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A window open on the world

Southern Africa at grips with racism
An outstanding example of Paleolithic art, this bison's head was incised in the clay floor of a cave at Niaux, southwestern France, in the 11th millennium of the pre-Christian era. The artist used tiny natural cavities formed in the clay by dripping water to indicate the animal's eye as well as ritual wounds in its body.
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In three countries of southern Africa today—South Africa, Namibia (formerly known as South West Africa) and Rhodesia (Zimbabwe)—the non-whites who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population are deprived of the most fundamental human rights. This issue focuses on the crisis in southern Africa and the efforts being made by the African peoples and the international community to put an end to racist oppression.
Apartheid represents today the vilest form of modern slavery. Unesco's patient but tenacious and vigorous action ties in with the struggle of the South African blacks themselves, who have shown that with the courage of revolt they have discarded fear and regained hope. If the international community is to remain true to itself, it must mobilize and act firmly in order not to disappoint that hope.

Unesco's position is based primarily on a detailed analysis of the effects of apartheid on education, on culture and on information. What is involved is not just isolated occurrences. Apartheid is a whole, a system, and this system is not the result of chance, it cannot be improved with a little tinkering here and there. It is, like Nazism, the coherent ideology of a racist state which, though it first hits the numerically largest black community, also affects the coloureds, the Asians and the whites themselves. Nobody escapes this master-slave dialectic.

This ideology finds expression in every institution of the Republic. It permeates the educational system at all levels, it is taught in the schools, it is imposed on creative artists and it controls information within South Africa and seeks to control it in other countries as well.

Unesco has repeatedly proclaimed that it is totally and radically opposed to this system. The "respect for... human rights... without distinction of race, sex, language or religion" stipulated in Article I of Unesco's Constitution would lose all meaning if such an ideology were to be tolerated.

Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow
Director-General of Unesco

From an address given at the opening of the World Conference for Action against Apartheid, held in Lagos, Nigeria, 22-26 August 1977
Human Rights Day is celebrated each year on 10 December, for it was on 10 December 1948 that the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. (See page 30 for full text of the Universal Declaration.) To coincide with the 30th anniversary of the Declaration, the United Nations is preparing to proclaim 1978 "International Anti-Apartheid Year". On the eve of this International Year, the Unesco Courier has devoted this special issue to an exposé of the intolerable conditions in which the African peoples of southern Africa are obliged to live under a system of racial discrimination enforced by law and daily practice.

The U.N.'s world campaign against apartheid

by
Enuga S. Reddy

Of all the crises in the world today, the growing conflict between the minority régimes and the liberation movements in southern Africa is of most direct and urgent concern to the United Nations. At stake are the purposes and principles of the U.N. and the imperative need to eliminate colonialism and racial discrimination, which are major sources of international tension and conflict.

The African people in Rhodesia, South Africa and Namibia patiently tried for decades, by peaceful and non-violent means, to obtain their legitimate rights. But the authorities consistently rejected peaceful change to full equality, and met the African demands with increasingly ruthless measures of repression. The African political movements were obliged to abandon non-violence and organize underground activity, sabotage and armed struggle.

Rhodesia is now the scene of an armed conflict between the illegal régime and the liberation forces in which, according to official accounts, over 5,000 people have been killed.

Encounters between the South African forces and the freedom fighters of the Namibian liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), have become a frequent occurrence.

In South Africa, many hundreds of Africans have been killed and thousands wounded since the killings of African schoolchildren demonstrating against racial discrimination in Soweto in June 1976. The violence has been entirely by the police, but the beginnings of armed resistance by the black people have appeared.

ENUGA S. REDDY of India is Director of the United Nations Centre against Apartheid, and also heads the U.N. Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa and the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa. He was Executive Secretary of the World Conference for Action against Apartheid held at Lagos (Nigeria) in August 1977.
These conflicts have spilled beyond national boundaries. South African and Rhodesian forces repeatedly committed acts of aggression against Angola, Mozambique and Zambia in pursuit of freedom fighters and to intimidate the neighbouring African states which support them. In 1946 the United Nations was seized with the problem of racial discrimination in South Africa and with South Africa’s moves to annex Namibia. Since then, U.N. action on southern Africa has evolved from mere appeals to attempts to apply sanctions and other forms of pressure, and finally to wide-ranging programmes of international action at governmental and non-governmental levels.

Until 1960, the United Nations annually appealed to the South African government to end racial discrimination in the hope that it could be persuaded by world opinion. These appeals failed, but the United Nations debates were not without value. They resulted in the gradual acceptance by all Member States of the competence of the U.N. to consider the situation in South Africa. In greater world awareness of the aspirations of the black people of that country and in the moral isolation of the South African government.

The discussions on Namibia—reinforced by advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice affirming the international status of the territory and the accountability of the South African government for its administration—helped prevent an annexation of that territory. The Namibian people were enabled, despite strenuous South African objections, to approach the international community through petitions to United Nations organs and hearings before them.

By 1960, the rapid advance of decolonization in Africa and the entry of newly-independent African states into the United Nations drew greater world attention to southern Africa.

The South African government, determined to resist the “winds of change” sweeping the continent, stepped up repression against the growing movement for freedom in South Africa and Namibia. On 10 December 1959, Human Rights Day, the South African police opened fire on a crowd of Africans in Windhoek, peacefully demonstrating against a forcible move to a segregated location, killing 11 and wounding 44.

On 21 March 1960, in Sharpeville, South Africa, police shot indiscriminately at a peaceful demonstration against racist “pass laws”, killing 68 and wounding over 200. These tragic events heightened world concern over the situation, especially in Western countries which had earlier resisted strong condemnations.

On 1 April 1960, the Security Council considered the situation in South Africa for the first time, and called on the South African government to abandon apartheid and racial discrimination. In December of that year, the General Assembly adopted the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, solemnly proclaiming the need to bring colonialism in all forms to a speedy and unconditional end.

As the South African government continued to defy United Nations resolutions, the African states, supported by Asian, Socialist and other states, pressed for economic and other sanctions against South Africa.

They felt that South Africa would pay little attention to United Nations resolutions so long as it was able to count on continued political, economic and other relations with the Western countries and its other major trading partners. The latter resisted sanctions, arguing that they were neither feasible nor appropriate, and that they could not achieve the desired results. United Nations deliberations began to reflect a consensus on the objectives but sharp differences on the means of promoting them.

On 6 November 1962, the General Assembly adopted a resolution requesting Member States to break off diplomatic and economic relations with South Africa, and to refrain from supplying arms and ammunition to that country. This resolution was opposed by the main trading partners of South Africa, and many other states abstained. The Security Council decided in 1963-1964 to recommend an arms embargo against South Africa but could not agree on mandatory sanctions.

In 1966, the United Nations General Assembly decided by an overwhelming vote to terminate South Africa’s mandate over Namibia and declared that the territory was henceforth under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. (See article page 16.) Following South Africa’s refusal to withdraw from the territory, the General Assembly and the Security Council recommended a number of measures to secure its compliance but again there was no agreement on mandatory decisions.

Meanwhile, the United Nations became increasingly concerned with the situation in Southern Rhodesia as the minority régime in that territory attempted to obtain independence without granting equal rights to the African population.

After that régime made a unilateral and illegal declaration of independence in 1965, and on the proposal of the administering powers—the United Kingdom, the Security Council imposed mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The effectiveness of these sanctions was, however, limited by the fact that South Africa (and Portugal until the independence of Mozambique in 1975) enabled the Rhodesians to circumvent the sanctions.

Most nations of the world have broken, or refrained from establishing, diplomatic relations with South Africa, but 21 countries, including the main trading partners of South Africa, maintain diplomatic representatives in Pretoria. All countries have recognized the illegality of South African administration over Namibia and almost all have terminated official relations with it. No country, except South Africa, maintains diplomatic relations with the illegal régime in Rhodesia.

But in the economic field, the results have been particularly disappointing. Though many countries complied with U.N. resolutions, some at considerable sacrifice, South Africa was able to increase its economic relations with its main trading partners.

Even more alarming was the military build-up by South Africa, despite the arms embargo. While most governments prohibited the supply of arms and military equipment to South Africa, a few arms exporting countries delayed action or followed non-aggressive interpretations of the United Nations resolutions. Some recommended. South Africa increased its military budget from $168 million in 1962-63 to $1,900 million in 1977-78. It acquired an enormous amount of sophisticated military equipment, and developed local manufacture of arms and ammunition.

While continuing to press the powers concerned to disen¬gage from the minority régimes, the United Nations organs began to push for greater action in directions where there was broader agreement. Particular emphasis was placed on assistance to the oppressed people of southern Africa and their liberation movements, on dissemination of information on the situation in southern Africa and on encouragement of action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to reinforce United Nations efforts.

Two important world conferences were held in 1977 with impressive participation of governments, liberation movements and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations: the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique, from 16 to 21 May; and the World Conference for Action against Apartheid, held in Lagos, Nigeria, from 22 to 26 August.

The United Nations has recognized the legitimacy of the struggles of the national liberation movements for freedom, and has granted them observer status in its deliberations on southern African problems. It has encouraged the specialized agencies and other intergovernmental organizations—as well as churches, trade unions, anti-apartheid and solidarity movements and other non-governmental organizations—to take all appropriate action,
each within its mandate, to isolate the minority régimes and assist the struggles for freedom.

In 1967, it established the office of the Commissioner for Namibia to help execute the decisions of the Council for Namibia, administer assistance to the Namibian people and mobilize public support to press for South Africa's withdrawal.

It also established a Centre against Apartheid, to help the Special Committee against Apartheid develop an international campaign, to expand information activity and to administer humanitarian and educational assistance to the victims of apartheid.

As a result of persistent efforts by the United Nations and other organizations, as well as by African and other Member States, the minority régimes are increasingly isolated. The specialized agencies of the U.N. and other intergovernmental organizations have all excluded Southern Rhodesia, and have refused to recognize the South African administration in Namibia. Many of them have accepted the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal authority for Namibia. They have exerted their influence to dissuade transnational corporations from collaborating with South Africa and from practising racial discrimination in their operations in southern Africa. The campaign to boycott racially-selected sports teams from South Africa has involved hundreds of thousands of sportsmen and sports enthusiasts in many countries, and has brought home to the white communities in southern Africa the extent of worldwide abhorrence of racial discrimination.

Several Western countries and other main trading partners of South Africa have taken further steps, however cautious and moderate, towards the implementation of U.N. resolutions. France, for example, announced in 1977 that it was halting supplies of military equipment to South Africa, and the Federal Republic of Germany has decided to close its consulate in Namibia. Scandinavian and other states have taken steps to stop new investments in South Africa.

The United Nations and related agencies undertook humanitarian and educational assistance to the victims of colonialism and apartheid in the early 1960s when repression greatly increased and sizeable numbers of refugees began to come out of southern Africa. In subsequent years, they established and encouraged programmes of direct assistance to the liberation movements, including help in preparing cadres for the future development of these countries. The United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa—established in 1965 to assist political prisoners and their families in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia—has received over $5 million in voluntary contributions.

The United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, also financed by voluntary contributions, has received over $10 million to train inhabitants of the three territories. It now administers over 1,300 scholarships.

The Fund for Namibia, established in 1972, has received over $9 million. Part of this goes to the Namibia Institute, established in Lusaka in 1976, to train cadres for the future administration of Namibia.
A turning point in African resistance to apartheid came on 16 June 1976, in the black township of Soweto, outside Johannesburg, when 10,000 black pupils made a protest march (right) against the compulsory use of the Afrikaans language in school. The police opened fire, killing a 13-year-old boy, and sparked off months of riots and strikes around the country. In the first week alone, 176 were killed and over 1,200 wounded.

The United Nations Development Programme has allocated substantial funds for assistance to national liberation movements, to be administered by Unesco, the International Labour Organization (ILO), the World Health Organization (WHO), and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). The U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees has been assisting tens of thousands of refugees from the three territories. Unicef provides assistance to mothers and children through the national liberation movements.

Few liberation struggles in history have received greater political support and concrete assistance from the international community.

The minority régimes in southern Africa are increasingly isolated and face mounting pressure. This has resulted in some movement towards settlements in Zimbabwe and Namibia, with U.N. participation in the process of transition to independence.

But the South African government remains adamant in rejecting majority rule and so long as it and its supporters resist change, there can be no secure peace in the region. The threat of a widening conflict, perhaps even a race war, with enormous casualties and inevitable repercussions beyond the region, will remain.

The United Nations is attempting, as a matter of utmost urgency, to maximize international efforts to avert this danger. Full observance of International Anti-Apartheid Year in 1978 can make an effective contribution to this effort.

Enuga S. Reddy

The vignettes in the above text are by the Polish artist Zygmunt Gasowski © International Institute of Human Rights, Strasbourg, France

South Africa:

facts and fiction

by Leslie Rubin

Behind a barrage of propaganda, the grim truth about apartheid

SINCE 1948, when Afrikaner nationalism came to power in South Africa, the outside world has become increasingly aware of what is being done in the name of apartheid by 4.5 million whites to more than 22 million non-whites: 19 million Africans, 2.5 million coloureds, and some 800,000 Asians (1). South Africa has responded to growing international criticism by mounting a massive propaganda campaign designed to present a favourable image of its racial policies.

Government spokesmen, including the Prime Minister, make frequent use of the media. A generously-financed propaganda machine pours out information through embassies, the Information Service, and unofficial bodies like the South African Foundation, and the Committee for Fairness in Sport.

Leading European and American newspapers carry full-page advertisements asserting the contentment of all South Africa’s peoples. Illustrated publications describe the successes of apartheid. Well-trained, persuasive officials of the Information Service attend the opening of every session of the United Nations.

In 1948 the information budget was $140,000; by 1969 it had grown to $5 million. For 1976-1977 it was more than $15 million.

All this costly propaganda is intended to demonstrate that apartheid is a just and viable system. The methods used are usually sophisticated, subtle, and shrewd: but deliberate misrepresentation is common. Taken as a whole the propaganda offers a grossly deceptive picture of South Africa today.

What follows is an attempt to expose this deception by looking at some of the claims made by South African propaganda in the light of available facts.

The indigenous inhabitants of South Africa

CLAIM: South Africa persists in claiming that the white man and the African came to South Africa at about the same time. Addressing the Los Angeles World Affairs Council on 6 June 1975, the South African Minister of Information said, “The Bantu were not indigenous. They came after the Dutch and the British”. 

(1) The term “white” is used for people of European stock. The term “African” replaces the word “Bantu” which is at present used by the South African government to designate people of African stock, except in direct quotations where, if the word “Bantu” was originally used, it is retained. The term “Asian” is used for people of Chinese or Indian descent, and “coloured” for those of mixed European and African or Asian background. In this issue the use of these terms “white”, “African”, “Asian” and “coloured” has been unavoidable because of the nature of apartheid itself. However, Unesco rejects the concepts of race and ethnic group relations that such terms imply.
Three months after the first Soweto riots, black African demonstrators (right) badly jolted the white community when they dared to turn out in force in the white districts of Johannesburg. They were promptly arrested by the police. In another, more ominous police crackdown in October 1977, the government arrested or banned persons, organizations and newspapers considered till then to be moderate. Under existing Internal Security legislation, political opponents can be detained for up to 12 months at a time. In the last year, some 26 blacks have died in detention. The General Assembly of the United Nations has proclaimed 11 October the Day of Solidarity with South African political prisoners.

FACTS: Anthropological and archaeological research has established that settled African communities existed in South Africa several centuries before the first white man arrived in 1652.

An archaeological group reported in 1966 that there were settlements in what is today Johannesburg as early as 1060 A.D. “The distinguished anthropologist, Monica Wilson, writing in 1959, cited 15th-century Portuguese records proving that shipwrecked sailors had encountered settled black communities in South Africa, and added: “None of these facts is new, all have been published at one time or another, but their implications appear to have been overlooked by the myth-makers of this generation”.

In 1966, Professor Vernon McKay of the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University (U.S.A.) told a Congressional committee: “A second popular theme to divert attention from the real issues is the argument which implies that South Africa’s policy is just because ‘the white man got there first’ or, in the amended version used by South African officials today, blacks and whites arrived ‘about the same time’ or ‘more or less simultaneously’... Although the above argument is largely irrelevant, it may be worthwhile to point out that South Africa’s own scholars have proved that it is also untrue”.

Separate development

CLAIM: The South African population consists of whites, several distinct African nations, the coloureds, and the Asians. The policy of separate development is just, ensures a sound political, social and economic future for each group, and is in the interest of the country as a whole.

In May 1977, in an article published in the Los Angeles Times, the South African Secretary for Information wrote that “a plurality of democracies” was coming into being... “The homelands of black people who settled in what is today South Africa, either have been given back to them or are in the process of being handed back”. The Asian and coloured communities, through their elected representative councils already administer most of their own affairs”.

FACTS: No African, coloured or Asian has the right, either directly or through representatives, to take part in the government of South Africa.

The Bantu areas, arbitrarily reserved by the whites for exclusive African occupation, amount to 13 per cent of the total land area of South Africa; the remaining 87 per cent is reserved for exclusive white occupation.

Leo Marquard, a noted authority on South Africa, has described the Bantu areas as “poverty-stricken areas, incapable of standing up to the periodic droughts and floods of South Africa, and unable to support the existing population... They are in fact vast rural slums whose chief export is their manpower, which goes to the mines and factories and farms to earn enough money to pay taxes and support the families”.

These, comprising 10 fragmented territories allocated to 10 African “nations” are the so-called homelands of the African people.

One of them, the Transkei (population 1.9 million), was granted “independence” by South Africa in 1976, but every country in the world (except South Africa) has refused to recognize the Transkei as an independent state.

Another, Bophuthatswana, is due to become “independent” in 1977. The remaining eight have rejected “independence”... In 1976 their leaders said, “We do not want to abdicate our birthright as South Africans, as well as forfeiting our share of the economy and wealth which we have jointly built”.

The functions of the Coloured Persons Representative Council and the South African Indian Council are consultative and advisory. The coloureds and the Asians do not share power with the whites. Government plans do not envisage such power-sharing in the future.

Personal freedom, education, work, health and housing

CLAIM: In October 1975 the Information Counsellor of the South African Embassy in the United States wrote in the New York Times Magazine: “…Blacks in South Africa enjoy more personal freedom than probably elsewhere in Africa and, in fact, have a more effective political voice than in much of Africa; South African blacks have the best educational facilities on the continent of Africa; there are almost 4 million black schoolchildren in South Africa; blacks in South Africa enjoy better health services.”

FACTS: A network of laws and regulations (the notorious pass laws) severely restrict African movement, while maintaining a controlled supply of African labour for the needs of commerce and industry. All Africans whose labour is not required are removed to putative “homelands”.

Every African must carry a reference book; failure to produce it on demand by a policeman or other official is a criminal offence. Prosecutions under the pass laws for the period 1974-1975 totalled 386,000, equivalent to 988 trials for every day of the year.

Right to work: There are laws that prevent an African from doing skilled work; empower the government to reserve specified occupations exclusively for whites, and deny to Africans the generally accepted rights to strike and organize in trade unions. An African worker’s opportunity to acquire skills and efficiency is limited by the grossly inferior educational facilities available to Africans... The earnings of African workers are considerably lower than those of white workers.

Employment of Africans as shop managers is prohibited. In March 1977 a white divisional manager of a national retailer and his African shop manager both received a suspended sentence of a $ 230 fine or imprisonment for 3 months. The permanent ban on black managers was confirmed by the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development in July 1977.
The "homelands" are not alleviating African unemployment. In 1971 and 1972 barely 10,000 jobs were created annually through industrial development in the "borderlands" and "homelands". Meanwhile 60,000 persons were sent to the Bantustans each year. In 1968-1969 alone, 26,736 Africans lost their jobs in the white urban areas.

In 1973 the per capita earnings of whites in Johannesburg were $131 per month. Africans in the adjoining township of Soweto earned $19 per month.

**Health:** The health system for South African whites is one of the best in the world, whereas African medical services are characterized by inadequate hospital facilities and a serious shortage of doctors.

According to a report published in June 1977 by the U.N. Centre Against Apartheid, there is one doctor for every 400 white South Africans as against one for every 44,000 Africans. Of the 693 medical practitioners who graduated in 1975, 601 were white and 6 were African. Facilities for training African doctors have been reduced.

South Africa does not provide statistics of African infant mortality but those available for the city of Johannesburg indicate that the African rate is the highest of all ethnic groups.

In 1977 the World Health Organization reported that "Mental health services for the non-white groups, especially for the African population, are inadequate in quantity and very poor in quality... There is not a single black psychiatrist in South Africa".

**Housing:** Speaking in Parliament on 28 April 1976, opposition leader Helen Suzman said Soweto, with a population of at least 1.3 million, had an average of 14 people living in a house. She warned that Soweto and other townships were becoming "gigantic overcrowded slums".

**Education:** Almost 30 years of rigidly separated and white-controlled schools and universities have resulted in grossly inferior education for blacks, both quantitatively and qualitatively. The cause of the 1976 Soweto riots and demonstrations since then, that resulted in extensive loss of life and damage to property, was the strong resentment of this system.

In 1976 per capita expenditure on white education was $696; African, $45. The teacher-pupil ratios for that year were: white, 1 : 22; African 1 : 60. The overwhelming majority of African children stop schooling at the primary level; only 5.5 per cent are in secondary schools.

Schooling for white children is free and compulsory; for Africans it is not compulsory, and African parents have to find the money for fees, uniforms and books.

Integated education is prohibited in private schools. In 1977, two Roman Catholic schools were officially threatened with closure unless a few African and coloured children "admitted in the past few days" were removed.

In 1975, 15,467 degrees and diplomas
SOUTH AFRICA:
“SOME ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS”

WHITES
4.5 million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Land allocation</th>
<th>87 per cent</th>
<th>13 per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of national income</td>
<td>75 per cent</td>
<td>75 per cent</td>
<td>less than 20 per cent¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of average earnings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum taxable income</td>
<td>750 rands</td>
<td>360 rands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors/population ratio</td>
<td>1 for 400</td>
<td>1 for 44,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality rate</td>
<td>27 per 1,000</td>
<td>200 per 1,000 in urban areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual expenditure on education per pupil</td>
<td>$696</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil/teacher ratio</td>
<td>1 for 22</td>
<td>1 for 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BLACKS
19 million

(1) The remaining 5 per cent is divided between the coloureds and the Asians.

Facts and figures in this table are drawn from U.N. sources and from the article on these pages.

awarded at South African universities went to white students, 1,757 to Africans.

Police have assaulted, arrested, and prosecuted hundreds of students at South African universities. Student leaders, students, and school pupils have been detained under Security legislation.

Freedom of the press: The law penalizes criticism of apartheid. There is also increasing government interference with newspaper investigation and reporting, by means of harassment, threats, arrests, and detention of newspapermen, particularly African reporters describing conditions and police behaviour in African townships.

In 1976 nine journalists were detained under the Internal Security Act, many of them while they were covering the Soweto riots. In December 1976 Percy Qoboza, editor of The World, South Africa’s leading African newspaper, was detained by the police following an editorial which described Prime Minister Vorster as “sleeping through one of the country’s most dangerous times”. He was released the same day following widespread protests. In October 1977 he was again arrested and The World was closed as part of a general crackdown on the black civil rights movement, in which some 70 leaders were arrested.

In 1977 Winnie Mandela, wife of the imprisoned African leader Nelson Mandela, was banished from Soweto. The Security Police officer in charge of a
force of 20 policemen carrying out the removal from her home, told reporters present that if they took photographs they would be detained for 14 days.

The family
CLAIM: The pass laws, which deny Africans the right of permanent residence in a South African urban area, are justified by the government on the grounds that they do have such a right in their "homelands".
FACTS: More than half the total African population—about 8 million—live in the towns of white South Africa, and their number has increased steadily since 1970. The pass laws continue daily to disrupt and undermine the family life of these millions. One of these laws, the Urban Areas Act, makes it a criminal offence for an African woman to live with her husband for more than 72 hours if she has not received a permit from a white official to do so.

Sport
CLAIM: A full-page advertisement in an American newspaper in 1977, with photographs of black and white competitors, claims: "...our teams are selected on merit and merit only... South Africa has been barred from the Olympics and many other international sport organizations on the pretext that it practices discrimination in sport..."
FACTS: On 23 September 1976 Dr. P.H.J. Koornhof, Minister of Sport and Recreation, announcing the government sport policy, declared that "white, coloured, Indian, and black sportsmen and women should all belong to their own clubs. Each should control, arrange, and manage its own sporting fixtures." The government approved of consultation between "the different race groups wherever possible, practical, and desirable", and of competition between teams "from different racial groups...by mutual agreement in consultation with the Minister".
In October 1976 Dr. Koornhof said that a rugby match played between a white and a black team was contrary to sports policy, which did not provide for mixed teams. In July 1977 the Minister rejected a formula providing for multiracial play which had been adopted by all four national rugby bodies—white, African, Asian and coloured. (See also page 26).

The rule of law
CLAIM: South Africa proclaims its adherence to the rule of law, pointing to the fact that apartheid is applied in terms of laws which are passed by Parliament and interpreted by an independent judiciary.
FACTS: The blacks have no say whatsoever in the making or the application of the law. As Nelson Mandela put it, "The white man makes all the laws, he drags us before his courts and accuses us, and he sits in judgement over us."
To curb black opposition to apartheid, South Africa has created a draconian police state apparatus. Since 1950, 60 laws relating to "internal security" have been enacted. These laws grant to Cabinet Ministers, policemen, and other officials, widespread powers of arrest, detention (often incommunicado), house arrest, search of person and property, interrogation, banning, and banishment, without right of recourse to a court of law.

During the past 17 years thousands of men and women have been deprived of...
freedom under these laws. The Christian Institute of South Africa estimates—the government does not provide information—that several hundred are in detention at the present time. From April 1976 to August 1977, 19 persons died while in detention. The police claimed they were all suicides. Urged repeatedly to appoint a judicial commission to enquire into police behaviour, Prime Minister Vorster has refused to do so.

The future of apartheid

CLAIM: Roelof Botha, South African Representative at the United Nations, said on 18 October 1974: "...My Government does not condone discrimination purely on grounds of race or colour. Discrimination based solely on the colour of a man’s skin cannot be defended. And we shall do everything in our power to move away from discrimination based on race or colour."

FACTS: Since 1974 blacks have been permitted access, formerly denied to them, to some of the country’s public amenities. But the changes that have taken place are minimal and peripheral. They leave the essential structure of apartheid unaltered.

On 10 March 1977, Prime Minister Vorster told the South African Parliament that his party "did not and never would support power-sharing" with the blacks.

In June 1977, United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim said that the past 17 years had "seen racism progressively institutionalized in every aspect of South African society."

Leslie Rubin

In South Africa, access to education, vocational training and jobs are determined by the racial group to which a person belongs: apartheid affects every aspect of economic life.

Millions of Africans live permanently in "white areas", where they are deprived of the most fundamental rights and are reduced to the status of foreigners within their own country.

And yet the rapidly expanding South African economy is becoming increasingly dependent on African labour, and the number of Africans in the white areas is mounting steadily. Such a growing interdependence between blacks and whites in economic activities could lead to a form of racial integration. To stop this from happening, the South African government has built as many barriers as possible between the races.

The working conditions of the Africans have been denounced many times. Each year the International Labour Organization (ILO) carries out a survey of developments in the labour situation in South Africa. An ILO study published in May 1977 draws attention to the many ways in which black African workers are deprived of their freedom and of any hope of improving their conditions. A Nationalist Party Member of Parliament stated the official position in unequivocal terms: "...The Bantu labourer is supplying a commodity to us... it is labour we are importing and not labourers as individuals."

No African may remain in a white area for more than 72 hours without permission, unless he qualifies to be there because he has lived or worked there over a long period. He may be granted a permit to stay in the area to look for work, but the permit will stipulate the class of work he may accept and the length of time he may work in the area.

All male Africans over the age of 15 who are either unemployed or not lawfully employed must register with a labour bureau, and, as a general rule, employers can only hire Africans registered at these bureaux. Every African aged 16 or over must be in possession of a reference book containing a record of his work contracts and when they ended.

In practice, the Africans have no freedom to choose their employment, since they can only accept work to which they have been directed by a labour bureau and cannot freely change jobs. An African who refuses on three consecutive occasions to accept a job offered him by a labour bureau may be defined as "idle". Such "idle per-

Throughout southern Africa black workers are poor in the midst of plenty. Whites monopolize skilled trades and professions, while blacks who form the mainstay of the economy are subject to restrictive legislation. African trade unions are not recognized by South African law and black strikers are dismissed and often fined and imprisoned.

This article is based on information drawn from "The ILO and Apartheid", a study published by the International Labour Organization, Geneva, May 1977.
sons" may be sent back to their home area, placed in a work colony or a rehabilitation centre, or, subject to their agreement, be ordered to take up employment with an employer for an officially approved period.

An African worker can only be accompanied by his wife if she is entitled to reside in the same area as her husband. Otherwise, she cannot visit her husband for more than 72 hours at a time, and if she fails to report her arrival or overstays the authorized period, may be summarily deported from the area.

Another prominent feature of the South African labour system is the "colour bar" whereby skilled occupations are reserved for whites. This is backed up by a battery of laws. Under the Industrial Conciliation Act, the Minister of Labour can prohibit the replacement of white employees by persons of another race, or reserve certain jobs or classes of work wholly or partly to persons of a specified race. Up to the end of 1975, 26 of these "job reservations" had been proclaimed. Special measures have been taken to "protect" work in the mines, the building trades, public transport and nursing.

Legislation has become even stricter since 1970. The Minister of Bantu Administration has announced his intention of prohibiting the employment of Africans in a number of occupations (including those of shop assistant, receptionist, typist, clerk and cashier) except in African townships and areas.

There is also a traditional colour bar preventing non-whites from carrying out work above a certain level of skill or responsibility.

The question of the colour bar in education is closely interwoven with that in employment. In this respect, non-whites in South Africa are handicapped from birth, since their racial category determines the educational system they will find themselves in. The same is true of vocational training.

Africans do have some opportunities to acquire technical and professional training, but these are almost exclusively in the Bantu territories. In practice, states the ILO report, it is "almost impossible for significant numbers of Africans to qualify for admission to apprenticeship and advanced training".

African salaries and working conditions are determined by a board of government-appointed white officials.

There is a wide gap between the earnings of Africans and those of whites. In mining, the average monthly wage is 79 rands for Africans and 590 rands for whites. (The rand is worth about U.S. $1.15). It is a fact that in mining African workers get free board and lodging, but in the manufacturing industries, where they do not, the disparity is still enormous: R 117 on average for Africans, R 550 for whites. According to unofficial surveys, the average monthly income of African households is still much lower than the minimum subsistence level. In almost all sectors of the economy, the wage-gap between whites and blacks is still growing.

The Industrial Conciliation Act grants legal existence to registered trade unions, but expressly excludes Africans from its definition of what constitutes an "employee". And so the Africans cannot belong to registered trade unions. Of course, they are not prohibited from forming their own unions, but such legally unrecognized bodies enjoy no legal protection for their activities, and can play no effective part in industrial relations.

It comes as no surprise, then, that the right to strike is strictly curtailed for Africans in a way which does not apply to other workers. The Bantu Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act provides penalties of up to three years' imprisonment for Africans who go on strike. Furthermore, since African trade unions do not enjoy legal recognition, they are not exempted from repressive legislation. Strikers run the risk of harsh penalties, including the death penalty.

Strikes still take place: there were 169 between January 1975 and June 1976. In many cases they were followed by waves of arrests and other police action. And yet African unions continue to exist and to grow.
Namibia moves towards independence

by Sean MacBride

Very few now can have any doubts as to the future of Namibia. It will acquire full independence in the near future; it is now only a question of when and how. But before dealing with this aspect let us look at Namibia.

In order to place Namibia geographically and historically for those who are not Africanists, let me briefly summarize: Namibia is one of the larger African countries, with an area of some 820,000 square km.—about the size of Texas and Florida combined or, in an international context, the size of Germany and France.

It lies along the South Atlantic Coast of Africa, which lies to the south. Namibia, the territory between Namibia and South Africa, as Namibia was formerly called South West Africa, became an Imperial German colony in 1884. This occurred at the great "Colonial carve up" which took place at the Berlin Conference of 1884, when the European colonial powers divided Africa among them.

The German Empire then conquered the area most ruthlessly and colonized it. It became German South West Africa. It was ruled with an iron hand; entire population groups including women and children were exterminated. The surviving African population became virtual slaves. German culture and the German language were implanted.

During World War I British and South African forces successfully invaded and took over the entire territory. The territory became a League of Nations mandate at the end of World War I. When World War II ended, South Africa alone among the former mandatory powers refused either to free its mandated territory or to place it under the United Nations trusteeship system.

South Africa also refused to recognize the right of the U.N. to supervise its administration of the territory. Unable to resolve this issue by negotiation or by decision of the International Court, the General Assembly finally revoked South Africa’s mandate in 1966 and established the Council for Namibia to administer the territory until independence.

Let us now look in more detail at the historical development of international legal responsibility for Namibia before analyzing the current situation.

Apart from gradual outlawing of slavery and the slave trade, international protection for people under colonial rule scarcely existed in the 19th century. They were regarded as "outside the law". Indeed, the main responsibility for them seems to have been to ensure their orderly and effective subjection to colonial rule.

Thus South West Africa, as Namibia was then called, was brought under the "protection" of the Imperial German Reich in accordance with the rules issuing from the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885, which was called to legitimize the division of Africa and to prevent the European powers from going to war with each other over the spoils.

The first expression of general international legal responsibility for colonial peoples came with the creation of the mandate system at the end of World War I—and even that had to be forced on the victorious allies by President Wilson. Under Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the former German protectorate of South West Africa was placed under South African administration as "a sacred trust of civilization".

The mandate agreement granted the mandatory “full power of administration and legislation over the territory... as an integral part of the Union...” and directed it to "promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory.""

In the years between the two World Wars, the League Council, aided by the Permanent Mandates Commission, exercised limited supervision over South African administration of its mandate. It forced South Africa to modify a number of lightly veiled attempts to claim outright sovereignty over the territory; but it could only censure the Union for sending its air force to bomb Bondelswarts women and children when the men of that small Nama community rose up with ancient hand weapons against the government.

After World War II, the Union sought United Nations approval for the annexation of Namibia. The Organization exercised its responsibility by refusing to agree to the annexation and by urging South Africa to place the Territory under trusteeship.

South Africa in turn refused. Claiming that the mandate had terminated with the demise of the League, the Union govern-
South Africa's illegal occupation of a neighbouring territory must inevitably come to an end.

In defiance of the United Nations, South Africa continues to administer Namibia (the name given by the U.N. to the former territory of South West Africa) and has introduced apartheid laws there. Thousands of Africans have been forcibly removed to "homelands" in those parts of the country most devoid of wealth and resources. Thus many Namibians seek contract jobs outside these "reserves". These migrant workers are often wretchedly housed in compounds and spend up to two years apart from their families. Left, a migrant worker returns to his home village.
ment quit reporting to the General Assembly on its administration of the Territory and began to impose its apartheid system there.

In response to requests of the General Assembly for guidance on issues raised by South Africa, the International Court of Justice advised the Assembly, inter alia, that the mandate still existed, that the Assembly should supervise its administration, and that South Africa could not alter the international status of the Territory without United Nations approval.

The Assembly was, however, unable to translate the Court’s advice into effective action. So, in 1960, Ethiopia and Liberia brought a contentious proceeding—i.e., one in which the judgement binds the parties—against South Africa, charging the Union in substance with maladministration of the Territory.

However, in somewhat dubious circumstances, six years later the Court held that the complainants had no standing to bring the proceedings and thus avoided ruling on the merits of the case.

Unable to persuade South Africa, by either negotiations or judicial proceedings, to live up to its mandate obligations, the General Assembly thereupon took an historic action: it revoked the mandate and made itself responsible for administering the Territory until independence.

Subsequently, it established the Council for Namibia, composed at present of 25 Member States, to act on its behalf. The name of South West Africa was changed to Namibia by General Assembly resolution 2372 (XXII) (of 1968), and the name of the Council for South West Africa, as it was originally called, was correspondingly changed to Council for Namibia.

South Africa, however, refused to recognize the Assembly’s right to take these steps. Consequently, the International Court of Justice was asked to rule on States’ obligations in the situation.

The new Opinion dealt with the issues in considerable depth and included the following findings (given hereunder in a condensed and re-arranged form for clarity):

1. The termination of the mandate by the U.N. General Assembly was legal and did not require South African consent.
2. It follows that the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia is illegal and South Africa is therefore under an immediate obligation to withdraw.
3. States that are members of the U.N. have an obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa’s occupation and are to refrain from any acts or dealings with the South African régime implying recognition of a legal South African presence in Namibia.
4. In terms of Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations, Member States are obliged to comply with Security Council decisions even if they had voted against such decisions.
5. South Africa remains accountable for any violations of the rights of the people of Namibia. (Author’s italics)

The Opinion of the International Court of Justice was accepted by the General Assembly.
Assembly and the Security Council.

Basically the obligations imposed on States by the International Court required States to treat South Africa as having no rights whatsoever in Namibia. South Africa is declared to be a naked usurper; an occupier on a par with the Nazi forces occupying Norway, Belgium, or other parts of Europe and it should be treated as such.

The mere fact that the wrongful occupation has stretched on for over a decade is no ground for automatically upgrading it to that of being a de facto government. The lapse of time can certainly not legitimize in any way, or to any extent, South African illegal occupation.

States are bound to make it clear at all times that South Africa has no legal authority to levy or collect taxes in Namibia. Consequently, governments whose nationals invest in Namibia should not grant them tax credits for "taxes" paid on such investments to the South African Government or its local surrogate.

Similarly, States should recognize that the Republic of South Africa has no valid authority to issue permits, concessions, licences, mining and prospecting rights, and so on. For this reason the Council for Namibia has issued a decree, approved by the General Assembly, making it unlawful to exploit any Namibian natural resource without a licence from the Council, or the Commissioner acting for it. Under General Assembly resolution 2248 (S-V) the United Nations Council for Namibia was given full authority "to promulgate laws, decrees and administrative regulations as are necessary..."

Resources exported without a United Nations licence are subject to seizure and forfeiture to the benefit of the Namibian people, wherever in the world they may be found.

The legal basis for the decree adopted by the United Nations Council for Namibia and approved by the General Assembly is quite simple:

1. The United Nations has given full powers to the United Nations Council for Namibia to protect the natural resources of Namibia on behalf of the people of Namibia.
2. The mining and export licences issued by the South Africans in respect of Namibian resources were granted by an illegal authority and are null and void.
3. The natural wealth of Namibia belongs to the people of Namibia and not to the illegal administration set up by the Government of South Africa nor to South Africa nor to any firm authorized by South Africa to despoil Namibia of its natural assets by an illegal authority.
4. In these circumstances it is open to the United Nations Council for Namibia to have these seized and held in trust for the people of Namibia. These assets can be pursued as stolen property illegally taken from the people of Namibia. There are ample precedents and authorities to support this view.

The decisions of the International Court of Justice and the Security Council are clear and unambiguous. South Africa must relinquish all claims over Namibia and surrender the Territory to the United Nations. It will then be for the United Nations to ensure the holding of free elections on the basis of universal adult suffrage for the whole Territory as one entity; such elections to be held under the supervision and control of the United Nations. The elections will be to a constituent assembly which will choose an interim government and adopt a constitution for Namibia.

The Security Council has also insisted on a number of preliminary steps such as an immediate amnesty for all political prisoners and freedom of movement and freedom of association for all SWAPO members in the Territory. While South Africa does not accept SWAPO as representing the majority of the population of Namibia, it does reluctantly agree that SWAPO is the biggest single political entity in the country.

The danger is that unless the South African Government agrees rapidly with the terms laid down by the United Nations, the existing armed conflict will escalate, thus rendering a peaceful transfer of power much more difficult.

The United Nations, in cooperation with Unesco, has established in Lusaka the U.N. Institute for Namibia. This is an institute for applied research and training to prepare the nucleus of a civil administration for an independent Namibia. The students—over 100 of them—are all Namibians.

The very highly qualified staff are all Africans and many of them are Namibians. Even now, the institute is in a position to provide Namibians who could assume administrative responsibilities. Ultimately it is the intention that the institute will form the nucleus of the future University of Namibia.

The initiative of the United Nations in the setting up of the Institute for Namibia was constructive and far sighted. It will do much to remedy the effects of South African misrule of the Territory.

by Hage G. Geingob

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights clearly states that everyone has the right to education and that education shall be free. This right is denied to almost the entire Namibian population.

In 1949, when the Nationalist Party came to power in South Africa, the government officially took over the administration of African education in Namibia, which till then had been in the hands of missionary societies. Even though there is now a more co-ordinated curriculum, the quality and content of education have not improved. In both South Africa and Namibia it could be defined as an instrument to perpetuate white domination.

The policies of the Nationalist Party are the same in South Africa as in Namibia.

HAGE GOTTFRID GEINGOB of Namibia has been Director of the U.N. Institute for Namibia at Lusaka (Zambia) since 1978. From 1966 to 1971, he was Chief Representative of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) to the United Nations and subsequently became a staff member of the Office of the U.N. Commissioner for Namibia.
In Namibia race determines which school system—white, coloured or African—a child must enter. The African system is further segregated along ethnic lines: above (from left to right) a Herero, a Baster and a Damara girl. In black schools the level of teaching is very low, and only a few dozen pupils graduate each year from secondary school. To prepare for Namibian independence and to train administrators for the future state, the U.N. in cooperation with Unesco has set up the U.N. Institute for Namibia in Lusaka (Zambia).

Apartheid permeates the entire educational system in Namibia: there are three separate school systems, one for whites, one for coloureds and one for Africans. The African system is even further segregated according to ethnic groupings: hence there are Herero schools, Ovambo schools, Nama/Damara schools, and so forth.

Education for whites is compulsory up to age 16, whereas education for African children is not compulsory at any age. It is extremely rare that an African child completes even primary schooling: 97.8 per cent leave school before then.

In secondary education, the teachers have a shockingly low level of education. Over 60 per cent have only completed primary school.

Students who complete their secondary schooling and who wish to attend university must go to South Africa, for there are no institutions of higher learning in Namibia, for either Europeans or Africans. It is very easy for whites to obtain passports and financial assistance, whereas for Africans it is very difficult.

Consequently, many Namibians have been forced to go elsewhere in order to avail themselves of U.N. scholarships and other aid offered by various associations and foundations. It was only after many Namibians had left the country and had obtained their degrees abroad that South Africa allowed a few to enter universities in South Africa. This decision was sparked by a SWAPO (South West Africa People’s Organization) statement that, as a liberation movement, it had trained more people in 14 years than South Africa had done in over 60 years.

University education for Africans in Namibia continues to be a dream. Two or three African students who do very well and whose political persuasion is deemed acceptable to the régime may be selected and given a scholarship to one of the three Bantu Universities in South Africa. But they are advised to study theology or teacher training and not courses that contribute to nation-building, such as engineering, medicine or the sciences.

In the final analysis, Bantu education is designed to provide Africans with only that measure of self-management which will alleviate feelings of acute deprivation, thus minimizing the possibility of African revolt while perpetuating white economic and political interests.

A new Namibia must therefore have a new educational system. Both the U.N. Institute for Namibia and SWAPO’s Education Centre at Nyango in Zambia are working towards this end.

The Institute is to carry out research on the educational system of Namibia to suggest solutions for the future Namibian government. It is also training middle-level administrative cadres in the field of education.

Meanwhile, the SWAPO Educational Centre has established its own primary and secondary school systems and conducts adult literacy courses. Its aim is to overcome an ingrained colonial mentality and to restore to the Namibian his self-respect as a citizen able to contribute to the new Namibia which is about to be created... a Namibia where all will be educated regardless of colour, ethnic origin or sex.
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The two names Southern Rhodesia and Zimbabwe symbolically represent the history of a single country. The Zimbabwe complex of ruins, south of Salisbury, goes back to the 11th century and was the political and religious centre of an African society which spread far beyond the boundaries of today’s state.

This civilization produced not only impressive buildings but also pottery, a settled agriculture, domesticated livestock, mining and smelting, and the manufacture of fabrics. There was already some occupational specialization and a highly developed internal and external trade.

We will not go into the details of shifts of power and of sovereignty within Zimbabwe, preferring to concentrate on the creation of Southern Rhodesia. In 1870 Lobengula became king of Zimbabwe and faced the growing push of British influence northwards from South Africa.

The Moffatt treaty signed between the government of the United Kingdom and Lobengula established a British sphere of interest over Zimbabwe. Through the Rudd concession, the British South Africa Company was granted mineral rights. There is, however, some indication that Lobengula did not understand—and was not told—the implications of these two treaties.

In 1890, that part of Zimbabwe known as Mashonaland was occupied by the “Pioneer Column”, an expeditionary force funded by the British South Africa Company.

Within a few years white settlers proceeded to evict the Shona people from their lands, to exercise an authority never before exercised by Lobengula, and to force the Shona people to work for them. The European settlers also dislocated the Matabele’s economy, seized their cattle, countermanded the orders of Lobengula, and punished the Shona and the Matabele if they resisted settler rule.

In the face of this the Shona and the Matabele united in the “rebellion” of 1897. This was harshly put down, and in its wake was established today’s Rhodesia, named after Cecil Rhodes, the founder of the British South Africa Company, which was delegated by the British Government to administer Rhodesia. In practice this meant settler rule, and from the beginning ensured that the colonization of Rhodesia would follow a different pattern from that of most of Africa.

Indeed as early as the end of 1898, the major institutions of administration and legislative policies had been elaborated. These were to last in their broad outlines until today. A franchise was elaborated that was, like today’s, theoretically non-racist. But few Africans could meet the property, monetary and literacy qualifications for voting.

White political power was consolidated by the unequal tenure and allocation of land, by white control over the labour power of blacks, and by the system of education which ensured that there was a white monopoly of technology as well as of the trade unions. The old society was shattered.

Chiefs and headmen were retained but they were appointed and could be removed by the central white government: they were salaried civil servants. Their power was now subordinate to that of the white District Commissioners and their main occupation was to collect taxes for the white government.

Just as important was the introduction of a money economy, which while it did not—and was not meant to—and the semi-subsistence farming of all Africans, forced many to seek work on European farms or mines in order to buy the things they needed and which were no longer produced, or which were new needs created by the nature of the new economy.

African society was further disrupted by the introduction of a new religion—Christianity—that was closely linked with the political power of the settlers, by new laws elaborated by a settler government, by new methods of settling disputes (the European courts) and above all by the massive alienation of land and cattle which, together with a hut tax, forced Africans to become labourers.

Land became more important for the settlers as the hopes entertained by Rhodes of vast mineral wealth receded. The result was a continuing appropriation of African land from the 19th century on. Indeed, between 1936 and 1959, according to a Rhodesian Select Parliamentary Committee on Resettlement (1960), over 113,000 Africans were compulsorily removed from “white” farming areas.

By 1969, 250,000 whites had the legal right enshrined in the Constitution to 44.95 million acres, while 5 million Africans had the right to 44.94 million acres.

Africans, moreover, have been hampered by the nature of marketing, which is tilted in favour of white farms; by the little commercial credit available to modernize their holdings compared with that granted to whites; by the fact that they have to pay higher interest rates than Europeans on what credit is available; by the lack of resources to employ paid labour; by the small size of their farms; and by the fact that their land is often poorer than that allocated to white farms.

It is not surprising, therefore, that with the constant degradation of the African rural areas, an increasing number of Africans were forced to seek work in the white areas, not only to maintain themselves but to subsidize the reserves.

Work on the plantations is poorly paid, and contact with outside society is discouraged. In 1975, adult workers on European plantations were often getting as little as between $8 (Rhodesian) and $15 (R) for 30 days’ work, semi-skilled and skilled workers earning between $30 (R) and $40 (R). In 1964, the African agricultural wage was 4.6 per cent of the European wage; by 1974 it had dropped to 4.3 per cent.

Child labour is often part of the farm school system, children being given half-day schooling and $1.50 (R) to $3.00 (R) for 30 days.

The mines present a similar picture. In 1964 in mining the average African wage was only 5.6 per cent of the average European wage. By 1974, average African wages were only 6.9 per cent of the average European wage.

The difference between European wages and African wages has become greater in nearly every sector of the economy, but it is in mining and farming that inequality is greatest.

Most Rhodesian Africans therefore prefer to go to the urban
Massive granite remains of Zimbabwe dating back to the 11th century rise on a hilltop to the south of Salisbury. They include a 10-metre-high tower and ramparts (detail, right) that measure some 300 metres around. Zimbabwe, which means "dwelling of a chief" in the Shona language, was a sanctuary and the burial place of kings, as well as the capital of a flourishing African civilization until it was sacked in the early 19th century. Drawing above depicts one of the famous carved soapstone birds discovered at Zimbabwe that were symbolic representations of the dead kings.

There is therefore a vested interest in promoting the sale of beer and its consumption.

Housing varies from tin huts to men's barracks and family dwellings. The tendency however is to establish single dwellings, so even when men can legally bring their wives from the rural areas, there may be no accommodation for them. The result is a new type of concubinage, prostitution, and a number of relatives who live there illegally—children hoping to get to school or adults looking for a job.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the African rate of urbanization is much lower than that of Europeans. However, in spite of the government policy of regulating the flow of Africans to the towns, the African urban population has risen from 676,000 in 1969 to about 970,000 today.

Africans, with the exception of a small middle-class of teachers, lawyers and priests, are employed in the lowest paid jobs in the economy: semi-skilled and unskilled labour, with as many as 14.08 per cent in domestic service.

It could be argued that this picture would change with the spread of education. Let us therefore look at the educational policy and practice of the Rhodesian authorities.
African education was intended to maintain African inferiority both on the labour market and in terms of access to political power.

Both the economic role expected from Africans and the method of maintaining white political control through a limited franchise dictated the level and the content of African education. Efforts were concentrated on providing Africans with primary education, and then only on the first four years of schooling, thus ensuring that most Africans who had gone to school at all were semi-literate.

Secondary education, on the other hand, expanded very slowly, and there was—and is—an increasing emphasis, not on the academic subjects that lead to a university career, but on technical subjects, such as carpentry for boys or domestic science for girls.

As long as the status quo was not threatened, African education could remain the affair of the missionaries. This provided a method of, not only conversion, but of decreasing government expenditure on African education. After the Rhodesian Front made a so-called Unilateral Declaration of Independence in 1965, and in the light of statements from most churches in favour of social justice, the Rhodesian authorities took certain measures to increase government control over education and to implement the government’s overall policy of “community development”.

Rhodesia has not officially announced an apartheid policy. Its aim has rather been stated in the more neutral terms of “community development”. The aims of “community development” however, differ only slightly from the Bantustan policy of the South African Government.

In both cases—apartheid and community development—chiefs are resurrected, tribes are recreated, and a so-called “traditional” political structure imposed. It has nothing to do, however, with the old traditions of black Rhodesians or black South Africans. It is a modern device whereby it is hoped that nationalism will be diverted into tribal loyalties.

The policy of the present illegal régime is to transfer African education from the missions to “responsible” community boards and councils, themselves politically controlled by the central government. These community boards are to be responsible for collecting extra taxes and contributions for African education, thus decreasing its cost to the white government as well as finding “voluntary” African labour for school building.

The financing of education follows the same lines as the division of land. Approximately the same amount of money is spent by the Rhodesian government on the education of white children as on Africans. Yet there are 275,000 whites and 6 million Africans.

We have gone into education in some detail. But the same situation exists with regard to health services. Hospitals are segregated both because of deliberate policy and because housing areas are segregated. Nor are they “separate but equal”. Africans are more likely to suffer from diseases linked to malnutrition and poverty. They also have less access to medical care. The same situation is repeated in access to amenities and social services: water, electricity, roads, pensions.

The situation in Rhodesia, however, is not quite the same as that in the Republic of South Africa. First, the present ratio between the black and white population is much greater than in South Africa, and in recent years the possibility of increasing the white population by immigration has vanished: more whites now emigrate than enter the country. Moreover, nearly 60 per cent of Rhodesian whites were born outside Rhodesia. The excuse of 300 years’ settlement used by the Afrikaners in South Africa is hardly relevant to the situation of white Rhodesia.

The so-called Unilateral Declaration of Independence in 1965 was in fact made to stem any advance towards majority rule.

**The flowering of modern Shona sculpture**

In recent years, a number of sculptors of the Shona people, descendants of the builders of ancient Zimbabwe, have come to the forefront. They are producing powerful creations that have nothing in common with copies of traditional Shona objects made for the tourist trade. Exhibitions of their work have been held at major museums in New York, Paris and London. A recurrent theme of Shona sculpture is a head with two or more faces, with a cyclopian eye in mid-forehead. Above, “Spirit of Wisdom” by the Shona sculptor John Takawira.

Times, however, have changed since 1965. First of all the Portuguese empire collapsed and was replaced by independent states such as Mozambique, which is hostile to racism, and which, moreover, won its independence through armed revolt. Guerrilla incursions into Rhodesia had started before the independence of Mozambique: they increased afterwards.

But besides armed revolt, Rhodesia was faced with the non-recognition of its so-called independence and with sanctions which partly dislocated its economy. It continues to exist only because of the massive assistance still provided by the Republic of South Africa.

The arms budget soared; Africans were forcibly removed to be concentrated into so-called “safe” guarded villages; the age for compulsory military service was extended; and a series of “raids”, sometimes amounting to an invasion, was made on Mozambique and other front-line African states. Even internally, the chiefs on whom the Rhodesian authorities depended were less willing to be informers, faced with the opposition of their people.

Faced with almost total isolation and an African population determined to be free, supremacy has become impossible to maintain without a massive military effort. Even so, it is unlikely to last.

Indeed, Africans look confidently to the future. For is not white rule at best only a century in the long history of their country and will not Zimbabwe continue long after Rhodesia is nothing but a name? 

Marion O’Callaghan
Stigma on South African sport

by Stéphane A. Ogouki

Over the last decade, the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa, which has 43 Member States, has been one of the harshest critics of racial discrimination in sport.

Though the white minority régimes in South Africa and Rhodesia are champions of racial discrimination today, it should not be forgotten that racism is nothing new in Africa. Racist attitudes date back to the time when the whites first settled in black Africa: as the indigenous inhabitants were not really human beings, it was better not to mix with them.

Apartheid in South African sport is simply the application of the official policy of “separate development” to the playing field. Athletes are divided according to race into whites, Asians, coloureds and blacks, the latter being further subdivided according to ethnic groupings.

Articles 1 and 24 of the Charter of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) expressly forbid any form of discrimination, and their spirit is echoed in the statutes of the various international sports federations. It was because they did not comply with these articles that South Africa and Rhodesia were excluded from the Olympic movement, the former in 1970, the latter in 1975.

“Separate development” in South African sport means that non-white athletes are barred from joining white sports clubs, that white teams may not compete against non-white teams (“mixed” teams do not exist), and that games and sports are administered by organizations corresponding to racial groups. Lastly, only white sports organizations represented South Africa at the international level.

It goes without saying that the best sports facilities are found in areas reserved for whites. Non-whites have no access to them, except on special occasions such as visits by foreign dignitaries or committees investigating racial integration. Even then, non-whites are confined to areas fenced off with barbed wire, and in no circumstances can they use the facilities for their own competitions.

Some putative attempts at integration have been made, the most spectacular being the so-called “multi-racial” games. Anyone can attend these events, but each racial group of spectators is confined to a specific area which is separated from the others by barbed wire. The whites compete among themselves to select their champions, then the non-whites do the same. Black athletes are obliged to wear jerseys bearing the name of their ethnic group in capital letters.

The only real efforts made by the leaders of South African sport have been the direct result of internal opposition to apartheid. This opposition was sparked off by South Africa’s exclusion from almost all the governing bodies of international sport, a situation which many South African athletes cannot accept.

Because of its persistence in practising racial segregation in sport, South Africa has been expelled from the Olympic movement (1970) and many other international sports federations, including the International Federation of Football Associations (FIFA) in 1976. Above, a Johannesburg mine-worker joins in an improvised soccer game.
Unesco's role in alerting world opinion

In 1955, the Union of South Africa withdrew from Unesco. The reason given was "interference in South African racial problems" by means of Unesco publications and studies being distributed in South Africa.

These studies proved that the theory of racial inequality had no scientific foundation, that in fact the Pretoria régime had divided the population into three main groups: the Africans (called Bantu); the coloureds (persons of mixed European and African or Asian origins); and the whites. Since 1952, the movement and residence of Africans had been more tightly controlled. The first major application of apartheid to education dated from 1953.

Unesco has always sought to keep world opinion informed about these questions. In 1965, the United Nations Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa requested Unesco to prepare a study on "the effects of apartheid in the fields of education, science and culture". Unesco's Executive Board accepted this task and added another field of research: information.

The report appeared in 1967. A second revised and enlarged edition was published in 1972, and the report was further updated in 1975. It concluded that "separate development... is a policy of deliberate inequity built into the educational system, expressed in scientific and cultural activities, and underlined in the regulations governing access to information."


In 1976 came a study on the African township of Muchelke, which is located at the edge of the white town of Fort Victoria in Southern Rhodesia. The study analyzes the living conditions of Africans and whites in each of these communities, and their inter-relations.

In 1977, Unesco published Southern Rhodesia: The effects of a Conquest on Education, Culture and Information, by Marlon O'Callaghan with an introduction by Reginald Austin. (See inside back cover.) This study shows the degree to which the education provided for Africans is inferior to white education, as well as giving a list of banned books and describing how the radio and press are controlled. A further contribution to this series of works, Namibia: the Effects of Apartheid on the Economy and Education, is to appear at the end of 1977.

Unesco is thus actively pursuing its task of informing the public. This was stressed by the Director-General of Unesco, Mr. Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow, in his opening address to the World Conference for Action against Apartheid, held in Lagos (Nigeria) in August 1977. Mr. M'Bow drew attention to certain facts concerning South Africa: that most newspapers published for the blacks are in the hands of white financial groups; that most African writers are in exile; and that in 1974-1975 expenditure on education totalled 131 million rands for Africans (71 per cent of the population) as against 435 million rands for whites (17 per cent of the population).

Further research is in progress, including a study on the way in which the international press has presented the situation in South Africa over a ten-year period. A special effort will also be made to analyze obstacles to the circulation of anti-apartheid information.

Another study will examine the effect of apartheid and racism on the situation of women in South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe. Unesco has not, however, confined itself solely to informing the public. In 1971, it organized a meeting at Dar-es-Salaam (Tanzania) on "the influence of colonialism on the artist, his milieu and his public in developing countries". In 1976, Unesco convened a conference at Maputo (Mozambique) on "Social Structure, Revolutionary Change and Culture in Southern Africa". This meeting brought together for the first time an international group of social scientists and members of the liberation movements of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa. Unesco also contributed to the Dakar International Conference (January 1976) devoted to the violation of human rights in Namibia.

Finally, Unesco has given direct assistance to education for several liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity. Aid totalled $ 2 million in 1975-1976. This cooperation will be strengthened in the near future.
Africans from neighbouring countries such as Lesotho, Botswana and Malawi come to work in South African and Rhodesian mines in the absence of employment at home. This inflow ties white southern Africa's neighbours to the industrial nexus of apartheid and keeps them in a state of economic dependence. Above, black mine-workers are numbered and referred to by their number.
HE United Nations system is in a sense based on a paradox. A group of Organizations, comprised exclu-
sively of States, has as one of its tasks the defence of human rights vis-a-vis the governments of these very same States.

Does this not imply that the ultimate goal of those who wield power should always be the protection of every individual and group, without any form of discrimination?

At the end of World War II the United Nations set itself a three-fold task in the field of human rights:

- the proclamation of a Universal Declaration of Human Rights that was to be taken “as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations”;
- the elaboration of one or several international covenants on human rights having the force of law in all the ratifying states;
- the setting up of bodies to supervise the observance of the covenants.

The first part of this task was completed on 10 December 1948 with the proclamation by the General Assembly of the United Nations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The second and third parts were only accomplished 18 years later, with the adoption on 16 December 1966 of two covenants on human rights. One dealt with economic, social and cultural rights; the other, completed by an optional protocol providing machinery for complaints by individuals, dealt with civil and political rights. The first covenant came into effect on 3 January 1976. The second, along with the optional protocol, on 23 March 1976 (1).

The rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration fall into two categories: on the one hand, civil and political rights and, on the other hand, economic, social and cultural rights. Because of the changing patterns of society in recent years, it has become imperative to formulate what the Director General of Unesco has termed “the third generation of human rights”.

The first generation concerns “negative” rights, in the sense that their respect requires that the state do nothing to interfere with individual liberties, and correspond roughly to the civil and political rights.

The second generation, on the other hand, requires positive action by the state to be implemented, as is the case with most social, economic and cultural rights. The international community is now embarking upon a third generation of human rights which may be called “rights of solidarity”.

Such rights include the right to development, the right to a healthy and ecologically balanced environment, the right to peace, and the right to ownership of the common heritage of mankind. Since these rights reflect a certain conception of community life, they can only be imple-
mented by the combined efforts of every-
one: individuals, states and other bodies, as well as public and private institutions.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, like the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen in 1789, has had an immense impact throughout the world. It has been called a modern addition to the New Testament, and the Magna Carta of humanity, and has become a const-
ant source of inspiration for governments, for judges and for national and interna-
tional legislators.

The constitutions of many states express the ideals enshrined in the Declaration, and in some cases even incorporate its provisions verbatim. Laws without number have been drawn up or modified to tie in with specific clauses or to reflect the spirit of the Declaration.

Time and again judges have used it to buttress their most convincing arguments. Countless men and women have fought and suffered in its name.

On the international level, the Declaration has become so widely accepted as the basis for universal and regional norms in the defence of human rights that one may ask what its legal force is. For since it is not a treaty—and therefore not a compulsory legal instrument—the Declaration may initially seem to have no more binding force than any other strong recommendation of the General Assembly.

However, in recent years, there has been a tendency, insofar as the Declaration is concerned, to look further than the distinction between mandatory and non-manda-
tory texts. Some specialists today consider that the Universal Declaration is binding on Member States; others feel it has become part of customary law; still others see it as a kind of “common law” for all mankind.

In all probability, none of these views is entirely correct. But by recognizing the Universal Declaration as a living document and leaving the jurists to argue among themselves, one can proclaim one’s faith in the future of mankind.

The adoption of the Universal Declaration in 1948 opened the way for the drafting of a “network” of texts of unequal juridical value. Today the corpus of international law governing human rights is comprised of some 15 declarations, the most important being the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the U.N. on 14 December 1960.

In addition, some 50 treaties can be con-
sidered as offshoots of the principles laid down in the Universal Declaration. Some were drawn up within the framework of organizations, such as the Specialized Agencies, notably the International Labour Organization and Unesco. Others, like the European Convention on Human Rights of 4 November 1950 and the Ameri-
can Convention on Human Rights of 22 November 1969, are limited geographically to such regional organizations as the Coun-
cil of Europe or the Organization of Ameri-
can States.

The task now facing human rights organ-
izations, which have grown in number over the years, is not so much to draft new texts as to see that existing texts are applied and respected.

The work of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, which is made up of representatives of Member States, has been fairly successful as regards the definition of international norms concerning human rights. With the entry into force of the International Covenants on Human Rights, the U.N. added a new human rights body to its structure which may help it achieve one of its original goals. The Human Rights Committee, established in accor-
dance with the Covenant on Civil and Politi-
cal Rights, will play a more or less impor-
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A 30-year struggle

The sustained efforts to give force of law to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

by Karel Vasak

The first part of this task was completed on 10 December 1948 with the proclamation by the General Assembly of the United Nations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The second and third parts were only accomplished 18 years later, with the adoption on 16 December 1966 of two covenants on human rights. One dealt with economic, social and cultural rights; the other, completed by an optional protocol providing machinery for complaints by individuals, dealt with civil and political rights. The first covenant came into effect on 3 January 1976. The second, along with the optional protocol, on 23 March 1976 (1).

(1) As of October 1977, the number of Member States that have ratified or acceded to these covenants is 69 for the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and 68 for the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
The Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Proclaimed by the United Nations

Preamble

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

Now, Therefore,

The General Assembly proclaims

This Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1 - All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2 - Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3 - Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4 - No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5 - No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6 - Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7 - All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8 - Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9 - No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10 - Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11 - (1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Article 12 - No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13 - (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14 - (1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

(2) This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.
Article 15 - (1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.
(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16 - (1) Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.
(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.
(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17 - (1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.
(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18 - Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 19 - Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20 - (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21 - (1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.
(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.
(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22 - Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23 - (1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.
(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24 - Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25 - (1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.
(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26 - (1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.
(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.
(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Article 27 - (1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.
(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28 - Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29 - (1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.
(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.
(3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 30 - Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

Article 31
A 30-year struggle

The activities of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations such as the ILO and Unesco are, broadly speaking, concentrated on the promotion and protection of a limited range of human rights.

The International Labour Organization, concerned entirely with the protection of social rights, has drafted some of the most important human rights conventions. They deal with such matters as forced labour, and the right to organize and to participate in collective bargaining. Above all, the ILO has developed a number of procedures to ensure that its Member States respect human rights. The most important of these concerns the international safeguarding of trade union rights through the Committee on Freedom of Association of the ILO Governing Body, which has received over 1,000 complaints from trade unions.

Unesco seeks to promote education, science, culture and information as rights and fundamental freedoms. Thus it has given priority to the fight against discrimination in education and has drawn up a convention to this effect. The right of everyone to education is reaffirmed in Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Unesco has further elaborated this right in a series of conventions and recommendations, including the Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1974).

In the major international documents on human rights, cultural rights have a rather curious status:

- They are associated either with civil and political rights (and thus, as we have seen, are considered as "negative") or with economic and social rights (and are considered as "positive"). They sometimes appear in both categories of human rights.

- They are always defined juridically as individual rights, whereas culture is essentially collective in nature, since it should be available to the whole community.

In view of the uncertain status of cultural rights, they should be recognized as having a specific nature, since they are at once individual and collective. Unesco has been and still is working along these lines.

ARTICLE 27 of the Universal Declaration refers to the right of everyone freely to participate in the cultural life of the community. It is only recently, however, that action has been taken to define how this right should be exercised and to give the individual the opportunity to express his cultural identity.

Intergovernmental conferences convened by Unesco in Venice (1970), Helsinki (1972) and Yogyakarta (1973) led to the adoption by the General Conference at its 19th session in Nairobi on 26 November 1976 of the Recommendation on Participation by the People at Large in Cultural Life and their Contribution to It.

The protection of copyright and the preservation of the cultural heritage are indispensable if people are to participate fully in cultural life. The moral and material interests of all forms of intellectual output are protected by a number of international agreements, including the Universal Copyright Convention of 1952, which was revised in Paris in 1971.

As far as the protection of cultural property is concerned, Unesco has paid special attention to the preservation of certain monuments, sites, manuscripts, collections of books and archives from destruction or damage in the event of armed conflict, as well as from theft, pillage or vandalism.

Freedom of expression as defined in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration and in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights includes freedom to seek, receive and impart by any means information and ideas of all kinds regardless of frontiers.

The free flow of information has always played an important role in Unesco's work. But to meet the challenge of the vastly increased volume of international communication and exchange of information in a world in which facilities for the transmission and reception of information and ideas are unevenly distributed, the Organization has progressively broadened its approach.

It has adopted a number of international agreements in this field, beginning with the Agreement Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Character of 10 December 1948.

More recently, on 15 November 1972, the General Conference proclaimed the Declaration of Guiding Principles on the Use of Satellite Broadcasting for the Free Flow of Information, the Spread of Education and Greater Cultural Exchange.

This brief survey of Unesco's activities in the field of human rights, placed in the legal perspective of the Universal Declaration, would be incomplete without a reference to the sensitive issue of the action which is or should be taken when private individuals or non-governmental organizations write to the Organization, claiming to be the victims of violations of human rights that fall within Unesco's competence.

The United Nations, which receives tens of thousands of such complaints each year, is faced with the same problem. The issue has provoked many and often heated debates.

At Unesco, it was decided in 1967 that a committee of the Executive Board should examine such complaints which fall within Unesco's competence.

At its Nairobi session, the General Conference requested that this procedure should be made "more effective", and it is currently being re-examined by the Executive Board. In seeking a more effective way of safeguarding the rights of individuals and groups, Unesco intends to remain faithful to its mission to serve mankind.
Unesco sets up world communications advisory group

Unesco has set up a 16-member international group of advisers to examine world communication problems. The group, comprising a wide range of specialists, was set up following a resolution of Unesco's General Conference in 1976 and is to be headed by Mr. Sean MacBride of Ireland (see biographical note page 16). It is expected to make a preliminary report to Unesco's 1978 General Conference and a full report which will be available in 1979.

Cooperation guide for developing countries

A guide informing developing countries of services they can obtain from one another has been published by the U.N. Development Programme (UNDP). Entitled Directory of Services for Technical Cooperation, the guide lists over 900 organizations in 67 countries which offer other developing countries technical cooperation in 16 economic and social sectors. Please send orders, accompanied by payment ($10.00 or equivalent in other currencies) to TCDC Special Unit, UNDP, One United Nations Plaza, New York, 10017, U.S.A.

Stamps against racism

On 19 September 1977, the U.N. Postal Administration at Geneva issued a set of four commemorative stamps on the theme “Combat Racism”. The stamp issue is part of the U.N.’s campaign to involve world opinion in the struggle against racism and racial discrimination.

Books in 151 languages

A major exhibition of translated works—one of many events marking the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution

by Boris I. Stukalin

As the U.S.S.R. developed, culturally as well as economically, there was a corresponding growth in the publication of books, including translations. In 1961, some 67 million copies of books and booklets by foreign authors appeared in the U.S.S.R. Five years later the figure had mounted to 97 million. During the same period 11,497 titles were translated, of which 457 million copies were printed. Over 4,000 of these titles (367 million copies) were fiction.

These translations were made not only into Russian but into dozens of other languages spoken by the different nationalities and ethnic groups of the U.S.S.R.

For many foreign writers printings are bigger in the U.S.S.R. than in their own countries. Over 200 of them have had works published in the Soviet Union in editions ranging from 1 million to 40 million copies.

In 1976, for example, there were 65 printings of works by modern American authors translated into nine languages of the U.S.S.R. in either book or serial form, and 25 printings of contemporary French works translated into 10 languages. Works by modern writers constituted 59 per cent of the translations from English literature, and 85 per cent of the Italian literature total.
diplomas of honour to the U.S.S.R. Ice hockey team, the Luxembourg racing driver André Bas- tin, and Chris Ripand, a 12-year-old yachtman from Malta. Nyembe successfully opposed the disqualification of an opponent during an international race, thus losing his chance to take part in an international regatta. The committee also made a posthumous award to Juan Manuel San- tístiban, the Spanish cyclist who was killed in an accident during the Tour of Italy.

Unesco award for International Catholic Centre

The Paris-based International Catholic Centre for Unesco tells Catholics in 100 countries about Unesco's work through "The Month at Unesco", a newsletter published in English, French, Spanish and German. To mark the 50th anniversary of the Centre's creation, Mr. Amadou-Matah M'Bow, the Director-General of Unesco, presented Unesco's silver medal to Mr. Jean Lar- naud, Secretary-General of the Centre since its foundation.

Medal for a militant

Dorothy Nyembe, a leader in the struggle for human rights in South Africa and in the wom¬ men's and rural labour movements, was sentenced in March 1969 to 15 years' imprisonment under an international regatta. The committee also made a posthumous award to Juan Manuel San¬ tístiban, the Spanish cyclist who was killed in an accident during the Tour of Italy.

Unicef greeting cards

Unicef, the United Nations Children's Fund, today "helps 116 developing countries to help themselves", providing needy children with better nutrition, improved health care, clean, safe water, and educational opportunities. For nearly 30 years, sales of its greeting cards have enabled the public to contribute to Unicef's pro¬ grammes. This year Unicef offers a wide selec¬ tion of cards ranging from five designs in mini¬ format to full-size cards designed by artists from some ten countries and a stationery portfolio containing ten different cards and five post¬ cards. All these cards are now available at Unicef sales points throughout the world. A 1978 Unicef desk calendar is also available in two versions, one trilingual (English, French, Span¬ ish), the other bilingual (French and German). The calendar's theme is "the tree of life". Card shown here is one of five designs from a 15th- century Italian treatise on medicinal herbs.

BOOKS IN 151 LANGUAGES

Since the end of World War II about 1 bil¬ lion copies of books from Western coun¬ tries have been published in the U.S.S.R. This figure includes: American authors, 7,377 works (221 million copies); French authors, 4,864 works (298 million copies); British authors, 4,590 works (230 million copies); Italian authors, 482 works (61 million copies).

The publication of translated works by Asian, African and Latin American writers is being stepped up. So far 764 books by Indian writers have appeared (over 30 mil¬ lion copies), 288 translations from Turkish (over 12 million copies) and 295 from Japa¬ nese (over 12 million copies). In the last few years there has also been a growing trend to publish anthologies of poetry and prose from developing countries. Four recent examples are: Above All, a collection of stories by African writers from Zambia, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria and Uganda (translated into Armenian); a volume of short stories by 30 modern Latin American writers from Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Mexico, Uruguay, Peru and Costa Rica (translated into Georgian); The Poetry of Struggle, an anthology of writing from Angola, Mozambique, Sao Tomé and Principe, and the Cape Verde Islands; and This Is Our Land! a collection of patriotic poems from Latin America (both published in Russian).

A new series entitled "Writers and Think¬ ers of the Orient" has just been launched. It aims to inform a non-specialized public about Asian writers and thinkers from an¬ tiquity, through medieval times to the pre¬ sent day.

The first Moscow International Book Fair, held in September this year, marked a new contribution to the implementation of the agree¬ ments concluded at the Helsinki Con¬ ference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, held in 1975. More than 1,500 publishers from 67 countries took part.

In the early days of the Soviet Union's existence, Lenin paid special attention to the development of book publishing, often pointing out that only an educated person can take an informed part in his country's political life and in the management of the state.

In 1913, there were 62 books and booklets for every 100 persons in Russia. By 1925 the figure had risen to 153, and in 1974 it reac¬ ched 672. It now stands at over 700. In the U.S.S.R. today there are some 200 large publishing houses, two-thirds of which are based in the national republics, and in regions and districts. The Soviet Union also has 360,000 libraries which provide free ser¬ vice to 180 million readers from their fund of 4,000 million copies.

But this does not mean that Soviet pub¬ lishing does not come up against difficulties.

For one thing, it cannot keep up with the constant and rapidly growing demand for books. Thanks to a far-reaching cultural policy, almost all Soviet citizens today are regular readers.

Another problem is the paper shortage. This cannot be solved merely by felling more trees each year, even though the Soviet Union has immense forests. One method being used to decrease wood con¬ sumption is the collection of waste paper from the general public. Persons who hand in a certain quantity of paper are given a token which enables them to acquire books that are otherwise difficult to find.

Some 380,000 tons of waste paper have already been collected for recycling. In this way 20,000 hectares of forest have been saved and millions of new books have been published. This voluntary programme is to be stepped up, and, combined with mea¬ sures being taken to improve the paper industry, is enabling us to satisfy the demand for reading materials more fully.

No matter how quickly the audio-visual media develop, we are convinced that books will never lose their place as the heralds of the ideals of peace, progress and cooperation between peoples.

Boris L. Stukalin
A carefully documented analysis, based largely on the regime's own data, of the impact of Southern Rhodesia's minority government on the schools, religion, cultural life and freedoms of the country's 6 million blacks. Also examines • teacher training • censorship • libraries • propaganda.
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Majority protest vs. minority rule

Despite demands for equal rights by Rhodesia's 6 million blacks, the present régime is stubbornly defending the entrenched interests of 275,000 whites. See article page 22.