The Marshall Square Prison Escape : The Liliesleaf Farm Trust archive, politics of memory and the creation of historical archives[1]

Vusumuzi R Kumalo

The 1960's are widely recognised as a tumultuous, painful, yet inspiring period in South African history, where significant socio-political upheaval occurred as a result of the banning of key political resistance organisations and the mass-scale arrests of political activists who waged a catalytic fight against apartheid. Like most movements, history is often distorted, bent to accommodate the interests of the powerful. The story of the 1963 Marshall Square Prison Escape is not exempt from such revision. This article examines how a popular narrative, spread by newspapers of this period, depicted Harold Wolpe and Arthur Goldreich, both white activists, as key figures of the escape whilst simultaneously erasing the presence of Mosie Moolla and Abdulhay Jassat, both Indian South Africans, from the story. The article illustrates how archival composition presents a methodological challenge to historians seeking to represent the complexity of the 1963 escape.

Keywords: Apartheid; South Africa; Marshall Square, Liliesleaf, liberation struggle, newspapers

Introduction

Nearly three and a half years after the Sharpeville Massacre, a traumatic event that was followed by the banning of both the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan African Congress (PAC), four little-known activists appeared on the stage of history by escaping from Marshall Square Police Station in Johannesburg. Harold Wolpe and Arthur Goldreich were both Communist Party activists (an organisation that was declared illegal in 1950) and Mosie Moolla and Abdulhay Jassat were Transvaal Indian Congress (TIC) stalwarts. These activists had been arrested on separate occasions for acts viewed as challenges to apartheid hegemony and were to face trial alongside Nelson Mandela and other Rivonia defendants.[2] Wolpe was picked up at the Bechuanaland border shortly after the Liliesleaf arrests in 1963, and taken to Marshall Square police cells in the city of Johannesburg. This is where he met Goldreich, Moolla and Jassat. Goldreich was being held after police raided Liliesleaf Farm in Rivonia.

[1] While the escape can be referred to as a 'prison escape' in common parlance, Marshall Square was a police station with holding cells. Strictly speaking it was an escape from police custody rather than a prison break.
[2] J. Head, *https://www.iol.co.za/capetimes/news/wife-smuggled-blades-into-jail-1568747*, accessed 8 January 2019.

Throughout the lead up to the escape, Liliesleaf Farm was the nerve centre of the liberation movement and a place of refuge for its leaders.[3] The property was purchased by the South African Communist Party (SACP) through Goldreich, who set up a front company called Navian (Pty) Ltd. Geographically, Liliesleaf was ideal, secluded in the peri-rural area of Rivonia. It provided a secure location where the underground leadership could meet.[4] It is where most of the African National Congress (ANC) mastermind, popularly known as the Rivonia trialists, were arrested in 1963. Mandela, who moved to Liliesleaf following an invitation from the SACP in 1961, was, however, not present during this raid. He was already serving a five-year sentence for inciting workers to strike and for leaving the country without a passport.[5] Today the farm has been restored into a museum and the archive details the events leading up to the Rivonia Raid. The buildings have been restored to their earlier condition, and visual and audio-visual displays recreate the dramatic events leading up to the police raid, and the raid itself.[6]

Coming across woeful newspaper reports of the story of escape in the Liliesleaf Archive generated intense excitement on my part. These media reports hinted a little-known episode in the undocumented lives of the anti-apartheid activists who successfully escaped from Marshall Square. I began poring over records to determine possible traces of the escapee's peregrinations. As so few written records attest to the escape, these newspapers first appeared to open a new avenue into this significant story of prison escape. After going through these news articles, I questioned why these fugitives enjoyed media attention and a great public sympathy, including the involvement of a police official, a naïve Constable Johannes Greef, who agreed to leave their cell door and the external doors unlocked, so that the four men could escape from Marshall Square. For his role, Greef was to be paid a R3 000 bribe for his help. Unfortunately, he was subsequently arrested. His payment was made only when South Africa became democratic in 1994.

[3] For discussion of this theme, see, D. Welsh, *The Rise And Fall Of Apartheid: From Racial Domination To Majority Rule* (Johannesburg, 2010); L. Strydom, *Rivonia Unmasked,* (San Francisco, 2019); N. Mandela, *Long Walk to Freedom,* (London, 1995); A. Sampson, Mandela: *The Authorised Biography*, (Johannesburg, 1999).
[4] L. Strydom, *Rivonia Unmasked.*
[5] D. Welsh, *The Rise and Fall of Apartheid*; L. Strydom, *Rivonia Unmasked*; N. Mandela, *Long Walk to Freedom,* (London, 1995).
[6] See, http://www.liliesleaf.co.za/ accessed on the 27 August 2020.

This article turns a historical lens on a lesser, but significant, aspect of archive, namely the creation of historical record from newspaper reports now deposited in the Liliesleaf archive in Rivonia. Drawing on Andre Brink's terminology, this article explores the silences of the past in order to discover or invent the voices subsumed in them.[7] It further explores the implications of the apartheid journalistic flaws as revealed by the escape story, and their repercussions for historical practice in South Africa today, more particularly for historical writing, archiving and promoting historical knowledge of the past. It contributes to an ongoing transformation discourse on archives. A discourse informed by the assumption that archives required redefinition, more precisely reinvention, for a democratic South Africa. In essence, this dialogue reflects on the nature of the archives, records, and memory along with their significance in the lives of previously marginalised individuals, communities, and societies; as well as the role and responsibility of an archivist.[8] The central concern of this article is the need to create space for Moolla and Jassat within the realm of history. In so doing, it offers an opportunity for one to grapple with the fragmented narrative of the story of the Marshall Square Escape. Undoubtedly, memories of the escape still have the power to undermine the self-esteem of Moolla and Jassat. In retrospect, the humiliation and torture they suffered during their arrest was traumatic. This left marks on them as victims.

In terms of organisation, in the first part of this article I employ a theoretical framework that gives a critical thought on the archiving practices of today. Since South Africa became democratic in 1994, many questions have been placed on the foundations and principles of archivists, as well as on the social position of archivists. In this section, I demonstrate how the complexity and dynamism of archival discourse that dramatically increased in a relatively short period of time is relevant to the story of the Marshall Square Escape, along with its archive. Thereafter, the inter-relationship between archives and newspapers is explored. The intention is not to retrace what has been published on the prison escape by journalists Allister

[7] A. Brink, 'Stories of history: reimagining the past in post-apartheid narrative' in (ed.), S. Nuttal and C. Coetzee. *Negotiating the Past: The making of memory in South Africa*, (Cape Town and Oxford, 1998), p. 32-34.

[8]For detailed accounts of this discourse, see, V. Harris, *Archive and Justice: A South African Perspective*, (Chicago 2007); C. Hamilton, et al., *Refiguring the archive* (2002). In this book questions about the archive are often brought into conversation with the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. See also, C. McEwan, Building a Postcolonial Archive? Gender, Collective Memory and Citizenship in Post-Apartheid South Africa, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 29, 3, (2003), pp. 739-757; A Birton, (ed). Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions and the Writing of History, (Durham, 2005).

Sparks and Glen Frankel.[9] Rather, to tackle the escape story as a complex illustrative case that offers a fascinating entrée into the comprehension of apartheid newspaper reporting and the creation of archive. My main interest is to explore what was and was not reported in *The Star, The Rand Daily Mail* (RDM), the *Golden City Post*, *Ilanga laseNatal,* and other national and international newspapers, most notably the stories of Jassat and Moolla. I argue that the political context under which the South African white newspapers operated in the 1960s gave rise to their own form of racism, a form of prejudice that disregarded certain facts, based on cultural, racial and class biases. This argument is substantiated by evidence from newspaper reports. These reports informed largely on Wolpe and Goldreich, both white activists, as key figures of the escape, whilst simultaneously erasing the presence of Moolla and Jassat, both Indian South Africans, who have often been most marginalised by colonialism and apartheid and excluded from dominant accounts of history. It is concluded that there is a need for the South African archives to create space for previously marginalised activists, whether children such as Nkosi Johnson (the youngest South African HIV/AIDS activist), male or female, black or white, to be equally represented in the process of restoring collective memory.

Theoretical context

A key reference point for analyses of the story of escape and its archive is the work of Jacques Derrida. According to Derrida, it is not so much the text or document that is important. Through deconstruction, Derrida describes the 'black holes' in the textual information of a document. In so doing, he argues that the traces that lie at the basis of a document can be retrieved.[10] Derrida's work remains a useful theoretical resource that cause us to raise questions on how post-apartheid archives should be more open about the gaps in their collection. Derrida raises the question on how former marginalised voices, such as oral histories that represent the undocumented side of the escape, could be incorporated in the construction of a post-apartheid archive. This line of reasoning would enable Moolla and

[9] G. Frankel, *Rivonia's Children*; A. Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen.* The story of the escape has been meticulously documented by two journalists, Glen Frankel and Allister Sparks. In his book, aptly entitled *Rivonia's Children,* Glen Frankel has done valuable work in contributing to our understanding of the story of the Marshall Square Escape, (MSE) popularly known as the 'Great Escape', and political activities that took place at Liliesleaf. In his monograph, he uses letters, oral interviews and other archival material, now stored at Liliesleaf Archive. He has competently reconstructed the political role of the handful of white radicals who sacrificed their comfort and risked their lives as white South African middle class members during the 1960s. Allister Sparks, who followed the white fugitives, Wolpe and Goldreich, up to Bechuanaland (Botswana), revealed the dangers that faced the escapees in Bechuanaland. He also reconstructs how difficult it was for journalists to capture the story of the escapees in Bechuanaland, and how dramatic it was for the escapees who feared a sabotage attack in their attempt to catch a flight to Tanzania.

[10] J. Derrida, *Archive Fever*, p. 114.

Jassat to convey the truth of what happened. In turn, this would free everyone to talk, not only regarding the emotional attachments to the escape, but also on what may have happened.

In the same line of thought, the theoretical question raised earlier by Derrida has meticulously been posed by Michael Foucault, who abstractly focuses on the law of what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events.[11] In his work, Foucault analyse the way discourses are ordered. He argues, 'my object is not language but the archive, that is to say, the accumulated existence of discourses. Archaeology, as I intend it, is kin neither to geology (or analysis of the sub-soil) nor to genealogy (as description of beginnings or sequences); it is the analysis of discourse in its modality of archive.'[12]

Foucault's concept of discourse, as Mark Olssen states, 'circulates with power and thus is active… It produces, limits, excludes, frames, hides, scars, cuts, distorts, and juxtaposes distorted and illusory images alongside knowledge of the present.'[13] Owing to the ongoing inquiry into monolithic archival practise described above, contemporary critics and historians, both in the East and the West, share similar sentiments. An Asian scholar, Ashis Nandy, argues, 'millions of people are still living outside history.'[14] His contention is based on the premise that the absence of written records in non-western societies allows modern history as an imperial category to establish complete hegemony and assume the authority to marginalise and banish races and cultures, other than the European and North American, from the realm of history.[15]

In recognition of gaps in historical data, Nandy suggests that the narration of the past cannot be a uniform. He goes on to assert that different people have a different way to reach the past.[16] It is a matter of who you are and how you perceive the world. To sum up Nandy's argument, all societies cannot resemble Europe or the United States in telling the story of the past. The other stories of mankind, such as those of the indigenous peoples crushed by modernisation, the stories about women and family life, each with a trajectory of its own,

[11] M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (trans. A. Sheridan Smith) (New York, 1972).
[12] M. Foucault, 'The discourse of history.' In S. Lotringer (ed.), Foucault live: Interviews, 1966– 1984. (New York, 1989), p. 25.
[13] M. Olssen, Discourse, Complexity, Normativity: Tracing the elaboration of Foucault's materialist concept of discourse, *Open Review of Educational Research*, 1:1, 2014, p. 35.
[14] A. Nandy, 'History's Forgotten Doubles,' *History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History,* 34, World Historians and their Critics (ed). P. Pomper et al, (Connecticut, 1995), p. 44.
[15] A. Nandy, 'History's Forgotten Doubles', p. 56-57.
[16] A. Nandy, ' History's Forgotten Doubles, p. 46.

need to be written and accepted as history.[17] This points to the ways in which stories of the past are positioned within power relations and how archives themselves determine history.[18] In a similar vein, Anıbal Quijano argues that the colonial cultural repression turned the previous high cultures of colonies into illiterate, peasant subcultures condemned to orality; that is, deprived of their own patterns of formalised, objectivised, intellectual, and plastic or visual expression.[19] Similar to Nandy, both Foucault and Derrida's work provides an important basis to define parameters of archives and archivists, an important consideration for reflecting critically on the story of escape in the light of changes brought by post-apartheid archival transformation. This escape story allows us to engage with the past erasure of documentation, particularly of Moolla and Jassat, in the construction of post-apartheid archive. As Scott Cline notes, 'when we do this, we operate within a moral and ethical imperative that ultimately associates archival practice and what Verne Harris terms "the call of justice".'[20]

Archive and newspapers

Here the story of the escape builds on the constraints and setbacks of South African journalism in the 1960s. It provides an opening to investigate how newspaper reports created a problem facing modern archivists in South Africa. As Verne Harris notes, these practical preoccupations constantly press upon archivists to make their work a work of justice and how they practice a hospitality of otherness.[21] In this context, archivists are called upon to do justice to the previously marginalised.[22] They are invited to welcome multiple voices into the archives by reintegrating and reintroducing oral records that will enable historians to cleave new research terrain of anti-apartheid history. This would assist historians in shifting away from relying on written material in the absence of oral and photographic material.

Thus, the story of the Marshall Square Escape is significant. It connects two disparate histories, the voluminously documented newspaper account of the 1960s and the concealed lives of the Indian activists. It allows archivists to enter an ever evolving and unfolding dialogue on the nature of the archive, records, and memory. It also allows one to explore

[17] A. Nandy, 'History's Forgotten Doubles, p.46-47.
[18] C. McEwan, Building a Postcolonial Archive? Gender, Collective Memory and Citizenship in Post-Apartheid South Africa, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 29, 3, 2003, pp. 739-757.
[19] A. Quijano, 'Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality,' *Cultural Studies*, 21:2-3, pp.173-174.
[20] S. Cline. 'To the Limit of Our Integrity": Reflections on Archival Being*' The American Archivist* , 72, 2, 2009, p. 341.
[21] V. Harris, *Archives and Justice: A South African Perspective,* p. 77.
[22] See, V. Harris, *Archives and Justice: A South African Perspective,* p. 77-78.

what Phillip Bonner referred to as 'less familiar moments and themes that the rich treasure trove of struggle history contains.'[23] Above all, it urges us to interrogate why Moolla and Jassat do not feature as prominently in the prevailing history of this dramatic prison escape as Wolpe and Goldreich.

Although five and a half decades have passed since the prison escape, historians, for their part, have yet to explore the 1963 escape in detail. The received information on the escape is presented by Allister Sparks and Glen Frankel.[24] The time is now ripe to revisit the nature of the sources created by the journalists who reported in the immediate aftermath of the escape, with a view to prising open new perspectives on the events of 1963.

Although newspapers have significantly revealed useful information on the escape, they however, do not address some key questions that Rashid Seedat and Razia Saleh, along with the work of Joel Joffe, have uncovered. They did not relate Moolla and Jassat's daily struggles for survival during escape. Significantly, nearly all the daily news reports presented by print media covered the daily experiences of Goldriech and Wolpe. Their account is well documented up to Tanganyika, an east African country that became the hub of political refugees who fled political persecutions from different parts of colonial Africa in the 1950s and 1960s.[25] The reporters followed their escape route and captured their story from Swaziland, Bechuanaland, Tanganyika and up to England, where they finally settled.[26]

---

[23] P. Bonner, 'Fragmentation and Cohesion in the ANC: The First 70 Years' in A. Lissoni, J. Soske et al. (eds.), *One Hundred Year of the ANC: Debating Liberation Histories* Today, p.3.

[24] G. Frankel, *Rivonia's Children: Three Families and the Cost of Conscience in White South Africa* (Johannesburg, 2000); A. Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen: Six Decades on the Political Frontier* (Johannesburg, 2016).

[25] Tanganyika (presently known as Tanzania) has been one of the most influential countries of independent Africa, taking a leading role in the effort to overthrow white minority rule in Southern Africa, and defining the ideals of African non-alignment. The country became the centre of African refugees. It accommodated members of the liberation movement who fled from different parts of colonial Africa. From southern Africa, Tanganyika accommodated members of the African National Congress (ANC), the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), or the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO). See, S. Ndlovu, 'The ANC in exile', in South African Democracy Education Trust, *The Road to Democracy in South Africa*, Volume 1, 1960-1970, (Cape Town, 2004); L. Ngculu, *The Honour to serve: recollections of an UMkhonto soldier,* (Claremont, 2009); L. Mphahlele, *'Child of this soil': My life as a freedom fighter*, (Johannesburg, 2002); A. Lissoni, "The South African liberation movement in exile, 1945-1970," (Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 2008).

[26] Bechuanaland (Botswana) and Swaziland were British protectorates that emerged as a place of refuge from its troubled white-ruled neighbour. Their reception of refugees made these countries distinct nations in the region. Unlike Swaziland, Bechuanaland from 1957 onwards Batswana people received a significant influx of political refugees from South Africa. For a detailed discussion, see, N. Parson, 'The pipeline: Botswana's reception of refugees, 1956–68', *Social Dynamics*, 34, 1, 2008, pp. 17-32; S. Ellis and T. Sechaba, *Comrades against apartheid: the ANC and the South African Communist Party in exile*, (London, 1992), For a detailed account of

Thus, the work of Seedat, Saleh and Joffe marks a turning point in the memorialisation of the escape. Their publications have a significant impact upon historical practice in post-apartheid South Africa. These scholars engage with the oral archive that remains undisclosed. They have recorded the experience of fugitives who have been hidden from the history of the breakout. They have shown that through oral history one can learn more about the perspectives of escapees, their feelings, personal private experiences, and their aspirations.[27] They have unravelled what Ashis Nandy refers to as 'secular processes and the order that underlie the manifest realities of the past time, available in ready-made or raw forms as historical data.'[28] Finally, they have revealed how memory and history are constantly in dialogue. For instance, Seedat and Seleh's work recounts experiences gained by Moolla and Jassat under the oppression of apartheid. In a similar vein, the content of the oral testimonies of Moolla, Jassat, Wolpe, and Goldreich, collected by the Lilliesleaf Trust, capture what has been suppressed in the dominant public representation of the escape. Drawing upon Jassat's testimony, it was not reported that:

> fled the country and went to Tanzania where doctors diagnosed him as suffering from epilepsy. The ANC sent him to Germany, Moscow and Czechoslovakia for medical treatment, where the doctors told him that the torture had damaged his central nervous system.[29]

We also lack knowledge that:

> From the time of his escape in 1963 until 1968 the apartheid state denied Mosie's wife Zubeida, and their children, Tasneem and Azaad, passports. Finally, in 1968, they were granted passports and travelled by train to Lusaka.[30]

Drawing from the writings of Harris, certainly, these accounts do justice to both Moolla and Jassat.[31] They fill a gap caused by newspaper reports of the 1960s.

Wolpe and Goldreich in Swaziland, see, C. Hooper, *The Red Car*, unpublished manuscript, *https://www.sahistory.org.za/sites/default/files/F21_RED%20CAR.pdf*, accessed on the 27 September, 2020.
[27] R. Seedat and R. Saleh (eds.), *Men of Dynamite: Pen Portraits of MK Pioneers* (Johannesburg, 2009); J. Joffe, *The State vs Nelson Mandela: The Trial that Changed South Africa* (Oxford, 2007).
[28] A. Nandy, *History's Forgotten Doubles*, *History and Theory*, Vol. 34, p.48.
[29] Liliesleaf Trust interviews, Liliesleaf Archives.
[30] R. Seedat and R. Saleh (eds.), 'Men of Dynamite,' p. 179.
[31] V. Harris, *Archives and Justice: A South African Perspective.*

The Marshall Square Escape

In the early hours of August 11, 1963, Harold Wolpe, Arthur Goldreich, Mosie Moolla and Abdulhay Jassat made a daring bid for freedom. Aided by an Afrikaner warden, Johannes Greeff, the four escaped from the Marshall Square police headquarters.[32] From Marshall Square, Moolla and Jassat headed off to an Indian quarter of Fordsburg where they merged inconspicuously into the local population and did not feature again in the dramatic escape story.[33] As accounted, 'The getaway car was parked near the prison but when they didn't escape at 12am as planned the gateway car was removed.'[34] Wolpe and Goldreich then walked to Hillbrow in the early hours of the morning. In the twilight, Harold could discern a figure urinating against a tree. They decided to take the risk. Walking closer, Harold realised it was none other than the writer and director, Barney Simon. They were in luck! Simon was on the list of names of sympathisers Mannie Brown and others had compiled for just such an event as this.[35]

What *The Star* newspaper called the 'most intensive man-hunt ever mounted' began once the South African authorities realised what had happened. [36] The apartheid regime offered a massive reward for information leading to the arrest of the dissidents. Rumours swirled about the whereabouts of 'the "hottest" political fugitives from South Africa for many years'.[37] With assistance of various friends, the escapees were moved from safe house to safe house over a period of two months, until they escaped to Swaziland. Planning depended on a coded list of known supporters and sympathisers.[38] From Swaziland, they flew to Bechuanaland (Botswana), and then Wolpe and Goldreich went into exile in the United Kingdom.[39] Meanwhile, Greeff was remanded for trial, charged with aiding the escape of prisoners.

The escape was widely reported and publicised in different conservative and progressive South African newspapers. The front page headline of the *Rand Daily Mail* (RDM) reported:

---

[32] Greeff was promised a bribe, but never received it. In 1994, when the ANC came to power, Greeff was traced and was finally paid the money promised to him.

[33] A. Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen*, p. 335-336.

[34] Interview with Nicholas Wolpe conducted by the author, Johannesburg, 20 March 2019.

[35] Interview with Nicholas Wolpe.

[36] *The Star* August 15, 1963.

[37] *The Star* August 14, 1963.

[38] Interview with Hilary Hamburger, conducted by the author, Johannesburg, 14 June 2019.

[39] [39] Interview with Hilary Hamburger.

'Four 90-Day Men."[40] The headline of *The Star* announced: 'Massive Police Net Out for Escapers.'[41] The headlines in local Zulu newspapers, such as *Ilanga LaseNatali*, reported, '*Yeqe Ejele Inkinsela yaseRivonia* (The rich man of Rivonia escaped from prison).[42]

Whereas Wolpe and Goldreich received assistance on their escape route in Swaziland and Bechuanaland from religious activists and government officials, and journeyed safely onward, the 'escape route' to exile of Moolla and Jassat was not recorded in the press.[43] Even today, it remains unclear how, where, and when they fled. We do not know whether they received similar support to that which the privileged white, educated comrades received. These are not simple questions – certainly not for a historian of South Africa's post-apartheid past. Such questions, while difficult to answer, generate further fundamental questions, which are of considerable value to historians, centred on historical evidence and archives. Despite that the majority of Jews 'were inwardly focused on specifically Jewish issues, remaining distant from the central South African issue of racial injustice and unsupportive of the anti-apartheid cause.'[44] History has shown that Indian and Jewish narration was marginalised from the official narration of South Africa during this period. Along with non-Whites, some Jews in the struggle against apartheid were assassinated, tortured, mutilated and imprisoned.[45] They were also discriminated against by some Afrikaner political organisations, such as the South African Gentile National Socialist Movement, a fiercely anti-Semitic group known as

[40] *Rand Daily Mail*, 12 August 1963.
[41] *The Star*, 12 August 1963.
[42] *Ilanga LaseNatal*, 17 August 1963
[43] See, C. Hooper, *The Red Car*, unpublished manuscript.
[44] While most South African Jews took the silent implicitly conservative position of the Board of Deputies, the great majority of white South Africans involved in 'the struggle' were Jewish. Many were Communists. Most like Harold Wolpe, James Kantor, Lazar Sidelsky and others were lawyers. When Africans freehold areas, such as Alexandra, Evaton and Kliptown were founded on the Rand some Jewish lawyers ran programmes that helped black South Africans to get mortgages that they were denied accessing. A few, such as Arthur Goldreich had money, but all faces what has been described as a 'double marginality' not fully accepted as white. This small proportion of Jewish activists were also alienated from an organised Jewish community. See, N. Mandela, *Long Road to Freedom* (Boston, 1995); I. Suttner, (ed.), Cutting Through the Mountain (London, 1997); M. Shain, The Roots of Antisemitism in South Africa (Charlotttesville, 1994); L. Herrman, *A History of the Jews in South Africa* (Johannesburg, 1935); d E.A. Mantzaris, 'Radical Community: The Yiddish-speaking Branch of the International Socialist League, 1918-1920', in B. Bozzoli (ed.), Class, Community and Conflict: South African Perspectives (Johannesburg, 1987).

[45] F.H. Adler, South African Jews and Apartheid, *Patterns of Prejudice*, Vol. 34, 2000, p. 24. For detailed accounts of this discourse, see, N. Mandela, *Long Road to Freedom* (Boston, 1995); I. Suttner, (ed.), Cutting Through the Mountain (London, 1997); M. Shain, The Roots of Antisemitism in South Africa (Charlotttesville, 1994); L. Herrman, *A History of the Jews in South Africa* (Johannesburg, 1935); d E.A. Mantzaris, 'Radical Community: The Yiddish-speaking Branch of the International Socialist League, 1918-1920', in B. Bozzoli (ed.), Class, Community and Conflict: South African Perspectives (Johannesburg, 1987).

the Grey Shirts.[46] This is better illustrated by the constitution of this movement stored at the University of the Free State archives, which reads as follows:

> The party stands for an enactment of stringent immigration laws to prevent Jews from entering the Union of South Africa…The discontinuities of the granting of South African nationality to Jews who entered the Union of South Africa after 1918….The party stands for extension of dealing with repatriation of Asiatics. In particular regard the presence of Indians in South Africa. [47]

In this way, Wolpe and Goldreich shared discrimination with the Indian activists. Skin colour has never been an obstacle to solidarity against apartheid.

As Edward Carr warned, 'no document can tell us more than what the author of the document thought – what he thought happened…or perhaps only what he wanted others to think.'[48] There are certainly elements of truth here. Michel-Rolph Trouillot argues, 'silences are inherent in history because any single event enters history with some of its constituting parts missing. Something is always left out while something else is recorded.'[49] This gap in the historical narrative should concern the historian, and it urges one to think more critically and imaginatively about the documentary records, and specifically about the archive out of which the histories of the Marshall Square Escape can and will be written. It is the goal of this article to mend the breach between fragmentary elements, with a view to show how newspapers that end up in archives shape our knowledge of the past. In every archival process, certain stories are privileged, and others marginalised. In the context of the escape, 'inequalities experienced by the actors lead to uneven historical power in the inscription of traces.'[50]

While it is self-evident that the sources under review were the product of an intentional archival process, it must be acknowledged that the process itself was fundamentally shaped by the act of recording impacted by the pressing socio-political issues of the 1960s.[51] It is

[46] See, F.H. Adler, South African Jews and Apartheid, p.26.
[47] The South African Grey Shirt Movement, PV 136, C.J.W Adendorff Collection, The University of the Free State Archive.
[48] E.H. Carr, *What is History* (Cambridge, 1961).
[49] M.R, Trouilott, *Silencing the Past,* p.49.
[50] M.R, Trouilott, *Silencing the Past* , p.48.
[51] V. Harris, 'The Archival Sliver: Power, Memory, and Archives in South Africa,' *Archival Science* 2: pp. 63–86, 2002. The National Intelligence Service headquarters, for instance, destroyed an estimated 44 tons of paper-

important to recognise that this was a challenging time for journalism in South Africa – it was the beginning of elaborate apartheid ideology that was marked by the inauguration of the new Prime Minister, Hendrik Verwoerd, who intensified the disciplinary vigilance of apartheid.[52] It was the time of forced removals, when metropolitan multi-racial cities were segmented into a series of self-contained black enclaves or townships.

It is therefore reasonable to argue that the political context in which the newspapers operated gave rise to their own form of racism, a form of prejudice that disregarded certain facts, based on cultural, racial and class biases. It is important to note that the escapees constituted a fairly coherent underground community of anti-apartheid activists with a strong sense of self-identity, driven by the common goal of overthrowing the apartheid government, yet their stories are reported unequally. I argue that this context created newspapers that later became incomplete archival sources, that today leave a researcher yearning for more information. These records are idiosyncratic, 'they do not act by themselves. They act through many conduits – the people, who created them'.[53] They do not provide us with an understanding of the complexities, contradictions, and nuances embedded in South African history. They effectively silence Indian activists and their political goals. Despite the achievements of the Liliesleaf Trust Oral History Project, a project of an independent organisation responsible for the commemoration of the political activities that took place in Rivonia, South Africans are still denied a complicated, complex, and nuanced portrait of the history of the Marshall Square Escape.

In Ann Stoler's terms, archives 'are products of state machines . . . technologies that reproduced the states themselves.'[54] If we present historical narrative based on a particular archival record without 'interrogating how archive logics work, what subjects they produce, and which they silence in specific historical and cultural contexts,' we perpetuate this denial.[55] We risk reproducing yet another generation that does not understand its history or the connection of the escape story to the emergence of a contemporary democratic South

based and microfilm records in a 6–8-month period during 1993. For a detailed account of the 1990–1994 purge, see my "'They Should Have Destroyed More': The Destruction of Public Records by the South African State in the Final Years of Apartheid", Transformation 42 (2000).

[52] A. Sparks, *Beyond Miracle: Inside the new South Africa*, (Johannesburg, 2003), p. 40.

[53] V. Harris, 'The Archival Sliver: Power, p. 65.

[54] A. Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain : Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton, 2010) p. 28. See also Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston, 1995); and Achille Mbembe, "The Power of the Archive and Its Limits," in Hamilton et al., *Refiguring the Archive*, pp. 19-26.

[55] A. Burton, "Introduction: Archive Fever, Archive Stories" in Burton, *Archive Stories*, pp. 1-24.

Africa. We also deny these future generations access to relevant, dynamic, and often controversial history or critical lenses that would give them insight into the history of the liberation struggle.

In this light, it is important first to explore these sources in their original context, with a view to understanding how and why these sources came into being and how their examination may contribute to our understanding of how apartheid impacted on South African media reporting in the 1960s. This will also assist in comprehending how South African investigative journalism was impacted by a ruthless government that entirely disregarded press freedom. The impact of the government on press has been highlighted by veteran South African journalist, Allister Sparks, who argued that 'it was not enough to ensure to your own satisfaction that your reporting is accurate'.[56] Building on this, I argue that a re-evaluation of journalism in this pivotal period benefits from a multidisciplinary perspective. Furthermore, although it might be misleading to lean too heavily on these sources, they are useful for our present inquiry insofar as they encourage further engagement with the story of the prison escape, not only as existing testament of the past, but also as an example of the future. A focus on journalistic content opens up further reflections on this story, as well as complexities that surround memory and archives.

Apartheid rule and record keeping

It is important to bear in mind that, under apartheid, the very acts of preserving, archiving, and even possessing anti-apartheid materials or banned books were themselves political statements that could garner a hefty prison sentence. In the event of an arrest, such materials could be used as proof of high treason. Apart from Wolpe, who preserved various accounts in a scrapbook housed in the Liliesleaf Archive, I tried to locate other documents. For security reasons, no other Marshall Square prison escapees saved personal documents. For this reason, the memories of the escapees form an important part of the personal records. The only available written records created on the day of the escape, and immediately thereafter, consist of newspaper reports and police records. No police records are currently available. The absence of police records raises some delicate questions: were they misplaced, destroyed, or archived, intentionally or otherwise? Some researchers, such as post-apartheid archive theorist Verne Harris, claim that 'between 1990 and 1994 the state engaged in a large-scale

[56]A. Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen.*

sanitisation of its memory resources designed to keep certain information out of the hands of a future democratic government.'[57]

In light of the inaccessibility or non-existence of prison records, an historical reconstruction of the story of the escape rests on newspapers and oral histories. Most newspapers, if not all, were and are still fragmented according to language and race. This fragmentation created several smaller distinct markets and also fragmented reporting in the 1960s.[58] At the same time, different media houses were engaged in a power struggle for control of public discourse and political agendas, with some explicitly supporting political parties, as was the case with the Afrikaner newspapers such as the *Vaderland.*[59] In addition, South African newspapers were under stringent surveillance by the apartheid media control platforms created by the provisions of the Suppression of Communism Act, Defence Act, and Terrorism Act, and later, by the Publication Act of 1974. It is not insignificant that the 1980s, during popular political activity, witnessed the emergence of 'alternative' media that focused on political issues, such as the *New Nation.*[60]

In the 1960s, censorship led to the arrest of non-compliant journalists, such as Raymond Eisenstein, an economic reporter on the *Rand Daily Mail,* Hugh Lewin of *Drum,* Jill Chisholm of the *Rand Daily Mail,* Benjamin Pogrund, the editor of the *RDM,* and many others.[61] Journalists were targeted as individuals, and some were subjected to banning orders, completely prohibited from writing, stripping them of their primary means of income. The offices of progressive newspapers, particularly the *RDM,* were frequently searched by the Special Branch.[62] All these arrests and provisions had been used to censor and

[57] V. Harris, "They should have destroyed more": The Destruction of Public Records by the South African State in the Final Years of Apartheid, 1990-1994, http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10539/7871/HWS-166.pdf, accessed on 12 February 2019.
[58] E. Potter, *The Press as Opposition: The Political Role of South African Newspapers* (Totowa, 1975); R. Pollak, *Up Against Apartheid: The Role and the Plight of the Press in South Africa* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois, 1981), 53; H. Wasserman and G.J. Botma, 'Having it both ways: balancing market and political interests at a South African daily newspaper'. This article is based on Botma's MPhil thesis and builds on his article in *Ecquid Novi* (2006) 27(2) pp. 137-158.
[59] R.B. Horwitz, *Communication and democratic reform in South Africa.* (Cambridge, 2001).
[60] L. Strelitz and L. Steenveld, 'Thinking about South African tabloid newspapers,' *Eqcuid Novi, Journal of African Journalism*, Vol 26, 2010, pp. 265-268.
[61] A. Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen.* These journalists covered high risk stories. Their reporting contravened the Prisons Act, which prevented publication of anything that went on in the country's jails. These journalists were involved in investigative journalism that reported politically related stories. Some of these journalists, such as Allister Sparks, reported on the court violation of legal procedure, and their reporting attracted international attraction.
[62] A. Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen.*

restrict newspaper coverage in South Africa.[63] Besides direct engagement, undercover agents posing as journalists collaborated with the state. Gordon Winter and others were on the payroll of 'Lang Hendrik' (Long Hendrik), a notorious security policeman who became prominent during what remained of resistance to apartheid after the 1960 banning of the ANC and other political organisations.[64]

In addition to security reasons, the Group Areas Act made it much more difficult and daunting for many white journalists to conduct fieldwork in Indian, Coloured and African townships. These prevailing conditions constituted an unwarranted interference with the aims, ethical conventions and practices of journalism, and with the goal of achieving the fullest communication with story makers. In some cases, African communities, which bore the brunt of apartheid, were understandably reluctant to accept white journalists who were seen as spies of apartheid. As Sparks indicates, 'this troubled me.' To cover politically-related stories was 'hellishly difficult', given the maze of security laws that journalists of the progressive newspapers had to navigate.[65] It is clear that ingrained popular suspicion of the disguises adopted by apartheid agents greatly constrained the capacity of journalism, contributing to the marginalisation of historical figures from particular stories, such as Moolla and Jassat.

Historical journalistic constraints thus pose a serious methodological problem in reconstructing the story of the escape and its political network. Frankel independently conducted oral history interviews for his chapter on the prison escape to counter this bias. Other individuals and groups such as the Liliesleaf Trust have positioned themselves within the vibrant archival transformation discourse by actively drawing an alternative evidentiary pathway and interrogating the contingencies of post-apartheid history writing. The Trust documented the voices of Jassat and Moolla, as well as the experiences of those either excluded from or otherwise marginalised by colonial and apartheid archives. Such initiatives may be interpreted as archaeological insofar as they take advantage of the new political moment to excavate silenced voices of political activists associated with a particular historical event or places, such as Liliesleaf Farm.

[63] J.A. Kalley, E. Schoeman and L.E. Andor, (eds.), *Southern African Political History: a chronology of key political events from independence to mid-1997* (Westport, 1999); P. Qoboza, from *Encyclopedia Britannica*, [online], Available at britannica.com [Accessed: 12 January 2019].
[64] A.D. Elsdon, *The Tall Assassin: The Darkest Political Murder of the old South Africa* (Johannesburg, 2011)
[65] A. Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen*, p. 335.

The silenced story

In the years following the prison escape, the full complexity of the escape story remained concealed and largely ignored by historians. The newspapers that served as the only available source before 1994 were rarely revisited. Other potential sources that touched on the escape were criminalised, insofar as they were deemed to be furthering the aims of communism and other illegal political activities. In addition, for much of the apartheid era, the overwhelming reason why South African historians based in South Africa neglected the escape story was the inaccessibility of exiled escapees.[66] Historians and other researchers were likely frustrated in their efforts to research this topic; and they reluctantly accepted that there were no new records with which to re-evaluate this period in history. Besides, traditional archives often neglected the lives of the escapees and other revolutionaries. During this period, the state generated huge information resources, which were archived and jealously concealed from public view. In this light, it is worth returning to Michael Foucault, who described archives as not simply institutions, but rather 'the law of what can be said, the system of statements, or rule of practise, that give shape to what can and cannot be said'.[67] Relatedly, Jacques Derrida held that there 'is no political power without control of the archive, if not memory. Effective democratization can always be measured by this essential criterion: the participation in and access to the archive, its constitution, and its interpretation'.[68]

In the South African context, archives were used as tools for chillingly erasing the memory and voices of the thousands who resisted apartheid.[69] South Africans were denied their right to be informed, to know, and to have access to important information about themselves. Personal rights were pitted against the right to privacy, with a view to protecting national security. The country's formal information systems became grossly distorted in support of official propaganda and related apartheid machinery. These tools of intentional forgetfulness legitimised apartheid rule and pushed the memory of resistance and struggle away into informal spaces and the deeper reaches of underground political networks.[70] In reaction to state archival practices, in the 1980s and early 1990s, a number of individuals and anti-government structures, such as the South African Committee on Higher Education

[66] S.D. Pennybacker, 'A Cold War Geography, South African Anti-Apartheid Refuge and Exile in London 1945-1994,' in N.R. Carpenter and B. Lawrance (eds.), *Africans in Exile: Mobility, Law, and Identity* (Indiana, 2018).
[67] M. Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge and Discourse on Language* (New York, 1972) pp. 79-134.
[68] J. Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*, trans. Eric Prenowitz (Chicago and London, 1995).
[69] V. Harris, 'The archival silver'.
[70] V. Harris, 'The archival silver'.

(SACHED) and others, began to give voice to the voiceless.[71] In his work on learning and social movements, Aziz Choudry has shown how these organisations fused learning, community practice and collective emancipatory struggles.[72] Consequently, a substantial number of records from these organisations were deposited in different liberal South African universities.

This period also saw a handful of intellectuals drawing much of their inspiration from the work of the 'New History' movement and the Schools Council History Project in Great Britain, which embarked on an historical knowledge project aimed at breaking down apartheid and colonial writing of history.[73] Many of these scholars were originally from the segregated 'ivory towers' of white South African English-speaking academe. Their concern was based on the fear that South African history had, for a very long time, been preoccupied by meaningful events and important people, but largely focused on white people. The contribution of the great majority was, for the most part, unwritten and unrecognised.[74]

These scholars were later joined by University of the Western Cape (UWC) historians and sociologists. These academics shaped the aforementioned institutions into what Jakes Gerwel (the former vice chancellor of UWC) called the 'intellectual homes of the left'. Despite severe constraints that emanated from the lack of funding and the dearth of written resources, this group of academics embarked on a struggle to align dynamic academic projects with anti-apartheid movements. According to Gary Minkley and Nicky Rousseau, these scholars 'transform[ed] the superficial historical consciousness that permeates and…produced from above in our society'.[75] This academic initiative organically aligned itself with the call for alternative education, popularly known as 'People's Education', as well as People's History. It is important to note that while this campaign was fundamentally associated with political mobilisation rather than the revision of school history curricula, it also provided a unique

[71] SACHED was born out of a struggle against the racist oppressive apartheid education system. Its foundation was a response to the passing of the Extension of University Education Act in 1959.
[7272] A. Choudry, *Learning Activism: The Intellectual life of Contemporary Social Movements* (Toronto, 2015).
[73]See, for example, B. Bozzoli and P. Delius, 'Radical History and South African Society,' *Radical History Review* No. 46-47, 1990, pp.19-27; C. Bundy, Re-Making the Past: New Perspectives on South African History, Cape Town, UCT, EMS, 1986; M. Cornevin, Apartheid Power and Historical Falsification, Paris, UNESCO, 1980; P. Bonner, 'New Nation, New History: The History Workshop in South Africa, 1977-1994', *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 81, 1994; J. Lewis, "South African Labor History: A Historiographical Assessment, Radical History Review, 1990.
[74] L. Witz, 'The write your own history project' in J. Brown et al. (ed.), *History from South Africa,* (Philadelphia, 1988).
[75] G. Minkley and N. Rousseau, 'This narrow language: People's History and the University: Reflections from the University of the Western Cape', *South African Historical Journal, Vol 34,* p. 180.

space for considering the nature of the history that should find its way into the national curriculum in the future democratic South Africa.[76]

This was a turning point in South African historical studies. As a discipline that lacked dialogue with other disciplines, history began to adopt an interdisciplinary and engaged activist approach. This period also saw the birth of the History Workshop at the University of the Witwatersrand, which was followed by the People's History Programme at UWC, and other institutes in various South African English universities. All these institutes began to produce a 'democratised historical knowledge'.

Heritage transformation

After 1994, the new democratic government played an important role in transforming the heritage landscape. This stimulated renewed interest in the debates surrounding the liberation struggle history as well as the story of the Marshall Square Escape. These debates were not confined to the academic sphere; they were not just debates among small elite, but concerned a much larger public than might normally be the case.[77] One complex issue that confronted the public was how to make museums, archives and heritage sites more representative, inclusive, and relevant for all South Africans. Then President Nelson Mandela said, 'The Government has taken up the challenge. Our museums and the heritage sector as a whole are being restructured. Community consultation, effective use of limited resources and accessibility are our guiding principles as we seek to redress the imbalances.'[78] These debates were not always pulling in the same direction; there was strong contestation and critical engagement, which was healthy and stimulated a high state of reflection.[79] The highly contested processes and particulars of the rationalisation and restructuring of the heritage landscape are, however, beyond the scope of this article.[80]

[76] P. Kallaway, 'History Education in a Democratic South Africa', *Teaching History*, No. 78, 1995, pp. 11-16.
[77] A. E. Coombes, *Visual Culture and Public Memory: History after Apartheid*, (Johannesburg, 2019).
[78] N. Mandela, Speech delivered during the opening of the Robben Island Museum, 24 September 1997.
[79] G. Corsane, 'Transforming Museums and Heritage in Postcolonial and Post-Apartheid South Africa: The Impact of Processes of Policy Formulation and New Legislation', T*he International Journal of Social and Cultural Practice, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Spring 2004),* pp. 5-15.
[80] For debates, see L. Witz, C. Rasool and G. Minkley, Repackaging the past for South African tourism, Daedalus: Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Winter issue: 277-96, reprinted in G Corsane, (ed.), *Heritage, Museums and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, (London and New York, 2005); J. Wells, 'Forging unity in diversity? Today's South African heritage practice and the post-apartheid recovery process', *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations, 6*, 2007.

It is important to note that the response to transformation was broadly divergent. For instance, President Thabo Mbeki initiated the South African Democracy Education Trust (SADET) in 2001. This institute attracted diverse scholars who contributed various stories of the liberation struggle and also kept track of the road to democracy by tracing the heroes, heroines and masses who have walked this difficult road to freedom and hope.[81] New public holidays, such as Heritage Day, Human Rights Day, Day of Reconciliation and others were inaugurated. In the context of the struggle for democracy and its connection with Liliesleaf Farm, researchers such as Frankel began to take a more sustained interest in the story of the political activists associated with Rivonia in the 1960s.

According to Ali Hlongwane, the people behind the new heritage initiatives were diverse, and held different, often conflicting, views. On one level, the memory makers were part of the post-1994 agenda of fashioning the past to suit current political needs, largely defined as reconciliation, symbolic reparation, and nation-building as well as addressing challenges of job creation. On another level, however, these memory makers were able to assert independence from the various tiers of government involved in making histories.[82]

Smaller, purpose-built museums, such as Liliesleaf and District Six, jealously guarded their independence and resisted being appropriated as projects of post-1994 state initiatives. These memorial spaces originated as a response to a perception that the mainstream government heritage bodies appeared disinterested in their seemingly lesser histories. This perception was reinforced by the fact that some histories and associated spaces, along with personalities, remained at the margins of the narrative of liberation struggle. Other museums, such as District Six, wanted to move away from a political emphasis by commemorating South Africans who have made an impact on the country outside of the conventional avenues of politics.

Liliesleaf was at the forefront of this agenda. In a 2013 *Daily Maverick* interview, Nicholas Wolpe (son of the struggle icon, Harold Wolpe), the founder and Chief Executive Officer of the Liliesleaf Trust, stated:

[81] T. Mbeki, (2004), *The Road to Democracy in South Africa*. Volume 1 (1960- 1970), (Cape Town, 2004).
[82] K.A. Hlongwane, 'The Historical Development of the Commemoration of the June 16, 1976 Soweto Students' Uprisings: A study of re-representation, commemoration and collective memory' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 2015).

> I organised a reunion of people associated with the Rivonia Trial and just felt that we couldn't allow the history of Liliesleaf to fade from the historical narrative and landscape. I presented the idea to establish the Liliesleaf Trust, which in 2002 began buying back three properties where the High Command of Umkhonto WeSizwe (MK) had met in the early sixties.[83]

Wolpe's heritage initiative and activism emanated from the fact that the mainstream government heritage body was not interested in the history of Liliesleaf. Until 2002, this historically significant space was not commemorated, nor did it feature on the priority list of legacy projects.

In his own words, Wolpe indicated that 'he saw the history of Liliesleaf as a powerful tool of engagement with South Africa's past.'[84] His vision, later fulfilled when the museum opened in 2008, aimed at reconstructing Liliesleaf as a space of engagement where liberation struggle activists and communities could take an active, participatory role in telling their own history, as well as enabling the preservation of a collection of archival material that might not otherwise be saved or heard.[85] This was emphasised by a member of the Liliesleaf Legacy Team, Samantha Horowitz, who conveyed how 'Liliesleaf is not trying to tell the story as it should be told but [rather] is opening up a platform for people to share their experience and memories of their history.'[86] When the preservation project started in 2004, 'the aim was to restore and preserve buildings, there was, however a need for the documentation of the story associated with the restored buildings, largely the July 11 Raid and other histories.'[87] The Liliesleaf Trust commissioned Sarah Haines and Garth Benneyworth of Site Solutions, a company established by heritage practitioners, to conduct an audit of archives, artefacts, and memory resources related to Liliesleaf. The company carried out all the necessary preservation responsibilities ranging from archiving to oral history interviews. In her testimony, Adrienne van den Heever, one of the founder researchers, indicates that:

[83] R. Fischer, *Daily Maverick*, 11 July 2013.
[84] During the meeting that was held between Wolpe and the University of Johannesburg, senior academic staff, October 2018.
[85]I am fundamentally concerned about what will happen when Liliesleaf loses the dominant activist connections of Wolpe and become reliant on public funding. Will it resemble the mainstream museums operated by heritage bodies?
[86] Samantha Horowitz presentation to University of Johannesburg historians who visited Liliesleaf, 22 February 2019.
[87] Interview with Adrienne van den Heever, conducted by the author, Johannesburg, 20 March 2019.

> This was not an easy task; the question was how to integrate the story of the escape into public history. The possibilities of putting the voices of the escapees at the centre of history and highlight their role as a category of analysis became a huge challenge. A central focus was to ask why and how escapees explain, rationalise and make sense of their past. How their past offers insight into the social and political framework within which they operated? Their perceived choices and political challenges they faced, as well as the complex relationship between them and apartheid authorities…It was not easy to access them, particularly Jassat who was still suffering from the post-traumatic stress of torture.[88]

Thus, an 'alternative knowledge space' with the archive, the physical objects and library collection was created. It was officially opened in 2008.[89]

Today some of the materials collected, such as the newspapers under review, are not only used to create histories of past struggles, but also to challenge the misrepresentation of history.[90] In this regard, Liliesleaf seeks to provide historical resources that will assist post-apartheid communities and activists to negotiate current socio-political and economic challenges that confront South Africa.

Review of source

Print media have played a major role in the information dissemination process, almost since the early days of the colonial period in South Africa. Until the very recent rise of online news, metropolitan daily newspapers remained the primary vehicle for South African journalism, as they provided current information on a wide variety of topics and could be purchased at a price that almost anyone could afford. National and international news, local events, regional coverage, sports and other socio-economic aspects all receive varying degrees of attention in South African daily and occasional newspapers. Even today, with the shift to online journalism, newspapers continue to provide readers with a vast array of information resources, the breadth of which remains almost unmatched.

[88] Interview with Adrienne van den Heever.
[89] Interview with Adrienne van den Heever.
[90] See for example, G. Benneyworth, 'Rolling up Rivonia 1962-1963,' *South African Historical Journal*, Vol 69, 2017, pp. 404-417.

According to Mark Stover, newspapers give access to historical local and state-wide news, information that would almost never be found in traditional databases.[91] This type of information is extremely valuable for students and researchers, especially in the humanities, social and behavioural sciences. Newspapers furnish a wider view of societal issues than is generally found in academic oriented or 'scholarly' databases. In liberal newspapers, for instance, the opinion section of a daily metropolitan newspaper contains 'person-on-the-street' viewpoints in letters to the editor and in opinion/ editorial pieces.[92]

If we are to make memory itself the subject of study, the creation of historical sources from newspapers, as indicated above, must be carefully contextualised, with attention to who reported, what their personal and social agenda was, and what kind of event they were describing. Drawing from a historian, Gregory Jay, it is also important to raise the following questions: Who represents what to whom, for what reasons, through which institutions, to what effect, to whose benefit, at what costs? What are the ethics of representation? What kinds of knowledge and power do authorised forms of representation produce? What kinds of people do such representations produce? Who owns or controls the means of information representation?[93]

For scholars of the past, one key challenge is to contribute to new ways of historical representation and knowledge production that might better achieve the goals of justice and democracy.[94] Some have argued that the liberal tradition, with its flexible approach to expanding 'recognition' for different classes of individuals, provides a good approach to the crisis.[95] In the context of the prison escape story, what were the underlying assumptions or problems that impacted on exclusive reporting in the 1960s? Regardless of political stance and class market, the analysis of various South African newspapers reveals that the newspaper depiction of the escape story is uniform.

---

[91] M. Stover, 'Newspapers on Disc: A Survey and Critique of Metropolitan Daily', *CD Rom Professional, November 1991,* p.1.
[92] M. Stover, 'Newspapers on Disc: A Survey and Critique of Metropolitan, p.1.
[93] G. Jay, 'Knowledge, Power, and the Struggle for Representation,' *College English*, Vol. 56, No. 1, 1994, p. 10.
[94] G. Jay, 'Knowledge, Power, and the Struggle for Representation'
[95] See for example, S, Edward. 'The Politics of Knowledge.' In Berman, Debating PC. 172-189. Originally published in Raritan 41.11991; Berman, Paul, (ed.), *Debating PC.* (New York, 1992). B. Michael. 'Public Image Limited: Political Correctness and the Media's Big Lie.' In Berman, Debating PC, pp 124-149.

While the biases of Afrikaans conservative newspapers are explicit, even progressive English liberal newspapers, such as the *RDM* and *The Star*, both with longstanding criticism of apartheid, presented a one-sided escape story. The biases of anti-apartheid liberal papers as historical sources underscore how newspapers must be treated with caution. Their silences surrounding Moolla and Jassat highlight how historically progressive newspapers can no longer be viewed as a panacea compensating for the lacunae of conservative newspaper apartheid reporting. In the *RDM*, *The Star*, the *Golden City Post*, *Ilanga laseNatal* and other newspapers, the two Indian fugitives who escaped from Marshall Square are unequally represented. Their names, with scant detail, only appear in editions of August 12 and 13, 1963. Indeed, a thorough review of all the newspaper cuttings archived at Liliesleaf, which many researchers rely on for historical construction, revealed that with the exception of aforementioned dates, there were glaring omissions. All the papers virtually ignored Moolla and Jassat. All the articles focused on Wolpe and Goldreich, and, to a lesser extent, their prison ally. Wolpe and Goldreich's escape route from Johannesburg was extensively covered until they reached England.

This journalistic oversight is better explained by Sparks, who covered the escape story for the *RDM* in 1963. Sparks narrates how, in the morning of 29 August 1963, Oscar Tamsen, one of the *RDM* senior editors, was seething in his office after calling several reporters who never answered their phones. He was calling to commission one of his reporters to cover the story of the 'left-wing couple', Wolpe and Goldreich, who had just landed at Lobatse in Bechuanaland. After calling in vain, Tamsen exploded:

> 'We are the first to know… we have to get the story for tomorrow's paper, it's a cracker. I have managed to charter a plane and I have got Ernie Christie standing by as a photographer. But I can't find a bloody reporter anywhere.'[96] In response, Sparks replied softly, 'Well, I am a reporter.'[97]

On the same morning, Sparks and Ernie Christie boarded a single engine plane to cover what turned out to be the most dramatic story of Sparks' career.[98] Later, the Grand Hotel began to

[96] A Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen,* p. 213.
[97] A Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen* , p. 213.
[98] A Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen*, p. 213. As a journalist during the turbulent times of the 1960s, Allister Sparks has done valuable work in contributing mightily to assembling and recording the materials (and conducting interviews with some of the players) needed for an examination of this key period in the history of the liberation of the African people and the other victims of apartheid.

fill up as journalists from every news operation in southern Africa and abroad landed in Bechuanaland. Reporting from Bechuanaland, the *RDM* reported:

> Arthur Goldreich, looking thin after a 16-day run from the South African Police, told me last night 'at no time did the police get anywhere near us. All those police statements about the net closing were so much nonsense.' But neither Goldreich nor Wolpe would give any clues about how they have engineered their dramatic escape or how they have managed to evade the massive police hunt.[99]

The *RDM* further reported:

> The charter aircraft flying from Dar es Salaam to pick up Arthur Goldreich, Harold Wolpe and Dr Abrahams in Bechuanaland crashed at Mbeya, Southern Tanganyika, yesterday.[100]

The article that reported the plane crash also had a photo of Wolpe, Goldreich and Dr. Kenneth Abrahams and his wife sitting in the jail cell in Francistown while waiting for the aircraft to take them to Dar es Salaam.

Even *The Star*, which was relatively progressive, omitted Jassat and Moolla.[101] This exclusion was replicated in the Rhodesian press, such as *The Chronicle* and *Sunday Express*, which only reported on Wolpe and Goldreich.[102] Perhaps even more interestingly, the story of Wolpe and Goldreich was also reported by Tanganyikan newspaper *The Reporter:*

> Hundreds of Tanganyikans paraded carrying anti South African placards to greet two South African refugees…after they have arrived in Dar es Salaam by charter plane on Tuesday night. Their arrival coincided with the sensational report that while they were giving a press conference there was an explosion at Dar es Salaam Airport.[103]

[99] Rand Daily Mail (undated newspaper cutting from Harold Wolpe's scrapbook, Liliesleaf Archive).
[100] *Rand Daily Mail*, 6 September 1963.
[101] A. Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen.*
[102] See for example, *The Chronicle*, 29 August 1963.
[103] *The Reporter*, 14 September 1963.

This reportage underscores how even news journalism in black majority-ruled independent countries echoed the narrow limitations of white South African papers.

Sparks indicates that *RDM* underwent a transition from 'class' to 'mass' readership in the 1960s. The newspaper became a powerful platform to put across its message of the urgent need to bring about radical changes in the political, economic and social life of the country. Under the editorship of the formidable Laurence Gandar, the paper became increasingly outspoken in the 1960s. It covered prison torture; it was the first white newspaper to employ an African journalist, the famous Drum writer Nat Nakasa. According to Sparks, this was the boldest step ever taken by the mainstream South African white press at the time.[104] By virtue of ignoring the 'Indian comrades' in its reporting, however, we can perhaps see elements of a programme of a white newspaper angling to attract black readership from the townships. This shortcoming suggests that the newspaper failed to handle the shift to the specialty market.

Nowhere did *RDM* report the escape route of Moolla and Jassat, even weeks after they had broken free from confinement. It is clear that the *RDM* and other liberal newspapers failed to fulfil the hopes and expectations of their non-white readers, particularly anti-apartheid activists and the educated who felt that the fugitives' resistance bridged ethnic and racial divides. Interviews conducted with 1960s newspaper readers from Soweto reveal that this generated anxiety. For instance, James Nxumalo, an anti-apartheid activist and avid newspaper reader, said that 'we were disappointed because we read much on Goldreich and Wolpe who happened to be our comrades, but nothing on other comrades, and we all worked together as non-racial activists'.[105] In a similar vein, Oupa Mogale exclaimed 'this was pure racism and one sided representation'.'[106] Although their roles might have varied widely in the liberation movement in terms of leadership and activism, they all put aside their own interests in order to pursue a bigger vision of overthrowing apartheid.[107]

[104] A. Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen,* p. 253.
[105] Interview with James Nxumalo conducted by Vusi Kumalo, Soweto, 12 February 2019.
[106] Interview with Oupa Mogale, conducted by Vusi Kumalo, Soweto, 12 February 2019.
[107] Wolpe was arrested after the police raid at Liliesleaf Farm, an event that constrained him to flee the country, but he was arrested on the border of British Bechuanaland (now Botswana). He was brought back to South Africa and imprisoned in 1963. Goldreich was detained when the entire leadership of Umkhonto WeSizwe, the armed wing of the African National Congress (ANC) was arrested on 11th July 1963. Mosie Moolla was among the first 14 South African activists to be detained under the notorious 90-day 'not trial clause' of the General Laws Amendment Act at Marshall Square Police Station in Johannesburg in May 1963. Abdulhay Jassat was imprisoned after he foiled the government attempt to forcibly remove the Transvaal Indian Congress (TIC) president, Nana Sita, from his home by blowing up the house that it was set aside from in a newly built Indian

None of the media coverage mentioned Moolla and Jassat, except for the *Golden City Post*, which inaccurately reported that Wolpe, Goldreich, and Moolla had been seen in the area [in Swaziland] and had left Swaziland.[108] Notwithstanding this falsehood, it is interesting to compare the *Golden City Post*'s reporting with the other newspapers. Different sources reveal that Jassat and Moolla did not go to Swaziland with their fellow fugitives; it was only Wolpe and Goldreich who were given refuge by Reverend Charles Hooper in Swaziland. The only non-whites recorded in newspapers as having been seen with the couple (Wolpe and Goldreich) in Bechuanaland (not in Swaziland), were Dr Abrahams and Ismail Bhana, and neither had been part of the group arrested at Liliesleaf. The flaws of the *City Post* reporting might be attributed to the fact that the newspaper was a relatively poor black weekly tabloid newspaper, and often drew on unreliable sources. Founded as a tabloid by Jim Bailey, the son of the mining magnate in the 1960s, it was localised and could not match the standard of the white newspapers of the time. Its coverage, funding, as well as the movement of its journalists were limited. As the cheapest and most accessible real media platform for black expression, it provided news access to groups that had not previously been targeted by the prestige press. The newspaper was dominated by black journalists who were economically limited and whose movement was monitored. Unlike their white counterparts, they could not follow the escapees to Bechuanaland. The evidence provided by Sparks' monograph reveals that they were not among the aforementioned journalists 'from every news operation in southern Africa'.[109] For international news, the *Golden City Post* often depended on and drew on reporting in the well-established white newspapers.

Other papers contain different inaccuracies or inconsistencies. The *Sunday Times*, for example, reported the challenges that both fugitives experienced on the way to Tanganyika: 'the only fain hope for the two fugitives now is that yet another attempt – the fourth may be made by organisations in Tanganyika to fly them out of Francistown'.[110] The *Ilanga laseNatal* represented Goldreich as the 'tycoon of Rivonia'. In the headline of an article published on 17 August 1963, *Ilanga* reported in isiZulu that '*Yeqe ejele inkinsela*

township of Pretoria, popularly known as Laudium. See, *http//www.doj.gov.za/trc/media/media/9605/s960502b.htm*, accessed 12 February 2019.

[108] *Golden City Post,* 18 August 1963.

[109] A. Sparks, *The Sword and the Pen*, p. 218.

[110] *Sunday Times* undated newspaper cutting from Harold Wolpe's scrapbook, Liliesleaf Archive.

yaseRivonia'.[111] For reasons that need further investigation, some newspapers, such as the *Golden City Post*, reported false stories on Goldreich.[112]

It is perhaps useful in passing to extend our analysis beyond the continent, to see echoes of the reporting patterns elsewhere. Upon arrival in England, Wolpe and Goldreich's stories were covered by the British press. One unnamed paper, likely *The Times*, reported: 'South Africa's two most wanted men … had been held for three hours at London Airport before the Home Officer decided "you can enter the country only for the limited period."[113] It highlights how the escape of Goldreich and Wolpe drew international attention, which led their escape story to be deposited in archives across the globe. Clearly bits and pieces of documentation such as these, dispersed across the globe, raise certain kinds of questions that require further study.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this article demonstrates how South African press failed to adequately report on non-white fugitives that simultaneously escaped from Marshall Square with their white comrades in 1963, as more people read newspapers than any other sources in the 1960s. This article has drawn the escape story from the press as the case study to explore a complex connection between the 1960s newspaper reports and the creation of the post-apartheid archive in a democratic South Africa. By so doing, this paper has turned to the press as a means of excavating silences of the past and the creation of archival sources. It has shown at which point a newspaper becomes an archival source. How could press reports be reviewed and simultaneously used with oral history to provide a mode of inclusion for the purpose of redressing archival lacuna.

The investigation found that people of colour were often neglected, misrepresented, or excluded. Based on the results of this study, what would a prospective researcher learn from these newspapers as archival sources? Researchers would be misled, they would learn that non-whites were virtually non-existent as citizens, subjects and sources. While previous studies focused on archival practise, this focus on the relationship between press,

[111] *Ilanga LaseNatal*, 17 August 1963.
[112] *Golden City Post*, 11 September 1963, headline 'Goldreich silent on future plan'.
[113] Harold Wolpe's scrapbook, Liliesleaf Archive.

representation and the creation of archival records adds a new dimension to the literature on South African archival transformation.

This contribution offers an opportunity for future studies to question and find out why marginalised Africans and non-white ethnic minorities were less likely to be used as sources, and equally be represented in public affairs. Furthermore, how they may be represented in the post-apartheid archive. Thus, this article has shown that there is an urgent need for scholars to draw from apartheid news reports and create a space for previously marginalised citizens. This would contribute to an ongoing debate on archival transformation, as well as the processes of memory and how memory is created and ascribed. Undoubtedly, this cannot be divorced from the long tradition of struggle for justice that is intractably linked to what Harris has identified as 'archives for justice.'