

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. 4 (Revised Edition)

March 1968

Contents:	Page No.
1. Editorial: "Black Death"	2
2. The Phantom Coalition	2
3. At the United Nations	3
4. Rhodesia and the Americans	6
5. Secret United States Arms Deal With South Africa	6
6. South Africa's Defence Policy Unveiled	7
7. Education: Apartheid Included in History Syllabus Matriculation Results Hardening of Apartheid in Education NUSAS Attacked by Government	8
8. Execution in Rhodesia	10
9. List of recently published articles on Southern Africa	11

IN MEMORY

of

CHARLES ANDERS WILHELM

Nov. 29, 1941 - Mar. 23, 1968

During the academic year 1966-67, the Chairman of UCM's Southern Africa Committee was Charles Wilhelm, who in 1966 received his M.A. in Christian Ethics from Columbia University and Union Theological Seminary. Since that time he passed his doctoral examinations in International Politics at Columbia. Charles died March 23 of lymphosarcoma, and although the loss of his life is a tremendous one to all who knew him, loved him, and worked with him, his life-giving spirit is still in our midst, pushing us to be more creative, more positive, more committed to Southern Africa concerns. His life was a commitment to those concerns, and many of the directions our work has taken were inspired and led by Charles.

Charles left us suddenly, yet his work and concerns go on. With the blessing of his wife, Carolyn, and other members of their families, a Charles Wilhelm Memorial Fund has been established at the UCM. Any persons who wish to express their communion with the Wilhelms and the Dickersons in the form of a gift may make their contribution to this fund. Be assured that it will be used to further the concerns which Charles and Carolyn shared so fully regarding Southern Africa. We invite all our readers to join us in this expression of our gratitude for Charles' life and in a community of concern for Southern Africa of which Charles and Carolyn have been a vital part, and for which they continue to be an inspiration.

Please make checks payable to the University Christian Movement, with an indication on them that it is for the Wilhelm Memorial Fund, and mail to the UCM, Room 758, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 10027.

EDITORIAL: "Black Death"

A prominent Briton recently said that Ian Smith had chosen the gallows as his symbol of self-assertion. And this is true. By hanging five Africans, Mr. Smith has taken the Rhodesian conflict over a new precipice and cast a glaring light on its transformation to a new violent level. It is clear that the Africans were hanged as a gesture of political power and that the British in their turn were forced to grant a reprieve. But the Hangman's noose caught more than five black necks, it caught a world-wide wave of revulsion and a cry for vengeance. It made five martyrs, and now the Zimbabweans must fight not only for freedom, but to avenge their dead.

As the Security Council of the United Nations meets, there is a confusion of viewpoints and a struggle over what constitutes practical action. It is here suggested that some of the confusion arises because the Rhodesian conflict is in transition from a rebellion against the British Crown to a civil war between black and white. It is not one; it is both.

As a rebellion, the conflict is over the legality of the government. The rebels must be made to return to legality. Sanctions are pushing them to doing this. In this view it is Britain's problem, her conflict. If Mr. Smith executes Africans, he executes "terrorists" and contravenes British law only because he ignored the Queen's reprieve.

If seen as a civil war, then it is black Zimbabwe's problem. It is a war for power. Mr. Smith has murdered freedom fighters and has executed prisoners of war. The only effective action will be for waves of guerrillas to invade Zimbabwe. To stretch the resources of the white man's war machine, until it cracks, just as the Vietcong have done in Vietnam.

Sickeningly, this is a race war and no quarter will be given. Black death will follow black death and the cry for vengeance will stir the blood of the living. A plague is growing in Southern Africa which may infect the world.

THE PHANTOM COALITION

Two publications (reaching somewhat different audiences) have recently directed their attention to the lines of confrontation that are being drawn in Southern Africa. Articles in the Providence, Rhode Island Journal ("Africa's Mason-Dixon line" by Sevellon Brown, Feb. 8, 1968) and Current History ("Southern Africa--the White Fortress" by Keith Irvine, February 1968) make reference to the development of a "phantom coalition" that is turning Southern Africa into a white fortress.

Both articles trace the growing military and economic strength of South Africa since the early 60's and the increasingly close ties among the white dominated countries. Mr. Brown concludes: "The growing economic and military strength of the white outposts, their increasing cohesion, the troubles that beset the rest of the continent and the indifference or greed of so many outside nations all combine to make any early change seem most unlikely." Mr. Irvine, although also pessimistic, sees a possibility that "South Africa's luck, together with that of her partners, which has held for seven years, may soon run out." He speculates on what might happen if (1) other international problems are settled and there is a resurgence of interest in Southern Africa; (2) France would turn to Niger rather than South Africa for uranium; (3) Television, and along with it gain in experience and support (here he speculates that "the situation may produce an unusual man--a twentieth century African Toussaint Louverture--who will, by the strength of his personality, exert a decisive influence.") Mr. Irvine concludes that "the situation therefore seems bound to escalate on both sides until, at last, the conflict becomes so insupportable and disruptive that the outside world is obliged to intervene."

"Power - - Hydroelectrical and Political"

In a joint statement issued on February 23, 1968, the governments of South Africa and Lesotho agreed, in principle, to proceed with the Oxbow hydroelectric scheme. In Maseru, Chief Jonathan said his government was negotiating with a big international

consortium for the construction work. The most extensive study of the feasibility of the project was done by the Capetown firm of Ninham, Shand and Partners. Stanley E. Sporseen, a member of the United States High Dams Commission, however, had looked over the proposed scheme on a visit to Lesotho four years ago, and was quoted by Newscheck (March 1, 1968) as having said: "To me, this is the kind of bargain we all look for and seldom find. And it is a bargain to both the seller and the purchaser."

It appears, however, that South Africa will be the major beneficiary--as both Newscheck and the London Times state quite openly. (London Times, Feb. 24 and Newscheck March 1). Lesotho has vast water resources and has been called the "sponge" of South Africa. As Newscheck puts it, "Oxbow will divert and canalise the vast water resources of the 'sponge' to where they are most needed--the industrial areas of the Southern Transvaal and the Orange Free State." The cost of the scheme involving huge dams, tunnels, water pipelines and hydro-stations may be as high as R100m. But it is estimated that Lesotho will sell electricity to the Republic for as little as R2.5m annually.

The Times Pretoria correspondent feels that South Africa has been cautious on the negotiations, fearing to invest so much in a country that might be expected to disapprove of her race policies. "These doubts appear to have been resolved on the assumption that if the Republic becomes associated in such schemes important to her neighbours, they would be likely to place political consideration in the background rather than put their economics into jeopardy." (London Times, Feb. 24, 1968)

The Oxbow scheme is only one part of attempts to utilize the hydroelectric potential in the Southern Africa area. The political implications of these attempts are far-reaching, as Dr. P. Smit hints in an article, "Water and Power" in Southern Africa (Feb. 5, 1968). (Dr. Smit is head of the geography department of the Africa Institute of South Africa.) All the important rivers are international (the Zambesi, Cunene, Okavango, Limpopo, Konati, Usutu, Orange River and Caledon River) and utilization of their resources would require cooperation between countries. Also the projects would have to be undertaken and utilized on a large scale to make them profitable--here again requiring international cooperation. Dr. Smit says, "Large projects are only possible if markets can be found for water and especially power beyond the borders of those countries where schemes are erected. A study of the water and power requirements of Southern Africa indicate that such a market exists in the Republic." (Our emphasis.) Whereas Dr. Smit sees Lesotho, at its "level of development", not being able to utilize more than 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ % of the water and power available from the Oxbow scheme by the end of the century, the Republic will be needing 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  times as much water as it now uses by that time. As far as utilization of water in the smaller countries for irrigation purposes is concerned, Dr. Smit remarks, "Experience has shown, however, that the Bantu do not adapt easily to irrigation projects where sustained labour is required throughout the year. As with industrial development, it will still be a long time before these countries can fully utilize the irrigation water made available by large projects."

Thus, the pattern repeats itself--the vast potential of this area will be tapped to the benefit of the white minority and the distribution of benefits will strengthen the status quo and the dependence of the exploited sections of the populace, and the "phantom coalition" draws closer together in a grid of power--political as well as economic.

#### AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Bishop Edward Crowther, exiled Bishop of Kimberly, appeared before the Special Committee on Apartheid of the U.N. on February 2. Bishop Crowther's presentation included recounts of the many personal confrontations he had with the South African government. One example was his attempt to feed 500 people who had been "dumped in the veld", after being forced to leave their homes, in terms of the Group Areas Act. The police tried to stop his efforts to provide food for these homeless and starving people.

In a brief comment on actions that should be taken, Bishop Crowther commented

upon the refusal to allow South Africa to join the Olympics. "White South Africans are fanatical about sport and such refusal to accept South Africa within the spirit of the Olympics would indicate very decisively world repugnance at the continued inequality of non-white South African athletes in competition and training facilities with their counterparts. Much publicized concessions in sport, loudly trumpeted throughout the world by Vorster, must not be allowed to obscure the fact that, for the average non-white participant or spectator, there is no difference in the policy of complete segregation."

Bishop Crowther also commented directly upon banking loans to the South African government: "I am glad to say that at least two Christian churches in the U.S. have definite recommendations before them for the withdrawal of their investments in those American banks which participate in apartheid by making loans available to the South African government."

#### "South West Africa Trial: U. N. Response" (Feb. 9)

The Council for South West Africa at the United Nations responded to the sentencing of 33 South West Africans with "profound shock and indignation." This trial had already been condemned by the General Assembly and Security Council as "a flagrant violation of the Government of South Africa of their (prisoner's) rights, and of the international status of the territory."

The Council for South West Africa referred the matter to the Security Council. The Human Rights Commission response also condemned the "illegal arrest, trial, conviction and sentence" of the South West Africans. Morris B. Abram, representing the United States, expressed "outrage at the conduct of the South African government at the trial of these so-called terrorists." The crimes which these people were accused of were in fact human rights, he stated.

The Human Rights Commission also asked for the immediate release of these convicted prisoners.

The Security Council met on February 16, 19 and 21, at the request of 60 states, to consider the sentences resulting from the illegal trial. In the Security Council debate a number of speakers condemned the South African action in regard to the trial and sentences, and called for measures to be taken by the Security Council. Several representatives proposed that sanctions be applied under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter. Further proposals included the following: that suspension of membership in the U.N. be considered for South Africa, that member states with political and economic relations with South Africa exert influence, that the Council issue a new appeal to South Africa, and that a special representative of the Secretary-General be dispatched to South Africa. Several speakers said the support of some western powers enabled South Africa to follow its present policies and to ignore U.N. decisions.

#### "South African Response to U. N. Appeals"

In a 54-page reply to the Secretary General on February 15, South Africa defended her right to try the South West Africans. In a comment seemingly unaware of the cause of guerrilla activity, South Africa stated that it would continue to combat terrorism by appropriate measures "at least until current political and social turmoil in Africa has abated and made way for greater stability." However, a section of the reply was even more outrageous: "Despite all efforts on foreign instigators to counter them, South Africa's policies enjoy the support of the overwhelming majority of the peoples of South West Africa and are achieving increasing success bringing satisfaction and security to them" A rare form of satisfaction and security indeed.

#### "Trial Observer's Reaction"

Professor Richard A. Falk, who had observed the illegal trial for the International Council of Jurists, stated the following in an interview in which he proposed that South Africa is preparing for new trials of this nature: (with permission of New York Times, March 3, 1968)

"The atmosphere of the trial was what you would expect in a police state," Professor Falk observed. "The prisoners were brought from the Pretoria jail through a gauntlet of barking dogs into a sort of cage, where they remained during the trial."

Referred to by Number

"The defendants were never referred to by name, but only by number," Professor Falk said. "This is part of the dehumanization of the African in general in South Africa."

"The Security police appeared to be engaged in an effort to gain increased power within the South African governing apparatus," he continued. "There are still at least 150 more prisoners being held incommunicado. The security police appear to be making the decisions about whom to prosecute and when."

"Pressure from the international community is the only thing which, in my judgment, might prevent South Africa from carrying out a series of these trials," Professor Falk said. "They are surprisingly sensitive to international opinion at times."

"The purpose of these trials is to dramatize to the white population the dangers that exist to the security of the state, and thus justify recourse to antidemocratic methods," Professor Falk said.

He scored the Terrorist Act; inequities he cited was the act's provision for "completely uncontrolled detention, with no charges made."

Professor Falk was one of the lawyers for Ethiopia and Liberia in the case they brought before the International Court of Justice accusing South Africa of having abused its mandate powers in South West Africa. The World Court ruled against Ethiopia and Liberia on technical grounds in 1966.

#### "Human Rights Commission Condemns Torture of South African Prisoners"

In a series of resolutions from February 16th to 21st, the Human Rights Commission looked at South Africa in its discussion of "situations which reveal a consistent pattern of violations of human rights."

The resolutions:

\*Unanimously condemned "torture and ill-treatment of prisoners in South African prisons" and called on South Africa to conform to minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners

\*Recommended without a dissenting vote that the General Assembly call on South Africa to repeal, amend and replace "discriminatory laws" and to release political prisoners, and asked the Assembly to condemn the acts of governments which maintain diplomatic and other relations with South Africa

\*Decided to look into prison conditions in the Portuguese territories

#### "Rhodesian Executions"

Both the Human Rights Commission and the Committee of 24 passed resolutions regarding the execution of Rhodesian political prisoners. The Human Rights Commission condemned the executions and asked the United Kingdom to take steps to restore the rights and freedoms of the African people in Rhodesia.

In a resolution in the Committee of 24 (Committee on Implementation of Independence to Colonies) the United States and the United Kingdom both abstained because one section "deplored the failure of the U.K. to prevent the perpetration of such crimes." In an often seen U.K.-U.S.A. alliance, the U.S. stated it regretted that censorious note of the draft.

RHODESIA AND THE AMERICANS

The American Southern African Council/Friends of Rhodesia recently came under the fire of Congressmen Ashbrook (Rep., Ohio) and Kykendall (Rep., Tenn.) for using their names in soliciting funds for a proposed Congressional trip to Rhodesia. Of the nine Congressmen named, only John Rarick (Dem., Miss.) and Thomas Abernethy (Dem., La.) participated in the trip. They were accompanied by Mr. Mainright Dawson, of the United Republicans of America, which is linked to the Liberty Lobby and to Mr. Carl Hess, the 1964 Goldwater speech-writer. The ASAC/FE were seeking \$32,000 for the trip in support of Rhodesia. Previously, most of their funds were obtained by letters of solicitation and from the sale of Rhodesian made goods to Americans. (Plain Dealer, January 24, 1968)

In Rhodesia, the two Congressmen claimed that they had been threatened with capture by a Zambian border guard when they were on the Victoria Falls bridge. Mr. Rarick said he hoped the United States Embassy in Lusaka would file a formal protest. (This is the same bridge on which five South Africans were captured January 1.) The guard insisted that the tourist group could not pass the frontier lines without proper papers. (Times of Zambia, Jan. 9, 1968)

After his return to America, Mr. Rarick told Congress that Vice-President Humphrey was wrong in his view of South African, Rhodesian and Portuguese "provinces". He asserted that "one-man-one-vote" is "not a universal principle of democratic life." (Congressional Record, Jan. 16, 1968)

Radio reports on March 5 indicated that Rhodesia's Prime Minister, Ian Smith, had applied for an American visa in order to accept an invitation to speak at the University of Virginia. The invitation was extended to Smith by the Student Legal Forum at the University, constituted primarily of law students. Although it was sent last summer, Smith did not request a visa until February. (New York Times, March 5, 1968)

The New York Times of March 6 reports that Ian Smith denied seeking a visa. The regime's Foreign Ministry stated that "he and Mrs. Smith would like to travel to America to keep this engagement and also visit a number of relatives who live in the United States, but they have not yet applied for visas." The State Department, however, said that a representative of the Smith regime had inquired at the U.S. Consulate in Salisbury about the possibility of a waiver of passport requirements in Smith's case but that they did not actually sign a form. The State Department declared that the visa was denied on the grounds that the United States does not recognize the Smith regime.

In Charlottesville, Va., the Rhodesian Information Agent in the United States, Mr. Kenneth Towsey, suggested that pressure will have to be brought to bear on the U.S. State Department in order to obtain entry for Smith. At a debate on the validity of sanctions, Towsey spoke against them on the grounds that the majority may constitute a tyranny. (Charlottesville Press, Nov. 17, 1967)

Mr. Towsey has since returned to Rhodesia for consultation, after the United States granted him re-entry status on his Rhodesian passport. "The United States concession to Rhodesia was very well received in Salisbury, where, partly because of gloomy and discouraging business forecasts, the government needs every aid to keep its chin up and the U.S./Towsey reconciliation is at least something." (News-check, January 1968)

THE U.S. AND SOUTHERN AFRICA: Secret U.S. Arms Deal With South Africa

Attempts by certain information sources in South Africa and the U.S. to represent guerrilla action against Rhodesia and South Africa as external, communist-directed aggression (see January 1968 issue of this newsletter, p. 2f.) assume special significance in view of a recent revelation by Senator James O. Eastland (Dem., Miss.).

The Senator claims that on June 15, 1962 the U.S. Ambassador in South Africa was authorized to state that "the U.S. Government can assure the South African Government that it will give prompt and sympathetic attention to reasonable requests for the purchase of military equipment required for defense against external aggression." (Johannesburg Star, March 2, 1968) According to this report (from Washington, D.C.), the assurance was given at a time when arrangements for the U.S. tracking and telemetry installations in South Africa were being renewed.

Neither the Pentagon nor Mr. Joseph C. Satterthwaite, the U.S. Ambassador in South Africa at the time, have made any comment, but have referred inquiries to the State Department. The State Department has postponed comment, but it can be expected that any response would refer to the 1963 arms embargo against South Africa, to which the U.S. and Britain both subscribe. This presumably supercedes any previous undertaking to supply arms. It is possible, however, that the U.S. Government would distinguish between external aggression and internal rebellion, in the same way that it claims to distinguish between the supply of arms to Portugal for external defence as opposed to arms to deal with insurrection in Portugal's African colonies.

This would explain the elaborate efforts (including the alleged capture of the alleged Soviet spy "Yuri Logunov" by the South African security police - see January issue, p. 3 of this Newsletter) to persuade the West, and in particular the U.S., that Rhodesia and South Africa are threatened by a foreign invasion. Senator Barry Goldwater's recent visit to these parts, together with his call for the lifting of the arms embargo against South Africa, is also of special significance in this context.

All this comes at a time when South Africa is exerting maximum pressure on the British Government to lift the embargo. Here its point of leverage is the Simonstown Agreement between South Africa and Britain, whereby Britain retains Simonstown as a military base, undertaking at the same time to provide military protection to South Africa. Prime Minister Wilson announced in December, 1967 that the embargo would continue, and in reply, the South African Government is reviewing the agreement, according to a speech by the Acting State President, Mr. Tom Naude, in opening the new session of Parliament in Cape Town (Rand Daily Mail, Feb. 3, 1968). This report also states that Nationalist parliamentarians appear to be hoping that there might be a change of government in Britain this year, leading to a change in British policy. Mr. Naude's speech emphasized the military importance to the West of the Cape sea route in view of Middle East tensions and the recent closing of the Suez Canal, a line of argument similar to that currently used in Washington by Senators and Congressmen favoring arms aid to South Africa. Their agitation on behalf of South Africa has its counterpart in Britain, where Conservative members of Parliament and industrialists have mounted a high-powered campaign to the same effect, assuring South Africa that she need not switch to the French arms market, as the Conservatives will lift the arms ban when they are returned to power (Sunday Times, Jan. 21, 1968).

#### SOUTH AFRICA'S DEFENCE POLICY UNVEILED

During the second week of March, South Africa's Minister of Defence, Mr. P. W. Botha, outlined the three main aims of South Africa's defence policy:

- \* To ward off aggression
- \* To serve as the final guarantee of peace and stability in the country and in South West Africa
- \* To inspire the youth of the country, to make them the pride of their country and keen to render service.

Mr. Botha went on to show that South Africa is becoming increasingly independent by providing her own weapon needs, and gave the following details:

- \* South African scientists have developed their own napalm bomb;
- \* An anti-armour mine, much cheaper than the imported product, had been made;
- \* Two types of highly effective shrapnel mines would give the Defence Force a formidable weapon at negligible costs;
- \* A night sight for infantry weapons would enable a soldier to aim accurately even in the worst possible light.

In addition, Mr. Botha stated that the country was self-sufficient in a whole range of other weapons. (The Johannesburg Star, March 16, 1968)

## EDUCATION

### "Apartheid Included in History Syllabus"

The Transvaal high school history syllabus has included apartheid as a separate topic, providing children with "background knowledge" of apartheid whether they choose history for matriculation or not.

Commenting on the new Transvaal high school history syllabus, Mr. Harry Briggish (Chairman of the Witwatersrand Central School Board) said that the education system was being geared to educate different sections of the population on different levels and to inculcate the idea of racial discrimination. "The introduction of teaching about the policy of Separate Development (apartheid) as a topic into school syllabuses is yet another step in the already steady process of indoctrination," Mr. Briggish said. Mr. Briggish doubted whether the presentation of the topic would include the "opposite point of view to apartheid which after all is the view of the majority of the people of the Republic." (Evening Post, Port Elizabeth, Feb. 10). Mr. Briggish went on to urge educationists, teachers and parent organizations to resist this new move, since this form of indoctrination should be resisted through every channel.

### "Matriculation Results"

The Joint Matriculation Board has published results of 1968 matric examinations as follows:

- \* 485 African candidates passed university entrance (out of 2,034). This represents about 24%.
- \* 311 got school-leaving certificates (about 15%).
- \* In Soweto only 20 of the 260 Soweto students passed - the worst result in the entire Republic.

Dr. P. P. Marolen, in an article in "The World", suggested that these horrible results could be remedied if modern libraries, laboratories, larger classrooms and more schools were provided for the non-whites in South Africa. He also suggested that the per capita expenditure on an African child be gradually increased to that of the white, and African wages increased as well. (Evening Post, Port Elizabeth, Feb. 9)



## "Hardening of Apartheid in Education"

The National Education Policy Act, passed by South Africa's Parliament in 1967, virtually handed control of public education for whites over to the Minister of Education. The Afrikaner Nationalist central government now rules all primary and secondary public education. (The Government took over African education with the Bantu Education Act of 1953, and assumed direction of Coloured education in 1964 and that of Indians in 1965.)

The new act gives the Minister of Education, Jan de Klerk, full power to determine general educational policy. He may fire anyone for misconduct or unfitness; he may withdraw or withhold a university's subsidy if it does not comply with a condition laid down by him.

Professor J. W. MacQuarrie of the Department of Education at the University of Natal, writing in the quarterly The Black Sash, says the act does "not, except in one or two respects, specifically alter our present system of education. Rather does it set the stage for the next act of the tragedy. The Nationalist Government has now secured control and can shape educational practice at its leisure."\*

The former head of the Federation of Afrikaans Cultural Societies (FAK), the organization which sponsored South Africa's "Christian National Education", stated: "Our Afrikaans schools...must be places where our children will be saturated with the Christian and National spiritual cultural stuff of our nation. We want no mixing of language, no mixing of cultures, no mixing of religions and no mixing of races." Professor MacQuarrie warns: "Increasing vigilance and immediate and vigorous reaction by protest and resistance to any encroachment of the healthy mental development of our children are now more than ever the duty of every responsible parent and citizen."\*

A gloomy assessment was made in early February by Dr. E. G. Malherbe, formerly the principal of the University of Natal, speaking at the annual meeting of the South African Institute of Race Relations at the University of Cape Town: "We are, as a people, increasingly showing signs of docile acceptance of an incipient political and cultural totalitarianism similar to that which sent Germany to her doom and which is the chief characteristic of the dreaded communistic state."\*

\*All quotes from the Epiphany Lent 1968 issue of the Bulletin of the Episcopal Churchmen for Southern Africa, with permission.

## "NUSAS Attacked by Government"

One of the few liberal organizations left in South Africa, the National Union of South African Students, is bearing a good deal of the brunt of the South African Government's pressure against interracial student organizations. Vorster's determination to mold South Africa to his views faces an obstacle in NUSAS which he is determined to overcome. The government's campaign against NUSAS has been relentless. NUSAS's (then) President, Ian Robertson, was banned in 1966 for inviting Robert Kennedy to South Africa. Last October a deportation order was served on John Sprack, elected to succeed Margaret Marshall as President of NUSAS. South African born, Sprack had used a British passport to travel and the South African government consequently revoked his citizenship. The Rand Daily Mail reported Vorster's comments at the time: "There are too many foreigners who have the audacity to take it upon themselves to decide the fate of South Africa... The government would continue to watch the activities of NUSAS very carefully and to take action against people promoting the aims of communism." (As quoted in the ECSA Bulletin mentioned above).

John Daniel, NUSAS Vice-President who took Ian Robertson's place and current President, was refused a passport. He was intending to take up a scholarship to study in the United States.

Students, faculty and others protested Sprack's deportation, but the fist is closing in on NUSAS. It cannot operate on the campuses of non-white "tribal colleges," the few hundred Africans, Coloureds and Indians still at the "open" universities dwindle in numbers, student societies have come under the rule of the Minister of Education. More books are being banned, more teachers and students imbued with western liberal traditions are leaving South Africa, and outspoken critics of apartheid are being silenced. Vorster's "Christian socialism" is on the verge of triumph in the field of education.

A third bill put before South Africa's Parliament on March 26, which closely followed two other bills providing for further hardening of apartheid legislation, deals with "interference by one population group in the political activities of another" and "prohibits any political party from receiving financial assistance from abroad." (New York Times, March 27, 1968) If NUSAS is on the road to being declared a "political organisation", then it too will be prohibited from receiving financial aid from abroad, as was the Defense and Aid Fund. In the embittered words of a former NUSAS President, "NUSAS may end up either having to go out of existence or becoming an organization for occasional Bible study, prayers, and 'socials'."

### EXECUTION IN RHODESIA

Since UDI the sentence of death has been passed on over 100 Africans in Rhodesia. The Smith regime had been wary of carrying out these sentences, as the regime had not been declared a "de jure" government. Until its position as such could be established, Ian Smith decided not to commit himself to any hangings. However, pressure from the right-wing demanded the hangings.

On March 6 three African freedom fighters were hanged. A few days later another two followed to the gallows. It is interesting to trace some of the events prior to the hangings and to subsequent reaction.

The judiciary of Rhodesia had shown signs of change. At the end of December, one judge refused re-nomination as the President of the Court of Appeal for African civil cases, and Du Pont, the Officer Administering the Government, made his first judicial appointment (London Times, Jan. 1, 1968).

On January 29, events turned dramatically. Leo Baron and Daniel Madzibamuto had appealed against their detention orders. Their cases required a judgment on the legal status of the Smith regime. The court of appeal is constituted by the five high court judges.

Four of the five judges ruled that the Smith regime is the de facto government of Rhodesia. Chief Justice Hugh Beadle stated that "(Rhodesia) is a fully de facto government in the sense that it is in fact in effective control of the territory and that it is yet so firmly established as to justify a finding that its status is that of de jure." Justice Macdonald asserted that the regime is in fact a de facto republic, its republican status created when the Queen declined to accept her position under the Smith 1965 Constitution. The one dissenting judge was Justice J. C. R. Fieldsend, who subsequently resigned. The major decision was summed up by the Chief Justice: "The present Government, having effectively usurped the governmental powers granted to Rhodesia under the 1961 constitution, can now lawfully do anything which its predecessors could lawfully have done, but until its new constitution is firmly established and thus becomes de jure constitution of the territory, its administrative and legislative acts must conform to the 1961 constitution." Thus the decision tried to have it both ways. (London Times, January 30, 1968)

The order to prevent the release of some 550 detainees, fresh detention orders were issued. The judgments were regarded by the Smith regime as a qualified victory. The de facto ruling from four judges, and the de jure ruling from two, had given them the right to rule the land. This meant, according to Lardner-Burke, Minister for Law

and Order, that "...the British Laws passed against Rhodesia since independence day have no legal affect." (London Times, January 30) However, the British government pointed out that the judgments said nothing about the external status of the regime. (London Times, January 11)

With these judgments in hand, the regime decided to implement the death sentences imposed on three Africans convicted of murder. In an attempt to avert this action, the United Kingdom Commonwealth Office declared that "anyone who took part in carrying out illegal death sentences would bear the gravest responsibility" (New York Times, March 2). Despite this, on March 6, Duly Shadreck, David Dhlamini and Victor Mlambo were sent to the gallows. Ten hours after the executions, the Rhodesian regime broadcast a statement accusing the British Government of irresponsibility and cynicism in having caused the Queen to act.

A New York Times Editorial (March 7, 1968) stated the following:

"(Smith's) extremists had demanded blood of the Africans and that is what he gave them, possibly in the hope that this act would deter others among Rhodesia's african majority of four million from striking at his regime... Smith was never serious about negotiating an honorable settlement with Britain on the basis of the principles he professed. Rhodesia now seems set, perhaps irrevocably, on the road to republicanism and apartheid. For Rhodesia's 220,000 whites it is not likely to be a road to peace."

In a step unusual for the Pope, a direct appeal for clemency of six Africans, scheduled to be hanged the day after the initial three, was made to Smith's regime. "His holiness has learned, with great pain, of the execution of three Africans in Rhodesia and, while he raises his prayers of mercy for their souls, expresses his sorrow that reasons of humanity were not heard. He permits himself to express his fervent wish that other condemnations not be carried out and that there be given instead broad application of provisions of clemency. With sentiments of sincere affection for the peoples of Rhodesia, the Holy Father sends his apostolic benediction." (New York Times, March 10, 1968)

Finally, two more men--convicted of murdering a tribal chief--were hanged. They were Francis C. Chirisa and Takauraye Jeremiah. Four more, supposedly scheduled to hang, convicted of various "terrorist acts", were granted an indefinite stay of execution. A hundred others are awaiting execution, mostly under the so-called "Hanging bill", which has mandatory death sentences for many "freedom fighter" crimes. Apparently responding to world pressure, it has since been announced that the sentences of a further 31 prisoners have been commuted. It is reported that the Rhodesian cabinet is deeply divided on the question of commuting all death sentences for acts other than murder. (New York Times, March 12, 14 and 15, 1968)

#### RECENT ARTICLES DEALING WITH SOUTHERN AFRICA

Bruce Detwiler, "Thaw in South Africa", Commonweal, Vol. LXXVII, No. 17, Feb. 2, 1968.

A former teacher in Zambia, Bruce Detwiler here describes South Africa's attempt at pacification of her opponents abroad. He reveals how adept South Africa is at giving lip service to tolerance and moderation while internally she hardens her grip over the lives of the people and apartheid legislation continually increases. The warning again: beware concessions from racists.

Roy Terry, "Close-up of a Terrorist", Atlas, February, 1968.

Here Roy Terry (Scope: Durban) interviews James E. D. Chikereza, Vice-President

of ZAPU. Chikereza describes to him the ANC-ZAPU alliance and the in-roads their struggle for liberation has recently made in Rhodesia.

Stanley Uys, "White Africa vs. Black", The New Republic, Vol. 198, No. 4, Jan. 27, 1968.

A description of the continued polarization of the races in Africa, particularly in Southern Africa, and its threat to world peace.

Kenneth N. Carstens, "Terrorism in South West Africa," Christianity and Crisis, Feb. 5, 1968.

Details of the "Terrorism Act" trial of the 35 South West Africans in Pretoria are exposed in this excellent commentary on the situation.

Eduardo Mondlane, "The future of Mozambique", Motive, Vol. xxvii, Feb. 1958.

In this apology (in the didactic sense) for Frelimo, Mozambique's Liberation Party headed by the article's author, Mondlane outlines briefly the aims, consequences and progress of Frelimo's struggle. He describes Frelimo's political philosophy as including three basic ideals: (1) democracy based on one-man-one-vote; (2) economic socialism; and (3) social welfare of all the people.

John D. Kirwan, "Rhodesia Beats the Rap," The Reporter, March 7, 1968.

A description of Rhodesia's recent executions of "terrorists" and how the outraged spectators from abroad register opinions that have no meaning or influence.

Noel Mostert, "High Stakes Southeast of Suez," The Reporter, March 7, 1968.

Helps one understand the issue of gold as regards Southern Africa, and the relationship of Britain's involvements Southeast of Suez to the situation in Southern Africa.

"Racism in Southern Africa: Challenge to U.S. Policy," Social Action, Vol. xxxiv, no. 8, April 1968. (United Church of Christ, 289 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10010)

This special issue on Southern Africa includes an editorial on "Response to Revolution in Southern Africa" and articles by Colin Legum ("Color in World Politics"), Alan Paton ("The Price of Segregation"), Gladstone Ntlati ("The Two Apartheids"), and Kenneth Carstens ("Churches and Apartheid"). It is excellent for a comprehensive introduction to several areas of concern, and for general background uses.

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

Mr. and Mrs. William Winter  
P.O. Box 20773  
Dur es Saleam  
RUWANDA