

Apartheid said no simple black-and-white

Editor's Note:

The following two articles present differing views of the "apartheid" system of South Africa. The first view is given by C. P. Mulder, Minister of Information and Minister of the Interior, of South Africa. It was first printed in the "New York Times" on May 14, 1974.

The second view comes from A. Butlitsky and was printed in the "New Times" June edition. It represents a somewhat different view from the first.

By C. P. MULDER

PRETORIA, South Africa - The Republic of South Africa is a microcosm of the world's ethnic and political complexities. Since South Africa is an imperfect society and since no policy applied to a complex situation anywhere in the world is perfect, we expect and appreciate well-founded criticism of the way

Realism said needed in understanding issue

in which we have set about restructuring our society.

However, the vehement criticism in some United States newspapers and in political circles about developments in South Africa is too often unfounded. The lack of perspective and balance is so striking, and so persistent, that I am sometimes inclined to attribute this state of affairs to intellectual dishonesty rather than ignorance.

If these politicians and news commentators have not allowed themselves to be taken in by the empty rhetoric and double standards practiced in the United Nations, then their criticism of the broad pattern of development in South Africa can only rest on a false premise.

This premise is that while South Africa is inhabited by a majority of black people (aborigines), they

are dominated economically and politically by a minority conglomeration of white settlers (latecomers) whose main objective is to stay in power while retaining black people as a source of cheap labor.

In the eyes of these commentators, the solution to this state of affairs in South Africa lies in a speedy social and political integration of all the races, and the only real obstacle is the white people's craving for power.

I have encountered this premise in almost every critical analysis of South African affairs in United States newspapers. But anyone who bases his argument on this premise with the facts at hand is being intellectually dishonest.

Consider the following:

South Africa is not inhabited by a homogeneous black society with a

common loyalty, language, history or culture. Instead, the black people consist of disparate ethnic communities, different nations, with a recent history of internecine tribal warfare.

As for "white settlers", considering that Dutch pioneers began farming in South Africa just a few years after the Mayflower reached America and that even the language of the majority of the white people evolved in Africa, not in Europe, then any continued reference to "white colonists" is dishonest.

The white South Africans are as much identifiable African nations as the French or the Germans are European nations, and as a nation the whites are numerically stronger than any of the black nations in South Africa except the Zulu nation.

Neither the black nations nor the white nation have a prior claim to all of South Africa except to those territories that they settled by right of first occupation. The reason these different nations find themselves within one border is a direct result of Britain's nineteenth-century colonial conquest of the sub-continent of Africa.

These considerations are at the root of South Africa's problem. With disparate nations living in one state there is a strong possibility of a clash of nationalisms if the nations are not satisfied.

What we propose to do about this multinational situation is precisely what the world has ordered for itself in the last thirty years: sovereign states for each different nation.

In 1945, there were only some 50 independent nations. Today there are 135. In southern Africa in the nineteenth and early twentieth

century there were only a few South Africa. The map of to seven independent nations when our political boundaries were drawn out there will be one black nation, the Xhosa, the resolution to independence will be development of domination by others. This picture from so many commentators. One can, then, the carrying rejection of an act of independence for those who readily accept various black nations were striving from Britain and Belgium. This transition of South Africa into a black nation is a direct result of Britain's nineteenth-century colonial conquest of the sub-continent of Africa.

The basic objectives include self-determination, protection of ethnic groups, and resolution to independence will be development of domination by others. This picture from so many commentators. One can, then, the carrying rejection of an act of independence for those who readily accept various black nations were striving from Britain and Belgium. This transition of South Africa into a black nation is a direct result of Britain's nineteenth-century colonial conquest of the sub-continent of Africa.

There is no doubt that the Biafra or the Congo. May it come as a reminder to the two and the predicted the death of South Africa. The and of the 1960s and coups convulsed the nation. It is high time shown in the Africa affair.

There is no doubt that the Biafra or the Congo. May it come as a reminder to the two and the predicted the death of South Africa. The and of the 1960s and coups convulsed the nation. It is high time shown in the Africa affair.

There is no doubt that the Biafra or the Congo. May it come as a reminder to the two and the predicted the death of South Africa. The and of the 1960s and coups convulsed the nation. It is high time shown in the Africa affair.

There is no doubt that the Biafra or the Congo. May it come as a reminder to the two and the predicted the death of South Africa. The and of the 1960s and coups convulsed the nation. It is high time shown in the Africa affair.



'Unholy alliance'

By A. BUTLITSKY

The fall of the fascist regime in Portugal came as a bad shock to the advocates of "baaskap" - the preservation of the white rule in South Africa. This is quite understandable: a vital link of the "unholy alliance", which united the European racialists and South African colonists for years, has cracked. Prime Minister Vorster of the Republic of South Africa, declared in panic that this could be "of tremendous consequence to this country." Addressing a

"congress of the Transvaal Nationalist Party" 24 parliament warned that the Republic "will be alone".

International Pressure from

This disma realistic. T ment's "n actually m offensive a