The cards are getting dealt fast and furiously in South Africa. It's in the newspapers, on television, it's the topic of talk shows. One would most probably be hard-pressed to find folk here who don't know that something is happening in South Africa. What that something is might still be a mystery to a lot of people, but the point is that something is happening and it's getting a lot of attention.

What is that something? It is the advance of the South African revolution. Just about every influential person and institution in the world from the Pope to Paul Newman has something to say about it. Suddenly there are people who want to support the struggle, people who want to control the struggle, people who want to pacify the struggle, and people who want to stop the struggle.

Our newsletter has always tried to place some analysis on events as they occur in relationship to South Africa. So much has happened since our last issue. We could fill an entire newsletter with facts and information. We aren't going to do that, because a lot of information is readily available, even though its sources are sometimes dubious. We are going to begin from the proposition that our readers are aware of the current situation in South Africa. More important, for us, is trying to place some meaning on the latest insurgence and its international response.

But let's get back to the fact that a whole lot of people now have something to say about South Africa. Let's take the remarks of someone who should know what it's like to wage war and protect wealth, Robert S. MacNamara. MacNamara was U.S. Secretary of Defense from
1961 to 1968, and President of the World Bank from 1968 to 1981 (How would you like to have that on your re­sume when it's time to put imperialist war criminals on trial?) He wrote an article about South Africa which appeared on the op-ed page of the New York Times (Aug. 13). The article supported some form of U.S. sanctions because according to Robert S. MacNamara, the time "when Blacks will share power with whites is inevitable."

The article then goes on to raise the questions at issue, namely 1) How long will this take? 2) With what level of violence? and 3) What about the safety of whites. MacNamara wants the answers to be 1) as soon as possible, 2) not much, and 3) by any and all means protect the whites.

The thrust of his article appears to be in opposition to constructive engagement and for sanctions, but Mr. MacNamara gives himself away by saying, "the power of the moderate Black leaders, men such as Chief Buthelezi and Bishop Tutu, is eroding with every passing day. Their successors will be radicals. And the targets of the violence, which until now have been largely Blacks who are thought to be informers or collaborators will shift to whites."

He is right, there isn't much room for moderation in the Black community, and whites are going to begin to get their asses kicked. This is the worst possible fear for Robert S. MacNamara and the interests he represents. The radical successors might not be interested in what he, his government or his bank have to offer, let alone have to say. So he advocates sanctions as a way for the U.S. to convince the whites to negotiate.

Robert S. MacNamara is no fly-by-night politician-come-liberal. He's a dyed in the wool, good ole American capitalist politician, and he's advocating sanctions! Is this position motivated by concern for morality and/or democracy? Come on! That's about as laughable as Reagan and Larry Speakes talking about their abhorrence of apartheid (if Reagan was Botha, he'd be doing the exact same things).

We flogged this horse in the last issue of News & Notes, and we're going to do it again. The goal of sanctions, from the perspective of the U.S. government is to create a political condition whereby reform occurs and revolution stops. There is no other logical explanation why one bloodsucker (the U.S.) would punish another (South Africa). It's not meant to be punishment, but rather to say, "Wake up guys and rip 'em off sophisticated style, like we do."

So, a whole lot of what the bigshots have to say might sound good, but watch out. It's designed to offset the revolution.

Robert S. MacNamara is one of the many voices trying to find some solution to the current situation in South Africa. Others are also holding forth and many hang their hats on dubious hooks... return to normalcy, moderation, condemnation of violence, etc. Their positions must be evaluated based on what interests they represent and seek to advance.

We want to address some of the the important questions that the South African situation provides:

"Black on Black Violence" Black collaborators are an important weapon in the enemy's arsenal. They provide a constant flow of information back to the police. They can prevent the community from developing the kinds of infrastructures it needs to effectively fight the police.

Yet, the movement is developing an effective counter-strategy. The attacks on Black police and informers will raise the price of collaboration so much that few people will accept its limited payoffs. This emerging strategy must be supported because it represents a strengthening of the Black movement. It's clear that the Black community was prepared for this eventuality. The killings of informers cannot be characterized as spontaneous outbursts. They indicate a high level of organization. People's Courts are held before any sentence is handed down against collaborators.

There is a calculated effort to distort the meaning of attacks by the movement against Blacks collaborating with apartheid. The impression created is that the struggle is not between Black power and white power, but rather that angry Black people will attack anybody, even their own people. Visions of crazy mob violence come to mind. Headlines blare "In South Africa, Black Police Officer Is Stabbed To Death Near Port Elizabeth" (New York Times, July 29, '85). We can only guess how many Black people were murdered by the police in that weekend, but for the Times, the only news fit to print was the death of one collaborator.

It must be remembered that collaborators face attack precisely because they have taken the side of the white power structure. It serves the South African government very well for the media to create the image of Blacks killing other Blacks, without any attention to who and why.

**Threats to White Security** Are whites paying the price for apartheid? They are beginning to, but not yet in a substantial way. The ungovernability of the townships stands as a threat to the continuation of white power since the white regime depends so heavily on total control over Black people. The mass uprisings, however, have primarily been geographically contained within the Black community. The impression is that the white soldiers and police, heavily armed and capable of killing many Blacks are invulnerable. They are not. A number of police have been killed—mostly by stabbing—as they patrol and search the townships. Police armored cars called hippos have even been hijacked.

Likewise, the number of whites killed by Blacks in the white areas has increased. These acts have always occurred and usually are dismissed by the authorities as the result of criminal acts by tsotis, the kids in street gangs. It is more than coincidence that these attacks have increased dramatically. The government has been extremely silent about white casualties precisely because it wants the whites to believe that they are invulnerable. Aside from these incidents, the bulk of the white community can still afford to be complacent because they are still well-protected for the time being.

It is naive to think that because whites are insulated from the confrontation that they do not understand it
or do not choose sides. The vast majority of the whites line up solidly with the government. The deaths of Blacks do not shake the commitment of whites to apartheid. At best, the Black insurgency erodes white confidence. At worst, it strengthens white allegiance to apartheid.

The developing threat to white privilege and security has to be continually expanded. It is clear that whites will understand nothing else.

**Moderate Solutions**  Moderate solution means a solution which is acceptable to international capital and can be sold to both some Blacks and to whites. While this idea might be very much alive outside South Africa, it doesn't have much support inside.

Firstly, the Botha regime is specifically prepared to neither seek a moderate solution nor to end its violence. Botha's speech revealed both an unwillingness to succumb to pressure and a desire to reaffirm white supremacy. Any reform which opens the road to majority rule is seen by the whites as an opening of the floodgates and is akin to surrender of white power. Yet this is the minimum that might satisfy the masses of Black people.

It is also extremely unlikely that any "moderate solution" short of Black political control will appease the demands of the Black community. What is more likely is that any negotiators of a moderate solution will become enforcers of the "new policy" upon those they hoped to lead.

Those who advocate moderation in the Black community are either clearly allied with the white power structure (Chief Buthelezi) or have no real following (Bishop Tutu). Thus, while the argument can be made about the limitations of the moderate solution, the reality is that it is not acceptable now to either side.

**The Negotiated Settlement**  Is this the time for negotiation? It seems to us that now is precisely not the time for negotiation. The movement is beginning to shake the powers that be in South Africa, but a lot is still firmly intact: the economy, the government, the privileged white community the army and police. Negotiations are either to settle terms of surrender between victor and vanquished or are over the terms of a cease fire between recognized equals. Any negotiation now means that the enemy is still in a position of strength and thus can dictate the terms of the settlement.

**Effective U.S. Sanctions**  Is this possible? The U.S. Congress is in the process of passing legislation to restrict trade relation with South Africa to impose sanctions. One of the major showpieces is the ban on Krugerrands. Banning the Krugerrand is a hollow act if what is put in its place are gold coins minted elsewhere, but still with a significant proportion of South African gold. No one talks about this.

As argued above, the U.S. has some leverage over South Africa because of its enormous investments and trade there, not because it has any moral authority. Why then would the U.S. consider inhibiting its ability to benefit economically from South Africa? We believe that U.S. sanctions will be imposed only to pressure the South African government to protect U.S. interests.

Right now, the U.S. is concerned about losing control in South Africa. From its vantage point, the closing of white ranks, as embodied in the State of Emergency decrees, only strengthens the Black liberation movement.

The intransigent repressive stance of the apartheid regime and the militancy of the Blacks can create conditions whereby U.S. interests could be seriously jeopardized. Thus the U.S. will use what leverage it has to avoid victory of a truly revolutionary movement in South Africa. For now, it will lean on its friend, the South African government.

**Return to Normalcy**  This phrase, uttered by the Reagan administration, is a loaded phrase. While couched in concerns about ending violence, in reality it means mass resistance must end and Blacks must passively accept life under apartheid.

We have no sympathy for such motivations. Black people are paying an awful price for freedom. To tell them to stop their struggle is akin to saying that their future will always be in the hands of their white bosses. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Likewise, when the anti-apartheid movement demands an end to the state of emergency, it has to realize that martial law will end only when law and order, apartheid-style is reinstated. Che Guevara once said that instead of the slogan "No More VietNams," what is needed are wars of liberation like VietNam all over the place. In other words, militant struggle is better than no struggle, even if there is a heavy price to pay.

There is much to mourn about in South Africa: loss of life, torture, detention. But there is also much to support. We can rejoice at the break of normalcy by the Black community. Business as usual must end. Whoever thought it would take less than bloody confrontation?... Only the naive. Black people in South Africa are developing the capacity to fight and win. They need everything we can give them. They deserve no less.

**Update**  Each day there are events occurring in South Africa that deserve mention and analysis. Our newsletter cannot do justice to all of these events because we are limited by deadline. However, we do want to comment on a few recent events.

**Gatsha Buthelezi's Inkatha Movement**  The recent wave of struggle in Durban and the surrounding areas has allowed the Zulu Inkatha Movement to actively enter the fray. Inkatha is portrayed by some people as the largest independent liberation group inside South Africa, with over a million members. This is a distortion.

Inkatha is a political machine. Its goal is not liberation, but power and control over the Black community. This role it already exercises, with the blessing of the white government. Its ranks are made up of coerced members. For Black traders to function in the townships, they have to pay dues to Inkatha. Likewise, Black people cannot own homes without some payola and allegiance to Inkatha. This is similar to the way that organized crime and political machines in the U.S. can control entire cities.

Inkatha is not as popular as it is portrayed. It remained largely silent throughout the disturbances of the past year until lately, when the Kwa-Mashu township community called for a boycott and seven days of mourning after the murder of Victoria Mxenge, a Black lawyer defending udf activists charged with high treason. Inkatha traders refused to implement the boycott, a stance that resulted in the burning of some of their shops. Similar action was taken in the case of Indian traders in and around Kwa-Mashu, who didn't respect
the boycott action. Inkatha militants, portrayed in media reports as attempting to soothe the atmosphere and prevent violence, were in fact enforcers out to protect storekeepers and attack those people fighting apartheid.

Gaisha Buthelezi was recently in Israel, and this wasn't a vacation. The Israelis are well-aware of how to use right-wing Arab groups against the Palestinian movement, the classic example being the Phalangist Party of Lebanon. It is possible that Inkatha could become the Phalangists of South Africa. Israel is a major military partner of South Africa, and has already developed military links with Lennox Sebe, ruler of the Ciskei homeland.

It seems likely that Inkatha and Chief Buthelezi will continue to play active roles in stemming the tide and even helping repress Black resistance. The leadership of Inkatha has too much investment in the status quo and too many enemies in the community to seriously advocate any progressive change.

The conflict between some Indians and Blacks in Durban This cannot merely be dismissed as unfortunate, although to some degree it is. All of the liberation groups in South Africa have attempted to address the question of unity. The Black Consciousness tendency in particular has advocated an alliance of all peoples who are oppressed because they are not white. There are Indian revolutionaries in most of the liberatory organizations.

The problem is not just one of Blacks not liking Indians and vice versa. It is the role of some of the Indians and their relationship to the Black community, particularly the Indian small traders and businessmen who profit from exploiting the Black community. Notice that these people are armed, too. To be non-white and armed in South Africa means that one has to have some real allegiance to the throne.

To bring the example closer to home, the Black community in Brooklyn has recently been outraged at the shooting of three kids at the hands of an Arab shopkeeper. It is a well-known fact that some of the Third World storekeepers and grocers in the Black community have an antagonistic relationship with Black people, based on ripping them off with high prices and on consistent mistreatment.

Believe it or not, it ain't that much different in South Africa. The same class has the same interests, and even though those very Indian traders are victimized and dehumanized by apartheid, they depend on exploitation of the Blacks, just as the whites do.

This is what is at the root of the Indian/Black conflict in Durban. What is not said in any of the media reports is that there is an enormous number of Indian workers whose lives are as miserable as those of Black people. Only a certain small percentage of the Indian population is in the middle class bracket or is among those who take part in political institutions designed for cooptation and the continuation of apartheid. There are different allegiances within the Indian community.

Piet Wapen's Speech All that can be said about this is that it represented a complete submission to the needs of the white conservatives, and that shoring up white unity is more important than even minimal reform for Blacks.

For the Thatchers and the MacFarlanes who read something positive in it, we suppose the same positive-ness could have been found if one deeply analysed a Hitler or Goebels or Goering speech at a Nazi rally in the 1930s.

Shut Down Rock Island

Protest in Land of Plenty Or Stick 'em Up the Arsenal

Every year anywhere between 50,000 and 100,000 people go to Washington D.C. to protest U.S. policies with large demonstrations, usually taking the form of marches and speeches (boy, do they have speeches!). Sometimes there's also civil disobedience and arrests. A myriad of anti-intervention, left, labor, and disarmament groups endorse these activities, and "November 18" or "August 2" or whatever date is chosen becomes the rallying cry.

The keynote speakers and the organizers will affirm that this is the dawn of a new era of protest and that never before has such a massive mobilization taken place. Comparisons will be made with the Civil Rights movement and the anti-Vietnam war movement. The marchers will be told that they are all sending a message to the White House and the lawmakers. They will also be told to go back to their communities/workplaces and build off the momentum of the large demonstration. They will be told to feel good cause they are not alone in their disgust.

Great care is taken to couch the demands of the demonstration in such a way that the broadest cross section of people will participate. Radical demands and militancy are always squelched because people (the white liberals) will be alienated.

The ruling class ignores the demonstrators—they've seen this all before. The police behave well—they know all too well that nothing will get out of hand. The strategy is to shout to the max with the hope that those in charge will listen—though they never have before. This is current state of national protest action in the '80s.

Intentions might be good. In such a large country it makes sense to pull together all the forces of opposition into a defined coalition. To do what—that is the question. It's hard to understand why so many people keep on going back to demo after demo in Washington D.C., other than for the opportunity to see old friends.

Perhaps the reason is that there is no clear alternative to the traditional forms of protest as a national action. Or is there? One alternative is the national call to shut down the Rock Island Military Arsenal on October 21, 1985. The call has been issued by Project Disarm, a midwest anti-war coalition.

The Rock Island Arsenal is the U.S. military's largest manufacturing plant for munitions. Forty percent of the Arsenal's weapons are sent to U.S.-backed regimes, such as those in El Salvador, Honduras and the Phillipines. The Arsenal is also headquarters for AMCCOM (the Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command). Most of the 9,000 Arsenal employees work for AMCCOM, which manages computer inventory, assembly and transport of all conventional, nuclear and chemical weapons for the U.S. Army.

Rock Island Arsenal is situated in the Mississippi River within the Quad Cities area of Iowa & Illinois. Because it's an island, it can only be reached from the mainland via road and rail bridges. This makes it a very visible target.

The Quad Cities are in the farming heartland of the United States. Internationally-known manufacturers of agri-
cultural machinery, such as John Deere, International Harvester, and Caterpillar, have large factories there. The priorities of these corporations are clear. They lay-off productive workers at their facilities here at home, and maintain large plants in South Africa that utilize the abundance of virtual slave labor in order to supply the apartheid government and wealthy white landowners. These corporations have made themselves the enemies of landless Black people in South Africa and of workers and small farmers in the U.S.

The irony of Rock Island is that the main employer in a farming and industrial area is a weapons factory. The prosperity (even survival) of people in the Quad Cities depends on war preparation. The short-term security that military production gives to workers is therefore directly connected to U.S. worldwide military intervention. It’s easy to see why the Rock Island Arsenal is and should continue to be a target for the anti-war movement.

Project Disarm’s upcoming action in October is not the first of its kind. Last year on June 4, 1984, they brought together hundreds of people to blockade the Arsenal. This activity was different from most “peace” protests in that a lot of the demonstrators used mobile tactics, which produced militant action without arrests (see coverage in News & Notes #18). The June 4th action shook the complacency of the Arsenal and the Quad Cities community. It also helped strengthen opposition to the Arsenal and what it represents.

Now, Project Disarm seeks to broaden participation in the protest and attempt to clarify a new kind of model for national anti-war actions. The following is a quote taken from the call to demonstrate on October 21, written by Project Disarm:

The U.S. is in crisis. More than an economic crisis marked by unemployment and malnutrition, more than a crisis that can be solved by removing the most aggressive politicians, it is a moral crisis. Too many people in the U.S., while searching for individual solutions, consciously or unconsciously accept U.S. military aggression around the world. At the same time, they turn a blind eye on those in the U.S. who, in Malcolm X’s words, “Don’t see any American dream... but an American nightmare.” And we who oppose this have limited ourselves, by and large, to mild forms of protest that solve our consciences without risking our own positions in the system. The question must be seriously confronted: what will it take, individually and collectively, to turn things around? Goals of disarmament, non-intervention and economic justice will remain only phrases until we can effect real disruption of the military. Actions that shut down the Arsenal are one way to begin.

Brooklynites Against Apartheid and SAMRAF are committed to help build for the Arsenal action in October. While we understand that it will be difficult for substantial numbers of people to travel from the East Coast to the Midwest, we believe that it’s important for people with some interest in participating to explore the possibilities.

This demonstration presents a clear opportunity for anti-apartheid activists to go after the U.S. war machine and directly make the connection between U.S. corporate investment in South Africa and U.S. military production. This is a golden opportunity to break with pleas to corporate boards, university administrations and politicians, while promoting a focus on the disruption of U.S. military support for apartheid.

For further information about the October 21 action to shut down the Arsenal, get in touch with us or communicate directly with Project Disarm. They can be reached at:

Project Disarm
407 S. Dearborn, #370
Chicago, IL 60605-1141
(312) 427-2533

Project Disarm
906 West 5th St.
Davenport, IA 52802
(319) 324-0800

Political Asylum Denied

All the World Loves a Soldier; Reagan Wants White Soldiers To Stick by Apartheid

While the U.S. government seems willing to pay lip-service to its supposed abhorrence of apartheid, it can be argued that this will only go so far. There are certain strategic arenas in which the U.S. will not substantially interfere, but rather covertly support. Perhaps the most crucial arena is South Africa’s military and its ability to wage war.

We have often argued that the backbone of the South African military machine is the young white men who are willing to serve apartheid. Just as this is true in South Africa, the white population, so is it true in the U.S. for the population in general. The ability of the U.S. to wage war and to have at its disposal the most powerful military force in the world is directly connected to the willingness of the American public to accept U.S. militarization. The U.S. has learned, through its experiences in Southeast Asia, the problems created by lack of morale and anti-war sentiment, both within and outside the military. Thus, the U.S. government is extremely wary of supporting that kind of initiative in other “friendly” military regimes.

This is evident in the State Department’s recent denial of political asylum for two South African war resisters. The U.S. government’s official statement of denial is a clear in-
The existence of the volunteer army, the compulsory period of imprisonment would be six years. By comparison, United Kingdom law provides that anyone who evades or refuses registration or service in the armed forces can be imprisoned upon conviction for a period up to five years. Prior to the existence of the volunteer army, the compulsory period of military service in the U.S. was two years. Thus, the five-year period of possible imprisonment represented 2½ times the length of the expected service. Particularly, in light of this comparison with U.S. law, it cannot be said that six-year sentences representing 1½ times the length of expected service is disproportionately severe.

How about that! The U.S. is using mathematical logic to explain its position. You know when they do something like that, it's usually to camouflage their actual politics. What they're really saying is that U.S. law and South African law are comparable, and that the U.S. military is not that different from the South African military. This is something we've been saying for years now.

What's left out of their mathematical equation is the role of the South African armed forces. By consciously omitting this most important political point, the U.S. lawmakers are in fact endorsing South Africa's ability to wage war. Likewise, what allows the U.S. to make this comparison is a change in South Africa's Defense Act. Previously, South African draft resisters were liable to re-curring prison sentences. In other words, a resister would be sentenced, and then upon completion of his term in prison, would again be faced with the prospect of military service or repeated imprisonment. While this law was hardly ever utilized to its full extent, it did mean in theory that a draft resister who refused to compromise on his political beliefs was liable to an indefinite term of imprisonment. This law has subsequently changed to a maximum period of six years for draft evasion.

If the reason for the harsh penalties against draft resistance is to deter young men from doing it, why would the South African regime change the penalty from an open-ended term to a fixed term. While this is not the only reason, we believe it was done in concert with allied governments such as the U.S. and Britain, precisely so the above-quoted argument could be made for denying political asylum in those countries.

Further on in the State Department's statement, it reads, "The South African Military Refugee Aid Fund (SAMRAF) is not a banned organization. An off-shoot of similar organizations, based and operating in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, SAMRAF is intended to provide legal and other assistance to South African draft evaders who have left South Africa. Because SAMRAF and its sister organizations were not established in South Africa and do not operate there, they cannot be banned. We have no reason to believe that draft evaders associated with SAMRAF would be subject to other than the normal penalties for failure to perform national service."

This explanation is in response to the draft resister's appeals that association with our organization is a further political offense. The familiarity that the State Dept. has with the logic/lack of logic of the banning laws in South Africa, is comparable to how the South African regime uses the same laws. It is true that only indigenous South African organizations or individuals are banned. This explains why SWAPO of Namibia is not banned. Does this not make SWAPO an enemy of the South African state. To believe they aren't is absurd, since SWAPO has been waging a 19-year guerrilla war against South Africa's military occupation of Namibia.

While we wouldn't dare equate our contribution with that of SWAPO, we and other exiled resister groups have always held the firm position that the apartheid regime must be smashed. Our reason for being and our political motivation is to contribute to the liberation of South Africa. The apartheid regime knows that, as does the State Dept. Likewise, if the U.S. government will acknowledge anything unique about South Africa, it might be the very high price exacted from those in opposition. South Africa certainly would not tolerate an organization such as our own within its borders. It barely tolerates opposition from abroad.

The argument is not over whether we are banned or not. Rather, it is over what we stand for.

From our perspective, these two quoted examples indicate the degree to which the U.S. government is willing to accept South Africa's laws. The final position is even more abhorrent. By denying the draft resister's application for political asylum, the U.S. government is implementing South African law. This decision will be appealed. But anti-apartheid activists in the U.S. should be aware that the government has just written another paragraph in its ongoing thesis of military collaboration with apartheid South Africa.

---

**American Hostages**

**Overseas Travel Can Be Educational But Ignorance Is Not Bliss**

The climate of apathy within the U.S. is of great benefit to the U.S. Government. Its overseas adventures, while not necessarily endorsed in full by the American public are also not opposed on any substantial mass scale. Building upon this apathy, the U.S. propaganda machine develops certain negative images of other lands, other peoples, other cultures and other sets of social values and political systems that are all to its distinct advantage.

A case in point was the recent hostage bonanza in Beirut. Headlines and official statements referring to the Shi'ites as barbarians were the order of the day. Beneath this racist slander was a direct appeal to U.S. national chauvinism. The basic message is "How can anyone support an attack on innocent Americans?" Many Americans believe themselves to be innocent and therefore not responsible for what the U.S. government does in the world, but are also unwilling to do anything about it. Or they believe that America is the greatest guardian of freedom in the world and therefore any attack on Americans must be undertaken by those who embrace tyranny and oppression.

In the absence of any counter-propositions, a more pertinent question, "Are there any innocent Americans?", is never even asked. How many times have we heard the advertising slogan, "If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem." This is certainly true for the way Americans are perceived by the overseas foes of U.S. aggression.

The Shi'ite action proved a number of things:

- The U.S. is at war and there are no idle by-standers. Those who don't recognize this reality are closet supporters of U.S.
aggression in the Middle East and therefore cannot be deemed as innocent.

- The hijacking was a rational military response to the Israeli hijacking of 700 Shi'ites from Lebanon. The Shi'ites, or any smaller opponent of U.S. intervention cannot respond in the same way as the U.S. They cannot place their gunboats off the coast of New York City and shell the Riverdale section, as the U.S. does with Beirut suburbs. So they did what they considered to be the most effective action to release their people from Israel's prisons. They clearly understand that Israel's war against Lebanon is only possible with U.S. support.

- To a certain degree, the hostages exposed the U.S. myth about sadistic Shi'ites. The hostages began acting like rational human beings, who were obviously frightened, rather than the way the U.S. wanted them to act, which was to call for Rambo to obliterate the Shi'ite "hordes." The media picked up on some of this. The government not only criticized the media for some of its sympathetic coverage, but also stripped certain hostages of their right to speak on behalf of the group because they were deemed too sympathetic to the Shi'ites. This example exposes the rift between how people can see and feel about things when exposed to reality and how the U.S. wants people to view things.

- The TWA event is a clear example of how military opposition to the U.S. is defined as terrorism, while much deadlier attacks (in terms of their human toll) by the Shi'ites are defined as legitimate retaliation or rescue missions.

- Well-meaning folk here might want to stay away from taking sides on issues like that of TWA flight 847, because they can see themselves as potential hostages. We believe there is no middle ground. People who see the U.S. role for what it really is have an obligation to expose it, especially when instances like the recent hijacking occur. People who live comfortably in the U.S. and yet accept no responsibility for U.S. practices are not really innocent, only naive.

**SAMRAF's Activities**

Agitating Against the Conspiracy, Putting a Face on the Enemy

This has been an extremely active period for us. Much of our time and energy have been taken up by work with Brooklynites Against Apartheid (BAA).

Since our last newsletter, BAA has campaigned against the racist South African film, "The Gods Must Be Crazy," and successfully disrupted two showings in Manhattan. We held an apartheid war zone march through the Park Slope section of Brooklyn. Here we targeted the block on President St. that succumbed to the payola from a South African corporation for use of their property in a filmed commercial. Later on in June, we held a 24-hour squat-in on the same block to expose the anniversary of the greedy alliance (the block association still clings to the blood money). We've made life difficult for Citibank and Deak Perera, a major dealer in Kruggerrands. Currently, we are trying to chase "The Gods Must Be Crazy" out of Brooklyn. We are also helping build for the Rock Island arsenal activity on October 21 in the Quad Cities.

Most of these activities have been undertaken to put a face on U.S. collaboration with apartheid and to bring home to people their responsibility to choose sides. BAA is not interested in merely eliciting anti-apartheid sentiment in words, but creating political conditions whereby people have to act on their sentiment. Our experiences at the movie disruption exposed the inadequacy of sympathy alone. When the audience was called upon to act on anti-apartheid sentiments (if we heard "I'm for the cause" once, we heard it 100 times) and refuse to go into the theater or once inside to leave, people reacted in a different manner. Instead of apartheid, the demonstrators were made into the enemy as they chanted for the police to come and arrest us.

Already, the popularity of "opposition to apartheid" has placed whatever "it" is in an acceptable corner. One older, irate white man outside the theater shouted at us, demanding to know why we weren't outside of the South African consulate because that's where we should be. Such contradictions not only show the narrowness of people's perceptions of "opposition to apartheid," but also reflect how the anti-apartheid movement has placed limitations on itself. People need to be confronted on their acquiescence. If they're not, they won't see the necessity to make a choice, let alone a reason to change.

Our work in BAA has overtaken our work with draft resisters and we believe this is both positive and necessary. Now is the moment to develop structures that agitate against and directly challenge U.S. complicity with apartheid. We hope that incoming draft resisters might be attracted to such activity.

Over the years, our experiences in trying to organize draft resisters have not met our expectations. Many have been too willing to accept the benefits that America has to offer white "educated" people. Aside from the obligatory lip service to the struggle, opposition to apartheid has usually gone as far as necessary in order to obtain political asylum. It could be said that some draft resisters might have had political differences with us and thus refused to involve themselves directly with us. While this might be true in the odd isolated case, it is demonstrably false overall because most of the 200 or so resisters that have passed through our office over the last seven years are not politically active at all.

Our point here is that we see no need to depend on such a politically unreliable constituency to determine the direction of our work. We will continue to put draft resisters in touch with legal assistance and we will continue to support the politics of white dissent. We also want to create a situation whereby politically motivated resisters will have an opportunity to act. At this point of time in the struggle, we cannot afford to cater to those white South Africans who will only act on self-interest. An example is a recent draft resister who asked if he had to be opposed to apart-
heid in order to apply for political asylum. We intend to
develop a serious critique of our work with draft resisters
for our next newsletter.

Meanwhile, our efforts will continue to go into build­
ing BAA because SAMRAF has been, is and probably will
always be a small group, we are limited in our choices of
what to do and we have to strategically evaluate where we
can be most effective. For us, working in BAA makes
the most sense. BAA intends to produce a regular newsletter,
and we intend that our readers will get at least the first is­
qure. After that, you'll be asked to subscribe. Because of the
amount of activities, plus the fact that we will be involved
in the production of another newsletter, we will be cutting
down on the frequency of News & Notes from six to three
issues per year (as if you hadn't already noticed). The BAA
newsletter will be another platform from which to report
our activities and argue strategies and tactics of anti-apar­
theid work.

Finally we want to take this opportunity to re-empha­
size our commitment to keeping you informed of our work
and our analysis via News & Notes. We hope it provides
you with some assistance in your efforts to give the beast
an ulcer.

Teddy Kennedy Remedy

Opposition to Apartheid Comes Cheap
Conservatives Join Liberals, Fairweather Friends

In our last newsletter, we reported extensively on
the furor created by Ted Kennedy's visit to South Africa.
We sided with the azapo criticisms that Kennedy is one of
capitalism's favorite sons and thus has certain interests to
protect, rather than serve the liberation movement.

For those folk who doubt this possibility (especially
those who objected to our critique of Kennedy's trip), we'd
like to quote Teddy himself, from his book, Decisions for a
Decade. Here Kennedy echoes the same liberal theme, ex­
cept he's not talking about South Africa, but VietNam.

He writes: "The Asian nations themselves have been
able to cope with indigenous insurgencies ... [Americans
should] not object if they [undeveloped nations] impose
reasonable controls and profit-sharing arrangements and re­
move some of the special protections our business now has­
... for if such adjustments were resisted, private American
enterprise could easily become the symbolic issue which
could sweep a truly radical government in, and our busi­
ness people out."

Kennedy had finally gotten around to opposing the
U.S. war in VietNam when he wrote this, just as he's finally
gotten around to opposing apartheid. The above quote un­
derlines both then and now the principle interest of the lib­
eral Ted Kennedy, namely how to save capitalism so that
more dollars can be squeezed out of South Africa.

Ted, you've let us down. All this rhetoric coming from
someone with direct experience at driving a white person
into the sea.

Live Aid

We Ain't Responsible for the World
Our Hands Are Clean

Does the new-found concern that the rich have
adopted about starvation in Africa not sit right with you?
Are you tired of millionaires being the voice of social con­
sciousness? Are you fed up with the apolitical explanations
of why it is that some people in the world have no food,
while others can improve their super star ratings singing
about it?

We are and here's why. Liberals and philanthropic
types are welcoming the "Live Aid/We Are the World" syn­
drome as the awakening of popular social consciousness in
the Western hemisphere to problems in the Third World.
We don't deny that this motion has at least exposed people
to the fact that there is a problem. But, it ends there. Their
solution to the problem is for Westerners to be a little more
generous. Live Aid and the constituency it's aimed at
proves this point.

The August 3 issue of Nation, at its editorial best,
sums up the political value of the Live Aid concert. It states,
"Live Aid marked the end of a long process of co-optation
by which the radical culture of the 1960s was subsumed
into the material mainstream. Woodstock may have been a
mess—dirty, druggy and wet—but for its generation, it re­
presented a necessary commitment to opposition. 'Live Aid'
was a show of obedience and a demonstration of the easiest
way out of a moral swamp of privilege. Its answers to hun­
ger, exploitation and oppression was charity—and small
potatoes at that. Like so much this year, it was a pheno­
menon of ending, not beginning."

We would argue that this kind of assistance amounts
to "Dead Aid." It is aid in terms of dollars & cents, but dead
in terms of political values and alternatives. There is no
room in "Live Aid/We Are the World" for the artists to
stand up and point the finger at their own governments and corporate bodies. If that was the message of Live Aid, it would not enjoy such vast promotion. While it might be hard for most artists to attack a system which has been so good to them, there are surely some who understand how exploitation really works.

"Dead Aid" will only come alive when young kids in Europe and the U.S. realize and move against the source of the problem. As long as kids are being told to eat all their vegetables at dinner because there are people starving in Africa, these kids are going to relish the fact that they have vegetables and dinner to eat. The notion of privilege is reinforced.

I remember when I was a kid and saw a photograph of starving children in India. My mother tut-tutted and said, "There will always be starving kids in India." "Live Aid" doesn't say anything substantially different. If anybody's got to suffer in the world let it be the "natives." We, in the West, can continually salve our consciences by upping our monthly pledges. And by the way, let no one raise the issue of starvation in America or Western Europe. That's just the fault of the lazy hungry people who don't want to work.

The real problem with "We Are The World" is "Who Owns The World."

Watch for Miami Steve van Zandt's album against apartheid. The former guitarist for the E Street Band is looking to get a whole bunch of musicians together to do a We-Are-The-World-type number about South Africa. But, unlike We Are The World, which is devoid of politics and doesn't suggest any real alternatives, this effort might help shake things up. Rumor has it that "Little Steven" is going to host some kind of musicians conference in September, at which the issue of apartheid will be discussed and the record cut. Good for him.

Hey, these are some hard times. So hard that some misdirected soul stole our typewriter, as well as other items belonging to the church where our offices are located. This was a nice typewriter and probably fetched a bunch on the street. We're looking at a $700 bill to get a reasonable replacement for the Canon machine we had. We need some help from our friends in order to buy another. Without a typewriter, it's difficult to produce the written word.

If you want to make a contribution to the typewriter cause, please make checks payable to SAMRAF. The office address is still 29 Seventh Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11217. If you want your contribution to be tax-deductible, make your check out to IFCO, and send it to us. Also if you see anybody in Brooklyn with a hot Canon AP300, let us know. It could be ours.

Role of Whites

Why White South Africa's Worries Are Not So Vital . . . Correspondence

So much has been written and suggested about what should be done in South Africa. The politicians and the U.S. take great care to include white South African concerns; they must negotiate, they should be reasoned with, the liberals must be sought out, and they're not all racists. The maximum sacrifice prescribed for whites is the willingness to share. The stated reason for shunning azapo among international groups is that they advocate not working with liberal whites. At least this is the explanation that always follows azapo in the media. Is there something horribly wrong with political disassociation with white South Africa?

Does the white community deserve such respect and care? We believe not. The following letter, written by a friend in Minnesota, indicates some of our reasons why. Our friend was responding to a letter entitled "Afrikaner's side of story not heard," which appeared in a local newspaper. We are reprinting the response because, rather than making excuses for why whites will or will not change, attempts to explain what it might take for white South Africans to gain any respect and regain their humanity.

Hey, these are some hard times. So hard that some misdirected soul stole our typewriter, as well as other items belonging to the church where our offices are located. This was a nice typewriter and probably fetched a bunch on the street. We're looking at a $700 bill to get a reasonable replacement for the Canon machine we had. We need some help from our friends in order to buy another. Without a typewriter, it's difficult to produce the written word.

If you want to make a contribution to the typewriter cause, please make checks payable to SAMRAF. The office address is still 29 Seventh Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11217. If you want your contribution to be tax-deductible, make your check out to IFCO, and send it to us. Also if you see anybody in Brooklyn with a hot Canon AP300, let us know. It could be ours.
Editor: "Afrikaner's side of story not heard," reminds me of the pseudo-hostorians who claim the Holocaust never happened and that Hitler was a good guy. The writer passes on the same rationale that the South African regime promotes and the U.S. slave states during Confederacy used to justify their exploitation of Black people's labor; that but for White control of power, society quickly degenerates into "a communist state." He asks: "If you were a white South African what would you do?"

Well, since you asked, I hope I would do the following: 1) humbly seek the support of the Black liberation movements in my country to help remove my White blind spot before rendering any advise of the country's future. 2) To earn the right to remain in South Africa I would then do everything necessary to overthrow the white regime from which my ill-gotten privileges flow. Anything less than these measures would condemn me to the righteous wrath of the other people who inhabit South Africa.

I dare say few white men in this country have earned the respect of the Black community as much as John Brown, who dedicated his life to the proposition "Slavery is evil... kill it." Apartheid is also evil, it must and will be killed. South African white society must produce John Browns if they are to earn the right to remain on their native soil. The chances of this happening are slight.

South African whites have one of the highest per capita living standards of living in the world, precisely because they hog all wealth and power for themselves. Poet Breyten Breytenbach calls his native African society a "vulture culture." In his much-heralded book, Confessions of an Albino Terrorist, he announces his determination to write no longer in his native Afrikaans, calling it a dead language of a lost people.

Black historian W.E.B. DuBois, in his 1921 book on John Brown, sets forth a premise especially apt for today's South African societies. "The cost of repression corrodes the soul of both repressor and his victim. The path to liberty no matter how painful will be less than the monstrous ongoing crimes of apartheid for all concerned.

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.

SAMRAF CONTACTS

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

San Francisco
415-641-9055

Chicago
312-376-3392

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.