

SOUTH AFRICA AND THE OLYMPICS:
AN INTERVIEW WITH DENNIS BRUTUS

by

Ed Ferguson

Dennis Brutus is President of the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SAN-ROC), and Chairperson of the International Committee Against Racism in Sport (ICARIS). An internationally acclaimed poet, Brutus was granted political asylum last year in the United States where he is an English Professor at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. Professor Ferguson, who is the Pacific Northwest Representative of Africa Network, conducted the interview for Ufahamu.*

Question: South Africa is now seeking readmission to the Olympic Movement from which it was expelled in 1970. Will South Africa be represented at the summer Olympics in Los Angeles?

Answer: Oh yes. There will be representatives of the Pretoria regime in Los Angeles. But they will not be sending a team to the summer Olympics. They only want to get their delegates accepted so that they regain membership. Then they will be eligible to send a team to the 1988 Olympics which will be in the "great democracy" called South Korea. The fact that the next Olympics will be in Seoul is just one more encouragement to the South Africans; one dictator to another, you know, one repressive regime to another. There is very little likelihood that anybody will be allowed to demonstrate against apartheid in Seoul. So they want to get membership this year and a team in 1988. That is their objective.

Question: What were the precise grounds on which South Africa was expelled from the Olympic Movement?

Answer: When South Africa was excluded from the Olympic Movement it was not, in fact, because of a policy called apartheid, or the fact that black and white are segregated, or that 80% of the population cannot vote, or that all African men and women over the age of 15 must carry a pass and must produce it on demand and if they fail to do so they will go to prison. All

*Africa Network coordinates activities and disseminates information regarding issues and projects related to anti-Apartheid movements in the U.S. For further information, please contact: Africa Network, P.O. Box 59364, Chicago, Illinois 60659. Tel. (312) 677-7416.

those are true of South Africa, but they were not the grounds on which South Africa was excluded from the Olympics. It was not, in fact, a question of human rights.

The Olympic Games are governed by the Olympic Charter. Fundamental Principle One of the Olympic Charter says -- or said until this year for it may have been changed -- that any country guilty of discrimination against athletes on the grounds of race, religion, or politics must be excluded from the Games. It has been in effect ever since the Olympics were founded.

So when South Africa was expelled it was on the grounds that it discriminated on the basis of race. Of course we had to supply evidence to the International Olympic Committee (IOC). One of the documents we submitted was simply a part of the South African statute book. It was a piece of legislation called the Group Areas Act. It is a law which says the country is divided up into areas for particular racial groups. There are areas for white groups, and areas for black groups, and areas for various shades of black. Under the Group Areas Act a stadium or park could be declared "whites only" and if any black athlete entered that stadium whether to run or to swim or to box, because he was contravening the Group Areas Act he was liable for arrest and he would go to prison. It applied equally to white athletes; if they went into a black area, played in a black stadium, they would go to prison. That was the law to which we were able to point.

I should add, I suppose, that South Africa is not equally divided in case anyone has that illusion. The 16% white population has allocated to itself 87% of the land area of South Africa by laws which it made, since no blacks are allowed to vote and do not participate in the law-making process. The remaining 84% of the population has been allocated 13% of the land area. This manifest injustice is something that I do not have to address further. That is the Group Areas Act and it is because of that piece of discriminatory legislation that South Africa was excluded from the Olympics.

Now comes the curious fact. That law is still on the South African statute books. It exists. It is still a crime for a white to swim in a swimming pool of blacks, or a black to run on the same track with a white. They have never removed those laws. What they do now is to temporarily suspend them for a particular event and then they reimpose them. So clearly, in strict law, South Africa is still in violation of the Charter and should still be kept out. Notwithstanding that, South Africa has applied for readmission to the Olympic Games.

Q: Has the IOC responded to South Africa's application?

A: Mr. Juan Antonio Samaranch, President of the IOC, has set up a commission to investigate the question of South African readmission to the Olympics without having changed the discriminatory laws that led to expulsion in 1970.

Q: Have you protested to the IOC?

A: Certainly. As President of the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SAN-ROC), I wrote on February 3, 1984, to Samaranch to inquire on the present status of South Africa.* I requested that a clear statement be issued by the IOC indicating that South Africa will not be readmitted to the Olympic Movement until all legislation discriminating against athletes on the grounds of race is removed. His answer is really unsatisfactory, though it seems to be satisfactory. He says, "The policy of the IOC towards South Africa has not changed." That sounds encouraging. But, we have every reason to believe the IOC will be considering at Los Angeles a revised version of the Olympic Charter under which South Africa was expelled. If it is true that the Olympic Charter has been changed -- and I believe it is true -- then the IOC can say, "We are abiding by the Charter, our policy has not changed." But something else has changed, the Charter has changed! I think we are in big trouble. We have a fight on our hands.

FROM SASA TO SAN-ROC

Q: You have led the fight against apartheid sport for over twenty-five years. Can you recall how you first became involved

A: Largely accidental. I was a very keen sport enthusiast. I was a good coach, my softball team did well. My table tennis team did well; I played in the finals of regional table tennis. I did a little long distance running in college. I was surrounded by great athletes who were turning in fantastic performances, blacks who were doing better than any white athletes. Some of the best athletes in the country were my colleagues; they were black and they couldn't get on the Olympic team.

Then, while I was teaching and coaching sport, one of my colleagues -- another teacher in a black school in the ghetto -- drew my attention to the fact that the Olympic Charter made racism illegal. In fact, he didn't even know about the Charter. He just said, "As far as I know, according to the Olympics you are not supposed to have racism." Then I tracked down the

*The letter is reproduced in the Spring 1984 issue of MBIRA NewsNotes; available for \$1.50 from Troubadour Press, P.O. Box 59364 Chicago, Illinois 60659.

Charter itself and I found the clause -- Fundamental Principle One -- that was the weapon.

I also managed to get hold of copies of the constitutions of the South African Olympic Committee and the South African sport bodies. Everytime there was a clause "membership is open to persons of European descent," that meant whites. Blacks were out. And so that was the basis of my fight.

Then I met a man who was suffering from polio. He had spent thirteen years in an iron lung and finally died. He could hardly speak. He used his throat muscles to pump air into his lungs because they were paralyzed. He used to talk to me about racism. He was one of those who encouraged me because he could see how they were vulnerable on the sport issue, both because of their obsession with sport and because there was an Olympic Charter we could appeal to.

His name was Christopher Gell. He was white. He was English. He had been to India as a magistrate and had got polio there. He was one of the most influential men in my life, not so much because he started me thinking along those lines, but because he encouraged me. He was able to give me contacts in the journalistic world who could carry my ideas. Sometimes he would sign the articles -- I would write them -- and sometimes he would tell me who would carry my articles, you see? I was able to develop a tremendous amount of influence inside South Africa and outside, but much of it undercover. The police didn't even know who was writing the articles and so on. I was able to arrange for my letters to Avery Brundage of the IOC to be smuggled out of South Africa and mailed in England. If I mailed them from South Africa they would never reach him.

But I never pretended that I could have done it alone. It was always a team effort. But there were certain people who were particularly important. Although sometimes people say that I sat down and I isolated a particular target -- that I went after that target -- it's not true. I could see the possibilities but it came over a period of many years.

Q: How did you develop that team effort in your struggle against apartheid sport?

A: We formed the non-racial South African Sport Association (SASA) in 1958, and we built it to the point where we had about 60,000 members. It became the most powerful sport organization in South Africa. It was also the one that was feared by the government because it had both black and white members. People like Alan Paton, Patrick Duncan, and Nelson Mandela were associated with it. The government didn't know quite how to hit it. Here was a sport organization -- black and white

-- which said, "We aren't going to break any laws. We're just determined to play sport like the rest of the world plays it. If you stop us you'll have to explain why. We're not going to defy you. We're just going to play our sport."

SASA had become absolutely dynamic by 1963. But we were not making any progress with the IOC for a very simple reason. Everytime we wrote to Avery Brundage, then President of the IOC, he or his secretary would send the same reply: "The International Olympic Committee only entertains correspondence from Olympic Committees. Whatever good case you may have, unfortunately, we cannot deal with it."

We were sending the IOC reams of clippings proving racism in sport. You know, blacks were being arrested for entering a white gym, just to go and watch gymnastics. So we had all these clippings and we sent them to Brundage and he had the same answer: "Unfortunately I cannot entertain your letter because IOC rules permit it only to respond to letters from Olympic Committees."

So there was only one thing to do. In order to get our letters taken seriously we had to become an Olympic Committee. It was obvious. So I introduced a resolution calling for the change of the name of our organization, that SASA should become the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee. My friends were hysterical! They attacked me, they condemned me. They said, "You've spent all these years building a powerful organization whose name is known throughout the country and across the world. You say SASA and people know what you are talking about. You are going to undo this? Ridiculous!"

I got word from people in the African National Congress (ANC), "You shouldn't do this." I went to them. I talked to Nelson (Mandela), I talked to Walter (Sisulu), and I said, "We need this." They understood. But there were other people who said, "What is Brutus up to? Who will ever remember a clumsy name like SAN-ROC? A long name? Forget it!" Fortunately, people who were in the sport organization could see the logic of what I was arguing. They voted with no difficulty at all. SASA became SAN-ROC. Years later SAN-ROC was a byword. Everybody knew what SAN-ROC stood for because an organization is not really measured by its title, it is measured by what it does.

Q: How did the Apartheid South African Olympic Committee react to the formation of SAN-ROC?

A: The white South African Olympic Committee practically begged for a meeting with us. They asked us to come and meet them. We met. They said, "Look, you are embarrassing us. We are t

Olympic Committee. All Olympic Committees are non-racial. How dare you come along and create a non-racial Olympic Committee." We said, "Great, if you are non-racial, let us in! If you don't let us in, we're going to form a non-racial Olympic Committee." I'll tell you, those guys like Frank Braun who was then president of both South African boxing and the racial South African Olympic Committee were begging us, "You can't do this to us!" We said, "Well, too bad," and we went ahead and we formed it.

DWARF PSYCHE

Q: You seem to have hit the apartheid regime in a vulnerable spot. Would you agree with those who say that sport is religion to the white South African?

A: Oh yes, I certainly do. In South Africa there are three big religions. There's the church which is number three. There's politics which is number two. Then there is sport which is number one. That is literally the order of priorities. Sport is the biggest obsession, then comes politics, then comes the church.

Q: Why is sport such an obsession for whites in South Africa?

A: There's no good explanation, but I have theorized about it. You see, it is a country which is desperately poor culturally. It has no art, no music, no ballet, no theatre, and more or less bad plays from Broadway or Picadilly or wherever. And so there is this incredible psychological barrenness. It is like a desert. In that desert the only thing that enhances the ego, that gives them a better self-image, is success on the sport field.

And so sport becomes the major compensation for a dwarf psyche. You can make it a giant psyche because you're "number one" in the world in rugby, and you have Gary Player in golf, or a Coetzee or whoever -- the "great white hope" -- who is going to fix all the black boxers in the world. That's one dimension. Two others are equally important.

The country is desperately isolated. It has got virtually a "cordon sanitaire" surrounding it so there is no contact with the outside world. Through sport they send a rugby team to Australia, they send a cricket team to England, they send a wrestling team to the United States. You read about it on the front page because there is evidence they are not isolated. It is through sport that they achieve the break-out from the corral.

Finally, sport is what the government uses to persuade the

white South African that it is not isolated. When you tell a white South African, "The world rejects you, rejects your racism, the world equates you with the Nazis," he is shocked and he's got nothing to say in reply. Then he can say, "Ah, but in Corvallis, Oregon, our boys were wrestling, and we had a girl running on the track in England, and we had a guy boxing in Las Vegas" -- in Caesar's Palace surrounded by Mafia hoods.* You know, everything that enables them to contradict reality, that persuades them they are not isolated.

That is why Chester Crocker went to South Africa on behalf of the Reagan Administration. The carrot he dangled in front of the South African was, "The United States can end South Africa's polecat status. We can bring you back into the world community. Play ball with us and we will help you play ball with the rest of the world."

Q: Your account of the white South African mentality explains why the government reacted so quickly to your organizing activities.

A: Perhaps. SAN-ROC was formed in January 1963, and I was banned in the same month. And of course I was arrested four months later, in May, at a meeting of the South African Olympic Committee. I was charged with the crime of attending a sport meeting. I was sent to prison on Robben Island.

Q: How did the IOC react to the formation of SAN-ROC?

A: The IOC could not ignore it. Our letters would be read, for now they would have to be replied to. But we had a lot to learn in the drive to expel South Africa from the Olympics.

There was the problem of the composition of the IOC. It turned out that about 70% of the people who made the decisions in the IOC were friends of South Africa. They came from the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. They were determined to preserve South Africa's right to participate even though the Prime Minister of South Africa had said in a speech in Parliament on the selection of the South African Olympic team, "What the world must understand is that when we select our team, proficiency has got nothing to do with it. We select first on color, then we select on performance." If you aren't white you don't get on the team. That was the official position, but we still could not move the IOC to action.

*For the account of South African wrestlers in Oregon, see Ed Ferguson: "Oregon and South Africa: The Sporting Connection," in Ufahamu, Vol. 11, no. 3, 1981.

Then we had to learn to carry out the struggle within the Olympic Charter. The IOC only recognizes violations of the Charter. They will take action against any country that violates the Charter, but you could go to them and tell them about a thousand prisoners on Robben Island and they would say, "That's too bad. That's none of our business. We only deal with the Charter." All those issues -- the prisons, the ghettos, the pass laws, unemployment, education, segregation -- are valid issues, but everyone of them was a waste of time when you approached the IOC. That was the mistake that Harry Edwards (the black American sociologist and world class athlete) made in 1968. He went to Brundage, he talked about segregation in Chicago on the southside, discrimination in the schools in Alabama, and so on. Brundage said to him, "Well, my man, too bad. I have no power over those affairs."

So our fight which was a successful fight resulting in South Africa's expulsion -- and that's the ultimate test of a fight, whether you win or lose -- came to be based on Fundamental Principle One of the Olympic Charter which says that any country that discriminates against athletes on the grounds of race, religion, or politics is violating the Charter and must be excluded.

Many friends would say, "Why are you being so pedantic? Why are you sticking within the Charter?" The answer was simple; any argument that was not based on the Charter was thrown out by the IOC because the white, largely Anglophone, members were not interested in expelling South Africa. In order to expel them we had to construct a very skillful case. That's why it worked.

So when we got South Africa suspended from the Tokyo Olympics in 1964 -- I was already in prison then -- and when we organized the international boycott in 1968 to keep South Africa out of Mexico City, and the international boycott in 1972 to keep Rhodesia out of the Munich Olympics, in each case we fought within the Charter and we won within the Charter.

NOT BY LAW ALONE

Q: So victory came solely from a carefully constructed legal case?

A: Oh no. When we won we never, in fact, won on the constitution alone. We won on the constitution plus clout. We had to develop clout. And the way we developed clout was to build support among nations and prominent individuals. In 1964 the people who contributed significantly -- and this may surprise you -- were Jackie Robinson, the black American baseball player who was very helpful in our struggle, and Eleanor Roosevelt who

made an important speech just before the Tokyo Olympics arguing that South Africa should be excluded from the Games. Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana also played a very active role in the suspension of South Africa in 1964 by raising the issue with other countries.

Much to our astonishment, the IOC readmitted South Africa to the Olympic Movement in 1968 after it had received a report that South Africa still practiced racial discrimination but had promised to reexamine it. So in Mexico City we found South Africa back in the Olympic games again. At that time we had to adopt a double strategy. Not only did we argue the matter constitutionally in terms of the Olympic Charter, but we mobilized the African countries around a very clear position through the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa. Through that organization we mobilized the African countries to take a stand and to protest and to say, "If the racists are there we will not be there."

When I met with Avery Brundage in Grenoble at the time of the meeting of the IOC he said, "We have had the Olympic Games without Africa before. We can have it again. We will not miss the Africans."

And so we turned to our friends and allies in the Third World. We went to the Asian countries who had their own organization -- called the Federation of Asian Countries -- and said to them, "This is the African position. Will you support us?" And we got all the countries of Asia -- led by India and Pakistan who were in agreement surprisingly on the issue -- to say that the countries of Asia would not participate if the racists were there. Then we turned to the Caribbean and Latin American countries. Cuba was always there to support us and other countries like Venezuela said, "We too will stay away from the Olympics."

And so we had about 67 countries threatening to boycott the Olympics in Mexico City in 1968 if the South Africans were there. Then Avery Brundage made a statement. He said, "If South Africa is the only team in the stadium, and if I am the only spectator in the bleachers, the Games will still go on." Of course, Brundage was also the man who talked to me about how he had dealt with Hitler in 1936 at the time of the Berlin Olympics. He told me, "I said to Mister Hitler that 'I don't care what you do to the Jews outside the stadium, Mister Hitler, but I will not allow you to have signs in the stadium saying 'No Jews and Dogs Allowed.''" This was his evidence of how great a liberal he was.

But we found that although we had Africa and Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean on our side -- and we had right on our side -- we still couldn't win. Mr. Brundage was sup-

porting the South Africans, and the U.S. Olympic Committee was, and the French, the West Germans, the Australians, and the Canadians. The role of western countries in the defense of South Africa was for me, as a naive person involved in sport, very educational. I learned to understand other issues as a result of that. The poor Mexicans were in the middle. They wanted to please us but they wanted to have the Games; they wanted a success.

In order to win we then went to the Russians. We said, "You have the whole of the Third World saying 'Keep South Africa Out.'" Now whose side are you on? If you support the Third World in its struggle for freedom we expect you to come out as well. If you let us down you are going to be exposed." The Russians never did take our side. But what they said to the press every now and then was, "We are thinking of withdrawing. We might just." And it was enough. When we could point to Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, and the socialist countries, we had to win.

Now you may, of course, disagree with that strategy. I've been perfectly honest with you. Just laying it out there so you know what happened. We forced South Africa out of the Mexico City Olympics in 1968. Two years later in Amsterdam at a meeting where I presented a case against South Africa and prepared it for the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa, South Africa was expelled, finally, from the Olympic Movement.

Q: But this year they expect to come back? Why do they think they can be readmitted in 1984?

A: Certainly not because of any change in Apartheid. The Group Areas Act is still there. The laws are more repressive than they were before; there were 200,000 people arrested last year in South Africa for not having a pass, for not carrying a piece of paper. Why then should the Apartheid regime believe that its chances for reentering the Olympics have so much improved? There are several answers to that.

The most important reason is the dramatic change in the posture of the United States towards South Africa since 1980. Instead of a president who said that aid would be regulated on the basis of human rights, and the observance of human rights, you have a policy now in the United States in relation to South Africa called "constructive engagement." This policy adopted by the Reagan Administration argues that by being nice to the racists, by helping the racists, by giving them everything they want, they will abandon their racism, they will become more humane. What is the evidence for that new policy? I don't have time to go into it all, I'll select just a few instances.

Since the Reagan Administration came to power there's been a dramatic increase in investment in South Africa and in the promotion of investment in South Africa through the creation of additional South African consulates in the United States. The investment we learned through a memo which Jack Anderson intercepted is not -- as is officially said to be -- in the region of 4.5 billion dollars in South Africa. It is now at least 14.6 billion dollars of American money in South Africa; a substantial investment.

Furthermore, under the Reagan Administration the sale has been licensed of 28 million dollars of military equipment to the Pretoria regime, including on the one hand highly sophisticated computers for use in nuclear technology and the development of nuclear weapons. It included on the other hand 2,500 cattle prods -- each with a voltage of 3,000 volts -- which are used in South Africa not for cattle but for people. And in addition the United States has acted as the broker in supplying to South Africa enriched weapons grade nuclear material for the production of nuclear weapons. All that has happened in the past three years and all under the rubric of "constructive engagement." The argument is that by being nice to Apartheid, Apartheid will change.

Bishop Desmond Tutu who visited the United States recently said that for the people of South Africa, the Reagan policy of "constructive engagement" was a disaster. And the Council on Foreign Relations -- it is a very respectable establishment body in this country -- has said that the benign policy of "constructive engagement" has done nothing to impede Apartheid. On the other hand it has encouraged Apartheid to be more repressive both in relation to the people of South Africa and the people of the neighboring countries.

THE AFRICAN SHAH LIVES

Q: Are the recent non-aggression pacts signed by South Africa and neighboring states a manifestation of the climate of support and encouragement for Apartheid which exists in the United States government today?

A: What I see happening is that Pretoria is going to be given the kind of military muscle that was given to other people in other parts of the world to make them the regional policemen -- the regional bully -- to keep that area under control. The classic example of that was of course the Shah of Iran. He was given some of the most sophisticated military hardware; in some cases jets which were not being supplied to the U.S. Air Force were sold to the Shah of Iran. But we know what a disaster the policy was there of arming a regional policeman and putting him in charge. So in the long run I think the policy of "con-

structive engagement" in relation to Pretoria will be a disaster as well. But I can't predict the immediate possibilities.

The implications of those agreements between the Pretoria regime and neighboring states -- specifically Swaziland, Mozambique, and Angola -- are still being worked out. But what is clear is that in each case South Africa behaved like a schoolyard bully and went in and beat up people in neighboring states and said "I'll beat you some more if you don't give me your lunch; and if you don't shake hands with me I'll beat you some more." You have the naked exercise of military force compelling those countries to come to terms and to sign agreements of non-aggression with South Africa. As an additional dimension the Pretoria regime was able to supply arms, helicopters and explosives to dissident groups in Lesotho, in Mozambique, and particularly Jonas Savimbi and UNITA in Angola, and to exercise enormous pressure on the governments in those countries, and in the case of Angola and Mozambique, compelling them to come to some accord with South Africa.

Pretoria will try to get other frontline states to sign non-aggression pacts too. And it is possible that this will happen. I'll give you two examples of why it might happen. I am sure you know that Nyerere in Tanzania has said he welcomes the accords between South Africa and Mozambique. I presume you know that. You may know that Kenneth Kaunda actually assisted from Zambia in negotiating the talks. He acted as a kind of broker between Chester Crocker of the United States and some of the people involved. So there is a possibility that Pretoria might, in fact, compel the other countries to enter into such non-aggression agreements as well.

Today's papers report that Botswana has just said it does not see the necessity for an accord, therefore it will not enter into an accord with South Africa. But South Africa, as you know, controls all the rail links into Botswana, the postal links, the telephone links -- if you want to call Botswana, it has to be routed through Johannesburg -- the airline connections, so that in many ways Botswana is at the mercy of South Africa. All South Africa has to do is to close the border, cut off the imports, cut off the exports, cut off the transport, and Botswana is going to have to do whatever South Africa says. Countries like Zaire which have already entered into diplomatic relations with Israel will have no hesitation about entering into diplomatic relations with South Africa.

Let me add just one very serious thought for all my American friends. If the United States wishes to make friends with the people of Africa -- which surely is a sensible thing to do -- the one thing that is stupid and short-sighted is to arm that racist minority of four million. Giving them money and

the arms to dominate a region of 60 million people is to make the people of that region hate the United States. It is so stupid, it is so short-sighted to form an alliance with that minority whose brutality and racism are known internationally. There are no secrets about Apartheid. We know what it is about. But for the United States to make friends with that minority is so damaging to the interests of the people of this country. Why would you have those millions of enemies out there cursing you, hating you -- in their tears and suffering -- for what is being inflicted on them?

Q: So Apartheid South Africa is hopeful it can be readmitted to the Olympics this year through United States support. What other reasons might encourage them at this particular time?

A: The second reason raises some very curious problems. When we were able to force South Africa out of the Olympics, it was first of all because of the unity of the African states through the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa which in turn was directly related to the Organization of African Unity (OAU). That unity has disappeared. There are now profound divisions in the ranks of African countries, divisions in the OAU itself. Some of the disagreements of policy, I think, are provoked by outside influences. I think particularly of the attempts to have a summit meeting of the OAU which was due to take place in Tripoli where Gaddafi would have become the new chairman of the OAU and where the United States interjected itself visibly and actively into the debate. Israel is helping South Africa to make connections with African states. Zaire, which has diplomatic relations with Israel, is now sending diplomatic representatives to South Africa. Other African states are secretly having business deals with the Pretoria regime. Whatever the reasons may be -- and those are certainly some of them -- we have in the continent of Africa today the most profound ideological and economic differences which, in themselves, frequently are cast in the cold war terms so that countries are either pro-West or pro-East, they're Marxist-controlled or Marxist-influenced, or they're friendly and they're willing to provide military bases.

This point -- the divisions in Africa -- has the consequence that one cannot with certainty predict African opposition to Apartheid's reentry into the Olympics. I am not saying that we shall have African support for Apartheid's reentry. What I'm saying is that some countries may conveniently contrive not to be present when the vote is taken. We may find that the delegates can't get there in time or, if the delegates get there, they have to go to the washroom at a rather crucial moment. Suddenly they're not there. These things have been known to happen.

So on the one hand we have support for Apartheid and on the other hand we have diminishing opposition to Apartheid. The two are faces of the same coin. Indeed, they are related in another way because it is "constructive engagement" -- the supply of money, and muscle, and technology, and arms -- which gives Apartheid the capacity to beat up neighboring countries and to exercise the role of "schoolyard bully" in dominating them. Those two facets go together. We have to see them as linked.

Now, the third reason why the Pretoria regime hopes to regain entry to the Olympics in 1984 is this. South Africa has had to face the solid opposition of the socialist countries in the past. They did not want Apartheid to come back into the Olympics. But now with the socialist countries pulling out of the Los Angeles Olympics you have a dramatically altered picture. Of course the Soviet Union will still have its delegates in Los Angeles; nothing will stop them from sending their delegates because delegates are not a team, you see. So their delegates will be there and will cast a vote against South Africa. But my feeling is that their collective power will be diminished. And many of the little two-bit countries like the Philippines and Grenada and Botswana -- all those -- will have their expenses paid by the United States so that they will be there to vote when the chips are down. So I would say the chances of South Africa getting back into the Olympics this summer have multiplied about ten-fold in the last week; suddenly their chances have been greatly increased with the pull out of the socialist countries.

THE SOVIET WITHDRAWAL

Q: Would you like to share your views on the reasons for the decision of the Soviet Union and other countries not to attend the Los Angeles Olympics?

A: Here's my point of view. I offer you -- as someone who has studied the Olympic Charter and the requirements of the Olympic Games -- the sober assessment that the United States has set out to create conditions which made it impossible for the Soviet Union to participate. I believe that there was a deliberate and systematic policy which was designed to force the Soviet Union at some point to say, "The conditions you impose are intolerable." I say that as someone with expertise in this area. I will select one or two points to support my argument.

The Games, you know, are not given to a country. Whenever the Olympic Games (venue) is awarded, it is awarded to a city. Only cities get the Games, not countries. Secondly, the city that gets the Games is required to enter into a set of agreements that involve costs and facilities and transport and se-

curity. One of the requirements is that you must ensure that the athletes are not harassed, that they are able to perform their normal functions on the track wherever it might be, whether in practice, whether in training, whether in performance. If you look at the newspapers in the two weeks before the Soviet decision was announced, you will see regularly the Soviet Union saying, "You are not sticking to the agreement. You are violating the Charter and those elements of the Charter that deal with security." It's all there.

Of course you may say their claim was false. But all I'm saying is you will see that they constantly complained. Now we're being told they did it out of spite because of the 1980 boycott and various other reasons. The truth of the matter is that the United States did not want the Soviet Union to participate. The best evidence for that I find on the streets of Chicago. When you ask the athletes, "How do you feel about the Russians not coming?" they say, "More medals for us!" That's their response. But that is the kind of empty-headed response that you get from athletes who are sometimes "muscle-heads." There are other athletes who are a lot more thoughtful about these matters and they express regret. But most of them don't know the inside story, most of them haven't seen the facts, most of them don't even know the requirements that a city has to fulfill in order to have the Games.

Now let's look at the other side. The argument being offered by the United States when the Russians say: "We don't want our athletes to be harassed" is to say, "But we are a free country. This is a democratic country. Everybody must have the right to demonstrate." Well, that should have been part of the agreement if, indeed, they intended to make that freedom override and supervene another agreement when they desperately wanted the Games. When they were out there bidding for the Games and making those promises, that was the time it should have been raised.

Let me offer one further thought on this matter. I believe in free assembly, and in freedom of speech, and in the right of people to denounce regimes -- to attack them for injustice. I denounce the United States for going in and beating up 110,000 people in Grenada, a little island that had to be invaded with "gunpoint democracy." I denounce that. I denounce what the United States is doing in Nicaragua. I denounce the support of the United States for butchers in El Salvador. I still would not insist that it was my right to demonstrate in that way in the grounds of the White House. What is more, if I tried, believe you me I would be hauled off pretty rapidly! What I am saying is that it is possible to permit people to exercise their right to demonstrate at the same time that it is possible to enable athletes to exercise their right to compete. There

ought not to be an irreconcilable conflict here. The United States has made no effort to resolve that.

Q: Hasn't Samaranch given the Soviet Union those assurances based on a letter he received from Reagan?

A: Now, Reagan's letter to Samaranch came after the Russians withdrew. Before they withdrew they asked for certain promises. They couldn't get those promises, so they withdrew. In a sense it's farcical. First you tell the guys to "go to hell," and then when they get out you say, "Hey chaps, come back, come back!" It's phoney. But, most important, you must read the fine print to catch one line that to me is overriding in its importance. That key line says, "No further action will be taken to satisfy the Russian complaint." Reagan says, "Please come back guys, you know we've done this and we've done that," but he does not say, "and in addition we will do what you've asked us to do." There is no promise of the action which the Russians have requested.

Q: What can we expect from the visit of Samaranch to the USSR?

A: Samaranch shouldn't be going to Moscow. He should be going to Los Angeles to talk to Peter Ueberroth of the L.A. Olympic Organizing Committee and saying to him, "Hey, you are violating the Charter by allowing athletes to be harassed. Get into line. Do what you're supposed to do. Keep the promises you were required to make!" Instead, he is talking to the President of the Soviet Union. I know what Chernenko will say. He'll say, "Go and talk to my Olympic Committee." And Samaranch will talk to the Soviet Olympic Committee and they'll say, "We would like to be at the Olympics, but we will not send our athletes to Los Angeles if they are going to be harassed. We are entitled to demand that they not be harassed." That is the heart of the matter.

JESSE GOES TO MOSCOW

Q: How do you view Jesse Jackson's offer to try and bring the Soviets back to the Los Angeles Olympics?

A: Jesse Jackson approached the Soviet Ambassador in Washington and he has offered to go to Moscow. Some people are seeing this as a propaganda ploy, as a vote-catching thing. Indeed, he was accused of that by an awfully stupid man on television the other night -- George Will -- who said, "If you boycott South Africa, if you keep South Africa out of the Olympics, then you ought to keep the Russians out as well." He tried to equate the two. Imagine! I hope I am not misrepresenting him, but he completely missed the point. South Africa violated the Charter; the Soviet Union has not.

The one thing you cannot say about the Soviet Union is that they keep athletes out of the team because they're black or yellow or whatever. No. Even those people who think that Jews are kept off the Soviet team -- they had better check it out. There has never been a Soviet Olympic team without Jews in it. Never. I have met them in Mexico City, in Munich, in Montreal. So I know what I'm talking about. You really have to be very careful when you argue along those lines.

Was it a good thing? I don't know, but I'm afraid that on some other issues Jesse's got the wrong angle. I'll explain why. You see, as I said earlier, it's not the Russians who have to be asked to come back to the Olympics. Jesse should be going to Peter Ueberroth and saying, "Hey you! You signed a contract to do certain things and you have not done them. Why don't you correct your behavior and then I'll go and talk to the Russians on your behalf."

But the way the problem is being cast, it is as if the Russians are the bad guys, you know, they are the stupid guys who either are boycotting out of spite or they're afraid that some people will defect or they're afraid of demonstrations or whatever. The problem is really with the misconduct of the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee. What I am hoping Jesse will do is speak to the Russians and say, "Come back into the Games," but he should also say to Los Angeles, "Hey, you'd better clean up your act." So, you see there are really two elements to it.

Q: Do you think African countries will follow the Soviets by withdrawing from the L.A. Olympics?

A: I am not sure at this stage. Newspaper stories are already being reported that the Soviet Union is trying to persuade other countries to boycott. This may be true or it may not be true. Even if it were untrue I am sure it would still be reported. At this stage I can't predict what the African countries will do. In many cases the African countries are just too poor to come to the Olympics, so when they stay away it's not a boycott. But it might be interpreted as a boycott. So it's really a very nebulous area. If you watch the press the picture will become clearer in a short time, I think.

Q: The press has also reported that the South African athlete Zola Budd, hopes to join the British Olympic team. How do you feel about that?

A: The short answer is that it is a matter of indifference to me. I don't mind whether she competes or whether she does not compete. She's an individual. Our fight has never been against individuals, it has been against principles or lack of principles.

ples. We fight in support of non-discrimination in sport, we fight against discrimination in sport. We keep South Africa out because it discriminates.

Here you have a single woman. She's a South African. Her father or grandfather was British, so she's gone to England. She's claiming British citizenship and she wants to be part of the British team. As far as I'm concerned that's fine, provided the rules are not broken specially for her and the rules are not bent specially for her.

Now according to the Olympic Charter -- which has a lot of rules -- one of the rules is you cannot compete for a country unless you have lived in that country for at least one year. She has not lived in Britain for at least one year. But, the rules also say that if the organizers and the governing body and the selection committee all agree to bend the rules then o.k., you can come in.

So, she may be able to come either by straight qualification or by a slight bending of the rules. If this is done for her as a special favor and it's the kind of thing that is not done for other athletes, then I would have serious questions. Otherwise, as far as I'm concerned, if she makes it, "good luck," if she doesn't, "too bad." But it's not an issue I'm willing to go to battle for.

VIETNAM SYNDROME ANTIDOTE

Q: You have suggested earlier that the Reagan Administration forced the Soviets out of the Los Angeles Olympics. What was the motive?

A: There is really a great deal to it. The action against the Soviet Union in the Los Angeles Olympics must be seen as a part of a much larger plan which is far greater than the Olympics.

Now the Olympics are the greatest international sporting event in the world. I would like to see it preserved even though it is full of imperfections. But when the United States looks at the Olympics it sees it in a much larger context. It sees it in a cold war context. It sees it as one more instrument it can use to whip up anti-Russian, anti-Soviet, anti-communist feelings in this country. It was the United States that brought politics into the L.A. Olympics by saying, "Anybody who wants to demonstrate, anybody who wants to organize for defectors, go ahead. We are a free country." There was where the violation of the Olympic Charter occurred.

You must remember that when Reagan comes to open the Olym-

pics -- and you know he is going to open it -- he is going to do more than that. In the same week he is addressing a rally in Los Angeles for "A Week of Captive Nations." This is being kept very quiet, although if you saw the Ted Koppel Nightline television show, the Russian who spoke on the program said, "Why are the American people not being told about the plans to have a rally for 'captive nations?'" He said, "Why do you do that when the Olympics are on?"

The larger issue is the creation of a cold war mentality and a cold war climate which will get Reagan reelected in November. He will come to power on the ticket as the man who "showed the 'commies,'" who "got tough," who "got us away from the 'Vietnam syndrome,'" you know, that whole psychology of dominance.

WHAT FUTURE, HUMAN RACE?

Q: Would you like to make any concluding observations?

A: Leading from that comes a far more terrifying consequence. Over all that, much larger than all that, looms for me a question of enormous import. A question which touches everyone of us. It is the question of where we are going and where this world is heading.

I look at what is happening in the Olympics. I see some countries being made to feel they cannot come and others being told you have to choose to be with "us" in the Games or you boycott with "them." I see countries being told you are either part of the "free democratic world" which, mark you, includes my own country of South Africa -- would you believe? -- or you are not.

We are told, "Out there there is an evil empire and that evil empire must be destroyed. We must prevail. We must get away from the 'Vietnam syndrome.' We must no longer be ashamed of what we did. America must walk tall!" Instead of settling for nuclear equality, "We must strive for nuclear superiority. We must start getting ready for star wars. We must get ready to take out the evil empire. Indeed, we must begin to prepare seriously--as thousands of people are today preparing seriously--for a limited, winnable nuclear war which this country is going to engage in!"

That explains why 182 billion dollars must be taken out of welfare, and schools, and jobs, and housing, and put into the military budget to create the most enormous and most terrifying machine in the history of this planet. A machine which can make this planet uninhabitable, can wipe out the human species. Our survival is at issue. We all face the possibility of ex-

tion. Those of us who survive will have to live through the "nuclear winter" which will make existence intolerable.

That is the reality that confronts us. And that is the reality of which the events in the Olympics are only a fragmentary clue. It is when we put all of the pieces together in the jigsaw -- when we see the vast mosaic -- that we see we are all at risk. Our lives are no longer certain. The survival of our children is something we can no longer assume.

I believe that this is the threat we must all confront, that we must think soberly about, and that we must then decide what we are going to do.