AF Press Clips

WASHINGTON, D.C. June 21, 1985 XX No. 23

THE NEW YORK TIMES
JUNE 20, 1985

Security Council Faults South Africa on Namibia

Special to The New York Times

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., June 19— The Security Council called today for "appropriate measures" against South Africa unless it complied with United Nations efforts to establish an independent South-West Africa.

The United States and Britain abstained on the statement, which came in the form of a compromise resolution.

The measure, negotiated by France, replaced an earlier draft that had threatened mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. The United States and Britain had been expected to veto that resolution.

The adopted resolution called on governments to take voluntary steps against the South African Government, including prohibiting new investments in South Africa. But unlike the earlier draft, the resolution dropped portions that urged nations to sever diplomatic relations with South Africa and impose an oil embargo.

Cubans in Angola Cited

The United States abstained on the resolution because it believes that any sanctions "are likely to retard," rather than advance, independence for South-West Africa, which is also known as Namibia, the American delegate, Warren Clark, told the Council.

Mr. Clark added that the "one key issue" that must be resolved before the United Nations plan for independence can be implemented is the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola, which borders South-West Africa. He said recent discussions indicate "a real potential for further progress" on the issue.

During the Council debate, a number of delegates from Western and developing nations rejected linking the issues of independence for South-West Africa and the withdrawal of Cuban troops, which the South African Government strongly supports.

The vote followed almost 10 days of Council debate, during which more than 80 speakers, including representatives of the United States, condemned the recent installation by South Africa of an interim government in the territory. Delegates also unanimously criticized South Africa's recent military incursions into Angola and Botswana. The Council will consider those incursions later this week.

The resolution, like previous ones, called for South Africa to implement United Nations plans for Namibian independence outlined in Resolution 435. The resolution, passed in 1978 with American support, calls for a United Nations peacekeeping force to oversee a cease-fire in the region and monitor a seven-month period that would culminate in elections.

THE WASHINGTON POST JUNE 18, 1985

New Namibia Leadership

South Africa Installs Panel, Quells Protest

By Allister Sparks
Special to The Washington Post

WINDHOEK, Namibia, June 17—South Africa installed a new internal administration in Namibia today amid a combination of pageantry and violence, staging an elaborate inauguration ceremony on one side of this picturesque capital while tear-gassing dissenters in a black area on the opposite side.

The inauguration featured the kind of pageantry normally reserved for declarations of independence, with a mechanized military procession, displays of stunt flying, parachuting, torch-bearing runners, fireworks, and a 21-gun salute for the new Cabinet.

While this was taking place, police, headed by a tough counterinsurgency brigade called Koevoet, maintained a massive presence in Windhoek's main black township of Katutura, where a day-long rally of dissenters was held. As the dissenters left a soccer field toward evening, the police dispersed groups of them with batons and tear gas. Six reportedly were hospitalized with baton injuries.

South African President Pieter W. Botha, who performed the inauguration ceremony, repeated earlier assurances that South Africa intends the new Namibian administration purely as an "interim mechanism for the internal administration of the territory." He said South Africa remains committed to seeking an internationally acceptable independence settlement for the territory through U.S.-led negotiations.

Despite these assurances, the United States and other western intermediaries have condemned the move, which informed sources here see as part of a broad South African strategy to bypass a United Nations program for the territory's independence.

[U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar declared the new administration "null and void" today and urged all states to deny it recognition, United Press International reported.]

South Africa has controlled Namibia's affairs for 67 years. In 1966, the United Nations passed Resolution 435, calling for an end to South African control, and later formed a U.N. special council to administer the territory until independence. South Africa has been formally committed to the U.N. measure for six years, but has largely disregarded it because of the role it gives the United Nations as supervisor of the transition to independence and because South Africans says it favors the main Namibian nationalist movement, the South-West African People's Organization (SWAPO).

The new South Africa-installed administration does not include representatives of SWAPO, although it does include some with African nationalist backgrounds, notably Moses Katjiuonga, 43, leader of the South-West African National Union (SWANU). Another of the new administration's leaders is Andreas Shipanga, one of the founders of SWAPO who later fell out with its leader, Sam Nujoma, and formed his own breakaway party, the SWAPO-Democrats.

South Africa is handing over powers of self-government to the new administration, except in foreign affairs, defense, and internal security.

Western critics of South Africa's latest move accuse the country of trying to impose a "regional settlement" of its own.

Botha said today that South Africa would do nothing irreconcilable with the U.N. plan as long as there was a realistic prospect of success in the present negotiations to bring

Continued on Pg. 7

THE WASHINGTON POST JUNE 15, 1985

South Africa: The Issue Is Justice, Not Jobs

The offensive paternalism of The Post's editorial "The South African Sanctions" [June 5] was only outdone by its ahistorical case against sanctions—"that the country's economy is its most effective engine of social transformation."

This old argument, that somehow economic and social change lead inexorably to political liberalization and to democratization is more than just an unproven assumption; it is blatantly false. We only have to look to the experience of Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia, Fascist Italy, Communist Poland —indeed, to the experience of South Africa itself —to see the fallacy of such a thesis. In all of these instances there has been progressive industrialization, economic and social change—and greater repression.

In making this old argument The Post is, surprisingly, making the same mistake as those who have a limited knowledge of South Africa's history or current reality: to project onto the South African situation America's own experience with racism and an evolutionary civil rights movement. South Africa is simply not the United States. It is a totalitarian police state that constitutionally denies the most basic of political freedoms to its citizenry. And its majority-minority relationships are reversed: whites are a minority in South Africa, desperate to hold onto their privileged position and power. Unless we understand that this reversal of the majority-minority relationship inevitably creates a different political dynamic, we are going to continue a foreign policy that can only be counterproductive.

The sanctions in the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985, adopted by a better than two-thirds bipartisan majority in the House, are specifically intended to increase external pressure on the regime to dismantle apartheid before it is too late. The legislation is also aimed at placing America unequivocally on the side of the victims of apartheid and at beginning the overdue process of disassociating ourselves from the viciously oppressive South African regime. This legislation is not, as The Post cynically suggests, intended as a partisan rebuke of the Reagan administration.

The editorial suggested that those who are advocating sanctions are really insensitive to the prospective suffering that might be created for South Africa's black population. Nothing could be further from the truth. The tragic reality is that it is the administration's policy of "constructive engagement" that is in fact producing more suffering, more violence and more repression. That is very simply because the message that "constructive engagement" has conveyed to the South African regime is that it now has a much freer hand to do what it will—not only internally, but throughout the region. Because of the current policy, the South African government knows in advance that no matter how much repression there is, and no matter how much aggression it unleashes against the neighboring states in the region, there will be no cost imposed in terms of the American-South African relationship.

It is simply wrong to focus more American concern on the 70,000 jobs American firms provide black South Africans than on the 26 million South African majority, which not only lacks economic opportunities but is dehumanized daily by a minority government. The struggle in South Africa is not primarily about jobs but more fundamentally about justice, dignity and political freedom.

In the final analysis, apartheid will be dismantled as the result of South Africa's internal political struggle. But the United States and the international community can play a significant role in accelerating the process of change and, thereby, in reducing the duration of the struggle and the dimensions of the associated violence and bloodshed.

—Howard Wolpe

The writer is a Democratic representative from Michigan.

THE WASHINGTON POST JUNE 19, 1985

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT REAGAN'S NEWS CONFERENCE

South Africa Policy

Yesterday, South Africans saw a new government in Namibia, which the United Nations condemned. Last week, South Africa raided neighboring Botswana, killing 12 people. And last month, a South African commando unit tried to blow up oil tanks partly owned by U.S. companies. In view of these events, do you plan any changes or alterations, modifications in your policy of constructive engagement with South Africa?

Well, as you know, we brought our ambassador home for consultations. All I can tell you is we think we have been successful in getting some concessions there and some changes in their policy of apartheid, which we all find repugnant, and we're going to continue doing that. The raid across the border was perhaps the kind of incident that I've just been talking about here in our own situation.

There is no question about the violence of the ANC [African National Congress] and their strike, their attacks on people and their murdering and so forth. But again, was the strike back at the people that were guilty, or was it just a retaliation in the general direction? So we don't know about that, but we are very concerned about it.

Then you don't consider these recent events to be a setback in your policy with South Africa?

Well, they're certainly not something that we heartily approve of. But whether they're something to make us break off relations with another government, I don't think that, either.

THE WASHINGTON POST JUNE 19, 1985

'Constructive Engagement' With South Africa to Continue

By David B. Ottaway
Washington Post Staff Writer

President Reagan said last night that the United States would continue to pursue its much-criticized policy of "constructive engagement" toward South Africa, despite recent actions by that country's government that threaten to jeopardize U.S. diplomatic objectives in the region.

He also ruled out a break in diplomatic relations with the white-ruled Pretoria government.

"We think we have been successful in getting some concessions there and some changes in their policy of apartheid, which we all find repugnant, and we're going to continue doing that," he said in his nationally televised news conference.

The president said he was concerned about the action Pretoria took last week in mounting a cross-border raid into the capital of Botswana to attack offices of the nationalist guerrilla movement there.

But he compared that raid to the U.S. government's current dilemma over whether to strike back at the Shiite extremists holding the American hostages in Beirut.

While saying he thought there was "no question" that the national guerrillas were also resorting to "violence" and "murdering" in their attacks on South Africans, he asked rhetorically, "Was the [South African] strike back at the people that were guilty or was it just a retaliation in a general direction" of the guerrillas?

"We don't know about that but we're very concerned about it," he said.

The president refused to describe a series of recent actions by the Pretoria government as a "setback" to U.S. policy toward southern Africa. These include setting up a "transitional government" in South African-administered Namibia on Monday, the raid last week into Botswana and the abortive attempt last month to blow up a partly American-owned oil facility in northern Angola.

"They're certainly not something that we heartily approve of," he said of these South African actions. "But whether they're something to make us break off relations with another government, I don't think that, either."

THE WASHINGTON POST

From South Africa, Contempt

JUNE 19, 1985

THE SOUTH AFRICAN government intensifies its campaign of force and threat against its neighbors. Just in the last few days, its armed forces, claiming to be attacking guerrilla bases, invaded neighboring Botswana's capital and coldly killed some 14 persons, including three women and a 5-year-old child. Then Pretoria proceeded with its long-rumored plan to set up a pliant puppet regime, its alternative to internationally acceptable independence, in its longtime colony of Namibia.

The attack on Botswana makes plain why the existence of apartheid in South Africa is itself a source of danger to the region. South Africa has made no showing that African National Congress guerrillas were operating out of Botswana. It simply stormed in, strewing about death, intending presumably to add one more mark of intimidation to all the others that have made life miserable for its neighbors over the years. The imperial arrogance of South Africa, its determination to flaunt its uncontested power, was on full view. But what it really demonstrates is the lack of self-confidence, the insecurity, that lie not far under the readiness to go to the gun.

South Africa has spent decades failing to deliver on its promise to grant independence to Namibia, also a neighbor. In the Carter period, it went the puppet-regime route. which led nowhere, and now it is trying again. There is always a fancy excuse; this time it is that Cuban troops remain in Angola, to Namibia's north. But what South Africa does not say is that Cuban troops remain there to protect the Angolan government precisely against South Africa. Last month its commandoes were caught about to sabotage the American-owned oil facility that is Angola's most valuable economic asset. Meanwhile, Pretoria continues to sponsor the Angolan insurgency led by Jonas Savimbi. The same lack of self-confidence is evident: a fear of the fact and example of self-rule by blacks not beholden to South Africa.

The United States responded to the raid into Botswana by calling the ambassador home. It boycotted the installation of the new setup in Namibia, which it had already denounced as null and void. The question is not whether these protests are right and sufficient, however. The question is why South Africa proceeds with policies—its repression at home as well as acts outside its borders—that trash the expressed opinions and urgings of the government whose favor is most important to it. It proceeds with them, moreover, as Congress contemplates sanctions.

The evident answer is that South Africa has taken the U.S. policy of "constructive engagement" as a big

Continued on Pg. 15

THE SUN

JUNE 9, 1985

U.S. blacks and apartheid

By Louis Freedberg
Pacific News Service

The fight against apartheid has caught the imagination of U.S. blacks unlike any other foreign policy issue. Why South Africa? Why have other issues and causes — even specifically African ones like starvation in Ethiopia — not generated this kind of passion?

There are at least three levels of congruence — personal, political, religious — that account for grassroots black support for the anti-apartheid movement.

On a personal level, most black Americans identify closely with the civil rights struggle being waged by South African blacks. Segregated housing, separate schools, job classifications, denial of voting rights, and outright racism have all been experienced by black Americans in one form or another.

These issues seem closer to home than arms control or U.S. involvement in Central America. And freedom in South Africa is not an "African" issue, like famine in Chad. Rather it is a black issue, a product of white racism, an issue most black Americans find all too familiar.

On a political level, blacks can comfortably claim South Africa as "their" issue, initiated by black leaders after years of complacency, even avoidance, by white politicians. It was the Rev. Jesse Jackson who placed South Africa on the front burner of debate during the 1984 presidential campaign. Then Randall Robinson of TransAfrica, Delegate Walter Fauntroy (D, D.C.) and many others committed the simple act of getting arrested outside the South African Embassy in Washington last November.

Those arrests sparked a national movement that now involves thousands of white students and faculty at dozens of campuses. Yet blacks continue to play a vital role in directing the movement — from Randall Robinson's Free South Africa movement to California Assembly Speaker Willie Brown, who has called for full divestment of the state's pension and university stock portfolios.

Finally, there is a religious connection that ties the South African struggle to the black church, still the most powerful and organized black institution in America.

Like the civil rights movement led by the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and more recently by Mr. Jackson, the resistance movement in South Africa has a strong religious base. South Africa's two most powerful above-ground — and unjailed — opposition leaders are Bishop Desmond Tutu, the Nobel Laureate who heads the South African Council of Churches, and the Rev. Allan Boesak, president of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches.

The parallels were strengthened when Bishop Tutu, like Dr. King, was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. This connection has helped Bishop Tutu gain access to black churches across America, and black ministers have organized support for him and his cause. It is almost as if Dr. King had returned to continue the struggle, albeit on another continent.

Even the old symbols have returned. At Bishop Tutu's U.S. appearances, audiences swayed together singing "We Shall Overcome."

These strands — political, personal, religious — have come together to create a potent force, one that in the long run may do much to bring full equality not only to black South Africans but to black Americans as well.

There is, though, a bittersweet quality to black support for the South African cause. In one sense, U.S. blacks are acting from a position of strength. In Oakland, Calif., for example, Bishop Tutu was greeted by a political power structure that is dominated by blacks — including the mayor, the city manager, a congressman and half the city council.

At the same time, the South African struggle must remind many black Americans that, despite visible political gains, the work of their civil rights movement is far from complete. At Bishop Tutu's appearances, audiences were reminded over and over again that racism is still a fact of life in America — black unemployment is still twice as high as white unemployment, the "poverty gap" between blacks and whites continues to grow, housing segregation is still practiced everywhere.

Ironically, because blacks are in the majority in South Africa, it is possible that white racism will disappear there before it does in the United States. If this does not happen, if white racism cannot be defeated in South Africa, it will reinforce what many already believe — that racism cannot be eliminated here either.

Perhaps that is why the struggle in South Africa is so important, not just to blacks, but to everyone who believes that a just society is an attainable goal.

Mr. Freedberg, a Pacific News Service editor and an anthropologist born and raised in South Africa, has worked extensively with minority youth in the United States.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR June 17, 1985

South African raid into Botswana dims relations with US

By Patrick Laurence
Special to The Christian Science Monitor

Johannesburg

The attack by South African commandos on alleged African National Congress (ANC) guerrilla bases in neighboring Botswana has raised questions about the direction of South African policy in southern Africa.

The raid last Friday was the first major attack in the subcontinent by the South African Defense Force since the signing of the peace pact, known as the Nkomati Accord, nearly 15 months ago between South Africa and Mozambique.

It comes in the wake of the much-publicized interception of South African commandos by Angolan security forces in the oil-rich enclave of Cabinda on May 21.

JOAN FORBES — STAFF

Against the backdrop of divestment legislation passed by the United States Congress, the raid marks a low point in South African relations with the Reagan administration.

US Ambassador to South Africa Herman Nickel has been recalled to Washington for consultations. In announcing the recall, State Department spokesman Bernard Kalb made clear US reservations about the sincerity of Pretoria's long-term commitment to peace.

In the attack on the homes of South African exiles in the Botswana capital of Gaborone at least 12 people were killed, including three women and a young child. The South African commandos launched simultaneous attacks on 10 "ANC targets" in Gaborone.

The purpose of the raid, observers said, was to assert Pretoria's dominance and to dissuade its neighbors from offering support of any kind to ANC rebels.

Two questions are raised, analysts say.

Was the raid a display of strength specifically designed to force Botswana to accede to South African demands to expel ANC cadres?

Or was it a reversion to the policy of "destabilization" that held sway in South Africa before the March 1984 signing of the Nkomati Accord with Mozambique and the Lusaka agreement with Angola the month be-

Continued on Pg. 15

The Washington Times

JUNE 17, 1985

Raid on Botswana drives wedge between U.S., Pretoria

By Michael Sullivan
THE WASHINGTON TIMES FOREIGN SERVICE

JOHANNESBURG, South Africa — The United States' recall of Ambassador Herman Nickel and South Africa's unrepentant stance underscore the serious gulf opened between the two states by South Africa's commando raid Friday against reported African National Congress targets in neighboring Botswana.

The predawn raid, which left some dozen dead in Gaborone, Botswana's capital, has been strongly condemned internationally as indefensible, and the recall of Mr. Nickel likely will push U.S.-South African relations to a new low and test the already shaky policy of "constructive engagement."

South African ambassadors in Britain, France and the Netherlands were called in to explain their country's action as worldwide criticism again mounted against Pretoria.

One victim, Achmed Geer, 36, a Somali national with a refugee passport issued by the Netherlands, was killed and his wife, a Dutch citizen, reported wounded in both legs. The couple apparently had rented the house just two weeks ago and were not connected to any ANC activity.

In addition, Botswana reported that a 5-year-old child had been killed and some half dozen people wounded in the hour-long commando raid that destroyed 10 houses in Gaborone's suburbs. There also was speculation that some people had been kidnapped during the raid.

Botswana President Quett Masire on Saturday condemned the raid as a "bloodcurdling act of murder of defenseless civilians."

Pretoria, however, far from apologetic, has strenuously defended the raid as vital to South Africa's security in the wake of recent guerrilla attacks and as a preemptive strike to thwart anticipated ANC actions.

In a five-page statement defending the action, foreign minister Roelof F. "Pik" Botha said Botswana had been repeatedly warned to halt ANC activity in the country, which he said had become the ANC's major infiltration route into South Africa. Pretoria also left open the possibility of repeat raids in the future.

At a Friday press conference, Gen. Constand Viljoen, chief of the army, said Botswana had been used as the ANC's control, planning and provisioning headquarters to plan assassinations and sabotage against South Africa. Since last August, he said, three South African police officers had been killed in clashes with ANC cadres and six ANC members had been killed in South Africa and the Bophuthatswana "homeland."

There have some 33 incidents so far this year, primarily limpet mine explosions, a 50 percent increase from 1984's figure.

NEWS ANALYSIS

A grenade attack a week ago on two colored members of Parliament, he said, was the "last straw."

"We intended to kill all the terrorists we found in the houses," Gen. Viljoen said of the raid, which he termed a "very great success." Photographs of the houses were mute testimony to the effectiveness of the raid, with rooms raked with automatic weapon fire, pools of blood and walls blown out.

Botswana and other African states insist those killed were refugees.

The raid has again cast South Africa as an outlaw nation.

Defended by Mr. Botha as vital, the raid came as a special U.N. debate continued on South Africa's scheduled handing over of administrative control of Namibia to an internal political coalition, the Multi-Party Coalition.

The United States earlier rejected South Africa's plan for Namibia and recently also condemned a South African foray into northern Angola that left two of its commandos dead and a third a prisoner.

South Africa in recent years has not hesitated to strike at bases and headquarters of the ANC — an illegal organization in the republic. The Gaborone raid followed a pattern established in 1981.

ANC offices in Maputo, Mozambique's capital, have been attacked three times, twice in commando raids and once, May 23, 1983, in an air strike after a bomb blast in Pretoria that killed 18 and injured more than 200.

Thirty-two ANC members and 12 civilians were killed in December 1982 when South Africa struck at ANC operations in neighboring Lesotho during a four-hour raid.

Continued on Pg. 15

THE NEW YORK TIMES
JUNE 20, 1985

PRETORIA ASSAILS OUTSIDE MEDDLING

Botha Says Western Nations Use 'Double Standards' in Their Dealings in Africa

By ALAN COWELL
Special to The New York Times

JOHANNESBURG, June 19 — President P. W. Botha denounced what he termed Western double standards toward his country today, and said South Africa could solve its problems without "international meddling" in its affairs.

The tone of his address to Parliament in Cape Town seemed to reflect a mood of embattled defiance nurtured by South Africa's growing isolation from Western allies, the United States in particular. Washington has recalled its Ambassador here, Herman Nickel, for consultations following South Africa's most recent military forays into neighboring Botswana and Angola.

"The international community should be in no doubt with regard to South Africa's resolve and ability to maintain itself at home, now and in the future," Mr Botha said. "We can solve our problems without international meddling."

In reference to the campaign in the United States for curbs on American investment here, he said: "If there are elements in Washington who think South Africa is going to be run by the U.S., then it must be made quite clear that these elements are heading for a confrontation with the South African government and people."

Parliament Ends Session

The President's 30-minute speech was made as the new, three-chamber Parliament ended its first six-month session. The segregated legisiature includes people of mixed and Indian racial descent for the first time, but it ignores the black majority.

In the session, Parliament has changed legislation forbidding mixed political parties and sex between whites and nonwhites. But, its opponents say, it did not erode such pillars of apartheid as the laws that segregate residential areas, identify people from birth by race and transplant millions of blacks to tribal homelands.

In his speech, Mr. Botha defended what he called the reforms that brought the new Parliament into being. He promised further changes to offer "self-determination" to South Africa's ethnic communities. But, he said, a political system based " one man, one vote" in a unitary state would be "disastrous."

The comment underlined the white minority's determination to maintain what it calls its own self-determination, a codeword for supremacy, while offering changes in the traditional system of apartheid.

In recent months, South Africa has been the target of international criticism for its handling of deep-rooted unrest in black townships, where over 400 people have been killed since September. The outcry intensified last month when South African commandos raided Angola's northern enclave of Cabinda. Last week, troops struck at Gaborone, capital of neighboring Botswana. In both attacks, South Africa said its soldiers were acting against insurgents based beyond its borders.

'We Shall Not Shirk'

Mr. Botha praised his security forces for their actions, saying, "We shall not shirk from our duty to maintain an effective police and defense force."

He accused Western nations of being manipulated into promoting Soviet interests and asked how those same nations, which he did not identify, could cooperate with dictatorial states in other parts of this continent while threatening South Africa.

"Some of them say they find our policies abhorrent," he said. "Well, we find their double standards and opportunistic policies abhorrent."

He made clear that his Government would not shy from further attacks on purported insurgent bases beyond its frontiers. "My Government will not abdicate this responsibility," he said, comparing South Africa's motives in acting its foes to those of the United States in Central America.

The President said South Africa offered a "hand of friendship" to black-ruled neighbors provided they observed what he called ground rules. He said these included the withdrawal of hostile foreign forces from the region — apparently a reference to the Cubans in Angola — and the withholding of support by black-ruled nations for South Africa's armed foes in exile, like the African National Congress.

Has 'No Rigid Ideas'

He did not spell out what measures he planned to take to redeem promises of some political power for blacks, saying his Government had "no rigid ideas about the type of franchise to be enjoyed by each of our peoples and communities."

"My Government," he said, "stands for an evolutionary process of adaptation and innovation."

The address seemed designed in part to rally domestic support against outside enemies.

Before Ambassador Nickel's withdrawal, United States policy toward South Africa, called "constructive engagement," was based on the idea that confrontation with Pretoria would produce only defiance of the kind displayed by President Botha today, while quiet persuasion would encourage change.

South African officials, however, reflecting the mood of aggressiveness, seem to say in private conversation these days that their Government is determined to chart its own course, whatever attitude the outside world shows toward it.

THE ECONOMIST
JUNE 15, 1985

South Africa

The underground is shifting

FROM A CORRESPONDENT IN JOHANNESBURG

How strong is the outlawed African National Congress? Do not expect a convincing answer from South Africa's whites. Government leaders, from President Pieter Botha downwards, blame the ANC, South Africa's main illegal anti-apartheid movement with a guerrilla wing, for the unrest sweeping across the black townships. Senior policemen, on the other hand, insist that the organisation is fractured by its own problems and has sunk to its lowest ebb for years. Major Craig Williamson, a top policeman who infiltrated the movement in the late 1970s, says that it is "one of the most unsuccessful Russian-associated terrorist groups".

Much of the past year's turmoil in the townships has been cheered on by the United Democratic Front, a collection of about 600 local groups spread across the country. The UDF's aims and much of its symbolism echo the old ANC. Many politicians say it is that body's surrogate. If that were so, then the ANC—it could be deduced—is strong. There is little evidence, however, that the UDF or the underground ANC directly instigated the turmoil, which seems to have been the result of spontaneous anti-apartheid combustion. Many people close to the scenes of unrest say that both movements were surprised by the fury of the violence and found themselves a step behind the rebellion.

Professional sabotage, rather than urban riots, is the ANC's strong point. Here both the politicians and the police seem to play down its activity. It is safe to assume that not all acts of sabotage are reported; but the police admitted that there were 56 ANC attacks in 1983. Last year, thanks partly to a peace treaty between South Africa and Mozambique, which had previously been the guerrillas' main launching base, the number fell to 44. This year, however, the annual rate of attacks has increased again to about 70.

Last month the ANC bombed the Johannesburg headquarters of the giant Anglo American corporation, which had just sacked 14,000 miners. A fortnight later, it bombed the police station in the town where a black trade union leader was being buried after he had died in police custody; and it is reckoned to have been responsible for two grenade attacks on the homes of mixed-race members of parliament on June 12th. In general, however, the ANC campaign has not been directed against civilians. The aim of the attacks—in the words of a local white academic—is to "select targets whose destruction would create the maximum popular resonance".

Continued on Pg. 6

THE NEW YORK TIMES, JUNE 17, 1985

NEW SOWETO CLASH MARS OBSERVANCE OF 1976 UPRISING

Tear Gas Is Used to Disperse Blacks After Anniversary Service in Cathedral

By ALAN COWELL
Special to The New York Times

SOWETO, South Africa, June 16 — Police and army units in armored vehicles used tear gas and rubber bullets in this vast and bleak township outside Johannesburg today to disperse thousands of black people commemorating the ninth anniversary of an uprising.

Despite calls by some clerics for prayers for the overthrow of the white minority Government to mark the day, however, the mood seemed almost an anticlimax compared with the passion voiced in advance.

For South Africa's black majority, June 16 is one of the most highly charged days of the year. The day in 1976 was the start of an uprising that spread from here and claimed more than 500 lives before the unrest eased in 1977.

4,000 at Ceremony

Today, about 4,000 black people crammed into Regina Mundi Cathedral in Soweto to hear a blend of hymns and political proselytization while police and army units waited outside. Churches are one of the few places where blacks may lawfully congregate in South Africa.

"We come before you knowing you are a God who sides with the oppressed, a God who sides with the poor, a God who sides with those who are exploited," Bishop Desmond Tutu, winner of the 1984 Nobel Peace Prize, said in a prayer as the four-hour gathering opened.

"We pray that you will be with us and that the day of liberation will dawn soon," he said.

Rival Groups Reproached

In a speech, Bishop Tutu, Johannesburg's first black bishop, seemed to chastise South Africa's rival black political organizations for feuding. "Let us not discredit our cause by some of the things that we are doing in our townships." he said, apparently referring to internecine bloodletting between the rival groups.

Both the main factions — the United Democratic Front and the National Forum — were present at the service in a rare display of unity. Organizers seemed anxious to insure that spokesmen for the affiliates of both groups were allotted equal speaking time.

The United Democratic Front espouses nonracial opposition to the policies of apartheid while the National Forum, proclaiming itself the torchbearer of the Black Consciousness movement, excludes whites. In recent months the two sides have clashed bitterly in black townships.

The service was punctuated by black nationalist cries of "Amandla!" — meaning "Power!" and "Awethu!" — "It shall be ours!" It came three days after South African commandos raided Gaberone, capital of neighboring Botswana, to strike at insurgent "safe houses" and other installations there said to form a "nerve center" of the outlawed African National Congress.

The City Press, a newspaper with a predominantly black circulation, accused South Africa's military today of bungling the raid since, it said, many of the 16 killed had been Botswana citizens not linked to the insurgents.

The African National Congress, the South Africans say, is supposed to open a major conference within the next few days, in either Zambia or Tanzania. Commentators say the meeting will be crucial in determining whether the Congress decides to widen its war. So far, it has sought to concentrate primarily on the sabotage of economic installations.

In Soweto today, police and army units seemed braced for unrest after the raid into Botswana. But many of the township's 1.5 million residents seemed prepared to stay home rather than risk a clash with the heavily armed authorities.

As the service at Regina Mundi came to an end, however, and hundreds of participants poured from the cathedral, some youthful demonstrators began peppering the police with rocks. The reaction was instantaneous.

Police and army units fired cannisters of tear gas into the crowd. Even after the crowd broke, the policemen and soldiers pursued the demonstrators, firing tear gas at those seeking to flee.

Jackson Urges Action

By PHILIP S. GUTIS

The Rev. Jesse Jackson urged President Reagan yesterday not to allow the United States Ambassador to return to South Africa until a plan to end apartheid had been formulated.

Mr. Jackson, speaking before about 500 people at a rally in Harlem marking the ninth anniversary of the Soweto uprising, said that Ambassador Herman Nickel "cannot go back — and must not go back — without a more humane African policy."

The United States recalled Ambassador Nickel on Friday to protest South African military raids into neighboring Botswana and Angola. The Administration said the recall was for consultations to review the situation in South Africa.

Mr. Jackson also said the Reagan Administration must work to insure independence for South-West Africa, which is also known as Namibia, and to protect the countries that surround South Africa.

"No American ambassador must return to South Africa until there is a plan to free Namibia and to end apartheid," Mr. Jackson said.

Protest Held at Columbia

Before the rally, several hundred people gathered outside Columbia University, a spot chosen because of the "disinvestment struggle that went on in the spring," according to Larry Holmes, an official of the New York Southern Africa Solidarity Coalition, which organized the event.

As the marchers walked through Columbia's campus, they chanted, "Trustees, you know, South African stocks have got to go."

Mr. Jackson commended the students who barricaded themselves in front of Columbia College's main administration building, Hamilton Hall

THE NEW YORK TIMES, JUNE 16, 1985

A Tarnished Krugerrand

Now that South Africa's racial laws have moved Congress to propose a ban on imports of the South African Krugerrand, many gold bugs are fearful that such a ban will further harm the coin's marketability.

The increased publicity about Pretoria's apartheid policies has already taken a toll on the Krugerrand. "Until this year, the South African one-ounce Krugerrand outsold the one-ounce Canadian Royal Mint's Maple Leaf nine to one," said Luis Vigdor, senior vice president of Manfra, Tordella & Brookes, the leading marketer of bullion coins. "A month ago, it was 50-50. Now it's 60-40 in favor of the Maple Leaf."

One result, Mr. Vigdor says, is that the Krugerrand's premium over its intrinsic value — the price of gold at any given time — has vanished, while that on the Canadian one-ounce Maple Leaf has risen on average in recent weeks to 3.5 percent from 2.5 percent. "If our Government does ban the import of Krugerrands, we wouldn't be surprised if they sold at discounts of 1 or 2 percent," he said.

THE UNDERGROUND IS SHIFTING (Continued)

The ANC has now diversified from sabotage into labour politics. It is trying to move closer to—perhaps even to commandeer—the burgeoning trade union movement. At first it was rather hostile to what it dubbed the "workerist" attitude of the trade unions, because they concentrated, rather cautiously, on bread-and-butter issues of wages and working conditions. But the trade unions have become much more overtly political in the past year, with one general strike in November in support of political demands and another last month to protest against the death of a trade union leader. If trade union and ANC interests do begin to converge, the combination of extremism and mass support could be quite a force.

THE WASHINGTON POST

JUNE 20, 1985

Namibia Gains Some Autonomy

S. Africa Hands Over Limited Authority to Neutralize SWAPO

By Allister Sparks
Special to The Washington Post

WINDHOEK, Namibia—In an effort to win credibility among Namibia's black majority, the South African government has given the administration it installed here on Monday greater powers than its predecessor and included in it members with authentic African nationalist backgrounds.

The new administration needs credibility to counter the popular liberationist image that SWAPO, the South-West African People's Organization, has built up during a 17-year guerrilla war for independence.

To this end, Pretoria has given it more power than a previous internal government headed by Dirk Mudge, which South African Prime Minister Piet W. Botha dissolved two years ago because he considered it a failure. South Africa has occupied and controlled Namibia since World War I, ignoring since 1966 United Nations efforts to assure the country's independence.

South Africa is handing over to the new administration all powers of self-government except foreign affairs, defense and internal security. The administrator general, a South African official who has run the country as a kind of viceroy, will retain a power of veto, but this is expected to be used with restraint.

Unlike Mudge's administration, which was seen as Pretoria's puppet, the new one includes some members with authentic African nationalist backgrounds, notably Moses Katjiuongua, 43, leader of the South-West African National Union (SWANU).

SWANU has been in the independence struggle since before SWAPO was formed, but is less powerful because it is rooted in the Herero tribe, which makes up only 6 percent of Namibia's population, while SWAPO's base is the Ovambo tribe, which makes up 53 percent.

Katjiuongua served a long radical apprenticeship in exile, much of it in Peking. He appeared at the June 17 inauguration in a Mao Tse-tung suit, lending an incongruous touch to a ceremony presided over by conservative white Afrikaners, who support strict policies of racial segregation.

"Our country is rotting internally. It is being run by South African colonial officers who have little real concern for our people. . ."

— Andreas Shipanga

Andreas Shipanga, one of the founders of SWAPO who later fell out with its leader, Sam Nujoma, and formed his own breakaway party called the SWAPO-Democrats, is another leader in the new administration.

Both Katjiuongua and Shipanga say they will be able to introduce important reforms and dismantle the segregationist system of apartheid that South Africa has extended to this former German colony during its 67 years of control.

"The whole [United Nations Resolution] 435 initiative is stalled, and there is no prospect of it moving again in the near future," Katjiuongua said in an interview. "We must try to find another road to independence, and I believe we can achieve enough to jolt SWAPO into negotiating a settlement that South Africa can accept."

SWAPO members in Windhoek scoff at the prospects of the strategy to force them into the government. They say there is no chance of the organization as a whole, or any of its senior members, agreeing to participate in what its vice president, Hendrik Witbooi, denounced at a meeting Monday as a "conspiracy" and "a step backward in the history of our country."

It will not be easy for the new administration to gain the credibility it needs. It is unelected and unrepresentative of the population. South Africa is simply handing power to a loose alliance of six anti-SWAPO parties who are prepared to cooperate with it, the biggest still being Mudge's Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, which has been given three Cabinet seats while the other parties get one each.

The same ratio has been used to establish a wholly nominated National Assembly of 62 members. The result is lopsided, giving the 7 percent white population two Cabinet ministers, the 6 percent Hereros two and the 53 percent Ovambos one.

Western observers have said that the new administration is just another effort by South Africa to sidestep a U.N.-approved independence plan and keep some control over the territory's affairs.

Shipanga says he has no illusions about South Africa's intentions, but denies that he is allowing himself to be used. Pretoria would go its own way regardless of him, he said.

"Our country is rotting internally," he said. "It is being run by South African colonial officers who have little real concern for our people and they are letting it rot. At least now we will be able to run the place ourselves and get a few things done."

NEW NAMIBIA LEADERSHIP (Continued)

about the withdrawal of the estimated 25,000 Cuban troops in Angola, which, according to South Africa, is the only remaining obstacle to the U.N. settlement.

But, Botha added, the people of Namibia could not wait indefinitely for a breakthrough on this so-called "linkage" issue, jointly introduced by the United States and South Africa four years ago.

"Should it eventually become evident, after all avenues have been thoroughly explored, that there is no realistic prospect of attaining the goal, then all parties most intimately affected by the present negotiations will obviously have to reconsider how internationally acceptable independence may best be attained in the light of prevailing circumstances," Botha said.

Observers see this as the opening to introduce South Africa's internal strategy, bypassing the U.N. plan. South Africa, these observers say, wants a plan that would reduce the U.N. role to a nominal presence while giving the main supervisory functions to a regional force made up of itself and the so-called "front-line states" of southern Africa.

Continued on Pg. 15

Los Angeles Times June 19, 1985

Namibian Regime Facing Crisis Over Police Control

By MICHAEL PARKS, *Times Staf*

WINDHOEK, Namibia—After only one day in office, Namibia's autonomous administration faced a major political crisis Tuesday that could determine its popular acceptance and its success as a "transitional government of national unity."

Even before its first meeting, the eight-man Cabinet was confronted with charges that police had brutally beaten hundreds of people leaving an anti-government rally outside Windhoek on Monday while the new administration was taking part in inaugural festivities on the other side of town.

Sixty-seven people were injured, according to the rally's organizers, as police fired tear gas into the crowd of 2,500, charged into it with batons and whipped people with quirts in a melee that continued for 90 minutes in Katutura, a black township outside Windhoek.

The police acknowledged using tear gas, batons and quirts to disperse what a police spokesman called an illegal march toward white areas of Windhoek after the crowd ignored two warnings. The spokesman said that only 20 people, including a policeman, had been slightly injured.

Several Cabinet members, speaking Tuesday at a news conference, said they had no knowledge of Monday's incident and denied having authorized the police action. However, they acknowledged the need to assert the newly appointed administration's authority over the police and other internal security forces immediately—or be taken as "puppets" of South Africa.

"These allegations must be investigated, the facts determined and considered and appropriate action taken," said Moses K. Katjiuongua, president of the South-West Africa (Namibia) National Union and minister of manpower, health and welfare in the new government.

"Beyond this incident, however, we as the Cabinet must review internal security policies and police practices and make the necessary changes, some of which are years overdue."

But Ebenezer van Zijl of the right-wing National Party asked: "What were those people doing there (at the rally) in the first place? I am not sure where the fault lies."

Although the Cabinet is already under heavy pressure to establish its authority and independence, the debate over the Katutura clash could quickly divide the six-party government along political lines of right versus left rather than racial lines because of the issues involved. Among them:

—Of what value is the bill of rights incorporated into the interim "constitution" under which the new administration operates?

—How serious are its calls for reconciliation with the South-West Africa People's Organization, which has fought a 19-year guerrilla war against South Africa's continued occupation of the territory, a former German colony?

—Will the new government really have the broad powers of self-administration that South Africa has promised in place of independence and be allowed to exercise them fully?

A previous Namibian government, which also had promises of autonomy, collapsed over lesser issues in 1983 after challenging South Africa's power here.

"It's their first test, and a nasty one since it concerns security," said a Windhoek business executive who follows Namibian politics closely. "If the government does not have authority over the police, then it is just local boys doing South Africa's work, acting as front men. Their credibility is already limited, and failure to act forcefully now could destroy what little they have or hope to have."

Several Cabinet members had already declared their intention to disband Koevoet, a special police counterinsurgency unit that has been repeatedly accused of atrocities, and to revoke the severe internal security laws. Koevoet members, brought down from the northern border region, were on duty at the Katutura rally Monday.

But such promises have not persuaded the South-West Africa People's Organization, known as SWAPO, and its allies to forgive those parties that joined the new government rather than continue to push for full independence under a plan laid down by the United Nations in 1978.

"For us, this government is simply another toy that South Africa has decided to put into this country to rule Namibia," Daniel Tjongarero, the chairman of SWAPO, told a press conference Tuesday. "We will have nothing to do with them."

Tjongarero called the police action at Katutura "a brief glimpse at what is happening in the north all the time," and asked: "Just what does this interim government plan to do about it? What can it do about it?"

THE ECONOMIST JUNE 15, 1985

Mozambique

SIR—In "Meanwhile . . . in Mozambique" (March 30th) you say: "Since the murder of its secretary general, Orlando Cristina, on an SADF "farm" near Pretoria in 1983, the nearest Renamo has come to a public face is its current spokesman, the youthful and immaculate Mr Evo Fernandes, based in Portugal. Like other Renamo officials, Mr. Fernandes was (and may still be) an employee of a Spanish tycoon, Mr. Manuel Boullosa, one-time Mozambican businessman and refinery owner, now resident in Brazil. Mr. Boullosa has a strong emotional interest in regaining his properties in Mozambique and is known to use his considerable resources in Portugal to support the revanchist cause".

This information is inaccurate, and mars my past as a businessman who has always avoided any political involvement.

I was the founder of Refinaria de Petróleos de Moçambique, which is now in a deplorable state, due to lack of technical assistance and bad management. It will need heavy investments which, at the moment, seem hardly worthwhile. Mr. Evo Fernandes was at one time employed by an enterprise I owned, and I consider him an honest man. Concerning his activities in Renamo, I only know what is relayed in the news. I have never given any donations to Renamo and have never been approached by them to that end.

South Africa needs all the poitical prestige the Nkomati accord can bring it to lessen its internal difficulties. The state department carefully supports the pact to avoid adding more difficulties to the already existing ones in South Africa—a nation needed for the western defence. Mozambique is neither politically nor economically interested in opposing the eastern countries who have given it some kind of help. And this should not be forgotten when it also turns to the west for the peace agreements which are so important in ending its present state of poverty.

An absolute communist regime will close the doors to western employment which is so essential in order to keep the state machine running. This will never be achieved without the help of Portugal, which has had 500 years' experience in multiracial and Christian policies.

It is forgotten that, without the use of the Portuguese language, Mozambique would cease to exist as a nation. The Portuguese nurses, teachers, labourers, clerks, and traders are essential as a link to the people in Mozambique where so many dialects are spoken. I was invited by the local government to visit Mozambique; we only dealt with business matters.

I went to South Africa last January, at the invitation of Mr Pik Botha. I spoke to Mozambican and Renamo representatives and suggested to Mr Botha that an international army to separate the enemies, and free elections would bring peace. Mr Machel would be accepted as president.

Rio de Janeiro MANUEL BOULLOSA

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

JUNE 20, 1985

South African Panel Urges Loosening of Exchange Rules

JOHANNESBURG – A government-appointed commission of inquiry into South Africa's monetary system has recommended that the nation's existing exchange-control regulations be significantly liberalized and eventually phased out.

The commission, headed by the central bank's governor, Gerhard de Kock, recommended that laws restricting the international flow of South African residents' funds be "substantially relaxed and simplified" as part of a process that eventually could lead to phasing out exchange controls or the retention of only limited controls.

THE WASHINGTON POST JUNE 18, 1985

Zimbabwe Set For Vote

By Glenn Frankel
Washington Post Foreign Service

HARARE, Zimbabwe—The gaunt face and high-pitched, deliberate voice on Zimbabwe's state-run television network late last week were eerily familiar. So was the message: that the country was heading down the road to communism, that "standards" were deteriorating, that the white minority needed to stick together to survive.

After five years as a virtual nonperson in Zimbabwe, Ian Smith, the last white prime minister of the land once known as Rhodesia, has reemerged publicly as a candidate and symbol in the whites-only poll that is a curious sideshow to the country's first national election since gaining black majority rule in 1980.

About 32,500 white voters—slightly more than 1 percent of Zimbabwe's electorate—will choose 20 of the 100 members of Parliament on June 27, leaving 2.9 million blacks to choose the other 80 the following week.

The huge imbalance between the two polls was the result of a compromise forged by negotiators in 1979 to ease the transition from white rule to black. They sought to assure the white minority here that it would not be swallowed up and rendered powerless by the black majority, which now makes up almost 99 percent of the population. The constitutional provision guaranteeing a share of power for whites is likely to be scrapped two years from now—that is, unless Smith has his way.

This campaign is the last hurrah for the 66-year-old Smith, who for 14 years presided over a white-minority government in defiance of international law, locked up hundreds of opponents—including the present prime minister, Robert Mugabe—and conducted a 7-year war of attrition against black guerrillas.

But the campaign is also an opportunity for the country's remaining whites to send an important message to Mugabe's government. Their choice is between the conciliatory stance taken by a loose coalition of white independents, or the harder-edged confrontation tactics practiced by Smith and his supporters.

At independence in 1980, Smith controlled all 20 white parliamentary seats. He started out by holding regular meetings with Mugabe, but the two soon fell out over a number of issues, including Mugabe's advocacy of a one-party state. Relations have grown increasingly acrimonious ever since.

Seven independent members of parliament broke with Smith three years ago, and they have been gaining support ever since. They have won the last three legislative by-elections and now hold 11 of the 20 white seats.

"The road on which Ian Smith was proceeding was the wrong road," said William Irvine in explaining the split. Irvine once sat in Smith's Cabinet but now leads the independents. "The daily confrontation with Mugabe wasn't doing the whites any good. We needed to have a working relationship with the government."

Smith contends that the independents are opportunists who "fell into the classical political trap that was laid for them" by Mugabe: "Divide and rule. Instead of white people speaking with one voice, they've been played one against the other to the detriment of the white people."

The white population here has steadily diminished since independence and now amounts to about 100,000—less than half its preindependence total. Many of those who have stayed appear to have made their peace with black rule, although most are clearly uncomfortable with the Mugabe government's socialist rhetoric and its tendency to sneer at the profit motive. Less than half of the eligible white population has not even bothered to register to vote, a fact attributed by some analysts to apathy and by others to acquiescence in the status quo.

Still, the election is a chance to gauge Smith's ability to appeal to the white constituency he once held in the palm of his hand. Few are willing to dismiss his chances.

"He's got a tremendous personal following, even among people who have no use for his party," said Chris Andersen, a white independent who is public service minister in Mugabe's Cabinet. "A lot of people will say 'I'm just voting for Smith, not his party,'" Andersen said.

Smith himself claims he has a lot of hidden support among whites who are afraid to speak out or even attend public meetings on his behalf. "A lot of businessmen contribute to my campaign, but only in cash," he said in a recent interview. "They do business with government and they can't afford to be seen supporting me," he said.

But black officials tend to treat the white contest as an anachronism of little import. Whoever wins, they say, they expect to be able to muster the 70 parliamentary votes that will be sufficient to eliminate the white election in 1987, when a provision requiring a unanimous vote for elimination expires.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR JUNE 17, 1985

Zimbabwe in drive to save black rhino

By Jan Raath

Harare, Zimbabwe

A new kind of battle is being waged on a 185-mile-long stretch of flood plain in Zimbabwe's Zambezi Valley.

The battle is between specialized government troops and the Zambian poachers who are plundering in one of Africa's important black rhinoceros sanctuaries.

In early 1984, three rhino carcasses were discovered on the valley floor, their huge leathery muzzles defaced when their horns were hacked off.

It was a clear warning that the international trade in rhino horn had shifted its operations to Zimbabwe.

Rhino horn commands top dollar. In Singapore, the traditional hub of the trade, a kilogram (2.2 pounds) of horn can fetch up to $1,000.

And when sold in its final form to the public in apothecaries throughout the Far East, a kilogram of the substance can ultimately be worth up to $10,000.

Zimbabwe's black rhino population is now regarded by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature as being the most important on the African continent.

Numbering about 1,500, the powerfully muscled animals have lived in the Zambezi Valley undisturbed for centuries, prospering off the dense vegetation and ample water supply and protected by the hostile environment, the area's remoteness, and, in the last 30 years, an efficient network of game ranges.

But in the first three months of this year, poachers crossing the river from Zambia killed 22 rhinos. Patrols by the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management proved inadequate, and the situation was worsened by lack of cooperation from Zambian authorities.

In late March, however, the problem came to the attention of Zimbabwean Prime Minister Robert Mugabe, an ardent convert to the cause of conservation.

In April, troops of the Zimbabwean Special Forces, a unit trained for anti-insurgency bush warfare and attached to Mugabe's central intelligence organization, were deployed in the area, as were men of Zimbabwe's police.

They had an almost immediate effect. Gangs have been surprised in ambushes and court appearances scheduled for those arrested.

"The situation has changed dramatically," said an official of the department of national parks. "The poaching is now being contained."

Continued on page 13

THE NEW YORK TIMES, JUNE 18, 1985

Aid and Sanctimony Do Not Mix

Hungry Africa may be hungrier because of a quarrel between the United States and a dozen members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. At issue is which should contribute how much to the valuable International Fund for Agricultural Development. All agree that the fund significantly helps small farmers, especially in Africa, where it spends nearly half its budget. The Administration approves the program but is seriously thinking about withholding support if OPEC countries don't contribute more.

The fund was established in 1974, in part to coax aid money from the then oil-rich nations. Its performance has been outstanding. The loans have aided 40 million peasants; overhead is held to 5 percent, and the recipient countries match every $1 with $3 of their own.

OPEC members together were supposed to match the contributions of 20 industrial nations, but that promise was never kept. When neither Iran nor Libya contributed a dime, the OPEC members' share fell to 42 percent of a three-year budget of $1.1 billion. As oil profits declined, that meant a heavier burden for Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates. The replenishment for the next three years was therefore cut to $800 million and the OPEC members want their share reduced to 40 percent. Since Kuwait now pays about as much as West Germany, and Nigeria about as much as Britain, there is some merit in the plea.

Some Administration officials, however, think it outrageous for wealthy oil producers to shave their agreed contributions, especially considering that their former oil prices had their most devastating effect in poorer nations. But the United States, originally pledged to $150 million over the next three years, is now the only holdout against a new funding formula. Other Western donors are even offering a bonus contribution to mollify Washington. Even without that, the OPEC shortfall would amount to only a few million extra for the U.S.

By all means keep pressing the oil producers to honor their pledges. But for hungry Africa's sake, don't disable this worthy program with sanctimony.

THE WASHINGTON POST, JUNE 15, 1985

Free Ethiopia's Farmers

THE RAINS are coming now in Ethiopia but since drought was never the major cause of famine, they are unlikely on their own to lead to plenty. The real problem lies in civil strife in the countryside and in the junta's Soviet-type farming policies. These twin disruptions have been focused in the north, where the prospects remain grim. In the south, less afflicted by violence and the junta's heavy-handedness, conditions are better. This is the critical point to bear in mind as Ethiopia and its would-be rescuers turn from a necessary preoccupation with relief to at least the beginnings of an effort to rebuild.

It is true that many things still need to be done to improve the distribution of relief. The government has to unclog the ports and to release army trucks for food transport—and to be denounced for its continuing reluctance to let relief missions enter rebel-held areas of Ethiopia. But the main requirement is to recognize the emerging priority of enabling the country to grow more of its own food. This should need no demonstrating. It is the only way.

For years, especially in the north, both the Ethiopian armed forces and their assorted challengers have ravaged the countryside, either forcibly recruiting peasants to take part in military campaigns or treating them and their fields as the enemy. Meanwhile, the government by enforced collectivization, price manipulation and other administrative means destroyed the country's agriculture.

If the country is to feed itself, all of this must be reversed. The fighting in the countryside must stop, and the political rigging must stop. The farmers must be left alone to grow their crops. They will have problems of seed, fertilizer, credit, transport and the like, but these are the sort of problems the farmers have traditionally solved. They do not need a big state apparatus or foreign network. They never had these things, and they grew a lot of food.

There is no wand to be waved to make Ethiopia's officials and rebels leave the farmers alone. The two groups—especially the government, which has the first responsibility to care for the people it claims are its citizens—have long since shown they are ready to put a quest for power ahead of considerations of human life. But they, all of them, need to be made accountable for their policies. They need to be held to a standard of responsibility. Nothing heroic or technical, nothing beyond their resources, is being demanded of them. They should just be expected to get out of the farmers' way.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, JUNE 18, 1985

Mubarak Goes to Sudan; First Visit Since Coup

CAIRO, June 17 (AP) — President Hosni Mubarak flew to the Sudan today for his first visit since the military coup that overthrew President Gaafar al-Nimeiry in April, Government officials said. Mr. Nimeiry now lives in Cairo.

The Egyptian officials said they expected the visit to be brief, but did not say how long he would stay.

Egypt's Information Minister, Safwat el-Sharif, said Mr. Mubarak left for Khartoum, the Sudan's capital, after discussing with his top aides a telephone call that he received today from Gen. Abdel Rahman Siwar el-Dahab, who led the coup April 6 and is chairman of the ruling 15-member military council.

Egypt and the Sudan, its southern neighbor, are linked by a 1976 mutual defense pact and a 1982 integration charter providing for a 10-year program of close coordination in political, economic and social matters.

THE SUN JUNE 17, 1985

ETHIOPIA

United Nations officials have secured a pledge from Ethiopia's military leader to increase the number of trucks used to haul food to famine victims, a U.N. spokesman in Addis Ababa said.

The pledge was considered significant because food has been piling up at the Red Sea port of Assab.

U.N. officials said they expect the number hauling aid to increase by 200 to 300.

THE WASHINGTON POST JUNE 13, 1985

The Tower: Round One

ONE CAN HARDLY imagine the circumstances that might pit a Northwest Washington neighborhood against the State Department and a fairly obscure nation located halfway around the globe. It would take far more imagination to believe that the neighborhood could win, but it has, at least through the first round.

The State Department, the west African nation of Benin and residents of the Woodley Park neighborhood squared off at the District's Board of Zoning Adjustments last week. At issue was whether the Benin Embassy could erect a 38-foot radio tower behind its Cathedral Avenue quarters. The diplomats said they were tired of getting in touch with their government only by telex, expensive telephone calls and diplomatic pouch. Their Woodley Park neighbors would have none of this, however: the tower would foul their television reception, look awful, emit radiation and be an all-too-tempting climb for their more adventurous children.

The neighbors went to the board ready to argue everything from endangered real estate appraisals to their reading of a 1982 foreign missions act, which they say disallows embassy expansions in residential neighborhoods. They didn't need all that. The board ruled that the antenna would be "visually intrusive" and would adversely affect the neighborhood. In other words, no radio tower.

The embassy has had little to say about all this, but the State Department clearly had a "Who do these people think they are?" attitude about the Woodley Park residents. The word "absurd" was used often. Absurd residents. Absurd city zoning laws. Suddenly, the building of that radio tower involved "the national interest." "We are extremely distressed and very puzzled," said one lawyer for the State Department. Communication, he said, is at the very heart of diplomacy. "Benin is a sovereign government and we don't have the right to question their needs," he said.

Attorneys at the State Department are said to be examining the prospects of appealing the ruling. There would be nothing wrong with that, just as there is nothing wrong with a group of residents wanting to have a voice in what gets constructed in their neighborhood. If their arguments are sound, then those residents deserve to win.

WASHINGTON POST JUNE 20, 1985

Benin Replies

In reference to the editorial, "The Tower: Round One" [June 13], I wish to make the following comments:

I was hoping that the intellectual level and world knowledge of The Post would have prevented it from showing off, with such an arrogance, an insulting contempt toward my country.

But instead of being, as established by the very narrow vision of the international society, the representative of a "fairly obscure nation located halfway around the globe," I rather proudly consider myself as the ambassador of a sovereign country, independent for almost a quarter of a century; of a nation that is part of a great continent, Africa; of a nation that would never be ashamed of its culture and its history and whose future is rich in promises, despite today's weaknesses and dramas.

And, coming back to the radio-antenna issue, I shall simply repeat that Benin, in accordance with international law and practice, as well as principles of reciprocity that result, is entitled to benefit, in Washington, from the same communication facilities accorded to your country in Cotonou. We shall therefore continue with the serenity and dignity we have always observed and, in close cooperation with the State Department, to look with patience and firmness for the triumph of these principles. Principles and understanding without which, indeed, diplomatic relations among states—big or small—would return to the chaos of the jungle.

GUY LANDRY HAZOUME
Ambassador of Benin
Washington

THE ECONOMIST JUNE 15, 1985

Ethiopia and Sudan

Slow food

You can move food to hungry countries quite easily; getting it to hungry mouths is harder. Thousands of tonnes of relief food now lie at Port Sudan on the Red Sea, in the Ethiopian ports of Assab and Massawa, and in Djibouti. In the Kordofan and Darfur regions of western Sudan, and in Tigre, Eritrea and other parts of Ethiopia, millions of people are starving. The failure to get the food to these people is the result of a shortage of roads, trucks and trains that work—and of organisation and will.

The United Nations planned to distribute 119,000 tonnes of food a month in Ethiopia. Although more than 500,000 tonnes have now reached the country, less than 50,000 tonnes a month are reaching the starving. Last December, Mr Kurt Jansson, the UN relief administrator, advised donors to buy 700 trucks. He thought it unrealistic to expect Ethiopia to shift hundreds of tonnes with its existing road transport fleet.

By May, fewer than 200 trucks had arrived. Mr Jansson then appealed for $50m worth of trucks and spare parts. So far, $8m has been pledged, but it will be months before the transport arrives. And in the coming months, when what remains of the latest harvest has been consumed, people will be hungrier than ever.

The donors complain that Colonel Mengistu's Ethiopian government has made little use of its existing truck fleet. The commercial economy (although 8m Ethiopians are starving, 34m are not), the civil wars in Tigre and Eritrea and the controversial resettlement of 400,000 people from the drought-affected and rebellious north to the south have kept most of the country's trucks busy. Not until May did Colonel Mengistu agree to use some military vehicles to take food from Assab to Addis Ababa. Since then, much more food has been leaving the port.

At present, most of the food from the ports is first moved to huge warehouses, then redistributed. The UN's transport organiser, Mr Roman Roos, wants long-haul trucks to take food straight from the docks to the starving. This, however, might reduce the rate at which the food leaves the docks. The only answer is for the Mengistu regime to assign more of its trucks: the politburo's response will show how high it puts famine relief on its priority list.

Some of the relief food—maybe 30,000 tonnes a month—is going not to famine victims but to ex-soldiers, militiamen and others whom the regime wishes to please. In Tigre and Eritrea, little food is reaching the hungry on the government's side of the civil war fronts, and almost none is reaching those on the other side. The government has consistently refused to allow UN or other food convoys into the war-torn areas in those provinces.

Sudan has a shortage of roads as well as of trucks. The few reasonable roads that run westwards end at Kosti, south of Khartoum. It is almost impossible for trucks to move food much farther, particularly when rain has turned tracks to mud. But Sudan does have a conveniently placed 1,300-mile railway, crossing the country from east to west.

It was Africa's longest railway when it was completed by the British in 1906. However, when Mr Jaafar Numeiri was ruling Sudan, he withheld resources from the railway in order to put pressure on the railway workers' union, which led the opposition to him in the 1970s. At any one time only 20 locomotives, some of them coal-fired relics of the 1920s, actually work; another 40 sit idle, awaiting spare parts. The tracks are badly worn; so trains have to go very slowly to avoid derailment.

Aid workers reckon that 64,000 tonnes of food a month need to be got to Sudan's famine victims. At present, 16,000 tonnes a month are reaching them by rail, with another 28,000 being brought in by air. British Rail advisers in Sudan reckon that, with a grant of $7.6m from the EEC, they should be able to get the railway into shape and shift the full requirement by rail. However, that would take at least three months; meanwhile, this month's rains will put the railway out of action in much of the country.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR JUNE 19, 1985

Improving the lot of women in remote Burkina Faso

By David K. Willis
Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

Take one step into the raucous, dusty, motor-scooter-filled, radio-blaring central market here in this remote West African state, and you are instantly besieged by women pressing upon you glossy tomatoes, cucumbers, pineapples, carrots, radishes, and parsley dripping with water to make them shine.

One woman in a long skirt removes a plastic envelope tucked into her hair, extracts from it some salad leaves and urges them upon me. Others jockey for position with wide straw baskets and a jocular line of sales talk.

The Mossi tribe around the capital of Ouagadougou in a nation many remember as Upper Volta, are farmers, and this market is their shop window. It is the women who do most of the work. They fetch and carry, plant and harvest, cook, and bear children.

Yet, as elsewhere across the third world, they lack status and respect. The female illiteracy rate here is 97 percent. For men it is 89 percent. A village girl grows up unable to read or write. As soon as she is big enough she carries a baby strapped to her back: At 13 she is married off. She has an average of six to seven children and a life of hard work while men make the decisions.

The United Nations is focusing new attention on the plight of third-world women this summer at a major conference in Nairobi, Kenya.

Meanwhile, here in this small country, the tall, young, charismatic Army captain who seized power in a coup two years ago has come up with some ideas of his own.

Last October, to the mirth and puzzlement of many of his fellow men, Thomas Sankara decreed that on one designated Saturday, no women would be allowed to shop in the markets.

Men would have to bargain and buy. Sankara said: "You men will see just how hard your women have to work."

"We all turned out," one government official told me, shaking his head at the memory. "There was music. . . . It was like a party." Sankara himself appeared in his local market to buy food for his wife and children.

"Anyone who has ever watched his own mother cannot avoid looking at the position of women," President Sankara commented earlier this year. "The women . . . do most of the work . . . but they never counted."

Sankara has appointed several women to his Cabinet as well. He is said to believe that, in general, male-dominated ways block his country's progress.

Once the women's one-day vacation last October was over, however, women returned to their usual chores.

Sankara continually stresses a populist sense of working together and of independence — in a country one of the most dependent on outside assistance in the world.

Caught between the Atlantic coast and the encroaching desert to the north, Burkina Faso has little industry. It exists mainly on foreign aid: Total aid from all sources this year will be about $230 million in contrast with a government budget of $140 million.

Some 2.5 million of its roughly 7 million people are affected by drought. The country is still today, as it was under the French, a source of unskilled labor. Each year it receives millions of dollars remitted by between 1 million and 1.5 million of its people working on plantations and in menial industrial jobs in Ivory Coast.

Sankara sees no alternative but to instill some kind of pride in his people. He works hard at a populist image. At the same time, he remains an authoritarian ruler. There is no talk of returning to any form of democracy.

A four-hour curfew that begins at 1 a.m. remains in force around the country two years after the coup. Machine-gun nests guard the road to the presidential palace.

When he seized power in August 1983, Sankara had cash and guns from Libya, and Westerners feared he would turn out to be a pro-Qaddafi radical.

But Burkina Faso's relations with Libya have cooled, while ties with the United States have improved steadily. "We are not the pawns of Qaddafi," he said recently.

Why? "Because he sees that Libya is simply not interested in the kind of sustained, long-term development aid that Burkina Faso must have to survive," says one informed Westerner. "Nor is the Soviet Union."

The Soviets have an embassy and 30 teachers here, but their diplomats reportedly complain a great deal and long to return home.

Meanwhile, as well as pouring in 53,000 tons of food aid this year (twice last year's figure and half of this country's emergency food aid from all sources), the US this year has spent some $210,000 on helping finance primary schools, dispensaries, and maternity clinics.

In a small, poor, illiterate country with a high birthrate, these projects are highly visible and much needed.

"Sankara also has a sense of style," says another Westerner. Recently, as giant Nigeria (population 90 million) was abruptly expelling hundreds of thousands of Ghanaians and other migrant workers, Sankara ordered every Nigerian in this country to report to a camp one Saturday.

As the day approached, the Nigerian Embassy grew alarmed.

From the Nigerian capital of Lagos came a government announcement that it would send in planes to fly its people out if necessary. The day came. The Nigerians showed up — to be told that, provided their papers were in order, they were welcome in Burkina Faso.

"It was deliberately done to show Nigeria how Sankara thinks Africans should treat other Africans," one source said.

"It had class."

The Washington Times JUNE 19, 1985

AMNESTY CHARGES UGANDA MILITARY

LONDON (AP) — Thousands of Ugandans have been tortured by the country's military forces since President Milton Obote took office 4½ years ago, Amnesty International said today.

"All but a few of those detained in military custody are tortured," and many have died, the London-based human rights organization reported.

Amnesty International based its findings on medical examinations of 16 people imprisoned at various times between early 1981 and late 1984, and on interviews with other former prisoners.

Mr. Obote was elected in December 1980. The former dictator, Gen. Idi Amin, was deposed in April 1979.

Amnesty International said in a 62-page report that prisoners have been beaten with iron bars, cables, rifle butts, machetes, hammers and pieces of wood studded with nails.

A number of former prisoners have described a form of torture in which an automobile tire is suspended above a prisoner and set on fire so the molten rubber drips onto the prisoner. In some cases, the torture was repeated until the prisoner died, the report said.

Many of the reported tortures took place at the Makindye military barracks in Kampala, the capital, Amnesty said.

Amnesty International called on the Ugandan government to prevent torture, to extend judicial rights to those arrested by the military and to allow an independent investigation into the torture allegations.

Kenya struggles with a million new mouths to feed each year

By David K. Willis
Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

Nairobi, Kenya

Clinging, peeping, smiling, ambling, running, shouting, eating, playing in streets and on hard red earth — Kenya teems with small children, evidence of the fastest population growth rate in the world.

This pro-Western bastion of free enterprise on the African continent is struggling to survive a growth rate of more than 4 percent a year.

> Four percent might sound like a small figure — but it means that a population that was just under 9 million at independence 25 years

ago is now 20 million. By the year 2000, the United Nations says, it will almost double, to 39 million.

That means the average Kenyan family still has eight children compared with a global average of 3.5 (and a United States and British figure of 1.8).

The growth rate is causing more and more alarm here. The US is said to be about to launch a big family-planning campaign here.

Only one-fifth of the land here can be farmed — and it supports 85 percent of all Kenyans. One-third is northern desert adjoining Ethiopia and Somalia, a desert that is gradually spreading. As waves of people swamp schools and slums, urban unemployment is estimated to be at least 30 percent.

> Almost 1 million children are born each year, says President Daniel arap Moi. He warns that even if Kenya's economy grows at 6 percent a year (which is double the 1984 rate) for the next 25 years, Kenyans will be only half as well off by the year 2000 as they are today.

But such predictions have had little impact on the Kenya of the moment: Women have al-

> most no status at all while the children they bear are seen as insurance against poverty

during old age. For men, having many children is regarded as a sign of masculinity. While birthrates have stayed high, infant mortality rates have fallen.

Official policy is to cut population growth to 3.6 percent by 1988. Western diplomats say it can't be done unless the government works much harder. Half of all Kenyans are under 14 years of age. Tomorrow's parents have already been born.

Kenya remains important for the United States and Western Europe, as a civilian-ruled democracy in East Africa, bordering on Marxist-ruled Ethiopia, and on Sudan, Uganda, and Tanzania. The US, West Germany, Britain, and others have big commercial investments here. Western navies use the strategic deep water port of Mombasa. Nairobi airport is the sophisticated hub of eastern and southern African air traffic.

The military has tried just once since independence to topple the civilians — in 1982. The coup failed. Memories of it have just been stirred here as an appeal against a death sentence by one of the coup leaders was rejected by the High Court of Kenya.

Hezekiah Ochaka, an Air Force NCO, seized the Nairobi radio station for four hours on Aug. 1, 1982, before being chased out by troops loyal to the President. Ochaka and another leader, Pancras Okumu, fled to Tanzania on an Air Force plane but were returned by the Tanzanian government. An appeal from Okumu, who had also been sentenced to death, was quashed Feb. 19.

> "The day of the coup was extremely tense," recalls one white Kenyan who was in Nairobi at the time. "Ordinary citizens were walking around the streets with hands held high, one hand holding their identity cards. All kinds of soldiers were

roaming around, jumpy and nervous, and you could hear shooting all that night. . . ."

A number of young white Kenyans see little future here. "I'm planning to get a job in the US," said one, who asked that his name be withheld. "Five years ago I wouldn't have said that. Now I've changed."

One reason: the faltering economy, threatened by high population growth. Another factor: crime is worsening, especially robbery. Other residents here agree.

"I've got a crossbow in my bedroom," said the young man. "And a pickaxe. . . . Everyone talks about panga gangs [groups of hefty young blacks wielding pangas or machetes who rob wealthy homes].

"I haven't been hit by pangas, but I was pole-fished."

Pole-fished?

"Yes, you know. I was asleep in Malindi [on the coast north of Mombasa] and woke up to see a long pole with a line poking through the window to hook my trousers from the back of a chair. I suppose he thought I had my wallet and keys in them. . . . Anyway, I had a dagger nearby and slashed at the pole. It was a metal rod, and the clang shook up whoever it was."

An Ethiopian refugee awoke recently to find several men trying to extract gold-filled teeth from his mouth with pliers.

Other whites here say fear of crime may be exaggerated. All big cities have crime of some kind. But Western embassies in Nairobi hire dusk-to-dawn guards and protect French windows with heavy metal screens.

"What you must not do," says a longtime white resident of Nairobi, "is have anything valuable like a video recorder or a color television in your home. My family and I simply do without such things."

"And on the coast, at Malindi for instance, where you have to keep your window open at night because of the heat, you must never leave any valuables within range of a pole-fisher." Only 36 hours earlier, a British couple and their security guard had been shot and killed by a gang within 300 yards of his home.

ZIMBABWE IN DRIVE TO SAVE BLACK RHINO (Continued)

Still, official approaches to Zambian authorities have had little effect, although sources said recently that they had received "indications that things are beginning to move."

The parks official would not be specific, but Zimbabwe has given the Zambians information about six poachers who escaped capture, as well as the names and addresses of dealers in Lusaka, the Zambian capital, who are believed to have financed poaching operations.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL JUNE 20, 1985

Tribal King of Lagos Wins Some Attention From Nigeria's Rulers, and His Subjects

By Steve Mufson
Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

LAGOS, Nigeria—Buckingham Palace it isn't.

The palace of the king of Lagos looks like a cross between an old warehouse and a filling station. Goats wander around the gravel yard, and a couple of beat-up old cars sit idly at one side. The king's sister sits on the concrete stoop having her hair braided.

The site originally was a field of papyrus reeds, hence the name Iga Idunganran, or Paper Palace. Today it abuts a major highway, hemmed in by this bustling, filthy capital city. From the receiving room, filled with old couches, visitors gaze out on the rusting corrugated metal roof tops of the shanties on Onilegbale Street. The royal carriage, an aging dark-brown Cadillac Fleetwood, waits at the door.

Still, the palace—and the king—are getting a bit more respect these days. The king, or *oba* as he is known to his subjects, is being courted by the one-and-a-half-year-old military regime. Nigeria's ruler, Gen. Mohammed Buhari, who comes from a royal family himself, has visited the palace.

Ordinary people file into the oba's receiving room daily on hands and knees to ask for his advice or, more often, for his money. The oba, a 73-year-old former pharmacist named Adeyinka Oyekan, accepts that he usually can do little for his subjects.

Some shopkeepers come to ask his help in convincing the government to reopen some closed stores. The oba asks, "Do you know what to do? Well, neither do I." A woman complains that there are too many cars in Lagos. Worst of all, she adds, she doesn't have one. The oba notes with a chuckle that he has only one car himself.

Some visitors get a brush-off. But obas often do give money for worthy local causes. And even though Mr. Oyekan supports four wives (the youngest of whom "is about 40") and 21 children, he has some money to distribute. He gets the obaship's property income, income from his pharmacy (now operated by a partner), a subsidy from the government, and money from his 21 chiefs, who meet once a month.

Foreigners upon whom he bestows the distinction of honorary chief must throw a banquet and give him money. The oba points to a chief snoozing in a chair next to him. "If he wants something, he gives me something to keep my spirit burning." The chief's eyes flutter half-open, then close again.

This summer, the oba will host the second national conference of traditional tribal leaders in Nigeria. He is spending a lot of time on that meeting. "To get all the robes flowing you have to work very hard," says Mr. Oyekan. "I don't know what we are going to talk about this time. Last time, three or four years ago . . . well, there wasn't much to talk about."

Plenty of robes will be there, though. Nigeria still has thousands of traditional rulers: obas, emirs, ezes, sultans and chiefs. In a nation where civilian and military governments come and go, the traditional rulers carry on. Mr. Oyekan has seen six governments during his 20-year tenure as oba of Lagos.

The tribal leaders could talk about how the oil-boom atmosphere and the migration of many Nigerians from their home villages to crowded cities has weakened the influence of many obas. But some obas still carry a lot of clout. They control land tenure in many villages, and property in the cities.

"Traditional rulers are the link between the government and the people," says His Highness Eze R.U. Mbalewe, a former director of SCOA, a trading company that represents Peugeot in Nigeria, who is now the traditional leader of Uvuru, in the eastern state of Imo. "Since the (Jan. 1, 1984) coup, there isn't any functioning local government. Everything the government does here comes through me."

The oba of Lagos suggests his country needs him and his like. "We could be better off under obas," he muses in his off-white, pajama-like ceremonial robes with matching cloth hat tilted to one side. "We wouldn't stand there whipping people," he says referring to some harsh punishment meted out by Nigeria's military, although he calls Gen. Buhari "a nice gentleman."

Obas are answerable only to the highest authorities: the spirits. Every nine days the oba of Lagos offers prayers at the shrine in one of his inner sanctums. The sanctums are actually empty rooms, each with a small wooden structure or shrine. After knocking three times, the oba opens the door to pay respect to the spirits, represented by a cake of rust-colored palm oil. The oba offers the spirits kola nuts, palm oil and chickens.

The oba of Lagos carries his title lightly. His domain has exploded from a small fishing village into a city of about five million, a high-income residential and business center with two big hotels, foreign embassies, and government housing.

"He was an ordinary common man and a bit of a rascal at that," says Eze Mbalewe, who knew the oba long before either man became a traditional ruler.

In 1950, the reigning oba died, setting off a battle over the succession among 50 people who claimed to be the rightful heir. It took Mr. Oyekan 15 years of bitter fighting within the council of chiefs that picks the king to attain his throne.

Mr. Oyekan's grandfather held the obaship, but was succeeded by a younger brother, then by another younger brother. "Then the whole thing became a muddle with everyone fighting," says Mr. Oyekan. "Everyone wants to be an oba."

WALL STREET JOURNAL

JUNE 17, 1985

Nigerians in U.S.

I have read your June 5 page-one article "Con Artists: Nigerians in U.S. Earn a Reputation for Ingenious Scams," in which you gave such undeserved prominence to the various crimes allegedly being committed by a few Nigerians living in the United States. I am all the more disturbed because, by your own admission, the alleged culprits represent only a very small proportion of Nigerians, most of whom are otherwise honest, sincere, hard-working and law-abiding.

As I have no means immediately of verifying the authenticity of the specific cases mentioned in your article, I am not in a position to dispute them in this rejoinder. May I leave you in no doubt whatsoever about my feeling. The fact that some Nigerians are at all involved in these activities is, indeed, a matter of deep concern and embarrassment. However, you will agree that the total import of your publication, much as it may be disguised, is to denigrate Nigeria and her people.

Obviously, criminal activities by foreigners in this country cannot be limited to Nigerians. Indeed, were you to catalog these in respect of other nationals, you will agree that the pages of your newspaper would not contain them.

Ignatius C. Olisemeka
Ambassador of Nigeria

The Washington Times *JUNE 17, 1985*

Walters attacks

New U.N. Ambassador Vernon A. Walters made his debut in the Security Council last week with a surprise, rapid-fire attack on delegates who he said distort U.S. policies for propaganda purposes. Mr. Walters was particularly critical of a Vietnamese delegate who had assailed U.S. policies in Africa and Central America and had decried South Africa's control of South West Africa (Namibia). Referring to Vietnamese delegate Le Kim Chung, Mr. Walters said he was "particularly interested in his [Mr. Le's] attempt to interpret the functioning of American democracy. Since he represents a government that has never tolerated any opposition, it might be better if he left the interpretation of the functioning of a free democracy to those who tolerate and therefore understand an opposition. . . . I hope the Vietnamese delegate's sympathy for countries occupied by foreign powers extends to the neighboring people of Cambodia," Mr. Walters said sarcastically.

SOUTH AFRICAN RAID INTO BOTSWANA DIMS RELATIONS WITH US (Continued)

fore? (Both agreements commit each government to a policy of withholding support from each other's foes.)

Destabilization raids on neighboring states, intended to compel them to close their borders to ANC fighters generally, and in some cases to expel specifically named ANC members, began in January 1981.

The raids included attacks on the Mozambique capital of Maputo in January 1981, May 1983, and October 1983; on the Lesotho capital of Maseru in December 1982; and incursions — not related to the ANC — by large numbers of South African soldiers into Angola.

Destabilization included support from South Africa for rebels in neighboring territories seeking to overthrow their respective governments: the Mozambique National Resistance, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola, the Lesotho Liberation Army, and dissidents of the Zimbabwe African People's Union.

The policy concluded in March 1984. Assisted by US mediation, both Mozambique and Angola signed accords with South Africa. Lesotho had earlier agreed to expel ANC cadres and to participate in joint border-security surveillance with South Africa.

Last year ANC attacks declined to 44, against 56 for 1983. The 1983 figure reflects the largest number of attacks in a single year since the 24-year-old ANC guerrilla campaign resumed in earnest after the 1976-77 rebellion in South Africa's black townships. According to the Pretoria government, the Nkomati Accord was a fatal blow to the ANC's "armed struggle" because it deprived the rebel organization of its bases in Mozambique.

But the respite was short-lived. By March this year the ANC strike rate increased. The grenade attacks on two members of parliament and a police station in Cape Town last week brought the number of attacks by insurgents in South Africa to 34 this year.

The situation is aggravated by the on-going rebellion in the black townships. Begun in September of last year, it has claimed at least 400 lives and has rendered some townships partly ungovernable.

Further aggravating matters is the fact that the raid comes almost on the anniversary of rioting that broke out in Soweto, June 16, 1976. During eight months of violent protest over forced teaching of some subjects in the Afrikaans languague in black schools, 575 people died.

South African police reported that riot squads went into action this weekend as anniversary rioting broke out in several black townships.

Observers here cite the immediate cause of the raid on ANC targets in Botswana as the grenade attacks in Cape Town but say the deeper causes lay in the rising number of ANC attacks and the rebellion in the townships.

Closely related to these causes was Pretoria's belief that Botswana had replaced Mozambique and Swaziland as the main conduit for ANC guerrillas entering into and fleeing from South Africa — and that the ANC was, in the last analysis, behind the unrest in the townships.

Botswana has denied that it allows ANC guerrillas transit through its territory to or from missions in South Africa.

It has denied that it allows the ANC to establish permanent bases. There was no evidence at the Gaborone targets attacked by South African commandos that they were occupied by armed ANC fighters. Pretoria insisted this was evidence of ANC ingenuity in disguising its Botswana operations, not the inaccuracy of its own intelligence.

Pretoria regards its policy as consistent: It will attack "ANC terrorists wherever they are."

FROM SOUTH AFRICA, CONTEMPT (Continued)

wink. The policy was supposed to earn President Reagan a South African hearing for his counsel to reform but, regrettably, what it has actually brought seems much closer to contempt. What a pity that the president, in his unconvincing defense of administration policy last night, could not recognize that fact.

RAID ON BOTSWANA DRIVES WEDGE BETWEEN U.S., PRETORIA (Continued)

As in the earlier raids, Friday's attack, according to Pretoria, was aimed at the latest ANC "nerve center" of operations.

While South Africa has negotiated treaties with Mozambique and Swaziland that had led to the expulsion of ANC members from each country, a similar arrangement with Botswana has not been reached.

Founded in 1912, the ANC is the oldest black liberation movement in South Africa. A later split within party ranks and the adoption of armed struggle and the formation of a military wing "Umkhonto we Sizwe" (Spear of the Nation) led to the organization being banned in 1960 and its prominent leaders, notably Nelson Mandela, being either jailed or exiled.

Mr. Mandela, 67, serving a life sentence for treason, recently rejected an amnesty offer by President Pieter W. Botha that included the condition that he reject violence as a method for bringing about change in South Africa.

As Pretoria remained convinced its actions were justified over the weekend, the raid served as a warning that South Africa would continue to conduct foreign policy on its terms, despite concerted international condemnation.

NEW NAMIBIA (Continued)

The plan also would contain mechanisms that, while not preventing a SWAPO takeover, which most observers think is inevitable, would dilute SWAPO's radicalism by forcing it into an alliance with other parties and imposing a more restrictive constitution.

Botha listed certain "ground rules" that he said were gaining wider acceptance in southern Africa, including one that "these problems should be solved on a regional basis by the leaders of the region themselves."

Other South African officials speak with the same ambiguity, insisting both that the government remains committed to the U.N. plan and that the new internal administration is necessary because Namibian politicians are becoming frustrated by the lack of progress in the negotiations. These officials suggest that the new Namibian administration might open the way to a "new initiative."

As one U.S. diplomat put it, "At the minimum, this new administration is occupational therapy for unemployed politicians. At the maximum, it is something intended to force SWAPO to accept some kind of political deal with the internal parties."

Most observers here in the territorial capital describe it as the latter, and that South Africa's plans for forcing SWAPO's exiled leadership to accept the alternative deal include stepping up its aid to Jonas Savimbi's rebel movement in Angola, in the hope that his position may be so strengthened that he can negotiate a place in the Angolan government.

Some believe the recent attempt by a South African commando unit to sabotage a major oil installation in Angola's northernmost province of Cabinda was an attempt to help Savimbi.

If Angola's leftist government can be forced to accommodate Savimbi, so the thinking goes, Savimbi would increase Angola's pressure on SWAPO to abandon its increasingly unpromising attempt to win independence for Namibia through guerrilla warfare, and switch to a political campaign through the new Namibian self-government structure.

If SWAPO were to do that, it is thought that South Africa would drop its insistence on Cuban troops leaving Angola as a precondition for Namibian independence. In effect, that would finesse the U.N. plan.

THE WASHINGTON POST

Melvin R. Laird

Opening to Mozambique

Over the past two decades, we have seen numerous African nations turn away from Soviet models and political alliances—Egypt, Somalia, Guinea, Mali, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau and Madagascar. Now the United States has the opportunity to reverse Soviet influence in the self-styled Marxist nation of Mozambique.

I recently accepted a State Department invitation to head a trade mission there. Our discussions with President Samora Machel and his government made plain that Mozambique needs and wants Western and especially American investment. I believe it is in our interest to provide it.

With the end of the Portuguese empire in 1975, Soviet-supported liberation movements came to power in Angola and Mozambique. The new government in Mozambique, its own problems unsolved, supported guerrilla movements operating against the Ian Smith regime in Rhodesia and against South Africa. Rhodesia retaliated by helping to set up an insurgency—the Mozambican National Resistance (RENAMO).

Thus began a cycle of cross-border violence that continued even after the establishment of a black-headed regime in Rhodesia—now Zimbabwe—for South Africa then offered RENAMO bases and support within South Africa. Increasingly frustrated by African National Congress operations launched from Mozambique, South Africa began also to mount its own land and air operations in Mozambique.

Three years ago, the combination of drought, guerrilla destruction, South African raids, the loss of Western and South African economic investment and technical expertise, and the unwillingness and incapacity of the Soviets to make up that loss, had reduced Mozambique's economy to a shambles. Machel made a basic decision that his country could no longer bear the brunt of a military confrontation with South Africa.

President Reagan realized that as long as the level of cross-border violence remained high, the Soviet Union would have opportunities to expand its influence, while a decision in the region to seek a diplomatic solution and concentrate on economic development would serve the United States. Only the United States had the relationships with all parties that would allow it to mediate. And only the United States and its Western allies had the private sector, technical expertise and development assistance to offer countries such as Mozambique hope of building their economies.

The United States helped bring South Africa and Mozambique together to discuss their problems. In March 1984, they signed the Nkomati Accord. Mozambique, against the wishes of the Soviets and of most other African states, carried through on its commitment to close ANC bases. South Africa officially cut off support for RENAMO, but apparently made a major arms delivery just prior to signing the agreement.

This "golden handshake" enabled RENAMO to intensify its activities, to the dismay of the Machel government. South African-sponsored talks aimed at a cease-fire between RENAMO and Mozambique neared agreement in October 1984, when, for reasons that remain obscure, RENAMO walked away from the table.

South Africa recognizes that its basic interest lies in having a stable regime on its borders and that the Machel government could provide that stability, whereas RENAMO could not. It has steadily increased its economic and security cooperation with Mozambique and spoken out with increasing clarity about the negative effects of RENAMO's activities.

The overall voting record of Mozambique at the United Nations is not what we want, but its position on 10 key votes improved substantially during the last session. The United States is receiving even-handed treatment in the Mozambican press, and our assistance efforts are highlighted favorably.

Mozambique has joined the IMF and World Bank, signed an agreement with the U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation and published a business code designed to attract Western investment. Collective farms are being turned over to private farmers and some industries, formerly state-run, are being sold to private entrepreneurs.

We have been helping to encourage a balanced relationship that includes diplomatic contacts, private investment, trade, economic and humanitarian assistance and a modest military training and assistance program.

I recognize there are those who argue that the United States should have nothing to do with a self-styled Marxist state. I disagree. The only way we can advance U.S. strategic goals in the Third World is if we compete in relevant ways--on the ground, through our programs, our presence and our diplomacy. The United States should be ready to respond constructively to openings that advance our interests whenever they occur.

The writer has served as a Republican representative from Wisconsin and as secretary of defense.