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WAYS OF HELPING

By becoming a subscribing member for £1 per year (or the equivalent in foreign currency) you receive all literature and reports. For £1 per year you receive a copy of the Annual Report.

By joining an existing Group, or forming a new Group.

By volunteering to help in the London office, or doing translating and typing at home.

By offering to do research into individual cases or for background papers.

By contacting the Secretary of your National Section if you live outside Britain. Where the address is not given in the Annual Report, as in the case of some Individual Groups, write to the London office.

By getting your local paper, magazine or journal to publish something about the work of Amnesty International.

By offering to speak to local organisations about Amnesty International. (Speaker's notes provided.)

By mailing a donation to the Prisoners of Conscience Fund.


THREE COUNTRIES with different ideologies — one a 'people's democracy', another 'a bastion of Western civilisation', the third the personal fief of an old-fashioned dictator — what have they got in common? They all practise political imprisonment.

In publishing these reports on prison conditions and political imprisonment in Rhodesia, East Germany and Paraguay, Amnesty International does not seek to make invidious comparisons between the different ideologies but merely to draw attention to what happens when the basic principle of imprisonment for political 'offences' is accepted. Last year delegates speaking in the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations went out of their way to praise the impartiality of Amnesty's reports on South Africa, Portugal and Rumania and to say that they were some of the most useful reports submitted by non-Governmental organisations. Once again we have sought above all to be factual and objective. In every case we have sought the co-operation of the Government concerned to explain and defend its policies or to give more information about conditions of imprisonment. Readers must judge for themselves whether the degree of co-operation we have received betokens an easy or a troubled conscience.

What strikes one very forcibly in reading these reports is the similarity which in practice underlies the attitude to political dissent of regimes which are theoretically totally opposed. Within the premises of 'socialist legality' the harshness of sentences in East Germany depends very largely on the general political climate. The general trend towards less severe sanctions against dissenters was, for example, interrupted at the time the Berlin Wall was being built. In Rhodesia individual civil servants very often attempt to enforce regulations humanely but at least as long as Mr. Lardner-Burke continues as Minister of Justice we are likely to see an ever-extending range of political opinion treated as 'unacceptable'. The announced intention of introducing a 'suppression of Communism act' marks the increasing tendency towards the 'South-Africanization' of the present regime in Rhodesia.

In both countries individual judges and officials may be honestly trying to administer the law or prison regulations as humanely...
as possible. Their ability to do so depends to a large extent on the degree to which outside pressure can restrain those who advocate ever harsher and more repressive measures. The moral conscience of the world is still a force which can have practical and positive results even within a regime which purports to be uninterested in outside reactions.

The case of Paraguay is rather different. The regime is less 'sophisticated' and there is less concern for legal and ideological justification. Yet Mr Marreco’s report at least gives ground for very moderate optimism. Here again outside influence and contacts have played a part in securing a modicum of rights for those who do not support President Stroessner.

In Copenhagen in September the General Assembly of Amnesty International will again select three countries about which Reports on political imprisonment and prison conditions will be prepared. Amnesty International is a non-governmental organisation dependent on the support of individuals who care about human rights and do not believe that to work for 'prisoners of conscience' in foreign countries is to 'interfere'. It is no longer a question of striving to establish the concept of ‘One World’, it is now an inescapable fact. Violence, torture, the infringement of human rights are like bacteria which pay no attention to national frontiers. "No man is an island, entire of itself..... Any man’s death diminishes me because I am involved in mankind and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee."
IN THE EARLY DAYS of white settlement, Southern Rhodesia was a British Protectorate controlled by the British South Africa Company. In 1898, the first Legislative Council was established and in 1923, responsible government was granted. Britain, however, reserved the right to veto or amend laws passed by the Legislature; this right has never been exercised. In 1961, when the new constitution was decided, African progression towards majority rule was guaranteed in certain entrenched clauses, which were unalterable except with British agreement; Britain also retained theoretical power to legislate for Rhodesia. 1

In 1962, the Rhodesian Front came into power under the leadership of Mr Winston Field, who was then succeeded by the present Prime Minister, Mr Ian Smith. In 1963, the Central African Federation—a political and economic union of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland—broke up and the two northern countries were granted independence soon after (as Zambia and Malawi). During 1964 and 1965, Ian Smith made repeated requests to the British Government for Rhodesian independence on a parallel with that attained by black African states. These demands were categorically refused on the ground that independence could only be granted to a country with majority rule. On II November, 1965, Ian Smith therefore made a unilateral declaration of independence despite British opposition and announced that Rhodesia was henceforth to be an independent sovereign state, over which Britain had no legal authority. This declaration (UDI) was ratified by the Rhodesian Assembly in a revised constitution which omitted the entrenched clauses laid down in 1961, and stated that constitutional change could be effected with a two thirds majority of the Assembly; it also provided for an Officer Administering the Government to take over those powers formerly held by the Governor, and this Officer would be appointed by the Rhodesian Government without recourse to the Queen. Since November, the Government which was in office prior to UDI has continued to legislate for Rhodesia.

The British Government reacted to Mr Smith's declaration by stating that it was an illegal act, that the subsequent Government was therefore a 'rebel' Government, and no action taken by it or by its individual Ministers could legally be valid. Economic sanctions were imposed on all trade with Rhodesia, and are still in force. At the time of writing, the legality of the present regime is being tested in law in a case before the courts brought

1. See Dr Claire Palley's historical analysis of the colony's development.  
viii by Mr Leo Baron and Mr Daniel Madzibumuto. Mr Baron is a nationalist leaders charged under security legislation, and Mr Madzibumuto is a prominent member of the People's Caretaker Council. Both were served with detention orders after UDI, and their case rests on the contention that since the Government itself has been declared illegal, no detention order signed by either the Minister of Law and Order in that Government or the Officer Administering the Government can be valid.

Shortly before UDI, on 5 November, the Governor was prevailed upon to declare a general state of emergency throughout Rhodesia; this is still in effect and may be prolonged indefinitely by the Legislative Assembly. The whole of the country is therefore subject to Emergency Regulations which, in addition to the censorship, preventive detention and police power of arbitrary arrest described in this report, provide the police with extensive powers to curtail freedom of movement and expression. Such powers could only be considered necessary in a country where deep-rooted opposition to the Government existed and certainly the evidence collected for this report makes it clear that police powers granted under the Emergency, rather than any political acquiescence, is the root cause of the relative peace in Rhodesia since UDI. Moreover, censorship of all news has meant that those incidents since November where crops have been burnt, cattle killed or trains stolen have not been reported.

The population of Rhodesia was, in 1963, estimated to be 4,013,000; of these 3,789,200 were non-white. But until 1962, no African had been elected to the Legislature, although a system of common roll franchise had been practised. This was due not to any law specifically barring African representation, but to the level of income and the educational qualifications required. Successive franchise amendments in 1914, 1951 and 1957 had so raised the qualifications for voting that in 1956 only 1,000 Africans could vote out of an electorate of 65,000. The 1961 constitution lowered the necessary qualifications to such an extent that 15 African members were elected to seats in the Legislature, but even at these elections, only 15,106 of the 103,032 enfranchised voters were African.

Basic human rights, similar to those laid down in the United Nations Convention of Human Rights, are stated in the Rhodesian constitution, but in practice these are limited in two important ways. Firstly, the protection afforded to an individual against racially or politically discriminatory legislation in the constitution itself is qualified in that it may be over-ridden on grounds of public safety, interest or order. Secondly, the constitution does not alter laws which were on the statute book before 1961, and thus means that the three main pieces of security legislation — the Emergency Powers Act (1960), the Unlawful Organisations Act (1959) and the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act (1960) — are unaffected.

Under the Emergency Powers Act, the Governor is empowered to declare a state of emergency at any time when it appears to him that "any action has been taken or is immediately threatened by any persons, . . . of such nature . . . as to be likely to endanger the public safety . . . disturb or interfere with public order." He may also make such regulations as appear to him to be necessary. The Unlawful Organisations Act enables the Governor to prohibit any organisation which he considers to endanger the public safety. Moreover, under the Act, a person is presumed "until and unless the contrary is proved" to be a member of an unlawful organisation if he attends a meeting or is found to possess any books, documents or insignia of the organisation. Under this law, all African political parties, with the exception of the official parliamentary opposition, have been banned during the past seven years.

The third and most far-reaching security measure is the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, which imposes considerable limits on the freedom of the press and the right to assemble. The Constitution itself is qualified in that it may be overridden on grounds of public safety, interest or order. The law has been described as "the most extreme and maximalist piece of legislative interference with free speech in the Western world".

The Act defines as "seditious" any statement, utterance, poem or song or of any extract therefrom which is likely to incite to hatred or to disturb public order or to prejudice public safety or to prejudice the maintenance of the state of emergency". The Governor may by order prohibit the posting of any notice; or the possession, sale, distribution or dissemination of any newspaper, magazine, periodical, bill, placard, pamphlet, circular or other written matter. The Governor may also make regulations as appear to him to be necessary. The law has been described as "the most extreme and maximalist piece of legislative interference with free speech in the Western world".

Under the Act, a person is presumed "until and unless the contrary is proved" to be a member of an unlawful organisation if he attends a meeting or is found to possess any books, documents or insignia of the organisation. Under this law, all African political parties, with the exception of the official parliamentary opposition, have been banned during the past seven years.

The third and most far-reaching security measure is the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, which imposes considerable limits on the freedom of the press and the right to assemble. The Constitution itself is qualified in that it may be overridden on grounds of public safety, interest or order. The law has been described as "the most extreme and maximalist piece of legislative interference with free speech in the Western world".

The Act defines as "seditious" any statement, utterance, poem or song or of any extract therefrom which is likely to incite to hatred or to disturb public order or to prejudice public safety or to prejudice the maintenance of the state of emergency". The Governor may by order prohibit the posting of any notice; or the possession, sale, distribution or dissemination of any newspaper, magazine, periodical, bill, placard, pamphlet, circular or other written matter. The Governor may also make regulations as appear to him to be necessary. The law has been described as "the most extreme and maximalist piece of legislative interference with free speech in the Western world".

Under the Act, a person is presumed "until and unless the contrary is proved" to be a member of an unlawful organisation if he attends a meeting or is found to possess any books, documents or insignia of the organisation. Under this law, all African political parties, with the exception of the official parliamentary opposition, have been banned during the past seven years.
on any form of African nationalist political activity (Appendix L gives details of some of its provisions).

Up to the present time, action has rarely been taken against European opponents of the Government under existing legislation. But recently, the Minister for Law and Order, Mr Lardner-Burke, announced his intention of introducing new legislation — presumably on the South African model — under which individuals suspected of “communist” activity or beliefs could be named and action taken against them. It is thought probable that this will affect European critics of the Rhodesian Front, as well as Africans.

The official African opposition party, which sits in the Assembly, is the United People’s Party, but its policies are regarded as ultra moderate by much articulate African opinion, and nationalist political beliefs find expression in the two banned parties — the People’s Caretaker Council, successor to the Zimbabwe African People’s Union (ZAPU), led by Joshua Nkomo, and the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) led by the Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole. ZAPU was the successor of the African National Congress and, after it was banned, the National Democratic Party, but after it was itself banned in 1963, ZANU was formed as a rival party by former prominent ZAPU members in Dar es Salaam. Both parties have the same basic political objective of African majority rule, on a basis of universal suffrage.

The ZANU/PCC split has, however, led to intense rivalry between members of the two parties, and this has frequently found expression in intimidation and physical violence; meetings have been broken up, supporters of one group have attacked supporters of the other, and this has resulted in injury and loss of life. These disturbances have considerably strengthened the Government’s stand in demanding support from its white electorate for increasingly stringent security measures against nationalist leaders, and is now a considerable factor in the extreme reluctance of the white community to make any concessions to African political advancement.

INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared with the purpose of presenting a brief, factual outline of the measures used by recent Rhodesian Governments to remove African nationalists from the community, and of the conditions provided for these people during their restriction, imprisonment or detention. As any form of restriction affects not only the life of the man concerned, but also that of his family, evidence has been collected to show the results of political restriction on the families and the assistance available for them in theory and in practice. In view of recent and repeated allegations that members of the British South African Police use violent methods when investigating political cases, the report will also examine the nature of the allegations and any official action taken to disprove them.

Sources Material has been drawn, firstly, from published sources — relevant legislation, Prison Regulations, annual reports of Government departments, Hansard, and the press — and, secondly, from interviews during the early months of 1966 in Rhodesia with lawyers, churchmen, welfare workers, and former prisoners, Restrictees and detainees. Although Amnesty International wrote to both the Rhodesian Government in Salisbury and to African nationalist leaders in Lusaka, informing them that the report was being prepared and asking for their assistance, we received replies from neither. Most individuals who gave information from their own experience did so on the specific condition that their names should not be used, and it has therefore been decided to name sources only when they are official statements or published material.

Until the Emergency Regulations prevented them, many people visited the three Restriction areas and are therefore able to describe the conditions as they were at least until May 1965 when the Emergency was declared in Nuanetsi, and access to Gonakudzingwa was controlled. There are also former Restrictees now living freely in the community. Information about the prisons has been harder to get and the picture given here is very far from complete. There are several reasons for this. Sentences under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, which is the most comprehensive security measure, have usually been for a number of years and as the Act has been on the statute

The word restriction in this section is used in two senses: (1) to refer to the process of restriction under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, and (2) to refer to the general curtailment of physical liberty entailed in imprisonment and detention as well as restriction. In this Introduction, where the first meaning is intended, the word is capitalised — thus: Restriction.
book for only six years, relatively few of those convicted under it have yet been released, while many of those who have completed sentences are now detained or restricted. Information about Rhodesian prisons has always been difficult to obtain; official organisations concerned with prisoners' welfare are reluctant to discuss conditions, and Section 118 of the Prison Regulations specifically forbids the divulgence of "any information concerning the administration of prisons and the condition and treatment and affairs of prisoners" by a Prison Officer or official visitor, with a penalty of imprisonment for a year or a £100 fine. Under the Emergency Regulations, a similar penalty is laid down for publishing any document written by a person in detention, and not passed by the police (39 (3)). As no-one detained in prison under the present Emergency has yet been released, very little can be known about these conditions.

A further obstacle in the way of researches inside Rhodesia since U.D.I. is the absence of impartial information. As many Rhodesians, Europeans and Africans, see themselves as being in a virtual state of war, statements by both members of the Government and nationalist leaders are often partisan to the point of distortion. Censorship of the press has been in effect since the Emergency was declared on 5 November and statements thought likely to "cause alarm and despondency" are cut from the newspapers. Moreover, under the Emergency Regulations, the publication of information "concerning any Restricted person, detained person, Restricted place or place of detention" can, by itself, constitute an offence (Section 34(3)). As a result of this and — even more — of the long absence of social contact between African and European, most whites are completely ignorant of the effects of security measures on the African population.

Many prominent Africans who, though not in Restriction, are known to be sympathetic to African nationalism, have been under police surveillance since U.D.I., and feel that their personal liberty is strictly conditional. One church leader has been called by the CID for questioning about his activities an average of once a fortnight since November. Another professional man, whose offices back on to a Government block, has been presented by the police with lists of recent visitors and asked what was discussed during the meetings. A third man, who says police often follow him during the course of his normal business round the city, claims that when he recently went on a three-day business trip to a neighbouring country, he was accompanied throughout by a man who he assumed was a member of the police. As unemployment among Africans increases, the fear of informers grows, and it is widely believed that certain telephones are tapped. It was therefore understandable that some informed and responsible Africans were reluctant to give information to Amnesty International for fear that it would be traced back to them.

**Forms of Restriction**

At the present time, the Rhodesian Government is empowered to use four different methods of physical restriction. Under normal, statutory legislation, those committing offences under the security laws are tried in court and sentenced to periods of imprisonment, while those who have committed no offence for which they could be brought to court, can be Restricted under Sections 50 and 51 of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act. Under the Emergency Regulations, two forms of detention without trial exist: detention for the duration of the Emergency or until revoked by the Minister, in terms of Section 21 of the Regulations, and detention by the Police for a period of up to 30 days in terms of Section 24. Under the Emergency Regulations, detention camps have been established inside the Restriction areas, and all Restrictees have been served with additional orders confining them to a particular camp; thus, under the Emergency, Restriction as defined in the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act in practice no longer exists, and all Restrictees are also detained persons.

For the purpose of this report, Restriction, imprisonment and detention have been treated as separate entities, but since most Restrictees remained in the Restriction areas after the Declaration of Emergency, although subject to additional orders confining them to detention camps, their conditions have been discussed in the section on Restriction. The section on Detention will therefore limit itself only to conditions for those

---

1. There is one exception to this statement — Mr Daniel Madzibumuto. Mr Madzibumuto was restricted at Gwakwakwamapi before the national State of Emergency, but under the Emergency Regulations he was served with a detention under confining him to Omilo Prison. He contested this order in court on the grounds that it had been signed by the Minister of Law and Order who had no power to do so since the whole Government had become an illegal one at the seizure of Independence. Judgment was initially suspended, but in the interim the court ordered that Mr Madzibumuto should return to his condition of restriction prior to the detention order. He therefore returned to Gwakwakwamapi, as the only restriction which was not subject to a detention order confining him to a camp, he had the sole freedom of the complete restriction area, except for the 2 camps inside which detention restriction were held.
4 detained under the Emergency Regulations in prisons and police stations.

**Numbers**

It is not possible to give any total figure for these at present in prison and the different forms of detention. Official figures relating to particular categories of prisoner have been published, but these do not give a complete picture. The only group for which relatively final figures do exist are those people in the restriction areas; this is partly because it has always been possible either to visit or to communicate, however indirectly, with restrictees, and partly because, by law, every Restriction order signed by the Minister must be published in the official Gazette. During 1965, the largest number of people in restriction was on 3 August, when the total was 616, while by 1 November the number had dropped to 231. In March 1966, there were 84 people at Wha Wha (71 men, 10 women — one aged over seventy — and 3 children) and 18 at Sjombotca, while in late April the total in the two camps at Gonakudzingwa was 325. Thus at the present time the probable total of people held under detention in the three Restriction areas is between 400 and 450. There are no figures for people serving sentences under the security legislation, but under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act alone, several thousand people have been sentenced since 1960: in 1961, 419 Africans were convicted and in 1962 the number rose to 555. One European has been convicted under the Act. Figures for detentions under the Emergency Regulations have also proved unobtainable, although isolated numbers are known — for example, in Gwelo Prison on 20 April there were 33 detainees and in Khami Prison in June their number was over 170. During the 1959 Emergency, 530 people were detained and during the Highfields and Harari Emergencies in 1964, the total was something over 1,400.

**Legal Defence in Political Trials**

The vast majority of Africans who appear in court charged with offences under security legislation have no legal defence although convictions and sentences in political trials have been reduced in cases where the accused have been represented by lawyers rather than having to conduct their own defences. Some lawyers refuse to accept political cases, but the prime reason for lack of legal advice is shortage of money. In 1965, the Legal Aid and Welfare Fund reporting on the situation said: "There are some provisions for legal aid in Southern Rhodesia, but these are far from satisfactory, particularly at the level of the Magistrate's courts. In many cases the accused is not able to conduct his own defence adequately. Despite this, ordinary Magistrates now have increased powers permitting them to impose sentences of up to three years' imprisonment on each count under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act. This legislation, introducing mandatory sentences, led to the... case of an eighteen-year-old African first offender being sentenced to nine years' imprisonment for intimidating people into going to the airport to meet Lord Gardiner and Mr Bottomley."

Although this report separates the different categories of "prisoner of conscience" in Rhodesia and deals with them according to the legislation under which they are held, it should be remembered that for many Africans, these are not completely different types of restriction, but become an almost continuous process. The case of an African political leader, at no time convicted of violence, who has been in almost constant restriction since 1959, will demonstrate this. Mr Moyo was detained under the Emergency in February 1959, he was held in prisons in Bulawayo, Selukwe, Fort Victoria, Gwelo and Marandellas and then in March 1961 he was released into Restriction at Gokwe. In November 1961 he was released from restriction and was at liberty until May 1962 when, having organised a strike in May, he was held for two months in Salisbury Prison on remand. He was released at the end of June, but in August he addressed a meeting in Sinoia after which he was charged with provoking a riot and held in prison for two weeks before the charges were withdrawn. In September 1962, ZAPU was banned and Mr Moyo was served with an order under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act restricting him to the area of Nuanetsi for three months. In July 1963, he was arrested for carrying an offensive weapon (which was in fact a walking stick) and given a twelve month sentence which was reduced to six months on appeal. Mr Moyo enrolled at the University College in Salisbury in 1964 and studied there for two terms before being served with a 12 month order on 12 August restricting him to Gonakudzingwa. On 14 August 1965, he was released and returned to the University College while at Gonakudzingwa he had taken and passed his first year exams, but on 14 December he was charged with arson and held at Fort Victoria Prison until 20 January when these charges were withdrawn. He was immediately taken to Gwelo Prison where, on 22 January, he was detained for 30 days under the Emergency Regulations. When this detention ended in February 1966, Mr Moyo was served with a five year order again restricting him to Gonakudzingwa."


(a) THE PRISON SYSTEM

The Rhodesian Prison Service was established by the Prisons Act (No.9 of 1955) to administer prisons throughout the Central African Federation; at the break-up of Federation it became a territorial service and, since December 1963, it has been the responsibility of the Rhodesian Government. At the present time, ultimate power in all matters concerning prisons rests with the Minister of Justice and under the Act, a Director of Prisons, who is responsible for prison administration, is appointed by him. Formerly, the Director was responsible for the administration of the Act itself, but by an amendment of 1966 ultimate responsibility has been removed from him and placed with the Minister. By this amendment, the Minister may now appoint not only senior and junior officers in the Service, but also Officers in Charge of prisons—a power originally held by the Director who may now appoint only subordinate officers. These changes took place shortly after the retirement of the Director of Prisons, Mr. D. Phillips.

Prisons exist in all main towns; they are divided for security purposes into the three usual categories of maximum, medium and open. Salisbury and Khami Prison at Bulawayo are the largest, but political prisoners and detainees have also been held at Gwelo, Marandellas, Fort Victoria, Gwanda, Que Que, Selukwe and Umtali. The prisons are also divided into four classes: classes I and II for prisoners with sentences of over 6 months, and classes III and IV for short term convictions. In general, reports suggest that conditions are better in prisons for long-term sentences—the facilities at Salisbury, for example, are much more developed than those at Gwanda. The Minister of Justice confirmed this when, in 1964, he told the Assembly that there was nothing basically wrong with the administration of class I and II prisons, but said: "I admit that in the smaller prisons, classes III and IV in the remote rural areas, they do leave quite a lot to be desired". Expenditure on prisons in Rhodesia has constantly lagged behind their estimated needs, and in the years 1954-1964 the total annual expenditure averaged £70,000—a smaller figure than the £100,000 of her Federal partner, Northern Rhodesia.

At the change-over from Federal to territorial control, the total manpower in the Prison Service numbered 1,148 (83% of the authorised establishment). The daily average prison population in December 1963 was 7,133. But increases in the Service under the 1966 Prison Act Amendment are aimed to raise the ratio of officers to prisoners from 1:61 to 1:6. The amendment also introduced four other changes designed to improve the quality of Prison Service recruits. The minimum age of entry was lowered from 24 to 20, to attract young men looking for a career; an educational qualifications for recruits was introduced, and laid down a minimum of three years secondary education for Junior Officers and Standard VI for Subordinate Officers; improved salary scales were brought in and, finally, whereas training had hitherto been left to the discretion of the Director and in practice been either scanty or non-existent, a three month period of basic training must now be taken by all recruits before they are posted to a prison.

Criticism of the Prison Service by ex-prisoners and Visitors stress the severe staff shortage and lack of training. They say that recruits have been put on the job with neither training nor a knowledge of simple penal theory. In 1959, warders on night duty in Salisbury were willing to pass letters between prisoners, while a more recent example is the case of a visitor to a European remand prisoner, also in Salisbury, in 1966, who was told that although the prisoner was allowed visits he could not be seen at that moment, because no Officer was free to bring him from his cell. Visitors have also described the calibre of some Prison Superintendents, Mr. W. S. Lawler, ordered a sackful of stray cats to be burnt, live, in the prison yard in full view of the prisoners. Mr. Lawler was later made an Assistant Director.

Penal Although it appears that many senior officers subscribe to the view that the duty of a prison system is to "endeavour to provide Vocational training for prisoners so that on release they may take their part in communal life", neither the existing prison legislation nor the Regulations anywhere state that the purpose of prison should be rehabilitative rather than punitive.
Visitors who have come into contact with a range of prison staff say that the common attitude, with some exceptions, among warders is purely punitive and is summed up in the words: "this is a prison, not a training establishment". This is supported by the authorities' initial reluctance to approve provision of educational courses for prisoners by a voluntary body.

**Regulations**

Regulations for the administration of the prisons were laid down in 1956 and were retained by the Rhodesian Government after Federation. The Minister may issue other regulations on all matters relating to prisons, and standing orders may be authorised by the Director.

**Inspections**

Under the Act and Regulations, prisons are inspected daily by the Officer in Charge or his delegate, and at intervals of not more than eight weeks by official Visitors. Under the Act the duties of these Visitors were to "see all parts of the prison and visit every prisoner", but the 1966 amendment has now made these permissive rather than obligatory duties.

**Complaints**

Complaints by prisoners about their conditions should be made either to the officer in charge or to a prison Visitor. Statements from prisoners suggest that this system is not completely satisfactory. A prisoner in Khami medium prison in 1964 says that complaints had to be made to the Superintendent with a warder present, who usually denied them. In Gwanda, when a prisoner complained to a Visitor about bedding and food, he was told he should have made the complaint through the officer in charge and given a punishment of extra labour. The prisoner in Khami said he saw a Visitor only once in 6 months, while another maximum security prisoner said he saw no Visitor from July 1963 to January 1966.

**Classification and Separation of Prisoners**

Neither the Act nor the Regulations establish any separation of prisoners on racial grounds, but prisoners are graded on entry to prison on the basis of their living standard in normal life, and these grades determine their food, clothing and cell accommodation and thus affect almost every aspect of their imprisonment. In practice it appears that European prisoners have been placed in Grade 1, Asians and Coloureds in Grade 2 and Africans in Grade 3; an African prisoner who is able to prove that he has a high standard of living in his home may be placed in Grade 2 and a white with a very low standard may also go into Grade 2. In Salisbury Prison, prisoners fill in a form on reception, stating their education and income and this determines their Grade. Asians claim that it is often very hard to prove a standard of living, particularly when their homes are far from the prison. Although Section 63 of the Act states that prisoners should be separated on the basis of age and criminal record, this is rarely done: official statements say that the commission is due to lack of space, but in practice this means that it is common for a young first offender to be held in a cell with adult habitual criminals. Prior to 1964 it appears to have been usual for no distinction to be made between criminal prisoners and those sentenced for security offences, but in that year the two groups were separated in Khami. This practice seems to be increasing. Unlike South Africa, however, as far as is known, political prisoners have been granted the same remission of one third of their sentences as is allowed to criminal prisoners.

---

1. Sir Edgar Whitehead put one case for separating political and criminal prisoners when he said "there are certain risks in confining in the same prison an expert professional burglar ... and ... a political fanatic. If, during the course of the sentences, the professional burglar also becomes a political fanatic he will be far more dangerous than most of those who are in for political fanaticism ... In the opposite direction, a political fanatic is likely to be much more dangerous if he is instructed in professional burglary during his period in prison". (Hansard, 25 March, 1964)
10 (b) SENTENCED PRISONERS

**Accommodation**
Cells are built as single or communal rooms. Prisoners may be alone in a cell or with two other prisoners, though never in couples, or in large cells of 40 or 50 people. Complaints of over-crowding are widely made, and in several prisons cells are accommodating more prisoners than was intended in their construction; allegations that cells for three have held six prisoners have been made in the press and Parliament. The communal cell in Gwanda in 1963 was so over-crowded that prisoners slept on their sides, and at night the latrine overflowed on to the floor. In many prisons, as for example, Khami maximum, windows are not glazed. Floors are normally of concrete and although Grades 1 and 2 prisoners have beds, Grade 3 are given a hard, sized mat and blankets. Bedding allowances vary considerably between Grades; as well as beds, Grades 1 and 3 have sheets, pillows, and a towel, none of which are given to 3. (For lists of cell equipment, see Appendix A) Moreover, in some prisons, notably Gwanda, shortages of mats are reported, and then prisoners slept on boards instead or else on the concrete floor. Prisoners say that blankets are seldom washed and soon become filthy and vermin-ridden, and this is apparently so even at Gwelo, where the prison has a monthly contract for blankets with the local dry cleaning firm. They also complain that at Gwanda they are made to fold their blankets in a communal pile when they go out to work, and the blankets are taken at random when they return, so prisoners never sleep in the same ones twice.

**Food**
Diet scales, too, are determined by grades and also by the class prison. Among hard labour prisoners, the daily calorie intake of a Grade 1 prisoner is 4,016 while that of a Grade 3 prisoner is only 3,300; prisoners in Class I and II prisons have a daily ration of 4 oz. meat, while for those in Class III and IV prisons it is 8 oz. twice a week. However, on penal diet the situation is reversed and the 16 oz. bread for a Grade 1 prisoner represents 1,136 calories, while the same amount of mealie meal is 1,632 calories. Full diet scales are given in Appendix B. The diet of a Grade 1 — or European — prisoner contains a minimum of 14 items, including meat, bread, oatmeal, various fats, fresh vegetables, potatoes, beans, cheese or jam, tea, coffee, sugar and milk. Grade 2 is equally varied, but Grade 3 contains only six different foods — meat, mealie meal, beans, vegetables, chillies, and fats. However, Africans serving sentences of over six months get, as well as their basic diet, 1 oz. each of coffee and sugar a day. African prison meals follow the rough pattern of breakfast — sadza and a cup of black coffee; dinner — sadza and beans; supper — sadza, meat and sometimes a vegetable. Sadza is a stiff porridge made from mealie meal — itself a meal made from what in England would be called sweet corn; it is very solid and unappetising when served without gravy or some form of relish. The beans given in this diet are boiled dried beans, and need lengthy soaking in water before being cooked, if they are to be digestible.

A Grade 3 prison diet means a considerable drop in nutrition for an urban, professional African accustomed to European food. Moreover, as Dr Palley told the Assembly, an able bodied man doing hard labour every day should medically have a minimum of 4,800 calories a day to enable him to perform his work. Dr Palley said “the individual who, as part of his punishment, must do hard labour... is... not being provided with sufficient energy to enable him to do the labour required of him”. 1

Grade 3 prisoners never receive knives, forks or spoons, and must therefore eat with their fingers. Plates are made of tin, and are said to be sections of paraffin tins in Gwanda Jail. They rust easily.

**Clothing**
The clothing provided for Grade 3 prisoners in summer consists of white shorts, shirt, and in winter an extra jersey and vests. They are not given the pyjamas, socks, long trousers, handkerchiefs, jacket or boots provided for prisoners in the other two grades. Sandals are listed as being given at the discretion of the officer, but in practice this is far from common. Whereas Grades 1 and 2 receive a towel, toothbrush, comb and razor, Grade 3 receives none of these. (See Appendix C).

**Sanitary Facilities**
The Regulations lay down that “every prisoner shall bathe himself on his admission to prison and thereafter as often as the Officer in Charge may require”. Washing facilities vary from prison to prison, and in some are reported to be adequate, as at Khami where prisoners in 1964 could shower every day, while in Gwanda prisoners say that no washing is allowed in the mornings before prisoners leave for work, it is only sometimes permitted in the evening on their return, and Saturday is the only day when they can always spend time in the ablution block. Small cells have latrine buckets, but most communal cells have a water-borne latrine. In many prisons this can only be flushed from outside by a warden, and is not done after 9.0 p.m.


---

1. One African, the Rev. N. Sithole, is known to have been given a Grade I diet, but he was given Grade 2 cells and clothing.
Work

The working day in prison must be between eight and ten hours in the week and not more than five on a Saturday. Prisoners who are skilled craftsmen are able to work in a variety of trades in the larger prisons, but most Grade 3 prisoners — and thus most African political prisoners — are employed on manual labour. The nature of this varies from prison to prison, but many prisoners are employed in farm work. There are prison farms at Khami and Connemara, where tilling, fencing and stumping are jobs described by former prisoners. At Gwanda, some prisoners work in the hospital, and former prisoners say their main jobs were in the mortuary and grave-digging. At Khami, Africans are sent out in work gangs for heavier labour like dam construction. If a prisoner gets a medical certificate that he is unfit to do outside work, he can be put on to lighter jobs, painting and cleaning Government or local authority buildings.

Medical Attention

The Prison Regulations state that prisons should be visited by a Medical Officer "not less than once a week"; he is responsible not only for the health of prisoners, but also for inspecting the prison regularly to ascertain that the sanitation, washing and cooking facilities are not in a condition which could be "injurious or dangerous to the health of the prisoners". Most prison doctors are Government Medical Officers, whose prison work is part of their official duties, but in Salisbury the doctor is a private practitioner and his reputation among prisoners is higher than that of most others. Complaints of irregular visiting have been made at several prisons, and when an official Visitor at Khami, Mrs Watson, inspected the prison in 1963 after a large number of complaints had been made in the Salisbury Chronicle about its administration, she found that the doctor's weekly visits had not been taking place. At Gwanda, in 1963, prisoners who reported sick were seen by a semi-trained Prison Officer who then decided whether they could see the doctor. Prisoners who need hospital treatment are sent to the local hospitals.

Punishment

Punishment for breach of prison discipline seems to have most commonly taken the form of loss of remission. In 1963 — the latest figures available — in all 749 prisoners had forfeited remission, compared with 128 sentenced to solitary confinement, 112 given extra work and 87 who were given solitary confinement on a reduced diet. Prisoners receive corporal punishment, but this can only be authorised by the local Magistrate. In solitary confinement — which may not exceed 25 days — prisoners remain in the cell throughout the day, apart from one hour exercise, without books or games, and all furniture is removed. Bending is placed in the cell only between 5.0 p.m. and 5.30 a.m. African prisoners say that the most common punishment for slowness, or disobedience, is beating.

Letters and Visits

Convicted prisoners may write and receive a maximum of one letter every four weeks, and if the Officer in Charge thinks extra letters would "promote the best interests of the prisoner or his family", he may authorise them. A prisoner may also have one visit of not more than three people for not more than thirty minutes every month, and these must take place in the "sight and hearing of a prison officer". It is difficult to know how far these regulations are implemented in the prisons; for many African families, the expense and distances involved in travelling to the prison make a monthly visit impracticable, while there have been complaints that the visiting time is cut to half its proper length. Similarly, many African wives are unaccustomed to letter-writing. All letters, whether outgoing or incoming, must be read by a warder who may then stop it if its contents are "objectionable" or "of inordinate length"; prisoners have complained of lengthy delays in receiving letters from their families.

Recreation

Although libraries exist in some places and the larger prisons have varied recreational facilities for prisoners to make use of their spare time, the Regulations make no specific provision for either of these. Prisoners at Khami have regular access to a library and soccer is played by all Grades at the weekends. At Gwanda, no sports are available, and one prisoner who repeatedly demanded books was finally allowed some old copies of the Readers Digest.

Official policy on education for prisoners is "to do all that is reasonably possible to assist prisoners who wish to undertake educational studies while in prison. If any prisoner wishes to take a correspondence course at his own expense, he is given adequate facilities to pursue his studies. The limited funds available in the education grant to prisons does not allow the Minister to provide correspondence courses from that fund". Since 1963, education for prisoners has been provided by a voluntary group — the Salisbury Prison Education Committee, which itself originated in the Legal Aid and Welfare Committee. Initially only 18 prisoners, out of the total 1,400 in Salisbury Prison, were allowed to take correspondence courses, and prison
14 officials opposed the scheme on the grounds that it would benefit only political prisoners, since they would be the keenest to learn, and might well create an élite which could endanger prison discipline. Prisoners were only allowed to enrol towards the end of their sentences, and thus a 16-year-old boy who wished to continue his school education by studying for Standard V was refused permission and told he had a long sentence to serve before he would be considered eligible for a course. But since 1964, the attitude of the prison authorities has changed and any prisoner who can arrange payment for courses may study.

Although, theoretically, no obstacle is placed in the way of a prisoner who enrolls for a course, the practical difficulties of lack of facilities — prisoners who have to study in their cells say the light is poor — and shortage of books, desks and writing materials have hindered his work. Books and stationery are provided in Salisbury by SPEC, and a similar committee has recently begun work in Bulawayo, but for prisoners in prison away from Salisbury and Bulawayo the position is much harder. An additional hindrance has been the suspension of courses for periods of six months or more as punishment for breaches of discipline. The offences, however, have often been the use of writing paper, provided for study, for unauthorized letters.

Religious Visits

"Ministers of Religion... may at such hours and in such places as may be prescribed... be admitted to prison to visit prisoners who may be desirous of their services; and be admitted to hold religious services." (Prison Act, 41) The system of religious visiting appears to be a fairly satisfactory one as far as convicted prisoners are concerned, with a single exception. Ministers are not automatically informed by the prison when a member of their church is admitted, and therefore they can only know which prisoners to visit by requests direct from the prisoners; this impedes normal pastoral visiting.

Legal Visits

Prisoners also have the right to see a legal representative, if they are involved in legal proceedings, in the sight but not hearing of a warder, "for reasonable periods at reasonable times". (Regulations, 146a)

(c) UNSENTENCED PRISONERS

Conditions of prisoners on remand — or "civil prisoners" — are those of sentenced prisoners with certain important differences. While on remand, prisoners are held in a completely separate part of the prison and have no contact with convicted prisoners. Before sentence, a prisoner may receive "or procure for himself" reasonable quantities of food and other necessaries, he may smoke and have "reputable" newspapers, he may choose to work but is not obliged to do so, he need not wear prison clothing unless his own is "insufficient, improper or in an insanitary condition", and he may receive weekly letters and daily visits. The regulations allowing daily exercise and visits, however, are permissive rather than obligatory; thus whereas they state that a prisoner "shall" be permitted to write and receive one letter a week, he "may be visited daily". (Regulations, 80-86)

Statements from former prisoners and from restrictees who spent time in the remand cells while in transit for their restriction area, suggest that the actual conditions of unsentenced prisoners are frequently at odds either with those laid down in regulations or with those necessary for physical well-being. This can be demonstrated by instances taken from statements relating to several prisons in 1965 and 1966.

In many prisons prisoners are fed only twice a day. In Gwelo meals are brought at 6.0 a.m. and 6.0 p.m., and in Chirunda the times are 11.0 a.m. and 3.0 p.m. When arrests are made after the second meal has been given in the afternoon, the new prisoners are not fed until 11.0 a.m. the next morning. As a remand prisoner does not work, and may have to wait for several weeks before his trial comes up in court, he has little to occupy him. In February 1966, a cell of 40 in Salisbury had one board of draughts between them. In some cases, books delivered for prisoners do not reach them, and there are also cases in which prisoners were refused permission to write letters. In Gwanda, visitors to prisoners on charge for political offences have been refused entry to the prison if thought to share the prisoner's political beliefs. In Salisbury, visits have been cut to five minutes, while, since visitors must apply in advance for a permit from the police, cases are known where two people were given permission on the same day and one was told on arrival at the prison that the visit for that day had already taken place; this is particularly hard where a relative may have travelled some distance. In some prisons, washing facilities for remand prisoners appear
to be grossly inadequate. In Gwelo in 1965, one man was held for 21 days and allowed only a small bowl of water to wash his hands in before each meal. He had no latrine facilities in his cell and could only go to the lavatory when taken by a warder. During this period he had no exercise at all. Over-crowding in cells appears to be fairly frequent, and this has recently been accentuated by the influx of 30-day detainees into prisons thus increasing the numbers in the remand sections.

**RESTRICTION**

Legislation

Since 1960, the Minister of Law and Order has been able to limit the freedom of movement of any Rhodesian who, in his opinion, presents a threat to the maintenance of law and order in the country. His powers to do this stem from Sections 50 and 51 of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, and enable him to define the area inside which the individual concerned must live. The Minister's action in doing this has become known as 'restriction'. Under the Act, restriction orders may be of two types: they may forbid the restrictee to enter a certain area (50 (a)), or they may compel him to live within a particular area (50 (b)). Unlike detention, however, the Minister may place no other limitations on the restricted person and may not control in any way his contact and communication with other people. Within the area of his restriction, the restricted person has complete freedom of movement.

Similar powers to restrict movement were given to the Minister under the Preventive Detention (Temporary Provisions) Act in 1959, although these could only be used upon those who were released from preventive detention. But the powers expired with the Act in 1964.

Contravention of a restriction order under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act carries a penalty of a £500 fine or a three-year prison sentence. Initially, orders were valid only for three months, but subsequent amendments to the Act have extended this period to five years; moreover, since no legal bar has been placed on re-restriction when the original order expires, in theory at any rate restriction can be indefinite. The Minister has himself said: "every time he (the restrictee) comes out, I can restrict him again". (Hansard, 13 March 1965)

Although as a result of the detention orders served on them those who came under consideration is one in which they had temporarily become detainees.

In practice, the first type of order has been used to prevent individuals—usually African political leaders—from entering rural areas or townships where they are known to have particular influence; in September 1965, it was estimated that some 120 Africans had been forbidden to enter the Salisbury area where, for the most part, their wives and families lived. The second form of order has been used in a wide variety of cases, ranging from the restriction of individuals to a certain radius of their homes — Garfield Todd and Leo Baron are notable examples—to the large scale removal of numbers of Africans suspected of "subversive" activities to the three restriction areas of Gonakudzingwa, Wha Wha and Sikombela. A third restraint on freedom of movement not allowed for in the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act has recently been employed by the police; certain Africans who, since November 1965, have been released from a restriction area or from prison have been verbally ordered by police to remain outside their home town or to report daily to a particular police station.

One example of this is the case of a man whose restriction order expired in late March 1966 and who was then discharged from Mpilo Hospital in Bulawayo where he had been receiving treatment for TB. He took a bus from Bulawayo to his home in Gwanda, but when the bus reached Gwanda town he was taken off it by the police, who placed him in the prison, held him there for four days and then gave him an alternative of returning to Bulawayo and keeping away from Gwanda or remaining in the cells for another 30 days. This particular case was complicated by the fact that the hospital had placed him on a special diet and given him tablets on his discharge; he was removed from the bus so hurriedly that he left his case behind containing the tablets, and during the four days in the police station he was refused permission either to contact a doctor to replace the pills or to send out of the prison, with his own money, for fresh fruit and milk to supplement the prison diet. No written order was served on him and his restriction to Bulawayo appears to be dependent on police pleasure.

When a restriction order is served on an individual, its provisions take immediate effect. Appeal against it is allowed in paragraph 4, and the recipient is given the right to "make representations in writing", within seven days, stating reasons why the order should be revoked. But the appeal is made difficult by the vague wording of paragraph 2 which states the Minister's grounds for deciding to restrict. Recently, the second reason has been the same in all cases; it
The first ground varies slightly according to the individual case, to furnish them, No cases where appeals have had discernible success are known. Although under the Preventive Detention Act, provision was specifically made for an annual review of each restrictee's case by the Governor, under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, no comparable provision exists, nor may appeal be made to anyone except the Minister who originally authorised the order. No restricted person need ever appear in court, nor are appeals heard in court, but are considered by the Minister who, according to the Act, must consider them and either revoke the order or notify the person to whom it relates of his refusal to do so (50 (6)).

**Restrictions**

Immediately an order is served, the recipient is under restriction. Unless the police who serve the order allow it, he may not inform his family or his employer, contact his lawyer or make arrangements for the care of his business and personal affairs. For those restrictees who own shops or are working in a profession this inability to set their affairs in order before an arrest takes place away from home, the police allow a man to return to his home to collect his clothing and tell his family, but in many cases the restrictee is taken immediately to a police station. In certain cases, restrictees’ families have never received official notification either of the restriction or of the man’s restriction area, and when this happens the wife must rely on messages from people who were present. Sometimes, when the arrest takes place away from home, the police allow a man to return to his home to collect his clothing and tell his family, but in many cases the restrictee is taken immediately to a police station. In certain cases, restrictees’ families have never received official notification either of the restriction or of the man’s restriction area, and when this happens the wife must rely on messages from people who were present when the arrest took place or enquire at all the likely police stations—which distance often makes impossible. Recently it has been common practice for police to call at a house in the very early hours of the morning; in Bulawayo in April, they usually came at 4.0 a.m. Orders are not always served at the time of the arrest, and in some cases Africans have been held for several days in police cells before receiving a retrospective order. Since November 1965, a restriction has been followed on 30-day detention, and then the man is taken from home or work to detention and sent straight to restriction at the end of the 30 days without being able to go home in between. While the restrictee is in prison or a police station waiting for transport to the camp, he is treated as a remand prisoner, but although he may receive visits, his wife can come only if she knows where he is being held. During this time, restrictees have their belts, ties and shoes removed, and, in April, these were not returned even when the men went under police escort to Mpho hospital for their medical examination, so they walked barefoot and had to hold their trousers up.

**Travel to the Camps**

Restrictees destined for Gonakudzingwa wait in their cells until a large enough group has been formed and then travel by train to Malvernia—the station for the area. On some occasions men have had to wait up to a fortnight before a group was made up. For the journey from Bulawayo to Malvernia, food is provided, but restrictees travelling in the reverse direction say that they receive nothing to eat during the whole of the 14-hour journey.

**The Three Restriction Areas**

Most restrictees have been sent to the area generally known as Gonakudzingwa, which in May 1966 accommodated some 320 Africans, all members of the PCC. This camp was established in April 1964, when the first PCC leaders were sent into restriction there. Initially, its official name was Gonakudzingwa, but when the original area in the Gona-re-Zou National Land was extended in late 1964 into the Sengwe Tribal Trust Land, it became officially called the Sengwe restriction area. At this time, too, the extent of the area rose from 110 acres to its present 400 square miles. Wha Wha was established in February 1964, when the area which had formerly been used as a rehabilitation camp for “vagrants” was changed into a restriction camp. Since 1965, it has been used for women

---

1. For the exact definition of the Sengwe restriction area, see Appendix 6.
2. The Wha Wha restriction area is defined in terms as: “The area of land situated in the district of Gwelo bounded by a series of lines commencing at the beacon common to the farms Umgeni, Pocklands of Woollahra and Gando, thence southwards along the line of the fence on the western side of Gando, thence eastwards along the line of the fence on the northwestern edge of the Intwini mine road, thence southwards along the line of the fence in the northern and southwestern edges of this road for a distance of approximately 7,400 English feet to the southeastern edge of the Kilombe road, thence in a
with their children, older men, restrictees whose health necessitates that they should be in easy reach of a hospital, and those officially categorised as "soft core" PCC members. In June 1965, a third camp was opened at Sikembela and 70 members of ZANU were sent there; in mid 1966 its inhabitants were transferred to the Remand section of Salisbury prison.

The Sengwe restriction area lies in the south-eastern corner of Rhodesia, adjoining Mozambique; it is in the Nuanetsi District. It is an exceptionally remote and arid region, part of which is used as a game reserve, and although some villages existed inside the restriction area, the inhabitants have gradually moved away. Gonakudzingwa is a place which, by reason of its heat — the temperature rises to a peak of 115°F; dryness — the mean annual rainfall is between 16" and 20"; and endemic malaria, is unattractive for human habitation. The altitude is only some 1000', and thus much lower, and consequently hotter, than the rest of Rhodesia. The area of Wha Wha is some 4 square miles. Sikembela is situated in thickly wooded country, in Gokwe District, sixty miles to the north-west of Que Que. Here, too, the rainfall is low. One of the first restrictees described the camp in June 1965:

"The nearest road... about six miles away from the camp, is the road from Que Que to the Gokwe District Commissioner's office... Most visitors get lost. Those who come by bus are dropped off seven miles away. When they arrive, some have had to spend the night in the bush. Others have given up before getting here... It is hot; the vegetation is dominated by that sign of dryness, the mopani tree. There is zebra; a lion roared near us the other day and elephants are said to visit occasionally. The nearest house is five miles away and outside the restriction area."

Wha Wha is close to the main Salisbury-Owelo road and railway, but access to Gonakudzingwa and Sikembela is made difficult by the distances involved — Gonakudzingwa is over 400 miles from Salisbury — and the conditions of the roads. Parts of the Gonakudzingwa road are passable only by Land Rover in the rainy season, but there is a rail service to Malvern. Since Sikembela was established, a road from Gatoona has been built which passes within a mile of the camp; there is no railway. Roads to both areas are un-metalled.

(Footnote 2, page 19, continued) northerly direction along the eastern edge of the Kabanga road, to the southern boundary of Umgeni and thence eastwards along the line of the fonce on the southern boundary of Umgeni to the starting point."
Until the Nuanetsi state of emergency was declared in May 1965, restrictees at Gonakudzingwa lived in five unfenced encampments, two or three miles apart from each other, in each of which living quarters, cooking facilities and wash-houses had been provided. They could decide in which camp they lived and move freely inside the whole restriction area.

But under the Emergency Regulations, the restriction area was declared a protected place, the camps themselves were fenced in, and detention orders were served on the restrictees confining them to a particular camp (see Appendix E). The provisions affecting detainees under the Emergency Regulations are described on pages 30-33. The present area of camps 3 and 4 is about 7 acres each. Camp 1, the nearest to the Mozambique border, is now used by the police, camp 2 is reserved for wives visiting their husbands and camp 5 is empty. The perimeters of the two occupied camps are patrolled by armed police with dogs, and the fences are lit by arc lamps at night. Similar detention camps were established at Wha Wha and Sikombela in November, and restrictees were also served with detention orders under the Emergency Regulations. Police permits are now necessary for anyone who wants to go outside the perimeter of the camp in which he lives, whether it is to collect firewood at Gonakudzingwa or to go to the wash-house at Sikombela, which is now outside the fence.

Control of Movement

All restriction areas are under the authority of the police, but in the present state of emergency, Protecting Authorities have been appointed — usually senior police officers — over all protected areas and they have complete control of movement inside the area. Whereas a restrictee under normal conditions must have a permit from the Minister of Law and Order if he wishes to leave restriction to go to hospital (see Appendix F), this authorisation must now come from the police, and whereas access to restriction is normally uncontrolled, all visitors must now apply to the police for permission (see Appendix G).

The Minister of Law and Order has on many occasions stated the necessity of controlling entry to restriction areas, and in 1964 he assumed powers similar to those of the police under an emergency, by declaring the land surrounding Wha Wha and Gonakudzingwa to be protected areas. This meant that although visitors could be in the restriction areas without permits, they could not cross the land surrounding them without the permission of the Minister. This action was challenged in the courts under the Protected Places and Areas Act (Chapter 70).
immediately when several restrictees at Wha Wha applied to the High Court arguing that by using the Protected Places Act in conjunction with the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, the Minister had exceeded the powers conferred on him by legislation. They won the case and since then access to restriction areas can be controlled only in an Emergency.

Surveillance of restrictees in normal times is minimal. At Sikombela, prior to November 1965, police visited the camp once or twice a week to deliver rations, but on the other days no police were nearer than Zhomba, 20 miles away. At Gonakudzingwa, restrictees had to report to the police at Vila Salazar once a week. At Wha Wha, a compulsory roll call at 6.15 a.m. was instituted; penalties were imposed for not attending. But when several restrictees were charged in court after persistently refusing to attend, they themselves brought - and won - a case on the grounds that restriction with such a condition was contrary to the declaration of rights in the 1961 Constitution and therefore invalid.

Inspections Since 1964, the International Red Cross has inspected the restriction areas annually at the invitation of the Government. The most recent inspection was made by Mr G. Senn in March 1966; by the restrictees' own report he was able to speak freely with them. On each occasion, a report on conditions has been sent to the IRC headquarters in Geneva, but these are not available as such reports are confidential and may only be published with the agreement of the government concerned.

Accommodation Accommodation in the camps is provided by the Government. It is of two types; barracks, which at Wha Wha measure 60' x 15' x 10', and should house 16 men, and huts, measuring 14' x 11' x 5.6'. Both barracks and huts are made of galvanized iron sheets, on a metal frame. They have rough concrete floors, and glazed windows. The roofs are corrugated, and are described by restrictees as "ovens in the day and refrigerators at night". Other complaints are that the barracks are having to accommodate 25 men, that their floors, at Wha Wha in particular, are level with the ground and therefore very damp in the rains, that the building construction is so bad that in March 1965 the roofs of two barracks at Gonakudzingwa blew off and restrictees had to sleep outside for a fortnight, and that since the buildings are not insulated and trees at Gonakudzingwa are sparse, restrictees have no adequate shelter. At Wha Wha, restrictees tried to improve their living conditions by building polo and dagga huts, which had the dual advantage of being insulated against the heat, and of providing private quarters for married people who otherwise had to live communally; but as these huts were built away from the other accommodation, the post-emergency reduction in the area of the camp has placed them outside the boundary fence and they can no longer be used.

The Government provides minimal furniture: in 1965, the occupants of Wha Wha had 10 chairs, 4 desks and 2 benches.

Clothing No provision is made for clothing, either in cash or kind. A proportion of those restricted possess only the clothes in which they were arrested, and unless their families are able to provide replacements when these wear out, they have no prospect of any other supply. Parcels of clothes may be sent into the camps, but in practice such gifts have met with practical obstacles; at Christmas 1965, when the Rhodesian Christian Action members sent a bulk parcel to Gonakudzingwa, it was returned by the authorities and they were told to divide the contents into a number of small parcels. When approached to provide clothing, Government officials have said that this is a need that can readily be supplied by voluntary organisations; in one instance, a welfare worker was advised to ask the Guild of Loyal Women for assistance. But when approached in May 1966, a Bulawayo member of the Guild said that they could supply second-hand clothing to whites and Asians only and would not consider extending their help to "Raffirs". At Gonakudzingwa, the clothing shortage is reported to be increasingly acute as time goes on; restrictees say that the extreme heat makes garments wear out more quickly than in a more temperate area, and many restrictees are now barely able to cover themselves. But as the heat makes it necessary to wear shoes, some sandals made from tyre rubber have been provided.

Bedding The official bedding allowance is 4 blankets per person at Wha Wha and Sikombela, and 3 at Gonakudzingwa; all restrictees have felt sleeping mats. In April 1965, only Wha Wha restrictees were provided with pillows. No beds are provided, except on medical recommendation for one or two restrictees; a few individuals have managed either to make or bring their own. A Wha Wha restrictee wrote about his sleeping conditions in 1965:

"...the old and dirty blankets, torn in most cases, and fur-like mat we use as the bed are far from being a normal bed.... But the bedding is so hard that our bodies are just painful. The Most of us are not accustomed to such type of bedding. The floors are of brick covered by a layer of dusty smelting so that in addition to poor blankets, lack of sheets, etc. we
breathe dust right through. The floors are not smooth and that makes it more painful to sleep on such a floor... In asking for beds, sheets, etc. we are not asking for a privilege. We are asking for normal sleeping conditions, which we have at our homes. They may not be as decent, but they must be忍受able. Many prisoners, all Europeans and a large number of African prisoners, sleep on beds and we see no reason why we, unconvicted people, who should legally be subjected to no punishment other than that of our restriction, should be denied these things.”

Light and No restriction area has electric light. At its establishment in 1964, Gonakudzingwa was lit by candles, and early in 1966, the 80 restrictees at Wha Wha were provided with 16 hurricane lamps, and a weekly ration of 15 candles and one box of matches.

Water is supplied from bore holes in each area. A visitor to Gonakudzingwa in 1965 reported that the camps were “well supplied with water from a nearby bore hole. Two large storage tanks are mounted in each camp and taps are distributed over the camp area. Taps are set in slabs of concrete to prevent the surrounding ground from becoming soggy.” But the soil round the taps does become slightly water-logged and this is regarded by restrictees as being important in a malarial area. During three months in early 1966, water in the camps was only turned on for 6 hours a day. At Wha Wha, an elevated tank has been placed beside the bore hole, but at Sikombela, in 1965, water was being hand-pumped from the bore hole and, until one was given by a European visitor, no storage tank existed in case the pump broke down. As the camp was then 20 miles from the police post and was without a telephone, lack of water could have been serious. Water in all camps is heated over open fires. Firewood for this and for cooking is collected by the restrictees; in Gonakudzingwa where the dead wood inside the camps has long been used up, restrictees are allowed outside the camps and a police lorry is provided to carry the wood back.

Food The official daily food ration for restrictees in April 1966 was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 oz maize flour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 oz rice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 oz maize flour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lb green vegetables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 oz dried beans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz shelled ground nuts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 oz fresh vegetables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 oz fresh meat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 oz margarine/ dripping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz salt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 oz sugar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ oz coffee or tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These rations are delivered by the police and cooked by the restrictees. As the food is delivered in bulk — either every week or every few days — and as the restrictees have no scales, it is impossible for them to check that they are given the proper quantities. Food appears to have improved since the camps were established; restrictees at Wha Wha went on a five-day hunger strike in 1965 before they were given meat, fresh vegetables and oil as a regular ration; at Gonakudzingwa, on several occasions reports have come through that the meat was so rotten when it was received that it was inedible. At Wha Wha, meat is now delivered daily, but restrictees say that fresh vegetables have often been cut completely and that the fruit ration is only one banana or orange a week. When the Asians at Gonakudzingwa asked that they should have a vegetarian diet, their meat ration was removed, but no protein substitute was provided.

Restrictees complain that the diet is so monotonous that they become unable to eat it, that no bread is provided and that it is a diet which, although possibly little different from that of a rural African, is seriously below the standard to which an urban or professional African is accustomed. One restrictee dropped in weight from 160 lb, to 140 lb, between mid-December and mid-April 1966. In 1965, an Indian restrictee, temporarily out of restriction, had Pellagra, Beri Beri and Scurvy diagnosed by his own doctor; these are all diseases stemming from malnutrition and had gone un-noticed by the Government Medical Officer. It is thought that other cases of malnutrition may exist in the camps.

Cooking is done by restrictees. Wha Wha is presently provided with 12 buckets for food storage and 19 for preparation. At Gonakudzingwa, the barracks are provided with 8' long grates, under an iron roof, supported by poles, and those who live in the huts have small, lean-to kitchenettes containing iron stoves. At Wha Wha complaints have been made that the kitchens, which are constructed like those at Gonakudzingwa, are sited very close to the latrines. The Government supplies iron, three-legged cooking pots.

Washing Facilities vary between the camps.

Facilities Camp 2 at Gonakudzingwa, in late 1965, had one zinc bath house, with 4 showers and 4 lavatories, for use by 80-100 people. Camp 3 has three ablution huts, each with 2 showers, a urinal and four flush lavatories with steel bowls cemented into a raised platform. At Wha Wha, there is one shower room, used by both sexes.
containing 6 showers, 2 latrines and 8 Turkish lavatories; the whole area is reported to be filthy and fly-infested as the waste-disposal pit is nearby and not enclosed. The Government has undertaken to build improved wash-houses, but these have not yet materialised. At Sikombela, there is a shower-house and also latrine pits, but the showers are now outside the camp perimeter. Water supplies are reported to be adequate and restrictees can shower as often as they like. There are no towels at Gonakudzingwa. The soap ration is: one 7d Lifebuoy tablet a week and 11b. of blue, carbolic soap a month.

Medical Facilities

Medical facilities also vary, and the frequency with which a doctor visits appears to depend on the accessibility of the camp. In recent months, all restrictees have been given a medical examination before being sent to Gonakudzingwa, and since April 1965, every restrictee has been given a weekly anti-malarial tablet. Government Medical Officers visit each camp — weekly at Wha Wha, when summoned to Sikombela, and at Gonakudzingwa the doctor should make a monthly visit. Medical supplies of a simple sort are available and medical orderly hold clinics in all the camps, but they are unequipped to do any diagnostic tests and can only treat symptoms of disease. Medical facilities have improved in the last two years. In 1964, a restrictee wrote from Sikombela:

"The police in charge are some 18 miles away — 17 miles outside the restriction area. In an emergency or if anyone became seriously ill, we would be helpless; we cannot go to the police camp (at Zhomba), even if we could walk 18 miles in time, without committing an offence carrying a maximum penalty of 3 years' imprisonment... We have repeatedly requested a dispensary with a permanent medical assistant, without success. Instead the police brought a few common remedies inadequate even for a first-aid kit."

Even at the present time, the medical situation is not satisfactory. Gonakudzingwa restrictees say that the doctor's visits have been taking place only every 6 to 8 weeks. There is little continuity as doctors often change from one visit to the next, and when a medical officer does come, he spends only about six hours in the camp and is thus unable to make a proper examination of all who have reported sick. At least one case is known where lack of treatment meant that a curable condition became permanent.

From Gonakudzingwa, restrictees go to Mpilo Hospital, Bulawayo, and from Wha Wha to the hospital at Gwelo. The standard of treatment in hospital is generally agreed to be high.

Education

Restrictees have been able to buy tobacco, razor blades, extra food, and stationery from the police, when they have money, but this depends on police good will and from time to time has been suspended either as a punishment or in periods of political tension, as in the weeks after UDI. As restrictees do no work except for the domestic tasks necessary to run the camps, a major problem is inactivity and boredom. Recreational facilities are not provided, although small libraries have been built up from books sent by friends, newspapers can be received as long as they are Rhodesian, but under the Emergency all wirelesses have been banned. No limit is placed on books which can be received, though police have tended to remove anything relating to politics. By far the most important activity in the camps is study. Classes are organised on a wide range of subjects and instruction is on a form of monitory system with students at one level teaching those at the level below. Although all classes were stopped by the police when the State of Emergency was declared, as were all forms of group activity, these are now again in progress. Since early 1965, the Ministry of Education has paid for courses taken through the Central African Correspondence College in Salisbury, and during 1965 some 200 restrictees enrolled. But the College does not provide courses beyond A Level, and those who want to prepare for degrees can only do this if they can find fees for another college from a voluntary source.

Apart from four desks at Wha Wha, and a minimum number of chairs and tables at Gonakudzingwa, no facilities for study have been provided by the Government, but the restrictees themselves have erected pole and dagga shelters in which to work as the tin barracks are too hot to sit in during the day. A restrictee, Mr. Sikanyiso Ndhlovu, described the courses available:

"The Gona Education Programme embraces Adult Education; primary and post-primary education; Junior Certificate and GCE; Public Administration; Book-keeping; Journalism; B.A.Econ.; Arts; Law; Constitutional Law, and Social Science... The educational staff consists of 26 restrictees who are qualified teachers, graduates, undergraduates and professional tutors. The Education Committee has ad hoc committees for the library and tutorial schemes."

Before the Emergencies, when communication with the outside world was limited only by the practical difficulties imposed by distance, visitors could come and stay in the camps and families were allowed to live with their husbands. Few if any families took advantage of this since no provision was made for their accommodation, food, children's education, nor was there any
Since then reports have come from Gonakudzingwa that release is increasingly dependent on renunciation of nationalist beliefs. Even when a restriction order expires, the restrictee is still subject to a detention order which can only be revoked by the Minister; the implication of these reports is therefore that the Minister is prepared only to release those who agree to "co-operate and say what is going on" — the phrase used in interviews between officials and those who are due for release. Those who refuse to agree to this are told that they must remain at Gonakudzingwa.

During these years, two restriction areas were used—first, and briefly, at Lupane, and then at Gokwe. At Gokwe, the restriction area was 200 square miles in extent, and inside this the restrictees could move freely. Each man had a pole and dogga hut, cooking utensils and blankets provided; instead of food, there was a monthly cash allowance. The hats were several miles away from each other, and restrictees complained of the loneliness. Purchases of food, clothes, etc., were made through the District Commissioner, and restrictees had to report twice a week, but in other ways no controls were placed on their activities. Medical treatment was, in at least one case, far from satisfactory. Families were able to visit as freely as the remoteness of the area would allow. The Gokwe restriction area was finally emptied early in 1963 when the last restrictees were released.

Release

Until November, all restrictees were released from restriction when their orders expired, but since then reports have come from Gonakudzingwa that release is increasingly dependent on renunciation of nationalist beliefs. Even when a restriction order expires, the restrictee is still subject to a detention order which can only be revoked by the Minister; the implication of these reports is therefore that the Minister is prepared only to release those who agree to "co-operate and say what is going on" — the phrase used in interviews between officials and those who are due for release. Those who refuse to agree to this are told that they must remain at Gonakudzingwa.
SINCE 1964, the Rhodesian Government has been unable to detain any person by normal constitutional processes except under a state of emergency.

In 1959, the Preventive Detention (Temporary Provisions) Act was promulgated under the 1923 Constitution to enable the Government to detain members of the banned African National Congress. When the Act expired in 1964, the Government renewed its provisions for a further period of five years and in November served detention orders under the renewed Act on Mr Nkomo and several other nationalist leaders. However, application was immediately made to the High Court by the detainees, contending that the orders were illegal in that the Act, as extended, was contrary to section 56 of the 1961 Constitution. The court granted the application and the Act was declared invalid. It is, however, the stated wish of the Secretary for Law and Order that powers of preventive detention should be re-introduced.

Under each recent state of emergency, provision has been made for preventive detention in the Regulations. Since the Highfields Emergency was declared on 28 August, 1964, a state of emergency has been in existence somewhere in Rhodesia on all but seven days; therefore, since the Preventive Detention Act was declared invalid, the Government has had virtually continuous powers of detention.

The Emergency Powers (Maintenance of Law and Order) Regulations, 1966, which are at present in effect, give the Minister of Law and Order extensive powers to detain "if it appears to the Minister that the detention of any person is in the public interest" (paragraph 21). Any police officer is also empowered to "arrest without warrant any person in respect of whom he has reason to believe there are grounds which would justify his detention under section 21". For arrest and detention under this section (24), no warrant is needed. Detention under section 21 ends either when revoked by the Minister, or when the emergency expires, but detention under section 24 may last for no longer than 30 days.

The main practical difference between detention and restriction lies in the fact that whereas a restriction order only defines the area inside which a man must live, under detention not only his residence is controlled, but also his contact with the outside world and the routine of his day. In February, the Minister explained the advantages of detention.

"Without the emergency I can do nothing except restrict him on an area, but with the emergency I can put him into detention to keep him away and out of circulation. This is more necessary with saboteurs, because when we are investigating the cases of saboteurs they must obviously be kept out of circulation... in restriction, they are in a big area of 400 square miles and there in all probability they will be training the other restrictees on a para military set-up."

Under section 21 of the Emergency Regulations, a detained person may be held in a prison or in any other place decided by the Minister. The Minister may establish camps for the accommodation of detained people — as has been done at Gwaii and Wha Wha — and appoint a superintendent to run them who may himself issue regulations for the "control and administration" and "the maintenance of good order and discipline". The superintendent of a camp may authorise a detainee to leave his place of detention for medical treatment and he has also power to try, convict and impose penalties on anyone who infringes these regulations. Penalties allowed in the Emergency Regulations include labour for up to 14 days, confinement to quarters with work also for up to 14 days, detention in a place "specially set apart for the purpose" for up to 28 days and spare diet. It is known that restrictees detained in Wha Wha restriction area have been placed in Wha Wha jail nearby for punishment (sections 26-28).

1. Under the Preventive Detention Act, provision was made for a Review Tribunal to examine all cases periodically and recommend whether they should be restricted, released or continue in detention. (See: General Report of the Review Tribunal, 1966.)
2. The Harare Emergency was declared on 28 August 1964 and extended until 25 May 1965; the Matabeleland Emergency was declared on 7 October 1964, which on 4 April 1965, the state of emergency in Lobengula was declared on 28 May 1965, and the national state of emergency covering the whole of Rhodesia began on 5 November 1965 and is still in operation.
Finally, the Superintendent has control of all communications. Section 38(1) of the Regulations states briefly that "no person shall... communicate with a detained person in any camp", without authorisation, and section 39 forbids any letters or documents from leaving the camp without the Superintendent's permission.

In the three restriction areas, superintendents in charge of the detention camps have been senior police officers, while in prisons this function is taken by the Officer in Charge.

The detention order itself states as the reason for detention "a belief that you are likely to commit acts in Rhodesia which are likely to endanger the public safety, disturb or interfere with public order, or interfere with the maintenance of any essential service".

Appeal is allowed in the same terms as in a restriction order.

(a) Detention under Section 21.

The conditions of Africans detained in the three restriction areas at Gonakudzingwa, Wha Wha and Sikombela have been described in the section on Restriction. Information on the conditions of those held in prisons has, however, proved almost impossible to obtain for the reasons given in the Introduction. Their general conditions have been those of remand prisoners, and they are allowed to receive books, as long as they are not political, Rhodesian newspapers, and some visits. They are usually held apart from the criminal prisoners.

(b) Detention under Section 24.

Detainees held under this section may be lodged either in a prison or in a police station. In Grey Street Prison, however, in December, seventy prisoners — some awaiting trial — were held in a cell designed for 30. In Fife Street police station, Bulawayo, in one case, thirteen men were in a cell with eight blankets and no mats. Washing was rare in the weeks following the emergency, one detainee did not wash for 29 days and another for 22 days. Exercise, too, seemed to be far from regular. In December, in Bulawayo, detainees were being refused books brought to the police stations for them, while visits by wives were also not allowed. Conditions appear to be those of remand prisoners, but are often extremely over-crowded and inadequate, especially in the police stations. One very general complaint is that detainees are being forced to wear prison clothing, even though they have not been sentenced. This has happened particularly in Gwelo Prison. The detainees concerned deny that their own clothes were in an unsuitable condition and state that the purpose of making them wear convicts' clothing was to make them appear guilty of some crime.

Rehabilitation

In 1964, a Rehabilitation Committee was set up by the Government with the initial objective of working among those detained during the Highfields and Harari emergencies and assisting their return to the community on release. The scope of the Committee's work is not clear, but restrictees are unanimous in regarding its wider purpose as being to persuade them to renounce their political beliefs. The Committee has been empowered to offer land or employment, but they have found few restrictees who were willing to accept, and have been met with total opposition at Gonakudzingwa where the camp committee has forbidden anyone to speak with Rehabilitation Officers unless they are with several other restrictees. The restrictee's general attitude was summed up by an African in April when he said:

"They want you to be submissive to the Government, that's all they mean by rehabilitation".

In his annual report for 1965, the Secretary for Law and Order described the Rehabilitation Committee's work during the year.

"After the release of the Highfield and Harari detainees, the Rehabilitation staff turned their attention to the restrictees. Their success was naturally conditional upon the amount of co-operation received from individual restrictees. It was found almost impossible to make any progress in rehabilitation unless arrangements could be made for restrictees to be interviewed individually; rehabilitation was much hampered by local intimidation within the camps. In order to assist this process, it became essential to isolate the 'hard core' restrictees from those who were willing to co-operate. With this in mind, 'soft core' FCC restrictees were moved from Sengwe (Gonakudzingwa) to Wha Wha."

The Secretary also said that the rehabilitation officers were "providing a service which is essential if the restriction camps are not to become a permanent feature of Rhodesia".

Early in 1966, the Chief Rehabilitation Officer resigned his post because he felt the Committee was able to achieve so little, and restrictees in Gonakudzingwa report that the Committee did not visit the camp during the first six months of 1966. It is not known whether the Committee is including in its work those detained in prisons.

1. See Appendix 1.
POLICE USE OF VIOLENCE IN THE LATE 1950s, the high reputation of the British South African Police in Rhodesia was rarely challenged, and although instances were known in which policemen had mishandled suspects, it was widely regarded as a disciplined and humane force. Since the passing of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act in 1960, large numbers of political cases have been brought before the courts, and during the same period there has been an increasing number of allegations of police use of violence. Many prosecution cases have been based on confessions made by the accused while they were held by the police and by Rhodesian law confessions are admissible as evidence in a court if made while the accused was "in his sound and sober sense and without having been unduly influenced thereby". But, unlike South Africa, confessions need not have been confirmed and put into writing in front of a Magistrate. (Civil Procedure and Evidence Act, Section 38)

Since 1959, the BSAP has undergone an increase in establishment of almost 400%, from 9,767 in 1959 to 36,701 in 1964. Changes, too, have taken place in their methods; dogs were added to the normal establishment in 1961, while in the same year firearms were first used to deal with disturbances, during the Salisbury riots. Eleven Africans died on this occasion, but violence was in no sense confined to the police; the Commissioner of Police later reported that: "the use of firearms in these disturbances shattered a record of 60 years' standing of non-recourse to firearms in times of emergency". Since then dogs and arms have been used increasingly in crowd control.

The allegations of police brutality while questioning suspects have usually taken the form of unsupported statements from the suspects themselves. There are rarely witnesses present other than police, when interrogation takes place, though in some cases where similar treatment has been given to a group of people, identical statements have been obtained from them all. On some occasions, doctors have examined the individuals concerned shortly after their interrogation, and these medical reports have substantiated the descriptions of brutality. An example of this is given in Appendix K. But a doctor's report, made after the event, can do no more than support a statement by confirming that similar injuries were inflicted to those alleged to have been caused by the police; it cannot prove that the injuries were in fact inflicted at the time and place and by the person named by the injured man. In several cases where police were charged with brutality, the charges have failed for these reasons. A particular example of this is found in the case of Patrick Keyser who was acquitted in July 1965 of the murder of Alexander Mashawira, an African who had been found dead in a Salisbury police cell after being questioned by Keyser. At the inquest, two doctors had told the court that the deceased, who was a healthy man, had died within a few hours of being beaten extensively across the back with an instrument that left no marks on the skin. Police witnesses admitted that Mashawira had had to be carried to his cell after questioning. But at the end of Keyser's trial, the judge pointed out that the doctor's evidence had shown that Mashawira's death need not have been caused by the beating inflicted on the day of his death by Keyser, but could have been the result of interrogation, by other officers, on the days before. He therefore could not convict Keyser. This case established, however, that beating had been used by the police during the interrogation. In another case, heard in April 1966, a doctor who had been asked to examine an African prisoner who had complained to the prison authorities, admitted under cross examination that police had told him to examine certain scars, but to ignore other newer ones. His report that the man's injuries were not consistent with his statement of recent police beating had therefore been based on an inadequate examination.

Reported methods of interrogation vary. The most common one is straightforward beating up with fists, boots or batons (see Appendix K). Another method is reported to be that of threatened castration. This is illustrated in a statement from a man presently at Gonakudzingwa.

"It was on 4 December 1965...that there arose disturbances among the people of Gwanda. There were road blocks and rail blocks and the post office was blasted. My nephew was among those who were arrested... Suspects were brought to the police station for questioning and I was among this lot. One by one...we were interrogated about the disturbances... I was forced to agree that I took part in the destruction of the post office with my nephew, and each time that I refused I was given some kind of punishment like the fastening of a stone on to some twine and on to my testicles and letting the stone hang from my testicles for a period; if I resisted this, the stone would be swung back and front and sideways. This made me agree for fear of cutting off my testicles." This is not an isolated report; others of a similar nature have been made.

A third method, apparently used mainly by the police in Bulawayo, is known among the African population as the "electric
snake". Here, suspects are reported to be taken to the police station, and placed alone in a small, dark room, without furniture. From the centre of the ceiling hangs a length of rubber tubing, which swings. Inside the tubing is an electric wire, which protrudes at the end and becomes live when turned on by the police officer standing outside. When it touches the skin of the suspect, it gives an electric shock. The electric current used does not seem to be strong, and it has been suggested that the principle used is the same as that of an electric cattle goad, where the wire is inside a rod and is operated from a battery held in the hand of the cowherd. The duress inherent in this situation seems to be fear. Africans have described the tubing as "a giant cobra" and "a snake which twists and turns in the air and when it strikes you, you faint away".

In the Gwanda Reserve in 1964, a group of suspects reported that they had been strung from a tree by the ankles and beaten while in this position, until they were prepared to confess.

Interrogation usually takes place in a police station, though sometimes suspects are moved to other places. In the Mashawira inquest, the Detective Inspector in charge of the Section at the time told the court that he had found Mashawira "making a lot of noise" during his interrogation, and as it might have proved embarrassing for visitors or civilians if this went on in the police station he had instructed the use of a "deserted building" nearby for further questioning. In April, 1966, a former butcher's shop in Khonji Road, Bulawayo, and a house near Epworth, outside Salisbury, called "Journey's End", were said to be used for interrogation. In the rural areas, questioning often takes place in the open within the area of a police camp.

In any general consideration of police methods, the experiences of a European priest who visited the Nkai District in early 1966 are most valuable. During his tour of the area he saw and photographed police beating up an African suspect, visited a kraal shortly after police had searched it and discussed the use of violence with several policemen. The photographs were destroyed, on police persuasion, but the priest's descriptions of the two other incidents appeared in the Church Times (4/2/66). The police "stoutly justified violence, without the slightest attempt to conceal that this was what they were doing. 'This is the only language that these people understand.' 'We've got to hammer them.' 'I don't approve of all this documentation we have to go through for the sake of regulations.' 'We only arrest a man when we know he's guilty.' 'If we arrest someone, he's not going to tell us the names of those who told him what to do . . . so we've got to beat it out of him.' The kraal had been visited by police searching for a particular African who had, by the time they arrived, already left. Nevertheless, they searched the largest hut. Every pane of glass was smashed, "radio and clock thrown on the floor and wrecked; mattress flung off the bed and slashed; chair seats broken through . . . wardrobe, which was not locked, smashed eight times with a rifle butt and every panel broken". The priest's description ended up: "I have never seen such destruction."

It is impossible to obtain figures for alleged assault. In August, 1964, the Minister of Justice said that since January three policemen had been convicted of assault, other reports had been made, but found on investigation to be groundless. Attorneys who have lodged complaints with the police on behalf of clients say that when they receive notification that a complaint has been investigated and rejected, they are never told on what evidence the decision was based. It is also certain that relatively few of the assaults that do take place are ever reported to the proper authorities. There are several reasons for this. Some Africans who have gone straight to the police with a complaint say that they were not listened to, and in other cases Africans who are known to have complained have been served with restriction orders shortly after. Even if the complaint has the necessary funds to bring a case to court, witnesses, if they exist, usually disperse and are hard to contact. An additional factor is that many Africans are afraid that a complaint, since it cannot eradicate what has happened, will achieve nothing for them and by bringing official attention to bear on them, may well lead to more trouble. One African minister, whose nephew was assaulted in February 1966, explained that he did not take him to a doctor for the necessary treatment for his injuries for fear that the doctor, who would be a European, would tell the police. This reasoning shows the deep fear, felt even by educated Africans, of any contact with officialdom, and the accompanying belief that since the police are so powerful, they can do what they will, and the individual faced with police action has neither rights nor chance of redress.

Official reaction to general criticism of police methods based on particular cases has recently been to regard it as something with a deeper, political motive. The Commissioner of Police has on several occasions said that a "deliberate campaign" was being waged "to besmirch the name of the BSAP," and when Dr Palley gave the Minister for Law and Order some affidavits
describing police treatment of students after a demonstration, the
Minister told him that this was "a deliberate attempt to embarrass
the Government". In 1964, a group of Europeans collected a
dossier of reports of police brutality; this finally contained over
70 recent cases, and, as well as the statements describing the
assaults, there were reports by doctors corroborating them. The
Europeans asked for a meeting with the Minister for Law and Order
to discuss the cases with him. They said they had no political
incentive for their action. They were all professional men — the
Dean of Salisbury, a lawyer, a doctor and two university lecturers.
They said that their action was prompted by their concern at the
number of complaints of assault that were being made and they
believed that the material they had collected provided a prime
facie case for a judicial enquiry. The Minister, however,
refused to meet the deputation on the grounds, firstly, that they
had no standing in such a matter, and, secondly, that since the rule
was that all complaints against the police should be made on an
individual basis, and when made were fully investigated, he
could take no action on a dossier presented in such a general way.
No further action is known to have been taken on this matter.
Since then, brutality allegations have continued to be made, but
under the censorship regulations these are no longer reported in
the press.

POSITION OF FAMILIES

WHEN a man is arrested the immediate effect for most families is
loss of income. Many politically-active Africans are profes-
sional men, and even if their wives are able to find work it is
unlikely that the income would be enough to cover the family's
habitual needs. Restrictees are rarely given time in which to put
their affairs in order, and for most families the restriction,
detention or imprisonment of the bread winner means that the only
sources of income are from an unmarried brother or from the
sale of possessions.

No official provision of relief for families of restrictees as
such has existed since early 1963 when the last people were
released from Gwelo. Prior to this, the Government had accepted
its responsibility towards the families of those originally detained
in 1959 and made available allowances for food, rent, clothing and
education.

1. The Minister of Justice and Internal Affairs stated the position in 1963, "Africans
originally detained under the Emergency Regulations have been continued to be paid
allowances ranging from £2.5.0. a month to £5 a month at the same rate
as those who may be in need."

An official statement in February 1965 amplified the situation.
"Applications by the dependants of restrictees for public assistance are examined and dealt with in exactly the same
way as applications received from other destitute persons.
Responsibility for destitute persons is shared by Government, local authorities and voluntary organisations. Central Govern-
ment accepts responsibility for making a contribution towards the
benefit of produce from agricultural land and stock holdings and other charges incident to the education of a detainee's children."

1. Footnote continued on page 39.
the basic needs of food and shelter. In cases which qualify for assistance on the grounds of destitution, food is made available at an approved scale and rent allowances are authorised at basic levels. The matter of obtaining accommodation is the individual's responsibility. Government does not itself provide clothing for destitute persons of any race. Voluntary organisations assist in this respect. (Hansard, 19 February 1965)

The restrictees themselves make two main criticisms of this as a policy. They argue that a restrictee is in need as a result not of laziness, desertion or failure to find work, but because of direct governmental action. Secondly, destitution relief is usually seen as being an interim measure designed to tide a family over until the bread winner can find work again; for restrictees this must be a period of anything from twelve months to five years or more, during which time there is no hope of any income. Thus, they argue, the parallel between restrictees' families and those destitute from other causes is in no way an exact one.

At the present time, however, the situation of restrictees' families must be seen in the context of social welfare as a whole. This is in itself a new development in Rhodesia, for until 1964 no social assistance, other than medical care, existed for the non-white population. In that year, limited grants were made available to the municipal authorities for distribution to families in need. In September 1965, this assistance was taken over from the municipalities as a direct responsibility of the central government, and now all applications for relief must be made direct to the offices of the Department of Social Welfare.

Relief

Assistance provided by Social Welfare takes two forms: a rent allowance of 30/- a month, paid direct to the township authorities, and a weekly ration pack. Cash allowances, instead of food packs can be made in "exceptional circumstances". No allowance is made for any other family need — cooking, cleaning, clothing, supplementary food like fresh fruit or vegetables, or travel fares to and from the welfare office. Although clothing is officially said to come from voluntary bodies, few European organisations are willing to give to African families, and the small number of African voluntary bodies have very limited resources. The weekly ration pack for a family of more than four contains:

- 2 lb moudo meal
- 2 lb proteine (soup powder)
- 3 lb skim milk powder
- 2 lb peanuts
- 7 lb beans
- 1 lb salt

Means Test

Urban All families may apply for social welfare assistance, but before they are granted relief, they must be assessed according to two principles — "less eligibility" and "effective urbanisation". First, the family must prove that it is completely destitute; this is stressed in all official policy on the grounds that no person who is receiving relief should be in a better financial position than the poorest person surviving through his own efforts. It is officially known as the principle of "less eligibility". Any income, of whatever size, tends to disbar the applicant; material possessions — whether furniture, a car, or, in rural areas, cows or goats — must be sold. Although it has been officially acknowledged in certain cases that long term interest demands that a family should retain at least adequate livestock for future breeding, some instances are known in which families with one or two head of cattle have been told to sell them. Thus in order to qualify for the food and shelter allowance, a restrictee's family must be in a state of propertyless poverty.

The second principle stressed by official handouts is that of "effective urbanisation"; this implies that only those African families who have lived in an urban area for a continuous period of ten years are eligible for relief in a town. Those who have either moved to the town more recently or appear to have retained close family ties with a tribal area, are refused relief by the urban office and told to return to the rural area; for this social welfare are empowered to pay travel expenses for a family to their district of origin or to where they have a claim to support or shelter. Questions asked by the assessing officers include: "How often and for what purpose does the applicant visit rural/tribal areas?" In the statement of policy for administration of public assistance (Department of Social Welfare Circular No.1 of 1965), payment of an allowance for rent is authorised "in cases where an applicant is effectively urbanised and has become detribalised". The belief which appears to underlie the criterion of "effective urbanisation" is that all Africans are still rural people, whose urban existence is at best a tenuous one. Thus in cases of hardship, they should return to their family in the reserves. Cases exist, however, where families whose life is well established in the township have been classed as having effective rural ties as a result of frequent short-term visits to relatives in the country. For a restrictee, this policy means that application by his wife for assistance during his restriction may result not only in refusal of assistance, but also in encouragement that she should take her family out of the city back to the rural area.
Applications for assistance in rural areas are made through the District Commissioner, in some instances they have had also to have the endorsement of the local Chief. Three main problems appear to arise with this method. First, the office of the District Commissioner may be anything up to 50 miles from the home of the applicant; applications must be made in person, and as public transport is rare in rural areas, the wife may therefore have to walk up to 100 miles there and back to make her application. Chiefs, as representatives of a traditional tribal authority, are often deeply opposed to the aims of African nationalism; complaints that a Chief would therefore refuse to endorse an application for political reasons, may not be without substance. The third problem encountered by restrictees’ families is that in cases where the man has been restricted on suspicion of political activity in the area, the man who advised the restriction order was in all probability the District Commissioner; families have stated that they therefore met with prejudice as the relatives of a “trouble-maker”.

In rural areas, Africans live in huts or houses on tribal land and thus pay no rent. Africans in urban areas, however, must by law live in a township which is administered through a Superintendent on behalf of either the local municipality or the central Government. Some home-ownership schemes are now in operation, whereby the tenant may buy his house through payment of instalments, or rent, over a period of 15 to 25 years, but most houses in townships are rented on a month to month basis from the township authorities. Rents vary: the lowest is 30/- a month and the highest is in the region of £6 or £7 a month. Waiting lists for houses in the townships are long and a man who is evicted from his house for non-payment of his rent through unemployment may not be allocated a house in any other township until he has a regular job. The average rent is around £3 a month. A restrictee’s family which is drawing national assistance receives 30/- a month for rent; if, as is so in the majority of cases, the family occupies a house with a rent in excess of this, money must either be given by friends or they must move out of their house. Waiting lists for houses in townships are long, and the cheapest houses are much in demand. The official allowance for shelter is therefore adequate in a very small percentage of cases.

Although no township can allow limitless credit to tenants who are unable to pay rent, it appears to be an increasingly general rule in government-run townships for families of restrictees to be allowed less latitude than others, before they are evicted. Among certain sections of the African population there is a belief that Government policy is now to evict families whose breadwinner has been restricted a second time. This has not happened in the Bulawayo municipal townships, but it is known to have occurred in Salisbury Government townships, and particularly in Harare and Highfields. It is impossible categorically to state that eviction of restrictees’ families is being used as an instrument to dissuade Africans from any participation in politics, but the Select Committee on Political Boycott, in its report to Parliament in 1966, recommended: “Your committee is forced to the conclusion that some individuals are irreconcilable fanatics and accordingly recommends:

(a) That in any such case in which a resident of an African township is placed in restriction for a second period or his initial period of restriction is extended by the Minister, the law should provide that his tenancy be terminated or if he be the owner of a house that this be disposed of.

(b) If and when such a restrictee is released from restriction, steps be taken to ensure that he be not allowed to return to reside in the township from which he was removed.”

Children of restricted or detained people are entitled to have their fees waived at Government primary and secondary schools. In March 1966 the Minister of Education stated:

“The provision which is being made for the children of detainees and restrictees whose parents are unable to pay school fees is exactly the same as the provision made for the children of other parents who are in need of financial assistance. It follows, therefore, that a detainee or restrictee can apply for remission of school fees.”

This remission, when granted, covers the full amount of fees—tuition, boarding and general purpose. It does not, however, cover books and uniform. At the present time, however, many restrictees have shown reluctance in applying for remission; this appears to be because the application must be made through the Rehabilitation Officer directly by the restrictee himself. Formerly applications could be made by husband or wife to the headmaster concerned. Restrictees state that application through the Rehabilitation Officer means that they must show willingness to modify their political beliefs as a prerequisite to obtaining the remission. Most Government schools are in urban areas; education in rural areas is provided by mission schools, which cannot offer remission of fees. In some cases, at considerable
cost to individual teachers, children have had their fees paid for
them, but in general terms any child whose parents are unable to
pay may not continue his education. No Government allowance is
available to assist restrictees whose children attend mission
schools and who are unable to pay the fees which, for a child
boarding at a primary school, will be about $15 a year.

Political Bias in Relief Awards

It is generally believed by politically-aware Africans that families of
restrictees or detainees have less chance of obtaining social welfare relief than
applicants with no political affiliations. Many wives feel considerable reluctance even to attend the social welfare offices to make an application, and for many the declaration of financial and personal details which attend any assistance interviews and the need to prove destitution are extremely repugnant. As many restrictees come from the professional African classes, the loss of their normal income may cause extreme hardship to the family long before it has become "destitute" in the technical sense of the term. Thus many restrictees' wives do not apply either out of a belief that they will be turned away for political reasons, or that they will be told to return to the tribal areas, or because their hardship has not reached the desperate, propertyless level of complete destitution. It is impossible to judge degree of political bias in this matter. Certainly an apparently large proportion of restrictees' families appear to be refused relief and the principles of "effective urbanisation" and "less eligibility" may well be more stringently applied in these cases. A group of men who were sacked from their jobs after striking against UDI on 27 December 1965 applied for social welfare in Bulawayo; in April, none had yet been granted relief.

POSITION OF A PRISONER OR RESTRICTEE ON RELEASE

When an African is released from prison or restriction, he invariably finds that he has no job to return to: this has been the case not only when people were imprisoned or restricted for several years, but also recently when they were detained for 30 days or even, on some occasions, held by the police for questioning for two or three days only. There are some exceptions to this rule where employers have not only held jobs open for restricted men, but also assisted their families, but these are rare. It is much more common for a man to be released, faced with debts which have mounted up in his absence, and unable to find a job; he may also find that his family have had to leave the town and move out to a rural area, in which, if he joins them, his chances of getting paid work are extremely small.

Labour exchanges exist in all towns, but many employers when given a choice prefer to employ a man who has just left a regular job rather than someone who has spent the last months in a restriction area and who is described officially as a "troublemaker". African unemployment has risen considerably as a result of sanctions, and this has only increased the competition for available work. Moreover, it appears to be policy on the part of some municipal authorities, among them Bulawayo, to refuse to re-employ a white collar worker who has been restricted. The Ministry of Education's stated policy is that any ex-restrictee who has failed to find a teaching job within one term of his release shall be considered to have resigned from the teaching service; until then he is on unpaid leave. In practice, few, if any, teachers are employed after restriction. In one case, at least, a school in Salisbury—the Highfield Community School—was told that if it re-employed one of its most qualified staff, who was due to be released, the Education Department would not be prepared to recognise the school.

At the present time, a combination of general unemployment and prejudice against politically active Africans makes the chances of a released political prisoner or restrictee finding work extremely small.

NON-OFFICIAL PROVISION OF RELIEF

Because of the stark inadequacy of the relief available from Social Welfare, two offices have been opened by the Christian Council of Rhodesia in Bulawayo and Salisbury to administer whatever funds can be obtained from voluntary donations inside and outside the country. These offices have now taken over the work which until 1965 was done by the Legal Aid and Welfare Committee in Salisbury. Monthly allowances are distributed to families whose bread-winners are in restriction, detention or serving sentences for non-violent political offences. The Christian Council Relief Office's funds are extremely limited, and although allowances are fixed according to an individual assessment for each family based on their rent, number of children and food needs; the average sum being paid out has averaged only £5 to £6 a month per family.

Welfare Committees set up by ZAPU and ZANU existed in a very limited way until 1965, when they were refused permission to raise money through public gatherings and bazaars, and they have since been compelled to stop all relief activities.
CONCLUSIONS

A. General Remarks

At the present time, the combination of far-reaching security legislation and statutory power of indefinite restriction, with constant states of emergency which allow detention and wide extension of police power, have resulted in a real and fundamental erosion of human rights in Rhodesia. This has on the whole affected only the non-white population and, as a result, the Rhodesian Government is enabled to deny freedom of political expression to the majority of its citizens while claiming to uphold the rule of law. Unless and until the present state of emergency is ended and large parts of the security legislation, including the power to restrict, are repealed, this situation cannot improve.

The main recommendations of this report must therefore be:

1. An immediate end to the state of emergency;
2. The release or trial of all those held in detention and restriction;
3. The reference of all security legislation passed after 1958 to the Constitutional Council, and the repeal of those provisions held by the Council to be in violation of the human rights provision of the 1961 Constitution;
4. The appointment of a strictly impartial judicial commission to enquire into methods employed by the British South African Police during the investigation of political cases, and the degree of official sanction which these have enjoyed; until the first two recommendations are implemented,
5. Government provision of adequate relief to enable the families of those restricted or detained without trial to live a reasonable life; this must include a cash allowance for adequate food, allowances for the fees of children attending mission schools, rent at realistic levels, costs of heating, clothing, cooking and other habitual but necessary expenses; it should also cover travel costs for visits to detention and restriction areas in order to preserve family unity despite long-term separation.

B. Prisons

In the opinion of this report, the Rhodesian Prison system suffers from three basic defects: the absence of any stated aim of rehabilitation for the prisoners, lack of training and hence professional standards among almost all ranks of prison officer, and a severe staff shortage. This has resulted in prisons which appear punitive in aim and inefficient in administration and from which there is little reason to suppose that a long-term prisoner will emerge as anything but a more embittered individual than when he was sentenced. The absence of modern penal method manifests itself primarily in the practical lack of classification, whereby prisoners are held together whatever their age or criminal record, and in the lack of official educational facilities. These are particularly serious factors for political prisoners, many of whom are young, highly intelligent people serving sentences of between ten and twenty years. The recent mild reforms can make little difference to the system, and indeed it is likely that the country's present economic crisis can only reduce the already scanty money available for prisons, while the rising political tension may be expected to worsen the relationship between a predominantly white prison authority, and black nationalist political prisoners.

Although to date the apparently deliberate brutality inherent in the treatment of South African political offenders has not been evident, two points must be born in mind in Rhodesia. Ultimate responsibility for the administration of prisons has recently been transferred from a non-political, professional, Director of Prisons, to the Minister for Law and Order, and during the last eighteen months, political and criminal prisoners have been held apart from each other. It is to be hoped that this does not mean that political prisoners will in future receive different conditions from those of criminals.

From the evidence collected for this report, particular conclusions may be made:

(a) Food: Grade 3 diet, given to most Africans, is nutritionally inadequate for an African who is either accustomed to an urban standard of living or sentenced to hard labour; moreover, no Africans in this grade receive knives, forks or spoons, and the quality of the plates appears in some prisons to be unhygienic as well as unattractive.

(b) Clothing: The grade 3 allowance is in itself a punishment for Africans used to urban ways of living: shoes are rarely given.

(c) Cell Accommodation: this is generally overcrowded, bedding is seldom washed and in many prisons is verminous, and the
The unconditional release or trial of all in restriction or detention;

That an independent tribunal be set up and all restriction cases be reviewed at least every 12 months; where continued restriction is advised, the restrictee should be told the particular reason for the decision. Appeals should be made to this tribunal rather than to the Minister for Law and Order.

Until this is done, this report recommends:

(iii) That conditions for those in restriction areas be brought at least into line with the living conditions for sentenced prisoners; this would therefore introduce the fundamental principle that conditions are determined by an individual’s standard of living in normal life.

(iv) As the climate of Gonakudzingwa is unhealthy as well as malarial, this camp should be moved.

(v) In view of proved malnutrition among restrictees, they should be (a) provided with fresh fruit and vegetables as a regular part of their diet, and (b) given scales so that they can check their rations. Considering the climate and conditions of the areas, fresh food should either be delivered daily or refrigeration should be provided.

(vi) Accommodation: restrictees who are accustomed to beds, sheets, towels, etc. should be provided with these; the huts should be insulated against the heat, extra accommodation should be built to reduce over-crowding; at Wha Wha, the huts should have their floors raised against the damp, and the present unhygienic situation of the kitchens, latrines and open garbage pit should be altered.

(vii) Since few families are able to send clothing, and many restricted people are at present clad only in the ragged remains of the outfit in which they were originally arrested, months or years ago, clothes should be provided as of right by the authorities.

(viii) Medical Facilities: complaints of inadequate medical facilities are fully justified. Adequate drugs should therefore be made available in the camps, which should be visited by a doctor once a week as a minimum.

(ix) Postal facilities and visits from friends, families and ministers of religion should be unlimited and uncontrolled. Moreover, as the lack of accommodation, schools, etc.
the camps makes it impracticable for families to live with
the husband, money allowances should be provided to enable
them to make as frequent and lengthy visits as are necessary
necessary to preserve the unity of the family. In the
cases where husband and wife are both restricted, they
should be moved to the same area and provided with private
accommodation.

(x) As restriction can be ordered for up to five years, a
restrictee must be allowed adequate time in which to put
his affairs into order, and arrange for the welfare of his
wife and family. An official curator must also be appointed
by the authorities to run restrictees' businesses in their
absence.

(xii) As study is the only creative activity possible in restriction,
the Government should augment its present provision of
courses by providing stationery, books, and classrooms
and by paying for degree courses.

(xii) Release should be made without regard for a man's political
opinions, and restrictees should be enabled to leave their
restriction when their orders expire.

D. General Should any negotiated settlement with the
Smith Government be contemplated by the
British Government this must have the
essential prerequisite of a full and
unconditional amnesty for all those serving sentences for non-
violent infringements of the security legislation.

---

Appendix B

Dietary Scale No. 2 Daily Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>12 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaten Flour OR Maize Meal</td>
<td>8 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>16 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>8 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR Fresh Fish</td>
<td>12 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans OR Peas OR Dahl</td>
<td>4 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Vegetables</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onions</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustard OR Pepper</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarine</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR Dripping</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR Groundnut Oil</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Appendix C

Self Employment Laid Down in Prison
Regulations (Sentenced Prisoners)

Table 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron bed and mattress</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupboard and shelving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small table</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looing glass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furs, knife and spoon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 4 blankets (winter)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 3 blankets (summer)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillow and slippers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where no permanent ablution arrangements are available, the following additional
issue will be made:

- 1 basin, water jug, soap dish, chamber pot.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>10 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaten Flour OR Maize Meal</td>
<td>8 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>16 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>8 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR Fresh Fish</td>
<td>12 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans OR Peas OR Dahl</td>
<td>4 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Vegetables</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onions</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustard OR Pepper</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarine</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR Dripping</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR Groundnut Oil</td>
<td>1 oz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OR Red Palm Oil

Salt

Sugar

Milk

Fruit (in season)

Curry Powder

Dietary Scale No.3 Daily Issues

Maize Meal

Peas CR Beans

Fresh Vegetables

Dripping

Salt

Fruit (in season)

Appendix C

Clothing and Accessories Laid Down in Scale 1 and 2 (Male)

Rice

2 shirts

CR Cassava

2 pairs socks

CR Millet Meal

2 pairs of pyjamas

OR Peas OR Deans

2 handkerchiefs

1 pair boots

I belt

I brush and comb

I toothbrush and shaving brush

CR Sweet Potatoes

2 pairs shorts

OR Groundnuts, Shelled

1 jacket (winter)

That for the purpose of maintaining law and order in Rhodesia it is desirable to

subsection (1) of section 30 of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act (Chapter 39), for the purpose of securing that, except

Order, or by a written permit issued by the officer in charge, any person or persons in any other area or in any portion of the area

which are likely to, endanger the public safety, disturb or interfere with the maintenance of any essential service or interfere with the pre-

any person or persons in any other area or in any portion of the area

with public order or interfere with any person or persons in any other area or in any portion of the area

that portion of the Sengwe Tribal

and order insofar as may be permitted by this

in subversive activities.

such information.

in paragraph 3 of this Order during a period of FIVE YEARS.

NOW, THEREFORE, in terms of subsection (I) of section 30 of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, (Chapter 39), I do hereby

order that -

This Order shall have effect immediately

Given under my hand at Salisbury this 11th day of March 1931.

Appendix E

DETENTION ORDER LIMITING RESTRICTIONS

1 You being a "restricted" person in

Section 50 of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act in terms of subsection (2) of section 51 of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, (Chapter 33), in respect of whom there is in force an order made by the Minister in terms of paragraph (h) of sub-section (2) of section (1) of section 51 of the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act, (Chapter 33), this Order shall have effect immediately

This Order shall have effect immediately

Given under my hand, at Salisbury this 11th day of March 1931.
NOW, THEREFORE, in terms of subsection (1) of section 12 of the Emergency (Maintenance of Law and Order) Regulations, 1965, I hereby order that you remain within the area commonly known as Camp 3 in the area hereinafter defined -

Area Defined: That portion of the Gwelo-Shona National Park commencing at an intersection of the Mzilivu river approximately 400 yards north of Nyala Siding where a road from the coast joins the arid area, thence northerly along the latter road for a distance of approximately 13 miles to the boundary between the area and the International Boundary between Southern Rhodesia and Mozambique, thence along the said international boundary to where it joins the Gwelo-Mzilikazi railway line, thence along the eastern side of the said railway line to the starting point some 400 yards north of Nyala Siding;

until the termination of the State of Emergency in Rhodesia or until the order made by the Minister making you a "restricted person" as in paragraph (1) above is revoked or varied.

This Order shall be under the provisions of Subsection (1) of section 21 of the Emergency (Maintenance of Law and Order) Regulations, 1965, I do hereby order that you remain within the area defined above in paragraph (2) of the Emergency (Maintenance of Law and Order) Regulations, 1965, I do hereby order that you shall be detained in Gwelo Prison, until you report in pursuance of your arrival.

I DO HEREBY PROHIBIT YOU ............

To: Sub-Sections(2) and (5) of Section 13 of the Emergency (Maintenance of Law and Order) Act (Chapter 321 you are hereby permitted to

PERMIT ISSUED IN TERMS OF SECTION 50 OF THE LAW AND ORDER (MAINTENANCE) ACT 1965

To leave the Sengwe restricted area for the purposes of visiting to Mpilo Hospital, for medical treatment.

This permit is issued subject to the following conditions:

(2) as read with subsection (5) of section 13 of the Emergency (Maintenance of Law and Order) Act.

You are hereby permitted to

FURTHER ORDER IN TERMS OF SECTION 3 OF THE EMERGENCY (MAINTENANCE OF LAW AND ORDER) REGULATIONS, 1965.

To 21st April 1966

PERMIT ALLOWING WIFE TO VISIT

Gwelo Hospital;

PERMISSION is hereby given to

Note: You are liable to be searched on

Section 33 of the Regulations, you have

return to Sengwe Restricted Area,

immediately before your departure from

IN TERMS OF SECTION 21 OF THE EMERGENCY (MAINTENANCE OF LAW AND ORDER) REGULATIONS, 1965

TO: D.W. Lardner-Burke

DETENTION ORDER

You are hereby notified that I consider it is expedient in the public interest to make an order against you in terms of subsection (1) of Section 21 of the Emergency (Maintenance of Law and Order) Regulations, 1965. I do hereby order that you shall be detained in Gwelo Prison, until the termination of the State of Emergency in Rhodesia or until this order is revoked or varied.

The Protecting Authority for the Midlands Province appointed in terms of Section 5 of the Emergency (Maintenance of Law and Order) Regulations, 1965.

The Protecting Authority for the Victoria Police Provinceappointed in terms of Section 3 of the Emergency (Maintenance of Law and Order) Regulations, 1965.

The Protecting Authority for the Victoria Police Province

CONTROL OF COMMUNICATIONS

WHEREAS by subsection 1 of Section 33 of the Emergency (Maintenance of Law and Order) Regulations, 1965, I do hereby order that the Protecting Authority may by order prohibit any restricted person from communicating by word of mouth, in writing or otherwise with any person who is outside the restricted area, in terms of Section 50 of the Law and Order (Maintenance of Law and Order) Act, 1965.
Appendix J

PERMIT ISSUED IN TERMS OF SECTION 10 OF THE LAW AND ORDER (MAINTENANCE) ACT

Chapter 32

You are hereby permitted to enter and remain on any premises at the Tanda Police Camp for the purpose of leaving the area in which you are restricted by a restriction order, subject to the condition that in the event of your being released from such detention prior to the expiry of your restriction order you are immediately required to return forthwith to the restriction area as determined by the Transport provided by the Government for this purpose.

MINISTER OF LAW AND ORDER

Appendix K

STATEMENT INSCRIBING INTERROGATION

With District's Approval

A public meeting was held at the Tanda Police Camp, in the Tanda District. The police tape was set up five miles away from my home. I was the Chairperson of the women's organization who had been arrested with others. A meeting was called for 7.00 am. I arrived at the meeting myself, because I had not been called. I arrived at the meeting myself, because I had not been called. I arrived at the meeting myself, because I had not been called. I arrived at the meeting myself, because I had not been called. I arrived at the meeting myself, because I had not been called.

The police arrived in my village at about 8:00 am. They came straight to my house and arrested me. I was then transported to the Tanda Police Camp, which is about five miles away. The African constable, Tafirinyika, and Chirango, took me to a place outside the African constable's office, I had my baby with me at the time and was told because I had a sick child. They then started interrogating me. They asked me repeatedly the information I had given them, adding that I knew. They then said to me, "If you do not tell us we are going to beat you, and you will not go back to the camp." I was not able to walk properly and so one policeman carried the child and the other assisted me to walk. We went straight to the African constable's office, I fell down on the steps outside the office and fainted and remained unconscious for a short time.

After the beating I was detained for six days at the Tanda Police Camp.

Doctor's Report

Complaint: Having been beaten on back and buttocks and had hit against wall of a house on 6 March.

On examination: T. 104°F

1. Dorsal area of back: Healing crusts and parallel weals and parallel bruise marks.

2. Buttoks: massive swelling of both cheeks, skin broken and oozing blood and serum. On the left side a large, prominent, tender area, probably due to a deep bruise that had become infected (cf fever).

The patient was sent immediately to Hospital where she was admitted.

Appendix L

PART I

This Act deals with control of processions, gatherings and meetings, by District Commissioners, regulating authorities (usually senior police officers) and the Minister for Law and Order. The type of limitation provided by the Act is well illustrated by an extract from Section 3 and Section 10:

"A regulating authority may issue directions for the purpose of controlling the conduct of public processions within his area...

Any person who wishes to form a procession shall first make application...

The regulating authority...

Such authority is satisfied that such procession is likely to cause or lead to a breach of the peace or public disorder, no small subject to section 10 imposes a permit...

Any general...

Subject to Section 10:

"If any time the district commissioner is of the opinion that by reason of particular circumstances existing in his district or in any part thereof, such public disturbance may be controlled by the holding of a public procession in that district...

The Minister for Law and Order...

The holding of all public processions...

Section 17 provides a power of arrest...

Section 18 provides for the arrest...

Section 19 provides for the arrest..."
politician t:nake a speech criticism of the Government would he caught by this... lie would not he alive to the distinction between the party in power and the Government in the sense of an organised entity. References to "white men" would be difficult to avoid in any speech about Rhodesia and would frequently lead to a conviction... (See Carman, op. cit.)

Sections 50 and 51 of Part IV contain the provisions for restriction, described elsewhere in this report, while Section 51 gives the police power to "stop and without warrant search any person or vehicle entering or leaving Southern Rhodesia and any person in or upon such vehicle; and seize any thing as to which he has reasonable grounds for believing that it will afford evidence as to the commission of an offence under the law.
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