

# Reader defends South Africa

From page 4

country is sufficient to judge it unless one visits it with prejudiced mind and apply one's preconceived ideas to it. One has to live there with an open mind—I do not include those whose purpose is revolution—to be fair, and to discover in the process that the error lies wholly in Western values being forced by Western allies on a largely tribal people.

The Cape Peninsula was sparsely populated by nomadic black tribes in the 17th Century when the Dutch first settled there. Almost 200 years later, the British settlers arrived and claimed the land their's in the name of their sovereign ruler. The seeds of resentment were sown from that time on between the Dutch and the English.

Compare in Canada the French and the English. Compare the different Indian and Inuit tribes to the various African tribes, each with their own tribal loves, dress, lifestyles, and superstitions. They cannot abide each other, then or now. Genocide of the black tribes by the white population has never taken place in South Africa, hence the consistently large black majority filtering into developed white areas from the various tribal lands. The Western world has no idea of the black situation there except what they know of the cruel slavery practised in North America in the past and the Klu Klux Klan of the present, and unjustly applying it to the South African situation.

No one yet has had the presence of mind to question Desmond Tutu on whether blacks are bought and sold, chained, starved and whipped into slavery. As a man of the cloth he will honestly have to admit that it has never taken place in South Africa. He pleads to the world to help save his people from being killed, playing artfully on the North America's history of slavery, and deftly fails to explain that they are killing each other and always have.

Mrs. Woodcock feels the blacks' education is inferior because of the apartheid system. I agree that it was so when South Africa was under British rule and then no one cried "Foul!" However, no one today has wondered about the apparent excellent education of Bishop Tuto, a fluent orator, of Mandela—a lawyer, of Winnie Mandela—a social worker. There are doctors, nurses, teachers, lawyers, social workers, car dealers, and a handful of millionaires and many labourers. They have a large university, an enormous hospital, medical centres, radio stations, elementary and high schools and recreation centers. These buildings are consistently destroyed as examples of "white influence", by the terrorists groups when rioting takes place amongst them, not by the police or the South African government. Their idea is for the world to lay blame at South Africa's door. I see nothing wrong with black teachers teaching black children nor the black doctors and nurses healing black patients because communication either way is in their own tribal language.

All the good things in South Africa have been scoffed at by people, like Lowell Greene, ex-moderator of the United Church, Lois Wilson, the hypocritical Anglican Church and the national media, all inadvertently furthering the Marxist cause which is no longer mere South African paranoia.

The black townships on the outskirts of the cities were created when the tribal blacks migrated to the cities to work. They are not rounded up or recruited. They

seek work like everybody else and leave of their own accord if the work does not suit them. They are fired for sloppy work, except the ones who work in the mines (they sign contracts lasting a year and may renew it for it pays well), and the reason is that they are handling gold and diamond ore.

Unlike the North American Indians who were designated reserve lands, the South African tribal lands remained as originally found, but the townships are a mixture of tribes, and the dreadful faction fights which take place frequently between them leave indescribable carnage and property damage. The South African government gave them the opportunity to administer and police themselves in the townships at a municipal level, not because it was too risky for whites to enforce the apartheid system as Mrs. Woodcock believes.

If the blacks cannot maintain law and order amongst their own, how on earth could their be power sharing on a multi-racial level? Have any of Mrs. Woodcock's black hosts informed her of the cannibalism which occurs during rioting. Have they explained the rioters' method of attack?—Children in the forefront armed with stones, then women with babies on their backs armed with stones and heavy sticks, the men behind them armed with Russian-made weapons. The peaceful and innocent who refuse to fight and stay away from their jobs, are killed as white collaborators.

Their townships are not walled compounds, by any means, but there are wire fences to keep outsiders out. These areas are off limits to whites too and any found there, whatever the circumstances, are committing an offence and liable to be charged according to the law—so it goes both ways, not merely for the blacks.

I cannot see the reasoning of Mrs. Woodcock's views that commuting South African blacks by bus to and from work almost constitutes a crime. Obviously, she has not given the Canadian Indians a thought that they too live on the outskirts of Canadian cities and with no bus services for transport. Commuting employees to and from Ottawa and Cobden, Cobden/Chalk River, Cobden/Pembroke, or Cobden/Renfrew are to be pitied by Mrs. Woodcock's rule of thumb because we do not live near our places of employ.

Too often the error is made by assuming the African black to be the same as the North American black—an impossible assumption, since the North American black has no language of his own, no tribe, no tribal dress and tribal folklore and lifestyle. To insist that there is no difference is to compel the African black to deny his tribal heritage.

Also, when passes were first handed out to blacks in Mrs. Woodcock's father's time, South Africa was very much a part of the British Commonwealth and the administration of law and order leaned heavily toward British influence and oppression. To cite the British each time as being the original perpetrators does not make me anti-British. I am merely telling it as it is.

Racial Riots are occurring regularly in Britain, in the U.S.A., in France and in the larger Canadian cities, but South Africa, with an incomparable situation, is the whipping boy of the world. Why? A bloodbath caused by South Africa's "apartheid" system? No, a bloodbath caused by Western countries too blind to see that South Africa and Israel are the only two countries in the vast

continent which have not yet fallen foul of Russian greed—yet! But it is getting there with Western help.

South Africa is rich in minerals, agriculture and industry. It's coastlines are vital to the worlds shipping lanes. When South Africa falls to communist-backed black rule, the U.K. will be next. South America is already a shambles by the same agitators and most of Europe and Asia are already communist ruled. North America would be surrounded by communism. Perhaps Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher are painfully aware of these facts.

Two incidences which I cannot help but relate, the first is of a white Anglican Bishop (none are ever South African born), booted out of South Africa years ago for inciting the blacks to riot. He now resides in Canada and appeared on television nineteen years ago to tell of the "Horrors" of South Africa. I resided there at the time of his "experieces." They were half-truths. Two isolated incidences of the type which often take place in the States, but mildly so in these two cases and he conveniently does not mention the severe punishment meted out for the assaults. I was shocked! When a man of the cloth tells half-truths with the sole purpose of incensing the public, it is certainly not for the glory of God but for man!

The second incident is of a young black journalist exiled from South Africa years ago when the first black uprisings began. He chose to go to England, found the prejudice there worse than he had ever experienced in South Africa. He decided to settle in the U.S.A. and found the prejudice there of equal intensity.

A few months later, before he committed suicide, he wrote to Rand Daily Mail (the newspaper he used to work for), to say that Britain and the States boasted no racial oppression, but he found it to be an intense undercurrent of prejudice. Incidentally, he also discovered at the time that Canada accepted no black immigrants. His final sentence was, "South Africa was honest. At least I knew where I stood there."

If the U.S.A., Britain and Canada feel justified that things have since changed, believe me, they have not solved the problem, but merely scratched the surface.

But I shall always wonder what the reaction of Canadians would be if Desmond Tutu or Nelson Mandela came to this country to arouse the Indians into revolution, to claim the land that is rightfully theirs, to overthrow the Canadian government. And what if the World Council of Churches jumped into the fray to join them, demanding an Indian or Inuit Prime Minister? What if a Canadian Indian chose an underground movement to bomb public buildings and to try to oust all whites from this country, as Mandela and the ANC are doing in South Africa, backed by a Marxist regime?

Canadian Indians and Inuit wish to control and govern land of their own. The South African government has given the people each black tribe their original land to govern, so as to preserve their tribal heritage and to vote for their own administrators, and in doing so was condemned by the Western world. It is a case of damned if they do and damned if they don't.

So we have the ANC in South Africa compared to the now defunct FLQ in Canada, the Dutch and the English, the French and the English, the various minorities in both countries, and the different African tribes compared with the different Indian and Inuit tribes. But as the Bible tells us "Let those without sin, cast the first stone."

Phyllis A. Delpont  
Cobden, Ontario