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The South African government's socially based policy of segregation and discrimination, or "apartheid," has caused tremendous external, as well as internal, pressures to reverse the government's inhumane treatment of its repressed populace. Until recently none of the pressures have been more forceful than those evoked by the sporting world and the United Nations. Since 1960, these forces have served to isolate South Africa from most international sports competitions, including the Olympic Games. At one juncture, various leanings in apartheid policy seemed to point toward a tilt in attitudinal posture not only in regard to sport but to various related apartheid conduct. Recent events, however, have elucidated a continued dominant posture concerning South Africa's all-encompassing socially repressive apartheid practice. It appears that, unless the South African government initiates swift and salient apartheid expiration, the perilous game they are playing may get out of hand.

In 1885 the literary classic *King Solomon's Mines* rolled off the presses in London just 6 months after the European colonial powers of the epoch met in Berlin to carve out subdivisions of what was then known as the "dark continent." The printed and bound instant success chronicled three English gentlemen *voortrekkers* accompanied by five African servants following a faded Portuguese map to King Solomon's legendary treasure. For millions of readers and future movie viewers, Rider Haggard's *King Solomon's Mines*—before being dethroned by Burroughs' *Tarzan of the Apes* (1914) and Isak Dinesen's *Out of Africa* (1937)—was Africa.

Haggard's legendary mine, of course, was never discovered. However, from 1867 to 1871 along the Vaal River in what is now Kimberly, South Africa, a treasure trove of diamonds far exceeding any literary imagination was unearthed that would not only shape the destiny of a few (Boers, British, Griqua, Tswana), but indeed, the world.1 The riches of South Africa became the spoils of colonial
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1 Direct all correspondence to March L. Krotee, School of Physical Education, 218 Cooke Hall, University of Minnesota, 1900 University Ave., Minneapolis, MN 55455.
“Randlords” (Rhodes, Barnato, Chamberlain, Milner, Wernher, Rothschild, Oppenheimer), and the fortunes of Southern Africa served to mold its colonially and racially divided societies for the next century (Maxon, 1986; Rosenbaum, 1976; Troup, 1977).

Thus, on May 31, 1910, the Union of South Africa (the merger of Cape, Transvaal, Orange River, and Natal Colonies) took its place as a self-governing, white-ruled dominion within the British Empire (other such dominions included Canada, New Zealand, and Australia). Three other British High Commission Territories—Basutoland (now Lesotho), Bechuanaland (Botswana), and Swaziland—as well as Rhodesia were excluded from the sacred union where the Africans were denied the right to own land or stake their claim to the “pipes” of the blue ground and later, in 1886, the gold deposits of Witwatersrand that by 1897 accounted for 39% of all sub-Saharan Africa export trade. A subtle combination of Boer, British, and missionary (mostly Dutch Reform and Anglican) paternalism reserved and preserved the rights of the new union for the chosen few, as long as they were white, and legislated masters, servants, and various dompas or “pass laws,” that justified the dispossession of the Africans from their land and vilified any dissent against the state, thus ensuring the continuation of the cheap black labor force that served as the backbone of the colonial empire.

Since that time, the approximately 4,577,000 whites (15.5%) have been “reserving” group areas, homelands (Bantustans) and townships, for the 21 million Blacks (72.7%), 2,577,000 Coloureds (9%), and 824,000 Asians (2.8%) (Lapchick, 1986; Standard Bank, 1985). Apartheid’s development web has incorporated the racial ideologies and strategies for populace control that seemingly have spared no segment of South African culture or societal structure, as evidenced by (a) the 1893 provision of educational separatism in the public schools, (b) the Native Land Act of 1913, (c) the Native Administration Act of 1927, (d) the Assembly Act of 1930, (e) the Prohibition of Mixed Marriage Act of 1949, (f) the Population Registration Act of 1950, (g) the Group Areas Act of 1950, (h) the Bantu Authorities Act of 1951, and (i) the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act of 1953, just to mention a few in the chain of the over 200 apartheid-driven governmental decrees that serve to protect and maintain the “parallel” development of the “mineral revolution.” In sum, everything in South Africa’s white dominated societal paradigm seems to be documented, controlled, and regulated (work, employment, political representation, transport, housing, marriage, education, reading material such as books, the media, and even sport) by those in supreme power in an atmosphere that might be characterized best as Slegs Blankes or Whites Only! (Sinclair, 1982; Steinberg, 1982; Oppenheimer, 1983).

This paper attempts to explore and analyze the roots of apartheid as well as to examine some of the social and historical forces which, over time, have influenced sport in regard to the South African sociocultural process. The nexus of the paper focuses on the 30-year campaign that has been waged to isolate South Africa from the realm of international sport and the internal change that these external stressors have stimulated. The changes are chronicled and examined for their significance as they are weighed by the international community. At one juncture in time, it appeared that these sport-related changes might serve as a vanguard for meaningful sociocultural change, but after a decade of systematic scrutiny, a gray cloud has been cast over the continued bondage of South Africa’s apartheid masters who continue to hold sociopolitical serve.
Apartheid and Sport

As the total sociocultural process of South Africa seems to be inflicted, sport has not been so fortunate to escape the bonds of apartheid. In the past decades, much has been written concerning the Republic of South Africa and its politically based discriminatory practice concerning sport (Cheffers, 1972; de Broglia, 1970; Hain, 1971; Horrell, 1968; Krotee & Schwick, 1979; Lapchick, 1975, 1979, 1986; Ogouki, 1977). Similar to that of other South African sociocultural processes, it was not necessary to compel the all-white sporting community to observe the policy of apartheid because they had been voluntarily practicing discriminatory racial membership with effectiveness since the beginning of colonization (Brickhill, 1976; Krotee & Schwick, 1979). The all-white sporting clubs continued their policy of racial discrimination and gained a firm foothold as well as positive affirmation in most international sport governing bodies. The result was that the all-white ruling bodies of South Africa virtually controlled all officially sanctioned sporting representation.

In 1956, Dr. T.E. Dounges, the Minister of Interior, best summed up the fate of the nonwhite sports participant, stating that although the government had no control over sport, whites and nonwhites should organize sport separately, that no interracial competition should take place within the union, and the mixing of races should be avoided. He went on to say that the government would withhold support from any nonwhite sports body seeking international recognition and would withhold the granting of passports to nonwhites guilty of such subversive intentions (Die Burger, June 25, 1956). Thus, equal opportunity to participate in international sporting competitions concomitantly with education, housing, and governmental representation for the vast majority of the South African populace has become a dream rather than a reality. The dream has turned into a frustrating nightmare for some while other more "qualified" performers such as Edwards, Steyn, Christo Van Rensburg (number 10 on the 1987 Association of Tennis Professionals [ATP] money leaders list), Visser, Muller, Fairbank (ranked number 22 in the Women's International Tennis Association [ITA]), Tarr, Schimper, Anderson, Mundel, and Andrew Burrow (this year's NCAA Men's Singles Champion), seem to be reaping the dividends of apartheid's flourishing segregated tennis system.

The sporting dilemma in South Africa is not new anymore than is the fact that a South African, banned African National Congress leader Chief Albert F. Luthuli, won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1961 (Luthuli, 1962). The roots of nonwhite sport have been segregation, frustration, and exile, a pattern accompanied by the sociopolitical mood of the day, both inside and outside the union. The climate has contributed to elite sports participants such as McKenzie (weightlifting), Khosi (athletics), Eland and Ntuli (boxing), Sengolum (golf), and Mokone (soccer) initiating an ongoing "sports drain" based upon the realization that they could never represent their country (de Broglia, 1970); a movement that began to stir note outside the union, as did the expelling of the all-white South African Table Tennis Organization by the International Table Tennis Federation (1956) and Eleanor Roosevelt's spearheading a Declaration of Conscience opposing apartheid, on Human Rights Day in December 1957.

Throughout the 1950s, however, South Africa seemingly hid and was internationally shielded by article 2(7) of the United Nations Charter forbidding out-
side interference in domestic affairs. The 1960s, however, delivered independence to much of Africa, and South Africa’s apartheid policies began to incur the wrath of the international community, especially after March 21, 1960, when 186 people were wounded and 69 people lost their lives in Sharpeville. This condemnation led the United States to call for and vote for a Security Council Resolution condemning apartheid as a danger to international peace and security, and eventually led to Fédération Internationale de Football Association banning the South African Soccer Association (1961) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC) barring South Africa from Olympic Games participation in Tokyo (1964) and Mexico City (1968); and, after an all-white “in-house” mini-Olympics was conducted in Bloemfontein in 1969, a permanent Olympic suspension was dealt to South Africa by virtue of a 35-28-3 IOC vote on May 15, 1970, in Amsterdam (Bissell, 1977).

Of course, this was just the beginning of various struggles, battles, and boycotts, ranging from the Soweto Uprising in 1976 to the African walkout of the Montreal Olympic Games in 1976 and the Third World boycott of the most recent Commonwealth Games in Edinburgh, that have attempted to bring apartheid to its knees.

**External Pressures Take Their Toll?**

South Africa’s apartheid policies have drawn no stronger fire than from the United Nations and the sporting world. As the IOC, FIFA, and various international sporting federations wrestled with apartheid, the United Nations General Assembly—resolutions 2775D (XXVI), 3411E (XXX), and 59–Power (31/6F)—reaffirmed in 1971, 1975, and 1976 the Olympic Charter principle that there should be no discrimination on the grounds of race, religion, or political affiliation, and recognized and supported the international campaign against apartheid as well as the banning of all South African teams or sportspersons associated with South African sport. These resolutions, together with the Programme of Action drafted in May 1976 at the United Nations Seminar on the Eradication of Apartheid and in Support of the Struggle for Liberation in South Africa, clearly pronounce the embargo of arms, trade, and sport which 128 members of the United Nations and various other organizational structures such as trade unions, religious organizations, and international funding agencies have laid before the apartheid government of South Africa (Abram-Mayet, 1982; Crocker, 1980/81; Krotee & Schwick, 1979; Ottaway, 1980).

More external squeezing by the Commonwealth Ministers in June 1977 persisted when they convened a special meeting in Scotland, which resulted in the Gleneagles Agreement calling for a halt to all sporting association with South Africa. Thus, some of South Africa’s staunchest sporting allies, namely the United Kingdom, Canada, and New Zealand, from a group that includes the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Israel, Japan, and the United States, further closed the sporting door on South Africa. Seven months later the European Economic Community followed suit in their position to refrain from international competition with South Africa. The gradual compliance with various United Nations resolutions, as well as the unceasing labor of organizations such as the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee, Organization of African Unity, and the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa, has resulted in creating an almost universal and relentless sports boycott concerning South Africa.
The United States political position on apartheid has represented a continued concern for human rights and dignity for all peoples. Former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance best describes the position concerning the practice of apartheid:

Apartheid must be condemned and must disappear from the scene. It is just morally wrong. Because it is morally wrong, and because it does deprive the individual of his dignity and his rights, it cannot last. It can either change by peaceful means or it will change by non-peaceful means. . . . My feeling is that this is a subject that has to be attacked and attacked immediately, because I think there is still a chance to change it by peaceful means, but I think time is running out. ("Vance," 1978)

The above combination of internal and external stressors imposed upon the Pretoria government seemed at one point to indicate slight postural and attitudinal modification, if not promise. Indeed, an article in the Durbin Times proclaimed that the National party caucus might be untangling the 30-year discriminatory apartheid web. Projected indications of possible potential reforms included the following:

1. A more overt dismantling of social or "petty" apartheid, especially in the sharing of facilities that cannot be duplicated in the cultural and entertainment sphere;
2. A better quality of life for urban blacks, extending from real powers given to community councils;
3. The removal of major constraints on black laborers who will be allowed complete mobility to sell their skills to the best market;
4. Sport would be open to all races and would be allowed to shape its own future ("Connie Mulder," 1978).

According to the Durban Times, Dr. Pieter Koorhof, Minister of Education and Sport, has arrived at a position on sport that reflects a new kind of thinking. Simply stated, the position is that free people in a free country have the right to play games with whom they please. The government position, according to the article, should be confined to maintaining order; it has no right to forbid people to play together, but neither has it a duty to force them to play together. Koorhof, in a letter written to the International Tennis Federation in the hopes of continuing South Africa's participation in the Davis Cup, assured that esteemed body that there was nothing to prevent any player from playing on any court or joining any club without a permit or permission, and invited a fact-finding tour. The Minister also announced that the 1977 Liquor Act (barring the admission of blacks where alcoholic beverages are sold, including sports clubs) would be changed to eliminate the need for a permit and to allow sportspeople of all races into licensed premises of sports clubs. Sports clubs will also be permitted to request status as "international" (multiracial) clubs, corresponding to a recent status change at some hotels in which their restaurants, bars, and facilities are not subject to the policy of apartheid ("Connie Mulder," February 26, 1978).

On January 28, 1978, a meeting of the South African Sports Federation was convened in Pretoria by the Minister of Education and Sport, and Secretary of Sport and Recreation, Dr. Hook. Unveiled in the meeting was a new South Afri-
can sports policy labeled *The Normalization of Sport in the Republic of South Africa*. This document describes the development of sports policy during the past decade. It states that the situation "must be viewed against a background of a young country in one of its most important stages of development, which not only manifests itself in the field of sport, but in all other fields of life" (International Liaison Committee on Behalf of Sport in South Africa, 1978).

The document describes South Africa as a young country where a mosaic of population groups (white, coloureds, and eight black ethnic groups, all in different stages of development) are trying to find a formula...to live together in peace and harmony. The sports tradition goes back over 300 years when the various groups played among themselves, not because they were told to do so but because of differences, both cultural and social. As late as a decade ago there was little interest in multiracial play, and it appears that South Africa’s apparently planned phasing out of apartheid sporting policy may be going full cycle and perhaps to normalization. In 1972, multinational (racial or ethnic) representation in sport was permitted. Then in 1976, multiracial sport was permitted, introducing the premier or mixed league concept (‘‘Black and White Club Teams,’’ 1976). And now perhaps reports of integration? Koornhof has been known to want to ‘‘see dirty, bloody politics out of sport and let the sportsmen get on with it’’ (Hawthorne, 1976). The new sports policy is pointed to inform the world that in South African sport, it can no longer be said that discrimination on the grounds of race, religion, or politics is practiced.

Indeed some improvements seemed to be slowly taking place. Referring to basketball’s progress toward integration, R.E. Ashworth, Chairman of the Basketball Federation of South Africa (BFSA), wrote in personal correspondence (August 16, 1978),

The impression that the government restricts club membership is now no longer correct. Groups and clubs now determine their own membership with the Springbok (the highest national sporting medal) open to all. The primary difficulty we face in promoting basketball is that it is a new game for Blacks and Indians; however, we do have Indian and Black teams in our Durban and Pietermaritzburg leagues.

Referring to Soweto, Ashworth stated, ‘‘A court has just been completed for people to play there. In the meantime a few enthusiasts have joined a white team in Johannesburg and play in their league. This ‘‘mixed’’ team will also compete in our National League.’’

Ashworth’s letter was confirmed via personal correspondence by Dan T. Tleketle, manager of the Hawks basketball team in Soweto. Tleketle, a black, noted on October 12, 1978, ‘‘The first and only non-racial team, the Hawks Basketball team finished in the best four in the Transvaal Amateur Basketball League after entering for the first time.’’

The South African tennis governing body has even appointed their first nonwhite Davis Cup player, Peter Lamb, a student at Vanderbilt University, in preparation for their August 1978 Davis Cup North American Zone competition against the United States in Nashville (‘‘Tennis and Apartheid,’’ March 20, 1978).

The previously noted apparent changes in South Africa’s sports programs seemingly attest to the fact that changes are slowly taking place within the Republic.
of South Africa. Even the prestigious Stellenbosch University admitted its first
15 black students despite condemnation by Dr. Koot Vorster, brother of the former
prime minister. Vorster stated that “This sort of thing will lead to integration
and it conflicts with government policy” (“NBK Clash,” 1978). In an editorial,
The East London Daily Dispatch replied to Vorster with an attitude shared by
many South Africans:

Exactly. And a good thing, too. The more integration there is, the better for
all South Africans. The more decisions there are which conflict with govern-
ment policy, the more hope there is for South Africa. The more blacks there
are in Stellenbosch (university) the better for educational standards gener-
ally. The reopening to all races of universities like the University of Cape Town,
Witwatersrand University (Johannesburg), and Rhodes University (Graham-
stown) is long overdue and Stellenbosch’s move in admitting blacks is simi-
larly overdue. More important, the opening of Stellenbosch may help produce
a generation of students not blinded by the ideology of the Koot Vorsters
of South Africa. (“Editorial,” 1978)

In September 1979, Prime Minister Pieter W. Botha rescinded the law ex-
cluding blacks from labor unions and declared that the government was even pre-
pared to consider changes in the laws on interracial marriage and sex. That same
year Pieter Koornhof, Minister of Cooperation and Development, pledged to an
American audience, “We will not rest until racial discrimination has disappeared
from our statute books and everyday life in South Africa. These are the beliefs
shared by my government” (Foreign Policy Study Foundation, 1986, p. 61).

Hence it seemed that South Africa’s loosening of its sports policy grip
might lead the way toward a progressive 1980s concerning a steady and meaningful
dismantling of apartheid. Some gradual relaxation of segregation in public facili-
ties such as government buildings, post offices, some transport services, muse-
ums, theatres, libraries, civic halls, and various selected “international” status
hotels seemed to validate, in part, that sport had become at least a partial reflec-
tion of societal modification.

Recommendations in a report by the Human Services Research Council
carried in an article in the September 27th Johannesburg Star, entitled “Sport
Colour Bar Abolition May Snowball,” included a call for additional abolition
of the Group Areas Act, Liquor Act, and the Black Consolidation Act which de-
determines how much time a black may spend in certain areas. Koornhof later eased
rules and permitted sports contest entrance tickets purchased in advance to serve
as “passes” for spectators to enter forbidden territory. In June of that same year,
the predominately white senate was abolished and in its stead was appointed a
60-member President’s Council of Whites, Blacks, Chinese, and Indians (Asians)
whose job it is to advise the state president in all matters of importance. The
new council provides for freedom of speech and debate (The Powers and Privileges
of the President’s Council Act, Act 103, 1981). Although the Council served to
bring “friends” into President Botha’s inner circle, its racial make-up was re-
cently duplicated by the mixture of spectators who attended the opening of Jo-
hannesburg’s new R33 million stadium as the Dion Highlands squared off against
the Orlando Pirates in an inaugural soccer match (“Sport Colour Bar,” 1982).

From most indications, it seemed like some apartheid barriers were begin-
ning to drop and the effects of the 30-year war on sport had struck a nerve in Pretoria. Indeed, it seemed that the South African government has been more sensitive to international pressures concerning sport policy than any other policy within its domain of over 200 racially repressive apartheid acts.

The Honeymoon is Over: Constructive Engagement to Constructive Enragement

The early 1980s brought to the forefront the United States policy of constructive engagement toward South Africa as the Sullivan Principles and geopolitical stabilization continued to guide American thought and conduct. Its views were based on the hope that, within a reasonable amount of time, a clear evolution toward equality of opportunity and basic human rights for all South Africans would emerge. After all, Zimbabwe (April, 1980) reflected a model of transition, and even the church offered signs of repentence when 123 white ministers of the Dutch Reform Church declared in a letter to the church that apartheid could no longer be defended scripturally, and they called for racial equality (New York Times, June 10, 1982). These among other previously noted conciliatory signs at home indicated a slight tilt in the apartheid bottle. Was it beginning to empty?

Unfortunately, it seems that constructive engagement has fostered more of a 5-year stall than a 5-year plan to initiate meaningful change in apartheid policy. Some contend that as the South African Defense Force pace in various "operational zones" increased, its apartheid stranglehold at home became more entrenched. This aggressive infringement has spilled over into the sports arena in the form of the Fall 1981 Springbok rugby tours of New Zealand and the United States, as well as more recent South African "raids" on the "promised land" of golf, tennis, rugby, and cricket. The Springbok rugby campaign turned into an ill-fated attempt to bring an aura of respectability around South Africa. This illusion was quickly shattered when it was revealed that Louis Luyt, a South African businessman, deposited between $25,000 and $75,000 in the U.S.-based Eastern Rugby Union to ensure that the "show would go on" ("New bid to cut," 1981). Two of the 12 scheduled matches in New Zealand had to be cancelled due to antiapartheid protesters. The September 15–28 U.S. tour endured five cancellations, encountered strong protests, and was at best counterproductive (Krotee & Jaeger, 1986).

Other aggressive sporting initiatives by South Africa, such as the Million Dollar Sun City golf and tennis events, and the sponsorship of "rebel" tours (rugby and cricket) by players from New Zealand, United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, Sri Lanka, and the West Indies, appear to have caused further irreparable damage to formerly close Springbok ties. These have resulted in a bar by the International Cricket Conference and a proposed United Nations antiapartheid campaign into South Africa's "gray" sporting areas such as rugby, cricket, tennis, golf, boxing, and motor racing. These turbulent and troubled sports scenes have served as a reflection of an evolved "enragement" toward South Africa's shameful apartheid government which seriously threatens its lifeline to the West. This enragement has taken many forms; witness the myriad embargos, divestments, and sanctions that have found their way to Pretoria's doorstep.

Evidence of this is seen in the withdrawal of public investment funds by the states of Massachusetts, Michigan, and New York (about $1 billion from 1982
to 1984); the U.S. Senate’s passage of the 1985 Anti-Apartheid Act as well as other sanctions including the barring of new investments, loans, computer sales, and oil drilling technology; and the imports of farm products, coal, and iron; and corporate walkouts (7 in 1984, 39 in 1985, and approximately 35 in 1986). The pullout parade includes GM, IBM, Eastman Kodak, Honeywell, Warner Communications, and Coke, just to mention a sample of corporate defectors who have had enough of Pretoria’s shallow rhetoric. Pretoria’s growing dilemma was further underscored in October 1986 when the 136-member-nation International Red Cross refused to seat the South African delegation as a protest to Pretoria’s “evil and inhuman” apartheid policy, and more U.S. states (15) and universities (116) moved to divest (USA Today, October 27, 1986). Even Barclay’s Bank (500 branches), a pillar of South Africa’s economy since 1925, closed their doors on apartheid (Time Magazine, December 8, 1986).

The Game is Afoot

In response to these and other internal and external stressors, the Botha government has raised its true colors. It declared a national state of security and emergency on June 12, 1986, that included the self-governing national states, and barred U.S. congressional visits, imposed strict media censorship, detained some 30,000 citizens including 10,000 minors under the age of 18, began construction of a 7-ft “Berlin Wall” around Soweto, closed 71 schools in the Eastern Cape and 10 more in Soweto, and began to exercise strict enforcement of previously relaxed apartheid laws. Even Archbishop Tutu’s Cape Town “estate” has been found in violation of the Group Areas Act (it remains to be seen if he will be forced to relocate as have many others in the Cape Town area), and Rev. Sullivan was denied a visa to visit on May 20, 1987. The national police have also cracked down on dissent by word, deed, or T-shirt slogan in their most recent reign of “reform” (Time Magazine, April 27, 1987).

These latest governmental actions amidst various strikes, such as the 6-week-old railway workers walkout, confrontations such as the antigovernment demonstrations at the universities of Cape Town and Witwatersrand, and brutal violence in Soweto, Germiston, and Umlazi serve to elucidate that the Botha government that overwhelmingly swept the May 6, 1987, all-white electoral has reaffirmed its ugly apartheid intentions (The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 6, 1987).

Since 1978, the world seemingly has been waiting patiently for peaceful delivery from apartheid, but it is clear that the Botha government has not taken any significant or meaningful action. It now appears that the bans, boycotts, sanctions, and freeze tactics aimed at isolating South Africa from the international sporting community may have had an opposite effect. Like a Karoo thorn tree that grows more resilient with every drought, South Africa seems to be drawing a deep breath and through its Sun City Million Dollar apartheid web, enticing sports luminaries such as Norman, Wadkins, Langer, Ballesteros, Laver, Rosewall, and many others into its confines—a process not unlike its trading or economic schema which has kept the apartheid island afloat amid its illusionary economic isolation. Although the South African apartheid issue remains cloudy, one thing stands out perfectly clear. That is the harsh reality that the South African government has no intention whatsoever of abandoning apartheid. Indeed,
it is posited that during the grace period of "constructive engagement," Pretoria used the time to further tighten its grip around the throat of its opponents. The ball now seems to be clearly in the hands of the South African people. In fact, we may have kidded ourselves that their destiny was ever in the hands of outsiders, as well as over-dramatized the role of sport in apartheid's game which the South African government has clearly used to its advantage. Make no mistake concerning the magnitude of the abhorrence of apartheid, which has no conceivable justification, but the game, it seems, must be played in the home court. I'm confident that all people who believe in human dignity and rights fully support the placing of the apartheid system on the scrapheap of history, and from my own vantage point, "we are now in sudden death overtime!"
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Notes

1Britain annexed the diamond fields in 1871, forming the Crown Colony of Griqualand West, and annexed Transvaal in 1877. In 1881, the Boers reversed the annexation at the Battle of Majuba Hill. Germany raised its flag in 1884 over the territory north of the Orange River (SWA/Namibia), and the Anglo-Boer War broke out on October 11, 1899. Belgium maintained presence in the Congo (Zaire), as did the Portuguese in Angola, Guinea, and Mozambique, and the French in West Africa.

2Apartheid or “aparthood” is the socially based policy of segregation and political and socioeconomic discrimination against blacks and other nonwhites in South Africa. Its philosophy was first enunciated officially by the National party of Prime Minister Daniel F. Malan, May 26, 1948.

3This international appeal opposing apartheid was signed by 123 world leaders on December 10, 1957. Signers included Julius Nyerere (Tanzania), founder of the Pan African Freedom Movement of East and Central Africa, and Martin Luther King.

4Internally, African National Congress leader Nelson Mandela was arrested for clandestine activities in 1962, and the military wing of the ANC, Umkhonto we Sizwe, began sabotage activity until 1963 when most of its leaders and network were dismantled by the security police. Riots in Soweto as well as eight other townships resulted in an estimated 100 deaths and over 1,000 injuries.

5The Sullivan Principles consisted of brief statements originally drawn up by Reverend Leon Sullivan on March 1, 1977. They have been amplified four times and now consist of 36 specific goals. They address equal rights and opportunity within the work force and improvement in the quality of life of South African employees of U.S. corporations within South Africa. In October 1984 there were 128 signatories as compared to the original 12. Canada, Europe, and Jordan also have similar but irresolute codes.