

The Star

Where the power should be

THE IMPORTANT THING NOW is to get the ultimate responsibility for the treatment of detainees withdrawn from the police and restored to the courts and Parliament.

Mr Mike Mitchell MP asks a good question. Why are the police holding detainees under section 6 of the Terrorism Act (which places police actions beyond supervision) instead of under section 22 of the 1966 General Law Amendment Act which says the detention must be examined by a judge within 14 days?

There are two points here. One is that the police, in using more power than they need, expose themselves to the suspicion of also using more force than they ought to.

The other is that if the police used section 22 they would not have to bear the total blame if anything untoward happened to a detainee. Their responsibility would be shared, as it always ought to have been, by the courts.

Look at what is happening now. Mr Vorster says the police act within the provisions of the law (presumably he means the rules governing interrogation) because "they have strict instructions" to do so. He is assuming precisely what remains to be proved. He cannot possibly know, and his accountability lapses.

Parliament was wrong to give the police so much unsupervised power. It ought not to be surprised if they use what they were given. But it ought now to get that power back into its own hands. Security is too important to be left entirely to the security police.

Incompetence

AFTER SOME DAYS of evasive silence, the police have now given an account of how — and why — Ahmed Timol died. This was done yesterday through the medium of a Nationalist Party newspaper, Rapport.

One senior officer says that Timol first made a dash for the door of the 10th-floor room where, presumably, he was being interrogated, and then headed for a window instead — and jumped. Another says that those who "know the communists" are aware that when they want to "go over to violence" they require of their men an oath to commit suicide rather than name their comrades.

This comes as close to calling Timol a communist as makes no difference — and presumably the public will be given some solid evidence of this allegation in due course.

But the point now is that if, by last Wednesday, the police believed, or had the slightest reason to suspect, that Timol was a communist or had even the most tenuous links with communists, then with the knowledge they claim of communist ways they should have assumed that he might have taken that "suicide oath."

They should then have taken every precaution against suicide. That — by their own account of the affair — they obviously did not points to alarming incompetence.

Quite simple

MR GERDENER is absolutely right. We must learn to accept a simpler way of life. Especially those who live the more luxurious life, such as most Whites. Two other Cabinet Ministers once made some play of washing their own dishes, which was good public relations in pressing an ideological point. If Mr Gerdener is to get through to the public now, similar publicised examples of simple living at high level are needed.