forced apartheid obsolete. Bellows from Washington will not contribute to this desired end.

Similar reflections concern the broadening of the franchise where the world owes South Africa a debt for refusing to go along with the mania of majority rule and "one man one vote once." Admittedly the color bar is an offensive and clumsy way to limit the follies of doctrinaire democracy. Far better to knit minimal educational or property requirements into the franchise as obtained in the infancy of the United States.

This approach was embodied in the Rhodesian Constitution of the sixties. Perversely the West turned its back on this hopeful experiment and today Rhodesia, renamed Zimbabwe, languishes under the one-party tribal rule of Mugabe.

South Africa has watched this denouement with increasing cynicism. It has given Indians and Coloureds a place in its Parliamentary structure and is now reaching out toward some kind of power-sharing with the Bantu, while avoiding majority rule. Bishop Tutu regards these moves as mere "crumbs from the white man's table." Others may see them as windows of opportunity.

The critical question however for Americans is a simpler one. It is whether at 9,000 miles remove the U.S. has the wisdom or indeed the will to manage and dictate South African affairs. This the more so because in the case of most other nations we have learned to curb our innate idealism.

Americans have not forgiven China for slaughtering millions in its "cultural revolution," but we nonetheless are doing big business with China. We do not seek to tear down India's caste system, though it may be a palpable cause of much misery. The very banks which under proposed legislation would be prevented from lending money to South Africa are today pouring money into East Germany which is fomenting discord in Southwest Africa (Nambia). Why single out South Africa for special treatment when she has remained loyal to the West and resisted Communist subversion and Soviet dictation?

The truth is that in the name of morality America is waging an immoral war of aggression on South Africa. The President has a Constitutional duty to veto sanctions or threat of sanctions against that country and should powerfully reassert America's enduring strategic interest. That interest lies in seeing to it that South Africa's vast store of mineral wealth remains in friendly hands. It is also to see to it that the sea routes around the Cape of Good Hope are properly defended. In the furor over apartheid it is easy to forget these imperatives. We may be sure the Soviets are making no such miscalculation.