



GMB/070/0008/14

02/71

# UNIT ON APARTHEID

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL AND SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS

No. 6/71

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS\*

February 1971

	<u>Page</u>
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON <u>APARTHEID</u> HOLDS HEARING ON "POLAROID EXPERIMENT" IN SOUTH AFRICA	1
IDEA THAT FOREIGN INVESTMENT CAN IMPROVE CONDITIONS OF AFRICANS - A DELUSION by Mrs. Jean Sinclair, National President, The Black Sash	5
SOME VIEWS OF <u>APARTHEID</u>	8
WORLD AGAINST <u>APARTHEID</u>	
World Federalists call for effective measures	10
Edinburgh University students call for end to investment in South African firms	11
Glasgow students disengage	12
Hain's book on <u>apartheid</u> a best seller	13
CARIS campaigns in Australia against exchanges with racist South African sports teams	14
PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIT ON <u>APARTHEID</u> IN 1970	16

71-02843

\* All material in these notes and documents may be freely reprinted.

Acknowledgement, together with a copy of the publication containing the reprint, would be appreciated.







SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON APARTHEID  
HOLDS HEARINGS ON "POLAROID EXPERIMENT"  
IN SOUTH AFRICA

On February 3, 1971, The Special Committee on Apartheid heard petitioners - Mr. George Houser of the American Committee on Africa and Mr. Ken Williams and Miss Caroline Hunter of the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers Movement - on the "Polaroid experiment" in South Africa. The following is a summary of the statements made by the petitioners. The full texts of the statements are reproduced in Committee documents A/AC.115/L.281 and A/AC.115/L.282./

Statement by Mr. George Houser

Mr. George Houser said that over the years, the American Committee on Africa had called for disengagement from South Africa. A new dimension had been added to that campaign in the autumn of 1970, when workers at the Polaroid Corporation in Cambridge, Massachusetts had publicized their demand that the Corporation should put an end to all its business dealings with South Africa. Part of that business was the supply to the South African military of equipment for producing identity cards and film used in making the passbooks, which were a corner-stone of the apartheid system. In reply, the Polaroid Corporation had stated that it would stop sales of equipment for passbook purposes, although the same equipment would be available for public sale in South Africa. It had sent a committee of four persons, two blacks and two whites, to South Africa to report on the situation. On 13 January 1971, it had taken out full-page advertisements in a large number of newspapers to announce its decision to continue to do business in South Africa.

It was estimated that the company, which had an annual volume of business in South Africa of the order of \$1.5 million, had spent at least \$50,000 to launch that propaganda campaign. However, it would be a grave mistake to consider that Polaroid was speaking solely for itself.

In an effort to show that it favoured progressive change, Polaroid had announced an experimental programme of assistance to Africans. However, it had admitted, under questioning, that it would operate within the laws of South Africa. The Special Committee was fully aware that African workers in that country had no political rights, their unions were not recognized and strikes were illegal.

The Polaroid agent in South Africa, as quoted in the Johannesburg Star of 16 January 1971, had said that he envisaged African employees holding jobs as supervisors of African staff. In that case, the number of opportunities would be very limited, for Polaroid's total black and white staff in South Africa amounted to only 180 people.



Polaroid would also pay the educational expenses of 500 black students, but education for blacks in South Africa was both Government-controlled and specifically designed to prevent any change. The philosophy of the Department of Bantu Education was that education should train people according to their opportunities in life, that it should not create false expectations of unlimited opportunity for the "Bantu" in white areas.

Polaroid's experiment was merely a paternalistic act of charity and the danger was that the programme would be seen as a substitute for the programme being supported by the United Nations, opposition African parties and the people actually waging the struggle against apartheid. In the period 1950-1968, United States investment in South Africa had risen from about \$148 million to more than \$800 million, but it had had no influence on apartheid, for many laws enacted since 1967 had made the system even more repressive.

The American Committee on Africa would support the Polaroid workers' call for a boycott of Polaroid products and expose the Corporation's campaign of self-justification. At the same time, it urged the Special Committee to call upon those countries which supported the strategy of disengagement from South Africa to join forces in discouraging foreign corporations from maintaining business relations with the Republic.

Mr. Houser pointed out that the really significant thing about the Polaroid campaign was the fact that a workers' movement had taken the lead. His Committee, which had also played a role in putting pressure on American companies to withdraw from South Africa, was glad to be associated with the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers Movement and hoped that the action initiated at Polaroid would spread to the automotive industry and to the oil companies, which for many years had been prospecting for oil in South Africa.

#### Statements by representatives of Polaroid Revolutionary Workers' Movement

Mr. Ken Williams said that with the ID-2 system developed by the Polaroid Corporation - tested and perfected in South Africa - masses of people could easily be controlled by means of identification cards.

He called upon all nations to boycott the products of the Polaroid Corporation.

Miss Caroline Hunter, reviewing the history of the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers Movement, said that on 5 October 1970 the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers Movement, a group of black workers at the Polaroid Corporation, had initiated a campaign against that Corporation by issuing a leaflet to all Polaroid employees containing general information concerning the Corporation's operations in South Africa. The following day, the Corporation circulated a memorandum stating that Polaroid had not sold its ID-2 system to the South African Government for use in the apartheid



programme but that sixty-seven ID-2 machines had been sold to the South African Army and Air Force. The memorandum had also stated that Frank and Hirsch, Ltd., Polaroid's South African distributor, had adopted a policy of equal employment opportunity for blacks.

On 8 October 1970, the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers Movement had presented the Corporation with three demands: that Polaroid should disengage from South Africa, that it should make a public statement in both South Africa and the United States confirming its position with regard to apartheid and that it should contribute all profits made in South Africa to recognized African liberation movements. On 21 October 1970, the Polaroid Corporation had issued a press release stating that it would discontinue the sale in South Africa of any of its products, including film, used directly or indirectly in South Africa's passbook programmes.

On 27 October 1970, the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers Movement, in order to emphasize the urgency of its three demands, had called for a world-wide boycott of all Polaroid products. Meanwhile, Frank and Hirsch, Ltd. had publicly denied that it practised an equal employment opportunity policy, stating that the South African Government would not allow such a policy to exist. On 25 November 1970, the Polaroid Corporation had published an announcement in all the Boston newspapers claiming that it wanted to understand the complexities of the situation in South Africa and planned to form a committee which would go to South Africa and investigate conditions there. During December 1970, Polaroid had in fact sent a group to South Africa composed of two black and two white employees.

On 12 January 1971, Polaroid had announced its findings at a closed press conference, and the following day had published an announcement, entitled "An experiment in South Africa", which had appeared in newspapers all over the country. The crux of that announcement was that Polaroid would not withdraw from South Africa since it was in the best interests of the black population of that country for it to remain. Since the Polaroid experiment was an insult to the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers Movement and to everyone striving for the liberation of black South Africa, the Movement would continue to press for an international boycott of all Polaroid products. It called upon the Special Committee to support that boycott and to use its influence to persuade the Polaroid Corporation to abandon its operations in South Africa.

The Polaroid experiment in South Africa was dangerous not only because the ID-2 equipment was a tool of repression and was very useful in maintaining the apartheid system, but also because it gave other American and foreign businesses an opportunity to continue to support the racist regime and at the same time, by providing training for black workers, to provide a solution to South Africa's acute labour shortage.

In reply to a question, Miss Hunter explained that the ID-2 system included a camera, instant processer and laminator and could produce a photo ID card in two minutes and 200 photo ID cards in an hour. While the



system served a useful purpose in the United States, it became a dangerous weapon in the hands of a repressive minority dictatorship.

Statement by the Chairman

Chairman of the Special Committee, H.E. Mr. Abdulrahim Abby Farah (Somalia), said that it was important to identify the intentions behind the Polaroid Corporation's proposals. It had advertised a programme aimed at improving the wages of its African employees and instituting better training programmes, but as the representative of the American Committee on Africa had pointed out, the net result of its proposals was that it would maintain its presence in South Africa. Furthermore, the proposed programme ignored certain relevant legislative enactments of the South African Government which enshrined discrimination as the basis of South Africa's employment policy and were designed to maintain the status quo by statutory means.

The South African laws empowered the Minister of Labour to prohibit anyone from doing any job because of his race: he could, inter alia, prohibit the replacement of workers of one race by those of another, thus ruling out the possibility that African employees might be upgraded at the expense of white employees. Moreover, in 1970, the Minister of Bantu Administration had prohibited Africans from holding jobs as typists and telephone operators, among other things. The South African Government had stated on many occasions that no white man would ever take orders from an African.

In the light of those facts, it would be interesting to learn which positions were held, both in the United States and in South Africa, by non-white workers in the Polaroid Corporation and which positions would be open to such workers in South Africa if the Corporation's new employment policy was put into effect. Its proposals must be viewed within the context of South African legislation and of the conditions created by that legislation.

He expressed the hope that a representative of the Polaroid Corporation would be in a position to testify before the Committee, since its policy could have repercussions far greater than might be believed from a first reading of its cleverly-worded but perhaps somewhat misleading advertisement.

He thanked the petitioners for the information they had given the Committee and the forms of action against apartheid which they had suggested. Their co-operation was representative of the kind of support which the Committee expected from the public.



IDEA THAT FOREIGN INVESTMENT CAN IMPROVE  
CONDITIONS OF AFRICANS - A DELUSION

by

Mrs. Jean Sinclair  
National President, The Black Sash

(The declaration by Neil Wates, prominent British businessman, against investment in South Africa - published in Unit on Apartheid Notes and Documents as a Special Article in October 1970, provoked a significant debate in business circles and the press. The Financial Mail of Johannesburg commented on September 11, 1970, that the decision of Mr. Wates does harm to the people discriminated against and deprived, and that "it is better to do what one can as a businessman to improve conditions of life within the system." In reply, Mrs. Jean Sinclair, National President of the Black Sash asserted that this view is a "delusion". Extracts from her reply are reproduced below.)

This hackneyed argument is the standard reply given to those who criticise the lack of positive action in the face of the myriad laws, controls and restrictions which inhibit the growth of a free enterprise economy and hold workers in virtual serfdom. It is an argument which stills the conscience of the businessman in the belief that he is alleviating the deprivations and hardships suffered by the African people.

Who is benefiting?

With respect and in all sincerity I ask who is benefiting by the opening up of new industry and the investment of new capital in South Africa? First, the Government, which takes 41 per cent of the profits in tax; second, the industrialist and his shareholders, who make a fair return on their investment; and last the African worker, who has a "better job and 30 rand in his pocket at the end of the month."

Poverty wages

Thirty rands a month is an average poverty wage, is 29 rand below the poverty datum line and is the level at which the African becomes liable for income tax. Those who believe that economics will bring about change and who believe that half a loaf is better than no bread should at least ensure that every worker receives a living wage.

According to Mr. Donald Woods, two-thirds of all South Africans are suffering from malnutrition. In Soweto alone approximately 70 per cent of the population live below the breadline. Mr. W. Langschmidt (Market Research Africa) estimates that 25 per cent of all urban households had monthly incomes as low as between 1 rand and 19 rand a month; 40 per cent between 20 rand and 49 rand; 20 per cent between 50 rand and 79 rand, and only the remaining 15 per cent are earning more than 80 rand a month.



Africans constitute 68 per cent of the population and their share of the nation's income is 19 per cent. In contrast, the whites, who comprise 19 per cent of the population, receive 73 per cent of the income.

#### Profiting from exploitation

The provisions of the Physical Planning Act, the recent statements of the Prime Minister and the Ministers of Labour and Bantu Administration with regard to the utilization of labour, and the insistence of moving more industry to the border areas, where wages are even lower than in the metropolitan areas, the terms of the Industrial Conciliation Act having been withdrawn from these areas, are surely indicative of the Government's determination to carry out its policy without regard to the needs of the economy and without concern for the needs of the African workers.

These facts make Mr. Wates' statement all the more pertinent. The crux of what he had to say is contained in the following paragraph of his report: " ... We could not be true to the basic principles on which we run our business and we should lose our integrity in the process. We should have to operate within a social climate where the colour of a man's skin is his most important attribute and where there is virtually no communication between the races; we should be locked into this system, we should have to operate within an economic climate which is designed deliberately to demoralise and to maintain an industrial helotry; we should, in turn, profit from such exploitation and ultimately end up with a vested interest in its maintenance."

If Mr. Wates were to adopt (the) rather presumptuous suggestion that he could use his profits for the benefit of African education, health and welfare, he would be doing the very thing which he finds so repugnant. He would be helping to bolster up the whole rotten system of apartheid and would "have a vested interest in its maintenance."

#### Businessmen silent on inhumanity of apartheid

For far too long, commerce and industry have sought to negotiate with the Government to obtain minor concessions and exemptions for themselves, from certain prohibitions and restrictions contained in legislation. But the public has never heard their voices raised in protest against: poverty wages which are often paid to African workers; lack of bargaining power for Africans; suffering caused by influx and efflux control and the migrant labour system; the serious shortage of housing; lack of security of tenure; broken families; the long distances they have to travel to and from work; the restrictions on the type of work they may do.

All the protest and the discussion has been with reference to the effect of the manpower shortage on the economy, but very little is heard about the effects of the policy on the African people who are being pushed around and denied the right to work.



Mr. Wates' decision, instead of invoking criticism should cause South Africans in general and businessmen in particular to stop and think why the whole world abhors South African policy, and to question whether they are using their considerable power to bring pressure to bear on authority to alter its uncivilised and inhumane policies before the country is completely isolated and before its economy is ruined.



SOME VIEWS OF APARTHEID

"I do believe in God and I cannot love my neighbour as myself and believe in apartheid at the same time."

- Professor Christian Barnard in B.B.C. television discussion on 29 November 1970. (Daily Telegraph, London, 30 November 1970.)

"...apartheid is contrary to the Christian gospel and the dignity of man."

- Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Michael Ramsey. (The Times, London, 31 December 1970.)

"I do believe that the destruction of the African family life (in South Africa) is going to make rootless revolutionaries. I believe that the rule of terror is going to be ultimately self-defeating.

"There is no such thing as the rule of law here any more. It's rule by decree. This is used as a weapon against the Africans. The Terrorism Act is itself an act of terror."

- Neil Wates, prominent British industrialist, on a visit to South Africa. (Quoted in Rand Daily Mail, Johannesburg, 5 September 1970.)

"...(in South Africa) there are 'White' taxis and 'Black' taxis, and never are the races to meet. Yet, the law was breached recently when an American consulate officer insisted that he and his Black aide ride together. The driver relented with the stipulation that the White official sit up front with him and the Black aide sit alone in the back..."



"Black medical students are forbidden to dissect a White cadaver.

"At the University of Natal in Durban, a White lecturer in mental illness asked the lone Non-White in the class to leave the room before he brought in a White patient and gave his case history."

- Mr. Carl T. Rowan, a former United States ambassador and a columnist. (Rand Daily Mail, Johannesburg, 10 September 1970.)

"Let us face it, no word is more hated in the Coloured community than the word 'apartheid'."

- Mr. Tom Swartz, leader of the Federal Coloured Party and Government-nominated Chairman of the Coloured Persons' Representative Council, at the fourth annual conference of the Party in Cape Town on 28 June 1970. (Rand Daily Mail, Johannesburg, 29 June 1970.)

"In South Africa we have more alcoholics than policemen. We Whites are the world's leading drinkers of hard liquor, the heaviest smokers, most frequent divorcees and most lethal drivers."

- Mr. Donald Woods, editor of East London Daily Despatch in the Day of Affirmation address at the University of Cape Town on 9 September 1970. (Cape Times, 10 September 1970.)

"Unless white attitudes change, I foresee the growth of a black power problem in South Africa such as no white group has faced in history."

- Mr. Denis Healey, former United Kingdom Defence Secretary, in an address to students at University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, on 21 September 1970. (Scotsman, 22 September 1970.)



WORLD AGAINST APARTHEIDWorld Federalists call for effective measures

The World Council of the World Association of World Federalists adopted the following resolution at its meeting in Driebergen, Netherlands, January 15-17, 1971:

"The failure of the major Western Powers to undertake effective measures, or to fully support United Nations resolutions and action with regard to colonialism and apartheid in Africa has led to a crisis of confidence in the United Nations by the Black African nations, and has seriously compromised the development of enforceable world law.

"All nations should support fully the existing sanctions against South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. In addition, arms suppliers of Portugal and South Africa should suspend completely all new and replacement arms shipments to those countries. The Security Council should adopt a resolution stating that the UN stands ready to assert its legal trusteeship over Namibia, if the Government of South Africa continues to refuse to recognize and act upon UN decisions and withdraw its authority over that territory."



Edinburgh University students call for end to investment in South African firms

In October 1970, the Student Representative Council at Edinburgh University petitioned the university court to exclude investments in any companies associated with apartheid. The court declared in reply that the suggestion was unrealistic as most large British companies had South African subsidiaries and traded with South Africa, as did the Government. It added:

"The university does not have directly, or so far as it is aware indirectly, any interests in companies known to be active in the support of apartheid."

At the beginning of December, the student newspaper, Student, published information, which it had managed to obtain, that the university had over £500,000 invested in 27 South African companies.

At an emergency general meeting, over one thousand students condemned the court's statement as "inaccurate and misleading" and called for the liquidation of all investments in South African companies by February 1, 1971. In reply, the university court claimed that its earlier statement had been misunderstood and that the university had no investments in companies "known to be active in support of apartheid". It interpreted active support as holding Government stocks or loans or actively and directly supporting Government policies.

The students rejected this distinction and were supported by a number of members of the staff. They insisted that the university dissociate itself from money-making out of a base and inhuman system of exploitation.

On January 20, 1971, Mr. Kenneth Cargill, Senior President of the Student Representative Council, told the press that a petition demanding immediate liquidation of the university's investments in South Africa had been signed by 2,100 students. Twenty Scottish Members of Parliament supported the demand of the students. They included Mr. Norman Buchan, Mr. Ronald King Murray and Mr. David Steel.

- British and South African press reports



Glasgow students disengage

The students association at Strathclyde University decided to wind up an insurance company which it operates jointly with Stenhouse Holdings. The students claim that Stenhouse Holdings, a prominent finance house in the city, receives five per cent. of its profits from operations in South Africa.

- The Guardian, London, January 21, 1971.



Hain's book on apartheid a bestseller

Peter Hain's book, Don't Play with Apartheid (George Allen and Unwin Limited, 45 shillings), published in January, has become a bestseller.

Peter Hain, 20, a student whose parents were obliged to leave South Africa because of persecution for their opposition to apartheid, was the leader of the "Stop the Seventy Tour (S.T.S.T.) Committee", which conducted militant demonstrations against the South African Springbok Rugby tour of Britain in 1969-70 and played a major role in preventing the South African cricket tour in 1970.

Mr. Hain reviews the S.T.S.T. campaign and calls for special persistence on the remaining sports affected by apartheid - notably tennis and golf - and for a widening of the campaign.

"We should not simply refuse to play with apartheid but should cease to trade with apartheid; and there is certainly scope for action against trade links."

The S.T.S.T. dissolved after the cricket tour was cancelled and some of its supporters announced in July 1970 the formation of "the Action Committee against Racism" (ACAR) to fight South African apartheid and racialism in Britain. Mr. Hain said on that occasion that the Committee would build on and strengthen the contacts developed in the cricket campaign for an assault on racialism and apartheid. It would give priority to strengthening contacts in African and Asian countries and building up an international network.

"The campaign against the cricket tour showed the importance of non-violent direct action tactics and ACAR has been formed with direct action as the basis of its campaign strategy..."

"Groups throughout the country will be mounting a militant assault on British firms with South African links. We are determined that the roots of British trade will not be built on the blood of the oppressed peoples of southern Africa..."

"We shall be maintaining a vigilant watch on the sports front. We are determined that the cricket tour shall have been the last attempt at a tour to Britain by an apartheid sports team."



CARIS campaigns in Australia against exchanges with racist South African sports teams

The Campaign against Racism in Sport (CARIS), founded in July 1969, has been campaigning against sporting contact with South Africa so long as its teams are chosen on a racial basis. It has obtained the support of a number of churchmen, trade unionists, politicians, students and sportsmen.

It applauded the decision to exclude South Africa from the Davis Cup and appealed to the Lawn Tennis Association of Australia and the International Lawn Tennis Federation (I.L.T.F.) to refuse entry to an all-white South African women's tennis team. (The matter will be discussed at the I.L.T.F. Annual General Meeting in July 1971.) It also wrote to tennis associations of other countries to do all they can to exclude South Africa from international tennis. (Australia has a special interest in the matter because the tennis star, Evonne Goolagong, is "Aboriginal".)

It has also opposed the proposed tour of an all-white South African surf life-saving team to Australia early in 1971, and other similar tours.

It declared:

"CARIS believes apartheid is in a different category to political discrimination. A man is not born with political opinions; nor when he develops them, are they stamped on his face. He can, if he so wishes, keep them to himself. A black man cannot keep his skin to himself. His black skin is an open invitation to the forces of repression.

"South Africa brings its apartheid policy into sport by selecting teams on a racial basis. Merit and ability are secondary. Facilities are segregated and preferential treatment is given to white people. Non-white spectators are also segregated or completely excluded.

"We believe:

IF YOU PLAY SPORT WITH SOUTH AFRICA YOU ARE  
CONDONING APARTHEID."

The Johannesburg Rand Daily Mail reported on December 11:

"Australia's anti-apartheid demonstrators are preparing to sabotage South African sports tours there next year...



Springbok cricket, rugby and life-saving teams will be in Australia in 1971 - playing in one of the last countries still prepared to accept all-white teams."

The Australian Council of Churches, at its Annual Meeting in August 1970, called for the cancellation of the Springbok tour. Prominent leaders opposing the tour include: Rt. Hon. E.G. Whitlam, Patrick White, Hon. Don Dunstan, Judith Wright, Gordon Barton, Rev. Alan Walker. The Australian Students' Union declared that students would be out in force against the Boks' tours.

CARIS circulated an appeal to rugby players, officials and supporters by six prominent rugby players - Anthony Abrahams, Jim Boyce, Paul Darveniza, Terry Forman, Barry McDonald and Jim Roxburgh - which read in part:

"We have all played football for Australia and there are two things that we have in common.

- (1) We have all toured South Africa with a Wallaby Rugby Union team;
- (2) As a result of what we saw in South Africa, we would not play against South Africa again, under present conditions."

- Information from Mr. John Myrtle, Convenor, Campaign against Racism in Sport, 43 Ballast Point Road, Birchgrove, N.S.W., Australia, 2041. Also from Mr. Peter McGregor, CARIS, 7 Addison Avenue, Roseville, N.S.W., Australia, 2069.

(To be continued)



PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIT ON APARTHEID IN 1970Studies

- |                  |   |                |
|------------------|---|----------------|
| ST/PSCA/SER.A/10 | Industrialization, Foreign Capital and Foreced Labour in South Africa, by Sean Gervasi. (Also published in French).** | September 1970 |
| ST/PSCA/SER.A/11 | Foreign Investment in the Republic of South Africa. (To be published in French).                                      | December 1970  |

Notes and Documents

- |      |   |               |
|------|---|---------------|
| 1/70 | Banishment of Africans in South Africa  | January 1970  |
| 2/70 | Trial of 22 Africans for activities of African National Congress *  | January 1970  |
|      | An African sentenced to seven years under the Terrorism Act   |               |
|      | More South Africans served with banning orders for opposition to <u>apartheid</u>   |               |
|      | Note on persecution of members of the legal profession in South Africa  |               |
| 3/70 | Sharpeville - ten years after   | February 1970 |
| 4/70 | A decade of repressive legislation in South Africa, by Miss Jill Chisholm *   | March 1970    |
| 5/70 | Statement by the Chairman of the Special Committee on <u>Apartheid</u> - H.E. Mr. Abdulrahim Abby Farah (Somalia) - to the United Nations Correspondents Association on February 26, 1970 | March 1970    |
|      | Christian election manifesto  |               |
|      | NUSAS opposes racial discrimination in sport  |               |
|      | South Africa bans United Nations publication  |               |
|      | World against <u>apartheid</u>  |               |



- |       |  |            |
|-------|--|------------|
| 6/70  | "Native Reserves" in South Africa  | March 1970 |
| 7/70  | Special Committee on <u>Apartheid</u> hears Mr. Dennis Brutus *  | March 1970 |
| 8/70  | Special Committee on <u>Apartheid</u> observes International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and tenth anniversary of Sharpeville Massacre<br>(Also published in French and Swedish). | April 1970 |
|       | United Nations Funds for aiding victims of <u>apartheid</u> and other southern Africans  |            |
|       | African editors' roundtable and regional conference of non-governmental organizations, Addis Ababa, February 17-21, 1970: Recommendations concerning <u>apartheid</u>                                  |            |
| 9/70  | Chief Albert J. Lutuli - Statements and Addresses - II   | April 1970 |
| 10/70 | Trade Union rights in South Africa   | April 1970 |
| 11/70 | Special Committee on <u>Apartheid</u> calls for boycott of South African racist sport bodies - invites organizations to plan programmes for International Year against Racism *                        | April 1970 |
| 12/70 | This is <u>apartheid</u> *   | April 1970 |
| 13/70 | <u>Apartheid</u> and education *   | May 1970   |
| 14/70 | This is <u>apartheid</u> - II  | May 1970   |
| 15/70 | Arbitrary detention in South Africa and its implications, by Mr. Joel Carlson  | May 1970   |
| 16/70 | Student movements in South Africa  | May 1970   |
| 17/70 | Statement by Mr. S. Abdul Minty, Honorary Secretary, Anti- <u>Apartheid</u> Movement, London, before the United Nations Special Committee on <u>Apartheid</u> , May 20, 1970                           | May 1970   |
|       | Military build-up in South Africa: Review of recent developments, by Mr. Uddhav Deo Bhatt, Rapporteur of the Special Committee on <u>Apartheid</u>   |            |
| 18/70 | South Africa's "Terrorism Act" *   | May 1970   |



- 19/70 Special Committee on Apartheid again expresses concern over detainees in South Africa June 1970
- Statement by Miss Mary Benson, writer, before the Special Committee on Apartheid, June 8, 1970.
- Circumstances of some leading South African Trade Unionists, by the International Defence and Aid Fund
- 20/70 Capital punishment in South Africa July 1970
- 21/70 The Immorality Act - South Africa's Sex Law, by Mr. Alex La Guma August 1970
- 22/70 Work, wages and apartheid, by Mrs. Ruth First September 1970
- 23/70 Scandinavian opposition to apartheid, by Mr. Sven Skovmand October 1970
- 24/70 Security Council resolutions on apartheid (Also published in French). October 1970
- 25/70 Why W.C.C. supports the freedom movement in South Africa, by Reverend Dr. Albert H. van den Heuval November 1970
- 26/70 Bantustans in South Africa December 1970

#### Special Articles

- Albert John Lutuli, by The Right Reverend R. Ambrose Reeves May 1970
- Bram Fischer June 1970
- Christianity and apartheid, by Dr. J. Verkuyl \*\* July 1970
- Robert Mangaliso Sobukwe, by The Reverend Arthur Blaxall September 1970
- International Labour Organization and apartheid September 1970
- A businessman looks at apartheid, by Mr. Neil Wates (Also published in French). \*\*\* October 1970
- Inequality in health care in South Africa, by Dr. Raymond Hoffenberg December 1970

---

\* Text or summary reprinted in Objective-Justice, July 1970.

\*\* Text or summary reprinted in Objective-Justice, October 1970.

\*\*\* Text or summary reprinted in Objective-Justice, January 1971.