

Policing Pop

EDITED BY

Martin Cloonan and Reebee Garofalo



TEMPLE UNIVERSITY PRESS
PHILADELPHIA

Temple University Press, Philadelphia 19122
Copyright © 2003 by Martin Cloonan and Reebee Garofalo
All rights reserved
Published 2003
Printed in the United States of America

∞ The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Policing pop / edited by Martin Cloonan and Reebee Garofalo.

p. cm. — (Sound matters)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 1-56639-989-0 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 1-56639-990-4 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Popular music—Censorship. 2. Popular music—Social aspects. 3. Popular music—Political aspects. I. Cloonan, Martin. II. Garofalo, Reebee. III. Series.

ML3918.P67 P65 2003

306.4'84—dc21

2002020419

Lyrics from "Carcass" (pp. 98–99 herein) are reprinted by permission of Dan Tobin, Earache Records.

Lyrics from "Bitchcraft" (p. 144 herein) are reprinted by permission of Vasja Ocvirk, Strelnikoff.

9 Music in the Struggle to End Apartheid: South Africa

The South African elections of 1994 installed a democratic and liberal system of government in a country previously ruled by the National Party. When the Nationalists assumed power in 1948, they instituted the repressive apartheid system of severe racial inequality and enforced racial separateness. Many musicians opposed this system through their music and support of antiapartheid political cause. In response, the Nationalist government attempted to minimize the impact of musicians by preventing controversial music from being heard and by repressing the musicians themselves. Notwithstanding the government's attempt to maintain its hegemony, musicians fought back in a multitude of ways.

In this chapter I focus particularly on the censorship of music in the 1980s—the decade immediately preceding the political transition that started in the early 1990s. I begin with the mechanisms of censorship and then consider strategies of resistance. Not all instances of censorship were overtly political, but they were always framed by, and took place within, an extreme legal-political system. No matter what their message was, censored musicians developed strategies to reach as wide an audience as possible. In doing so, they articulated and transformed culture, opening spaces in which particular forms of artistic expression emerged (Eyerman and Jamison 1998:160–165). I conclude with a brief overview of the changes that have taken place since 1994. Not only did cultural struggle play a part in local changes, but musicians attempting to overcome censorship in other parts of the world can learn important lessons from the South African experience.

The Mechanisms of Music Censorship

Legislation

The Publications Act of 1974 was the central mechanism for direct censorship of publications (including sound recordings) in South Africa. The act provided for the establishment of the Directorate of Publications, which responded to complaints from the police, customs and excise officers, and members of the general public. The directorate decided whether or not to ban material submitted to it. Objections were referred to the Publications Appeal Board (PAB), a government-appointed committee designed to set aside or confirm the directorate's decisions. The government also made use of several security laws (such as the Internal Security and Protection of Information Acts of 1982) to ban publications. Organizations such as the African National Congress (ANC) were banned under the 1982 Internal Security Act, and as such their publications were automatically banned without having to be reviewed by the directorate. During the 1980s the relatively liberal directorate and PAB were the sites of contests between board members and the police and government. When the director of the Appeal Board, Kobus van Rooyen, decided not to ban the film *Cry Freedom*, it was banned under the Internal Security Act. Van Rooyen received death threats, his house was set on fire, and he was the victim of a variety of other "dirty tricks" (personal interview with van Rooyen, 11 September 1998).

With the declaration of consecutive states of emergency in the mid-1980s, the state was further empowered to ban material. The 1986 emergency regulations "made it an offence for any person to make, write, record, disseminate, display, utter or even possess a 'subversive statement'" (Marcus 1987:9). According to Director of Publications Braam Coetzee, the government used these regulations as a "parallel system" to ban material independently of the directorate (personal interview with Coetzee, 14 July 1998).

Despite all the mechanisms in place, music was, in fact, rarely banned by the Directorate of Publications: Fewer than one hundred music records were actually banned at this level during the 1980s. The main reason was that the directorate itself did not go in search of material to ban: It only responded to complaints received. The board received very few complaints about music—not only because most music was listened to by youths who were unlikely to complain anyway, Coetzee believes, but also because lyrics were generally unclear or inaudible (*ibid.*). Some complaints came from parents who overheard or read the lyrics, but most came from the police. The case of Roger Lucey is representative. The police targeted Lucey in the early 1980s, when his overtly antiapartheid lyrics began to receive widespread coverage in the press. But the directorate was unwilling to ban music that was not likely to be an immediate threat to state security. In general, political music rarely sold more than one or two thousand copies. "One of the key reasons that the state un-banned

my fourth LP 'Beachbomb' was the fact that I never sold more than one thousand copies of any of my records," musician Warrick Sony argued. "If the system works on its own there is no need to ban records or anything" (1991:115).

Broadcasters: SABC and Independent Radio Stations

The system to which Sony referred is a combination of radio play and record company support that is almost always crucial for success, especially in a limited market such as South Africa. The state-owned South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) had a virtual monopoly over the South African airwaves and rigorously vetted the music played on its stations. Like the Directorate of Publications, it was concerned with political and rebellious messages, blasphemy, and overtly sexual lyrics but went even further by actively supporting the government's ideology of separate tribes, independent homelands, and cultural purity. Thus, no slang or mixing of languages was permitted, and groups like Sankomota—whose members sang in a variety of languages—suffered as a result. The SABC committee regularly held "record meetings" to scrutinize the lyrics of all music submitted to it for airplay (lyric sheets had to be submitted with music). This committee prohibited thousands of songs: Sometimes the entire repertoire of a group would be restricted, as was the case with the Beatles in the late 1960s, following John Lennon's claim in an interview that the band was "more popular than Jesus Christ"; Stevie Wonder was banned after he dedicated his Oscar award to Nelson Mandela in 1985. Once a song was denied airplay on SABC, "Avoid" was marked alongside the song title on the album sleeve. On occasion a sharp object was used to scratch the vinyl, making it physically impossible for a DJ to play a particular song. Although very little was directly banned by the directorate, the SABC's relentless attack on musicians' freedom obscured the degree to which the government was censoring music, since the general public was unaware of the extent to which radio play was controlled. The SABC's attitude is aptly captured in a *Sunday Times* article (11 June 1989): "An SABC records committee member, Mr Roelf Jacobs, denied that the SABC 'banned' songs. 'We just don't play them,' he said" (quoted in MacLennan 1990:152). SABC Television followed a similar line in terms of censoring its very sparse music coverage.

Apart from the SABC radio stations, two independent stations operated within South Africa. Capital Radio (launched in 1979) and Radio 702 (1980) were the official commercial music stations of two of South Africa's "independent homelands,"¹ Transkei and Bophutatswana respectively. Although not strictly bound by South African legislation (given that the government had granted the homelands "independence"), these radio stations generally adhered to the decisions of the Directorate of Publications. They did not, however, carry out the sort of internal censorship practiced by the SABC. Consequently, in the early eighties in particular,

Juluka, Via Afrika, and other groups who were not played on SABC were played on Capital—the more liberal of the two independents. But the Artists United Against Apartheid's antiapartheid song "(Ain't Gonna Play) Sun City," released in 1985, was not played on either of the stations because both were partly owned by Southern Sun, proprietors of the Sun City Holiday Resort.

Record Companies

The SABC's stance put pressure on record companies, and they in turn put pressure on musicians, to practice self-censorship in order to receive airplay. As a result, record companies often made changes to songs. In 1987, for example, the EMI International Label Manager wrote to the supervisor of the SABC record library about a song that had not been passed by the committee:

Due to problems arising from certain sections of the lyric content of this song, we have received a re-mixed and edited version of which I enclose a cassette dubbing plus revised lyrics. This is to confirm that no further copies of the original version are available or will be pressed and distributed by this Company, and that this will be the only version available for Radio play and Retail Sale in South Africa.²

In a similar dismissal of artistic integrity, when the directorate banned Peter Tosh's "Equal Rights" album because of the song "Apartheid," CBS re-released the album without the banned track. "Offensive" songs were regularly left off albums. Rob Allingham, archivist for Gallo Records, described the companies' motives: "The record companies in no way took it upon themselves to reinforce whatever machinations the state had in mind as far as directing culture, but the bottom line for them was, and always is, and always probably will be, that they want to make money" (personal interview with Allingham, 17 April 1998). Most record companies (particularly the majors) made use of racial inequality to exploit black musicians by paying them extremely low royalties.

Independent record companies like Shifty Records and Third Ear Music were progressive in their antiapartheid stance, but still occasionally practiced self-censorship. In 1983 Shifty toned down the lyrics of Bernoldus Niemand's satirical "Hou my vas Korporaal" ("Hold me tight, corporal") in an unsuccessful attempt to get the song played on the radio (Sony 1991:113–114). In 1979 the director of Third Ear Music, Dave Marks, toned down Roger Lucey's "The Road Is Much Longer" album because his lawyers had warned him that certain lyrics could lead to severe prison sentences for those involved. These lyrics were left out, and some superficial songs such as "Pay Me the Dues on My Bottles" were included. The album nevertheless contained four hard-hitting songs, and the Directorate banned it and made its possession a criminal offence. From the outset Lucey was opposed to the compromise, believing that Third Ear should have disregarded the warnings and released

the album in its original form (personal interview with Lucey, 17 July 1998). Had they done so, he acknowledged, there was a good chance that Dave Marks would have been prosecuted and Third Ear Music closed down.

Self-Censorship

Musicians often avoided political messages altogether in order to receive airplay. "We keep the radio in mind when we compose," Joseph Shabalala, leader of Lady-smith Black Mambazo, explained: "If something is contentious they don't play it, and then it wouldn't be known anyway" (Andersson 1981:87). Timothy Taylor (1997:78–82) defended Shabalala, arguing that to divide musicians in terms of resistance versus complicity is to accept "the very grounds of the oppressor/oppressed paradigm that European colonialism imposed." Apartheid presented many obstacles to would-be black musicians, and to succeed despite lack of education, poverty, urban squalor, and other difficulties was certainly a triumph. To celebrate all aspects of human life despite apartheid was part of the struggle to live the kind of life to which all people have a right. Nevertheless, Shabalala's statement pointed to a deliberate decision to silence his own political voice in the face of SABC censorship.

Other musicians wrote figuratively about the South African situation, expressing their convictions through symbols and innuendo. An example is Steve Kekana's song "The Bushman," released in 1982, about a Bushman who taught himself to shoot with a bow and arrow. This fitted in well with apartheid notions of blacks as primitives and was consequently played on SABC. However, Kekana's lyrics were open to radical interpretation. "In my mind," he explained, "I didn't really think of a real Bushman, I was thinking of the guerrillas" (personal interview with Kekana, 16 September 1998). Symbolism had to be very vague in order to receive airplay on SABC. Roger Lucey opposed this approach:

What's the point of having an antifascist message with lyrics like "I'll take the high road and you take the low road and we'll go and smell the daisies." This is bullshit. It meant nothing. I didn't believe in that approach. I believed in an in-your-face, tell-it-like-it-is approach. The cops are out there. They're fucking throwing people out of windows. And that is what it's all about. And that's what the song says. Simple. (Personal interview, 17 July 1998)

The South African Police

If other means were not sufficient to prevent musicians from recording or performing political music, then the police were prepared to intervene. The Security Branch targeted Lucey in the early 1980s. His music was banned, his record company and venue owners were threatened, live shows were disrupted. The police

bugged his phone, thus finding out about future gigs and putting an end to them (*Mail and Guardian*, 1995). Mzwakhe Mbuli, who put his poetry to music, was the victim of even more serious attacks in the mid- to late 1980s. A hand-grenade was thrown at his house, he was shot at, and his passport applications were turned down. His first album, "Change Is Pain," released in 1986, was banned by the Directorate of Publications, and he was arrested, detained, and tortured.³

The police often broke up concerts by overtly political groups such as Juluka, and they used the full range of apartheid laws to victimize and harass musicians—arresting them under the pass laws (this applied to black musicians in white areas without a permit), taking hours to search their vehicles at roadblocks, and closing down concerts that did not have a valid permit by declaring them illegal gatherings. Steve Gordon (1997:5) illustrated a common form of harassment whereby black musicians were told to play for the police to prove their musicianship. In one instance in the early 1960s, jazz musician Kippie Moeketsi was arrested for being in a venue where illegal alcohol was being sold. At the police station he was asked to play something and played "Don't Fence Me In." They responded: "Jy speel lekker man. Hardloop" ("You play well man, push off!").

Musicians in a Counterhegemonic Struggle: Strategies of Resistance

Overt Lyrics, Camouflaged Messages, and Disguised Tunes

Despite police harassment, many musicians refused to bow down to state repression. Their most obvious form of resistance was through their music, most of which was never played on radio and some of which was not even recorded. Mzwakhe Mbuli and the Cherry Faced Lurchers, for example, confronted the state directly through the lyrics of "Behind the Bars" and "Shot Down" respectively. The Directorate of Publications banned some of this music, and none of it was played on the radio. Many musicians nevertheless attempted to get potentially "subversive" music played on the SABC. Singing about issues in a roundabout way rather than making outright statements (when that is what the artist really wants to do) is self-censorship. Yet for many musicians faced with severe state censorship, this seemed to be the only option, better than saying nothing at all or having music banned so that very few ever got to hear it.

Many musicians tried to sneak controversial ideas onto radio using innovative methods. Keith Berelowitz of Carte Blanche revealed that they submitted counterfeit lyric sheets with albums sent to the SABC, replacing controversial words with ones that had a similar sound. In one instance they changed "policeman" to "please man" (personal interview with Berelowitz, 15 April 1998). In 1985 Shifty Records released a compilation album of rebel rhythms called "A Naartjie in Our Sosatie" ("A tangerine in our kebab"), a play on "Anarchy in our society." The Directorate

of Publications file on the album (which it deemed “not undesirable”) included no discussion whatsoever of the contentious album title.

One of the most astute (and successful) attempts at getting through the SABC’s controls was represented by the 1987 release of Bright Blue’s “Weeping.” The group used symbolic lyrics to sing about a man living in fear within a heavily repressive society. These lyrics were sung against the backdrop of a haunting version of “Nkosi Sikeleli,” the ANC national anthem. The song became a major hit on SABC’s Radio 5. Strains of freedom songs were often used with new lyrics or performed as instrumentals (especially by jazz musicians). Ian Kerkhof (1989:12) discussed how “(Abdullah) Ibrahim has for many years now utilized the melodies of various freedom songs in his piano improvisations. . . . In this way instrumental music, charged with the melodies of freedom songs, gains a level of political meaning for the South African audiences who hear the unstated lyrics in their hearts.” Ibrahim was one of many jazz musicians who gave political titles to instrumental pieces, such as his “Anthem for the New Nation,” released in 1979. Similarly, some bands’ names made their stance absolutely clear and told the audience how to read their music: Illegal Gathering, Gramsci Beat, Amandla (meaning “power” and used as a call of defiance at political rallies and meetings).

Antiapartheid Censorship: The Cultural Boycott

Beginning with Trevor Huddleston’s call in 1954 for a cultural boycott of apartheid South Africa (Nixon 1994:157), pressure was brought to bear on cultural performers to refuse to play there. In December 1968 the United Nations General Assembly accepted Resolution 2396, according to which all member states and organizations were asked to cut “cultural, educational, and sporting ties with the racist regime” (Willemse 1991:24). By December 1980 the call had been stepped up (in terms of UN General Assembly Resolution 35/206E) through the establishment of a Register of Artists, Actors and Others who have performed in South Africa. The cultural boycott prohibited musicians from outside South Africa from playing there and prevented South African musicians from performing, recording, or releasing their music elsewhere, unless they no longer performed in South Africa or went into exile.

Support for the boycott grew with the release of the “Sun City” album by a collective of musicians calling themselves Artists United Against Apartheid. The album was an attempt to create awareness about apartheid and in particular to call for an artists’ boycott of the Sun City hotel complex in the “phoney homeland” of Bophutatswana. The boycott strategy deprived apartheid’s supporters of live performances by overseas musicians and kept them from having their message heard outside South Africa. Yet it censored all musicians within the country, whatever their stance—including many antiapartheid musicians who were thus silenced not only internally through censorship but also externally through the boycott. For example, in 1988 Johnny Clegg and Savuka were barred by the British Musicians’ Union

from playing at the Nelson Mandela Seventieth Birthday tribute concert at Wembley, even though they had been given the go ahead by the United Democratic Front (UDF), the internal wing of the ANC. The ban was instigated because Clegg lived and worked in South Africa (Bell 1988:12).

By 1987 the ANC already felt that the political credentials of each South African group or performer should be taken into account when deciding whether or not they should be allowed to perform outside the country. However, the interpretation of this policy and other aspects of the boycott were always shrouded in disagreement. Many South African musicians supported the boycott insofar as they refused to perform at Sun City, although few agreed with banning South African groups from performing and releasing their music overseas. They disagreed either because they were not sufficiently politically involved or because they were, and wanted their message to be heard. Furthermore, the cultural boycott made it very difficult for South African bands to make a living from their music. Although several overseas artists broke the cultural boycott by performing in South Africa or, as in Paul Simon's case, by recording there, there were those who supported the struggle against apartheid through boycotts, campaigns, and their music. South African musicians in exile also supported the struggle in this way.

The mid-eighties saw a trend of releasing songs collectively performed by a multitude of musicians in aid of a humanitarian cause (for example USA for Africa's "We Are the World," aimed at raising money for, and awareness of, famine relief in Africa). In 1986 the South African government decided to exploit this trend. A propaganda song entitled "Together We'll Build a Brighter Future" involved a cross-section of South African musicians promoting peace and multiracial harmony in South Africa, despite ongoing police brutality and the erosion of freedom which came with the state of emergency. The government offered musicians large sums of money to participate, but, in an instance of left-wing censorship, most top musicians refused. The severity of the cultural struggle was emphasized when arsonists burned down the house of Steve Kekana, who participated in the recording. A friend who was staying there was burned to death.

Live Performances, Festivals, and Compilation Albums

At music festivals and concerts in support of various causes, including the End Conscription Campaign (ECC) and campaigns for detainees or striking workers, bands could make political statements that might not have been allowed on their albums. As musician Jennifer Ferguson commented: "You had a sense of the importance of live work because there was so much repression on many other levels that the theaters and cabaret venues were often the only place where any kind of truth could be uttered" (personal interview with Ferguson, 8 April 1999). Shifty Records was also pivotal in focusing much resistance music that might otherwise have remained isolated. It produced two compilation albums of resistance music in the mid-

1980s—a time when major companies were hesitant to record a single political song on any of their albums. In addition, in 1989 Shifty organized a tour of alternative antiapartheid Afrikaans performers known as the “Voëlvrý” tour (meaning “free as a bird,” sounding like “feel free”) and released a corresponding compilation album. The tour went to small and large urban areas alike, often taking its political message into the heartland of conservative Afrikanerdom. Not surprisingly there was a strong backlash in the form of death threats, cancelled venues, slashed car tires, and teargas sprayed into venues. Many of the musicians used pseudonyms to maintain a degree of anonymity (personal interview with Ralf Rabie, 10 September 1998).

Foreign Funding

Deprived of the radio play that generates broadcasting royalties and sales, Shifty Records sought overseas sponsors to pay for recording costs. Although the company attempted (mostly unsuccessfully) to get songs played on SABC, the production costs were in most instances paid for through financial aid. This freed Shifty to record many marginal artists and musicians with a political message, such as the Kalahari Surfers, Jennifer Ferguson, and Mzwakhe Mbuli. The drawback of this approach was that Shifty tended to be less innovative in its marketing strategy than many of its musicians would have liked. As a result Shifty Records has made a major and crucial contribution to archiving resistance and other alternative music, but most of its music was not heard by a wide audience.

Mobile Studio and Self-Production

Shifty’s most innovative strategy was the use of a mobile studio. Lloyd Ross of the label explained how it worked:

We put a little studio together in a caravan. The idea was of mobility and hence the name Shifty—it could shift from here to there. . . . We recorded in quite a few locations in Southern Africa, the first one of course being in Lesotho [a small mountain kingdom completely landlocked by South Africa] because Sankomota wasn’t allowed to come into this country. They were banned from being here because of a tour they’d done in seventy-nine, and they had a message which wasn’t exactly acceptable to the powers that be. (Personal interview with Ross, 14 April 1998)

Warrick Sony (1991), who worked with Shifty, bypassed the major pressing plants by releasing his first album on cassettes that he produced at home and distributed personally. This strategy was adopted by a number of people, sometimes for commercial reasons, but often for political ones. Barry Gilder (1983:19) released an album of his songs in this manner, and it was banned after police found copies of it during a raid on the University of Cape Town student union offices. Scott Marshall (1995:212) emphasized the importance of cassettes as a small, cheap, and

easy-to-use format, providing an important opportunity for tiny production companies. The advent of digital recording, computer technology, and home compact disc production also offers an important opportunity to political musicians wanting to release their music. As musician and studio owner Willem Möller said:

I know a lot of bands who just form their own record companies. They don't bother with anybody else. They've got a computer. They master the thing. They make their own cover. They print the minimum order of a few hundred. They sell it at gigs, easily make their money back on the recording, and then finance a slightly bigger album the next time. And do it themselves. . . . They control it. They own it. They do it on their own terms. (Personal interview with Möller, 15 April 1998)

This approach bypasses large record companies with commercial interests and can allow for the small-scale release of albums that might otherwise be banned by repressive governments. The option of pirate radio stations was never seriously undertaken in South Africa during the apartheid era because of the heavy political repression. This strategy has, however, been successful in other parts of the world. An alternative is provided by community radio stations, which are an increasingly popular airplay route in contemporary South Africa.

Challenging the Directorate of Publications

Record companies often challenged Directorate decisions and sometimes got them reversed. For example, in 1989 Shifty challenged the banning of the Kalahari Surfers "Bigger Than Jesus" album, which was eventually unbanned on condition that the title of the album be changed (even though the song with that title was allowed to remain). This strategy demonstrated a reluctance to accept the Directorate's decisions passively while also forcing it to provide reasons for its decisions and thus expose "not just the enemy within, but a whole set of cultural power relations and antagonisms" (Hill 1992:42). Justifications for banning songs were generally insubstantial, thus illustrating the undemocratic process that censorship is: a practice indulged in by the few to the disadvantage of the many. Roger Lucey was informed that his album song "Thabane" was "undesirable" simply because it "contains a reference to Steve Biko and his death as one of many."⁴

Formal Links with Political Organizations

Finally, musicians made good use of formal political organizations to strengthen their position. In the early 1980s it was difficult for musicians to align themselves with political organizations because of a lack of internal structures. The launch of the UDF in 1983 provided the beginnings of a clearer structure through which musicians could operate. As discussed above, musicians were able to perform on UDF platforms and show their commitment to the antiapartheid cause in different

formats. The UDF encouraged musicians to adopt principles in line with a “people’s culture” position, involving a general commitment to the antiapartheid movement, especially through lyrics/music, performance, and principled stands on a variety of issues. The role of musicians within the antiapartheid struggle became formalized only with the formation of the South African Musicians’ Alliance (SAMA) in September 1988. Musicians finally had their own political union through which they could channel their efforts and receive guidance. While SAMA did not affiliate with the UDF, it supported a lot of its work. In particular SAMA focused on three basic freedoms central to the work of any musician: freedom of association, freedom of expression, and freedom of movement. An important consequence of the formation of SAMA—which supported a selective boycott—was that it (in conjunction with the UDF) was able to give clearance to performers wanting to perform overseas (personal interview with Johnny Clegg, 20 April 1998).

Beyond Apartheid Censorship

Throughout the struggle to end apartheid, musicians voiced the protest of many South Africans, and sometimes challenged apartheid laws and beliefs. Musicians of different races played together—at the risk of being arrested—when it was still illegal to do so. Thus white musician Johnny Clegg and black musician Sipho Mchunu together explored Zulu culture on stage in front of South African audiences who had been taught that intercultural and interracial mixing was wrong. Despite government attempts to stop them, many South African musicians remained committed to the fight against apartheid and censorship, often at the expense of commercial success. Musicians were able to play a role in the counterhegemonic struggle that ultimately saw the demise of apartheid in the early 1990s. Through developing ways of overcoming censorship as discussed in this chapter, musicians became political as well as cultural agents and helped shape an emergent cultural formation. Indeed, the postapartheid South African constitution places strong emphasis on freedom of expression, a right for which many musicians fought furiously during the previous era.

Policies regarding censorship in present-day South Africa reflect the new freedom that has been secured. The new government’s Film and Publication Board has not banned any music, and under the new constitution the Board is extremely unlikely to do so in the future. SABC policy is also far more relaxed. According to Cecile Pracher, manager of the SABC Record Library:

There is virtually no formal censorship practiced by the SABC regarding lyrics of songs on CD. Record Librarians indicate on CDs when unacceptable words or content appear as part of the lyrics, and it is up to the announcer or DJ, to decide whether the song is to be played, or not.⁵

This is in stark contrast to the apartheid era. Through all the efforts of those who resisted the apartheid system, musicians in South Africa are finally at a stage where they are able to concentrate on the more “normal” problems confronting bands in peripheral societies. They have secured a quota system (of 25 percent local music content) on South African radio stations. An increasing number of performers have recorded music independently and released their albums over the internet or through other alternative distribution networks. This alone does not secure them sufficient income to survive as musicians, and breaking into a larger (particularly international) market remains the central problem for most. But they can embark on this new challenge without the threat of prosecution or seeing their music banned: a significant advance for those musicians who suffered under the widespread censorship of the apartheid regime.

Notes

Acknowledgments: The Rhodes University Joint Research Committee, the National Arts Council, and the Arts and Culture Trust are acknowledged for their financial assistance in funding the research trips that made my research possible, while Shifty Records and Third Ear Music are thanked for supplying albums used in this research. Much appreciation goes to all those interviewed, who gave generously of their time.

1. Attempting to give credence to its policy of separate development, the South African government established separate homelands for each of South Africa’s ethnic groups. The plan was for these to be granted independence so that blacks could gain full citizenship in these “independent states” only. Just four of the nine homelands were ever granted such independence: Transkei, Bophutatswana, Ciskei, and Venda. The Sun City holiday resort in Bophutatswana exploited its “independence” to attract a host of international musicians to perform in South Africa despite the cultural boycott.

2. Letter from the EMI International Manager to Cecile Pracher, supervisor of the SABC record library, 3 April 1987. The letter is part of the SABC radio archives.

3. Personal correspondence, Pretoria, October 1998 (an in-depth, open-ended, written response questionnaire).

4. Letter from the Directorate of Publications to Roger Lucey, October 1982.

5. Personal correspondence with Cecile Pracher, 17 March 2000.

Bibliography

- Andersson, M. 1981. *Music in the Mix: The Story of South African Popular Music*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Bell, A. 1988. “Musical Discord,” *Time Out* (London ed.), 29 June–6 July, p. 12.
- Eyerman, R., and Jamison, A. 1998. *Music and Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gilder, B. 1983. "Finding New Ways to Bypass Censorship," *Index on Censorship*, 1, pp. 8–22.
- Gordon, S. 1997. "Basil Breakey—A Brief Biography," in B. Breakey and S. Gordon, *Beyond the Blues: Township Jazz in the '60s and '70's*. Cape Town, S.A.: David Phillips, pp. 5–7.
- Hill, T. 1992. "The Enemy Within: Censorship in Rock Music in the 1950s," in A. De Curtis (ed.), *Present Tense: Rock & Roll Culture*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, pp. 39–71.
- Kerkhof, I. 1989. "Music in the Revolution," *Journal of Black Musical Traditions*, 2, pp. 10–21.
- Maclennan, B. 1990. *Apartheid: The Lighter Side*. Plumstead, U.K.: Chameleon Press.
- Mail and Guardian*. 1995. "Music to Security Branch Fears," 7–13 July, p. 8.
- Marcus, G. 1987. "The Gagging Writs," *Reality*, 19:3, pp. 8–10.
- Marshall, S. 1995. "Long Live the Humble Audio Cassette—A Eulogy," in R. Sakolsky and F. Ho (eds.), *Sounding Off!: Music As Subversion/Resistance/Revolution*. New York: Autonomedia, pp. 211–214.
- Nixon, R. 1994. *Homelands, Harlem and Hollywood*. London: Routledge.
- Sony, W. 1991. "Strange Business: The Independent Music Culture in South Africa," *Staffrider*, 9:4, pp. 113–119.
- Taylor, T. 1997. *Global Pop: World Music, World Markets*. New York: Routledge.
- Willemse, H. 1991. "Censorship or Strategy?" in D. Smuts and S. Westcott (eds.), *The Purple Shall Govern*. Cape Town, S.A.: Oxford University Press, pp. 24–25.