

2.26

# mayibuyye

BA 322.405  
MAY  
S. 89/173  
1980-11-21  
UCT



26

bulletin of the A.N.C., South Africa  
P.O. BOX 1791 LUSAKA, ZAMBIA

# CONTENTS

EDITORIAL . . . . .	1
Robbers In Robes . . . . .	2
Strategic Seaways . . . . .	5
The British House Of Lords . . . . .	9
Fighting Talk . . . . .	11

# ANRSVA

On the occasion of this June 26 - the South Africa Freedom Day, the National Council of the Communist Party of India sends you warmest fraternal greetings of the Indian Communists. We request you also to convey our greetings and regards to the leadership of the African National Congress of South Africa and through them to the hundreds of thousands of Freedom Fighters of your country.

Indian people and the Communist Party of India have always closely followed and admired the heroic struggle of the South African people against Apartheid, for liberation of their country from the fascist racialist ruling clique supported by imperialism over several decades now. In this difficult and long struggle the peoples of South Africa has forged the unity of Africa, Indian and Coloured peoples and the democratic elements among the White population.

The South African people have embarked upon a new course since the middle of 1967 - that of armed struggle. This year's freedom day is being commemorated in the midst of the illegal Smith regime in Rhodesia which is being supported by the South African racist regime with armed forces and heavy weapons as tanks, helicopters, etc. There is no doubt that this is a combined struggle of the Zimbabwe and South African peoples to overthrow the racist regimes and liberate the entire Southern African region.

Dear friend, in this sacred struggle of the South African peoples the Indian people and the entire progressive democratic forces of our country, which include the communists, have been and will be with you.

On this Freedom Day, we declare that the Communist Party will continue to work persistently for mobilising our people in active support of the cause of national liberation in South Africa.

With warm greetings and regards,

(C. RAJESHWAR RAO)  
General Secretary,  
National Council of the  
Communist Party of India.

VORSTER SMEARED!

Any society, where power is held by a minority which monopolises all the wealth, inevitably abounds in contradictions. In fascist South Africa where the racist white minority has usurped political power these contradictions exist in their most extreme form. The major contradiction is that between the white oppressor and the Black majority; all else revolves around this.

And as the liberation struggle advances, other latent contradictions are brought to the surface. At one time it was correct to speak of the "monolithic" Nationalist Party and of the unity of the Afrikaners. This is no longer true. Under pressure from the liberation forces and, no doubt, on the advice of their imperialist allies the South African racists have been obliged to present a new "image" to the outside world. We thus see a sudden "concern" for independent African countries, offers of technical and financial "assistance", the admitting of Black diplomats (with due precaution), the offer of sending a "mixed" team to the Olympic Games, etc. These gimmicks have brought about no real changes in white supremacist thinking nor have they brought a halt to the over-mounting repression of the Black majority in South Africa.

But even this facade, this pretence has resulted in considerable misgiving among a section of Nationalist Afrikaners. We have had occasion, in the past, to refer to the split between the Verkramptes and the Verligtes most recently in an Editorial in Mayibuye No.24(17/6/68). The Verkramptes, who claim to be the "true" guardians of Afrikanerdom, fear that the Verligte policies being pursued by Vorster may result in diluting the Afrikaner "tradition". So Vorster, the Nazi sympathiser whom even Malan's Nationalist Party in 1948 regarded as too much of an extremist, the architect of such draconian measures as the 90 day and 180 day detention laws, the father of the notorious Terrorist Act is attacked by the Verkramptes as being too "liberal", a "pink", a "fellow traveller". Not that Vorster is about to become any of these things.

"These splits show that in their attempt to cope with the outside world, the oppressors get entangled in the contradiction inherent in apartheid." (Mayibuye No.24).

A recent incident illustrates very clearly that Vorster and his Verligtes remain true to fascism and that the Verkramptes are but their lunatic fringe. Recently the latter circulated an unsigned letter in which they identified the Verligtes with persons like the late Senator Robert Kennedy and Mr. Harry Oppenheimer. We will not discuss Kennedy, but Oppenheimer is notoriously well-known in Africa. He is boss of the vast Anglo-American Company whose empire reaches out from the Cape to the Congo and beyond. By no stretch of the imagination could this magnate, whose happy hunting ground is poverty-stricken Africa, be described as even a mild liberal, let alone a leftist. Yet the purpose of the anonymous letter was to show that the Verligtes were becoming leftist! Needless to say that section of the Afrikaans Press which supports Vorster gave wide publicity to this "scurrilous smear". Several columns were devoted to attacking the Verkramptes for this "scandalous" behaviour. These are the Verligtes, the outward-looking ones, for whom even Oppenheimer is too "left".

Part I

ROBBERS IN ROBES

The Legal Cloak Over Apartheid

This is the first article in a series which will trace the history of oppressive legislation in South Africa since Union. One of the features of the South African situation has been the mask of legality and parliamentary rule which has been erected to make less ugly the face of racial and colonial exploitation. With Freedom Fighters now penetrating to the Republic's borders, the forum of struggle has moved out of the debating chambers and courts of law. Yet although the mask has slipped with the development of the Republic into an embattled, laager State, the process of oppression can usefully be traced by an examination of the successive statutes of privilege.

Other articles to follow will discuss the founding law of the Union, and the formation of the African National Congress; labour laws - a modern serfdom; the Land Act - theft through law; and the Native Administration Act - rule by decree.

Part I Convention and Constitution

The South Africa Act of 1909 was the founding law of the Union, proposed and ratified by the four colonies of the Transvaal, Cape, Orange Free State, and Natal. Although it was passed by the imperial government in Britain, it was nonetheless a home-grown statute, the virtually unamended result of discussions held by local white politicians. This founding law not only, at the outset, established privileged White rule at the expense of African, Coloured and Indian rights, but brought into being a sovereign parliament which was over the years to spin out a web of oppressive laws into every corner of the nation.

Some historical background is important for an understanding of how this law came to be passed. The South African (Anglo-Boer) war was concluded in 1902 by the Treaty of Vereeniging. This was a war of imperial expansion by Britain, in which the indigenous people were regarded largely as pawns, significant mainly as units of labour for the farms and the mines of white South Africa. Even before the war had ended, however, the question of African rights and colonial "native policy" was to emerge as the crucial issue of the first decade of the new century. The Boer Republics suspected Britain of wishing to further African interests at their expense - a view which was based on the relatively liberal franchise policies of the Cape colony, and the history of African Administration in Natal (Natal policy had at one stage been transferred bodily to the old South African Republic, to the dismay of the burghers). Britain's concern at this stage was, however, to establish a stable dominion in mineral-rich Southern Africa, with the minimum of unrest caused by friction between Afrikaners and Englishmen.

The Peace Treaty was a conciliatory gesture which heralded the entrenchment of this policy; an explicit promise to shelve 'the native question' was included in the treaty - "the question of granting the franchise/...

franchise to the natives will not be decided until after the introduction of self-government" (Clause 8). Milner's kindergarten, as the British Colonial officials were known, busied themselves with paving the way to a closer union between the colonies, and sorting out the commercial interests involved. Customs conventions between the territories already existed, but important barriers to free trade remained. The railway was a particular bone of contention, and jealous bickering over its revenue and administration was hindering economic development. The memorandum on closer union prepared by Selborne, the High Commissioner, which largely persuaded Britain to push for some form of association, relied chiefly on powerful economic arguments. These arguments, however, were concerned solely with the welfare of the Whites and the interests of investors abroad.

The Zulu rebellion in Natal, sparked off in 1906 after long years of despotic misrule, gave added impetus to the desire for a uniform "native policy", and a centrally-controlled army and police force to control further outbreaks of resistance. No less than 4,000 Africans were killed before the rebellion was crushed. The consolidation of the different types of rule practised by the colonies was seen by White interests as highly desirable, and necessary for stability.

To the National Convention in Durban, 1908, came 33 delegates from the four colonies to discuss the founding of a single State. While not a single African was invited to this all-important conference (Africans in the four colonies at this stage outnumbered the Whites by five to one), three White delegates from far-away Rhodesia were welcomed. The African and Coloured people of the Cape and Natal had been playing a responsible political role for many years, despite repeated attempts to cut down the weight of their voting power. Under a qualified franchise based on property and wages, 22,784 African and Coloured men - over 10% of the electorate - possessed the vote. In a number of Cape constituencies, the African vote was decisive, and many aspirant politicians learnt to treat it with respect.

Discussion at the Convention centred on the key question of the native franchise. The policy of the Transvaal and Orange Free State was uncompromising: "the people will not permit equality between Coloured persons and the White inhabitants, either in church or State" was a basic policy of their constitutions. It was this view that prevailed, in the face of the demands of Cape delegates for a country-wide extension of their franchise laws. The idea of a universal franchise was rejected, since not only would it imply equality, but would mean that many poor Whites would lose the vote. The Cape was mollified by the entrenchment of their franchise in the constitution. (Predictably, despite the entrenchment, it was soon destroyed; the Africans were voted on to a separate roll by the requisite majority in 1936, and right off in 1959. The Coloureds were squeezed out by parliamentary juggling and legal trickery. Against this background it is easy to understand why Africans in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) today have absolutely no faith in so-called constitutional guarantees while a majority/...

a majority of Whites have all effective political power).

When confronted with this attitude towards the rights of Africans, the British Secretary of State for the Colonies commented that it was "a delicately balanced compromise" between the White groups, and "any other course would wreck the chances of union".

The South Africa Act itself largely embodies the draft resolutions of the Convention, with minimum amendments by the Whitehall draftsmen. Its blatantly racialist character is soon made clear. Only persons of European descent may sit in parliament (Sections 24 and 26). For the record it may be stated that the main body of the Act laid down the structure of a two-House (bicameral) legislature, of the judiciary, the provincial governments, and the siting of the capitals, and voting procedure. As far as Africans, Indians and Coloureds were concerned, the role they were to play in government, either by vote or representation, was merely a relic of an earlier period in the Cape. Even the delimitation of the constituencies showed a racial bias, being based on the total number of European male voters; as a result the Cape lost the equivalent of seven seats due to its African and Coloured voters. The only concessions made to the advocates of a more liberal colour policy were the entrenched franchise, and the right on non-Whites to sit in the provincial councils of the Cape and Natal.

Generally as far as the African people were concerned the Governor-General was invested with overall control and administration, and the special powers of the colonial governors. This was the enabling measure for the eventual unification of differing policies, and the basis for a system of arbitrary rule without representation which will be discussed in a subsequent article.

An interesting section of the South Africa Act contemplated the handing over of what were then the High Commission territories, held as Protectorates by Britain, to South Africa. Britain's hopes for peaceful racial co-operation implicit in this section were sadly at variance with her acceptance of a constitution which denied so many rights, and which was compiled without reference to the majority of the people it purported to govern. The attitudes of the British revealed an ill-conceived belief that Afrikaner and Englishman would settle their differences, and make the Union a powerful, imperial dominion. However, the handing over of sovereign power to an exploiting, White group ensured that the new State would handsomely repay its capital investors. Seen in this light, the National Convention was no more than a congress of minority White interests; the South Africa Act served as an entrenchment of White privilege.

The idea of national unity was a worthy one, but in 1901 it represented little more than a dirty deal between two White groups intent on exploitation. The call for a truly representative National Convention by the African National Congress in 1961 was, significantly, its last legal act. The response of the Nationalist government to this peaceful demand was to call out its Saracens, and crush with police violence the stay-at-home strike designed to bring home to White South Africans the justice of the people's demands. The spirit of the 1908 convention lived on in these repressive/...

repressive actions. The South Africa Act it produced will be the first law to be rewritten when power is taken from the hands of a minority and placed in the hands of the majority. The new South African constitution will outlaw racialism rather than enshrine it and declare that the Government of the country will be entrusted to representatives of all the people and not merely to the spokesmen of a small, racialistic and exploiting minority.

(The next article will discuss the African reaction to Union, and the founding of South Africa's first national political party - the African National Congress).

\* \* \* \*

### STRATEGIC SEAWAYS

- By Veteran

The sea route along South Africa's coast line is one of the world's great commercial and strategic seaways. Now that the Suez Canal has been closed, the Cape is a vital link between the Indian Ocean and the Atlantic seaboard. Underlining the route's importance, leading oil companies have decided never again to use the Canal. These factors are being given a prominent place in the diplomatic and strategic plans of White supremacists in the South.

They argue that Western Europe cannot survive economically without oil from the Near East. Since the oil tankers must steam round the Cape, it is in the supreme interest of the North Atlantic powers to safeguard the route and to obtain access at all times, in peace and war, to friendly harbours. White South Africa offers herself as a faithful custodian and loyal ally of the West.

Addressing the Nationalist Party's central congress at Parow last May, the Prime Minister B.J. Vorster said that he was amazed at the blindness of the North Atlantic powers. They would not recognise South Africa's importance to them, and even refused to sell her arms. Yet, in spite of rebuffs, insults and isolation, South Africa would continue to fulfil her responsibilities as guardian of the Cape route, both for her own sake and for the sake of the West. 'This we must do', he urged, 'no matter what sacrifices are required of us individually and as a people'.

P.W. Botha, the Minister of Defence, recently reported that discussions were taking place with 'friendly powers' in the Southern hemisphere about the possibility of a military alliance, similar to the Northern Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in the Northern hemisphere. Australia and New Zealand in the East, Argentine, Brazil and Uruguay in the West, have been mentioned as possible allies. Conditions were forcing them, it is said, to co-operate closely.

One of the alleged conditions is the withdrawal of Britain, who for more than half a century has dominated the seas of the Southern hemisphere from Australia to South America. Her decision to scale down military commitments East of Suez has created a vacuum which, White strategists in the/...



in the South argue, is being filled by the Soviet Union. Her activities in the Northern region of the Indian Ocean have opened a new phase in world politics and in the position of Whites in Southern Africa. It is possible that their safety may be threatened one day from the sea. South Africa must in her own interest assume the burden of protecting the sea routes along her coast, but she would welcome allies.

The Cape route, said Botha, was a 'two edged sword'. Because of its importance, the West would yet be compelled to abandon its vendetta against South Africa, and to give it both material and moral support in her struggle against communism. On the other hand, South Africa was bound to be a target of the highest priority in a general conflict.

According to some commentators in the government press, the national liberation war in Rhodesia, Mozambique and Angola is part of a great design, a preliminary battle in a grand strategic move against the entire Western security system, which is anchored in the Southern part of the continent. The ultimate target is South Africa. If the White supremacy regime is overthrown, a pro-communist government will take power, and the Cape sea route will be closed to the West.

Much of this kind of argument can be dismissed as party propaganda. The Nationalist government hopes to counteract internal cleavages and a growing dissatisfaction amongst its supporters by crying wolf, and by appealing for the utmost solidarity against external dangers. But there is also a genuine note of alarm, arising from the realisation that the balance of forces in Africa and the world at large is moving against racial discrimination and White supremacy rule.

Leader writers in the government press express this fear by warning readers that universal White domination, which alone made it possible for Whites to establish a colony at the Cape, has disappeared for all time. With it has gone the guarantee that White supremacy will continue to exist. Other guarantees must be found: on the one hand by cementing an anti-communist alliance with the great capitalist powers; on the other hand by establishing 'good neighbourly relations' with States on South Africa's borders.

'A tough, persistent war is being fought close to our frontiers', wrote Die Burger on May 30th. 'Armies totalling more than 100,000 men are locked in battle in neighbouring States, or are in the field to ward off a never-ending threat. We have no reason to doubt the vigour of their efforts but as little must we question the strength of the forces they have to face. Since Algeria and Vietnam sensible people no longer talk of revolutionary war with contempt. Were it not for the resistance put up by our neighbours, the battlefront would today be along the Kunene and Limpopo'.

The war against the Freedom Fighters of Angola, Mozambique and Rhodesia is being fought to perpetuate White minority rule throughout Southern Africa. White South Africans regard it as their war. According to Die Transvaler of May 18th, the concentrated attacks in the North are being aimed, first at Portuguese territory and Rhodesia, and ultimately at South Africa/...

Africa. She was not afraid of the attacks - we are told - though she would do her best to discourage them. 'But they will not be readily stopped, because those responsible say they will desist only if South Africa is prepared to let the State pass out of the hands of the white man. That we are not prepared to do; and we have repeatedly made our position clear, not only to the African States concerned, but to the rest of the world'.

It is a central aim of White supremacists to involve the West on their side in this war. For the purpose, they are staking their hopes on the Cape's strategic importance. The capitalist bloc must be persuaded that it will be in mortal danger if hostile forces obtain control of the seaways; and that the best way of warding off the threat is to enter into an alliance with South Africa in a kind of SATC - a Southern Alliance Treaty Organisation.

Once committed in this way, the West will be obliged to guarantee South Africa's frontiers also to the North against an invasion by land. Or so the White supremacists argue. Not only the minority regime, but the control of the sea route will be threatened if the Freedom Fighters succeed in converging on South Africa; there the West must assist the minority regimes to defeat the Freedom Fighters.

One should not jump to the conclusion that the hopes and fears of South African Whites are a true mirror of policies or attitudes elsewhere. The Western powers must balance the arguments here examined against other pressures, such as the weight of international opinion against colour discrimination and racial oppression, the growing strength of the Afro-Asian countries, and the influence of socialist States in world affairs. In spite of South Africa's claims, the Cape sea route is not so important that it should be made an overriding consideration. Moreover, it is not a bargaining counter. South Africa has no choice in the matter: she must keep it open to the West, or for that matter to the rest of the world, in the interests of her own security.

Nonetheless, we cannot afford to ignore South Africa's attempts to woo the West. Her propaganda will make headway in reactionary circles, as among the British Tories, who have increasingly expressed sympathy with her insistence on White supremacy rule.

The national liberation movement must combat the propaganda by exposing the real nature of South Africa's policy. This is to maintain White minority governments in Southern Africa by using the techniques of fascism. Any support given to the regime will prove to be a bad investment, and recoil on countries that are prepared to sacrifice principles and friends for the sake of material gain and strategic expediencies.

NEWS ITEM:

P R E S S R E L E A S E

THE SECRETARIAT OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR  
SOLIDARITY WITH THE WORKERS AND PEOPLE  
OF SOUTH AFRICA

With the presence of the majority of its members and under the Chairmanship of Mr. KAMALIZA, General Secretary of the National Union of Tanganyika Workers and Vice-President of the All-African Trade Union Federation, the Secretariat of the International Trade Union Committee for Solidarity with the workers and people of South Africa, which regroups in its ranks trade union organisations of different centres and affiliations, together with the World Federation of Trade Unions and the All-African Trade Union Federation met on the 25th - 26th April, 1968 in Dar Es Salaam. In their two days session the members reviewed the past activities of the Committee and examined the present developments in the situation in South Africa and the regions surrounding it. They noted with great indignation that the racist regime in South Africa is intensifying its fascist measures against the African population of that country. They also noted that the regimes in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Portugal are building an unholy Alliance to face the vast national and international movements which are working and calling for their downfall.

The members of the Secretariat greeted with admiration the peoples of South Africa, Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and other African countries who are engaged in armed struggle to liberate their countries.

The members further noted that despite the ever growing strength of the liberation movements in these countries and the development of a vast international movement in their support, the racist and oppressor regimes are still in power in these countries because of the direct and indirect support that they receive from the big imperialist powers, especially those of the U.S.A., Britain, France and Federal Germany. The Meeting called upon the workers of these countries to put pressure upon their imperialist powers to respect the decisions of the UNO and refrain from supporting those who are practicing the policy of apartheid, racial and colonial oppression in Africa.

The Meeting took necessary measures to mobilize still further the forces of the International Trade Union Movement to support the just and legitimate struggle of the oppressed people in Africa. It launched an appeal to the workers and trade union organisations and adopted two memoranda, one to the Organisation of African Unity and the other to the United Nations Organisation.

To strengthen even further the activities of the Committee, the Meeting decided to enlarge the Secretariat. New trade union organisations have been added: 4 from Africa, 2 from Europe, one from Asia and one from Latin America. The Secretariat furthermore decided to enlarge the scope of its activities/...

its activities to include Zimbabwe, South West Africa, the Portuguese Colonies and all the other countries and regions of Africa still under racial and colonial oppression.

Since the question of racial discrimination was the essence of the discussion of the Secretariat, the Meeting could not overlook what is going on now in the U.S.A. In this respect, the Meeting passed a resolution condemning the assassination of the great Afro-American freedom fighter and leader, Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King.

Thanks to the good conditions created by the National Union of Tanganyika Workers, the deliberations of the Secretariat were carried out in a friendly and fraternal atmosphere.

DAR ES SALAAM,  
27TH APRIL, 1968.

\* \* \* \*

THE BRITISH HOUSE OF LORDS

- By Mbokodwebomvu

The United Nations has passed comprehensive sanctions against the illegal government of Ian Smith. Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II has issued an order in Council to make this U.N. Resolution into a law. According to the B.B.C. Report on June 14, 1968 the House of Lords is going to revolt and vote against the Queen's order in Council and this according to the report is going to create a constitutional crisis.

Who are these gentlemen in the British House of Lords? How can we explain their behaviour? How did they come to be Lords? How can gentlemen of such breeding behave in such an irresponsible manner? Don't they know that Smith has disgraced their Queen? These gentlemen form the cream of the British Bourgeoisie. To us their behaviour towards the illegal Smith regime is not surprising. It is very similar to the attitude of their forefathers towards the British workers in the 19th century. In their attitudes to the Smith regime the British Lords seem not to have changed one iota from their forebears and they fit this description of theirs written by Engeles in 1845.

"I have never seen a class", Engeles then wrote, "so deeply demoralized, so incurably debased by selfishness, so corroded within, so incapable of progress, as the English bourgeoisie...for it nothing exists in this world, except for the sake of money, itself not excluded. It knows no bliss save that of rapid gain, no pain save that of losing gold. In the presence of this avarice and lust of gain, it is not possible for a single human sentiment or opinion to remain untainted. True, these English bourgeois are good husbands and familymen, and have all other sorts of other private virtues, and appear in ordinary intercourse, as decent and respectable as all other bourgeois... I once went into Manchester with such a bourgeois, and spoke to him about the condition of the working people's quarters, and asserted that I  
had never/...

had never seen so ill-built a city. The man listened quietly to the end, and said at the corner where we parted, 'and yet there is a great deal of money made here, good morning sir". The English gentlemen was utterly indifferent as to whether the working men were starving or not, all that mattered to him was money. All conditions are measured by money, and what brings no money is nonsense, unpractical, idealistic bosh."

With the collapse of the Empire, these decaying English gentlemen have been exposed. For these gentlemen constitutional niceties, the prerogative of their Crown are reduced to mere inconveniences if they interfere with one thing supreme in their life - MONEY. They have told us that sanctions against Rhodesia won't work, but they wouldn't say that because they refused to make them work. One of their ilk Sir Alex Douglas Home goes to Rhodesia and finds Smith a reasonable man and the former Governor of Uganda Crawford, another British "Sir" chose to lose his British pass-port than denounce Smith, all because he is a director of companies that are based in Rhodesia. His counter-parts in the British House of Lords would rather create a constitutional crisis than have the British Government pass the Queen's Order in Council that might bring down" Smith's illegal regime. This, just because Smith is their surest safe-guard for their vested interest in Southern Africa. For these gentlemen White people have a right to live on the sweat, labour and property of Black peoples Yes we saw their hypocrisy before when America, Britain and Belgium staged the Congo air-lift to massacre innocent Africans. They were the first ones to vote for the air-lift.

The English gentlemen occupy their positions in the British House of Lords because of well breeding, Knightly sportsmanship, and invincible courage even in the face of death, but when it comes to making money and in their attitude to Black people they have never hesitated to use machineguns; they have indulged in lying, murder, theft, rape, deception and degradations. These are some of the gentlemen who got their titles by serving in the former colonies and who after bleeding these territories Whites were given titles to honour them for their theft. But even in such high office, which should make them exemplary they still behave true to their past. Never before has an incident exposed the rapacity of the so-called gentlemen of culture and service so much. When a people representing what is theoretically the best in a country consent to any economic result, no matter how monstrous its cause, rather than destroy the system, that is an indication of decay. The British Lords know that Smith is a racist, that Southern Africa is a powder keg ready to explode anytime, but these gentlemen do not care as long as they clip coupons made from the fortunes of exploited Black labour in Southern Africa.

\* \* \* \*

WITH SOUTH AFRICA FREEDOM DAY - JUNE 26 - STILL FRESH IN OUR MINDS, HOW ABOUT DOING US AND YOURSELVES A NATIONAL SERVICE BY SENDING IN YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS/DONATIONS TO MAYIBUYE.

FIGHTING TALK:

S.A.- PAPER TIGER WITH NUCLEAR TEETH?

- By Chibusa Wandu

Recently, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty sponsored by the USSR, Great Britain and the United States of America. However, the heated debate on this issue is by no means over. Four countries voted against the Treaty and as many as twenty-four abstained: In a couple of months' time the non-nuclear Powers are scheduled to meet to canvas this issue further.

However, we were most intrigued by South Africa's stand in the current debate on the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. South Africa, finding itself in respectable company when several Afro-Asian States showed reluctance to support the Treaty, hedged around and kept her cards close to her chest. At first she opposed. Said the South African magazine, Newscheck (24/5/68):

"South African opposition to the Treaty carries much weight .....At the moment, though, it looks as if the government has a keen desire to keep its nuclear options open for a while to come."

When voting time came however, South Africa voted with the majority and endorsed the Treaty. What caused this sudden about face?

Some observers claim that the United States persuaded South Africa to drop its opposition. For certain tactical reasons South Africa might have acquiesced. Indeed, a Dr. P. van der Merwe, the Chairman of the regime's foreign affairs group has used the current situation to call for closer relations between South Africa and the United States. He is reported to have said recently:

"It was time to lay greater emphasis on the similarities between the two countries: both were relatively young, both had race relations problems which each was trying to solve in its own way, they had been allies in two world wars and in Korea....both were producers of nuclear power.

(Our emphasis) JOHANNESBURG STAR, (1/6/68)

For some time now South Africa has been secretly trying to lay her hands on the nuclear know-how. The Times of Zambia of May 24th, 1968 reported that Zambia and Sierra Leone had warned the U.N. that South Africa was moving towards becoming a nuclear power. Chief Mpanza, a Zambian Ambassador in Cairo, charged at the U.N. that certain Western powers including West Germany, were assisting South Africa in its nuclear designs (Times of Zambia, 24/5/68).

For some years now, the strategy of the S.A. racist regime in its efforts to crush the national liberation movement in the country has been taking a definite pattern. S.A. spends annually some 110 million pounds for defence. This amount is more than the national budgets of many African States. Moreover, many of the new weapons she has acquired are clearly not defensive but offensive.

Therefore/...

Therefore, S. Africa's grand design is to build up an armoury capable not only of suppressing internal uprising but also ready to unleash aggression against those militant African States that help the freedom movement. The launching of the guerrilla movement in Zimbabwe has thrown to the surface some of the plans S.A. has been operating in secret. In a brazen fashion, S.A. has stepped up its military intervention in Rhodesia and quietly doing the same in Mozambique and Angola. She is digging-in in South West Africa.

S. Africa's next logical step was one of imposing open political pressure against independent African States which support the guerrillas and the liberation movement. In order to maintain a position of military superiority S.A. is now feverishly seeking to acquire nuclear weapons.

It is therefore obvious that it is in the interests of free Africa to prevent her from doing so. But Africa cannot possibly tolerate any form of nuclear blackmail from S.A. and if S.A. did acquire nuclear weapons, Africa might be forced into a nuclear race that might be disastrous for her economic progress.

How sincere was S.A. in voting for the Nuclear Non-poliferation Treaty? Quite clearly no serious revolutionary can take the word of honour of fascism at face value. The history of Nazism showed that those who did so paid a very high price indeed.

S. Africa has already shamelessly betrayed the sacred International trust given to her by the International Community on the question of S.W.A.

At the U.N. the African States correctly insisted that U.N. must first of all compel S.A. to honour the various resolutions taken by the world body on policies, before the question of the Non-poliferation Treaty was finalised.

If S.A. defies the U.N. with impunity, the argument goes, what guarantee is there that she will respect the Nuclear non-poliferation Treaty?

Since Africa holds dear both the cause of her total freedom as well as the cause of disarmament and non-poliferation of nuclear weapons, the present treaty has stressed once more that the freedom struggle and the struggle for disarmament are two sides of the same coin.

\*\*\*\*\* JUNE 26 MESSAGES OF SOLIDARITY.\*\*\*\*\*

"Please convey my fraternal greetings and solidarity to militant fighters of Southern Africa for freedom and independence STOP unconditional support of OAU to struggle waged against colonialism and racialism in Southern Africa and solidarity with observance Week of Solidarity with South Africa national liberation struggle from June 23 to June 29 STOP FRATERNAL GREETINGS."

Brother Diallo Telli,  
Secretary General of  
the O.A.U.