

2-21

# mayibuyye

5n/6d.

BA 392.405  
MAY  
S. 89/173 BY  
1996 -11- 21  
UCT LIBRARIES



21

bulletin of the A.N.C., South Africa

P.O. BOX 1791 LUSAKA, ZAMBIA

# CONTENTS

EDITORIAL . . . . .	1
Africa Freedom Day . . . . .	2
The Struggle Of The Indian People And The "Indian National Council" (by Anti-Pass) . . . . .	3
Voices Of The Two Presidents . . . . .	6
Politics Of Sports . . . . .	8
Ordeal In Botswana . . . . .	13
Letter To The Editor . . . . .	15

# ANCSA

## JUNE 26 APPEAL

This year, June 26 finds the forces of progress meeting the forces of White racist reaction in armed struggle. In the hills and valleys of Zimbabwe, in the mountain fastnesses and in the villages and farms, the ANC/ZAPU guerrilla units are fighting the White racist troops.

The African National Congress of South Africa has decided to observe a Week of Solidarity with the Armed Struggle in Zimbabwe and South Africa. The Week will begin on Sunday June 23 and end on Saturday June 29.

We appeal to all the people of the world who abhor apartheid and racial discrimination to express their solidarity with our struggling people. We address this Appeal to all Governments, Anti-Apartheid Committees, Afro-Asian Solidarity Committees, to social, cultural and working-class organisations and to public institutions in every land and at every level to take whatever action they can against apartheid. Your support will help us to liberate our country from the scourge of racism; to free our people from the miserable life of race oppression which is their lot today. Support our armed struggle to smash White racism in South Africa and, indeed in the whole of Southern Africa.

\* \* \* \* \*

THERE ARE VARIOUS WAYS IN WHICH YOU CAN PLAY YOUR PART IN THE STRUGGLE OF THE AFRICAN PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION. WE ARE SENDING YOU, UNDER SEPARATE COVER, A DETAILED LIST OF THE SPECIFIC TASKS YOU CAN PERFORM TO ENSURE THE OBSERVANCE OF JUNE 26, 1968 ACHIEVES A RESOUNDING SUCCESS.

\* \* \* \* \* CONGRESS UNDERGROUND STEPS-UP ACTIVITY \* \* \* \* \*

The enclosed leaflet is a message from Dr. Y.M. Dadoo, banned President of the South African Indian Congress addressed to the Indian people in South Africa. Like the earlier leaflets distributed by our underground resistance machinery within the country, its call to action has aroused wide-spread and enthusiastic support amongst the masses.

WHITHER BOTSWANA?

On the occasion of His Excellency President Kaunda's State Visit President Seretse Khama of Botswana is reported to have said at Gaborone, the capital:-

"The inescapable fact, whose implications are not readily appreciated by many who are far removed from the local scene, is that Rhodesia and South Africa are our neighbours, and our existence in Botswana is inseparably bound up with theirs."

We take the liberty of suggesting that the reverse is, in fact, true. Friends of Botswana and all African Revolutionaries are extremely mindful of the very difficult position in which the people of Botswana find themselves. Not only by the circumstances of geography but also from the legacy of poverty left behind by the British colonialists, Botswana finds herself dependent on the racist White South. Botswana's import and export trade is largely either with South Africa or through South Africa; thousands of Botswana citizens, unable to find employment in their own country because of the criminal neglect visited upon it by British imperialism, have to go and work on the mines, the farms and the factories of South Africa.

Cognisant of these difficulties, African Revolutionaries have not pressed Botswana to implement what President Khama describes as "unrealistic resolutions" on South Africa and Rhodesia. We have also looked upon with joy at the still embryonic but developing relations between Botswana and Zambia, evidence of which is last year's visit to Zambia by President Khama and the present visit to Botswana of President Kaunda. We have felt that if Botswana were able to gradually loosen the economic stranglehold of the racists she would then begin to play more fully her rightful role on the side of the African Revolution.

Alas, some recent events in Botswana have created grave doubts in our minds. Without at present, going into details we would like to mention:

- a) The patrolling of the Botswana/Rhodesia border by the Botswana police for the purpose of apprehending our Freedom Fighters.
- b) The treatment meted out to our guerrillas by the Botswana police after their arrest.
- c) The long sentences imposed on our Freedom Fighters by the Botswana courts.
- d) The frightening rumours of the activities of the South African Security Police in Botswana and

- e) The arrest and detention last week of our Chief Representative in Zambia, Mr. Tennyson Makiwane, who had gone to Botswana to attend the funeral of his late colleague, teacher and relative, Professor Z.K. Matthews.

These and other developments have filled us with consternation, and dismay. Is it any wonder that some of our members question whether Botswana's ties with the racist White South are purely economic or whether they go deeper? This is a most serious question reflecting the grave doubts that exist in the minds of many. We would like to think that the situation is not as it appears to be. But we do not know. It is for the Botswana Government to explain its actions with the minimum of delay.

In the event, President Kaunda's speech to the Conference of the Botswana Democratic Party which is in power was indeed timely. Historically it reflects what is inevitable - that power must pass to the African majority in Southern Africa irrespective of the methods the fascist-racists adopt to maintain their oppressive rule. Perhaps it is reading too much into His Excellency's speech to suggest that he was warning Botswana of the future. Nevertheless, the occasion and circumstances of the speech should serve to remind Botswana of the undeniable truth that what is today will not be tomorrow. Botswana must choose.

\* \* \* \*

#### AFRICA FREEDOM DAY

On the occasion of Africa Freedom Day 1968, the African National Congress of South Africa salutes the gallant freedom fighters who are engaging the enemy in a life and death struggle to bring an end to minority, racist regimes in Southern Africa. We pay special tribute to those who have already laid down their lives in the name of African freedom and independence.

Since last August the African National Congress and the Zimbabwe African Peoples' Union opened a new chapter in the struggle to free Rhodesia and South Africa when our guerrillas launched a well-planned offensive in the Wankie area. In recent months our guerrillas have stepped-up the armed struggle in Zimbabwe and the war of liberation will soon spread to the heart of racism - South Africa.

The ZAPU-ANC alliance has struck fear in the ranks of the enemy. Inspired by the noble ideas of Pan-African Solidarity, our alliance is a fitting reply to the wicked anti-Africa conspiracy of Portugal, Rhodesia and South Africa. The long-standing political, economic and military ties forged by these fascist powers are designed to suppress the freedom aspirations of the African people.

Our guerrillas have exploded the myth that the racist armies are invincible. They are scoring impressive victories and are giving deserving punishment to the evil forces of oppression. They have aroused afresh the hopes of the people in the final victory of their cause.

LONG LIVE THE STRUGGLE FOR THE TOTAL LIBERATION OF AFRICA!!

THE STRUGGLE OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE AND THE  
"INDIAN NATIONAL COUNCIL"

More than a century ago, in 1860, the first Indians came to South Africa to work on the plantations of the White colonists of Natal. They came after much pleading and many promises made by the colonists. Within a short time of their arrival they transformed the agrarian economy of Natal particularly the sugar plantations. Exports began to soar and the White settlers became rich. Seeing this increasing prosperity and recognising that the Indian indentured labourers were directly responsible the colonists held out all sorts of inducements to encourage the Indian to stay in Natal instead of returning to India. They were offered, land, changes in employment, education and health facilities, service in the army including combat duties should the need arise and above all, voting rights.

Since then much water has flowed under the South African bridge - or should we say, breach. For not only is apartheid a breach between various racial groups in South Africa, but the White man has been guilty of the most blatantly selfish breach of faith as regards the rights of the Indian people. Systematically and deliberately the Indians have been deprived, over the years, of every single right they possessed. The franchise, the municipal vote, the land which they won by toil and sweat from the wilderness - every right one can think of; social, political, or economic is now denied to the Indian people. Of course, it is not only the Indian people who are denied these rights but also the Coloureds, and the African majority is in a worse position, if such a thing is possible. In apartheid-compartmentalised South Africa the Indians are naturally, Blacks and as such dehumanised creatures to be exploited when it is profitable to do so and to be rejected, bounded and humiliated if their labours are no more required by the "civilised", pure White Herrenvolk.

In defense of the rights they once possessed and in the struggle for freedom and equality the Indian people, despite their small number (less than 5% of the total population of South Africa), have played a noteworthy part. Their struggles go back to the days at the turn of the century when Mahatma Gandhi, then a young practising lawyer, was active in South Africa. It was here that he first experimented with the technique of Satyagraha (Passive Resistance). There were many stirring revolts notably the great march of thousands of men, women and children from Natal into the Transvaal in defiance of the government of the day. It was Gandhi who formed the Natal Indian Congress which subsequently became the South African Indian Congress, and which to this day is the only mass political organisation of the Indian people.

Soon after the Second World War the Smuts Government attacked further the land rights of the Indian people. In protest the Indian people, led by the South African Indian Congress launched a great passive resistance campaign. Thousands went to jail in defiance of apartheid laws. So successful and so all-embracing was the campaign that the law could not be implemented and within two years the White minority government repealed it.

From the/...

From the 1950's onwards the struggle of the Indian people has become indissolubly linked with that of the African majority led by the African National Congress. Being a member of the Congress Alliance, led by the ANC, the Indian Congress has participated in every major campaign launched by the Alliance - the strikes, the stay-at-homes, the Defiance Campaign, the Congress of the People, the boycotts, etc. A large number of Indian leaders were among the 156 accused in the infamous Treason Trial which lasted for four years between 1956 and 1961. Hundreds of Indians have been banned by the fascist-racist government, many scores have served or are still serving various terms of imprisonment for their part in the freedom struggle.

When, in 1961, the ANC launched the armed struggle, many Indians immediately joined the military wing, Umkhonto We Sizwe, some in positions of command at various levels. Many are serving long sentences of imprisonment on the notorious Robben Island for their activities in the underground army.

The present Indian population of South Africa is now the fifth and sixth generation. Most South African Indians have never left the shores of the country simply because they cannot afford to do so. Yet until very recently they were regarded by the Whites as an alien community to be "repatriated" back to India at the first opportunity!! This abominably hard-hearted policy was not only unjust in the extreme but impracticable for various reasons notably the Indian Government's complete refusal to co-operate with such blatant injustice.

Finally, in the 1960's the racist regime has now acknowledged that the Indians are South Africans - 100 years after they arrived!! In a sense this is an acknowledgement of defeat that in spite of numerous restrictions, repression and virtual economic strangulation half a million people could not be hounded from the land of their birth. But, despite this recognition, the restrictions, the oppression and repression continues. Indians together with other non-Whites continue to be non-citizens in their own country.

In fact the statement "recognising" the Indian people as "permanent inhabitants" of South Africa was accompanied by another piece of apartheid legislation - the setting up of an Indian National Council. In their Grand Design the apartheid fanatics seek to bring about a total separation of the various communities comprising the South African population. The hard-headed politicians and economists are, of course, aware that this is not possible because the super-profits and the prosperity of the Whites is based on exploitation of the Blacks. So gestures are made. Thus we have the Bantustan fraud for the African majority, the Coloured Council and now the Indian National Council.

The legislation authorising the setting up of this Council was passed five years ago. So total was the opposition of the Indian people to this fraudulent substitute for full citizenship rights that even the stooge element within the Indian Community spoke out against it. None could be found to co-operate voluntarily with the racist government in planning the setting up of/...

up of the Council. In desperation the Minister of Indian Affairs had to resort to sending 100 personal invitations to selected stooges and members of the teaching profession who are in a particularly vulnerable position being employees of the State. It is noteworthy that at the first meeting held in December 1963 the Minister was obliged to state that because of "agitation, intimidation and internal strife" democratically elected leaders of the Indian community could not be found!!

The Minister went on to say:-

"If the required co-operation is still with-held it will not mean that I shall refrain from going ahead with the task entrusted to me. But I shall do so as I see fit and nobody will be entitled to accuse me of taking matters into my own hands without first having consulted you."

These statements of the Minister clearly demonstrate the solid opposition of the Indian people to the Indian National Council and their refusal to co-operate in their own oppression.

The Indian National Council will obviously have no legislative or real administrative functions. It is intended as an advisory body to "consult" with the government on matters pertaining to Indian education, health services Indian industrial development and opportunities for employment, old age pensions, the setting up of local government in "Indian areas", etc.

Some well-known stooges, such as P.R. Pather and A.M. Moolla, seem recently to have had second thoughts about the Indian National Council. In the police State that is South Africa all opposition to the racist regime is silenced by the monstrous punishment meted out to opponents. Taking advantage of this foetid atmosphere the stooges appear to be coming out in their true, ugly colours. No doubt as a sop to their decayed consciences they have called for an elected council rather than a nominated council. They hope thereby to dupe and confuse the mass of the Indian people - as if it was not well-known that the government itself envisages an elected council in the hope of passing it off to the world as a democratic institution. The stooges represent nobody but themselves and will be dealt with by the people at the appropriate time. And the government has not the shadow of a hope of bluffing the Indian people, let alone the world.

The Indian people of South Africa are not interested in phoney, fraudulent institutions such as the Indian National Council, nor are they interested in being "recognised" by the fascist-racists as "permanent inhabitants" of South Africa.

They were born in South Africa like their fathers and grandfathers and they will accept nothing less than their birthright as citizens of South Africa.

Through the/...



Through the South African Indian Congress the Indian people have thrown in their lot with all the oppressed people of South Africa led by the African National Congress. Long after the fascists and their fraud and trickery will have been overthrown the Indian people will continue to flourish in South Africa as South Africans.

\* \* \* \*

ALL NATIONAL GROUPS SHALL HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS!

There shall be equal status in the bodies of state, in the courts and in the schools for all national groups and races; All people shall have equal right to use their own languages, and to develop their own folk culture and customs; All national groups shall be protected by laws against insults to their race and national pride; The preaching and practice of national, racial or colour discrimination and contempt shall be a punishable crime; All apartheid laws and practices shall be set aside.

- FREEDOM CHARTER

\* \* \* \*

VOICES OF TWO PRESIDENTS

PRESIDENT KHAMA'S VOICE:

\* \* \* \* \*

"President Khama declared that his country would not accept 'Some unrealistic resolutions' which were formulated elsewhere and unmindful of the repercussions to Botswana

Sir Seretse Khama said that although South Africa was under fire from the United Nations, and Rhodesia, since U.D.I., has been a perennial issue at the Commonwealth Conferences, these two countries were Botswana's neighbours and the existence of Botswana was inseparably bound up with that of South Africa and Rhodesia.

President Khama said: 'My Government is committed to the promise made and the programmes it has given to the country. We seek first and foremost to shape our destiny, to shoulder our responsibilities, improve the social economic condition of our people and to work towards a viable economy.'

He pointed out that in the past what any country did inside its borders was its own business, and in any way countries lived unto themselves. But today every country in the world was known. He added: 'We can no longer pursue our own way of life unobserved by the rest of the world.'

But he said that no amount of the recrimination from the highest platforms would help correct the wrong that was being done....

Sir Seretse also pointed out that Zambia was one country he was bold to say, had shown a keen appreciation of Botswana's geographical position in Southern Africa and her efforts to resolve its relationship with its neighbours and the problems of Southern Africa."

PRESIDENT KAUNDA'S VOICE:

"President Kaunda has declared that apartheid must go if there is to be peace and security not only in South Africa but the world over. He has also declared that Africa looks to Botswana as an outstanding example which South Africa and Rhodesia must follow. Dr. Kaunda was speaking at the Botswana Democratic Party conference in Gaborone on Thursday.

It was the most hard hitting speech and a terrible indictment Dr. Kaunda ever made against racist South Africa and Rhodesia during his four day state visit to Botswana. His historic speech drew great applause from the thousands of people attending the party conference.

Dr. Kaunda declared: 'There can be no security for us in Botswana and Zambia unless there is genuine peace and security in South Africa, South West Africa, Rhodesia, Angola and Mozambique, Let us not deceive ourselves, there is no stability in South Africa.'

The President noted that the present instability in territories like South West Africa, South Africa, Rhodesia, Mozambique and Angola was bound to affect Botswana and Zambia now or in the future. Democracy for the few as that exercised in Southern Africa did not provide stability and genuine peace but was actually oppressing the majority of the people and creating conditions for their exploitation.

Dr. Kaunda warned: 'But as long as the fifteen million people in South Africa remain without a voice no amount of coercion, no amount of physical force will suppress that unquenchable thirst for freedom, individual liberty and the will to truly human beings.' The President continued, 'Let me make it also clear that we do not hate the white people in South Africa. We do not wish the whites dead or exterminated. They are human beings, they deserve our love. Those in Rhodesia are exactly the same. Let them realise now that they cannot be misled any longer. If they are interested in the country and its wealth it had better be shared fairly at this early stage or else they are allowing the building up of an explosive situation, the consequences of which will be the loss of all that they hold dear.'

South Africa's association with the so-called free world, he said was a false claim, as long as freedom was denied to those who deserved it....."

- ZAMBIA BROADCASTING SERVICE

THERE SHALL BE PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP!

.....Peace and friendship amongst all our people shall be secured by upholding the equal rights, opportunities and status of all; The people of the protectorates - Basutoland (Lesotho), Bechuanaland (Botswana) and Swaziland - shall be free to decide for themselves their own future; The right of all the peoples of Africa to independence and self-government shall be recognised, and shall be the basis of close co-operation.

- FREEDOM CHARTER - Adopted at the Congress of the People, Kliptown, S. Africa, on 26 June, 1955

POLITICS OF SPORTS! - S.L. Mngqikana

May I through the columns of your periodical comment and attempt to correct and clear up some misunderstanding, if not deliberate distortion, entailed in an article entitled "Olympics Insult - An African Speaks Out" which appeared in the 22nd February issue of the Daily Dispatch by Gordon Qumza. I shall address myself also to those who have held similar misguided opinions on this Olympic issue.

Firstly, it is incorrect and misleading to say that the African States have decided to boycott the Olympic Games "just because South Africa has been readmitted to the Olympics fold" for the fundamental objection of the African States to South Africa's participation is that South Africa practises racial discrimination in sport against the non-White people. The motive force behind the boycott is the adherence of the African States to values which they hold to be inalienable and on which compromise is unthinkable. To participate would be a betrayal of apartheid system in South Africa. The fact that they have, by their decision, deprived some of the athletes of the possibility of winning medals for their respective countries is a demonstration of the value they attach to this principle. Medals are material things which cannot be put on par with human dignity. One could here draw a parallel with Mr. Vorster's intransigence when he explicitly pointed out that there could be "no compromise, negotiations or abandonment of principles" as regards mixed sport. The difference between the two standpoints is that one upholds the principle of racial equality whilst the other stands for racial inequality and inferiority. The former enjoys, not only the support of the people of South Africa, but also of the majority of the international community. The latter stands censured and condemned, not only by the majority of the people of South Africa, but also by the majority of the international community. Why is it then that Gordon Qumza and others do not understand Africa's reason for boycotting the Games?

Secondly, the African States' boycott reflects a refusal to be deceived by the fraudulent "new sports policy" which is intended to project a false image of racial harmony and progress for overseas consumption while at home rigid discrimination has been intensified. To accept this position would mean "the blackmen of South Africa would be like trained monkeys who would be shown at the fair and who would go back to the forest once the party is over". (Mr. Andre Hombessa - Chairman of the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa:)

Thirdly, the African States have shown consistency in their attitude to South Africa's administration of sport. Resolutions passed unanimously by the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa in Teheran last year had explicitly stated that the African members of the Olympic Committee will reconsider their participation in the Mexico Games if a South African team is invited whilst racial discrimination and segregation is maintained inside South Africa. There is nothing "difficult to understand (in) the move for our (South Africa's) neighbouring States" since racial discrimination and segregation, to which they object, still obtains. What should be difficult to understand/...

understand and seemingly inconsistent is how to reconcile "integration" abroad and maintain rigid separation inside South Africa. I shall, however, try to show the insincerity in the "new sports policy" below.

It is not an accurate reflection of non-White sportsmen's desire that they only "clamoured for inclusion in Springbok sides" just for the sake of being in a Springbok side, as Gordon suggests in his article. The clamour stems from the principle that the apartheid concept in sport must end. It is bizarre to suppose that "the very countries that agitated for the inclusion of the non-Whites" did so only on the superficial level of having "integrated" Springboks only outside South Africa. Mr. L.S. Booty Casojee, Vice-President of the Border Soccer Union, in the Evening Post reasserts the stand of the non-Whites' position:

"Charity begins at home. When I, a South African of copper colour, can participate with South Africans in local, provincial and national championships at home without stigma I have something to be happy about!"

The paramount reason for agitation against South Africa's sports policies is abhorrence of racism in sport. The boycott is a manifestation of their disapproval and condemnation of the racist policies and a preparedness not to participate in or connive at promoting racism in the Games. Crucial in the whole issue is not to test the competence or incompetence of the non-White South Africans but whether South African sport is run on an equitable basis and whether equal opportunity is afforded to everyone irrespective of colour.

To say "(that) now the war has been won" is to live in a world of fantasies. It is wishful thinking to assume that the African States, let alone the South African non-Whites, have won their fight against discrimination in sport as a result of the exportation of an "integrated" team to the Olympics. It is highly inconceivable how one can shout victory when Vorster has blatantly and granitely declared there would be "no compromise, negotiations or abandonment of principles". Winning a gold or silver medal in Mexico will not significantly alter the non-Whites' discriminated position, nor would the campaign for inclusion be fully legitimized by such token "victory". The only cause for joy and victory would be the elimination of racialism in sport.

Negro athletes have been more vocal in their protest against racial discrimination and this is illustrated in their public statements. For example, Tommie Smith, who holds 7 world records said:

"It is discouraging to be in a team with White athletes. On the track you are Tommie Smith, the fastest man in the world, but once you are in the dressing room, you are nothing more than a dirty Negro."

Since the Olympic Games have drawn publicity from all quarters, I presume I shall not be doing justice to Gordon Qumza if I single him out as the only/...

the only person who has expressed misguided views. Fred Thabede, administrator of non-White boxing, is reported to have said of the African States that by deciding to boycott the Games:

"Now they slap us in the face in the most blatant showing of discrimination against our Whites and non-Whites that I have ever seen."

This is devoid of any truth as I have explained above why the African States have decided to boycott the Games - It was never an act of discrimination. But the most striking stupidity is for Fred Thabede to complain about the "most blatant....discrimination" by the African States! How low has Fred stooped to speak of "discrimination against our non-Whites and Whites" as the worst thing he has ever seen. What does job reservation, group areas, arbitrary removals and arrests, influx control, separate and inferior educational system mean to Mr. Thabede? What despicable trash to utter when the daily lives of the non-Whites are subjected to the most brutal discrimination ever perpetrated against man since the Hitler days! If Mr. Thabede is proud of the discrimination policies obtaining in S. Africa, most non-Whites are not. In reply to Edward Sono's statement that:

"To the Afro-Asian countries everything from South Africa must be treated with suspicion."

I can only say that the mere fact that South Africa will allow an "integrated" team abroad and no mixed teams inside the country must arouse some suspicion in the minds of any sober thinking person. The suspicions of the Afro-Asian countries are therefore well-founded.

The impression created by some of these comments gives a false picture of what the mass of the people think about non-White participation in the Games. Militant opponents of apartheid have long been muzzled and it is no surprise that they have not come out in the open on this issue. How could they lay themselves open to harrassment by the Special Branch, some of whom hold official positions in, for instance, the South African Rugby Board?

A close look at the "new sports policy" shows a close inter-relation between the question of sport and the government policy, and to talk of "no politics in sport" is sheer delusion, self-deception and naked hypocrisy. The flabbergasting contention that politics has nothing to do with sport is like saying sport has nothing to do with life. Belief in the divorce of sport from politics is tantamount to saying that sport is more important than life itself. Were the decisions to refuse Maoris in the New Zealand teams decisions taken in the interests of sportmanship? Is the decision to debar non-Whites from Whites' sports fields one in the interest of promoting sport? My submission is that both these acts were and are primarily motivated by political considerations - the same holds true of the decision to send an "integrated" team to Mexico. The latter was a response to a cross-pressure position in which the government was put arising from international pressure on the one hand and domestic pressure on the other which/...

which came from White sports officials. There is no better illustration of the sense of frustration and an irresistible urge to be readmitted to the Games than Mr. Braun's testimony before the International Olympic Committee when he said:

"Expulsion from the Olympics has deprived us of the very reason of our existence. Despair, frustration and disillusionment have been deeply felt at all levels of sport in South Africa and among all sections of the population. The stigma of being looked upon as an outcast has been no easy cross to bear."

Mr. Braun's statement might be true insofar as it affects the Whites, as for the non-Whites, they have been denigrated as outcasts in the South African sporting society from time immemorial. Hence Mr. Casojee's remark, reported in the Evening Post:

"As a true South African who believes that only merit in sport - irrespective of race, colour, or creed - I see nothing to be elated about in the new move. To save itself from being kicked out completely it (South Africa) has hit upon this gag."

The export of an "integrated" team to Mexico is part of a diplomatic move to hoodwink world public opinion into believing that "concessions" have been made in the apartheid structure. It has misled some people as is evidence from the remarks of a few sports writers. The fact is that this is part of broader plans for a South African public relations campaign to arm defenders of apartheid to present it as a tenable proposition. Mr. "Bill" Stonehouse, manager of the non-White members of the team which toured Britain recently confirms this contention in his report to the South African Amateur Athletics when he said:

"The African Athletes were excellent ambassadors for South Africa. The fact that Britons could meet South African Bantu who were satisfied with conditions in South Africa was a real eye-opener to them and did much to improve South Africa's image among the many people we met."

Mr. Braun is guilty of the same crime that he levels against other people when, according to the Johannesburg Post, he said of the I.O.C. that:

"(it) does not take cognisance of the support of the population for the prevailing political and social order."

This same trend of thought is evident in the above statement by Mr. "Bill" Stonehouse. How naive it is for any serious-thinking person in the light of prevailing inequality, job reservation, bannings, night raids and arbitrary arrests, passes, Bantu

Education, etc! The sending of a mixed team to Mexico by South Africa is an attempt to use the Olympic arena to hide what is really going on back home. John Lovessay in the London Sunday Times of the 18th February, 1968 succinctly observes:

"The idea that a Black South African would with an Olympic medal serve as an inspiring focus for his own people is as naive as it is old-fashioned. Such a man would become a prize specimen to be brought out, displayed and returned when his dazzling appearance has deceived a few eyes."

In conclusion I suggest that the "concessions" are a gimmick the purpose of which is to alleviate pressure on the South African government. Basically the apartheid stance has not shifted an inch.

\* \* \* \*

RESOLUTION OF THE N.E.C. ON  
JAMES JOLOBE HALEBE.

At its meeting held in Morogoro on the 15th April, 1968, the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) examined JAMES JOLOBE HALEBE'S behaviour and conduct, and arrived at the conclusion that Mr. Hadebe's conduct, persisted in despite patient and prolonged attempts to dissuade him, was a politically motivated move to subvert the African National Congress and thus undermine the cause of the people.

At a time when the African National Congress is engaged in a most fierce armed revolutionary struggle in Southern Africa, Mr. Hadebe's counter-revolutionary activities constitute a stab in the back of those brave heroes now locked in battle against the white minority regimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa.

In the circumstances, the National Executive Committee of the African National Congress has resolved to expel Mr. Hadebe from all organs of the African National Congress of South Africa.

D. NOKWE

Secretary-General.

ORDEAL IN BOTSWANA

- By Tennyson Makiwane

The D.C.4 aircraft of the Botswana National Airlines, after a two hour smooth Southward bound flight from Lusaka, began to lose height, preparing for a landing. "Fasten seat belts", flashed the red light on the panel above the door leading to the pilots' cabin. We braced ourselves up in an exercise that was rather familiar to some of us. Yet I missed a heart beat or two and I noticed an air of excitement surrounding my colleague Mrs. Ruth Mompoti who was seating next to me. On the whole it had been an uneventful voyage and we had not had much to talk about travelling - as we were going to the funeral of the late Dr. Z.K. Matthews who was to be buried in Gaborone. At one point I was a bit concerned when I looked through the window and observed below a vast lake which could only be Lake Kariba. "Good Lord!" I said to myself, "Is this plane flying over Rhodesia?" But that thought flashed through my mind just for one second.

Now I was looking through the window again and below I could see the characteristic scanty vegetation of Botswana, betraying the near desert conditions.

Francistown was soon in view—modern architectural houses on one side and at the other end the thatched huts of the African township. Soon the plane was rolling on the run-way, screeched to a halt before taxiing towards the airport building. The plane was due to stop over at Francistown for half an hour. We had reached Botswana safely and the first leg of the journey was over.

"I am looking forward to seeing a good many friends of mine", said Mrs. Mompoti as if she had read my own thoughts. Both of us had not been to Francistown for six to seven years. She added that she hoped she could buy some biltong which she had not tasted since she had been in those parts.

Some of the friends she spoke about, many of whom were former schoolmates, were now occupying senior government posts. One or two were cabinet ministers.

I first sensed trouble when I observed the mean look I was given by some of the White policemen as we entered the immigration office. The most arrogant turned out to be a uniformed policeman who wore a moustache that looked like miniature horns of a buffalo. He looked rather like one of those characters from cheap jungle movie films except that he was minus a double-barrelled gun. This was Muscell, the Police Chief of Francistown. He appeared to be in charge of immigration formalities. When I presented my papers he ordered an African special branch policeman to drive me into a small police office in the building. Mrs. Mompoti and our two ZAPU colleagues, Atwell Bokwe and Saul Ndlovu suffered the same fate. Two African plain clothes policemen were detailed to guard us. Still we could not believe that we would be prevented from proceeding to Gaborone, our destination. We still hoped we would be called and given some kind of lecture about/...



about how we were supposed to conduct ourselves in Botswana. But the incredible happened. The rest of the passengers were asked to board the plane and we were still held in that police room. We began to act fast and asked the policemen guarding us why we were being held there. They did not know and referred us to their White superiors. After a few sharp exchanges with these, we were finally told that we were held under immigrations laws on instructions from Gaborones. So we then demanded that our luggage be taken off from the plane. No, this could not be done we were told. The luggage would be taken off at Gaborones and would be sent back that afternoon. We were then ordered to get into a landrover taking us to the police station in town. At this point we stood firm and demanded to know what was happening. Were we under arrest? we asked. No, we were not, we were told. One of the policemen said that they merely wanted to know from headquarters in Gaborones what they were supposed to do with us and it was likely that we would be able to continue with our journey by a local plane flying to Gaborones that evening. Suddenly, without provocation, the police boss Muscell shouted at the top of his voice something to the effect that we should stop arguing and go to the police station otherwise we would not even get our luggage back. We felt there and then that we should put him in his place and we should make him realise that he was not going to push us around. And we did.

We ultimately got to the police station. By that time some of the policemen had become a bit polite. They told us that they were contacting Gaborones about us and they would soon let us know the result. Meanwhile they turned down our own requests to telephone friends and government officials in Gaborones. The police boss Muscell rudely dressed down an African sergeant who tried to make a telephone call on our behalf to inform some friends in Francistown that we were detained.

After about two hours one of the White policemen told us that Gaborones had phoned back and the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs had ordered that we be detained pending the decision of the President. In another fifteen minutes police boss Muscell triumphantly announced that the final word had arrived. We were not being allowed to proceed to the Funeral. And we would be detained in the State Prison pending deportation to Zambia from whence we came. After this staggering piece of news, one shocking police announcement was to follow another. We were told that we were being detained in terms of Section II of the Immigration Act which permits the police to detain for fourteen days;

- a) Anybody suspected of being a prohibited immigrant.
- b) Or who is likely to be declared a prohibited immigrant or an undesirable person.

The law, we were told permitted the police to search us. And to take our finger-prints, palm-prints and photographs. Then Atwell Bokwe and I were told that we had been declared Prohibited Immigrants on July 27th 1966. That was before Botswana became independent. Naturally our first question was to ask why such a prohibition order was still regarded as valid under/...

under an independent African Government. Moreover, why had we, in this period of nearly two years, never been told that we were P.I.s in Botswana. Ruth Mompoti and Saul Ndlovu were not prohibited immigrants but all the same, they too would be detained. Ruth Mompoti was called away and returned after some time to tell us that during a police search an attempt was made to strip her naked but she resolutely resisted such humiliation. Attempts were also made when I was being searched to strip me naked but I refused.

When the time arrived for us to be taken to prison we decided to lodge a resolute protest with one of the police officers about the scandalous treatment we had so far received.

In the State prison some of our inmates were men arrested for manslaughter, stock theft, a lunatic and a very sick man who let loose a shrilling scream every night. No one was permitted to visit us in the jail.

After four days we were released and taken straight to the airport to join the flight to Zambia. We left Botswana not only with a bad taste in the mouth but with the firm conviction that that country is not yet fully independent. If we go by our experiences in Francistown, it seems obvious that the immigration law was deliberately framed in order to permit the victimisation of Freedom Fighters whose only crime is that they are fighting the racist-fascist regimes of Rhodesia and South Africa.

The people of Botswana have still to struggle hard to break the grip of the pro-fascist colonial officials who seem to be pushing their weight around in Botswana.

\* \* \* \*

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The Editor,  
MAYIBUYE,  
P.O. Box 1791,  
LUSAKA.

Dear Sir,

I read MAYIBUYE No.12. On the whole I think it is a good issue except for a very, unfortunate article entitled "Sharpeville - A Tragedy." There are serious, wrong, and dangerous statements in this article which distorts a phase of our struggle.

I am, however, most gratified to note the official views of the African National Congress on Sharpeville as expressed in the article of the Secretary-General, Mr. Duma Nokwe under the title "Sharpeville in Perspective". (MAYIBUYE No. 18). After reading that article, I felt that justice had been done to all the heroic struggles of our people. It is quite clear that there have been many "Sharpevilles" in the life of our people, that the White oppressors have killed hundreds of our people in cold-blood in the same way that dozens were shot down at Sharpeville.

Many of/...

Many of the historical facts were stated erroneously in the article "Sharpeville - a Tragedy." I do not wish to comment on what I think is an over-statement in the first paragraph that "for those eight years Sharpeville has epitomised for all progressives the brutal nature of the White minority regime." We have, over the years, fought with some success to ensure that international progressive organisations understand the background to the tragedy that occurred at Sharpeville. Some people, of course, are ever ready to exploit this national tragedy for petty political ambitions.

The paragraph headed "South African Background" is a gross misrepresentation of the history of the African National Congress. To say that: "Up to 1950 the liberation movement in South Africa had been disjointed and without a plan. True, there had been campaigns etc. but there had not been co-ordination of effort between various sections of the oppressed, insufficient contact between various regions of the country and minimal communication between the industrial workers and the liberation movement as a whole". This statement is not factual and does serious discredit to the history of the African National Congress and its leaders.

Congress was born in struggle, first against the colour bar clauses in the South Africa Act of 1909 (which excluded Africans, Coloured and Indians from both houses of parliament), and secondly against the Native Land Act of 1913. Our movement carried on a vigorous, country-wide campaign against both oppressive measures.

Congress sponsored the Women's Anti-Pass Campaign of 1913 against the pass laws, and initiated the first 'burning of passes' on the Witwatersrand in 1918. In that year, Congress also took a leading part in a strike of Municipal workers and later of Miners in Johannesburg.

In the 1920's and 1930's Congress frequently proposed or supported joint action with Coloured and Indian leaders against colour bars and racial oppression. It is true that these attempts met with small success, but the reasons for the failure must be found in the social conditions of that period.

"Co-ordination between various sections of the oppressed" did not only commence after 1950. Since its inception the A.N.C. co-operated with the African Peoples' Organisation under Dr. Abdurahman. In fact, some of its leading members like Dr. Rubusana belonged to both organisations. In 1946 there was the famous Dadoo-Xuma-Naicker pact of co-operation, which laid the basis for joint action in the 1952 Defiance Campaign.

The expression that in 1949 the ANC was "invigorated by the influx of courageous, young men and thus adopted a 'Plan of Action' is both unfortunate and incorrect. What was adopted in 1949 was a "Programme of Action" in which both the older and younger members participated in its formulation.

I should also like to point out that it was not the Sharpeville massacre that made the ANC decide to embark on armed struggle. The true reasons for this decision are to be found in the Congress booklet, 'ANC of SA' Page 20-24.

For these and other reasons, I consider that the article 'Sharpeville - a Tragedy' contains a number of errors of fact and interpretation, and does less than justice to the ANC.