



CAMP 09/0137/5 Joseph Saloogee

150, ROUTE DE FERNEY P.O. BOX No. 66 1211 GENEVA 20 • TELEPHONE : (022) 33 34 00 • TELEX : 23 423 OIK CH • CABLE : OIKOUMENE GENEVA

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

PROGRAMME UNIT ON JUSTICE AND SERVICE
COMMISSION ON THE PROGRAMME TO COMBAT RACISM

Geneva, December 1977

BCS/Gr

Dear Friends,

The death in police custody of Steve Biko on 12 September 1977 and the banning of eighteen organisations and a number of individuals on 19 October by the South African Government have outraged world opinion. Many churches, national councils of churches, regional and world ecumenical bodies, including the World Council of Churches, have made strong statements of condemnation. Like other people, Christians are bound to ask whether these latest measures are simply a further step in a policy of increasing repression or whether they represent a new and final stage for the apartheid regime. How do we interpret the facts, and how do we respond to them ?

The WCC's Programme to Combat Racism is sending copies of the enclosed background paper, entitled *South Africa's Hope - What Price Now ?* to the Central Committee members, National Councils of Churches, member churches, interested groups and individuals. This paper tries to describe the latest events in South Africa and the issues they raise for Christian conscience both inside and outside South Africa. It has no official status. Its purpose is to stimulate discussion and, through this, to offer lines for action, both corporate and individual.

We are asking you to distribute the paper as widely as possible and to ensure that the issue will be placed on the agenda of every relevant committee and working group, of every congregation and gathering of Christians. We hope very much that you will send us your comments and suggestions for concrete action in supporting the oppressed as they struggle for liberation.

Yours sincerely,

Baldwin Sjollema
Baldwin Sjollema

Encl.

With the Compliments

of the

DIVISION of WORLD OUTREACH



of

THE UNITED CHURCH of CANADA

85 ST. CLAIR AVENUE EAST
TORONTO CANADA

M4T 1M8

John K

Geneva, December 1977

SOUTH AFRICA'S HOPE - WHAT PRICE NOW ?

On 19 October 1977 the South African Police and Justice Minister, James Kruger, served banning orders on eighteen organisations and a number of individuals. The Johannesburg *Financial Mail*, a liberal weekly, began its issue of 21 October with an editorial entitled 'Into the Darkness'. This read, in part: '... one thing is certain, Kruger's action has taken South Africa another step away from the possibility of peaceful racial reconciliation and further down the road that leads to violence ... Kruger may be able to ban and detain who he likes at will. But one thing neither he nor anyone else will ever succeed in doing is banning black South Africans' loathing of apartheid and their determination to be free of it for ever ...'

Among the organisations banned was *The World*, South Africa's second largest daily newspaper and the one read most widely by black people. The *Financial Mail* editorial ended with these words: 'Jimmy Kruger may well find that in banning *The World* he has taken on the world. And that world cannot be silenced by a banning order'.

The whites in South Africa constitute about 17% of its population. They regard the black population as divided into three groups: Africans (over 75%), 'Coloureds' (those of mixed race - about 6%), and Asians (about 2%). Africans are further arbitrarily classified by whites along supposedly tribal lines, and each of the nine 'tribes' is deemed to be a separate nation, whose rights are confined to the nine 'homelands' or Bantustans. The Bantustans together make up slightly more than 13% of the total area of South Africa: all black people within the remaining 86% of the country are there on white sufferance and to serve white needs, and none of them may vote, let alone take any part in the government of the country. The white Government's policy of apartheid (racial separation) is buttressed by over two hundred separate pieces of legislation whose effect is to turn black people from human beings into labour units.

By virtue of its apartheid legislation the white Government:

rules by a farcical 'rule of law': the black population has no say in any of the laws to which it is subject. Beyond that, any South African may be detained without trial - and without recourse to the courts - without any time limit at all, and with no access to family or lawyers, and may also be placed under indefinite house arrest or banning (which denies them any political, professional or social life);

rules by arbitrary definition: 'terrorism', 'communism' and 'subversion' are three of the labels most commonly used to define any activity of which the Government disapproves, and lack the slightest objective content;

'hangs more people than the rest of the Western world put together', according to Progressive Reform Party member Mrs Helen Suzman. She quoted figures of those sentenced to death in the year ending 30 June 1975: of the 87 people sentenced, two were white, 25 'Coloured' and 60 African;

admits a high number of deaths in detention: between September 1973 and September 1976, 25 people died in detention. And during the eighteen months which ended on 31 October 1977, 23 people died;

forbids people of different racial groups to marry or have sexual relations (under the Immorality Act); to live in the same areas (under the Group Areas Act); to share common social services (including, for example, ambulance services); and recreational facilities; to belong to common political parties or trade unions;

treats all Africans in the 'white' 86% of the country as temporary migrants; stringently controls their every movement (in the year ending 30 June 1975 386,414 Africans were prosecuted for offences against the pass laws); has 'resettled' - in other words, forcibly removed - over two million Africans to the Bantustans, with probably another three million still to follow;

reserves skilled jobs (and others) for whites; refuses equal pay for equal work; is content for most Africans to live below the officially recognised poverty line; denies African workers unemployment benefits, and the right to strike;

uses the Bantustans as reservoirs of cheap black labour, as Third World enclaves whose agricultural and mineral poverty and lack of infrastructure deny even a bare subsistence living to most of their people and force jobseekers to migrate away from their families to sell their labour in 'white' South Africa; per capita incomes in the Bantustans are appreciably lower than in almost every country of Black Africa;

provides the country's people with racially-segregated health care: A 1977 UN estimate stated that there is one doctor for every 400 whites, and one for every 44,000 Africans; Soweto, with a population estimated at about 1½ million, is served by one hospital, which was built to cater for a community of 600,000. An official estimate in 1970 of the infant mortality rate for urban Africans was 122 per thousand; in Port Elisabeth (in 'white' South Africa) it was reported in 1971 that one-third of all Africans born died before reaching their first birthday; other reports suggest that in some rural areas the rate is as high as 50%;

provides the country's children with racially-segregated education: schooling is compulsory and free for white children, voluntary and expensive for Africans; estimated per capita expenditure on pupils of different races by the State in the 1974-75 financial year was: whites R605, Coloured R125,53, Indians R170,94 and Africans in 'white' areas R39,53; in 1976 teacher/pupil ratios ranged from 1 : 22 for whites to 1 : 60 for Africans; and

gives white South Africans one of the highest standards of living in the world, by exploiting black labour and by attracting substantial economic support and investment from abroad - notably from the major Western industrial nations.

This catalogue gives some of the principal effects of apartheid: every fact it cites is taken from authoritative published sources. It begins to explain why the South African Government's apartheid policy inspires such massive loathing and such desperate opposition.

Yet this litany of repression describes South Africa *before* the bannings, detentions and arrests of 19 October. Perhaps the most important lesson of that day is the realisation that it marked not simply a further stage in a policy of increasing repression but that policy's rapid slide towards its final stage. For having outlawed practically all the remaining peaceful channels for expressing opposition to apartheid, the South African Government has served notice that it is prepared to do anything to muzzle its opponents.

The new bannings are to be seen in line with the violent repression of the Soweto peaceful demonstrations in June 1976. In the film "There is no crisis" reporting on the Soweto riots, Deborah Matshoba, one of the SASO leaders was prophetically saying: "The only thing that can quell the Black Consciousness Movement is to ban them, that is the Movement themselves. But then the Movement are not card-carrying members and so on. It's the ideology and the message and at this stage I must say Kruger is very late because the message has been getting across and every black member of the community is receptive to their ideology - they are all members. Which means they will have to imprison everybody, or ban everybody or even kill everybody if they want peace". The South African Government has banned all the organisations, and we have the right to ask the question of how far the regime will go to impose its rule "in peace". Nearly thirty years in the making, totalitarian rule is about to come to full flower. Increasingly, the opponents of apartheid inside the country will have to choose between keeping silent and engaging in illegal activity. But the Government's own choice is even more stark, because there can be no turning back for it now. Its only option since 19 October can be ruthlessly to stifle all dissent, and having set out on such a road it must know that only one destination awaits it, for every totalitarian state bears within itself the seeds of its own final destruction.

The decision the Government has made has not been forced upon it, for it has spurned repeated opportunities to listen and to learn. In White Wealth and Black Poverty (Greenwood Press, 1976), Barbara Rogers writes: 'During the 1950s, African trade unions, rural Africans in the "reserves" and in national political organisations, the African National Congress, the Pan-Africanist Congress, and others waged massive campaigns to achieve mild reforms and to redistribute political and economic assets more equitably. The ruthless Government reaction included banning of black political parties, arrest or exile of the leaders, breaking-up of the trade union movement for Africans, and passage of repressive "national security" legislation giving unlimited powers of supervision, arrest and detention, without trial, and other measures to the security police. The 1960s, with its economic boom, coincided with the most repressive period of South African history ...'

On 21 March 1960 a peaceful demonstration by Africans against the pass laws was fired on by police at Sharpeville: 69 Africans were killed and nearly 200 wounded. On 16 June 1976 a peaceful demonstration in Soweto by African schoolchildren against being taught in Afrikaans was fired on by police: the uprising which began then and lasted for four months left 386 dead according to official figures (the true figure is far higher and exceeds a thousand). On 12 September 1977 Steve Biko, an emphatically peaceful opponent of apartheid and leader of the black consciousness movement, died in police custody: he had been detained a few weeks earlier. The Government claimed he had died as the result of a hunger strike lasting little more than a week. The subsequent *post mortem* showed that he died from damage to his brain and kidneys. A month later Police and Justice Minister James Kruger finally admitted the cause of death but commented: 'A man can damage his brain in many ways'. Later, an inquest absolved the police of any responsibility for Biko's death. Aged thirty when he died, Steve Biko had been recognised by people inside and outside the country as a potential Prime Minister of a future multiracial South Africa. On 19 October 1977 Mr. Kruger announced the banning of eighteen organisations (see Appendix)*.

*Association for Educational and Cultural Advancement
Black Community Programmes
Black Parents Association
Black People's Convention
Black Women's Federation
Border Youth Organisation
Christian Institute of Southern Africa
Eastern Cape Youth Organisation
Medupe Writers Association
Natal Youth Organisation
National Youth Organisation
South African Student Movement
South African Students Organisation
Soweto Students Representative Council
Transvaal Youth Organisation
Union of Black Journalists
Western Cape Youth Organisation
Zimele Trust Fund

The *Financial Mail* (21 October) commented on the organisations affected that '... all of them have explicitly rejected both communism and violence ... the pressure to eschew non-violence will grow. So too will the attractiveness of the communist alternative'. And that is the achievement of the South African Government.

With the near-complete polarisation it has now achieved between legal support for and illegal opposition to its policies, the Government has introduced a baleful simplicity into South African life. It has deliberately opted for a remorseless progress towards ever more frequent and violent confrontation. It has left no middle way open. This means that things in South Africa are going to get worse before they can hope to get better.

For opposition to apartheid has not been stifled, and it will not be. The uprising of 1976 was the work of young Africans, of the apartheid generation, who have made clear their determination not to live out the rest of their lives under the only system they have ever known. Significantly, their revolt was joined by their 'Coloured' and Indian peers, who thus made clear their total rejection of white attempts to divide them from the Africans by offering them marginally better treatment. The initiative for ending apartheid lies with the black people of South Africa, with the support of those whites who can find the courage and vision to join them.

But the stark choice which now faces South Africans also faces those people outside the country who are determined to see apartheid and exploitation ended. Many have hoped against hope for a sign that South Africa was capable of peaceful change, and that they could contribute to the search for a just society through reform. How does that hope stand now? How are we to respond? For our responsibility remains.

Here it is worth repeating the relevant parts of the statement of Section V of the WCC's Fifth Assembly (Nairobi, 1975): '*Racism is a sin against God and against fellow human beings. It is contrary to the justice and the love of God revealed in Jesus Christ. It destroys the human dignity of both the racist and the victim. When practised by Christians it denies the very faith we profess and undoes the credibility of the Church and its witness to Jesus Christ ... South Africa, which highlights racism in its most blatant form, must retain high priority for the member churches. Apartheid is possible only with the support of a large number of Christians there*'. This issue of Christian responsibility was spelt out as clearly as possible by the Lutheran World Federation's Sixth Assembly (Dar-es-Salaam, 1977). Within the Statement on Confessional Integrity which the Assembly adopted appeared the following passage: '*Under normal circumstances Christians may have different opinions in political questions. However, political and social systems may become so perverted and oppressive that it is consistent with the (Lutheran) confession to reject them and to work for changes. We especially appeal to our white member churches in southern Africa to recognise that the situation in southern*

Africa constitutes a status confessionis. This means that, on the basis of faith and in order to manifest the unity of the church, churches would publicly and unequivocally reject the existing apartheid system'. If the unity of the Church means anything, then, it is Christians everywhere who are called upon 'publicly and unequivocally' to reject apartheid.

So those outside South Africa who abhor apartheid and the violence and exploitation which are integral to it are called to action. Now more than ever they are needed for the contribution they can make to the ending of injustice.

In their concern to help a just society to birth in South Africa there are three areas where outsiders need to develop a clear understanding of reality.

A JUST STRUGGLE

The first area concerns the nature of the struggle against apartheid which is going ahead within South Africa itself. It is now all too clear that the Government will not countenance a negotiated and peaceful dismantling of apartheid but is adamant that it will be maintained with however much violence is necessary. This means that opposition to apartheid is increasingly likely to be not only illegal but violent as well. If this proves true, the Government will be answerable for provoking that violence on a larger scale than ever before. Those outside South Africa who wish to see the structures of apartheid abolished peacefully will now understand that the Government has rendered that possibility ever more remote by its new restrictions. For whatever hope was left of the development of the African tradition of non-violent change has now been officially snuffed out.

How then do we respond as Christians to this threat of violence? Perhaps the most relevant recent statement by the WCC on this issue was the resolution adopted - without dissent - by its Central Committee in Addis Ababa in 1971: 'The Churches must always stand for the liberation of the oppressed and of victims of violent measures which deny basic human rights. It (the Central Committee) calls attention to the fact that violence is in many cases inherent in the *status quo*. Nevertheless, the WCC does not and cannot identify itself completely with any political movement, *nor does it pass judgement on those victims of racism who are driven to violence as the only way left to them to redress grievances and so open the way for a new and more just order'* (italics added). It is worth remembering also the distinction that Christians have sometimes made between their person and their office in connection with violence. According to this distinction, there may be a significant difference between violence used for one's self-preservation and violence used in protection of another.

This refusal to pass judgement on those who believe they have no option but to answer repressive violence with the violence of rebellion is reflected by the WCC's Programme to Combat Racism, which has made and continues to make grants from its Special Fund to a number of liberation movements in southern Africa, including the African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress (both of them black peoples' political movements banned by the South African Government in 1960).

But can we claim to stand in solidarity with those who rebel for a just cause if we simply refuse to pass judgement on them? The new situation in South Africa demands of us far more precision in saying what we mean by a just rebellion. For as Anglican Bishop Henry Okullu of Kenya told the WCC's 1977 Central Committee, some definition of a just rebellion still awaits formulation by the churches - most of which have found no difficulty in supporting the concept of a just war. The continuing lack of such a definition can be no excuse for failure to support the struggle of black South Africans now.

Those who are uncertain about the legitimacy of the unfolding struggle to end apartheid may find it helpful to recall that it is the struggle of a historically non-violent majority against a determinedly violent minority. To compare, as the Vorster Government does, the black revolution in South Africa with current terrorism in Europe is simply fraudulent, as the terrorists are a minority using violence against Governments which still allow avenues of peaceful opposition. This distinction was made recently by Dr Lukas de Vries, President of the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Namibia, when he spoke at a meeting of church and mission representatives in Wuppertal (Federal Republic of Germany). There was a basic difference, he said, between terrorism as experienced in West Germany and liberation movements in his part of the world. In Namibia, for example, the issue was 'to end an illegal structure of oppression', and not to overthrow a legal structure.

In debates about violence such distinctions are constantly drawn. A report commended in 1973 by the WCC Central Committee stated: *'There are some forms of violence in which Christians may not participate and which the churches must condemn. There are violent causes - the conquest of one people by another or the deliberate oppression of one class or race by another - which offend divine justice. There are violent means of struggle - torture in all forms, the holding of innocent hostages and the deliberate or indiscriminate killing of innocent non-combatants, for example - which destroy the soul of the perpetrator as surely as the life and health of the victim'.*

We do not define the resistance fighters of Occupied Europe, who used violence against their Nazi oppressors, as terrorists, because we accept that their cause was just and their methods disciplined.

Christians who refuse to condemn the use of violence in the attempt to end injustice must constantly make such distinctions. They recognise that we have no right to condemn the use of violence by others in pursuit of justice if we are prepared to use it ourselves for the same end. They also acknowledge that down the ages there have been Christians to whom violence was morally repugnant but who have nevertheless resorted to it in an attempt to end a still greater evil. One of the best-known recent examples is Dietrich Bonhoeffer's participation in the plot to kill Hitler.

It is on the grounds of exactly such arguments that South Africa's black people today claim our recognition of their struggle as a just rebellion. The point was illustrated by Dr Ian Fraser in his article 'Violence in Camouflage' in the WCC monthly magazine *One World* (No. 32, December 1977): *'... Freedom fighters are violent (except those in our own glorious past). Régimes which have robbed people of their land, their rights, their history get milder labels. Embedded violence - violence done by the way life is organised, by the unfair distribution of resources - is simply not being adequately identified and reckoned with in comparison with the violence which lashes out. There is very little sign that the Church is combating this dangerous superficiality. Yet it should be if it is concerned for the truth, for human dignity under God, and especially for the poor.'*

The words of a black South African who lived through June 1976 in Soweto speak to us today: 'I was in Soweto when the police came in. I saw them shoot an eight-year old child dead in the street. And you ask me to be non-violent?'

SOUTH AFRICA'S DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN FRIENDS

The second area where understanding is essential concerns the South African Government's dependence on support from overseas. Many people inside and outside the country have recognised that without a continuing flow of loans and investments from abroad the South African economy would collapse. But few have made the point as graphically as Professor Julian Friedman of Syracuse University, New York: *'Foreign investment in South Africa bears an ascribable responsibility for apartheid. By no means the exclusive underwriters of apartheid, foreign investors are nonetheless to be counted among the bankers and providers of know-how for the present version of apartheid. Their roles are to be identified directly with a major cornerstone of racial containment, namely economic exploitation as reflected in the high rate of earnings ...'*

The South African Government itself has stated that, despite any criticism it may encounter, it can continue its policies so long as it continues to receive financial support from beyond its borders. Some idea of the degree of support it receives may be gauged from the following figures:

Foreign investment in South Africa distinguished by region (*)

Total foreign liabilities to:

(direct and non-direct investment)

<u>Year</u>	<u>EEC</u>	<u>Rest of Europe</u>	<u>Americas</u>	<u>Africa</u>	<u>Asia</u>	<u>Oceania</u>	<u>Inter-national organisations and 'other'</u>	<u>Total</u>
	Rm	Rm	Rm	Rm	Rm	Rm	Rm	Rm
1973	6 698	956	1 776	375	216	78	281	10 380
1974	7 945	1 147	2 557	447	279	84	298	12 757
1975	9 851	1 690	3 566	498	348	85	412	16 450

Rm = million Rand

(*) South Africa: An Appraisal - The Sovereign Risk Criteria.

Published by the Nedbank Group, 1977. Nedbank Group, Economic Unit

The South African Government's total foreign debt rose by R1,096 million between 1970 and 1975. In 1976 its total borrowings from international banks amounted to more than \$2.2 billion and the breakdown of its debt on 17 November 1976 was as follows:

<u>Currency to be repaid</u>	<u>'000s</u>
Deutschmarks	1,080,735
US Dollars	470,820
Swiss Francs	148,000
Sterling	10,330
Dutch guilders	22,500
European units of a/c	16,300
European currency units	23,000

(Source: Nedbank, op. cit.)

Those who wish to see those policies abandoned, therefore, have within their grasp one of the most effective - and non-violent - means to secure the ending of apartheid, by ending their financial involvement in the Government and the economy that practices apartheid.

Overwhelmingly, this power remains tragically unused. The *Religious News Service*, for instance, reported on 24 October 1977 from New York: 'A survey of corporations, representing nearly 90% of US industrial investment in South Africa, has shown that they have unanimously refused to consider withdrawal of operations from that embattled country'. The UN Security Council's recent decision to impose a mandatory arms embargo points to a growing recognition of the importance of sanctions. Even so, on 31 October the Council saw the USA, France and Britain veto a proposal that economic sanctions should be applied to South Africa. Profits speak louder than justice.

The few individuals and undertakings which have made the opposite decision are conspicuous by their loneliness and rarity. In 1970 the British businessman Neil Kates explained to his directors why he was opposed to the company's investing in South Africa: '*...the idea of doing business in South Africa is totally unacceptable ... We should have to operate within a social climate where the colour of a man's skin is his most important attribute.... 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 much exploitation and ultimately end up with a vested interest in its maintenance ... The cumulative effect of all these factors ... must make it impossible for ourselves individually, or as a company, to connive at anything which would serve to perpetuate a system which in the last analysis has no other justification than the preservation of white supremacy as an end in itself ...*' Seven years later, Wates' argument speaks with even greater force. In the spring of 1977 the two largest Dutch banks, the Amsterdam-Rotterdam Bank and the Algemene Bank Nederland, announced that they would be making no further loans to the South African Government until fundamental changes - which, they both made clear, must amount to the dismantling of apartheid - took place there.

The call to end financial support for the apartheid system, which has been made repeatedly by the WCC, is made very clearly by black South Africans themselves, despite the fact that - as many outsiders point out - an economic boycott of South Africa would hurt black people. They do not believe that a boycott could inflict upon them greater suffering than they already endure, but they do believe that it would hasten the ending of apartheid. This call came first from the liberation movements (ANC and PAC) and was later repeated by many of the now banned black organisations (e.g. SASO and BPC) as well as by the Black Renaissance Convention.

All these groups insist that it is the entire system of apartheid, and not simply individually objectionable features of it such as job reservation, which must go. They are therefore not concerned with such irrelevant changes as codes of conduct which seek to tame the behaviour of foreign firms operating within South Africa and which repeat a classic formula for permitting alterations to a system whose basic existence is not allowed to be questioned. They do not wish to improve apartheid, merely to end it.

THREE NEW BILLS

The third area that needs clear understanding involves the severe limitations that will soon be imposed upon anyone within or outside South Africa who is concerned, not necessarily to oppose apartheid, but even to give succour to its victims. Despite the outcry they have caused, three bills now before the South African Parliament are virtually certain to become law in February 1978 as the Social Workers and Associated Professions Act, The National Welfare Act and The Fund Raising Act. A leading South African lawyer has commented on them that 'their ambit is far wider than is reasonably necessary for the protection of the public ... social work is so widely - and vaguely - defined that it will become the sole preserve of the professional social worker and will exclude the voluntary worker. The fund raising provisions may also prove fatal to some bodies'. The International Commission of Jurists commented in its *Review* (No. 19, December 1977): '*Viewed against the banning of the black consciousness movement's educational, cultural and welfare organisations, and bodies such as the Christian Institute, it must be expected that the bureaucratic labyrinth to be constructed under these three Bills will be used to prevent the formation and growth of other lawful organisations to take their place*'.

The Social Workers and Associated Professions Bill will oblige social workers and members of associated professions to seek registration, and will reserve the right to perform social work to them alone. But it defines social work so vaguely that those professions likely to be affected include lawyers, criminologists, church workers, educationalists, town planners, and workers in psychiatric clinics and legal aid and citizens' advice bureaux. Even workers not required to register may fall foul of the bill's provisions if they research such matters as racial discrimination, crime, poverty and migratory labour, and as the provision of advice and counselling falls within the terms of the bill it is likely that the administration and provision of scholarships will also be affected. The National Welfare Act will 'provide for the registration of organisations rendering social welfare services ... and for the investigation of activities of welfare organisations ...'. Probably only social workers registered under the previous bill will be eligible for employment by welfare organisations as defined by this bill, which defines the organisations so broadly as to include everything from churches to Rotary groups. Effective control

of all the organisations will reside with the Minister of Social Welfare and Pensions, who will have very wide-ranging powers to register and to investigate organisations. Under both these bills, penalties for breaches of their provisions will not normally be enforceable in the first instance by a court of law but a body constituted separately under the bills. Under the Fund Raising Bill a Director of Donation Funds will be appointed with powers to control the collection of any contributions to any organisation. Forms of so-called 'collection' covered by the bill will include fund-raising by holding fetes or selling Christmas cards, legacies, gifts to their schools by former pupils, competitions of all sorts, and clothing drives. Significantly, donations to a church will either have to be made during a service or else be specified as being exclusively for its religious work. Bodies as disparate as the Boy Scouts, sporting clubs, Rotary groups and welfare, library and educational trusts stand to be affected by the bill. The powers to be conferred on the Director and on his inspectors are so authoritarian that they exceed even those entrusted to the police.

The bills have clear implications, and not least for the churches. In future the South African Government will not have to resort to the crudity of banning an organisation like the Zimele Trust Fund or the Christian Institute (two of those banned in October) in order to extinguish it. The powers to be conferred by the bills will enable the Government to dispose of those of whom it disapproves quietly and without fuss, simply by denying them funds or staff or permission to continue to provide their services. So it will soon be pointless for anyone inside or outside South Africa to try to channel support to the victims of apartheid in the ways that they have become accustomed to using. The South African churches will find themselves confined to a narrow range of strictly defined 'religious' activities, for preaching and living out the social implications of the Gospel will have been outlawed.

The agony faced by these churches will be how to live with integrity inside these restraints. For how do Christians respond when law makes their witness 'illegal' ? Whose justice then prevails ?

Given the point which repression has reached in South Africa and its all too probable future intensification, what can prevent the country's self-destruction? For those inside the country, whatever opposition they undertake will be understood as illegal. We must respect whatever risks they are willing to face. Some of them will be forced to leave the country because of their commitment, and it will be for the Christian community outside South Africa to care for these people in every possible way. An important part of this group will consist of young people who will wish to be trained for the future of their country.

Those outside South Africa who wish to see apartheid ended have a choice between doing nothing and doing something. If they choose to do nothing they will be endorsing the heresy of those South

African churches and Christians who claim that apartheid is compatible with the Gospel. They will also be endorsing the preference of most of the industrialised nations of the West for profits rather than justice. And, by their inaction, they will be obstructing the just struggle of the oppressed.

If they choose to do something, they will find their choice more limited than heretofore. They will continue to express their concern through intercession and prayer. But they may no longer entertain any hope of directly influencing events in South Africa itself, either by visiting the country or by supporting those peaceful organisations which the Government has just chosen to exterminate. So there are three effective ways in which they can act:

- by providing all possible support for those forced to become refugees (this includes the provision of training facilities);
- by building support for all those who are working inside South Africa for liberation; and
- by working wherever appropriate to end all foreign support for South Africa: for a complete halt to all economic, military, diplomatic, cultural and social links.

These offer the only grounds for hope if we are not to resign ourselves to mute acceptance of the sharply heightened level of oppression which this paper describes. And Christians are people who dare to talk about hope in a world accustomed to despair. Now more than ever South Africa's struggle challenges us to say what we mean by that hope, and to help to pay the price it demands.

The new South Africa which is struggling to be born is itself a sure ground of hope. An essay of Steve Biko's, first published in a book of essays entitled *Black Theology: the South African Voice*, edited by Basil Moore and published by C. Hurst of London, has since been reproduced by the Trustees of the Christian Institute of South Africa (the Trustees are based in London) as a tribute to his memory. The essay, which deals at length with the subject of black consciousness, includes the following passages:

'Some will charge that we are racist but these people are using exactly the values we reject. We do not have the power to subjugate anyone. We are merely responding to provocation in the most realistic possible way. Racism does not only imply exclusion of one race by another - it always presupposes that the exclusion is for the purposes of subjugation. Blacks have had enough experience as objects of racism not to wish to turn the tables ... We have set out on a quest for true humanity ... In time we shall be in a position to bestow upon South Africa the greatest gift possible - a more human face'.

ORGANISATIONS BANNED

In the fiercest attack on opposition organisations since the banning of the ANC and PAC in 1960, the Government took action under the Unlawful Organisations Act on 19 October and banned at least 18 organisations, including most groups in the Black Consciousness movement. The full list of organisations banned is as follows:

SOUTH AFRICAN STUDENTS' ORGANISATION (SASO), founded in 1969 by black students under the leadership of Steve Biko in a break-away from the white-dominated National Union of South African Students (NUSAS). SASO was prominent in student protests and unrest in the early 1970s and though based in the black 'tribal' universities and colleges has always rejected separate education, Bantustans and apartheid as a whole. In 1973 the entire SASO executive was banned and in 1974 many individuals arrested; nine were eventually imprisoned at the end of 1976 after a long trial. Many other former officials are in exile.

BLACK PEOPLE'S CONVENTION (BPC) founded in 1971 as a Black People's organisation unifying African, Coloured and Indian members, building Black awareness and stimulating community action. BPC has always operated as an open political movement. In 1973 much of its leadership was banned. The BPC has remained active politically (for example it organised the 'Heroes Week' called in March this year) and in encouraging community projects such as health clinics. The current president of BPC is Hiaku Kenneth Rachidi.

SOUTH AFRICAN STUDENTS' MOVEMENT (SASM) formed in 1970 as a national movement for Black high school students, and involved in the 1976 boycott of Afrikaans in schools and subsequent demonstrations. SASM has branches all over the country; in September 1976 five members were imprisoned for incitement to military training. Many other school student members have been arrested.

NATIONAL YOUTH ORGANISATION (NAYO) formed in 1973 as a Black youth organisation. Its president was banned in the same year and in 1975-76 several officials and members stood trial under the Terrorism Act before being acquitted. Among NAYO's constituent bodies are the following, also banned:

BORDER YOUTH ORGANISATION

NATAL YOUTH ORGANISATION

TRANSVAAL YOUTH ORGANISATION

WESTERN CAPE YOUTH ORGANISATION

EASTERN CAPE YOUTH ORGANISATION

BLACK COMMUNITY PROGRAMMES (BCP) formed in 1973 to undertake and encourage projects by and for the Black community. It has organised welfare and self help projects in the Eastern Cape, Natal and Transvaal. Its workers and officials have suffered bannings similar to those imposed on SASO and BPC. BCP has also published the annual survey Black Review from 1972-6.

ZIMELE TRUST FUND, a Black charitable organisation established in 1975 to help the economic, social and educational rehabilitation of former political prisoners and their families, which has initiated a relief fund and various other projects. Almost all the Zimele Board of Trustees detained in August 1976 and its administrator, Mapetla Mohapi, died in detention.

BLACK WOMEN'S FEDERATION (BWF) formed in 1976 as an umbrella body for about 60 Black women's organisations. Several of its members, including its president Fatima Meer and Mrs. Winnie Mandela were detained during 1976 and subsequently banned. The BWF has taken a strong position on the issues of squatters, Bantu Education and nursery provision.

BLACK PARENTS ASSOCIATION (BPA) formed in Soweto during the 1976 uprising to act as a liaison between the students and the authorities. It has continued to speak on behalf of Black people and has been responsible for distributing relief money to victims of last year's shooting. Its chairman is Dr. Manas Buthelezi.

SOWETO STUDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL (SSRC) formed in 1976 by SASM members with delegates from Soweto secondary schools to organise the action against Afrikaans and Bantu Education and subsequent demonstrations. Responsible for issuing many of the calls to action and subject to intense police harassment which forced many of the leadership underground and eventually into exile. Before its banning, the SSRC was actively organising the schools boycott in Soweto and calling on teachers to resign as a first stage in the dismantling of Bantu Education.

UNION OF BLACK JOURNALISTS (UBJ) formed in 1973 to represent Black journalists. Has published a bulletin; several members were detained during 1976 and the current UBJ president and five other members are in detention.

MEDUPE WRITERS ASSOCIATION, formed in January 1977 as a Black writers' group based in Johannesburg to promote Black literature. Membership is currently over 200.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL ADVANCEMENT OF AFRICAN PEOPLE (ASSECA) founded in 1969 to raise funds and improve the standard of African education. Criticised as too moderate by some Black people.

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTE (CI) formed in 1963 as an ecumenical church group. Together with the South African Council of Churches the CI sponsored SPRO-CAS, the study project on Christianity in an Apartheid Society, which produced ten reports on different aspects of apartheid. In 1975 the CI was declared an Affected Organisation and prohibited from receiving funds from overseas. It has regional offices as well as headquarters in Johannesburg. Several of its officers and its journal were also banned.

In addition to the above it was reported that the SIYAZINCEDA TRUST, a group in Cape Town established to help the families of political detainees, had also been declared an unlawful organisation. This would bring the total number of banned organisations to 19.

NEWSPAPERS BANNED

As part of the clampdown in South Africa on 19 October, two newspapers - the Johannesburg based WORLD and WEEKEND WORLD - were banned. Although staffed by blacks and with a predominantly black readership, the sister newspapers were in fact owned largely by the Argus Company. At the same time the editors of both papers were detained under the Internal Security Act.

(FOCUS, News Bulletin of the International Defence & Aid Fund, No. 13, November 1977)