

Struggle for liberation

By LEANNE SCOTT and SUSAN LUNN

THE CHIEF REPRESENTATIVE of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), Ysraf Saloojee, spoke at St. Mary's University on Sept. 26 on the subject of South Africa's apartheid system and the struggle of black South Africans for liberation.

The ANC, formed in the 1950s in response to increasing repression of blacks by the white-dominated government in Pretoria, is generally recognized as the main representative body of black South Africans. Though outlawed, it continues to operate underground in South Africa itself and as a paramilitary organization in neighbouring black African states.

Saloojee says clashes between blacks and whites began in South Africa with the first incursions of Dutch settlers in the seventeenth century. Later the territory came under the control of the British Empire, leading to the Boer war of 1899-1901 between descendants of the original Dutch and the British. A constitutional settlement in 1910 gave the right of home rule to the white minority. Saloojee says the settlement completely overlooked the rights of the majority of black people.

In World War II South Africa felt compelled to join Allied forces along with the British. Saloojee says black South Africans went to fight in hopes of regaining some of their old rights. Instead they saw the white government use the example of Nazi Germany to set up the system of apartheid, or institutionalized segregation of the races.

Saloojee says the United Nations has referred to this form of government as a crime against humanity. Despite this, the government has continued the policy to the present day.

Saloojee adds that perhaps the greatest injustice has been the establishment of the black "homelands." The homelands have reserved 30 percent of South Africa's land for 20 million blacks, while the other 70 percent, including the most productive territories, are to be exclusive to the four million whites.

The ANC estimates 30,000 blacks are arrested each year for protesting apartheid. "We will continue to fight and struggle for our South Africa that belongs to everyone in it," says Saloojee. He says the goal of the ANC is to "institute a non-racial unity for South Africa."

Nelson Mandela, acknowledged leader of the ANC, has been in prison in South Africa since 1963. Saloojee says this has been one of the main concerns of the members of the ANC, but government officials refuse to release Mandela unless he renounces the use of political violence, which he has refused to do.

"To sustain our place in the country we have to continue with violence," says Saloojee.



The presidential search committee faces the task of replacing Dal president Andrew MacKay (above). Who could follow an act like this? Photo by Dal Photo.

70 after prez's job

By JOANNE TURPIN

WHO WILL BE THE NEXT president of Dalhousie University? The seven-member presidential search committee is on the way to find out.

The committee is composed of representatives of the Board of Governors, the Senate, and the Student Union. The members are William Jones, chair; Peggy Weld, vice-chair; Catherine Blewett; Alan Andrews; George Cooper; Judith Fingard; and Douglas Chaytor, executive secretary.

The committee began its duties last March, shortly after current president W. Andrew MacKay announced he would not seek a second term of office. MacKay's term will expire on Aug. 31, 1986.

Though the committee has until January to make a decision, Blewett says, "we will probably

have made a decision by December."

About 70 candidates, male and female, have been nominated for the position to date. Blewett says the new president must have a solid background in both academics and administration. She says the committee is looking for a candidate dedicated to the academic development of the university, with the ability to talk to outside agencies such as governments.

The candidates are being considered individually, on personal record and ambition, as well as academic and administrative experience. Blewett does not deny there is a political aspect to the decision as well.

"The candidates will be judged on merit but it is naive to think that politics don't play a role," Blewett says.

Feds reviewing committment

OTTAWA (CUP) — The office dividers are pushed together crooked around the room. People walk in and out quickly. A tin of no-name coffee sits next to a coffee pot on a filing cabinet.

By the door to one office a piece of looseleaf is taped to the wall. "Ben Wilson" is written on the paper in blue felt pen.

Wilson is the leader of the Study Team on Education and Research, a branch of the Deputy Prime Minister Erik Nielsen's review of all programmes funded by Ottawa.

The team has precious little time. Assembled in the summer, they began work after Labour Day, and must submit a report to Nielsen on Nov. 8.

This is what they have to decide: is \$4.4 billion in federal money given to the country's colleges and universities being well-spent? Or is it inefficient? Is there waste and duplication in the universities, which get 80 per cent of their money from the federal vault?

Eight of the 12 study team members come from Ontario. Four are from the federal government, and others are from the Ontario provincial government, INCO corporation and the University of Ottawa. There is also a small business representative from Alberta, a Laval University Professor, and a union official from Newfoundland.

continued on page 4

News Analysis:

NORAD — A threat to Canadian sovereignty?

By JENNIFER CHOW

BEGINNING THIS WEEK IN Yellowknife, the federal government will conduct a series of public hearings into the proposed renewal of the North American Aero-Space Defense (NORAD) agreement.

The key issue to be addressed in these hearings is whether Canadian defense policies can retain independence from influence and control by the U.S. Today, with the American push for Canadian participation in the "Star Wars" project and with recent challenges to Canadian sovereignty in the Arctic, the issue appears more important than ever.

Even the mainline Canadian press is beginning to question an agreement that once seemed carved in stone. An article appearing in the *Ottawa Citizen* in September said Canada should consider the long-term effects of the NORAD agreement. A successful "Star Wars" space defense system might give the Americans the confidence they need to build a comprehensive air defense system.

"Canada should remember the possibility that some day down the Reagan road Americans are going to want to use Canadian territory for basing anti-ballistic missiles in mid-course over our Arctic," said the *Citizen*.

The North American Aero-Space Defense agreement was signed in 1958 between Canada and the United States in response to a perceived "bomber threat" from the Soviet Union. NORAD's goal was the defence of the North American continent from Soviet threats, especially bombers. NORAD consists of (1) an Early Warning System for detection of incoming bombers; (2) surveillance which includes monitoring of space; and (3) active air defence.

In the 1950s and '60s, the U.S. paid most of the costs of air defense and radars in NORAD. Canada is now being asked to contribute more, says Dr. Joel Sokolsky of the Dal Political Science department and the Canadian Centre for Foreign Studies.

"Strategically NORAD is OK. The problem is political for Canada," says Sokolsky.

"On the one hand, if we do renew NORAD, there will be linking to the U.S., and on the other hand, if we do not renew NORAD, we will be handing over (the responsibility of) our defence to them."

James A. Everard, in his article, "Canada and NORAD: The Eroding Agreement," writes that with "the devolution of NORAD space responsibilities to the United States Air Force (USAF) Space Command, there is increasing concern that Canada's role is becoming increasingly symbolic."

Everard points out that "Many U.S. observers view Canada as a

partner in name only. The fact that Canada is not financing any portion of the DEW line's update appears to reinforce this view."

Sokolsky disagrees with this view. He says that Canada has a potentially important role in the North Warning System, which when completed would detect Soviet bombers coming over the north pole. "Canada's role in NORAD is surveillance," says Sokolsky.

"There are costs of participation," Sokolsky says. "With linking, Canada would not be able to do anything if the U.S. decided to change its doctrine, for example, with SDI."

If the Canadian government chooses not to renew NORAD, which is highly unlikely but theoretically possible, Canada will have no radar system of its own with the dismantling of the CADIN-Pinetree radar system in Southern Canada, says Sokolsky. "Canada would have to depend on the U.S. for detection and surveillance of its airspace." This in effect would give the U.S. a free pass to Canadian airspace; this situation would be unthinkable for Canada.

What of the possibility that NORAD, with its active bomber defence and surveillance system, would form part of SDI? The *Citizen's* article states: "The renovation of the old DEW Line or the new North Warning System is not designed for ballistic missile warning so has nothing to do with Star Wars defence, and therefore the renewal of the NORAD agreement next year is a straight-forward question of continued co-operation in defence against bombers."

The link between NORAD and SDI is speculative, says Sokolsky. "NORAD would be revitalized regardless of SDI." Sokolsky adds that though NORAD is becoming more space-oriented, NORAD "has no space implications."

The U.S. is planning to spend \$600 million to upgrade the Distance-Early-Warning (DEW) radar line which is situated mostly in Canada. Everard writes that Canada can still play an important role in providing an active backup system to U.S. satellite defence. Also, the Over-the-Horizon Backscatter radar (OTH-B) may need Canadian mid-north geography in its deployment.

Will Canada be seen by the Soviet Union as a greater danger to its security because of the DEW line? If Canada were to be hit, "the targets would be the radars in North Bay. But Canada is not the prime target," says Sokolsky.

"Canada's role in surveillance is useless to Canada itself," says Sokolsky. "What are we going to do with the information? ... In a crisis it's the U.S. who decides when to launch."

"If the U.S. were to go on global alert, NORAD would pull Canada in," he adds.