)(c), the Board found that the reference to “Afrikaner Nationalist mentality” in the foreword is used in order to make the Afrikaans people of the society despised” (“*is bereken om die Afrikaner volksgroep veragtelik te maak*”) (Du Toit P78/5/214), and that it was undesirable that they were referred to as “a frightened people, desperately clinging to their ethnic purity and their power” who Biko had no idea “would kill him” (Woods *preface*). For the above mentioned reasons, along with the fact that the Board has just previously banned Woods’ book, it is not surprising that the censors would too prevent dissemination of this publication, finding it ‘undesirable’.

Upon resubmission in 1990, it was stated by the censors that upon review, and due to Section 15(2) of the Act, the publication is “not undesirable within the meaning of Section 47(2) of the Act” and that dissemination would thus go ahead (Jansen P90/12/31).

The film dramatisation of the British theatre production was sent in to the Publications Board in 1989, seeking approval for dissemination. A Mr W. Malan stated that it was “undoubtedly a one-sided recapitulation” and places “strong emphasis on the role played [...] by Advocate Kentridge” who “dominates this version of the inquest in question” (Malan P89/7/17). He states that it “vividly focus[es] attention [...] on the abuses of Biko’s interrogators, including the alleged use of undue force and coercion and the holding of a naked Biko in chains” and strives to depict the “seeming incompetence or indifference of the doctors who attended Biko” (Malan P89/7/17). Malan did however, note some positive features in the film, including the fact that the actual court proceedings “reflect positively on the S.A. system of justice with Kentridge for example being given absolutely free rein to penetratingly question the Security policemen [and] doctors” and that the “magistrate is shown to be acting scrupulously correctly at all times” (Malan P89/7/17). He noted that the “Security Police and Biko’s doctors are shown in a very poor light” but that one must note that “the Appeal Board has ruled on more than one occasion that this is not sufficient per se to render a publication or film undesirable” (Malan P89/7/17). He further observed the fact that because the film is “unnecessarily long and [...] tedious,” it means that it will not “significantly hold the attention of most viewers, particularly that of the less sophisticated,” and for this reason, it is “unlikely that it will unduly sweep up the emotions of those viewers” (Malan P89/7/17).

A Mr G. Giaavelos of the Board also gave his opinion, stating that events and facts of the case are “well known to all South Africans and the court procedures were reported in all the South African newspapers” (Giaavelos P89/7/17). This reason, together with the fact that the film focuses on Biko’s detention and death, and not on Biko “as a great political leader,” nor his role in the Black Consciousness Movement or “of the black liberation struggle in general” acts as another “redeeming feature” which “outweigh[s] the negative elements and render the film as a whole not undesirable within the meaning of Section 47(2)(e)” (Giaavelos P89/7/17). The majority of the Board decided that, while they would not ban the film, it would be necessary to instate an age restriction of 2 to 18 years on the film due to the fact that “the subject and treatment [in the film] is an adult one” (Giaavelos P89/7/17). They stated that “maturity is required to view the events portrayed in the right perspective” and that in this light, “only adults possess the necessary objectivity to

distinguish and fully comprehend the controversial subject and its ‘dramatic’ presentation” (Giauvelos P89/7/17). Mr Malan’s opinion however, differed from other members of the Board, as he did not think that any age restriction would be necessary as there “is no visual material whatsoever which is likely to disturb younger viewers” (Malan P89/7/17). Dissemination of the film could thus take place, but with the instated age restriction.

Biko Memorabilia

During the tempestuous period directly after the death of Steve Biko, it was not only publications and film about the life and death of Biko that were brought to the attention of the censors, but so too were the countless posters and Biko memorabilia that created awareness of the current situation. For example, a poster with a picture of Biko and two small black children, stating that “Generations of Rage Shall Rise From his Death” was found “undesirable” in terms of Section 47(2)(e) and 9(3) of the Act of 1974. Again Lighton was the censor who reported, saying that it did not “commemorate the death of Biko as a human being, but [has] political motives to exploit his death in a manner calculated to promote White/Black confrontation and thereby to undermine the safety of the State” (Lighton P78/10/32). Another poster with a picture of Biko and the words “Died In Detention” was also deemed undesirable by Lighton under the same Act, due to the fact that the inquest was yet to be completed, and that this poster gave the impression that “Biko’s death was caused by those who held him in detention”, which ultimately means that these people are “[crying] murder before the facts are known, indicat[ing] how South Africa’s image was deliberately being undermined” (Lighton P78/3/91). There was even a poster for the “memorial service for Bantu Steve Biko” which was found to be “undesirable,” due to the fact that the word Azania (the African name for South Africa, much like Rhodesia was called Zimbabwe at that time), appeared on the poster (“*die word Azania kom op die plakkaat voor*”), with the censors stating that “this is the name for South Africa used by forbidden organisations and terrorist groups” (“*dit is die naam wat vir Suid-Afrika gebruik word deur verbode organisasies en terroriste-bewegings*”) (Van der Westhuizen P79/9/108). In 1982 a T-shirt with Biko on it, along with the phrase “Black Consciousness the Road to Freedom” was banned, as it was said to “propagate the ‘Black Consciousness Movement’ as well as Biko” (“*propageer die ‘Black Consciousness Movement’ asook Biko*”) who was a “militant and radical South African leader of those organisations” (“*militante en radikale S.A. leier van*

hierdie organisasies") and was thus "undesirable" under the same sections as above (Du Toit P82/10/23). Even ten years after his death, in 1987, there was still the desire of the state to ban Biko memorabilia. A pamphlet under the title "We Remember Comrade Biko" that discusses Biko's role in the Black Consciousness Movement was found to be "undesirable" in terms of Section 47(2)(e), as the censorship report argued that the likely readers of that pamphlet would be the black youth who will be "receptive to the call for "socialism or Barbarism", as well as the principles of "Anti-Capitalism, Anti-Ethnicity, Non-Collaboration" etc. that is made" (*"ontvanklik sal wees vir die oproep "socialism or Barbarism", asook die beginsels van "Anti-Capitalism, Anti-Ethnicity, Non-Collaboration" ens. wat ten slotte gestel word"*) (Du Toit P87/10/28).

Conclusion

This thesis set out to examine apartheid thinking by tracking down and commenting on the apartheid censor's responses to the works of three major theorists of African liberation: Frantz Fanon, Amilcar Cabral and Steve Biko. Some of the major discoveries that emerged out of the study were the tension and interface between local and the continental, between the idea of a Pan-African spread of ideas, and of the specificities of local or national situations. The three theorists themselves at times insist on the specificities of their local liberation struggles, but at the same time reach out to the rest of Africa in their references, and there is no doubt of cross-pollination in ideas across their work. Similarly, while apartheid relied on the argument of being "a special case", the censors were strangely concerned with the spread of ideas of African liberation from other parts of the world.

Most of Fanon's works were banned in France and South Africa at a time of increasing independence among former colonies from colonial rule. An exception to this is *Black Skin, White Masks*, which was not banned by the apartheid censors, most likely because it stated negative aspects of interracial sexual desire. Although *The Battle of Algiers* was banned immediately in France, it was only in the 1980s that it seems to have been an issue and was banned in South Africa. While the initial decisions to ban certain of Fanon's work were made at the height of apartheid in South Africa, the final decisions to allow for the dissemination were made as apartheid was drawing to a close, as negotiations were taking place between the ANC and the South African government. What has become evident from examining the censorship process and the works themselves is that in France and in South Africa, Fanon's works were all of an anti-colonial nature, encouraging an active revolution of the oppressed people and were thus brought to the attention of the censors to examine whether they could be deemed to be dangerous to the minds who may be exposed to the material. Ironically, in tracing the reception history of each one of these works, one notes not only the ways in which they influenced revolution, but also how they reached a global network of counter-revolutionary force at its most paranoid.

Through the examination of the apartheid censors' responses to the works of Cabral, one sees a contradiction in the views of the censors: while they clung to the idea of South Africa as "a special case," they also seemed to believe that Cabral's ideas for revolution in

Guinea would be influential in South Africa. Cabral's own views share something of this tension between theorising a local anti-colonial struggle and a Pan-African anti-colonial struggle. With *Revolution in Guinea*, the censors were troubled by Cabral's explicit description of revolutionary tactics and theories, together with the fact that he quite obviously calls for an armed struggle in order to liberate his people. Clearly they feared that the oppressed people in South Africa at the time would read his "terrorist" theories and gain ideas on how to overthrow the apartheid regime. The Board did, however, explicitly state that the comments that Cabral made in the book were not applicable to the South African situation and would not persuade South African readers to embark on an armed struggle, but they still chose to ban the book in order to protect the peace and good order in the country, thus clearly contradicting themselves. However, when this decision came to be reviewed towards the end of apartheid, the Board shifted their focus to the fact that the book would give its readers some historical insights into the mind of an African leader. Furthermore, because the situation in South Africa was currently changing, the censors felt that the book no longer applied to the South African situation and thus could not be seen as threatening to the peace and good order of the state, reinforcing their earlier contradiction. With *Return to the Source*, the censors were opposed to the fact that the book contained actual photographs of the armed struggle, and were of the opinion that some of the freedom movements of the PAIGC could be dangerous for South Africa if read by freedom fighters, even though they explicitly pointed out that the struggle in the book takes place in Guinea Bissau and Cape Verde and thus nowhere near South Africa. Yet even so, the book was deemed to be "undesirable". Again, on review of this decision, with apartheid reaching an end, the Board later reasoned that Cabral rejects racist theory and deals, on a relatively high intellectual level, with a historical situation that has little to do with South Africans. They also stated that as the book was also out of print, it would not receive many readers, thus highlighting the fact that even when approving dissemination, the censors preferred that the book remain out of distribution. With *Unity and Struggle*, the Board were once again wary of the fact that Cabral emphasises the need for an armed struggle, and highlighted that the book thus comes across as propaganda for revolution. As the book centrally deals with revolution in a Portuguese colony, the censors felt that there would be a wider readership in all those countries that were under Portuguese rule would thus relate to it. The fact that Mozambique and Angola are bordering countries to South Africa meant, to

the censors, that the situation could thus be related to South Africa too, and thus deemed it to be “undesirable”. Reviewing their decision towards the end of apartheid, the censors noted that the revolution dealt with in the book was based on the revolution in Guinea-Bissau, a country far away from South Africa and all but forgotten, and thus it could be viewed as a historical book. The Board noted that any guerrilla tactics Cabral may have mentioned were by now common knowledge to South Africans and, as negotiation was underway, these tactics were no longer a threat to the peace and good order of the state. There thus seems to be a constant element of contradiction present in the minds of the censors as, although they were obviously aware of the transnational ideas which existed in Cabral’s works, they tried as much as they could to separate Cabral and the situation in Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde from the situation in South Africa during apartheid – an unsuccessful attempt as South Africans involved in the liberation movement were well aware of, and influenced by, Cabral and his theories despite censorship.

The trajectory of the banning of the works by and on Biko in South Africa once again exposes the underlying thinking and the many contradictions of the apartheid-era government, through the censors as their agents. With *I Write What I Like*, the Board’s initial banning in 1979 was based on the fact that the “main character” of the book was Biko, a banned person in the country at the time. The censors felt that whites and the laws of apartheid were portrayed in an unfavourable manner in Biko’s writings and that this would be detrimental to relations between the races. They also believed that the book would promote a form of domestic unrest as it would encourage the spreading of Biko’s “underground” theories, and that it was thus “radically undesirable.” The book was therefore considered “undesirable” due to the fact that it would be damaging to the peace and good order of the state. Upon later reconsideration in 1985, the Board again concluded that the book would be harmful to the relationships between white and black South Africans. This constant focus on the negative impact that the book would have between so-called “relationships” between the races is interesting when one considers the fact that apartheid was based on a lack of “relationships” between the two groups. However, Biko’s book focused on empowering black South Africans, a notion that was the complete antithesis of the objectives of apartheid. In 1987 the Board slightly amended their earlier view, stating that Biko was actually not an advocator of violence and, because of this, they

felt that a possession ban on the book was no longer necessary. However, it was only with the amendment of the Publications Act and the end of apartheid that Biko's book was no longer banned. With *Biko* by Donald Woods, the Board noted in 1978 that Woods was a "listed person" and thus was not allowed to write or publish anything to do with South Africa. J.C. Van Rooyen, who compiled and signed the report for the Publications Appeal Board, claimed that Woods' book was filled with untruths and "deliberate lies," lacking evidence for its statements, and that it depicted the police in an unfair light. The Board, including Van Rooyen, viewed the book purely as propaganda, and felt that, as it refers to the ANC and their call for violence, and even goes so far as to equate the apartheid situation to that of Nazi Germany, it was detrimental to the peace and good order of the state, thus making it "undesirable." Again the Board said that the book may be detrimental to the relations between the Black and White populations, and was against the favourable manner in which the ANC, PAC and BPC were portrayed, thus highlighting their own racist views. However, when the book was reviewed towards the end of apartheid in 1990, the Board were now of the opinion that the book contained historical value and, due to the current situation in South Africa at the time, they felt that the book posed no threat to the safety of the state, thus admitting that they previously had viewed it as a threat, therefore encouraging them to view the book as "not undesirable." The path of the banning of *Cry Freedom* was particularly interesting and contradictory, as the Board initially decided to allow the dissemination of this film about Biko, despite the fact that it had banned the book *Biko* on which *Cry Freedom* was based. This decision that *Cry Freedom* was "not undesirable" was primarily to convince foreign onlookers that the South African government was progressive and was not trying to cover up what had happened. The Board further attempted to justify their decision by stating that South Africans would find the film boring and over-exaggerated, but also that the violence depicted was nothing new, inadvertently perhaps admitting that the violence portrayed in the film did actually occur, and as such was not necessarily an exaggeration of the truth. Public outcries and bomb threats forced the police to seize the film, indicating that while the Board wished to come across as moderate and reasonable to world, it was the local right-wing public who took offense to the film. Yet again, it was only with the end of apartheid in sight that these threats died down and the film could be viewed as simply "historical," and dissemination could begin. This examination reveals a constant tension within the minds of the censors as they knew that South Africa

was in the spotlight and thus wanted foreign perception to be that there was nothing to hide, while at the same time preventing the South African public, particularly the Black students of the revolution, from being exposed to this material and Biko's theories.

Despite the apartheid government's emphasis on South Africa as "a special case" whose situation could not be compared with anywhere else and that did not have to conform to international human rights norms, evidence from the archives reveals that the apartheid censors were aware of the fact that there was a transnational flow of ideas about African liberation, and thus indirectly acknowledged the fact that the South African situation was comparable to other places. In "Emerging From Censorship", one of his essays in *Giving Offence*, J.M. Coetzee points to the state's envy of "a certain disseminative power of which the power to publish and have read is only the most marked manifestation". Here Coetzee suggests that "the word of the master author" – whether written or oral – "has a disseminative power that goes beyond purely mechanical means of dissemination" (43). The word of great writers, Coetzee says, and, I would like to add, of great theorists of liberation, "particularly in cultures where an oral base survives, can spread by word of mouth, or from hand to hand in carbon copies... [and] even when the word itself is not spread, it can be replaced by rumors of itself, rumors that spread like copies" (43). As history has shown, despite their efforts the apartheid censors were powerless to prevent the dissemination of ideas about liberation, and ultimately to prevent the liberation of South Africa from apartheid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alessandrini, Anthony. "Fanon, Frantz (1925-1961)." *Encyclopedia of Race and Ethnic Studies*. 1 June 2010. <<http://www.bookrags.com/tandf/fanon-frantz-1-tf/>>
- Austerlitz, Saul. "At Arms' Length." *Reverse Shot Online* July/August 2003. 1 June 2010. <<http://www.reverseshot.com/legacy/julyaugust03/algiers.html>>
- Bienen, Henry. "State and Revolution: the Work of Amilcar Cabral." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 15.4 (1977) Cambridge: 555-568.
- Biko, Steve. *I Write What I Like*. United Kingdom: Bowerdean Press. 1978.
- Bernstein, Hilda. *No. 46 – Steve Biko*. London: International Defence and Aid Fund. 1978.
- Botha, H. P87/10/114, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.
- Brink, André. *A South African Censor's Tale, preface*. Pretoria: Protea Book House. 2011.
- Cabral, Amilcar. *Revolution in Guinea: (An African Peoples Struggle) Selected Texts by Amilcar Cabral*. Handyside, Richard [ed]. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1970.
- Cabral, Amilcar. *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches by Amilcar Cabral*. African Information Service [ed]. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1973.
- Cabral, Amilcar. *Unity and Struggle: Selected Speeches and Writings*. 2nd ed. Ed. Maurice Taonezvi Vambe and Abebe Zegeye. Pretoria: UNISA Press. 2008.
- Caillé, Patricia. "The Illegitimate Legitimacy of *The Battle of Algiers* in French Film Culture." *Interventions* 9.3 (2007) London: 371-388.
- Chabal, Patrick. *Amilcar Cabral Revolutionary Leadership and People's War*. Eritrea: Africa World Press, Inc. 2003.
- Coetzee, A. P81/5/101, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.
- Coetzee, J.M. *Giving Offense: Essays on Censorship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1996.

Cowie, Peter. "The Casbah, Rocked: Gillo Pontecorvo's The Battle of Algiers". 9 September 2008. *Film in Focus*. 1 June 2010.

http://www.focusfeatures.com/article/the_casbah_rocked_gillo_pontecorvo_s_em_the_battle_of_algiers

Davidson, Basil. *Unity and Struggle, preface*. Pretoria: UNISA Press. 2008.

De Lange, Margreet. *The Muzzled Muze: Literature and Censorship in South Africa*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. 1997.

Delpont, J.R. AM3/2/10/27, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Du Toit, J.B. P87/10/28, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Du Toit, S.F. P78/5/214, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Du Toit, S.F. P79/1/174, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Du Toit, S.F. P82/10/23, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Du Toit, S. P80/6/44, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Du Toit, S.F. P88/05/47, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Duhnkrack, Sophie. *Jean Paul Sartre, Albert Camus and Frantz Fanon and decolonization*. 2009. 1 June 2010. <<http://www.grin.com/e-book/141510/jean-paul-sartre-albert-camus-and-frantz-fanon-and-decolonization>>

Fanon, Frantz. *A Dying Colonialism*. New York: Grove Press. 1965. [Originally published in France as *L'An Cinq, de la Révolution Algérienn*, Paris, 1959.]

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press. 1967. [Originally published in France as *Peau noire, masques blancs*, Paris, 1952.]

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press. 2004. [Originally published in France as *Les Damnés de la Terre*, Paris, 1961.]

Fanon, Frantz. *Toward the African Revolution*. England: Penguin Books. 1970. [Originally published in France as *Pour la Révolution African*, Paris, 1964.]

"From Censorship to Classification." Film and Publications Board pamphlet, 2003.

Fourie, J. P90/04/61, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Gerhart, Gail M. *Interview with Steve Biko*. MNXGITAMA_Interviews indd. 2008.

Giauvelos, G. P89/7/17, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Gibson, Nigel C. *Fanonian Practices in South Africa- From Steve Biko to Abahlali baseMjondolo*. South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press. 2011.

Graham, Lucy. "Behind Closed Doors: Looking Back on the Modus Operandi of Censorship Under Apartheid." Presented at the New South Africa: Reading, Writing and Resistance Conference, Nottingham Trent University, April 2003.

Hart, O.D. P78/4/127, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Hickman, T. P78/5/81, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Jansen, J.P. P90/02/12, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Jansen, J.P. P90/12/31, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Jansen, J.P. P80/9/127, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Jansen, J.P. P80/6/44, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Jansen, J.P. P90/06/41, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Jansen, J.P. P77/2/16, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Jansen, J.P. P85/2/62, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Jansen, J.P. P90/04/11, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Kaufman, Micheal. "Film Studies." *New York Times*. 7 September 2003.

Kotze, H.J. P90/07/03, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Kreis, George. *Switzerland and South Africa 1948-1994*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang Academic Publishers. 2007.

Lighton, R.E. P78/4/127, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Lighton, R.E. P78/8/03, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Lighton, R.E. P78/10/32, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Lighton, R.E. P78/3/91, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Liukkonen, Petri. *Frantz Fanon (1925-1961)*. 2008. 1 June

2010.<<http://www.kirjasto.sci.fi/fanon.htm>>

Lopes, A. *Unity and Struggle, foreword*. Pretoria: UNISA Press. 2008.

Macey, David. *Frantz Fanon: A Life*. London: Granta Books. 2000.

Malan, E.G. P75/4/32, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Malan, W. P87/10/114, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Malan, W. P89/7/17, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Maslin, Janet. "Cry Freedom (1987) Film: Attenborough's 'Cry Freedom'." *New York Times* 6 November 1987.

Mbembe, Achille. "Afropolitanism." *African Remix: Contemporary Art of a Continent*. Ed. Simon Njami and Lucy Duran. Johannesburg: Jacama Media. 2007: 26-29.

McDonald, Peter D. *The Literature Police: Apartheid Censorship and its Cultural Consequences*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Merrett, Christopher, "South African Censorship: A Legacy of the Past and a Threat to the Future." *Innovation* 4 (1992).

Merrett, Christopher, *A Culture of Censorship: Secrecy and Intellectual Repression in South Africa*. South Africa: David Philip Publishers (Pty) Ltd. 1994.

Murray, A.H. 1461/65, BCS, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Murray, A.H. 605/67, BCS, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Murray, A.H. P76/8/143, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Murray, A.H. P76/9/24, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Nel, P.R. P90/05/25, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Phillips, John. "Old Wine in New Bottles? Literary Pornography in Twentieth Century France." Ed. Lisa Sigel. *International Exposure: Perspectives on Modern European Pornography, 1800-2000*. United States of America: Rutgers, 2005.

Phillips, Richard. *A Timeless Portrait of the Anti-colonial Struggle in Algeria*. 29 May 2004. 1 June 2010. <<http://www.wsws.org/articles/2004/may2004/boal-m29.shtml>>

Pontecorvo, Gillo (dir.). *The Battle of Algiers* (film), (1966).

Rivers, Patrick L. "Governing Images: The Politics of Film and Video Distribution in Late-Apartheid and Postapartheid South Africa." *Journal of Film and Video*. 59.1 (2007): 19-31.

Rhodes, P. National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Sanders, Mark, "Memories of Censorship", *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 11.1-2 (2010).

Sartre, Jean Paul. *The Wretched of the Earth, preface*. New York: Grove Press. 2004.
[Originally published in France as *Les Damnés de la Terre*, Paris, 1961.]

Shepherd, Nick and Robins, Steven [eds]. *New South African Keywords*. North and South America: Ohio University Press. 2008.

Simon, John. "Injustice, Universal Style." *New York Magazine* 5 June 1978: 84.

Smit, P.C. P85/9/65, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Smit, P.C. P87/12/108, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Smit, P.C. P85/2/63, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Smith, Maurice. *The Testimony of Steve Biko*. Great Britain: Maurice Temple Smith. 1979.

Stora, Benjamin and Stevens, Mary. "Still Fighting." *Interventions* 9.3 (2007) London: 365-370.

Stum, Robert. "Fanon, Algeria and the Cinema: The Politics of Identification." *Multiculturalism, Postcoloniality, and Transnational Media*. London: Rutgers University Press, 2007.

"*The Battle of Algiers* (film)." *Academic dictionaries and encyclopedias*. 1 June 2010. <<http://en.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enwiki/5314666>>

Taylor, Jeremy. "Black Skin, No Mask." *Caribbean Beat Archive (1992-2006)*. Issue 66, March/April 2004. 2 December 2010. <<http://www.meppublishers.com/online/caribbean-beat/archive/index.php?id=cb66-1-48>>

Turner, Lou. "40 Years Since Fanon's Dying Colonialism." *News & Letters*.

Vambe, Maurice and Zegeye, Abebe (Eds). *Unity and Struggle, introduction*. 2nd ed. Pretoria: UNISA Press. 2008.

Van der Westhuizen, M.J. P79/9/108, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Van der Westhuizen, M.J. P87/12/13, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Van der Westhuizen, M.J. P87/10/151, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Van Niekerk, A.A. P90/06/39, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Van Pittus, G. P78/4/127, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Van Rooyen, Kobus. *A South African Censor's Tale*. Pretoria: Protea Book House. 2011.

Van Rooyen, J.C.W. *Censorship in South Africa*. Kenwyn: Juta & Co, Ltd. 1987.

Van Rooyen, J.C.W. P78/4/127, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Van Rooyen, J.C.W. P93/88, IDP, National Archives, 72 Roeland Street, Cape Town.

Van Zyl, Thelme. "'A Completely Different Framework': Attenborough's Cry Freedom and South African Censorship." Honours essay submitted to Stellenbosch University, 28-04-2009.

Woods, Donald. *Biko*. London: Paddington Press. 1978.

Worrall, Denis. *Interpreting South Africa*. December 2009. African Business.FindArticles.com. 15 Oct. 11.<http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa5327/is_359/ai_n45470017>.

Wyrick, Deborah. *Fanon for Beginners*. New York: Writers and Readers Publishing, Inc. 1998.