

Nat'l. Conference on
"South African Crisis and American Action"
March 21-23, 1965
Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C.

AMERICAN PRIVATE INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

by

Joseph C. Kennedy

AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT: TOURISM

What is South Africa today? Listen to its description from the travel brochures. "It is the land that time forgot. There is something incredibly strange and different about Africa...this strangeness is due to the unbelievable primitive life...native groups and communities that have been almost untouched by civilization."

South Africa today is the "land of safaris under the watchful eye of a professional white hunter."

"Everywhere there are good hotels and a wide selection of all types of accommodations. In the provision of race courses, tennis courts, bowling greens, rugby and football stadiums, cricket fields, golf courses, and other sporting amenities Durban is unexcelled. Johannesburg...there is a lively intellectual and cultural life...Ballet, symphony concerts, celebrity recitals, live theatre, and art exhibitions...500 restaurants and tea rooms, 8 theatres...nearly 50 city and suburban cinemas...97 hotels."

This is South Africa today - and the people, and the conditions? "Despite newspaper headlines, travel to the most important and interesting parts of Africa is feasible and practical...the political unrest that will continue to grip this vast area has not involved tourists."

"The Republic of South Africa is staunchly pro-Western and uncompromisingly anti-communist. It is a bastion to which the Free World can look with confidence...South Africa is a parliamentary democracy."

"South Africa's integrity in all matters of finance is known throughout the world. No foreign investor has ever lost a cent on loans issued abroad by a South African governmental authority."

And of the Africans: "Here is an exhilarating land lying under a warm, beneficent sun. Cities alive with prosperity and confidence, form a contrast to picturesque Bantu villages, where ancient tribal rites and tradition are still to be seen." More - "the Zulu...Proud, statuesque, yet naturally simple and happy..."

And the Bantustans - "Although a common pride in South Africa has developed steadily over the years, all of these diverse groups still nurture and protect their individual national identities." And "Because the Transkei is Bantu Territory, and because the Bantu jealously guard their right to privacy, all non-residents of the territory are required to hold special visas if they wish to leave the main roads."

"The transition to self-government of South Africa's Bantu peoples is progressing peacefully in marked contrast to the emergence elsewhere of many other African states. The Transkei elections in December 1963 were a model of democratic order and discipline."

This is the South Africa portrayed to attract American tourists - and every year more and more Americans, and people from other parts of the world, are being attracted to South Africa. "It is well known that the South African tourist trade has increased rapidly during the past few years, but it has come as a surprise to many that tourism now ranks among the five leading industries earning foreign exchange for the country."

In 1963 tourism contributed \$112 million to South Africa's economy. The largest numbers of tourists to South Africa came from Europe, especially England, and the second largest number from the United States.

	<u>Number of Tourists & Countries of Resident</u>				
	<u>1960</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>
Europe	23,121	22,490	27,536	33,235	39,854
United Kingdom	15,648	17,734	17,596	?	24,308
Germany	2,047	2,001	2,769	?	4,409
Canada	606	668	658	847	1,116
United States	4,863	4,303	5,328	7,274	8,317
<u>Grand Total</u>	187,516	190,485	202,157	217,005	229,252

There has been a constant increase in the number of tourists going to South Africa since 1960. The 200,000 mark was passed for the first time in 1962. Included in these increases have been increases from some African countries, notably Rhodesia and Mozambique (but the number of tourists to South Africa from other parts of Africa has decreased).

The greatest rate of increase has been from Europe and the United States, however. The number of American tourists who went to South Africa in 1963 was a 33.4% increase over those going in 1962, and there was still another substantial increase in 1964. Of the American tourists who visited South Africa in 1962, 3,574 went on holiday, 1,423 went on business, 15 went for educational purposes, and 316 went for short term visits. July and August have been peak months for travel to South Africa.

And these Americans who go to South Africa - how do they react? They see the cities, visit the resorts, and see the wild life, they see the "natives", they see what the travel brochures have set forth. Some say, "South Africa is the greatest country in Africa - what is wrong with the rest of Africa?" Or they say, "The leader of Africa is South Africa, the other countries should depend on South Africa, they are only hurting themselves if they try to boycott." Others say - "the natives are happy and want things the way they are. After all, they earn more than any other Africans." and "Oh, yes, the natives are happy, the agitations in South Africa are by whites - and they are all Communists." Some, without thinking of the full implications say - "It's a white man's country". Even some Peace Corps members, going to South Africa as tourists, have been quoted as saying, "We heard a lot of bad things about South Africa before we came here...but we found they are untrue...all races seem to get along pretty well with each other." Or, as written in Esquire Magazine, comparing South Africa with Australia and Canada, "All three have developed a race of big men and beautiful women, leading good, comfortable, middle-class lives strongly oriented to sports and outdoors... The look of much of the place is American... Ringing the South African cities are suburbs of big, comfortable, middle-class homes with barbecues... on sprawling, close-cropped green lawns. (This is the white man's South Africa, of course.)"

How is it possible for thousands of Americans to go to South Africa, even as tourists, and perceive South Africa this way - and not be aware of the black man's South Africa, of the non-white man's South Africa? One very big reason, of course, is that they are brain-washed before they go to South Africa. They are already conditioned by the propaganda of the South African promotional agencies in the United States which promote this "white man's image" of South Africa. In the United States, huge sums of money are spent building this kind of image.

Out of the South African Tourist Corporation, with offices located in New York City's Rockefeller Center and in Los Angeles' Wilshire Beverly Center, literature, films, and thousands of words flow - selling this "white man's image" of South Africa, and Americans have shown an interest in South Africa. In 1962-63 these two offices handled 24,241 inquiries about the country.

Since tourism has expanded over the past decade to become one of the largest single industries in the world, South Africa has set out to compete for and capture a large portion of this trade. The South African government created a new Ministry of Tourism in 1963 under Minister F. W. Waring, who has said about tourism, "The money spent by foreign tourists in the Republic represents a windfall of no small significance". New facilities for tourists are being undertaken. South African Airways has established new low fares made available to travel agencies. More international airlines are inaugurating flights to South Africa. Today, most of the leading European airlines have flights there - Alitalia, Sabena, Lufthansa, KLM Royal Dutch, BOAC, Air France, SAS, EL AL, and, from the United States, Pan American Airways. Advertising and publicity are being "increased and intensified".

The South African Tourist Corporation produces at least 15 publications. (Most of these publications are actually prepared and printed in South Africa, then transported to the U.S.) Some of these publications are: Desk Calendar - "the pictures chosen not only present South Africa's many tourist attractions, but deliberately tend to portray our Western way of life". Colourful South Africa - fifty-four bound color plates; South Africa for the Visitor; South Africa in a Nutshell, "giving brief factual information on South Africa"; Shell Folder, for tour operators; and many others.

One of these brochures, put out not by SATOUR but by the Information Service of South Africa, 655 Madison Avenue, New York City, which was sent to various travel agents who promote tours to South Africa, is entitled South Africa in Fact. Only a few quotes from it establish the kinds of facts being presented. "An ally of the Free World in two World Wars...the only country in Africa unequivocally alligned with the West". "Between 1650 and 1850 large parts of South Africa, at the time uninhabited, were settled by white people...other tracts of South Africa were settled, also by right of first occupation, by Bantu (black) peoples... Neither the Bantu nor the White people, therefore, have a prior claim to the whole of South Africa." "Since their original entry into South Africa the Bantu people have never been a homogeneous nation with a single loyalty.. The white people on the other hand...today are a permanent African nation in their own right...". South African Tourists Corporation also produces films. Within the past year films showing through agencies in America numbered 7,262, and SATOUR films were viewed on TV by 13,075, 710 persons in U.S. and Canada.*

SATOUR also has many outlets for articles pertaining to South Africa. In the United States and Canada publications such as The Social Spectator, Town and Country, Toronto Globe and Mail, Country Club Magazine, Sunset Travel Review, Miami News, U.S. News and World Report and Esquire Magazine have carried special South African features. Through the SATOUR American offices, liaison tours and lecture tours have been set up, in Boston, Las Vegas, Miami, San Francisco, and Seattle. Exhibits designed to promote South African tourism have been held at the Hartford Times Travel Show and the Boston Herald Show. In New York a new SATOUR center was opened on the Concourse Level of the RCA Building, Rockefeller Center, with floor-to-ceiling murals by the New York artists Fred Koester.

According to a SATOUR report, "It is not always fully appreciated that the task of encouraging people to visit the Republic to share in its beautiful attractions is at times fraught with certain difficulties. Not least among these are adverse publicity, criticism in the press, on television, and through radio broadcasts. News presentations favor the controversial and sensational; against this factual tourist news is at a disadvantage, but is, for that reason, all the more essential."

*See section on Entertainment

In promoting factual tourist news, SATOUR is assisted by travel agents, carriers, television, radio and travel editors, tourist bodies, motoring clubs and influential people in the travel sphere, as well as by South African diplomatic and consular representatives abroad. Figures show that many thousands of organizations and individuals are actively engaged in assisting the Corporation.

"The number of persons in Europe alone who have the inclination to travel and who could afford to travel to South Africa is estimated at half a million. Competition for this market is severe but greater promotional efforts could without doubt lead to a gain of tens of thousands of tourists from Europe and America annually, especially if these methods are backed by satisfied visitors who have returned home having regulated their "imagination by reality" - but what is the reality of South Africa?

With all of the forces working to promote tourism to South Africa, with all of the forces working to present a "white man's image" of South Africa, American tourist who certainly is not well informed about Africa might have a hard time seeing anything but a South Africa as described in the travel folders and by the South Africa Tourist Corporation. Still, the question must be asked, how is it possible for the American tourist to see only this phase of South Africa? How could he be so totally shielded from all the negative aspects of apartheid? Could he go to South Africa and have no awareness that "In the workings of apartheid, colour comes first in importance, race next, and human beings last"; that "there is no equality between blacks and whites"; that "there is no African, Coloured, or Indian member of the South African Parliament"; that "The Bantustan scheme is nothing if it is not an attempt to entrench racial discrimination and white domination throughout the length and breadth of South Africa. That is why the Transkeian Bantustan scheme has had to be constituted over the dead bodies of scores of African people, and under the crushing grip of a State of Emergency."

Could he know nothing of the overcrowded, poor African "Reserves", the forced movement of Africans from their homes and the mass razing of African homes? Could he not know about the wide discrepancy between the wages of the white worker and the African worker? Could he know nothing of the notorious Pass Laws, that at least one thousand Africans per day are convicted by South African courts for petty pass offenses, that perhaps as many as 2,000 Africans end up in the jails every day? Could he not know that the difference in life expectancy for the white and the African is 30 years in favor of the white; that between 1948 and 1960 the total number of Africans killed by police bullets in the course of political protest, including the victims of the Sharpeville massacre, was approximately 300 according to official records, and "since then there have been scores of Africans killed in the Transkei when the African people opposed the Government's attempt to impose a Bantustan on them"?

No, most American tourists who go to Africa and "see the realities" undoubtedly do not know about these things. They do not know because they have been propogandized and really don't see. They do not know because within the United States among the general population there is not an awareness of what is really happening within South Africa. They do not know because they do not want to know, because as with most people, they are unconcerned unless they are personally touched, personally involved. Some do know - but do not care because within the United States they have not cared about the American Negro's struggle for equality, or they have cared and endorsed the South African way.

By not knowing, by not caring, by swelling the ranks of those Americans who go to South Africa, these American tourists end up supporting apartheid, for as a South African official has remarked, "People who have seen things 'as they are' in the Republic are almost invariably on their return home the best promoters of tourism in South Africa".

On the part of those Americans who do know the tragedies and consequences of apartheid, who do know the threat the South African situation poses to international peace, there is an obligation and duty to make these Americans know, to make all American know and care.

Another development in South Africa, highly related to tourism is the encouragement of immigration - white immigration - to South Africa. Both tourism and immigration to South Africa are based on the same promotional themes and the same basic appreciation of apartheid.

In 1961 a new Department of Immigration, with an allocation of nearly 2½ million dollars, was set up to encourage white immigrations to South Africa, to recruit overseas (in competition with Canada and Australia), to bring these immigrants to the country (paying their passage cost), and to help them find housing and jobs. Radio programs and SATOUR Films have been developed for this endeavor.

In the past three years, more whites have moved to South Africa than have left. In 1963, 26,000 whites immigrated there - "the highest total in the 15-year reign of the pro-apartheid Nationalist regime". Most of these immigrants come from Europe - Holland, West Germany, Italy, Portugal, Greece and Scandinavia, but the greatest number come from Britain. In 1963, 11,000 persons immigrated to South Africa from Britain and, according to reports, the South African Embassy in London receives 80 inquiries daily from prospective immigrants.

How do these immigrants feel about apartheid? ... "After the initial revulsion, they will, like their predecessors avert their eyes." They, as with most American tourists, will not see, and will not care, and will in the end support apartheid.

AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT: SPORTS

An area in which the effects of apartheid are extremely important is the area of sports competition. While this area does not make the financial contribution to the South African economy which tourism or big business make, it is nonetheless perhaps even more critical - for while tourism relates to the individual, sports can really be called one of the prime "image makers" of a country or a people. Often, long before the general public knows anything about a country or its history, some outstanding sports figure from that country is known - has created an awareness and an image of that country.

During the years 1913-1925, while people in the sports world knew of Battling Siki, the black African who fought American top boxers, they did not know of Senegal or its depressing colonial status. The names of Hogan Kid Bassey, former world welterweight champion, and Dick Tiger, former world middleweight boxing champion, were well known by people who knew nothing about Nigeria. More recently, in the Rome Olympics in 1960 and again in 1964, the championship running of the barefoot. A. Bikila of Ethiopia, first double winner of the marathon in Olympic history, made a great impact on the sports world. These athletes and many more like them were not only "putting their countries on the map", not only creating an awareness and image of their countries, they were also creating an image of the ability and accomplishments of black people.

Certainly within the United States, the athletic exploits of the great Jesse Owens - winner of four gold medals in the Olympic games held in Berlin in 1936, at a time when Hitler was proclaiming the superiority of the Aryan "race" - were known within the United States and around the world. His athletic exploits, added to those of such champions as Joe Louis, Jackie Robinson, Willie Mays and others, have done much to bring honor and glory to the United States, have done much to create a positive image of America, and have done much to create around the world the recognition of the abilities of the black man.

Because athletics perform such a vital function - the creation of images of a country, the creation of positive images of the participants and the winners - because it becomes difficult to speak and think in terms of white-black racial superiority and inferiority when blacks and whites are competing on an equal level, and blacks and whites are winning championships, equal sports participation within South Africa and outside South Africa becomes a threat to the entire concept and structure of apartheid. The South African government is well aware of this threat, of the certain exposure of apartheid as a fraudulent concept, as is evidenced by the strong, severe stand it has taken on sports competition within South Africa and by South African participants abroad.

As recently as 1963, the Minister of Interior, Johannes de Klerk, reaffirmed the South African government's position that it would not approve of South African teams composed of white and non-white sportsmen competing abroad or foreign teams so composed entering South Africa. Separate teams of different racial groups from South Africa may compete with any team abroad. Within the Republic, however, whites must compete only against whites, and non-whites against non-whites.

The policy of the South African government towards sports competition as an example of the rigidity of apartheid is worth summarizing.

- "1. In South Africa whites and non-whites must play sport separately. Whites and non-whites must not compete against one another, whether in individual events or as teams or part of teams.
- "2. South African sportsmen could compete outside the country's borders with sportsmen of different races who were not South Africans.
- "3. In sport outside the country, the Government would observe the customs of other countries. But teams and sportsmen visiting South Africa should observe the country's customs. In South Africa, White should compete against White and Non-White against Non-White.
- "4. Participation in international sports tournaments or competitions of mixed teams as representatives of South Africa could not be approved. For example, if Whites took part individually in such tournaments they must do so as representatives of the Whites of South Africa, and Non-Whites must take part as representatives of Non-white South Africans.
- "5. Invitations to South African teams from neighbouring states to take part in competitions there in conflict with the customs in South Africa, and in matches which were obviously not international ones, would not be regarded favourably.
- "6. It was Government policy to help white and non-white sport associations as far as possible, but most certainly not where their purpose was to force the country to depart from the Government's policy.
- "7. In administration and control non-white associations could exist alongside the corresponding white associations. The white executive committees could serve on a high level as coordinating bodies between the associations and as representatives in the corresponding world organizations."

When the Minister of Interior made this statement in 1963, it was indicated that he intended to introduce a "Protection of Race Relations Bill" to enforce and further expand rigid apartheid in virtually all cultural, sporting and entertainment fields. The wait for this legislation did not take long. Only last month, as reported in The Star Johannesburg of February 20, 1965, the Group Areas Act was expanded by placing a maximum fine of R400 or two years in jail or both against anyone who contravenes the government's proclamation on mixed audiences at public entertainments and sports meetings. Under this proclamation, the ban on mixed audiences includes church fetes, agricultural shows, banquets, horse racing, in addition to the more obvious cinema and theater shows and sports meetings.

Under this bill, any organizer of any function at which members of more than one race are to be present must apply for a permit. This proclamation pertains to public affairs and "it is not necessary to obtain permits for private parties - except at clubs which are specifically referred to in the proclamation".

While both the organizer of the function and those who attended are liable to punishment, one of the most important aspects of the measure is that the responsibility for deciding whether a particular function requires a permit is left with the organizer. The effect of this feature is that many organizers will not want to shoulder this responsibility of deciding with the subsequent punishment if their judgment is wrong, and they will attempt less and less to organize various functions.

This new proclamation is an extension of the Group Areas Act which was passed in 1950 to provide separate areas for Africans and whites but dealt rather exclusively with actual occupation of property. In 1957, this act was extended by giving the President power to issue proclamations extending the scope of the act to provide segregation of cinema and theater performances, restaurants, clubs, and other places of entertainment. Now in 1965, this new, more stringent proclamation has been passed - giving further testimony to the total unending commitment of the white South African government to preventing any mixing of "different races".

Already, the effects of this new proclamation have been felt in the sports world of South Africa. A soccer team, the Johannesburg Wanderers Club, experienced a sharp drop in attendance at two major games over a recent weekend. The Wanderers stadium is in a predominantly white area of the city and Africans were not permitted to attend the games. While National League soccer is played only by whites, it was estimated that one-quarter of last season's two million spectators were African.

This then is the South African approach to athletic competition - complete racial separation - and where before it wasn't totally separate, now it must be. Within South Africa, Africans and whites cannot compete

against each other, neither individually nor as part of a team. Visiting athletes must comply with this ruling - whites against whites, blacks against blacks.

South African teams participating outside the country can compete against interracial teams, but even then there is a catch. When South African teams are sent abroad, the teams are completely segregated - whites represent whites and Africans represent Africans - and then ironically neither represents South Africa.

In 1962, the South African Amateur Athletic Union decided that participants for teams should be selected on merit, but separate trials should be held for whites and Africans. When one of the African participants registered the first time, the plan was abandoned. The African was not included on the team.

In 1963, Africans were included on a team which toured Britain, but they were not given the South African "Springbok" colors because they could not represent South Africa. But even this situation was not as bad as the following year, for then in order to avoid any controversy, the government withheld the passports of the Africans - thus eliminating the problem of whether they should be allowed to wear the team colors. Where whites and Africans have been chosen to tour abroad jointly, they have traveled separately, slept in separate accommodations and have participated as individuals and not as a team.

Separate white and African athletic associations have been set up in South Africa and where whites and Africans have attempted to form interracial teams, they have been forced to join the separate racialist associations, or have been charged with contravening the Group Areas Act. Even where this separation of white and black associations is complied with, the African associations are harrassed and plagued by the police. Dennis Brutus, honorary secretary of the non-racial South African Sports Association was banned from travel outside the country for fighting for non-racial sports. Later he was arrested and imprisoned.

Because of the Group Areas Act which rigidly sets aside white areas and non-white areas, the non-white teams must get permission to play in certain areas and often have no place to play. In 1963, for example, the Benoni and Springs municipalities ordered non-racial football teams to join the racialist Football Association, and when this was not done they removed the goal posts and prevented the teams from playing. The secretary of the South African Non-Racial Olympic Council was quoted as saying in 1964, "The non-white professional league, whose teams drew crowds of between 30,000 and 50,000 in the main stadium in Johannesburg, are now barred from the stadium by the municipal authorities. These teams now have no ground in the whole Transvaal".

Audiences attending matches in South Africa are segregated and usually special branch detectives attend athletic events to see that these laws against mixed participation and mixed audiences are upheld.

The setting forth of this background of the South African government's attitude toward athletic events adds up to but one tragic fact - there is no freedom nor equality for the African - and further points out that any foreign sports body which competes against South African teams, either within South Africa or outside South Africa, becomes a partner in apartheid.

The South African government's position is so firmly and rigidly drawn that there is no compromise - international sports bodies and individual athletes must completely disassociate themselves from any competition with South Africa, or go on record as supporting apartheid in sports and apartheid in general.

World bodies can bring pressure on the South African approach to sports. Perhaps the best example is the South African participation in the Olympic games. On a segregated all-white basis, South Africa had participated in 1956 Olympics. Long before the 1960 Olympics, pressure had been brought on the International Olympic Federation to either request South Africa to permit all "races" to compete equally for the Olympics or to ban them.

In the United States and at Geneva the matter was brought before Avery Brundage, the American president of the I.O.F. After a statement by the South African I. O. F. member, Reginald Honey, that there was no racial discrimination in South African sports, that selection and participation was solely on ability (presumably black Africans did not have the ability), Avery Brundage stated that he was satisfied with this statement. Subsequently, on a segregated all-white basis, South Africa did participate in the 1960 Rome Olympics.

By 1964, however, world pressure had built up and after several subterfuges by South Africa, the invitation by the I.O.F. to compete at the 18th Olympic Games in Tokyo was withdrawn in August 1964 as the South African Olympic Committee declined to disassociate itself publicly from the government policy of banning interracial sports events. In fact, the Minister of Interior declared in June 1964, "Where whites participate in international tournaments they must do so as representatives of the whites of South Africa. Non-whites must represent non-whites." World concern has further been shown through protest demonstrations in London, Oslo and other cities when South African athletes appeared in international competition.

The United States singly has not had extensive interaction in sports with South Africa. One large reason has been that the major sports played in the United States - baseball, basketball and American football - are not played to any great extent in most of the world. The major South African sports on the other hand - soccer, cricket, rugby - while international sports played in many parts of the world, have little popularity in the United States. Thus, opportunities for direct encounters are limited. Nonetheless, the United States has, even through limited participation, given support to apartheid. In the fall of 1963 an all-white South African women's hockey team toured the United States in an international meet made up of representatives from countries from Western Europe, the Caribbean, Africa, Asia, South America and New Zealand. The South African team played against the United States team.

In June 1963 a team of four African boxers toured the United States. Also in the same year it was reported that "four American-style basketball courts" and American type bowling alleys, among other facilities, were being built for the non-white athletes and that "Much of the warrior spirit that had characterized the various Bantu nations in the past centuries today finds a healthy outlet in the boxing ring, on the soccer field...etc."

In February of 1964, the all-white South African Junior International Sunshine Cup tennis champions competed in Miami, Florida, and then toured the East Coast and visited Philadelphia for the third People to People Sports Committee on a U.S. State Department educational tour.

Also in 1964, the American "Flying Grandfather", Max Conrad, set out to fly non-stop from Cape Town to the United States. Furthermore, in 1964 fourteen American track and field stars participated, on a segregated basis, in the South African Olympic games held in Johannesburg.

Today, in the United States, thousands of people have cheered the little white South African golfer, Gary Player. He was the first non-U.S. resident to win the Masters Tournament and in the nearly eight years in which he has competed in the United States, he has been among the top money winners. When he won the Masters in Augusta, Georgia, it was reported, "Player, who today became the first foreign pro to win the Masters Tournament, never forgets that he is an ambassador as well as an athlete."

One incident involving American sportsmen which attracted international attention was the 1964 Wimbledon tennis matches in England. In these international matches where South Africa was represented on an all-white team basis, several countries, notably the Soviet Union team, declared they would withdraw rather than play against segregationist South Africa. The position of the United States team players was that they were bound by the U.S. Lawn Tennis Association rules and they would play anyone. (Later South Africa cancelled a tour in Europe because of the Olympic censure and Wimbledon issue.)

By an ironic but unfortunate coincidence, the one American Negro on the U.S. male team (and only the second American Negro to play in these Wimbledon matches - the first, Althea Gibson, was twice Wimbledon singles champion) was placed in the position of saying he would play against anyone and politics should not be brought into sports.

No matter how little direct contact American athletes have had with white South African athletes, or how limited the amount of direct contact with South African white athletes within the United States, there are innumerable sports competitions taking place outside the U.S. in which Americans participate. The United States has produced some of the world's greatest athletes and the field of sports, more than any other "organization" in the country, has taken the lead in breaking

down racial barriers and affording equal competition. The athletes and sportsmen of the United States would be turning their backs on their achievements within this country if they did not take a stand against apartheid in sports.

It should be clear to all that there is no such thing as equal sports competition within South Africa and that the white South African teams sent abroad for international competition are not representative of South Africa. As a force in the international sports world, all American athletes should join in individually and as bodies to stand against racial segregation in sports, to stand against South Africa and her policies of apartheid.

The isolation of South African segregated sports from the rest of the world will have an effect on South African policies. Already some effects are being felt. As taken from an editorial in the Johannesburg Rand Daily Mail "...more and more the problem that has arisen in the South African entertainment world is coming to resemble that which has arisen in the world of sport. When our sportsmen travel abroad, many people see them as upholders of a way of life which has become abhorrent everywhere, and show them a hostility which is really intended for the system under which they live. They feel they have no other way of expressing their distaste."

AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT: ENTERTAINMENT

Just as the expanded Group Areas Act forbids mixed white and non-white audiences or participants in sports, so too does it set up the same restrictions in all forms of entertainment. The form apartheid takes here is readily recognized and the American involvement quite pronounced.

When South Africans attend movie houses throughout the country, the chances are they will see a picture made in Hollywood, U.S.A., for at least 80% of all feature films shown in South Africa are made by the leading United States' film producers. (Fifteen percent of the films come from England)

Every day of the week, every week of the year, somewhere in South Africa, a new motion picture "made in Hollywood" is introduced for the first time. There can be no doubt that overseas distribution of American-made motion pictures is big business. The seven leading American motion picture producers (Columbia, Universal, Allied Artists, Paramount, Warner Brothers, 20th Century-Fox and MGM) realized income of \$300-\$310 million from overseas distribution in the year 1964. This represents about 50% of their total income. From South Africa, in 1964, these seven companies earned \$6 million, slightly less than the \$6.5 million earned in 1963. The total earnings to the United States motion picture industry is actually higher than this because the incomes of independent producers are not included.

comprising about 19% of the total population, 75% of the 522 movie houses in the country are set aside. Thus, the huge majority of people must attend only 25% of the movie houses. This lack of equality is not indicated in the description of the "Cultural South Africa" -- "Theatersgoers, dressed in their smartest, dot the downtown streets at night. For Johannesburg, like New York, is the leading cultural center in her country. Ballet, opera and shows (many recently hailed on Broadway) attract thousands nightly. Blazing marquees announce the latest movies from Hollywood."

There would be no need to go into the names or nature of these American films distributed in South Africa. The leading motion picture producers made 207 new pictures in the year 1964, and as one representative of a motion picture studio commented, "Naturally, most of these pictures show up in South Africa." (The number of new films available to South Africa is much higher than this figure of 207 because prints of previous years are available and are constantly being shifted around. Thus 350 new films were distributed in South Africa in 1964.)

While most of these pictures do show up in South Africa, it should be quite obvious that certain kinds of pictures -- those very few pictures made in the United States which depict the American Negro in a favorable light -- would never be shown there. Entertainment in South Africa, especially the cinema, becomes a combination of American films being shown to segregated audiences, seated in segregated theaters, viewing "segregated" pictures.

Because the motion picture business is such an involved operation (that is, producers, actors, distributors, theater owners, agents, and so on, are all involved), it would be difficult to control the showing of these films without great cooperation from many sources. Full control would have to come from a concerned, involved motion picture industry. Nevertheless, some individual motion picture performers have taken a stand against apartheid. Marlon Brando and Sir Laurence Olivier have stipulations in their contracts that none of their films shall be shown before segregated audiences. Although many motion picture performers do not have the same stature or power as these two stars, nonetheless, nearly all top motion picture performers are independent agents; that is, unlike in the past, most of them are not under contract to a major studio. Thus, they could refuse to perform in South Africa and stipulate that their pictures not be shown before segregated audiences.

While no other entertainment media has the breadth of motion pictures, Americans have been and are involved with South Africa in other forms of expression. In the past, classical and jazz artists such as

Jan Peerce (twice), the Westminster School Choir, and Yehudi Menuhin have toured South Africa. An American producer, Margaret Webster, has visited and lectured on the theater and contemplated staging "A Man for All Seasons" there. Recently a group of American actors, the Everyman Players, directed and headed by a Professor and Mrs. O.R. Corey, faculty members of Centenary College in Shreveport, Louisiana, toured South African theaters. This group is made up of young university graduates. Before touring South Africa, they had appeared at the New York World's Fair.

Also recently, the Claremont String Quartet of New York, under the U.S. State Department's Cultural Exchange Program, was going to perform in South Africa. They were refused visas by the South African government however because the South African government believed they would perform only before mixed audiences. The visas were not granted, but the quartet's manager "denied that the Claremont Quartet had a policy of playing only to integrated audiences." The manager had agreed to play before any audience on the tour.

A year and a half ago, a well-known white American folk singer was going to give 16 concerts in South Africa. The singer agreed to perform before segregated audiences but on being told that certain of her songs, which included Negro spirituals and a West African freedom song, would make her liable to imprisonment, she cancelled the tour. It is ironic, and yet an accurate commentary on the rigid nature of apartheid, that in the above two cases the performers were willing to perform before segregated audiences but the rigidity and fear engendered by an untenable concept of racial separation and superiority still made it impossible.

Fortunately, some individual actors and actresses, performers and playwrights have taken definite stands against apartheid. In 1964, Edward Albee refused to grant permission for his very successful play, "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf" to be done in South Africa unless it was performed before mixed audiences. Naturally, the South African government would not agree to this. Other American playwrights such as Arthur Miller, Tennessee Williams have likewise refused to have their works performed before segregated audiences. Only a few weeks ago, permission to perform "Fiddler on the Roof" in South Africa was denied because of the laws and practices of racial segregation. These are acts of individual conviction, for as yet American actors, variety artists and so on, have not come together in a concerted action against apartheid.

Of the American associations governing actors, writers and so on, only the Actors' Equity, which is the governing body for actors on the legitimate stage, has taken a definite stand on apartheid. In all Equity agreements and contracts, clauses are contained which prohibit performances in any theater or other places of performance where discrimination is practiced as to admission or seating by reason of race, color and creed. In 1961, in a resolution specifically drawn

up in reference to South Africa, Actors' Equity declared, "the Council does request that its members do not accept engagements to perform in said country while the present policies of the government on discrimination and segregation exist."

The American Guild of Variety Artists governing nightclub performers does not have this stipulation. The Screen Actors' Guild does not have this stipulation. The American Federation of Television and Radio Artists does not have this stipulation. In light of the lack of action taken by all these groups, Actors' Equity - four years ago - took a brave, bold course -- a course which could be taken by these other associations.

Actors' Equity has also cooperated with the British Musicians Union in at least one case where the rights to perform the musical "Pajama Game" had been obtained in South Africa and the South African producers wanted to use British performers. When they refused because of racial segregation, South Africa turned America for casting -- but they were refused also by American actors. (Apparently the British Equity and Variety Artists' Federation still has not taken a definite stand, while the British Musicians' Union has forbidden all engagements in South Africa as a protest against apartheid.)

Many overseas playwrights have refused to give permission to have their plays performed in South Africa. In Ireland, 28 playwrights including Samuel Beckett and the late Sean O'Casey signed a declaration to that effect in 1964. In Britain, such playwrights as John Osborne, Graham Greene, Terrance Rattigan and Lionel Bart have also refused to give such permission. Individual artists such as Sir Laurence Olivier, John Gielgud, Sybil Thorndike and Larry Adler have gone on record against apartheid. Some of the British pop singers have also refused to go to South Africa, most notably the internationally known Beatles who in 1964 refused to perform before segregated audiences. Only a few months ago, two pop singers encountered difficulties with the South African government. One, Adam Faith, was asked to sign before leaving London a document promising he would sing only before segregated audiences. He refused, was later given a visa, performed in South Africa (before some segregated audiences) but became fed up, attempted to leave, but was detained by the police until a huge bond had been posted.

Within the United States there has been limited involvement with South African performers, although under the United States Cultural Exchange programs and through independent producers, South Africans have come to the United States. Included in some of these private endeavors have been such things as the World Art Show presented by the Washington Square Galleries in New York in 1964. In this World Show some 250 works from 41 countries were shown, including the works of three white South African artists. Also, in the international competition of the Guggenheim Foundation in New York, a Guggenheim prize was awarded to a white South African and the works of four other

white South Africans were entered in this competition. In Washington, D.C. at the Ninth International Exhibition of Ceramic Art, sponsored by the Kiln Club of Washington, four white South Africans participated. South African dancers, most notably Nadie Nerina, have performed with the Royal Ballet which has toured the United States. One South African dancer was a member of the Jackie Gleason show on television. On the legitimate stage, plays from South Africa have included Alan Paton's "Lost in the Stars" (from his novel "Cry the Beloved Country" - also a motion picture), "Too Late the Phalarope," and the more recent "Sponono" (written with Krishna Shah). All of these were done on Broadway with racially mixed casts. Off-Broadway, there has been the Athol Fugard play, "Blood Knot." There are South African singers, musicians and other entertainers in the United States who have managed to escape from the evils of apartheid. Performers such as musician Hugh Masekela and singer Letta Mbulu are well-known. The name Miriam Makeba is well-known in this country and elsewhere. There are white South African movie stars who visit or live in the United States, such as Glynnis Johns, Juliette Prowse and Mary Peach.

The motion picture "Zulu" was one of the more recent films made possible through United States independent producer and South African government cooperation. According to one report, "South Africa, with its virtually year-round sunshine and crisp colors, is fast become a movie-makers' Mecca." The film "Zulu" was made in South Africa's Natal National Park. It was co-produced by the American producer-director Cy Endfield. The British actors Stanley Baker and Jack Hawkins, and the Swedish actress Ulla Jacobsson were starred. Also, "some 50 South Africans soldiers of the Active Citizens Force were lent by the government as extras during the last three months of their training... 250 Zulu warriors were imported from the Melmoth district of Zululand... 3,000 local Zulu braves traveled to the locations site..." This film premiered in the United States and was shown all over the country.

In the area of "entertainment" one of the most productive makers of motion pictures and film strips is SATOUR, the South African Tourist Corporation, with major offices in New York and California. According to their 16th Annual Report of 1962-63, "Film showings through agencies in America numbered 7,262 and 42% more people were reached than in the previous year, mainly as a result of screenings in drive-in and other cinemas." Also, several SATOUR films were shown on television. "The total number of telecasts in America was 342 in comparison with 301 in the previous year...the total estimated audiences who viewed SATOUR films on TV was 13,075,710 in North America inclusive of Canada." Additionally, an estimated 400 TV shows featured South Africa and South Africans in the United States, Canada and other countries. Some of the films they have produced and shown around the country are: "The Face of South Africa," which was awarded a prize in the Sixth International Documentary Film Festival in Canada in 1961; "To Catch a Rhino"; "Lake Wilderness," awarded a prize in the Brussels Film Festival as "the best tourist film with the greatest educational value"; "South Africa - A Preview", and "Introducing South Africa."

In actuality, therefore, one of the greatest contacts the United States has with South Africa in the "entertainment" field is through the South African tourist office. These films are shown through both commercial and non-commercial outlets -- and often as pure entertainment rather than as promotional, propaganda films. One notable example of an attempt to pass off a propaganda piece as pure entertainment was the film, "A Touch of Gold." This film was produced by a public relations firm in New York, under contract with the South African government. It was presented in the form of a travelogue about the wonders of "modern Africa" and depicted South Africa as "a land inhabited almost exclusively by happy, industrious whites and a few primitive, near-savage Africans." Although this firm was registered with the Department of Justice as representative of a foreign agent during its period with the South African government, when this film was shown in the New York area it did not carry - as required by law - the notice identifying it as the product of a registered foreign agent. This picture was being distributed by Warners and shown at the RKO and Skouras Theaters. After protests by the American Committee on Africa, CORE and other concerned organizations, this film was withdrawn.

This film, "A Touch of Gold," and the reaction to it is an example of the way in which quick, concerted action have a direct effect on the distribution and showing of material which purports to be "South African" but in actuality is sheer propaganda for a repulsive way of life.

Though at this point the entertainment world has hardly begun to fight against racial discrimination wherever it may exist and many of those involved have not yet resolved the question of whether it is better for a top artist to totally shun South Africa until her policies and practices change or whether it is better to have them perform under present conditions in order to stimulate and give exposure to the non-white artists, some perceptive people inside South Africa are beginning to be aware of the effect even limited pressures have had on the cultural life of South Africa.

"Whatever the arguments may be, South Africa can no longer ignore the effectiveness of the boycott campaign. Some theaters which have never opened their doors to non-whites before have had to do so in order to get famous names to agree to come to South Africa. (This of course will be impossible now with the tightening of the Group Areas Act which forbids mixed audiences.) Even worse than that, some famous artists simply will not come to South Africa any longer under the present arrangement." Thus a recent page-long article in the Johannesburg Rand Daily Mail bemoans this state of affairs.

One music and theater critic of national repute in South Africa is quoted as saying, after a tour of Britain and the United States, "it is becoming increasingly difficult to say, 'I hope this musician or that actor will come to South Africa.' The number willing to come -- at least among top-rankers -- is dwindling. We shall have to get our shows from the American South, where our policies get sympathy, or from those countries where human freedoms are considered minor issues. We shall have to take 'package' companies of which the directors are looking for any avenues or haven't given the matter a thought." This critic added that the argument that artists ought to come anyway to help enlighten the country is no longer accepted abroad and that "No one wants to listen. No one wants to argue any more. A sort of silence is setting in."

This last sentence sums up the kind of effect the American entertainment world can have on the policies and practices of the South African government. In the present world, entertainment and reactional outlets are necessary for the people. Opportunities for creative endeavors and creative growth are vital to the growth of any nation. When the South African government is made to realize that they can be, will be culturally isolated from the United States and the rest of the world -- and the silence of isolation sets in -- then the South African government will, must bend.

AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT: EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

As indicated by its title, this is the area in which there is the greatest amount of direct personal contact between individual Americans and South Africans. Each year hundreds of Americans go to South Africa and hundreds of South Africans come to the United States on various kinds of exchange programs -- cultural exchange, University lecturing, study courses, leadership programs, and so on.

To know precisely how many Americans and South Africans are actually involved in this yearly exchange is difficult because in addition to several large well-established exchange programs, there are numerous exchanges which may be worked out between two universities with special interests, for example, or between two scientific organizations, and so on.

Some of the larger private exchange programs are those of the American Field Service, the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program Inc., and the Carnegie Corporation Travel Grants Program. Of these private American exchange programs, one of the oldest is the American Field Service. Starting in 1914 as a volunteer ambulance service with the French armies, it instituted graduate fellowships for French universities between the wars and in 1947 began to provide international scholarships for teenagers.

The American Field Service International Scholarship is a private educational organization with "no religious or political affiliations." Students selected for this program are between 16 and 18 years of age. Students coming to the U.S. attend the

senior year of high school and live with selected American families. Americans who are juniors in high school are sent abroad to live with families. Between 1950 and 1965 nearly 11,000 American students have been sent to various countries around the world while 19,000 students from about 72 countries have come to the United States.

The American Field Service program began exchange with South Africa in 1958. Since that time 277 South African students have come to the U.S. The past two years have been the peak years with 74 coming one year and 73 last year. American Negroes have been involved in these exchanges with other countries, but not a single Negro has gone to South Africa and not a single black African has come to the United States under this program. Because of the manner in which the program is operated, that is, living with a local family, it might be difficult for the American Field Service to include American Negroes or black South Africans in their program. Nonetheless, apparently they have made little, if any, attempt to do so. Without such an attempt, without efforts to crack the wall of apartheid, the American Field Service, which is doing such a fine job around the world in creating international understanding, is implicitly accepting apartheid in South Africa, or at least seems to be saying that the South African policy of apartheid is so rigid and entrenched that it cannot be breached.

In this area of American-South African exchange, this view may not be totally valid, as evidenced by the limited experience of another group, the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program. This program was organized in 1958 "to develop through non-governmental means a mutual basis of cooperation between professional, business, community, and religious leaders of all races in the United States and South Africa." It is a voluntary, non-profit organization managed by Americans and South Africans and financed by American and South African funds.

Among its programs, the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program conducts a Leader Exchange Program, a Science Education Project in cooperation with the United States National Science Foundation, and a Faculty Exchange project. In 1963 and again in 1964, 23 persons were included in the leader exchange program, among them were "an associate Nieman Fellow, an editor of a science journal, a social case worker, a management consultant, members of the clergy, a psychologist, and numerous educators." Included in the 1963-64 Faculty Exchange were professors of Theology, Law, English and African studies.

Of the 23 persons in the 1964 Leader Exchange, 17 were South Africans and six Americans. Of the South Africans, four were black Africans, and of the Americans, one was American Negro. According to reports from the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange, "the highlight of 1964 was Dr. and Mrs. S. M. Nabrit's visit to South Africa in June. Dr. Nabrit, Zoologist and President of Texas Southern University, conferred with Administrators and Professors of English, Afrikaans, African, Coloured and Indian institutions of higher education on new approaches to accelerating the achievement levels of university students. Dr. and Mrs. Nabrit received a warm welcome everywhere, stayed at the best hotels in Johannesburg, Durban and Cape Town, and met a broad cross-section of South Africa's population."

A single case or a few cases do not represent a change or break in the structures of apartheid, but they might indicate that there may be a possibility of broadening all exchange programs to include black and white on a more equitable basis.

Another exchange program is that of the Carnegie Corporation, which provides travel grants to enable university teachers and educational administrators in various commonwealth or former commonwealth countries "to become acquainted with colleges and with recent developments in their own fields in the United States and Canada." In the year 1962, Carnegie travel grants were given to 57 persons in 11 countries. Six of these were for South Africans to come here and one for an American to go to South Africa. In January of this year, of the 24 travel grants given to persons in ten countries, four went to South Africans.

Among other large exchange programs those of the U.S. Government should be mentioned for though out of the scope of private involvement, they certainly become very much a part of the total exchange program picture. Under the U.S. State Department Educational and Cultural Exchange Program in 1962-63, 478 Africans from all over the continent came to the U.S. -- for advanced study, for university lecturing, for observing, and so on. Forty-one of these persons came from South Africa and about one-quarter were non-white. Of all grants given in Africa from 1949 to 1963 to persons from 46 African countries or territories, the number given to South Africans ranked second highest (199) only behind Nigeria (200). Twenty-one South Africans were brought to the U.S. in 1964.

Other programs are those of the Smith-Mundt program under which South African university lecturers have come to the United States and the People to People program started under President Eisenhower in 1956 to foster understanding between Americans and people in foreign countries. Under this latter program "thousands of Americans have traveled as members of this People to People scheme." Among some of these exchanges, in 1964 thirteen white Americans traveled to South Africa, went to meetings and were "entertained through a 'Meet the South African' organization." One of the American leaders of the group, the "group's envoy," reported "they had all been impressed by what they had seen."

On a smaller scale, there are innumerable organizations and individuals involved in exchange programs of various sorts. Some examples of these various exchanges are:

The Chairman of the Medical Department of Brookhaven National Laboratories went to South Africa last year to visit scientific institutions and universities to renew acquaintances made with South African scientists who have studied at Brookhaven. "Scientific information which will eventually lead to closer cooperation between the United States and South African scientists particularly in the field of nuclear energy and allied sciences" was to be exchanged by the American Chairman and his South African counterparts.

Early this year, 1965, a senior lecturer in industrial psychology at the University of South Africa came to the United States under a scholarship from the Ernest Oppenheimer Memorial Trust. Under a U.S. National Institute of Health grant, a professor from a college in Vermont went to South Africa to investigate medical facilities. South Africans have come to the United States under Rotary International Scholarships. Others have come on grants from the South Africa Cancer Society, and still others on International Road Federation Fellowships (given by the Allis-Chalmers Company of the U.S.)

There have been international conferences on various subjects held in the U.S. which South Africans have attended, such as a 40-nation Anesthesiology Conference, such as the New York Herald Tribune Forum, such as an International Conference on Local Government held in Washington, D. C., which a member of the Executive Council of Cape Provincial Administration attended. In 1964, 13 delegates representing 29 Junior Chambers of Commerce participated in the annual World Congress of Junior Chambers International in Oklahoma City - the sixth such Congress in which South Africa had participated. At this conference were 3,000 delegates representing 90 countries and "smack in the middle of things was a massive information booth designed to tell all and sundry the South Africa story." This conference was "open to young men and women from all walks of life..." but the 13 delegates from South Africa were white. These are but a few of the many conferences which take place each year and to which South Africans - white South Africans - are invited.

Finally, there are scores of exchanges which take place between individual groups with special interests. These may be exchanges between persons, or verbal exchanges, or lectures, and so on, where South Africans present a "South African point of view" - white. Here there are such things as the South African Cultural Attache talking at a University of Kentucky foreign language conference on "Cultural Achievements in the Union of South Africa"; as an assistant town engineer from Cape Town doing research on expressways at Northwestern University; as a one-year appointment of a South African as an assistant curator at the Botanical Gardens in Boston; as two American traffic experts going to Johannesburg to help solve traffic problems in South African cities; as a South African composer coming to lecture at the Peabody Institute in Baltimore; as a South African coming as a visiting professor at the University of Washington Medical School in Seattle; as a South African professor joining the staff of the University of Rochester Medical Center as a visiting fellow in Radiology; or an annual International Food Fair, arranged by the Washinton D.C. Y.W.C.A. in which 28 countries participated, among them South Africa - and which was visited by the wife of the then Vice-President, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, in November 1963.

There have been such things as the South African participation in the Seventh United States World Trade Fair in San Francisco in 1964 - with the theme of the South African Pavilion being "Progress Through Stability."

There are the invitations extended to such people as the South African Minister of External Affairs by the National Press Club of Washington, D. C., or the invitation extended to the South Africa Ambassador to the U.S. by the Alexandria, Virginia Rotarians. Before the Rotarians the South African Ambassador, Dr. W. C. Naude, stated: "Africa never was a black continent." ...that "he whose ancestors came from Europe centuries ago is no less a child of Africa than the black man...that the black man in South Africa was never made the slave of the white man...that the Bantu does not have a claim, deriving from prior occupation, to all of South Africa...The truth of the matter is that we believe that in our circumstances, the greatest freedom is found where the individual can live out his life in the embrace of the traditions, heritage, and the cultural values handed down to him. Diversity is innate in human organizations, just as diversity is innate in human beings. To deny it is to be blind. To attempt to change it is to attempt to make a shapeless, uniform agglomeration out of mankind. Ours is a policy of live and let live...the present South African government accepts and respects that men are created equal."

From the many exchange programs, the large, well-organized programs, the United States government programs and the small special interest exchanges, hundreds, even thousands, of South Africans have come to the United States and hundreds of Americans have gone to South Africa. Rarely though have these exchanges involved black Africans or African "Coloureds" or American Negroes. The overwhelming majority of all exchanges have been between white South Africans and white Americans.

One of the great strengths of any exchange program is the opportunity provided to get to know people from different backgrounds, to get to know more about their views, their ways, and their countries. Unfortunately, when only white South Africans are the exchangees coming to America, this getting to know one another, this getting to know and understand another's country, is superficial and deceptive, for these white South African exchangees cannot represent South Africa. Willingly or unwillingly, they represent and strengthen the concept and policy of apartheid.

AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Looking at the various ways in which Americans are involved in South Africa on a non-governmental, private level -- through tourism, through sports, through entertainment channels, and through educational and cultural exchanges -- it is readily seen that thousands upon thousands of Americans and South Africans are involved. It is just as readily seen that principally white South Africans and white Americans are involved. This is what the present South African government dictates. This is what the preaching and accepting of apartheid dictates.

Before considering what action should be taken in this area of American private involvement in South Africa, one fundamental question must be answered. On the part of the white South African, can contact with other parts of the world where apartheid is abhorred and not accepted lead to an ever-expanding enlightening of the white South African and lead

to an eventual withering and dying of the philosophy and mentality of apartheid? On the part of the black South African, can he gain strength to a point where he can end the tyranny of apartheid? Can contacts with an outside world with different views about the equality and rights of man bring this about? Without this contact, will the white South African point of view harden, move more and more toward the strictures of apartheid? Without this contact, will the black South African lose courage, lose inspiration?

Theoretically it can be said that if barriers between people are to be broken down, there must be contact between these people; that if one group of people has a point of view which moves against the tide of man's thinking, contact will weaken and break that point of view. Yet, contact alone is not enough. There must be some equality of contact. In the present South African situation, whites can have contact only with whites, and blacks only with blacks. Under the present South African approach to "race relations" where blacks and whites must be totally separated, where they cannot study together, where they cannot participate in sports events together, cannot sit together -- where new measures are constantly being passed to prevent racial mixing on any level -- where all this is happening, there can be no equality of contacts.

Therein lies the answer to what America's private involvement should be. Under the present South African government a continuation of contacts, through sports, through entertainment, through educational and cultural exchange, cannot breach the walls of apartheid. American contact with South Africa must be totally stopped or totally changed.

Under the circumstances, if total cultural, educational and athletic isolation were imposed, eventually the wall of apartheid would break. Eventually more and more white South Africans would join those whites who are already fighting alongside the black South African and the forces against apartheid would become stronger. But total isolation would not be practical in certain areas of contact.

Tourism and the promotion of tourism to South Africa, with the kind of propaganda it produces, is one of the greatest perpetuators of an undesirable way of life. Though it involves individual persons, it becomes "big business." Of the various types of involvement though, it is perhaps the most vulnerable to pressures. Here the sources from which the information flows can be located -- the South African Tourist Corporation, the travel agencies which promote tours to South Africa. Pressures can be brought to bear here. Counter-propaganda -- merely stating the truth about present-day South Africa -- can be undertaken, though it is difficult to educate an unconcerned American population and especially without the financial resources available to those promoting tourism. Until conditions in South Africa change, American tourism to South Africa should be discontinued.

American involvement in South African athletic events whether inside South Africa, whether in the United States, whether in international competition, should be totally discontinued -- until apartheid is discontinued

in sports, until Africans can compete equally with no restrictions on participation or observation. Few American amateur athletes compete on their own, that is, they are generally part of a larger body or association. All American sports associations, both amateur and professional, should be encouraged to break off contact with South African athletes -- until apartheid is discontinued.

American involvement with South Africa in educational and cultural exchanges, in student and leader exchanges should be discontinued -- until Africans are included on an equitable basis in these exchanges, until American Negroes can be included in exchanges to South Africa. Those few black Africans or black Americans who might rarely be included in present-day exchanges would not suffer by making a small personal sacrifice for the larger gain.

American involvement with South Africa through various entertainment channels should be on a more selective basis. The avenues of entertainment are too complex for total isolation but certain actions should be encouraged. American legitimate stage actors and actresses, screen performers, pop artists and nightclub performers should refuse to perform in South Africa or anywhere in the world before segregated audiences. American playwrights should refuse rights to their works if performed before segregated audiences. Pressures should be brought to bear on the various entertainers' guilds and associations to follow the lead of Actors' Equity and isolate South Africa until apartheid in the whole field of entertainment is discontinued.

Within the United States, greater selectivity should be exercised toward South African entertainment imports and toward South African performers. Some should be encouraged, some discouraged. Some motion pictures boycotted, others promoted. Some South African writers should be encouraged and some discouraged. Greater attention should be focused on the American motion picture industry. Here, too, on a selective basis, American motion picture producers should be made to know that some Americans care about the kinds of films they send to South Africa, the kinds of audiences who view them, and the kinds of films they make in South Africa.
