

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, N.Y. 10027

Vol. I, No. 6

June 1968

CONTENTS:	PAGE NO.
1. Editorial: <u>Keep Your Eye on the Ball</u>	2
2. <u>My Guerrilla Fight Against Smith</u> (Reprint)	3
3. <u>South Africa and the United States:</u>	5
U.S. Must Wrench Itself from Complicity	
A Drop in the Bucket from the U.S.A.	
Message to the United States from the Freedom Fighters	
American Bishop Barred from South West Africa	
King's Death -- Smugness and Shock	
Swazi Leaders in the United States for Orientation	
4. "More War Than Most" Part III	7
Portuguese Defenses in Guinea-Bissau	
5. <u>Inside South Africa</u>	9
African Family Life	
South Africa's Billion	
Drop in Number of Bannings	
Fight for Coloured Representation Lost	
Prohibition of Improper Interference Bill	
Alan Paton to Address NUSAS	
\$140 Million Arms Plan	
6. <u>The Press, Ideology and Southern Africa</u>	11
7. <u>Inside Rhodesia</u>	12
8. <u>South Africa: Educational and Cultural Affairs</u>	15
9. <u>United States Investments and You</u>	17
10. <u>Industrialization of Angola and Mozambique</u>	18
11. <u>At the United Nations</u>	19
U.N. Team Fails to Enter SWA	
South African Foreign Minister Invites U.N. Representative	
U.N. Office Rebuked	
South Africa Rebuked	

EDITORIAL

"Keep Your Eye on the Ball"

The United States is to have a new man at the United Nations, Mr. George W. Ball. If the Journal "Human Events" of May 4, 1968 quotes him correctly, it will mean that the wind in Southern Africa will get a bit chillier.

Firstly, Mr. Ball seems to think it "simplistic" to demand that Portugal should give her African territories immediate independence, because this would surely lead to civil war. Even if it were as simple as that, the view is historically blind. Lincoln was faced by an issue of civil war or continued slavery and his choice is celebrated to this day. Those men who live in Portuguese bondage will be free, Mr. Ball, and they are fighting their war now, with the goal of peace, freedom and independence.

Mr. Ball would also have the restrictions on the sale of weapons to South Africa lifted, a less critical role by the United States at the U.N. and a real effort to build bridges of friendship with the South African regime. Again the argument is similar, if military and economic pressure brought true democracy and a multi-racial society to South Africa it would ruin the country in doing so. The whites would flee the country and the blacks would suffer as the economic structure collapsed. Mr. Ball would thus forsake the goal of a multiracial society and encourage the whites in their Bantustan policy.

For a man who makes such arguments, freedom and democracy must mean very little. He would not suffer to achieve them.

But what baulks the mind is that this designated Ambassador to the United Nations, does not see that the Bantustan policy is a facade, to hide the hellish servitude of fifteen million people. To trap them there and their descendents in perpetuity. Behind this charlatan's sleight of hand, the bla. man's family is dragged apart, he must labour in inhuman serfdom and he must know that, while the white hand holds him, he must forever be without human rights in the country of his birth.

Remember the story of Noah, Mr. Ball. When the rains came they rained upon the good and the evil. Sometimes to make a better world, good men must suffer.

As Ian Smith's troops faced the strongest freedom-fighters' force yet to strike at Rhodesia, Jack Halpern last week obtained for the Sunday Times the story of one of the men who went in with the first wave in 1965, the year of U D I. He is one of two of the original 37 who evaded capture, and has now been granted political asylum in Britain.

My guerrilla fight against Smith

AT LAST I am free to tell my story. I was born in Rhodesia in 1943 in the farming district of Mazoe, where hundreds of Africans were massacred by Rhodes's white settlers after the Mashona Rebellion in the 1890s. My father gave up teaching to become a business man. After four years of primary education, when I was nine, we followed him to Salisbury.

When I was thirteen, by chance, I heard George Nyandoro speaking to a small meeting of the African National Congress. I had never heard of this A.N.C., which started a year before, but I felt very concerned when Nyandoro said that we Africans must organise to get back our stolen land, cattle and rights. If we united, the white man would have to listen.

I had never heard such serious speech before. In my home rural area people still talked of the Mashona Rebellion and everybody was very anti-white. Unlike now, almost everybody then believed that the white man was next to God and that the African could not challenge that. My parents told me never to attend such meetings again, but I felt that Nyandoro was right and next week I joined the A.N.C.

The "liberal" Sir Edgar Whitehead banned the A.N.C., then the N.D.P. and then Z.A.P.U. between 1959-62. I joined and worked for each new party with fresh hope, meanwhile studying at home—my parents could not afford secondary school fees. I then became a full-time youth-wing organiser for Z.A.N.U. when it was formed in 1963 in opposition to Nkomo's weak leadership.

In 1964, after a Z.A.P.U.-Z.A.N.U. clash, the police were looking for me. So I went into hiding in the country, where a certain African priest kept me at his home. Later, his family suffered from the police for this.

After both parties were banned late in 1964, Z.A.N.U. agents began recruiting intensively for guerrilla training. Some members of the youth wing had already been in China for training. I therefore admired Mao Tse-tung very much, because China had helped African nationalist parties financially, too, and spoke of revolution in Africa.

I and many others volunteered for training with a burning desire to fight for the liberation of the country. But some volunteers wanted mainly foreign travel and the respect and fear which



By Hassan Chimutengwende, freedom fighter: 'We were the first of many'

people had for those who had been trained and could bomb or shoot at will.

These people, if caught returning, were quick to say they had been deceived by promises of study scholarships. Genuine freedom-fighters, when captured, have also said this to fool the police. But all of us knew we were going for guerrilla war training.

With my forged papers, prepared secretly in Rhodesia, I simply went from Salisbury to Malawi by bus in November, 1964. I was disappointed to learn in Blantyre that I would not be sent to Chairman Mao's China, but it was still an honour to go, by aeroplane, via Dar es Salaam to Kwame Nkrumah's Republic. I was very pleased that in Ghana we were to be trained by Chinese, who had recently replaced Russian instructors because it was felt they knew more of guerrilla warfare.

Our training camp was an abandoned mine at Kumasi. It was a new camp in the middle of a jungle-like forest, so we had first to clear the ground and repair the houses. There were about 200 of us; thirty-seven from Rhodesia, others from the rest of non-independent Africa, and groups from the independent African States of Nigeria, Niger, Cameroun and the Congo.

The area was terribly hot, with many mosquitoes. We stayed three in a room, each with a bed and three blankets. We were given two-khaki uniforms, a pair of army boots and a pair of tennis shoes. There were latrines and a small clinic but no showers. We washed in a nearby river, toughening up for a jungle way of life.

We trained or worked on the camp from 8 a.m. to noon and from 2 to 4 p.m. five days a week, but in the evenings we were free to visit nearby villages. We got a little pocket money, so we could buy some beer.

Our four Chinese instructors had two

other Chinese to translate in to English. Students then interpreted further into French, Portuguese and Swahili. The main emphasis was on teaching us sabotage: how to use British-made dynamite to blow a bridge or building, throwing Chinese hand grenades and how to make our own bombs.

Very little time was spent on teaching us to use rifles and sub-machine guns, on the grounds that we were not to engage in positional warfare. These weapons were British and Russian, mostly old ones passed on from the Ghana Army, but our Chinese instructors would not teach us with the Russian arms. So they were obliged to "back Britain" while vainly waiting for Chinese equipment to arrive.

In lectures, we were taught the principles of war and guerrilla tactics according to Mao Tse-tung, given lectures on the People's Army of China and shown films of how they fought the Japanese. We also had lessons on how and from where to begin the Zimbabwe revolution.

Rhodesia's geography familiar to Chinese

When we told the Chinese instructors that some of their experience could not be applied in the different conditions of Rhodesia, we were astonished to find that they knew more of Rhodesia's geography than most of us did.

The course was for nine months, but we Rhodesians left after six months because Ian Smith's U.D.I. threats were growing. We had to launch the people's armed struggle. We thoroughly enjoyed the course, but the Chinese instructors did not satisfy me. They refused to discuss politics or Communism, about which I was curious, saying one day that they had not come to teach us their ideology but how to liberate ourselves. They were very reserved and did not appear happy to me.

At the end of the course, we each received £45 in cash and, civilian clothing vouchers worth £20 to be spent in designated shops in Dar es Salaam. We flew to Dar in May, 1965. Our thirty-seven divided into four groups, each with two leaders. In Dar es Salaam we discussed plans with leaders of Z.A.N.U.'s military arm, the Zimbabwe

African National Liberation Army, ZANLA, among them Advocate Herbert Chitepo.

Each unit was given a name—mine was the Tiger Group—and a specific area of operation. We planned to attack the enemy's weakest points: European farms, bridges and unguarded buildings. We were not to attack people except those on our "white list": Rhodesia Front MPs and senior party members. We were to avoid a direct clash with the Rhodesian "Security" forces.

Each freedom fighter then swore a solemn oath never to give away useful information to the enemy and never to betray the spirit of Chamunika, our great nineteenth-century Shona prophet.

Arms had been sent ahead and hidden, so that, once more on forged documents, we returned to Rhodesia like ordinary travellers. Some of us entered through Zambia. My Tiger Group went in through Malawi and by train through Mozambique. Four simply flew by air from Blantyre to Salisbury.

We had the blessing of the Organisation for African Union's Liberation Committee, which had been partly responsible for our training. We knew we could never win overnight and that the war could take one or even two decades, like other wars of liberation. The feeling became even stronger after UDI and Britain's refusal to use force. But our inspiration was that ours is a popular revolution, supported by the majority against systematic oppression and injustice by a 4 per cent. minority.

Unfortunately, most of us were wanted by the police for political so-called crimes committed before we left the country. The false names we assumed helped very little. Some of our guerrilla force were arrested immediately they entered Rhodesia. It is not impossible that somehow the police were tipped off. In any event, the police soon realised that those now arrested for old political offences had meanwhile become part of a well-organised guerrilla network.

Others, like myself, of whom the police had no photograph, were sheltered by ordinary villagers. But in the end, of our thirty-seven, only I and one friend avoided capture.

Intercepted, we had to give up our

planned operations, and each struck out on his own. I dressed in ragged khaki shorts like any villager and behaved as though I had never been to school, in order not to attract attention. And when I came to a new village, I would never simply announce, as some of my comrades unfortunately did, that I was a freedom-fighter and demand help. For the villagers suspected that such a man might be a security police stooge, sent to get them into trouble.

Lost their nerve and surrendered

Instead, I would ask the temporary hospitality traditionally given to any African traveller. Later I revealed my true identity and task to someone whom I felt I could trust.

Some few of our group, when left alone, lost their nerve and surrendered to the police, hoping for pardon by pretending that they had been misled by African nationalists.

There were, of course, quite a few informers in the villages, including the chiefs, who are paid and allowed to hold office only by the white government's orders. Heavy unemployment, cowardice and love for money produced other informers.

But I stayed at large for eight whole months in Rhodesia, moving from village to village, and I learned that if a freedom-fighter can convince a villager that he is genuine he will be helped, whether he is ZAPU or ZANU.

I cannot honestly say that all Africans support one of these two parties—many do not. But almost every African in Rhodesia, and certainly the rural ones who have never heard of the tiny handful of real white liberals, hate the white man.

In trying to track me down, the police arrested my mother and elder brother several times and interrogated them, but they gave nothing away.

Just after UDI our exiled nationalist leaders directed the villagers to begin cutting down the white farmers crops, burning down farmhouses and out-buildings, and filling cattle dipping-tanks with sand. The people even in the remotest areas heard this by listening on transistor radios to broad-

casts from Zambia, Tanzania and Cairo.

I explained to villagers that the British Government had said that it would intervene militarily only if "law and order" broke down in Rhodesia. For that reason, I urged them to do lots of burning and crop-cutting, and was able to advise them. The "gospel of action" which I preached was passed on by others.

Although it was kept out of the Rhodesian newspapers, many European farmers, especially in the Mazoe district, suffered very heavy losses.

By now, things were getting very tight. The police were simply arresting all the young men they could find and beating and interrogating them in case they knew something about the burnings and crop-cuttings.

So, making my way from village to village and across bush, I finally crossed the border into Botswana. There I found work and picked up old and new contacts among the Rhodesian Africans who worked there or passed through.

The Botswana Government, when they found that I had received military training, ordered me to get out of their country, but I had no funds. After living from mouth to mouth on a conditionally extended permit, I was finally helped by the World Council of Churches to come to Britain, where I have been granted political refuge.

Looking back, I can see many mistakes on our part, and shortcomings in our training. But we were the first of many, and I know that those fighting in Rhodesia today are well-trained and armed. Above all, my experience gives the lie to Smith's claim that freedom-fighters have no support from the villagers and tribesmen. Without their help, I would not be here to tell my story.

Interview with Zambia's President Kaunda—page 8

Reprinted with the kind permission of the Sunday Times, London (March 24, 1968)

SOUTH AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES

"The U.S. Must Wrench Itself from Complicity"

Sen. Edward W. Brooke (R-Mass.), said in the Senate on April 29, 1968 that "the time has come to wrench ourselves from ... implied complicity with the southern African regimes.

Senator Brooke, the Senate's only Negro member, spoke at length on the subject of American policy in Africa after a three week study trip to twelve African countries, including Tanzania, Zambia and Botswana. In the course of an

analysis of the total situation of Africa in relation to the United States, he charged that U.S. preoccupation with Southeast Asia is leading to neglect of other areas of the developing world, including Southern Africa, where "festering racial tensions" are responsible for "the gravest crisis in Africa today."

"Trouble is brewing in this area," he maintained, as a result of the denial of rights to over 32 million people in the five states dominated by white minority governments. As these have become more repressive, "numerous well-organized liberation groups have turned to violence to secure the rights of the majority."

As "staging areas" for the guerillas, Tanzania and Zambia would inevitably be drawn into the war. The superior military capacities of the minority regimes would combine, and compound the bloodshed and devastation. "The other independent nations of Africa have cast their lot with the freedom fighters," he pointed out in addition. "At the September meeting of the Organization of African Unity in Kinshasa, the 38 members of the OAU voted to give \$2 million of their \$3.1 million budget to the various liberation groups."

Much of the weaponry, he averred, seems to come from Communist sources. In discussing this with several leaders of the freedom movements, he was told, "If we have to use Communist aid to free ourselves, we would be foolish not to use it. Where else can we get it?" Senator Brooke expressed the view that though Communist weapons, advisers and training is being used, the leaders did not see the struggle in Marxist class terms nor use "the rhetoric of communism." In the long run, however, while southern Africa may not go Communist, it may turn out to be very pro-Communist.

The United States has made clear its opposition to apartheid policies, joined in economic sanctions against Rhodesia and tried to exact guarantees from its NATO ally, Portugal, that military equipment provided by the United States will not be used outside the NATO area. What speaks much more clearly to Africans is, however, what the United States has not done. He pointed out that "we have taken no purposeful action to discourage American private investment in South Africa, which is now in excess of \$600 million and serves as a vital pillar of support for that unpopular regime, that "we have placed no restrictions on U.S. trade with South Africa, other than a prohibition against the sale of military equipment," (Trade with that country has now risen to \$650 million a year) that the United States has done little to persuade the British to increase pressure on the white rebel government in Rhodesia, nor to persuade its allies to desist from selling arms and sophisticated military equipment to South Africa. On the contrary, the African freedom fighters insist that American weapons are killing their people in Angola and Mozambique.

Senator Brooke urged that the United States begin to disengage from its burgeoning economic ties with South Africa, reduce its military relations with the Lisbon government, even at the sacrifice of the military facilities developed on Portuguese territory, and support the belated British proposal in the U.N. Security Council for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. "At stake is our moral and political credit with all of Africa," according to the Senator. "We can prejudice our case severely if we allow our preoccupation with the Cold War to dominate our policies, or if we presume to chastise nations for accepting Communist aid." (Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 90th Congress, Second Session.)

"A Drop in the Bucket from the U.S.A."

What the American Committee on Africa describes as "a drop in the bucket" has at last been contributed to the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa in the form of a paltry \$25,000. This first gift pledged on March 21, 1968, comes belatedly over two years after the Fund was established by a General Assembly resolution in December 1965 which was supported by the United States. Once again, therefore, U.S. words are belied by lack of action.

The Fund, which makes grants through voluntary organizations, agencies, and host governments, goes towards:

- a. the legal defense of persons charged under South African repressive legislation,
- b. the relief for dependents of these persons persecuted by apartheid,
- c. the education of prisoners and their dependents, and,
- d. relief for refugees from South Africa.

Five nations, all far less wealthy than the United States, have made larger grants than the American contribution. These include \$119,125 from Denmark, \$30,000 from France, \$27,584 from the Netherlands, \$196,775 from Sweden and \$40,000 from the United Kingdom.

The U.S. Mission to the U.N. requested an allocation of \$150,000 for the U.N. Trust fund and the U.N. Education and Training Program for South Africans, but the amount was whittled away during Senate discussions of the Foreign Assistance Act in 1967, according to information supplied by the American Committee on Africa.

The U.N. Trust Fund helped pay for the \$100,000 defense costs in the recent trial of 35 South West Africans in Pretoria. U.S. representatives, including Vice-President Humphrey, condemned this trial as illegal and inhumane, but the U.S. contribution would have scarcely paid for a quarter of the costs of defending these men.

The American Committee on Africa appeals for letters urging "a respectable American contribution" to be sent to: U.S. Mission to the U.N., 799 U.N. Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017; to The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, The Department of State, Washington, D.C., to Congressmen and to Senators.

"Message to the United States from Freedom Fighters"

The "valiant military exploits of the ZAFU-ANC forces," which "have sown terror and panic in the enemy," according to Mayebuye (April 17, 1968) an organ of the freedom movement, have also "begun to worry Western Europe and the U.S.A." "What will the Western powers do?" the paper asks. In two extended trips to the U.S.A. in 1965 and 1966 ANC leader Robert Resha had "hammered on an important point...that when war started in Southern Africa, the West would side with our oppressors in order to protect its prolific investments."

The article charges that in the U.S.A. there are signs of rallying to the aid of Smith and Vorster, especially on the part of the Radical Right. "They want to defend themselves against the spectre of communism at our expense - our suffering," the writer comments, pointing to a study issued in 1967 by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in Washington, begins with these words: "The Legislative Reference Service has recently received several inquiries as to what courses of action the Congress might take to prevent the use of American troops by the United Nations in the future in South Africa or Rhodesia! (emphasis by Mayebuye). (Congress and the use of American troops in South Africa and Rhodesia. Washington, D.C., JK 1001 E, F-224). The Reference Service sidestepped the question by merely indicating that Congress could deny funds for such an operation.

The article concludes: "To the people of the United States we say: We are inspired by the same ideals as you. We believe in human freedom and dignity, equality and happiness. But in our country these rights are trampled under foot. Now our people have had enough.

"We have taken up arms not because we are warmongers or butchers but because we are dehumanized and massacred. We have taken up arms not because we have despaired of international aid but because the world helps those who help themselves.

"In vain have we pleaded with your Government in Washington, at the United Nations, even here in Lusaka. We have spoken ourselves hoarse in your pulpits and your campuses. Our efforts have been in vain. Who will deny that we have exhausted all means of peaceful change. Now, our patience has run out. Guns will decide."

"American Bishop Barred from South West Africa -
Protest Call by Episcopal Churchmen"

A call for Americans to protest against the barring of American Bishop Robert H. Mize from South West Africa has come from the Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa, 14 West 11th Street, New York, N. Y. 10011.

Bishop Mize has been informed by the South African Secretary of the Interior that his permit will expire on July 26, 1968, and that he must leave South West Africa and the Republic of South Africa on or before that date. No reasons were given for the action.

This represents further defiance by South Africa, both of the original League of Nations mandate over South West Africa, which guaranteed missionaries the right to work in the territory, and of the U.N., which has declared the mandate at an end and set up a Council to administer the territory and prepare it for independence.

Bishop Mize is the third Anglican bishop to have been banished in recent years. Bishop Ambrose Reeves was refused re-entry to South Africa when seeking to return to his Johannesburg diocese in 1960, and Bishop Edward Growthier of Kimberley was deported in 1967. The Rev. Mark Garrison, an American priest who worked with Bishop Mize, was denied a permit renewal in 1966.

According to Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa, Bishop Mize was an out-and-out pacifist and tried to avoid the issue of apartheid. The bishop's departure will virtually close down American Episcopalian work in the territory.

The Archbishop of Cape Town and other South African religious leaders have protested to the South African authorities and the U.S. State Department has made strong representations to the South African government. Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa asks Americans to add their protest by writing to: Ambassador H. L. T. Taswell, South African Embassy, 3051 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20008.

"Smugness and Shock"

The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King has made more impact on Africa than any American event since the death of President Kennedy, according to the Washington Post (4/6/68). While messages poured out from African heads of state and other leaders to Mrs. King and to President Johnson, Africans at all levels expressed to one another their shock and sorrow at the murder of a yet another world renowned and revered American, a leader of black people in a land of whites.

In Southern Africa it can be assumed there were many who would have expressed publicly, were they not kept silent by police state tyranny, the view of many Afro-Americans, that this event underscored the failure of non-violence and the necessity in the future to engage in armed struggle to win basic human rights. As it was, since militant black leaders are now either behind bars, in hiding, or in exile, only the most moderate and conservative were available and ready to comment - as might be expected - in condemnation of American black power advocates such as Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown.

While there are South African whites who sincerely mourn King's death, many regard the assassination and riots as yet another vindication of "our traditional way of life," according to the Johannesburg Star (4/13/68). "It just goes to prove that integration only aggravates racial hatred," was a typical comment recorded by the Star.

As usual, such whites completely fail to see that it is the non-implementation of professed integrationist policies that has brought about the present crisis in race relations in the U.S. They thus fail to recognize in the riots in America the writing on the wall that spells the doom of the apartheid police state.

"Swazi Leaders in the United States for Orientation"

The three Swazis who will be principally responsible for their country's external relations after independence are now in Washington, D.C. for an intensive

"orientation" program (Johannesburg Star, 5/4/68). They are Minister-of-State-designate for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Zonke Khumalo; the Ambassador-designate to the U.S., Canada and the U.N., Dr. Samuel Sukati, M.B.E.; and the High Commissioner Designate to London, Mr. Nkomonde Ntiwane.

Swaziland is one of the three "enclave" territories land-locked within the white dominated countries around them.

MORE WAR THAN MOST: Part III - "Portuguese Defenses in Guinea-Bissau"

After last issue's review of the African nationalists' organization and activity, it is necessary to flip the coin and examine the known facts about the state of the Portuguese military structures and alliances. The Portuguese have allocated 20-35,000 troops to fight the war in Guinea, but in essence the key to the Portuguese staying power depends upon her air and naval strategy. As one commentator wrote: "The rugged terrain makes this an air war, both for attack and for transporting troops and supplies." In addition, the numerous coastal inlets and waterways necessitate the use of "gunboat" patrols by the Portuguese. On the air front, the Portuguese have Sabre and Fiat jets, and depend heavily on helicopters. The major thrust is to drop napalm and phosphorus bombs on nationalist occupied (Free Zone) areas and anti-aircraft positions. Fragments of the bombs have been cited as marked "Made in U.S.A." (CSM 1/12/68). Naturally the main source of Portuguese weaponry is NATO, which includes \$1 million worth of American military equipment per year (Washington Post, 4/28/68). Amilcar Cabral, Secretary General of the revolutionary PAIGC, has criticized Portugal's NATO participation as bestowing a decidedly unfair advantage on Lisbon, and has stated that if the Portuguese Government were forced to pay directly for their arms, it would likewise be forced to negotiate with the African nationalists. In a more particular instance, the United States has loaned Portugal funds for the building of naval escort destroyers, vessels which could be conceivably deployed in the Guinea war.

Beyond Portuguese continued dependence on NATO alliance supplies, the colonial authorities are concentrating on the defense of their strongholds in the Guinea urban centers and on the offshore islands. A new military and civil airfield is being constructed near Bissau, complete with guard towers, barbed wire and machine gun nests. The Cape Verde Islands, 500 miles off the coast, are the center of logistical support to the mainland areas. The Portuguese are constructing a military communications complex on Sao Vicente Island as well as improving the island's harbor facilities. On nearby Salt Island the South African Government, through South African Airways, is plowing \$7.5 million into the rebuilding of an airfield. Both Bissau and Salt Island are bases for the Portuguese air force, and recently a U.S. Naval patrol squadron used the Salt Island strip "apparently only for exercise purposes." Heavy security surrounds the bases, no tourists are allowed on the islands and the PIDE swarm around the Salt Island airfield. The only planes with clearance rights are those of TAP, the national Portuguese airline, a Brazilian line and a local company. In 1967 jet flights between Lisbon and Bissau were established. A Portuguese airforce colonel commands the air traffic zone for the Cape Verdes and Guinea mainland, and it is more than apparent that "The Portuguese mean to stay in the islands for good." From the other vantage point it is said that until the threat of Portuguese air power is reduced, the African nationalists will avoid moving into the more visible urban centers in Guinea.

On another level, the Portuguese are attempting to widen their influence over the local population through encouraging (with money) the growth of an African militia and even in some cases by hiring convicts for military service at 6¹/₂ per day.

In April, 1967 the Governor of Guinea announced that African language programs would be introduced in Guinea and that the power of the Government stations would be expanded. (In July of the same year, the PAIGC initiated Radio Liberte'.) The Portuguese press cites progress in the training and arming of hamlet villagers, through the relocation and fortification of reminiscent "strategic hamlets" and the exacerbation of any possible ethnic conflicts (New York Times, 1/15/68). On the economic front, Guinea suffers because of her small size and lack of mineral wealth, with the only major hope resting with the discovery of petroleum. Esso Guinea Exploration Inc. holds an exclusive petroleum concession in Guinea, with projected investments of \$10.5 million over the next four years. The Portuguese will depend heavily on this American investment to fulfill their projected Third Development Plan for Guinea.

Note: The entire report on the Portuguese defense in Guinea comes from a Copley News Service story from London, reprinted in the San Diego Union, Dec. 14, 1967.

"And From Mozambique"

On March 25, Dr. Eduardo Mondlane, President of the Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO), held a Press Conference in Dar Es Salaam to announce the reopening of another Frelimo front in the northwest Tete Province of Mozambique. This region is particularly important as the location of the projected hydro-electric dam at Cabora Bassa. Bids for the dam construction have come from Western European, American and South African sources, and the Portuguese have plans to settle one million Portuguese in the Zambesi valley. At the press conference, Dr. Mondlane revealed that the intensity of South African interest in the area can be measured by the fact that South African troops (1 battalion and several companies) have been sent "to defend the site of the dam". Thus the importance of the "popular armed struggle in Tete", for with "the progress of the struggle in this province, successive regions will be detached from the control of the Portuguese."

INSIDE SOUTH AFRICA

"African Family Life"

The destruction of family life and normal patterns of marriage is becoming an ever increasing problem for Africans. The problems resulting from this situation are shown in part by the large number of illegitimate children born. The figures for Pretoria for 1965 are as follows: of the 8,455 children born to African women, 2,289 of them were illegitimate (62nd Annual Report of the Medical Officer of Health for Pretoria).

In a typical township of approximately 7,000 inhabitants, more than a third of whom are of marriageable age, not more than 13 marriages took place during the whole of 1967. The high cost of living is a chief factor in this, making it extremely difficult for a young man to afford marriage. Further, the growing indifference to marriage is a result of the restrictive law which makes it impossible for a man or woman to marry outside his/her proclaimed area without facing great obstacles in living together as man and wife (Johannesburg Star, April 20).

"South Africa's Billion"

The Minister of Finance, Dr. N. Diederichs, opened the annual congress of the Institute of Credit Managers in Cape Town by announcing that South Africa's gold and foreign exchange reserves have passed the one billion mark for the first time. He said: "Our financial strength and our credit as a country have never stood higher" (Star, 4/27/68).

"Drop in Number of Bannings"

There has been a significant decrease in the number of people restricted or warned under the Suppression of Communism Act. In 1966, 263 people were prohibited from being in certain areas or from leaving certain areas. In 1967, only 86 people were so restricted. The number of people prohibited from attending certain meetings dropped from 258 to 89, and the number of "warnings" by magistrates dropped from 27 to 2. What these statistics show is that the Government has achieved a level of control that makes it unnecessary for many more people to be silenced. Non-white political leaders are already either in exile, restricted or imprisoned. Opposition has been frightened into silence. (Star, 4/27/68)

"Fight for Coloured Representation Lost"

With the passage of the Separate Representation of Voters Amendment Bill, the representation of Coloureds in Parliament ends with the close of the present session of Parliament. This is the final step in a long series of measures which have slowly diminished the rights of the coloured people. According to Helen Suzman, Progressive Party M.P., the real reason for this action is to prevent the Progressive Party from winning four more seats in Parliament, as the Coloureds oppose both Nationalist and United Party policy. A new Coloured Peoples' Representative Council will be set up where coloureds can "exercise their political rights," says the Minister of Coloured Affairs, Mr. Viljoen. The Council will begin to function in May or June of 1970. However, in reality it will have no power. It will be composed of 40 elected and 20 nominated members. The Minister of Coloured Affairs must approve all legislation that is even introduced for discussion in the Council, and the State President will have a veto over all legislation. Further, the Council will have no taxing power. There is no proper machinery for consultation between Parliament and the Council. The Progressive Party has opposed this action but to no avail.

"Prohibition of Improper Interference Bill"

The Liberal Party has disbanded because the Prohibition of Improper Interference Bill makes the existence of multiracial political parties illegal. The Liberal Party has stood for a universal franchise. The only representatives that it ever had in Parliament were 4 members representing the African population. This representation was ended by the Government and since that time the Liberal Party has had very little impact. Alan Paton, President of the Party, speaking at its closing meeting, pointed out that the bill enabled the Nationalists and the Nationalists alone to interfere in the politics of other races (New York Times, 5/9/68). For the Liberal Party to continue to exist, it would have had to violate its fundamental principle that membership be open to all persons who subscribe to its objects, regardless of race, colour or creed. This it is unwilling to do; it is unwilling to conform to the demands of apartheid (Star, 4/27/68).

The Progressive Party has reacted to the Prohibition of multiracial parties in a different way. It has chosen to become uniraical but only "under protest and under compulsion." The Progs state that the work they are doing must be carried on and that the non-white members of the party want the white members to carry on, on behalf of those who no longer will be allowed to participate (Star, 4/27/68).

"Alan Paton to Address NUSAS"

Alan Paton, President of the now disbanded Liberal Party of South Africa and honorary Vice-President of the National Union of South African Students, will deliver the 1968 Day of Affirmation of Academic and Human Freedom address at the University of Witwatersrand in June.

The address, organized by NUSAS, is the culmination of an annual protest against the Government's legislative violation of the concept of academic and human freedom. NUSAS President, John Daniel, said this year's ceremony would also mark the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which forms the basic policy of NUSAS. The ceremony on June 5 at which Paton is to speak is the culmination of a series of "Human Rights Weeks" at all major university centers.

The annual NUSAS Congress will also be held at the University of Witwatersrand this year, from June 30 to July 9. (Sunday Times, Johannesburg, 3/31/68)

"\$140 Million Arms Plan"

The Minister of Defense, Mr. P. W. Botha, has introduced a bill in Parliament which will establish the Armaments Development and Production Corporation of South Africa - - Armscor. It will be a State-owned industry with a share of capital of at least \$140 million. Its purpose will be to guarantee South Africa's future supplies of armaments in the face of mounting arms boycotts and threats of boycotts. It will also manufacture arms for export and firearms and ammunition for supply to the general public. (Johannesburg Star, 5/4/68).

THE PRESS, IDEOLOGY AND SOUTHERN AFRICA

Those of us writing for the Survey are well-acquainted with the biases of the American press concerning news on southern Africa. What little daily news exists is found in the Washington Post, the Christian Science Monitor, and the New York Times; that news is spotty, erratic in coverage and quality and seldom well-informed with the total picture of African contemporary diplomacy, economy, and polity. Much better is the coverage of the London Times, Manchester Guardian, and Observer of London, but that, all too reflective of old colonial ties, is not startling. And these papers seldom have good news on developments in the African liberation movements.

Africa: Agence France Presse and the AFP press clippings are more informative. On top of it all, with a keen eye on economic developments, are the house journals and news summaries of several industrial firms. Perhaps the London Financial Times is the best source of developments in the mining and economics section on southern Africa. Best of all is the pro-southern Africa twice-monthly London journal called Southern Africa - especially on new companies and financial arrangements in southern Africa...and their monthly review of the goings and comings from London to Cape Town of British gentry and financial barons provides good entertainment.

The biases of American journals are worse than the erratic news coverage. Time is worst of all on almost all African news. Min-skirts in Lusaka, savagery and missionary heroism in the Congo, John-Wayne-get-tough-mercenaries in Rwanda, and blood in Nigeria is the frequent fare of this cornerstone of American journalism. Newsweek is somewhat better, though hardly worth perusing for anything African. U.S. News and World Report is always good for an interview with Vorster or Ian Smith on how well the whites are doing and how dangerous investment is in black nations. And the liberal to radical journals just do not have much at all...and that includes New Republic, Dissent, Liberation, Commonweal, and Ramparts. Africa draws all but a blank. It even took the Saturday Evening Post in monthly format to discover the CIA-Portuguese deal for B-26 bombers for African use.

The British press is slightly less erratic. Combined with Le Monde one can find somewhere most of the major news stories of the anglo- and francophonic areas. All have the major problem of relying on "stringers", locally-based reporters who file copy to any number of different buyers and occasionally sign themselves on full-time for some given period to cover a major newsbreak. Many stringers cover too

large an area to cover anything but the major stories- e.g. all of East and Central Africa. Others live in the community in which they report and therefore are careful not to "jeopardize their sources." Too frequently, the contacts of such men are to some extent continuations of their colonial contacts and the men themselves may be former colonial civil servants who are fre-enterprising with the expertise they gathered in their former more official capacities.

Worst of all are the ideological styles which too frequently appear in the stories. Several years ago it was popular to see the "Red Threat" all over Africa, but after African students returning from Eastern bloc universities failed to set the continent afire with Bolshevism and after several conspicuous difficulties of Soviet missions in African countries, the "Red Threat" receded. Currently, it is replaced by the "Chinese threat", which is backed with one of the smallest aid programs by any major foreign power in Africa, the possibility of Chinese railway builders in Zambia, and the conspicuous Chinese trade and friendship exhibitions and delegations in Africa.

Between the two "red phases" of reporting on Africa, the Congolese and Nigerian civil wars occasioned the "Great Return to Tribalism" twist to our stories, which have ignored both the great complexities of tribe and identity in all these lands as well as the growing sociological and anthropological literature on the function of tribe and tribal identity in the modernization process.

Now the re-appearance of Soviet and Chinese military equipment in Rhodesia may give additional fuel to the "Red Hunters".

One wonders what the Western news media may have in store for us in the future years. Undoubtedly, we shall awake some morning to discover that there are indeed liberation movements in southern Africa and that they already operate over and, in some cases, control large areas of land. We also shall discover that South Africa has a rather formidable armaments supply and burdgeenning industry, due in a major part to U.S., U.K., West German, French and Italian technology and technicians (including ability to build a military jet, defeat a naval blockade with South African-manned submarines, and even mount a tactical nuclear attack - thanks to an initial reactor sold by a U.S. firm). Readers of this publication need not be surprised at these developments.

What we can be surprised at is the inability of the world's wealthiest, most other-directed, and technologically advanced nation to provide any sophisticated coverage on an area which increasingly involves the economic, strategic, political and social interests of this nation.

(Note: some sections from Africa Confidential, No. 6, 3/15/68)

INSIDE RHODESIA

"Rhodesia and Britain" (Rhodesia and British Company Assets)

Before UDI, Britain found Rhodesia a useful source of income and trade - through direct investments, cheap raw materials (e.g. asbestos), a big share of the lucrative tobacco market and relatively cheap tobacco, banking business, etc. As UDI trade relations came to a halt, and Rhodesia retaliated against the already weak U.K. economy with non-payment of U.K. bank loans and interest, non-payment of dividends to U.K. holders of Rhodesian stock, and Rhodesian channelling of business into non-U.K. firms in Rhodesia, increasingly Japanese, French and West German goods are preferred over British stock. Rhodesian goods are shipped in non-U.K. shippers.

Perhaps worst of all, the Rhodesian exchange control stops all payment of profits to the U.K. Some big U.K. companies in Rhodesia are now on a maintenance and care basis - notably the British Motor Corp. and Ford auto assembly plants. Ford

has sold its plant and left. BMC has its plant on a care and maintenance basis. Firms like BMC, Dunlop, Imperial Gallahers (tobacco), Turner and Newall (asbestos) all debate whether to try to cut losses and get out or to hang on in hopes of a settlement soon. Needless to say, as long as there is a hope of a settlement under any terms, these financial interests have a vested interest in that settlement. (Sunday Times, 3/10/68)

Also in this light, it is not surprising to see 18 Conservative U.K. MP's tabling a motion of censure against the Wilson government for her abhorrence of Rhodesia, her referral of the problem to the U.N., and her use of the Queen in an attempt to avoid the hangings of the African prisoners. Another group of 30 MP's attempted to censure the Wilson invocation of the Queen in the hangings. (Southern Africa, 3/18/68) And in spite of all the talk to the contrary about the hangings ending all basis for conference and conversations between the Rhodesian and British governments, middle-ground conservatives like Duncan Sandys (former Conservative Colonial Secretary) call for resumed talks and castigate Wilson for attempting to "invoke authority where no power exists." (Southern Africa, 3/18/68)

"Sanctions - Britain Calls for Extensions"

Britain proposed to the U.N. Security Council that mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia be extended - countering an Afro-Asian draft calling for UK use of force against Rhodesia.

In spite of Rhodesian "confidence statistics" for 1967, the worst drought in 44 years and the failure to move the tobacco crop for 1966 and 1967 means Rhodesia still could be hurt if sanctions could be made effective and all foreign exchange cut off from countries outside southern Africa. South Africa and Portugal alone could not bolster the Rhodesian economy without considerable expense and loss of exchange themselves.

New mandatory measures if approved in the U.N. are to ban

- (1) all imports of Rhodesian goods;
- (2) all exports of Rhodesian goods;
- (3) all transport of Rhodesian goods;
- (4) all investment in Rhodesia;
- (5) acceptance of all Rhodesian passports;
- (6) all flights directly or indirectly to Rhodesia;
- (7) all immigration to Rhodesia;
- (8) allowing entrance of one's country of any known "sanctions breakers and active supporters of the illegal regime";
- (9) all credits or loans to Rhodesia;
- (10) acceptance of Rhodesian goods on consignment;
- (11) acceptance of Rhodesian post and tele-communications.

A special committee of all members of the Security Council would oversee these complete sanctions, which allow exceptions only for medical, educational, informational and food products (e.g. foods, educational equipment, books, periodicals, newspapers). Members would be required to report on their compliance at quarterly intervals. The new sanctions would be applied to the "landlocked states of Africa" only to the extent they feel they can cooperate. (London Times, 4/24; 4/25; AFP 4/25; Washington Post, 4/24)

British opinion seems strongly behind this new sanction attempt to equalize the burden among the Western partners, some of whom have been profiting by Britain's unilateral complete sanctions. Thus the London Times comments: "It is now for the members of the U.N. to show whether they can make sanctions effective...by firm controls in their own areas and over their own traders. If, given time, they cannot or will not do so, they can hardly expect Britain indefinitely to continue to bear a costly burden that others will not share... The British Government's responsibility to the Africans in Rhodesia is fully acknowledged, but no Government can long forget its prime responsibility to its people at home." (Times, 4/25/68)

"Sanctions Busting"

Rhodesians have been making plans to cope with the possible new sanctions, especially those against travel, postal, and telecommunications. Some in South Africa feel it likely that the U.S. and Commonwealth nations may join the U.K. but not France, Germany, and other European countries. (Johannesburg Star, 3/16/68)

Sleuthing by a U.K. Observer correspondent has uncovered the entry of Rhodesian meat into the U.K. and other sanction busting operations in Europe and Africa. Tobacco is routed through the "free ports" of Holland with customers including West Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. False U.S. and South African documents are used in the transactions. Meat is routed through the Canary Islands and sold with false Argentine papers. Rhodesia's secret trading organization "Universal Exports" (Univex) is covered in its public operations by the French organization SEFA. (London Observer, 3/17/68)

"Guerrilla Action Continues in Rhodesia"

Continued reports from Rhodesia reveal a more or less constant confrontation of Rhodesian-South African security forces and guerrillas of Rhodesian and South African origin. The corner seems to have been turned from sporadic crossings from Zambia of small contingents of Rhodesian Africans to a more or less small but constant stream of revolutionaries. This has resulted in the embarrassing reporting from Rhodesia that every week is a "mopping up" operation.

During March the entire security forces of Rhodesia were alerted, including Police Reservists, Army Territorial Forces, Air Forces, and South African "police". In addition to the Rhodesian (Canberra) jet bombers, South Africa supplied and maintained tanks are being used against the guerrillas. One incident involved Rhodesian bombs falling in the wrong area with the death of four Rhodesia Government soldiers. (London Times, 3/22 and 3/25; Financial Times, 3/26)

ZAFU and ZANU statements total 56 Rhodesian soldiers killed in action north of Salisbury up to the end of March. And rumors circulate of increased citizen participation in the guerrilla activity, including the assassination of informers.

Rhodesians claim that guerrilla leaders are red-bloc trained, induce men into fighting service with promises of educational scholarships, and surrender without significant resistance when confronted (CSM, 3/30). But Rhodesian planes have been dropping pamphlets urging guerrillas to "surrender at once or die" in parts of the Zambesi Valley. The seriousness of the action is belied by the statements of the South African General Keevy who says there is no intention to withdraw present South African reinforcements and that further men and military equipment is immediately available if needed to help in the running battles. (Economist, 3/23; Economic Times, 4/1 and 3/29)

During March the South African ANC and Rhodesian ZAFU groups fought in concert in the Karoi and Miami areas (on the Salisbury-Lusaka road). Actions included an air-strike against the guerrillas, extensive use of helicopters, and actions in which ANC-ZAFU claimed 56 Government soldiers killed plus two jets and one helicopter downed. ANC-ZAFU reports that the entire area north of Salisbury was an "attack zone." (East African Standard, 3/25 and 3/26) These attacks were described in Zambia by ZAFU leaders as "vengeance attacks" for the hanging of the five Africans in Salisbury. Rhodesian Government forces claimed 17 guerrillas and two RG soldiers killed in the actions. (East African Standard, 3/26; Toronto Globe and Mail, 3/27)

The aim of the Rhodesian Government is to isolate the guerrillas from the main towns and from merging with the local population. The Rhodesian Government estimated 50 guerrillas were involved in the encounters. ZAFU leaders in Lusaka claimed they had overrun the small administrative center of Miami, 80 miles inside the Rhodesia border from Zambia. (Globe and Mail, 3/28)

Equipment continues to be the excellent Russian machine guns, Chinese bamboo and steel bazookas, American hand grenades, and other arms from the international arms market. The Rhodesian African Rifles opposing the guerrillas carry Belgian automatic rifles or British machine guns, machetes, and antipersonnel grenades.

The RAR troops are largely African expatriots (especially Malawians who volunteer for 7 year terms). Information on the guerrillas comes from local residents, some of whom gossip about unusual occurrences, some of whom tell for money, some of whom tell for fear of retribution. The Rhodesian Government claims that many of the fighters are South Africans, some of whom are "press-ganged" into service in Zambia. Training, they claim, takes place in China, USSR, Tanzania, and Zambia. (Christian Science Monitor, 3/30)

ZAPU sources claim scores of white forces hospitalized in military commandeered hospitals in Karoi, Sinoia, and Inkomo, and some desertion from the white forces into Botswana. (Mayibuye, 3/30; Nairobi Daily Nation, 4/1; The Nationalist, Dar-es-Salaam, 4/1)

In press communiques, the ZAPU-ANC forces claim that all action during March-April came not from new incursions but from forces permanently established in Rhodesia. (Mayibuye, 4/7)

The South African Rand Daily Mail commented, "Terrorists in the new incursions are proving better-armed, better-equipped, better trained and tougher than those in previous forays" (March 28). Die Burger noted that after the fighting, "...a strong base camp was found and which has been built over a long period. That has been destroyed, and the elimination of the rest of the small army of invasion is under way" (March 25). The Durban Sunday Tribune noted that "the choice of the camp site perched on a cliff and consisting of several acres of camouflaged supply dumps, ammunition dumps and bivouac areas, indicated a high degree of organization and training on the 'terrorist' side. The camp was approachable only across open space which afforded the 'terrorists' a clear field of fire. The 'terrorists' had good medical supplies and modern drugs including snake-bite kits and even transistor radios. They methodically entered radio news into a group 'war diary' and kept regular accounts of rations issued. Ration books showed they had hunted and killed rhino to supplement their supplies of Rhodesian-made tinned goods and South African tinned fish" (March 24).

Further action was claimed by ZAPU-ANC in the Banket and Mtorashanga areas on April 13 and near Salisbury around April 1. In another incident, nationalists claimed that a Rhodesian patrol boat with South African and Rhodesian troops exploded in Lake Kariba on April 16. The explosion, it is thought, was caused by the explosion of a mine in the boat. (ZAPU-ANC Communique, 4/16/68)

The extent of the operations was finally admitted by Ian Smith on April 28 when he noted that "We have come to the conclusion that we may have to live with this sort of thing for quite a while." Guerrillas in some areas have set up permanent camps, begun indoctrination programs to local inhabitants, attempted to make local recruits and to extract local food and supplies. (Outpost, magazine of the British South Africa Police, March 1968; and Globe Daily Mail, Toronto, 4/30)

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

"Engelhard Honored"

Word was recently received that Bucknell University hoped to grant an honorary doctorate to Mr. Charles Engelhard at its June 2 Commencement exercises. Bucknell is the university in the hills of Pennsylvania that sponsors an African Conference annually at which scores of Southern Africans express their uncompromising opinion about the evil of apartheid and American investment in the Afrikaner racist regime. Evidently these annual conferences have had little effect on the administration of the university and the Board of Trustees. Besides, there are members of the Board of Trustees who may have suggested such an honor, including:

Dr. William R. White of New York City, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, is also on the Board of Directors of Schick, which has several plants in South Africa. He is also Vice-President of Morgan Guaranty Trust, one of the ten banks which have formed the consortium for loans to the South African Government.

Dr. Robert L. Rooke of Newark, N.J., a member of the New York Stock Exchange and Director of Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith. He speculates in precious metals.

Dr. Paul L. Troast of Clifton, N.J., Director of the New Jersey Bank and Trust, Trustee of Kress Foundation, Chairman of the New Jersey Economic Development Council, and State Chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews (the organization which in 1966 awarded Engelhard the "Brotherhood Award").

Dr. Detley W. Bronk of New York City, President of the Rockefeller Institute and Trustee of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Also connected with Sloan-Kettering.

Mr. Engelhard has apparently found it impossible to be present at the Commencement, and presence is a requirement for receiving an honorary degree. He is an extremely busy man, and may well be out of the country.

Other honors in the social world have been given the Engelhards, by the New York Times (May 27) which has a long article on a benefit given in New Jersey by the Duke and Duchess of Windsor at which the Engelhards were present, along with other members of New Jersey's "beautiful people", and in the Special May issue of Vogue which suggests Mrs. Jane Engelhard to be one of the women of the year.

"Stokely and Miriam"

On Monday April 29 Stokely Carmichael of "Black Power" fame married Miriam Makeba, the versatile South African songstress. The wedding took place in Washington, D.C. and the Washington Afro-American (May 4) reports the following: "The couple applied for the license on April 22. In answer to a question asking the color of the applicants, both wrote, 'beautiful black.' They will reside in a section of Washington informally called by some of its inhabitants 'Gold Coast.'"

"A New Slant to Job Reservation"

The World (April 11) reported that "The Department of Bantu Administration and Development (B.A.D.) is at present actively engaged in a scheme whereby members of its African staff are encouraged to obtain higher educational qualifications, according to a statement issued in Pretoria this week... The purpose of this scheme, as well as other existing schemes, was to build a nucleus of properly trained African officials who will be in a position to perform all duties in the 'homelands'."

In other words, African staff of B.A.D. are urged to go to night school, not so they can better their positions, earn higher salaries, or move up in the professional scale, but in order that they may be fired, relocated, and placed in positions in the "Bantu homelands" that have none of these benefits! One might call it "Education for Retrogression."

"'South Pacific' Harmful"

South Africa's Minister of the Interior, Mr. LeRoux, calls "South Pacific" "Contrary to the public interest, and offensive or harmful to public morals." The film version of the play was cut by the censors. Although the play as such was not banned, the person who applied for the production of it was strongly urged not to stage it. LeRoux said that the play is a plea for the intermingling of races of different color. (Daily Dispatch, East London, March 16)

UNITED STATES INVESTMENTS AND YOU

At several college campuses this spring the issue of an institution's investments in companies doing business in South Africa has been raised. At the University of California at Santa Barbara, Princeton University, Cornell University and most recently the University of Wisconsin, black and white students, working in coalition, have challenged the continuation of these investments. The usual demand has been to sell the stocks and to use the proceeds to underwrite scholarships for refugee students from Southern Africa, especially South Africa.

There are a number of student meetings this summer all over the country at which time the issue of investments should be discussed. It is not an issue distant from the student community, since students must begin to realize the intimate financial connections between American corporate growth (with its increasing emphasis on overseas expansion) and university expansion. Large donations to building funds, endowments, and academic chairs come from the large corporations whose directors and presidents are found most conspicuously on the boards of universities and colleges. These boards are closed corporate entities responsible only to themselves, and are not required by law to disclose their corporate activities, most especially the university's real estate holdings. The question most focused by the Columbia rebellion was the following: Is the university a corporation or an academic institution? It is this question we would hope every student meeting this summer would raise, for it bears vitally on a university's stock portfolio which, in turn, supports companies doing business in South Africa. If an American university, as academic institution, is committed to the freedom of speech and of movement, then it must be committed to those principles in all of its institutional roles. Since American companies in South Africa strengthen the economy of an apartheid government whose laws abrogate those principles, support of those companies through stock ownership is inconsistent with one of the fundamental commitments of the academic institution. For several years Yale University has sought to be consistent with her role as an academic institution, thereby not investing in any of the 260 companies (except four) which did business in South Africa. We hope that the current leaders of the Yale Corporation will continue what we consider an outstanding example.

As mentioned, domestic student meetings this summer are an excellent place to raise the issue of the institutional self-definition of the university. But there are international meetings of students this summer as well. A fitting line of pursuit would be discussions among representatives of South Africa's major trading partners (U.K., U.S.A., France, Japan, Germany and Italy). While a boycott is almost out of the question economically, and certainly politically, the questions still remain: in what key areas of South Africa's economy does each trading partner participate, and how is that key area strengthening apartheid? On another issue, that of the breaking of Rhodesian sanctions, these same countries are vitally linked to that issue since nationals in each of those countries are aiding in sanction-breaking (Cf. London Observer, 3/17/68). Movements by students who expose and then counter these various nationals will strengthen the forces which seek to undermine the regime of Ian Smith, forces which are operating within the broad mandate provided by the United Nations.

Another activity would be for representatives from student meetings to visit the headquarters of companies in South Africa whenever the location of those headquarters coincide with the location of the student meeting. The following cities are listed in alphabetical order, followed by important companies in South Africa in the hope that students will interview members of the management concerning their company's policy in South Africa, e.g. wage scale, hiring practices, fringe benefits, etc. One must remember, of course, that the South African government controls all these policies, so once these questions have been asked, an important line of questioning would concern the American company's role in an authoritarian, state-controlled economy.

Akron, Ohio	Firestone Tire and Rubber, General Tire and Rubber
Baltimore, Maryland	Eastern Stainless Steep Corporation
Bartlesville, Oklahoma	Phillips Petroleum, Co.
Battlecreek, Michigan	Kellogg Company
Canton, Ohio	Timken Roller Bearing Company
Chicago, Illinois	Link-Belt Company, International Harvester Company
Cleveland, Ohio	Thompson Ramco Woolridge Company
Columbus, Ohio	The Jeffrey Company
Denver, Colorado	Denver Equipment Company
Geneva, Switzerland	Chrysler International, South Africa
Greensboro, North Carolina	Burlington Industries, Inc.
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Allis-Chalmers International, Inc.
Moline, Illinois	Deere and Company
New York City	American South African Investment Company, California Texas Oil Corporation (Caltex), Esso Standard Eastern Inc., Farrell Lines, Inc. General Motors Overseas Operations, Mobil Petroleum Company, Newmont Mining Corporation St. Regis Paper Company Le Tourneau Westinghouse Company
Peoria, Illinois	Rohm and Haas Company
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Joy Manufacturing Company
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	J. I. Case Company
Racine, Wisconsin	Symington Wayne Corporation
Salisbury, Maryland	Crown Zellerbach Corporation
San Francisco, California	Hewitt-Robbins, Inc.
Stamford, Connecticut	Weyerhaeuser Company
Tacoma, Washington	Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corporation, Kaiser Jeep Overseas, South Africa
Toledo, Ohio	Heinemann Electric Company
Trenton, New Jersey	Norton Company
Worcester, Massachusetts	Berkshires Knitting Mills
Wyomissing, Pennsylvania	

INDUSTRIALIZATION OF ANGOLA AND MOZAMBIQUE

An Ambitious economic development program five times the size of its 1959-64 program has been launched by Portugal. Of the total, 27 percent is to be spent in Mozambique and Angola over the next six years in a program that stresses mining and manufacturing, transport and communication, agriculture, education and research, and hydroelectrical power in that order of priority.

The funding for this development program is to come from public and internal credit sources (76%) and from sources outside Portugal, chiefly the Republic of South Africa (SA Financial Gazette, 2/9). It is obvious that South African investment in Mozambique and Angola will be inclined to work toward an integration of these two territories in a Southern Africa market which will threaten the Lisbon government's prime concern of a common market embracing all the Portuguese territories and controlled by the central government.

Aside from the Republic of South Africa's investment and promises to buy power from three hydroelectric developments in Angola and Mozambique, there are other signs of rapid industrialization for the two territories.

Cabinda Gulf Oil, a subsidiary of the American Gulf Oil Company, will begin production at the end of 1968 ten years after the start of exploration. It will have poured \$124 million into the project and in return will be getting an estimated 7,500,000 tons of oil a year when the wells reach peak production in 1970. The Portuguese will receive royalties plus 50% of the net profits. The production will eliminate the need for Angola to import oil in the future. (London Times, 3/20 and Business Europe 11/3) This oil find has brought a lot of activity to the enclave of Cabinda and considerable increase of foreign population in Luanda also.

The exploration and production of iron ore of good quality from Cassinga in Central Angola is another factor working for the industrialization of Angola. An international consortium headed by Krupp of West Germany has invested over \$100 million under the control of a Portuguese mining company. The production target is 500,000 tons a month by the end of 1968 and it is expected that the foreign creditors will have been paid off in the first seven years of an estimated twenty years of full production. The ore removal has necessitated the building of deep water port in Mocamedes and the extension of an existing rail line by 65 miles.

In Mozambique the Cabora Bassa Hydroelectric Project on the Zambesi River will function as a source of low cost electric power for industrial development in Southern Africa. It will make the Zambesi River navigable upstream as far as Tete and possibly as far as the Rhodesian border approximately 700 miles from the Indian Ocean. The dam construction is expected to take five years and will be another step toward a common market power concentration for all of Southern Africa. The plans call for a station capable of producing about 17 billion kilowatt hours of electricity yearly. This is nearly double Aswan's maximum capacity. The plans also project the construction of a second dam farther down the Zambesi River. (Journal of Commerce, 4/16/68)

Scientists from the Portuguese Atomic Energy Commission have visited South Africa for a week as guests of that country's Atomic Energy Board. The chairman of the Atomic Energy Board, Dr. Roux, said that South Africa was already cooperating with many Western countries and the visit should lead to closer cooperation between Portugal and South Africa in the nuclear field. (South African Digest, 4/19/68)

AT THE UNITED NATIONS

"U.N. Team Fails to Enter South West Africa"

The delegation from the U.N. Council on South West Africa is continuing its attempts to fly into South West Africa, despite the refusal to grant them visas. The purpose of the visit is to confront South Africa with the illegality of her control of South West Africa. So far their plans have been met with failure. The airlines which have been approached have not committed themselves to hiring a plane. The airlines recognize that their aircrafts would not be permitted to land by the South African authorities. If a landing is forced, they run the risk of having their planes confiscated.

Responses to the proposed landing varied in South Africa. The Prime Minister said that the U.N. Committee under no circumstances would be allowed to land. "I am not saying this just to be difficult but because I have a right to say it. We are not taking this attitude because we want to play at being big, but because a small nation is also entitled to its self respect," said the Prime Minister Vorster. He also stated: "A good Nationalist Government has existed there for years." And speaking for "white and non-white alike", he said "We cannot allow that we are prescribed to from outside how South Africa, white and non-white, should be ruled." (Die Beeld, 3/31/68)

The whole enterprise was an act of international piracy, said Die Vaderland (4/1/68). The purpose clearly was to provoke the South African Government into acting physically against the U.N. representatives, it said.

The Johannesburg Star (3/30/68) stated: "This, no doubt, is the occasion chosen for some sort of demonstration, for publicity is what the delegates hope for. A moment's thought ought to tell them that publicity will not evoke sympathy, but will emphasize the impotence of the world body."

"South African Foreign Minister Invites U.N. Representative
On Condition"

South Africa has informed U Thant that in the interests of all the people of South West Africa, the people convicted in Pretoria of terrorist activities could not be released and their release could not be discussed. However, South Africa, insisting it had nothing to hide, said it would be willing to receive a personal representative of the Secretary General, not to discuss the prisoners' release, but to give him "factual information about the territory." U Thant's representative would only be acceptable if South Africa could be assured that factual information would not be ignored as in the past. (Rand Daily Mail, 4/1/68)

"U.N. Office Rebuked"

South Africa last week sternly rebuked the United Nations Office of Public Information for presenting "a completely one-sided review" of South Africa. A booklet put out by the Office of Public Information (OPI) titled "The United Nations and Human Rights" prompted a letter of protest from Mr. Botha.

Mr. Botha said that publicity from OPI could not be allowed to endure unless it was to be "completely discredited as nothing but an instrument for the dissemination of malicious, politically inspired propaganda."

Botha contended that South Africa's policy was the reverse of the domination and repression indicated in the U.N. publication. "Separate development is not a policy of racial discrimination or racial superiority, but is an entirely pragmatic approach to an exceedingly complicated set of human relationships. The objectives pursued by South Africa are the same as those set out in the Charter of the United Nations and are in accordance with modern concepts of human rights and dignities," Mr. Botha said. (South African Digest, 4/1/68)

"South Africa Rebuked"

The U.N. Conference on Human Rights at Tehran, Iran approved an African resolution condemning racial discrimination by white minorities in Southern Africa despite reservations from several western nations. 21 countries, including the United States, abstained from the resolution condemning apartheid as a crime against humanity and as a "threat to international peace and security" punishable by international action. The resolution passed 53-0. The United States abstention is ritualistic now whenever a resolution tries to put the teeth of sanctions into a stand against South Africa. (Washington Post, 5/6/68)

"U.N. Group Calls for Use of Force in South West Africa Dispute"

The U.N. Council for South West Africa recommended today that the Security Council use force to break South Africa's hold on South West Africa. It stated that racial war is inevitable if South Africa refuses to turn South West Africa over to the United Nations. The Council President said "The Council is convinced that the situation constitutes the gravest threat to international peace and security in the area."

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

May-June, 1968