

S O U T H E R N                      A F R I C A

Monthly Survey of News and Opinion

Published by the Southern Africa Committee, University Christian Movement, Room 758,  
475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10027

Vol. I, No. 8

Sept. - Oct. 1968

---

CONTENTS	PAGE
1. "Contact, Criticism, Courage" - the students in South Africa	1
2. Report from the Annual Conference of the new University Christian Movement of Southern Africa, July 1968	2
3. Events at Cape Town University and the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg	6-8
4. The Fort Hare Incident - <u>AN URGENT APPEAL FOR HELP</u>	8-11
5. Capitulation of July-September Events in South Africa	12
6. The "Silent Church" in South Africa Speaks Out	13
7. South African Students in the United States	15

---

EDITORIAL

"Contact, Criticism, Courage"

In June, 1968 the new University Christian Movement of Southern Africa published the first issue (Vol. 0, No. 0) of "One For the Road" - an ecumenical quarterly. On August 23, 1968 the Johannesburg Star carried the notice that the South African government had banned this first issue of the journal.

It isn't unusual for good literature to be banned in South Africa. Even some literature that isn't so good may be banned simply because it stirs peoples minds. (A tragic example is the banning of the old teen-age favorite, Black Beauty. Such a title may, after all, have racial overtones, even if the book is about a horse!) Perhaps the principal reason for the banning of "One For the Road" was the lead article on "Student Power" which begins with the interesting statement: "The only revolutionary class left in the Western world today is the community of students." In a country that defines "terrorism" as "advocacy of social change", it is no wonder that a violent reaction occurs when the word "revolutionary" is used.

Since the publication of "One For the Road", its editors and contributors, and the officers of the UCM/SA have faced intimidation, harrassment, interrogation, and other forms of suppression by the South African government and Special Branch. This because they have dared to ally themselves with students around the world who are seeking some solutions to the world's problems of racism, impersonalism, dehumanization, war, and poverty. This because they are trying to emerge from their cocoon of smug self-satisfaction and inwardness and identify with the world-wide struggle for justice and peace. It is a courageous step to take in a police state such as South Africa, and their courage may be rewarded with annihilation.

We feel that it is important for the rest of the world to be apprised of the new courage of South Africa's student community. We fear that their few and small voices will soon be silenced as South Africa withdraws even more into the shell that will

ultimately have to be cracked--if not by moral suasion, then by the bullet. For this reason we have decided to use most of this issue of our newsletter to inform our readers of what has been happening the last few months in South Africa in the university world. We are especially concerned for the life of the new UCM of Southern Africa, since it is our "sister movement" in many ways.

Over the past twenty years of Nationalist Party rule in South Africa, the regime has systematically eliminated one after another form of opposition to apartheid, from African political parties and the multi-racial Liberal Party, to social welfare organizations with little overt but with inherent political overtones. Elements of the academic community have resisted this trend steadfastly. The National Union of South African Students (NUSAS) and individual campus student associations have struggled to maintain academic independence and inter-racial relationships, but the South African government by parliamentary action and administrative decree has drastically narrowed their liberties and effectiveness.

It is for this reason that the student community appears to be the last place where a "peaceful" opposition to apartheid could be expressed. If this opposition is silenced, then South Africa has itself brought about the necessity of a counter-violent opposition that can only end in a racial holocaust such as the world would never forget.

Thus we would like to record the words of students in South Africa who have come forward so courageously at this time, by quoting the last paragraph of the lead article in their banned publication:

"CONTACT, CRITICISM, COURAGE - these are three elements necessary for the creation of a genuine revolutionary movement among South African students. What part can an organisation like U.C.M. play in such a movement? The answer is all too clear: if U.C.M. is to be any use at all it must be totally committed to the cause of student revolution. Its members must be at the centre of the storm that is about to break. We, more than anyone, should make this cause our own. For as we have pointed out it is freedom that is the basis of the revolutionary power of the student community. And it is 'for freedom that Christ has set us free' - a freedom that can only be absolutely radical, freedom from every form of enslavement to ideologies that would freeze the dynamics of society into a static order or set limits to the possibilities of man. We must discover for ourselves that the Christian Gospel is a truly revolutionary force, that faith can be the basis of a criticism that is more radical than any simple scheme of party-politics. We already possess this freedom; it is our driving force. At the same time it is our goal. We who put our hope in Christ know that the dynamics of a truly human society are not compromise but revolution."

---

REPORT FROM THE UCM/SA ANNUAL CONFERENCE, July 1968

"The UCM/SA - - An Agent for Change Within South Africa??"

At the time of writing this report the University Christian Movement of Southern Africa is facing a "crisis of existence". During its first year (it was born in July 1967) the UCM/SA received criticism from its church sponsors, newspaper reporters and harassment by the Special Branch, including phone tapping and opening of mail. Since the Stutterheim Conference in July 1968 (its second annual assembly), the UCM has been literally fighting for its life! A month after the Conference some of the UCM/SA executive officers were called in for interrogation by the Special Branch, and the movements of others have been closely scrutinized (including the movements of two

American students who were fortunate enough to attend the conference). Finally on August 16 Prime Minister Balthazar Vorster issued a public statement to the effect that he was "busy looking at the UCM, and it will not be my fault if steps are taken against this movement when I am finished." Since that time the scrutiny has increased, the passport of the past President of UCM/SA was removed, the new President's home was searched, UCM/SA was banned on the Fort Hare campus (a "tribal college" for Xhosa-speaking Africans), and the UCM journal "One For the Road" has been banned.

As with many "liberal" movements in South Africa, a tremendous amount of energy must be spent just to keep alive.

But what has happened in this first year of the UCM's life in South Africa to merit such a fierce response from the Nationalist government? What characteristic does it possess that makes it such an appropriate focus of attack for the racists? What attitudes flavor the life and policies of the University Christian Movement of Southern Africa?

In many ways UCM/SA is a unique animal. It is completely multiracial, evidenced by the fact that 60% of the Stutterheim Conference was non-white. It is completely ecumenical and strongly linked with its five supporting churches (Methodist, Congregational, Anglican, Presbyterian and Roman Catholic). It is also, in the words of its General Secretary, Father Colin Collins, attempting to practice what its participant churches have always preached, and therefore is immersed in a concern for the relevant social issues of the day.

UCM/SA is deeply worship-centered and much of its language and rationale for action reflect the traditional language of the faith in contrast to more secular language used by the Christian youth movement here. One of its chief areas of experimentation has been in new forms of worship and communion. The newly elected President, the Rev. James Moulder, claims that UCM/SA is attempting "to link the Gospel to modern life and current affairs." In its "linking" it has given visible expression to the belief that segregation is wrong.

#### "The Stutterheim Conference"

The July 7-13 week at Stutterheim (called "Event '68") was a very symbolic expression of much that UCM/SA is. One Hundred Fifty students, faculty and university chaplains met in the contrast of life that is South Africa. Joy and sadness, celebration and repentance, reflection and passion, unity and diversity marked the week together. Stutterheim provided the possibility for in-depth personal, political and religious communication between whites and non-whites.

"Event '68" was in many ways based on the educational and communication model of UCM/USA's Cleveland Week of "Process '67" in December, 1967. Three delegates had come from the UCM/SA to Cleveland and returned to South Africa brimming with ideas on Depth Education Groups (small discussion and strategy groups), innovative worship, renewal of the church, new theology, models for social change and strategy for South Africa.

Initially the leadership in plenary and small group sessions of "Event '68" was taken by the whites, tinged often with a smack of paternalism so characteristic of white liberals. By the third day a metamorphosis occurred which dramatically changed this kind of atmosphere of domination/submission to which South African whites/non-whites are so accustomed. On the third day it was announced that all non-whites would have to "sign out" of the conference center and be transported to the next municipal area, then return and "sign back in." This announcement was made because of a municipal by-law in South Africa which states that non-whites may not be present in a "white area" or "urban area" more than 72 hours without a special pass. Some non-whites present suggested that the conference refuse to conform to this by-law and advocated an act of civil disobedience by remaining at the conference without permission. Finally, after lengthy debate, it was concluded that such an act of civil disobedience would be poor strategy in that it would do nothing to eliminate the unjust law and could not bring about a full confrontation against the system that perpetrated it. As a result, the entire conference (white and non-white) voted to march together out of the conference municipality into the next

municipality and back again. So came about one of the strangest occurrences ever seen in South Africa. Far from the nearest town, only viewed by a few rural Africans and one passing car, 150 people marched over the municipal boundary line singing "We Shall Overcome" (banned in South Africa) and wearing signs reading "The Truth Shall Make Us Free." The known presence of informers in our midst did not deter us.

This meeting and the resultant march were a watershed for the conference. From this point onwards, non-whites often took a leadership role, entertained us with their ability to find humor and irony in the tragedy of South Africa, blatantly confronted white liberals with their paternalism and non-involvement in suffering, and spent several hours together in a black caucus. Yet throughout, a spirit of unity and comaraderie prevailed.

Addresses on theology, ecumenism, the present racial situation, strategies for change (including a sharp look at the possible necessity of violence), were given in the evenings. Small groups met twice daily to discuss areas such as Independent Africa, Black Power, New Theology, the Church and Social Change, etc. Workshops on photography, folk singing, dance and drama punctuated the daily schedule. Representatives of the supporting church bodies in South Africa participated fully in all these sessions.

One of the significant features that differentiates UCM/SA from NUSAS is its lack of a "resolution complex". Students distinctly disenchanted with the propensity of NUSAS to pass resolutions without working on overall strategy for change have turned to UCM/SA as a last hope and as an outlet for their creative and active energies. However, the idea of thinking in terms of long-term strategy is very foreign in many South African circles and even UCM/SA was undergoing labor pains as she sought to think in terms of flexibility and movement rather than constitutionality and institutionalization. However, the exciting thing was that people were trying to think strategically and that UCM/SA via its formation schools throughout the country was allowing students an opportunity to spend a weekend learning how to think along such lines.

At its plenary sessions UCM/SA passed a number of motions for action and involvement for the coming year. Probably the most significant were resolutions on a minimum wage campaign and a literacy campaign - - both extremely important issues and extremely difficult to attack with any effectiveness in a country whose laws are designed to keep the majority of the people (non-whites) as virtual slave labor.

#### "U.C.M. - There and Here"

The relationship between our two movements has been one of close fraternal association and close communication. To try to take it beyond that point would have meant dangerous repercussions for UCM/SA. Even the presence of two Columbia University students at the Stutterheim Conference at the invitation of UCM/SA was ammunition for the anti-UCM propagandists. Certainly widespread knowledge of UCM/USA's opposition to the Vietnam war and pro-black power stands would condemn UCM/SA by association if a formal link were to be established.

#### "UCM/SA As a Part of the Confessing Church"

In many ways UCM/SA is the modern relevant church in a country where the relevant socially concerned church is indeed a rarity. The church militant, willing to suffer and stick its neck out, has been almost nonexistent in South Africa. However, with the Christian Institute, the UCM/SA, and the September 22 statement by the South African Council of Churches, it is evident that a "confessing church" is surfacing that is willing to sacrifice and suffer. On the part of UCM/SA there is definitely a cadre of people who are willing to go to jail for their beliefs. Unfortunately that may have to be one of the sacrifices required.

## "Problems and Difficulties"

As she enters her second year, UCM faces many major problems. The support of the major denominations for her social stands and innovations in expression and worship has been equivocal to say the most. Obviously one of the strongest playing cards in the UCM/SA pack has been her ability to claim church support and implicate churches in her actions opposing apartheid. Without this support she would be immediately classified as a "political party", and under Parliamentary law banning multiracial political parties, would be immediately eliminated. Because of UCM/SA's issue of "One For the Road" and her forthright social stands, churches have criticized her for naive tactics, for being too political, or for opposing legitimate government policy. There has been a frantic attempt during the last month to consolidate church support behind UCM/SA, especially important because of the necessity that UCM maintain its status as a Christian organization.

The "Christian tag" is one which alienates many sincerely concerned people from participating in UCM/SA. However, it is interesting and encouraging to note the number of agnostics who have suddenly found the Christian message to be relevant as they have watched people take its implications of love seriously, and many such people have thrown their lot in with UCM, if not for its theology, at least for its sense of community and action.

### "The UCM/SA - An Agent for Change?"

Dozens of people we talked to this summer, churchmen and non-churchmen alike, saw UCM/SA as a ray of hope in the generally dismal South African scene. However, this hope must be viewed realistically in terms of political effectiveness. Even if the Special Branch were not so effective and the situation so restrictive, the base UCM/SA is relating to is the university and the church within South Africa. The university certainly has a distinct role to play in fermenting social change. However, in South Africa there is no Latin American-type tradition of the university as a "revolutionary force". The intellectual elite of a country has seldom played the historical role of an initiator and implementor of radical social change, and this possibility is even more remote in South Africa. Whether or not the student community can be the great force for revolution in 1968 is a question that the future may answer better than history. But the firmly state-controlled universities in South Africa can hardly play more than the role of a catalyst, a stimulus, a worrying gnat for social change.

The church is even more discouraging as a possible power base from which to bring about radical social change. It is generally politically unsophisticated and uninvolved, and all too often the very home of those racist sentiments which perpetuate the system in South Africa. Furthermore, to hope for change from the university and the church is to optimistically believe that the "white leopard will change its spots", i.e. that the white man in South Africa will decide to sacrifice his privileged position socially and economically on behalf of the non-whites. Surely the myth of original sin indicates to us that the self-interest of the white South African will not be altered by an appeal to conscience, any more than an appeal to conscience has altered the racism in the heart of white America.

Both power bases are weak and generally politically ineffective, and the "carrot on the stick" they offer is not bait enough to lure white South Africa away from apartheid. Yet futile as the situation seems, it is true that UCM/SA is one of the few viable peaceful alternatives for change left within South Africa, and for this reason deserves our prayers and financial support as they battle in the midst of futility.

Possibilities for UCM's effectiveness for political change are also dimmed by the fact that they are facing a formidable and ruthless enemy which is able to squelch them before they become a real threat, and this is actually now in the process of being done.

Recognizing these overwhelming obstacles, we still must admit that UCM/SA is attracting and significantly involving hundreds of university students in the racial

issue of South Africa and in a humanizing process, and is contributing to authentic multiracial dialogue on many issues (a real rarity in South Africa), and is equipping, via its formation schools, hundreds of students to think strategically. The movement faces fantastic odds in its attempt to remold history, yet it deserves our deepest support for this task, a task of suffering and possible defeat, yet a task in which is still embodied a bright and glowing glimmer of hope.

-----

### "The University of Cape Town Sit-In"

On August 12 there was a mass meeting of the student body at the University of Cape Town which gathered to discuss how to protest the "sacking" of Mr. Archie Mafeje, an African sociologist who had been appointed to the faculty by the University Council and whose appointment was later withdrawn. (Senator de Klerk, Minister of National Education of South Africa, chastised the University Council for appointing Mafeje, the first African to be appointed to a department other than African languages in an all-white university. Thus the Council withdrew its appointment.)

Although Monica Wilson, Professor of Sociology at UCM and world-renowned author and sociologist, said Mafeje was the most highly qualified person for the post, government officials felt that the color of his skin was the most important issue and that he should not be allowed to teach at UCT. At the student mass meeting it was decided to march to the Administration Building and to sit in there en masse until the University Council agreed to meet on the issue. Since the President of the University was vacationing in Australia, this meant a sit-in of at least a few days.

As it turned out, the sit-in lasted two weeks. Led by Mr. Rafael Kaplinsky, President of the Radical Students Society and Duncan Innis, President of the Students Representative Council (SRC) and newly elected President of NUSAS, the sit-in was well-organized and orderly, and consisted of approximately 600 students, a few of which were "coloured" (South Africa's term for persons of mixed race). Some professors held their classes and gave lectures to the demonstrating students, and teach-ins on Student Power were held. Food service was provided by sympathetic townspeople and restaurateurs.

However, President Luyt did not return to South Africa until August 23, at which time the sit-in ended due to threats of violence by students who opposed it. Bombs had been planted by reactionary students who support the government's apartheid rule, and one meal of food had even been poisoned causing illness among many of the sit-in participants. When 1,000 "Nat" students stormed the building to "mow down the demonstrators", and police were called in to protect them, it was decided to end the sit-in so as to allow the University Council to meet in an atmosphere of general peace and non-pressure.

Although the Cape Town students did not expect the Council to re-appoint Mr. Mafeje, they expected the University Council at least to "make the government do its own dirty work", or, in other words, for the government itself to sack him and not the University Council.

Mr. Mafeje, an Oxford graduate who at the time of the sit-in was job-hunting in London, stated the following in the Jhannesburg Star of August 21:

"The whole thing is so superficial. The students talk about this university autonomy business. But do they think they can have a free university in a society that is not free? Suppose I had been allowed to join the faculty... Would they have protested against the fact that I would be forced to live off the campus, because no Africans can live on it? That I would have to carry a pass; that I would have to have a permit to stay in Cape Town? So long as I can sit with them for a few hours a day in the university canteen, many of them would call that academic freedom... The Government has controlled African education for years. Who worries about that?"

"Demonstrations at the University of the  
Witwatersrand - Johannesburg"

A few days after the beginning of the UCT sit-in, students at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) petitioned the city for permission to stage a sympathy march through Johannesburg. The petition was denied. The Students Representative Council, chaired by John Kane-Berman, held a mass student body meeting on August 20, the result of which was a massive picket-line on campus property. On the same day that the Wits sympathy demonstration began, the "coloured" participants in the UCT sit-in had to withdraw because they had been personally harrassed and intimidated and their families threatened by the Special Branch. Some of the picket signs at Wits read: "De Klerk is white: Mafeje is Educated", and "We've Had Enough". The pickets appeared each day for several hours during the evening rush hour, and it wasn't long before the police appeared and began to harrass and bully the picketers. Soon the issue grew from a sympathy demonstration for UCT to a demonstration against police brutality and for academic freedom.

A cavalcade of cars filled with Wits students drove to nearby Pretoria, the government's administrative capital, to present a petition to the Prime Minister, and were met by University of Pretoria students and prevented from their mission. Some of the students were beaten, others had their heads shaved and were thrown into fountains. For the next several days a counter-demonstration appeared across the street from the Wits pickets, peopled by students from Pretoria and other "Nationalist", Afrikaans-speaking colleges. The counter-demonstrators hurled eggs, rotten fruit, waterbags and all sorts of material against the picketers, but the picketers remained peaceful and non-violent. Police did nothing to stop the counter-demonstrators from their violence, and on the fourth and fifth days didn't even appear to try and control the situation at all.

"Vorster's Heilbron Speech"

On August 17, Prime Minister Balthazar Vorster made a speech in public on the anniversary of twenty years of Nationalist Party rule. In his speech he made reference to the student unrest, saying that he would not stand for such nonsense. He stated that if the universities do not end their protests "in a reasonable time, then I will do it myself and I will do it thoroughly." He also warned that "it would be a good thing if parents of the children at these universities also take heed of this." He added that he was "busy looking at" the new UCM and that "it will not be my fault if steps are taken which I am finished against this Movement."

"UCM's General Secretary Replies to Vorster"

In its first public reply to the Prime Minister's strictures made at Heilbron, the UCM said that it was practising what Christian churches had always preached and warned that "any attempts to intimidate or destroy the UCM are direct attacks against the participating Churches."

Father Colin Collins, General Secretary of the UCM, told a Press conference on September 7 (Johannesburg Star) that "The UCM is not a political party nor has it identified itself with one. If, however, by politics is meant an interest in Man in his actual situation, then the UCM is political. In this it is in the main stream of Christian thinking from the earliest days of Christianity. In general the UCM has initiated an examination of the whole question of the Church's involvement in the situation in South Africa. In all this the UCM has simply attempted to practise what its participating churches have always preached, and to implement the mandate given by those churches to the UCM at its inauguration. For that reason any attempts to intimidate the UCM are direct attacks against those churches."

Father Collins continued: "For this reason we deplore the kind of intimidation that has already been exercised against the UCM. The Heilbron statement of the Prime Minister has not been the only means of intimidation. Pressure has been brought to bear by the Security Police. No doubt these intimidatory measures will cause some students to leave the UCM and may cause a greater number of parents and church leaders to pronounce words of caution and possibly even condemnation. While we appreciate that some steps taken by the UCM could be considered unwise, it should also once more be borne in mind that the UCM is practising what the churches have preached in the South African situation. It should be noted in this regard that the UCM is well aware of the power structure in South Africa. The movement knows that there is very little that it can do to change the thinking or influence the ways of those in power. It also realizes that those in power can quite easily, either through legislation or other well-tried methods, destroy the UCM as an organisation. On the other hand, the UCM believes that what it stands for can never be destroyed. Therefore it will continue to propagate its ideals, not by use of that kind of force that has been used against it, but by the power of intellectual persuasion and Christian love." (Star, 9/7/68)

-----

### THE FORT HARE INCIDENT - AN URGENT APPEAL

(When South Africa passed the "Bantu Education Act" in 1953, and followed it up several years later by the "Universities Extension Amendment Act" (which did not in fact "extend" universities, but rather provided that thereafter all centers of higher education in South Africa would be on a tribal basis), the way was paved for total apartheid in education. It is now no longer possible for a non-white to go to a white university, unless he wishes to take a course not offered in "his own" college, and then only by special Parliamentary action and approval. Thus there are three defined African "tribal colleges" in South Africa - - Terfloop in the Northern Transvaal, the University College of Zululand in Natal, and Fort Hare (for Xhosa-speaking students) University in the Cape. The student bodies of each number approximately 600-650, and the total African population in South Africa is about 12.5 million. Recently Fort Hare College has had to face a major crisis of which the following is a report.)

#### "Report From Fort Hare"

In order to understand what follows in this report, it is important to remember that the students of Fort Hare have refused to appoint a Student Representative Council for a number of years. The reason for this is that student leaders appointed to an SRC have unfailingly been acted against by the University authorities, who have often expelled or refused to re-admit duly elected student leaders without giving reasons, and by the police who have interrogated such students.

In the absence of an SRC, the only means of communication between the students and the authorities (government-appointed white Nationalists) has been through elected deputations. There have been similar consequences for the students elected. On one occasion a written guarantee from the authorities that no action would be taken against a deputation was not adhered to. Thus there was an understandable reluctance on the part of the students to appoint representatives for consultation.

On August 16, 1968 Professor de Wet was installed as the new Rector, and Mr. Blaar Coetzee (Minister of Bantu Education) was the guest speaker. The vast majority of the students boycotted the ceremony. Following this, certain offensive remarks concerning Prof. de Wet, Mr. Coetzee, Prime Minister Vorster, and Dr. Verwoerd were painted on the walls of various University buildings. These were subsequently removed by the University staff.

On Sunday August 18th, 17 students received notices instructing them to meet with the Rector at 9:00 am on Monday 19th. It is not known how the 17 names were selected. They were accused of being either directly or indirectly responsible for the painting on the walls, and when they denied all knowledge of who was responsible, they were told that



they were known to be student leaders, and therefore must be implicated. They were warned that should there be any further student disturbances on the campus, they would be held responsible and sent down. Thus, without having any administrative, disciplinary or legislative power, they were made responsible for maintaining student order at the cost of their careers.

Subsequently the Security Police were called in and most of the 17 were taken to the charge-office for interrogation, and their rooms were searched. It was this action on the part of the Rector and the police against students whose guilt of any offence had not been established that led to reaction from the student body.

Two requests to hold a student body meeting to discuss the matter were refused by the Rector, and his approval to hold such a meeting on the evening of August 27th was given late that same afternoon. At this meeting a resolution outlining the student grievances and requesting the Rector to address the whole student body on the matter was passed. They decided to gather the next day outside the Administration building and to remain sitting until the Rector did address them.

The Rector left for Pretoria on University business early the next morning.

In accordance with the resolution the students did not attend lectures on August 28th but staged a quiet sit-in near the administration block. During the day a notice was posted in the hostels saying that if the demonstration was continued until Friday 30th the College would be closed. This notice carried the authority of the Rector, who was still in Pretoria. As Thursday was the first day of the short vacation, the students had not, in any case, intended to make any demonstration after Thursday noon.

On Thursday another notice appeared on the official notice boards stating that the University Christian Movement had been banned on the campus. This arbitrary and authoritarian action intensified the resentment of the students. Thursday noon the College closed for the vacation during which the Rector returned.

On September 4th, the eve of the new term, the chaplains of the Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational students approached certain members of staff and asked them to request the Rector to meet a deputation of students.

On Thursday September 5th, the students recommenced their sit-in. During the morning there were two communications from the Rector. In the first, the students were warned that if they had not returned to lectures by noon, further action would be taken. In the second they were informed that they had until 4:00 pm to send a deputation of students to meet the Rector. The chaplains tried to persuade the students to agree to the deputation, but they refused fearing that members of any such deputation would be victimized. They would not accept any assurances that this would not be so, saying that such assurances had been given before and could not be trusted. Finally the students decided to appoint two members from each house committee to present a written statement to the Rector, outlining the student grievances and again asking the Rector to meet the Student Body. The Rector merely maintained his decision that a deputation must meet him by 4:00 pm.

On Friday September 6th the sit-in continued. During the morning the following statements by the Rector were communicated to the students:

"Seeing that the students of the University College of Fort Hare have contravened regulations by staying away from lectures for three days and have persevered in doing this even after their attention was drawn to the contravention and seeing that students have not availed themselves of the normal channels that existed, and will always exist, and have turned down the invitation to make known their problems through a deputation, I feel myself compelled, after a full and serious discussion with the Advisory Council to restore normal conditions by taking the following steps: Students who are desirous of continuing their work for the year and who undertake to submit to the discipline of the college, must in the course of the morning cease their participation in the sit down strike, or any other form of demonstration, and must indicate their intentions of doing so by signing the

lists which will be available for this purpose at their respective hostels before noon today.

The admission of students who have not ceased their participation in the sit down strike or any other form of demonstration, and who have not signed the mentioned list at their respective hostel before twelve noon, will be cancelled forthwith, and such students will have to leave the hostels and the campus of the University College before 4:30 pm in the vehicles which will be available for the purpose.

Students who have signed the undertaking at their respective hostels and who at any stage during the rest of this year stay away from lectures without the permission of the warden or the head of the relevant department shall be considered to have broken the agreement and shall be subjected to the same measures as are mentioned above."

After the appearance of this notice, the students appointed a deputation of five students which then attempted to meet with the Rector. Permission for such a meeting was refused twice; on the first occasion because the Rector was busy, and on the second occasion because the deadline for the delegation had already expired. After the failure of the deputation, the students signed the lists signifying their readiness to continue with lectures, and to abide by College regulations, but stated that they would continue with the sit-in until the Rector agreed to meet their request to address them.

When the sit-in reconvened after lunch, the following statement was communicated to them:

"All students still in front of the administration block must please note that they have been suspended as students of this University, and are contravening regulations by their presence here. This is a final warning, and if students are still there at 3:00 pm, steps will be taken against them."

At 3:00 pm over 300 students were still gathered in front of the Administration block. At 3:05 pm large numbers of police, who had been in Alice from mid-morning, arrived at Fort Hare. At least ten police vans and an estimate of at least 30 police arrived. The vans were used to block entrances and roads. The police, with six dogs, and equipped with tear gas bombs and gas masks, surrounded the demonstrating students.

The students were then addressed by the commandant, who stated that they were under arrest for trespassing, and that they had only two options to them; either to be imprisoned in the local police cells, or to pack their belongings and return to their homes under 'protective police custody'. They were advised that the matter would be referred to the Attorney General for his decision on further action. None of the students were formally charged, but police, seated at tables took the names of all the students and their home addresses. They were then taken, under police escort, to their various residences to pack their belongings. They were not permitted to go into town to withdraw any money for the journey, nor were they allowed to collect articles of clothing from the laundries.

Fort Hare students resident at the Federal Theological Seminary were sent back to the Seminary after representation by the Seminary principals, but were warned that if they set foot on the Fort Hare campus they would be arrested for trespassing.

Under frightening circumstances, which some students felt could easily have led to panic and drastic police reprisals--especially with the dogs present--, the students remained calm and orderly, and at no stage resisted the police. The students sang "Nkosi Sikelel' Africa" and "We Shall Overcome" before moving off to their residences.

When some students who had not been in the sit-in at 3:00 pm saw the police action, they joined with their fellows and accepted suspension and removal. The students never really believed that the Rector would take such drastic action against them for their simple request and orderly demonstration.

By 7:00 pm all the suspended students had been put onto the railway buses, provided for the purpose, and sent to both Amabele junction and Cookhouse station to await trains to take them home. Students who did not have tickets for the journey were not given tickets, and they were not given the opportunity to make arrangements to get from the terminus to their respective homes. They were provided neither food nor money for the journey, and some had to wait on the stations for a considerable length of time before being able to get connections or seats on the available trains.

Attempts were made by individuals to contact the students at the two railway junctions to provide them with food and money. However, large numbers of police were present on both stations. At Cookhouse the police threatened those who attempted to contact the students with arrest, took names of individuals, and prevented any communication with the students. At Amabele there was no police interference and it was possible to talk to some of the students and to give them some money.

#### "Summary"

In total, more than half the student body at Fort Hare was expelled. Later the Rector said they would be readmitted if they all applied individually for readmission. What the university authorities did not say is that certain students would not be victimized. By requiring application for readmission, the authorities can assure that the leaders and potential leaders do not get back in. As of September 30, all but 30 of the students have been allowed to return, but to be accepted they had to take their parents with them, and in the presence of parents and the Rector have had to sign an undertaking not to continue with any demonstration, to abide by all the University regulations, and never to stay away from any lecture without the permission of the house warden or head of Department. With the parents really unable to sacrifice a whole year of their hard-earned savings to educate their children, such pressure has been brought to bear on the students that their spirit has been broken. They also, very cleverly, staggered the times when the students could return, so that no mass movement could again be created or organized. The 30 "leaders" who have been finally and permanently expelled include all the students who participated in the UCM Annual Conference, plus a few others who are active in UCM but could not attend the Conference.

#### THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FORT HARE SCHOLARSHIP FUND - - AN EMERGENCY APPEAL TO ALL READERS

The UCM of Southern Africa has sent a request to the major denominations in the U.S. for the establishment of a scholarship fund on behalf of those students at Fort Hare College who have been expelled by the authorities. For these students there is only one other possibility for an education - - through correspondence with the South African College for Higher Education (SACHED). Having been expelled from their "tribal college", there is no other place they can go. For many of these students it means the abandoning of their education with only one year remaining to receive their diplomas.

Estimates are that it would cost approximately \$50,000.00 for one year to continue the education of the 30 expelled students. This figure may seem large, but compared to the cost of sending 30 American students to university for a year, it is very small.

It is our hope that our readers will be moved to send in contributions for the Fort Hare Scholarship Fund, and that they will also approach their organizations (church and/or university), clubs, and friends to make whatever contribution they can.

PLEASE HELP US HELP THE STUDENTS AT FORT HARE ! ! ! ! !

SEND YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS TO:

Southern Africa Committee  
University Christian Movement  
Room 758  
475 Riverside Drive  
New York, N. Y. 10027

Calendar of Events in South Africa

- June 1968 Mr. Archie Mafeje, African sociologist, appointed by the University Council of Cape Town University, to the faculty of the Department of Sociology
- July Senator de Klerk, Minister of National Education, intimidates the UCT University Council into withdrawing Mr. Mafeje's appointment.
- July 9-15 UCM Second Annual Conference held at Stutterheim, attended by 150 students (majority non-white), faculty, chaplains.
- August 13 UCT Mass student meeting, followed by march to the Administration building and beginning of 11-day sit-in over the Mafeje issue.
- August 15 Reactionary UCT students plant bomb in midst of sit-in demonstrators.
- August 16 Over 200 UCT faculty members join student sit-in protest.
- August 17 Prime Minister Vorster makes "Heilbron speech" attacking student demonstrators and UCM
- Students at the University of the Witwatersrand (Johannesburg) petition for right to have sympathy march through city of Johannesburg. Petition denied.
- August 19 Fort Hare students first called before Rector for boycotting inaugural speech
- August 20 Mass student meeting at Wits initiates sympathy pickets on campus property
- Coloured students leave UCT sit-in as result of intimidation and threats.
- Mr. Mafeje issues statement from London.
- August 22 UCM banned at Fort Hare
- UCT sit-in stormed by reactionary students who initiated violence. Wits picketers attempt to petition Prime Minister, met with violence by students. Mrs. Helen Suzman, Prog MP, joins Wits protest.
- August 23 UCT President returns from Australia. UCT sit-in ends.
- UCM publication "One For the Road" banned.
- Wits protesters assaulted by counter-demonstrators.
- August 28 Fort Hare sit-in begins, ended 2 days later by beginning of vacation.
- Students demand Rector speak to them.
- September 6 Fort Hare students recommence sit-in. 300 students expelled and forced off campus by police, gas bombs, dogs, and police vans.
- September 22 South African Council of Churches (Christian Council) issues public statement condemning apartheid as a "pseudo-Gospel".
- September 30 All but 30 Fort Hare students readmitted under strict qualifications.
- Christian Council of South Africa issues statement supporting UCM.

"The Silent Church in South Africa Speaks Out"

During the 20 years of Nationalist Party rule in South Africa, the laws of apartheid have become increasingly more stringent and oppressive. Advances in the economic and industrial field have been met with equal retrogressions in the human rights field. When one looks for signs of opposition to this policy of encroaching racism, the Progressives and Liberals (the former ineffective, the latter now banned), the university, the Black Sash were evident. The Church too often was silent, if not in direct support of the forces of the status quo.

On September 22, 1968 this discouraging general silence was broken by "A Message to the People of South Africa" issued by the South African Council of Churches and published in a full page advertisement in a prominent South African Sunday newspaper, with an impressive roster of preliminary signatures.

This "Message" may seem rather traditional and innocuous on the international scene where churches publish openly their opposition to American racism and the New York Times carries several times a month full page ads calling for a stop to the war in Vietnam and discrimination at home. However, in the South African context this "Message" is a courageous breath of fresh air which exposes the Christian Council, as well as the individual signees, to government persecution via the Secret Police and possible banning for their opposition to apartheid. The September 22 message is a clear refutation of apartheid as a "pseudo-gospel" and a call to loyal Christians to join in this public stand against racism in South Africa.

In a country where the church has remained silent, except for isolated instances of brave opposition (several ex-patriot bishops and church leaders have been banned and/or exiled), it is encouraging to see that a remnant of the church is attempting to be the true "Confessing Church" as men like Dietrich Bonhoeffer tried to be in Nazi Germany. The two situations are remarkably parallel in many ways, and it seems quite appropriate to use the term "Confessing Church" (the Church trying to be true to its principles rather than swinging with the tide of the times) in South Africa as well.

The following are only excerpts from the published statement, which may be obtained in full by writing your request to:

Dr. Theodore Tucker  
Room 666  
475 Riverside Drive  
New York, N. Y. 10027

"Excerpts from the Christian Council of South Africa's 'Message'"

"In the name of Jesus Christ

We are under an obligation to confess anew our commitment to the universal faith of Christians, the eternal Gospel of salvation and security in Christ alone.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ is the good news that in Christ God has broken down the walls of division between God and man, and between man and man.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ declares that Christ is the truth who sets men free from all false hopes of freedom and security...

The Gospel of Jesus Christ declares that God is reconciling us to himself and to each other; and that therefore such barriers as race and nationality have no rightful place in the inclusive brotherhood of Christian disciples.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ declares that God is the master of this world, and that it is to him alone that we owe our primary commitment.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ offers hope and security for the whole life of man, not just in man's spiritual and ecclesiastic relationships, but for human existence in its entirety. Consequently, we are called to witness to the meaning of the Gospel in the particular circumstances of time and place in which we find ourselves. In South Africa, at this time, we find ourselves in a situation where a policy of racial separation is being deliberately effected with increasing rigidity. The doctrine of racial separation is being seen by many not merely as a temporary political policy but as a necessary and

permanent expression of the will of God, and as the genuine form of Christian obedience for this country. It is holding out to men a security built not on Christ but on the theory of separation and the preservation of racial identity; it is presenting the separate development of our race-groups as the way for the people of South Africa to save themselves. And this claim is being made to us in the name of Christianity.

We believe that this doctrine of separation is a false faith, a novel gospel; it inevitably is in conflict with the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which offers salvation, both individual and social, through faith in Christ alone. It is keeping people away from the real knowledge of Christ; therefore it is the Church's duty to enable our people to distinguish between the demands of the South African state and the demands of Christian discipleship.

The Christian Gospel requires us to assert the truth proclaimed by the first Christians, who discovered that God was creating a new community in which differences of race, language, nation, culture, and tradition no longer had power to separate man from man. The most important features of a man are not the details of his racial group, but the gifts and abilities which are given to him as a unique individual by the grace of God; to insist that racial characteristics are more important than these is to reject the deepest facts of our own humanity as well as the humanity of the other man.

But, in South Africa, everyone is expected to believe that a man's racial identity is the most important thing about him; only when it is clearly settled can any significant decisions be made about him. Those whose racial classification is in doubt are tragically insecure and helpless. Without racial identity, it seems, we can do nothing; he who has it, has life; he who has no racial identity has no life. This belief in the supreme importance of racial identity amounts to a denial of the central statements of the Christian Gospel. In practice, it severely restricts the ability of Christian brothers to serve and know each other, and even to give each other simple hospitality; it limits the ability of a person to obey Christ's command to love his neighbour as himself. For, according to the Christian Gospel, our brothers are not merely the members of our own race-group. Our brother is the person whom God gives to us. To dissociate from our brother on the grounds of natural distinction is to despise God's gift and to reject Christ.

Where different groups of people are hostile to each other, this is due to human sin, not to the plan of the Creator. The Scriptures do not require such groups to be kept separate from each other; on the contrary, the Gospel requires us to believe in and to act on the reconciliation made for us in Christ. A policy of separation is a demonstration of unbelief in the power of the Gospel; any demonstration of the reality of reconciliation would endanger this policy. Therefore, the advocates of this policy inevitably find themselves opposed to the Church if it seeks to live according to the Gospel and to show that God's grace has overcome our hostilities. A thorough policy of racial separation must ultimately require that the Church should cease to be the Church.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ declares that God is love; separation is the opposite force to love. The Christian Gospel declares that separation is the supreme threat and danger, but that in Christ it has been overcome; it is in association with Christ and with each other that we find our true identity. But apartheid is a view of life and of man which insists that we find our identity in dissociation and distinctions which the Holy Spirit is calling the people of God to overcome; it calls good evil. This policy is, therefore, a form of resistance to the Holy Spirit.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ declares that Christ is our master, and that to him all authority is given. Christians betray their calling if they give their highest loyalty which is due to Christ alone to one group or tradition, especially where that group is demanding self-expression at the expense of other groups. God judges us, not by our loyalty to a sectional group, but by our willingness to be made new in the community of Christ. Christ is inevitably a threat to much that is called 'the South African way of life', and many features of our social order will have to pass away if the lordship of Christ is to be truly acknowledged and if the peace of Christ is to be revealed as the destroyer of our fear.

And Christ is master of the Church also. If the Church fails to witness for the true Gospel of Jesus Christ it will find itself witnessing for a false gospel. If we seek to reconcile Christianity with the so-called 'South African way of life' we shall find that we have allowed an idol to take the place of Christ. Where the Church abandons its obedience to Jesus Christ, it ceases to be the Church; it breaks the links between itself and the Kingdom of God. The task of the Church is to enable people to see the power of God at work, changing hostility into love of the brethren, and to express God's reconciliation here and now. For we are not required to wait for a distant 'heaven' where all problems will have been solved. What Christ has done, he has done already. We can accept his work or reject it; we can hide from it or seek to live by it. But we cannot postpone it, for it is already achieved; and we cannot destroy it, for it is the work of the eternal God.

We believe that Christ is Lord, and that South Africa is part of his world. We believe that his kingdom and its righteousness have power to cast out all that opposes his purposes and keeps men in darkness. We believe that the word of God is not bound, and that it will move with power in these days, whether men hear or whether they refuse to hear, and so, we wish to put to every Christian person in the country the question which we ourselves face each day; to whom, or to what, are you giving your first loyalty, your primary commitment? Is it to a subsection of mankind, an ethnic group, a human tradition, a political idea; or to Christ.

May God enable us to be faithful to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and to be committed to Christ alone.

---

#### SOUTH AFRICAN STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

"Some Facts and Figures"  
as of September 1968

We have collected some preliminary figures on the number and status of South African "refugee" students in the United States in order to inform our readers of some of the problems which they face.

First, it is important to note that most South African students were brought to this country under the sponsorship of the Southern African Students Program of the African American Institute (AAI), which has been funded by our State Department. However, the AAI has recently dropped this program and is bringing no new South African students to the USA this year (or probably again in the future at all) because of some of the difficulties that have been created regarding their status. Many of the students came on passports or travel documents that have now expired, or on "exit permits" which do not allow their return to South Africa. Even if some of them could return to South Africa physically, they would face severe reprisals or possible detention by the South African government. A large percentage of the students have no usable travel documents whatsoever, and are even unable to return to independent Africa if they should wish to do so.

Many of the students have now graduated from their college or university (or been terminated for some other reason), and are unable to return to Africa because of lack of travel documents. They are unable to secure employment in the United States because they are usually on "J-1" exchange visas, which require that they leave the United States for two years before they can return as immigrants or job-seekers. Therefore they are thrust into a state of "limbo", officially called "docket control" by our Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), which creates many difficulties for them, chief among which is simple means of livelihood and peace of mind which are denied them.

Officials in AAI have informed us that they could be relieved of this difficulty if a department of the United States Government (Judicial, State, etc.) gave approval. However, AAI seems to have washed their hands of the affair and are doing little or nothing to secure any kind of acceptable status for the students.

Our concern is that black students from South Africa who were brought here by our Government, are now being treated almost as poorly as they were at home...as if they had no rights. They are manipulated and harrassed by their sponsors and the official administrators of the various programs. They are pressured to take jobs in Africa which individually they may prefer not to take, just in order to make them leave the country. They are denied official refugee or "political asylum" status simply because they are black and they are from a white-dominated country which is officially "anti-communist," though overwhelmingly fascist in nature.

It is a small enough number to be absorbed into our life and society with no difficulty. It is also a small enough number that the officials in our government could use political and diplomatic pressure to secure the travel documents which the students need for free access to other parts of the world. Why are none of these things done for them? We can only ask for an explanation from the AAI or from the State Department.

The following are some figures:

Total number of SASP students in the USA	87
those at Orientation Center, Lincoln Univ.	8
others	5
GRAND TOTAL	100

Repatriation candidates 31

Repatriated students	3
Departed - not graduated	5
Scholarships terminated before graduating	8
Scholarships renewed (United Nations)	1

Students in the U.S. with documents for travelling	
Invalid travel documents	34
Passport waivers	17
Revoked passports	1
None known	9

<u>Degrees:</u>	<u>Completed</u>	<u>Studying</u>
Bachelor's	15	33
Masters	13	3
Diploma	3	0
Ph.D.	0	5
None Known		12
Medicine (repatriated)	1	



FORT HARE SCHOLARSHIP FUND FORT HARE SCHOLARSHIP FUND FORT HARE SCHOLARSHIP FUND FORT

# AN URGENT APPEAL

for contributions

to enable the expelled students at Fort Hare College  
in South Africa to complete their university studies

H  
A  
R  
E  
  
S  
C  
H  
O  
L  
A  
R  
S  
H  
I  
P  
  
F  
U  
N  
D

PLEASE HELP

Send your contributions (tax deductible!)

to

The Southern Africa Committee  
University Christian Movement  
Room 758  
475 Riverside Drive  
New York, New York 10027

*[Faint, illegible handwritten text]*

Southern Africa Committee  
University Christian Movement  
Room 758  
475 Riverside Drive  
New York, N. Y. 10027

-----  
September-October 1968

*[Faint, illegible handwritten text]*

*[Faint, illegible handwritten text]*