The South African-caused breakdown of the United Nations pre-implementation meeting on the future of Namibia in Geneva in January is another watershed event in the agonizing struggle of the Namibian people for their independence. Pretoria's abrupt withdrawal - its spokesman maintained it was 'premature' to set a cease-fire and a timetable for UN-monitored elections - is no surprise. The South African overlords and their adherents inside the International Territory know they cannot win; they acknowledged off the conference floor that SWAPO would sweep any free and fair election, and they mentioned another 18 months to two years as the time they needed to be prepared for such voting. The regime which illegally occupies Namibia has all along played a double game: carrying on negotiations with the international community while steadily emplacing a group of collaborators as a 'government' in Windhoek. With negotiations now at a public standstill, Pretoria is actively pursuing track II. There is talk of exalting South Africa's administrator-general in the Territory to an honorific position, letting the Pretoria-picked Council of Ministers run their 'government'. There is talk of a 'government of national unity' with seats in the Pretoria-created national assembly being offered to tiny splinter parties, another attempt to gull the world into believing that SWAPO is not the choice of the people.

Dismal failure that it was, Geneva clarified some things. Pretoria's duplicity - and there were doubters - stands exposed. So too does the four-year-old scheme of the Western Contact group (the United States, Britain, France, West Germany and Canada) to consummate a solution to the Namibia issue. All of the Gang of Five, as they were so aptly named, are heavily invested in and trade with South Africa and take part in the exploitation of Namibia. They have the power, influence and know-how to press Pretoria, even to the point of sanctions, to accept the UN solution, but they lack the political will. Their approach to the South African regime has amounted to accepting Pretoria as if it were sovereign in the International Territory to the detriment of the basic fact: the United Nations is the lawful authority over the International Territory and Pretoria is in illegal occupation. The Gang of Five was dealing with a gang of brigands. Namibia would surely now be a free and independent nation had those who could have exercised a commitment to resolving this pressing issue in accordance with the repeatedly expressed desires and methods of the world community. How much agony would the Namibian people have been spared? How much more will they suffer?

Geneva showed all the world the full measure of SWAPO. SWAPO agreed to a cease-fire and to the terms of the UN plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435. SWAPO endured at Geneva the endless harangues of the collaborators which Pretoria managed to foist upon the conference. The gutter attacks upon both the UN and SWAPO by these pretentious puppets proved the utter bankruptcy of the South African regime's plans for Namibia. In contrast, SWAPO's solidarity, poise, maturity and statescraft were clear and incisive.
Geneva generated anger and outrage. In quick succession, the Co-ordinating Committee for the Liberation of Africa meeting at Arusha, Tanzania; the Ministerial Conference of Non-Aligned Countries at New Delhi, the heads of state and government of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Nigeria, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe meeting in Lusaka; the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity at Addis Ababa condemned Pretoria, affirmed support of SWAPO and called for stern action at the United Nations. The General Assembly early this month resumed debate on Namibia (it was persuaded to hold the matter in abeyance last December lest the upcoming Geneva talks be imperiled) and voted 112 to 0 to call on the Security Council to impose on South Africa 'comprehensive mandatory sanctions'. There were 22 abstentions - the Western Contact group and its European allies sum Australia and Japan. Even more countries abstained on a resolution dealing with the plunder of Namibian uranium. The Western Five abstained on all other resolutions - prefiguring yet another triple veto by the USA, Britain and France whenever the Security Council meets. A veto on comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria regime will bring about a special session of the General Assembly.

Pretoria, elated with the new Reagan administration in the USA, is sending a four-man delegation from its Namibian collaborators to Washington the week of 16 March. They are Dirk Mudge, the wealthy white farmer who heads the Council of Ministers; Chief Kuama Riruako, a member of the Council; Peter Kalangula, president of the South African-chosen Democratic Turnhalle Alliance political coalition; and Faniek Kozonguizi, a lawyer who bears the title of director, international relations of South West Africa/Namibia. Jonas Savimbi, head of the UNITA group operating in Angola with South African support is to come to Washington in the near future.

The atmosphere in the nation's capital is inviting. The American government is now run by people who have repeatedly shown sympathy for Pretoria and UNITA. Secretary of State Alexander Haig in January launched a verbal attack on Soviet-supported 'international terrorism' and the following day the State Department's official spokesman gave as examples support of guerrillas in El Salvador and Namibia. A State Department letter to ECSA of March 9 says: 'We do not characterize national liberation movements as terrorist organizations although we have expressed our views sharply when such movements use terrorism as a tactic in support of their political goals.' The same letter averts support for 'those in South Africa who advocate peaceful evolutionary change.' At the same time, the Reagan administration is intent on repealing the Clark amendment which was enacted five years ago to forbid the US from giving overt or covert assistance to UNITA.

The feel in Washington among those newly in power is that on settling the future of Namibia the United Nations has failed. Those most able to make the UN effective are the very ones who undermine the world organization's ability. There are active efforts underway to somehow extract the problem of a Namibian solution from the UN, and there is concentration on finding a method similar to the British government's handling of Zimbabwe at the Lancaster House talks in 1979. A March 2 story in THE CITIZEN, a South African daily which supports the regime, says there is a plan afoot to have the US government sponsor a Camp David-Lancaster House kind of conference. The Johannesburg paper states a South African diplomat 'suggested...that the current impasse over the SWA future might be overcome if the new administration agreed to sponsor a Lancaster House-style constitutional conference.' A US State Department official '...said an American-sponsored conference would seem to be very attractive to South Africa', especially if Pretoria did not have to concede anything to get new talks underway.'

Namibia is a crucial element in the global scope of the Western Five as their economies are strained, as they concentrate on unimpeded access to the fuel for their societies - oil, uranium, gold, strategic minerals. Think tanks in the USA, Britain, France and West Germany have issued a paper posing the need for their countries and Canada, Italy and Japan, plus any friendly country affected by a single issue (South Africa) to reach out from NATO to preserve what they conceive as their stability. Already, generals from South American right-wing dictatorships are visiting Washington. Can P.W. Botha be far behind? What appears to be shaping up is the formalization of a South Atlantic Treaty Organization. These happenings threaten the liberation of Namibia and the independence of the free states of Southern Africa.
'This has been a frightful week for the United Nations, Southern Africa and the alignment of world forces. The world body played the desperate game of Russian - of Soviet - roulette, inviting its own extinction. The division between the communist revolutionary world and the western moderate world deepens. This subcontinent is again disclosed as a primary arena in the impending conflict and South Africa's role is clarified. The General Assembly met in special session to discuss South West Africa. This followed the failure of the multiparty conference in Geneva in January to reach agreement on the implementation of the United Nations formula for the Territory's independence, as contained in Security Council resolution 435. South Africa sought to put its case in the debate, and although it is a founder member of the organization and although its participation is indispensable to a settlement in South West Africa, it was silenced. The United Nations bias against South Africa and towards the Soviet-backed SWAPO movement was the reason for the failure in Geneva. It was conceded by western spokesmen that the world body would have to demonstrate its fairness if there was to be any progress. What it did this week was to demonstrate in the most blatant manner its partiality. It has finally disqualified itself as a mediator and umpire in South West Africa. Resolution 435 has been effectively killed and a solution for South West Africa will now have to be found outside its ambit.

'As for the fate of the world body itself, American ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick castigated the General Assembly for its violation of the Charter and the fundamental rights of a member. Previously, she indicated that American would withdraw its support if the organization continued to abuse itself as a forum for ideological warfare and to work against the interests of the United States and its allies.

'And a crucial second test looms. Threats have been made to deprive Israel also of her rights, and if that is done, the end of America's participation and its financial contributions and thus of the organization will be at hand. The fact is, that the United Nations cannot contain present international tensions. The vote this week of 112 against the right of South Africa to speak, 22 in favor, was but a symptom of the great divide that separates the world today. On the one side, those who reject civilized standards of international behavior; on the other, those who uphold them. On the one side, those who align themselves, knowingly or otherwise, with the Soviet Union in its drive for global domination; on the other, those who align themselves with the United States in defense of the freedom of nations.

'That, as of 1981, is the struggle that overrides all others. And, with the new government in Washington, the country's dependability, loyalty and strategic importance will determine in future whether or not it is accepted as an ally of the United States. The point was clearly made by President Reagan in a television interview on Tuesday when he described South Africa as a "friendly country". And when he said of her "can we abandon a country which has stood beside us in every war we've fought, the country that strategically is essential to the free world in its production of minerals which we all need?"

That rhetorical question requires no answer, as it explains why Southern Africa is a main arena of the world-wide struggle, and why South Africa is a main target of the Third World-communist consortium in the United Nations. It is because of its minerals that are so important for the well-being and survival of the west, as is the oil of the Persian Gulf. A key strategy of the Soviet Union has therefore been, through the United Nations, to isolate South Africa. However, it has overlapped its hand. And this week's events provide the most encouraging evidence yet that its objective will not be achieved.'
Report on a visit to hospitals in Luanda, Peoples Republic of Angola, by a delegation from the 2nd Session of the International Commission of Inquiry into the crimes of the racist and apartheid regimes in Southern Africa, held 30 January to 3 February 1981. This report is made by Margaret Ling, research officer of the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, London.

The delegation saw a centre where seriously wounded war victims were being treated. They visited individual victims. Many had lost limbs or been paralysed. They included both members of FAPLA and members of SWAPO. They were being treated and cared for in very efficient conditions. Everything was very clean and very proper, and gave the delegation a very favourable impression.

The delegation then visited the Central Military Hospital, which receives wounded who cannot be treated in the regional hospitals. The delegation saw about 120 seriously wounded patients; the majority were handicapped, either as amputees or paralysed.

The wounded in the different rooms welcomed the delegation and expressed their deep trust in the work of the Commission and their deep hopes of seeing positive results from its work. The delegation explained the Commission's aims and goals, told the wounded that their problems were well known and that the Commission would disseminate the information internationally.

In one room the wounded sang revolutionary songs.

The visit illustrated the methods used by the South Africans - booby traps, anti-tank mines, the latter made so that they only explode after half the convoy has passed over them. The booby traps activate shells which explode together with mines to produce an enormous explosion and corresponding injuries.

We saw the results of double mines, which have a more lethal effect.

Also inflammable mines, which contain oil or gasolene. Personnel who are burned by these mines cannot be saved.

We saw wounds from rockets and missiles fired from helicopters; and wounds from the explosives contained in projectile missiles such as those used in Vietnam.

The methods used by the South Africans are not normal. It is impossible to "reconstruct" the victims of these attacks and explosions - they are so badly broken and disfigured, i.e. The South African philosophy is to destroy the man. The weapons used are intended not only to wound and to kill, but to destroy the fibres and to mutilate.

In spite of their horrible wounds these victims have a very revolutionary militant spirit. They have trust in the cause of their people. We must also mention the contribution of the Cubans who work in the hospital.

The Medical Corps have prepared a report listing the fundamental priority needs where overseas organisations can make a contribution (NB This report is due to be circulated to Commission members and delegates).

It is obvious that the most seriously wounded cannot be treated in Angola. They are transferred to friendly socialist countries for treatment.
DEATH IN NAMIBIA

Markus Kateka, the Namibian farm laborer sentenced to death under terms of South Africa's Terrorism Act, is awaiting the results of an appeal being prepared for submission directly to South Africa's highest court, the Appellate Division. Mr Kateka was found guilty in Windhoek Supreme Court on 13 October 1980 because he did not inform his employer of the presence of armed men on the property. Another worker, Hendrik Kariseb, received a 10-year prison sentence.

The armed men in question attacked the farm owner's house on 17 February in the Grootfontein district of war-torn northern Namibia. During the trial, the State prosecutor called as his last witness a South African security police major who was allowed to recite the entire chronicle of insurgent attacks on farms beginning with December 1975, none of which had any relation to the defendants. THE WINDHOEK OBSERVER reports on Judge J.J. Strydom's statement at the time of sentencing: 'It was axiomatic to expect farm workers not to associate with insurgents. Farmers were also entitled, he said, to such protection as the Courts could provide in the form of a deterrent.' Markus Kateka's imminent hanging is to serve as a warning to all Namibians to obey completely the occupying power in their country. South African 'law' is, of course, illegal in the International Territory of Namibia. The exercise in Namibia of any South African law is 'illegal and invalid' - as declared by the United Nations Security Council and affirmed by the International Court of Justice.

Pretoria's legal doings are applied selectively - as recent instances show:

- THE WINDHOEK ADVERTISER on 22 October reports that a man was given leave to appeal in Windhoek Supreme Court against his death sentence for murder in the African township of Katutura. Markus Kateka was denied this permission; his case must risk an attempt before the high court.

- THE WINDHOEK OBSERVER of 25 October recounts the appearance in Windhoek Supreme Court of a white South African policeman charged with murdering a waiter outside a Windhoek nightspot during the course of a riotous evening of drinking. Only after the OBSERVER brought the murder to public attention was the cop brought to court. He was released on his own recognizance, no bail.

- On 1 November, THE OBSERVER details how three white security guards at a power station were charged with the murder of a young black man. Moses Namaseb had been found in critical condition, his face 'mutilated beyond recognition, and he had multiple body injuries'. He died within 24 hours. The paper continues 'it appears that Mr Namaseb was picked up near the Van Eck power station in the early morning hours and then taken to a spot near the railway tracks...where he was beaten up. Police also confiscated a number of heavy boots allegedly worn and used by the three men to kick the young Black.' The accused were released on 500 Rand bail each.

The US State Department in a December 1980 letter to ECSA wrote: 'We have made known to the Government of South Africa our most serious concern and have urged that, in the event Mr. Kateka's conviction is upheld, his sentence not be carried out. It is the established position of this Government that application of the Terrorism Act in Namibia is in violation of South Africa's legal obligations by virtue both of important elements of the Act and the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia. Moreover, the hanging of Mr. Kateka would, in the circumstances as we understand them, be an alarming instance of unusually severe and cruel punishment.'

CALL ON PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN TO DEMAND PRETORIA REVOKE THE DEATH SENTENCE IMPOSED ON MARKUS KATEKA.
CALL ON THE PRESIDENT TO CONDEMN PRETORIA'S ILLEGAL OCCUPATION OF NAMIBIA, AND THAT HE PUBLICLY DEMAND ALL NAMIBIAN PRISONERS AND DETAINEES BE RELEASED.
Jonas Shishveni Shimuefeleni was arrested in March 1966 and detained in South Africa's Pretoria Central Prison until charged in Windhoek under the Terrorism Act in February 1969. He was found guilty of conspiring to overthrow the South West Africa administration by force and to replace it by a SWAPO-led government. In August 1969, he was sentenced to 18 years and taken to Robben Island prison colony off Cape Town. On numerous occasions doctors have recommended that he be released because of a serious kidney condition, a state shown on the death certificate. Beating in the region of the kidneys is a favorite method employed by the police. Jonas Shimuefeleni - now buried in the good earth of Namibia - deserves at least an autopsy to determine the real cause of his death at 49 years.
2nd SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF INQUIRY
INTO THE CRIMES OF THE RACIST AND APARTHEID REGIMES IN
SOUTHERN AFRICA (LUANDA, FROM JANUARY 30th TO FEBRUARY 3rd)

SWORN STATEMENT

BY: SILAS NDAPUKA

I was born in 1942 at Okatu, Northern Namibia. I am married and have 3 children. By profession a trader (shop owner).

I was arrested in June 1980 at my shop in Ombafi, by South African soldiers headed by a black officer name Lucas Paulus. I was taken to a military base at Uutapi where I was kept for 9 days, during this 9 days I was given only one tin of meat and one of milk for the whole period, drinking water was in my cell. Then I was transferred to Oshakati prison where I was immediately interrogated by the military police of the S.A.D.F. they were 8 whites and one black. I was then asked are you Silas the terrorist? I answered yes I am Silas but not a terrorist one of them said we know everything about you and if you don't want to speak we shall make you speak by some different methods. Then I was put in a small cell for one person for 8 days.

I was called to the office second time for further interrogation, after entering the office I was ordered to stand in one corner facing the wall the black M.P. came with a cloth and tighten it across my face covering my eyes, then my arms were tight behind my back attached to some instruments which I could not see because I was blind-folded. At once I felt extreme pains all over my body, this was repeated after every two three seconds till I fell down unconscious, after that I was ordered to remove all my clothes except underpant, then the beatings start by all of them until blood was running from my nose, I was put back to my cell to wait for the next time for further torture.

The second time I was called in to the office blind-folded immediately and electrical instruments were tighten on my ears and switched on and off. I felt my whole body was paralised by those pains, water was running all over my body, then after that I was asked again to confirm if I had helped transporting what they called my co-terrorists and help them with food and accommodations.
The next time I was then ordered to bent down putting my hands on the chair to form a shape of a horse and imitate a running horse but my knees must not touch the ground two men have now to ride on me one after the other. I got so tired and my back was terribly paining till I could not move my body anymore, my knees were now touching the ground but they kept on beating me so that I should continue moving my body like a running horse till when I fell down on the ground, after some time I was taken back to the cell in my extreme pain I past a sleepless night, the following morning one soldier came to call me to the office I told him that I can not stand-up out of bend I need a doctor my back seems to be broken. He said he is going to inform the prison authority about my state of health.

I was later transferred to big detention camp still at Oshakati and forced to do all kinds of work being the stripping off the clothes from dead corps that came in everyday at list two or three per day, and we were told that these are freedom fighters killed in the battle.

Their face were always smashed beyond recognition. after the removal of the clothes, corps are taken to unknown place where there is a massgrave, and clothes are to be burned in a ditch just near the detention camp, we have to do all this work.

When I was released I came home and start medical treatment at the Hospital near my home, to heal the wounds on my buttocks as a result of the flogging and my back which was still paining since the day I was turned in to a riding horse.

I also find that, the South African military police have taken my truck number S.B.A. 4836 Ford, and I was told the truck is at Oshakati police station there was nothing I could do about it I just have to leave it there and see how I can safe my life.
We shot this young girl. She must have been about five...

When it comes to killing there are some of them who laugh about it. They love killing.

Trevor Edwards

The South African Defence Force was a military organization maintained by 1,300 soldiers who were supposed to have been killed by the Cubans in 1976, but by mystery officers from a base which obviously does not exist.

The incident was touched on by South African military intelligence officers, who claimed that angolan civil war was against the United Nations forces in Angola, the FNL and the Unita. The South Africans fought to get within 18 miles of the Angolan capital Luanda, which was that base, and then move into Luanda while prisoners and aid and shelter. The FNL was led by Mobutu's brother-in-law.

The South African Defence Force was involved in the Angolan civil war. For two years, South Africa tried to aid the Unita and the National Union of Angolan Youth that civilians must be killed to get supplies to the troops.

The main job is to take an area and clear it. We sweep through it and kill everyone in the way, including nice people, children, pets, and so we stop them getting in our way.

The half the time the heads don't know what's going on. We're just fucking them up and it goes out of hand. Some of the guys get a little sick at first and then they start not by us and cross the cold line between Angola and Namibia. It's not the soldiers stopping them.

By Christmas Eve, the doubts that had set in when the deposed mother had been brought out from her base at Buffalo on the Okavango River in northern Namibia for four weeks' leave. But instead of staying in Cape Town, he got on a plane and flew to the site enough of it and I just stood there. Now we've got what we have been doing out there.

The Battalion of the South African Defence Force in a military operation, was unoccupied by 1,300 soldiers who were supposed to have been killed by the Cubans in 1976, but by mystery officers from a base which obviously does not exist.

The incident was touched on by South African military intelligence officers, who claimed that the Angolan civil war was against the United Nations forces in Angola, the FNL and the Unita. The South Africans fought to get within 18 miles of the Angolan capital Luanda, which was that base, and then move into Luanda while prisoners and aid and shelter. The FNL was led by Mobutu's brother-in-law.

The South African Defence Force was involved in the Angolan civil war. For two years, South Africa tried to aid the Unita and the National Union of Angolan Youth that civilians must be killed to get supplies to the troops.

The main job is to take an area and clear it. We sweep through it and kill everyone in the way, including nice people, children, pets, and so we stop them getting in our way.
The war that poses a question for the West

THE UNITED STATES lost the Vietnam War, it is often said, on television screens and in the, newspapers of America. While official propaganda claimed that the war was won in 1975, the reality is that the war was a failure, and that the United States was forced to withdraw its troops and interests from Vietnam.

In their war in Namibia against the South African army, the Angolans People's Organization, the South Africans, and other African states have followed a similar strategy. The Angolans People's Organization, supported by the Soviet Union, has waged a guerrilla war against the South African army for decades. The South African army, supported by the United States and other Western countries, has responded with a series of military operations and bombings.

The war is costly for all parties involved. The South African army has suffered numerous casualties, including civilians. The Angolans People's Organization has also suffered numerous casualties. The war hasAfricandered the political landscape of southern Africa, and has placed a heavy burden on the economies of the countries involved.

The war poses a question for the West. The United States and other Western countries have supported the South African army, and have provided financial and military support to the South African army. The United States and other Western countries have also provided financial and military support to the Angolans People's Organization.

The war has also had a significant impact on the economies of the countries involved. The South African economy has suffered from the war, and the Angolan economy has also been affected.

The war has also had a significant impact on the political landscape of southern Africa. The war has led to the displacement of thousands of people, and has caused political instability in many countries.

The war has also had a significant impact on the environment. The war has led to the destruction of many natural resources, and has caused environmental damage.

The war has also had a significant impact on the human rights of the people involved. The war has led to the violation of human rights, and has caused suffering for many people.

The war has also had a significant impact on the economy of the region. The war has caused economic instability, and has led to a decrease in trade and investment.

The war has also had a significant impact on the political stability of the region. The war has caused political instability, and has led to the displacement of thousands of people.

The war has also had a significant impact on the environment. The war has led to the destruction of many natural resources, and has caused environmental damage.

The war has also had a significant impact on the human rights of the people involved. The war has led to the violation of human rights, and has caused suffering for many people.
President Ronald Reagan
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We represent a number of American groups long concerned about Namibia. We support the United Nations as the lawful authority over the International Territory of Namibia. We support the Namibian people in their just struggle for independence.

Like most of the world, we are dismayed and angered by the arrogance of the South African Government in breaking off the talks in Geneva last month which were aimed at reaching a peaceful settlement on the future of Namibia. Pretoria's act was one more instance of its decades-long defiance of the world community by illegally occupying the International Territory.

In contrast, the leaders of SWAPO, the South West Africa People's Organization of Namibia, who have been fighting diplomatically and militarily for the freedom of their country from foreign rule, at Geneva once again pledged their support for the UN settlement plan and offered to sign a ceasefire with the South African regime. The United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, members of the Western contact group, the Front Line African states, all went out of their way to accommodate Pretoria and induce it to agree to the peace plan and the launching of Namibia-wide elections leading to the establishment of a constituent assembly of Namibians who would work out their nation's future.

Mr. President, the people of Namibia have endured almost a century of foreign misrule. The wealth of their land is exploited by South African and other foreign interests. Under the Pretoria regime, the Namibian people suffer from the actions of the South African Defence Force and the South African Police. They are detained without trial. Some are tried in South African courts exercising South African laws and condemned to South African prisons or to death. Namibians, particularly young people, have fled into exile by the thousands. At this moment thousands more are crossing the borders into Angola, Zambia and Botswana chiefly to avoid being forced to fight in Pretoria's South West Africa Territory Force against their fellow Namibians.

The time is long past for the Namibian people to achieve their independence and to assume their rightful place as a free nation. We call on you to -

- Press publicly for the South African Government to accede to the UN implementation plan for Namibia;

- Pledge again United States Government support for that plan;

- Support at the United Nations appropriate action, including mandatory sanctions against South Africa, unless that government agrees immediately to the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia.
Very sincerely yours,

George M. Houser
Executive Director, American Committee on Africa
198 Broadway
New York, NY 10038

Edward C. May
Director, Office on World Community
Lutheran World Ministries
360 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10010

Jerry Herman
Southern Africa Program Coordinator
American Friends Service Committee
1501 Cherry Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102

Randall Robinson
Executive Director, TransAfrica
1325 18th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Bruce Cameron
Co-Chairperson, Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy
120 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
The new United States administration has said that it has not yet formulated an Africa policy. American ambassador to the United Nations Jean Kirkpatrick has stated that the USA is not prepared to debate the Namibia issue in the Security Council. British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington is reported to have urged Secretary of State Alexander Haig to make clear to Pretoria the US's determination for a peaceful solution in the International Territory. Haig—perhaps obsessed with El Salvador—did not respond. One instance of the US's attitude toward South Africa emerged in mid-February during debate at the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva. We print below excerpts from a statement by US representative Richard Schifter. It reflects the already existent support for 'evolutionary' change, the ritual 'abhorrence' of apartheid and, most important, condemnation of 'terrorism'. On 23 February, Schifter abstained on or voted against five resolutions calling for action against South Africa and in support of SWAPO in its liberation struggle in Namibia.

'Mr Chairman, the United States cannot endorse a system that is racist in purpose or effect. As long as the South African Government pursues actively and as a matter of policy the maintenance of a system of apartheid, my government will not develop the type of relationship with South Africa that we, and others, might wish.

'I will not chronicle the abuses under which a majority of South Africans must live. I am sure that other speakers here today will do so. What I do wish to concentrate upon is my government's belief that there is hope in the future for a peaceful process of change to occur in South Africa. To encourage that process, we will not turn our backs to this crucial issue nor indulge in moral posturing or idle gestures.

'As we look to the future, we can all agree that evolutionary change is necessary, not only because the system of apartheid offends fundamental values, but because any system which seeks by law and policy to keep 85 percent of its people in a subordinate position is unworkable and doomed to failure. But how do we then seek to encourage those in South Africa who support this course to gain and hold the initiative?

'Mr Chairman, strident rhetoric and the calls for radical actions are not useful in this undertaking. If there is no dialogue, the international community will not be heard within South Africa. Such rhetoric might encourage those prone to violence or further alienate those in South Africa who hold steadfastly to the status quo. Neither of these groups will enjoy our support. We cannot and will not aid or abet terrorism or terrorists, nor will we assist those who consistently stand in the way of change.'

* * * * * * * * *

FROM PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN'S INTERVIEW ON C.B.S. TELEVISION CONDUCTED BY WALTER CRONKITE, TUESDAY, 3 MARCH 1981, IN ANSWER TO QUESTION ABOUT SOUTH AFRICA AND HUMAN RIGHTS:

THE PRESIDENT: 'No, no, I think that there's been a failure maybe for political reasons in this country to recognize how many people, black and white, in South Africa are trying to remove apartheid and the steps that they have taken and the gains they have made. As long as there's a sincere and honest effort being made based on our own experience in our own land, it would seem to me that we should try to be helpful... Can we abandon a country that has stood beside us in every war we've ever fought, a country that is strategically essential to the free world and its production of minerals we all must have and so forth... I just feel that myself, that here if we're going to sit down at the table and negotiate with the Russians surely we can keep the door open and continue to negotiate with a friendly nation like South Africa.'
The Episcopal Diocese of Alabama comprises the northern and central parts of the state of Alabama. It has since 1978 maintained a close relationship with the Anglican Diocese of Namibia and with the Suffragan Bishop there, the Right Rev. James Kauluma. Episcopalians in Alabama are well aware of the situation in Namibia and of the International Territory's military occupation by South Africa in defiance of the lawful authority, the United Nations. The Convention of the Alabama Diocese, meeting in Anniston on February 15, 1981, passed a resolution on Namibia by a 3 to 1 majority. We print here the operative sections thereof:

BE IT RESOLVED, that this One-Hundred and Fiftieth Annual Convention of the Diocese of Alabama request the Bishop to create a diocesan Committee for Namibia which shall be charged with the responsibility of monitoring political and social developments in Namibia, particularly as they affect the life and mission of the Church there, to inform the people of this diocese of such developments on a regular basis, to send assurances of our support to the Bishops and people of the Anglican Church in Namibia, and in consultation with our Bishop to send messages of concern regarding policies of our Government that affect the Namibian situation to appropriate persons in the legislative and executive branches of our Government; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Convention supports those United Nations resolutions which call for an immediate cease-fire and for free and fair elections in Namibia under the supervision and control of the United Nations; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Convention urges the United States Government to use its strongest influence, including economic sanctions against the Republic of South Africa if necessary, to insure that South Africa will cease to interfere with the process leading to freedom, independence and self-determination for the people of Namibia; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this resolution be sent to President Reagan, the Secretary of State, Senators Heflin and Denton, and all Alabama Representatives in the Congress.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
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