



# THE SHOALS of GOOD HOPE

Published by  
PITTSBURGH COMMITTEE ON SOUTHERN AFRICA

P. O. Box 8134, Pittsburgh Penna. 15217

January 1968

## DR. BLAIBERG'S BLACK HEART

At the time of this writing Dr. Philip Blaiberg, recipient of the world's third heart transplant, is reported as recuperating satisfactorily. Newspapers pointed out that in spite of race-conscious South African customs, the heart donor, (Clive Haupt, who died of brain damage) was partly Black. Dr. Blaiberg was also quoted as saying, upon regaining consciousness, that he was grateful, and didn't care about the race of its donor.

Before this attitude is understood as presaging a new turn in South African race relations, we should remember that Americans also didn't have any scruples against using slaves for such intimate purposes as wet-nurses, bed-warmers, and "mammies" to their children; yet as Southerners themselves enjoy pointing out, that was before, (and, we might, add no guarantee against,) the rising levels of civil injustice perpetrated to "keep the Negro in his place", and the Black revolution dedicated to secure the rights and privileges of equal citizenship under our Constitution.

The Southern argument maintains that there was a degree of human relationship even when slaves were used for intimate purposes: "little children loved their mammies. Bed-warmers provided young gentlemen with their first sexual experiences, sometimes at the prior arrangement of the young man's father. The trouble came when Negroes had the temerity to aspire to higher callings.

But in the case of the current surgery in South Africa, even this modicum of human interaction is missing. The mulatto's cardiac organ is all that is needed. We must remember that white doctors have long been in the habit of turning to horses and cows for the donation of hormones and antibodies and other organic matter without feeling the necessity of entering into any inter-personal relationship with the donors or fellow members of their species in order to fulfill the transaction. It will be news indeed when a white has a heart to give to an ailing Black (either figuratively or literally, for that matter).

However, there is at least grounds for some encouragement in this matter of inter racial heart transplants in South Africa. The Government has some official attitudes toward racial biology which are reminiscent of the Nazi attitudes toward the Jews in the 30's. Blacks are considered to be less advanced evolutionarily, and therefore more prone to "primitive" behavior communicated by heredity. Anti-miscegenation laws (named the Immorality Act!) seek to prevent any opportunity for interbreeding by forbidding even such acts as a white employer driving a female Black servant home after work. An official agency makes rulings upon the classification of individuals whose racial stock is in doubt. Haupt was "officially" Cape colored, and as such was limited to a specifically prescribed life. Often families are separated as one member is "discovered" to be non-white, and is deported from white residential areas. Therefore, assuming of course that Dr. Blaiberg survives and Apartheid spokesmen cannot say his white body rejected the "subhuman" transplant, the whole question of bio-social classification will be called into question. Hopefully, the issues will be so complicated that they will demonstrate how ludicrous any legislation based on biology must be. For example, would Dr. Blaiberg now be classified as mulatto? But given his social, international, prominence, and medical significance, would it be feasible to banish him from his white community into the Newton slum reserved for the Cape colored? Would his colleagues and associates be ready to attribute eccentric behavior he may demonstrate as the result of his newly "mixed blood"?

Perhaps one can hope that as a result of this surgical success at least the non-white will be up-graded from his present status as biologically only quasi-human to the level obtaining during the period of American slavery. Perhaps as physical organism he can come to be considered of neutral status, vis-a-vis the white physical organism. From there South Africans can move on to the task of treating him as a social equal as well. That in itself, American experience demonstrates, is quite a task.

#### MORE ON THE "TERRORISM ACT"

The following is taken from Southern Africa, a Monthly Survey of News and Opinion, published by the Southern Africa Committee, University Christian Movement, Room 758 475 Riverside Drive, N. Y. 10027

As every loyal South African knows, South Africa is a country in which stern measures are necessary to maintain law and order. The problem is that more and more oppressive laws are being passed with less and less internal protest. This convinces many people that South Africa is, in fact, a police state and is moving rapidly from being an authoritarian state to a totalitarian one.

The most recent evidence of this is the "Terrorism Act" which was passed by the South African Parliament and signed by the Acting State President in June 1967, but which was made retroactive to June 27, 1962. The Act defines a "terrorist" as:

- any person who intends to endanger the maintenance of law and order in the Republic and who - anywhere - commits any act or conspires or incites, advises, encourages any other person to commit any such act;
- anyone who attempts to undergo or advises or encourages any other person to undergo training "which would be of use to any person intending to endanger the maintenance of law and order";
- anyone who possesses explosives, ammunition, firearms or weapons and fails to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he did not intend using these to commit any act likely to have such results as, among others - "to hamper or deter any person from assisting

in the maintenance of law and order; to promote, by intimidation, the achievement of any object; to cause serious bodily injury to or endanger the safety of any person; to cause substantial financial loss to any person or the State; to cause, encourage or further feelings of hostility between the White and other inhabitants of the Republic; to obstruct or endanger the free movement of any traffic on land, at sea, or in the air; to embarrass the administration of the affairs of the State".

The Act continues that "the accused shall be presumed to have committed or attempted to commit.....such act...unless it is proved beyond a reasonable doubt that he did not intend any of the results aforesaid."

In addition to this broad definition of terrorism, the Act is, by definition, made to apply to South West Africa. The international importance of this is that South Africa's legal and administrative jurisdiction over the international territory of South West Africa was declared terminated by the UN General Assembly resolution 2145 in October 1966. This makes South Africa's legal right to incorporate the territory into a definition of the Republic of South Africa and to apply her racially discriminatory and repressive laws extremely questionable.

The first case to be tried under the Act is the trial of 37 South West Africans (now 35 - two died in jail) which began September 11 in Pretoria. Some of the accused had been detained for 200 or even 300 days before the Act was enacted. The men on trial come from many different occupational backgrounds, including 21 laborers or "unemployed" persons, 4 peasants, 2 teachers, 1 mechanic and 1 clerk. Some of the accused are members of the Executive Committee of the nationalist South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO).

Morris B. Abram, Senior Advisor to the U. S. Delegation to the UN said that in the trial under "outrageous ex-post-facto legislation...which violates at least ten articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights," the defendants "are being tried by a foreign government whose rights have already been forfeited in South West Africa" and have been "transported 1,000 miles away from home to be tried without a jury in a foreign land." Mr. Abram concluded that moral force - the spotlight of international conscience, mobilized by information - is now the only present practical hope of those doomed men." (New York Law Journal, Nov. 13, 1967)

There is an immediate need to draw the attention of the President, Secretary of State, Ambassador Goldberg, Senators and Congressmen to:

- (1) The questionable legality of South Africa's detention trial of South West Africans in view of the UN action (which was supported by the U. S. Government) in October, 1966.
- (2) The likelihood of a mass hanging of many of the accused unless authoritative and broad protests are made to the South African Government.
- (3) The grave implications and consequences for South Africa and the future of South West Africa and for race relations and world order if any of the accused should be hanged in view of the disputed status of South West Africa and of the utterly iniquitous character of the Terrorism Act.
- (4) The need for the U. S. embassy and other Western embassies' officials to personally observe the public trial in Pretoria.