

S O U T H E R N A F R I C A

A Monthly Survey of News and Opinion

Published by the Southern Africa Committee, University Christian Movement, Room 758
475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027

Vol. I, No. 2 (Revised Edition)

January 1968

CONTENTS:

PAGE NO.

1. A Review of Some Recent Events in Southern Africa
 2. South Africa in Rhodesia
 3. Why We Need Your Help: South Africa Must Not Be Readmitted to the Olympics
 4. Methodists Take Action
 5. Educational Tyranny
 6. At the United Nations
 7. Portugal in Africa
 8. United States Economic Activity in Southern Africa
-

A REVIEW OF SOME RECENT EVENTS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Two Prominent U.S. Visitors to Africa

During December 1967 Africa South of the Sahara was visited by two prominent U.S. leaders, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey and Senator Barry Goldwater.

While Goldwater has confined himself to the white-dominated South, the Vice-President has paid a flying visit to nine independent African states in Central and East Africa. He originally planned to visit only eight countries, but at the last minute Zambia was included. This, according to the Sunday Star (December 24, 1967) "involved one of the major policy decisions of the year for the Johnson administration's African experts. . . Zambia was added. . . as a show of U.S. support for a nation that has been among the most vocal critics of Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence."

The Vice President received his warmest and most spontaneous welcome in Mogadishu, Somalia. Reception elsewhere has been unenthusiastic, even hostile, according to a New York Times report (Jan. 8, 1968). Addressing 500 diplomats and dignitaries in Addis Ababa at Africa Hall, the headquarters of the Organization of African Unity, Vice President Humphrey denounced "small minorities" who still believe they can "indefinitely hold dominion over large majorities." He recalled the U.S. refusal to recognize the white minority regime of Ian Smith in Rhodesia, U.S. backing for sanctions against Rhodesia, and the U.S. vote with the majority of the U.N. for the resolution rejecting South African jurisdiction over South West Africa. His attack on the trial of 35 citizens of South West Africa in Pretoria brought prolonged applause. "We have supported majority rule, human rights and self-determination throughout the world. We will not abandon them in the southern sixth of Africa," he pledged. (New York Times, January 7, 1968)

Regarding Goldwater's sojourn in South Africa, the South African journalist Stanley Uys writes in The New Republic of January 6, 1968 that the former presidential candidate describes his visit as "primarily a holiday trip." He admitted, however, that he would be seeing "friends." Among these "friends" is apparently Mr. Douglas Fuchs, Director of Programmes of the blatantly propagandist South African Broadcasting Corporation, and other representatives of the extreme right, for many of whom even former Nazi-sympathizer Balthazar J. Vorster is too much of a liberal. Speaking on the radio network of the S.A.B.C. Goldwater at times embarrassed his rightist friends by making such unorthodox statements as "I am unalterably opposed to discrimination and segregation on the basis of race, color or creed. . ." He redeemed himself, however, by expressing himself suitably impressed by the apartheid "experiment", on which he does not think there need be a time limit. He is emphatic too that the U.S. should lift the embargo on the export of arms to South Africa, since South Africa needed arms to fight the "terrorists" moving down the continent.

In Rhodesia the U.S. Senator has lunched twice with Ian Smith, of whom he said, "In my country he would make a good Republican." He said too that he saw no violation of human rights in Rhodesia. It was "a progressive, dynamic country and its economy would continue to thrive in spite of economic sanctions. . ." (Washington Post, December 19, 1967) Goldwater remarked that he had a son-in-law who is deputy mayor of Bulawayo (Times of Zambia, December 11, 1967).

U. S. "Right" Joins Hands With South African Racists

The full significance of the Goldwater visit only becomes evident, however, in the wider context of a deliberate joining of hands between the U.S. "right" and the white racist powerholders in Southern Africa. A concerted effort is presently under way to persuade the U.S. public, Congress and State Department that the guerillas engaging the Portuguese and venturing into Rhodesia are not patriots turning to violence as a last resort to liberate their homelands, but represent a communist-directed invasion against the last bastions of western civilization and democracy in Africa.

The South African Information Service (December 8) for instance reports retired U.S. military historian Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall to the effect that "South Africa, Australia and Japan are three firm bastions of strategic importance for the United States in an area covering approximately one quarter of the globe. . . With the exception of these three countries there is not a single country on which America could really rely. . . ."

In addition, an article originating in South Africa appeared in the October issue of U.S. News and World Report. This represents guerilla action in Southern Africa as communist-oriented, and mentions the use of Russian-made weapons while ignoring declarations of non-alignment by liberation leaders (see for instance the speech from the dock of A.N.C. leader Nelson Mandela, now jailed for life, published under the title "Why I Am Prepared to Die" by Christian Action, 2 Amen Court, London E.C. 4). According to reliable sources, the organizations sending the guerillas have appealed to both East and West for assistance. By likening the situation to Vietnam, this article suggests in effect that there might be occasion for U.S. intervention on the side of the white regimes.

Furthermore, an "American-Southern Africa Council" has appeared of late, with an office strategically situated in Washington, D.C. Among the literature it distributes are publications of the extreme right wing "Rhodesian Candour League" on "Communism in Africa." It has also published a fund-raising pamphlet of its own which brands the Southern Africa liberation movements as "Communist" and calls for help for the white minorities. Aided and abetted by the "Friends of Rhodesia," a group with about 116 loose knit chapters round the U.S., it is waging a campaign for U.S. recognition of the Smith government and an end to U.S. support for U.N. sanctions.

(The sanctions include a boycott of Rhodesia's main exports and a ban on shipments to Rhodesia of arms, motor vehicles and petroleum.) The Council also organizes tours of Rhodesia, sells Rhodesian-made radios (not on the boycott list) and distributes order blanks for the Rhodesia state lottery. (Washington Post, December 26, 1967)

Meanwhile in South Africa strenuous efforts are being made to represent guerilla activities as Moscow-directed aggression - - as if Africans in rejecting white domination in their homelands would forthwith subject themselves to white domination issuing from another country thousands of miles away!

At the psychological moment, like a rabbit out of a hat, the ever ingenious South African security police have produced an alleged K.B.G. agent "Yuri Loginov alias Edmund Trinka". In the past few months since his arrest on July 17, 1967, he has, in the parlance of security agents, been "singing like a canary," obligingly linking the liberation movement with a master plan emanating directly from the Kremlin. The Deputy Minister of Police, Mr. S. G. Muller, has claimed that the security police intercepted three radio messages beamed from Moscow and intended for Loginov. He was allegedly directed to send information on such wide-ranging subjects as "conditions for the entry and departure of Negro (African) immigrants, border and customs regulations and details of the borders with Botswana and Lesotho, whether clandestine landings were possible on the coast between Port Elizabeth and Durban, and about the influence of the A.N.C. and areas of organized resistance to the regime, about "what measures can logically be undertaken to render support and to strengthen disturbances." He was also allegedly instructed to seek "progressive individuals from among the residents, local or foreign, who regularly travel to third countries" (Johannesburg Sunday Times, November 12, 1967).

Doubt has been cast on the whole story, according to former Sunday Times reports, because of the naivete of the alleged master spy, e.g. in openly photographing the headquarters of the security police in Johannesburg. But even if a bona fide Soviet spy has indeed been tracked down in South Africa, no reliance can be placed upon his statements, in view of the methods used by the South African security police to obtain information - - prolonged solitary confinement and prolonged interrogation sessions with the use of statue and/or electric shock torture (Cf. "Witness in the Dark", a pamphlet published by Christian Action in London).

Either way, it is not unreasonable to conclude that all this is part of the over-all effort to persuade the West, and particularly the U.S., that white South Africa is the target of an anti-western international conspiracy and as such merits help against the guerillas.

If moderate and liberal opinion in this country is disquieted by guerilla warfare and fears it may open the way for eventual control of the South by Moscow or Peking, the remedy is obvious: to oppose rightist pressures for a withdrawal of sanctions against Rhodesia by a counter pressure directed at Congress, the State Department and the U.S. Mission to the United Nations. The call must be for the implementation of U.N. resolutions for sanctions against South Africa and the withdrawal of economic and military support for Portugal. Without such measures the limited sanctions against Rhodesia are bound to be ineffective. This is clearly the only way in which a prolonged race war can be avoided in Southern Africa.

Action by U.S. Churches

That church influence can be telling and even decisive is evident from recent action by the U.S. National Council of Churches and United Presbyterian Church on the recommendation of the Southern Africa group at the N.C.C.-sponsored conference on Church and Society in Detroit in October, 1967, against the trial of the 35 South West Africans in Pretoria. The N.C.C. mailed accounts of the trial to 70 Congressmen and Senators, as well as the U.S., U.K. and French missions to the U.N. In addition, several influential churchmen made private approaches on high government level in connection with the case. Subsequently an editorial based on the N.C.C. appeal appeared in the New York Times (December 9, 1967). Soon after, on December 16,

the U.S. took the unusual action of co-sponsoring an Afro-Asian resolution in the General Assembly condemning the trial. This was approved by a vote of 110 to 2 (New York Times, December 17, 1967).

Prime Minister Vorster responded promptly to this, accusing Arthur J. Goldberg, the U.S. delegate to the U.N., of using words "which one civilized country does not use about another" and served notice that South Africa would not bow to the U.N. on South West Africa" (New York Times, December 17, 1967). The U.N. General Assembly had also adopted a resolution by 93 votes to 2 recommending that the Security Council use its enforcement powers to force South Africa to give up its rule over South West Africa, but the U.S. abstained from voting for this resolution.

Visas and Travel Restrictions

The South West Africa question has also been brought into sharper focus by the attempt on December 6 of four U.S. private citizens to enter the territory without visas issued by South Africa, "to explore projects to further development of an independent country." The four are George M. Houser, executive director, American Committee on Africa; John L. S. Holloman, past president, National Medical Association; Samuel F. Ashelman, Jr., consultant with the International Cooperative Development Association; and Lyle Tatum, executive secretary, Farmers and World Affairs. (Washington Post, December 17, 1967).

The South African refusal to allow them entry points up the anomolous situation that U.S. citizens obtaining visas to enter South Africa automatically obtain permission to enter South West Africa as well, although the U.S. does not recognize South African jurisdiction over the territory. The question arises whether the U.S. should press for the issuing of South West African visas by the U.N. Commission set up for the territory.

A related issue is that of transit rights for U.S. diplomats posted to the former British protectorates (now Botswana and Lesotho) and Swaziland. A dispute between the U.S. and South Africa is reported to have flared up when South Africa insisted that special permission should be obtained for each trip to and from these land-locked countries. Five U.S. officials and their families are believed to be directly affected. The "crisis level" in the dispute is, however, understood to be passed, according to the report (Johannesburg Star, December 2, 1967). Is this a way of saying that the U.S. has backed down on the issue? If so, this means that the U.S. has acquiesced in measures which strike at the sovereignty of the three enclave countries and has subjected them to the stranglehold of their powerful neighbor, South Africa.

SOUTH AFRICA IN RHODESIA

The fighting in the Zambezi valley between guerillas and the security forces of Rhodesia and South Africa is having its effect on the crystallization of alignments in Southern Africa.

Prime Minister Vorster made reference to this in a speech given to 2,000 during the Day of Covenant celebrations at the Voortrekker Monument in mid-December. He stated that South Africa would "continue to fight terrorism wherever it was allowed to fight it in Southern Africa." Although he could visualize the time when South African forces could be brought back from Rhodesia, if it should become necessary to increase the number, "South Africa would not hesitate to do so." (London Times, December 18, 1967; Johannesburg Star, December 16, 1967; South African Digest, December 22, 1967). (Another Day of the Covenant speech, given in London, had a

somewhat more pacifistic tone - - perhaps the audience had something to do with it. Dr. Hendrick Luttig, the South African Ambassador in London, said that South Africa was "sincere in its desire for establishment of a new community of nations in Southern Africa - - a multi-national community of different and independent people, who lived in friendly recognition of one another's laws and usages." South African Digest, December 22, 1967) Returning to the more belligerent tone, in reference to other parts of Southern Africa, Natal Administrator Gerdner, said that the South African Government would have the "fullest justifications" for sending troops to fight guerrillas in Portuguese African Territories. (Times of Zambia, November 27 as cited in AMAX Newsletter)

Whereas the Star (December 23) saw Vorster's statement, that he could visualize a time when Rhodesian forces could be recalled, as a sign that the campaign was near completion, recent reports in the London Times (January 4 and 6, 1968) describe a new invasion and build-up of "infiltrators" leading to more clashes and capture of guerrillas. No figures were given, but it was reported that no security men were lost.

The recent incident in Zambia in which six South African "policement" crossed over into Zambia from Rhodesia at Victoria Falls reveals again the seriousness of the massing of South African forces in a foreign territory. The policemen (whom the Zambian Government claims are soldiers) were confronted by Zambian immigration authorities after the South Africans refused to stop at one of the control points between Zambia and Rhodesia. The South Africans dispersed and hid in the bush and were not captured until police forces from Livingstone came to the aid of the immigration authorities. One still remains in hiding. The South African Government quickly apologized and said the men were not under army control, but under police command and asked that they be returned. President Kaunda replied that "everything the men had said," their behavior and their uniforms indicated that they were soldiers. They were being held in a Livingstone jail for further interrogation (London Times, December 30, January 1, 2; Johannesburg Star, December 30).

The Star of January 6 referred to the incident as a "storm in a tea cup" and that after the "commendably prompt apology from South African Government" President Kaunda "always under extremist pressure" has charged the men with an offense rather than returning them to Rhodesia. The article concludes: ". . . that the incident was a misadventure with nothing sinister to it ought to be uppermost in President Kaunda's mind in every further action he decides to take."

That President Kaunda feels this was more than a misadventure is reflected in his appeal in the first Zambian official statement on the incident. He appealed to the countries of East and Central Africa to form a defense pact in the face of threats from the minority ruled countries and that unless this were done, "the combined forces of South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese in Angola and Mozambique" could overwhelm them (London Times, January 2, 1968). The Financial Times (December 19, taken from AMAX Newsletter) had reported that the Zambian Government is shopping for jet aircraft or surface-to-air missiles to defend her front-line position as the neighbor of the white supremacist bloc makes a proper defense system essential. When Vice-President Humphrey visited Zambia in December, President Kaunda warned him that "Unless your great country can act quickly, a catastrophe of a racial nature and an ideological nature is inevitable," - disgruntled millions in southern Africa no longer want just sympathy, but action (London Times, January 6).

Malawian-South African Diplomacy

December saw the formal opening of diplomatic relations between Malawi and South Africa. Jan Wentzel, South African Charge d'Affaires arrived in Blantyre in mid-December at the same time that Mr. Philip Richardson, Charge d'Affaires of the Malawi Embassy in the Republic arrived in Pretoria. Mr. Joe Kachingwe, the assistant

to Mr. Richardson, was to arrive in South Africa at the end of January and to go directly to Capetown for the opening of Parliament on February 2 (South African Digest, December 1 and 22, 1967).

The Malawian Parliament cheered when Dr. Banda announced the formal opening of diplomatic relations. This gave Dr. Banda the opportunity to make further announcements on Malawi's policies - - one being opposition to moves by Commonwealth Sanctions Committee members to vote to blockade Lourenco Marques. On Malawi's relations with Zambia and Tanzania, he referred to activities of ex-Malawian ministers exiled in these countries who were being allowed to engage in subversive activities. This, and some border disputes, were the main causes of tension between Malawi and her African neighbors, he said, but he added that he recently received a personal note from Kaunda and from the tone and contents, he was hopeful that relations would improve (Johannesburg Star, December 16, 1967).

The South African reaction to Malawian diplomatic links were generally approving with some touches of wariness. Die Vaderland (December 12, 1967 as summarized in the Press Digest, December 21) saw this move as "laying a pattern of individual independent existence for nations" and that South Africa was "establishing a link with a free African state, not by surrender of the principle and right of white sovereignty in the Republic of South Africa but precisely on the basis of the acceptance of its individual right." The crucial nature of this diplomatic link with Malawi was mentioned by one writer: "If we fail to make a success of the Malawi mission, we can forget the rest of Africa; cease in our endeavor to convince the world of the correctness of our case" (Press Digest, No. 50, December 21, 1967).

The Star, in a hopeful editorial, projects Malawi as "The Switzerland of Africa", in that it might serve as a neutral meeting ground. With one foot firmly in the white Southern African bloc, it is now trying to mend its fences with Zambia and Tanzania. The article mentions that when Dr. Banda visited Nairobi, he expressed interest in an African trading community embracing East Africa, Zambia, Malawi and the Congo, while still keeping links with the South. President Nyerere had invited Dr. Banda to attend the inauguration of the Treaty for East African Cooperation at Arusha and Banda sent two senior Cabinet ministers who seem to have been well received (Johannesburg Star, January 6, 1968).

The Star, in the same editorial, expressed the feeling that Banda has "proved conclusively that he is in control of his country and that he has massive support." That this "control" may eventually need to rest on something more than "massive support" in his own country is suggested by unconfirmed reports in mid-December that a second rebel invasion into Malawi took place under the direction of Mr. Chiume, Banda's former Education Minister who previously fled the country.

The Portuguese "Presence" in Southern Africa

Some rather puzzling and seemingly contradictory aspects of Portugal's role in Africa have been emerging lately. In his first public speech in 18 months, Salazar spoke on November 30 to Mozambique deputies concerning Angola, Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia and Rhodesia, but made no mention at all of the Republic of South Africa. This omission caused considerable interest among diplomats and there was speculation that this might reflect Salazar's fear that the growing influence of South Africa in Portuguese Africa may move Angola and Mozambique out of Portugal's orbit and more into the sphere of a Southern Africa dominated by the Republic. He asserted that Portugal would not give in and would continue her colonial policy. He was widely applauded when he concluded, "I think that we should be optimistic when we are sure that our resistance can endure indefinitely" (Johannesburg Star, December 2; New York Times, December 1; Christian Science Monitor, December 2).

Recently, however, in the January 11 issue of the Manchester Guardian Weekly, Salazar is quoted as having said, in reference to Angola and Mozambique, that "If the troubles continue very much longer, they will diminish and destroy our ability to carry on." This, of course, is seen as a distinct change in the previously oft-repeated theme of no surrender in Africa and defense at all costs and is seemingly contradictory to his November 30 speech. The Guardian article also mentions that defense costs are already absorbing half of Portugal's state budget.

On a somewhat more superficial note (although reflecting the reality of Portugal's help to Rhodesia), Salisbury sent "the world's largest Christmas card" (4½ x 3 ft.) to Lisbon. In return, Lisbon was to send Salisbury two pair of swans (London Times, December 14, 1967).

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE: For a thorough survey of the Portuguese areas of Africa, see Africa Report, November, 1967, "Three Revolutions: Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea" by John Marcum.

WHY WE NEED YOUR HELP: South Africa Must Not Be Readmitted to the Olympics

On January 30 the International Olympic Commission (IOC) will meet in Grenoble, France. At this time, the IOC will give a final ruling on the question of whether or not South Africa will be allowed back into the Olympics to participate in the 1968 Mexico City Games. Suspended from the 1964 Tokyo Olympics on the issue of racial discrimination in South African sports, South Africa is now pushing for readmission on the basis of a so-called "New Sports Policy" as expounded by Prime Minister Vorster in April, 1967. The IOC itself, which is the autonomous governing body of the Olympics, has not been totally unsympathetic towards the South African move, and in September it sent a three man commission (Lord Killanin, an Irish peer; Mr. Reginald Alexander, Kenyan Olympics Association Director; and Sir Adetokumbo Ademola, Chief Justice of Nigeria) to investigate on the spot the South African sports situation. The Commission's report will be presented at the IOC Grenoble meeting, and will be an important factor in the IOC's decision.

The key to South Africa's attempt for readmission is the new plan which will allow for the first time a racially mixed South African team to go to the Olympics - all under one flag. This is the image of racial harmony and progress which the South African government and white sports officials have stressed. In reality the team will be selected after separate, segregated trials have been held for Africans, Asians, Coloreds and Whites, by a multi-racial board with a white Chairman. Thus it appears that apartheid will remain until the South African team arrives in Mexico City. Within South Africa among South Africans there would be no mixed sporting events and upon this policy Prime Minister Vorster said there could be "no compromise, negotiations or abandonment of principles" (Department of Information, South African Embassy, London, Policy Statement on Mixed Sports).

Thus, as Alan Paton has commented, "Mr. Vorster's announced new policy was no breakthrough at all. . . and Mr. Vorster has made it clear that South African non-whites will never be allowed to play against whites on the sports fields of this country. . . The intention of the Prime Minister is to limit participation by non-whites as strictly as he can. He is only doing this because of outside pressure" (Sunday Express, Johannesburg, April 16, 1967).

But because South Africa is making an all-out effort for readmission and because she has found valuable allies in the western world (and extremely lukewarm opposition, except in Africa), she may succeed in this campaign and make it her first major building block in the effort to remold international opinion to a pro-South African stance. The Supreme Council of Sport in Africa announced after its December meeting in Lagos that if South Africa is readmitted to the Olympics, African nations would withdraw from the IOC (The Standard, Dar-es-Salaam, December 15, 1967). Will this be enough pressure to prevent the IOC from compromising its principles of non-discrimination? Maybe not.

The attitudes of American sportsmen and Americans will be a crucial factor in the IOC's decision, particularly in view of the black athletes' announced boycott of the games. Therefore all of us, whether athletes or not, should express our opinions before the Grenoble meeting to the following individuals: (write, call, telegram, visit)

*Mr. Douglas Roby, President, The U.S. Olympic Committee, 57 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

*Mr. Avery Brundage, President of the I.O.C., Hotel LaSalle, 10 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois

Thus far these gentlemen have remained noncommittal in their reaction to South Africa's new policy, and they may wittingly comply with South Africa's plan and call it true multi-racialism. But as Dennis Brutus, President of the exiled South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee stated about the new policy: "Two points must be recognized, one, that there have been changes vis-a-vis the outside world, and secondly, that these changes do not affect the racial structure of South African sport in any way."

For more information on South African sports and the campaign for non-racialism, write:

South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee
22 Seymour Place
London W.1, England

*Note: Due to the delay in completing this issue of the Newsletter, it is too late to write the above gentlemen prior to the Grenoble meeting. A January 31 article in the New York Times states the following: "A report submitted today by a fact-finding committee to the International Olympic Committee apparently brightened South Africa's chances of being admitted to the Olympic Games at Mexico City in October. Despite a boycott threat by some African nations if South Africa is readmitted to the Games, observers indicated there was at least a 50-per-cent chance that the I.O.C. would vote in favor of South Africa. The big question is whether the I.O.C. will accept a South African refusal to allow mixed race trials - inside or outside the Republic."

METHODISTS TAKE ACTION

Questions are often raised about the effectiveness of the Bank Campaign which was originated by the University Christian Movement, American Committee on Africa, and students from Union Theological Seminary. The effectiveness must be measured by the overall influence it has had on opening up the issue of the racist suppression in Southern Africa. After over 2½ years of negotiating with the Methodist Board of Missions about its funds invested through First National City Bank (et. al.), the Board voted at its September 1967 Executive Committee meeting to withdraw a \$10 million investment portfolio from FNCB if the consortium loan were renewed to the South African Government.

While still awaiting word on the renewal of the loan, the Board of Missions has adopted a stance of responsibility and intention to use its "material and human" resources to assist in the "improvement of people throughout the world who have been oppressed by racial reasons." Although aimed more at countries of Southern Africa that are dominated by white minority governments, the Board noted also that racial injustice and oppression existed in the U.S. as well - - although to a lesser degree.

The January statement actually becomes the general policy that will provide guidelines for future social, political, economic and theological action in its overseas relationships. In regard to Southern Africa the Board said that its new and extended involvement may include the withdrawal of support from institutions, corporations, and programs which by their economic or other actions support governments in power which officially uphold the principle of apartheid or otherwise exert suppression of black Africans. This could not only bring the Board into almost direct confrontation with white racist governments in South Africa, Rhodesia, and the Portuguese who rule Angola and Mozambique, but also in conflict with U.S. corporations and banking institutions that do business in Southern Africa. Politically, the Board said, it will now mean speaking to the governments of Southern Africa and supporting those who oppose the present policy of minority domination. It will mean supporting African movements of liberation and include efforts to influence the U.S. Government to realize its responsibility for the political future of Southern Africa. Economically it will call for a rethinking of the Protestant concept of stewardship. "It is accepted that all natural resources, and this includes economic power, should be used in accordance with the will of God and to His glory. . . It therefore should be an integral part of our stewardship responsibility to utilize our financial resources for constructive social change."

"This may involve withdrawing funds from enterprises supporting minority domination in Southern Africa, and seeking changes in the policies of corporations that exploit the present situation mainly for profit alone, with little or no regard for social betterment."

As further demonstration of its concern for the oppression in Southern Africa, the Methodist Board's World Division approved a special \$600,000 political and social action program of its own to aid the African majority in Southern Africa. The program, budgeted at \$200,000 per year for three years, will include relief and service to exiles and victims of oppression, special education and leadership training, action that will contribute to social change, and programs in the U.S. to improve public and governmental information concerning the problems of Southern Africa.

EDUCATIONAL TYRANNY

Education in South Africa, for the African, is becoming more and more of a misnomer. Since the "Bantu Education Act" was passed in 1953, the direction of education for the African has been progressively downhill. This year the first class of Africans are graduating from secondary school having undergone their entire period of formal education under the system of "Christian National Education." This system can aptly be summed up in the following quotation from The Christian Citizen in a Multi-Racial Society, a report of the Rosettenville Conference in July of 1949 which was the precursor for the passage of the Bantu Education Act:

"We believe that Native education should be based on the principles of guardianship (voogdyskap), non-equality and segregation. . . We believe that the Native should be led to an independent acceptance of the Christian and National principles in education, and that the mother tongue is the

basis of Native education. . . We believe that owing to the cultural immaturity of the Native it is the right and task of the State, in collaboration with Christian Protestant Churches, to give and to control Native education. . . on the understanding, however, that the financing of Native education shall be placed on such a basis that it shall not be at the expense of European education."

Also, in sum, the Eiselen Commission, which was established to do research into the proposed system of Bantu Education, made the following report in 1951: "Bantu education does have a separate existence just as, for example, French education, Chinese education, or even European education in South Africa, because it exists and can function only in and for a particular social setting, namely, Bantu society." (See Muriel Horrell, A Decade of Bantu Education, Johannesburg: SAIRR, 1964, p. 4)

One can easily see that the results of this system are indeed fulfilling its aims. The African is being educated to provide a semi-skilled labor force for the whites. The government is attempting to separate the African tribes, as shown by the establishment of "Bantustans" and separate university colleges for different tribal groups. In 1956 an officer of the Department of Native Affairs stated that "the Bantu should not come to the white university, but the university should be taken to the Bantu. Only by the creation of separate university facilities, can the Bantu student develop the attributes of leadership in his own circle and will be able to assume his rightful place in the Bantu community life."

In the face of such a system, it is easy to understand how the African in South Africa is becoming increasingly forced into his own little dark closet, from which there is little chance of escape. Even the one hope of the past - education - is losing its attraction, for education has become a means of retrogression for him. Little wonder that more and more responsibility for future leadership is thus placed on the shoulders of those who finished their education prior to the Bantu Education Act, or those who have been fortunate enough to escape South Africa and secure their education elsewhere - for example in the United States. But does this fact offer any hope either? Let us take a glance at the situation of South African students studying in the United States.

It is estimated by the African American Institute (AAI) that 83 South Africans have completed U.S. study programs in 1967, and 46 more will finish in 1968 (the figures for South West Africa are 2 and 10 respectively). The number decreases proportionately for 1970 and 1971. The numbers are small, but other statistics are even more disheartening. The fact that the U.S. State Department has made a serious cutback in foreign aid appropriations for Africa is an indication of what is happening all across the board. U.S. Government funds to such agencies as AAI that offer scholarships and aid to South Africans have also been affected by the cutback. Consequently, AAI programs are unable to offer any new scholarships to South Africans for the academic year 1968-69, and are unable to say whether the program will be renewed or not after that!

It is a policy of the South African Government not to grant passports to Africans who wish to study overseas. If they take up scholarships offered to them, they must leave on an exit permit, which prohibits them from ever returning to South Africa. Many South Africans, once they have completed their course of formal study, find their stipends have been cut off, and because they are "aliens" it is difficult for them to secure satisfactory jobs. Further training and/or satisfactory jobs in Africa are also scarce and hard to come by, and the burden is on the students for securing their own travel documents to get there.

Colin Legum, noted South African author and journalist for the London Observer, speaking in New York City on January 19, 1968, stated that there is little we can do outside South Africa to radically effect the situation within South Africa. Even

our economic sanctions, though necessary (both morally and economically), have little immediate effect. He feels that the best thing we can do outside South Africa is to support such groups and institutions as the liberation movements, the National Union of South African Students, the University Christian Movement of Southern Africa, and other liberal groups within South Africa such as the Institute of Race Relations and the Black Sash. He suggested that if we ourselves cannot effect radical change within South Africa, we at least must support those who can - namely, South Africans themselves. We can do no less than help to develop more leaders among South Africans "in exile", and to support and develop programs for students from South Africa while working for a liberalization of our own government's position.

AT THE UNITED NATIONS

New Initiative to the World Court Possible on South West Africa

A group of African, Asian and Western countries is considering asking the World Court to rule on the legality of the present South African "Terrorism Trial." The fact that some African countries have joined in this discussion indicates a revolutionary change of mind from the sour stance they legitimately held when the World Court refused to take a stand on South Africa's right to rule South West Africa.

This new initiative would give the Court (with a changed membership at this time) an opportunity to reverse a portion of its former decision on South West Africa, and it would also be an element of international pressure on South Africa to stop the trial. Ethiopia, India and Sweden have shown specific interest in this approach (Washington Post, December 26, 1967).

U.N. Demands End of Pretoria Trial

The General Assembly, by a vote of 93 to 2, asked the Security Council to use its powers to force South Africa to give up its rule over South West Africa. The United States was one of the nations abstaining. (A usual step on any resolution that would put teeth into a South West African resolution and really bring a confrontation with South Africa).

The General Assembly also approved by a vote of 110 to 2 a resolution demanding the trial of the 35 South West Africans facing charges of "Terrorism" in Pretoria be abandoned and the Africans be released and repatriated.

The first resolution asked for complete withdrawal of South African authority from its former mandate (a U.N. resolution of October 1966 declared South Africa's mandate over South West Africa ended) and conceded that the special 11 nation council for South West Africa had been unable to act because of South Africa's refusal to cooperate. The resolution concerning the trial termed the arrest and trial of the 37 (original number) South West Africans "a flagrant violation of their rights" and appealed to all states to help in halting the trial. This request for international pressure on South Africa was supported by two New York Times editorials which called for the U.S. to "condemn the whole rotten procedure in the strongest terms" (New York Times, December 17, 1967).

Another New York Times article of January 29, 1968 stated that the death penalty had been dropped against the South West Africans on trial. It appears that international pressure might have played some role in keeping these men from hanging; nevertheless, the "release and repatriation" appears to be an impossibility, since they have all been found guilty of "treason".

When only two months ago there was a general feeling that some of the men would definitely hang, it is easy to be encouraged by the dropping of the death penalty. It is also easy to understand why the South African courts might merely be attempting to appease those who have brought pressure for the release of the prisoners. In South Africa's courts, since rulings are seldom accompanied by sentencings, this announcement of the dropping of the death penalty could very well be a maneuver for breathing space in order to get the international spotlight off the "Terrorism Act". The actual sentences are yet to be delivered against 30 of the men under trial. There is no question, however, that the hoped for "release and repatriation" of the prisoners is an impossibility.

U.N. Consideration of Apartheid

The Assembly, on 13 December, requested the Security Council to resume consideration of the question of apartheid with a view to adopting more effective measures to secure an end to South Africa's apartheid policy. It reiterated its conviction that the situation in South Africa threatened international peace, that action under Chapter VII of the Charter was essential, and that universally applied mandatory economic sanctions were the only means of achieving a peaceful solution; condemned the actions of South Africa's main trading partners and other States, as well as foreign financial interests, which encouraged South Africa to persist in its policies; requested those States to disengage from South Africa and facilitate action to end apartheid, and requested the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) to deny assistance to the South African Government.

The draft resolution (A/6914), recommended by the Special Political Committee, was adopted by 89 votes in favor to 2 against, with 12 abstentions (GA/3553).

South Africa to Attend United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development opens in New Delhi on February 1 with a South African delegation in attendance. Officially the Conference could not have been held unless all members of the U.N. were invited, in spite of what measures or resolutions are outstanding against any member. Although the Indian Mission to the U.N. denies it, the U.N. UNCTAD office says that special care is being taken for their safety (!).

PORTUGAL IN AFRICA

Prime Minister Antonio De Oliviera Salazar's December 1967 speech announcing that Portugal could endure indefinitely in her overseas territories can be interpreted as a major policy stance. As such, Portugal sees herself as an overseas power rather than part of the European system, and this self-concept will no doubt continue as long as Dr. Salazar remains Premier. The question of his succession is very much an open one, with the front contender probably being Dr. Antunes Varela, until recently the Minister of Justice. He is 48, rather to the right of the political spectrum, and a man strongly backed by the church hierarchy and some businessmen (The Times, London, Monday, January 8).

There is political opposition in Portugal herself, the most active being a group known as the LUAR (Liga de Uniao e de Accao Revolucionaria). In 1967 this opposition group staged two overt actions in Portugal by robbing a state bank and sacking a military depot (Times, London, January 8).

Dr. Soares, the most prominent lawyer in Lisbon and leader of the opposition which is forbidden by law to form political parties, was arrested in December. More

than 100 Portuguese lawyers sent telegrams on January 12 to the Ministry of Justice protesting against the "arbitrary arrest of Dr. Soares," news of which has not appeared in the local press (New York Times, January 14, 1968).

Police action and internal disputes have made the Communist Party in Portugal ineffective since it received intense surveillance. Other opposition consists in a left-wing Catholic group which takes its inspiration from the Bishop of Porto, now living in Lourdes, who has been in exile since he criticized Dr. Salazar publicly in 1959 (The Times, London, January 8).

There are organized cooperatives which provide a cultural information service; they are not banned as political organizations since they operate in a commercial basis, and they are able to introduce some political material into discussions of economic and social problems. They are, however, closely supervised by the police, and in 1967 one of their headquarters was closed.

There is a constant cry of many opposition leaders for direct force against the regime because they feel that no avenues exist for dialogue; and the PIDE and efficient police force can squelch any embryonic organization that might take on political character by the relentlessness of their interrogations, which may go on for days and nights on end.

The war in Africa costing more each year is the dominant issue in the political scene. More than 100,000 Portuguese troops are engaged in Guinea, Angola and Mozambique. At present the major concern is with Portuguese Guinea. In the difficult terrain of this small territory, surrounded by hostile states, Portugal finds herself less and less in effective control - but she dare not abandon it because of the propaganda value this would give to African nationalists in the two territories of Angola and Mozambique.

The war in the overseas territories is given as a reason for not lightening press censorship or any other move toward liberalization.

They do not wish to make the same mistake as the Americans made over Vietnam, and weaken the home front as the last line of defense (Times, London, January 8).

To persecute the war against, at least, five nationalist groups in the three overseas territories, the Portuguese have made plans for recruiting women as secretaries and car drivers into the armed forces in order to release **more men** for combat duties. There was also an extension of military service for men made during 1967 (Times, London, January 11).

The economic resume of the overseas territories for 1967 seems to substantiate the claim that Portugal can endure indefinitely overseas. The extract of a manufacturing industries report of the overseas provinces showed considerable increase in almost all areas during 1967. Coffee, the main foreign exchange earner for Portugal, only increased production by 4% because of the international coffee agreement. New plantations were discouraged during the past year and farmers were urged to diversify into other areas.

An upturn in production was noted in the agricultural crops of sunflower seeds, corn and cotton, and in the output of the fisheries industry. During 1967 petroleum production declined because of difficulty in the Purфина field near Luanda in Angola. But the forecast in 1968 is reassuring - the Cabindo oil find explored by Gulf is due to begin producing in the latter part of 1968, and assures the country of becoming a major world producer (Diario de Noticias, January 3, 1968).

Small manufacturing firms increased production and there was a general higher level of consumption of electrical power in the overseas territories. On January 10, 1968 the tenders for construction of the Cabora Bossa Hydroelectric Development on the Zambezi River in Mozambique were opened. They were received and given to a technical committee for study and decision. Among the several firms bidding were Portuguese entrees and also ZAMCO, which is a consortium of Western Germany, France, South Africa and Sweden.

In a New Year's day speech the President of Portugal mentioned the launching of the third plan of development to raise the level of living of the Portuguese. He took pains also to bewail the state of the world - manifested by a restlessness in the United Nations, other countries of the world, and even now creeping into the church (Diario de Noticias, January 3, 1968).

UNITED STATES ECONOMIC ACTIVITY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Dollars and Gold

At a New Year's Day press conference, President Johnson announced a sweeping balance-of-payments policy change which would curtail further U.S. direct business investments not only in Europe, but also in South Africa for 1968 (Washington Post, January 2, Department of Commerce, circular #6090, January 4).

The immediate cause of the major shift in policy appears to have been France's stepped-up program of converting dollars into gold, thus reducing U.S. holdings of gold to a low of \$12 billion, just \$1.4 billion above the minimal legal level. In a three-way contest for gaining commercial ascendancy, DeGaulle's double-edged policy of keeping Britain out of the Common Market and buying U.S. gold has made the franc one of the world's most stable currencies (Wall Street Journal, November 28, 1967).

The effect on South Africa, the non-communist world's largest gold producer, is considerable. The price for gold paid by the U.S. Treasury has long been \$35 an ounce, and, repeatedly asserted by Johnson, will remain so. Thus, South Africa's Minister of Finance, H. Diederichs, has said: "I consider it my duty to say that, on the basis of the present gold price, South Africa may not in the future be able to make gold available on the same level as in the past" (Scope, November 1967). Dr. W. J. Busschau, former president of the South African Chamber of Mines and former chairman of Goldfields of South Africa, has said the present price will cause a decline in gold production from 41.7 million ounces (1966) to an estimated 35 million ounces (1975) (Johannesburg Star, December 9). In addition to the fixed price, mines have had to close and production is slowed because the South African economy is in a period of inflation, thus causing rising costs for production.

One of the long-range results of the fixed U.S. price for gold is the gradual replacement of gold with iron as the chief mining industry (Christian Science Monitor, November 16). Dr. Christian M. Kruger, managing director of the South African Iron and Steel Corporation (ISCOR) has been in Japan and Europe looking for prospective buyers for South Africa's "astronomical" iron-ore reserves. Japan, according to its trade mission in South Africa, is "very interested" in the reserves. (One of the prospective buyers, Japan's giant Yawata Steel, had previously signed a ten-year, \$250 million contract with South Africa in 1962 for 500,000 tons of iron-ore annually. The deal was arranged by an American, Henry J. Leir of Continental Ore Corp., New York City. His commission was \$2.5 million. Business Week, January 20, February 3, 1962. Whether or not Mr. Leir is a third party to South Africa's recent efforts to promote iron-ore trade cannot be determined at this time.) One estimate placed the reserves in the Sishen-Postmasburg area alone at 4.3 million tons of ore with 60% iron content (Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 16).

Inquiries: on balance of payments policy, write: William H. Shaw, Office for Direct Investment, Dept. of Commerce, Washington, D.C.; Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 33 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y. for circulars #6090 (direct investment), #6086 (banking and non-banking financial institutions policy with regard to balance-of-payments). Continental Ore Corp., 245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. (212)661-4300.

Chrome: The Story of Two Pairs of Strange Bedfellows

Alloy, West Virginia was the place last November where Kenneth Rush, president of Union Carbide, revealed that Rhodesian sanctions (Rhodesia is the non-communist world's largest supplier) had forced his company and Vanadium Chrome to look elsewhere for new sources of supply (Cincinnati Inquirer, November 8). Both U.S. companies had found Russia a willing supplier because she had cut off her sales of chrome to China not long before. Sometime in the late summer of 1967, China (anti-capitalist) and Rhodesia (anti-communist) concluded agreements on the sale of chrome, an unusual but necessary trading partnership (Rand Daily Mail, October 2). Since China was not a party to Rhodesian sanctions, she moved to fill the vacuum created by American withdrawal, striking a deal for 60,000 tons, 20% of Rhodesia's supply. As if the switching of trading partners were not enough, Russia raised her price \$5 a ton, effective January 1, 1968, thus causing chrome interests in this country to increase their pressure for an end to Rhodesian sanctions. An attack on Executive Order 11322 establishing sanctions was launched in the Senate by Strom Thurmond of South Carolina on behalf of the Foote Mineral Company (Lynchburg (Va.) Advance). The firm, with chromium mines in Rhodesia, had asked the Foreign Assets Control Division of the Treasury Department for a license to import chrome. The Division denied the request, thus giving Thurmond the opportunity to point out the irony that the U.S. was now dependent upon Russia for a militarily strategic material used to fight the Vietnam war.

Inquiries: Union Carbide Corporation, 270 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10017 (212)551-2345. Vanadium Corporation of America, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017 (212)973-3000.

Mining: Newmont Mining and American Metal Climax, each owners of 29% of Tsumeb Corporation, Ltd., are developing a copper mine 28 miles from Windhoek, capital of South West Africa (U.S. News and World Report, December 18). A director of Newmont Mining, Fred Searles, Jr., is also a director of American Metal Climax. Both mining firms also have sizeable stakes in the O'okiep Copper Company, Ltd., through which exploration and development have been intensified. Newmont Mining (an old J.P. Morgan interest), which owns 29% of Phalaborwa Mining (South Africa), has figured its total investment at \$14.3 million for a new open-pit copper mine in the Northern Transvaal. Newmont figures its investment will be repaid out of dividends in 26 months after production started in 1966. Newmont has already acquired a 10% interest in Highveld Steel and Vanadium Corporation (South Africa). American Metal Climax, 46% owner of Roan Selection Trust, is searching for copper in Botswana, having already outlined some 33 million tons of potential copper-nickel ores (U.S. News and World Report, December 18).

Inquiries: Newmont Mining Corporation, 300 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022 (212) PL 34800. American Metal Climax, 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10020 (212) 757-9700

Automobiles

An article in Business Week (November 18) provides the best, most up-to-date information on the penetration of U.S. auto makers into the South African economy. General Motors and Ford each have 20-25% of the South African market, while Chrysler, recently replacing British Motors as South Africa's largest auto maker, has 11% of the market (Volkswagen is third). Chrysler, a relative newcomer, is building a \$35 million plant at Pretoria to open in 1968 which will quadruple present production capacities. Ford, indicated by Newscheck (November 24) as having sold cars as early as 1905 in South Africa, has invested a total of

\$63 million since 1924. In recent years both GM and Ford have assured their market positions by building large engine plants, \$24 million (1965) and \$11 million (1964) respectively. While new South African laws have increased the per cent of South African auto parts to be used in the making of foreign cars (55% by 1969), American auto makers, heeding the local content requirements, dismiss the thought of production slowdowns as a result.

Four Chrysler vice-presidents, Philip N. Buckminster, Henry E. Chesebrough, R. S. Bright, and A. Newton Cole, visited South Africa recently to review building progress at the previously mentioned Pretoria site, saying that it would be the most modern and best equipped plant in the world (South African Digest, December 8). Kaiser-Jeep has started production at a fully automated car assembly plant (500 vehicles per month) at Rosslyn, near Pretoria, the second such plant to be built in the Transvaal by Kaiser-Jeep in recent years (South African Digest, December 15).

Inquiries: General Motors Corporation, General Motors Building, Detroit, Michigan 48202 (313) TR 37200. Ford Motor Company, The American Road, Dearborn, Michigan 48121 (313) 322-3000. Chrysler Corporation, 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48231 (313) 883-4500. Kaiser-Jeep Corporation, North Cove Blvd., Toledo, Ohio 43601 (419) 244-2861.

News Notes

Amoseas, jointly owned by Texaco and Standard Oil of California, is prospecting for oil in the vicinity of Cape Agulhas, Africa's southernmost point (U.S. News and World Report, December 18). International Factors (South Africa), a firm helping to expedite international trade for South Africa, especially in Africa, is partly backed by the First National Bank of Boston (South African Digest, December 15). The A. C. Nielsen Company, famous for its Nielsen TV ratings, has established a food and toilet articles index to guide manufacturers and retailers in those product lines. Arthur Nielsen himself, 70, and controlling stockholder, went to South Africa personally to see his subsidiary get off its feet (News/Check, November 24).

Inquiries: Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017 (212) OX 78000. Standard Oil of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, California 94120 (415) 434-7700. First National Bank of Boston, 69 Milk Street, Boston, Mass., 02106 (617) 434-2200. A. C. Nielsen Company, 2101 West Howard Street, Chicago, Illinois 60645 (312) HO 54400.

Dear Reader:

The Southern Africa Committee of the University Christian Movement is happy to provide this monthly survey of news and opinion free of charge to any persons interested and involved in the issues that we cover therein. However, in its new form the newsletter is quite costly to reproduce and to distribute. We find it necessary to "weed out" from our mailing list those persons who find no use for the newsletter, or those persons who do not read it for one reason or another.

Thus we would appreciate your response in order to help us determine whether your name should remain on our mailing list. In some cases it has been many months since we have heard from any of you. We are asking that you complete the form at the bottom of this page and send it back to us at your earliest possible convenience.

If you have any suggestions for additional persons who should receive the newsletter, who will make fruitful use of it and will find it beneficial in their commitment to Southern Africa concerns, please let us know their name and address (with the zip code!) and we will place them on the mailing list.

Because of the higher costs of printing and distributing the newsletter, and the growing mailing list, we will appreciate any and every contribution you might make. You may send it with the form below to:

The Southern Africa Committee
University Christian Movement
Room 758, 475 Riverside Drive
New York, N. Y. 10027 (212) 870-2367

We urge and welcome your response and suggestions.

-
- I am attaching a list of persons to be added to the mailing list.
 - Please take my name off your mailing list for the Southern Africa newsletter.
 - Please correct my mailing address as shown below:
 - Enclosed please find my contribution for the Southern Africa Newsletter

Name: _____

Address: _____

Southern Africa Committee
University Christian Movement
Room 758
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N. Y. 10027