Apartheid Publishing, Library, and Archival Histories: Censorship and Exclusionary Strategies

Montserrat Romero

Members of South Africa's mainstream apartheid-era publishing, library, and archival institutions supported the National Party's goals of racial exclusion and information control. This paper discusses publishing, library, and archival institutions' obedience to the regime wherein they further pushed apartheid's agenda from 1950, beginning with the Suppression of Communist Act No. 44 of 1950, to 1994, the end of the regime. The National Party gained power and established apartheid in 1948. Consequently, at the beginning of its rule, the government seized control of library and archival management and used them to censor information to further their control of the population and erase their own corrupt acts. However, these institutions chose to be more complicit, which helped further the National Party's agenda even more than if they would have otherwise. Moreover, studying their histories maps out the tools and strategies the regime and its supporters used to control information, censor literature, and gatekeep knowledge it deemed subversive. Despite the regime's efforts to divide the general populace along racial lines, mold their thinking in support of their ideologies, and hide the regime's acts of destruction of archival materials and books, they were unable to completely succeed.

Independent publishers, authors of banned writings, and revolutionaries resisted the National Party's plans for the country, and their efforts helped pave the way to the end of the regime. Regardless of the National Party's efforts, their authoritarian government fell in 1994 and the voices they tried to silence were further unearthed. Therefore, South African publishing, library, and archival histories during apartheid tell a story. Despite the efforts of the apartheid regime and those complicit in their acts to control knowledge through censorship there are still

people who resist. Consequently, through their resistance regimes can fall and evidence of hidden acts and muted speech cannot be completely erased.

South African publishing, library, and archival institutions were not apolitical. Instead, they played major roles in upholding apartheid ideologies. Many of these organizations were already separated by race or followed suit, pre-emptively reject manuscripts, and destroyed books and archival documents thus contributing to apartheid censorship. Firstly, they strengthened existing exclusionary and racially targeted requirements for membership status. Secondly, they manipulated the flow of information to the people via limited access to contrary literature and active suppression of said literature by refusing to publish and/or distribute it. Finally, they engaged in the removal of books and destruction of archival materials. Therefore, I argue members of mainstream publishing, library, and archival institutions upheld apartheid ideologies of racial separation and suppression of knowledge through their exclusionary and censorship tactics. I further argue, that by studying these strategies it is possible to develop methods to counteract them.

A study into the historiography of South Africa's education and missionary histories are necessary to further construct a robust narrative to add to the literature about the country's publishing, library, and archival histories. Historian Vusumuzi Rodney Kumalo argues that a marker of colonial usurpation of control over education was the beginning of missionary schools.[1] The National Party viewed missionary schools as a hindrance in effectively enacting the Bantu Education Act throughout South Africa. However, Kumalo offers a perspective wherein even missionary schools, who supposedly opposed the Bantu Education Act, shared the same goal as the National Party in which they strived to control Black Africans through their schooling. Additionally, historian Alan Gregory Cobley argues that the National Party was more worried

[1] Vusumuzi Rodney Kumalo, *South Africa's Struggle for Independent Education: The African Methodist Episcopal Church and the History of the Wilberforce Institute*, 1st ed. (Cape Town: BestRed, 2023), 1.

about what Black South Africans were reading rather than the fact that they could read.[2] Historian Paul S. Landau highlights the importance of knowledge and referred to underground channels of banned literature distribution among Nelson Mandela and other revolutionaries in Chapter 5 of his book, "Mandela's Book Case." Landau has degrees in both history and African studies. His perspective provides reasoning behind the National Party's fear of contradictory literature and their ever-growing paranoia of it throughout their reign.

Additionally, to gain a further understanding of archival history I have referenced historian Thula Simpson's work regarding South African historiography. Historiography has a linkage to archival studies wherein the two are tied closely together since going through the archives is one of the ways to begin engaging with history. Simpson studies the historiography regarding Nelson Mandela's task force Umkhonto we Sizwe. He analyzes the various narratives and methodology employed by the historians he references; ultimately, Simpson shines a light on an aspect of archival history about the methods in crafting historical narratives and the ways historians present memory.

However, I refer also to historian of African history Helena Pohlandt-McCormick as both a primary and secondary source for South African archival history. I will use the recounting of her time in South African archives from 1990 -1994 as a primary source while focusing on her academic contributions as a secondary source. She argues for the validity of the use of missing archival materials as a source wherein their absence provides evidence of acts of censorship. Furthermore, she claims that it is necessary to bring these histories to light and that archives bear responsibility in maintaining the archival record.[3] Regardless of whether records are saved in the

---

[2] Alan Gregor Cobley, *The Rules of the Game: Struggles in Black Recreation and Social Welfare Policy in South Africa*, vol. 182 (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997), 59.

[3] Antoinette M. Burton, *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 319.

archive, she notes that their safety is not guaranteed simply because they are in the archive since, "we know that institutions are only as good or as bad as the people who run them".[4] She further warns, "danger comes, even now, when controls put in place to protect people or evidence are suddenly used to control access to information and to restrict knowledge."[5] Pohlandt-McCormick's warning emphasizes the power archivists hold over knowledge distribution and their potential as tools of censorship.

My contribution offers a historical lens on South Africa's apartheid-era publishing, library, and archival histories and their relationship with each other. In this paper, I attempt to fill a gap in the historical field regarding these niche topics and their connections to each other. Using a censor's memoir, written accounts of past experiences, handbooks, directory guides, newspaper articles, tables of library data, a Black South African's academic library dissertation about non-white libraries in the then Transvaal, banned readings, and *Jacobsons List of Objectionable Literature* from 1991 I will extrapolate the history in those sources. I also use legal documents like the Bantu Education Act of 1953, censor correspondence, and issues from the *Government Gazette* to further study the goals and rationale behind these acts.

The National Party established apartheid in 1948 and officially remained in power until 1994. The mid-1950s marked the start of much of the regime's censorship efforts. Afterwards, the 1970s to the 1980s signified a major resurgence in resistance movements in the public eye. The years 1990 to 1994 were a time of transition from the authoritarian government of the National Party to a democracy. By the time the time the National Party fell apartheid had been declared a crime against humanity. The National Party's Suppression of Communism Act No. 44 of 1950,

---

[4] Antoinette M. Burton, *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 320.

[5] Antoinette M. Burton, *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 320.

the Publications and Entertainments Act No. 26 of 1963, and the Publications Act No, 42 of 1974 are three legal implementations by the regime to censor information in South Africa. Among them, the Suppression of Communism Act allowed the government to ban publications regarding communism and ban or punished others based on suspicion of unsavory motive and means.[6] This gave the party the power to imprison individuals without evidence. Additionally, police officers torturing political prisoners was a secret, but acceptable, practice within South Africa. The National Party organized the political landscape to strengthen their power. Therefore, they deemed extreme punishments as suitable actions against whoever they labeled a political dissident.

Moreover, publishing, library, and archival institutions were not apolitical; regardless of how they attempted to portray themselves their colonial roots colored their actions. Many publishing institutions were separated by race. Black libraries did not exist until a combination of persistent protest from Black South Africans and assistance from the Carnegie Corporation helped establish them in the 1930s. Prior to that, even if there were no outright laws against Black workers in White libraries, they would not be hired. Finally, the archives were places of exclusive access prioritizing maintaining a record of colonial documents. After the National Party came to power, members of these institutions embraced their rise to power and fully revealed their true motives in reinforcing apartheid.

An understanding of South Africa's education history is necessary to begin a discussion regarding its publishing and library history. Schools had their own libraries beginning from Standard 1 up to university level education. These schools were the purchasers of books from publishing institutions. Teachers would order books for the classroom library, their own private collection, or a student's assigned reading. Therefore, looking into apartheid education history can

[6] Rachel Matteau Matsha, *Real and Imagined Readers: Censorship, Publishing and Reading under Apartheid* (Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2018), 13.

reveal the effects mainstream publishing institutions had on schools. Once an understanding of apartheid's education history has been established, one can move onwards to the discussion regarding apartheid censorship. This section analyzes the Bantu Education Act of 1953, *Jacobsens Index of Objectionable Literature* from 1991, and Kobus Van Rooyen's censor's memoir along with its preface by Afrikaans author André Brink in order to glean their relation to South Africa's publishing history. Additionally, this section suggests through its finding that, during the time of the National Party's rule, mainstream publishers supported the censorship of contradictory knowledge and reinforced apartheid's racial divide via their segregated institutions and self-censorship.

The National Party enacted the Bantu Education Act of 1953 to seize control of the country's educational foundation. The beginning of the Act stated it was "to provide for the transfer of the administration and control of native education from the several provincial administrations to the Government of the Union, and for matters incidental thereto."[7] The Bantu Education Act allowed the minister control of the location of schools for Black South Africans, the funding they would receive, and the curriculum deemed suitable. Additionally, the Bantu Education Act listed out the National Party's plans for the knowledge they deemed suitable for Black South Africans to know. The goal was to cultivate a cheap servant class for White Afrikaners. Thus, the Bantu Education Act was an example of the National Party's strengthening of apartheid's racial separation agenda. Moreover, it shows the government's seizure of control over the funding, curriculum, and schools' ongoing existence. Therefore, the Act is further evidence that the National Party's agenda was to manipulate and control the population. Specifically, it is part of their overall plan to control the Black population in South Africa. By taking control of education,

[7] *Bantu Education Act*, No. 47 of 1953.

the regime acknowledged the power they believed education gave to Black South Africans regarding the opportunities they could have and how that shaped their own beliefs.

I will begin exploring South Africa's publishing history by using *Jacobsen's Index of Objectionable Literature* as a reference point. *Jacobsen's Index of Objectionable Literature* was an unofficial guide to banned readings in South Africa that was first published in 1956 after the implementation of the Customs Act of 1955. According to *Jacobsen's Index* it was "A COMPLETE LIST OF ALL PUBLICATIONS IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER TOGETHER WITH AUTHORS. PROHIBITED FROM IMPORTATION INTO THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA. AND ALL OTHER BANNED LITERATURE."[8] Although it was an unofficial guide, librarians and publishers used it to remain up to date with new banned readings. As noted on the cover of *Jacobsen's Index*, it was a "lists of Banned Books, reproduced under Government Printer's Copyright Authority No, 2354 of 4th October, 1956."[9] Although I was only able to access a few scanned pages of the index, I noted that much of the banned literature on them were related to sensual or sexually related content, queer literature, or of a political nature.

Jacobsen's Index organized the banned readings alphabetically in a large grid by title. After each title, *Jacobsen's Index* listed the publisher under the Publication column, followed by the author, then listed columns Sec. 9, Sec. 47 (2), and G.N. No regarding the work's relation to the Publications Act of 1974 and the *Government Gazette* identification number. The final columns fell under the *Gazette* category, which referred to the *Government Gazette*. The *Gazette* was the government newspaper that announced the banned or unbanned statuses regarding questionable literature. Finally, the last columns underneath the *Gazette* category listed the issue number and

---

[8] *Jacobsen's Publishers, Jacobsen's Index of Objectionable Literature (1956–1991)* (Stellenbosch University Library), 2022.

[9] *Jacobsen's Publishers, Jacobsen's Index of Objectionable Literature (1956–1991*) (Stellenbosch University Library), 2022.

date. According to André Brink, an Afrikaner author, after the Publications Act of 1974, "the infamous *Jacobsen's Index* of banned publications, include[ed] hundreds of the greatest titles of world literature, was expanded to well over twenty thousand titles."[10] Therefore, *Jacobsen's Index* demonstrated an increase in publication censorship after 1974.

Additionally, Brink provided the perspective of an author interacting with publishing companies in the preface of Kobus Van Rooyen's memoir. Kobus Van Rooyen was chairman of the Publications Appeal Board in 1980 until 1990. Brink recounts that, "…the publisher was anxious to reprint, a costly business he dared not contemplate unless he knew that the new edition could be sold," regarding the lack of response by the Publications Appeal Board about the appeal status on the banning of his book *Looking on Darkness*.[11] From Brink's remembrance of events, it could be gleaned that even publishers who were alright with books of contradictory knowledge, in the face of the censors' verdict, would still be hesitant to publish those types of books. Additionally, Kobus Van Rooyen recalled in his memoir that in 1975, a year after the 1974 Act, an exchange he had with a "Koos Human from Human & Rousseau [who] confirmed that, for the first time, a manuscript was rejected for fear that it might be banned."[12] Both these recollections from Brink and Van Rooyen revealed a fear-induced complicity as their motivations to why members of mainstream publishing institutions adhered to obeying apartheid ideology. However, by complying with the regime, members of publishing institutions, like the unnamed individual who rejected a manuscript because they anticipated it might be banned, further encouraged the cultivation of a literary environment that supported apartheid ideologies. This incident was evidence of publishers self-censoring themselves before the government could officially ban the

[10] Kobus Van Rooyen, *A South African Censor's Tale* (Pretoria: Protea Book House, 2011), 10.
[11] Van Rooyen, *A South African Censor's Tale*, 10.
[12] Van Rooyen, 31.

books they produced. Therefore, by pre-emptively censoring themselves, as individuals who could dictate whether the manuscripts they received would be published, they censored the literature available to the public. Thus, mainstream publishers practiced censorship by rejecting manuscripts and fostered a literary culture wherein they suppressed the voices of contradictory authors.

However, a further look into Kobus Van Rooyen, who was once a professor of Criminal Law at the University of Pretoria, shows insight into a potential strategy against censorship within an institution. Brink admits that he views himself as someone more inclined to direct confrontation. Therefore, he did not care for Van Rooyen's approach of "working within the system," but acknowledges that Van Rooyen was able to "[use] the weapons the system itself had placed at his disposal" to act against it.[13] Throughout his memoir, Van Rooyen provides examples of how he circumvented the system. He justified that, "…only when material posed an actual danger of violence or amounted to a real contribution to violence, would we ban the distribution."[14] Under such rationale, papers like the *Freedom Charter* and *Staffrider* were unbanned. He lists out multiple times the ways he wielded the Publications Act as a shield, by citing "…the Publications Act expressly prohibits anyone from influencing or attempting to influence the Appeal Board."[15] Although the Publications Control Board could ban a work, the Publications Appeal Board could later unban it. Under Van Rooyen's leadership, the verdicts of the Appeal Board trended toward unbanning rather than banning when compared to the Appeal Board under his predecessors.

Therefore, by looking into these histories, one can glean the methods of the oppressor and find ways to counteract them. The National Party enacted laws to further their control over the population and, to a degree, it worked. Some members of mainstream publishing institutions

[13] Van Rooyen, 12.
[14] Van Rooyen, 112.
[15] Van Rooyen, 127.

preemptively censored themselves and, as a result, the information they distributed out of fear of the regime. However, individuals like André Brink and Van Rooyen show that there were those who resisted the regime's censorship laws and used their privilege to strive to make a change. André Brink's approach of direct confrontation via his controversial writings and Kobus Van Rooyen's strategy of working from inside the system to dismantle it both show steps that led to the fall of apartheid.

An analysis of previously banned readings during apartheid can also help provide insight as to why they were banned and later hypothesize why they were unbanned. Of what was the party afraid? Why were these readings perceived as a threat? Answers to these questions are suggested in this section. This section analyzes banned readings and legal correspondence beginning with the *Freedom Charter*, *House of Bondage* by Ernest Cole, the first issue of *Staffrider*, and letters between Ravan Press attorneys and the Censor's Office regarding the banning of *Staffrider's* first issue. This book and publications, particularly ones that were later unbanned, gives insight into the reasonings behind the censorship and decensorship of them.

Additionally, a look into banned readings and alternative independent publishers provides insight into the different methods of resistance against apartheid's censorship laws and the control exerted over the voices of the people by mainstream publishing institutions. Organizations like Ravan Press published magazines like *Staffrider*, an alternative literary magazine showcasing Black and resistance literature, actively pushed the boundaries and fought for literature. Additionally, by looking into previously banned literature such as the *Freedom Charter*, Ernest Cole's *House of Bondage*, and *Staffrider*'s Volume 1 Issue 1 in conjunction with issues of the *Government Gazette* announcing their censorship and decensorship statuses, it is possible to gain

deeper insight into censorship tactics. Looking into these strategies can reveal the ways South Africans fought against them in their everyday lives.

The *Freedom Charter*, was initially made in 1955, banned in 1956, illegally distributed in the interim, and then finally unbanned in the 1980s. The African National Congress (ANC) organized the *Charter's* creation and it was adopted at the Congress of the People. The *Charter* revealed the wants of the people during 1955 and, as evidenced by its distribution in the 1980s, the people still shared those sentiments. The first statement of the *Charter* provided a clear basis for what it stood for, which was "That South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of all the people."[16] Additionally, it claimed as one of its goals that "all apartheid laws and practices shall be set aside."[17] Moreover, it declared that "No-one shall be imprisoned, deported or restricted without a fair trial; no-one shall be condemned by the order of any Government official."[18] Members of the regime feared that the mere distribution of the *Charter* would be enough to incite violence, revealing their paranoia and fear of the people. Separation of races was not enough, and their censorship attempts grew stricter as the years went on. However, as evidenced by the distribution and debates among South Africans in the 1980s of the *Freedom Charter*, there were those who questioned the regime and resisted.[19] The National Party revealed, based on their reaction to the Charter, that they did not feel secure in the fact that they had and would have definitive control over South Arica both then and in their future.

---

[16] "The Freedom Charter," Adopted by the Congress of the People, June 26, 1955," in *From Protest to Challenge: A Documentary History of African Politics in South Africa, 1882-1964,* ed. Thomas Karis and Gwendolym M. Carter, vol 3, *Challenge and Violence, 1953-1964,* by Thomas Karis and Gail M. Gerhart (Stanford, Calif: Hoover Institution, 1977), 205-8.

[17] "The Freedom Charter," 205-8.

[18] "The Freedom Charter," 205-8.

[19] Kobus Van Rooyen, *A South African Censor's Tale*, (Protea Book House, 2011), 117, 120.

Ernest Cole was a Black South African who actively chose the path of self-exile in order to publish his book *House of Bondage* which contained his five-year compilation of photos revealing Black urban life in South Africa. Additionally, the book included a foreword by reporter Joseph Lelyveld and Cole's essays on life for Black South Africans. His work was first listed as banned in the *Government Gazette* in 1968, a year after its publishing in 1967.[20] This section analyzes Cole's essay "Education for Servitude" from his book *House of Bondage*. Cole's essay discussed the installment of the Bantu Education Act of 1953. However, Cole provided his own educational experience prior to the enactment of the Bantu Education Act to compare with that of the children he observed after the Bantu Education Act was passed. He concluded that the education he received was of better quality than the education those children received.[21] He also noted the ways the government distorted the usage of statistics to paint the Bantu Education Act in a favorable light and used it to support their lie that it bettered Black South Africans' education.[22] Cole critiqued that even though there were fewer educational institutions and students prior to the Bantu Education Act, the quality of the curriculum and the rates at which students continued and then completed their education were higher.[23] According to the *Government Gazette*, it was partially unbanned, though the book could only be distributed to university libraries.[24] The partial unbanning of Cole's book reveals the loosening of censorship laws overtime in South Africa.

---

[20] *Republic of South Africa Government Gazette*, vol. 34, May 10, 1968.

[21] Ernest Cole, *House of Bondage: A South African Black Man Exposes in His Own Pictures and Words the Bitter Life of His Homeland Today* (Random House, 1967), 109.

[22] Ernest Cole, *House of Bondage: A South African Black Man Exposes in His Own Pictures and Words the Bitter Life of His Homeland Today* (Random House, 1967), 109.

[23] Ernest Cole, *House of Bondage: A South African Black Man Exposes in His Own Pictures and Words the Bitter Life of His Homeland Today* (Random House, 1967), 109.

[24] *Republic of South Africa Government Gazette*, vol. 298, April 20, 1990.

The *Staffrider* magazine had its publication in 1978 wherein the first issue was banned for supposedly violating the Publications Act of 1974. By looking at the correspondence between Ravan Press attorneys and the Censor's Board, a larger understanding for its banning can be gained. Although the Board acknowledged that some parts of the magazine had "literary merit," they listed out their reasonings behind banning the magazine overall.[25] Firstly, they banned it for being similar to another banned publication, *Donga*.[26] Secondly, they argued it because "the authority and image of…the police…are undermined."[27] Thirdly, they claimed their reasoning was because of its obscene language, including the usage of words like "poes" and "shitty".[28] Lastly, they justified banning the Issue because it "calculated to harm Black/White relations."[29] These reasonings taken from correspondence discussing *Staffrider*'s banned status reveal the specific standards authors had to navigate around when dealing with apartheid censorship.

The first issue of *Staffrider* declared the goals of the literary magazine. Wherein: "the aim of this magazine is not to impose 'standards' but to provide a regular meeting place for the new writers and their readers, a forum which will help to shape the future of our literature."[30] This section examines a short story in *Staffrider*, "Soweto Hijack!" by Miriam Tlali. According to the correspondence it was on of the deciding factors for the issue's banning. The story supposedly

---

[25] Bowman, Gilfillan & Blacklock to The Director of Publications, R. E. Lighton, April 25, 1978 and May 13, 1978, quoted in Rachel Matteau Matsha, *Real and Imagined Readers: Censorship, Publishing and Reading under Apartheid* (University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2018).

[26] Bowman, Gilfillan & Blacklock to The Director of Publications, R. E. Lighton, April 25, 1978 and May 13, 1978, quoted in Rachel Matteau Matsha, *Real and Imagined Readers: Censorship, Publishing and Reading under Apartheid* (University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2018).

[27] Bowman, Gilfillan & Blacklock to The Director of Publications, R. E. Lighton, April 25, 1978 and May 13, 1978, quoted in Rachel Matteau Matsha, *Real and Imagined Readers: Censorship, Publishing and Reading under Apartheid* (University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2018).

[28] Bowman, Gilfillan & Blacklock to The Director of Publications, R. E. Lighton, April 25, 1978 and May 13, 1978, quoted in Rachel Matteau Matsha, *Real and Imagined Readers: Censorship, Publishing and Reading under Apartheid* (University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2018).

[29]Bowman, Gilfillan & Blacklock to The Director of Publications, R. E. Lighton, April 25, 1978 and May 13, 1978, quoted in Rachel Matteau Matsha, *Real and Imagined Readers: Censorship, Publishing and Reading under Apartheid* (University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 2018).

[30] "Staffrider Vol.1 No.1 1978," *Staffrider*, March 1978.

posed harm to interracial relations and contained negative portrayals of South African police. The story revolved around the character Masoli and her experience in jail after attempting to attend a funeral meeting for Steve Biko the leader of the Black Consciousness Movement. Masoli, along with ninety-one other people, were rounded up by the police and had tear gas thrown at them. Early into her account she noted seeing an Afrikaner officer attempt to rape a Black twelve-year-old girl. The story, true to its subtitle, "a story of our times", was meant to be a reflection of life under apartheid for Black South Africans.

An analysis of banned readings and alternative publishing reveals the ways they actively resisted against censorship laws or circumvented them. *Staffrider* framed themselves as an innovative and new creative literary magazine proposing the cultivation of a new literary culture. Not all their issues were censored like the very first issue, however, there were still some issues that were banned. Unlike members of mainstream publishing companies, the writers for *Staffrider* chose to risk their work being banned rather than to pre-emptively silence their own voices. Additionally, even though the *Freedom Charter* was banned, there were individuals who printed out pamphlets listing out the *Charter* for distribution when it couldn't be published. Meanwhile, Ernest Cole actively chose self-exile in order to publish his book *House of Bondage*.

Throughout the process of working on his project of recording the lives of Black South Africans he knew what he was doing was a precarious endeavor. Additionally, he understood that publishing his work would increase the risk of danger and it would become a banned book in South Africa. Although Cole did not explicitly state what the specific danger was, it could be inferred that he risked becoming a specific target for state imprisonment. However, he still decided to continue his project in documenting the everyday lives of Black South Africans under apartheid and willingly left the country to publish *House of Bondage*.

Such readings were banned and were unlikely to have been in libraries or, if they were, to be distributed via mainstream channels. Through an analysis of banned readings and legal correspondence this section attempts to glean the different strategies South Africans had to cultivate to circumnavigate censorship. Therefore, based on the sources, this section hypothesizes the alternative strategies could have been: anonymous distribution, toeing the line to see how much they could get away with, or going abroad in order to ensure the publication of their work.

A look into library and archival histories reveal the ways members of these institutions maintained and furthered apartheid's agenda of racial exclusion and censorship. Looking at a library manual and archivists' accounts of their experience in the archives during apartheid highlights the foundation of race-based subdivisions of these establishments and deliberate destruction of archival materials. South African libraries and archives engaged in their own exclusionary and censorship tactics. Libraries were segregated pre-apartheid, however, library associations had no rules regarding the race of their members. The South African Library Association began excluding based on race after, apartheid thus leading to the establishment of race-based library associations in the country. Meanwhile, archives remained a place of limited access.

Using Marguerite Peters' *Handbook of Library Methods* an understanding behind library management during apartheid can be achieved. This can lead to a further understanding of the motives behind the foundation of race-based institutions and the strategy behind the manipulation of materials deemed acceptable or unacceptable to these institutions. Additionally, recounts from historian Helena Pohlandt-McCormick's time in the archives and Verne Harris' recounts as a TRC investigative archivist in 1990-1994 provide perspectives of individuals perusing and working in the archives offering a multi-faceted outlook of these institutions during apartheid. Therefore, it

can be easier to recognize the warning signs of corruption and to learn from what has been done about in the past when such history is highlighted.

Marguerite Peters wrote *The Handbook of Library Methods* in 1966. The edition was written to be used by librarians and students training to be librarians as guidelines for working in a library. Additionally, it provided information about various library training methods in South Africa. One of the chapters that Peters included was chapter five, "Library Associations in South Africa," wherein she discussed the different library associations, their history, and their constitutions. She claimed library associations worked for the best interest of their members and noted the different racialized associations people could join. Although the handbook was trying to provide helpful context for librarians and library students in training it was not concerned about revealing the hypocrisy of the South African Library Association. The South African Library Association claimed in its constitution it aimed "to unite all persons engaged or interested in library work…" in 1930.[31] However, by 1962 it adjusted its aims so that "the membership of the South African Library Association be limited to Whites…" thus banning non-white people interested in library work from their organization.[32] Even though the phrasing in the 1930 constitution presents an open and welcoming message, this was not the case in reality as evident by the lack of Black public libraries in the 1930s. Therefore, the change in jargon among their constitution in 1962 reveals a more blatant aggressive display of 'Whites-first' type of mentality among the South African Library Association which had always been present. Moreover, this chapter further revealed the reach apartheid's racist and exclusionary policies had within the library sphere. The South African Library Association contorted its benevolently appearing constitution into

[31] Marguerite Andrée Peters, "Library Associations in South Africa," in *Handbook of Library Methods*, ed. Marguerite Andree Peters and members of the Non-European Library Service (A.A. Balkema, 1966), 40.

[32]Marguerite Andrée Peters, "Library Associations in South Africa," in *Handbook of Library Methods*, ed. Marguerite Andree Peters and members of the Non-European Library Service (A.A. Balkema, 1966), 41.

hypocritical ethos. Therefore, Peters exemplifies the solidification of mainstream South African libraries' stance on adhering to exclusionary practices. The South African Library Association became an Afrikaner library association in all but name.

Helena Pohlandt-McCormick recounted her time as a student in the archives when writing her dissertation on the 1976 Soweto Uprising. She had begun her graduate studies in 1989 wherein "Archivists carefully controlled access to the records that remained in the archives according to strict rules and pro-government biases of which [she] knew [her] research agenda would run afoul."[33] Moreover, she recalled how she "…faced the prospect of closed archival holdings, a somewhat unyielding archival staff, and the secretive nature of government…"[34] Additionally, Pohlandt-McCormick provided an example of one such closed archival holding in her account wherein "[l]ike other archival holdings younger than 1960, the records of the Cillié Commission were closed to research."[35] She claimed, "In the same way that the voices of the participants had been rendered almost completely indistinct, or had been silenced or ignored, the documented sources too had become inaudible and hidden."[36] She recounted the changes in archival space compared to the beginning of 1990 and 1994 during the transition to democracy wherein those same archivists initially acted like gatekeepers and then in 1994 behaved more like research fellows.[37] Therefore, Pohlandt-McCormick's account reveals strengthening of the archives' closed-door policy which limited access to scholars prior to the end of apartheid. However, by

[33] Antoinette M. Burton, *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Duke University Press, 2005), 300.

[34] Antoinette M. Burton, *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Duke University Press, 2005), 303.

[35] Antoinette M. Burton, *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Duke University Press, 2005), 307.

[36] Antoinette M. Burton, *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Duke University Press, 2005), 307.

[37] Antoinette M. Burton, *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History* (Duke University Press, 2005), 308.

1994 before the regime's fall, archival research became minutely more open compared to before given the archivists' new change in attitude and more lax policies. Although there were changes, they were miniscule and the overall restricting nature of the archives remained.

Verne Harris' *Ghosts of Archive: Deconstructive Intersectionality and Praxis* was an autobiographical study on archival studies. He mixed in his apartheid experiences along with his own research. Although many of his personal accounts were about events post 1994, this section focuses on the ones prior to 1995 to highlight his time as an investigator for the Truth and Reconciliation Council's archival investigation. Harris began his recounting of events at age fifteen wherein he was conscripted into the army. He noted that when he was discharged at seventeen years old, he was a "fucked up" youth.[38] He then continued that he sought solace in historical processes like archival studies and reading the works of Derrida and Cixous wherein they shaped his view and archival approaches. However, he also noted the political climate at the time when he was an activist and his own act of resistance such as when he recalled, "as a writer during the apartheid era, I resisted the regime's essentializing of ethnic and racial identities by using lowercase letters and inverted commas (signifying 'so called') when referring to these identities."[39] However, regarding the archives he noted some experiences he had. He recalled a moment with a former freedom fighter assisting the investigation when they found some Security Police case files. Harris observed that prior to finding those files the former freedom fighter was outraged at the idea of someone claiming that more documents should have been destroyed. He witnessed that same freedom fighter state, after finding the documents, "Maybe they should have destroyed them all."[40] Harris also noted the existence of the South African History Archives which

[38] Verne Harris, *Ghosts of Archive: Deconstructive Intersectionality and Praxis* (Routledge, 2021), 8.
[39] Harris, *Ghosts of Archive,* x.
[40] Harris, 21.

started as a grassroots effort among activists to preserve records the regime tried to destroy. Throughout his accounts, Harris solidified his opinion that he believed archival work is important and a work of justice. Harris' accounts exemplified the desire members of the National Archives had to destroy certain archival materials. Moreover, the destruction of archival materials was an act of censorship and historical erasure.

Both archivists' perspectives defined what an archive was, their role, and their condemnation for how the archives were treated at the hands of those in power: the government and archivists of the time. They also exemplified the exclusionary tactics and information suppression that members of these institutions practiced. Peters displayed in the handbook the separation of the institutions based on race with the establishment of various South African Library Associations wherein one of the qualifying requirements for membership status was that individuals must be of the correct race corresponding with said association. Pohlandt-McCormick revealed the minute changes in behavior among archivists towards visitors to the archives from the beginning of the transition period of 1990 to the end in 1994. She highlighted their closed-door practices which served as an obstruction to scholars' research process during apartheid. Moreover, Harris shone a light on the efforts of the regime to destroy archival materials and the efforts of grassroots resistance organizations like SAHA in preserving records.

The National Party's rise to power established a strict white-supremacist hierarchy, in South Africa that it attempted to maintain via manipulation the establishment of legal measures both information and racially-motivated separation of the population. Mainstream publishing, library, and archival embraced the Party's rise to power and establishment of apartheid by promoting and maintaining apartheid ideologies. They rejected manuscripts they deemed problematic to apartheid's and the National Party's message. Additionally, through the suppression

of objectionable literature, they converted themselves into propaganda machines since they primarily published works that aligned with the National Party's pro-Afrikaner ideology. Meanwhile, libraries discarded what they deemed to be unsavory materials. Additionally, National and University archives limited who could access their collections and actively destroyed archival materials and were also racially separated institutions. However, identifying what they did and highlighting the ways people counteracted and resisted against them reveals methods people in the present day can follow to fight censorship in their own lives. Therefore, we can use these institutions censorship and exclusionary tactics to avoid walking down apartheid's path once more. Additionally, the significance of this research helps to identify when similar restrictive policies begin to appear in present day. By having this knowledge we can mitigate, dismantle, and prevent apartheid and the rise of other malevolent regimes.