



**U.S. Educational Assistance in South Africa:
Critical Policy Issues, Report of a Staff Study
Mission to South Africa**

<http://www.aluka.org/action/showMetadata?doi=10.5555/AL.SFF.DOCUMENT.uscg019>

Use of the Aluka digital library is subject to Aluka's Terms and Conditions, available at <http://www.aluka.org/page/about/termsConditions.jsp>. By using Aluka, you agree that you have read and will abide by the Terms and Conditions. Among other things, the Terms and Conditions provide that the content in the Aluka digital library is only for personal, non-commercial use by authorized users of Aluka in connection with research, scholarship, and education.

The content in the Aluka digital library is subject to copyright, with the exception of certain governmental works and very old materials that may be in the public domain under applicable law. Permission must be sought from Aluka and/or the applicable copyright holder in connection with any duplication or distribution of these materials where required by applicable law.

Aluka is a not-for-profit initiative dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of materials about and from the developing world. For more information about Aluka, please see <http://www.aluka.org>

U.S. Educational Assistance in South Africa: Critical Policy Issues, Report of a Staff Study Mission to South Africa

Alternative title	U.S. Educational Assistance in South Africa: Critical Policy Issues, Report of a Staff Study Mission to South Africa
Author/Creator	Committee on Foreign Affairs; House of Representatives
Publisher	U.S. Government Printing Office
Date	1982-12-30
Resource type	Hearings
Language	English
Subject	
Coverage (spatial)	South Africa, United States
Source	Congressional Hearings and Mission Reports: U.S. Relations with Southern Africa
Description	This report is from a staff study mission to South Africa, to survey conditions and policy issues related to U.S. educational assistance for South Africans.
Format extent (length/size)	41 page(s)

<http://www.aluka.org/action/showMetadata?doi=10.5555/AL.SFF.DOCUMENT.uscg019>

**U.S. EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE IN SOUTH AFRICA: CRITICAL
POLICY ISSUES**

REPORT

OF A

STAFF STUDY MISSION TO SOUTH AFRICA

AUGUST 21-28, 1982

TO THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**



DECEMBER 30, 1982

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON :

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
DON BONKER, Washington
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
ANDY IRELAND, Florida
DAN MICA, Florida
MICHAEL D. BARNES, Maryland
HOWARD WOLPE, Michigan
GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR., Michigan
BOB SHAMANSKY, Ohio
SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TOM LANTOS, California
DAVID R. BOWEN, Mississippi

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
LARRY WINN, JR., Kansas
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, California
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
JOEL PRITCHARD, Washington
MILLICENT FENWICK, New Jersey
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California
JIM LEACH, Iowa
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
TOBY ROTH, Wisconsin
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
JOHN LEBOUTILLIER, New York
HENRY J. HYDE, Illinois

JOHN J. BRADY, Jr., *Chief of Staff*
GERALD E. PITCHFORD, *Staff Consultant*
MICKEY HARMON, *Staff Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA

HOWARD WOLPE, Michigan, *Chairman*

GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR., Michigan
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
ROBERT K. DORNAN, California

JOHNNIE CARSON, *Subcommittee Staff Director*
GARDNER G. PECKHAM, *Minority Staff Consultant*
STEVE WEISSMAN, *Subcommittee Staff Associate*
PRISCILLA NEWMAN, *Subcommittee Staff Associate*

FOREWORD

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

This staff report has been submitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs by staff members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Subcommittee on Africa and who conducted a study mission to South Africa from August 21 to 28, 1982.

The findings in this report are those of the study mission and do not necessarily reflect the views of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, *Chairman.*

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., November 22, 1982.

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Transmitted herewith is a report of a staff study mission which went to South Africa from August 21 to 28, 1982, to examine critical policy issues concerning current and planned U.S. educational assistance for South Africans under the Foreign Assistance Act. The scope of our study is outlined in the introduction to our report.

The undersigned would like to express their thanks and appreciation for the assistance, advice, cooperation, and hospitality extended during the course of the study mission.

GERALD E. PITCHFORD,
Staff Consultant.

STEVE WEISSMAN,
Staff Associate, Subcommittee on Africa.

PRISCILLA NEWMAN,
Staff Associate, Subcommittee on Africa.

GARDNER PECKHAM,
Minority Staff Consultant, Subcommittee on Africa.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword.....	iii
Letter of transmittal	v
Nature and purpose of the staff study mission.....	1
Summary conclusions.....	4
Black education in South Africa.....	8
White-led educational change.....	10
Black-led educational change	14
U.S. interests and U.S. aid to education in South Africa	22
Suggested guidelines for U.S. educational assistance in South Africa.....	22
Specific programs recommended for U.S. assistance	26
Conclusion: The need for a clear direction in U.S. policy.....	35

NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STAFF STUDY MISSION

A staff delegation from the House Foreign Affairs Committee visited South Africa from August 21 to 28, 1982. This study mission was stimulated by the emergence of a number of critical policy issues concerning current and planned U.S. educational assistance for South Africans.

At the initiative of Representative Stephen Solarz, the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Congress has authorized a 2-year \$4 million per year program of scholarships in the United States for black South Africans facing "legal discrimination in obtaining entrance and access to university and professional training in their own country." The framers of the legislation expected U.S. universities and corporations to contribute to the program and indicated that "the students would be selected by a group of leading black and white South African educators and community leaders." The program's objectives were to: "Demonstrate America's commitment to racial justice, peaceful change, and black advancement in South Africa," enable skilled blacks to contribute "to the running of their country—now and in the future," and "generate a substantial amount of good will on the part of the black majority within South Africa toward the United States."¹ During the program's first year of operation some important questions have arisen. Is the multiracial South African selection board, the Educational Opportunities Committee (EOC), running a fair and representative selection process? Does the South African Government's ongoing investigation of the EOC's legal parent, the South African Council of Churches, threaten the continuation of the program? Should the U.S. Government consider increasing its involvement in the selection of students? Are the subjects of study being emphasized the right ones, and is the balance between undergraduates and graduate students appropriate? And how does this external scholarship program fit into an overall framework for promoting peaceful but fundamental racial change through U.S. educational assistance?

Early this year, "in recognition of the process of change that is now underway in South Africa and * * * the extent that education is a key to that change," the administration urged Congress to approve a \$2.3 million internal education program for blacks to encourage "peaceful evolutionary change."² The House Foreign Affairs Committee responded by adopting legislation requiring that internal education occur only in "nonsegregated institutions" where "all the facilities" were open to the trainees "on a racially nondiscriminatory basis", and that the students not be "legally

¹ Recommendations of the Subcommittee on Africa in "Foreign Assistance Legislation for Fiscal Year 1982: Part 8" (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1981), pp. xxiii-xxvi.

² Assistant Secretary of State Chester A. Crocker, "U.S. Responses to the Educational Needs of Black South Africans", Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies, Dec. 17, 1981.

prohibited" from using their training in "racially integrated organizations and institutions".³ In subsequent consultations with administration officials, committee staff became aware of several perplexing issues which had to be resolved before major programs could be implemented. For instance, should U.S. assistance go to "white" universities which were increasingly open to blacks through Government permits to study subjects not offered at black universities? Could these universities be considered nonsegregated institutions either now or when they were able to replace the permit system with one based on simple racial quotas? Was the fact that some of these universities were already housing some black students on campus relevant? Should the widely acknowledged need for qualified black teachers be addressed by U.S. educational assistance even though these teachers were confined to a separate black school system? How responsive was the South African Government likely to be to the new De Lange committee report which urged increased voluntary integration in South African education? What priority should U.S. educational assistance give to management-entrepreneurial training vis-a-vis labor education? More fundamentally, how could limited U.S. educational aid further peaceful racial change in South Africa without contravening basic U.S. principles of racial justice?

A U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) mission headed by Deputy Assistant Administrator for Africa W. Haven North spent 17 days in South Africa in November-December 1981 exploring possible assistance to South African education. While the team's subsequent report contained a great deal of valuable information and shed light on many key policy issues, it also suffered from certain limitations. It gave only minimal attention to the external scholarships program which was just getting off the ground. Its predominant orientation was to the views of white and black educational program administrators, not those of black political leaders and students who are key audiences for U.S. policy in South Africa. And the team failed to consider the possibility of funding labor education projects.

The staff delegation included: Gerald Pitchford, full committee staff consultant, Steve Weissman and Priscilla Newman, staff associates of the Subcommittee on Africa, and Gardner Peckham, minority staff consultant for the subcommittee. Over 7 full working days and evenings we met with a wide variety of South Africans concerned with black education. In Pretoria and Johannesburg we spoke with South Africa's Minister of National Education, Gerrit Viljoen, Gavin Relly, chairman of the Anglo-American Co., and John Mavusu of Inkatha; Dr. Mokgethi Motlhabi, director of the tors and political figures; John Rees, Hazel Moolman, and Ina Perlman of the South African Institute of Race Relations; Gibson Thula and John Mavusu of Inkatha; Dr. Magethi Motlhabi, director of the Educational Opportunities Committee; Sheena Duncan of the Black Sash; John Samuels, director of the South African Committee on Higher Education (SACHED); executive director Clark Else and other businessmen from the American Chamber of Commerce of South Africa; Rex Pennington, director of the chamber's PACE

³ H. Rept. 97-547, 97th Cong., 2d sess., p. 49.

Commercial High School project; Prof. Sonny Du Plessis, vice-principal of the University of the Witwatersrand, along with Peter Hunter, Eric Glover, Stan Kahn and other officials of the University; black faculty and students at Wits; Emma Mashinini, general secretary of the Commercial, Catering and Allied Workers Union; Ike Van der Watt, general secretary of the South Africa Boilermakers, Iron and Steel Workers, Shipbuilders and Welders' Society; Dr. Nthato Motlana, chairman of the Soweto Committee of Ten; Phirosaw Camay, general secretary of the Council of Unions of South Africa (CUISA); Judith Hawarden of the Education Information Centre; Sam Motsenyane, president of the National African Chamber of Commerce (NAFCOC); Eric Mafuna, chairman of the Black Management Forum; Bishop Desmond Tutu, chairman of the EOC and secretary-general of the South African Council of Churches; Dusty Ngwane, vice-president of the Chemical Workers Industrial Union and Transvaal Regional Organizer for the Federation of South African Trade Unions (Fosatu); and Loet Dowes Dekker, president of the Urban Training Project.

While in Capetown we met with Di Cooper and other officials of the General Workers Union; Franklin Sonn, director of the Peninsula Technikon and president of the Cape Teachers' Professional Association, Rector Richard Van der Ross and faculty and students of the University of the Western Cape; principal Stuart Saunders and faculty and students of the University of Capetown; Prof. Chris Hanekon of the University of Stellenbosch and the President's Council; three members of the EOC Regional Board—James Moulder, special assistant to the principal of the University of Capetown, Abe Daniel, registrar at the University of the Western Cape, and Nontebeko Moletsane, community organizer for SACHED; and approximately 15 representatives of community-oriented education projects in Capetown. Two of us also visited two U.S.-funded self-help projects in Capetown: Foundation for Social Development and Masifundise Educational Foundation.

The delegation also visited the industrial and trade union center of Port Elizabeth and Durban and met with Ian Segoni, lawyer for the Port Elizabeth Black Civic Association; Bobby Manulski of the Black Sash; Alan Hendrickse, national secretary of the Labor Party; Anglican Bishop Bruce Evans, Prof. Philip Botha of the University of Port Elizabeth's Center for Continuing Education; Government Zini, general secretary of the Motor Assembly and Component Workers' Union of South Africa and the General Workers Union of South Africa; Fred Sauls, general secretary of the National Automobile and Allied Workers Union and a leader of the Fosatu trade union federation; Fred Ferreira, director of industrial relations of Ford Motor Co.; William Ross, rector of Dower Teacher Training College; Prof. Absolom Vilikazi of the University of Zululand; Dean H. Philpott of the University of Natal Medical School; four members of the EOC regional board including Prof. A. J. Lembele of the University of Zululand; Mr. A. T. Benghu; Reverend Mbangula, and D. Rampono of the Natal Technikon; and Miss Msimang, principal of the Ntuzumu College of Education.

In most cases our discussions took place at the institutions concerned. We also tried to gain further insight into the environment

of South African education by attending a topical black play in Johannesburg, visiting squatter housing in Port Elizabeth, and touring various racial and ethnic neighborhoods in Capetown.

Of great importance was the refusal of some black groups to meet with us in protest against what they perceived as the U.S. Government's support of a repressive South African regime. This was the case with the Student Representatives Councils of both the University of Natal Medical School and the University of the Western Cape and the Black Students Society of the University of the Witwatersrand.

We had extensive discussions with U.S. Embassy and consulate officers in each of the cities we visited. And upon our return to Washington, we had the opportunity to meet with such well-informed South African visitors as Leonard Mosala of the Committee of Ten, chief councillor Enos Mabuza of the Kangwane "homeland," and Bishop Tutu.

There were some gaps in our program. Due to the possibilities of a demand for official visas or a misinterpretation of our presence, we avoided visiting the so-called independent states of Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Ciskei and Venda which have not been recognized by any country other than South Africa. Also, considering both our time constraints and the practical difficulties of making contact with nonofficial black opinion, we did not venture into the rural areas of white South Africa or the "homelands." But we did obtain a good amount of information about education in rural South Africa from some of our interviews and our background reading.

The following discussion and policy recommendations reflect the consensus of the delegation based upon a continuing study of the issues and reflections upon recent experiences in South Africa.

In this report, we use the terminology of the South African Institute of Race Relations in referring to Africans, coloreds (mixed race individuals) and Indians, and grouping them collectively as blacks. However it should be kept in mind that Africans are six times more numerous than coloreds and 20 times more numerous than Indians and other Asians.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

First, the South African education system is based on racial, and to a large extent ethnic, segregation. Black education is vastly inferior to white education as illustrated by comparisons of teacher-pupil ratios, per capita spending, teacher qualifications, and curriculum quality. The discriminatory character of South Africa's education system results from the governing Nationalist Party's historic purpose of preventing the social and political "absorption" of blacks into white society, constricting black participation in white South Africa to the provision of "certain forms of labor," and preparing blacks for economic, social, and political roles in their separate "national" communities.

Second, recent Government-sponsored changes have significantly increased the quantity of education available to blacks living in white urban areas, but have thereby widened the relative disadvan-

tage of rural blacks. The South African Government has not yet committed itself to a plan or timetable for movement toward educational equality. In general, the content and direction of educational reform does not indicate that the Government has changed its view of the role of education in perpetuating the social and political disenfranchisement of its black population.

Third, Government leaders would like U.S. assistance in certain long-range educational programs oriented to the base of the educational pyramid: Training of preschool teachers, adult literacy projects to enhance the learning environment of children, and in-service training for science and mathematics teachers.

Fourth, black educational and political leaders and their white supporters have recently embarked upon a variety of education programs which have the common aim of advancing the transition to a postapartheid South Africa. These innovative programs are distinguished from activities undertaken in the official system by several basic principles. Education must provide blacks with a sense of self-confidence and self-worth based partly on cultural self-awareness. It must be rooted in a sense of responsibility to the black community and it must facilitate community initiatives. Since fundamental change is coming more rapidly than the Government thinks, education must provide blacks with advanced scientific and technical skills to enable them to "run the country," special nonformal "bridging" programs to quickly increase the number of secondary students going on to advanced education, and alternative teacher training to transmit a new conception of self, of what education is, and of responsibility to the community. And no educational program can be a credible effort for fundamental change unless it is sponsored by an institution that is itself a credible opponent of apartheid. Educational initiatives which are widely approved by black and white foes of apartheid include:

The Educational Opportunities Committee program to select black students for college and university scholarships in the United States.—The students are chosen on the basis of academic merit and community service orientation, and their fields of study are the scientific, technical, and commercial ones that would be critical in a future political transition.

The South African Institute of Race Relations programs of black undergraduate scholarships at mainly white South African universities and tutoring/counseling for black secondary school students.—These activities are aimed at fostering an antiapartheid model of education and training the black leaders of a postapartheid South Africa.

The South African Committee on Higher Education's teacher upgrading, bridging and other educational programs.—SACHED is the premier change-oriented educational institution serving black South Africans, and supplies materials and training to other community agencies as well. Its various projects try to correct for "limited and distorted information," in the state educational system and implement teaching techniques which "create a dialog between teacher and pupil to encourage the development of an independent learner."

The labor education programs of independent black trade unions. These new unions have brought about significant ad-

vances for blacks in the workplace, but are also perceived as constructing an organizational base that will become a critical force in the struggle against apartheid. Their education programs range from courses in "How To Be a Shop Steward" to specialized leadership training in labor history, labor law, environmental issues, and political issues impacting the workplace.

Fifth, the overwhelming majority of black leaders and their white supporters desired U.S. assistance for education in South Africa, but preferred support for the types of activities just described. The majority of change-oriented leaders strongly opposes American assistance to "homeland" and other Government-controlled or financed institutions because they feel this would be interpreted by the South African Government as support for its continuing framework of education for separate development.

Sixth, the United States has strong interests in supporting a relatively peaceful transition toward racial justice and majority rule in South Africa. U.S. assistance to black education could play a role in promoting such change if it communicated to the South African Government that the United States believes it needs to make fundamental social and political changes in its own enlightened self interest, and it provided blacks with educational resources that enhanced their own capacity to advance fundamental change. Were U.S. aid to aim simply at an apolitical spreading of educational benefits (ignoring the political functions of South African education), it might educate a number of people but fail to promote a political environment of meaningful change. In effect it would fail to challenge a status quo that does not serve U.S. interests.

Seventh, U.S. educational assistance for black South Africans should be founded on the following criteria:

No assistance should be provided to South African Government-controlled or financed institutions. Aid to individuals attending such institutions could be provided only if black South Africans did not perceive this as aid to the institutions themselves.

Aid should be directed toward programs which in both their character and institutional sponsorship reflect the drive of most South Africans for an end to separate development.

Aid should be channeled through private U.S. and international voluntary organizations to maximize its acceptability and political credibility within the autonomy-seeking black community.

The limited assistance that is likely to be available should be concentrated on a small number of programs for maximum symbolic and substantive impact.

Eighth, in light of the suggested guidelines and a review of educational programs in South Africa, the following program priorities are recommended:

(a) A continued but strengthened Educational Opportunities Committee external scholarships program

The evidence to date is that the EOC is evolving a community-based, geographically representative, national selection process, that no alternative community-based structure could promise to be more representative, and that even a suspicious minority (members

of the Zulu-based Inkatha group) continues to work within the existing system and does not call for a new one. Were the United States to replace the EOC with a new "independent foundation" granting a larger role to Inkatha and other groups, as some have suggested, it would be widely perceived as opposing an authentic community-based initiative for peaceful fundamental change. This could seriously damage the credibility and viability of the whole program. Nor is there any danger, as some have feared, that the EOC program could be shut down as a result of the Government investigation of its current legal parent, the South African Council of Churches.

To strengthen the scholarships program, the following recommendations are supported by a broad spectrum of antiapartheid leadership:

Move rapidly toward a totally graduate-level scholarships program mainly to concentrate on more mature and well-rooted students who are likely to return home after their studies.

Increase resources, in staff and logistical backing, of the EOC to enable it to carry out a more extensive and effective selection process.

Increase resources to facilitate expanded contacts between the EOC and scholarshipholders in the United States to help the students keep in touch with South African developments and encourage their return and reintegration into the society.

Evaluate existing U.S. contractors for the program and limit their number—ideally to one contractor per year—to facilitate contacts between the EOC and its scholarship students.

(b) An internal undergraduate scholarships program through the South African Institute of Race Relations

This would correct a widely perceived imbalance in current U.S. scholarships assistance where relatively large amounts of money are spent on a relatively small number of students abroad while many blacks are unable to attend or stay in universities at home because they lack much more modest educational subsidies. The same "developmental" fields emphasized in the external program would be appropriate for a new internal one. Black leaders and students believe that aid to the student will not be perceived by the black community as aid to South African Government-supported universities. In accordance with black preferences, students receiving scholarships will decide which universities they wish to attend.

(c) Teacher upgrading, bridging, and other programs through the South African Committee on Higher Education and other community-based organizations

A major U.S. aid initiative could build on SACHED's existing capacity and help it reach its full potential as a center for education-based change in South Africa. Such an initiative should take full account of SACHED's relations with other, similarly inclined agencies. Assistance to SACHED and related organizations for teacher upgrading and bridging could best be channeled through American foundations.

Given the enormous needs of rural areas, American assistance for community-based, nongovernmental projects there would be

beneficial if it were not perceived as implying official recognition of homelands or so-called independent states. Other small-scale community projects would be supported by U.S. Embassy self-help funds.

(d) Labor education through independent black trade unions

By assisting labor education in the new independent black trade unions, the United States would be visibly identifying itself with one of the emerging but most impressive forces for fundamental social and political change in South Africa. The most acceptable intermediary for U.S. aid would be the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions which has an existing \$1 million program for these unions. Aid to this program could be earmarked for particular labor education activities and transmitted to the ICFTU via the AFL-CIO labor federation.

Ninth, there is a need for a clear direction in U.S. educational assistance to South Africa. Thus far, reflecting a mixture of administration and congressional concerns, American policy has been characterized by caution rather than commitment. The need to strengthen the ongoing external scholarships program has received insufficient attention amidst exaggerated fears that the whole program could be wiped out by the Government's investigation of the South African Council of Churches. A small internal program wherein U.S. consultants prepare study guides for students taking the high school leaving test (a prerequisite for university entrance) has become caught up in controversy largely because the consultants are not working directly inside South Africa to utilize and enhance community-based expertise. The U.S. Embassy's new self-help education projects also manifest an absence of purposeful engagement since their character differs according to the consulate sponsoring them. Field implementation of educational assistance by the U.S. Information Agency, which specializes in information and exchange programs, has both reflected and contributed to the lack of strong involvement with internal development work. An AID factfinding team's useful recommendation that a new education programs coordinator be assigned as special assistant to the American Ambassador to provide "full time professional advice and coordination with the black community" and guide and coordinate programs has unfortunately not been implemented.

BLACK EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

The basic dimensions and dynamics of racial discrimination in South African education are fairly clear. In the first place, all public primary, secondary, and advanced technical education is racially segregated, and 90 percent of the black students at residential universities attend segregated black universities. Black education is essentially administered by 13 separate departments: one each for Africans, coloreds, and Indians in the "white" area, six for Africans in ethnic-based "homelands," and four for Africans in the ethnic-based "independent states." Then, within the "white" areas, the South African Government spends approximately 10 times more per white student than per African, 5 times more per white than per colored, and 3 times more per white than per Indian. For

1980-81, the teacher pupil ratios in South Africa (excluding the "independent states") were 1 to 18 for whites, 1 to 24 for Indians, 1 to 27 for coloreds and 1 to 48 for Africans.⁴ The disadvantage for students living under the jurisdiction of the South African Government financed and guided homelands and independent states educational system—two-thirds of all African students—is even greater.⁵ For example, the teacher-pupil ratio for African primary school students in the Kwazulu homeland was 1 to 56 compared with 1 to 47 for African primary students in the adjoining white Province of Natal.⁶

Black students receive fewer books, materials, and educational facilities (such as assembly halls, classroom space, libraries, and guidance and health services) than whites.⁷ Black, especially African, high schools offer fewer advanced courses than white ones. According to the American Chamber of Commerce in South Africa, of 1,162 African secondary schools, only 195 offer math, 36 accounting, 31 business economics, 28 economics, and 15 typing as subjects in the final year.⁸

Qualitative aspects of racial disadvantage are also important. The percentage of underqualified teachers among whites is 3.36 percent, Asians 19.7 percent, coloreds 66.14 percent, and Africans 85 percent.⁹ Elements of the curriculum, such as eurocentric versions of history and geography, religious, and citizenship classes emphasizing submissiveness, and a late introduction to the English language, as well as a pedagogy based on rote learning contribute mightily to black educational inferiority.¹⁰

The wastage in black education has been thoroughly documented on the primary and secondary levels. Thus the percentage of all South African pupils who started school in 1963 and completed 12 years of schooling in 1975 was: Whites, 58.4 percent, Indians, 22.3 percent, coloreds, 4.4 percent, and Africans 1.96 percent.¹¹ Of Africans who started school in white areas during 1967, only 1.25 percent had completed high school and passed the national matriculation examination by 1980.¹² Michael Corke, headmaster of the racially integrated, private St. Barnabas school in Johannesburg, has described the interplay of factors affecting the educational achievement of African students:

Even in their school environments, pupils encounter little which is likely to help them rise above the difficulties imposed on them in the outside world. They are inhibited in their development by a late and unsatisfactory introduction to English as a basic means of communication; their teachers generally lack the confidence neces-

⁴ Muriel Horrell, ed., "Survey of Race Relations in South Africa 1981" (Johannesburg, Institute of Race Relations, 1982), pp. 334-35. However these figures include teachers who do not work in classrooms as well as those who do.

⁵ Kenneth Hartshorne, "The Unfinished Business: Education for South Africa's Black People", *Optima*, July 30, 1981, p. 25.

⁶ The Buthelezi Commission, "The Requirements for Stability and Development in Natal, II" (Durban: H&H Publications, 1981), p. 294.

⁷ Franz Auerbach and David Welsh, "Education," in Sheila T. Van Der Horst, ed., "Race and Discrimination in South Africa: A Review" (Capetown: David Philip, 1981), pp. 69-72; Human Science Research Council, "Provision of Education in the RSA" (Pretoria, HSRC, 1981), pp. 48, 55-56.

⁸ American Chamber of Commerce in South Africa, Project Pace, Bulletin No. 2, p. 3.

⁹ Human Sciences Research Council, *op.cit.*, p. 24.

¹⁰ Mokubung O. Nkomo, "The Contradictions of Bantu Education", *Harvard Educational Review* LI (February 1981), p. 129.

¹¹ Human Sciences Research Council, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

¹² Horrell, *op.cit.*, p. 351.

sary to deal in an imaginative and constructive manner with their subject matter; teachers and pupils suffer alike in large and unwieldy classes; the resulting practice of rote learning militates against the development of the individual as a thinking being; they lack confidence in dealing with the white members of the community.¹³

Black universities in South Africa are rigidly controlled by government officials who approve the hiring of faculty and senior staff, limit academic freedom, and generally provide inferior faculties and facilities. They tend to be suffused with the demoralizing, and protest-inspiring atmosphere of apartheid.¹⁴

Broadly speaking, educational discrimination in South Africa is the result of the historic political disenfranchisement of blacks. But the particular character of contemporary black education owes much to the distinctive world view of the National Party which has governed the country since 1948. From the Nationalists' perspective, South Africa is made up of separate Indian, colored, and Bantu (e.g. Zulu, Xhosa, Sotho) "nations" with separate destinies, and "education must train and teach people in accordance with their opportunities in life, according to the sphere in which they live". In the late Prime Minister Voerword's historic formulation,

The Bantu must be guided to serve his own community in all respects. There is no place for him in the European community above the level of certain forms of labor * * * For that reason, it is of no avail for him to receive training which has as its aim absorption in the European community while he cannot and will not be absorbed there. Up till now, he has been subjected to a school system which drew him away from his own community and partially misled him by showing him the green pastures of the European but still did not allow him to graze there.¹⁵

Thus the essential purposes of black education have been to prevent the social and political "absorption" of blacks into white society, to constrict black participation in white South Africa to the furnishing of "certain forms of labor," and to prepare blacks for economic, social, and political roles in their separate national communities or homelands. To achieve these goals, black education was removed from provincial and missionary control and centralized in separate Indian, colored, and African departments at the national level. Under National Party guidance and financial control, the responsibility for educating rural Africans was gradually devolved to authorities in the homelands and independent states. Total per capita spending on black education plummeted.¹⁶ Curricula were rewritten to underline the virtues of separate development. The autonomy of English-speaking white universities, which had previously admitted blacks without restriction, was curtailed; the outstanding church-controlled University of Fort Hare was taken over by the state; and new segregated universities were established for Indians, coloreds, and Africans.

WHITE-LED EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

In the past several years, the need for stabilized, skilled black labor in white areas along with the politically explosive character of black student protests against inferior education have helped in-

¹³ Quoted in K. Hofmeyr, "Problems of Black Advancement in South Africa" (School of Business Leadership, University of South Africa, 1981), p. 2.2.

¹⁴ John Marcum, "Education and Politics in South Africa," *Africa Index*, IV (Dec. 31, 1982), pp. 85-90.

¹⁵ Nkomo, *loc. cit.*, p. 127.

¹⁶ Hartshorne, *loc. cit.*, p. 21.

fluence white political leaders to launch various educational reforms. Government spending on colored and African education in the white area has increased dramatically, with the latter doubling over the last 2 years. Efforts are being made to enhance teacher qualifications by raising entrance and graduation requirements at state teacher training colleges, providing racially equitable salaries for fully qualified teachers, and expanding programs for the upgrading of existing teachers. The dropout rates for blacks have been reduced: In 1981, about 7 percent of African pupils were finishing high school as compared to 2 percent in 1975.¹⁷ Apprenticeship training for Africans, once confined to the homelands, has begun in white areas; and advanced technical education is also expanding with two new African "technikons", one in the "white" area and one in a homeland. In a step away from "petty apartheid" restrictions on black-white contacts in public facilities, the Ministry of National Education has become more flexible in granting permits to black students to study at "open" white universities if particular courses are unavailable at black institutions. During 1981, 4,034 blacks were enrolled at residential universities for whites, making up approximately 5 percent of the total enrollment but 10 percent of that of English-speaking universities.¹⁸

Yet the accumulation of these substantive reforms has not disturbed the basic "grand apartheid" formula of educating blacks for full participation only in their own separate national communities and educating urban Africans for narrow economic functions rather than absorption into the white social and political structure. It is true that South Africa has significantly increased its spending on black education in "white" areas. But owing to its resettlement and influx control policies, the Government has direct responsibility for a declining proportion of African schoolchildren, two-thirds of whom now fall under the jurisdiction of the homelands and "independent states." And, as previously mentioned, teacher-pupil ratios and per capita allocations for these areas are being permitted to fall increasingly behind those for blacks in "white" South Africa. Actually, overall per capita spending and teacher-pupil ratios for South Africa remain less favorable to blacks than they were in 1949 shortly after the Nationalists took power.¹⁹ The South African Government has not yet committed itself to a plan or timetable for movement toward educational equality. Indeed it spends only 4.4 percent of the gross national product on education, "lagging behind many much less developed countries." According to careful estimates, South Africa would have to double its annual education expenditure to achieve racial parity within 10 years.²⁰ There have been no conspicuous changes in teaching methods or the content of curricula in black schools. Despite the absolute increase of black students in white universities, the proportion of all blacks studying in segregated universities has barely changed since 1971.²¹ Furthermore, although nearly one-half of African students

¹⁷ Estimates based on published and unpublished data from the South African Institute of Race Relations.

¹⁸ Horrell, *op. cit.*, p. 380.

¹⁹ Hartshorne, *loc. cit.*, p. 24.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 25; Human Sciences Research Council, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

²¹ Statistics provided by Prof. John Marcum from a forthcoming study of South African education to be published by University of California Press.

at residential universities attended white, English-speaking ones in 1958—before apartheid was implemented at universities—today 90 percent of all African students are forced to attend the segregated institutions popularly known as bush colleges. Minister of National Education Viljoen told us that the Government was thinking of substituting racial quotas for individual permits to regulate black admissions to white universities, but officials of the English-speaking universities said they preferred to return to the pre-1959 system of autonomy in student admissions. In sum, there is precious little to indicate that the South African Government has changed its view of the role of education in perpetuating the social and political disenfranchisement of its black population.

Particularly revealing has been the Government's reaction to certain key recommendations of the De Lange Committee—Human Sciences Research Council—report on education which the Cabinet itself had commissioned in 1980. Members of the De Lange Committee agreed on the need for a more open educational system, including voluntary racial integration at local and regional levels and complete university autonomy in student admissions. It strongly recommended a single department of education to provide and finance education in terms of progress toward racial parity as soon as feasible. In response, the Government reiterated the Nationalist credo: “the Christian and national character of education” and the policy of separate schools and departments for each population group. Shortly after the De Lange report was tabled in Parliament, the legislature approved the creation of a new, segregated, urban multicampus university for Africans named Vista.

During a conversation with the staff delegation, Minister Viljoen—who is responsible for most advanced education for whites, national examination standards for blacks, and the coordination of the Government's response to the De Lange Committee recommendations—stated that, beyond the construction of physical facilities, his priorities for black education were in preschool education, adult literacy to improve the learning environment of children, upgrading of teacher qualifications, and the application of educational technology to the classroom. His focus was clearly on long-range programs directed at the base of the educational pyramid. In fact, he expressed skepticism about remedial programs for black university students, noting reports of 80 to 100 percent attrition for blacks in white universities. In accordance with his expressed priorities, the Minister suggested that U.S. educational assistance emphasize training of preschool teachers, adult literacy, and inservice training for science and mathematics teachers. He also praised various black education projects of multinational firms in South Africa: a Barclay's Bank program to tutor 200 gifted Soweto blacks a year for university entrance, the American Chamber of Commerce's Pace Commercial High School which will accommodate 600 Soweto blacks, and a German Chamber of Commerce nonformal education center, also in Soweto.

Thus Government-led educational change in South Africa has significantly increased the quantity of education available to blacks living in white urban areas. Yet the content and direction of reform is not such as to challenge historic Nationalist concepts of education as an instrument of separate development, a means for

obtaining necessary black labor for the white economy, and an institution to divert blacks from absorption into white-led social and political structures. The Government believes that it has plenty of time to implement its long-range strategy for improvements in black education, so it is focusing on the base of the educational pyramid. It would like the United States to supplement its own efforts, especially in teacher-training and adult literacy, and it appreciates efforts by multinational corporations to educate urban black high school students and adults.

White business leaders are increasingly active in the field of black education, itself perhaps an implicit criticism of the pace of the Government's program. A few of these private projects also seem to go against the grain of the Government's grand apartheid policy. Examples include the Anglo-American Co.'s \$5 million grant for academic support programs for black students at the white University of the Witwatersrand and the liberal business-sponsored Urban Foundation's support of autonomy and self-awareness-oriented counseling and career guidance services for urban blacks—these services are virtually nonexistent in black schools.²² Other initiatives appear to have a more ambivalent relationship to separate development. For instance the American Chamber of Commerce's PACE school will provide much needed quality education for students interested in university degrees, professional business diplomas and basic clerical and administrative skills, albeit in a necessarily segregated setting. On the other hand, neither the program itself nor its declared justification incorporate notions of promoting general community advances against apartheid and preparing blacks for new social and political roles. Rather, the chamber's literature on PACE situates it more in the traditional contexts of education for manpower provision and corporate public relations:

It will provide a source of commercially well-trained blacks for employment within the South African business sector. It is a way in which you can effectively act for good in South Africa and enhance the image of business, both here and overseas.²³

Similar ambiguities surround the smaller Shell Oil and Anglo-American bridging programs aimed at shepherding a few talented high school students through engineering and business studies at white universities. Still other business-supported activities—like Urban Foundation funding of the building of primary schools to be taken over by the state and provision of science kits to schools in the independent state of Ciskei, Anglo-American financing of the construction of a state teacher-training college in Soweto, and Urban Foundation support for a technikon to be run by the Kwa-zulu Homeland Government—seem to reflect a complementarity of interests between the Government and business. On the whole then, the present business thrust in black education, while providing many new benefits, does not constitute a clear departure from the reigning assumptions of the South African system.

²² These services are provided through the Education Information Centre and the Careers Research and Information Centre. On the absence of guidance services in black schools, see Human Sciences Research Council, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

²³ American Chamber of Commerce in South Africa, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

BLACK-LED EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

As an oppressed people, it has been our fate that we cannot fruitfully guide the choice of careers and educate in the classroom for our own purposes. Someone else designs our education for his own purpose.

There is very little, for instance, in our curricula in school and university that is intended to reinforce our confidence in ourselves to sharpen our awareness of self in the African context, to shape a collective consciousness that is constructive, to stimulate us to create.

On the contrary, because we are being educated for other people's purposes in the classical colonialist sense—after all we are a colonized people—because we are considered primarily to be a labor reservoir, we are being trained to fit into jobs.

If such jobs are not ready for us we shall have been trained also to look for them, to present ourselves in suits and ties and polished shoes for the interview. We are trained to work for a white man or under white supervision, and not to create jobs of our own according to the genuinely felt demands of our communities.

In addition to this deficiency, ours is an authoritarian and not a humanistic education. A handicap which, alas, we share with whites, although few of them will have perceived it or admit it—blinded, deafened, insensitized as they are by privilege and power, by tribal loyalties.

A curriculum that we have not ourselves fashioned in accordance with our sense of communal imperatives except at the superficial level of a "job description", and on top of that an authoritarian education—that is what we have.

PROFESSOR EZEKIEL MPHAHLELE,
*University of Witwatersrand.*²⁴

In general, black leaders' notions about black educational needs are altogether different from those of white leaders. During the widely supported colored and African school boycotts of 1976 and 1980, the major educational demands were: Equality of educational resources, a single national education department for all races, and revision of curricula so as to reflect black history, culture, and achievements. More fundamentally, there was "a strongly articulated dissatisfaction with the South African system of education which students say is designed to perpetuate blacks' inability to compete on an equal footing with whites."²⁵ In a recent address to the African Teacher's Association of South Africa, Chief Minister Gatsha Buthelezi of Kwazulu, a moderate leader, warned,

Blacks are simply never going to learn to trust the educational system until there is clear evidence of good faith on the part of the authorities and until this good faith is symbolized by a single department of education. This will be the only way in which the authorities in Pretoria will be able to prove to blacks that their intention is to equalize black and white education * * *

We also know that if we are concerned about the peace and stability of our society in the future, we cannot afford the luxury of whites living in a false and short-term paradise of apartheid.²⁶

In short, the evidence is that black leadership rejects the white government's contention that education should prepare blacks for separate development and for only meeting particular manpower shortages in the "white" areas.

In the aftermath of the education-based protest movements of recent years, black educational and political leaders and their white supporters have embarked upon a variety of educational programs which have the common aim of advancing the transition to a postapartheid South Africa. These innovative projects are in-

²⁴ From "Education: A Handicap We Share with Whites," *Frontline* (September 1982), pp. 12-13.

²⁵ Study Commission on U.S. Policy Towards South Africa, "South Africa: Time Running Out" (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), p. 112.

²⁶ "Teaching for the Eighties," Address of Dec. 11, 1981.

formed by several basic principles which distinguish them from activities undertaken within the official system. First, education must provide blacks with a sense of self-confidence and self-worth based partly on cultural self-awareness; it should foster a willingness to take risks and an ability to cope with failure so that blacks can become agents of fundamental political and social change. As John Samuels, the director of the South African Committee on Higher Education [SACHED] put it, "Education [should be] for change * * * to exploit the gaps in power * * * to increase awareness of power, of history, to develop an independent learner." Second, education must be rooted in a sense of responsibility to the black community and it must facilitate community initiatives. For instance, a black educator with a community-based agency in Cape-town told us, "Current formal education doesn't prepare you for liberation and being an agent of change in the community rather than just 'making a living'." And several black leaders underlined the importance of training skilled teachers outside the state teacher-training institutions so that they could develop and transmit "new kinds of attitudes." According to Bishop Tutu such attitudes would be based on "a new conception of self, of what education is, and of responsibility to the community." Third, foreseeing more rapid and more fundamental change than their white counterparts, black leaders put priority on the acquisition of scientific and technical skills to "run the country" in an upcoming transition, special nonformal "bridging" programs to quickly increase the number of secondary students going on to advanced education, and the aforementioned alternative teacher training. Fourth, no educational program, no matter how innovative, can be a credible effort for fundamental change unless it is sponsored by an institution that is itself a credible opponent of the apartheid system.

During our visit to South Africa we learned about several educational activities that were associated with black aspirations for fundamental social and political change and were widely approved by black and white foes of apartheid.

(1) The Educational Opportunities Committee [EOC] program of scholarships in the United States

During the current academic year, 81 students are receiving full scholarships for undergraduate and graduate studies in the United States through the EOC. Sixty-eight of the students are largely financed by the U.S. Government with assistance from colleges, universities, and corporations. The scholarships are mainly for studies in scientific, technical, and commercial fields. The program was initiated by a group of prominent Sowetans, including two members of the Committee of Ten, whose commitment to fundamental change is clear. Its purpose according to a leading member of the EOC is "To look to the post-change era, to have professional leadership, as professional as possible. Blacks say we want the technology denied to us by South Africa * * * we want to learn from the experiences of other states like Algeria and Nigeria." For EOC Chairman Bishop Tutu and others, the very experience of living and studying in the United States will be liberating because students will "breathe free air" and thereby overcome the "claustrophobia" of life in South Africa. In addition to conventional academic crite-

ria, the EOC judges scholarship applicants on their orientation to community service and the likelihood that they will return to serve their country. With its multiracial national and regional boards and selection committees, the black-led EOC is emerging as a national institution of South Africans concerned with black education and opposed to apartheid. At the close of our visit, after we had traveled throughout the country to feel the pulse of black education, we attended the EOC national board meeting in Johannesburg and encountered in one place most of the key leaders we'd met in the previous week.

(2) *The South African Institute of Race Relations [SAIRR] scholarships and bridging programs*

In response to the educational upheavals of recent years, this white-led, antiapartheid, factfinding group has significantly expanded its educational services to black communities. Three foreign government donors—Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland—are contributing approximately 200 undergraduate scholarships, largely for blacks who attend white universities. Most of these scholarships actually begin in the last 2 years of secondary school. The students are selected on the basis of academic achievement and financial need, and the institute also provides tutoring and confidence-building counseling for its scholarship holders. From the standpoint of both the donors and the institute, this program represents an attempt to foster an antiapartheid model of education and to train the black leaders of a postapartheid South Africa.

Also, following the "breakdown of schools in Soweto in 1976 and the subsequent unrest in 1977-78, many young people approached the institute to supervise their studies through private institutions." The institute responded to this community demand by establishing a Saturday morning schools program which presently serves more than 3,000 secondary students in the Johannesburg area and others in cities throughout the country. According to the institute, "All school subjects are offered and given by volunteer, highly skilled, and dedicated teachers. Pupils are also given career guidance workshops."²⁷

Although it is mainly white-led and some aspects of its programs may reflect characteristically white liberal preferences—that is, the lack of a community-service criterion for awarding scholarships as in the EOC program—we found that the SAIRR programs enjoyed considerable support and credibility in the black community.

(3) *The South African Committee on Higher Education [SACHED] teacher-upgrading, bridging, and other community-oriented programs*

By virtually all accounts SACHED is the premier change-oriented educational institution serving black South Africans. It was founded in 1958 in reaction to the implementation of Bantu education in the universities, offering correspondence courses through the University of London. SACHED is governed by a multiracial

²⁷ "Overview of Educational Programmes," South African Institute of Race Relations, Aug. 26, 1982.

board which includes such well-known black leaders as Bishop Tutu, Bishop Manas Buthelezi, and Dr. Ezekiel Mphahlele; and has a black-led multiracial staff. Its explicit policy is "to assist change for a better, equitable South Africa * * * by providing opportunities for black adults to gain skills, and awareness of their surroundings, and by facilitating wherever possible the growth of community initiative."²⁸

SACHED currently offers bursaries and tutorial support to 1,714 students enrolled in University of South Africa part-time correspondence programs; a third of these students are teachers seeking to improve their qualifications. In addition, SACHED is preparing 457 students, of whom a quarter are teachers, for the Joint Matriculation Board (JMB) examination; good marks on this test are the "passport" to university education. SACHED also offers a variety of bridging courses to help its students overcome educational deficiencies. It prepares its own course materials in the traditional fields and has pioneered in the development of African studies. SACHED also provides commercial education, runs basic administration courses for the two main independent black trade union federations, and publishes a monthly educational magazine for teenagers and a monthly news magazine for urban adults. It is planning to begin a new correspondence degree program in which SACHED-designed courses will qualify students for a bachelor of general studies degree at Indiana University. SACHED projects operate in the major urban centers of South Africa, including Johannesburg, Pretoria, Durban, Capetown, Grahamstown, and Port Elizabeth.

SACHED's various projects attempt to correct for what it calls the "narrow and constraining confines of limited and distorted information"²⁹ in the state education system. Examples of innovation in the provision of information include a seven-workbook African studies course, labor education, and the mass circulation periodicals.

But the distinctive character of SACHED education is mainly manifested in its pedagogical style which deviates sharply from that of the South African Government. Both its course materials and its teaching techniques—the product of substantial research and evaluation departments—attempt to "create a dialog between teacher and pupil to encourage the development of an independent learner."

While it has inevitably encountered difficulties in trying to further social and political change through education—a newspaper education supplement was terminated when the black paper was closed by the Government and a project in the "independent state" of Bophuthatswana had to close because of the Government's objections to its curriculum and teaching techniques—SACHED has more than survived. It employs a staff of approximately 90 persons in addition to 100 part-time tutors to administer a \$1.2 million program. Financing comes from modest student fees and grants from the Ford Foundation and World University Services (supported by Scandinavian governments). SACHED is increasingly at the center

²⁸ The SACHED Trust, Annual Report, 1980, p. 5.

²⁹ "SACHED Trust Progress Report 1981," p. 2.

of other community-oriented educational initiatives as well. Thus it jointly runs its JMB teacher-upgrading program with the African Teachers' Association of South Africa. And it supplies materials and training to the bridging and other educational programs of the SAIRR, the EOC (for an adult literacy project), the Zingiesa Educational Trust, and the Council for Black Education and Research. In Capetown we visited a reading room and learning center in Nyanga township which had been organized by a SACHED field worker.

(4) Independent black trade union education programs

In the past 5 years, blacks have made their most impressive strides in challenging white power in the field of trade union organization. Independent black labor unions, that is to say black unions which have not been created or greatly influenced by traditional white unions or white companies, have mushroomed to approximately 200,000 members and are still growing rapidly. Currently, about 8 percent of blacks working in white cities (excluding domestic servants) and 20 percent of blacks working in manufacturing, construction, and transportation have joined the new unions. This movement has brought about significant advances for blacks at the workplace in material benefits, status, and organization. The new unions have also expressed strong opposition to the apartheid system, and some have sought to use their new organizational power in alliance with other community organizations to further specific political demands. While most of the independent black trade unions have restricted industrial action mainly to workplace issues, they frequently enlist the support of sympathetic community groups, and—as in Poland—they are in part surrogates for repressed political opposition to apartheid. Most black leaders and informed outside observers see the unions as constructing an organizational base that will become a critical force in the struggle for a new society. Whether officially multiracial like the Fosatu federation or black-led like the Cusa federation, nearly all the new unions favor an eventual multiracial society.

To help build the bases for fundamental change, independent black unions are increasingly involved in their own labor education programs. These range from basic courses in "How to be a Shop Steward" or "What a Labor Union Is" to specialized leadership training in labor history, industrial economics, labor law, and current political issues impacting the workplace, to utilization of university-sponsored research on occupational health and safety, environmental problems, and cost-of-living trends. Fosatu has established national and regional education programs for its unions with some assistance from lecturers with the Center for Continuing Education at Witswatersrand University. Cusa unions use the urban training project, chaired by Prof. Dowes Dekker of Wits, for most of their training. Unaffiliated independent unions seem to have less developed programs, partly because of manpower and financial shortages and strong Government harassment, but are interested in expanding their efforts. Recently, for instance, the Motor Assembly and Components Workers' Union and a sister union established a shop steward training program through the University of Port Elizabeth Center for Continuing Education; and the General Work-

ers Union would also like to institutionalize various training activities. In all, the scale of activity is impressive. According to one observer,

During 1981, 400 of Fosatu's 1,500 shop stewards participated in training seminars. Cusa in 1981 trained shop stewards, organizers and rank and file members in seminars nearly every weekend.³⁰

Beyond members' dues, independent black trade unions are receiving financial assistance for education programs from Western European church groups and foundations and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions [ICFTU] Coordinating Committee for South Africa. The latter is expected to contribute approximately \$1 million in 1982 to labor education and other activities of independent black unions.

The overwhelming majority of our black interlocuteurs and their white supporters desired U.S. assistance for education in South Africa but proposed a very different agenda from that of white governmental and business leaders. They preferred:

Continued support for the EOC external scholarships program for professionally skilled, community-oriented leaders, with emphasis upon graduate training;

Assistance for a similar undergraduate scholarships program at South African universities through a credible change-oriented organization such as SAIRR;

Help for community-based educational initiatives, particularly in the areas of bridging and teacher-upgrading, through SACHED and other change-oriented organizations;

Support for the labor education program of the new independent black trade unions.

Some black and white South Africans who favor fundamental change did not oppose these suggestions but emphasized other potential vehicles for U.S. assistance. Thus representatives of the Zulu-based political movement Inkatha, which is headed by Chief Buthelezi, and black administrators of the University of Zululand, the University of the Western Cape, the Peninsula Technikon, and Dower Teacher Training College favored U.S. aid for segregated, state-controlled black institutions of higher education. They argued that for all their weaknesses these institutions "had and would continue to produce the skilled leaders of the black community in South Africa." On the other hand, antiapartheid white officials at Witswatersrand and Capetown Universities were eager to obtain U.S. aid for academic support programs for their increasing black enrollments since the universities' subsidies from the Government do not cover these needs. An Inkatha representative employed by the Urban Foundation sought U.S. support for Urban Foundation programs. And black businessmen asked for U.S. support for entrepreneurial and middle management training efforts.

Yet the vast majority of change-oriented leaders we met strongly oppose American assistance to homeland and other Government-controlled or financed institutions. Partly this was because of their perceived deficiencies from the viewpoint of education for fundamental change, as in the conservative attitudes at state teacher-

³⁰ David Hauck, "Black Trade Unions in South Africa" (Washington, D.C.: Investor Responsibility Research Center, 1982), p. 27.

training colleges, severe repression of student demonstrations at Fort Hare and Zululand universities, and continuing pockets of faculty and student racism at Witswatersrand University. But blacks mainly oppose U.S. aid to Government-controlled and subsidized institutions because they felt it would be read by the South African Government as support for its continuing framework of education for separate development and a constricted black role in white areas. There was an additional concern that aid to these Government-related institutions could convey the impression that the United States was taking responsibility for what the Government should be doing, thereby allowing the regime to evade the issue of fundamental reform. It seemed significant to us that even black students at white Witswatersrand University said they would be suspicious of U.S. aid to Wits, and defined their own opposition to the Government by refusing to participate in intercollegiate sports lest that imply some form of acquiescence to the racial status quo.

For similar reasons, there was an absence of support for U.S. assistance to business-sponsored projects. Several blacks were averse to support of the more change-oriented Urban Foundation programs because the Foundation itself was viewed as "an attempt to co-opt a black middle class" or "government associated in its origins." Some cautioned that U.S. aid to business projects could associate the U.S. Government closely with the profit maximization goals of multinational corporations. We were also struck by the lack of interest in black entrepreneurial and middle management training such as that carried out by the National African Chamber of Commerce (NAFCOC) and being developed by the Black Management Association. And one prominent black leader explained, "It's not that NAFCOC doesn't have some credibility, but many have ambivalent feelings about it. People are concerned about it being an elite. There's a poor view of free enterprise here."

While there is no scientific survey of black public opinion on education programs in South Africa, we believe that the views we heard are—in their broad thrust—representative on the views of politically conscious blacks. Some of the leaders we saw, such as Motlana of the Committee of 10 and Bishop Tutu, are believed to have wide national followings. A recent Johannesburg Star poll of Africans in Johannesburg, Capetown, and Durban indicated that Motlana was second only to imprisoned African National Congress Chief Nelson Mandela as an approved political leader. This poll, along with others, shows high urban black support for Mandela and the ANC on the part of coloreds as well as Africans, and only middling backing—largely from Zulus who represent a quarter of the African population—for Chief Buthelezi and Inkatha. These findings are also consistent with other survey data showing urban blacks to be extremely critical of the very principle of ethnic homelands and highly discontented politically with expectations of large-scale unrest and violence.³¹ Less is known about the attitudes of blacks who live and work in the rural areas. But a recent survey by the Buthelezi Commission suggests at least considerable ambivalence toward the homelands by many of their residents. When

³¹ Johannesburg Star, Sept. 23-24, 1981; Buthelezi Commission, op. cit., I, pp. 243-46, 196-280 passim; Study Commission, op. cit., pp. 157-59, 190-204.

asked, "Think of the places that are known as a homeland for the black people—what things would you say about Kwazulu?" Sixty-nine percent of Zulus owning land in Kwazulu replied with negative attitudes.³² In any case it is reasonably clear that the center of gravity of black political activity in South Africa is not in the rural areas, where political participation is actually declining; overt independent political organizations are virtually nonexistent; and disproportionate numbers of women, children, and elders attempt to eke out a bare survival, but rather in the white cities where a majority of economically active blacks work and where political consciousness is rising.

Last, change-oriented leaders prefer that U.S. assistance to black education be channeled through private U.S. or international agencies. This doesn't mean that they would not appreciate a constructive U.S. Government initiative in black education. Instead it seems to reflect a wariness about white intentions born out of bitter historical experiences and a disappointment with recent Western and U.S. policies toward South Africa. As Leonard Mosala of the Committee of Ten explained, "We are 'politicians' in a political environment of suppression. We have a background of defiance, mistrust, and suspicion of association." A constantly posed question about prospective U.S. aid was "What's in it for you?" and a frequently expressed fear was of "manipulation" because "our image causes you problems." Responding to this widespread suspicion, most community-based groups prefer to avoid direct financial dealings with foreign governments.

Yet there also seemed to be a special reluctance to accept direct U.S. Government assistance. For example, the EOC has accepted a small grant from the Dutch Government which is perceived as a "cooperative small power." And SACHED leaders acknowledge that even the private U.S. Ford Foundation grant was controversial within the organization. We were struck by the fact that the United States as an influential superpower is being held to a particularly rigorous standard by black South Africans and is widely condemned for failing to press the South African Government to make fundamental changes. This perception of the current administration's stance of constructive engagement is strongly reinforced by the official South African press. An indication of the depth of many blacks' bitterness was the refusal of black and white student representatives at three white and black universities to meet with our staff delegation in protest against current U.S. policy. Other inhibitions on receipt of direct U.S. aid spring from the existence of over \$2 billion in U.S. direct investment—a union leader asked, "Do you want to give aid to tame the unions for your business interests?"—past allegations of covert CIA support for foreign trade unions as vehicles of American influence, and a fear of attacks from the external leadership of the "anti-imperialist" ANC which could damage internal groups' standing with other African countries.

³² Buthelezi Commission, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 253-55.

U.S. INTERESTS AND U.S. AID TO EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

There is a broad consensus among U.S. policymakers that the United States has strong interests in supporting a relatively peaceful transition toward racial justice and majority rule in South Africa. Such an evolution would be consistent with American values of democracy, civil rights, and nonviolent change. It could also frustrate the growth of Soviet influence and involvement in southern Africa which has been aided by regional instability. It could help sustain commercial relations totaling \$3.4 billion a year and U.S. direct investment of more than \$2 billion. And it could be useful in avoiding a damaging diplomatic collision with the important nations of the Third World over the issue of international sanctions against South Africa. Even if a U.S. policy of furthering peaceful but fundamental change were unsuccessful, America would have gained a measure of political credibility with most South Africans, African states, and the Third World, facilitating the pursuit of its other interests in southern Africa.

If then U.S. interests lie with peaceful but fundamental change in South Africa, U.S. assistance to black education could, in conjunction with other policies, play a role in promoting such change. But to do so, this assistance would have to indicate to the South African Government that the United States believes that it needs to make fundamental social and political changes in its own enlightened self-interest, and provide blacks with educational resources that enhance their own capacity to advance fundamental, peaceful change. Were U.S. aid to aim simply at an apolitical spreading of educational benefits, ignoring the political functions of education in South Africa, it might succeed in educating a number of people but fail to promote a political environment of meaningful change. In effect, U.S. educational assistance would fail to challenge a status quo that does not serve U.S. interests.

SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR U.S. EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE IN SOUTH AFRICA

In light of U.S. interests, we suggest that U.S. educational assistance for blacks in South Africa should be founded on the following criteria:

(1) No assistance should be provided to South African Government-controlled or financed institutions. (This would not preclude possible aid to individuals studying at such institutions provided that black South Africans did not perceive this as aid to these institutions themselves.) This would underline U.S. disassociation from an educational system geared to apartheid and at odds with America's own rejection of racial discrimination in government-supported (that is, public) education.

(2) Aid should be directed toward programs which in both their character and institutional sponsorship reflect the drive of most black South Africans and many white South Africans for an end to separate development.

(3) Aid should be channeled through private U.S. and international voluntary organizations to maximize its acceptability and political credibility within the black community.

(4) The limited assistance that is likely to be available should be concentrated on a small number of programs so that it may have the maximum symbolic and substantive impact.

The suggested guidelines may usefully be compared with expressed administration positions.³³

The first criterion, excluding aid to South African Government-supported institutions, is clearly more restrictive than recent administration statements. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Chester A. Crocker has declared his opposition to "any approach which calls upon the United States to play the role that is properly that of the South African Government," but he has not specifically indicated which activities are appropriate for each government or discussed whether complementary or coordinated programs would be desirable. AID's factfinding team would exclude "direct assistance to or through the Government of South Africa owing to its legal restrictions on educational opportunity by race" but "not exclude assistance to programs of nonsegregated institutions which receive government funds but otherwise provide open educational opportunity." In this latter category, the team favors aid to black-oriented programs at three English-speaking universities, Witswatersrand, Natal, and Capetown which have endorsed an end to racial discrimination and achieved "dramatic though incomplete integration," and it also contemplates future assistance to "segregated government teacher-training colleges" running formally nonsegregated (teacher) upgrading programs for blacks. Thus the AID team rejects assistance to Government education departments and to Government-controlled institutions for their regular segregated programs, but supports help to Government-financed institutions that have achieved a limited measure of racial integration and to segregated Government-controlled institutions for their supplementary, formally integrated activities.

Yet many South Africans and Americans would oppose aid to white universities where admission of blacks is strictly regulated by the Government and—despite courageous efforts by academic officials—most blacks cannot be housed on campus, impeding their use of libraries and other facilities. And many would also reject aid to segregated teacher-training institutions even if they offered extension-type courses for blacks on a formally nonsegregated basis.

Our recommendation is substantially similar to the Foreign Affairs Committee position, but we believe that our suggested language has the virtue of forestalling controversy over precisely what degree of segregation in an institution might be permissible. By explicitly prohibiting aid to Government-controlled or financed institutions, all of which are impacted by laws and regulations designed to foster separate development, we would establish a clear criterion which:

³³ See Crocker, *op. cit.*; Committee Report 97-547, *op. cit.*; and AID Fact Finding Team, "South Africa Education Report November-December 1981," *passim*.

Is in harmony with U.S. domestic public policies of nondiscrimination;

Backs black preferences for fundamental racial change;

Avoids any impression within South Africa that the United States is tacitly consenting to the continuation of an official education system geared to separate development, including the disenfranchisement of the black population.

We do not exclude the possibility of directly aiding a student who is forced to obtain his education in wholly or partially segregated institutions rather than aiding the institution itself. For us the key question to be answered is whether South Africans, especially blacks, would consider that aid to the student lacked the political connotations of aid to the institution. This problem is discussed further below in connection with our specific programmatic recommendations.

Criterion (2) directs aid toward educational programs which are antiapartheid in structure and organizational sponsorship in accordance with the political preferences of most blacks and many whites. Assistant Secretary Crocker favors a more traditional approach of addressing "the educational needs of those black South Africans who are the recipients of separate and unequal education" in "consultation with South Africans of all groups including, particularly, the black community." And he considers that this approach "will act to encourage a constructive process of change motivated by self-interest and not hindered by the continuing ideology of separation on the one hand or the ideology of armed struggle as the only option, on the other hand." Hence conventional educational assistance will help harness South Africa's self-interest in carrying through "the process of change that is now underway" though "the extent of social change and therefore the true nature of South Africa's * * * reforms remain undefined."

Our own recommendation spells out more specifically than administration statements that the kind of change we seek in South Africa is the end of apartheid. Therefore it also gives more emphasis to the views of the black community in the formulation of U.S. educational programs. Furthermore, insofar as recent South African Government educational and other reforms have occurred within a continuing overall framework of separate development and black disenfranchisement, we believe that U.S. educational assistance must, through its content and indigenous sponsorship, convey to the South African Government that it is in its interest to pursue fundamental change and provide blacks with resources to help achieve such change. In the present context, conventional educational assistance would risk reinforcing a system verging on violent confrontation.

Criteria (3) and (4)—that aid should be routed through United States and international private voluntary organizations to enhance its acceptability to blacks and that it should be concentrated for maximum impact—find support in the report of AID's factfind-

ing team.

We considered the possibility of only funding education programs where beneficiaries would not be legally prohibited from using their training in racially integrated organizations and institutions. This condition could prevent American aid for black teacher upgrading since restrictions by provincial departments of white education effectively exclude black teachers from white schools and restrictions by the Central Government allow only a small number of whites to teach in black schools. Such a limitation could also impede any aid to independent black trade unions' educational programs since their officeholders cannot realistically aspire to participate in racially integrated trade unions as long as South African law permits white unions to officially register and receive the benefits of such registration on a racially segregated basis. To perhaps stretch a point, one might plausibly argue that the whole legal structure of apartheid—from separate education, homelands, and group areas to the apparatus of political repression—effectively prohibits almost all educated blacks from using their training in truly racially integrated organizations and institutions.

We began our trip with considerable skepticism about the notion of the United States training black teachers to return to a segregated educational system. We particularly feared that this sort of aid would connote some form of U.S. complicity in an immoral system of racial oppression. But we were very impressed by the fact that blacks and whites who were trying to destroy apartheid did not share our qualms. From their perspective, as South Africans, "if you live in South Africa you're compromised, but the mere fact that we live in this country is not an acceptance of the status quo." Recognizing that "any context the United States enters will be a context of the apartheid structure," they said that the legitimacy of U.S. efforts in teacher training and other fields would depend on whether their "quality, content, and political direction" were for fundamental change away from apartheid and they provided "tools to break down rather than reinforce the system." Thus, for example, they supported U.S. aid to community-initiated efforts to upgrade black teachers and help them struggle against their imprisonment in the apartheid structure, but they opposed aid to South African Government, assisted teacher training institutions which clung to the existing system.

Last, Assistant Secretary Crocker has suggested that a "marker" to be "observed in attempting to design a U.S. response to the educational needs of black South Africans" is that "any approach which is interventionist in nature would be opposed by the South African Government as it would by any sovereign government." We recognize that the South African Government could, at any time, decide that a U.S.-supported educational project was "interventionist" and therefore cut off receipt of U.S. funds. But we do not agree that this possibility should affect the "design" of U.S. aid. For that would amount to giving the apartheid Government a veto over the kind of assistance provided. Thus far the South African Government has not significantly interfered with foreign support for community-based educational projects, and one virtue of

U.S. support for such initiatives would be to raise the international political costs of such interference. But if, in the end, South Africa prohibits aid to change-oriented programs, it would be in U.S. interests to terminate all aid rather than design projects that do not clearly stand for fundamental social and political change.

SPECIFIC PROGRAMS RECOMMENDED FOR U.S. ASSISTANCE

In light of the suggested guidelines and our review of educational programs in South Africa, we recommend the following priorities for U.S. assistance.

(1) A CONTINUED BUT STRENGTHENED EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES COMMITTEE EXTERNAL SCHOLARSHIPS PROGRAM

Black and white South Africans who are committed to fundamental change applauded the U.S. Government's decision to provide needed quality advanced education to disadvantaged blacks via scholarships in the United States. They expressed satisfaction with the level of the effort—86 full scholarships for fiscal year 1982 and 100 planned for fiscal year 1983. And they approved the program's emphasis upon developmental fields—mainly mathematics, natural sciences, computer science, agriculture, and business but with some flexibility for appropriate education and social science subjects. These disciplines were viewed as providing the crucial skills for the transition from apartheid. Yet opportunities for high quality education in these fields are largely confined to a relatively few black students studying at white universities. Indeed some key disciplines are not offered at any of the African or colored universities such as engineering, architecture, veterinary science, and food science.

We also discovered broad support for the EOC's role in screening and selecting academically qualified and community-oriented students. Two representatives of Inkatha did express substantive criticisms of the EOC's performance. They were suspicious, though admittedly lacking any concrete evidence, of possible political biases in student selection arising from the weight of Committee of 10 members and sympathizers on the EOC national board and the alleged absence of professional educators on the board. EOC officials retorted that the 11-member board was a voluntary formation of individuals, not groups, and included two professional educators, and the actual selection of students was done by regional and national selection committees composed of professional educators. They also pointed out that an Inkatha member sits on the Durban regional board and a Zululand university professor on the Durban selection committee.

Yet we were stuck by the fact that the Inkatha representatives did not propose an alternative structure to the EOC but only asked for the appointment of an educator, such as a representative of the African Teachers' Association of South Africa, to the national board. EOC leaders were not receptive to this suggestion, seeing in it an unprecedented demand for political representation on the board by Inkatha. We are persuaded that continuing differences over the composition of the EOC board largely reflect political differences within the black community. But the evidence to date is

that the EOC is evolving a community-based, geographically representative, national selection process, that no alternative community-based structure could promise to be more representative, and that even the suspicious political minority continues to work within the existing system and does not call for a new one.

Were U.S. policymakers to heed the appeal of some concerned individuals and replace the "controversial" EOC scholarships selection mechanism with a new "independent foundation" that granted a greater role to Inkatha and other groups, we believe that the United States would be widely perceived in the black community as opposing and manipulating an authentic community-based initiative for peaceful, fundamental change. In that case, we fear that significant participants would refuse to join in such a foundation and thereby seriously damage the credibility and viability of the scholarships program.

An illustration of the potential danger has been provided by black leaders' reactions to modest U.S. revisions of the scholarships selection process. When AID first started funding the external scholarships program in fiscal year 1981, it contracted with the Institute of International Education [IIE], a well-known international education organization which was already running a small external scholarships program with the EOC. The EOC selected students with some technical aid from IIE, and the latter placed the students in suitable colleges and universities and sought private funds for the program. For fiscal year 1982 AID contracted with IIE and, per force, EOC for 68 students but decided to obtain 18 additional students from an inexperienced U.S. contractor with no relation to the EOC—the American-African Educational Foundation [AAEF]. AAEF's director, Kevin Callwood, traveled to South Africa and, with the help of U.S. Information Agency personnel, selected 18 students. The early literature of the AAEF (since discontinued) identified it as a proponent of "free market enterprise." Nationally prominent members of the EOC reacted to this change with great suspicion and doubt.

Just last September, Bishop Tutu told the House Foreign Affairs Committee that "An organization in the U.S. gets part of the money for scholarships and is for free enterprise. If that kind of string is attached, the program will get killed stone dead. People worry about manipulation." This particular controversy has subsided as AID has decided to select all 100 students for fiscal year 1983 through IIE-EOC.

But the incident underlined the need for U.S. policymakers to avoid taking any steps in their choice of U.S. contractors or their relations with black leaders that could be perceived as "politicizing" the scholarships program.

Nor does the current South African Government investigation of EOC's legal parent, the South African Council of Churches, provide a compelling reason for the United States to trespass our suggested guideline against direct involvement in aid and place the selection process under the supervision of the U.S. Embassy. Even if, as some worry, the South African Government eventually prohibits foreign funding to the Council of Churches, there is no real danger that the EOC would shut down. The EOC originally associated with the council mainly out of convenience to avoid anticipated delays

in obtaining a separate fundraising number from the Government. It has in fact behaved as an autonomous group and has taken the decision to become a legally independent organization as soon as the investigation of the council is completed. Should there be any delays in this transition, it would temporarily receive external funds by simply becoming a thrust of another organization having a fundraising number.

In a more constructive vein, there are a number of steps that should be taken to enable the scholarship program to better realize its objectives. These suggestions emerged from our discussions in South Africa and are backed by a broad spectrum of antiapartheid leadership:

(a) Move rapidly toward a totally graduate-level scholarships program

There is widespread concern among black South Africans that many undergraduates who receive scholarships to go abroad may choose not to return to South Africa. Graduate students are generally viewed as more mature, more rooted in South African society, and less impressionable. We believe it is important for the scholarships program to respond to this community concern. During fiscal year 1982, only 20 percent of IIE students were graduate students. However, this year IIE South African Education Program Director David Smock reports that about half of those being interviewed for scholarships are prospective graduate students. Given the rapid rise in black enrollments at South African universities over the last 4 years—a 50-percent increase in African students at African universities and UNISA correspondence college and a 100-percent increase in African students at white universities from 1978 to 1981—an immediate and major expansion of graduate scholarships seems feasible. As indications, in 1980 African universities conferred 81 bachelors' degrees in commerce and administration but in 1981, 169 students were taking their third and final year of these subjects; and in 1982 there were 118 Africans studying science and engineering in Witwatersrand University, and 421 Africans in all at Wits, as compared to only 101 Africans studying there in 1978.³⁴ The number of graduate students in the external scholarships program could be further enlarged by an expanded EOC recruitment drive (see below) and creative programing to overcome the obstacle that the 3-year South African undergraduate degree poses for admission to U.S. graduate schools. For example, scholarships might be made available for a pregraduate year in the United States or efforts might be made to find internal aid for the fourth "honors year" in South Africa.

(b) Strengthen the EOC selection mechanism

The EOC has only two full-time employees, a director and an administrative assistant, to run the organization, its adult literacy program, and the external scholarships program. Almost none of the approximately \$500,000 allocated by AID to IIE for the fiscal year 1982 program went to the EOC. The fledgling EOC adminis-

³⁴ Statistics provided by Prof. John Marcum and Dr. David Smock.

trative skeleton is actually subsidized by a small Ford Foundation grant of approximately \$60,000.

As one might expect, it is impossible to adequately run a complex student selection process on a shoestring. We found that there were certain areas of the country where, for lack of sufficient publicity, the scholarships program is little known (for example, Port Elizabeth) or unknown (Chief Councilor Enos Mabuza of the Kanguwane homeland had never heard of it). The EOC director, Dr. Mothlabi, told us that he has not had the resources to establish an alumni association which could also aid in recruitment. We met the volunteer members of the EOC regional boards in Capetown and Durban who told us of their frustration when information and application forms did not arrive from Johannesburg in a timely fashion and complained that there was no money for paid staff to operate programs. In fact, our conversations with the regional board members led us to believe that a portion of the strain between the Johannesburg-based National EOC and the Durban-based Inkatha comes from the sense of alienation from the center that all regional boards share. We suspect that these problems could be reduced significantly by increasing resources for the EOC network. Finally, given financial constraints, the EOC director has been unable to establish a recordkeeping system, including information on student backgrounds and performance, which could help in achieving a more representative and effective program. In contracting for the external scholarships, U.S. AID should recognize its obligation to adequately fund the EOC portion of the program. Sufficient paid, full-time staff and logistical backing should be provided for the national office and each regional office to conduct an effective, truly national selection, including hard-to-reach rural areas. Current plans of IIE, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation to fund 1½ additional positions in the EOC are welcome, but inadequate, measures.

(c) Facilitate expanded contacts between the EOC and scholarship holders

Since a major purpose of this program is to educate future leaders of South Africa, it would be sensible to help scholarship students keep in touch with developments in their country. This could also encourage their return and facilitate their reentry into the society. The EOC leadership would like its planned alumni association to fulfill some of these functions. In addition, EOC regional board members are eager to keep in touch with "their" students (but at the time of our visit, most were unaware of the schools these students were attending). Another suggestion strongly endorsed by members and nonmembers of the EOC was to permit students on 4-year scholarships to return to South Africa for the summer following their second year. Since the students receive full maintenance during the summers, and the cost of round-trip transportation home could largely be made up by possible summer jobs with multinational firms and community organizations and the lower expense of living with their families, such a provision might be almost costless as well as cost/effective in fostering community leadership for the future.

(d) Evaluate existing U.S. contractors and limit their future number—ideally to one contractor per year

In fiscal year 1982 IIE and AAEF received contracts to select students and administer their subsequent placements. For fiscal year 1983 IIE has been chosen by AID to operate the selection process which is being conducted through EOC. AID also plans to award new placement contracts following a competitive application process. Officials have informally indicated that they would like to give contracts to at least two placement agencies in order to spur competition for better performance.

We think it would be a mistake to award new contracts without a thorough evaluation of last year's placement experience. We are concerned about some aspects of AAEF's first year performance. First, AAEF has not been able to attract nearly as much university and corporate support for its students as IIE has and it has required more help from AID to administer each of its placements. During fiscal year 1982 AAEF received approximately one-third of AID's scholarship program budget for less than a fifth of the students. Second, AAEF Director Callwood acknowledges that the organization's placements are not up to the academic quality of IIE's and that a few AAEF students will be attending colleges with very low foreign and African student enrollments. On the other side, Callwood maintains that AAEF must be judged as a new organization that did not receive its contract until very late in the academic year. He also argues that he is developing a more personalized counseling program than IIE's.

A major reason for limiting the number of contractors is to facilitate contacts between the EOC and its students in the United States. Given the weaknesses in the EOC structure and the inherent difficulties in maintaining relationships across thousands of miles, it would be desirable to have as small a number of U.S. intermediaries as possible. In fact, the ideal—if supported by extensive evaluations—would be one intermediary organization. While competition for AID contracts is to be encouraged, this can, and usually does, take place through a yearly contest rather than through the incorporation of competing organizations into the same program.

Adoption of the above suggestions would result in a significant strengthening of the EOC. This could entail side benefits for black education beyond the scholarships program. EOC members see themselves as participants in a national, multiracial organization concerned with black education. They would like the group to become more of a planning and coordinating body for internal educational initiatives as well. Already they are operating an adult literacy center and regularly exchanging information and views on educational programs. To the extent that the U.S. favors fundamental change through educational assistance in South Africa, it ought to welcome the growth of a promising national educational institution.

(2) AN INTERNAL UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS PROGRAM THROUGH
THE SAIRR

Virtually all of the people we spoke to in South Africa felt there was a serious imbalance in the U.S. external scholarships program because large amounts of money were being spent on relatively few students abroad while many black students were unable to attend or stay in universities at home because they lacked much more modest educational subsidies. Adding to this their aforementioned preference for undergraduates to be educated at home, black leaders recommended that the U.S. fund undergraduate scholarships internally while providing graduate fellowships in America. There was a consensus that the same "development" fields emphasized in the external program would be appropriate for a new internal program. We were assured—by black students attending white and black universities as well as black leaders—that aid to the student would not be perceived by the black community as aid to South African Government-supported universities.

A few black leaders would prefer that U.S. internal scholarship aid be restricted to black students attending white universities which have recently expanded their black enrollments. Their idea is to support quality education in a confidence-building atmosphere of relative academic freedom, endorse a model of postapartheid interracial cooperation, and encourage/pressure the South African Government to permit more black students to attend white universities. On the other hand, the vast majority of black leaders we met, including Tutu, Motlana, Gibson Thula of Inkatha, and John Samuel of SACHED, were unwilling to exclude students attending black universities from U.S. assistance. They felt that these students, far more numerous than those at white universities, should not suffer a "double penalty" of being forced to attend lower quality segregated institutions and being denied foreign assistance to obtain their degrees. They acknowledged that there were stricter Government controls and limitations on academic freedom at black universities, but stressed the traditional student culture of resistance to apartheid and community involvement, a culture which had helped produce most contemporary black leaders. They also pointed out the continued racial humiliation involved in blacks applying for permits to go to white universities. Some also worried that vanguard blacks at white universities might be coopted into becoming a middle class elite disengaged from black community concerns. Interestingly, all the black students we met at the predominantly white Witwatersrand University were in favor of aiding black students at black universities.

This debate among blacks is another reminder that no U.S. internal aid program can completely escape the overarching environment of South African apartheid. Two foreign donors—the Governments of Germany and Holland—have decided to provide undergraduate scholarships only to blacks attending white universities. Paradoxically, the Germans are also aiding teacher training at the black University of the North and University of Zululand. Yet the Swiss Government awards scholarships without any such restriction. Bishop Tutu suggested that the United States "might give preference to the white 'open' universities" without excluding the

black ones. But this raises the tricky problem of how much of a preference should be given. *In the end, we are hesitant about imposing on change-oriented black South Africans a foreign view of what kind of scholarship assistance will best further fundamental change.* We would therefore prefer to let the student receiving a scholarship decide which university to attend. However, we believe that a large majority of these students will at least try to enter a white university.

At this time, the natural South African vehicle for an undergraduate scholarships program is the SAIRR. It currently administers 2,000 bursaries and scholarships, including almost 200 German, Dutch, and Swiss scholarships. It provides tutoring and counseling for all its students. The SAIRR has a national network of offices and projects and enjoys high political credibility in the black community. As a white-led antiapartheid group, it has much less political difficulty in accepting direct foreign government funds so a U.S. intermediary would probably not be necessary. As the EOC gains experience and structure, it could perhaps become another, more community-based, vehicle of U.S. assistance or serve as a channel to other such agencies. We would suggest an initial program of 100 undergraduate awards to create a balance with the external scholarships program. As in the external scholarships program, sufficient support should be provided for effective national selection, including the hard-to-reach rural areas.

(3) TEACHER UPGRADING, BRIDGING, AND OTHER PROGRAMS THROUGH SACHED AND OTHER COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

Teacher upgrading and bridging are the program priorities of change-oriented leaders and SACHED is their clear first choice to deliver these services. SACHED's innovative approach and programs have been described earlier. A major U.S. aid initiative could build on the organization's existing capacity and help it reach its full potential as a center for education-based change in South Africa. Since SACHED is already providing materials and training to many of the key organizations involved in teacher upgrading and bridging, its programs have a potentially wide diffusion. Thus to achieve maximum impact and institutional development, U.S. assistance should emphasize SACHED's role and take account of its relations with other similarly inclined agencies.

Assistance to SACHED and related organizations for teacher upgrading and bridging could best be channeled through American foundations such as Ford—currently aiding SACHED and SAIRR; Rockefeller—planning a grant to SACHED; and Carnegie—which has funded the Council for Black Education and Research.

We also learned about other kinds of community-based education that should be considered for U.S. aid. Many were small-scale and might best be supported through Embassy self-help fund mini-grants, like the Masifundise reading room and learning center in Capetown's Nyanga township which is already receiving a self-help grant. As most South African children live in the homelands or independent states, we found the general absence of community-oriented, nonofficial organizations for educational assistance in these

areas very frustrating. Two community-based educational projects that were recommended to us were the Ibopeng project in the Lebowa homeland and the Zingeisa educational trust in the independent state of Ciskei. Both are run by former colleagues of the late black leader, Steve Biko. American assistance for these types of rural activities would be beneficial if it were not perceived as implying official recognition of either homelands or independent states, but were seen as providing concrete support for the aspirations of the most disadvantaged black South Africans.

(4) LABOR EDUCATION THROUGH INDEPENDENT BLACK TRADE UNIONS

By assisting labor education in the new independent black trade unions, the United States would be visibly identifying itself with one of the emerging but most impressive forces for fundamental social and political change in South Africa. At a dinner we attended in Johannesburg, Dr. Motlana pointed toward a leader of one of the new labor union federations and exclaimed, "Here is the man who is really changing South Africa."

Aid to union educational programs could encompass basic shop steward and general membership training, specialized courses for officeholders in labor history, economics and law and current political developments impacting the workplace, and research projects on the economic status of workers, occupational safety and health, and environmental problems. In line with union preferences, some training might take place at Government-aided white universities. But in accordance with our guidelines, U.S. assistance should be channeled to the unions to support programs of their design, not to white universities carrying out these programs.

From our discussions in South Africa we have concluded that the most acceptable intermediary for U.S. aid to independent black trade unions would be the ICFTU which has an existing million dollar aid program. The way this works, various national union federations—those of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands— earmark funds for particular labor union programs in South Africa. There is no requirement that the South African recipients be members of the ICFTU. Thus U.S. aid for certain labor education programs could be routed through the AFL-CIO national office to the ICFTU. Officials of the AFL-CIO's African-American Labor Center, who have collected \$90,000 for the federation's new "Program of Action to Assist Black Unions in South Africa" have indicated their willingness to contribute to and cooperate with such an effort. Given the political sensitivities of the new black unions, it would be very important to avoid any impression that American aid was discriminating against any major segment of the emerging independent black labor movement.

We considered the possibility of the United States funding an AFL-CIO labor center in South Africa as it has done in many countries of black-ruled Africa. We also looked into the possibility of an ICFTU center including technical assistance from the AFL-CIO. But autonomy-seeking black unionists do not want foreign labor centers in their country, nor do they feel that the new labor movement is united enough to come together in one centralized training institution. An official of the ICFTU South Africa program

told us that the organization did not favor the setting up of an ICFTU center in South Africa.

What though about black unionists who do not belong to the so-called independent black trade unions? A number of colored and African unions and unionists are affiliated with the Trade Union Congress of South Africa. At its inception in 1958, Tucsa excluded African unions in order to propitiate conservative white and colored unions. It has had a checkered history on this question, admitting them in 1962, excluding them again in 1969, and readmitting them in 1974. The African unions now in Tucsa are "parallel unions," closely associated with their senior white counterparts and generally sharing white general secretaries. There are some African and colored workers in white unions but they are organized in separate, segregated branches. These examples of white paternalism raise questions because blacks and whites often have conflicting interests in labor matters.

Although Tucsa is considered more progressive than the all-white South African Confederation of Labor and has recently endorsed such liberalizing planks as freedom of association in trade unions and equality of educational opportunity, it is not generally regarded as a force for fundamental social and political change in South Africa. Some African unions recently disaffiliated because of the federation's refusal to join the new black unions in protesting the death in detention of Dr. Neil Aggett, a white organizer for the African Food and Canning Workers Union. At Tucsa's recent annual conference, a resolution supported overwhelmingly by African and colored affiliates that called for union detainees to be charged or freed was defeated by white union opposition. Unlike the independent black unions, Tucsa steadfastly refuses to even take positions on major, nonlabor, political issues and it staunchly defends the Government's position that all unions should be officially registered.³⁵

Our general conclusion is that U.S. educational assistance, which is directed to promoting peaceful, fundamental change, should not go to Tucsa or its affiliates. Perhaps an exception might be considered for an affiliate like the South African Boilermakers Society which under its General Secretary Ike van der Watt, leads the progressive opposition within Tucsa. The boilermakers have an integrated executive council and have raised such liberal political issues as influx control and detentions unsuccessfully at Tucsa meetings. They also appear to have a relationship of mutual respect with the independent black unions. On the other hand, they are increasingly in competition with these unions in their efforts to organize black mineworkers through a related African trade union. We believe that the decision on whether to help any Tucsa affiliates should rest with the knowledgeable democratic trade unionists in the ICFTU program.

If the United States joins this program, it would probably be necessary for additional provision to be made for the monitoring of U.S. aid. As we understand it, the ICFTU currently responds to requests on the part of South African black unions and receives re-

³⁵ On recent developments in Tucsa, see *Financial Mail*, Sept. 17, 1982, p. 1370; Oct. 1, 1982, p. 54 and Oct. 15, 1982, p. 274.

ports on their expenditures. We believe that any necessary in-country auditing of U.S. assistance could take place in a way that did not disturb the independent black trade union's concern for their autonomy.

CONCLUSION: THE NEED FOR A CLEAR DIRECTION IN U.S. POLICY

Reflecting a mixture of administration and congressional concerns, American educational assistance policy has been characterized so far by caution rather than commitment. The major initiative now underway is the external scholarships program. Yet, as our earlier discussion indicated, the need to strengthen the program has received insufficient attention amidst exaggerated fears that the whole operation could be wiped out as a result of the Government's investigation of the South African Council of Churches.

A small internal program wherein U.S. consultants prepare study guides for the JMB matriculation examination with input from community groups began 2 years ago, and was budgeted for \$383,000 in fiscal year 1982. But it has become caught up in controversy which the consultant blames on lack of communication³⁶ and SACHED's director attributes to lack of community consultation. The root of the problem may well be that the U.S.-supported consultant is assisting a community which he acknowledges is "separated from development activities by thousands of miles"³⁷ rather than working directly inside South Africa to utilize and enhance community-based expertise.

Another proposed U.S. project to bring 18 volunteer teachers to a U.S. university for a 2-month English teaching course appears to suffer from the same reluctance to become closely involved with change-oriented education projects in South Africa. While the candidates would come from community-based organizations, all of their training would take place in the United States, isolated from South African conditions. The proposal, in its current form, forgoes the increased relevance, potential multiplier effects, and decreased cost that could result from building upon existing community capacity—such as SACHED's long experience with curriculum development, teaching methods, and evaluation.

An absence of purposeful engagement is also indicated by the confusing character of the U.S. Embassy's new self-help education projects which totaled \$94,000 in fiscal year 1982. The consulate in Durban has allocated most of its money to projects in Government schools whereas the consulate in Capetown has tended to favor community-based agencies.

Field organization for the monitoring, coordination and development of U.S. educational assistance seems to have both reflected and contributed to the reticent American stance. First, since AID's Africa Bureau, with its programs centered on black-ruled Africa, has been reluctant to become involved on the ground in South Africa, much of the work has been performed by USIA which has a presence in the country, experience with the traditional

³⁶ "Answers to Clarifications on Questions Posed for the Agency for International Development about the University Preparation Program," Consulting Group Inc., San Diego, Calif., Oct. 30, 1981.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

Fulbright scholarships program there, and good relations with many black community groups through its information and exchange programs. But because USIA's official mission is in information and exchange rather than internal development work it does not appear to have actively monitored various internal activities. For instance, the contractor for the JMB preparation program has complained about the U.S. Embassy's "lack of familiarity of some of the fundamental aspects and features of the program".³⁸ USIA has also emphasized exchange-type activities rather than internal developmental ones in its suggested programs for the future: for example, the English teacher-training proposal. The AID factfinding team's useful recommendation that a new education programs coordinator be assigned as special assistant to the Ambassador to provide "full-time professional advice and coordination with the black community" and serve as "a high-level focal point for guiding and coordinating"³⁹ education programs has, unfortunately, not been implemented.

We hope that this report will contribute to the establishment of a clear sense of direction in U.S. policy toward education in South Africa. We also hope that the direction chosen will enable the United States to identify itself with the aspirations of most South Africans for peaceful but fundamental social and political change. As Chief Buthelezi has warned, "We have a duty to whites as well as ourselves to start creating an awareness that the paradise of [white] privilege cannot continue and that if it persists much longer they will lose everything."⁴⁰

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ AID factfinding team, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-67.

⁴⁰ Buthelezi, *op. cit.*