

12

SPORT

The year 1975-76 was marked with remarkable manoeuvres by South African sports officials to negotiate with each other with the aim of forming single bodies in control of different sports. These negotiations either ended in deadlock or with promises that could never be effected without Government approval as was the case in cricket. All these attempts were made in the wake of boycott threats by international bodies unless South Africa diverted from its policy of apartheid in sport. The stumbling block was not only those Whites who were not keen on mixing with Blacks but also the declared South African sports policy which barred integrated sport at club level and promoted a policy of multinational sport, which saw the South African racial units as 'nations'.

Most non-racial bodies were striving hard to discredit segregated bodies at international level so that South Africa could be expelled from world bodies. The effect of moves by these bodies, together with the London based South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SANROC), were seen when South Africa was excluded from a number of international bodies in 1976. In determined efforts to bar any opposition from within the country, the South African Government had refused passports to many outspoken sports officials representing the non-racial ideology. Amongst victims who suffered this measure was Raxuba, chairman of the South African Non-racial Olympic Committee (SANROC) in London, whose South African passport was withdrawn by the South African Government because of his continued fight for South Africa's sport isolation¹ in preference for inclusion of non-racial bodies. All these controversies will be illustrated when different sports are discussed below.

Soccer

During the period under review, several voices from various quarters were heard calling for integrated soccer play from club level. Although no one could predict at this stage when, if ever, a positive response to the call would come from the South African Government, it could be said that some of those calls were significant. They registered attitudes which contributed to decisions made when other governments or sports bodies declared policies on sports relations with South Africa on the one hand, and they would hopefully also contribute to decisions made when on the other hand, the South African Government reviewed its race policy in sport.

The Government, with the co-operation of the white Football Association of South Africa under Mr Dave Marais, made various offers to black leagues to either play top level internal inter-racial games under the banner of multinational sport or for black leagues to select sides to play visiting international teams as well as organising top level mixed invitation sides to play international sides. Most of these were often accepted with such smooth success that it had become common belief that the black leagues concerned were not bothered about segregated soccer. All these were seen by some critics as attempts to improve the South African image in the international soccer fraternity embodied in the International Football Association (FIFA), the 143 nation brotherhood of world football. For over ten years the white Football Association of South Africa (FASA) has been a member of FIFA but in latter years the retention of its membership has remained in precarious balance as a result of apartheid in South African soccer.

The only national soccer body which has always stood uncompromisingly against what they regarded as window dressing of apartheid, is the non-racial South African Soccer Federation under the leadership of president Norman Middleton. Recent events, however, within the South African National Football Association (SANFA), the powerful All-African soccer front, under Mr George Thabe, indicated growing impatience amongst African soccer administrators regarding the Government's race policy.

A quarrel of African clubs affiliated to the National Professional Soccer League (NPSL) and the South African National Football Association (SANFA) which is supposed to administer African amateur soccer, brought out strong feelings of opposition to the Government's multinational sports policy. The trouble started when several NPSL affiliated clubs expressed dissatisfaction with SANFA control of the NPSL. A number of grievances arose against the SANFA hand in NPSL

administration, amongst which were: the expulsion of Mr Rogers Sishi, the General Manager of NPSL, by SANFA without the consent of the NPSL clubs; sponsorship policy laid down by SANFA which made it difficult for clubs to raise financial support privately for themselves; and unreasonable disciplinary measures by SANFA against member clubs.

Explaining the sponsorship discontentment in an interview with *Black Review*, a director of the Kaizer Chiefs (one of the most powerful clubs), Mr Kaizer Motaung, said the problem arose from the fact that professional soccer was not a life-time occupation and therefore professional soccer players needed to be allowed to raise as much money as they could during their active years. "But according to the present policy, all sponsorship can only be channelled through the national body. We cannot, as individual clubs, make deals in the interest of our players," added Mr Motaung.

As has been indicated, this crisis, in which thirteen of the sixteen affiliated clubs of the NPSL stood up in revolt, came out with expressions of opposition to multi-national sports games. Spokesmen for the boycotting teams declared that their players were not to participate in the match organised between the Argentinian visiting side All Stars and a South African mixed Invitation XI not only because of their quarrel with SANFA but also because the match had been organised as a show staged to impress FIFA.

Although all the clubs later reconciled with SANFA and agreed to play the Argentinians, the desire for non-racial sport was not quenched. Talking to *Black Review* Kaizer Motaung said that he and a lot of other soccer players were opposed to the multi-national sports policy and would only be satisfied when non-racialism was introduced at club level. He said that he regarded multinationalism in sport as a modification of the apartheid policy in South Africa.

The mixed match referred to above was witnessed by a committee of three men sent by the International Football Federation to come and observe whether apartheid policies in sport were being relaxed or not. The Argentinians' game against the South Africans coincided with the fact finding FIFA delegation's presence in the country. The delegation met several soccer officials from all persuasions to discuss the effect and general developments in the South African sports policy. Amongst the key people the committee met, were senior officials of the non-racial South African Soccer Federation, under Norman Middleton, who submitted a memorandum to the committee. In the memorandum, the Federation urged the world body to expel the white FASA from international soccer because it had done nothing positive to bring about non-racial soccer in South Africa.² In a later statement a FIFA vice-president, Mr J. Goni of Chile, who was also a member of the FIFA

committee, said that they would recommend that the suspension of South Africa from the world body be maintained because they were not convinced that there was genuine progress towards non-racialism. Referring to the Argentine match with a mixed South African team, Mr Goni said, "we could not ignore the fact that the game was staged especially for our benefit and we made this known to the South African soccer authorities and the Minister (of sport in South Africa)."³ Another member of the Committee, whose name was not disclosed, said that unless some dramatic gesture was made before FIFA's congress in July, South Africa would be expelled from the world body.

The man, who was described as one of FIFA's moderates, added, "This is not my opinion, this is a fact. You people in South Africa do not realise how out of step you are with the rest of the world."⁴

Although the delegation saw the game with the Argentinians as a step in the right direction, they saw the isolated match as an insignificant instrument to help South African status in the world football. While the South African soccer scene was settling to wait for the FIFA's verdict at the July conference in Montreal, the president of the non-racial South African Soccer Federation, Mr Norman Middleton, applied for a passport to attend the July FIFA conference. Mr Middleton also stated that he wanted to visit the United Kingdom, United States, Australia and New Zealand as well.⁵ The Government said that he would be given a passport if he made a written undertaking to the effect that he would not, at any stage during his absence from South Africa *with a South African passport*, commit any act designed to prevent any South African sportman or sportswoman from participating in international sport, or to cause any other harm to the Republic.

A similar governmental condition had been given to Mr Middleton when he applied for a passport for similar purposes in 1974. As he had done at the time, the SASF president once again refused to give the required undertaking. The Federation had however, already sent a memorandum presenting its case to the International Soccer Federation, through the FIFA delegation that visited South Africa in March 1976. Talking about the written undertaking that his Government demanded from Mr Middleton, the Minister of the Interior, Dr Connie Mulder, said that it was "regarded as a reasonable request with which any loyal South African citizen should be able to comply without hesitation."

Meanwhile, other attempts were made by FASA to win credibility in the international soccer arena, and subsequently retention of recognition by the International Football Association (FIFA). Mr Dave Marais, FASA President, and his secretary, Dudley Zagnoev, undertook a European tour to canvass support for FIFA congress which was to be held in Montreal, Canada. He was optimistic that South Africa would

not be expelled from this body. The least he expected was continued suspension which the three-men delegation that had visited South Africa in March 1976, had recommended.⁶

As the days for the Montreal Congress drew near, FASA began to debate the question of who would represent South Africa to plead her case. It was then decided that the all-white four man delegation consisting of FASA President, Mr D. Marais, Vice-President, Mr Syd Chaitowitz, Secretary of FASA, Mr Dudley Zagnoeov and Viv Granger would be ideal.⁷ After examining the chances of the South Africa story, of gradually moving away from discrimination, being believed, FASA decided to invite Mr George Thabe, SANFA president, to accompany its delegation to Montreal. This request was flatly refused by Mr Thabe who stated that he was not prepared to help FASA from expulsion. He said that the appointment of the all-White delegation had clearly shown that FASA wanted to go it alone without even discussing the matter at the multi-racial Top Level Committee. He feared that he would not be representing black football if he attended with FASA.⁸

George Thabe further accused some white officials of trying to wreck black football by making their own leagues multiracial. He pointed out that several black players and clubs had been approached and encouraged to break away and affiliate to white associations. The absence of any black football representative in the delegation was seen by observers as a blow in the face of South Africa soccer and as significant in that it would decrease the power of influence of South African delegates.⁹

Prior to the Montreal Congress, it was reported that African nations, through the African Football Confederation (AFC), would again seek South Africa's expulsion. The AFC president recalled that a clause had been inserted into the FIFA rules in 1974, barring countries practising racial discrimination from affiliation. Therefore in terms of this clause, South Africa did not qualify.¹⁰ Indeed South Africa was expelled from FIFA. South Africa was expelled after the Cavan report by the three delegates who had been sent to South Africa had been read. Commenting on this expulsion Mr Dave Marais said: "It is now perfectly clear this is definitely a political decision. Only a change of government or a change of policy in South Africa might enable FASA to get back into FIFA and even then I wonder if we would be accepted."¹¹ Most people blamed the Government for this move which could have been avoided. Norman Elliot, chairman of Durban city football club, confused as to what to do next, said that FIFA had not been fooled by this window dressing earlier in the year (referring to the multi-racial South African side).¹²

Rugby

The division between community segments supporting the rival policies followed by the various major bodies controlling rugby in South Africa grew wider during the period under review, with each side using what influence it had to tip the scales in its favour.

The struggle is the age old one between the pro-government rugby bodies established and maintained along racial lines, e.g. the all-African South African African Rugby Board (SAARB) and the all-Coloured South African Rugby Federation (SARF) on the one hand and the consistently non-racial South African Rugby Union (SARU) on the other. Paradoxically the officials of both the SAARB and the SARF have always claimed commitment to a sports policy that observes no race in selection of teams. These feelings were expressed by the SARF President, Mr Cuthbert Loriston, when interviewed by *Black Review* in 1975. They were echoed in a special newspaper article by Mr C. G. Mdyesha, who was vice-president of the African Rugby Board in 1975. In this article Mr Mdyesha said, "South African African Rugby Board has repeatedly said that it stands for multi-racialism in sport. It has made it clear in a memorandum that in agreeing to the match at Newlands it was in no way prejudicing its rights to merit selection, but it is prepared to try any method and approach that will ultimately lead to its goal. It is definitely not prepared to adopt the extravagant all-or-nothing approach," said Mr Mdyesha, apparently alluding to the approach adopted by SARU, the non-racial body which maintains a hard-line attitude to the question of race in rugby.¹³

A match in August between SARF and SAARB sides at a Johannesburg stadium, drew divisions between the supporters of the opposing bodies of racial as against non-racial rugby. The national leadership of the Coloured Labour Party came out in firm support of the SARU non-racial policy.¹⁴ Incidents of violence and bottle throwing threatened the security of the Federation players and officials at their hotel on the eve and morning of the big day.¹⁵ The rival SARU had organised a counter attraction event at Johannesburg's Western Oval stadium, just a stone's throw from the Protea/Leopards venue, where they fielded the Union's biggest crowd-drawers, Kwaru (from Port Elizabeth) versus Tygerberg (from Cape Town). SARU attracted 3 000 spectators as against 600 that watched the Protea/Leopards match. Commenting on the turn-out of people, the Labour Party Leader, Mr Sonny Leon, said:¹⁶ "The message is loud and clear, that people want non-racial sport." Referring to the earlier violent hotel incidents which he denounced,

Mr Leon, however, described them as "the expression of a powerless frustrated people."¹⁷

Attacking the attitude of the Labour Party in the matter, the Transvaal Rugby Football Association, the organisers of the Protea/Leopards match said: "It is surprising that the Labour Party, instead of seeing to the needs of the public as a whole, should interfere directly in sport."¹⁸ The Transvaal leader of the Labour Party, Mr Miley Richards, admitted that there were political overtones. He explained: "Because of government interference in sport, the Leopards and the Proteas are treated as separate racial teams. Our party is trying to get politics out of sport and that is why we support the non-racial unions."¹⁹

The question of how much politics influences the direction taken by sport or how much sport directs the political thinking in any given country, has always been a debatable one depending on the extent of influence on the issue by either the sporting public or the political power in control. However, as the South African Prime Minister, Mr B. J. Vorster, said, "Sport can influence people, nations, or even governments all over the world".²⁰ Likewise in those countries where certain sports activities are held in high esteem, this question arises every so often with regard to relations with South Africa. At the end of 1975 this point became an election issue in New Zealand's general election with the governing Labour Party, under Mr Wallace Rowling, opposing sporting ties with this country and the opposition National Party under Robert Muldoon pledging not to prevent development of the sporting ties New Zealand has with the Republic.

The New Zealand Rugby side—the All Blacks—has been in controversy in and outside South Africa as one of the four international rugby bodies regarded by anti-apartheid campaigners as guilty of promoting racism in Rugby by continuing to ignore the strong presence of Blacks in the sport in their dealings with South African rugby. The other three are the British Lions, the French Tricolors and the Australian Wallabies. Holders of the 'anti-apartheid' view maintain that outside the few consolation events available to sectional black sides like Leopards and Proteas on the occasions when a foreign team visits the country, there are in fact no worthwhile activities to occupy the rest of their time. This can be attributed to the growth in strength of the support the public gives to matches organised by the non-racial SARU. Supporting this view an official of the Border Rugby Union, Mr Silumko Sokupa, said in an interview with *Black Review* that

**Mr Sokupa has subsequently been banned
so it is not possible to quote him.**

Notwithstanding this, the White South African Rugby Board made plans in 1976 for the touring All Blacks to play a multi-racial South African Invitation XV during their tour. The SAARB Leopards would then meet the SARF Proteas as curtain-raisers on this occasion which was scheduled for 10 July in Cape Town. The Leopards and the Proteas were also due for individual opportunities to play against the visitors.

There was every reason to believe that the planned matches involving the black sides would go on as envisaged because the black administrators are known to see advantages in accepting matches at international level as former African Board vice-president, Mr C. Mdyesha, pointed out that such matches help to force South African authorities to construct stadiums for Blacks quickly to international specifications. Since the 1975 historic Invitation XI which met the French at Newlands in Cape Town there has since developed a tradition to have such matches with touring sides as is evidenced in the plans for the All Blacks touring side and reports of a possible 1977 French tour of South Africa. It has been reported that the French rugby Federation wants a multi-racial team to tour France at some future date.²¹ However, the non-racial SARU still insists on mixed rugby to start from club level.

Meanwhile the storm over whether or not to support the Government's race policy on sport should determine what teams may use official recreation stadiums in black townships, had not subsided since the 1975 rugby season when an official decision forced Kwaru and Sedru both Eastern Cape Province SARU units to play the rest of their South African cup matches on open fields. The highlight of this issue came in October 1975, when, while five sports stadiums in Port Elizabeth's African townships were virtually empty, more than 20,000 sports fans, both black and white, watched a SARU cup final between the Union's giants Kwaru and Tygerberg (TYRU) at a makeshift sports stadium on barren land.²² This controversy has since escalated to the Border area (East London, King William's Town complex) where there has been reports of growing defections by clubs from the Border African Rugby Board (SAARB affiliate) to SARU sub-unions. In East London's giant African township Mdantsane, which is under the administration of Ciskei Bantustan Government, a number of teams affiliated to Mdantsane Rugby Union (MDARU non-racial) have been experiencing problems with regard to sporting facilities. A senior official of the All African Border Rugby Board, Mr Joe Mtyeku, was quoted to have said that MDARU with their non-racial stand in rugby which he regarded as "political" would only play in Mdantsane over the dead body of Mr L. F. Siyo, a Senior Ciskei Cabinet Minister,

known to be strongly pre-SAARB.²³ While MDARU players feel entitled to all amenities in the township by virtue of their being residents and rent payers of the township, most of them hoped for very little, especially when Mr D. Jongilanga joined the Ciskei cabinet (Mr Jongilanga only resigned his office in Border African rugby in November 1975 when he became Ciskei Minister of Education). While the other Border African rugby officials condemned Mr Mtyeku's statement as destructive, Mr N. B. Gwili, Mdantsane sports officer in charge of all sports facilities, re-interated that MDARU's position could only be considered if they would guarantee to exclude 'Coloureds' in their matches, in line with Government policy.²⁴

Cricket

In the previous years attempts had been made by the major bodies controlling cricket in South Africa to form a multiracial organ which would have overall control of cricket in the country with the following aims:

- Gaining acceptance into the international cricket arena;
- Merit selections of players to compete against visiting teams;
- Playing cricket non-racially at club level which would allow freedom of affiliation to any club regardless of race.

The latest and the most significant attempt by the South African cricket bodies in persuance of the above goals came in January 1976, when the third summit meeting in four years, which was the most crucial for South Africa's domestic and international cricket future in that it sought to satisfy the requirements of the International Cricket Conference which is committed to recognising only one body truly representative of all South African cricketers.

This summit meeting which involved the white South African Cricket Association (SACA), the South African African Cricket Board (SAACB) and the non-racial South African Cricket Board of Control (SACBOC) resolved in principle to form a single body governing cricket, the constitution, name and composition of which would be agreed later on.

Commenting on the resolution the President of the white SACA, Mr Billy Woodin, said "mixed cricket is the ultimate we all wanted".

However, he added, "it will take time to get the end result we want, we cannot jump from where we are to Utopia overnight." The All African SAACB Mr Moses Nyangiwe saw the implications of the resolutions as the start of cricket play from grassroots level.

A nine-man committee mandated to ensure that the resolutions adopted at this meeting were implemented, was elected under the chairmanship of the SACBOC president, Mr Rachid Varachia. Other committee members Messrs Pat Naidoo, Mat Seegers (SACBOC), Moses Nyangiwe, Lennox Mlonzi, Nelson Mabunu (SAACB), Billy Woodin, Wally Hammond and Joe Pamensky (SACA).

Cricket enthusiasts, officials and anti-apartheid organisers, the world over, welcomed South Africa's move towards mixed cricket. The International Cricket Conference indicated its readiness to reconsider its ban on South Africa, should this principle be put into effect. Amongst the key people who registered their support for the move was Peter Hain of the Anti-Apartheid movement in London, who immediately declared an end to all hostilities against South African cricket but added: "I hope they do not let themselves get bowled up by the government. If their fight survives I will be in the crowd to cheer the first team from a genuinely multi-racial cricket background in South Africa." Mr Donald Carr, secretary of the Cricket Council, said "after the long years in the cold a platform at last has been built to bring the Springbok cricketers back into the international fold." But he also added, "We must wait and see how it progresses."

At home, the move was commended by a number of provincial and district cricket administrations although there was an intense feeling of concern in the majority of people who could not see cricket's way through the South African Government's policy. The Chairman of the special committee appointed to study the introduction of multi-racial cricket, Mr Rachid Varachia, expressed hopes to start negotiations on multi-racial cricket at all levels within three weeks.

Meanwhile on the eve of the historic summit meeting SACA President Bill Woodin announced that players of all races could be included in the South African Invitation teams to play the Derrick Robins XI²⁵ (an international invitation side sponsored by cricket philanthropist Derrick Robins). The matches against the tourists were both to be one day games in Cape Town (28 January) and Johannesburg (11 February) organised by the Western Province and Transvaal Unions respectively, all affiliates of SACA. In the past the non-racial SACBOC had always rejected unanimously all calls for them to participate in South African Invitation teams against touring sides including the Robins XI as token once a year indabas. However, as a result of the pledges made by officials of all races at the summit meeting to implement normal cricket

play at all levels, a new invitation was extended to SACBOC with regard to the current Robins event. SACBOC executive under the guidance of President Varachia thought acceptance would act as a sign of goodwill as well as showing the South African Government that all races wanted to play together and they duly accepted the invitation.

This act of goodwill led to heated debates when individual provincial units held their own meetings and insisted that SACBOC should not deviate from its previous stand—non-racial cricket at club level before anything else. The feeling of most players talked to was that their Board could be hijacked into accepting such invitations to confuse the international cricket community into believing that non-racialism was already fully on the cards in South African cricket. The players challenged the Whites to show their sincerity by calling off all tours to and from South Africa and instead concentrate their efforts in starting club leagues.²⁶

The disappointed SACBOC president Rachid Varachia believed that non-cricketers had influenced his players. This belief was also expressed from the white side by a springbok player who felt that SACBOC players were after one-man-one-vote and that their stand was politically motivated. The allegation that political activists outside cricket were behind the cricket players' stand had once been made in September 1975, when an agreed programme of mixed friendly matches between white and black cricketers from the Transvaal units of SACA and SACBOC collapsed. The matches which were organised as per agreement between Mr Joe Pamensky's white Transvaal Administration and Mr Varachia's non-racial Transvaal administration were seen by the SACBOC players as deliberately planned to coincide with a possible tour of this country by Australian cricketers. At the time, Mr Pamensky suggested that black politicians had pressurised the black cricketers not to go through with the agreed plans for mixed play, which allegation the players did not take kindly to.

Hopes remained high within the cricket community that the Government would not thwart their plans of playing 'normal cricket' — from club level in the near future. Expressing this point in an interview the chairman of the nine-man committee appointed to work out the scheme to implement non-racial cricket, SACBOC President Rachid Varachia, told *Black Review* that provincial units of all three national bodies—SACBOC, SAACB and SACA—were busy working out provincial and district plans for the operation, with intentions to have normal play in the 1976-77 season starting on 1 October 1976. Mr Varachia added however, that they had not yet met the Minister of Sport to discuss the plans, contrary to reports that the nine-man committee had met Dr Piet Koornhof, the Minister. He claimed that

they were just going ahead. "We shall use available grounds and facilities in all provinces, any difficulties we shall deal with when we encounter them," said Mr Varachia.

Tennis

The battle between the non-racial South African Lawn Tennis Union under Mr N. Pather supported by Black African, Asian, Latin American, and Eastern European countries on the one hand, and the white South African Lawn Tennis Union of Mr Ben Franklin backed by the whole Western block, raged through 1975 and 1976. This battle centred mainly around whether or not the white South African Lawn Tennis Union should or should not continue to represent the whole South African tennis community at the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF) and the Davis Cup Nations. Such representation, which the white South African body had always enjoyed, enabled it to participate in the all important international Davis Cup Competition.

South Africa had won the Davis Cup by default in 1974 when the last nation it had to face, India, refused to play in protest against apartheid in South African tennis. The Davis Cup Management Committee then gave the cup to the South Africans. In July 1975, when the ILTF met in Barcelona, the Conference decided not to discuss the expulsion of South Africa. This followed a previous decision taken by the Davis Cup Nations Committee which voted against expelling South Africa from the 1975 competition. Apparently the committee was convinced by the case made by the South African delegation which included white SALTU president, Mr Ben Franklin, and all African South African National Lawn Tennis Union president, Reggie Ngcobo, in favour of South Africa. Addressing the Committee meeting, Mr Ngcobo said that moves to expel South Africa from the competition were politically motivated and unsporting; and that if South Africa were expelled, part of the Davis Cup objectives to promote and foster the game of tennis would be defeated in South Africa.²⁷ He said black tennis players also benefited from the hope that one day they could participate in the competition. With South Africa out of the competition he said, the number of black players in the country would shrink and tennis courts built for them would become white elephants.

Mr Ngcobo was subsequently deposed as president of the African Union because of the trip he undertook with the white tennis officials without the mandate from his executive to "pilot South Africa's case" at the Davis Cup Nations meeting in London. He was accused of telling

the London meeting that there was no apartheid in South Africa. Mr Ngcobo, who declared the meeting that ousted him unconstitutional and invalid, refused to step down nor to co-operate with the new administration.²⁸

The non-racial SALTU sent former South African black tennis champion, Mr Jasmat Dhiraj, now living in London, to address the 1975 ILTF meeting in Barcelona to make it clear that the white tennis union was not complying with the world body requirements.

Disclosing this the president of the non-racial body, Mr Pather, explained that the white Union had promised the world body that tennis in South Africa would be played on non-racial basis from club level onwards. This had not been fulfilled. All that the white body had done was to accept affiliation of Mr Ngcobo's African Union on a federal basis. Such affiliated players had been allowed to participate only in multinational tournaments. However, as had been said above, South Africa question was not debated at all at the ILTF conference.

In 1976 events took an interesting turn when the move to expel South Africa failed once more when the Davis Cup Nations Committee and the ILTF management committee held their meetings in April in Spain. The United States threatened to withdraw from the Davis Cup if Mexico was accepted in the competition for 1977. Mexico had refused to play South Africa earlier this year. The US delegation leader added, "we are also making it absolutely clear that if South Africa's entry for 1977 is refused, we will also leave the Davis Cup nations." The American threat was countered by Yugoslavian warning that Yugoslavia would also withdraw if Mexico was in any way punished for refusing to meet South Africa.

The Federation Management Committee also voted not to expel South Africa from its ranks. The matter would further arise for debate when the annual conference of the ILTF met on 1 July, 1976. Meanwhile the Management Committee condemned a motion lodged by the United Nations Committee on Racialism in Sport, and by the Soviet Union to have South Africa and Rhodesia boycotted by the tennis world. ILTF president Derek Hardwick of Britain said, "we reiterate more strongly than ever that the ILTF will not tolerate the interference of politics in sport. We regard the motions against both South Africa and Rhodesia as political."²⁹

The growing of clear divisions on East-West lines within the Davis Cup Nations might destroy the Davis Cup Competition as it has traditionally been known. The American withdrawal threat is expected to be supported by nations like Britain, France, West Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands while the Yugoslavia call might be supported by several Eastern and Third world countries. At best it could create two entirely separate competitions with effect from 1977.

Other Sports

The pattern followed by other sports organisations showed a similar trend as that depicted above. Apparently because of continued boycotts and/or isolation of South African teams abroad, there was a noticeable defection from segregated bodies in preference to non-racial bodies.

In athletics, participation by Blacks in 'white' tournaments was observed. The Comrades Marathon which had been regarded as exclusively for Whites, changed its pattern in 1976 when more Blacks officially participated in the race. A black runner, Gabashaene Raka-baele, was amongst the top ten winners. Despite all these attempts to satisfy the world demands, in a move seen by observers as a calculated effort by South African authorities to improve their image in the international scene, South Africa invited Zambia to compete in the athletics championship to be held in Johannesburg in February 1976. However, the secretary treasurer of Zambian Amateur Athletics Association, predicted that in view of Zambian policy against apartheid, the invitation would be turned down.³⁰ In a meeting between world athletics bodies held in Montreal, South Africa was expelled from the International Amateur Athletic Federation. For years, South African Athletics had been stopped from competing in international matches (as representatives of South Africa) but could only compete as individuals. This expulsion brought the above concession to an end. This expulsion came as a shock to the South African delegation to Montreal which, as Western Province Athletics Union chairman, Mr Jannie Mombery, said, "is a tragedy because we have done everything to conform to world demands".³¹ The fear expressed by athletics administrators was that athletics' participation in internal matches would weaken following this expulsion because athletes would lack motivation which had been, in the past, overseas participation and the aim to break world records.³² It was believed, from some circles, that SANROC (South African Non-racial Olympic Committee) had helped in lobbying countries towards isolating South Africa. SANROC, a London based organisation involved with campaigns for South Africa's international isolation in all fields of sport as long as South Africa still practised social segregation, had also called on all overseas countries to boycott a cycling tournament to be held in Cape Town in 1975. All those who participated would face strict disciplinary measures from the International Olympic Games. However, this issue did not crop up at the Olympic Games in 1976. SANROC was also believed to have played a key role towards the expulsion of South Africa from international football.

In the fields of karate and judo, attempts were being made to stage multi-racial tournaments. For instance, a karate championship tournament was arranged by Amateur National Karate Association for October 1975 at Curries' Fountain. Doors were opened for both white and black participants. This tournament was accorded international recognition by the world.³³ As preparations for the October tournament in Curries' Fountain, a non-racial karate, judo and jiu-jitsu body was formed in Mdantsane to meet for the demands of the world body. This organisation, called non-racial Border Martial Arts Association, would be fragmented into many clubs in the Border.

In swimming, the South African Amateur Swimming Federation (non-racial) had always been fighting for recognition by the world swimming body—FINA, instead of the White South African Amateur Swimming Union. In a bid to discredit the White SAASU in the international body and instead to present its case in the world body, the SAASF hoped to send its president, Mr Morgan Naidoo (who was living under restriction regulations of the Suppression of Communism Act since 1973) to Montreal. On applying for a passport, Mr Naidoo's application was turned down. This refusal added more water to SAASU's fight to escape expulsion. It had been speculated that SAASU would be expelled from FINA at its congress held in Montreal at the time of the Olympic Games. Both SAASU and SANROC had been barred from addressing the FINA conference, for various reasons. It had already been recommended by the FINA 14-men Bureau that South Africa be expelled. The Congress was contemplating ratification of this recommendation.³⁴

With the boycott of the Olympics by African delegates, chances of the white SAASU winning its case were better, since the presence of African countries could have lessened chances of success. Without the full support of the African delegates and with Britain and the United States usually wielding the big stick in swimming and generally known to show sympathy for white South Africa, SAASU was likely to win the battle. If the white SAASU were to be expelled from FINA, the non-racial SASF would stand a good chance of being admitted to the ranks of world swimming. A decision taken by FINA adverse to white SAASU would probably affect the position of the two South African swimming competitors who were at the Olympics at the time.³⁵

There were no remarkable events within the sphere of boxing. All that remained to be mentioned was continued victories by black South African boxers over overseas opponents. Amongst the best black boxers of the country were Mzukisi "Wonder boy" Skweyiya and Nkosana Mgxaji "Happy boy" both of Mdantsane, East London. For years boxing (whether Black or White) had been controlled by the South African Boxing Board of Control to which all South African boxing

bodies were affiliated. This body was responsible for arranging outside matches as well as the multi-national boxing tournaments between different races. There was also an all-black South African Amateur Boxing Union to which black bodies were affiliated. However, in September 1975 the Secretary for Bantu Administration and Development, Mr J. P. Van Onsellen, wrote a letter to the black South Africa Amateur Boxing Union, to which Indian, African and Coloured clubs were affiliated, informing them to operate separately. In that letter, Mr Van Onsellen drew the attention of the union to the Government's policy that different racial groups should have their own separate sports organisations and therefore, participate separately. He said, "As you readily agree it will only be possible to have one national controlling body for a particular sport per racial group which means that the Bantu, Coloured and Indian boxing clubs should be separate, with separate provincial associations and national unions."³⁶ This news was received with great shock by bodies affiliated to the Black SAASU who saw this decision as set-back in black boxing. Mr E. M. Lockhat, president of the Black Natal Amateur Boxing said that from a practical point of view the ruling could not apply because there were not more than ten Coloured and two Indian amateur boxers in Natal, therefore, they would not form themselves into effective separate bodies. There would be no competition which was an incentive to any sportsman irrespective of colour or creed.³⁷

In October 1975, black and white hockey officials from all over the country met in Cape Town to discuss non-racialism in hockey. However this meeting ended in deadlock resulting from the South African Hockey Union (white) failing to accept the (non-racial) South African Hockey Board's call for the total abolition of any racial hockey bodies. The union also said that it could not agree to players having the right to join any club without any form of racial discrimination. Officials of the white hockey body expressed their belief in gradual change towards the solution.³⁸ It was believed that further meetings of hockey officials would be arranged.

REFERENCES

¹*Daily News* 24.2.76

²*Intsimbi* 5.6.76

³*Daily Dispatch* 27.3.76

⁴*Rand Daily Mail* 23.3.76

⁵*Daily Dispatch* 11.5.76

⁶*Rand Daily Mail* 22.6.76

⁷*Rand Daily Mail* 8.6.76

⁸*Rand Daily Mail* 26.6.76

⁹*Rand Daily Mail* 24.6.76

¹⁰*Star* 29.6.76

¹¹*Daily Dispatch* 17.7.76

¹²*Sunday Tribune* 18.7.76

¹³*Imvo* 26.7.75

¹⁴*Rand Daily Mail* 4.8.75

¹⁵*Imvo* 9.8.75

¹⁶*Rand Daily Mail* 4.8.75

¹⁷*Ibid*

¹⁸*Rand Daily Mail* 1.8.75

¹⁹*Ibid*

²⁰*Daily Dispatch* 19.2.76

- ²¹*Rand Daily Mail* 25.2.76
²²*Intsimbi* 5.10.75
²³*Weekend World* 8.1.76
²⁴*Ibid*
²⁵*Rand Daily Mail* 11.2.76
²⁶*Rand Daily Mail* 21.2.76
²⁷*Herald* 3.7.75
²⁸*Weekend World* 8.1.76, *Daily Dispatch*
23.12.76
²⁹*Daily Dispatch and Star* 12.4.76

- ³⁰*Daily Dispatch* 1.1.76
³¹*Rand Daily Mail* 23.7.76
³²*Ibid*
³³*Natal Mercury* 9.10.75
³⁴*Graphic* 30.7.76
³⁵*Star* 5.6.76
³⁶*Daily News* 25.9.75
³⁷*Ibid*
³⁸*Sunday Times* 12.10.75