

The Citizen 01/04/81
Soweto may soon get
Wednesday
legal liquor lounges

By LAWRENCE MAYEKISO

SOWETO residents are availing themselves of an opportunity granted them by the Government to sell liquor on licenced premises.

Two of them have applied to the Soweto Council for permission to covert their existing business premises to bar lounges.

A third has applied for a bottle store licence.

The police are conducting extensive raids on shebeens in the townships during which large quantities of

liquor are confiscated in a move to clear the townships of illicit liquor dealings.

This is seen as a police move to prepare the township residents for lawful liquor consumption at their own bars.

All night parties at which there is deafening music have been banned by the police.

Mr Patrick Mbatha, who owns a block of shops near the Dube railway station in Soweto, has applied to the Soweto Council for permis-

sion to convert his business premises to a bar lounge.

Mr Victor Magudulela has asked for permission to alter his building material business premises to a bar lounge, too.

The Soweto Council has approved their applications subject to the Liquor Board issuing the two men with licences to operate their bar lounges.

According to some shebeen owners their reluctance in applying for the bar lounge licences is caused by lack of capital as large sums of money will be required for the construction of suitable premises, and also for a licence for this type of business.

Specifications for the premises are laid down in the Liquor Act.

It lays down specifically that liquor premises should be removed from dwellings, unlike shebeens which are operated from homes.

Mr Lucky Michaels, a night-club owner, has applied for a bottle store licence.

He will be a senior director in a company formed by shebeen owners.

THIS
WEEK



JUST AS Dr Verwoerd's visionary notion of separate and viable homelands has come to naught with Mr P W Botha conceding that, economically at least, we are one, so is what remains of his dream of a constellation of southern African states rapidly fading, if it has not vanished altogether.

Right now the little that is left is Mr Botha's nebulous concept of a confederation incorporating whichever of these dependent independents still feels they can't do without us if the moment ever comes to get together again.

Meanwhile north, east and west of the 'constellation' of 40 million people south of the Zambezi and Kunene rivers which Mr P W Botha had his dreams about in March 1979, things are moving rapidly. Black Africa's alternative to Nationalism's 'Southern African Commonwealth' — the nine-nation Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference — whose meeting in Salisbury ended on Saturday, has in less than six months gathered pledges of more than two billion dollars in aid, even if only 1.2 billion of it is 'new' money.

More significant is the fact that less than six months after the Maputo donors' dinner in November, when 650 million dollars of aid was forthcoming (only 100 million dollars of it 'new' money), Mr Robert Mugabe was able to announce at the weekend that the fund-raising get-together Zimbabwe had organised yielded 1100 million in pledges. After the 25 million dollars it had given at Maputo, the fact that the United States had trebled its original offer of aid to Zimbabwe to 180 million dollars over three years offers the possibility, if not the probability, that it now sees substantial potential not only in Zimbabwe but in

The 'anchor' has slipped but there's still a great chance for S A in Africa

Natal Mercury Appeal 1-1981

by
JAMES McMILLAN

what might be achieved in fostering the fledgling association of states.

Notice of this sizeable interest in the US contribution was given almost simultaneously with the request by the Reagan Administration to Congress on March 24 for a record 836 million dollars in aid for Africa — 29 percent more in development assistance and 59 percent more in economic support funds than the 'soft touch' Carter Administration had sought for 1981.

Food production

The money, which is for sub-Saharan Africa and excludes 107.5 million dollars for the massive Sahel development programme, is aimed at raising food production, reforestation as a renewable energy source, refugee aid and health.

While the more generous attitude of the United States in Salisbury has something of the appearance of a sweetener after the Organisation of African Unity's sharp warning to the US against the 'tilt' towards Pretoria and might also have been intended to some extent as well, to soften a refusal to go along with sanctions against South Africa over South West, the more likely explanation is that it is a combination of both these things but with greater emphasis on a broader goal of strengthening the entire area against what Reagan strategists see as a very vulnerable and increasingly attractive target for Russia and her surrogates.

Also important is that while government-to-government US assistance will continue along with other bilateral aid, Mr Reagan's Assistant Admin-

EDITOR

istrator for Africa, Mr Roy A Stacy, has laid considerable emphasis on donor co-ordination, which he said was especially important for US programmes in Africa.

He did not say so, but with the overriding criterion for that aid now 'the degree to which an individual programme or project appears likely to accelerate economic development' rather than 'no-strings-attached handouts', there is going to be much closer supervision to see to it that aid is effective and the giving will be planned along with other donor countries.

This lends added importance to the emergence of the SADCC grouping of Zimbabwe, Zambia, Mozambique, Angola, Tanzania, Malawi, Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana (at least four of the countries which were candidates for Mr Botha's 'constellation'), because of the greater likelihood — with good neighbours keeping an eye on one another's vegetable patches so to speak — that there will be a lot more crops to reap and progress to report.

On a continent where nutritionists class 70 million of its 440 million inhabitants as undernourished and warn that 20 million face famine this year the

initial two billion dollars raised so far for the benefit of SADCC countries is a drop in the ocean compared with the more than 64 billion dollars which United Nations planners have said is needed — in addition to emergency aid — if Africa has any hope whatever of becoming self-sufficient in food alone by the turn of the century.

But it is a healthy beginning and what is more important than statistical pictures of doom and disaster is that unlike the woeful record of the past, which has seen much of the 250 billion dollars of aid since the 1950s seemingly evaporate in the African sun, organised and better-supervised development such as that being planned by the SADCC offers considerable hope of substantial development.

This is particularly so when, as will be the case, it is kept under the friendly eye of the major Western donors to Africa who are already co-ordinating their efforts. These are Germany, Belgium, Canada, France, Britain and the United States and Mr Stacy has told Congress that several Arab/Opec countries are interested in strengthening their co-operation with the Western aid group. This means considerable funds could become available for 'controlled' development.

they prosper so will they of necessity expand their trade and even if chronic inefficiencies are reduced their demand for food, manufactured goods, as well as the nuts and bolts of industrial growth will rise. That will be to our advantage too, but while that prosperity will bring greater stability in the region there is also a serious danger — that because of their estrangement from the south they become totally dependent for survival — oil and other imports and exports — on the only two openly marxist states in the grouping, Mozambique and Angola.

Both are firmly in the Russian camp. Proof of this is that neither is prepared to join the Lome II Convention (which recognises West Berlin as the capital of a some-time-to-be united Germany) to get aid. Mozambique is in fact seriously considering joining Comecon, the Soviet bloc's economic community. The convention is pertinent because the European Economic Community, with guaranteed 100 million dollars in aid over and above 800 million dollars it is providing for SADCC countries other than Angola and Mozambique, is insisting that the money is channelled via the convention.

Russia, as was to be expected, was not at either SADCC gathering and has offered nothing. But with the checkmate position of

Chance for S A

All this points up sharply the role South Africa might have played in a southern Africa community of nations — Dr Verwoerd's grand 'constellation' — had she been less determined to maintain apartheid and white domination at all costs. Instead her 'anchor' role has now been taken over by Zimbabwe and while there is a good measure of wishful thinking in the Salisbury and Lusaka avowals to be free of economic dependence on South Africa in ten years, the very commitment itself is a further hardening of opinion towards Pretoria.

Of course those countries are landlocked and several of the others, too, are at present dependent on South Africa for ports and rail and road transport, as well as R1 000 million or more in trade every year, but with financial and technological aid from the West, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund they will soon be improving their own transport links and the East Coast ports of Maputo, Beira and Ncala.

The 'nine', with all the Western assistance that has been promised, are certain to grow less dependent on us than they have been. Zaire, too, has been making overtures to join the club.

An advantage is that as

two of her cubs she doesn't have to put her hand in her pocket for anything but surplus weapons to exploit conflict.

What an opportunity this all offers for South Africa to disappoint the Russians and take her rightful place on the Continent as the powerhouse of what many knowledgeable people have said could become the area of greatest growth in the world.

That would take courage and demand a willingness to make ourselves truly part of Africa. To share that greater peace and prosperity it would mean that we would have to begin by sharing at home.

The alternative is to man our borders from Mozambique to South West or the northern Cape and watch across the Limpopo as the Russian pincer steadily throttles the rest of Africa before being turned on us.

If Prime Minister Botha is able to grasp the need for black, brown and white 'boys' together on the border then why not a similar recognition of their need of one another in ordinary life? Or does his 'total strategy' against the 'total onslaught' also carry within it a double standard — the maintenance of that very apartheid which the Russians would like to make our epitaph?

Will Reagan shooting be another mystery?

By AIDA PARKER

WAS the assassination attempt by John Hinckley on Mr Ronald Reagan simply another wantonly senseless "lone-nut" effort? Or was it because the hawkish new President, the man chosen to lead the free world in these early "Awful Eighties," was already making too many global political waves?

That's the question being asked round the world today. Whether we'll ever get the answer, or the real answer, is another matter. Chances are it will remain as big a mystery as that surrounding a good few other assassinations in America's stormy political history.

There's no doubt, of course, that America has a veritable "assassination sub-culture."

Four Presidents — Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley and John Kennedy — have been fatally gunned down. Three more, Franklin D Roosevelt, Harry Truman and Gerald Ford, have been the targets of would-be assassins.

There was a plot to kill Nixon. John Kennedy's brother, Robert, was assassinated by Sirhan Sirhan in a Los Angeles hotel on June 5, 1968, while civil rights leader, Dr Martin Luther King, was killed by James Earl Ray on April 4 of the same year.

Two particular Presidential ghosts haunt Americans.

Even 116 years after Abraham Lincoln, the 16th US President, was assassinated, there are still claims that his killer, John Wilkes Booth, was never caught. Biggest question mark of all, however, hangs over the assassination of John F Kennedy, the young "Camelot" President who had sections of his brain shot away while riding in an open limousine with his wife, Jackie, in Dallas on November 22, 1963.

Although unlikely now ever to be officially confirmed, it is today generally agreed that the man who ordered this killing was Cuba's Marxist dictator and would-be Conquistadore of the Third World, President Fidel Castro.

And maybe not altogether without cause. Because Kennedy, there is ample evidence to indicate, was fully aware of "Operation Mongoose," the CIA plot to kill Castro.

The Kennedy killing remains the example par excellence of a deliberately-

Question mark still over John Kennedy's slaying

The Citizen 11/04/81

Wednesday

contrived official "cover-up." In 1964 President Lyndon Johnson set up the Warren Commission to investigate the assassination which had rocked the world. After ten months, the commission issued its findings.

Lee Harvey Oswald, it found, was solely responsible for the killing. There was no evidence of any conspiracy.

The "single assassin" claim was immediately met with a howl of outrage, condemned as a "deliberate whitewash." And the guessing game began. Just who was responsible? The Mafia-organised crime? America's own intelligence services? Big steel? The oil companies? Or the Communists?

In 1976, with polls showing 80 percent of Americans still sceptical about "official findings," the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities turned its attention to the Kennedy assassination.

Senator Richard Schweiker, who headed the committee's investigation, accused the CIA and FBI of a "cover up" and said there was no longer any reason to have faith in the Warren Commission's picture of the Kennedy killings.

The possibility, he said, was that "Cuba's Premier Castro ordered Kennedy's assassination in retaliation for a CIA plot to murder Castro at the time of the Kennedy killing."

This report in turn led to the establishment of a two-year, R4-million investigation by the House Select Committee on Assassinations. After two years of investigation, this committee issued a wishy-washy report in 1979, concluding



TOP: John F Kennedy. ABOVE: Jackie Kennedy and brother-in-law Robert Kennedy at the funeral of the assassinated President Kennedy. Robert was subsequently assassinated as well.

that both John Kennedy and Martin Luther King were "probably killed as a result of conspiracies."

In the case of Kennedy, it said, "the possibility of involvement by organised crime or Cubans could not be ruled out."

The official conspiracy of silence has, however, been many times pierced by Press leaks, most of them pointing to Castro as the culprit.

In the July, 1973, issue of Atlantic Monthly, Leos Janos, a former aide to President Johnson, said that sometime before Kennedy's death "a CIA assassination

team had been picked up in Havana."

Johnson reportedly told Janos that the assassination of President Kennedy in Dallas "was in retaliation for the thwarted attempt" to kill Castro.

On July 3, 1975, the Washington Star published an interview with retired Major-General Edward G Lansdale, a former Special Assistant to Defence Secretary Robert S McNamara.

Lansdale was quoted as saying that in 1962 Robert Kennedy ordered him to "launch a CIA project to work out all feasible plans for getting rid of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro." Assassination was one of the methods the project envisioned.

In a follow-up article Richard Goodwin, who attended an August 10, 1962, meeting of Special Group Augmented, reported in Harper's Magazine that Defence Secretary Robert McNamara proposed Castro's assassination as "the only productive way of dealing with Castro."

In an interview taped for Public TV on December 8, 1972, Judge Warren stated he accepted the chairmanship of the Warren Commission because President Johnson feared "the JFK assassination could lead us into a war — a nuclear war."

In early 1979 a White House memo dated February 17, 1964, was declassified. Describing the first meeting of the Warren Commission, the memo reported that Johnson told Judge Warren that it was his "duty" to suppress all rumours contrary to the "lone assassin" story because "the real facts could conceivably lead the country into a war costing 40-million lives."

In another statement, Judge Warren said that if the true facts behind the murder of President Kennedy had become known, "the aroused indignation of the American public might have forced an American retaliation against Castro, a man under the protection of the USSR, and could have precipitated a US-Soviet war."

Does any similar high drama lie behind the attempt on President Reagan's life? Will we ever know?

THE CITIZEN COMMENT

Shooting of Reagan

11/04/81 Wednesday

WE ARE shocked at the attempt to assassinate President Reagan.

Shocked because we have in recent times seen assassins kill President John Kennedy and his brother, Robert, as well as civil rights leader Martin Luther King, and we cannot understand why this great nation that is the United States of America should have such ghastly violence against its leaders as part of its make-up and history.

That President Reagan, a conservative, is a man whose views and policies we particularly respect adds to our revulsion at the attempted assassination, but we would feel shocked whoever the incumbent was.

The Americans will be asking themselves why? Why was the intended victim President Reagan, a man of 70, who has impressed everyone by the charm of his personality, his sincerity, and the moderation of his views?

Why was the would-be assassin a young man, of good family, who blasted away at the President from close range, a young man who was undergoing psychiatric treatment but who, from first reports, does not appear to have been mad?

And they will wonder especially whether there were any political motives behind the attack; or whether this was the action of a loner with an imaginary grudge, or a psychopath with a compulsion to get himself into history by committing such an atrocious act against the leader of his country.

Somehow, though we are also a country of violence, of far too many trigger-happy people and guns, of far too many crimes of passion and family slayings in which guns are the most frequently used weapons, a country in which one of our own leaders, Prime Minister Verwoerd, was assassinated, we still shake our heads in sadness at the frequency of assassinations and attempted assassinations in the United States.

The first US President to be killed by a gunman was Abraham Lincoln in 1865.

Of the 16 US Presidents this century, seven have been the targets of assassination attempts and two, William McKinley and John Kennedy, were killed.

And as a report from New York puts it, "the gun has not only been turned on Presidents but has been used to kill hundreds of other prominent Americans and thousands of ordinary people."

Among the most recent victims was former Beatle John Lennon.

In one year, 217 000 Americans (almost four times the number of US soldiers killed in Vietnam) die from bullets fired by accident, self-inflicted, or during a crime.

It is ironic that President Reagan himself opposed strict gun control measures, saying "Guns don't kill; people do."

He proposed a mandatory sentence of five to 15 years be added to the sentence of a person convicted of carrying out a crime with a gun.

We doubt that this will be a deterrent in a land in which the 18th century constitution, framed for an era of frontiersmen opening up a new land, says a free man has the right to bear arms.

We ourselves believe that strict control of guns is a partial answer to the problem of violence in the United States, as it is in South Africa, where there are far too many guns in the hands of far too many people who either are unfit to have them, or are untrained to use them properly, or who are careless in the way they leave them around so that they fall into the hands of criminals or potential criminals.

However, unlike America, we have laws that require a person to acquire a permit from the police before he can legally possess a gun.

But too many permits are issued — and too many people are also able to acquire weapons illegally.

We should like to see the gun laws here tightened considerably and even stricter penalties imposed for the use of firearms in crime.

Nevertheless, we accept that if a man is determined to use a gun, he will find a way of acquiring one — and if he is out to kill a prominent person, it will be difficult to stop him.

The main problem lies in the nature of the society in which a person lives — and if it is a violent one, then he suffers the consequences.

As is happening in America — and, possibly to a lesser extent, in South Africa.

The Americans will be putting their own society once more under the magnifying glass — and we would do well to examine what is amiss with our own.

Meanwhile, our sympathy goes out to the wounded President and his family.

We hope his recovery will be complete, and that he will once again lead the United States along paths which will benefit all mankind.

SA company, Swaziland settle claim

The Citizen
2/04/81 Wednesday

MBABANE. — In an out-of-court settlement at the Rand Supreme Court, the Swaziland government has agreed to pay a South African company, International Paper Industries, almost half

the R82 128 owing to it for paper and equipment delivered.

The Times of Swaziland yesterday reported that according to the terms of settlement, Swaziland would pay the company R37 807.

Last month the company obtained a Rand Supreme

Court order for the attachment of money due to the Swazi government under its customs agreement with South Africa.

The report said the company's lawyers had followed this up with a letter to the Prime Minister, Prince Mabandla, through the Minister of Justice, Mr Polycarp Dlamini.

The letter expressed the company's "deep concern" at the fact that "you and your government have suffered severe embarrassment as a result of the adverse Press reaction and radio and television broadcasts which followed the attachment of your money."

"Our client wishes to make it clear that its action in attaching your money was in no way motivated by an intention to embarrass you or your government, and our client sincerely regrets the embarrassment you suffered."

In a Press statement released after the settlement, the company's attorneys agreed to make public that the attachment of the Swazi money did not in any way arise out of the inability or unwillingness of Swaziland to meet her commitment.

In terms of the agreement Swaziland would pay the company that portion of its claim which was not in dispute. — Sapa.