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Children of Empire
Poems by Robert Chrisman

This powerful and moving collection of lyrics touches on politics, love and art as they exist in the struggle for humanity and justice, and illumined by the poet's extraordinary gift for imagery and music. Using autobiographical progression, Children of Empire traces Chrisman's early perceptions of his life and experience, on to maturing realizations that the U.S. is a declining empire whose human potential can only be saved through the process of revolution. "Beautifully lyrical," states Alice Walker. "A fine book of a poet with a passionate voice for justice. . . ." writes James Schevill. "A book of exceptional power and beauty," states Adam Miller. This is the first collection of poems by Robert Chrisman, Publisher of THEBLACKSCHOLAR, whose poems and essays have appeared in a number of national and international publications. Featured are illustrations by Eileen Nelson. Soft Cover—$4.95

In the Hills Where Her Dreams Live
Poems by Andrew Salkey

Famed Jamaican poet and novelist, Andrew Salkey's prize winning collection of poetry, In the Hills Where Her Dreams Live, is for Chile. It is about the struggle, pain and determination of a persistent people who have suffered frightful repression. States the Chilean scholar, Fernando Alegría, of this remarkable work, "Rarely has a poet delved as deeply into the tragedy of a people . . . His poetry is full of the faith in the people's will to fight and win." The gripping power of these poems forces one to read them again and again, teaching tine gaining more insight into the lives of the Chilean people, as well as increasing respect for Andrew Salkey, whose extraordinary poetry records one of the most important struggles of our time. Featured are illustrations by renowned artists Elizabeth Catlett and Francisco Mora, from original linoleum cuts commissioned for this volume. In the Hills Where Her Dreams Live won-Cuba's prestigious Casa de las Americas Award for English Carribean poetry, 1979. Soft Cover—$4.95

Reprinted by popular demand! Sonia Sanchez' I've Been a Woman is now in its second printing. This remarkable collection of poems features selections from her previous four volumes and new work published for the first time. Softcover—$5.95; Hardcover —$10.95
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ANC Leader Assassinated

When African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) official Joe Gqabi was shot to death in Salisbury on July 31, the Zimbabwean government said South Africa was responsible. “The government believes this brutal act to be the dirty work of unscrupulous agents of the South African regime,” Information Minister Nathan Shamuyarira declared.

US intelligence has information that tends to corroborate the Zimbabwean charges, says Randall Robinson, executive director of the Black American lobby TransAfrica. Robinson says he learned from “a reliable source” in late July of a Defense Department daily intelligence summary report which stated that the South African military had assembled an assassination squad to kill ANC leaders. “Yet the US did nothing to dissuade South Africa or to warn the ANC,” Robinson charged. Thus far, US officials have refused comment.

Andy Meldrum, reporting from Salisbury, says South African officials have repeatedly warned that an ANC office in Salisbury would be subject to reprisals for the ANC’s frequent guerrilla assaults on strategic South African installations. The ANC has not officially opened an office in Salisbury.

Zimbabwe has stressed its support for the ANC but has flatly refused to allow any ANC military operations in the country. On one occasion, the government sent ANC guerrillas back to a base in Zambia.

But Mugabe has said the ANC, the Pan-Africanist Congress and SWAPO can open offices in Zimbabwe. There are an estimated fifty members of the ANC and PAC living in Salisbury.

After South African Police Minister Louis le Grange warned recently that South Africa would “hit hard” against any ANC activity in Zimbabwe, Prime Minister P.W. Botha was asked if the threat extended to the establishment of offices. “Offices to my mind are the beginning of action against a neighboring country, and should that happen we will deal with it in a way we find proper,” he stated.

A previous attempt on Gqabi’s life had been made before he was shot to death in his car at point blank range outside his Salisbury home. On February 22, a large amount of explosives was found attached to the car in which he later died. He had represented the ANC here for nearly a year. [AN]

South African Funds For US Rugby

The Eastern Rugby Union of America, which is sponsoring next month’s controversial US tour by the South African Springbok rugby team, accepted a $25,000 donation from a Johannesburg businessman who has previously served as a conduit for secret South African government funds.

The donation was made in December of last year, the same month that the American rugby union issued an unprecedented invitation to South Africa’s Springboks.

According to Eastern Rugby Union documents obtained by Africa News, the $25,000 grant in December was provided by Louis Luyt, chairman and chief executive officer of Triomf Fertilizer, “for upgrading coaching/refereeing in the ERU.”

The $25,000 donation amounts to a significant boost in income for the Eastern Rugby Union, whose membership includes clubs in 23 northeastern and southern states. Treasurer Bill Hafner has projected $25,000 expenditures of $32,350, and in a recent memo to member clubs on “Money,” reported that “the ‘pains of growth in funding programs (sic) was eased’ by the large grant.

The donor, Luyt, had been a key player in a worldwide South African public relations drive that produced a nasty scandal in the mid-70s, forcing South African Premier John Vorster and his heir apparent from office. Government inquiries at the time named Luyt as recipient of some $15 million in secret funds for The Citizen, the staunchly pro-government newspaper he established in 1976. The Committee for Fairness in Sport, another Luyt creation, has also been named as an Information Department front, as has the Club of Ten, which placed advertisements arguing white South Africa’s case in major Western newspapers. [AN]

Tekere Dismissed

Prime Minister Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe has consolidated his control over party and military affairs with several recent administrative decisions.

Particularly significant is the dismissal of former Cabinet minister Edgar Tekere from his post as secretary general of the ruling ZANU-PF party. Only a year ago Tekere was considered by many observers to be highly popular, and was portrayed as leader of a more radical wing within ZANU ZANU insiders who support Mugabe leadership, however, deny that Tekere was more radical in substance, saying he was instead undisciplined and given to in temperate rhetoric.

In practice, Tekere has not acted in a capacity as ZANU-PF secretary-general since last November. His heated declarations, hostile to whites, to the minority party of Joshua Nkomo, and sometimes to his own government itself, and his hammering away on the theme of continuing the revolution caused Mugabe growing annoyance. Consequently, he was quarantined by party officials and particularly the prime minister.

Two weeks ago Mugabe declared, “There are those who are complaining that the revolution is not continuing, and they are the most immoral and laziest in the party.” Though no names were mentioned, the reference to Tekere was clear.

The former secretary-general said last week he will no longer be active in the party but will return to “the grassroots from whence I came.”

Eddison Zvobgo, party secretary of publicity and minister for local government and housing, said in an interview last week that the ZANU-PF central committee voted unanimously to exclude Tekere. Zvobgo, who is believed to be the leading contender to replace Tekere, also said that the dismissal was part of a broad restructuring that would be carried out under Mugabe’s personal supervision. [AN]

UPDATE this month was jointly prepared by Southern Africa and Africa News Service, which publishes a weekly digest available to individuals for $25.00. Address correspondence to Africa News, P.O. Box 3851, Durham, NC 27702.
Forward Together! Backward Never!
—An Interview with the National Black United Front

by Andrew Marx

"Stop U.S. Aggression at Home and Abroad," read the large banner at the head of the massive May 3 demonstration in Washington. "$ For the Poor/Not the War."

"Marchers Protest against US Involvement in El Salvador" read the newspaper headlines the next day. True enough. More than 100,000 people answered the call of the People’s Anti-War Mobilization that sunny spring day, demanding an end to the growing US intervention in Central America.

But the newspaper reports virtually ignored the other words on the banner that fluttered above the leading contingent in the march, the words identifying them as members and supporters of the National Black United Front. Nor did the press find room to mention that leaflets distributed by the NBUF and the speech delivered by Front Chairman Herbert Daughtry from the steps of the Pentagon emphasized not only El Salvador but Namibia and South Africa as key areas of concern about "aggression abroad."

The prominent role played by the Front in organizing for the May 3 mobilization and in pressing for inclusion of demands for self-determination and independence in southern Africa reflect a strategic thrust with major implications for the growth of solidarity work here in the United States. In an interview with Southern Africa, the head of the NBUF’s international affairs section, Adeyemi Bandele, explained the Front’s perspective and some of the experience it has accumulated in doing southern Africa support work.

"We have always been concerned that the question of southern Africa not be left out as an issue in any major event," Bandele stated in reference to the May 3 mobilization. "The Front itself has always been involved in international affairs from our inception because we realize the importance of linking the struggles that are waged domestically with the international arena."

Even while concentrating its energies on building chapters across the country, prim-
arily around demands for an end to police brutality and devastating cutbacks in social services, the National Black United Front in its first year of existence has indeed made its presence felt internationally. NBUF Chairman Herbert Daughtry and other representatives have traveled to the Caribbean, Europe, and Africa, meeting with leaders of governments and liberation movements. Most recently, Daughtry attended and addressed the International Conference on Sanctions Against South Africa held in Paris May 20-27 under the auspices of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity.

At home, the Front has thrown itself actively into a variety of solidarity campaigns. The House of the Lord Church in Brooklyn, the Rev. Daughtry's home pulpit and the Front's home base, has served as a meeting place to plan for numerous demonstrations and as a lecture hall where people from the community can hear speakers from the revolutionary government of Grenada or the liberation movements of Namibia, South Africa and Puerto Rico.

National Protests Organized
During the six weeks after the May 3 march, the Front organized nationwide protests against the visit of South African Foreign Minister Roelof Botha and staged a spirited rally in New York marking the anniversary of the Soweto rebellion and targeting Citibank for its loans to the apartheid regime.

An International Struggle
"Stemming from the concept that Malcolm talked about, we see our struggle as a world-wide struggle," Bandele explained, relaxing in the offices of a community center where this coordinator of international affairs also organizes recreation activities for children. "Having the opportunity to talk with representatives of many of the liberation movements, they have always emphasized to us the importance that struggle here—support work and raising the level of consciousness of people about various struggles—can have for their struggles. I remember once when I was hosting a radio show on Malcolm that Elizabeth Sibeko (widow of slain Pan Africanist Congress leader David Sibeko) pointed out to me that Malcolm, his writings and his visits, inspired many of them. People like Steve Biko and others who read Malcolm's works were inspired both by Malcolm as an individual and also by the struggle being waged here in America, particularly during the '60s."

On another occasion, Bandele recalled, he met a Brazilian activist at a conference in Libya and asked if he knew anything about the Black movement in the United States. "Off the top of his head, he started talking about Malcolm and Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown. And he said that the struggle that was waged and the mistakes that were made by the urban guerilla movements in Brazil closely paralleled those of the Black Panther Party. So my travels have just reinforced the understanding that our struggle here in the US affects the struggles of other Third World countries, just as we are inspired by the victories of other countries to go forward—Grenada is a prime example."

"Because We Are Africans"
Within this internationalist perspective, Bandele said, "Southern Africa is a focus because we are Africans." He pointed to the corollary between the rise of the independent nations in Africa after '57 and the development of the Black liberation struggle here." While the Front also emphasized solidarity with Latin America and Asia, he added, people in the Black community also identify most immediately and most strongly with the struggles in Africa.

"We have found it to be good—An easy—to raise the question of southern Africa in the Front," Bandele stated, "simply because the Front has been a mass-based movement. The Front did not come together with a whole bunch of old activists. A lot of people who came into the Front were just regular street people who are concerned about domestic issues—Cops, the closing of hospitals and so on. And so as we organize people around these issues, we then introduce them to the international concerns, particularly Africa.

I don't think it takes a lot to inspire someone, an African in this country, to be concerned about Africa, once they have an opportunity to be introduced to what's going on, to meet some of the people firsthand. Of course, not everybody accepts the term African [for Blacks in the United States]. I'm not talking to somebody simply because they don't call themselves African. I use the term Black and African interchangeably, although certainly I prefer African."

In addition to the value of socialist work as an educational process, the Front has defined specific areas in which it can play an important role. One of those areas Bandele stated, lies in "keeping a check on those forces in this country, both governmental and non-governmental, who are doing things that are detrimental to the liberation struggles."
By that he doesn't mean only Jean Kirkpatrick (the US ambassador to the UN whose resignation the Front called for after her secret meeting with South African intelligence officials) or Citibank (whose involvement in $1.6 billion in loans to South Africa has made it the target of a Front boycott call). He also and particularly spoke of exerting pressure on Black American entertainers like Ben Vereen, Ray Charles, Sister Sledge, and the O'Jays who have traveled to South Africa. "Unless we put them under heavy manners here," Bandele said, "they are going to continually do that and not be concerned that they will be 'spanned,' that folk are going to boycott their affairs, turn them out or whatever. Because in southern Africa, the brothers and sisters there are doing it. Somebody has got to really put some pressure on them. That's something that we can do right here. We certainly in the Front have not paid enough attention to that. But we plan to."

Backing Legislative Investment

The Front also sees an important role for itself in backing efforts by Black and progressive legislators to sever US ties to South Africa. Al Vann, head of the New York state legislature's Black and Puerto Rican Caucus, drafted a bill requiring all companies with state contracts not to do business in South Africa. Although the bill was defeated, Bandele said, it played a valuable educational function. Supporters of the Front actively participated in hearings Vann held in Brooklyn.

While the Front has its own priorities for southern Africa support work, it by no means excludes working with other groups on particular campaigns and demonstrations. Nor does the Front's concentration on organizing in the Black community mean it shies away from working with solidarity groups whose membership is mostly white. "The Front has no problems with working in multi-racial groupings," Bandele stated, "because we are very secure about who we are. We know where we are going. So we're not afraid to work with folk because we know that nobody's going to deter us from our concerns and our direction."

"There is a relationship that can be a healthy and productive relationship as long as we do not repeat the mistakes of the '60s where you had some elements of the white left or the liberal element who felt that they knew best for us. Those are bygone days, as Malcolm used to say. Everybody just has to lay their cards on the table up front. Just meet, lay out your principles of unity and be very vigilant about any hidden agendas that folk come up with. And if that appears, then bring it right down front and confront people as opposed to bickering through their papers and communications organs."

"Either white or multi-racial organizations can play a very important part within their respective arenas," Bandele added. "White students need to agitate, educate and organize on the college campuses. That, to me, is probably the area of least resistance to US imperialism today, the least involved sector in the struggle. It's unfortunate. I don't think that they are operating to their maximum."

"You find more grassroots people involved in struggles within the inner cities around hospitals; killer cops or whatever than you find college students being involved in activities. It's a shame. I'm really looking forward to them bursting forward again. I don't mean they have to take over buildings and come out with shotguns and stuff, but there can certainly be a greater level of activism on their part. I mean even around the cuts, there's a bit of squirming but no 'Stand Up and Fight' kind of approach."

Involving Young People

Bandele acknowledges that the Front has encountered similar difficulties in the Black community. "It used to be easier to mobilize the younger people, but it's becoming much harder now," he remarked. "It's been difficult. What we have been trying to do is activate the Youth Division [of the Front.] For instance, last year was our first effort around linking the youth movement in the city with the African liberation struggle by focusing in on Soweto Day as we did again this year. [In 1980 the Front organized a march of over 200 school children to join the Soweto day demonstration in New York City.] The focus we take is that in Soweto it was young people who were involved, so young people here need to pay respect and honor to their struggle. We try to get the film 'Last Grave at Dimbaza' and a couple of others into the high schools, particularly some of the schools where almost all the students are Black."

Through the films, the demonstrations, through talks like Rev. Daughtry's report to the Youth Division about the sanctions conference he attended, the Front hopes to get more young people involved and aware. For with them, as with others they are trying to mobilize, Bandele sees a lack of awareness and understanding as one of the key problems. "In the bit of traveling I have done," he commented, "I have found that young people in the US, actually the basic population in the US, is probably the most ignorant of international affairs. They just don't know what's going on, or what little they do know is warped."

"It's particularly dangerous during this period, with the heavy onslaught of this anti-communism, 1980's redbaiting thing. They are basically appealing to the..."
SWAPO Comments on Secret Documents

Whether the Reagan administration likes it or not, the reality of the liberation struggle in Namibia is that any political solution there must include SWAPO. SWAPO is the only organization that is internationally recognized as the legitimate representative of the Namibian people, and only SWAPO can end the war by accepting the terms of a settlement.

Yet as we go to press, there has not been any formal contact between the US State Department and SWAPO’s external representatives. In light of the administration’s stated interest in a peaceful resolution to the Namibian crisis, their failure to consult SWAPO is no less than astonishing.

SWAPO has released a number of official comments on US policy and below we have reprinted an official SWAPO statement on the recently released US policy documents.

These documents reflect the extent to which the United States administration is willing to go along with the South African regime in subverting Resolution 435 (1978), the United Nations plan for elections in Namibia. The lack of any public dissociation from these documents by the other Governments of the so-called Contact Group of five Western countries (Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Canada) tends to suggest that they are at the very least acquiescing even if some of these governments are feeling a little uncomfortable about the style of approach of the US administration.

These documents, acknowledged by the Administration as remaining basic documents of strategy, (New York Times), raise very serious issues which SWAPO of Namibia believed need further scrutiny—issues and attitudes which will have a fundamental influence on the future of the whole sub-continent. It is now no less than five months since South Africa rejected Resolution 435 at the mis-named Pre-Implementation Meeting in Geneva and the gang of five have come up with no reasonable excuse for not pressuring the South African regime into implementation of Resolution 435 which they themselves originally drafted and described as being fair and the best possible solution for a settlement in Namibia. Since Geneva, the South African regime has repeated on several occasions its rejection of the United Nations plan. Their rejection is again clearly restated in these documents.

We would like briefly to draw out certain attitudes and issues raised in these documents, and their implications:

1. Perhaps the most significant indication of the intentions of the US administration is the context in which the issue of Namibian independence is posed. Namibia is presented as a key arena of the cold war; the concept of a settlement there as a strategic gain for Western interests against what is described as the “Soviet threat.”

   This approach represents a diversion from the real issue—the question of South Africa’s illegal occupation of Namibia and the suppression of legitimate rights and aspirations of the majority of its population. Far from being motivated by the slightest concern for the well-being of Namibians, the US wishes to use the achievement of a “settlement” in the territory as a show piece to prove South Africa’s “good faith” to sell a cosmetic solution internationally in order to justify its own closer relations with the illegal regime.

   Although Namibia is described as “the primary obstacle to the creation of a new relationship with S.A.,” the American government is effectively consolidating its relationship with Pretoria in the absence of any commitment to Namibian independence.

2. Secondly, the documents show that the US and South Africa’s mutual concept of a settlement on Namibia basically rejects the United Nations independence plan contained in UN Security Council Resolution 435 (1978). The issues are deliberately distorted, the clearest evidence of the deceptive diplomacy envisaged by the US Government is the discussion about the importance of semantics and the need to call changing the Resolution “complementing.”

   While the US government has actually asked Pretoria for a clearer indication of its response to the ideas put forward in the discussion (London Daily Telegraph, May 18, 1981), the State Department says it is still formulating its foreign policy. Soliciting a concrete response from other parties to negotiations can only take place where concrete proposals are put forward. It would be naive to believe that the discussion covered in these documents took place in the absence of a fairly elaborate policy formulation.

   Obviously, the type of “solution” envisaged here is one which excludes an effective SWAPO government in Namibia, despite universal recognition of the fact that SWAPO would emerge victorious through any democratic process. While South Africa explicitly states that it is not willing to have “SWAPO in Windhoek,” the US puts forward the possibility of a strategy to render any future SWAPO government ineffective. This objective could be achieved by means of the type of constitutional guarantees and fragmentation of the Namibian nation covered in the discussion. The US government clearly favours the imposition of a full-blown constitution—one which would tie the hands of any future government. Should South Africa ever agree to sign a ceasefire this would be conditional upon the guaranteed perpetuation of the bantustan system.

3. The implications of these discussions for the war in Namibia and the conflict in southern Africa are far-reaching. Throughout the documents the unanimity on the need to preserve the mutual interests of South Africa and the West—extending, of course to both strategic and economic aspects—is consistent. The key to the preservation of these interests is the retention of substantial military force in the region subservient to the designs of South Africa and its major Western trading partners—hence the Namibianization of the war by the creation of a force including Namibian conscripts, South African soldiers, mercenaries recruited from Western countries and the remnants of the UNITA and FNLA forces. It is significant that since these discussion moves have already been made for the “normalization” of US-SA military attaché relationships. Likewise, the other major point of discussion was SA-US nuclear collaboration, particularly important in light of continued on page 2
Secret Documents:
Reagan Leans Right, SWAPO Left Out

By Kevin Danaher

“The problem with Reagan is that all he knows about southern Africa is that he’s on the side of the whites.”

The words of a disgruntled Democrat? Or an African guerrilla leader perhaps? No. The above observation was made by one of Ronald Reagan’s own top Africa advisors during a pre-election interview. And judging from the contents of two sets of secret State Department documents leaked in late May, Reagan seems intent on turning his prejudices into policy.

One set of documents found their way to TransAfrica, a Washington-based Black lobby for Africa and the Caribbean. Included in the documents is a briefing paper on US/South Africa relations prepared by Assistant Secretary of State Chester Crocker for Secretary of State Alexander Haig’s May 14 meeting with South African Foreign Minister Roelof P. Botha in Washington. Also released was a summary of Crocker’s meeting with Botha and South African Defense Minister General Magnus Malan in Pretoria April 15-16, and a short paper detailing South Africa’s request for the resumption of enriched uranium deliveries from the United States. The Carter administration halted uranium shipments in 1977.

The secret memoranda stress the linked themes of movement toward an “internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia” preferably excluding SWAPO; efforts “to foreclose opportunities for growth of Soviet influence in southern Africa; and greater acceptance of South Africa within
the global framework of Western security.”

**Namibia-Angola Linkage**

A second secret document, a February 7, 1981 memo drafted by Crocker and Paul Wolfowitz, head of the State Department policy planning staff, was leaked to the *New York Times*, and excerpted in a June 1 front page story. This document lays out the Reagan administration’s strategy for obtaining a Namibia settlement and for dealing with the presence of Cuban troops in neighboring Angola.

On the question of Namibia, the paper makes a settlement in that country conditional on the removal of Cuban troops from Angola and the inclusion of South African-backed rebel Jonas Savimbi in the Angolan government. In a frank assessment of the likely African outrage at these demands, the document’s authors suggest that US officials lie about the linkage between a Namibian settlement and the demands on Angola: “We would insist that these are unrelated, but in fact they would be mutually reinforcing, parallel tracks of an overall strategy.”

The general tone of the documents is arrogant: “African leaders would have no basis for resisting the Namibia-Angola linkage once they are made to realize that they can only get a Namibia settlement through us.” They are also challenging US recognition of Angola “is out unless the Cubans leave and they [Angolan government] cut a deal with Savimbi . . . if they won’t play we have other options.” The leaked documents do not, however, go on to state what “other options” the administration is contemplating. But in light of Reagan’s stated willingness to rearm Savimbi’s guerrillas and the concerted effort made this spring to repeal the congressional ban on such aid, military options are clearly high on the list.

**South Africans Stubborn, Suspicious**

The detailed memo of Crocker’s April visit to South Africa provides numerous insights into official South African thinking. On Washington’s efforts to improve US/South African relations, Crocker found the South Africans “suspicious of any US stopped SAG [South African Government] in Angola in 1975”—a reference to the disastrous US-backed invasion of Angola by the South African army. “He [South African Foreign Minister Botha] argued that SAG went into Angola with USG support, then US voted to condemn in UN.” Botha and defense chief Malan agreed, let sanctions go on. South Africans would rearm Savimbi’s guerrillas and the concerted effort made this spring to repeal the congressional ban on such aid, military options are clearly high on the list.

Chester Crocker, Orchestrating US policy.

“doubted whether, given domestic pressure and views of such African states as Nigeria, US could continue any policy favorable to South Africa which would not provoke constant criticism.”

Against a domestic backdrop of growing unrest in South Africa’s overwhelmingly Black workforce, violent resistance in the Black townships, and the steady upsurge of guerrilla activity, Botha confidently predicted that “developed moderate Blacks will” . . . will engage with us in common effort against communism. When whites see Blacks as allies, whites will move away from discrimination. With more distribution of economic goods, more Blacks will join us.” Nevertheless, the South Africans cautioned against making success of P.W. Botha’s [reform] program a condition of US/South Africa relations.

But it was over the question of a Namibia settlement that the memos reveal the South Africans at their most belligerent: “[South African Defense Minister] Malan flatly declared that the SAG can’t accept prospects of a SWAPO victory which brings Soviet/Cuban forces to Walvis Bay [Namibia’s major port city]. This would result from any election which left SWAPO in a dominant position.” Since even South Africa now admits that SWAPO would win any reasonably free elections in Namibia, Malan’s statement amounts to rejection of an internationally acceptable settlement.

**South Africa: War Before SWAPO**

The South Africans also told Crocker that they preferred prolonged years of warfare in northern Namibia over any political settlement leading to a SWAPO government on the unlikely assumption that: “The longer it takes to solve the Namibia question, the less South African presence will be required there. We will reach a stage where internal forces [such as the recently created “Territorial Force”] in Namibia can militarily defeat SWAPO.”

Botha repeated South Africa’s familiar claim to be a victim of an international communist onslaught, and threatened to engulf the region in bloodshed if SWAPO came to power: “We’re convinced Moscow controls present government in Angola. We’re convinced SWAPO is Marxist. Namibia will nationalize the whole place and cause upheaval and civil war, involving South Africa. We will have to invade Namibia and other countries as well. SAG’s bottom line is no Moscow flag in Windhoek [Namibia’s capital]. If US agrees, let sanctions go on. South Africans survive sanctions.”

The South Africans were also worried about Savimbi, whom they considered friendly “buffer” for Namibia. Having supported him so far, it would damage SAG honor if Savimbi is harmed.” Crocker responded to this position by arguing that he saw “no prospect” for military victory for UNITA, but that Savimbi’s inclusion in the Angolan government could be achieved “by playing on divisions in MPLA.”

**US Position**

The “Soviet threat” is a major theme in all the leaked documents. In his Pretoria meeting with Botha and Malan, Crocker stressed that top US priority is to stop Soviet encroachment in Africa. A memo to Haig from Crocker advised the secretary of state to assure South African officials that “a Russian flag in Windhoek is unacceptable to us as it is to you.” In the same memo, Crocker denounced Pretoria’s tough talk as “partly bluster, partly an opening bargaining position with us.”

As Crocker’s memo to Haig reveals, the Reagan administration is trying to strike a deal with the South Africans, exchanging an acceptable Namibia settlement for an “end to South Africa’s polecat status in the world . . . and small but concrete steps toward political acceptance” such as the normalization of our military attaché relationship.”

Crocker urged Haig to tell Foreign Minister Botha that the US is “willing to
them to open a new chapter in our relationship," based on the shared perception that "the chief threat to the realization . . . of stability and cooperation in the region . . . is the presence and influence in the region of the Soviet Union and its allies."

The Reaganites do acknowledge the danger posed by Pretoria's regional aggression, but oppose it only on strategic grounds: "We cannot afford to give them [South African government] a blank check regionally . . . SAG intransigence and violent adventures will expand Soviet opportunities and reduce Western leverage in Africa."

Constructive Engagement

Central to the Reagan team's "constructive engagement" strategy is the ability to claim that Prime Minister Botha's government is seriously committed to internal reform. The documents reveal that during Crocker's meetings in Pretoria, he told the South African foreign minister: "US ability to develop full relations with SAG depends on success of Prime Minister Botha's [reform] program and extent to which it is seen as broadening SAG's domestic support." At another point Crocker instructs Haig to tell the South Africans: "We can cooperate with a society undergoing constructive change. Your government's explicit commitment in this direction will help us to work with you. You must help make this approach credible." But Crocker assured Foreign Minister Botha that "this is not a condition, but reflects US desire to support positive trends."

For Crocker, a "credible" appearance of change is enough. As the secret memo notes, "It is only the problem of Namibia which . . . is a primary obstacle to the development to a new relationship with South Africa." Once the white minority government agrees to an acceptable settlement, they would be returned "to a place within the regional framework of Western security interests."

The only snag the memo foresees is whether or not the South Africans "are in fact prepared to move to a settlement now." Crocker warned Haig that "we cannot allow the South Africans to be disingenuous with us over Namibia. If they have no intention of pulling out under circumstances reasonably acceptable to the international community at large, we will want to opt out of the negotiations process. . . . We need to know SAG's authoritative position."

"Bilateral Agenda"

But Haig apparently received no commitments from Botha in Washington. On June 10, Crocker returned to Pretoria for more talks on Namibia, accompanied this time by Deputy Secretary of State William Clark. They also toured Namibia, meeting with the South African-backed internal parties.

No details of these discussions have been released, but Crocker repeated his threat to "disengage" from the negotiations a week later, an indication that South Africa still prefers an internal solution.

This sequence of events may also suggest that the South Africans believe Washington is already committed to improving US/South Africa relations for ideological reasons, regardless of the outcome of the Namibia negotiations. At this point the South Africans appear confident that they can get everything the administration is prepared to offer them without making political concessions over Namibian independence or liberalization at home.

And they are probably right. On June 17, Crocker confirmed that the US would "draw a distinction of items on our bilateral agenda and our diplomacy on Namibia. Washington has already agreed to an increase in the number of military attaches exchanged with South Africa, and an increase in the number of South African consulates in the US. A South African request to train coast guard personnel in the

US is under consideration, as is a resumption of shipments of enriched uranium to South Africa's nuclear reactors, and a visit by a South African rugby team.

The administration has also authorized the sale of metal detection and medical supplies to the South African police, evidence that the administration is relaxing the international arms embargo against South Africa in the "gray area" - sales of non-lethal but militarily useful materials to the South African security forces.

Growing Opposition

But as Crocker learned in April, African leaders see the apartheid system, not the Soviets, as the major threat to peace in southern Africa. The memos note, "On Namibia Crocker found the front line states (Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe) rhetorically unyielding in their insistence that the only acceptable solution to the problem was the immediate implementation of an unchanged UNSCR 435 [the internationally accepted UN plan for Namibian independence] to be brought about by Western pressure on South Africa."

African opposition, fueled by release of the secret documents, reached a crescendo at the OAU conference in Nairobi in late June. All fifty member states condemned US "collusion with the South African racists." The resolution went on to castigate Reagan's "unholy alliance with Pretoria . . . and the misrepresentation of continued on page 31

"C'mon. We'll play ball with you, buddy"
UNITA—Looking at the Past

South African troops on Angolan border operations in 1978.

As the Reagan administration’s policy towards southern Africa begins to take shape, one theme that emerges from the shadows is renewed support for Jonas Savimbi and his National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA). Savimbi, Reagan and his advisors argue, “controls half of Angola.” And according to secret State Department documents leaked to the New York Times, the administration may now demand that the ruling Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) share power with Savimbi as a precondition for the US supporting Namibia’s independence.

The current US administration is also pushing strongly for the repeal of the US law known as the Clark Amendment, which bars covert military aid to Angola. Although administration staffers deny that repeal of the Clark Amendment will automatically imply renewed aid for Savimbi, they have left no doubt that if aid goes to anybody in Angola it will go to Savimbi.

Savimbi is not a new face on the Angolan scene, he has a long history in African political circles. Although he is now placed in the limelight by the US administration, it is likely that Washington would prefer some of that history to remain buried.

by William I. Robinson

Jonas Malheiro Savimbi was born in the central Angolan province of Bie in 1934. He went to Europe as a student in the late 1950s and it was there that his active involvement in politics began.

In the early 1960s Savimbi was persuaded to leave his studies and return to Africa to join Holden Roberto’s Union of the People of Angola (UPA), an organization which later became part of the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA). Both Roberto and Savimbi, however, were strong individuals and Savimbi’s alliance with Roberto and the FNLA proved to be short lived. At a June 1974 summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity Savimbi delivered a fiery denunciation of the FNLA leadership and resigned.

Following the split, Savimbi seemed to have dallied with the idea of joining the MPLA, who pressed him to do so. Savimbi, having grown up in the southern part of Angola among the Ovimbundu people, was able to draw some support from that area and this made him an attractive partner for any national liberation movement wishing to draw support from all parts of the country. But instead of joining the MPLA Savimbi announced in March 1966 the formation of an entirely new organization, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), with himself as president.

Savimbi’s supporters today are fond of saying that he fought the Portuguese colonialists, but it seems that these activities were confined to a few sporadic military operations against the Portuguese in the late 1960s.

Between 1966 and 1974, Savimbi organized a southern ethnic base for UNITA among the Ovimbundu people, playing on tribal rivalries and racial differences for support. UNITA never became a serious military force; however, and one CIA source quoted in the British Guardian described the movement as consisting of “twelve guys with knives before US backing turned it into a well-financed, heavily armed force.”

Distracting Sideshow

In 1969, a United Nations survey noted that “there has been no mention of UNITA in the Portuguese military bulletins since 1968.” Noted author Basil Davids records that by 1970, a year of important military victories for the MPLA, western European and OAU observers in eastern districts of Angola were unanimous in concluding that UNITA had become “little more than another distracting sideshow.”

In 1972, Savimbi wrote the new commander-in-chief of the Portuguese army in Angola to congratulate him on his appointment. “We will never entertain raising up arms against the authorities,” he wrote. “We use our arms so that one day we will force the MPLA to abandon the east.”

Several sources have revealed that Savimbi worked for the colonial army and HIDE (the secret police) from the early 1970s on. Although Savimbi has consistently denied these allegations, published writings of the former Portuguese dictator Marcelo Caetano and several of his generals reveal the colonial command offering a deal with Savimbi’s “movement” in which he would be left alone providing he turned what guns
he had against the MPLA (whom Savimbi consistently referred to as "the common enemy"). Savimbi eagerly accepted the offer. According to classified military documents released in 1974 by the new Lisbon regime and first published by the French magazine Afrique-Asie, Savimbi wrote the Portuguese army offering to provide UNITA guides to the MPLA operational zones.

With the end of the colonial war in 1974, Savimbi signed a separate ceasefire with the Portuguese and at once set out to woo the settlers, who saw him as their hope for a new neo-colonial order. Abandoning his earlier 'Maoist' rhetoric which had served to mystify the real nature of UNITA and mask his own virulent anti-communism, he declared that "the people of Angola are not ready for independence" (Le Monde, 7-8 June 1974).

At the same time, however, UNITA continued to try and forge alliances first with the FNLA and, on three occasions, with the MPLA. All of these efforts at reconciliation, including a brief agreement between all three groups in early 1975, failed as the movements both feared and mistrusted each other.

Full scale civil war broke out in Angola in early July 1975. Throughout this period, however, Savimbi continued to scramble for an ally. Several attempts were made to forge a cease fire between UNITA and the MPLA. All of these efforts at reconciliation, including a brief agreement between all three groups in early 1975, failed as the movements both feared and mistrusted each other.

Full scale civil war broke out in Angola in early July 1975. Throughout this period, however, Savimbi continued to scramble for an ally. Several attempts were made to forge a cease fire between UNITA and the MPLA. All of these efforts at reconciliation, including a brief agreement between all three groups in early 1975, failed as the movements both feared and mistrusted each other.

Full scale civil war broke out in Angola in early July 1975. Throughout this period, however, Savimbi continued to scramble for an ally. Several attempts were made to forge a cease fire between UNITA and the MPLA. All of these efforts at reconciliation, including a brief agreement between all three groups in early 1975, failed as the movements both feared and mistrusted each other.

Full scale civil war broke out in Angola in early July 1975. Throughout this period, however, Savimbi continued to scramble for an ally. Several attempts were made to forge a cease fire between UNITA and the MPLA. All of these efforts at reconciliation, including a brief agreement between all three groups in early 1975, failed as the movements both feared and mistrusted each other.

Full scale civil war broke out in Angola in early July 1975. Throughout this period, however, Savimbi continued to scramble for an ally. Several attempts were made to forge a cease fire between UNITA and the MPLA. All of these efforts at reconciliation, including a brief agreement between all three groups in early 1975, failed as the movements both feared and mistrusted each other.
Regular readers of Southern Africa know that the magazine rarely covers issues not directly related to the struggle for freedom in southern Africa. But some recent developments in Washington have forced us to make an exception. The Reagan administration, not content with its tilt towards South Africa and cutbacks in social services to the poor, is now taking a stab at civil liberties as well.

The conservative victory last year has led to the introduction of a host of repressive congressional bills designed to clamp down on constitutional rights in this country. Among them are bills, which if passed, will severely limit the ability of all journalists to report on the activities, abuses and misdeeds of US intelligence agencies. This specifically includes information already on the public record. The proposed legislation would seriously erode our readers' right to know the scope of their government's activities, and our ability to cover all the news.

For instance, under the proposed legislation, the article which appeared in the May/June issue identifying the CIA agents expelled from Mozambique might have been punishable by a $15,000 fine and possible jail sentences for our staff.

We feel those bills are of concern to all of us and have printed below a summary of the proposed legislation, prepared by the Center for Constitutional Rights, an organization which is actively opposing the bills.

**The Left Press Under Fire**

Congress is on the verge of passing the "Intelligence Identities Protection Act," a formidable new weapon in the government's repressive arsenal. A bill will be used to suppress criticism of The Central Intelligence Agency's interventions in the affairs of other countries.

The Act provides for criminal punishment of up to three years in prison and a $15,000 fine for any person or organization that discloses "information that identifies a covert agent." Under the Act, the writing, publication, and distribution of magazine articles criticizing, for example, CIA payments to King Hussein of Jordan or to Holden Roberto in Angola would be a crime. If one member of an organization discovered infiltration by FBI or CIA agents or informers, passing that information to another member of the organization would also be a crime.

The Act is carefully worded so that it can only be used against left-leaning political groups and individuals. To violate the Act, disclosure of an RI's identity must be made with the intent to "impair or impede the foreign intelligence activities of the United States." Therefore, information which disclosed an agent's identity in a story supporting the CIA's infamous Phoenix program of civilian executions in Vietnam would not be a crime, while that same information in an article aimed at stopping the program would be. Similarly, the Act would punish the public identification of a member of the FBI's foreign counterintelligence and counterterrorism sections (the sections generally being used against US-based international solidarity groups and Third World organizations), but not the identification of a member of the Bureau's organized crime branch. Hence, Southern Africa magazine would commit a crime in exposing a government agent who infiltrated its staff, while the Mafia would have no such problems.

Much of the public discussion around the bill has conveyed the impression that its effects will be much narrower than is actually the case. While it is true that a principle target of Congress in passing the bill is Covert Action Information Bulletin, the Act's field of fire is far broader than one magazine. For instance, the Act is not simply limited to stopping magazines from publishing names of agents. Rather, it prohibits disclosing "information that identifies an agent." The vagueness of this phrase leaves open the possibility that a publisher printing a story about a CIA operation could be held liable if the article aided someone with other information figuring out the names of CIA agents. This possibility may have a chilling effect on the willingness of many periodicals to publish critical discussions of US intelligence operations. In addition, the Act prohibits not only transmitting information derived from classified sources, but also knowledge gained from public sources, including books, magazines and word of mouth.

The Act covers activities of the CIA, the FBI, military intelligence, and all other government intelligence agencies. Although the bill states its role is to protect agents, it then proceeds to define "agent" in very broad terms. The definition includes former and present employees of an intelligence agency, paid and unpaid informants, and "sources of operational assistance." Such "sources" include people like King Hussein and Holden Roberto.

Added to the maximum sentence of three years imprisonment and a $15,000 fine for anyone who discloses such information there is a special ten year, $50,000 criminal penalty for former agents or anyone "having or having had authorized access to classified information." This severe penalty could be used to, in effect, make political prisoners of former agents such as Phil Agre, John Stockwell and others who have blown the whistle on illegal and improper CIA operations.

The Intelligence Identities Protection Act is but one part of the Administration's onslaught against civil rights. While both the Voting Rights Act and the Freedom of Information Act are under fire, conservatives are moving to strengthen the "anti-terrorism" squads of the FBI, squads which are increasingly being used to terrorize Black communities. And they have established a Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism to revive the witch-hunts of the McCarthy era. The government is also attempting to force California-based Guatemala solidarity newsletter and the Center for Cuban Studies in New York to register as foreign agents.

**continued on page 13**

Mr. Neufeld is an intern at the Center for Constitutional Rights, and has been actively involved in preparations for the legal challenge to the Intelligence Identities Act.
Zambia Expells CIA Agents

by Gloria Jacobs

Citing alleged CIA activities—particularly its search for "an alternative leadership in the country"—the Zambian government expelled two American diplomats from that country in June. Four other Americans—three diplomats and a businessman—were declared "persona non grata" and a Zambian Foreign Ministry official was arrested.

The official, Webster Kayi Lumbwe, confessed to working with the CIA since 1979 and was charged with supplying information to his CIA "controls" on weapons deployment, and on political visits of Eastern European government officials. In addition, the Zambian government alleges Lumbwe provided the CIA with profiles of important Zambian political and military leaders.

US Assistant Secretary of State William Clark has lodged a "strong protest" with the Zambian Ambassador to the U.S. over the expulsions of John David Finney, a political affairs first secretary at the American embassy in Lusaka and Michael Francis O'Brien, public affairs first secretary and director of the United States International Communications Agency in Lusaka.

Three other diplomats, who were not in the country at the time of the expulsions, were barred from re-entering Zambia. One of the three, Frederick Boyce Lundahl, was expelled from Mozambique in March on charges of being a CIA agent (see Southern Africa, May/June 1981). Prior to his posting in Mozambique, Lundahl worked at the US Embassy in Lusaka, allegedly as CIA station head. Also affected by the barring order were embassy officials Norman Smith and Robert Richard Simpson.

The charges of anti-government CIA activity in Zambia suggests that the Reagan Administration has moved far from earlier American support of Kaunda as the great liberal, the "enlightened" leader of Africa. The charges against Lumbwe and the CIA indicate they were considering cultivating some of the funding for the coup attempt came from a prominent Lusaka lawyer, Edward Shamwana, the government has also charged that South Africa was involved in the coup attempt.

According the the London-based magazine Africa Now, the South African danger is by no means exaggerated. A specific example of South African aggression was recently revealed by a peer in the British House of Lords.

Lord Hatch, back from a visit to Zambia, told the British Upper House that in late February South African planes had come close to bombing the Namibia Institute in Lusaka. The raid had been aborted when the planes were already heading toward their target and they jet-sisoned their bombs over Zambian or Zaire territory.

Some of Kaunda's and the nation's political woes stem partly from charges of corruption within the government and party, but the most serious problems arise from the restrictions placed on Zambia by the IMF in return for a $946 million loan, the largest ever to an African country. To receive the loan the government had to agree to tax increases and a reduction in subsidies to the agricultural sector. Price rises in basic foodstuffs are expected to cause serious dislocations among the population, which is already suffering from a depressed economy.

Nevertheless Africa News notes that so far: "In spite of growing discontent, President Kaunda has managed to keep the lid on unrest."

In an attempt to control economic development and diversify the economy away from its excessive dependence on copper, the government has recently announced that the two state-owned copper mines, Nchanga Consolidated Copper Mines (NCCM) and Roan Consolidated Mines (RCM) will be merged into one company. There is speculation that the merger will allow the government to plan the development of cobalt mining more effectively, while protecting its private partners—South African mining companies—from operating deficits such as those encountered in previous years.

Gloria Jacobs is a freelance writer and teacher living in New York and a former editor of Seven Days.
Legislators, Activists Meet

Julian Bond. US policy is shifting to the point where "mineral rights are exchanged for human rights."

Over 200 legislators, community activists and anti-apartheid organizers gathered in New York on June 12 and 13 to discuss tactics for ending the investment of state and local government funds in banks and corporations that do business in South Africa. Forty-two legislators from 22 states came together to discuss what has become an important new focus of the anti-apartheid movement in the US: divestment of state and local government funds from corporations involved in South Africa and reinvestment of those funds in local communities.

The conference, on "Public Investment and South Africa," was organized by a coalition of nine national anti-apartheid organizations that have been actively working to support government-level divestment efforts over the past year. According to conference organizers, state and local governments control a staggering $167 billion annually. Such a large sum of money, it is argued, would be better invested in local communities than in banks and corporations that do business with South Africa.

Four states, Nebraska, Michigan, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, have already adopted divestment legislation that restricts the investments of public funds in South Africa. By sitting these successful legislators down with other local elected government officials, conference organizers hoped to provide an impetus for further state and local government actions.

US Aid to Apartheid

The two-day conference began with a press conference at the United Nations, hosted by Nigeria's Ambassador Akporode Clark. Clark, who also chairs the UN Special Committee Against Apartheid, stressed the importance of foreign and particularly US investments in the South African economy which, he said, strengthened the military and industrial base of the white minority government.

William Dyson, a state representative from Connecticut, then described to the other legislators how he successfully steered a bill through the state legislature authorizing the state treasurer to divest the state of all holdings in corporations operating in South Africa that have refused to sign the Sullivan principles. The Sullivan principles are a voluntary code of conduct for US corporations doing business in South Africa. The principles, drawn up by the Reverend Lewis Sullivan, a member of GM's Board of Directors, urge corporations to implement a number of workplace reforms. Activists in South Africa and the US have criticized the principles as a moral smokescreen to continued U.S. investment in the white supremacist state. Dyson was one of many legislators at the conference who had sponsored a bill affecting state investment in South Africa and his description provided a model for divestment activists seeking legislative action.

Investment in Evil

"Our cause," said keynote speaker Julian Bond later that evening, "is to take whatever action we can to end American complicity with this international crime... In short we intend to end American investment in evil, in the system of apartheid." Bond, a well known civil rights activist and state senator from Georgia, called on the conference to "put..."
together legislators, trade unionists, and students in that growing constituency for freedom in South Africa." The Reagan administration's policies towards Black Africa have shifted from "benign neglect to a kind of malignant aggression," said Bond, where "mineral rights are exchanged for human rights."

The second day of the conference focused on specific strategies and tactics as conference participants described how most public funds, including tax revenues, are held in short term, high interest rate accounts that form an important source of liquid capital for bankers. Many of these funds are routinely placed with banks and other financial institutions that engage in a range of objectionable practices, from investing in South Africa to withholding mortgages from low income neighborhoods in their own cities.

Michigan state Representative Virgil Smith, whose bill prohibiting the deposit of state funds in banks that loan money to South Africa became law last year, emphasized that local governments had an obligation to ensure that public money is invested in ways that benefit the public.

The investment of public and private employee pension funds also received close scrutiny at the conference. According to investment specialist John Harrington, chairman of the California Governor's Public Investment Task Force, the combined value of these pension funds is in excess of $650 billion, and "is the largest single source of capital in the world," a source which controls twenty percent of all common stocks in the United States, and forty percent of the bond market.

Return Funds to the Community
Yet for all their size and earning potential, Harrington cited several studies of major pension funds whose rate of return over the twenty years since 1960 averaged only two to four percent, while more socially responsible investments, like federally guaranteed housing mortgages, returned an average of sixteen percent. Harrington, who has studied California's public investments for over a decade, told the conference that pension funds could be safely diverted from companies operating in South Africa, and returned to the local community in ways that actually increase investment income, create jobs, and improve living standards.

William Lucy, secretary treasurer of the American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees, and president of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists was the keynote speaker of Saturday's session. Lucy criticized what he termed the "cash register mentality" of many management-appointed pension fund trustees. But he cautioned the conferences to work closely with union and retirement groups when designing pension fund divestment strategy. The labor leader noted that organized labor had begun to look into ways to use their pension funds to reduce unemployment and improve living standards for their membership.

Evidence is accumulating that the Reagan administration wants to reverse the trend towards isolation of South Africa by the world community, even as the criminal apartheid regime is continuing to sabotage the United Nations-plan for Namibian independence, trying to destabilize the front line states, and intensifying its war against the people of Angola, Mozambique, and its own citizens. Alexander Haig says liberation equals "terrorism." We say a US "tilt" in favor of South Africa's state terrorism equals a threat to freedom, self-determination and world peace. Join members of the labor, church, academic, legal, civil rights, entertainment and sports communities at an historic meeting to combat US government policy and build strong support for the just struggles of the Southern African peoples.

For complete program and pre-registration form, write:
Carl Bloice, Conference Coordinator
Southern African Conference, UMCUN
777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017
(212) 661-0176.

Hon. Ronald V. Dellums, President of the Preparatory Committee
Lennox S. Hinds, Esq., Chair of the Preparatory Committee Secretariat • Carl Bloice, Conference Coordinator

In co-sponsorship with the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO)
In cooperation with the International Committee Against Apartheid, Racism and Colonialism in Southern Africa (ICSA).

Hosts: The Southern Africa Team/Outreach Ministry, Riverside Church; Dr. Carl Fields, Leader, and The Rev. George Thomas, Minister of Outreach, Riverside Church.

Paid advertisement
Tambo Meets Black Activists

"The purpose of our meeting is clear: to show that there is a substantial body of opinion in the United States, led by the Black community, which protests and opposes these developments in US policy towards southern Africa."

by Cheryl Danley

With these words, a historic conference on the future direction of the US anti-apartheid and liberation support movement opened at Howard University in Washington D.C. on June 8. The conference brought representatives from Black American organizations, church groups, government officials, trade unionists, and anti-apartheid activists together with Oliver Tambo, president of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), Moses Garoeb, administrative secretary of the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO) and representatives from SAC-TU, the South African Congress of Trade Unions.

The Washington meeting was significant in two respects. The first was the overwhelming sense of urgency in which the meeting took place, a sense of urgency brought about by the Reagan administration's sharp lurch towards South Africa. But equally important was the substantial participation by a wide spectrum of Black Americans, and the initiative of Black organizations in leading the opposition to Reagan's Africa policy.

The conference, co-sponsored by TransAfrica, a Washington-based Black lobby for Africa and the Caribbean, and the Southern Africa Support Project, a community support group also located in the nation's capital, was the first of a series of meetings held in New York, Atlanta and Detroit to coordinate and build public opposition to US ties with South Africa, and to encourage support for the African liberation movements, particularly in the Black community and the US labor movement.

"The struggle in southern Africa proceeds relentlessly," ANC President Oliver Tambo told the more than one hundred participants at the Washington meeting. Tambo also told the delegates that whether Washington liked it or not, the people of southern Africa were "determined as never before to destroy the criminal apartheid system of slavery and to liberate Namibia."

Tambo reminded delegates that their efforts to oppose apartheid were part of a global struggle against the racist state, pointing to the Paris conference in May that saw 122 governments endorse mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa.

SWAPO representative Moses Garoeb told the group that SWAPO rejected constitutional proposals for Namibia, that the liberation struggle in southern Africa would stop only when South Africa itself was free. Conference speakers wished to communicate to the world community the existence of domestic opposition to Reagan's policies—particularly resistance from Black Americans.

In discussions of how best to build a movement against US policy in Africa, unity was a key issue. Salimathu Diallo from the Organization of African Unity said she was happy to see the growing unity between Black people on this side of the Atlantic with people on the African continent.

Tambo, too, spoke of the common heritage of Black people. He observed that slaves were taken from Africa to North America at about the same time that whites arrived in southern Africa, "thus launching a common struggle, an umbilical cord between the Blacks in the US and the people of southern Africa."

"Tambo told the predominantly Black audience, "Not only are you our natural allies but you have invested us with your struggle." Liberty," he said, "is indivisible, if you destroy it anywhere, you destroy it everywhere."

Free Nelson Mandela

The Liberation Support Movement in California has produced, in conjunction with the United Nations, an 18 by 22 inch color poster to support the "Free Nelson Mandela" campaign. The reverse side of the poster includes information about liberation support activities.

Because of limited stocks, LSM, distributing the poster only in quantities of between 10 and 100. The posters are free but orders must include 15 cents for each poster. Write: LSM, P.O. Box 2077, Oakland, CA 94604, USA.
Rugby Tour Opposition Growing

Opponents of the upcoming US tour by South Africa's national rugby team, the Springboks, won a major victory in early August when New York City Mayor Edward Koch bowed to intense public pressure and barred the team from playing at a city stadium. The decision was a reversal on Koch's earlier claim that he would allow the Springboks to use the city's public stadium on Randall's Island, near Harlem.

Organizers of the broad-based and growing coalition formed to oppose the Springboks tour predict the South Africans will be met by some of largest anti-apartheid protests ever held in this country. Nearly 100 Black, civil rights, religious, anti-apartheid, political, and sporting groups have joined the Stop apartheid Rugby Tour (SART), which is demanding that the tour, scheduled for Chicago, Albany, and New York on September 19, 22, and 26, be cancelled.

South Africa views its participation in international sporting activities as a means of breaking out of its growing international isolation. But as more and more nations have responded to demands that they cut relations with the white supremacist state, anti-apartheid forces are making even greater efforts to end sporting contacts.

The Springboks' current tour of New Zealand has sparked such massive demonstrations and civil disobedience that they threaten to bring down the conservative government of Prime Minister Robert Muldoon. Thousands of New Zealanders clashed with police at demonstrations, and upwards of 100,000 marchers gathered to protest the government's decision not to halt the tour.

And, according to SART representative Richard Lapchick, SART plans to "mount the same determined opposition to the US tour." Demonstrations are planned at all three tour cities, and at least one national demonstration is also under discussion.

Announcing his reversal, Koch, undoubtedly aware of the uproar in New Zealand, and perhaps eager to save some political face in the upcoming mayoral elections, cited a report from the New York City police commissioner warning of a "strong possibility" of violent protests, and a $400,000 city security bill if the match went ahead. Koch's statement, which implied that SART protests were likely to spark violence, were strongly denied by SART Chairman William Booth.

Despite Koch's cancellation, and the planned protests, the tour's US sponsor, the Eastern Rugby Union announced that the tour will continue on schedule. ERU chairman Tom Selfridge told reporters "We have no intention of cancelling the tour," and that an alternative site was being sought for the New York City match.

With reports from The Guardian,
US Labor Leader Speaks Out

"The Reagan administration's positive support for a South African government that denies eighty percent of its citizens the most elemental human and economic rights is immoral and intolerable." With these words President Douglas Fraser of the United Automobile Workers opened a United Nations conference on transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia.

Trade unionists, prominent Black leaders and anti-apartheid activists gathered in Detroit in early June to discuss ways of raising public awareness in the US about the role of US corporations in support of apartheid.

Detroit was chosen as the site for the meeting because, like many other industrial cities in the US, Detroit faces a declining industrial base and rising unemployment. On the day of the conference the Detroit city council, meeting in the same building, was holding an emergency session to try and save the city from bankruptcy. Noting this crisis, Jesse Jackson, chairperson of the Chicago-based People United to Save Humanity (PUSH), pointed to the growing role of US auto companies in South Africa. As the auto industry closes down in Detroit, said Jackson, they are investing more money in apartheid South Africa; where low wages for Blacks guarantee high profit.

The conference was particularly aimed at involving the labor movement in organizing against apartheid. In addition to Douglas Fraser's speech, UAW Vice-President Mark Stepp gave a major address to the conference.

Stepp stressed the need to support the people of South Africa. He went on to castigate Reagan's lobbying efforts for repeal of the Clark Amendment and the administration's policy towards Namibia. Perhaps most interesting of all, however, was Stepp's view of the role that organized labor in the US—and the UAW in particular—has to play in opposing apartheid. We have reprinted excerpts from his speech on the second day of the conference below:

Apartheid is linked to our own existence by a complex web of corporate investments, trade and political considerations.

We in the labor movement know this well.

In 1971, Firestone closed its Fall River, Massachusetts tire plant. It laid off 770 US workers while employing more than three times that number of South Africans. Five years later, Goodyear laid off 300 workers in New Bedford, Massachusetts and went on to employ eight times more in South Africa.

Whatever reasons these companies may have given for their investment decisions, they clearly hinged on the availability in South Africa of an abundance of economically desperate, politically handcuffed Black and so-called "colored" workers. This highly exploitable labor pool was, and is, the crowning achievement of apartheid.

It is clear that South Africa has no intention of abandoning the racist policies that have made it the outlaw of the civilized world. Its brutal racism cannot be covered up by a few meager reforms or by the high priced consultants it has hired to prettify its image in North America.

Nor can its unyielding racism be wished away by Pretoria's good friend in the White House, who calls South Africa an "old ally" that has "stood by us in every war we fought" and is now, commendably, "trying to remove apartheid."

Does Mr. Reagan really believe that? If so, with Pretoria's oppression of Black and "colored" Africans as naked today as it ever was, he insults not just the decency but the intelligence of people everywhere.

Let me assure all of you here today that unlike our shortsighted politicians in Washington, most of us in the labor movement know it is sheer folly to prop up regimes that are at war with their own people.

My own union, the United Auto Workers, has taken several steps to expose and weaken the props for apartheid here in the United States.

Four years ago we adopted the position that we would not deposit funds in banks and financial institutions making loans to South Africa . . . .

At the time, we also urged the Carter Administration to end all Eximbank insurance, loan guarantees, and discount loans supporting trade with South Africa; to halt all forms of nuclear collaboration with South Africa; and to stop several other programs that encouraged US trade or investment in that country.

I am happy to say that some of these requests were honored.

Then, two years ago, we became the first union to win—in our contract negotiations with Chrysler—a mechanism to bar the investment of certain pension fund money in companies refusing to abide by the Sullivan Principles in South Africa.

This victory is now being consolidated. Under a new provision of our Chrysler contract, we won the right each year to inform our UAW-Chrysler Pension Fund Trustees not to make any new investments in up to five such companies. The trustees may refuse, but we strongly believe they will accept our recommendations.

Three months ago we notified thirteen large US corporations that they might be targeted for an investment cutoff unless they could show us that they were, indeed, following the Sullivan Principles. Some of their responses were adequate, others were not.

Today I am happy to report to you that we have given our UAW Chrysler Pension Fund Trustees a list of five US corporations we wish to be denied further investments from this fund.

These corporations are Allegheny Ludlum, Dresser Industries, Eaton Corporation, Newmont Mining, and US Steel.

Now, as I have said, this unusual development is rooted in the Sullivan Principles. I want to make two further remarks about them.

First, we hope that at the very least the Sullivan Principles will become the basis for similar and stronger pension fund investment cutoffs through our contact with many other companies.

Secondly, we are mindful that the time

continued on page 30
Report from the War Zone

The South African army in Namibia has tried to portray the war in northern Namibia as a minor military problem, simply a series of small sporadic skirmishes. But reports in the press and from people who have recently visited Namibia indicate a large scale conflict is going on in what the South Africans call the “operational zone.”

In February a member of the Toronto Committee for the Liberation of Southern Africa (TCLSAC) visited northern Namibia and Owambo, an area of Namibia that borders Angola and is the center of the expanding war for Namibia’s independence. We have reprinted here a report of this trip which first appeared in the April 1981 issue of TCLSAC Reports.

WINDHOEK—The operational zone, or war zone, is an area of northern Namibia known as Ovamboland. It is where half the Namibian population lives. Where most of the migrant workers come from, taking six month contracts year after year trying desperately to save some money and escape their grinding poverty. Where SWAPO claims to have semi-liberated areas in which they say they can move about freely under the protection of the local people who feed them and hide them. And where the South African defense forces who claim to be protecting the people from SWAPO can only move by helicopter or heavily armed vehicles harassing people, looking for SWAPO and killing civilians.

I slept over at Tsumeb and set off at 5:30 a.m. Thursday in order to get to the military checkpoint when it opened at 7:00 a.m. The operational zone is sealed off by the South African Defence Force from six p.m. to seven a.m. every night. Early in the morning they sweep the road to see if any land mines have been laid during the night.

When I arrived there were already some thirty huge trucks and some smaller traffic waiting to drive in. The trucks were carrying beer, live beef, sections of pipe for two kinds of pipelines, and a variety of other supplies for the many military bases and huge numbers of troops occupying the north of Namibia.

All Blacks had to get out of their vehicles, including the Black truck drivers, and have their I.D. checked at this checkpoint at Oshiveló. Whites simply give their name and destination to the soldiers on duty and drive through. As soon as I had entered Ovamboland, I saw what I was going to see for the rest of the day. The road, heavily tarred to prevent land mines, was absolutely full of South African military vehicles and personnel. My first sight was about ten “hippos,” the ugly armored vehicles used in Soweto outside of Johannesburg for clearing the streets of student demonstrators.

Every few miles along the side of the road there is an army camp. The one at Ondangwa is huge. It has large earthworks constructed all around it to hide what is going on inside. But I saw two helicopters landing there and the tail sections of several large aircraft sticking up beyond the earthwork walls. All this suggests that this is one of the bases from which South Africa launches its attacks against Angolan industrial and civilian targets with the excuse that they are chasing SWAPO guerrillas.

Army Bases At Every Town

There are army camps elsewhere in the country to be sure. The one at Okahandja, the first town north of Windhoek, had a crudely drawn portrait of Sam Nujoma, SWAPO’s president, with a boot on his head and something written in Afrikaans which I couldn’t read. There is in fact an army base in and around every Namibian town. There is also a massive road building project to allow army vehicles to bypass Windhoek.

There are prisons in every town as well. Prison extensions are being built almost everywhere. There is a concentration camp in southern Namibia, near Mariental, where prisoners of war captured during the raid on Cassinga in Angola have been held in...
The Namibian people are being protected to death by the South Africans.

Ovamboland

This being the rainy season, Ovamboland is a beautiful lush green, with palm trees everywhere, patches of millet growing, and wide open green spaces that almost look like golf courses. The landscape is dotted with fenced kraals encircling huts separated by cultivated fields. What could be a productive, peaceful agricultural environment is nothing of the kind.

At Ongwediva, six miles south of Oshakati on the main road, we detoured around a bridge which had been bombed by SWAPO and was taking more than two weeks to repair. At Oshakati itself, the administrative centre of Ovamboland, there had been a SWAPO rocket attack just a few nights ago.

The Oshakati Black township is totally surrounded by a high wire fence. There is a general curfew imposed by the South African occupying force and after six p.m. anything that moves can get shot. Including, just the other night, a ten-year-old boy who was chasing a donkey that had broken out of his kraal. The boy was shot and killed. Tall communication towers and watchtowers with machine guns dominate the skyline.

In Oshakati and on the main road the South African military is everywhere—armed, young, white South Africans. Increasingly, Namibian Blacks have also been recruited into what is called the Territorial Force, but are in fact regular South African units.

Since October 1980, there has been forced conscription of Namibian Blacks into the South African military. But not from Ovamboland or Kavango. Other blacks are to be used to fight against these people in the northern area.

At the north end of St. Mary’s compound, I saw the ten foot high barbed wire fence installed by the South Africans to mark the “no-go” area, about one kilometer this side of the Angolan border. There was a hole in the fence just where I happened to be looking at it. But I didn’t dare to stick my head through it. I had heard a story about someone standing at this spot and being shot at. And I had promised my sons I would be careful in this trip. The numerous vehicle tracks along the southern side of this fence indicated that it was often patrolled by South African armored vehicles.

Arrests Common

On our way to Odibo we stopped to talk to an old man who had recently been released from detention. He was walking back from the police station where he must report every week. He was walking because his car had been confiscated when he was detained and never returned. Clothing that had been given to him while he was inside was also confiscated.

The old man had been detained for twelve months, never brought to trial, and never charged with any offense. It had simply been rumored that he had transported SWAPO guerrillas in his car. He was asked if this was true when he was first arrested. He said no. They had no evidence against him, but they kept him inside for twelve months anyway.

These stories are commonplace in Namibia. In my one short week in Namibia I actually met and spoke with ten individuals who had similar stories of long detentions with solitary confinement only to be released with no charges ever brought against them. But the harassment doesn’t end there. Once released these people are burdened with a variety of restrictions on their freedom of movement, many have to be in their homes by eight p.m. each night and some must report each week to a police post.

SWAPO Mines Road

I visited the Lutheran church center at Ongwediva and learned that their printing press had just been blown up a second time by the South African military “protectors.” They obviously feel the need to be protected from the writings of Christian church workers. The military also objected to the bell on the church at St. Mary’s Mission at Odibo. They stole that about four weeks ago along with $60. But strangely enough, after Anglican church leaders complained of this latest theft, the army actually returned the bell tongue and reinstalled it. They even offered to repay the stolen $60.

SWAPO Mines Road

I had to drive along small, windy back roads to get to Odibo which is 31 miles northeast of Ongwediva right on the Angolan border. The main road used by the South African military is still dirt and often is mined by SWAPO. The smaller back roads are occasionally mined by the South Africans because they know this is how the local people get around and they want to blame SWAPO for local injuries. The people, however, often find these mines planted by the South Africans and gently place branches over them as a warning to drivers. We were following carefully in the tire tracks of the vehicles which had preceded us that day, but at one point we saw one of these clumps of branches and gave it a wide berth.

Arrests Common

On our way to Odibo we stopped to talk to an old man who had recently been released from detention. He was walking back from the police station where he must report every week. He was walking because his car had been confiscated when he was detained and never returned. Clothing that had been given to him while he was inside was also confiscated.

The old man had been detained for twelve months, never brought to trial, and never charged with any offense. It had simply been rumored that he had transported SWAPO guerrillas in his car. He was asked if this was true when he was first arrested. He said no. They had no evidence against him, but they kept him inside for twelve months anyway.

These stories are commonplace in Namibia. In my one short week in Namibia I actually met and spoke with ten individuals who had similar stories of long detentions with solitary confinement only to be released with no charges ever brought against them. But the harassment doesn’t end there. Once released these people are burdened with a variety of restrictions on their freedom of movement, many have to be in their homes by eight p.m. each night and some must report each week to a police post.

Saint Mary’s Mission at Odibo has been attacked several times by the South African army. I saw rocket holes in some of the buildings, bullet holes, radio wires torn down, windows smashed and just general vandalism. This Anglican Church center which used to be a thriving school and hospital, is blamed for starting the teaching of English in this area. This is seen by some South Africans as being the start of all the trouble in South West Africa. A courageous group of Anglican priests and deacons is just barely managing to keep St. Mary’s functioning, and they are under constant threat of attack.

At the north end of St. Mary’s compound, I saw the ten foot high barbed wire fence installed by the South Africans to mark the “no-go” area, about one kilometer this side of the Angolan border. There was a hole in the fence just where I happened to be looking at it. But I didn’t dare to stick my head through it. I had heard a story about someone standing at this spot and being shot at. And I had promised my sons I would be careful in this trip. The numerous vehicle tracks along the southern side of this fence indicated that it was often patrolled by South African armored vehicles.

But I didn’t see a single South African soldier on the back roads between Oshakati and Obido. I knew I saw SWAPO people or at least SWAPO supporters. This means that the SWAPO claim of having semiliberalized areas in the north is true. They can move freely here but the South African army can not. When the army moves it is backed by the most sophisticated military hardware; SWAPO is simply backed by the people.
Strike Wave Brings Crackdown

Boycotts are becoming an increasingly effective union weapon. Last year, strikers in Cape Town organized a largely successful boycott of red meat in the Black community.

In South Africa, the more things change, the more they stay the same. Despite the liberalized policies towards Black labor advocated by the Wiehahn Commission, the standard South African response to Black trade unionism is still to fire the workers, arrest the leadership, and dump the newly unemployed in barren bantustans. And according to leaked secret documents, the "liberal" government of P.W. Botha has added covert subversion to its strike-breaking arsenal as well.

In the latest government effort to stem the growth of trade union militancy in South Africa, close to the entire leadership of two of South Africa's most active Black unions was arrested in June of this year. The crackdown on labor leaders came at the same time that sweeping detentions of student leaders, political figures, and journalists were taking place throughout the country. The detentions came in the wake of popular protests organized to oppose the government's official celebrations of the Republic Day holiday, and protests organized to commemorate the Soweto uprisings of 1976.

On June 26, security police in East London arrested three top leaders of the South African Allied Workers Union (SAAWU), including the union's president Thozamile Gqweta. Earlier that month, police detained most of the leaders of the Port Elizabeth-based Motor Assemblers and Components Workers Union of South Africa (MACWUSA).

Nearly sixty SAAWU workers were arrested by Ciskeian police earlier this year during a strike at the SAAWU-organized Wilson-Rowntree factory in East London. The dispute is still at a stalemate, though close to 500 of the striking workers have been fired.

That these two unions have come under fire from the government comes as no surprise given their roles in a series of recent strikes in Port Elizabeth and East London. Both unions have refused to register under the government industrial council system, yet both have gained some measure of recognition as a result of their aggressive organizing.

Boycotts Used

Using a combination of grassroots organizing tactics and community support, SAAWU, which a year ago was a small, little-known union, has swelled its ranks to close to 75,000 members. MACWUSA has similarly expanded from its original base at Ford's Port Elizabeth plant to represent workers at a number of major automotive plants in that area.

The use of secondary boycotts on strike-breaking companies has also re-emerged as a union organizing tactic. Last year Black workers organized a largely successful boycott of red meat during a long strike of Cape Town meat workers and, in a convincing show of solidarity last May, South African automotive workers in Port Elizabeth boycotted Firestone rubber products in three Ford plants and a General Motors plant. When plant workers refused to handle Firestone tires, Ford's Cortina assembly line was brought to a standstill and the plant was forced to shut down. The dispute in involved over 1500 Firestone workers and brought into sharp focus union grievances with government efforts to impose legisla-
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tion controlling labor-management disputes.

Though management at first refused to negotiate and dismissed all the workers, it eventually agreed to refund the pensions. When the workers agreed to reapply for work, however, some of the places had already been filled with newly hired scabs. Workers who were not hired then appealed to their union, the Motor Assemblers and Components Workers Union, (MACWUSA) for help.

MACWUSA was formed in the beginning of 1980 when Black workers in Port Elizabeth broke with the existing union, the United Auto Workers, over strategy in the strike against Ford (see Southern Africa, February 1980). MACWUSA attempted to negotiate with Firestone over reinstatement, but management would not go further than to hold out the possibility of rehiring the 160 workers should new positions become available. Firestone's refusal to negotiate further finally sparked the boycott.

The Ford/GM/Firestone boycott remained in effect for two weeks and ended after a compromise had been reached on June 4. While not entirely successful, members of MACWUSA did manage to see 21 of the 160 workers rehired, those whom the union said had been fired because of their age. Efforts to obtain commitments by GM and Ford to hire some of the other workers failed. Fred Ferreira, Ford's industrial relations manager explained: "We have had discussion with MACWUSA and have stated that we are not going to get involved in a sympathy strike." Firestone still contends that it will rehire the remaining workers as jobs become available.

**Sigma Workers Strike**

Owned in part by Chrysler Motors and South Africa's mammoth Anglo-American corporation, Sigma Motors in Pretoria has been the scene of extensive strike activity in the last few months. Four thousand workers organized by the National Union of Motor Assembly and Rubber Workers of South Africa (NUMARWOSA) walked off their jobs demanding wage increases to $4.50 an hour, up from the current minimum of $1.56, along with company recognition of their union.

In negotiations with Sigma last year, the company had agreed to negotiate with union officials if NUMARWOSA could prove that over fifty percent of Sigma's workforce were union members. Though the union maintains that this was accomplished through the counting of stop-order vouchers (the method by which union dues are collected by payroll deductions), the company then refused to negotiate and fired the workers.

On the same day as the mass dismissals, one of the striking workers, 24 year old Paulos Mahlangu, was shot and killed by a white woman. The man was shot after workers, angry over the dismissals, began throwing rocks and stopping traffic. The woman was driving in her car and alarmed by the crowds, drew a gun from the vehicle's glove compartment, and killed Mahlangu. NUMARWOSA released a statement blaming Sigma for "helping to create a situation in which this tragic incident could occur."

Soon after the incident, Sigma workers ended their fourteen day strike based on an agreement which was expected to lead to full wage negotiations between Sigma and the union. Once rehiring was completed, however, eighteen out of the twenty members of the worker's committee had not been rehired along with over 200 other strikers.

Sigma management did eventually agree to pay raises of between 38 cents to 63 cents an hour, but this raise was rejected by many workers as too meager. In addition, the issue of victimized members of the worker's committee along with other dismissed participants in the strike has yet to be resolved.

Workers at two British Leyland plants in Cape Town also staged a strike recently demanding higher wages. But Leyland would not budge, and fired 1900 workers, who are also members of NUMARWOSA. The company has already replaced the fired workforce with 1500 new employees brought in from the bantustans, South Africa's desolate pools of reserve labor. Leyland workers were striking for pay increases of 35 cents an hour to bring the hourly minimum wage to $1.95.

The actions by the unions at Sigma and Leyland to gain higher wages reflect a growing movement by automotive workers to obtain uniform wage levels, on a par with raises won by Ford, General Motors and Volkswagen workers last year.

The South African Allied Workers Union in particular has not only had to deal with intransigent employers but has also had to contend with direct government harassment. The South African government has pressured companies whose workforces are being organized by SAAWU to help combat the union.

Secret documents leaked to a progressive journal put out by University of Witswatersrand students, *Work in Progress*, have revealed secret meetings between government and company officials that provide some insights into government efforts to destabilize SAAWU. According to the Johannesburg *Star*, at one of these meetings Minister of Manpower Fanie Botha called on business executives to resist SAAWU demands until the union could be curbed by new legislation. Botha described the situation as "a dangerous situation which could lead to a breakdown of law and order."
Apartheid Fest Sparks Protests

In late May South Africa's white minority regime was hit by the most wide-spread series of protests since the 1976 Soweto uprising. The regime responded to the demonstrations with heavily armed police, tear gas, dogs, and rhinoceros whips. But the government was unable to curb the demonstrators. Nor were government efforts able to prevent a string of successful acts of sabotage timed by the African National Congress to coincide with the popular protests.

Opposition began in the Black communities during the weeks preceding Republic Day—the official holiday on June 1 that marks South Africa's break with the British Commonwealth—and spread into pockets of white liberal opinion, particularly in the churches and universities.

The underground African National Congress issued thousands of leaflets calling for actions including a boycott of all festivities, a worker's strike, a student boycott of classes, and a boycott of public transportation from May 25 to 28.

These calls were paralleled in late May by a series of armed attacks on strategic targets, infuriating the government and wrecking its claims that the country was happily united in celebrating the founding of the apartheid Republic—the move which ended South Africa's membership in the British Commonwealth. Railway lines near the major cities of Durban and Port Elizabeth were blown up, as were power lines near Vrede in the Orange Free State; a police station was attacked in East London, and an army recruiting office blown up near the center of Durban. Despite massive security force searches, the ANC saboteurs appeared to make a safe escape.

Across the nation school children refused to participate in the celebrations, sometimes facing the threat of expulsion for their defiance. By June 1 the boycotts had been endorsed by ever significant organization claiming to represent or sympathize with Black aspiration in South Africa. Endorsers included: the Catholic, Methodist, and Anglican Churches, the Natal Indian Congress, the South African Institute of Race Relations, the South African Allied Workers Union, Chief Gatsha Buthelezi's Inkatha organization, the Azanian People's Organization, and the National Educators Union of South Africa.

Thousands of students at Black universities like those of Durban-Westville and the University of Fort Hare, defied university officials and were absent from classes. Similar actions convulsed the dominantly white "liberal" universities such as the University of Witswatersrand, where both white and Black students clashed violently with right-wing white students after a South African flag was burned at an anti-Republic Day rally on May 24. Following the orders of Minister of Police Louis le Grange to "act relentlessly" against similar incidents, riot police invaded Witswatersrand campus the next day with clubs and whips, arresting hundreds of students under the Riotous Assemblies Act. Both the Black Students Society and the Students Representative Council had called for a boycott of Republic Day.

Burning the South African flag became a symbol of opposition to Republic Day, and the established press reacted by calling for strong action against flag burners, and editorial demands for specific legislation outlawing flag burning. In perhaps the
strongest of the flag burning protests, eight
South African flags were burned in Soweto
on May 31 and fifty flags bearing the colors
of the ANC were raised in their place.

Detentions and Demonstrations
Just two days earlier the government had
detained Andrew Borange, the white presi-
dent of the National Union of South
African Students (NUSAS) and son of a
Parliament member for the opposition Pro-
gressive Federal Party. Borange was later
placed in detention under the General Law
Amendment Act which does not require
any charges to be filed against offenders.

Black high school students offered equal-
ly strong resistance to the celebration and
organized large scale boycotts of classes. In
Durban, more than 500 Indian school
children were expelled from high schools
after they responded to the ANC call with a
three-day walkout from classes. At the
Christiaan Botha high school for
“colored” students in Johannesburg, Aziz
Jardine, president of the Students Represen-
tative Council, was detained May 27 after
150 students held a hunger strike against
Republic Day activities. His detention led
over one thousand students from different
schools to organize a protest march June 3
in a township outside Johannesburg.

As the marchers approached Westbury
High school, however, riot police clad in
military uniforms charged the assembled
students. Many pupils, blindfolded or over-
come by tear gas, were beaten with baton
and rubber bullets. Others, trapped in a
crowded building trying to escape, tan
fumes and tear gas, were heard screaming
by witnesses two blocks away. At least
50 students were arrested on charges of
trespass.

Riot police used tear gas and rubber bullets against unarmed demonstrators.
At A Glance . . .

- According to a tobacco marketing board official, China bought more than $22 million worth of goods from Zimbabwe in February, overtaking South Africa as the country's largest export market.

- Landless peasants squatting on private farms will continue to be a problem in Zimbabwe until the government's resettlement program can provide more land for these families, predicted Robbie Mapavose, Secretary for Lands, Resettlement and Rural Development. His comments were made in mid-May after officials from his ministry persuaded 300 squatters to leave ranch land and in the Umvuma region.

- Zimbabwe will resist all threats, military or economic, from South Africa, stated Prime Minister Robert Mugabe in early June; but added that trade could still be an area "where relations can be harmonious." The statement was made in the wake of South African warnings against any offer by Mugabe of Zimbabwe facilities for ANC and PAC political offices, which the Prime Minister may provide as part of Zimbabwe's commitment to the OAU.

- In line with commitments made at last November's SADCC meeting, France and Portugal will provide over $52 million to Mozambique for construction and improvements on the eastern port of Nacala and the railway linking Nacala to Malawi. The completed route, tied in with a Malawi-Zambia railroad under progress, will lessen traffic on the Zimbabwean and lower Mozambican systems and reduce the need to transport freight through South Africa.

- United States efforts to by-pass UN Resolution 435 in its proposals for a Namibian settlement were criticized by SWAPO leader Sam Nujoma at the OAU meeting in Nairobi June 22. Nujoma called on the West, and the US, to support sanctions against South Africa or risk OAU action, such as an oil embargo by Nigeria, against themselves. The proposals, disclosed by the Washington-based group TransAfrica, envision a Namibian federal system with states based on ethnic groupings.

- Zimbabwe will spend $168 million in 1981 on projects aimed at lessening regional economic dependence on South Africa. According to documents released at a meeting of the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) in July, Zimbabwe will spend about $119 million on expanding the Salisbury airport, with the balance going towards twelve additional transportation and communications projects.

- On July 8, a Mozambican Mig 17 fighter plane was flown to South Africa by its pilot, who requested political asylum upon landing. Though the pilot, Lt. Adriano Francisco Bomba, told reporters he "didn't agree with Frelimo policy," some observers speculated Bomba's fight might be connected to the recent trial of four Mozambicans in Maputo for espionage, sabotage, and armed rebellion.

- In Windhoek during late July, nearly 1,000 Namibians protested a South African conscription law passed to force young Black Namibians into a 60,000 man "home army" to counter SWAPO guerrillas. The immediate cause of the demonstration was the detention of thirty young Namibians who had identified themselves as SWAPO members while undergoing basic military training. Since conscription began, many Namibian youths have fled into neighboring Angola to join the ranks of SWAPO guerrilla forces.

- The United States became South Africa's leading trade partner in 1980 with US exports up 74 percent to $2.7 billion, surpassing even the traditional leader, Great Britain. South African exports consisted primarily of base metals and minerals such as platinum, diamonds, gold, manganese and Krugerrand gold pieces. Imports were mainly capital intensive agricultural machinery, vehicles and airplanes. While boasting of a high developed industrial sector, South Africa remains dependent on Western and US imports for sophisticated technology and equipment.

- In a landslide victory, PF-ZAPU won all fifteen contested seats in a local election in Bulawayo June 9. The violence which disrupted earlier election dates in November and January was absent as ZANU and independent candidates acknowledged their defeat in the ZAPU stronghold.

- Markus Kateka, a Black Namibian farmhand sentenced to death by a white judge for allegedly assisting SWAPO guerrillas was reprieved when a South African appeals court commuted his sentence to seventeen years in prison. Kateka's death sentence, had stirred an international outcry, since even the South African prosecutors conceded that Kateka had committed no act of violence.

- An increasingly debilitating economic crunch in Zambia has resulted in the announcement of three new World Bank loans totaling $16.9 million to boost dairy production, small scale farming and the local fishing industry. West Germany and Canada have also agreed on loans amounting to another $70 million to be invested in road building, rural water supplies, grain storage and the promotion of small industries. Zambia's foreign exchange deficit, creating scarcities of imported raw materials, continues to wreak havoc on local industry. The situation has necessitated widespread layoffs and factory shutdowns, further contributing to the nation's worsening economy.

- Military spending in South Africa rose forty percent for 1981-82, increasing arms expenditures to $2.75 billion.

- At a conference arranged by Time Inc., three South African businessmen-including Mike Rosohl executive chairman of Barlow Rand—were among 22 executives who met with Ronald Reagan on June 22, following three days of off-the-record meetings with government officials in Washington.
Tales From Mozambique

The following selections were taken from Tales of Mozambique, published in 1980 by Young World Books, London, England. The book was designed and translated by Chaz Davies, Ruhi Hamid and Chris Searle.

Translator’s Preface

In Mozambique, a people’s culture—trod upon through centuries by colonialism, but which was always tenacious and unconquerable—has taken power. For the force of arms and wills which created the military and political power of Frelimo, has its roots in the people’s culture, in its very survival, continuity and determination to resist. Now, the cultural offensive being launched and dynamised by Frelimo—of which the publication of this book was a part—sweeping through city, village, home, school and workplace in Mozambique, is a continuation of that same energy, now being reinforced and vindicated instead of being condemned and repressed.

But a revolutionary culture does not seek to relive some fictional golden age in the past, or sentimentally evoke sad, lost or bygone times. It re-interprets those past events or stories in the context of the present, it takes the strength of the past and sharpens it for the contemporary struggle in a revolutionary epoch.

Certainly nothing could be less sentimental than the following tales from the people’s stock in Mozambique. Animals are personified but never softened or stupefied with wool. Men and women fight to feel themselves, preoccupied about impending starvation or their continued existence. They struggle with situations of nature making, their enemies’ making and their own making, situations often cruelly real that need wit, inventiveness and tenacity to overcome—those identical qualities which won the war of liberation in Mozambique and put the people in power. These are no fairy stories to lull us asleep or to give us sweet dreams. Even the elements of fantasy in the stories speak of nothing that is not as real as our own flesh and blood. Through fable, allegory, fantasy and domestic tale, the Mozambican story teller underlines his message—use your intelligence and initiative, adapt your resolution of difficulties to the actual and real situation you are faced with, don’t be waylaid by dreams, ambition, selfishness or vanity. At last, even the sharp but overreaching rabbit is learning this by the final stories—particularly when he tries to take on the collective force of the organised people.

The existence of the roots and trunk of a huge popular culture is giving to Mozambican children a massive base for their creativity. At school and at home the students write their poems and stories completely un-complicated by the embarrassment that the creative act still causes in societies whose cultures have been set aside and alienated. When they write they are continuing yet transforming with revolution, insight, humour and energy, the irresistible culture of their people. Two examples of the work of two of these young ‘continuadores’ of the revolution—work which is regularly published in national newspapers and journals—show how the people’s storyteller has moved into the mind and conviction of the Mozambican school student.

Tales of Mozambique. London: Young World Books (available from Liberation 313/5 Caledonian Rd., London N1 1DF) 1980. 74pp, ill. $4.00 plus p&h. Note: We know of no North American distributor for this publication.
The Tortoise and the Elephant

In times that are a long time gone, the Tortoise and the Elephant had an argument. Afterwards, the Elephant laughed and began to poke fun.

"Well Tortoise, you really have got short legs!"

The Tortoise answered him:

"I may have short legs, but I can still jump over you—even when you're standing up."

The Elephant didn't believe it.

"What! You must be joking. With those short legs and no height at all—how can you get over me, an elephant? No chance—you can't jump over me."

The Tortoise insisted. "That's what you think! But I can guarantee you that I'll make it."

"Never! You can't jump over me."

"But if I manage it—what will you give me?"

The Elephant replied, "Listen, if you do it, I'll pull out one of my tusks and give it to you."

Then as they were there together, the Tortoise had his idea. He went off to speak with another tortoise, his companion, and told him:

"Listen. I've just been speaking to the Elephant. Do you know what he said to me—'If you can jump over me, I'll give you a tusk.' Now, we can work together for something. You go and hide there, near to where I'm going to jump. Then afterwards we can get a lot of money for the tusk."

They decided to work together. The second tortoise would go in front and hide, and the other would arrive with the Elephant at the entrance of the village.

The Elephant and Tortoise both stood up, ready for the contest. The Tortoise said, "I'm going to jump!—and then hid himself in the bush. From the other side of the Elephant the second tortoise suddenly appeared from his hiding place and said, "Chito, chito, chito," which was the sound of someone falling to the ground.

Then the second tortoise asked:

"Well, did I or did I not jump over?"

The Elephant confessed, "I still don't understand this."

He stood up again. The first tortoise came out of his hiding place and cried out, "I'm going to jump!" At the other side of the Elephant the second one appeared. "Chito, chito, chito!" he said. The Elephant had to admit defeat:

"All right boy, the discussion's over," he said. He took hold of a tusk, pulled it out and gave it to the Tortoise.

Later, when other elephants began to arrive with missing tusks, they understood how the Tortoise had tricked them. But the tortoises always managed the trick because they worked together. So the Elephant had to learn to live without the tusk which he gave to the Tortoise!

The Peasant Rabbit

There was once a rabbit who could never get enough to eat. And it was true—that whenever he sneaked slyly into any machamba where cabbages and carrots were growing, there was always someone who told him to clear off.

"You peasants are a bad lot!" he would sob, running away. "If I had a machamba I wouldn't chase anyone away who was hungry!"

"Then why don't you become a peasant then?" said a Chirico, flying nearby, who was also hungry.

"Good idea mate!" exclaimed the Rabbit. "I'll start right now!"

So he grabbed a spade, a hoe and a rake, planted some cabbages and carrots, and watered and weeded them. And every morning he went to see if the plants were ready for picking.

Then, one day, who did he see in his machamba? The Chirico, his neighbour the Chicken and the Gazelle were eating the new shoots!

The Rabbit got very worked up at this—"Get out of there!" he shouted. The Chicken and the Gazelle at once moved back, but the Chirico, staring at him gave him a reminder:

"But you once told me that if you had a machamba you'd never chase anyone away who was hungry."

"That's true. But you lot have got no idea of all the work I put in to grow those things! Come on. Move off and get out of there!" And he made such an angry face that the poor Chirico was scared and stepped back too.

"Perhaps I could help you..." he suggested. "And we could sow again."

"I'll do the watering," said the Gazelle.

"And I could pull out the weeds," put in the Chicken.

"In that case," the Rabbit agreed, laughing all over his face, "I don't need to send away anyone who's hungry. The machamba becomes ours!"

And he sat down on the ground with his new friends. They ate with a hearty appetite, and they gained the strength to take up the hoe, spade and rake to begin to work!
For many reasons—moral and material—the U.S. cannot remain aloof from conflict in South Africa.
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has come to push beyond the Sullivan Principles. As outgoing president, Doug Fraser said here yesterday, we must greatly broaden the base of our campaign to deny pension and other monies to firms doing business in South Africa.

In conclusion, my friends, I believe no system as rotten as apartheid can ever be reformed, moderated, or softened sufficiently to make it a tolerable way of life. Every “improvement” put forward, or grudgingly accepted, by such a system tends inevitably to extend its control by subtler means.

We in the UAW know therefore, that the steps already taken by our union, by church, civil rights, and international groups, by the United Nations—and above all by the brave and decent people of South Africa—are only a prelude to the final confrontation that must come.

That confrontation will be decided mainly by the South African people themselves, but we must help in every way we can. Rather than relax our sanctions against Pretoria, we must strengthen them. When the proper coordination and effort can be achieved, we must move from an investment freeze to outright disinvestment, from a limited embargo on arms and trade to a total embargo. History shows these things are easier said than done, but they can and must be done in the interest of humanity.

Apartheid is doomed. And when it ends, I hope we can all meet again to celebrate its burial.

Republic Day

continued from page 24

In Port Elizabeth, following the suggestion of the Coloured Management Committee, a committee of the city council named three new streets in a move clearly timed to coincide with Soweto day. Nelson Mandela Street, Steve Biko Crescent, and Amandla Street were approved by the committee as names for streets in a new township called Bethelsdorp Extension 10.

The unprecedented scale and diversity of the Republic Day protests was a severe embarrassment for government officials intent on presenting an image of national unity to the world. As Dr. Motlana noted, “The most outstanding feature of this boycott has been the unanimity of the people outside the Afrikaner who are utterly and totally opposed to this sectional, divisive apartheid state, namely the Republic of South Africa.”

Even those Afrikaner who gave little attention to anti-Republic and Soweto demonstrations could not ignore the first-time shock of being publicly frisked and having bags inspected by police searching for ANC saboteurs and sympathizers during the height of guerrilla activities. The ANC itself had declared: “Slowly but surely we are mobilizing ourselves. We confront the enemy of all fronts. The ‘Republic Day’ celebration is just one of those fronts.”

The June events gave vivid evidence of the fact that across South Africa people are organizing themselves in factories, schools, and communities. Only the foolish among even the most ardent apartheid supporters could have gone to bed on June 1 dreaming about the next Republic Day celebrations in 1991.

S.V. □

UNITA
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these provinces.”

Isolated Rebels

Rather than a popular-based and organized guerrilla campaign, the picture that emerges today of UNITA in central Angola is one of small and isolated bands of rebels who are able to find cover in the mountains and bush while occasionally raiding an undefended village. One reporter who visited central Angola in September 1980 was able to write in the London Times that “such claims of widespread UNITA activity belong in the realm of fantasy. . . . I could find no sign that most of this area was anything other than under firm government control.”

Testimony of a Mercenary

Further insights into how UNITA operates were disclosed by Jose Ricardo Belmonto, a Black Angolan who deserted to MPLA forces from the South Africa Defense Force Battalion 32 in January 1980 (see Southern Africa, March-April 1981). A captain in the “Buffalo Battalion,” (composed of mercenaries and ex-FNLA members), Belmonto described “bailing out” actions in which his unit gave assistance to UNITA forces who radioed South African military security personnel for help. In addition, he explained, SADF soldiers “go and give instruction in UNITA bases and sometimes carry out operations with UNITA without the presence of Battalion 32 personnel.” In outlining relations between his unit and UNITA, Belmonto stated, “we had different spheres of action but were serving one and the same boss, who were both controlled by South Africa.”

The current Reagan Administration decided to repeal the Clark Amendment, which prohibits US aid to UNITA and other anti-government groups in Angola, underestimating the importance of Savimbi as a key pawn in the US drive to undermine the Angola revolution.

Their Man in Angola

The Administration reportedly met contact with Savimbi almost immediately after Reagan’s election, when he flew to California to meet with Reagan people last year. Since then, there have been a number of contacts between Savimbi and US officials, including a meeting with the acting Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Lannon Walker in Morocco, after Washington reportedly asked Savimbi to postpone a planned trip to the US.

Other reports have surfaced which indicate that despite the present congressional ban, Washington might already be aiding UNITA. A March 27, 1981 SWAPO communiqué from “a reliable US source” informed them that: “a delegation of US personnel met recently with General Haig to discuss US assistance to UNITA. Haig apparently gave an undertaking that the USA would assist UNITA, but wish to approach the matter cautiously... at present they [the US] have three or four people with UNITA in southern Angola assessing the situation in preparation for giving military assistance.”

But whatever the particulars may be, the US is once again moving to bolster Savimbi as their “man in Angola.” Washington may find, however, that it is banking on “a perennial loser,” to quote John Stockwell, former CIA station chief in southern Africa.

“Savimbi has no ideology,” he said, “he believes in nothing beyond his own selfish ambitions.” Stockwell concluded by advising the US government to avoid “seeking new bloody involvement with the likes of Savimbi.”

Subscribe to Southern Africa
Randall Robinson, TransAfrica’s executive director and the person responsible for releasing the documents, told Southern Africa, “These documents prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Reagan administration is clearly against Black interests in Africa.” Robinson termed the documents a “tar baby two,” equal in significance to the release of National Security Memorandum 39. NSSM 39, the so-called Tar Baby Option released in 1974, which was a secret US policy memorandum that revealed the underlying racism that marked US policy towards southern Africa in the Nixon and Ford administrations. Robinson pointed to growing Afro-American opposition to US support for South Africa, saying the criticism reflected Reagan’s “anti-Black, anti-poor” policies at home.

The furor has already caused the administration to back off from some of the positions revealed by the secret memos. Crocker retracted his threat to withdraw from the Namibia talks after the leaks, and State Department spokespersons are saying that the documents “no longer” represent official thinking.

The State Department has never denied the authenticity of the documents, but instead labelled the leaks “contemptible and reprehensible” and ordered an investigation to find the culprit.

Alexander Haig put it nicely when he toasted the visiting Botha over lunch. “Let this be the new beginning of mutual trust and confidence between the United States and South Africa... old friends who are getting together again. May we now drink to friendship and cooperation between the United States and South Africa.” And the old friends drank.

Legislators

Workshops on the role of US investments in South Africa and how to organize legislative support for alternative investment programs rounded out the conference and was followed by a brief closing session.

At the closing session participants pledged “to see to it that the use of public funds for investment in banks and companies in South Africa is ended, and such funds be reinvested in socially responsible ways.”

In interviews after the conference ended, legislators stressed the usefulness of communications. “It is good to know what types of legislation other states are using to address this problem,” said Alan Price, state representative from Beaumont, Texas. Alan Spier, state senator from Minnesota, urged the conference to form a continuing committee that lawmakers could consult when confronted with the need for additional information.

Interview

It is clear the the primary domestic targets of this revamped repression are oppressed peoples and international solidarity groups. Congressional anger toward Covert Action Information Bulletin, which manifests itself in the Intelligence Identities Protection Act, stems from CAIB’s material support for sovereignty of Third World nations in the face of CIA efforts to destabilize their economies, assassinate their leaders, and buy off their politicians.

There has already been much criticism of the Intelligence Identities Protection Act from legal scholars and civil liberties groups because of the Act’s broadside attack on First Amendment rights. But there must also be greater public awareness that the ultimate target of the new legislation is not just a publication or an individual, but a fundamental assault on the people’s right to know—and judge—the actions of their government.

SWAPO

South Africa’s growing nuclear military capacity.

These documents are an indication of the huge rift between the interests of South Africa and its Western allies and those of the people of Namibia and the African continent. SWAPO’s desire for the speedy attainment of peace and democracy in Namibia led us to accept Resolution 435 (1978). This resolution had been universally accepted by South Africa, the Western five, SWAPO, the African states and the entire international community as the most effective means to a peaceful solution. It should however be noted that the UN plan was extremely accomodating to the South African regime, going so far as to provide for the regime’s actually running the elections. SWAPO has thus made maximum concessions in the interests of an early end to the Namibian conflict. We therefore reject the attempts of the South African regime and its Western allies, particularly the US, to subvert the United Nations plan, thereby condemning the people of Namibia to a protracted and bloody struggle.

Strikes

the meeting as a forerunner to other meetings planned to rally most major businesses in the East London area against SAWU.

Drafted jointly by the Department of Manpower Utilization, the security police, and the Department of Cooperation and Development the documents outline ways “to break the power of SAWU and unregistered [Black] unions.” The documents—dated September 11, 1980—maintain that urgent action is needed in order “to act as a millstone around the neck of SAWU to prevent the acceleration of the successes” of unregistered unions.

Other strategies designed to weaken unregistered Black trade unions include the compelling of names of potential strike-breakers so that companies can rapidly replace striking workers; further encouragement of the white conservative Trade Union Council of South Africa (TUCSA) and efforts to promote recruiting and organizing of new members of its parallel Black unions; and the enactment of legislation that would outlaw general workers unions such as SAWU, so that unions may represent only one trade or industry.
SOUTH AFRICA'S POPULOUS and heavily industrialized Transvaal province is facing a severe power shortage as a result of pro and anti-apartheid guerrilla actions in two countries.

In April, anti-government Mozambican guerrillas (MNR), who are financed and armed by South Africa, struck power lines carrying electricity from Mozambique's Cabora Bassa hydro-electric complex into South Africa. The attack reduced South Africa's total power supply by ten percent.

The cut-off, coming during the peak use winter season, dropped the South African electricity supply Commission's reserve capacity well below minimum levels.

Then, on the night of July 21, African National Congress guerrillas struck two major power stations in the Transvaal region, destroying three transformers at the Arnot power station, and two transformers and five coupling stations at the Camden power plant near Ermelo, plunging that city into darkness.

The resulting loss in generating capacity, combined with the cut-off of Mozambican power and normal maintenance shut-downs at other plants, has produced an "electricity supply nightmare," for the South Africans, according to the authoritative South African weekly Financial Mail. As a result, the entire country has been experiencing power cuts and temporary blackouts.

Johannesburg, South Africa's largest city, was one of the hardest hit areas. Africa News reports that the city has had to cut back power supplies to its largest industrial consumers, leading to reductions in industrial production. The city has also begun generating power from expensive and inefficient diesel burning generators.

The Mozambican government receives only a fraction of the revenues coming from the sale of Cabora Bassa power to South Africa, and since the power was cut, it has linked the resumption of power exports to South Africa to the ending of Pretoria's support for the MNR guerrillas. Mozambique promised to repair the downed power lines as soon as the managing company "is satisfied the area is safe for their technicians." But the Mozambican statement went on to say "Full security for 900 kilometers of power line is only possible when South Africa stops supporting anti-government rebels."

Despite the twenty-year-old United Nations arms embargo, the South African navy has managed to add a number of sophisticated new ships to its aging fleet and, in the process, make some important strategic changes in the navy's role. According to the South African Financial Mail, in recent years the Navy has placed less emphasis on developing (or replacing) escort type—or defensive—ships and has begun to purchase lighter, more mobile, quick strike patrol boats. These boats, it now appears, come complete with a wide range of foreign—including US—ammunitions.

The latest addition to the fleet is the navy's 430-ton fast missile craft. Six out of a proposed total of twelve vessels have been delivered so far. This ship, known as the Reshef, was designed in Israel and while three of the original six were also built...
there, the other three were built in Durban. The ships are equipped with some of the latest American radar jamming and decoy systems and are armed with Israeli Gabriel surface-to-surface missiles (the South African version of which is called the Scorpion). Other equipment of international origin on board these ships are two three-inch guns of Italian design (with shells on board these ships are two three-inch guns of Italian design (with shells contained a serious editing error.

Africans have become less preoccupied with responsibility they gained as part of a mine warfare vessels, and 25 reconnaissance planes, according to the Financial Mail.

Before the UN arms embargo the navy had been predominately oriented towards protecting shipping in the Cape Sea route, a responsibility they gained as part of a mutual defense pact with Britain. Since the arms embargo, however, the South Africans have become less preoccupied with protecting ships going around the cape—only a very small portion of which are South African—and more concerned with enhancing its ability to make quick offensive strikes, for instance on neighboring front line states. This switch, according to the Financial Mail, is clearly indicated by the push to acquire naval strike craft and the navy’s newly-announced marine detachment.

**ZIMBABWE’S PRIME MINISTER**

Robert Mugabe announced on August 8 that a former white Rhodesian army officer, General Alexander Maclean, will head the new Zimbabwean army, now composed of retrained former guerrillas, and selected former Rhodesian army troops.

The former Rhodesian general fills the post vacated by his old commander, Lt. Gen. Peter Walls. Walls, who led the Rhodesian army during the war and became commander of the integrated national army after independence, was fired by Mugabe last year for criticism of the new government. Maclean’s appointment was seen by some observers as a continuation of Mugabe’s efforts to reassure Zimbabwe’s remaining white population.

Balancing Maclean’s leadership, Lt. Gen. Rex Nhongo, former head of Mugabe’s ZANLA guerrilla force, was named army commander; Lt. Gen. Lookout Masuku, past leader of Joshua Nkomo’s ZIPRA guerrillas will be his second-in-command. In addition, the government replaced eight out of ten white battalion commanders with Black officers.

Rearrangement of the command structure follows the successful disarming of guerrilla assembly points earlier this year. Priorities of the military will now be integration of the fewer than 10,000 guerrillas remaining in assembly points; reduction of the army from 65,000 to a strength of 35,000; and establishment of a defense headquarters.

In another military development, a contingent of North Korean military instructors arrived in Salisbury on August 8 to train the Zimbabwean army in the use and maintenance of some recently acquired Korean tanks and armored cars. North Korea was an important arms supplier to Mugabe’s ZANLA forces during the war for independence and the new government reaffirmed these close ties when Mugabe made his first official visit as prime minister to the Korean capital of Pyongyang last October.

Nevertheless, South Africa and the Western powers, particularly the United States, are said to be unhappy about the presence of Korean personnel. Until now, all military training had been carried out by Britain, the former colonial power.

When reached for comment, one state department official in Washington would only say the situation was being closely monitored.

Zimbabwe’s agricultural policies are paying off as both the nation’s economy and its peasant farmers reported a successful end to the 1980-1981 growing season. Maize production hit a record level of over two million tons, resulting in contracts worth $40 million for maize exports to neighboring countries. At the same time, the country’s Agricultural Finance Corporation indicated that small-scale peasant farmers—whose welfare is a major concern to the government—were having little difficulty paying off earlier loans used toward seed and crop expenses.

The government’s Grain Marketing Board expects to export 277,850 tons of maize this year to neighboring Malawi, Zambia, Mozambique, and Zaire. Previously the four nations had imported maize, a staple food for most people in the region, from South Africa.

In anticipation of the huge volume of grain to be collected and stored, the Marketing Board has coordinated rail and road transport and set up forty depots around the country to deliver and deposit the harvest before seasonal rains begin.

The size of this year’s harvest appears to vindicate Prime Minister Mugabe’s controversial decision to preserve and aid large-scale commercial farming by whites who remained in Zimbabwe after independence.

The Agricultural Finance Corporation’s loan report was equally good news. The corporation is one facet of the government’s efforts to create new social programs and extend technical and financial resources to the rural African population, who were largely abused and neglected under the white Rhodesian regime. The loans, which will total $18 million spread among 35,000 small-scale farmers this year, have helped peasants produce harvests that are large enough to provide for their families’ needs and repay the loan as well.

Though the crop and loan announcements were welcomed by the government, several cabinet members strongly contested a warning on exorbitant food subsidies by Enos Nkala, Minister of Finance. The nation will face a bill of $171 million for food subsidies next year, asserted Nkala, adding to the deficit that already forces the government to borrow one-third of what it spends. The solution lies in "progressively reducing" the subsidies which, he said, benefit the worker minority but not the peasant majority.

**Correction**

The article entitled “Front Line Focus” in the May-June issue of Southern Africa contained a serious editing error. Paragraph seven of that article reads: “The release of the nationalists was more a product of negotiations between Kaunda and South African Prime Minister Vorster than of front line state policy as a whole.”

The author of that article has pointed out that while Kenneth Kaunda initiated the talks it is not at all clear that the release of the nationalists would have occurred without the support of Tanzania and Frelimo. Thus the release of the nationalists was a product of negotiations undertaken by all the front line states.
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