The Executive Council of the Episcopal Church at its December meeting passed four resolutions having to do with the Church's relations with American companies and banks doing business in Southern Africa.

These enactments resulted from four months of exhaustive work by the Committee for the Study of the Church's Financial Relationships with Southern Africa under the chairmanship of Bishop William Marmion and composed of prominent academics, bankers and attorneys.

Immediate attention was paid to the involvement of the Church with American banks that are members of a consortium providing a $40 million revolving credit to the government of South Africa. The Council's Executive and Finance Committee is directed to consult with those banks with which Council has deposits or investments, and depending on the Committee's judgment of the banks' promotion of African life and livelihood based on certain criteria, the Treasurer is authorized to terminate Council's involvement with the banks.

(The full text of the resolutions and the names of the banks appear on page 8.)

Another resolution calls for dioceses, parishes and other groups throughout the American Church to examine their own investments in the light of the actions of Council. We hope that Episcopalians as officials at all levels of the Church and as individuals in all walks of life will make a serious and extensive examination not only with regard to their duties as keepers of Church holdings but with the responsibility expected of stewards of Christ's Church and as partakers of His faith and teachings.

This is the second attempt by the Executive Council, specifically and in detail, to face the Church's financial entanglement with racist regimes of Southern Africa. The first effort in 1967 ended in a fizzle. The Episcopal Church's concern with Southern Africa has been voiced at General Conventions since 1958 and countless conferences, official and otherwise, have concentrated on the problem with greater and more urgent frequency. We are now on the verge of a Church-wide probe into this tinderbox region with which we have numerous links, some apparent, others appearing only in shadowy form.

Southern Africa is a handsome prize, because of its strategic position, because of its enormous wealth. For the same reasons - and others - it is a source of immense danger. It encapsulates the world's major tensions: white/non-white relations; minority over majority control; a European/non-European culture confrontation; a have/have-not contradiction; an industrialization/rural gap. Looming over it is the menace of an East/West clash. White-controlled, Western-oriented, Christian Southern Africa is indeed Tillich's crucible for Christianity in the 20th century. We of the USA face this situation woefully unprepared.

The lines between independent black Africa and the white minority dominated enclave below the Zambezi River are tightly drawn and there is active war along the periphery of the white bastion. The Republic of South Africa, the breakaway British colony, Rhodesia, and European Portugal in the form of its dominance over Angola and Mozambique manifest and enact racial supremacy to a degree unique in the world. These regimes (continued on next page)
hold within their influence or under their sway the territory of South West Africa, or Namibia; the satellite black countries of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland; the associated black state of Malawi. White supremacy, relentlessly enforced with all the tools of any 20th century totalitarian state, has been condemned by almost every nation of the world, has brought into active hostility the non-white world and has given rise to armed resistance by liberation movements organized by exiles from Southern Africa.

It is the Republic of South Africa, the powerful, industrialized, resource-blessed, Western and sovereign state at the tip of the African continent which is the dynamo around which the others cluster and from which they draw their strength. United States diplomatic involvement stands at a middle distance, influenced both by a distaste for apartheid and racism, and an attachment due to economic benefits, cold war values, the wish to protect the Cape route, by ties of a culture common with Southern African whites, and by the need to shore up our Atlantic partner, Britain, which is heavily and historically invested in Southern Africa.

We deal with the Republic in a gingerly fashion, claiming to exert continuous persuasive pressure upon its government to abandon apartheid and allow human rights, deploring racism at the United Nations, but avoiding to support any action with teeth in it. Lately there are alarming signs that ties with South Africa may be strengthened. A high State Department official made a visit to Pretoria late last year described in THE NEW YORK TIMES as "fruitful". The occasion remains clouded.

White minorities have dominated black Africans for up to 300 years. Africans have spent long and frustrating decades trying to appeal to and reason with their white overlords for a just and equitable share of their countries. To no avail: the screws were tightened and turn ever tighter today.

In South Africa, African passive resistance to race-determined law and practice went on for 50 years, and, as stated by Nelson Mandela, the South African National Congress leader, "had brought the African people nothing but more and more repressive legislation, and fewer and fewer rights." Nelson Mandela's speech before the court which sentenced him to life imprisonment at Robben Island prison colony off Cape Town, "I Am Prepared To Die", needs to be read by all Americans.

In 1961, after the Sharpeville massacre and after white South Africa declared itself a republic, Mandela and other nationalist leaders published their Manifesto of Umkonto We Sizwe (Spear of the Nation), proclaiming "The time comes in the life of any nation when there remain only two choices - submit or fight. That time has come in South Africa. We shall not submit and we have no choice but to hit back by all means in our power in defence of our people, our future and our freedom."

American responsibility and implication in the affairs of Southern Africa were pinpointed in January, 1967, when a group of U.S. church leaders - including several Episcopal bishops - called for the end of U.S. bank support of the South African government by means of the $40 million revolving credit. They said in part in their statement:
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The only significance of the American banks' loan is a symbol of the support of the American people, through their leading banks, for a government enforcing a system of unparalleled racial discrimination and repression, which the American people, speaking through their representatives at the United Nations, in concert with virtually all mankind, have repeatedly condemned. Conversely, the act of not renewing the $40 million revolving credit arrangement will be recognized throughout Africa, this country, and the rest of the world as an indication that the American banking community supports the United States Government's reiterated condemnation of political apartheid in South Africa.

The churches and the banking and business organizations are the two elements of our society most deeply committed in Southern Africa. The perhaps unwitting partnership of trade and temple is a common feature of Western society. As matters deteriorate in the white enclave, as the African liberation movements increase their efforts, as the white regimes' desperation grows, the tendency of people in the USA will be to take their cue from familiar institutions in Southern Africa.

American bankers and businessmen acknowledge the cruelties of apartheid and deplore present conditions in South Africa. Yet they maintain that their involvement contributes to better living conditions and may affect internal changes. They argue an American withdrawal will harm African, Coloured and Indian workers and their families who would be the first to suffer. They defend normal relationships with South Africa in order to sustain a robust economy which will eventually eradicate racism.

The American commercial and industrial presence in Southern Africa is tightly restricted to funding, manufacturing and exploring for natural deposits of raw materials. Businesses are there to make a profit, and a handsome one it is, running pretty consistently above 20% per annum, a rarity in the world today.

The implied suggestion that Americans, merely because they are Americans, will somehow influence Southern African racial policies is a feeble argument. Any American businessman posted to the sub-continent may ostentatiously shake a lot of black hands and talk about the Bill of Rights, but he soon falls under the spell of the paradisical (white) surroundings. It takes a strong will to withstand the spiritual torpor of that clime. Any white South African who has battled long and hard for justice can attest to that. Certainly an American businessman will hardly run into a white who holds opinions divergent from those common to most of the white section. He will hardly get to talk frankly with African, Coloured or Indian opponents of the regime: they are in exile, in prison, or wouldn't dare risk speaking the truth to a white - however American he may be.

The South African government is quoting in its propaganda a recent survey of American and Canadian businessmen. Over half of the replies thought opportunities for profit excellent while 75 percent thought South Africa's opportunities are better than in most developed countries. South Africa is "not really subject to serious jeopardy due to racial or economic unrest in the foreseeable future" is the opinion of 92 percent. Surely Prime Minister Vorster's boast in his 1969 New Year's Message that the South African scene is marked by order, calm, peace and lack of tension, in contrast to the rest of the world, is well-aimed, if indeed self-serving.

The Americans' contention that they contribute to a state of health in South Africa which will inevitably do away with racial injustice and apartheid is a curious irony for the 15 million black and brown people of that country. Ever-increasing oppressiveness of South African life for them and for the white dissenters stands in stark denial. The Africans being swept from their homes in Natal and dumped into resettlement camps on the barren veld can only think of the millions of Rand being spent on tourist, residential and industrial (white) development on the Indian Ocean coast nearby. The gigantic uprooting of non-white people continues at an accelerated pace - in cities and towns, in the faraway country town in Johannesburg, in District Six in Cape Town. The eradication of the African Old Location at Windhoek in occupied Namibia last summer is fresh in the mind.

A migratory labor system is maintained by rigid "influx control" laws which determine where Africans may live and work. The Bantu Laws Amendment Act of 1964 funnels African male workers into white urban areas and returns them when unneeded to the overcrowded, rural reserves under conditions that are destructive to family life. The African in South Africa is no longer a person, but a unit of labor at the disposal of the white minority.

An instance of the dehumanization of Africans is raised in the January 19 issue of the Johannesburg SUNDAY TIMES. An expert on African labor and the pass laws, an attorney and official observer for the International Commission of Jurists, Mr. J. Carlsson, writes of the re-establishment of "aid centres" for African workers.
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Mr. Carlson relates how under an earlier system set up in 1954 hundreds of Africans were arrested each day for small discrepancies in their passbooks, required to be carried by every South African non-white. The Africans were handed over by the police, without any evidence having to be produced in a court, to officials of a Labour Bureau who then "induced" the prisoners to work. These men were literally farmed out. A series of habeas corpus applications in 1959 exposed the alleged wrongful arrests by the police, serious abuses by Bureau officials, and brutal ill-treatment at the farms where the Africans had been sent, by white farmers and their black "boss boys".

The South African government at first denied in Parliament the existence of this system, but the successful applications forced the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development to suspend the scheme and appoint a commission of inquiry. Now, the government has come up with a new "aid scheme" containing no provisions for protection of the hapless Africans. Mr. Carlson urges the aid centers to be operated in full public view, stating pointedly: "Aid centres are no substitutes for courts".

The Johannesburg STAR editorializes, "that the government instead of simplifying and humanizing the influx controls laws through legislation has chose to set up 'aid centres' where Africans caught up in influx tangles will be able to get help and advice suggests that the Government's first consideration is not to make the law work more humanely, but to make them work more efficiently".

Twenty years of apartheid, codified and intensified race separation and white domination built upon centuries of prejudice and convention, have undermined painfully nurtured relations across color/culture lines. African, Coloured and Indian can witness to the effective penetration by apartheid laws and practice into areas where racialism was being offset.

At some church services - by no means all - black and brown and white may be together at the altar. During what in America is known as the coffee hour the fragile oneness of God's people commences to disintegrate. Communicants cluster according to color. Everyone, particularly whites, are conscious of the watchful eyes of the neighbors and the agents of the South African police state. Blacks and browns, often willing to take the risk, are shunned by their more cautious white countrymen. When the congregation disperses, entrenched racialism comes into full play. The whites return to their positions from which they run the country or to their comfortable homes. The blacks and browns go to serve the whites or back to their ghettos. Whatever fellowship had been generated at the altar of God is sacrificed before the idol of apartheid.

The churches in South Africa have for several years held group dynamics conferences which brought together people of all races, backgrounds, incomes and denominations for a week or so of intense study, prayer, discussion and communal living. Drastic rethinking occurred and remarkable dialogues were called forth, and surely some fast friendships resulted. But these occasions, carefully noted by the Special Branch, the South African secret police, are but some bright moments in the overcast. When the participants leave the laboratory, reality crashes down, the acid of apartheid sets its corrosive work. Can close friendships be kept alive when all of society stands against them? There is a great gulf fixed and few the bridges over it.

Some consider any effort at financial withdrawal from Southern Africa as purely a symbolic act. It is far more than that.

A firm and voluntary move of this nature will indicate to the African and Coloured and Indian people that Americans are at last serious in their rejection of apartheid and racist totalitarianism to the extent that they renounce their share of the profits easily reaped from those systems.

Black and brown Southern Africans will not be misled by the contention of their white countrymen that the Americans are deserting them. They know their white overlords too well, and will not buy any more the crocodile tears of those who live high on the hog at their expense.

Paramount to all considerations will be the message to the oppressed of Southern Africa: that we of the Church are deeply concerned for them and that we are backing our words with concrete action.

Withdrawal will affect the hesitating and frustrated white liberal elements in Southern Africa - and we must here include many of the church leaders - who are paused in anguish of conscience and paralysis of motion on the edge of committing themselves to desperately needed radical solutions.

The recent Message to the People of South Africa issued by the South African Council of Churches spelled out the distinction between Christianity and apartheid. It brought forth eager responses from individual churchmen and angry threats from Prime Minister Vorster that "the cloth you wear will not protect you in South Africa".
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The Message has found 2,000 subscribers, one-third of them clergymen, in a country of 18,500,000. An act of financial withdrawal by Americans will encourage the tiny number of whites who see clearly what must be done, and will press to stiffer action those church leaders who are hesitating to promote a confrontation with the forces of injustice.

Withdrawal would have its greatest impact on the South African government and its adherents. South African whites have a long attachment with Britain because of past Empire and Commonwealth connections, present-day economic ties, and because Britons compose the largest minority within the three and a half million white community. But South Africa is a new land, not altogether tamed, still possessing the frontier spirit. The naturally attractive land overseas is the USA. The white Afrikaner in his rough, self-reliant way comes nearer to being like a white American than a white European. A show of toughness—his own kragdadigheid—by the USA would further shock the Afrikaner people and government.

At the moment, white South Africans profess scorn for U.S. liberalism and concern about apartheid, and reject any suggestions from the outside as uninformed tinkering with their own affairs. But, when the chips are down, when the African armies of liberation make serious inroads into the white bastion, white South Africans and their government will plead for help from the outside, particularly from the United States of America.

South Africa realizes this eventually and is redoubling its efforts to influence Americans, most lately by the inauguration of South African Airways flights from Johannesburg to New York. South Africa's national symbol, the Springbok—wings lures White Americans on tours of "big,bold,beautiful South Africa" on flights which are "mirrors of your home town country club". White tourists will be shown the scenery, not the black ghettos and reserves and prisons, and will return to infuse fellow Americans with tales of this wonderful society. South Africa's stepped-up propaganda, both official and private, is incisively disclosed in THE SEEDS OF DISASTER by John Laurence (Taplinger Publishing Co., 29 East 10th Street, New York, N.Y. 10003)

The goal is not merely monetary; it is survival. South Africa and the other Southern African regimes see the handwriting on the wall. They know their stamina is not endless in the face of rising black hostility. They will have to depend on friendly nations outside Africa. What greater source of strength than the superpower, the United States of America?

Because of our general distaste, disapproval or outright condemnation of their racial policies, the representatives of the Southern African regimes have operated mostly out of wide public view, dealing with those American business organizations having a common interest in pursuing financial gains or speaking in areas and before audiences in this country where there is little knowledge of the true nature of the situation or where there is built-in sympathy for apartheid.

Now they are becoming bolder, not only because of the mounting pressures they feel in Africa but because of signs of growing disengagement in the United States, of our confusion about world conditions and those in our own land, because of our concern for law and order. The Southern African governments endeavor to create among Americans the certitude that they stand for law and order, that their enemies, both the exile liberation movements and those who still oppose them inside are the lawless, the savage, the communistic. They exploit the subtle issues of culture and race. They pose as defenders of Western, Christian civilization. They are depending on the message, more clever than George Wallace's, of racial solidarity between the whites of Southern Africa and those in the United States. Americans will have to face this ancient persuasion—the call to blood. Have we the clear-headedness, the gut strength, to resist the siren song?

The churches must make a stand independent from that of the business and financial world. As Episcopal Church dioceses, vestries and councils take up the questions raised by the Executive Council, inevitably conflicts of interest will arise. Diocesan standing committees and parish vestries are top-heavy with bankers and businessmen who are accustomed to taking the judgments and ethos of the boardroom into church councils. For them there will be the unavoidable question: to whom is my ultimate loyalty?

For black Episcopalians, as for other black Americans, the issue is clear, instinctive, bone-deep. The most conservative, the most militant, react with common feeling. They will watch their white counterparts closely.

White Episcopalians will feel distress at Southern African racism. Some will favor disengagement, a meaningful act to dissociate from apartheid. Others' consciences will tell them involvement is wrong, but they will seek the comfort of the banking and business communities' arguments. Habit, informed conscience and tribal pull will engage in struggle.
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Americans cannot ignore Southern Africa. We cannot avoid facing up to our own complicity in sustaining those regimes. We must not allow the white supremacist governments of Southern Africa to dazzle us with their efficiency; their productivity; their technical prowess, so familiar to us; to blind us to the vast human cruelty that lies behind the glitter and the wealth.

We stand by while fanatics pursuing racial domination are crushing those who are our friends. We cannot ignore a power which has deported three Anglican bishops and numerous other Churchmen in eight years, which kept a Nobel Peace Prize winner in virtual isolation until his strange death, which drives good people into exile, and sends them to rot in prisons, which is intent on destroying the cadre, the seed, which is needed for the new society which must come to Southern Africa.

This Lent of 1969 is a time of special testing for Church people in the United States. We are being called to make a historic judgment. Now is our last chance to revise our attitudes and intensify our Christian commitments in Southern Africa. We of the Church must rid ourselves of our identification with colonialism and our entanglement with the forces of white supremacy and apartheid.

There is a stir across our land - among students, in the black community, in academic circles, and others. The Methodist Board of Missions has acted. Do not let the Episcopal Church be laggard. If we don't act now - quickly, compassionately, intelligently - we will react in hysteria when the inevitable happens.

- withdraw your deposits and investments from institutions benefitting the racist regimes of Southern Africa.
- write Presiding Bishop John E. Hines urging the Executive Council to withdraw its funds from those institutions at once.
- re-invest in African areas, such as Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland or other African countries where racist determinations do not obtain.
- write your congressmen and senators to press for sterner USA stands toward the governments of Southern Africa.
- invite Southern African students, visitors and representatives of liberation movements to speak to your church group.
- support funds to provide legal defense for Southern African political prisoners and aid and education for their families.
- support prison chaplaincies to these men.
- subsidize Southern African parishes that lose members because of their stand on apartheid.
- provide scholarships for African, Coloured and Indian students in schools within and outside Southern Africa.
- urge the United States government to support United Nations resolutions having to do with Southern Africa.
- for further advice, write: Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa 14 West 11th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011


Left to right, front row: C.R. Tambo, African National Congress of South Africa (ANC); Dr. Eduardo Mondlane, Mozambique Liberation Front (FRELIMO); President Houari Boumediene of Algeria; Diallo Telli, Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Barely visible behind Mr. Tambo is Dr. Agostino Neto of the Popular Movement For the Liberation of Angola (MPLA). Behind Dr. Mondiane, left to right: James Chikerema, Zimbabwe African Peoples Union (ZAPU), Rhodesia; Sam Nujoma, SWAPO, of Namibia; Amilcar Cabral, African Party for the Independence of Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC), Guinea-Bissao.

Dr. Mondiane was assassinated in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, on February 3, 1969. He was widely recognized, in Africa and around the world, as one of the great liberation leaders. He had led FRELIMO since 1964 in the struggle against the Portuguese, and had seen a fifth of his homeland freed from colonialist rule.

MAY HE REST IN PEACE.
I. Resolved, That the Executive and Finance Committee, on behalf of the Executive Council, examine and apply, in relation to the investments of the said Executive Council in companies and banks doing business in southern Africa, the following criteria:

(a) Is the bank or business making credit available to or doing business in southern Africa, especially including South Africa, South West Africa, Rhodesia, Angola and/or Mozambique?

(b) If so, how significant is this involvement in the economy of the southern African country?

(c) If the involvement is significant, what is the effect in promoting such things as: Education of Africans; Development of family life; Labor-management relations and the collective bargaining process; Increased skills of the African labor force and integration into higher levels of leadership; Equalization of wage scales, pension provisions and social security; Hospitalization and other benefits; Breaking down of the pass law system and other restrictions;

and be it further

Resolved, That, wherever the answers to criteria (a) and (b) are positive, then decision as to whether the Council invest and/or deposit the Church's funds or continue to invest and/or deposit in such companies and banks be dependent on how positive is the answer to criterion (c); and be it further

Resolved, That, nonetheless, where feasible in promoting the welfare or education of all people of southern Africa without regard to race, the Council consider investments in such companies or banks promoting such projects.

II. Resolved, That the Executive Council direct the Executive and Finance Committee to consult with the banks in which the said Council has deposits or investments, and which are members of the consortium extending credit to the government of South Africa; and that, unless the said Executive and Finance Committee concludes that the involvement of the said banks is positive in respect of helping to promote the activities listed in Section (c) of Resolution I, the Treasurer be directed to terminate the Council's involvement with such banks within a reasonable period of time; and that the Executive and Finance Committee report its findings and actions to the Executive Council.

III. Resolved, That the Executive Council report its action on the above Resolutions to the Committee on Trust Funds and request them to examine their investments and to take appropriate action along similar lines and request that the Committee report its actions to the Council as soon as possible.

IV. Resolved, That the Executive Council shall report its action on the above resolutions to the dioceses and parishes and request them to examine their own investments and to take appropriate action along similar lines. To accomplish this the Council shall send the resolutions to the dioceses along with appropriate background materials and request the dioceses to draw the actions and materials to the attention of the parishes and other groups in their jurisdictions in the implementation of the 1967 General Convention "Resolution on Apartheid".

*

From the RESOLUTION ON APARTHEID, General Convention of the Episcopal Church, September, 1967:

Resolved, that this General Convention call upon the officials of this Church at all levels to review the Church's economic involvement in banks and corporations which do business in the following countries: The Republic of South Africa, Rhodesia, Mozambique, Angola and South West Africa; and urge the above-mentioned officials and the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church to exercise responsible stewardship over the funds entrusted to their care; and be it further

Resolved, that the Executive Council implement this action and report to the 63rd General Convention of the appropriate steps taken.

*

The ten American banks of the consortium providing a revolving credit to the government of South Africa are:

New York - First National City; Chase Manhattan; Manufacturers Hanover Trust; Chemical Bank New York Trust; Morgan Guaranty Trust; Bankers Trust; Irving Trust.

Chicago - Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust; First National.

San Francisco - Bank of America.
Of South Africa's total land area, 87% is allotted to the 3,560,000 Whites. Over two-thirds of the country's 13 million black Africans live now in "White" areas. It is South African government policy to return 5% of these African people to the "Bantu homelands" each year. If this plan were to be carried out, it has been estimated that by the year 2000 an additional 12 million people would have to be housed, fed and employed in the homelands - 13% of the land.

A "Black Spot" is land owned and occupied by Africans in an area which has been classified by the South African government as "white". Most black spots are farms owned by individual Africans or by a tribe. Some are on the fringes of rural towns where Africans - along with other racial groups - bought land at a time when they were not prohibited from doing so. Other black spots are on church mission lands. The removal of black spots is an integral part of the policy of apartheid which demands complete separation of South Africa's racial groups, whatever the cost.

A year ago the government began a series of mass removals of 12,800 Africans from black spots in the Klip River-Dundee area of Natal province. The first was on January 29, 1968, on the African-owned farm named Meran where 2,000 people lived. They had been under threat of removal for over two years, but not until January 26 were the children sent home from the local school with messages to their parents to be ready to move in three days. The Africans were trucked 15 miles away and dumped on the bare veld. There was no shelter, no sanitation, no schools, no stores, no medical facilities, no work. The Minister of Bantu Administration and Development explained: "Whilst the Department is sympathetic in regard of stock, the scarcity of land for Bantu occupation does not allow of settlement of Bantu from mission stations and other European areas on an agricultural basis".

No African who owned less than 20 morgen of land (a morgen is about 2 acres) could get an equivalent amount of land; few of them could qualify. Tenant farmers and squatters were given plots in a "closer settlement". They were not allowed to take their livestock although they depended for their livelihood on their cattle. The Minister of Bantu Administration and Development explained: "Whilst the Department is sympathetic in regard of stock, the scarcity of land for Bantu occupation does not allow of settlement of Bantu from mission stations and other European areas on an agricultural basis".

The "closer settlements" are envisioned by the government as "towns", even "cities", in the African homelands and there is much talk of setting up "border industries" to provide work for the dispossessed. These industries have yet to materialize.

Fifteen years ago the Tomlinson Report recommended the creation of 50,000 new jobs in the Bantustans each year to meet the demands of the growth of population. In seven years only 44,600 Africans were provided jobs in border industries. Only 8.5% of Africans employed in the manufacturing industry are in border industries. These figures are deceptive, for many of the jobs are in "border" areas on the outskirts of white cities. In the homelands proper, such as the Transkei, a total of only 945 new jobs have been created in 6 years - at a cost of $15,400,000.

Limehill, the Natal dumping ground, late in 1968 was struck by gastro-enteritis and typhoid. Roman Catholic priest R. Nelson, who with his fellow missionaries had followed their flock, helping them to set up tents and celebrating Mass out of doors, disclosed the health conditions despite an official clamp-down and governmental denial.

The Most Rev. Denis E. Hurley, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Durban and chairman of the Natal Citizens' Association, visited the resettlement camps and stated that at least 45 people had been buried between October 1 and December 10. Four doctors working voluntarily near Limehill reported large numbers of Africans were suffering from pellagra, scurvy and kwashiorkor.

Johannesburg's RAND DAILY MAIL editorialized: "Limehill is a tiny, insignificant spot, but it is of great importance in this respect: it stands as a symbol of a callousness, a spiritual sickness on a national scale as deadly as any that has struck people down at the place itself".
A case before the Supreme Court in Pretoria was settled in October, but enough was revealed in written charges and responses to those charges to underpin a larger case before a South African tribunal the unrestricted activities of the country's security police, the dreaded Special Branch, showing that body to be a law unto itself.

Members of the security police responsible for interrogating alleged "terrorists" were accused of a "systematic course of torture".

Events surrounding the detention of a 68-year-old South West African, Gabriel Mbindi, were reported daily on available court records in the South African press, notably the RAND DAILY MAIL and THE STAR of Johannesburg. The story was told succinctly in a November DAILY MAIL article entitled "Strange Case of Gabriel Mbindi".

In December, 1967, during the Terrorism Trial, one of the accused Namibians, Joseph Helao Shityuwete, made an urgent application to the court. Mr. Shityuwete asked that protection be given his friend and fellow Ovambo, Gabriel Mbindi, who was being held in detention in the same cell block in Pretoria Local Jail. Under the terms of South African detention laws, Mr. Mbindi had no access to friends, lawyers, courts or family. Mr. Shityuwete, having passed through his period of detention and being on trial, had recourse to an attorney.

Mr. Shityuwete stated that word had been passed to him down the row of cells that his friend had been assaulted by the security police while under interrogation. He alleged that Mr. Mbindi had been subjected to beating and kicking while handcuffed to a waterpipe with his feet barely touching the floor. Mbindi's face and one arm were swollen, his ears closed and he had bled from three days. An earlier assault in June was also recounted.

The DAILY MAIL quoted Shityuwete: "I have every reason to believe that Gabriel is truthful in his allegations in view of the fact that I and many of my co-accused have been similarly assaulted by members of the security branch during our detention".

Mr. Shityuwete's startling application named as respondents the South African Commissioner of Police, the commanding officer of Pretoria prison and South Africa's Minister of Justice. The Court ordered protection for Mbindi, although due to successful government contentions, his status as a detainee remained unchanged.

The case of Gabriel Mbindi brought more into focus the role played by Major Theunis Jacobus Swanepoel, head of the security police section charged with interrogating suspected "terrorists". This man is well known and rightly feared in Southern Africa. An observer has described him as "the incarnation of pure evil".

Others of the Namibian men in the Terrorism Trial submitted affidavits attesting to beatings. Allegations were made of electric shock torture both at Pretoria and at the police station at Oshakati, the capital of the new Bantustan in Ovamboland.

Simeon Shihungeleni stated that at Oshakati Major Swanepoel had him handcuffed to a window frame while he was in leg irons and that electric shocks had been applied. Kaleb Tjipana affirmed that in Pretoria "Major Swanepoel then instructed a Bantu police officer to handcuff me to an iron waterpipe and this was done so that I was suspended. While I was in this position, Major Swanepoel and others struck me many blows. At one stage I was blindfolded with a wet cloth and electrical shocks were administered." Joseph Shityuwete stated he had been beaten in Major Swanepoel's presence and threatened with death unless he told the truth.

Major Swanepoel and an assortment of police officials, African constables and interpreters, magistrates who had visited the prison and medical people denied the prisoners had been beaten or showed signs of mistreatment.

The Mbindi case had been scheduled for a hearing and was postponed several times. In February, 1968, shortly before the sentencing of those charged in the Terrorism Trial, Gabriel Mbindi was released from detention (he had never been charged with a crime), given 92 Rand in witness fees, and returned to Windhoek. The only issue remaining then was that of costs, but to determine government liability cause would have had to be found by evidence in court.

Evidence was ordered but an agreement was reached between Mbindi's attorneys and those of the State. The government made no admissions, nor did Mbindi. The settlement was for 3,000 Rand. Gabriel Mbindi is today a free man.

Mr. Shityuwete's attorney, Mr. Josh Carlson, who was also solicitor for the Namibians in the Terrorism Trial, reported the settlement on behalf of Mr. Shityuwete. The RAND DAILY MAIL reported, "Without any admission of the truth or correctness of the affidavits in support of the respondents."

The State made the settlement "without prejudice and without any admissions whatever of the truth or correctness of the affidavits filed in support of the application, especially in relation to alleged assaults."

The accused government officials reached the settlement, according to the RAND DAILY MAIL, "solely in view of the fact that the court may consider it undesirable to devote time to a lengthy hearing to determine the issue of costs and the possibility that they may be litigation against a man who may not be able to meet an order for costs should they succeed."
A witness told an astonished courtroom at South Africa's second "Terrorism Trial".

Dasingee Francis, an Indian South African, who testified that he had been in solitary confinement in South Africa for 421 days, was appearing as a State witness at the trial of 12 Africans, one a woman, who are charged on five counts of contravention of the Terrorism Act of 1957. Mr. Francis was said to be their accomplice.

"I am a South African, and I have been mercilessly treated by South Africans," the witness continued. He identified his torturers as the Security Police.

Mr. Justice Henning, presiding judge at the Natal Supreme Court case held in the city of Pietermaritzburg, replied, according to a report in the NATAL WITNESS:

"It is not the purpose of this Court to inquire into your complaints. The Court is at the moment concerned with the trial of the 12 accused."

The twelve Africans are accused of offenses alleged to have taken place between 1963 and 1968. The Terrorism Act contains an ex post facto provision which covers acts committed as far back as 1962. Ten of the accused have lodged against them alternate charges under the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950. All have pled not guilty.

Testimony of African State witnesses, the identities of whom have been withheld, has described journeys - in the company of various of the accused - outside the Republic of South Africa to undergo military training in Algeria, China, Ethiopia, Russia, Tanzania and Zambia. Training was also said to have taken place in the Transkei, South Africa's first Bantustan.

The charges allege the accused "endangered the maintenance of law and order in South Africa and conspired with one another or with other people and organizations to commit acts and foment and encourage dis-

content, violence and revolution in South Africa, and to overthrow the existing order by means of subversion, terrorism, violent revolution and warfare."

Ten of them are charged with undergoing or attempting to undergo military training, and of preparing to set up military bases in South Africa, including sites for secret submarine landings along the coast.

Police, some armed with Sten guns, stand guard at the College Road Court in Pietermaritzburg. American, British and Swedish members of the diplomatic corps are sitting as observers. The South African press is reporting the progress of the trial.

Unlike the Pretoria "Terrorism Trial" of last year, the accused in this case are all South Africans. The Pretoria men were all Namibians who had been taken from their homeland and tried and convicted in the Republic of South Africa.

Evidence has indicated that South African and Rhodesian liberation movements were the organizations many of the accused had served with. Captured arms were exhibited; they bore marks showing Czechoslovakian, Russian, Chinese, British and United States of American origin.

A number of Rhodesian police and security officers have testified that they apprehended most of the accused.

How were the prisoners turned over to the South African authorities? ●

Does Rhodesia, legally a British colony, have an extradition pact with South Africa? ●

What is Britain's position regarding this obvious collusion? ●

What will the world community do about this further instance of South Africa's illegal atrocities? ●

**FREEDOM OF THE PRESS**

The prisons affair has caused a wide stir in South Africa and the world, with demands from some political leaders and churchmen for a government commission of inquiry, a step the government has refused to take.

The office of the DAILY MAIL has been raided repeatedly by the police who confiscated tape recordings, notes and affidavits.

One item in the charges has to do with whether or not an electro-therapy machine was used as an instrument of torture on African prisoners. The indictment does not contest this fact, but alleges that the head of the prison was not present if and when shock treatments were used.

The trial began in early November and is expected to last six months. Mr. Gandar and a co-accused, if found guilty, face maximum sentences of 12 months on each count.
The Episcopal Church School Missionary Offering this Lent of 1969 is for the schools maintained by the Anglican Church (as the Episcopal Church is called in Southern Africa) in Ovamboland, a region of South West Africa, now also known as Namibia.

Namibia is an international territory which the Republic of South Africa occupies - and is on the point of annexing - in defiance of the legal authority, the United Nations.

The Church's emphasis on a part of the world little known to Americans but of great significance to them comes at a time when events in Namibia, as in all Southern Africa, have deteriorated into a state of war. The overriding fact in Southern Africa today is the confrontation between black and white - both between white-controlled Southern Africa and black-controlled Africa north of the Zambezi River, and between the races within the white bastion.

In this situation the Church is placed, to do its historic work of bringing people to Christ, of providing education and healing wounds. A further task is placed upon the Church in Southern Africa: to perceive its role in an area of bitter conflict and to shake itself loose from a past in which it has often identified with white colonialism and a present in which it is entangled with the forces of totalitarianism and racism.

A young American studying a commitment to the young people of Ovamboland must consider the differences in their lives. What are Americans' prospects for a future in the United States? What are the prospects for an African young man or woman?

An African, after completing his schooling in the Church's Ovamboland schools, has few choices. He can possibly train to become a teacher under the terms of the apartheid-inspired Bantu Education Act. He could perhaps get a job as a government clerk. A man might study for the priesthood. A woman can enter nurses' training.

But take into account that there is no college or university for a black African in the entire territory of Namibia. On very rare occasions an African is allowed to leave the country, usually to pursue ministerial studies and then only usually in the Republic of South Africa. When this happens it is only after much pleading by Church authorities with government officials.

A young man in Ovamboland can remain and till the soil and herd his flocks of sheep, goats and cattle. Most likely a young man from Ovamboland will go south, having first to obtain a travel permit, into the so-called Police Zone of Namibia, set aside by law for white occupation. There he can work in the fish canneries on the Atlantic coast, or in the American-controlled copper mines around Tsumeb, or the rich diamond fields about Oranjemund. He can become a servant in a white household or an office boy in the white-owned businesses in Windhoek, the capital, or another city. Or he may find a job on a white-owned ranch as a shepherd of karakul sheep, enduring the life common to a European serf in the Middle Ages.

The half-million black Namibians face daily the fact that the 96,000 whites of the territory possess the wealth, the power, the business and industry, the government, the good homes, the votes. They have access to cafes, moving pictures, the free run of the community, although whites are technically barred, except by special permission, from African ghettos and the remote reserves allotted to Africans. Shops serve all races and here - on a standing up or waiting in line basis - there is some break down in strict separation, a tribute to the buying power of even the poverty-stricken Africans.

College, a good job, a rewarding career, a home and family as we in the United States understand them are denied to black Namibians. No matter his hopes or abilities or education a young black man or woman in Namibia is still only another "kaffir" to those who run his country.

The options for life for a black Namibian in his own country are few. Many flee their homeland, to trek across desert and through forest to Botswana or Angola, thence into Zambia or Tanzania or another free African country where they join the thousands escaping Southern Africa racist control.

(continued next page)
Most of these refugees remain frustrated and in despair, unable to proceed on to higher education. Free African nations have heavy internal problems of their own citizens and only a few Southern Africans are accepted in European or American colleges. Many enter the ranks of the African liberation movements and train as soldiers so that they can return and fight for the freedom of their native lands.

A word about the African liberation movements is necessary. We in the United States may find it difficult to understand Africans who have embarked on a liberatory war.

Africans in Namibia - and in South Africa, Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique - though forming a majority of the total population have no real say in how they are governed, where they may live, what jobs they can work at, how they will be educated, where and when they may travel, even in many instances if they may live together as a family. African leaders have for many years appealed to their white rulers for fundamental rights. But their peaceful applications were consistently answered with more oppressive and tighter laws, sternly, even brutally enforced. Drastic action by the white regimes - such as at Sharpeville in 1960 - underscored for African leaders the depth of resistance to any idea of black participation in society.

The Africans have appealed to the Western nations like Britain and the United States, but the Western nations, though professing disapproval and horror at apartheid and racial oppression, have done nothing that has changed for the good the lives of African people inside the white bastion. Rather the Western nations, which have heavy investments in and do a thriving business with the countries of Southern Africa, provide important, if not crucial, support for those regimes they deplore. Appeals to the United Nations have brought nothing but countless resolutions and a heightened sense of frustration.

For Namibians the last hope for help from the outside world faded with the World Court non-decision of 1966. Those Africans who had not already done so realized that if they were to gain their freedom and dignity they would have to accomplish these ends by their own efforts.

One of the political organizations formed by Namibians is called the South West Africa Peoples' Organization. Its history goes back to the mid-1950's but it was 10 years later that SWAPO determined that it would have to fight to obtain freedom for Namibia. By August, 1966, a series of battles between SWAPO guerrillas and South African police trained as army troops took place in Ovamboland and the Caprivi Strip. A number of guerrillas were captured. The South African government also seized some officers of SWAPO who lived in Namibia. All were taken hundreds of miles away to Pretoria, the capital of the Republic of South Africa.

In August, 1967, 37 of these Namibians were brought to trial in Pretoria. They were charged under terms of the Terrorism Act which had been passed in June, 1967, by the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa.

This law has a provision putting it into effect as of June, 1962, an ex post facto article contrary to the concepts of Western justice. Other provisions enact unlimited detention without recourse to any attorney, family and clergy. "Terrorism" is comprehended as almost any form of opposition to the State.

The trial ended in February, 1968, with 20 of the freedom fighters (or "terrorists" according to the South African government) receiving life terms in prison, 9 getting 20-year-terms, two receiving 5 years. Three were sentenced under lesser charges and given suspended sentences, and two were acquitted. One man died in prison under mysterious circumstances. An appeal in November, 1968, reduced the life sentences of five men to 20 years in prison. Vigorous protest and observation from the outside world undoubtedly affected the sentences. An undetermined number of Namibians are being held in detention in South Africa and will presumably be tried at the convenience of the government.

The Namibian men in the Terrorism Trial were farmers or herdsmen or laborers. Most of them had little education; a few were illiterate. Almost all were Christians.

One of these men has special significance for us. He is Toivo Herman ja Toivo, a member of the Anglican Church. He was also regional secretary for Ovamboland for the South West Africa Peoples' Organization.

As a young man, Mr. Toivo attended St. Mary's School at Odibo, largely for the same reason that young Africans do today: because that school taught the English language and used the medium of English in instruction. Every African understands the value of this world language as compared with South African government encouraged Afrikaans, a white tribal tongue in use only in a tiny region of the world.

With the utter integrity which has marked his life, Mr. Toivo became an Anglican only when he was quite sure of what he believed.
In 1958, Mr. Toivo, then working in Cape Town, was arrested for participating in political activities, shipped back to Ovamboland and placed under house arrest. Eventually he was released and he opened a general store. He became a layreader and continued his work for SWAPO. Authorities limited his activities both in party and Church by placing heavy restrictions upon him. Mr. Toivo was arrested in 1966 and detained along with his comrades, undergoing torture at the hands of the South African security police.

At the Terrorism Trial, Mr. Toivo addressed the judge:

"Your Government, my Lord, undertook a very special responsibility when it was awarded the Mandate over us after the First World War. It assumed a sacred trust to guide us towards independence and to prepare us to take our place among the nations of the world. We believe that South Africa has abused that trust because of its belief in racial supremacy (that white people have been chosen by God to rule the world) and apartheid. We believe that for fifty years South Africa has failed to promote the development of our people. Where are our trained men? The wealth of our country has been used to train your people for leadership and the sacred duty of preparing the indigenous people to take their place among the nations of the world has been ignored."

Mr. Toivo received a 20-year prison term which he is now serving at South Africa's notorious Robben Island prison just off the coast from the lovely city, Cape Town.

"Certain Unalienable Rights". Most young Americans will have to think back to their own historic Revolution to identify with the struggle of Namibians. Americans in 1776 engaged in armed struggle with a foreign power to seek their freedom. The efforts of the Continental Army is not unrelated in spirit with those of today's African freedom fighters.

Our ancestors went to war with Britain for far fewer grievances than those suffered by Africans in Southern Africa in the 20th century. Young black Americans of today will find an easier identity: they are at this moment caught up in a struggle within our own society for their full rights and dignity.

There are those who cannot envision a resort to armed warfare in Southern Africa. Let Toivo speak to that:

"There are some who will say that they are sympathetic with our cause, but unwilling to condone violence. I would answer that I am not by nature a man of violence and I believe that violence is a sin against God and my fellow men. SWAPO itself was a non-violent organization, but the South African Government is not truly interested in whether opposition is violent or non-violent. It does not wish to hear any opposition to Apartheid. We have found ourselves voteless in our own country and deprived of the right to meet and state our own political opinions.

"Is it surprising that in such times my countrymen have taken up arms? Violence is truly fearsome, but who would not defend his property and himself against a robber? And we believe that South Africa has robbed us of our country."

It is important to remember that the Namibian freedom fighters were attacking the troops of a foreign power occupying their homeland. It is important to keep in mind the years of non-violent protest of the Namibians - protest which led them nowhere. It is important to consider that the freedom fighters were taken to a foreign country and tried and convicted under the laws of that foreign country.

And we must remember that the freedom fighters would ordinarily be considered prisoners of war and the civilian leaders should be accorded special status. The United Nations Council for Namibia in a 1968 report recommended that the General Assembly of the U.N. "Call upon the Government of South Africa to respect the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, with regard to the Namibian freedom fighters, and the Convention of the same date relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War".

American Episcopalians have an unusual commitment to Namibia. In 1960, Robert H. Mize, Kansas-born American priest, was selected to be Bishop of Damaraland, the diocese comprising all of the territory of South West Africa. During the eight years of his episcopate many American clergy and laity went to work there. Their presence was a refreshment and a source of hope for the Africans. But the American presence worried the South African authorities, because these people from our country came with a special spirit of dedication, because their air of equality and liberalism was a threat to apartheid and racist thinking. In the eyes of the South African government and their adherents, liberalism is but one step away from communism.

(continued on next page)
Although Bishop Mize studiously avoided preaching or acting against government policies, in early 1968 the South African Minister of the Interior advised him that his visa would expire in July and not be renewed. Despite pleas and protests from within and outside, the South African government did not change its ruling.

The new bishop, British-born Colin Winter, with a South African and Namibian background of concern for justice for African and Coloured people, has assumed one of the most sensitive and difficult posts in the world-wide Anglican Communion.

The situation in Southern Africa is distinct from that in those areas of Africa where there is turmoil, bloodshed and warfare - Nigeria and Biafra or the Sudan - or where there is injustice, such as the threat to Indians in some African countries.

In Southern Africa white and black face one another in a tension that is working into deeper conflict. Racial confrontation is nowhere more explicit and unyielding. The events in Southern Africa will enflame other parts of this planet where races in sizeable numbers are thrown together - not the least here in the United States. Once the flames spread higher and farther in Southern Africa, profound repercussions will bring to the breaking point tender color and culture relations which we so vividly are experiencing now in our own country. The horrors of world-wide racial war stare us in the face. Young Americans will soon have to deal with the present generation's long neglect of Africa.

Why send funds for the Ovamboland schools if the state of the African students is so bleak? Because these young people want an education. Although isolated, despite the bondage of apartheid, they know there is a world which one day they will join. They have faith that the future will be theirs.

Americans who have served in Ovamboland report an interesting fact. The graduates of such schools as St. Mary's at Odibo possess a certain quality. They look their white overlords in the eye, they have a secure sense of their destiny. This precious ingredient encourages and challenges the young African people.

Our concern extends into the future of the people and the country of Namibia. To partake of their faith in their future is an honor for any young American. To help them in their search for that future is our duty as Americans and as Christians.
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EPISCOPAL CHURCHMEN for SOUTH AFRICA
14 West 11th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011
The Vorster government's long expected penultimate step toward take over of South West Africa - Namibia - is at hand.

On April 1, 1969, the territory will, according to the Johannesburg STAR, "become a virtual fifth province of South Africa". The South West Africa Affairs Bill has passed the Republic of South Africa's House of Assembly and awaits the signature of South Africa's State President.

THE NEW YORK TIMES reports that the new bill enables the South African Cabinet to apply South African laws directly to the territory. The South African Nationalist government will also have the power to change the laws "as they deem fit".

THE STAR goes on to say that the take over date "will see the end of the considerable autonomy South West Africa has had, through its Legislative Assembly, since it became a South African mandate in 1919..........

"On April 1 practically all this autonomy will be removed and the Legislative Assembly reduced in power to the level of a South African provincial council."

White South West Africans are deeply disturbed. Most will comment only privately, but THE STAR reports a Windhooek speech by J.P. Niehaus, leader of the United National South West Party, which has no seats in the all-white Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Niehaus foresaw "the threat of a major calamity to their future prosperity" as a result of South Africa's plan to carve up the country according to the Odendaal Plan. "One does not promote the welfare of population groups in a country by undermining the prosperity of that particular group which is the fountainhead of this same prosperity in which all population groups share." He warned against South Africa's incorporation of the territory. "Such a step would be a confrontation of the United Nations and the Western world......the outside world would view the proposed changes as an annexation in all but in name."

The South West Africa Peoples' Organization, from its exile headquarters in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, called on the United Nations' Council for Namibia to go to the territory immediately, to set up a presence.
SOUTH WEST AFRICA-NAMIBIA

SOUTH WEST AFRICA is 318,000 square miles in extent, about the size of California, Oregon and Washington State together. It lies on the South Atlantic coast of Africa and has several hundred miles of common border, partly along the Orange River, with the Republic of South Africa. South West is dry, open, mountainous in some sections, with large stretches of desert over much of its surface. It is very wealthy, with diamonds, copper, semi-precious stones, many kinds of minerals, and flourishing karakul lamb, cattle and fishing industries.

South West Africa - or Namibia - has a population of a half-million black Africans, 96,000 whites and some 29,000 Coloured people, or people of mixed race. The Africans are mostly tribal farmers and herdsmen and provide contract laborers for the white farms, businesses and industries. Blacks - and Coloureds - have no voice in the country's government, no vote, and are completely subject to the white minority. There is an all-white South West African Legislative Assembly; its power is to be reduced as of 1 April 1969 and that of the South African government will be increased. South Africa is in de facto control of the territory, in open defiance of the United Nations and the world community.

South West Africa was a colony of the German Empire before World War I, having been annexed by the Kaiser's government in 1890 in a land grab for overseas territory. European explorers have written of the inhabitants of the vast tract of land dating back into the late 15th century. The Africans were fairly prosperous and their herds of cattle roamed the countryside. The Hereros, Namas, Ovambos, Berg Damaras and Bushmen occupied the huge territory with occasional disputes amongst the strong and efficient tribal organizations.

The Germans took over the territory after the 1885 Berlin Conference at which European powers pledged to guard the interests of Africans and to cultivate their moral and material development. Germany's view of this development was stated at the time by an official of the German Colonial Office in words only too prophetic of Adolf Hitler: "The decision to colonize in South West Africa could after all mean nothing else but this; namely, that the native tribes would have to give up their land on which they had previously grazed their stock in order that the White man might have the land for the grazing of his stock. When this attitude is questioned from the moral law standpoint, the answer is that for nations of the kultur position of the South African natives the loss of their free national barbarism, and their development into a class of labourers in service of and dependent on the White people, is primarily a law of existence in the highest degree."

This philosophy was ruthlessly effected by the German colonial governor, the father of Reichsmarshall Hermann Goering. The Africans were subdued and driven into pockets by the German army. The Hereros were literally decimated; 80,000 men, women and children were reduced to 15,000.

In 1920, South West Africa was placed under the League of Nations Mandate system and the Mandate conferred on the British Crown to be administered by the Union of South Africa, at that time a part of the Empire. The territory was mandated with the provision that "the Mandatory (South Africa) shall promote to the utmost the moral well-being and social progress of the inhabitants of the territory in accordance with the League's Covenant which directed "there shall be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization".

South Africa (which became a Republic outside the British Commonwealth in 1961) has refused to recognize the United Nations as the successor to the League of Nations and has continued the process of incorporation of Namibia despite repeated admonitions of the U.N. and three advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice. South Africa has not allowed black South West Africans to leave their country to appear before the U.N. nor has it submitted annual reports on its administration of the territory as required under the terms of the mandate. However, friends and exiles from Namibia have presented appeals and petitions to the world body each year.

On July 18, 1966, the International Court of Justice at The Hague, after 6 years of argument, and by an 8 to 7 vote, dismissed a case against South Africa for its administration of South West Africa. South Africa took this non-judgment as a vindication of its occupation and has steadily increased its control over and extended its apartheid laws throughout the territory.

On October 27, 1966, the General Assembly of the United Nations, by a vote of 114 to 2 (the United States concurring; South Africa (and Portugal alone voting 'no'), terminated South Africa's mandate and itself assumed the trust. The U.N. set up an 11-nation council to administer the territory. But the U.N. has run into great reluctance, particularly on the part of the Western nations which have invested a great deal of money in South West Africa, to enforce the U.N. 's authority. South African Prime Minister Balthazar J. Vorster has repeatedly warned the outside world about interfering in the occupied territory and has indicated that South Africa would fight to maintain its position there. The U.N. has officially changed the name of South West Africa to Namibia. Meetings are held and resolutions passed to no avail.

The South African government, pursuant to its policy of "creative self-withdrawal", inaugurated the first puppet "Bantustan" in Namibia in October, 1963. Ovamboland was selected as the area, and the South African Minister of Bantu Administration and Development opened the first session of the Ovamboland Legislative Council at Oshakati, the "capital" of Ovamboland. A white Commissioner General for the Native Nations of South West Africa will also have headquarters at Oshakati.

Other ethnic entities are scheduled to be established, following the outline laid down by the South African Odendaal Commission during 1962/63.
PROPOSED HOMELANDS
SOUTH WEST AFRICA
On behalf of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I have the honour to inform you that the Council has decided to draw your attention to the deteriorating situation in the Territory brought about by the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African authorities in defiance of General Assembly resolutions 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967, 2325 (XXII) of 16 December 1967, 2372 (XXII) of 12 June 1968 and 2403 (XXIII) of 16 December 1968.

In this connexion, it should be pointed out that there has been no advance towards the exercise of the right of self-determination and the attainment of independence by the people of Namibia and that the Council for Namibia has been denied the exercise of its responsibilities under the aforementioned resolutions.

The Council is gravely concerned with the defiance of the expressed wishes of the international community which in itself is disruptive of the international atmosphere. The South African defiance and the denial of self-determination of the people of Namibia here with the potentials of racial war and thus constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. Consequently, the Council deems it necessary that the Security Council give urgent consideration to the situation and take appropriate action.

Since the adoption of the above mentioned General Assembly resolutions, the Government of South Africa has engaged in a number of illegal actions, inter alia, those aimed at destroying the territorial integrity of Namibia. Some of these illegal actions are:

1. the calculated destruction of the unity of the people and the territorial integrity of the country by establishing bantustans, among others that of Ovamboland;
2. the forcible removal of indigenous people from their native location in Windhoek to Katutura;
3. the arrest, deportation, trial and conviction of Namibians, in contravention of General Assembly resolution 2324 (XXII of 16 December 1967 and Council resolutions 245 and 246 (1968);
4. the displacement of over a thousand Namibians from the Caprivi Strip who subsequently took refuge in Zambia;
5. the projected removal of children from Hoachanas about which the Council has recently received reports.

The United Nations Council for Namibia mindful of its responsibilities under the General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967 once again feels constrained to draw the attention of the Security Council to these blatant violations by the South African Government of the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2145(XXI) of 27 October 1966 under the provisions of which the Mandate of South Africa over Namibia was terminated and the Government of South Africa was called upon to refrain and desist from any action constitutional, administrative, political or otherwise which would in any manner whatsoever alter or tend to alter the international status of Namibia.

In conclusion, the Council, frustrated in its efforts to discharge fully its functions and responsibilities as a result of South Africa's illegal presence in the Territory, considers that urgent action is required to secure the immediate withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia. At the same time, the Council is convinced that the progressive deterioration of the situation in Namibia arising out of various illegal measures adopted by the South African Government against the wishes of the people of Namibia points to the danger of the outbreak of widespread racial conflict in the area. In the view of the Council these developments constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. The Council accordingly considers that the situation in Namibia calls for urgent consideration by the Security Council.

From: DIE SUIDWESTER, Windhoek. 24 February 1969. (translated from the Afrikaans)

"United Nations

"...concerning proposals making the rounds at the United Nations, the United States has demanded that the most important part of the proposals be left out. This portion which should be left out says that the situation which is developing from South Africa's responsibility in South West Africa is a threat to international peace and security. In case the Security Council accepts this decision, it will open the way for compulsory sanctions to be applied against South Africa.

"The United States also made a complaint as to the wording of a proposal which says that if South Africa does not immediately comply with the decision of the Security Council, then the Security Council would meet and consider further steps. This decision would be the first in which the Security Council would follow up the 1966 resolution by the General Assembly."