

JANUARY 1990



SECHABABA

official organ of the african national congress south africa

ANDREW MLANGENI LAUNCHES THE CAMPAIGN TO DEFEND NEW NATION



HANDS OFF NEW NATION!

JANUARY 1990
SECHABA

ISSN:0037-0509

Volume 24 No 1

CONTENTS:

EDITORIAL

..... 1

STATEMENT

ANC on Namibian elections 2

OBSERVATIONS ON CDF 4

PARIS CONFERENCE 6

SOUTH AFRICAN STATE TERRORISM

By Sizwe Msibi 8

ANC INTERNATIONAL

United States—United Kingdom—Japan—Netherlands 13

POLITICAL TRIALS STILL CONTINUE

By Mark Guthrie 18

OUR APPROACH TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

By Mervyn Bennun 20

HINTSA THE GREAT

By Ralph Mzamo 23

LETTER TO THE EDITOR 26

BOOK REVIEWS

The Southern Africa Holocaust 28

Disinformation in Europe 30

Financial Links Report 31

Graphic design by Hylton Alcock and Khwezi Kadalie

LISTEN TO RADIO FREEDOM

**Voice of the African National Congress
And Umkhonto We Sizwe, the People's Army**

Radio Lusaka

Daily 7.00 pm:
Wednesday 10.15-10.45 pm:
Thursday 9.30-10.00 pm:
Friday 10.15-10.45 pm:
Short wave 31mb 9505 KHz
Sunday 8.00-8.45 am:
Short wave 25mb 11880 KHz

Radio Luanda

Monday-Saturday 7.30 pm:
Sunday 8.30 pm:
Short wave 31mb 9535 KHz
and 25 mb

Radio Madagascar

Monday-Saturday 7.00-9.00 pm:
Sunday 7.00-8.00 pm:
Short wave 49mb 6135 KHz

Radio Ethiopia

Daily, 9.30-10.00 pm:
Short wave 31mb 9595 KHz

Radio Tanzania

Monday Wednesday Friday 8.15 pm:
Tuesday Thursday Saturday 6.15 am:
Short wave 31mb 9750 KHz

The above are South African times

DE KLERK BRUISED BUT NOT INJURED

De Klerk and his regime have been making some "cosmetic changes" which have led some people to think De Klerk is the most "radical reformer" that has ruled South Africa since 1948. All this would not have worried us had it not been for the fact that even some of our genuine friends and allies have started to believe that De Klerk is sincere about these "reforms."

What is happening in South Africa today is a result of our sacrifices and our blood which — as our hero and martyr Solomon Mahlangu said — nourishes the tree of freedom. This was during the Soweto Uprising. Commenting about the militancy and courage of our youth in the face of police and army brutality, Comrade Alfred Nzo, ANC Secretary-General said that South Africa could never be the same again after the events of June 16th 1976. These were prophetic words. Indeed since then South Africa has never been the same again. The eighties — despite the Nkomati Accord and as a reaction to the tricameral elections — saw an escalation of the struggle.

Since then — despite the State of Emergency — the people have been organising, mobilising, attacking and re-grouping.

They have been re-grouping because of repression — repression provoked violence and violence provoked more repression. This state of affairs led to a stalemate — Botha had to go and De Klerk began to make superficial changes.

What we are saying is that De Klerk's "reforms" are no sign of a change of heart but a reaction to a changing mood of the people. The people are determining the pace of changes. It should be stated that the people are not interested in swimming from the same beaches as the Whites — they want a vote and the dismantling of apartheid.

The White community in our country has its role to play in this process. It has become clear

from the last elections and the rumblings from every sector of the White community — business people, academics, sports people and so on — that they are not in agreement with the regime on a host of issues. Yet they take no visible action against it. There is undeniable proof that the regime has been involved in a lot of misuse of public funds and yet it continues to feel safe from the White community that voted it into power.

The comfort that De Klerk enjoys because of his public posture as a "reformer" is enhanced by his knowledge that he need not fear a massive movement from the White electorate demanding democratic change in South Africa. There is a fear of democracy among a large section of the White population. This fear of democratic majority rule blinds them even on issues which directly affect them.

What we need to do now is to expose De Klerk for what he is. He is a man who has been forced out of a particular line of defence into another, and in this position of retreat, he has to posture as a man of strength and resolution. He is bruised but we must really injure him.

Prospects for peace in our country and the region are nil as long as the De Klerk regime continues to be in power in our country. White youth who may rejoice at the reduction of the term of conscription are still stuck with compulsory conscription. The military and police budgets are higher than ever before which means that De Klerk still plans to wage war on the South African people and our neighbours as his predecessors did.

The way forward is one — **STRUGGLE**. The majority of South Africans are already forcing changes in South Africa. What is needed from the White community is the fore-sight to realise that apartheid has no place in this changing world. **It must go!**

ANC STATEMENT

MESSAGE TO SWAPO ON THE OCCASION OF THE ELECTIONS

After more than one hundred years of colonial misrule, the people of Namibia stand poised on the threshold of freedom. Colonial domination, imposed upon Namibia by the decision of the imperialist powers at Berlin in 1884, survived this long because of the policies of a handful of states, who did all in their power to delay the arrival of this day.

The dawn of Namibian independence is owed, in the first instance, to the selfless struggles of the Namibian people themselves. Indeed it was their undaunted courage that earned them the solidarity and support of the international community.

Virtually from the day of its initial session, the United Nations Organisation has been seized with the Namibian question. For years, until the mid-1960s, the leading Western powers deliberately stood in the way of serious discussion of this issue, of vital importance to the peoples of Africa in general and those of Namibia in particular. It was the intransigence of the racist regime, supported as it was by the leading Western powers, that reluctantly compelled the Namibian people to take up arms — to take the

solemn decision that they must return to the battlefield, where they had originally lost their freedom, in order to reclaim it.

As we cast our minds back, we recount and recall the names of the great men and women who stood firm, often against terrifying odds, in defence of their country and its people in order to build the Namibian nation. In centuries to come, long after the names of the colonialist administrators have been swallowed up by the mists of infamy, the names of these great fighters will live on in the annals of humankind. The names of Hendrik Witbooi, Hosea Kutako and other Namibian patriots are inscribed for eternity in that roll of honour. So too will be the names of the heroes of this hour — the leadership and cadres of SWAPO.

In 1966, when the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, resolved to wage armed struggle, there were those who said it was the action of desperate persons who would soon regret their 'rash' decision. There were yet others who counselled patience and moderation. A small minority thought it wiser to accommodate the aggressor and collaborate with him. There could be no clearer vindication of the wisdom of the decision to take up arms than this day.

After 23 years, during which the cream of Namibian humanity suffered the deprivations of imprisonment, banishment and exile, SWAPO, under the able leadership of Comrade President Sam Nujoma, has stood firm on principle and refused to trade the people's birthright for a handful of silver and the plums of public office under the colonial regime.

Namibian independence, so eagerly awaited by all, has been obtained at the price of great sacrifices. It is fitting on this day that we remember the hundreds who perished in the wars



Comrade President Sam Nujoma

of resistance against German colonialism, the scores massacred in every quarter of Namibia during the decades of South African occupation, the thousands who have been imprisoned, tortured, maimed and executed, the hundreds mercilessly butchered at Kassinga, and the fighters of the People's Liberation Army of Namibia — PLAN — who gave their lives on the battlefield to make this day a reality.

A special word of tribute is owed also to the peoples and governments of Southern Africa, who, despite every blandishment and intense military pressure, have stood shoulder to shoulder with the Namibian people through the bitter years of armed conflict. We salute in particular the people of Angola, whose blood has been shed in defence of their own country, and to secure the freedom of a sister nation.

Especially on this day, as we celebrate a victory, we dip our revolutionary banners in silent homage to their memory, firm in the knowledge that their sacrifice was not in vain. We remain unshakable in our belief that the new Namibia that shall rise from the ashes of racist occupation will be a monument worthy of their courage and dedication.

Our joy is, however, tempered by the overwhelming need for vigilance. The provocation staged only this past week by Roelof 'Pik' Botha is a clear warning that the enemies of our freedom still harbour hopes of turning back the tide of African progress. Unity must remain the watchword until the gains you will score today have been consolidated in a democratic constitution for Namibia — unity of all the forces of national independence and freedom, unity of all

patriots under the banner of SWAPO, the movement created by the Namibian people to wrest freedom from the clutches of the racists and their allies.

On this propitious day, the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress, speaking on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of militants of our movement, on behalf of our leaders and cadres in the prisons of apartheid, in the name of the fighting ranks of our people's army and underground, indeed, on behalf of all South African democrats and patriots, expresses our fraternal solidarity with the Namibian people and their National Liberation Movement, SWAPO.

As you embark on this final leg of your long and arduous march down the high road of freedom, we reiterate that you may rely on the bedrock of friendship and solidarity that has bound our two peoples during these decades of struggle. The historic reverse suffered by our common enemy in Namibia is a portent of the defeats that await him in South Africa itself. Namibia's victory today heralds the victory of our people tomorrow.

Long live the unity of the Namibian people!

Long live SWAPO of Namibia!

Long live the fighting spirit of PLAN!

The struggle continues! Victory is certain!

ANC National Executive Committee

Lusaka, Zambia

November 7th 1989



IMMEDIATE REFLECTIONS AND OBSERVATIONS ON THE CDF

From a SECHABA correspondent

The excitement and sense of achievement that grips all committed patriots and democrats when they view the results of the Conference for a Democratic Future (CDF) must be the same that coursed through the veins of those who participated in the Congress of the People and later in the All-in Africa Convention in 1961.

The very act of convening a conference of such importance and challenge to the apartheid system constitutes a victory in itself. It testifies to the immense organisational skills the oppressed people of South Africa have developed under a system that has never allowed them to organise freely and, in this case, under the conditions of a State of Emergency. Again, the very fact that the organisers did not move rashly on to convene it when conditions did not allow it last year and in October this year, reflects on the political maturity they have attained in the last few years of intense struggles.

December 9 will go down in the history of our struggle as one of its greatest moments. It can only adequately be described as a day of unity, a day of action in unity and unity in action. The attendance — 4 600 delegates representing about 2140 organisations — about 15 million people — attests to the popularity of the conference. But it was the amount of co-operation from organisations which in the past have sometimes, if not often, taken opposing positions, that underpins the unity that the convening and the conference itself achieved. It went a long way to show that the democratic forces of our struggle have it in them to unite for the single purpose of fighting the apartheid monster that devours our country.

For months, organisations and leaders of political groupings had been canvassed on a ten-point unifying perspective. These points were:

- ★ one person, one vote in a democratic, non-racial and united South Africa
- ★ the lifting of the State of Emergency

- ★ a living wage for all
- ★ freedom of association and expression
- ★ the unconditional release of all political prisoners
- ★ the scrapping of repressive laws
- ★ the ending of political trials and executions
- ★ the withdrawal of troops from the townships
- ★ the unbanning of the ANC and other organisations

Perhaps it might not have been necessary to mention these points in the manner that they have been mentioned because the publicity given to them, prior to the CDF, means that they became known to millions of people, let alone the leaders and organisers of various organisations. But one of the few set-backs of this conference of democratic-minded South Africans was the refusal by some organisations to take part in the conference because of the participation of other organisations and an unfounded fear that the conference was a prelude to negotiations. It would not do justice to the successful conference if we did not look into the validity of these reasons for withdrawal and, as a body that has emerged in the past, and in the CDF as central in the struggle, urge these organisations to reconsider their stand and work towards participation in the process that has been triggered off by the CDF.

These organisations specifically objected to the participation of those who are regarded as working within the apartheid system. This is in a way understandable. For a long time this was every patriot's position but in the new conditions, demanding the broadest coalition of democratic forces to confront the apartheid system, is it necessary to maintain the same position against these forces 'working within the system' even if these adhere, in principle, to points such as were put forward for participation in this conference? Certainly not. The focus at this time should be on the removal of the apartheid scourge

from our country. In this process, all forces, even those with a modicum of anti-apartheid feeling, should be harnessed on to our side and not left for the enemy to use. Obviously, this excludes those organisations that stand directly opposed to the advance of our struggle.

The conference certainly proved to be an important arena of struggle as had been envisaged by its organisers. Important victories were scored in terms of committing almost all the forces present to the actions decided upon in the various areas of struggle. This could not have been done by closing out these organisations. By involving them, the Mass Democratic Movement and other principal organisers such as the Black Consciousness Movement and the Churches, have ensured that the regime's support base is further diminished.

At the end of the conference no formal structure of a broad anti-apartheid coalition emerged. This might be construed as a failure in some quarters prejudiced towards the conference and its aims, but to those to whom the theme of the conference had meaning, there is a great victory in that no one tried to force this coalition on another. The conference was a beginning. Its major success lies in the envisaged actions and the united action that will see to their realisation. Therefore there is an opportunity even for these organisations that did not take part in the conference to engage in the actions that have as their object the destruction of the apartheid system.

The CDF's decisions must certainly allay the fears of those who thought it might compromise

the perspectives of our struggle. It endorsed the Harare Declaration of the OAU and stated in no uncertain terms that the climate in which negotiations can take place with the De Klerk regime, has not been created. It emphasised that the oppressed people of South Africa shall be the masters of their own history and not De Klerk; that nothing that De Klerk has done convinces us that he is genuine; that the question of political power is still on top of the agenda and that there should be no rest until all the people of South Africa — Black and White — govern in a non-racial, democratic and united South Africa. In short, the declaration and all the resolutions were about nothing else but the intensification of the struggle on all fronts.

As with the mass defiance actions that have rocked the country since June, the friends of the regime, in South Africa and abroad, have sought to credit it with the sensibility and benevolence of allowing the conference to take place. Nothing is further from the truth. De Klerk neither wanted the conference to be organised nor have his 'offer' of negotiations tested. The number of organisations that this conference would unite around a single perspective would expose once and for all the unacceptability of his lame offers. Similarly, he would not want to allow the ANC, his sworn enemy, a platform on which its time-tested and widely-supported positions would be adopted by even more organisations and people.

There can be only one conclusion for this acceptance of the holding of the conference. It is the inevitability of that conference being held.



PARIS MEETING — A STEP FORWARD FROM DAKAR

Two years after the history-making journey to Dakar by the African National Congress and over 50 White South Africans seeking political change in South Africa, another chapter has been written in the journey to Paris by over 100 South Africans. For five days, November 27th to December 2nd, the area of Marly Le Roi, on the outskirts of Paris, was alive to intense and often heated debates under the theme "Towards a non-racial, democratic South Africa."

If the Dakar meeting was historic in that it brought such a large number of White South Africans face to face with the ANC, the Paris meeting went a step further. Not only was White business, academic, media and so on represented, but there was also Black business, the alternative media and the mass democratic movement in full force. The scope of participation had been widened and so were the areas of discussion. It also opened wider the possibilities of such meetings taking place inside South Africa between the mass democratic movement and the various forces that were represented in Paris.

The ANC was represented by a delegation of 22 which included five National Executive members, heads of departments, lawyers, journalists, academics, diplomats and others. Below, *Sechaba* publishes the text of the statement which was adopted by all the participants at the end of the conference on December 2nd 1989.

STATEMENT

PARIS CONFERENCE ON SOUTH AFRICA November 27th to December 2nd 1989

At the invitation of the Fondation Danielle Mitterrand, a large group of South Africans met for more than five days to discuss together the transition towards a non-racial, democratic South Africa.

Delegates to the conference were drawn from many walks of life, and included an ANC delegation, the Mass Democratic Movement, and delegates from business, the legal profession, the church, the press, the trade unions and academia. Deliberations, which were wide-ranging, included the following topics:

1. Recent developments in Southern Africa.
2. The current situation in South Africa.

3. Towards a new constitution for South Africa (which included a focus on the Law Commission report, the ANC Constitutional Guidelines, the Harare Declaration and a consideration of the constitutional proposals of the present government).

4. Present and future economic policies in and for South Africa.

The discussions, whilst often intense, were characterised by a spirit of enquiry and underlying unity, which transcended the varying viewpoints of the delegates. (This was especially true of the economic debate, which revealed considerable common ground, despite clear differ-

ences.) In particular, there was common cause that the apartheid system was untenable and indefensible. Further, it was stressed that, in order to safeguard the future, a new post-apartheid South Africa was imperative. Such a society should be based on fundamental human liberties and equal political and economic choices and opportunities for all South Africans irrespective of race, creed or gender. There was consensus that a non-racial democracy would require honest thinking, hard work, commitment and, wherever possible, unity of purpose and action.

In particular, negotiation politics can only succeed if a climate of negotiation was developed in South Africa.

Such a climate would be encouraged by action against apartheid and towards a non-racial democracy in every sphere of life. Delegates were agreed that the journey towards such a new society is greatly facilitated by conferences and meetings such as the one held at Marly Le Roi.

The conference places on record its deep appreciation to France Libertes and, in particular, to Madame Danielle Mitterand.



Members of the ANC delegation at the Paris Meeting Thabo Mbeki and Aziz Pahad (others in the background)



From left to right: Alex Baraine (Idasa), Willie Breytenbach (academic), Trevor Manuel (UDF) and Thabo Mbeki (ANC)

SOUTH AFRICAN STATE TERRORISM AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

By Sizwe Msibi

During the last ten years, at least 46 attempts have been made on the lives of ANC members outside South Africa. They were attacked with letter bombs, parcel bombs, car bombs and bullets. Some were killed, some seriously maimed. Late in 1989, Almond Nofomela, a prisoner on death row, and Dirk Coetzee, formerly a captain in the police force, both made statements about having been members of an assassination unit within the South African Police, which was specially set up to make such attacks. Coetzee also stated that the South African embassy had been involved in smuggling explosives for the bombing of the ANC office in London in 1982.

These revelations confirmed that the racist regime of Pretoria is engaged in a campaign of exporting terrorism to the capitals of states where there are missions of the African National Congress. The atrocities perpetrated by the apartheid regime (as well as those perpetrated at home) prove the correctness of the judgment passed by the international community that apartheid is a threat to world peace.

The murder in cold blood of chief representatives and other activists of the ANC by Pretoria death squads and other mercenaries at the service of the apartheid regime calls for concerted action on the part of all those states that are opposed to racial discrimination and state terrorism. The history of international relations abounds with notable lawsuits, when disregard of the basic principles of international law and, in particular, the flouting of the norms of diplomatic and consular law by one state, resulted in the severance of diplomatic ties between states.

Other states accused of 'terrorism'

The USA and its allies, self-appointed champions of the struggle against 'terrorism,' are known for their timely and orchestrated action against those states and liberation movements that are supporting, or are engaged in, 'terrorism.' For example, the USA, after having accused Libya of involvement in 'terrorism,' bombed Tripoli, targeting civilian settlements.

The British Government gave its blessing and approval to this raid by making Britain available as a launching pad.

Furthermore, the United States Administration embarked on a campaign lobbying for the total isolation of Libya. It should be noted that, as regulated in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, self-defence justifies resort to the use of force; otherwise a threat to use force, or the actual use of force, is a violation of a basic principle of international law.

When the United States linked the Palestine Liberation Organisation with 'terrorism' and also violated the Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations, it seriously impeded

the normal functioning of the observer mission of the PLO at the United Nations.

How long will the Pretoria regime continue to transgress the norms of law, ostensibly tracking down the 'terrorists,' without taking the consequences?

On February 5th 1988, the day after an attempt had been made on the life of Comrade Godfrey Motsepe, then the ANC Chief Representative in the Benelux countries, the ANC issued a statement signed by the Secretary-General, Alfred Nzo. The statement said:

"The permissive attitude adopted by certain states towards the apartheid regime's acts of aggression has given Pretoria the confidence to extend its activities so far afield."

Comrade Dulcie September, Chief Representative in Paris, was murdered the following month.

Are the assassinations, the attempted murders, the conspiracy to kidnap chief representatives and other members of the ANC, and the destruction of its property by the agents of the Pretoria regime in the territories of states violations of sovereignty of these states and interference in their domestic affairs by Pretoria? If so, then crimes have been committed against the United Kingdom, France and so on, and equally against the people of South Africa as represented by the ANC. Therefore, the law should take its course against racist South Africa, the culprit.

Sanctions against criminal states

The governments of the western countries must not allow history to register their complicity in the crime of apartheid. It is high time these states had recourse to

the instruments of international law. For example, the Declaration on the Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States, entrenches the right of states to protect their legal personality as well as to apply sanctions to violators of international legal norms.

It is common knowledge that the diplomatic support rendered to apartheid by the western countries props up the moribund racist regime. The oppressed and struggling people of South Africa are calling for the total isolation of the Pretoria regime, and they pooh-pooh the allegation that they will be the worst hit by the effects of sanctions.

When it suits the interests of monopoly capital, the authentic liberation movements are labelled 'terrorist' organisations, and consequently ranked with gangs of counter-revolutionaries and bandits. But time has proved that the ANC has always waged the liberation struggle within the ambit set by the principles and the other norms of international law. The ANC is a signatory to such important instruments as the 1977 Protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions 1949, and adheres to their terms.

Theatres of apartheid war

Just as the ANC is not engaged in imitating the dastardly tactics of the Pretoria regime, the western powers must not, tacit-



Dirk Coetzee

HALVING AN ARMY BUT LEAVING ITS FUNCTIONS INTACT

The De Klerk regime is certainly out of step with the demands of the South African people. It acts too late and gives away nothing. Its much publicised act of halving the period of national service for young Whites and the dismantling of its National Security Management System have been rejected by one of the most representative and well-attended meetings in the history of the South African political struggle. The resolution from the Conference for a Democratic Future reflects the position of over 15 million people on the apartheid army and the whole system it defends.

ADOPTED RESOLUTION ON APARTHEID ARMY

This Conference

Noting:

1. The system of military conscription whereby all White males are legally obliged to fight in defence of apartheid;
2. The growth of objection to service in the SADF as shown by the recent stand of 771 objectors and the thousands of conscripts who leave South Africa annually to escape military service;
3. The imprisonment of those men who have refused to serve in the SADF — some of whom are currently serving 6 year sentences;
4. The allegations that members of the SADF, including conscripts, have been involved in death squad activities;
5. The increasing recruitment of poor and unemployed Black South Africans into the security forces;

And believing:

1. That conscripts should have the right to refuse to serve in the SADF;
2. That the current system of compulsory conscription should be ended;
3. That the question of whether a system of conscription should exist at all is an issue to be decided by all citizens of a non-racial democratic and united South Africa.

Therefore resolves:

1. To call on all peace-loving White conscripts not to serve in the SADF and to work with the mass of our people in building a non-racial and democratic South Africa;
2. To demand an independent open judicial enquiry into SADF/SAP and other security force involvement in death squads;
3. In the context of the need to create a climate for negotiations as laid down in the OAU declaration, to campaign for:
 - 3.1 an end to conscription into the SADF;
 - 3.2 a moratorium on all objector trials;
 - 3.3 the unconditional release of jailed objectors;
 - 3.4 the unconditional return of exiled objectors;
4. To call on foreign governments to provide asylum for conscientious objectors and other South African political refugees;
5. To campaign for local and international companies and organisations to end material, spiritual and financial support to the security forces eg. Armscor, Barlow Rand and Atlas Air Corporation;
6. To initiate awareness campaigns directed at both conscripts and Black security force members in order to educate them about the role of the SADF in upholding apartheid.



ly or by implication, give Pretoria the green light to transform their territories into theatres of apartheid war. The battlefield should remain embraced by the borders of South Africa.

The question of recognition, representation and protection of the chief representatives, the members and property of the national liberation movements, demands a dialectical approach to the whole problem of modern and dynamic international law. In modern international law, peoples struggling for national liberation are a sovereign subject of international law,



Griffiths Mxenge, stabbed 21 times, Durban 1982

possessing a specific politico-legal property, namely national sovereignty, which serves as a politico-juridical source of the international legal personality of such peoples and nations. Therefore, the fighting people of South Africa, represented by their vanguard movement, the ANC, enjoy this status.

Thus the ANC is empowered actively to participate in the determination and engineering of the international relations that are affecting the peoples of South Africa, or will be of interest to them even in the post-liberation era. This therefore necessitates representation, hence the accreditation of the ambassadors and chief representatives of the national liberation movements.

Status of our external missions

The external missions of the national liberation movements deserve the respect and protection of the host country, as this guarantees favourable conditions conducive to the normal functioning of these missions. This obligation emanates from the agreements entered into by the host countries and the liberation movements, granting the latter a right to establish a mission of representation.

Furthermore, as elaborated in the Declaration of Principles of International Law 1970, the substance of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of nations and peoples (which is not a moral principle but a norm of *ius*



Joe Gqabi, shot in Harare 1981



Ruth First, killed by parcel bomb, Maputo 1982

cogens, a peremptory norm) includes a right to apply force against racist or colonial regimes and receive international legal protection or any other necessary assistance from the other subjects of international law. In turn, states are obliged to promote jointly or individually the realisation of this principle by the struggling peoples and nations, according to the United Nations Charter, Articles 55 and 56.

Many other instruments, such as the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of 1955, and the Convention on the Suppression and Punish-

ment of the Crime of Apartheid of 1973, expressly call on all states to offer support to the struggling peoples.

Therefore, diplomatic support rendered to the liberation movements, such as permission to open an external mission, should not be treated as a favour; nor is it supposed to be given solely or mainly for the propaganda purposes of the host country. Should this be the case, then the purpose or object of the basic principle, that treaties must be observed, is frustrated, especially because it demands that the obligations must be fulfilled *bona fide*.



Dulcie September, shot dead in Paris 1987





FW de Klerk is expecting a report from Minister of Law and order Adriaan Vlok on Police hit squads

Need for a co-ordinated approach

If analogy or reference cannot be made to the operating instruments of diplomatic and consular law regulating external representation (for example, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against International Protected Persons of 1973) then there is a need of a universal agreement defining and regulating the legal position of the external missions of the liberation movements —

the sovereign subjects of international law. But then, in my opinion, the strict observation and implementation of the currently operating norms of international law can remedy the lawlessness prevailing in the world, fanned by such states as South Africa and Israel with the collusion of the imperialist powers.

Similarly, though the question of racial discrimination is tackled in many documents of international law, nevertheless a specific convention (cited

above) was adopted, and was meant to co-ordinate the efforts of states in the fight against the crime of apartheid. Therefore, on the question of external missions of the national liberation movements also, the international community must adopt a co-ordinated, positive approach. Recognition goes to those states that have appreciated the necessity of granting diplomatic status to the external mission of the national liberation movements.

ANC INTERNATIONAL

UNITED STATES AWARD FOR ALBERTINA SISULU

In November 1989, Albertina Sisulu was honoured by the African-American Institute in New York for "front line defence of African freedom." She shared the award with former US President, Jimmy Carter, and General Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria. We print here a slightly shortened version of her speech of acceptance.

"We view this award as a tribute to the people of South Africa, the millions whose involvement in the struggle against apartheid guarantees its success.

The conviction among these millions is that our victory is in

sight. As we watch the elections in Namibia, we know that our continent has entered the final stages of the process of ending centuries of colonial and White minority domination. The historic process whereby the people of Namibia are taking power back into their hands will not stop on the banks of the Orange River. It is sweeping over South Africa. The atmosphere in the country is one of expectation that the long night of racial tyranny will, in the not too distant future, yield to the new dawn of freedom and justice for all the people of South Africa and peace for the peoples of our region.

We have no illusions

This conviction does not derive from any illusion that F W de

Klerk and the Nationalist Party have had a change of heart. They continue to emphasise their commitment to the apartheid concepts of racial and ethnic groups, group rights and so-called power-sharing among these groups. Our certainty that change is in sight is born of our knowledge that the struggle for a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa will escalate and intensify until victory is achieved.

The award we are happy and honoured to receive tonight symbolises the commitment of the American people and the rest of the international community to help us abolish the system of White minority rule in South Africa. When the day comes when we shall elect the government of our choice, we shall surely say thank you to you all for standing with us in the common struggle for liberty, human rights, justice and peace.

But that day has not yet dawned. Ahead of us is a continuing struggle in which you must continue to be involved. The apartheid system remains in place. Despite the great people's victory represented by the recent release of some of the most senior leaders of the ANC, thousands of other patriots, including Nelson Mandela, remain in prison, on death row, in detention and under banning orders. The state of emergency continues.



Albertina Sisulu

Freedom has not yet been achieved.

As we intensify the struggle within the country, we expect that you will continue the campaign for the isolation of apartheid South Africa.

Campaign for sanctions

That campaign for isolation, for the imposition of sanctions, is part of the struggle to end the apartheid system. It is therefore only logical that it must continue until this system has been abolished. We urge you not to listen to any voices which suggest that De Klerk should be given a chance. To give him such a chance would only give him time to look for ways of further entrenching the apartheid system.

Tomorrow we return to South Africa, to the thick of struggle. We shall convey to our organisations, our leaders and people your good wishes. We shall tell them that, as we left these shores, we felt even more convinced that the day when you join us in South Africa to celebrate a victory that will belong to all humanity is not far away."

WOMEN'S SECTION MESSAGE SALUTES BRITISH SISTER

The struggling people of South Africa have good friends among the people of Britain, and Barbara Castle, the distinguished British Labour Party politi-

cian, has been notable among them for a long time. On the occasion of her retirement, the ANC Women's Section in Lusaka wrote a letter to her, part of which we quote here:

*Our dear sister
We write to you having heard that you have decided to retire from active public life, during which you represented large sections of the British people as a member of the British and European Parliaments...*

We remember with undimmed feeling your lone and historic journey to South Africa in 1957, when you came to the small rural town of Zeerust to hold hands and express solidarity with the Black women who had decided to stand up and defend themselves against the tyrannical actions of the apartheid regime of the day...

We feel all the more privileged that we came to know you and, through you, came to understand that a new relationship between the women and people of South Africa and their British counterparts could be built, to replace a relationship of previous centuries which had defined the Black as underling and the White as the natural-born superior...

We look forward, dear Barbara, to the day when you make a second visit to Zeerust as a guest of our women and people, to enjoy the fruits of your efforts in a free and peaceful South Africa and to meet those who remember you and the purpose of your visit to their region.

*Gertrude Shope
Head of ANC Women's Section*

LETTERS TO THE LONDON OFFICE

Thousands of letters from ANC supporters come into the London ANC office from all corners of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales (writes **Anna-Zohra Tikly**). It is worth letting *Sechaba* readers know about these letters. Only a few people ever see them, but they are really meant for all of us working for liberation in South Africa.

The letters are not only from anti-apartheid activists or trade unionists, but also from a whole range of individuals — an old-age pensioner from the Isle of Skye, a prisoner in Durham Gaol, a child from a housing estate in Birmingham. Many letter-writers are eager to reassure us that Margaret Thatcher does not speak for them, that they are horrified at what they see on the television news about South Africa, and that they want to help the ANC.

This letter is from a couple in Swansea in Wales, who had received an ANC mailing on the plight of migrant workers:

"Please accept our deepest sympathy and compassion. My wife and I are octogenarians, and are members of the working class, receiving an inadequate pension, but after reading your letter we nearly cried with shame that

human beings were treated in this fashion. We decided to send you a donation to help alleviate the suffering of your people. May the day soon dawn for the release of Nelson Mandela, to lead and relieve his people from the bondage of apartheid."

They enclosed a poem they had written about Mandela. We receive many poems, and also pictures and cards. People are keen to send original ideas they have had for campaigning against apartheid, and craftsmen or business people offer us their services, or prizes for the annual ANC raffle.

Often people are upset that they cannot afford to donate, and go to lengths to explain why. Mostly this is because they are old age pensioners, or unemployed, like this young man in Edinburgh:

"I also live in a country where the government is also in the minority, and while I'm not saying it is anyway near as bad as South Africa, the English Torys use Scotland as a testing ground and a waste ground ... I support everything the ANC do, and would like to help, but as a disabled and unemployed person I do not have enough money to pay my bills, so I can't send financial support, but please let me help in any other way you can."

Much interesting and moving mail is received from the aged. This is from an old age pensioner in Southend-on-Sea:

"I think your people should be allowed a vote. What does the colour of one's skin matter? I am afraid this country

will not do a thing to help you all while we have that evil Mrs Thatcher in power. My late father saw 25 years in the army, so he was able to tell his children how you were all treated by us Whites. So that is why I have always been a rebel for the underdog of human nature."

This letter from a 74-year-old woman in Nottingham was another response to the migrant worker mailing:

"I read your letter through carefully, and my heart aches. I am sending you this with my love, and only wish it could be more. We live on a pension. We have brought up four children on very little money, but I know we have never known poverty and sheer misery as our Black brothers and sisters. Bless you all, and may the day of liberation dawn very soon."

From the old to the young, who are freshly infuriated by what they have seen on the television, or learned at school, about apartheid. This 14-year-old also writes from Nottingham:

"Please find a cheque enclosed. This is my pocket money, and I wish it to be donated to Nelson Mandela's birthday fund. He is a very courageous man. Would you also forward this birthday card, so that it will reach Mandela in time for his birthday?"

Her letter was signed, "With my loyal support." A young

Dear Sir / madam,
I am writing this letter to express my extreme disappointment at the British sportsmen in particular the Welsh Rugby Union, for their participation in the South African centenary celebration.

This show of support to the Southern African government is turning a blind eye to democracy and peace in South Africa.

I wish to get actively involved in helping make apartheid a thing of the past, so please could you send me as much information

man from Wembley in London explained that he would like to send a donation, but:

"I am only 12 and a bit short of cash. Please don't take offence. I still support your cause very strongly."

Teachers write asking for teaching materials about apartheid; some from inner-city multi-racial schools, some from village schools in remote rural areas. One primary school class made its own petition, stating, "We think Nelson Mandela should be released from prison," and all signed it in their sprawling, childish handwriting. They also wrote letters like this one:

"I wish you get out of gaol you did not do anything you just want the Black people to have a vote I wish that your birthday present is to get out of prison."

We receive requests from short- and long-term prisoners for material about the ANC, and sometimes they write letters. This prisoner in Durham asked to be put in touch with a South African political prisoner:

"Send me details on what support a prisoner will be needing. I'm sure I can arrange some support through my family and even myself, especially books, if they are allowed, as I know how the regime prevents any kind of worth-while education ... if it's a long-term prisoner I am put in touch with, the better, as I am released in 15

months and will go on supporting him/her after my release."

Many religious people write letters, including a nun from a convent in Wales. She wrote:

"Alas, I have little or no money of my own to hand out — but here is £1 a friend gave me recently."

Often, individual supporters raise support in their work places for the ANC, then write to tell us how they have pinned our information on the notice board, or sold our raffle tickets. Again, they are from all types of places including fire stations and building societies.

This recent letter from a young Welsh woman perhaps sums up the commitment and encouragement we receive from our supporters:

"I would like to say I am grateful for the information I receive from your organisation, and hope you will continue to keep me in touch. I greatly admire and congratulate you on all your work and efforts to help the advance of freedom in South Africa, and will always support your cause in any way I can. I wish you continued strength and success."

BRITISH SIGNATURES AGAINST APARTHEID

An advertisement placed by the ANC and our supporters in *The Guardian* and *The Independent* newspapers in September was an opportunity for British people to express their abhorrence of apartheid and their opposition to the Whites-only elec-



tions. Nearly 8 000 people responded to a letter from ANC Chief Representative Mendi Msimang, inviting them to put their names to the advertisement and to send a donation to help pay for it. A strict deadline meant that there was room for only 6 500 names, and even then the size of the advertisement had to be changed from one full page to a page and a half. It was produced with help volunteered by British media workers, and generated great interest among the public and the media.

The text of the advertisement read:

"I wish to express my opposition to the 'elections' and what is happening in South Africa today. Please add my name to your list of supporters, and campaign on my behalf for the abolition of apartheid and the institution of free and fair elections in which all the people of South Africa, irrespective of race, colour, sex or creed, will be able to participate."

ANTI-APARTHEID NETHERLANDS 1649

The first anti-apartheid movement could be said to date back to 1649 (writes **Karel Roskam**, a journalist in the Netherlands). Of course, they did not know it at the time, but there was then a protest by two Dutch officers of the Dutch East India Company against the treatment meted out to the Khoi-Khoi people living at the Cape.

Aggression in return for hospitality

It all started with the sinking of the Dutch ship, the Haarlem, on March 25th 1647. The shipwrecked sailors, led by Leendert Janszoon, were hospitably taken up by the resident Khoi-Khoi, with whom they stayed for almost a year. They were picked up again in April 1648 by the Dutch return fleet coming from what was then called the Dutch East Indies, with Jan van Riebeeck on board.

Sailors from this fleet shot and stole cattle belonging to the Khoi-Khoi, who, in retaliation, shot and killed some Dutch sailors.

On their return to the Netherlands, Leendert Janszoon and his fellow-officer, Nicolas Proot, wrote in their report to the Council of Seventeen, the supreme directorate of the Dutch East India Company:

"Others will say that the natives are brutal and cannibals, from whom no good can be expected ... this is a vulgar error ... We are convinced that the (Dutch) peasants of Holland, were their cattle shot down or taken away without payment, would not be a hair better than these natives, if they were not obliged to respect the law ... The killing of our people is undoubtedly caused out of revenge by the natives when their cattle is seized ... The uncivil and ungrateful conduct of our people is therefore the cause."

They went on to warn, that if this behaviour of the Whites were not stopped, it:

"May cost the lives of some of ours, if the natives find an opportunity, and Your Honours may consider whether the latter would have cause for such a proceeding."

The Dutch East India Company did not react to this; Jan van Riebeeck was ordered to go and settle at the Cape in order to produce fresh vegetables and meat for the Dutch ships on their way to and from the Dutch colonies in the East Indies.

Van Riebeeck called the Khoi-Khoi:

"... the Black, stinking dogs ... dull, stupid, lazy and stinking."

He went to war with the Khoi-Khoi in 1659. The Khoi-Khoi leaders, Harry, Doman, Oedetsa and Aukaisoa, accused Van Riebeeck at the peace negotiations a year later of waging war in order to deprive them of the land which had belonged to them from all the ages.

Van Riebeeck did not even bother to deny this. He said that the Khoi-Khoi had:

... now lost that land in war, and therefore could only expect to be henceforth entirely deprived of it ... Their country has thus fallen to our lot, being justly won in defensive warfare, and ... it is our intention to retain it."

It was a long time before the next anti-apartheid protest was heard from any European country.

POLITICAL TRIALS STILL CONTINUE

By Mark Guthrie

The writer of this article is a member of Lawyers Against Apartheid, an organisation formed in London to examine political trials in South Africa and expose the illegality of the South African judicial system.

The release of our leaders on October 15th 1989 is a victory for democratic forces both inside and outside South Africa. The reception given to them by 85 000 people at Soccer City, and the open support for the ANC confirms that our organisation leads the struggle of the South African people. Our victory, and the unceasing talk of negotiations, might tempt us into believing that the apartheid regime is about to concede power to us and that national liberation is just around the corner.

However, the reality is that De Klerk continues to talk of apartheid under the guise of 'group rights.' The ANC has demanded that the regime shows its willingness to enter into meaningful negotiations by — among other things — releasing all political prisoners and detainees and ending all political executions.

A review of current trials, and of those awaiting execution on death row, shows that, for the apartheid regime, it is business as usual.

In August 1989, 35 political trials, involving 135 people, were in progress in South Africa. Of these people, 25 were convicted, 28 acquitted and 82 had the charges against them withdrawn. In the preceding ten months, there were 248 such trials, involving 861 people, and of these 300 were convicted, 172 acquitted and charges were withdrawn against 341.

Refusal to recognise illegal courts

Examining some of the trials which have recently concluded or which are at present in progress, one can see that the armed struggle is very much one of the pillars of our struggle. It is also clear that our combatants of Umkhonto we Sizwe have

been increasingly engaging the apartheid regime militarily.

The demand of our combatants to be accorded POW status has continued to be made this year.

★ The four Delmas combatants powerfully stated their claim to be recognised as soldiers, and their refusal to recognise the court. The fact that three of the four received the death sentence has done nothing to deter other combatants from taking the same stance.

★ In August, Vukabe Mhlongo and Nkonsinathi Mazibuko demanded to be treated as soldiers, and refused to participate in their trial for alleged activities in Umkhonto we Sizwe. Legally unrepresented because of this, the two were found guilty and sentenced to 10 and seven years' imprisonment respectively.

★ In November, the Potchefstroom Three — Putswe Litlhakanyane (aged 19), Lawrence Seleko (19) and Thembisile Batyi (23) — each received a total of 12 years' imprisonment for 'terrorism,' undergoing military training and belonging to a banned organisation. From the beginning of their trial, the three played no part in it, and this included refusing to give evidence in their own defence.

★ Just before the Potchefstroom Three were sentenced, two young combatants — Obed Madonsela (19) and Christopher Khumalo — refused to plead to charges of terrorism. Comrade Madonsela told the court on their behalf that it was "against the dictates of (their) conscience" to take part in a judicial system where they had no say in drawing up the legislation:

"We believe a trial in an apartheid court cannot and will not be fair."

The young generation of militants continue in the footsteps of their predecessors. This point was made in November, when the three Broederstroom trialists, Damian de Lange, Ian Robertson and Susan Westcott were visited at their trial by the recently released leaders, Comrades Sisulu, Kathrada, Mlangeni and Motsoaledi. The Broederstroom case is also significant in that it is another example of White patriots responding to the call of the ANC to take up arms.

MK is everywhere!

The fact that the armed struggle waged by Umkhonto we Sizwe takes place throughout the country is confirmed by the various locations in which MK trials are taking place. The Potchefstroom and Durban trials have been mentioned above.

★ Meanwhile, in the Transvaal there are the two separate 'terrorism' trials of Petros Vantyn and Helen Mogale

★ Delmas, also in the Transvaal continues to be the scene of yet another important trial, that of the 12 charged with treason, murder and attempted murder, arising out of alleged ANC activities.

★ In the Cape, the Wynberg Three, Danisile Mkhatywa, Buyiswa Jack and Agnes Yoyo, face charges of treason.

Our demand for an end to political executions should remind us that at the time this is being written there are 67 people awaiting execution for political activities. Neither should we forget that the release of our leaders still leaves an estimated 3 500 political prisoners still serving sentences, including Anthony Mfane Xaba, who is at present on Robben Island and who has spent a total of 25 years in imprisonment. In addition, there are about 266 people detained under the state of emergency.

Undaunted spirit of our people

De Klerk's apparent eagerness to enter into negotiations is an attempt to seize the initiative



and rescue the apartheid regime from the impasse which confronts it. While De Klerk would want to negotiate on a basis and in a context which is unacceptable to us, he would not be even speaking of negotiations were it not for the manner and spirit in which the peoples of South Africa have challenged and engaged his regime. Current political trials show that people have maintained their military engagement at a high level and in an undaunted spirit. Despite the prospect of the death penalty, combatants have been steadfast in proclaiming the justice of their cause. The enthusiastic and jubilant reception that defendants have received from the public attending their trials indicates the popularity of their actions.

The large number of political trials and executions has not stopped recruitment to the ANC and to MK. Rather, the heroic stand of our cadres in recent trials has been an inspiration to others to emulate them and to take our struggle to new heights.

The nature of trials in progress at present bears out the contention that the apartheid regime needs to negotiate because it is cracking under the pressure of the people's struggle.

If that intensity of struggle and the determination of the people is maintained, which it undoubtedly will be, it will not be long before De Klerk finds himself forced to concede the principle of one person, one vote in a non-racial democratic and unitary state.

OUR APPROACH TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

By Mervyn Bennun

This writer takes up a point in Mphunki's article, *Capital Punishment — Towards a New Approach*, which appeared in the September 1989 issue of *Sechaba*.

Mphunki's article was an important contribution to the question of capital punishment in our country, both now and in the future.

I would like to comment on a statement he makes in the opening lines. He refers to the case of the Sharpeville Six, and states that the world-wide support for these people was based on "the availability of indisputable facts proving their innocence." I feel that the arguments against the death sentence imposed by the regime are already so powerful that we do not need to resort to statements which are certainly not relevant and which may not be true.

Assuming that the Sharpeville Six really were involved in the killing of the councillor, Sam Dlamini, in 1985, does Mphunki mean that the African National Congress would not — or should not — rally to their side? Further, the whole world is aware of the barbarities which go on behind the scenes when a trial takes place in South Africa; can we believe the evidence of any of the witnesses in such trials? We must also take care how we regard those

members of the community who were dragged in to give evidence for the prosecution — people who might have been terrorised, detained and tortured no less than those put on trial, and thus forced to make false statements and to give false evidence incriminating others. Their tragedy and plight may be almost as terrible as those they give evidence against — their own friends, family and comrades.

Making South Africa ungovernable

We demand the release of the Sharpeville Six and others in a similar situation because our movement called for total opposition to the institutions of the apartheid state and for the people to render South Africa ungovernable. President Tambo said in the message of the National Executive Committee on January 8th 1985:

"... we shall need to pursue, with even greater vigour, the task of reducing the capacity of the colonial apartheid regime to continue its illegal

rule of our country. The destruction of the organs of government weakens the regime and is a necessary part of our continuing mass offensive."

By our demand for the release of everyone brought to trial by the regime for their actions in response to this leadership from our movement, we make it clear that we stand with the people, and that we refuse to accept the judgment of the regime on what is and what is not right in their struggle against it. It is thus irrelevant whether the Sharpeville Six were involved in the death of Dlamini or not.

Mphunki's statement that there is "indisputable evidence" that the Sharpeville Six were not guilty leads to problems we must avoid. There are other cases where the people who were convicted were more clearly involved, but we do not discriminate among them. We demand the release of **all** such people, regardless of whether or not they took part in the activities concerned. I suggest that this is the correct and principled position we should hold.

The regime has no right to pass judgment

This is consistent, for example, with our stated policy on 'necklacing.' This hideous practice was never the policy of the ANC, and it has been ended by the self-discipline of the people under the leadership of our movement. However, when the people who made such mistakes are condemned by the regime, we stand by them, for only the people united in the revolutionary struggle, and not the apartheid regime, has the right to pass judgment on those within the ranks.

But the matter goes even further than this. Once we acknowledge that in one case there may be evidence that those convicted committed what the regime regards as a crime, or deny in another case that there is such evidence, then we would accord legitimacy to the courts of the regime; we would be saying that some convictions are correct and just, and comparing them with others which we claim are miscarriages of justice.

The truth of the matter is that the South African courts have no legitimacy whatever. They do not represent the people, their procedures are barbaric travesties of justice, and what they regard as 'crimes' are the acts of men and women in a desperate struggle to free themselves. We expect no justice from South Africa's courts, because they are the institutions of the enemy. Thus, when Mphunki claims that the

Sharpeville Six are innocent, we must be clear what is meant by this statement. It means that we place no value on what the South African courts think about the Six, or about any of the others involved in similar trials.

Mphunki observes that the South African courts rely on evidence obtained by torture. This makes it all the more important that we should take care to attack the South African legal system from a correct starting point. For Mphunki to make his statement that there are "indisputable facts proving their innocence," one has to rely on the defence evidence in that case and to regard it as more credible than the evidence given for the prosecution. I think this leads us into a trap, for it implies that it is possible to put on a fair and full defence before a South African court. In fact, a criminal trial in South Africa is rotten and unjust in all its aspects.

Forced confessions

Consider just some of what we know about criminal trials, especially in political cases. The prosecution evidence is prepared and presented with the use of detention, torture and lies, and who becomes a prosecution witness and who the accused person is decided against this background. The procedure of taking an accused person before a magistrate to make a statement is supposed to be a protection; in fact, it is used by the prosecution and police

as a weapon against the accused. How this is done is simple and well-known.

The accused person is subjected to torture, terror and inducements, isolated and without legal advice, until a statement is made which the police regard as satisfactory to themselves, and which the person agrees to repeat before a magistrate. The person making the statement must go back to the custody of the very people who have used torture, terror, and threatened with more of the same — unless the statement made is a confession of guilt which matches up neatly with what others, who will be prosecution witnesses, will say in court.

And who are these others? They are frequently the friends and family of the accused person and who have themselves been battered into saying what the prosecution wants. A statement made to the police is usually taken under oath; and if that person subsequently gives evidence in court and says something different then a serious crime is committed. Further, it is no defence for the person to refuse to give evidence in court, on the grounds that the statement to the police was false and it would be lying to repeat it. This is treated as yet another crime, and the person involved is likely to be prosecuted alongside the person on trial. Frequently, the witness in this situation and the person on trial are close friends or family.

Judges show malice and hatred

In court, the case is conducted in what is simply a foreign language, and the case of the Sharpeville Six illustrates time and again the misunderstandings and confusions caused during interpretation. The trial judge in the case deliberately used these problems to demonstrate that the Sharpeville Six and their witnesses were untruthful. This is yet another problem which must not be forgotten — not only are the judges not drawn from the ranks of the people, but they do not hesitate to show their malice and hatred for those who are fighting against apartheid. In the case of the Six, Judge Human could not wait to convict them and sentence them to death. When one reads how he conducted himself, his statements on the law, and what he said in the course of the trial, it is clear that he did not care whether or not the people on trial had anything to do with the killing of Dlamini; he was simply determined that because they were on trial they should therefore hang.

Against this background, therefore, we should not be willing to say that we trust even defence witnesses — not even the statements of the accused themselves. This is not to say that we think that they are deliberately and maliciously untruthful; it is simply because against such a background we should not give a criminal trial even a cracked veneer of

legitimacy by relying on anything **any** witness says.

Let us frankly face another problem. By their own evidence, some of the Sharpeville Six were present in the crowd or near the scene when Dlamini was killed, and sought to explain why they were there, in ways which relieved them of responsibility. They did not adopt a political basis for their defence — some said, for example, that they were intimidated into joining the demonstration which ended in Dlamini's death. In view of what they had been through at the hands of the police and what they well knew would be the attitude of the court, and in view of the horror of apartheid and the desperate struggle of the people, we do no favours if we pass judgment on the truthfulness of what people say in their own defence when charged before apartheid courts.

No faith in a corrupt system

If any were being truthful when they said they were intimidated into taking part, then this is clearly a serious matter for the development of the struggle; and if they were lying, then how do we help anyone by saying that we believe them? We should not encourage people under such circumstances to lie, nor should we take on our shoulders the task of advising them how to conduct their defences; it is for the people involved in each case to decide

what to do in the light of what they know, their strength, and what they can hope for. The correct attitude for us to adopt is to make it clear that we have no faith in the system, because the entire procedure of the court is rotten and corrupt.

Especially where accused people do not present their defences in clear political terms — and in the case of the Sharpeville Six they did not — we must not pass judgment on them by claiming that they are innocent. Because the trials are mockeries of justice, we cannot know that that is true, and the accused persons may well know that it is false. Such a situation does not help them, and it does not advance our struggle.

The correct and politically sound response is to make it known to all that, as our movement has called for the people to destroy the institutions of apartheid, no court of the apartheid regime has any legitimacy to pass judgment on the conduct of those who respond. We must beware of manoeuvring ourselves into the position of saying that those who are prosecuted for acts committed in support of our struggle are not guilty because others committed them instead. If the acts are such as are wrong and harmful to our struggle — as, for example, necklacing — then we must respond by ensuring that our struggle is conducted with dignity and discipline. We promote our struggle best by ensuring that all involved identify correctly with the cause of national liberation, and act with that dignity and self-discipline.

HINTSA THE GREAT

By Ralph Mzamo

Ahi Zanzolo, Hintsa ka Khawuta, ka Gcaleka, ka Phalo, is probably the most venerated of the Xhosa kings who had contact with, and fought, the colonialists. A number of factors contributed to that reverence; and that Hintsa was martyred under nefarious circumstances in a war of resistance against foreign marauders has greatly added to his esteem in the minds of the nations of South Africa as a whole. He was the immediate link between the fighters of modern times and their forefathers who fought the colonialists. He died only 150 years ago, but at the height of the wars of dispossession.

Hintsa was a direct descendant of Phalo, the father of Gcaleka and Rarabe, whose names are used respectively for the Transkei and Ciskei provinces (Kwa-Gcaleka and Kwa-Rarabe all being umzi Ka-Phalo). As Phalo himself was a descendant of Tshawe, the father of the entire Xhosa nation, it follows therefore that any Xhosa would pay allegiance to his descendants in turn.

He was born in about 1785, and ascended to the throne at a very early age in 1804, during turbulent times, as his subjects in the west, ama-Gqunukhwebe, were locked in a relentless struggle at Ngqantosi under Chungwa ka Tshaka. The colonialists were advancing eastwards, but the war of 1799-1802 had ended in a stalemate.

Hintsa's authority over all Xhosa can be illustrated by Ndlambe's retort to Ngqika. Ndlambe (Rarabe's right-hand son and therefore Ngqika's uncle) ruled over the principality of E-Mnyameni, where he gave asylum to Nxele ka Makhanda (The War General). Ngqika demanded of Ndlambe to hand over Makhanda, but Ndlambe pointedly retorted that only Hintsa was King, with authority to issue orders, but Ngqika was just a chief with no more power than Ndlambe himself, and therefore could not order him about. At the Battle of Ama-Linde the Ngqikas were scattered about by a combined power of the Ndlambes and ama-Gcaleka, and Ngqika fled to exile kwa-Nojoli, from where he made tentative attempts to mobilise the help of the colonialists.

A judicious king

The most graceful, noble-minded and judicious king, Hintsa exhorted his son, Sarili, (at Sarili's initiation ceremony after his circumcision) to rule wisely and take counsel even from the weak as from the strong, the coward as from the intrepid. The fundamental principles of his outlook earned him respect and popularity among his subjects in his time, and the everlasting reverence of their descendants. He was benevolent towards the poor, and realised the importance of cattle-wealth because: "if you have cattle, poor men will not pass by your house. No, they will stop with you. When a councillor asks you for cattle, give him some, though your cattle are pretty, because that way will your people love you."

When the Mfengus applied for asylum they first did not reveal their chief, but hedged. He perceived their fear, and remarked, "I am not in the habit of killing people who seek refuge in my country." Later on, he showed them clearly that now they had been accepted they would be treated on an equal footing and, as the process of assimilation takes various ways, some entailing physical pain, the King did not wish to be troubled by petty litigations. He told the Mfengu to fend for themselves, and asked of them, "were you not men in your country? Were there no forests with sticks on Luthukela? These Xhosas have bodies just the same as you. When they hit you, hit them back."



Illustrations of British treachery in arresting and killing of Chief Hintsa

Defence against the invaders

The war of 1834-1835 had initially been a Rarabe war, with ama-Ndlambe, ama-Ngqika and ama-Gqunukhwebe embroiled in bitter struggle against the colonists. When Hintsa gave his approval it took on a new and wider dimension, encompassing all the Xhosa nation. The King, gracious as ever, did not wish to visit the personal misdemeanours of Ngqika on the heads of his sons. He listened attentively to their report on the worsening situation in kwa-Rarabe and to the appeal to declare war. He concurred, and in this way the war of 1834-1835 became Hintsa's war. He gave his royal seal for the nation to rise up and defend itself against the invaders.

Even before he had officially declared war, traders had misrepresented him to Benjamin D'Urban, the colonialist governor, as "the chief instigator of all the mischief," and D'Urban had swallowed the falsehoods hook, line and sinker.

But an unbiased spectator, a Mr Read, wrote to Fairbairn on April 12th 1834: "it is a wonder that under all the provocation during the last eight months the Kaffirs have not attempted to retaliate." When D'Urban sailed from Simonstown on March 8th 1835, he is said to have been "horrified" at the ruin he found in Albany (at Mnyameni). But the actual war had only lasted about five months. The whole area east of Cacadu, except at Rini, was abandoned by the colonists. They were killed, their houses burned, cattle repossessed, and the remainder had been chased away, those who had speed.

Formal declaration of war

Benjamin D'Urban declared the whole area west of Nciba River as the Province of Queen Adelaide (what insolence!) but failed to subdue the inhabitants. They clung and fought on

relentlessly, sweeping all before them, and Rini was expected to fall any minute. Maqoma and Tyali had co-ordinated with other chiefs, and also expected reinforcements from the Khoi and the San.

Tyali, after he and Maqoma had obtained Hintsa's approval, had dictated a letter of declaration of war, which contained specific points on which the war was declared and would be ceased. The patriots wanted the return of the land east of the Nxuba River, full compensation for the wounding of Xhoxho (Tyali's younger brother who had been wounded in the head as he was defiantly grazing the chief's cattle in the usurped territory) and that any cattle captured in the Colony would be regarded as legitimate payment for the wrongs they had suffered. Tyali reiterated that the war would stop as soon as negotiations began.

Hintsa was kept fully informed of the developments, receiving regular intelligence. The chiefs were shot, their cattle seized and their lands appropriated, but U'Urban failed to rout the Ngqika in the Mathole Mountains, and decided to cross the Nciba to the King's capital.

Colonel Harry Smith had by this time formed the "Grahamstown Committee of Safety," and he then proceeded to perform his theatricals for the benefit of some chiefs, in an attempt to overawe them by firing charges of gunpowder and announcing himself to be 'inkos'enkulu' (the overlord, the superior chief). Maqoma and Tyali were, however, firmly secure in the fortress of Ngqika, which provided them with unbreachable protection but allowed them to attack their pursuers easily.

Disgrace of broken promises

The colonialists then marched to the easier target, the Gcalekas, who had not had much experience in fighting the invaders as the Rarabes had had. D'Urban invited the King to his camp, and Hintsa responded, after D'Urban had given him assurances of personal safety.

Hintsa entered the British camp on April 29th 1835, and is said to have shown no fear. D'Urban and Smith demanded that he order the sur-

render of the Rarabe chiefs, and compensate the 'bereaved' settlers in cattle and horses. The King realised his true position when his retinue was forcibly disarmed and his guard strengthened. He was actually a prisoner.

D'Urban insisted that the King order Maqoma and Tyali to surrender and raise a ransom of 2 5000 cattle and 500 horses for his personal release. He had miscalculated. He had not realised that he was dealing with a man of honour, a man of integrity. He had thought he was dealing with a simpleton.

Hintsa was above personal considerations when the very existence of his people was being threatened. He sent messages to the Rarabe that he was a prisoner, and instructed his people to drive the cattle farther afield. Many of these cattle had been brought from the war zone after they had been repossessed from the colonists.

He asked Smith, "What have the cattle done that you want them? Why must I see my subjects deprived of them?"

Hintsa died honourably

As the colonists marched along the Nqabara River valley, Hintsa made a dash for freedom. He was pulled from his horse, shot through the back and through the legs. Desperately, he scrambled down the river bank and collapsed into the watercourse. A scout named George Southey, coming from behind him, blew off the top of his head. Then some soldiers cut off his ears as keepsakes to show around the military camps. Others tried to dig his teeth out with bayonets.

Thus died the King of the Xhosa, for trusting to the honour of a British governor. He died defending his people by refusing to comply with the order to instruct his subordinate chiefs to lay down arms and collect ransom to release himself. He died honourably. British colonialist historians and their surrogates are wont to shout from rooftops about the atrocities committed in war by others such as the Portuguese, the French, the Germans, and so on, but if the heinous murder of Hintsa does not rank the most vile, nothing else can.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

ANOTHER LOOK AT MAPANTSULA

Dear Comrade Editor

The increasing number of political films about South Africa is a welcome development. Film has a very powerful impact on the viewer, and this proliferation of films about South Africa must be encouraged. This is the time to throw a challenge to our artists to rise to the occasion. There is a revolution going on in South Africa and artists cannot afford to sleep through it.

The review of *Mapantsula* in the July 1989 issue of *Sechaba* must be welcomed, albeit grudgingly. Comrade Mzamo has regrettably misunderstood the film to the extent of being negative and destructive. His fundamental problem is the question of form and content.

It is true that the film portrays Panic, the main character, as a gangster, a typical South African township *lipantsula*. His general behaviour towards most people is in line with the character. He is a tsotsi, a product of objective and subjective circumstances. The life of a tsotsi is definitely not glorifiable. But that is not the point being made in the film.

Panic is in prison. He has been arrested in a demonstration against high rents in Soweto. Watch how he is arrested. The police, in typical South African fashion, give instructions for the demonstrators to disperse, and, when they fail to do so, fire teargas at them. Sam's mother (beautifully acted by Dolly Rathebe) is overcome by the teargas, and is carried away by Panic and Duma (an ANC underground cadre active in organising people). The police advance. Panic and Duma don't know that the police will have a video recording of the demonstration (acquired either from the press or from their own sources) showing Panic next to Duma.

Panic makes a political statement

Panic and Duma run away. They do not get very far. The police corner them. Duma has a South African Domestic Workers T-shirt which draws the attention of the police. Duma manages to escape, but Panic is arrested and brought to the police station, defiant. He is put in a cell packed with political activists. In typical tsotsi style, he says to the activists, "Bandiet, wie is julle? My bras call me Panic."

Once in the hands of the interrogators, Panic is subjected to the familiar methods of the police in attempting to extract con-

fessions or turn people against their own folks. He is first enticed to tell them what they want to hear about Duma, but he refuses. He is beaten up, mentally tortured, stripped naked. The police want him to sign a statement implicating Duma. His last "No" is a powerful political statement. This is crucial; if it is not understood, the whole content of *Mapantsula* will be lost. When Panic refuses to sign the prepared statement, there is defeat on the faces of the interrogators.

While he is in police custody he reflects on the life outside. That is how his lumpen lifestyle comes in, that infuriates Comrade Mzamo. Panic is thinking about how he robbed people, stabbed others, stole from department stores, about his life with his girl friend, who by this time has left him, and so on. The film does not in any way "project the lumpen element as a viable and legitimate component of the struggle." If anything, it shows that not even the lumpen element can escape the all-pervasive political, economic and social relations of the apartheid system.

Situation of domestic workers

Take the example of domestic workers (called 'servants' in South Africa). Panic's girl friend, Pat (Themba Mtshali), is a domestic worker. She lives in the servants' quarters at the back of the house. Panic has to tiptoe in order to visit her at night. She is too tired after a

hard day's work. The madam is a lazy White woman who spends her day shopping, floating on the swimming pool or bragging about her weekend exploits. And no matter how loyal and hard-working a servant may be, she can be easily dismissed, and another hired, as happened to Pat. That is South Africa.

So, when Panic is expelled from his girl friend's workplace by the madam holding a seemingly vicious dog, he is naturally angry and frustrated. That is why he throws a brick at the window. The audience is "expected neither to sympathise with him" nor to be "overjoyed and encouraged," as Comrade Mzamo suggests. But an audience will naturally be appalled at the whole situation of domestic workers and White employers in South Africa, and will, I think, find itself in solidarity with Pat. Most people would also agree with Panic when he says to Pat in connection with her job: "this is not work, but shit."

A truly South African production

I think a word of appreciation and congratulation should be extended to all those behind this film. The fact that it was filmed in the real South Africa is a development to be appreciated. The actors in particular have given us a truly South African production. The accents, mannerisms and various behaviour patterns are authentically South African. There can be no disagreement that Thomas

Mogotlane is a brilliant actor, but Themba Mtshali, Dolly Rathebe, Peter Siphuma and Marcel van Heerden give brilliant performances, too.

Van Heerden as an interrogator succeeds in evoking a sense of anger in the audience. Brilliant! The fact that the main actor is also the co-director is a good sign that things are moving in South Africa. It is important that Black artists get involved at that level, as well.

The music by The Ouens is deeply touching and superbly fused with the content of the film. The theme song is in a class of its own. The revolutionary songs sung by the township folk are ANC songs, and, coming in a popular film, are a welcome experience. And seeing young and old joining demonstrations together in the film was good. It showed something crucial in the ideological contestations of the 1980s, the so-called divide between the generations, with the older generation said to be conservative and anti-radical. There are also contemporary slogans, like "Apartheid Divides, UDF Unites."

Most of the translations into English from African languages are misleading, and those who depend on them may lose some of the humour and content. But that should not be a major constraint. Of course, the South African audience will naturally love the conversations in tsotsitaal. It has a homely feel about it.

Political mood of our times

There are many forces at play in a revolution, and they do not approach the revolutionary process from the same angles. Some come from the lumpen proletariat, some as a result of personal grudges, still others through friendships of various types. Apartheid relations push all these forces towards the revolutionary movement. Most of these forces come very raw politically, but it is the task of the revolutionary movement to instil in them revolutionary discipline and political depth through a rigorous process of training.

People like Panic do become good political soldiers. See how Panic angrily goes out looking for Sam. Eventually gets arrested. Such a combination of circumstances has pushed many tsotsis into the revolutionary movement. They are tough and daring.

Mapantsula is probably more powerful than *Cry Freedom*. It does not romanticise the role of White liberals. It does not exaggerate political confrontations. It is a contemporary production; it captures the political mood of the 1980s through the exploits of Panic, and the songs, T-shirts, teargas, cells, police and so on all say something of the 1980s. It is a film about the people, a film of depth and usefulness.

Thando Zuma

Lusaka

BOOK REVIEWS

THE SOUTHERN AFRICA HOLOCAUST

Apartheid Terrorism: The Destabilisation Report, prepared by Phyllis Johnson and David Martin, Commonwealth Secretariat, London, 1989.

At a time when the regime of F W de Klerk is promoting itself as reformist and as seeking a peaceful solution, this report on Pretoria's regional destabilisation makes sobering reading. The extent of the suffering apartheid has inflicted on the independent countries of Southern Africa is seldom realised. In his introduction to the book, prepared for the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa, President Kaunda of Zambia compares South African aggression in the region to the Nazi holocaust.

Drawing on primary sources, the authors catalogue the crimes the apartheid regime has committed against humanity. They conservatively calculate that the war-related death toll in the six Front Line States since 1980 stands at 1.5 million people. They cite a recent Children's Fund (UNICEF) report showing that 825 000 Angolan and Mozambican children have died, mainly because of the destruction wrought by the South African regime and its surrogates. They state that four million people have been displaced from their houses, and 1.5 million have become refugees. They calculate, on the

basis of official statistics, that apartheid destabilisation had cost the Front Line States US\$45 million by the end of 1988, in terms of the cost of defence, damage and lost development.

Apart from an historical overview, detailing the phases of Pretoria's destabilisation, each of the Front Line States is examined in detail. Pretoria's duplicity in Mozambique and its backing of the wanton terrorism of the MNR — which continues under De Klerk — is examined in detail. So, too, is the war against Angola, the occupation and destabilisation of Cunene province, and the ravages caused by the surrogate, UNITA. There are strong chapters on Zimbabwe and Zambia and Botswana, documenting every recent incident of direct aggression, as well as assessing the overall effects of economic destabilisation and the use of surrogate bandit groups. Although Tanzania has suffered far less than the other countries, the authors point out that it was the first target of destabilisation and that it, too, has paid a heavy price for its support for the liberation of Namibia and South Africa.

Perhaps with current sen-

timents in the West in mind, the authors also document the appalling destruction of the environment. In particular, they list the destruction of forests in Southern Angola, and the annihilation of up to 200 000 elephants by UNITA, which is obliged to pay in teak and ivory for the weapons it receives from its South African masters.

President Kaunda, in his introduction, calls on his colleagues in the Commonwealth, and the international community as a whole, to "tighten the screw" on Pretoria, and says:

War-Related Deaths of Infants and Young Children in Angola, 1981 to 1988

Year	Dead
1981	10 000
1982	20 000
1983	31 000
1984	42 000
1985	55 000
1986	56 000
1987	58 000
1988	59 000
Total	331 000

Source: UNICEF

Wounded and Dead on Mozambique Railways, 1982 to 1988

	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988
Railway Workers							
Wounded	30	42	88	50	150	68	59
Dead	11	20	16	20	18	33	16
Passengers							
Wounded	82	66	108	93	142	153	284
Dead	22	43	20	39	11	71	112
Totals							
Wounded	112	108	196	143	292	221	343
Dead	33	63	36	59	29	104	128

Source: Mozambique Ports and Railways, April 1989

"If we do not speak out and act now; or if we hedge about with meaningless sentiments; or push our heads deep into the sand for any convenient reason, then we shall be as guilty as the direct perpetrators of this heinous crime against humanity."

face of this and other evidence presented at the Commonwealth Summit at Kuala Lumpur in October 1989, the Commonwealth adopted only limited further sanctions against the racist regime, and Thatcher opposed any tightening of the screw. There has not been sufficient pressure on the De Klerk regime to persuade it to end the war against independent Africa.

Indeed, the regime has just embarked on a new drive. This includes the joint development with Israel of an intermediate-range missile which will enable it to mount a nuclear attack as far north as Angola and Tanzania. Far more decisive action needs to be taken by the international community to stop apartheid aggression and terrorism.

But, almost unbelievably in the

Recorded MNR Cross-border attacks into Zambia March 1987 to May 1989

Year	Incidents	Dead	Wounded	Abducted	Huts Burnt	Cattle Rustled	Shops Looted
1987	24	1	1	122	—	419	7
1988	88	30	28	36	9	298	12
1989	21	44	12	13	152	121	9
Total	133	75	41	171	161	838	28

Source: Ministry of Defence

(The figures for 1989 are for the first five months only)

BOOK REVIEW

DISINFORMATION IN EUROPE

Werner Puschra: *Schwarze Gewerkschaften in Südafrika (Black Trade Unions in South Africa)* Verlag Neue Gesellschaft, Bonn, 1988.



Few books on trade unionism in South Africa are originally published in German, so this one is likely to have much influence on academic and public opinion in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Apart from providing no new insights into the development of South African unions, the book turns out to be a book for transnational companies in South Africa, as its main thesis is that multinational companies have promoted the process of emancipation of African unions in a decisive way.

Puschra praises the multinationals for paying wages in lower wage categories that are higher than those paid by national companies. He claims to observe tendencies towards a rise of African workers through the wage categories, though a table on the same page shows that only 17% of workers in the higher categories are Africans, and although he says there are no significant differences between multinationals and nationals in opportunities of advancement.

'Improvements' like these tempt Puschra into his most striking declaration: that multinationals were willing to annul the restrictions imposed by apartheid on a larger scale than national companies; and that the policy of the multinationals strengthened the position of the African labour force on the labour market and helped create conditions for the emergence and development of African trade unions. He cites the greater willingness of multinationals to recognise independent trade unions, but a look at another table shows us that not even 2% of multinational workplaces had recognised independent trade unions in 1978, the time he is discussing.

So, although Puschra's statistical material proves that the conditions in multinational companies are hardly better than in

national companies, if at all, he stubbornly tells us they are better, that the policy of the multinationals secured the survival of independent African unions.

In this way, he conceals the fact that the unions had to fight hard for any rise in wages; that multinationals cannot annul apartheid, and don't want to; that they profit by apartheid; and that whatever limited advantages their policies offer to a few, the many still live in the same misery as before.

One has to cope with many more shortcomings in Puschra's book. He generally refuses to discuss the importance of cheap African labour for the system of apartheid, or the importance of the system of apartheid for the capitalist economy. In spite of its title, the book concentrates on unions in manufacturing industry, leaving aside those in the mining sector. Thus he ignores the problem of labour migration. SACTU is discussed in two paragraphs, the political dimension of labour unions in two pages, and limited to the 1980s. After the fashion of reformist propaganda, he stresses wage rises.

Finally, Puschra shows us how he wants a good union to be: moderate and reserved; and he shows us how surprised he is at the "political maturity" of Africans:

"... they (the African unions) proved to have a political maturity no one believed them to be capable of."
(p.198)

— Walter Ehmeir

BOOK REVIEW

FINANCIAL LINKS REPORT

Banking on Apartheid, The Financial Links Report, prepared for the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa, James Currey, London, 1989.

The publication of this report follows on the meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Governments in Vancouver in 1987. All countries at this meeting, with the exception of Britain, agreed to initiate an expert study of the relationship between South Africa and the international financial system, in view of the importance of the South African economy in this respect. The decision was made with the conviction that economic and other sanctions against South Africa already adopted by the Commonwealth and the international community had had a significant effect on South Africa, and therefore it was imperative that wider and tighter application of sanctions become an essential part of any action against apartheid.

This interesting and penetrating study shows the South African economy in a state of constant deterioration, in which it cannot maintain a reasonable rate of growth without an injection of new sources of foreign exchange. Such injections are needed to expand the economic base, increase and sustain growth, improve the balance of payments on current and capital account, and keep the economic motor at full throttle. Such injections are not very much in prospect.

Capital-exporting countries have banned new investment in the South African market; new loans from prospective creditors are at an all-time low; the world community is disgusted by the inequalities and gross economic disparities of apartheid, and prospective foreign investors are reluctant to provide new loans in such a high-risk market, rife with disruptions and uncertainties emanating from apartheid. The result is a poor economic outlook, and disinvestment

pressure is packaged with financial and trade sanctions.

Gold, the major foreign currency earner and key mineral export, is faced with increasing competition and fluctuating price prospects; the only short-term relief comes from foreign trade credits. International financial institutions are not keen to intervene in the crisis.

The *Financial Mail* of August 12th 1988 commented that investors the world over continue to see the only solution to the problem as being political rather than economic. The *Financial Week* of August 18th-24th 1988, said, "The price of apartheid is growing ever more horrendous."

On the other hand, the Commonwealth Eminent Persons' Group acknowledged that change in South Africa is unlikely to take place for as long as the regime believes, or assumes, that it is immune from economic pressure from the world community.

The report goes on to consider other aspects of the South African economy, and to suggest various strategic considerations about areas of the economy in which it is most vulnerable: the capital account and the financial rand system, relations between South Africa and foreign banks, disinvestment, international financial institutions, and gold. Gold has its own peculiarities; nevertheless, strategy is to be kept under review. The gold market should become sensitive to source, especially in countries that have decided on a boycott, and it should be possible to find ways of exposing any circumventions of any boycott.

Throughout, it is made very clear that in all these respects the crisis originates from political factors, such as the South African financial crisis of 1985, which was not due to over-borrowing or severe economic difficulties, but to the reactions to civil disturbance and repression. The market response to political instability, and the lack of creditworthiness of the country, triggered the financial crisis.

All these recommendations need to be considered closely, as it is essential for the activist economist, and other campaigners, to be aware of the economic intricacies involved in maximising pressure on South Africa, as well as in sustaining the pressure, in order to be able to devise

and achieve an effective strategy. The study concludes that while South Africa is not at present stretched to its financial limits, its room for manoeuvre is very small. On financial sanctions the following recommendations are made:

★ Refusal of bank lending is the most significant sanction.

★ Trade sanctions and disinvestment pressures have played a supporting role.

★ Disinvestment has contributed to the poor outlook for direct investment.

★ There should be no relief for South Africa

in its relations with the Bank of International Settlements and the International Monetary Fund.

★ If financial sanctions were maintained and extended, it would hobble the economic growth of the apartheid regime and maintain the economic pressure on it to abandon apartheid.

The report is concise, lucid and up to the mark on the subject. It is expertly written throughout, and its treatment of the issue is equally accessible to the practitioner, the activist and the non-specialist.

— *Mathe Diseko*

Sechaba and other ANC publications are obtainable from the following ANC addresses:

Annual Subscriptions:

USA and Canada (air mail only): \$30

All other countries: £12

Please make cheques payable to:

Sechaba Publications c/o ANC PO Box 38 London N1 9PR

ALGERIA

5 Rue Ben M'hidi Larbi
Algiers

ANGOLA

PO Box 3523
Luanda

AUSTRALIA

Box 49 Trades Hall
4 Goulburn Street
Sydney NSW 2000

BELGIUM

PO Box 137
1040 Brussels

CANADA

PO Box 302
Adelaide Postal Station
Toronto
Ontario M5C-2J4

CUBA

Calle 21A
NR 20617
Esquina 214 Atabey
Havana

DENMARK

Landgreven 7/3 t.h.
1301 Kbh Copenhagen K

EGYPT

5 Ahmad Hismat Street
Zamalek
Cairo

ETHIOPIA

PO Box 7483
Addis Ababa

FINLAND

PO Box 336
00531 Helsinki

**FEDERAL REPUBLIC
OF GERMANY**

Postfach 190140
5300 Bonn 1

FRANCE

28 Rue des Petites Ecuries
75010 Paris

**GERMAN DEMOCRATIC
REPUBLIC**

Angerweg 2
Wilhelmsruh
Berlin 1106

INDIA

50KP Thacker Block
Asian Games Village
Siri Fort Road
Khel Gaon Marg
New Delhi-110049

ITALY

Via S. Prisca 15a
00153 Rome

JAPAN

Square-House Shin-Nakano
Room 105
4-38-16 Honcho Nakano-Ku
Tokyo

KENYA

PO Box 40432
Nairobi

MADAGASCAR

PO Box 80
Antananarivo

NETHERLANDS

PO Box 16657
1001 RD Amsterdam

NIGERIA

Federal Government
Special Guest House
Victoria Island
Lagos.

NORWAY

PO Box 6765
St Olavs Plass
N-0130 Oslo 1

SENEGAL

26 Avenue Albert Sarraut
PO Box 3420
Dakar

SWEDEN

Box 6183
S-102 33
Stockholm

TANZANIA

PO Box 2239
Dar es Salaam
PO Box 680
Morogoro

USSR

Konyushkovskaya Street 28
Moscow 123242

UNITED KINGDOM

PO Box 38
28 Penton Street
London N1 9PR

UNITED STATES

801 Second Avenue
Apt 405
New York NYC 10017

ZAMBIA

PO Box 31791
Lusaka

DEFEND

F

New Nation

