

**NO TIES
WITH**

APARTHEID

NATIONAL U 3

National U

APARTHEID SUPPLEMENT

REPUBLIC OF WHITE

In May this year, White South Africans plan to hold a month-long celebration to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of South Africa on 31st May 1961. The army, navy and air force will stage massive demonstrations of strength; there will be a national sports festival; and schoolchildren, youth organizations and loyal National Party workers are planning special activities.

The establishment of the Republic in 1961 was the culmination of all Afrikaner dreams and aspirations since the Boer Republics were crushed by the British in the Boer War. What has the Republic brought to South Africa?

Neville Curtis, President of the National Union of South African Students, wrote to all South African university campuses asking them to boycott the celebrations, and detailed the "achievements" of 23 years of National Party rule and especially the decade under the Republic. He pointed out:

- A coloured child dies of malnutrition every 35 minutes and two African children die before they are five years old. Even in the showcase Transkei "homeland", 40% of the children die before they reach the age of 10.
- It is estimated that 50% of the Indian population in Natal Province live below the poverty line, as do 68% of the families in Johannesburg's main African township. Average non-White income is \$8.75 per head per month, while that of Whites is \$118.75. So the earnings of Whites are 48.5% of those of non-Whites, and the disproportion has increased annually.
- 0.1% of the African population has matriculation or school leaving certificate. In 1969, \$297½ million was spent on White education and only \$18.2 million on Black education.
- Expenditure per capita on African education is one-eighth of that on White education and the gap has been growing for 13 years.
- In 1968 there was only one qualified Black engineer, and there was not one registered African apprentice in the whole of South Africa.
- The crime rate increased 216% between 1950 and 1966, and the number of people murdered increased 377% in the same period. Each year one out of every six Coloured men is convicted of a crime and hundreds of thousands of Africans of pass offences.
- The defence estimates rose from \$50 million in 1959 to \$341½ million in 1969, and South Africa now owns \$2500 million worth of military equipment.
- The police force has grown from 20,500 men in 1948, to 34,500 in 1969, and the prison population has increased from 284,000 to more than half a million in the same period. More than 2000 Africans are arrested every day for pass offences alone (700,000 a year). Half the number of homicides between 1953 and 1966, and South Africa accounts for nearly 50% of the world's known hangings a year.
- These are frightening statistics, but they tell little of the human misery that results from the racist policies of the National Party Government of the Republic.

The New Nazis

The Nationalist Government has its ideals, and it has come a long way towards achieving them, as these two quotations show:

"We stand for Christian Nationalism, which is an ally of National Socialism. You can call this anti-democratic principle dictatorship if you wish. In Italy it is called Fascism, in Germany National Socialism, and in South Africa Christian Nationalism".

— present Prime Minister B.J. Vorster in 1942
 "The Nationalists have the right idea. They are much shrewder than you think. They are following the same path as Hitler did, but they will not be as hasty as he was. They are going very slowly now, but they will smash their enemies in the end".

— British Nazi William Webster, after talking with a Nationalist Deputy Minister in 1963.

Two Nationalist Prime Ministers — Verwoerd and Vorster — ran into trouble with the authorities during the last war for



their Nazi sympathies. So it is no wonder that legalistic nostrums such as the "Suppression of Communism Act" and the "Terrorism Act" are found on South Africa's statute book. The official definition of Communism is so vague that the Government itself may even be guilty — at least of "statutory Communism", to use their jargon.

The net has been cast so wide that all true open opposition to Nationalist policy has been stamped out. The parliamentary "opposition" flounders to produce any meaningful policy differences between itself and the Government, while thousands of African nationalists in the jails testify to the Government's ruthless suppression of the African National Congress and other African parties. The Sharpeville massacre of 1960 is only the best known police shooting of unarmed protesters under the Nationalists.

At all times it is suggested the regime pose risk either indefinite detention without trial, or an undetermined number of 180-day periods of detention without trial; or being "banned" (i.e. being placed under some form of house-arrest, barred from attending meetings of more than three persons, not allowed to be quoted, etc.); or just simply disappearing.

And the Republic of South Africa claims to be the Bastion of Western Christian Civilization in Africa.

Vorster's Nuremberg Pacts

Amid the bouquet of putrid-smelling South African legislation, two blossoms have the most noxious odour: the Group Areas Act, and the "pass laws" — proper title: Natives (Abolition of Passes and Co-ordination of Documents Act).

Under the Group Areas Act white suburbs may be moved at will from their urban homes — where many of them have lived for centuries — to new segregated areas on the fringes of the cities. The average new "Bantu township" is composed of rows and rows of dour boxlike structures, all exactly uniform. Residents are faced with higher rents and greater distances from their workplaces. Meanwhile, their former areas are taken over by Whites.

When the Coloured suburb of District Six in Cape Town was declared a "White area" in 1966, 5,700 families were evicted. In Durban the authorities plan to move 189,500 people over a long period under the Act. Durban's Indian trading community, whose customers and businesses are in the city area, estimates its losses at \$43 million. Many non-Whites whose homes and livelihood are threatened by the Act commit suicide.

The pass laws dictate that every African over the age of 16 must have a 96-page "reference book" containing his identity card, employer's signatures, tax receipts etc. It must be carried 24 hours a day, and produced on demand. Police permission to move from one area to another must be stamped in the pass book. No African may stay in an urban area for more than 72 hours without a permit unless he was born there and lives there permanently, or has worked there for at least 10 years. The number of arrests under these laws has risen from under 1000 a day in 1955 to almost 2000 in 1966.

Thousands of Africans have been "endorsed out" of urban areas because their presence is considered "undesirable". They are usually dumped in "transit camps" — dismal collections of shacks on semi-desert in the "homelands".

Exploited African Labour

South Africa's wealth is not based on abnormally vast natural resources, but on cheap Black labour which makes otherwise uneconomic projects profitable. This is particularly true in the mining industry.

Despite the great numbers of Africans involved in mining, their 1967 pay packets totalled only \$12½ million, in comparison with the 347½ million paid to Whites. i.e. the average White received \$196.45 per month, and the average Black \$22.50. In fact, African miners' wages are worth less than half a century ago — based on 1938 values, the yearly wage



Sharpeville

has dropped from \$90 in 1911 to \$88.75 in 1966. The ratio between White and Black wages widened during this period from 12:1 to 18:1.

All this must be seen against the background of huge international companies drawing enormous profits from the South African mining industry. The Anglo-American Corporation, which (together with its De Beers subsidiary) dominates the industry, made a net profit of \$38½ million in 1967. British investments, mainly in mining and manufacturing, yielded a return of 19% in 1965, compared with the world average of 11%. American investments in manufacturing yielded 17% (world average 11%) in 1968.

What is an African worth? A White teacher with a degree and teaching diploma is worth about 2½ similarly-qualified African teachers (the starting salary for a White teacher fresh from University is the same as the highest salary an African headmaster with years of experience can aspire to). In other professions the equation varies from 1 White doctor = 1½ Black doctors to 1 White police sergeant = 5 Black police sergeants. The average "houseboy" earns 5% — 8% of his master's wage.

According to Willie Marce, National Party leader in Natal and a Cabinet Minister:

"There could not be equal pay for the various race groups in South Africa. This is because the living standards of the groups differ materially".

Another Nationalist leader in Natal, Gert Classen, explained: "Non-White doctors do not warrant the same pay as White doctors do not warrant the same pay as White doctors because they are not as adequately equipped. It is a question of ability: Jews make good doctors, Greeks make good shopkeepers".

Education — Progressing Backwards

By far the most revealing statement on the aims of the so-called "Bantu education" for Africans was made by the late Dr. H.F. Verwoerd, former Prime Minister of South Africa, in 1957:

"There is no place for him [the 'Bantu'] in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour... Until now he has been subjected to a school system which drew

THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS SAYS TO VORSTER AND HIS GANG:



YOUR DAYS ARE COMING TO AN END!!

• You hear that black is busy yet whenever you look it is our world which makes your good and money while even the most useless who stands there as our boss...
 • You pretend that black is ignorant? But you know that even low professions — doctors, our lawyers and our teachers have less rights than even the most ignorant white laborer.
 • You have the cheek to say that in our own country black is foreign while every white immigrant who has never before breathed the air of Africa can come here and become our lord and master.
 • Like a frog that you want the world to believe that the national home of the Black people is in those little corners of our land which you call "Bantustans" while the national home of every white is in the roof of his car, his house and in the land which he calls his own.
 • You think you can treat black people like children and you give us toy payments to play with while the white children from the age of 10 can vote for the persons which rule our country and the Bantustans.
 • Because you are frightened of us you give us the so called black papers of the world are not fit to read even in their own countries yet you know that if the white imperialist governments who have in this century killed and maimed more people than in any time in history...
 WE LAUGH IN YOUR FACES AT ALL THIS NONSENSE AND TOGETHER WITH OUR COLLOURED AND INDIAN BROTHERS WE SAY "MOVE OVER OR YOU WILL BE PUSHED".

WE WILL TAKE BACK OUR COUNTRY!

Thousands of ANC broadsheets such as this were scattered from pamphlet bombs in four South African cities last August.

him away from his own community and misled him by showing him the green pastures of European society in which he is not allowed to graze... What is the use of teaching a Bantu child mathematics when it cannot use it in practice?"

Thus the syllabus for prospective "boys" is different from that for the up-and-coming generation of Herenwolk.
 While almost 80% of Black children start primary school, only 0.013% reach the inferior "Bantu tribal colleges" which substitute for universities for Africans. One of the main reasons for the high drop-out rate are the African languages in primary schools to English or Afrikaans at secondary level. These languages are only taught in primary schools to a level which will enable the African to "understand simple commands" (Verwoerd's words). But most children leave school after Standard Two.

Education and text books are free for Whites, but Africans must pay. The Government has not changed its total expend-

South Africa's only response to protests against apartheid.

How to camouflage racial discrimination in sport

About seven years ago, we were having pre-lunch drinks in our hotel in Cape Town. The African who cleaned the ashtrays was wearing tennis shoes. It turned out he was playing in a non-White tennis tournament that afternoon and the head waiter said he would probably win it.

"Do you ever play tennis against Whites?" I asked. "The Baas makes a joke," replied the African. "They won't play with us." Yet recently White South African tennis players have been claiming that they never practised racial discrimination in their sport in South Africa.

Some of my wife's relatives live in a large country town in the Transvaal. The White minority there did very well for golf courses, tennis courts, swimming pools and rugby fields. As far as we could discover, the thousands of Africans had nothing at all. And this seemed typical of other towns too. Yet in 1968 South Africa told the International Olympic Committee that non-Whites had satisfactory sporting facilities in South Africa.

Last year, before the South African cricket tour of England was actually cancelled, the MCC had decided that that tour would be the last between South Africa and England until the South African team was a multi-racial one. Yet this year sees Whites-only South African lifesaving, rugby and cricket teams touring Australia. (The UN has declared this year the International Year to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination it might also be called the Australian Year for Support of Racism.) These South African teams are Whites-only because only Whites are considered for selection, even though 4 out of 5 South Africans are non-White; but, to quote a South African journalist at the time of the rugby tour of England: "Some of England's fanatics persist in trying to disrupt South African sport because of our so-called colour discrimination".

An interesting thought. How does one disrupt South African sport by trying to unite something that is already disrupted into tight little compartments, with the Whites at the top? And how can Whites-only sport be "South African sport?"

Another thought: do we, in fact, ever play South Africa at sport? If the Australian team were selected only from Queenslanders or Aborigines, would that represent "Australia"? If American tennis players were chosen only from Negroes, would we ever play "America" at tennis? No. And so, as South African teams are chosen only from their White minority, we never do ever play South Africa.

So a South African rugby, cricket or lifesaving team made up only of Whites is actually masquerading as a national team. Which means that such teams are unrepresentative of their country (Widen and agree, please note). Sportsmen who agree to play against Whites-only teams are making it easier for themselves to win, for the best players are probably missing (because of their skin colour) from the South African team. Is that what we mean by "sportsmanship"?

Plausible Excuses

But there are plenty of plausible excuses ready to hand, even though most of them first saw the light of day in South Africa, and all of them present the White man's viewpoint only. Most of these excuses are based on the argument that apartheid is only "apartness" or segregation, and that this is not really racial discrimination but "separate development". In fact, one new argument is that South Africa might be persuaded to send a White team and a Black team to play rugby in Australia next year — provided Australia promises not to mix the two together.

This and every other kind of plausible argument and excuse

flourish on African education (\$16% million) since 1953, despite rising costs and growing numbers of children — so per capita expenditure on Africans is actually declining. This has been managed by introducing two or even three shifts a day, by reducing the quality of school facilities, and by employing unqualified teachers.

The ultimate reward available to Africans — a degree from a "Bantu tribal college" — is quite worthless by any international standard.

The Homelands Fraud

South African propaganda trumpets the success of "separate development" in the "Bantu homelands" — eight tribal states "larger than England and Wales" (or alternatively "as big as Switzerland"). One "homeland", the Transkei, is purported to be self-governing with its own Prime Minister, parliament, flag and anthem. The others we are told, will soon follow.

In fact, only 13.7% of South Africa's land has been set aside as "homelands" for 67% of her people. The Transkei alone makes geographic sense: the others are absurdly fragmented (the proposed "Zulu homeland" consists of over 200 tiny pieces of ground widely dispersed). The "homelands" are 26% of the Transkei is even worse, and the situation in the other "homelands" is true erosion.

Eventually the whole African population will be retributed and "repatrimented" to their appropriate "homelands" — which the majority have never even seen before.

The whole policy of "separate development" has two cardinal aspects.

Firstly, the "homelands" will function as huge labour reservoirs. African men, suitably controlled by pass laws, will

for South Africa's racial policies in sport, and for continuing to play Whites-only or segregated South African teams, rests largely on the shrewd manipulation of language — on the pretence that South African apartheid is really only segregation, and that separate development is somehow fair and equal. What we need to do is to redefine our terms — to find a word which describes South Africa's race policies (at least in sport) as they really are. Then we will see what is behind the camouflage of that often deceptive phrase "apartheid in sport".

There is in the Concise Oxford Dictionary a word which is much closer to the South African reality of job reservation, spectator exclusion, curfews for non-Whites and so on than is "apartheid". The word is defined as:

"Punish, coerce (person, class, nation) by systematic refusal of social or commercial relations"

We only have to look at the fact that nearly every South African sportsman is White — in a country where only 18% of the population is White — to see that there is indeed a "systematic refusal of social relations" to a class of people: all non-White South Africans.

So we now have a better word for apartheid: "boycott". It is very accurate. (If you don't think so, try getting a Black South African into any of the cinemas, restaurants, theatres, sports centres or hotels in any but the worst parts of any South African city.) Using the word "boycott" certain truths are now apparent.

The Hostage Theory

We are frequently told by apologists for White South Africa that we must not boycott that country in sport (they mean we



commute on long-term contracts from their "homelands" to their jobs in the "White areas", White-owned "border industries" have been established near the "homelands" to make this process more efficient. Wives and children, plus Africans who are of no use to the White economy, will somehow subsist in the "homelands".

Secondly, Africans must abandon their claim to citizenship and a share in South Africa as a whole, and resign themselves to an unpromising future either in the miserable "homelands" or as "temporary labour" in the cities.

The so-called parliament in the Transkei is nothing but a



Underpaid and exploited, these Black mineworkers are the backbone of South Africa's economy.

— John Laurence (author of *The Seeds of Disaster*, a guide to South African realities, race policies and racial propaganda — some of which he helped to write in South Africa)

mustn't boycott the 18% White minority). But the boot is on the other foot. By playing Whites-only South African teams, we have (as will be shown later) actually been aiding and abetting the White South Africans' sports boycott of the 82% of non-White South Africans. We have not only been collaborating with racism, we have taken part in the longest and most malicious boycott in the history of sport.

(Malicious it is. In 1969 the Foreign Editor of the London Times was told in South Africa that any movement towards giving non-White South Africans their rightful chance in sport would be hindered if Britain "applied the heat" over Basil D'Oliviera. Further proof — it was needed — that 18% of South Africans are using the 82% majority as hostages in sport — and perhaps other things too.)

This hostage principle has itself been misrepresented, both by South Africans and misguided Australians. Their argument is that determined action against South Africa never works. We must instead continue to play sport against White South African teams, as our liberal White ideals will then rub off on them, and that will be the end of their racial boycott in sport. Or, in other words, the only way to help the oppressed is to reward the oppressor and invite him home to play games with you.

Appeasement Doesn't Work

People who believe this sort of thing either know nothing of South Africa's history in sport, or refuse to look at it. For the only occasions on which we have been able to help South Africa's non-White majority have been when we stood up to

piece of window-dressing to impress gullible people outside the Republic. The majority of its members are Government-paid chiefs, who are appointed by Pretoria and who will be deposed by Pretoria the minute they forget their lines. It cannot legislate on matters of importance, and even on minor matters its legislation must be approved by the White Government in Pretoria. As the Minister of the Interior (Senator de Klerk) admitted in 1966:

"The South African Government has not yet granted the Transkei a single essential right enjoyed by a sovereign independent state. . . It has merely been given control over domestic matters, and every single department of the Transkei Government has a White official to give it leadership and guidance".

The people of the Transkei have shown what they think of their pantomime parliament. Constant unrest has kept the Transkei under a State of Emergency since 1960, and visitors may not leave the main roads without a permit. (According to Government tourist literature, this is because "the Bantu jealously guard their right to privacy".)

Whites-Only Republic

The Government has failed miserably to interest the non-White people of South Africa in the Republic anniversary celebrations, even its own stooges. For example, the puppet "Urban Bantu Council" in the African area of Johannesburg turned down a Government offer of \$625 to celebrate the anniversary. Mr. David Thebalian, one of the Council members, recalled that non-Whites had not been consulted in the 1960 referendum on the establishment of the Republic. He asked "What is there to celebrate in the Republic if you are an African?"

PROTEST!

During the next few months there will be protests and demonstrations across the nation against South Africa's racist policies and against the visit of all-White South African sporting teams. Below is a rough guide to the times and dates of these protests, together with other events of interest. South Africa's lily-white livesavers are still in Australia at the time of going to press, so the details of the end of their tour have been included.

the Whites and demanded that they suspend or ease their boycott. Here are the facts that prove it:

For decades, we pleaded with South Africa to give her non-Whites a chance in the Olympics. We were cold-shouldered. In 1964 South Africa was thrown out. In 1968 non-Whites were suddenly admitted to her team.

For half a century New Zealand asked South Africa to accept Maoris in the All Blacks rugby team. South Africa refused. New Zealand called the 1967 tour off. In 1968 South Africa agreed to accept Maoris.

In 1969 White officials refused to admit non-White spectators to the Whites-only South African Games. It became known that this might cost South Africa her place in the 1972 Olympics. Non-White spectators were suddenly admitted.

In 1969 Iran suggested to South Africa that unless the Iranian Davis Cup team was allowed to play in South Africa, a big oil deal might have to be re-examined. The Group Areas Act was promptly broken so that the Iranians could enter and play.

In 1969 The International Lawn Tennis Federation was considering a Swedish motion to ban South Africa from world tennis. South Africa suddenly promised to admit non-Whites to her Davis Cup team when they reached a "high enough" standard.

The other side of the coin is equally consistent. A non-White South African golfer was so good that he even beat Gary Player. White golfers refused to stand by him when the Government banned him from tournament after tournament (Gary Player actually wrote to the Johannesburg "Sunday Times" saying that all South African citizens should obey their country's laws). The golfers of the world looked the other way. Who today remembers Papwa Sewgolom, the South African non-White who might, unboycotted, have been better than Gary Player?

The facts are very consistent and the story they tell is this:

The overriding consideration in South African sports is the self-interest of the Whites. They have for years reserved nearly all the overseas tours for themselves, and hope to continue to do so. But, if other nations put their foot down, then not even the Whites could play international sport. So they allow a very few non-Whites in — for the benefit of the Whites. (The situation when other nations don't put their foot down has been

New South Wales

March:

Fri. 19th & Sat. 20th:

Sun. 21st:

Tue. 23rd:

Wed. 24th:

Fri. 26th:

Sat. 27th:

June:

Sat. 26th:

Sharville Activities
All-night vigil at South African Airways, Elizabeth st, and Town Hall — guerilla theatre and mock massacre.
Sharville Day rally, Central Methodist Mission, 210 Pitt St, Sydney (2 p.m.)
Protest at South African surfers' arrival at airport, 4.30 p.m.
Demonstration against livesavers at Hotel Manly (5 p.m.), then to Dee Why Surf Club for Warrangah Shire Council's \$600 Civic Reception (6 p.m.)
City demonstration at Prince Alfred Park, then to placard vigil at Surf House, Buckingham St. (4 p.m.) Possible march from Sydney Uni.
Demonstration at surfing "third test" at Coogee Beach (venue of test still unconfirmed)
South Africa Freedom Day activities. Details to be announced. (The itinerary for the visit of Peter Hain, chairman of the British 'Stop the Seventy Tour' Committee, has yet to be fixed — it will be in early July. The following details of protests at the rugby matches are a skeleton programme only; there will also be demonstrations at the airport, hotels, etc.)

July:

Tue. 6th:

Sat. 10th:

Sat. 17th:

August:

Sat. 7th:

Victoria

March:

Wed. 17th:

Fri. 19th:

Sat. 20th:

Sun. 21st:

May:

Mon. 31st:

June:

Sat. 26th:

Sat. 3rd:

Queensland

March:

Wed. 17th:

Sun. 21st:

June:

Sat. 26th:

July:

Sat. 24th:

Tue. 27th:

Sat. 31st:

Australian Capital Territory

March:

Sun. 21st:

June:

Sat. 26th:

July:

Wed. 21st:

South Australia

March:

Sun. 21st:

June:

Sat. 26th:

Western Australia

March:

Sun. 21st:

June:

Sat. 26th:

Tasmania

(Details to be announced)

YOU can help to fight apartheid. Join these protests. Get your club, social group, etc. to organize meetings and activities in support of the anti-apartheid movement. Get an anti-apartheid group going at your campus to put out leaflets, organize meetings, demonstrations etc. Talk to your friends about it and get them interested. Get moving!



New Zealand protest against All Blacks tour.

graphically described by a Black South African as: "Every time you are generous to a White South African you are mean to four non-White South Africans.")

It comes down to this: Appease White South Africa, and racial discrimination there increases. Boycott the minority to help lift the boycott on the majority, and non-Whites begin to get a chance. So boycotts of South Africa — possible if you like — are the only way to help non-White South Africans. The history of sport proves it.

But there are those among us who will no doubt continue to swallow White South Africa's arguments.

For instance, in 1969 a South African official told a group of British MPs that Basil D'Oliviera was not rejected by South Africa "because of his colour as such". (So if he were White, South Africa would still have rejected him as a member of an MCC team? Some people actually believe this sort of thing.)

"We have no reason to suppose that South Africa's White sportsmen support apartheid" is another ploy. So why do they consistently elite people to their sporting bodies who never — but never — criticize their Government's political interference in sport? They criticize their Government about the lack of television straight enough, however.)

Sport and Politics

"I'm not interested in politics — I'm a sportsman," is the favourite excuse of Australian sportsmen who refuse to face the real issue. But it is South African politics that are involved, and they are a matter of human rights, and even of life and death. So such sportsmen are really saying "I'm not interested in human rights or matters of life and death — I'm a sportsman".

There are a couple of analogies which expose our hypocrisy. For instance — what if South Africans excluded non-Blacks but Jews from their teams? If we played Aryans-only South African teams, then we'd be anti-semitic. If we didn't then we'd be saying there's a real moral difference between anti-semitism and anti-colourism. But in that case — what if it?

Another analogy. If they had apartheid in Northern Ireland, would we play their Protestants-only teams? And would that serve the cause of religious peace there — or here? Yet religious discrimination is not as bad as racial discrimination. One can change or hide one's religion.

And another. If it were a Black minority holding down a White majority in South Africa, would the politicians, sportsmen and sports writers who now insist that we should play Blacks-only teams? (Well — would they?)

On the South African side, there is little doubt that the

specious arguments will continue as before. Proof that many of these arguments are based on double standards has been given by the South African Prime Minister himself. For instance, early in 1968 he bluntly told the International Olympic Committee that he would allow no mixed trials in South Africa, and none in any other country either. But a few months later he attacked Britain with the statement: "Guests don't make the rules, they obey them". So one hopes that one day South Africa will obey our rules, which bar segregated teams.

Rationalizing Racism

One hopes too that we will make plain our dislike of the way that certain White sports administrators in South Africa apparently look on non-Whites as a different kind of life-form. For instance, a South African Olympics official, explaining why Africans were excluded from swimming teams there, stated last year:

"Some sports the African is not suited for. In swimming the water closes their pores and they cannot get rid of certain carbon-dioxide, so they tire quickly".

But a very different reason was given in the same period by a White South African sports writer who cabled to a London newspaper:

"Non-Whites take very little interest in swimming, water polo, and equestrian events, and as such have no candidates in these fields".

Is it not strange that the non-Whites themselves are never allowed to give their version of why they are excluded?

Perhaps not — for some of us at least can remember hearing exactly the same kind of thing before, at the Berlin Olympics in 1936. "The sole reason", explained Ritter von Hall, the well-known Nazi sports leader, "for Jews having failed to qualify for the Games was always the fact that no Jew was able to qualify by his ability for participation in the Olympic team... 'Heil Hitler!'"

Perhaps the excuse was that the Jews had por toe trouble too. But we have no excuse. We are making the same mistake now — and putting forward the same weak and self-centred arguments in our defence — that we did a third of a century ago. And then, as now, they were mistakes that innocent people in other countries suffered for, in one way or another. Will we never learn the simple truth that a compromise with racialism always turns out to be a victory for racism?