Malcolm X once cautioned people, saying, “If you are not careful, the newspapers will have you loving the oppressor and hating the oppressed.” These words of wisdom apply very well to a recent story emanating from South Africa.

The headline in the Wall Street Journal (Friday, January 18, 1985) read, “Why South Africa’s White Businessmen Oppose Apartheid: It’s Good for Business.” Earlier that month the same publication reported on the “manifesto of the South African private sector.”

What's all this about? It seems that six groupings of business conglomerates in South Africa have put their names to a memorandum that, according to them, would amount to the dismantling of apartheid. These six are known as the Afrikaner Handelsinstitut (Trade Institute), the Association of Chambers of Commerce, the Chamber of Mines, the Federated Chamber of Industries, the National African Federation of Chambers of Commerce, and the Steel and Engineering Industries Federation. Their recommendations include political participation (allowing the vote) for Blacks, free trade unions, an end to restrictions on the free movement of Black people, the right of all groups to conduct business anywhere in the country, an end to job reservation by race, and a cutback of police power.

This manifesto was published at the same time as Ted Kennedy was visiting southern Africa on his fact-finding mission. Kennedy, on the eve of a speech to some 800 South African business executives, said the manifesto could be an important milestone.

Both Kennedy’s tour and the newfound “concern” of big business occurred amidst another burst of militancy from the Black community resisting white domination. It is this Black resistance which clearly underlies any apparent change of heart by certain sectors of the ruling class.

What is it that primarily concerns these economic institutions? It is difficult to believe that they value the aspirations of the Black community. Their years of silence, direct collaboration with the machinery of apartheid, and exploitation of Black workers are clear evidence to the contrary. Rather, at stake here is the threat of civil war which would disrupt the very structures that allow these profiteers to continue. Their ultimate fear is that Black resistance to apartheid will also be resistance to capitalism.

From the perspective of the ruling class, the basic solution lies mainly in opening up the franchise to Black people. From our perspective, it is very important to be aware of the limitations of this plan.

The crude aspects of apartheid rule (those outlined in the manifesto) would be gradually eroded, thus decreasing international opposition and pressure. There would then be little basis to call for total divestment; all sectors of society, after all, would be the “beneficiaries” of economic development. Certain small elements of the Black community could and would become upwardly mobile, also diminishing the argument that says wealth and success are reserved for whites only. Doesn’t it all sound familiar... a bit like the United States.

True, these reforms might somewhat affect the quality of people’s lives. But, such changes could not be a substitute for revolutionary change, a process which lies solely in the hands of those oppressed by apartheid. Thus, “the dismantling of apartheid,” a term so glibly used by corporations and governments, actually translates into the hope for a less-obvious system of oppression based not so much on race and probably yielding even greater profits.

Any apparent divergence of interests between the South African business community and the apartheid state is something that can be exploited for only insignificant gains. In any capitalist society, the state exists to preserve the laws prescribed by the economically powerful. The only difference in South Africa is that the...
Let's Go Yankees

Ted Kennedy’s Tour to South Africa Stirs Varied Responses; SAMRAF Reviews the Reactions

“Kennedy’s Trip: Stirring Things Up In South Africa.” So says the New York Times (January 15, 1985). This was true; Ted Kennedy’s tour created a lot of attention, not only in South Africa but internationally as well. Basically, there were three views of the visit: 1) total opposition from the South African regime; 2) support from Bishop Tutu and the United Democratic Front; and 3) protests by AZAPO—the Azanian Peoples Organization—a Black liberation group.

The Guardian newspaper ran an article entitled “Who were the blacks against Kennedy’s tour? AZAPO’s protests played up in press, anger Tutu” (January 25, 1985), written by the Solidarity News Service. Their article was sympathetic to the people who invited Kennedy and very critical of AZAPO. Yet, the Guardian account didn’t do justice to the left opponents of Kennedy.

Rather than trying to outline the article, we have simply reprinted it. We also felt the need to reply, and our response follows the Guardian extract:

“Behind these walls there are men who are deeply committed to the cause of freedom,” Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) said while protesting outside South Africa’s Pollsmoor Prison last week. The senator was hitting Pretoria’s refusal to allow him inside the facility to visit Nelson Mandela, the long-jailed leader of the African National Congress.

While Kennedy stood outside Pollsmoor, however, a small contingent from the Azanian People’s Organization (AZAPO) continued its vocal protests against his presence in the country. Kennedy arrived in the apartheid state Jan. 5 at the invitation of Nobel Prize winner Bishop Desmond Tutu and Rev. Alan Boesak, head of the South African Council of Churches, to begin a fact-finding tour. During the controversial visit the senator and his entourage came into increasing conflict with representatives of the Pretoria regime, as well as with black forces such as AZAPO and Kwazulu leader Gatsha Buthelezi. The mass-based United Democratic Front (UDF), of which both Tutu and Boesak are patrons, meanwhile gave tacit support to the visit.

The polarization began as Kennedy was being welcomed at the airport by Tutu and Boesak. A small group of AZAPO supporters waved “Yankee go home” placards while a lone white right-winger joined in the demonstration, waving a South African flag.

Kennedy’s first open clash with the regime came as he toured a number of resettlement areas and communities threatened with forced removal. While visiting the Onverwacht resettlement camp in the Orange Free State, Kennedy had a heated, face-to-face altercation with the Department of Cooperation and Development’s chief commissioner for the area, Hennie Kriel. When Kriel tried to tell the senator that the infant mortality rate at the camp was the same as that for white South Africans, Kennedy said: “You know that is not right,” and quoted figures from the Carnegie Inquiry into Poverty to contradict him.

“We had heard we would not get straight answers on infant mortality and so we visited the graveyard to see for ourselves,” Kennedy said.

Kriel then claimed that there were seven doctors living in Onverwacht and suggested that Kennedy visit the clinic to check. When the senator asked nurses, in front of Kriel, they told him there were no doctors living in the camp.

After meeting with Winnie Mandela, banned activist and wife of the imprisoned ANC leader, Kennedy hailed her “a source of inspiration for people all over the world who care about freedom and human rights.”

“Anyone who has had the opportunity, as I have, to be in her presence is inspired by the things she believes in,” he said.

After his application to visit Nelson Mandela was refused, Kennedy said, “Although I am unable to speak to Nelson Mandela and other leaders, I believe I have found their spirit in the small houses, villages and towns I have
travelled through in South Africa."

As small pockets of AZAPO supporters continued to protest the visit they were given unprecedented coverage in the government-controlled media, and faced hostility from many respected black leaders, organizations and journalists. Percy Qoboza, writing in the black-circulation *City Press*, attacked the AZAPO demonstrators, noting it was "odd that AZAPO should have aligned itself with the government, right-wing groups and hostile Afrikaans and English newspapers in opposing Kennedy's tour."

"Indeed, for the first time, AZAPO got maximum favorable publicity on [official] radio and television—even getting guarded accolades from [the pro-apartheid] *Current Affairs* and *The Citizen*. All this embarrassed many AZAPO supporters. And it is bound to turn out to be the biggest error of judgment the organization has ever made. Many people," Qoboza continued, "did not see any of the AZAPO people when [Prime Minister] PW. Botha visited Soweto."

Another article in the *City Press* reported that "ANC sources have expressed amazement at the small AZAPO-organized protests against Sen. Kennedy's visit to South Africa. Characterizing AZAPO's action as 'immature,' they said: 'Nobody who is seriously working for a democratic South Africa could possibly be against the visit of a man like Kennedy—who has spoken out correctly on some of the burning issues in our society and who has concentrated his visit around those issues. These issues—the hostel system, forced removals and bannings—are basic to the apartheid system."

"A worrying aspect of these demonstrations is that one sees these people forming a strange alliance—with the government, with Chief Gatsha Buthelezi and with the Progressive Federal Party,' they said."

AZAPO identifies itself with the black consciousness movement and has criticized the UDF for its willingness to work with whites who oppose apartheid. The group has remained outside and extremely critical of the main protests of the last several months, including the successful 2-day general strike in the Transvaal last Nov. 5-6. When Kennedy met with key black trade union leaders in Johannesburg last week and AZAPO blocked the nearby street in protest, the police did not intervene. Observers noted that such official restraint had been previously unheard of in the face of black marchers in that city.

In apparent reference to AZAPO's characterization of Kennedy as an opportunistic "capitalist imperialist," Winnie Mandela noted after his visit to her, "We have never really dreamed that our salvation lies with someone else. We believe our salvation lies in our hands. We do not think he can necessarily bring about meaningful change as such, but we do believe he could use the visit positively when he goes back home to inform the American public about conditions in this country."

ANC sources have said that they view Kennedy's trip positively in that it can help "provide a platform for the opposition to Reagan's policy of constructive engagement" and thus "strengthen the anti-apartheid movement in the U.S." They recalled also that AZAPO did not protest the many visits to South Africa by Reagan administration envoy Chester Crocker, who was a guest of the apartheid regime, but went into the streets against the visit of an administration critic invited by the popularly based UDF.

AZAPO has since announced that it will stage similar protests if the Rev. Jesse Jackson visits South Africa.

Kennedy's departure from South Africa to Zambia for talks with the exiled ANC leadership received front-page cov-
Legacy of Lancaster

Five Years After the Negotiated Settlement Brought Independence to Zimbabwe

In the course of these articles, we have made a couple of references to the outcome of the Zimbabwean revolution. While we have never discussed this in detail in any of our previous publications, it does make sense now to outline some views on Zimbabwe. We are doing this a) because the left, including the anti-apartheid movement, appears to have steered away from dealing with this situation; and b) because it bears some relevance to what is being discussed and we don't want to be misunderstood.

The negotiated settlement known as the Lancaster House Agreement of 1979 brought an end to the war in Zimbabwe and the birth of an independent state. This followed years of peoples war which mobilized a major part of the Zimbabwean population into ongoing confrontation with the white minority regime. The popular movement (ZANU) held strong socialist positions and organized the masses not only to fight Smith's army, but also on the basis of self-determination and control of land and resources. The outcome of the election, which ZANU-Patriotic Front overwhelmingly won, would indicate that the people had seized control and that power and ownership would soon be transferred into their hands.

Did this happen? NO. The reasons why are evident in the way the current leadership came to power—via negotiation. The constitution, negotiated at Lancaster House, allowed certain fundamental aspects of former colonial rule to remain entrenched. The new Zimbabwean government had to re-purchase land from the multi-national corporations and the white farmers if they sought to sell, land that the liberation movement had fought to own. Immediately, the government had to borrow money from the same sources that supported the Ian Smith regime in order to establish any redistribution of land. Thus, the new government created a dependency on outside institutions that had historically been hostile, from day one, to the Zimbabwean revolution.

Secondly, free enterprise was encouraged. Again, the same corporations that boosted the war effort on behalf of white minority rule were allowed to invest. This continued the transfer of wealth outside of Zimbabwe. Or shall we say, the majority of the Zimbabwean people did not benefit from such economic investment.

Thirdly, the government was placed in the ridiculous position of trying to integrate two hostile armies (Smith's and that of the liberation movement) into one force that represented the demands of a "majority rule" constitution. This seemingly impossible task was undertaken for one reason only: to allay white fears of what a ZANU government was all about. It was absurd to take two ideologically opposed forces, and suddenly say, "Hey, we're all on the same side, guys!" As result of a negotiated agreement, the notion of military victory was underplayed. Whites who had played a hideous role in oppressing Black people in Zimbabwe were now being pandered to on the basis of "their expertise and know-how" being necessary. The integration of the army was one way to do this. White war criminals were and still are in positions of power.

While Zimbabwe was being heralded as the new socialist state in southern Africa, in fact quite the opposite was occurring. The settlement actually entrenched the status quo.

There were many arguments and reasons to explain why the Patriotic Front leadership went ahead with this deal, even though it seemed to have shortcomings. The most popular argument (and the one that does make some sense), was that the settlement brought an end to the war and to the terrible suffering that the war inflicted on many Zimbabweans. Another argument was that the negotiations did, indeed, achieve the goal of the war, namely an independent Black government.

These popular concepts were difficult to refute. The
Consulates Collared

Civil Disobedience Campaigns Create Varied Opportunities for Anti-Apartheid Movement

On November 21, 1984, Congressman Walter Fauntroy, Dr. Mary Berry of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, and Randall Robinson of Trans-Africa were arrested at the South African Embassy in Washington D.C. for refusing to leave the offices. This activity received widespread publicity, and almost immediately, similar actions started to occur in other major cities in the U.S. (primarily New York and Chicago). Black civil rights leaders proclaimed an ongoing campaign to perform civil disobedience at various South African Consulates to expose conditions under apartheid and to lobby for a more humane U.S. policy toward South Africa.

Among those arrested in New York have been representatives of the Black United Front, Trans-Africa, Black religious & labor leaders, local Black politicians, along with well-known musicians & actors. Demonstrations have taken place almost daily in front of the South African Consulate on Park Avenue.

Since November, at least 1,300 people have been arrested nationwide, with more every day. Activity has spread to numerous cities, such as Boston, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Portland, Seattle, New Orleans, and Houston. Not all of the campaigns focus on Consulates or the Embassy. Other targets have been coin dealers who sell Krugerrands, such as the Deak-Perera Corp.

The national organizers have formed themselves under the banner of “The Free South Africa Movement.” The National Steering Committee is made up of Randall Robinson, Rev. Joseph Lowery of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Rev. Jesse Jackson, Mary Berry, Benjamin Hooks of the NAACP, Cong. Walter Fauntroy, Bill Lucy of AFSCME, Prof. Eleanor Holmes-Norton of Georgetown Law School, and Rev. John Adams of Washington D.C. Following are the demands of the Free South Africa Movement:

- Release of detained labor leaders
- Release of long term political prisoners
- Convening of a constitutional convention in South Africa to discuss the implementation of majority rule
- An end to the Reagan administration’s program of “Constructive Engagement”

Certain cities do not have an official South African Consulate, but do have Consuls-at-large, usually American businessmen, who represent South Africa. In Boston, such a Consul was pressured to resign as a result of the protests (others may also have resigned). A prominent dealer in Krugerrands, Kaufman’s, has decided to halt sales of the coin in Pittsburgh, as has the First National Bank of St. Paul, MN. Protests in New Orleans have forced the South African Trade representative to relocate.

In New York, the Consulate demonstrations continue, with various groups taking responsibility for organizing on certain days (musicians, students, etc.) The Free South Africa Movement has also initiated picketing outside the storefront offices of Deak-Perera.

There have been some obvious positive aspects to this recent campaign. The civil disobedience activities received front page news coverage, and for once South Africa seemed to be a popular media topic. News of the demonstrations reached a number of people who otherwise would be quite unaware of what is going on in South Africa.

The motion of U.S. protests is predominately Black-led. Because many of the key figures are in the political mainstream, this aspect does underline an important point: the most consistent forces in solidarity with the struggle in South Africa are the Black and Third World peoples here.

The leaders of the Free South Africa Movement created a spark and were most likely surprised by the large scale of positive response. The question is whether the situation was fully taken advantage of or not. On the whole, it can be argued that it wasn’t, with a premium placed on the symbolic arrest of rich and famous people, while other protesters were placed in a more passive position. Like so many other acts of protest in this country, the approach seemed to be that because elected officials, film stars, union bureaucrats and others were willing to get arrested (at little or no risk), then this gave the movement its legitimacy. Unfortunately, this merely reinforces the weakness in the overall approach of the U.S. anti-apartheid movement, namely that the moral witness stance of a famous person is more important in affecting the U.S. government’s policies than large scale anger.

This is not to say that the emphasis has always been to put dignitaries at the top of the list. Currently, local activists are getting arrested. Rather, what it says is that the leadership does not actually have a program to provide for
people to act out their resistance, other than symbolic arrests. At some point, this is no longer even deemed newsworthy, and the campaign loses its attraction.

Another quality of the activity which is particularly gut-wrenching is the level of co-operation between the demonstrators and the authorities. The NYPD has gone on record in the New York Times commending the demonstrators for their good behavior. Most recently, the NY police academy has been sending recruits to the Consulate to make arrests, thereby getting some additional training.

This points out a more serious shortcoming in the overall campaign: the U.S. government and its agencies are not regarded as the enemy. This falls right in line with the historical strategy of the anti-apartheid movement, a plea to those in power to somehow change their minds about the way they support apartheid. A more direct challenge to the U.S./South Africa alliance would necessitate the development of a movement that has a clear and non-negotiable position of NO collaboration with apartheid. Leadership of the movement has to utilize tactics which disrupt the U.S./South Africa relationship. Remember, the police are outside of South African Consulates to protect these "diplomatic" institutions. Thus, they are part of the conspiracy to protect apartheid.

This shortcoming is again underlined in one of the demands of the Free South Africa movement, namely the call for a round-table convention to discuss majority rule. At one meeting of FSAM in New York, this demand was compared favorably to the Lancaster House negotiations which led to the problematic Zimbabwean constitution which has preserved some colonial and white-minority interests.

In many ways, FSAM's demand for a convention can be interpreted as a recognition of a rightful place for the apartheid government in the future of South Africa. It is also not much different from the stand taken by the white businessmen or the white opposition party (PF). The current situation in South Africa and the wealth of support coming from this country to the apartheid regime provides the solidarity movement with a significant challenge. The Free South Africa Movement is in a position to take up that challenge and truly develop an alternative, if it can see that there is nothing that can be salvaged. The boat doesn't need to be rocked. It needs to be overturned.

The following account of local activities in conjunction with the current wave of anti-apartheid protest was submitted in a letter from a friend, active for some years in New Orleans political struggles:

On December 14, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) called a demonstration at the local and the South African trade representative's office in downtown New Orleans. SCLC president Rev. Joseph Lowery was the featured attraction. The picket line was similar to one held two weeks earlier and organized by the New Orleans Anti-Apartheid Committee. But, as the press would say, the demonstration turned ugly (read militant).

Actually, it was one of the most exciting things to happen for some time. Several people had agreed earlier to attempt the peaceful occupation of the trade rep's office if they could gain entry. Apparently, this plan fell apart before the picket because of poor organization. Once I arrived and learned of the scrapped plan, I suggested that we attempt to rush the door when opened for employees exiting for lunch. Because of light police security, the organizers agreed, and in an instant the battle was on.

We managed to tie up the office entrance for several minutes while struggling with the police inside the building. It took extra police to finally reclaim the entrance, and the confrontational posture of the 40 protestors prevented arrests. Only a local Black journalist was arrested. Later in the day, four protestors staged a peaceful sit-in at a local Krugerrand outlet, resulting in their arrest.

Lowery spent most of his time begging the demonstrators to allow the police to drag off the reporter peacefully. One Black activist told him, "Fuck that non-violent bullshit!" Later Lowery attempted to prevent protestors from joining the Krugerrand sit-in, arguing that they were "violent" and needed to take a workshop on how to protest. Actually, there was no violence against the police, just lots of shoving and resistance to arrest. I'm not sure what the sense of the crowd was on this issue, but a lot of people were annoyed by Lowery's actions, as well as his criticisms of organizers to the press.

A few days later, the trade representative decided to move his office.

I'm not sure what direction this will take, but clearly the actions in Washington around the South African Embassy have inspired the movement here. People seem willing to risk arrest, and the idea of disruptive, rather than symbolic acts, seems to have some room. Since South African uranium ore comes through the port of New Orleans, there appear to be opportunities to link the anti-nuke movement with anti-apartheid actions.

In the last 30 years, one after another, African countries have become independent. Some of these countries were granted independence from the colonial powers, others had to wage armed struggle against the colonial, settler forces. Many of these countries did not undergo any serious transformation other than the establishment of an indigenous government still willing to serve the interests of the colonial powers.

When Reagan talks about independence for Namibia, he means independence based on this neo-colonial model.

SWAPO's Vision Alive

But Reagan-South Africa Version Means Obstacles to True Namibian Liberation

During the election campaign last fall, Reagan was heard to call for "the independence of Namibia," on more than one occasion. What is he really calling for, and why now?
An independent government, as far as he is concerned, is one that safeguards U.S. political and economic interests in whatever the region. Elections are a must unless a "friendly" dictator such as Mobutu in Zaire is in power (democracy is defined nowadays by elections, no matter how they are conducted).

The South African regime's strategy in Namibia is more heavy-handed. Everything indicates that they are putting together yet another coalition, stooge-type of government in Namibia; this time under the auspices of the Multi-Party Congress (MPC). This will be similar to the Turnhalle Alliance, which was a previous attempt to install a puppet regime in Namibia. What made the Turnhalle bit so ridiculous was its leader, Dirk Mudge. Despite efforts by the South Africans to find a Black puppet leader, they couldn't, so they opted for Dirk Mudge, a white rancher.

The MPC would represent a stalling tactic in order for the South African government to continue its repressive military campaign against the guerrilla army of SWAPO, knowing as the Peoples Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN), and in order for the Americans to further hurdle and plot with the Boers. But, in the long run it will be rejected by the majority of Namibians.

Right now, it's important to know what the U.S. is doing in Namibia. The U.S. has opened up a liaison office in Windhoek and does want to see some move on behalf of South Africa that can be claimed as a victory for "constructive engagement." The U.S. has taken the lead in the Contact Group, assigned by the United Nations to implement Resolution 435, which at least guarantees U.N.-supervised elections in Namibia.

The U.S. is forceful on the question of "linkage" (which is their term used to link the presence of Cuban troops in Angola with Namibian independence), and strongly endorses the military activity of UNITA, the dissident Angolan group backed by South Africa. UNITA enjoys healthy support from the U.S., and it is also involved in military activity against SWAPO.

SWAPO is fighting the South African army. In fact, SWAPO's response to the current climate, which strongly favors isolating them, is to intensify resistance, though they are presently limited by whatever agreement has been reached between the hard-pressed Angolan government and the apartheid regime. According to a spokesperson for the enemy (a representative of the South West Africa Territorial Force), "There have been a number of bombings and explosions in the Ondonga and Oshakati areas of Northern Ovamboland, uncharacteristic of a usual or normal terrorist detachment."

Also, the South African Defense Force has claimed an increase in guerrilla infiltration in the north of the country. While SWAPO endorses the implementation of resolution 435, they have shown no signs of accepting a Zimbabwe model solution in Namibia. The release from prison of Adimba Toivo ya Toivo (an important Namibian revolutionary) was designed to divide the leadership of SWAPO. Instead, SWAPO welcomed Toivo back into the active fighting force and his uncompromising radicalism, together with SWAPO's militant position, indicate that the Boers are not able to spread dissension within SWAPO.

Currently SWAPO represents the only alternative to "independence on a silver platter" which is no independence at all. The Namibian people know that freedom cannot be given, it must be won. SWAPO deserves all the support it can get for continuing to fight for the real needs of the Namibian people.

---

**An Apartheid Free Zone**

**Update on Local Activities in Brooklyn: Effort to Rid One Community of Collaborators**

In the last two issues of *News & Notes*, we've reported our involvement in a group called Brooklynites Against Apartheid, which began as part of a community's opposition to a South African company filming a television commercial in their neighborhood. Since that incident last summer, the group has been protesting a South African film that is blatantly racist, *The Gods Must Be Crazy*.

In addition, an educational evening was organized for people in Park Slope, Brooklyn. Last October 26, 35-40 people attended "The Struggle Continues in Southern Africa," a forum co-sponsored by Brooklynites Against Apartheid and Brooklyn Mobilization for Survival. After viewing *Generations of Resistance*, the film about Black South Africa's long history of fighting white rule, presentations were given by Tapson Mawere, former U.S. representative of ZANU, and Mike Morgan, a white South African working with SAMRAF. Pam Patrick provided some political entertainment to round out the program.

After the forum, the group has developed plans for two areas of focus: 1) an action-oriented component for planning activities designed to raise consciousness in the community, organizing protests against apartheid, and showing the connections between South Africa and its U.S. supporters; and 2) a study component which has been attempting to provide historical readings and a theoretical framework for the entire group.

On January 19, '85, the group initiated an apartheid/U.S. war zone tour of downtown Brooklyn. Fifty people met in front of Citibank and marched to a Merrill Lynch office, then down Fulton Street Mall making stops at First National Republic Bank, Key Food, Junior's Restaurant, Kentucky Fried Chicken, the Chemical Bank, and then ended in front of the Armed Forces Recruiting Station.

Someone from Brooklynites Against Apartheid spoke at each location, outlining how each place was involved in concretely supporting apartheid. The banks and Merrill Lynch have loans to the South African government, and Republic National Bank also sells Krugerrands. Key Food sells many products made by South African companies and American firms doing business in South Africa, such as General Foods and Del Monte. Junior's has South African lobster tails on the menu, while Kentucky Fried Chicken has franchises throughout South Africa.

At the recruiting station there were speakers from the African National Congress (ANC), the Black United Front (BUF), and SAMRAF. The links between the U.S. and the South African military were made on a leaflet that was passed out during this part of the demonstration. Other literature prepared included a call to protest, and a leaflet detailing U.S. bank, corporate and business collaboration with apartheid. Then, on the day of the demonstration we passed out the main leaflet, entitled "Why Are We Marching In Brooklyn Against Apartheid in South Africa?"

Newspeople from the local NBC-TV station showed up to get video footage and interviews with marchers. A 30-second segment aired that night and was surprisingly sympathetic.

The local police were out-of-sight at the beginning and then tagged along as the march progressed. They tried to find out where the march was going, but otherwise were
unusually docile. It was a conscious decision by the organizers not to seek the permission of the authorities.

The group also decided to stay between banners to give the protest political definition, to *march* rather than walk, to stay together without letting the marchers be divided at street crossings, to have a different spokesperson speaking for two or three minutes while other participants formed a moving picket line in front of each business. The lead banner was "Free South Africa," while the trailing banner was "Brooklynites Against Apartheid."

On the whole, the march received a positive response from people shopping in the downtown mall area. In retrospect, many of the demonstrators felt we should have stayed where the people were concentrated, rather than marching out of the shopping area to the recruitment station, slightly off the beaten track. The original plan was strictly adhered to, without room to adapt to circumstances as the day unfolded. This led to a few moments in which we were speaking for only our own benefit. A similar protest action is being planned for the Park Slope neighborhood of Brooklyn, sometime in March.

The goal was not only to get quite a few people interested and involved, but to compliment the almost-daily, on-going demonstrations at the South African Consulate in Manhattan. The Brooklyn action showed that local opposition to apartheid could be translated into community-based protest. Basically, what we’re saying is that you don’t have to look too far to see how and where the U.S./South Africa alliance operates. The slogan, "Make your community an apartheid-free zone" is broad enough for people to define in creative ways, including resistance to any manifestation of white supremacy. But, the slogan definitely involves more than passing a city council resolution. The concrete links need to be exposed and broken.

---

**President St, Brooklyn**

*White People in Park Slope Behaving Like White People in South Africa*

It’s been eight months now since the President Street Block Association in Park Slope, Brooklyn, accepted $4,500 from a South African production company for the filming of a television commercial on their block. There have been repeated appeals by Brooklynites Against Apartheid and some residents for those responsible to turn over their ill-gotten gains to the struggle. But, foot-dragging has been the order of the day.

Recently, information leaked to the effect that the block association intended to *keep* half the money and donate the other half to charitable organizations. Late in February, a meeting was called to discuss the allocation of the funds. Brooklynites Against Apartheid sent a delegation to this meeting at the request of a sympathetic fellow who lives on the block.

Some of us went along to observe what turned into quite a spectacle. It could well have been held in some suburb of Johannesburg. (People should know that this particular area of Park Slope has some of the most expensive real estate in Brooklyn.) We were forced to sit through the entire agenda, which bears some mention due to the great social and political import of some of the topics.

To kick off the meeting, they introduced a guest who was studying urban anthropology and writing a thesis on brownstones. Then they discussed their major concerns, primarily how to gain a better relationship with the police and a litany of fears related to crime—heavy stuff like controlling graffiti. They even suggested writing house numbers very large on the front, back, and roof of each house on the block to more easily identify a particular location in which a possible expropriation of goods may be taking place. One of the uninvited guests was heard to mumble the suggestion that numbers might also be put on their pillboxes. The next topic was dog shit. They decided to create a scolding committee to reprimand owners and their dogs for soiling the sidewalk. Next came some wailing about poor service from workers, everything from garbage removal workers, who supposedly had to be paid extra in order to do their jobs, to dyslexic mailmen (who may have been purposely mixing up these people’s mail).

Well, having sat through all this misery, they finally dealt with us. The majority of people claimed to be offended by our very presence. After all (thank God) we didn’t even live on the block. The poor guy who did live on the block and had invited us was told he was out of order. Despite the efforts of a few people to at least hear what we might have to say, they voted in favor of asking us to leave the premises. This futile discussion was filled with defensiveness, such as the affirmation on their part that they didn’t need anyone coming to them with information on South Africa (referred to as lecturing). They, after all, were well-educated people and aware of such issues.

Our side remained pretty cool. We didn’t go there to lecture them. We went to let them know that they had a choice to make. They didn’t want to hear anything like that. As we were leaving, one old geezer shouted out: “This is an extremely pluralistic block association.” Sure it is... if pluralism means an assortment of whites who don’t want any challenges to their “well-educated” worldview.

Over the years, Park Slope has been assessed by some activists as a community open to organizing. It has had the appearance of a “progressive and integrated neighborhood.” This is patently untrue. Park Slope has changed. The people in the President Street Block Association accurately represent the “yuppie invasion” that has pushed out most Black and Hispanic residents while sharply pushing up property values. They represent a supposedly liberal tradition in this neighborhood—the kind of liberalism that lets people think they can spend money gained from apartheid on themselves while at the same time passing themselves off as politically involved in things like the nuclear freeze campaign.

They could function quite readily in South Africa because wealth, privilege and ownership in an unequal society have allowed them to insulate themselves from social problems. At the time they accepted the $4500 for the filming of the South African TV commercial, they claimed ignorance about certain aspects of the deal. Now they claim to be well-educated about South Africa. The unwillingness to see such blatant contradictions is the hallmark of selfishness. They can easily rationalize spending $2500 on sprucing up their block, apprehending mischievous kids, and scolding messy dogs. But, they should understand that their choice puts them in the same camp as the many who collaborate with apartheid. Some day they may be held responsible.
Sometimes people argue things they know are wrong. Conditioning by society usually plays a central role in how people think, but often people's experiences contradict these "sensible, thought-out" positions. A good example of this concept comes from Bruce Springsteen (and his father) when asked by Rolling Stone Magazine in December, '84 how he managed to escape the draft during the Viet Nam war: I got a 4-F. I had a brain concussion from a motorcycle accident when I was seventeen. Plus, I did the basic Sixties rag, you know: fillin' out the forms all crazy, not takin' the tests. When I was nineteen, I wasn't ready to be that generous with my life. I was called for induction, and when I got on the bus to go take my physical, I thought one thing: I ain't goin'. I had tried to go to college, and I didn't really fit in. I went to a real narrow-minded school where people gave me a lot of trouble and I was wounded off the campus—just looked different and acted different, so I left school. And I remember bein' on that bus, me and a couple of guys in my band, and the rest of the bus was probably sixty, seventy percent black guys from Asbury Park. And I remember thinkin', like, what makes my life, or my friends' lives, more expendable than that of somebody who's goin' to school? It didn't seem right. And it was funny, because my father, he was in World War II, and he was the type that was always sayin', "Wait till the army gets you. Man, they're gonna get that hair off you. I can't wait. They gonna make a man outta you." We were really goin' at each other in those days. And I remember I was gone for three days, and when I came back, I went in the kitchen, and my folks were there, and they said, "Where you been?" And I said, "Well, I had to go take my physical." And they said, "What happened?" And I said, "Well, they didn't take me." And my father sat there, and he didn't look at me, he just looked straight ahead. And he said, "That's good." It was, uh... I'll never forget that. I'll never forget that.

Miami Steve Van Zandt, now of Little Steven and the Disciples of Soul, but formerly with Springsteen and the E Street Band, claims that he is going to focus his next album on the struggle and conditions in South Africa. Miami Steve originally wanted to go and play in South Africa, because he claimed, "It might motivate young white kids to think about fighting authority." However, what he decided to do was go on a visit there, to see for himself what it's about. Apparently, he was so disgusted with what he saw, that he intends to write and sing about apartheid. Certainly it is questionable why someone has to see something that is so obviously bad in order to believe it's bad. Secondly, a tour to South Africa would have been in violation of the cultural boycott, even though Miami Steve's intentions would have been to poke holes in the white view of the world. Fortunately, he came to the right conclusion.

Listen to his music... this guy's stuff is pretty good. Again, there is a lot of relevance to a white musician, whose audience is young white kids, singing about racial injustice and the struggle to bury it. If Miami Steve indeed pulls off the creation of an album filled with these politics and related to South Africa, he could make quite an inroad into the way inequality is usually perceived by young white folk in America.

FEAR
by Steve Van Zandt

In this jungle we're slave to politics
And we call ourselves civilized
If you ain't got the muscle
Fear is gonna run your life

Fear makes me wanna hurt you
Fear makes you want to hurt me
Fear keeps you angry 'cause you don't understand it

Got no chance if we're fighting on the wrong side
Got no chance if we're fighting
on the wrong side again
Can you taste it
Tastes like fear
I used to love to fight baby all the time
Until the day I realized
Somebody I don't know pushin' me inside
I been spilling strange blood and I don't know why

Fear makes me wanna kill you
Fear makes you wanna kill me
Fear keeps us segregated
Fear feeds a hatred we ain't born with

Got no chance if we're fighting on the wrong side
Got no chance if we're fighting
on the wrong side again
I can taste it
Feels like fear
Tastes like fear

There's been some real scuzzy TV reporting lately on the situation in South Africa. The prize for the most distorted drivel has to go to Morley Safer of "Sixty Minutes" for bending so far overboard to accommodate white supremacy that he almost fell off the boat. With an emphasis on integration, positive reform, etc., Safer painted a picture which could only have enhanced South Africa's propaganda campaign. Perhaps the most telling part of this "documentary" was the finale. With the camera zooming over downtown CapeTown, Morley Safer dramatically states, "With all this wealth, it's not too difficult to understand why the whites are so unwilling to share power." In other words, any sane person would be willing to oppress, kill and rape to reap the benefits that South Africa has to offer white folk.

The MacNeil-Lehrer Report gets the prize for poking fun at whites. In their report on South Africa, they dealt with the current economic situation: rising prices, inflation and all that. The price of gas in South Africa is quite high (it has risen by 44%). The day prices went up, they filmed a white woman, blond and obviously well-off, filling up her Mercedes sports car. Complaining about the price of gas, she turned to the cameras and said, "This is terrible, this is worse than Tutu getting the peace prize." Come on now, who says white South Africans don't have it tough.
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
415-641-9055

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.