

7/10/85

WORLD/NATION

Heads of 20 colleges sign letter asking sanctions against S. Africa

Presidents say they are involved only as private citizens, not officials

By DAVID GRUMHAUS JR.
Home News correspondent

Presidents of 20 Eastern colleges and universities, including William Bowen of Princeton and Edward Bloustein of Rutgers, have addressed a letter to Sens. Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., and Robert Dole, R-Mo., calling for economic sanctions against South Africa.

The letter, which said "the apartheid system offends the basic ideals of the United States," was signed by the presidents of all of the Ivy League colleges and other respected institutions such as Stanford and Williams.

The presidents claimed they were writing in their "individual capacities as citizens" and not on behalf of their institutions.

"This is not an institutional act," said Robert Durkee, Princeton's vice president for public affairs. "President Bowen is signing it as an individual who has become knowledgeable" about South Africa's apartheid policy. Bowen was unavailable for comment.

The letter asks that the sanctions be strict. "Token sanctions, or sanctions that are easily evaded, will not only be ineffective; they will reinforce the feeling in South Africa that our government is not serious but is merely making gestures for domestic political consumption," it stated.

It also asked that the sanctions be targeted at the South African government, and, insofar as possible, "avoid inflicting harm on non-white South Africans."

Bloustein, reached last night at his home, reiterated that the letter expresses his views as a private citizen and not as the chief executive of Rutgers.

"I've had deep feelings on this issue for a long time," he said. "It wasn't too long ago that I was standing outside the consulate in New York."

The Rutgers president was referring to his participation in an anti-apartheid protest outside the South African consulate on Park Avenue Jan. 11.

Asked if the letter he signed will have any bearing on legislation dealing with U.S. sanctions

against the South African government, Bloustein said, "We've spoken to a number of political leaders in Congress and they've said they feel the letter will be very significant."

Harvard President Derek Bok came up with the proposal for the letter after he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this year.

Besides Bowen, Bloustein and Bok, the other signers of the letter were the presidents of Bowdoin College, Brown University, Bryn Mawr College, Colby College, Colgate University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Emory University, Haverford College, the University of Pennsylvania, Stanford University, Swarthmore College, Wellesley College, Wesleyan University, Williams College and Yale University.

Home News staff writer Lenny Melisurgo contributed to this story.

ABROAD AT HOME

Anthony Lewis

NYT 10/7/85

Why Not Do as We Say?

They should deal with the African National Congress." That was Secretary of State Shultz's urgent advice last week to the South African Government. He said Pretoria should release Nelson Mandela from prison and start talking with him and his banned national organization.

Sound advice, most specialists on South Africa would say, because the A.N.C. has widespread support among the black majority. But there is a puzzling question about it: Why don't Secretary Shultz and his colleagues take the advice themselves?

Reagan Administration officials will not meet leaders of the A.N.C. There have been casual encounters with American diplomats at receptions here and there, but U.S. policy excludes regular appointments and discussions.

South African business leaders went to Zambia last month to talk with officials of the A.N.C. But those officials are not invited to the U.S. Embassy in Lusaka. Oliver Tambo, the A.N.C. president, came to this country last spring and met business people and others. He was not invited to the State Department.

Urging South Africa to talk with the A.N.C. while we do not do so ourselves is so curious that to make sure the policy remained in effect, I asked

The anomaly in U.S. policy toward South Africa

the State Department last week. A spokesman checked with an official of the African Bureau and then reported: "You're right, we have never met the A.N.C."

That anomaly is indicative of the more general trouble with the Reagan policy toward South Africa. While Mr. Shultz says that the apartheid system must go — and means it — the message does not get through to South Africans with clarity or force.

The recent history of American policy is one reason for its muffled impact in South Africa. For four years the Reagan Administration acted on the assumptions that P. W. Botha's Government was ready for accommodation on its borders and meaningful reform at home. The assumptions were fallacious. And acting on them, cozying up to the white regime, made the United States look like its supporter.

Events forced a change in the Reagan policy. Mr. Botha's brutal repression at home and military aggression across the borders made it impossible to keep saying with a straight face that change was at hand. Congressional opposition was about to overwhelm the policy when President Reagan made his timely switch to modest sanctions against apartheid.

But American responses to the alarming reality of the South African crisis remain faint and timid. Mr. Botha insults the United States, and the whisper comes back. His police shoot children, and you have to strain to hear any comment from the President of the United States.

There could hardly be a more deliberate insult, between supposed diplomatic friends, than what the South African Government has done lately on its borders. Its planes and troops have struck deep into Angola, and it has admitted supporting terrorist forces in Mozambique — both in violation of the most serious undertakings to the United States.

To that President Botha has recently added personal insults. Speaking to a party congress, he said: "President Reagan, who has much to say in his mispronouncing way about apartheid, is shoving Indians into reservations..."

Or think about the behavior of the police as they occupy black townships in South Africa. A study by Cape Town University found that 83 percent of detainees it questioned reported being tortured by such methods as electric shock, strangulation and beating.

Imagine how the Reagan Administration would react if Nicaragua invaded one neighboring country and admitted supplying terrorists in another, if its police shot into crowds of people day after day, if it detained 3,000 of its own citizens without charges, including hundreds of children. The outrage would not be muffled.

A State Department spokesman, Sondra McCarty, said last month: "With the state of emergency in effect, and violence and repression affecting the lives of so many South Africans, we believe the South African Government must be held publicly accountable for its actions."

Exactly. But the United States Government is not holding Pretoria accountable in the only way that will be understood: by speaking in one voice, acting on its stated principles, marshaling its economic and political resources against the racist system it condemns.

Other American institutions, then, must make the message loud and clear. As through this whole year of South African crisis, the American public will have to lead its Government to a proportionate response. □

Botha to offer blacks role in forming policy

BY ANTHONY ROBINSON IN PORT ELIZABETH

PRESIDENT P. W. BOTHA last night painted the vision of a South Africa which was "outgrowing" the discriminatory aspects of apartheid and groping towards a kind of federal formula which recognised cultural diversity and guaranteed the rights of minorities.

He said he would make provision for black leaders to join the President's Council, the top-level policy advisory body, but made clear that it would be several months before the Government responded to the council's recent recommendation to scrap influx control and the pass laws.

Mr Botha also praised the role of the army and the police as the guardians of reform but made no reference to recent allegations of torture and abuse of detainees under the state of emergency.

In a wide-ranging speech which demonstrated that the President will not bow to foreign pressure for swift reform, Mr Botha traced the origins of apartheid to its colonial roots and praised the unique role of the National Party. Mr Botha repeatedly emphasised the need for a system which reflected South Africa's own special characteristics and provided guarantees for all minorities, not only the white one. He again rejected any solution on one-man-one-vote lines, describing this

as a formula for dictatorship in other African countries. But in a veiled attack on the right-wing Conservative Party opposition, he condemned those who thought the National Party should stand firm on its original 1948 manifesto.

Speaking on his home ground at the opening of the Cape Congress of the ruling National Party in Port Elizabeth, Mr Botha said that in order to prevent minorities being dominated "it is evident that units will have to be recognised on a geographical and group basis which also has to include the black urban communities who, for constitutional purposes, are recognised as political entities."

In the opaque, coded language of National Party rhetoric this appeared to be a hint at a federal or confederal solution under which "each unit should have autonomy that only affects it while units on the central level should jointly manage matters of mutual concern."

Mr Botha declined to spell out, however, the details of such a federal formula, saying: "It is the conviction of the Government that the structures in which this co-operation takes place must be the result of negotiation with the leaders of all the communities."

Handwritten notes: "F.T. 10/1/85" and "F.T. 10/1/85" written vertically.

Black Boycotts Spark Spirit of Negotiation

BOYCOTTS, From A15

it on a different course. One is that a former industrial psychologist named David Hanson decided to make the resort his retirement home, so that when the boycott began Port Alfred whites had someone to advise them on conflict management.

The other is the presence of an able and forceful black leader named Gugile Nkwinti, a former male nurse now studying law at Rhodes University in nearby Grahamstown.

On Hanson's advice, local whites formed an employers' federation that opened negotiations with a group of black community organizations headed by Nkwinti. The employers' body, headed by Charles de Bruin, chairman of the local Chamber of Commerce, pledged its support for the blacks in trying to get redress for their grievances.

"We made it clear we wanted to become involved," de Bruin said. "We told them we were not in a position to discuss government strategies, but we could comment on local problems and we offered to use our channels of communication so that they could get to government to present their grievances."

Within two weeks the boycott was called off. Meetings were organized with the chairman of the government body that administers black affairs in the region and with the local provincial counselor who represents the ruling National Party.

The influence of both Colesburg and Port Alfred has spread to other towns. Emulating the hard-liners, the Chamber of Commerce in Queenstown, west of here, has advised its members to cut the pay of their black employees in retaliation for the consumer boycott there.

It also has circulated a pamphlet advising housewives to keep their black domestic servants from talking food and other provisions home to the "location," saying that is "only feeding the intimidators."

Port Alfred's de Bruin, on the other hand, has become a roving adviser to towns that want to negotiate. He visited Cradock recently, and now the white traders here also have formed an employers' federation and begun negotiating with representatives from the "location."

Most people in the region believe the advocates of negotiation are gaining ground. "I would say most of the towns in the eastern Cape are swinging the way of Port Alfred rather than Colesburg," said Frank Collett, who was chairman of the Cradock meeting. "People who think long-term can see that negotiation is the only way to solve the problem."

Tony Gilson, director of the Port Elizabeth Chamber of Commerce, whose members are suffering the worst boycott of all in that major eastern Cape Province city, agrees.

"Some who favored counteraction have come around to the view that that is not the right way," Gilson said in an interview. "They are beginning to realize that it would not only be ineffective but in the long run will make the real solutions much harder to achieve."

Gilson confirms an impression that the boycotts have jolted the whites into a sharper appreciation that their country is in crisis.

For more than a year the black townships have been imploding with revolutionary violence, but this made little impact on the whites living in their tranquil separate suburbs. Only when the boycotts began to hit them where it hurts did they become more aware of black grievances.

"Obviously our members are not happy about the boycott," Gilson said, "but it has awakened an awareness that the causes are a manifestation of genuine aspirations. Many businessmen now realize that there has got to be genuine reform."

In some towns there seem to have been major conversions. Johan van Rooyen, who represented the businessmen of backwater Steynsburg at Tuesday's meeting, said the first reaction of some whites in his town to the boycott was to arm themselves and form a vigilante group.

But the "Skiet Piets" (Afrikaans for "Shooting Peters"), as he called them, changed their minds as others began negotiating with local blacks. They found that whites with a bad racial record suffered worst from the boycotters.

"We've got one guy who beat up a black 15 years ago and they remember that. He's having a helluva time," van Rooyen said.

The result, according to van Rooyen, is that some supporters of extreme right-wing political parties are now among Steynsburg's most enthusiastic negotiators.

"We have built up a fantastic mutual trust in Steynsburg," van Rooyen enthused. "I really think we can work out something that can suit us and build up goodwill, peace and prosperity. If all of us can start at this basic level and build up trust, then I think we can solve our problem nationally as well."

Several others at the meeting excluded this kind of enthusiasm. It is as though the discovery of contact across the color line has released a latent moral energy in this unlikely environment.

There could be disillusionment ahead. Many blacks express a skepticism verging on cynicism about this new-found white concern. They also have discovered a weapon to use against the whites nationally, but one that could override local agreements made by local black leaders.

Another factor in many towns is the intervention of the security police, whose arbitrary arrests often disrupt the negotiations. The businessmen of Port Elizabeth cannot begin negotiations because all the city's major black leaders have been detained. "We keep appealing to the police to release them, but we get a flat no," Gilson said.

Even the Port Alfred accord is in danger of collapsing because Nkwinti was detained two weeks ago. This has sown suspicion among the local blacks. "I'll never let Gugile negotiate with the whites again. I don't trust them," his tearful wife, Koleka, said.

N made the ingre

Three things determine whether a newscast worth watching. The people who report the news. The news they report. And the technology they use to report it.

Compromise any one of those things, and broadcasting news that is dull, useless or dated. At WJLA, we never compromise.

We pick anchor teams who deliver news who have a genuine, demonstrable interest in what they're reporting.

We air stories that But never at the expense of journalistic integrity.

And we invest in the latest, microwave, rad technology. All with the goal of news more immediate.



WORLD

S. African Boycotts Get Whites' Attention

Many Businessmen Eager for Negotiations

By Allister Sparks
Special to The Washington Post

CRADOCK, South Africa—A funny thing is happening down on the South African *platteland*, that flat expanse of farmland and isolated small towns where white racial attitudes have always been at their hardest.

Last Tuesday white businessmen from half a dozen small towns decided at a meeting here to send a delegation to Pretoria to put the grievances of local blacks to President Pieter W. Botha.

A second delegation will call on Constitutional Affairs Minister Chris Heunis to ask him to let the little towns take over the administration of their adjoining black "locations" from the central government, because they believe they can give the blacks a better deal.

This sudden concern for black welfare in a traditional bastion of apartheid is the result of the latest campaign that blacks have launched in their rebellion against the country's system of segregation and white minority rule.

For the past three months, in one small town after another in the racially volatile eastern Cape Province, blacks have been refusing to buy goods in white-owned stores. They have been getting by with the few essentials they are able to purchase at the rudimentary stalls in their ghetto townships, which are called "locations" in the outback.

In some cases where there are not enough "location" stalls, the boycott organizers have exempted one or two general stores in the adjacent white town, usually those run by shopkeepers with less hard-line racial attitudes.

The results have been shattering for the white shopkeepers. Many had not realized until now how dependent they were on the "location" customers, whom they dealt with brusquely and sometimes compelled to use separate entrances. Many have gone bankrupt and all are suf-



BY DAVE COOK—THE WASHINGTON POST

"Obviously our members are not happy about the boycott, but it has awakened an awareness ..."

— Tony Gilson,
Port Elizabeth Chamber of Commerce

fering. According to some commercial leaders in the little towns, it has been a blow worse than the Great Depression of the 1930s.

The shopkeepers' reactions have varied. Some have tried, often with the security forces, to crush the boycotts. Others have become eager to meet and negotiate with local black leaders. This has resulted in the blacks presenting lists of grievances, some broadly political, some relating to their local living conditions, which these strangers to interracial negotiation are now pondering.

It was the problem of finding themselves thrust into the unaccustomed role of having to intercede for the aggrieved blacks that led to Tuesday's meeting here—and the decision by the businessmen to send delegations to Botha and Heunis.

Two towns in particular repre-

sent the polarities of white reaction to the boycotts. One is Colesburg, in the sheep-farming Karroo region 150 miles northwest of Cradock, where local blacks contend that there has been an attempted countersiege to make them abandon their boycott.

The other is the resort town of Port Alfred, 200 miles to the southwest, where the whites became involved in negotiations with local black leaders that led to a lifting of the consumer boycott and some direct meetings between the blacks and government representatives.

Blacks in Colesburg say that local businessmen, backed by the police, tried to starve them into submission. They say there was an attempt to pressure two exempted stores into refusing them service, and that water supplies to the town's three "locations" were shut off twice.

Jaap de Ruiter, chairman of the Colesburg Sakekamer, an Afrikaner businessmen's organization, denies this. In a stormy interview in his office—during which he telephoned police, who arrived presently and ordered me not to enter the "locations"—de Ruiter said the only water stoppage had been due to a burst pipe and "because we have a drought here."

He implied that the exempted stores were reluctant to sell to blacks because too many wanted to buy on credit. "They are starving themselves out," he said, although he later admitted that it was "not totally incorrect" to say the Sakekamer had tried to pressure the exempted stores into closing.

One of the exempted shopkeepers, Wynies van Wyngaard, confirmed that there had been such an attempt but would not elaborate. The atmosphere in Colesburg is tense with aggression, fear and mutual suspicion.

Despite the attempted countersiege, the boycott is continuing and appears to be ruthlessly enforced. Blacks interviewed in the town Wednesday told how boycott pickets had stopped a woman who had bought meat at a local butcher shop that day and flung her purchase into the dirt. When she complained to police, black activists beat her unconscious, poured gasoline over her and set her on fire. She is now in a hospital in critical condition.

Port Alfred, by contrast, is relaxed. Two factors seem to have set

See BOYCOTTS, A18, Col. 1

SHULTZ SUGGESTS THAT SOUTH AFRICA RELEASE MANDELA

Freeing of Black Leader Could Signal Willingness to Seek Compromise, He Says

By BERNARD GWERTZMAN

Secretary of State George P. Shultz said yesterday that the South African government could "signal" its willingness to search for a political compromise with the black majority by freeing Nelson Mandela, the prominent black political prisoner, and agreeing to negotiations with him and the outlawed African National Congress.

"That would be a huge event for the South African Government to do," Mr. Shultz said, "and that would be traumatic for them."

Mr. Shultz, speaking in an interview with The New York Times, elaborated on his comments Wednesday night that apartheid was "doomed" and that the South African Government should move promptly to negotiate with the black majority before it was toppled by "violent revolution."

Apartheid 'Can't Last'

"Apartheid is through," he said yesterday. "It is not only wrong in our view, but at least in my judgment it is over. It can't last."

"I think that there comes a time when people stop arguing about whether something is a good idea or not and accept the fact that that's irrelevant. It doesn't matter whether you think apartheid is a good idea or not, it's going to disappear."

"Now the question is how do you manage the transition," he said. "That's the problem psychologically. It would be like the South Africans to address because if they address it even now, there is a real chance of doing so through a process of discussion and negotiation. If it isn't addressed, we can have a cycle of continued violence and at least one can readily imagine this blowing up into a really violent upheav-

Mr. Shultz, who made his comments to reporters, editors and executives of

Continued on Page A12, Column 4

Pretoria Links Cubans to Angola Withdrawal

By ESTHER B. FEIN
Special to The New York Times

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Oct. 3—The Security Council, which was convened today to consider an Angolan complaint against South Africa, heard a proposal from the Pretoria Government for a resolution demanding the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Angola.

The South African proposal came as a surprise to many members of the 15-nation Security Council. Delegates agreed that it was the first such action by South Africa in the Council in recent memory.

Because of its policy of apartheid, South Africa has been barred from all General Assembly activities since 1974. But it has been a frequent participant in Security Council meetings. It is not a member of the Council.

The South African chief delegate, Kurt von Schirmding, said the proposed resolution was aimed at "getting rid of the Cubans" in Angola. But he acknowledged that the call for withdrawal of all foreign troops would apply to South African forces as well.

"We felt this was a positive contribution that we could inject into these very tiresome debates," Mr. Schirmding said after the Council adjourned its morning session.

South African Raid

The meeting today was requested by Angola to protest a South African raid on Angola last Monday, which the Angolan Government said killed more than 65 people. The Security Council has condemned South Africa repeatedly for aggressive acts against Angola, most recently on Sept. 20.

South Africa has contended that its raids are necessary to pursue guerrillas from the South-West Africa People's Organization, a rebel movement that is fighting against South Africa's control of South-West Africa, also known as Namibia. Pretoria maintains control over Namibia in defiance of United Nations resolutions.

In the speech today, Mr. von Schirmding restated South Africa's claim, asserting that "the Soviet Union and its surrogates" were actively supporting Angola's Marxist Government.

"Soviet pilots are flying some of Angola's MIG-23 aircraft and MI-25 helicopter gunships," he said. "It is clear that they are directly involved and are in fact commanding the current M.P.L.A. offensive."

25,000 Cuban Troops in Country

The Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, known by its initials in Portuguese as M.P.L.A. has controlled the Luanda Government since Angola gained its independence from Portugal in 1975. It is backed by some 25,000 Cuban troops and military advisers from Soviet bloc countries.

Pretoria supports a rival group that has remained active since the civil war that followed independence, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola, or Unita, led by Jonas Savimbi.

The Angolan envoy, Elisio de Figueiredo, told the Security Council that South Africa's continued "rape" of Angola compelled his Government to keep appealing to the Council "to get some concrete international action which will lead to the cessation of the racist attacks."

Mr. de Figueiredo was supported in his arguments by representatives from 11 other countries, but the only draft resolution submitted was that of South Africa. In the Sept. 20 meeting, which was called after a series of South African raids on Angola that began on Sept. 16, the Security Council demanded the unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angola. It also sent a three-member commission to Angola to assess the damage resulting from the raids. The commission's report is expected no later than Nov. 15.

Shultz Suggests the South Africans Free Mandela

Continued From Page A1

The Times, including the paper's publisher, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, was asked what the South African authorities could do to indicate their willingness to have a peaceful transition. Mr. Shultz replied that there were many possibilities.

He suggested that "it could be in the form of releasing people from prison and saying that they are willing to deal with them, as in the case of Mandela."

"We have said that Mandela should be released and that they should deal with the African National Congress."

Covington & Burling, a Washington law firm, dropped South African Airways as a client, after a law-student boycott hurt recruitment. Page D1.

he said. Mr. Mandela, who has been imprisoned since 1962, was president of the A.N.C., a black nationalist group that has been barred from South Africa.

Mr. Shultz had previously called for Mr. Mandela's release in Congressional testimony on Sept. 18, and other officials have suggested that South Africa free him as a conciliatory gesture.

President P. W. Botha of South Africa offered last year to release Mr. Mandela if he would renounce violence, but he refused the offer and has insisted on an unconditional release.

In the hourlong interview, Mr. Shultz made these points:

On Israel's raid against the Palestine Liberation Organization headquarters outside of Tunis, he reflected the Reagan Administration's ambivalence. On the one hand, he said, "we should always want to take actions opposed to terrorism," but he suggested a less drastic approach might also have been appropriate. A senior official said later that Israel had not violated American law in using F-15's in the attack because Israel was acting in self-

defense. American law prohibits foreign countries from using American weapons except in self-defense.

On the agenda for the meeting next month between Mr. Reagan and Mikhail S. Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, Mr. Shultz said that besides the usual questions of arms control, regional issues and bilateral matters, the two sides had recently agreed to discuss long-range relations "of where we go from here."

On Central America, he said "the trends are very favorable" both in the region and in the United States where, he contended, "the solidity of support" for the Administration's anti-Sandinista policy has grown.

On the Soviet leadership, he remarked that Eduard A. Shevardnadze, the new Soviet Foreign Minister, with whom he conferred last week, had a more informal style than his predecessor, Andrei A. Gromyko. But he said that it seemed as if Mr. Gromyko "wrote the talking points" for his successor because of the lack of change in the Soviet negotiating position.

Mr. Shultz was questioned at length on the Administration's attitude toward the Israeli attack on the P.L.O. headquarters. At first the White House seemed to endorse Israel's right to retaliate for acts of terrorism that Israel's charged had been organized by the P.L.O. from Tunisia. But on Wednesday the Administration took a more ambivalent approach, asserting that

the Israelis had cause to undertake a raid, but that the use of violence could not be condoned.

"I think we should always want to take actions opposed to terrorism," Mr. Shultz said. "And that covers a wide array of things, and that includes the possibility of some direct action make it clear that terrorism costs."

But he added, "That doesn't mean that it leads you inevitably to some particular kind of action." As an example, he noted that after the shooting of six Americans at an outdoor cafe in Salvador last June, the United States did not take military action against suspected terrorists but rather helped the Salvadoran Government to take the assailants down.

"So there are all possible ways going about it," he said.

When a questioner suggested that it was saying it was "right to punch somebody hard, but the response should be proportionate," Mr. Shultz replied:

"I didn't say that. I may think that but I didn't say that. I'm trying to say first that I think we should always be wanting to get at terrorists and stop them. And there are all sorts of ways to go about it, and we're doing all sorts of things. One of the things that is possible is to strafe some place where you know terrorists exist. That is one way. There are lots of other ways. So I don't see any one way that you should always do that."

THE GREAT BRITISH CLOTHING SALE



S. African doctor taken off duty in prisons

By Jim Jones in Johannesburg

DR WENDY ORR, the South African Government doctor who two weeks ago won a supreme court order restraining police from assaulting detainees at two Port Elizabeth police stations, has been told her duties will no longer include attending to prisoners according to a Sunday newspaper report.

Dr Orr has been reassigned to half-day community duties caring for residents of old age homes.

In September Dr Orr led evidence in the Port Elizabeth supreme court that 153 detainees had been illegally assaulted by policemen between July 22 and September 16 and alleged that police had been "quite unrestrained in the abuses they inflicted."

Dr Orr testified that her superiors had shown scant concern over reports of alleged police assaults on detainees.

In a parallel development, two other South African doctors have said they are to examine the conduct of Dr Ivor Lang, the acting Port Elizabeth district surgeon, in the handling of alleged assaults on detainees.

Dr Lang was found guilty in July of improper conduct by the South African Medical and Dental Council, following an investigation into the death in 1977 of black consciousness leader Steve Biko.

● Medical tests show that Mr Nelson Mandela, the imprisoned black leader, does not have cancer, South Africa's department of prisoner services has announced. Mr Mandela underwent examination for cancer following earlier medical examinations had indicated that his enlarged prostate gland needed removing

2.1
10/12/83

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

POLITICS AND POLICY

Sanctions on South Africa Are Seen as a Victory For Randall Robinson and 1960s-Style Protests

By JOE DAVIDSON
And DAVID IGNATIUS

Staff Reporters of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WASHINGTON—When President Reagan reversed himself last month and imposed economic measures against South Africa, the conservative weekly Human Events headlined its story: "Randall Robinson Wins on South African Sanctions."

The headline overstates Mr. Robinson's role in the anti-apartheid battle, but not by much. For as Human Events said, it was the 43-year-old Mr. Robinson who masterminded the wave of demonstrations outside the South African Embassy, starting nearly a year ago, that turned South Africa into one of the hottest foreign-policy issues in America, even before the recent wave of violence in South Africa.

Mr. Robinson's success demonstrates that 1960s-style protest remains a powerful weapon, even in a town that seems to run on power lunches, contributions from political action committees and bureaucratic bickering. But it also shows that in the 1980s, even the most passionate protest won't get off the ground without constant organizing, an eye for media politics and a large measure of luck.

The tall, conservatively dressed activist says the anti-apartheid battle in the U.S. is only beginning. "We have made a commitment to be relentless," he says. The next steps are further arrests at the South African Embassy, a campaign to gather a million signatures on a letter protesting apartheid and perhaps protests against U.S. companies doing business with South Africa.

The embassy protests began Thanksgiving Eve last year. It was a slow news

week. Ronald Reagan had recently won reelection by a landslide, and liberal causes seemed dead. A black South African bishop named Desmond Tutu had just won the Nobel Peace Prize. In this atmosphere, a group of three prominent black protesters getting arrested at the South African Embassy seemed like a novelty.

"The day was chosen because at prime time on Thanksgiving Eve a lot of people are looking at news, and there's nothing to report but turkeys," explains Walter Fauntroy, the Washington, D.C., delegate to Congress who was arrested that first day along with Mr. Robinson and Civil Rights Commission member Mary Frances Berry. The three had decided to stage the protests only a few days before, and when they were arrested, they hadn't even decided on a name for their group. (The day after the arrests, they decided to call it the Free South Africa Movement.)

"It wasn't totally planned from the beginning," admits Mr. Robinson, executive director of TransAfrica, a lobbying group on African and Caribbean affairs. But the protests took off, becoming a daily event at the embassy and soon spreading to South African consulates and Kruggerand dealers in other cities. The momentum picked up during the rash of violence in South Africa in recent months. Through last month, more than 2,700 people had been arrested at the South African Embassy.

The reasons for this explosion of interest in apartheid remain something of a mystery, even to Mr. Robinson. He had been trying for more than a decade to raise American interest in South Africa, with limited success.

Powerful Moral Appeal

Fred Wertheimer, president of the self-styled citizen's lobby Common Cause, theorizes that Mr. Robinson benefited from timing his protest during a dead news period and from the powerful moral appeal of the anti-apartheid issue. He notes that the embassy protests began as a local news story in largely black Washington, covered on the 11 p.m. news and the Metro page of the Washington Post, and quickly

became a national story covered by the national media.

Like the movement he heads, Mr. Robinson blends the political styles of the 1960s and 1980s. He is at once Mr. Outside and Mr. Inside: a civil-rights protester who rouses the public with civil disobedience and a former congressional aide turned lobbyist. He also benefits—in credibility and media savvy—from the fact that his brother, Max Robinson, was a network anchorman for ABC News.

Segregation and protest were part of Mr. Robinson's upbringing in Virginia. Because of racial restrictions in Richmond, he never saw the inside of a bowling alley or ate a pizza until he left home. As a college student, he participated in sit-ins at lunch counters. By the time he graduated from Harvard Law School in 1970, he was planning campus protests against Portuguese colonialism in southern Africa and agitating against apartheid. Several years later, he arrived on Capitol Hill as an ambitious staffer.

TransAfrica was a child of the Congressional Black Caucus. Mr. Robinson helped found the group in 1977, when he was still on the staff of Rep. Charles Diggs (D., Mich.). The idea was to create a strong lobbying voice for black Africa, in the same way that the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee provides support for Israel.

Starved for Cash

TransAfrica has never quite succeeded at that goal. Like many black political organizations, it's starved for cash. It has a staff of just nine people, and the budget last year totaled \$141,000 for lobbying and \$156,000 for publications. A year ago, just before the embassy protests began, it

seemed in danger of going under financially.

The group also gets poor marks from Capitol Hill on some of the mundane details of lobbying, such as compiling accurate head counts of where each member stands on key bills and amendments affecting Africa. House Budget Committee Chairman William Gray (D., Pa.), for example, was surprised that TransAfrica didn't have an accurate head count on the sanctions issue last month after Congress returned from recess.

Mr. Robinson has succeeded, perhaps all too well, in drawing the attention of conservatives. Human Events denounces him as an "apostle of Marxist revolutionaries" who, "while denouncing such reformers as (South African President F.W.) Botha, has a peculiar affinity for such bloody Third World tyrants as Cuba's Castro and Ethiopia's Mengistu." A conservative black group called The Lincoln Institute recently published a pamphlet criticizing TransAfrica as "a lobby of the left."

Undeterred by Criticism

Undeterred by such criticism, Mr. Robinson is planning the next stages in his anti-apartheid campaign. "We still have quite a distance to go," he says. Civil disobedience at the South African embassy "will go on." He's also launching a campaign to gather a million signatures on a letter to Bishop Tutu, which will culminate next month on the anniversary of the first arrests at the embassy.

Economic pressure is the key to ending apartheid, Mr. Robinson argues. "The South African regime won't negotiate in good faith until they're certain that the U.S. is prepared to impose the stiffest of sanctions, including withdrawal of American companies, cessation of trade, a halt in U.S. energy supplies," he says. His next goal: "Take the campaign to the private sector," with protests that may include sit-ins at companies that do business with Pretoria.

In white South Africa, meanwhile, Mr.

Robinson seems to be regarded with a measure of adversarial respect, as the man who launched a movement that has already caused severe problems for the

Botha government and could cause more. An article in the Rand Financial Mail earlier this year called Mr. Robinson "a revolutionary in Brooks Brothers suits."



Randall Robinson

Separate investigations allege police torture of S. Africa detainees

By Patrick Laurence
Special to The Christian Science Monitor

Johannesburg

South Africa's already deeply divided society is struggling to digest the implications of yet another highly emotional issue: prima-facie evidence that political detainees have been tortured by police.

Two recent events have made alleged ill-treatment of detainees a major public issue:

- An order by a supreme court judge restraining the police from assaulting literally scores of detainees,
- An investigation by the Institute of Criminology at the University of Cape Town into the alleged torture of detainees.

Both events have reinforced the fears of those South Africans who argue that granting police arbitrary power to detain people without trial leads inevitably to abuse of power — and to torture and even death.

About 500 people are currently detained under South Africa's Internal Security Act, which authorizes detention without trial. Another 1,325 people are held under state of emergency regulations put into effect in July.

Since the introduction of detention without trial in the early 1960s, at least 59 people have died in detention. Police have not been found criminally responsible, although there have been out-of-court settlements in civil cases in which the relatives of dead detainees have sought

compensation.

Suspensions that detainees are abused and tortured hardened last week after Judge J. P. Eksteen granted an order restraining police from assaulting detainees in two prisons in Port Elizabeth and future detainees in two districts.

Judge Eksteen's order was made in response to an urgent application from a district surgeon, Wendy Orr, in which she detailed "overwhelming evidence" of systematic police abuse of detainees. Dr. Orr examined hundreds of detainees in the two jails concerned, citing cases in which detainees charged that they had been tortured.

One man claimed he had been forced to eat his hair, another that a policeman had dropped a brick on his bare foot, a third that he had been suspended from a pole by his wrists and ankles and beaten.

Orr gave clinically precise descriptions of the injuries of detainees. She told the judge that in many cases the injuries were consistent with their allegations.

Shortly before the judge granted his order, the University of Cape Town published the result of an investigation by two researchers into the treatment of detainees. Based on interviews with 176 ex-detainees, the research-

'Experience shows that detention and solitary confinement lead inevitably to death.'

— Detainee Parents
Support Committee

ers, Don Foster and Diane Sandler, found that four of every five detainees charged had been tortured physically and that nearly all complained that they had been abused or tortured psychologically.

According to Dr. Foster and Ms. Sandler, "These results provide clear and definite evidence that physical torture occurs on a widespread basis and constitutes a systematic and common experience for those detained for interrogation purposes. [They] contradict in no uncertain terms the standard utterances of state officials claiming that torture does not occur in South Africa, apart from a few isolated cases."

So far the response from the authorities has been minimal. South African President Pieter W. Botha has stressed that Judge Eksteen's order was an interim order only while the commissioner of police, Gen. Johan Coetzee, has declined to comment on the report until he has studied it.

But the Detainee Parents Support Committee, a group that opposes detention without trial, said: "Past experience has shown that detention and solitary confinement leads inevitably to death in detention. We are now witnessing an alarming escalation of deaths in police custody relating to arrests of a political nature."

After noting that three men from the same small village in the eastern Cape had died within hours of being taken into custody, the parents' committee added, "We can only fear that more such deaths are in the offing for as long as the police operate with such unbridled powers."

Political scientists observe that detention without trial is integral to the system of control in South Africa. It is officially justified as necessary to counter "terrorism" and prevent a communist takeover. But if arbitrary detention is an essential instrument of control, so is the torture alleged to be associated with it, political scientists contended.

The way these political scientists see it, torture would have two overlapping logical purposes: extraction of information from, and intimidation of, activists who oppose apartheid, South Africa's policy of strict racial separation.

But whether it fulfills its intimidatory purpose is questionable: Some analysts fear the abuse of prisoners may alienate and radicalize more people than it frightens.