

The strike was supported by opposition parties in Parliament, but criticized by the Azanian People's Organisation (AZAPO) which called it a destabilizing tactic. Bishop Desmond Tutu, Secretary of the South African Council of Churches (SACC), said he deplored the act as much as he did the Pretoria blast.

It appears that the Maputo attack was directed at the same Matola suburb which was the target of a raid by South African commando units in 1981 on houses and buildings they believed to be occupied by ANC members (p.5921).

In December 1982, the South Africans made a similar raid on alleged ANC "nests" in Maseru, the capital of Lesotho, killing 42 people. Many were ANC members, but 12 were Lesotho civilians whom the South Africans said, had been unintentionally "caught in the cross-fire" (p. 6673).

Speaking in Parliament on May 23rd, General Malan said the latest raid had been carried out by Impala Mark 3 aircraft. A missile site of the Mozambique Defence Force protecting the ANC positions had also been "effectively neutralized".

General Malan said the attack had been an act of revenge for the bomb blast in Pretoria, which occurred outside the headquarters of the South African Air Force and the offices of military and naval intelligence. Armed Forces personnel were among the victims, but most seem to have been civilians, both black and white. (TT 24/5)

Civilian Casualties

The Mozambique Information Minister, Mr. José Luís Cabaço, said in Maputo on May 24th that Mozambique would allow ANC refugees to live in the country but would arrest any who bore arms against South Africa.

Accompanied by foreign journalists, Mr. Cabaço visited the sites of the air strike by South African Air Force jets against alleged ANC bases.

Mozambique said the jet attack killed six people, including two women and two children, and wounded 40 others, almost all Mozambicans, at a jam factory, a day-care centre, and private houses. Damage appeared slight at most of the six places hit in the three-minute attack.

However, the South African Defence Force said on May 24th: "The SADF is satisfied that the places hit were allocated to the ANC and were occupied by terrorists." It claimed that its air strike killed 64 people, including 41 ANC members.

"The latest confirmed intelligence reports", showed 17 of those killed were Mozambican soldiers and six were civilians, in addition to the 41 "guerillas" it said.

Referring to witness accounts of the scene, the Defence Force said: "Sealing off an area hit by security forces, hiding the bodies of terrorists, and showing dead civilians to sympathetic journalists have been standard propaganda ploys".

Meanwhile, the ANC suggested in a fresh communiqué that it would strike again at South Africa to "honour" those who died in Maputo. "The only way we can truly honour these victims of aggression is by intensifying our offensive within South Africa", a statement from ANC offices in Zambia said.

In Maputo, Mr. Cabaço stood in front of the houses strafed and rocketed by the South Africans and shouted: "Does this look like the ANC?" The six sites included the jam factory, where three workers died.

Mr. Cabaço said Mozambique would continue to allow ANC members and any other genuine refugees to enter the country. "It is a principle of our Constitution". But he added that ANC members would never be allowed to carry arms against South Africa. Asked what would happen to those who did, he replied: "They would certainly be arrested". (GD 25/5)

OAU's Condemnation

President Moi of Kenya, who is also the current Chairman of the OAU, said on May 23rd that he had learnt "with dismay and horror" of the attack and bombardment of civilian targets by South Africa's air force in the suburbs of Maputo in Mozambique "killing and wounding innocent people and causing extensive damage to property".

President Moi said in a statement that this type of naked aggression against the sovereign state of Mozambique, was not only a violation of the United Nations Charter, but "an act of genocide by the racist regime of South Africa". The OAU, he said, condemned "the constant violation, provocations and aggression carried out by the racist South African regime against the Front-line states". He called on the international community to condemn the present aggression and to take concerted action to contain "the dangerous and unwarranted violations of international peace and security in southern Africa". (R. Nairobi 23/5)

Meanwhile, in Addis Ababa, the Secretary-General of the OAU, Mr. Edem Kodjo, strongly condemned the South African attack on Mozambique. In a statement to the Ethiopian News Agency, Mr. Kodjo noted that the latest South African attack on Mozambique could compel the forthcoming OAU summit in Addis Ababa to pay special attention to Pretoria's aggressive policies in the region. (R. Addis 23/5)

Support for Mozambique and condemnation of South Africa was also expressed by many other African leaders. In a message to President Machel, reported by Radio Dar es Salaam,

President Nyerere said the "Boer leaders" were showing their panic by attacking innocent citizens in neighbouring countries; Tanzania, its party and Government, would always stand together with their Mozambican brothers. A Tanzanian Government statement called on the international community to take steps against the threat to peace and security caused by South Africa.

A Zimbabwe Government statement issued by the acting Foreign Minister, Mr. Nathan Shamuyarira, reported by Radio Harare on May 24th said it was "high time that Western powers, collaborating with Pretoria, accept their responsibility and control these manic acts of aggression"; the brutal attack on May 23rd had been carried out "to satisfy the bloodlust of a group of enraged bulls".

A message to President Machel from President Moussa Traoré of Mali, reported by Radio Bamako, and a Congolese Government communiqué, reported by Radio Brazzaville, expressed profound indignation at the raid.

An Ethiopian Foreign Ministry press release, reported by Addis Ababa radio, referred to Pretoria's preparations for a new wave of aggression and the need for cohesion and rededication among Africans; it called on the UN Security Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Pretoria.

Radio Johannesburg on May 24th, in reporting that Mozambique's Foreign Minister, Mr. Chissano, had said in New York that his country would not be requesting a special session of the Security Council to discuss the raid and that his Government would continue to support the ANC, noted that a number of countries, including Britain, France, the USSR, Portugal, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Angola and Zambia had condemned the raid. A US State Department spokesman had said the US deplored the renewed violence in southern Africa: neither the bomb attack in Pretoria nor the raid into Mozambique was justified.

Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, Secretary General of the United Nations, for his part, expressed his "great regret at the escalation of violence in southern Africa and the loss of innocent life". (HT 24/5)

Daily Nation's Comment

Commenting after the raid, the *Daily Nation* (Nairobi) said that neither the attack nor its mode should surprise anybody. In fact, it would have been surprising if Pretoria did not react in this way.

The bombing had hit the racist regime where it hurts most. And it is not just the number of casualties. What hurts most is that the black nationalists could cause those casualties on the pavement of one of the country's most sensitive military centres.

To be humiliated before the eyes of the electorate by what has been so far portrayed as a scattered band of ineffectual terrorists, is not something the white dictators of Pretoria have learnt to live with.

By attacking Mozambique, Pretoria is trying to shift the blame. In effect, it is asserting that actions by South African nationalist fighters are not possible unless planned and executed from neighbouring countries, including Mozambique.

True, the guerrillas have to pass through someone's territory to reach South Africa. But last week's bombing and other daring actions by the guerrillas have only been made possible through the support they get within South Africa.

As one prominent South African church leader pointed out soon after the bombing, such actions would not be possible were it not for the fact that government policies are pushing the black majority to take up violent struggle as the only option open to them.

Sending out a squadron of jets to bombard Mozambique is not going to extinguish the fires of revolution by the repressed majority inside South Africa. But the Pretoria regime hopes to cover the Mozambicans into rethinking their support for the black nationalist fighters, while trying to show the white electorate that it has the determination to hit back hard.

More attacks will no doubt be planned against other Front-line States. Now that Pretoria has been stung hard, it can be expected to act like a wild beast, hitting out with blind fury against real and imagined enemies.

But no amount of pressure is likely to curb the Front-line States' support of the liberation movements. Their determination has been put to the test before and they have not been found wanting.

But they should not be expected to shoulder the burden alone. They rightfully accept the material backing of other African nations who have undertaken, by accepting the OAU charter, to dedicate themselves to the liberation of every inch of African territory.

The South African racist authority would not feel free to stage its raids against any of the Front-line States if it knew the risk was too high. Right now such raids are fairly low risk ventures because of the Front-line States limited means.

But that would change if African nations pooled their means and put them at the disposal of these states so that they could face the racist forces on equal terms.

Unfortunately, African nations are so much divided right now, even making them sit together is proving to be almost impossible. While split, African

nations cannot expect others to take them seriously.

And their disarray prevents them from exerting pressure on Pretoria's Western godfathers to put a leash on their contemptible business associate. (DN24/5)

Cycle of Violence

The *New York Times* takes the view that South Africa can segregate its races, but it cannot segregate itself from the violence its policies breed. This is the meaning of last weekend's terror bombing in Pretoria, which claimed 17 lives, white and black, and left 217 wounded. Bombs beget bombs, and South Africa has compounded a gruesome deed by loosing its warplanes against Mozambique, insisting it aimed at guerrilla targets.

One can mourn all the victims without indulging the injured innocence of South Africa's white rulers. To the challenge of racial violence, they offer a single explanation: it is a Communist plot, backed by the Soviet Union and carried out by the outlawed African National Congress. And they propose a single remedy: an eye for an eye.

But the true, and truly evil, explanation is home-grown. It is the system of apartheid, which has the appalling effect of making 21 million blacks strangers in their own land. For all the years of talk of power-sharing or conciliation, in every vital respect power in South Africa remains the monopoly of 4.5 million whites. The huge black majority is left with "citizenship" rights in patchwork homelands that Pretoria pretends are sovereign states.

Apartheid — apartness — means that, theoretically, blacks must carry pass-books and are forbidden to spend more than 72 hours in white urban areas. But if apartheid were enforced literally, it would bankrupt a white economy grown prosperous on cheap black labour. And yet for a black to question this system is to risk jail, torture or death.

Reflecting on the French Revolution, Burke warned: "A state without the means of some change is without the means of its own conservation". But in the name of conservatism, South Africa's rulers have imposed a radical system that denies the majority the hope of real and peaceful change. Then Communists are blamed for the explosive result.

These truths are apparent to the Reagan Administration, which has applied the soft nudge of "constructive engagement" to the hard rulers in Pretoria. The State Department even-handedly deplores all violence, putting the desperation of victims on the same plane as the brutality of masters. But for all this restraint, Washington has yet to wrest a single tangible benefit in the form of change from the South Africans or in Namibia, which they occupy illegally.

If the latest blood-letting fails to sober Pretoria, it ought to impress Washington. "I weep for my country," said Bishop Desmond Tutu, a black dismayed by both bombings who has tried consistently to touch the troubled conscience of his white overlords. "We cannot solve problems this way".

President Ronald Reagan also has a chance, if he will but use it, to speak to that same conscience on behalf of all those in South Africa, white and black, who yearn for peaceful change instead of hatred, repression and death. (HT 25/5)

Conflicts' New Level

Analysing the current situation, the *Guardian* (UK) says that the bomb blast in Pretoria and South Africa's swift counterstrike at the external mission of the ANC in Maputo are both unprecedented. No previous ANC attack—and there appear to have been about 150 in the past seven years—has caused such carnage. Nor has there previously been so swift a retaliation—or one in which South African Air Force jets rather than commandoes have been used for the counterattack.

In this sense, the events of the past few days have lifted South Africa's 20-year-old insurgency conflict to a new level. Alan Paton, author of *Cry, the Beloved Country* noted that the Pretoria explosion signalled an end to ANC policy of avoiding the killing and wounding of people. The *Star*, the Johannesburg evening paper, noted that "the ANC has lost its image of a responsible body reluctantly resorting to 'selective violence'. This is plain, cold-blooded urban terrorism." Other observers have suggested that the ANC's initial equivocation in admitting responsibility—it has since done so unambiguously—arose from fear that the carnage in Pretoria might alienate people otherwise sympathetic to it.

Yet it is problematic pinpointing exactly when or how the escalation in the level of violence began. Nor is it easy to determine when the ANC's external mission, or sections of it, decided to use indiscriminate terror rather than selective attacks on targets like energy installations and police stations.

Since June 1982, there have been at least three attacks for which the ANC has been blamed in which it was fortunate, or even miraculous, that there was no carnage on the scale seen in mid-May. On June 4th, 1982, a young white man was killed when a bomb exploded in a lift in the building in Cape Town that houses the President's Council. On June 19th, several hundred people on a train narrowly escaped death when the locomotive detonated a bomb on the line near Waterval-onder in the Eastern Transvaal (p. 46498). This year, on February 18th, 86 blacks queuing up at a pass office in Bloemfontein were injured by a bomb explosion. The sole casualty was the person the police suspect of placing the explosive (p.6745).

Though the ANC has not claimed responsibility for all of these incidents, the police contend that it is to blame. Reports reaching Johannesburg from Harare in the middle of last year suggested that the external mission might be abandoning its earlier policy of avoiding civilian casualties. In October, a leaked CIA report suggested that youngsters who joined the ANC in the wake of the Soweto riots in 1976 (p. 4060) were becoming more powerful in the external mission's military wing and were pressing for such a change in strategy.

While no firm conclusions can be drawn, it does at least seem possible that the car-bomb incident on May 20th was not the first time ANC personnel planted a bomb that carried obvious risks for civilians. The idea has also been mooted by diplomatic and other sources that the external mission of the ANC contains several different factions.

A 21-year-old man currently on trial for high treason in Pietermaritzburg claimed in his defence earlier in May that he and his colleagues had aborted a mission to blow up a fuel station in Mahlabatini in Kwazulu when they saw black people in the vicinity. He contended it was not ANC policy to kill or injure anyone.

The questions which obviously arise now are whether militants within the external mission are gaining the upper hand and whether a change of strategy has taken place. The air force strike into Mozambique was the third military attack into an immediately neighbouring state of this magnitude. The first was a raid by helicopter-borne commandos into the Matola area of Maputo in January 1981 and the second the commando strike into Maseru in December 1982, in which 42 people were killed.

In the light of what happened in Pretoria, it is worth recalling some of the editorial comments made by South African newspapers about the Maseru raid. Several of them made clear that they felt the strike was an over-reaction. But *The Citizen*—in a remarkably critical editorial for a pro-government paper—went so far as to predict that the strike into Maseru would provoke counter-attacks even though it might achieve its objective of reducing the threat of terror attacks over the festive season. But *The Citizen* then added that, on the other hand, "we have caused the terror forces to plan revenge against us and they will no doubt try some new nastiness to show that they are still in business"

Setback for US

The *Guardian* goes on to say that the increase in the insurgency conflict is a setback for the Reagan Administration's policy of "constructive engagement", which is directed not only at South Africa but at the region in general, one of the purposes being to promote security for the region as a whole. The Americans have been trying to increase their own and reduce Soviet influence in Mozambique, and US officials who have visited Maputo in the past year have almost certainly used their good offices to try to bring about a lessening of tensions with Pretoria.

It was moreover as recently as May 5th that Pretoria and Maputo had talks at ministerial level at which the activities of both the ANC and the Mozambique National Resistance (MNR)—which the US contends is backed by Pretoria—were discussed.

Clearly, the atrocity on May 20th and the retaliatory strike will undermine all these negotiations.

The Pretoria bombing, which occurred at the same time as newspapers in South Africa were reporting at some length the British Labour Party's promise in its election manifesto to give material and financial aid to "liberation movements" in South Africa and Namibia has provoked an unprecedented wave of condemnation and revulsion from black and white organizations. Several statements have, however, drawn attention to the government's proposed new constitution, which seeks to entrench the exclusion of blacks from the parliamentary franchise (p. 6834).

At a mass rally of 6,000 Africans and 1,000 Indians in Stanger on the north coast of Natal, Chief Gatsha Buthelezi said that he and his colleagues in the South African Black Alliance remained opposed to any form of violence "be it indiscriminate planting of explosives or organized invasion of innocent countries like Lesotho." But he added that those who held the reins of political power in South Africa were themselves in a position to prevent the occurrence of "such atrocities". Blacks, he said, regarded their exclusion from power-sharing as an insult.

Gopie Munsook, a Conservative who was once a member of the officially-recognized South African Indian Council and who signed the President's Council report on which the government's present constitutional plans are partly based, said: "If the new constitu-

tional proposals cannot offer a solution to the political frustrations of the people behind this senseless violence, I am afraid that the Pretoria incident may only be an hors d'oeuvre of things to come".

Willem Kleynhans, professor of political science at the University of South Africa, condemned the blast as senseless terrorism but added that it should be read as a crucial warning to the government to reconsider the exclusion of blacks from top-level political decision-making. He said it was not too late for the government to scrap its constitution bill, which is currently going through Parliament.

But the *Rand Daily Mail* said in an editorial: "If those responsible for the terror believe for a moment that these acts are going to frighten or force the government into a fundamental change in its ways, they are guilty of a gross and tragic miscalculation. They show that they do not understand the thinking and attitudes of those who control the power in our country". (GD 24/5) (See pp.68348C, 6845C)
Last reference p.6807

RISE OF THE ANC

1912. Founded as the South African Native National Congress.

1913. Opposed Native Lands Act, which limited blacks to buying land in tribal reserves.

1923. Changed name to African National Congress. Aims: End to racial discrimination and a qualified franchise for blacks. 1952. "Defiance campaign"—non-violent civil disobedience—against apartheid laws.

1959. Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) forms breakaway group.

1960. Sharpeville massacre. 69 blacks killed, 180 injured when police fire on anti pass laws demonstrators. ANC and PAC banned.

1961. ANC turns to policy of limited violence. Military wing set up. Sabotage begins.

1964. Rivonia Trial. Nelson Mandela and others sentenced to life imprisonment.

1976-77. Riots in Soweto and other townships leave 600 dead. Young blacks leave for guerrilla training abroad.

1981-82. South African raid on ANC houses in Mozambique, and Maseru. Later raid kills 42.

1983. Bomb blast in Pretoria kills 17 and injures 217. ANC justifies blast as against military target. (TT 23/5)