

EDITOR'S NOTE

Our readers will note that with this, number 8 of the *South Africa Bulletin*, our scope has been widened, to include all of "Southern" Africa—South West Africa, Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland.

All of Southern Africa is inextricably linked together, with South Africa as the hard core of white resistance to majority rule. We feel it therefore important to bring our readers, from time to time, information about various of these related areas and news of the African struggle for freedom in those parts of Southern Africa not yet independent.

You may recall that Bulletin no. 7 contained an article on South West Africa. In this issue we bring you one on Rhodesia, written especially for us by a Rhodesian, Mr. Aristone M. Chambati.

RHODESIA TODAY

By Aristone M. Chambati

Observers of the Rhodesian political scene agree that the current situation has slipped completely out of British control and into the hands of a white supremacist group rivalled only by South Africa in their extremist racial policies. All efforts to achieve a negotiated political compromise, acceptable to all groups involved in the conflict, have failed and the latest endeavour, mandatory economic sanctions by U.N. member nations on selected Rhodesian goods, brings only a defiant prediction of similar failure from Mr. Ian Smith, Prime Minister of the current illegal regime. Mr. Smith is quite right.

In order to understand the intricacies of the present political crisis, it is necessary to have some general knowledge of the constitutional developments which have led to the presence of such an ostentatiously powerful minority group. The history of Rhodesia since its colonization in 1890 is a history of the blundering colonial policy of the British government.

In 1923 the United Kingdom granted internal autonomy to a handful of white settlers. The African people were excluded from participation in any stage of the deliberations; the white minority, having gained "self rule", used that autonomy to entrench its supremacy over the black majority.

Some devices used to ensure the perpetuation of that supremacy:

The Land Apportionment Act passed in 1930, which divided Rhodesia into black and white areas, enforcing territorial segregation of the two races. The larger, more fertile, and mineral-rich portion of the land was designated for the fewer Europeans (only 224,000); the Africans—some 4,000,000 of them—were pushed onto less productive, sandy soil ensuring that they would remain poor and dependent on European employment. This

Act became the Magna Carta of the white minority and the basis of future discriminatory laws.

The Pass laws were enacted to control and restrict the movement of the African. These required that every African male over the age of 16 should carry a pass (chitupa), to be produced upon demand of a policeman, or suffer the penalty. This legislation severely restricts the movements of the African to this day.

The Native Affairs Department was created for the sole purpose of supervising the affairs of Africans. As things turned out, this department became a government within a government. While claiming to represent the interests of the African people, it stripped the African traditional rulers (chiefs) of their main powers; turning them into paid agents of the government, and trying to force complete regimentation of African political thought. The department was empowered to deal with "trouble-makers" among the "Natives" and to punish others so bold as to articulate the grievances of the African.

The Rhodesian Parliament was exclusively white by design. The franchise was based on high educational and economic qualifications which excluded all Africans living in the above described circumstances from qualifying as voters.

It should be noted that when the British government granted self-rule to the white minority it retained what were known as "Reserved" or "Entrenched Clauses" which empowered the British parliament to scrutinize all bills before the Rhodesian parliament to see if they were in the best interests of Rhodesia as a whole—ostensibly to safeguard the interests of the African people. Yet, the discriminatory laws enumerated above and the multitudinous others which exist today were passed by the Rho-

desian parliament without objection from the U.K. government. There is no time in the recorded parliamentary history of Rhodesia when the British government invoked this Clause to stop the passage of any of these laws. The British government is therefore equally guilty with the white minority of promoting racism in Rhodesia.

It should be pointed out that the "Entrenched Clause" gave the British government the right of final say on the Rhodesian constitution. The U.K. had (and still has) a right to impose a constitution on Rhodesia, yet has remained silent on matters of such import to the African people.

If the first blunder the British government made was to grant self-rule to a white minority, the second was her indifferent attitude toward the entrenchment of white supremacy in Rhodesia. Despite all the negative developments in Rhodesia, in 1953 the U.K. agreed to the creation of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland after protracted negotiations with the whites, mostly Rhodesians. The Federation was created *against the wishes of the African people as a whole in the three territories*—Southern Rhodesia (Rhodesia), Northern Rhodesia (Zambia), and Nyasaland (Malawi).

The Africans in the north, (now independent Zambia and Malawi), were most vocal in their protests against the Federation as they felt that they had much to lose politically. The two northern territories, unlike Rhodesia, were British Protectorates and their status different from that of a colony such as Rhodesia. Another difference lay in the fact that there were more whites in Rhodesia than there were in both N. Rhodesia and Nyasaland, and racial discrimination was more acute in Rhodesia. The U.K. justified the creation of the Federation on the grounds that it would be economically advantageous for the three countries to come together.

The Africans were not opposed to the Federation in principle, but what they did not want was a Federation dominated politically by Rhodesian whites—as it was for the duration of its ten-year existence.

Another principle which the U.K. found attractive was the policy of "partnership", which was to be the basis of the Federation as propounded by its architects, Lord Malvern and Sir Roy Welensky. Once this Federation became a living reality the African people of Rhodesia resigned themselves to it and were willing to take part in any organization that would help promote partnership among the races. Following the formation of the Federation there seemed to be an enormous reservoir of goodwill among Rhodesians. There was a boom in multi-racial clubs, in the main cities. Africans, Asians, and whites participated in these clubs and associations such as the Salisbury Multi-Racial Club and the Capricorn Africa Society. Indeed, it seemed that Rhodesia was on the right path toward racial cooperation and harmony. Multi-racial parties became fashionable and belonging to one of these clubs became a status symbol among both whites and blacks.

But as time went on, toward the middle fifties, the Africans began to look for the signs of true partnership in all aspects of life. They found that "partnership" was confined to cocktail parties and multi-racial clubs. Discrimination in all other aspects of Rhodesian society continued: public places such as cinemas, restaurants and hotels remained closed to Africans; no African could become a civil servant; the *Land Apportionment Act* and pass laws remained intact; the wages and salaries of the African people were still below the bread line; education remained segregated—Africans still had to pay school fees while whites received free, compulsory education up to the secondary school level. There was no real partnership.

It became obvious to the African people that the word "partnership" had been used as bait to hoodwink the compliant British into accepting the creation of the Federation. Educated young Africans demanded to see the policy of partnership implemented. This state of affairs provided fertile ground for the development of African nationalist movements.

In 1956 young men and women of the African community formed the Youth League as a protest movement demanding African participation in Parliament so that they could be part and parcel of the running of the affairs of their own country. The movement gathered momentum with amazing rapidity, and in 1957 the Youth League joined hands with the almost defunct African National Congress (ANC) to form a single formidable organization. This became a popular movement and a power to reckon with. The then Prime Minister, Mr. Garfield Todd, realised that African nationalism had become a force and that the only way to deal with it was to come to grips with the reality of the situation. He advocated a change in the Rhodesian franchise so as to include educated Africans. He also raised the wages of the African workers from a minimum of about \$13.00 per month to a minimum of about \$20.00 a month. (At this time the average European wage was about \$270.00 per month). This wage increase angered white business men, who accused Todd of trying to cripple industry. His amendment of the franchise also raised a hue and cry among the white electorate.

In early 1958, Todd was dismissed in a cabinet coup, and Sir Edgar Whitehead was recalled from his diplomatic position in Washington to become the new Prime Minister. It was then that Rhodesia made a radical turn from the path of multi-racialism to follow a semi-apartheid policy. Whitehead promised the white electorate that he would see to it that power remained in "civilized" (white) hands. He collided head-on with the African National Congress, which by then had spread into the rural areas where the majority of Africans live. In order to ensure white supremacy, he banned the A.N.C. on February 26, 1959, and arrested the leaders and hundreds of its members, putting them into prisons, detention camps, and restriction areas to rusticate for five years without trial.

Subsequent to the banning of the ANC, the Rhodesian parliament passed harsh security legislation intended to make it impossible for African nationalism to ever rise again. The Prime Minister contentedly declared at one point that "African nationalism is dead". This security legislation included, *The Preventive Detention Act*, under which a person could be arrested and detained for a period of up to five years, without trial; *The Law and Order Maintenance Act*, which covered all forms of political activities and included among possible penalties the death sentence. The *Unlawful Organizations Act* made it illegal for a person to belong to a banned organization or to appear to be continuing any activities relating to it.

Whitehead was soon to realise that African nationalism was not a dead issue. On January 1, 1960, a handful of young Africans announced the formation of the National Democratic Party (NDP). That movement was proscribed and the members and their leaders were arrested and detained without trial. The Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) was then formed, eight days after the banning of the NDP. The Africans appealed to the U.K. to intervene and impose a constitution acceptable to the majority in Rhodesia. Britain refused to intervene. The Africans took the matter to the United Nations, where the British government blocked any possible action by the U.N., claiming that Rhodesia was "the responsibility of Her Majesty's Government".

In 1962 the present ruling Rhodesian Front Party (RF) came to power under Mr. Winston Field. Whitehead's party, the United Federal Party, which had sought to make minor concessions to African demands, lost the election to the RF which promised the white electorate *independence* under the 1961 Rhodesian constitution. This 1961 constitution, rejected by Africans because it gave the whites complete power, had removed most U.K. powers over Rhodesian internal affairs. It created a House of 65 members, fifty of which were to be elected on the "A" roll, having high educational and economic qualifications. In other words, the parliament was to be composed of 50 whites and 15 blacks, although the African—white population ratio is almost 20 to one. The Africans continued to protest against that constitution, through their two nationalist movements, the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU). Both organizations have since been banned and their leaders "detained", but they carry on activities from outside the country.

Prime Minister Field also wanted to make some concessions to African demands, and he, like Todd in 1958, was toppled in a cabinet revolt and replaced by Mr. Ian Smith, present government leader. Smith again promised the white electorate that he would achieve independence under the 1961 constitution, and on November 11, 1965, with the protesting African majority under "police state" suppression, he actually issued a Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI).

Africans at the United Nations asked the U.K. to intervene militarily to put down this rebellion against The Crown. Britain refused and instead persuaded the U.N. to

impose voluntary economic sanctions against Rhodesia—despite predictions that they would produce no change of heart. The reasons given for refusing to use force: that British public opinion would not concur; the question of fighting against "kith and kin" was and remains questionable. Elsewhere, whenever Britain was faced with a rebellion she has never hesitated to send troops. She did so in Aden and in Guyana against Chedi Jagan. Once again, the racial implications are quite clear.

Britain has, in effect, permitted the creation of another South Africa in Rhodesia. Since UDI, police-state measures whereby the 224,000 whites control a 4,080,000 black majority by armed force have been strengthened. Not only have larger numbers of opponents of the regime been punished (including the former Prime Minister, Mr. Garfield Todd, who has been restricted) but there has been noticeable retrogression in African education. The Smith regime has cut back on the number of Africans who may attend secondary school, and the already limited number of university scholarships available to Africans have been reduced. The tendency is toward even more severe measures.

As predicted, the voluntary economic sanctions urged by the U.N. after UDI have failed to produce significant pressure on the Smith regime which, in fact, has been given time to firmly entrench itself and its policies. After further unfruitful negotiations with the Smith regime Britain again came to the U.N. in December 1966 with a Resolution which was subsequently passed in the Security Council and which imposed certain selective *mandatory* sanctions against Rhodesia, including tobacco and oil. Most members of the U.N. (including the U.S.) have accepted the mandatory boycott, South Africa and Portugal being notable exceptions. The African governments, however, through their delegations at the U.N., have rejected both voluntary and mandatory sanctions as an inadequate means of dealing with the problem. As long as South Africa and Portugal continue to trans-ship oil and carry out normal trade relations with Rhodesia, so long will the economy remain stable and the sanctions program ineffective. The current activities of the exiled nationalist movements are a tale in themselves; I do not have space to discuss them here. However, a major effort is under preparation. If a widespread, armed African uprising were to occur, the implications would be international in scope and could lead to a racial war spreading far beyond its immediate confines.

The British government still has time and the authority to act. It is imperative that they should not ignore the warning signals of the enormous tensions about to be unleashed and that they establish a physical presence in Rhodesia. Once the U.K. has reclaimed its constitutional right to be in Rhodesia there can then be a transitional period of political change from minority to majority rule. If a firm course of action is not immediately taken and the present trend reversed, the result will be even more bitter race relations in southern Africa, expressed by violence, and the onus must be placed squarely upon the British Government.

Americans Against Apartheid

SHARPEVILLE — IN MEMORIAM

Seven years ago 69 unarmed African men, women and children were shot dead and some 200 more wounded at Sharpeville, South Africa, as they demonstrated peacefully against the hated badge of their slavery: the "pass". More were similarly killed and wounded in other parts of the country, bringing the toll of dead and wounded into the hundreds.

On March 21, in New York, three events took place which commemorated the Sharpeville of the past and warned of much worse violence in the future, if the Western democracies—South Africa's chief friends and trading partners—do not cease their present support of apartheid.

1. A *Press Conference* for Dennis Brutus, South African poet, ex-Robben Island prisoner and political leader, was held, called jointly by the A. Philip Randolph Institute and the American Committee on Africa.

2. A *Demonstration*, mainly consisting of students, and including many Africans, was held between 2-4 P.M. at the South African Consulate on Madison Avenue. Mr. Brutus also attended this picket, and was televised by two of the National networks. Informed that the Consulate had closed, Mr. Brutus nevertheless decided to deliver a letter to his Government. After vigorous knocking the door was opened a crack, and this letter was gingerly received—through the fastened door-chain.

3. A *Memorial Meeting* was held in the evening at St. Mark's Methodist Church, in Harlem. The Chairman, Mr. Percy Sutton, Manhattan Borough President, eloquently reviewed the events of seven years ago at Sharpeville; Mr. Brutus, speaking of his own experiences, gave the picture of "today" and the somber prognosis of "tomorrow" for his tragic homeland. Other speakers on the challenging program were: Ambassador Marof Achkar of Guinea (Chairman of the United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid), Floyd McKissick, National Director of CORE, William Booth, Commissioner on Human Rights, and George Houser, Executive Director of the American Committee on Africa. Pete Seeger inimitably sang Freedom Songs. Three hundred forty-three dollars were raised at the meeting for care of the families of South African political prisoners.

DENNIS BRUTUS TOURS THE UNITED STATES

Dennis Brutus, South African poet, sportsman and "fighter for freedom", has just completed a 6 week tour of the United States (and Toronto) under the auspices of A.C.O.A., which took him, in more than 30 engagements, from Washington, D.C. (where he buttonholed Congressmen and spoke before the House Sub-Committee on Africa) to Washington State, to California, and from Toronto to Tuskegee, Alabama. Everywhere he went he was acclaimed as one of the most competent and articulate representatives of the South African Liberation Movement ever to visit this country.

Mr. Brutus has two predominant facets to his work for South Africa: one, as Chairman of SANROC (South African Non-racial Olympic Committee) the insistence on true de-segregation of sport in South Africa, (including integration of not only the teams but also of the spectators and facilities at playing fields). The other: the recently launched (in Britain) Campaign for the Release of Political Prisoners in Southern Africa, of which he is Chairman. Excerpts from his testimony before both the United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid and the United States Congress House of Representatives Sub-Committee on Africa on the conditions and treatment of political prisoners will be included in the next issue of the *Southern Africa Bulletin*.

Anyone desiring information about either of Mr. Brutus' campaigns may contact the Editor, *Southern Africa Bulletin*.



CHASE MANHATTAN DEMONSTRATION

THE BANK CAMPAIGN

The Campaign for withdrawal of funds from Chase Manhattan and First National City Banks, led by the Committee of Conscience against Apartheid, (Chairman, A. Philip Randolph), ended its major thrust on December 9, 1966 with a large demonstration at the banks' Wall Street headquarters—and with a documented withdrawal figure, from both banks, of considerably more than \$22 million.

This figure, which represents a significant—and practical—protest against the direct financial support of the Government of South Africa lent over a period of years by both banks, was contradicted by bank officials, who claimed that their combined loss totalled only \$35,000—an amount which is \$10,000 less than the publicly announced withdrawal of one large church, during the campaign!

As a matter of fact, it is known that considerably more money has been withdrawn than claimed and represented by more than 200 signed and verified pledges. Hardly a day goes by without learning of some new withdrawal, or one of which the Committee was not previously notified. More than \$150,000 has been withdrawn—quite unsolicited—since the official “close” of this first phase of the offensive against *American involvement in Apartheid*.

Visible and direct results of the bank campaign were disappointing. The \$40 million revolving credit, made available to South Africa by a consortium of 10 United States banks, (led by Chase and First National City), was

renewed, in spite of vigorous protests by high officials of many United States Churches, the National Council of Churches, civil rights leaders and well-known Americans in other fields.

A slight but possibly significant victory may however be seen in the *one year* credit extension instead of the usual two year renewal. Perhaps after all the Committee of Conscience Campaign did influence these powerful American banks to leave themselves an escape loophole for the future, in their support of apartheid.

WE MUST KEEP THE PRESSURE ON!!

THE U.S. and SOUTH AFRICA

THE SHORE-LEAVE BATTLE

Twice in the last two months the United States Government has been forced, in the cases of the Aircraft carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt and the missile-tracker, *Sword Knot*, to choose between principle and “popularity” with the South African Government and even with some of its own navy crewmen, and twice Washington has painfully chosen the path of principle.

The United States Aircraft Carrier F. D. Roosevelt had scheduled a 3 day visit to Cape Town, in early February, for re-fuelling and shore leave for its 3,800 Americans—including 200 Negroes—who were returning from Vietnam.

Elaborate plans for hospitality in Cape Town had been planned by individuals and civic groups—all on a segregated basis. When this word reached the United States, the American Committee on Africa, the civil rights groups, the American Negro Leadership Conference on Africa, and liberals all over the country swung into action. Thirty-eight congressmen urged President Johnson to cancel the stop of the F.D.R., since: “it subjects several hundred Negro servicemen who have been fighting for their country to severe discrimination”. A “pro-and con” debate raged in Washington, but principle won the day. As the great ship docked, to the welcome of a 21 gun salute, the skipper announced cancellation of all shore leave. The disappointed South Africans called the American Consul the polite equivalent of a liar, when he blamed the cancellation on: “difficulties in setting up arrangements”—an excuse which was indeed contradicted by the United States Department of Defence, which stated that a “lack of integrated crew activities” was the cause. Prime Minister Vorster rejected the United States “explanation”; the South African man in the street also got the message, according to the *New York Times*, that: “the American authorities were opposed to South Africa’s apartheid policies”.

AMERICAN ECONOMIC INVOLVEMENT: NEW EMPHASIS

More than 240 American companies have investments in South Africa and significant trade there. (A list of firms will be furnished on request.)

A.C.O.A. is now conducting a country-wide search for stockholders in these companies willing to either appear at the Annual Meetings and protest the use of their money to bolster apartheid, or to give their proxies to someone who will represent them.

As an opening salvo in this campaign, James Farmer, former head of CORE, on March 15th appeared at the Annual Meeting of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, in New York. Mr. Farmer said: “Morgan Guaranty’s support of the present Government of South Africa makes us all accomplices of apartheid and makes this racial conflict, with its disastrous consequences for all involved—even investors such as Morgan—more certain”. Mr. Farmer offered a resolution that Morgan Guaranty withdraw from the 10 bank consortium presently furnishing a \$40 million line of credit to South Africa and use its influence to break down apartheid. The Chairman, Mr. Thomas S. Gates, defended his bank’s policy on the dual grounds of continued United States diplomatic relationship with South Africa—and a purported fear that by withholding credit they “might do hardship on *all people* of South Africa”—indicating a delicate care for the blacks, which they, however, do not appreciate, since African political leaders have repeatedly called for economic sanctions.

Mr. Farmer’s resolution was not debated or voted upon. Press photographers and television cameramen were refused admittance to the meeting by bank officials, but interviewed Mr. Farmer after the meeting adjourned.

Chase Manhattan Annual Stockholders meeting was also the scene of a protest by four stockholders, on March 28, and a well publicized demonstration outside in the Plaza. Details of this meeting will be in the next Bulletin.

YOU CAN HELP in this campaign! If you are a stockholder in one of the 240 apartheid-helping companies, *fill out the enclosed card* and return it to us. We will get in touch with you and plan our strategy together. If you are not able to attend the Annual Meeting, a proxy still makes your protest possible. If not a stockholder, you can help organize a picket line at the company headquarters

on Annual Meeting day. We are especially interested at this time in stockholders in automobile companies (General Motors, Ford and Chrysler.)

We expect this protest movement against the involve-

ment of American banking and business in apartheid to spread all over the United States. Help us make it effective with *your* protest or *your* proxy!

MAIL THE ENCLOSED CARD NOW!!

South African Notes

NEW "BANTUSTAN" IN SOUTH WEST AFRICA

A new "Bantu Homeland" in Ovamboland, South West Africa, is about to be born, announced Prime Minister Vorster on March 21st. The plan comes complete with now familiar promises of "self-determination" as a beginning, and "complete independence" at the far-off end of the trail.

Ovamboland has the largest population of any area of South West Africa: approximately 240,000 Ovambos. The creation of an "African State" there will no doubt be on the model of the one "Bantustan", the Transkei, which has been established in the five years of effort in this direction. In the Transkei there is a legislative council (as envisioned for Ovamboland) but all its decrees can be vetoed by Pretoria, and it is in no way "democratic", for government-appointed chiefs and headmen (who are salaried civil servants) outnumber the elected members. Transkei courts can be overruled by higher South African tribunals, and a Pretoria-proclaimed State of Emergency has existed there since the inception of this strange "self-rule"—for more than six years—under which arrest without warrant and imprisonment without trial are practiced, by South African, not Transkeian authorities.

It is clear that Vorster's magnanimous offer of "self-rule" to the Ovambos is an attempt to confuse and hinder the work of the special fourteen-nation United Nations Committee on South West Africa, which is due to report in April. Further, the setting up of a Bantustan in South West Africa would be another serious extension of the world-condemned policy of *apartheid* into that country—which, by an overwhelming vote last October 27, was transferred from the previous South African mandate to the direct jurisdiction of the United Nations. The new South African maneuver will confuse no one; it is an additional reason for using all possible speed—and all reasonable means—to establish the presence and authority of the United Nations in South West Africa.

SPORT APARTHEID "BENDS" — JUST A LITTLE!

Sport is probably the interest most widely shared among black and white in South Africa. Outstanding golfers, cricket players, boxers and other first-rate athletes have long been produced, but many of them, the non-whites, have been hampered by lack of training facilities and frustrated by the strict color-bar in sport, which has always regulated internal competition as well as the invariable choice of all-white Olympic teams.

The South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SANROC), of which Dennis Brutus was the organizer and chairman, for years has fought to implement the Olympic principles of non-racialism in his country, with the result of South Africa's exclusion, on these grounds from the last Olympics.

A decision about South African participation in the 1968 Olympics in Mexico is to be taken at a Committee meeting in Teheran, in May. Recently, well in advance of that session, the chairman of the South African Olympic Council, Mr. Frank Braun, announced a new apartheid formula—for international sports only—which is supposed to end the Olympic ban against South Africa and "neutralize friction points (with the outside world) in the field of sports".

The new arrangement would give South Africa an integrated Olympic team—but the players would remain segregated except when out of the country; sports bodies would remain racially constituted; facilities, players and spectators in South Africa would still be segregated, and the Olympic team would be chosen at racially separated trials held by the individual white, African, Colored, or Indian sports bodies.

In other words, this is another of South Africa's "smoke screens", to obscure the fact of continued racial segregation and team selection—as expressly forbidden by Olympic principles. Such a transparent maneuver should not for a moment deceive the Olympic Committee, when it meets in Teheran.

LEST WE FORGET

The 180 Day Detention Law is still in force in South Africa. Imposed in June, 1965 and ostensibly framed to "safeguard" potential State witnesses at political and criminal trials, it has been widely used to extort information, often under conditions approaching torture, from the friends of those politically accused.

In the first 14 months of this nefarious law, 125 people have been "detained—without court procedure and in solitary confinement—for varying periods. Caroline de Crespigny, mother of a young child, spent 144 days behind bars, completely alone, without writing materials or reading matter—except for the Bible. (22 of the detainees have been women.)

To three, their detention has proved unbearable: three men have committed suicide after being held for two, 16 and 37 days respectively.

Southern Africa Bulletins can be ordered by your organization: \$4 per hundred, \$15 for 500. Send check payable to American Committee on Africa to: Mrs. M. L. Hooper, ACOA, room 705, 211 East 43 St., New York 10017.