South Africa seems to be enjoying wider credibility in the United States. As a result of its phony peace agreements with neighboring African countries, the government of South Africa has received acclaim from the U.S. government and from big business here. South Africa is increasingly capable of spreading its tentacles in a variety of different directions, a few of which have been noticeable lately in New York City.

News and Notes #18 deals in detail with one such experience, namely the filming of a commercial for South African television in Brooklyn. Other examples include an exhibition on the evolution of mankind at New York's Museum of Natural History. Most of the exhibition is drawn from a white South African anthropological view of the world.

A film, called The Gods Must Be Crazy, produced and directed by white South African movie maker Jamie Uys, is currently being shown in New York. This "comedy" pokes fun at the San people (Bushmen), who think a Coke bottle thrown from an airplane by a litterbug pilot is a gift from the gods. This film is particularly insidious because it provides no historical perspective and the San people are presently close to extinction; the reason being that it used to be a favorite pastime of white farmers to hunt the "Bushmen" for sport. Such a film by a white South African is yet another attempt to trivialize and make money off the plight of Black people in South Africa, something they constantly want white Americans to support.

In the sporting arena, a growing number of athletes and teams are flaunting the international boycott and competing in South Africa. Gerrie Coetzee is going to take on Larry Holmes for boxing's heavyweight title, a fight that is certain to raise deep passions and will be viewed as the battle of the white South African versus the black American.

Zola Budd has gained fast fame as white South Africa's Olympic hopeful in the women's distance runs, even though she is officially competing on the British team. The South African Olympic Committee is furiously lobbying to be re-instated in time for the 1988 games by using the argument that a racially integrated team would represent South Africa. If the apartheid outlaws are successful in their application for re-admission, their presence in the Olympic games would be one of the crowning jewels in a grand propaganda campaign for world respectability.

These individual aspects may seem relatively small in the context of the overall struggle. But, taken together, these and numerous other examples do have decidedly political significance. White South Africa is desperately trying to sell its product — racism — and make it an acceptable, even desirable commodity.

We who live in the U.S.A. and want to see social transformations take place, have a responsibility to put these things together, see the connections and organize against them. We certainly cannot trust those holding power in the U.S. to halt South Africa's propaganda blitz or their aggressive racism, primarily because Ronald Reagan and others in power are just as racist. The same blend of ingredients is used by the U.S. system with the same goal in mind: legitimizing foreign aggression and selling its "melting pot" image, while the reality is quite the opposite: grossly unequal conditions of life.
Selling Apartheid Products

Filming of South African-Backed TV Commercial Provides Opportunities for Brooklyn Activists

A South African production company, Gough Nurock, completed filming a commercial for a South African brand of liquor in Park Slope late last month. The commercial advertises Mainstay Cane Spirit, a type of white rum made from sugar cane and will be shown to predominantly Black audiences back in South Africa.

Samuel Wright, the star of a Broadway production called The Tap Dance Kid was among the breakdancers in the commercial, which will basically consist of 40 or so seconds of Black and Hispanic young men dancing around a white woman slugging away at the Mainstay bottle.

The filming took place on President Street not too far from the SAMRAF office. This particular part of Brooklyn, known for its Brownstone houses, is in a neighborhood which is fast becoming the domain of the upwardly mobile. Thus, it’s not surprising that it became the site for such an enterprise. The production team apparently had approached a number of other blocks and were turned down. The Block Assn. of President St. received $4,500 for allowing the block to be used, with some homeowners getting additional amounts for the use of their property. In an interview with a black newspaper in Brooklyn, The City Sun, a resident of the block said, “We basically prostituted ourselves and sold out the block.” More than just the block was sold out.

This little enterprise provided us with opportunities, some of which were missed and some of which we can still take advantage of. Right after we became aware of the filming a very ad-hoc group got together to see if something could be done. The crew revealed they would be filming for three days, and we decided to surprise them on the afternoon of the second day, by planning some boisterous action to disrupt the filming. Despite the short notice, quite a few community people expressed an interest in putting their voices together in resistance to apartheid.

Unfortunately, two things occurred which blew us out of the water. One, there was a monsoon-type thunderstorm which stopped production about an hour before our planned protest. But, they had another reason for closing up shop early on that afternoon. In some ways our ad-hoc coalition was uncoordinated, and one group advertised the demonstration on a leaflet which denounced the commercial. By openly announcing the demonstration, the cops were alerted and arrived in force. The element of surprise was lost. So even if it hadn’t rained, our chance of effectively protesting was compromised by the lack of coordinated planning.

The production crew returned the following day. Some of us went down to the block to see what was happening. We distributed our leaflet (text included below) and raised our voices. While we had blown our chances of major disruption, we did cause a decided lack of concentration on the part of both crew and cast. The police intervened at an early point in our activity and threatened arrest for “interference.” A number of people shouted back that they couldn’t do that. Police logic is sometimes pretty strange. The police began to argue with one of our people, a Brooklynite, that no one had the right to say anything about South Africa who hadn’t been there. At which point a white South African exile stated that he had grown up there, so the cop said he had a right to speak.

Generally, the protest got an interested reception. People took the leaflet, and surprisingly, not too many were discarded and left on the sidewalk. Some kids from the neighborhood showed an interest, and one Black kid hauled us over to his buddies, making them shut up while we explained what the deal was all about. Some people identified very clearly with an anti-apartheid position. They were thoroughly disgusted when informed about the commercial being made.

The humorous high point of our effort was identifying the white South Africans who were directing the operation—about five in all. Amidst inquiries like “Excuse me, don’t you come from South Africa,” they mostly denied their nationality. One fool with an accent that only a white South African could have, claimed he was from the United Kingdom. These people were too scared to associate themselves with South Africa, but not too scared to make money off black oppression. Pretty sleazy, heh?

When they finished filming, one white South African exile got into a discussion with these guys, who tried to argue a rational line for the maintenance of white supremacy in South Africa. Why is it that the only people who claim things are getting better in South Africa are white people? They had no response when challenged with that viewpoint. We certainly gave them something to think about, and perhaps they’ll think twice before returning to Brooklyn.

Other community people took the initiative to draw up a petition denouncing the commercial and the apartheid system. They collected 300-400 signatures on the final day of filming and sponsored a press conference the following week outside City Hall to hand over the petitions to a representative of Koch’s office.

We were very upset that a South African film company could walk into a Brooklyn community and get away with making a commercial enticing Black people in South Africa to buy more liquor. They did get away with it, but their little en-
terprise has provided the spark for some potential organizing. An ad-hoc coalition has been formed under the name of Brooklynites Against Apartheid. A speak out is to be held on July 25 (too late for us to report on its outcome) at which people in the community will discuss what happened and what we can do to respond.

While it is positive that folk push local politicians to pass resolutions or make statements to the press, there is certainly a need for more direct response aimed at the South Africans. We cannot afford to disarm our own capabilities and put the struggle in the hands of elected officials, most of whom are not representative of the community in the first place. We have to show apartheid and its supporters that we can act independently on behalf of the struggle for freedom in southern Africa.

We certainly hope that a more organized community will be the outcome of further discussions concerning this incident, which indeed left its mark on the Park Slope neighborhood of Brooklyn. We'll keep you posted about this interesting new situation.

This film operation may seem like a relatively harmless display by Madison Avenue types trying to foist another product onto us all. Unfortunately, this is not really the case. This commercial advertises a South African brand of liquor known as Mainstay Cane Spirit. You can't buy Mainstay Cane Spirit here. You can only buy it in southern Africa.

We're angry about the filming of this commercial because its goal is to make money for a South African company, and any profits made in a country like South Africa can only be seen as blood money.

If you don't know anything about South Africa, you should try to find out. South Africa is a country that is run by an all-white, minority government. The South African government allows all kinds of privileges to the white population (making up about 20% of the total), while the majority of the people (Africans and some Asians) have no human or political rights.

In order to enforce this gross inequality, commonly referred to as apartheid, the South African government rules by force. South Africa has a para-military police force and the largest army in Africa.

Because Black people are neither allowed to own land, nor to choose where and how they want to work, nor to choose their own leaders, they continually resist the government. This resistance, together with the draconian system of social control, makes policing Black people a full-time job for white people.

The sad thing about all of this is that the United States government and the corporate big shots here think that South Africa is a great place to do business, because of the high profits and also because South Africa is regarded as a friend of the West. What they really mean is that racism doesn't bother them. Why should it? They are racists, too, in their own right.

In 1976, when young Black students were fed up with being treated as sub-human beings, they rioted in a Black township or ghetto called Soweto, near Johannesburg, South Africa. These unarmed students were gunned down in their hundreds by the South African police.

The students attacked a number of institutions in the ghetto which continually ripped them off, like the schools and the government offices. But, they also went for the government-sponsored liquor and beer drinking halls.

Many of these places were burned to the ground, because the students knew that the government encouraged drinking among Black workers. Alcoholism in South Africa, like drug addiction in the United States, causes the poor community to turn on itself and makes organizing against the real source of the problem a more difficult task. This commercial will play right into the strategy of putting another nail in the coffin of Black people in South Africa.

It's not like the people behind the commercial don't know some of this stuff. They don't care, because they're getting paid a bundle to do business with a racist pariah.

And, it doesn't matter how hip it seems, whether there's breakdancing and cool people in the commercial, and even some Black people. The end result is still the same: the supporters of apartheid benefit.

We say "Get out." The people of this community cannot idly endorse a promotion so tightly secured to the oppression in South Africa. If any message is to be sent from this community to the people of South Africa, it should be "We support your fight for freedom," not "have another drink." Don't allow these people to make money off the backs of suffering Black workers in South Africa. Let's chase 'em away.

**Shut Down The Arsenal**

*Project Disarm, Coalition of Midwest Anti-War Activists Poses a Challenge to U.S. War Machine*

On June 4 this year, a group of anti-war activists in the Midwest got together to resist the U.S. war drive in a different kind of way from the usual forms of symbolic protest. This particular action, after five months of planning, was against an army establishment, the Rock Island Arsenal, situated on an island in the Mississippi River within the Quad Cities area of Illinois and Iowa.

Rock Island Arsenal is a large production center for small arms, many of which get shipped to Central America. It also manufactures 155 mm. howitzers which are capable of firing tactical nuclear warheads. Its facilities are also used to house the army's computerized inventories, which maintain control over the whereabouts and transporting of the army's nuclear, chemical and biological weaponry. It is a center of war production. The stated demand of the demonstration was to "Shut the Arsenal Down."

The arsenal was chosen as a target for a number of reasons. It symbolizes America's gunboat diplomacy and allowed the activists to raise issues of weapons production, U.S. intervention, support for the revolutionary movements in Central America and the nuclear threat. Likewise, the domestic problems facing workers could be addressed given that the arsenal is productive while what was once a large agricultural industry seems to be going the way of the buffalo.

As important, was the vulnerability of the arsenal. Its location on an island means that its connection to the mainland
is by bridges, three to be precise. Demonstrators felt that they could effectively disrupt business-as-usual by blocking the bridges.

The coalition of activists chose the name Project Disarm. It included anti-war activists from Chicago, Madison, Southern Illinois, the Quad Cities area, Iowa City and Kansas City—both pacifist and non-pacifist anti-war activists. Organizing was no easy task and like any other coalition, Project Disarm had its problems. There was agreement that the actions should be advertised as non-violent demonstrations.

There was much debate about tactics and two basic poles emerged. One argued for the moral witness approach usually adopted by civil disobedience actions. In other words, individuals would purposefully get arrested to show their moral indignation toward the war machine and the action had to remain within the boundaries defined by the law.

The other approach argued for non-negotiation with the authorities, a de-centralization of tactics in the form of various mobile groups of activists with a more confrontational approach. People could disrupt and try to get away from the police. They did not have to get arrested. The latter approach was the one most embraced by Project Disarm. Although people were free to choose their own tactics while remaining within the general guidelines of the demonstration, there was agreement that non-negotiation and a confrontational posture were acceptable.

This gun factory employs over 8,000 workers. Current economic conditions have resulted in closures and layoffs at plants such as John Deere. Consequently, the Arsenal has become the main employer in the area. Another topic of debate was the approach to Arsenal workers, and again the activists generally fell into two camps. One group felt moral indignation at what the Arsenal workers are doing and said the workers should quit their jobs.

The other group argued that the workers needed to be challenged but talked to at the same time. While this debate was not resolved, Project Disarm did not take an antagonistic approach toward the Arsenal workers. Care was taken not to damage their property (cars), but workers were encouraged to realize that they were participants in the weapons production of the U.S. military and were siding with the source of the problem. Certain groups put out leaflets encouraging the workers not to quit their jobs, but to think and organize about how they might mess up production at the Arsenal.

With the emphasis on mass direct action, Project Disarm activists formed themselves into various affinity groups. An office was set up in Moline, Illinois (one of the quad cities), and preparatory work took place daily during the three weeks prior to the action. About five days before, a public speak out was held.

By the time demonstrators arrived, the quad cities area was polarized. Most of the community knew about the demonstration and it was a hot topic of debate. Likewise, the military and police forces had taken very overt precautions to protect the Arsenal. The press reported that 300 military police had been brought in from Fort Riley and Fort Bragg. The military put NATO wire (like concertina wire) in the river for fear of an amphibious assault. The various quad cities police departments were all decked out in new riot gear. Bridges leading onto the island were closed to the public on the Sunday preceding the action. Only officials and workers with correct identification were allowed onto the island. By Sunday night the battlelines were drawn.

Over 500 people participated in the action which began at dawn on Monday. Demonstrators were situated near the three bridges at Davenport on the Iowa side and at Rock Island and Moline on the Illinois side.

Groups in Moline adopted mobile tactics, which involved disrupting the flow of traffic by blocking the streets. These mobile groups did not intend to get arrested and by remaining mobile, together with the incompetence/restraint of the Moline police, few of the demonstrators were nabbed. In Davenport, a more classic civil disobedience approach was taken with the demonstrators sitting in front of traffic and then being hauled away by the police. Some groups chanted and held banners. Overall, about 200 people were arrested. By 9:00 that morning, the activity was over.

Project Disarm didn’t accomplish its goal, namely to shut down the Arsenal. Though the authorities could boast about business-as-usual, it is safe to say that a large number
of workers stayed away from the Arsenal that day.

But, there was victory in defeat and many lessons were learned. The most important thing gained from this experience was that it is possible to take mass direct action and not be governed by the rules of the authorities. The actions taken by the State to protect its resources at the Arsenal were directly connected to the threat posed by Project Disarm.

The people who participated in this event felt energized. They now want to share their experience with others who are sympathetic to the struggle against U.S. greed, militarism, and intervention. There are plenty of military installations similar to Rock Island Arsenals all over America. Unless we act in a positive confrontational manner toward these institutions of war, they will continue to produce and our movement will remain non-threatening to the biggest threat the world has ever experienced.

**Resistance In The Military**

**Forum in New York Reveals Differences Between South African and Israeli Resister Groups**

Earlier this month, SAMRAF had an opportunity to participate in a forum with a representative from an Israeli military resistance group, Yesh Gavul. The literal translation of Yesh Gavul is "There's a limit/border." It was formed soon after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982.

This group came to life by publishing a petition signed by both officers and soldiers of the Israeli army. Sections of the petition state: "To the Prime Minister and Minister of Defense: We, the undersigned officers and soldiers in the reserve military service, turn to you and ask not to be sent to Lebanon, because we can't take it anymore! We have killed, are being killed too much in this war. We have conquered and bombarded too much. And for what?"

The petition continues, "Today it is all clear to us: through this war you are trying to find a military solution for the Palestinian problem. But a people's problem cannot be solved militarily . . . BRING THE SOLDIERS HOME!!! We took an oath to defend the security and the welfare of the state of Israel. We remain faithful to our pledge, we are therefore turning to you to enable us to do our reserve duty within the boundaries of the State of Israel and not on Lebanese territory."

According to Yesh Gavul, by May 1984, 130 soldiers and officers had been imprisoned for refusing to serve in Lebanon.

Our interest in being part of this forum came out of our efforts to understand the similarities between Israel and South Africa, the parallels in the questions facing Jews in Israel and whites in South Africa. The forum allowed us to understand more about their organization and what they are trying to achieve.

There are some striking differences between our approach as South African war resisters and the approach of Yesh Gavul. The major difference is that while we deny the very legitimacy of the state and the society we are supposed to defend, they are only resisting one aspect of Israeli policy, military expansionism.

How would their position be translated in the context of Southern Africa? They would be opposed to South Africa's invasions and occupations of neighboring countries, perhaps even calling for a pullout from Namibia. But, they would willingly serve in the South African military forces, confined to duty inside the country but still defending apartheid, a totally criminal system.

It's easy to see how such a position can be easily co-opted by those in power. Already in South Africa, those who have argued a similar position have been offered alternative service in a non-combatant role. So, they still perform their "duty" for the South African army.

The real shortcoming in Yesh Gavul's position is that they are unwilling to confront the main source of the problem and that is Israel's relationship to the indigenous peoples. Just as in South Africa, the existence of a state that by definition is antagonistic to the majority of the native peoples, means internal resistance and upheaval. The solution to such a problem lies in the removal of such a state. Whites who resist the army in South Africa have to do so because they are unwilling to defend an unjust system. This same question confronts Yesh Gavul and until they are willing to deal with it head on, they will not be of any serious assistance to the cause of Palestinians because they will still be willing to defend the institution bent on denying Palestinians full human equality.

A group such as ourselves would have no credibility, either with the Black community in South Africa or with the international solidarity movement, if we did not have a clearly articulated position on the need to destroy apartheid. Yesh Gavul is unwilling to see Zionism in the same light that we see apartheid.

A number of groups in the U.S. anti-draft movement sponsored Yesh Gavul speaking engagements. It seems to us that these groups have a responsibility to argue and debate these important political questions with Yesh Gavul. A failure to do so underlines one of the more serious ailments afflicting parts of the U.S. movement: a lack of clear support for the right of self-determination for oppressed peoples.

Resistance inside an oppressive military institution is always important. But, to be really effective it has to question the very basis upon which that institution is founded. Until Yesh Gavul is willing to make a clean break with the oppressive system in Israel and recognize the necessity of full human and political rights for the Palestinian people, they will not be able to be a vital force for social change in the Middle East.

**Story Of Jakob Morenga**

**Leader of United Resistance to German Colonization of Namibia, 1904-07**

The struggle of Africans against the invading European colonialists is a rich history, one which has produced numerous freedom fighters. Unfortunately their deeds are not common knowledge, because the recorded history tends to reflect the views of the invaders, rather than the indigenous peoples. Many of these African leaders were men and women of keen vision and intellect. They understood, very early on in the game, the need to resist foreign domination.

NEWS & NOTES intends to run a regular column on various African liberation fighters, as a way of sharing some of the true history of Africa with our readers.

In the last issue of NEWS & NOTES, the story of Hendrik Witbooi exemplified the extent of people's resistance to German colonization in Namibia. After World War I the League of Nations gave South Africa a mandate to administer Na-
nibia or South West Africa as it was then called, but it was a
German colony from 1884 until Germany’s defeat in the war.

Most leaders of the Namibian resistance (even Maherra-
ero of the Herero people and Witbooi of the Namas) orga-
nized themselves primarily along tribal lines and at some
time negotiated peace treaties which amounted to collabora-
tion with the Germans. Jakob Morenga did not think alongtri-
bal lines and wanted to see both Nama and Herero fighting-
German imperialism.

The Bondelswarts, part of the Nama nation, were actu-
ally fighting with the Germans before the Herero took up
arms in 1904. The fact that some German troops were occu-
pied with this rebellion in southern Namibia may have influ-
tenced the timing of the Herero revolt. While Maheroer and
Witbooi led the struggle in northeastern and central Namibia,
Morenga led the resistance in the south. Morenga was imme-
diately outlawed by the Germans and a price of 1,000 Marks
was put on his head.

Morenga began his battles with a band of 11 men, but
within months their strength increased to 150 rifles and then
nearly 400. His followers included members of both the
Nama and Herero peoples.

Towards the end of 1904, the focus of the war shifted to
the south, and the resistance shifted to guerilla warfare. Mor-
enga was a master of guerilla tactics. He specialized in quick
strikes which tended to leave the Germans dismounted. Mor-
enga took a humane approach, seeking not maximum casual-
ties but rather bold strikes to drive the Germans out of Na-
mibia. The same cannot be said of the Germans who adopted
a strategy of extermination. In the period that followed, Ger-
many, with about 15,000 soldiers in the field, was locked for
years in a struggle with what was only 1,000 to 2,000 Nama,
whose methods of warfare proved too much for the tradition-
ally trained German army.

If Hendrik Witbooi had not been killed in October,
1905, the struggle would have continued in central Namibia.
Without him, other Nama leaders in that region made peace
with the Germans. Morenga and the Bondelswarts, led by Jo-
hannes Christian, fought on in the south.

The Germans, under Colonel Deimling who was com-
mander of the “protective force” in Namibia, made changes
in strategy, using a willingness to negotiate and more mobile
military tactics to wear down the resistance. On 23 December
1906, the Bondelswarts signed a peace treaty, and by June
1907, the numbers of their people confined to “locations” rose
to about 1,224. After they gave up the battle, the only groups
continuing the struggle were Simon Kopper’s 100 to 150
Franzmanns (also part of the Nama nation) and scattered
units.

Refusing to negotiate with the Germans, Jakob Mor-
enga surrendered to the British across the border in South Af-
rica (then an English colony) after his forces had been sur-
prised and slaughtered by a German detachment. Asked
whether the war would drag on for much longer, Morenga re-
p lied: “Yes, indeed. It will last as long as there is a single Afri-
can in the bush.”

Morenga expected fair treatment from the British, but in
this he was mistaken. He was held captive for more than a
year. After his release in June, 1907, he was approached by the
British, acting on behalf of the Germans, to accept peace
terms. He refused because he knew he would not be safe in
Namibia.

Morenga ultimately took refuge in the remote and in-
hospitable border area between Namibia and South Africa.
This decision enabled the British to move against him. His ap-
pearance in the area and the movement of people to join him
had the effect of producing a German/British manhunt for
Morenga. Bruno von Schuckman, the new Governor of South
West Africa told the British authorities in the Cape that it was
the duty of a good neighbor to remove Morenga at once from
the border, either dead or alive.” The state of war in Namibia
had been officially lifted “by order of His majesty” on 31
March 1907, but the Germans so feared Morenga’s power to
raise the banner of resistance that they pursued him to his
death.

On 20 September, a combined force led by an English
major and a German captain attacked Morenga and his fighters
near Eenzamheid along the border. Morenga, one of his
brothers and two of his nephews were killed. What the Ger-
mans could not accomplish on their own had been accom-
plished by Anglo-German collusion.

Bits n Pieces

According to the South African Institute of Race
Relations, the supporters of apartheid have a little
something to worry about, even when many things are
going their way. Statistics show that more people were
killed or injured in sabotage acts in the first six months
of 1983 than in the preceding 6 years combined. From
the information we in SAMRAF have pieced together
lately, there have been at least 12 different actions of
armed resistance during the recent months of May and
June.

These stats can not sit too well with the white
power structure. Each military action reminds them
that their problem is inside South Africa and that a
meaningful solution will not be found over tea & crum-
pets with Margaret Thatcher.

Also referring to the 1984 Report of the Institute of
Race Relations, for every dollar whites earn in South
Africa, the Indians make 59¢, so-called Coloured folk
make 40¢, while Black people earn 15¢. These figures re-

clect the pervasive inequalities which dominate every
sphere of life in South Africa and crush any arguments
about how much better things are getting.

The apartheid government has been pushing a
statistic of its own, recently released by the Ministry
governing white education and that controlling black
education and training. According to these stats, there
are now roughly equal numbers of black and white stu-
dents graduating from high school. But, again, since
80% of the population is Black people, this supposed
achievement is much more of an indictment.

Speaking of glaring contradictions, while P.W.
Botha was on his goodwill European tour, 37 represen-
tatives of SWAPO who work legally inside Namibia
were arrested. As the Prime Minister of apartheid pro-
moted all his bullshit about the changes being made in
South Africa and peaceful relations, the SWAPO mem-
bers were detained for attending a braai (barbeque),
a violation of the Prohibition and Notification of Meet-
ings Act. But, when the security forces realized that this
would not go down well internationally with Botha
romping around Europe, the brothers and sisters were
released.
In the June 15th issue of SA Digest, a newsletter published by the apartheid government for international distribution, the lead article was titled: "South Africa Has Become One Of The World's Safest Countries". Apparently, they're making a case based on industrial safety, but even those safety regulations and thus the statistics do not apply to Blacks. Additionally, being Black and being “safe” in South Africa are contradictory terms, as was made explicit by P.W. Botha in Berne, Switzerland, when a journalist asked him a question about forced removals. Botha replied, "We do not force people to move to new homes, we coerce them." He then tried to correct himself, saying "We convince them.”

A $6 million contract was recently signed for the import of garden furniture from South Africa, specially for the International Merchandise Mart of Norfolk, Virginia. Norfolk has also been a center for African liberation support work for the past 10 years. Perhaps the International Merchandise Mart needs a reminder that South Africa's garden furniture and other products are not to be sold in Norfolk until the people that make the products are free. Doing business with apartheid can be bad for business.

Chris Evert Lloyd captured the recent Triumph South African Women's Open Tennis singles title, defying the international sports boycott. Did she just want to see Johannesburg or did she really need the money?

The real kicker behind the Nkomati Accord (remember the declarations of peace between Mozambique and South Africa) is what it means for white South African businessmen. One kingpin beneficiary may turnout to be Sol Kerzner, of Sun City (or Sin City) fame. Sol, who has paid $2 million to such scintillating artists as Frank “scoobie doobie do” Sinatra for the entertainment of rich whites in southern Africa's luxury resorts, is now looking to open a hotel/casino in downtown Maputo. Perhaps he'll pick the site of some recent bombing raid by South Africa's air force.

Recently interviewed on British TV, Kerzner stated that "Tswanas are born to be good servants and waiters," referring to the captive people living in the homeland of Bophutatswana around Sun City. Sin City remains an eyesore. While Black people of that region are suffering enormously as a result of a long drought, Kerzner and his gang have built a man-made lake and golf course for the elite to enjoy. Watch out for this guy. He's not only personally exploitative, he seems to have no qualms about carrying out business deals as a front man for the South African government.
SAMRAF and Our Program

SAMRAF is a political organization made up of white South African military resisters, political exiles, and American supporters. SAMRAF's goal is to contribute to the creation of an independent South Africa, free from white supremacy and foreign exploitation. To do this, we encourage resistance within the nearly all-white South African army, in an effort to weaken its deadly role and to help create a pro-liberation sentiment among certain sectors of the white community, particularly draftees. We believe this provides concrete support to the liberation movements in Namibia and South Africa.

Our program to support war resistance includes the following:
- Producing and distributing literature which encourages resistance to apartheid military service.
- Providing assistance to genuine South African war resisters who flee South Africa and arrive in the U.S., especially those who are seeking political asylum.
- Initiating actions such as campaigns and demonstrations which send signals of our call to resistance into South Africa and make our presence known to those who are considering alternatives to military service.
- Contributing to the involvement of white women in war resistance work.

The U.S. government and multi-national corporations are a serious enemy to both the peoples of South Africa and to Black, Third World and working people here in the United States. Racism is one of the major stumbling blocks in building a viable movement which challenges support for apartheid in South Africa and at the same time struggles for full liberation in the U.S. SAMRAF believes it must be involved in the U.S. political struggle, not only because elements of U.S. society are a threat to liberation in South Africa, but also because we view it as our responsibility to fight white supremacy on all fronts.

Our program to support this overall struggle includes the following:
- Participating in the Southern Africa solidarity movement, thereby raising political and material support for the national liberation movements.
- Participating in other social movements such as the disarmament movement and the anti-war movement, raising issues related to South Africa and stressing the need to fight racism.
- Participating in the anti-racist struggle in the U.S., thus supporting the liberation of oppressed people here.

SAMRAF CONTACTS

New York
29 Seventh Ave.
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11217
212-638-0417

San Francisco

Chicago
312-376-3392

News and Notes is our primary platform for communicating with our allies, and interested individuals and organizations in the United States. We produce six issues a year, and the newsletter reaches over 500 people. It costs us about $160 per issue, with the cost of mailing being the major expense. We hope to offset some of that cost by encouraging you to subscribe. News and Notes is only $10 a year.

To those of you who have contributed or subscribed recently, a big thank you. We hope that you can repeat your donation from time to time or regularly renew your subscription.

To those of you who have been receiving News and Notes for some time without making a $10 contribution, please try to spare that amount for such a worthy cause as soon as possible.

To those of you who send us your publications in return for ours, thanks very much and keep them rolling. We also appreciate responses from political activists to the viewpoints expressed in News and Notes.

To our Advisory Board members, we consider News and Notes our main vehicle for communication with you. We would really welcome your feedback.