

"South Africa, now suitably encouraged, will launch annual tournaments. The 'Dirty Dozen' may never see an England sweater again, but they could be committed for years ahead to play in South Africa — the richest, loneliest men in cricket."

But the problem is also one of professionalism in sport, It has some similarity to the row over marathon-man Johnny Halberstad who has now been barred from amateur running because he was paid to run. It is a matter of sportsmen selling their talents to the highest bidder because they have made their talents into a business and all the old tenets of playing for the sake of the game are fast becoming obsolete.

Of this matter in cricket Lewis says: "The ICC lies flabby on top of world cricket like a toothless, clawless lion . . . what international cricket needs is a board of directors.

"Today, cricket is a highly entertaining business run on archaic, unbusinesslike lines. Perhaps that is why the game has not kept pace with the hardnosed element which has turned itself into a mercenary army to everyone's embarrassment.

"And then, when everyone has counted the cost of the tour, the one figure which should remain in all minds is the 387 racial laws in South Africa where a black skin is synonymous with racial crime."

All heavy stuff for a newspaper which has said more for South Africa than against it.

When, after a month of indecision, the TCCB finally banned the rebels from playing test cricket for three years and ruled that players playing in South Africa in future would not be eligible for England selection, it was promptly criticised for "savage reaction" and for bowing in the face of external pressure.

Of course, the South African cricket authorities reacted too, in the way they knew best. They promptly offered leading members of the rebel team contracts for next season to offset their financial losses through the ban, estimated at R40 000 a year.

This means that Gooch will probably play for Western Province next season, while South Africa's Allan Lamb, who honoured his contract in England and did not play the rebels, will probably play for England.

But, in the end, the prediction of the convenor of the Springbok cricket selectors, Dr Ali Bacher, probably came closest to the truth.

He warned against over-reaction to official British attitudes, saying it was politic for the English cricket authorities to make anti-tour statements to save the Indian and Pakistani tours.

"I tell you, the row will die down in months . . ."

Will that indeed prove to be so? □

2 JUST CRICKET OR JUST NOT CRICKET

by Malcolm McKenzie

Graham Gooch's team of English cricketers has recently completed a whirlwind tour of South Africa, during which they provided the Springboks with a fair semblance of international competition for the first time in a decade. They have been hailed by many whites here as brave men who have risked their international careers in order to fight what these people see as the immoral interference of politics with sport.

Immediately after the TCCB had imposed a three year ban upon Gooch and his team, the Springbok captain Mike Procter wrote a vigorous defence, in his weekly Sunday Tribune column, "of the feelings of many who have been shocked by the hypocrisy and double standards that have been displayed by those responsible for the well-being and future of the game." In addition, the tour was seen by its supporters as something of a victory for the so-called 'normalisation', not only of cricket, but of sport generally in this country. Mr Joe Pamensky, president of the South African Cricket Union, has been reported as saying that the tour "has resulted in an awareness outside South Africa of the very real changes that have taken place on the sporting scene in the Republic."

There is however, another way of looking at the tour. And it is particularly important, in view of the total strategy mounted by the South African white-controlled media in favour of the tour, to be aware of this other side. Keith Fletcher, the present captain of English cricket, has said of the banning of the 'rebel' team: "They got what they deserved." Much closer to home, similar sentiments have been voiced. Dr Errol Vawda, chairman of the non-racial Natal Council on Sport and a member of the executive of SACOS, has written that "the present touring party deserve the contempt that we all have for mercenaries of any kind." As if this is not explicit enough, he has gone on to suggest that "Mr Gooch and his friends must be treated as scabs in the world sporting situation." What, we may well wonder, are the reasons for such animus?

It is for a number of reasons pertinent to consider the views of a man of Dr Vawda's position. SACOS, the South African Council on Sport, is an organisation which actively furthers the cause of non-racial sport in this country. And it does so both by serving as the umbrella body which promotes the playing of non-racial sport within South Africa and by encouraging the international boycott of South African sport

because of the many sporting codes here which have remained resolutely racial in character. One of the cornerstones of SACOS policy is the belief that the sport played in any society can not be separated from the society in which that sport is played: the structure of the former inevitably reflects the structure of the latter. It is for this reason that SACOS has coined the slogan: "No normal sport in an abnormal society."

Such a rallying cry points very succinctly to the practical impossibility of 'normalising' sporting arrangements in a country where vast and blatant social inequalities are condoned by apartheid laws. A really crucial point to grasp here is that the policy of SACOS is not founded upon obstructionist motives. It is not that SACOS does not wish for 'normal' sport; it is simply that it realizes that such a wish must remain a dream until the structure of our society changes considerably.

It follows that, within the present social system, any changes in the sporting dispensation are going to be no more than mere window-dressing. Various ad hoc amendments to statutes such as the Liquor Act and the Separate Amenities Act, amendments designed to create loopholes through which sports players might squeeze, do not magically transform the racial character of much South African sport. It is obviously absurd for Mike Procter to accuse the TCCB of "hypocrisy and double standards" when the very newspaper in which the accusation is made carries an article on Archie Siwisa, the first black Springbok trampolinist, who is not allowed to train with the rest of his team because the facilities of the Oribi Recreation Centre are reserved for the use of whites only.

Neither does the presence of Errol Tobias in the Springbok Rugby team, nor that of Omar Henry in Peter Kirsten's Western Province side, suggest any significant move in a non-racial direction. When Mr Pamensky speaks of "very real changes" is he lowering his eyes to grass-roots level, or is he gazing only at the upper echelons of white-controlled sport?

Any attempt to argue for the non-racial character of white-controlled sport, if it manages to sidle past all the other barriers, must inevitably founder on the rock of disproportionate facilities. Mr Peter Cooke, the manager of Gooch's side, has claimed that cricket in South Africa is now non-racial. The experience of SACOS cricketers in Pietermaritzburg, however, suggests exactly the opposite. The MDCU, which is the local branch of the SACOS-affiliated South African Cricket Board, has seventeen teams playing under its aegis: the number of fields granted it by the City Council is four, only one of which has a turf wicket. The predominantly white MCU, on the other hand, boasts considerably fewer players, and yet has the use of seven fields all with turf pitches.

The distribution of facilities at school level is even more iniquitous, so much so that it is miraculous that any black sports players reach the top of their particular sporting codes. It is important to remember, too, that these inequalities are the direct result of political decisions, as they are one of the visible manifestations of the policy of differentiated education. The following figures are for schools in and around Stanger in 1981.

STANGER INDIAN HIGH SCHOOL

PUPILS	1058
STAFF	57
SPORTSFIELDS	0

A half-sized soccer field was taken away for prefabs.

ML SULTAN HIGH SCHOOL

PUPILS	1275
STAFF	76
SPORTSFIELDS	A half-sized soccer field

STANGER HIGH SCHOOL (WHITE)

PUPILS	307
STAFF	40
SPORTSFIELDS	Rugby and Soccer fields plus

Rugby training ground. Cricket field and two practice nets. Olympic size swimming pool and fully equipped gym.

TSHLENKOSI	307
STAFF	8
SPORTSFIELDS	Half-sized soccer ground. Tennis court.

In the light of the above, what sense does it make to talk of the merit selection of South African teams? And how dare Mr Pamensky speak of "very real changes . . . on the sporting scene."?

A complete international boycott of sporting ties with South Africa is one of the ways in which these "real changes" may be achieved. Although not entirely insignificant, the changes that have been made until now have been minor ones, and it is important to keep up the psychological pressure so that major ones may follow. It is for this reason that SACOS has proposed a moratorium on all tours to and from South Africa. And again, the motives for such a stance are not obstructionist; the moratorium is designed simply to create a climate within the country which is conducive to change. Historically, sporting contact with South Africa has not built bridges, it has merely reinforced white domination. Temporary isolation appears to have a much better chance of success. □

Reprinted from NUX