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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Each year the National Union of South African Students, a multiracial student organization, celebrates a Day of Affirmation at which time they pledge:

We believe that it is the responsibility of a university to insure that no unjust discrimination is practiced in academic life on grounds of race, religion or politics. We pledge ourselves to work for the attainment of this ideal within the realms of all freedoms--of association, of speech, and of movement--for we realize that true academic freedom can exist only in a democratic South Africa whose society is based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and on the highest regard for the integrity of educational and human freedom.

On June 6, 1966, Senator Robert F. Kennedy delivered the Day of Affirmation Address at the University of Cape Town to approximately 18,000 students and their guests. Earlier, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. had been invited to speak to this organization at their annual convention but the South African Government refused to grant him a visa. Although the Government did issue a visa to Senator Kennedy, it denied visas to at least forty American newsmen and photographers who wished to accompany the Senator. Premier Hendrik Verwoerd's Government maintained that this trip was merely another facet of the Senator's "Presidential publicity-seeking build-up" and they would have no part of it.
Three weeks before Senator Kennedy's visit the President of the National Union of South African Students, Ian Robertson, a 21-year-old senior law student, was "banned" for a term of five years by the Minister of Justice under the Suppression of Communism Act. This Minister of Justice who "banned" Ian Robertson is Balthazar J. Vorster, a man who "was interned in South Africa during World War II because of his activities in a Nazi-like terrorist force that harassed the British allies." In spite of vigorous public protests against the "ban" Vorster refused to discuss his decision or state any cause for it. Mr. Robertson was "banned" from engaging in any political or social activity or attending any "gathering" which is defined as any group of three people including himself. Neither will he ever be allowed to teach again in South Africa. Under the "ban" he could attend classes, but despite the fact he was studying law, he could not attend court except as a witness under subpoena.

Although the Government has officially denied it, many persons ascribe this "banning" to the invitation extended Senator Robert Kennedy. "The Verwoerd government's unofficial view is that it was provocative of NUSAS to have invited the Senator and provocation of him to have accepted."
PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to analyze selected speeches of Robert Kennedy in South Africa and thereby examine the rhetorical implications of his speaking tour. This study merits investigation for at least two major reasons which are enumerated in ascending order of importance.

First, racial tension in South Africa is going to be a major issue in African, and probably world, history. Therefore it would seem that this research and analysis may yield information pertaining to South Africa's apartheid policy and thereby contribute to our understanding of its racial relations. From this we may possibly draw parallels with racial relations in the United States.

Second, Robert Francis Kennedy occupied a unique position on the American political scene. First of all, he was a Kennedy, brother of the thirty-fifth President of the United States and "the closest any one will ever get to John F. Kennedy." For the first time in American history: (1) a man held a Cabinet post in the Administration of a close relative; (2) three brothers served in the United States Senate; and (3) a man was proclaimed probable future President of the United States years before he actually became a candidate for the nomination. Possibly excluding President Johnson, Robert Kennedy was the most sought-after and most chronicled public figure in America. He was also one of the
most controversial figures. As Roger Mudd so aptly ex-
pressed it on the television program first broadcast June
20, 1967 and titled "CBS Reports: Robert F. Kennedy"

He gives everyone a choice of which Robert
Kennedy they want to admire, despise, trust
distrust, laugh at, scowl at, idolize, blas-
pheme. Within one 24-hour period he can be
almost everything the voter wants or does not
want in his President.

Why is a rhetorical study of Robert Kennedy justified?

In the United States Senate on July 30, 1968, Senator Ralph
Yarborough (D-Tex.) asserted:

"... The speeches ROBERT KENNEDY made during
and after his travels demonstrate the unusual
rapport with other peoples that made him one
of our most respected and credible spokesmen
... He talked to people no other national
leader was talking to and at a level where com-
munication was not distorted. One of his leg-
acies is that understanding of the people and
issues that are the forces of change today.
That understanding was made clear on this floor
and in forums around the world in speeches
which are surely the most perceptive articula-
tion now available of the new order of things
which he helped to introduce and which, for many,
his symbolized."

Senator Edward M. Kennedy supplied the most cogent
reason for choosing Robert Kennedy's South African addresses
for rhetorical study. In his eulogy delivered at the funeral
of Robert F. Kennedy in New York City on June 8, 1968, Edward
Kennedy said:

"... What he leaves to us is what he said, what
he did and what he stood for. A speech he made
for the young people of South Africa on their Day
of Affirmation in 1966 sums it up the best. ..."
The four speeches to be analyzed constitute Robert Kennedy's addresses to university audiences in South Africa. They include the speeches at Cape Town, Stellenbosch, Natal and Witwatersrand universities. In this analysis special attention will be directed to the Cape Town speech because the invitation to deliver the Day of Affirmation Address was the justification for Kennedy's South African visit. These four addresses are of particular interest to the rhetorical critic because they reveal the speaker's adaptation to diverse audiences. At Cape Town the audience was a predominantly favorable one while the audience at Stellenbosch was essentially hostile. At Natal the audience was mixed, but at Witwatersrand the audience was favorably disposed toward the speaker and his ideas. All four speeches belong to the epideictic genre.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND SOURCES OF DATA

As far as this researcher has been able to determine there have been no rhetorical studies made on South African speakers or speakers in South Africa that are pertinent to this study. To be sure, innumerable books and articles have been written about South Africa and several of these are cited in Chapter II.

So much has been written about Robert Kennedy, on the other hand, that even to attempt to list the studies would be an almost insurmountable task. But, despite the overall
literature dealing with him, it is somewhat surprising that so few rhetorical studies have been made. In fact, to this researcher's knowledge, no doctoral dissertations that are pertinent to this study have been done. Donald Richard Powell has written a Master's thesis on the analysis of Attorney General Robert Kennedy's University of Georgia Law Day Address and Marilyn Nordlund discussed Kennedy's rhetoric in the Oregon Presidential Primary of 1968. In the book entitled Robert F. Kennedy: Apostle of Change, Douglas Ross has reviewed Kennedy's public record as evinced in his speeches, campaign statements, press releases, published interviews, Senate votes, Congressional testimony, and his own books and articles. Ross has analyzed these and placed them in topical order. T. A. Hopkins has edited Rights For Americans: Speeches of Robert F. Kennedy which deals with Kennedy's speeches on civil rights from the time he took office as Attorney General in 1961 until the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 was passed. Hopkins has placed these speeches in historical context and has made appropriate commentaries about a number of them. These two books constitute the major rhetorical work pertinent to this study. Sources of data for this study may be divided into two categories—primary and secondary. Primary sources would include Congressional Hearings on United States—South Africa relationships, the four speeches to be analyzed, tape recordings of Kennedy's speeches, interviews, and public appearances in the United
States as well as in some other countries, his own writings, and personal conversations with those who knew him. In addition, this researcher was permitted to travel with the press corps on October 8, 1966, when Kennedy campaigned in Columbus, Ohio, on behalf of the Ohio Democratic Party. On this occasion she was thus able to observe this orator in action at close range. Secondary sources would include books and articles written about South Africa and Robert Kennedy.

Some constraints upon the availability of materials for this study must be mentioned. When the South African Government refused visas to visiting journalists and photographers, that source of information was closed. After Senator Robert Kennedy's death all his files and papers were placed in the Presidential Library of the National Archives. Consequently, they are not available for study and examination. Attempts to gain access to this material have proven unsuccessful. Attempts to gain information about this trip from the National Union of South African Students have also proven unsuccessful. Mr. David McDonnell of the United States Embassy staff in Pretoria, South Africa, did obtain a recording of the Cape Town speech and a souvenir booklet published by the Rand Daily Mail for this investigator but was unable to obtain any additional material. Thus, for the Cape Town speech both the written copy and a recording have been obtained. However, the introductory remarks of welcome and the questions following the speech are not available. The address at Stellenbosch
with its subsequent question-and-answer period is a transcript of the recorded event. However, a number of the questions from the floor were inaudible so that the actual questions must be surmised from Kennedy's answers. In addition, this transcript is apparently incomplete because it stops abruptly. The Natal address and question-and-answer session, as well as Archbishop Hurley's speech of appreciation and Kennedy's expressions of appreciation for the John F. Kennedy Room, appears to be the only complete account of Kennedy's appearance at a university. This account is a transcript of the recorded event. The University of Witwatersrand address is a mimeographed copy of the speech. Not included are the introductory remarks of welcome and the question-and-answer session which followed the address. Ms. Jean Main of the late Senator's staff in Washington assured this investigator that the above mentioned speeches represent true written copies of what Kennedy actually said. Within these limitations this critic will attempt to evaluate Robert Kennedy's South African addresses.

PLAN OF THE STUDY

The responsibility of a rhetorical critic, as defined in this study, is to make fair and accurate judgments concerning the efficacy of Robert Kennedy's epideictic speaking in South Africa in June of 1966. Primary components of such
an appraisal include: an examination of the rhetorical situation, the context in which the speaking occurred; an account of those factors which molded the communicator who went to South Africa; an examination of the constraints operating within the particular situation; an appraisal of the speaker's effectiveness in achieving his rhetorical goals; an evaluation of the responses elicited by his speaking; and, finally, a summary and the conclusions which may be drawn from this study.

Chapter II will reconstruct the rhetorical situation; Chapter III will treat those facets of Kennedy's life and philosophy which are crucial to this study; Chapters IV, V, VI, and VII will analyze the speeches; Chapters VIII and IX will present the results, summary, and conclusions.

The remainder of the present chapter will consider the methodology by which the rhetorical critic appraises constraints operating in any rhetorical situation as described by Lloyd Bitzer; and the criteria by which the critic arrives at judgments concerning the orator's epideictic discourses as elucidated by Chaim Perelman.

**METHODOLOGY**

Lloyd Bitzer defines a rhetorical situation as a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so
Bitzer maintains that the situation evokes a rhetorical dis-
course which is a fitting response prescribed by the situa-
tion itself. The discourse is rooted in reality and its
structure may be simple or complex and may be fleeting or
persistent. Bitzer's three constituents of a rhetorical
situation which exist prior to the discourse are exigence,
audience, and constraints. An exigence is defined as "an
imperfection marked by urgency . . . a defect, an obstacle,
something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than
it should be." A rhetorical audience is limited to "those
persons who are capable of being influenced by discourse and
of being mediator of change." Constraints are "made up of
persons, events, objects, and relations with are parts of
the situation because they have the power to constrain de-
cision and action needed to modify the exigence." When the
orator enters the picture (situation) he adds important con-
straints such as his personal character, style, and image.
Thus constraints arise from the situation and the orator.
These will be dealt with in this study as will Perelman's
techniques of evaluation.

Chaim Perelman treats the classical canons of inven-
tion, arrangement, and style as part of his techniques of
argumentation which he utilizes to arrive at judgments rela-
tive to the efficacy of epideictic speaking. (He ignores
the canons of memory and delivery.) Before proceeding, however, it seems appropriate to explain briefly what this oratorical genre is. Epideictic speaking, like deliberative and forensic oratory, dates back to antiquity. The epideictic genre differed from the others in that no issues were decided, no new legislation passed, no individual convicted of a crime or freed as innocent of any such charge. The audience for this type of speaking consisted of those individuals of discriminating tastes who were capable of assessing the artistic merits of the particular speech. Very often, the speeches were not given orally but were merely circulated as written compositions. Thus epideictic oratory was considered to be an end in itself and not a means of effecting consequences through argumentation.

Perelman disagrees with the traditionalists that epideictic speaking is an end in itself. However, he does agree with them that it is primarily an affirmation of shared values. He therefore asserts that epideictic oratory begins with audience analysis which provides the orator with knowledge of the values and hierarchy of values held by his auditors which he may utilize to further his ends in speaking. One way of measuring the speaker's efficacy is to examine those means he uses to effect persuasion for knowledge of an audience is intimately related to knowledge of how to influence it. Thus the skilled orator is one whose message intensifies the adherence of minds of those values.
Perelman provides the orator with a system for intensifying his auditor's adherence to commonly shared values through his techniques of argumentation. The techniques most applicable to this study are quasi-logical strategies, the structure of reality strategies, the dissociation of concepts method, and the structure and the interaction of arguments techniques. These basic standards and their supporting criteria provide the framework used in this study to examine and evaluate Kennedy's artistry.

Since Perelman's methodology is to be used extensively in this study it would be worthwhile to examine his concepts in greater detail. Perelman divides his treatise on argumentation into three parts: The Framework of Argumentation; The Starting Point of Argument; and Techniques of Argumentation.

**Framework of Argumentation**

Perelman views argumentation (rhetoric) as audience-centered whether that audience be universal, an immediate or distant group, another individual, or oneself. He defines audience as "the ensemble of those whom the speaker wishes to influence by his argumentation."\(^1\) The domain of argumentation is restricted to "that of the credible, the plausible, the probable, to the degree that the latter eludes the certainty of calculations."\(^2\) In other words, that which is
arguable must lie in that area where choices are possible
and those choices must be justified.

For the very reason that argumentation aims
at justifying choices, it cannot provide jus­
tifications that would tend to show that there
is no choice but that only one solution is open
to those examining the problem.13

In this respect one may say that Perelman's rhetoric
is designed not so much to evaluate objective truth as to
measure its efficacy with a given audience. The aim of all
argumentation "is to create or increase the adherence of
minds to the theses presented for their assent."14 Yet, in
order to be able to gain and intensify this adherence the
speaker must have a thorough understanding of the speaking
situation, i.e., the attitudes, beliefs, and values of his
audience as well as the social context in which the argumen­
tation is to take place. As Perelman puts it:

In argumentation the important thing is not
knowing what the speaker regards as true or
important, but knowing the views of those he
is addressing . . . . It is indeed the aud­
ience which has the major role in determining
the quality of argument and the behavior of the
orators.15

Epideictic Oratory As Argumentation

As has been stated before, Perelman agrees with the
classicists that epideictic oratory is an affirmation of shared
values but he disagrees with the traditionalists in viewing
this genre as an end in itself. Perelman believes that epi­
dectic oratory forms a central part of the art of persuasion,
that it is not merely a literary exercise. He conceives the role of epideictic speaking to be "[the] appeal to common values, undisputed though not formulated, made by one who is qualified to do so, with the consequent strengthening of adherence to those values with a view to possible later action." Perelman continues:

The intensity of the adherence sought is not limited to obtaining purely intellectual results, to the declaration that a certain thesis seems more probable than another, but will very often be reinforced until the desired action is actually performed.

The Epideictic Speaker

Perelman equates the epideictic speaker with educator.

... the speaker engaged in epideictic discourse is very close to being an educator. Since what he is going to say does not arouse controversy, since no immediate practical interest is ever involved, and there is no question of attacking or defending, but simply of promoting values that are shared in the community, the speaker, though he is assured in advance of the goodwill of his audience, must nevertheless have a high reputation. In the epideictic, more than in any other kind of oratory, the speaker must have qualifications for speaking on his subject and must also be skillful in its presentation, if he is not to appear ridiculous. For it is not his own cause or viewpoint that he is defending, but that of his entire audience. He is, so to speak, the educator of his audience, and if it is necessary that he should enjoy a certain prestige before he speaks, it is to enable him, through his own authority, to promote the values that he is upholding.

In the preceding quotation two of Perelman's concepts hold particular significance for this rhetorical study. First is his interpretation of the epideictic speaker as an educator
and second is his emphasis on the speaker's "image." Let us examine these two ideas. As educator the epideictic orator functions as a formulator of those common values. He makes their presence conscious. The choices of values to be placed in the forefront indicate the speaker's own hierarchy of values, his concepts of his society. This, in turn, serves as an index for determining his construct of his particular audience. But how is argumentation possible if one is dealing with "undisputed" values? Perelman explains that although a value may be undisputed when it appears alone, it is disputable when it is juxtaposed with other undisputed values that clash. For example, we all accept the values of both national security and freedom of speech. It is when these two values are put in a single context that controversy often arises and it is these areas of controversy on which Perelman concentrates. Hence the function of the epideictic speaker is to justify those values he espouses, to argue, to intensify the adherence of minds to his beliefs.

In epideictic speaking, the "image" of the speaker is crucial. He is the spokesman for his audience and as such if he is to persuade individuals then it is essential that his construct of his hearers be adequate to the occasion, that his concept of the particular audience he is addressing be as close as possible to reality. One way of testing how accurately he assesses his audience is to examine those means he used to effect persuasion. Thus the skill with which
he presents his discourse indicates how well he conditions his audience to accept those values he upholds. The process of conditioning the audience so that it is no longer the same at the end of the speech as it was at the beginning necessitates continual adaptation of the speaker to his audience.19

The Starting Point of Argument

Perelman's analysis of arguments first deals with the starting point of argumentation and is then followed by their development through associative and dissociative processes. Starting points of arguments presuppose the audience's agreement. "When a speaker selects and puts forward the premises that are to serve as foundation for his argument, he relies on his hearers' adherence to the propositions from which he will start."20 However, his hearers may not grant their adherence because they disagree as to what the speaker presents as "accepted"; they believe his choices of premises are too biased; or they resent the way the speaker advances his premises. Thus the first task is to determine what sort of agreements can serve as premises. Objects of agreements may be divided into two classes; one consisting of facts, truths and presumptions which concern the real, and the other which concerns the preferable consists of values, hierarchies, and lines of argument relating to the preferable.
Facts

In Perelman's terminology a fact "is uniquely characterized by the idea that is held of agreements of a certain type relating to certain data . . . designat[ing] essentially 'what is common to several thinking beings, and could be common to all.'"²¹ In other words, facts are characterized by the adherence of the universal audience. Facts thus are accorded privileged status until and unless they are questioned. When a fact is used as the conclusion of an argument, however, and not as a possible starting point then it also loses its status which it can recover only by being detached from the context of the argument.²²

Truths

What has just been said about facts applies equally well to truths. Perelman draws the distinction between facts and truths as follows:

The term "facts" is generally used to designate objects of precise, limited agreement, whereas the term "truths" is preferably applied to more complex systems relating to connections between facts. They may be scientific theories or philosophic or religious conceptions that transcend experience.²³

Presumptions

Like facts and truths, presumptions enjoy universal agreement; unlike facts and truths, presumptions require reinforcement of adherence by other elements. Attempts to justify a fact may lessen its status but justifying a presumption
helps to preserve its status. As a general rule, however, presumptions are admitted immediately as starting points of arguments. In some cases certain presumptions are governed by conventions and can be imposed upon audiences. Presumptions are based on the normal, the likely.

Values

Facts, truths, and presumptions are characterized by agreement of the universal audience whereas values, hierarchies, and loci of the preferable seek adherence of a particular audience. Perelman discusses values as follows:

Agreement with regard to a value means an admission that an object, a being, or an ideal must have a specific influence on action and on disposition toward action and that one can make use of this influence in an argument, although the point of view represented is not regarded as binding on everybody. The existence of values, as objects of agreements that make possible a communion with regard to particular ways of acting, is connected with the idea of multiplicity of groups.24

At some stage or another, values enter into every argument and in argumentation of the epideictic kind they form its basis. "One appeals to values in order to induce the hearer to make certain choices rather than others and, most of all, to justify those choices so that they may be accepted and approved by others."25 Values cannot be ignored or denied but they may be disqualified, subordinated to others, or interpreted. Perelman distinguishes between concrete and abstract values as they relate to argumentation. He defines
a concrete value as "one attaching to a living being, a specific group, or a particular object, considered as a unique entity."26 This close connection between the concrete and the unique is significant, for by emphasizing the unique character of a thing its value is automatically enhanced. Concrete values are placed in the forefront by those who seek to preserve, to maintain the status quo. Abstract values, on the other hand, are relied upon by those who seek to change the established order. Argument on abstract values (e.g. justice or truth) raises incompatibilities which permit new concepts of these values to be formed. One should be very careful, however, in designating a value as "concrete" or "abstract" in argumentation for, at times, it is difficult to perceive the role played by each. Perelman's example provides an apt illustration.

When a person says that men are equal because they are children of the same God, he seems to be relying on a concrete value to find an abstract value, that of equality; but it could also be said that really only the abstract value is expressed, by appealing, through analogy, to a concrete relationship; in spite of the use of because, the starting point would lie in the abstract value.27

Thus it is that in argumentation concrete values form the foundations of abstract values and vice-versa.

Hierarchies

Even more important than values in and of themselves is the degree to which specific values are esteemed, that is,
the hierarchy of values. Although many audiences would admit to certain values by themselves, they would not assign the same hierarchy to these values. Therefore, justification of the particular hierarchy becomes a prime concern of the orator if he is to intensify the adherence of a particular audience; in other words, if he is to realize his rhetorical goals.

Loci

When a speaker seeks either to establish certain values or to intensify the adherence to certain values and their hierarchies he may resort to connecting them to other values and hierarchies or he may rely upon premises of a general nature. These general premises are called loci, and, according to the classicists, are defined as headings under which arguments are classified. Perelman departs from the practice of the traditionalists by limiting the application of loci "to premises of a general nature that can serve as the bases for values and hierarchies." Since epideictic oratory is based on commonly shared values and their hierarchies, consideration of loci seems particularly appropriate. Perelman's discussion of loci is restricted to the examination and analysis of concrete arguments. Two of these, loci of quantity and loci of quality, are especially worth examining in greater detail. "By loci relating to quantity we mean those loci communes which affirm that one thing is better than another.
for quantitative reasons. . . . [Frequently,] a locus relating to quantity constitutes a major, though implied, premise, without which the conclusion would have no basis."29 Examples of arguments based on loci of quantity would include such contentions as: The whole is greater than the sum of its parts, the greatest good for the greatest number, a lasting evil is greater than one that is momentary, justice is better than courage (because justice is always useful while courage is only needed at specific times). "A locus of quantity, the superiority of that which is accepted by the greater number of people, forms the basis of certain conceptions of democracy and also of conceptions of reason which equate reason with 'common sense.'"30 Preference for the probable over the improbable, for the easy over the difficult, for the normal over the unusual are based on loci of quantity. Loci which seek to show effectiveness of a means will also generally be of a quantitative nature. Loci of quality, on the other hand, emphasize that which is unique as compared with that which is ordinary. That which is unique becomes more precious; it is more precarious; its loss may be irreparable. Loci of quality, the opposition to numbers, are used by reformers, by those who oppose commonly held opinions. Again, one should be cautious in categorizing. For example, the bases of the value of the irreparable may be quantitative or qualitative. It is quantitative when viewed as the infinity of time which will elapse after an irreparable
event, and that the effects ensuing from the event will continue indefinitely. It is qualitative by its uniqueness. As loci become more specific they may be treated as values or hierarchies.

Presentation of Data and Form of the Discourse

In developing the concepts relating to the starting point of argument, Perelman treats the presentation of data as related to the form of the discourse. He considers technical problems of presenting data, verbal forms and argumentation, modes of expression and the status of presentation of the elements of argumentation. An important concept is that language and figures of speech may be used in three basic ways. They may be used to promote choice, for emphasizing one element over another; they may be employed in a manner to promote presence, i.e., to make the object of discourse present to the mind; and finally, they may be utilized as a means of promoting communion, i.e., to increase or bring about better rapport between the speaker and his audience. Figures relating to choice include oratorical definition, periphrasis, antonomasia, and anticipation. Figures relating to presence would include such elements as onomatopoeia, repetition, anaphora, amplification, and imaginary direct speech. Figures relating to communion would include allusion, quotation (if it is not used for authority), apostrophe, and the oratorical question. Perelman asserts that communion is often
achieved through references to a common culture, tradition, or past. He then proceeds to the discussion of argumentative techniques.

Techniques of Argumentation

The argumentative techniques, according to Perelman, may be classified as associative or dissociative schemes. These schemes may "also be considered as loci of argumentation because only agreement on their validity can justify their application to particular cases."\textsuperscript{31}

Associative Schemes

Associative schemes are those "which bring separate elements together and allow us to establish a unity among them, which aims either at organizing or at evaluating them positively or negatively, by means of one another."\textsuperscript{32}Associative schemes consist of quasi-logical argumentative techniques which are based on the structure of the real, i.e. alleged to be in agreement with the nature of things; and arguments which aim at establishing the structure of the real, i.e., those which consider the particular case or argument by analogy.

Quasi-Logical Techniques

According to Perelman, quasi-logical arguments are valid arguments which are so designated because of their similarity
in structure to formal demonstration, i.e., the reasoning of logic or mathematics.

... we believe that formal reasoning results from a process of simplification which is possible only under special conditions, within isolated and limited systems. But since there are formal proofs of recognized validity, quasi-logical arguments derive their persuasive strength from their similarity with these well-established modes of reasoning. What characterizes quasi-logical argumentation, therefore, is its nonformal character and the effort of thought which is required to formulate it.33

The quasi-logical standard for evaluating effectiveness of arguments includes: (1) compatible or incompatible but not contradictory arguments; (2) the ridiculous or what discourse is to be laughed at because it conflicts with an accepted opinion, i.e., ridicule and irony; (3) identity and definition according to the normative, the descriptive, the complex, the condensed; (4) application of the rule of justice, i.e., what is applicable in one case is applicable to all cases belonging in the same category; (5) argument of reciprocity; (6) argument of transitivity; (7) argument by including the part in the whole and division of the whole into parts; (8) argument by comparison; (9) argument by sacrifice, i.e., what one is willing to sacrifice in order to attain his goal; and (10) argument as to probability, i.e., the chance of this not happening is so slight that the fact should be accepted as true.
Arguments Based on the Structure of Reality Standard

These arguments are of two kinds; (1) those based on sequential relations in which a phenomenon is united to its consequences or its causes; and (2) those based on the relations of co-existence in which two realities that are not on an equal level are united. Techniques of argumentation by sequential relations include establishing a causal link, argumentation by consequences, ends and means, argument from waste, argument of direction, and argument of unlimited development. Techniques of argumentation based on the relations of co-existence include argumentation from the nature of things, argument from authority, techniques of severence that inhibit the influence of authority on decision making, the group and its members, act and essence, arguments concerning differences of degree and order, and establishment through the particular case by example, illustration, model and anti-model, analogy and metaphor.

Dissociative Schemes

Dissociative schemes are "techniques of separation which have the purpose of dissociating, separating, disuniting elements which are regarded as forming a whole or at least a unified group within some system of thought: dissociation modifies such a system by modifying certain concepts which make up its essential parts." In the respect that dissociation modifies concepts it is characteristic of all original philosophical thought. Yet, both logically and
psychologically, "all association implies dissociation, and, conversely . . . . The two techniques are complimentary and are always at work at the same time."\(^{35}\)

**Breaking of Connecting Links and Dissociation**

Opposition to establishing interdependence among values will be seen as a refusal to recognize the existence of the connecting links among them, i.e., the link does not exist. Dissociation, however, assumes the original unity of elements comprised within a single conception and the goal is to modify the very structure of the elements. Dissociation is established by discovering the philosophical pairs and reversing their order thereby making the inferior term the superior, e.g. \(\text{Name}^2\) to \(\text{Thing}^2\). Reversal of \(\text{Name}^1\) \(\text{Thing}^1\) the pair is the goal of dissociation.

**Interaction of Arguments**

Arguments interact with one another and may be either strengthened or weakened by this process. The strengths of arguments can be increased by acting as if they were superior to what one has ground for believing them to be. On the other hand, the speaker may diminish the strengths of arguments by advancing conclusions that fall short of what the audience expected from the merits of the case. By the same token, the strengths of arguments may be played up or down by attributing their strengths to the character of the person making the speech, i.e., the prestige influence. Another way of
diminishing the strengths of arguments is by emphasizing the routine character of the arguments, making them appear old hat to the hearer. Arguments may also be strengthened by the interaction of convergence by which several arguments are used to support a single conclusion. In addition to the interaction of arguments themselves, the order in which they are presented plays a part in determining the speaker's efficacy for "order ensures that particular premises are given sufficient presence for them to serve as starting points of reflection." The reason Perelman gives for the importance of order in a speech is that "Some arguments can only be understood and accepted if other arguments have already been stated."  

These, then, are Perelman's concepts of argumentation which will be utilized in the evaluation of Robert Kennedy's efficacy in speaking in South Africa. Let us now turn to an examination of the rhetorical situation, the context in which the speaking occurred.
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CHAPTER II

SOUTH AFRICA

An evaluation of Robert Kennedy's speaking in South Africa requires some basic knowledge of the speaking situation, i.e., the political, socioeconomic, cultural climate of South Africa. Hence the purpose of this chapter is to provide the reader with the information and insights necessary for a rhetorical understanding of Kennedy's speaking in this situation. Why was Robert Kennedy invited to South Africa? To answer this question we must first place the invitation in historic perspective.

Geographically, the Republic of South Africa occupies the southernmost part of the African continent. Its southern, western and eastern boundaries are the Atlantic and Indian oceans. On the northwest it is bounded by South West Africa, on the north by Botswana (formerly Bechuanaland) and Rhodesia, and on the northeast by Mozambique (Portuguese East Africa) and Swaziland. From 1910 to 1961 it was called the Union of South Africa and was a part of the Commonwealth of Nations. It consisted of the former British colonies of Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Transvaal, and Orange Free State (previously known as Orange River Colony) which became the
four provinces of the Union. On May 31, 1961, South Africa achieved independence and henceforth became known as the Republic of South Africa. This is the country Robert Kennedy visited in June of 1966.

In the Republic of South Africa apartheid (pronounced apart-ate) permeates all aspects of the society. Apartheid may be defined as an Afrikaans word meaning "apartness," the state of being separate or segregated. It is the name given by the Afrikaner Nationalist Party, in office in South Africa after 1948, to the policies that govern relations between the country's 3,000,000 white inhabitants and its 12,000,000 nonwhite, mainly African, inhabitants. It is also used to describe the long-term objective of the territorial separation of races that is advocated by Afrikaner church and intellectual circles. The basic tenet of [this] policy has always been the complete domination of state and society by the white population . . . .

Since apartheid is governmental policy and this policy is predicated upon the separation of the races, any understanding of South African society must begin with a consideration of ethnic groupings. According to apartheid dictates, ethnic classification may be divided into four categories: "Bantu," "White," "Coloured," and "Asian."  

"Bantu" refers to all the Negroes of South Africa regardless of their tribal heritage. "Correctly used, [however] Bantu refers to a number of peoples, including the Matabele, the Zulu, and Swahili, who speak a similar language." Other terms which describe this ethnic category include "African,"
"Native," "Black," and the pejorative designation of "kaffir." This last mentioned term refers to an Arabic word meaning "infidel" and carries the same connotation as the word "nigger" in the United States.4

The second ethnic category, the Whites or Europeans (the preferred Nationalist designation), may be subdivided into two general groups: Afrikaner and English. The Afrikaners, also referred to "Afrikaans-speaking Europeans,"5 whose Calvinist Dutch forefathers settled in the Cape Colony in 1652, constitute approximately fifty-eight per cent of the White population in South Africa. The second large sub-group of Europeans are the British, also referred to as "English-speaking South Africans,"6 who settled in the Cape Colony in the early 1800s after they had acquired the Cape as a result of victories in the Napoleonic wars.

Under the present governmental system the Whites or Europeans are singularly significant in South Africa because they alone are the determiners of its destiny. Only the Whites have the vote7; they alone can alter policy and they alone can enfranchise the nonwhite majority.

The "Coloured" or those of mixed blood (mulattoes) constitute the third ethnic apartheid category. Like the Whites, they, too, may be subdivided into two general groups of Malaysian Coloured (also called Cape Malays) and Cape Coloured. The Cape Coloured, so designated because most of them live in the Cape Colony and especially around Cape Town
itself, and the Cape Malays, who are descendants from Moslems who were brought to South Africa many years ago as slaves, represent approximately ten per cent of the country's population. South Africa's Coloured (both Cape and Malay) originated in miscegenation between the original white settlers and Hottentot or Malay women.\(^9\) Joseph Lelyveld states:

> The Cape Coloreds, or so it is often said without any obvious distortion of the historical record, came into existence nine months after Jan van Riebeeck founded the first Dutch settlement at what is now Capetown in 1652. "What other people can date its origin so precisely?" a colored intellectual asks.\(^9\)

Unlike the other ethnic classifications, the Coloured are identified by what they are not, that is, by exclusion. Lelyveld asserts that the best legal definition of Coloured is "a person who is not a white person or a native."\(^10\)

"Asians" represent the fourth and final apartheid category. This group also consists of at least two separate ethnic stocks: Indian and Chinese. The Indians, the largest subgroup, were brought to South Africa in the 1860s to work on the sugar plantations in the province of Natal while the Chinese were imported as laborours for the gold mines between 1904 and 1907.\(^11\) It is interesting to note that although Indians and Chinese are classed as "Asians," the Japanese in South Africa are designated "honorary whites."\(^12\)

At times, for governmental purposes, the Asians are classified as subgroups of Coloured. These then are the racial groups in South Africa's Land of Apartheid.
Although the term apartheid was coined as a slogan by the Nationalist Party, the policies concerning the separation of the races along ethnic lines had their beginnings much earlier. The Nationalists did not invent these policies; they merely provided a definite pattern and a direction for white domination.

Leo Marquard explains the rationale for the governmental policy of apartheid as follows: The whites and non-whites are so dissimilar in culture that they could never live together as a community. Any attempt to do so would result in either the non-white swamping the whites or the white minority suppressing the majority by force in order to preserve its own identity. Therefore, where people of different colours inhabit the same country the only solution is to divide the country into areas where each group would have the rights and privileges of citizenship. Theoretically, the natural area for Africans would be the reserves which were the original tribal homes that were reduced by conquest. Policies of apartheid were to acquire official sanction by legislation. Thus by enlarging upon previous legislation while implementing new policies the South African government constructed apartheid.

As previously mentioned, the Nationalist Party did not invent the policy of separation of the races, but they did refine and enlarge it. To illustrate: The Land Act of 1913 prohibits Africans (Bantu) from acquiring land except
in the Reserves. Originally this did not apply to Africans in the Cape Province, but the Natives Trust and Land Act of 1936 removed this exception. Although Whites are prohibited from owning land in the Reserves, this poses no great hardship for them since only thirteen per cent of the land in the Republic is allocated for the Reserves. The Immorality Act of 1927 provides another example. This Act prohibits extramarital relations between Europeans and Africans. The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1948 is a further extension of the 1927 Immorality Act. This Act aims at preventing marriages between different racial groups. A companion piece of legislation, the 1950 Amendment of the Immorality Act of 1927, seeks to prevent further mixing of racial groups. The Population Registration Act of 1950 serves to classify the population according to racial groups and thus helps to implement the above mentioned acts.

Conviction under the 1927 Immorality Act carried a maximum penalty of five years for men and four years for women. However, marriage was considered an adequate defense although the burden lay with the couple to prove they were legally wed. The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 eliminated this defense, while the 1950 Amendment of the 1927 Immorality Act extended the law so that it became a criminal offense for individuals of dissimilar races to have carnal relations. (This would include the Coloured, Indians and Chinese as well as the Bantu.) Yet, in order
to convict individuals under this law it is essential to know the racial group to which each belongs. The purpose of the Population Registration Act of 1950 is to so classify individuals. As a result of this legislation, every South African resident must carry an identification card which, among other things, indicates his race.

How is an individual's racial classification determined? According to Leo Marquard, the Act of 1950 defines a white person as "one who (a) is 'obviously white in appearance,' or (b) is 'white by general repute and acceptance.' But if he is Coloured by general repute and acceptance, he will not be considered white even if he obviously is so." The original Act of 1950 stressed "general repute and acceptance" as evidence, but an amending Act of 1967 makes the application of "descent" the test of primary importance. According to this last mentioned Act the test of "descent" is to be applied before any consideration of "general repute and acceptance." E. S. Sachs states that people are classified into three distinct groups, white, coloured and native. A "native" is defined as a person who in fact is or is generally accepted as a member of any aboriginal race or tribe of Africa.

Of all the apartheid measures the law prohibiting sex across the colour bar carries the greatest stigma. Ian Robertson states that supposedly the law was enacted
to protect chaste white womanhood from the ravages of black men. . . . Of 1,184 persons of all races charged in the latest annual period, only four black men were convicted. The greatest single group of offenders netted by the Act is white men—a noticeably disproportionate number of whom are policemen or ministers of the vigorously pro-apartheid Dutch Reformed Church.

In 1970 in a small country town of 700 whites, seven white farmers along with fourteen black women were arrested under the Immorality Act. The accused included a town councilor and several of the town's wealthiest men. Reaction to the arrest was described by one citizen as follows: "If an atom bomb had been dropped on our town, it could not have had a greater impact." One of the accused men, while free on bail, shot and killed himself rather than face trial. Also, according to the article, more than 7,000 convictions have been obtained under this law in the last 20 years.

Since more whites have been charged under this law it would appear that the law does not discriminate between whites and blacks. This is not the case. Ian Robertson asserts:

Since 1965 there have been twelve cases involving consenting adults in which, incredibly, the white partner has been found innocent and the black partner has been convicted. Precisely how a person achieves the feat of having interracial intercourse alone is not immediately apparent, but South African courts seem undisturbed by the phenomenon...
Under the 1949 Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act persons from different racial groups may not marry, and any such union solemnized outside South Africa is void within the country. Two examples suffice to illustrate the above.

The first case involves Susan Schoeman, a twenty-year-old white woman and Henry May, the Chinese father of her three children. The couple had been convicted under the Immorality Act so Miss Schoeman was seeking to be reclassified as Chinese in order that they might marry. According to Miss Schoeman, she had been given shelter and care by May after she ran away from home at age sixteen and came to Johannesburg to escape her stepfather who had tried to rape her. If the reclassification were approved, the couple would marry; if not, they would leave South Africa. This particular case has a happy ending in that the couple's sentences under the Immorality Act were suspended while the apartheid laws were bent to allow Miss Schoeman to be classified as Chinese instead of White.

The second case concerns a couple who were married in London in 1966. The husband, Joseph Jacquesson, is a South African citizen by birth whose father is a Lebanese of French citizenship. The prosecution alleges that he is an Indian male who is married to a white female, an English girl named Barbara. Each is charged with "wrongfully and unlawfully having or attempting to have unlawful intercourse" with each other. Jacquesson, who has an export business in London,
returned to South Africa in 1964 and was called up for military service as a white person. In 1964 he applied for his white identity card but the card was not issued to him until 1969 and it gave his classification as Indian. After he received his identity card, but before his appeal to the Race Classification Board could be heard, he was charged under the Immorality Act. When the couple returned to South Africa they were not warned that their marriage would create any problems.24

The process of identification under the 1950 Population Registration Act has led to tears, anguish, heartache, and even broken families. Until the law was amended in 1967 sometimes natural brothers and sisters, whose appearance differed, were differently classified. Sandra Laing's case provides an apt illustration.25

Sandra, one of a family of five, is the only one who in appearance is not obviously "white," i.e., she has an olive complexion and crinkled hair. Her two brothers obviously are white and are treated as such, while her parents know of no Coloured ancestors on either side. Also, the family's associates are all white. Nonetheless, when Sandra was ten years old and after she had spent four years at a boarding school for whites in the Transvaal town of Piet Retif, she was taken home by school officials who informed her parents that Sandra could no longer be accepted in the
school because she was Coloured. Sandra was then so classified by the Department of Interior under the Population Registration Act. The Laings contested this decision in court. During the long court case Sandra dressed herself every day in her school clothes and waited. If the classification stood, then not only could Sandra not attend any white school but she could not even live in a white area. On the other hand, the Laings, who were white, could not live in a Coloured area. Mr. Laing's query epitomizes the dilemma. He asked: "What do I have to do to keep our daughter? Will we have to register her as a servant to keep her with us?" The court upheld the decision. However, the Laing case had received world-wide publicity and, according to Frye, this publicity helped push through an amendment to the law in 1967. The amendment stated that if both parents of a child were white, the child, too, automatically was white. Sandra thus officially became white and the Laings rejoiced. Yet when they began to look for a school for Sandra they found that they faced a much more formidable obstacle than even official prejudice. That obstacle was public prejudice. Attempts to enroll Sandra in school met with failure. Parents threatened to withdraw their children if Sandra were admitted. When Sandra's father sought to have his daughter readmitted to the Piet Retif school the Transvaal Education Department instructed the school to admit her.
However, the hostel committee for the school refused to admit her and the Education Department ruled that this committee was within its rights. Therefore, Sandra could not live at the school. The Laings sought other lodgings for Sandra but to no avail. At another nearby school, the Sheepmoor Primary School, Sandra had a similar experience. Angry parents at Sheepmoor insisted that "If Sandra comes, our children leave." Even some Roman Catholic convent schools refused to admit Sandra on the grounds that they depend on public good will and they would only be inviting trouble if they accepted her.

Sandra Laing's experience thus indicates that even officialdom becomes impotent when pitted against public prejudice.

William Frye relates another case in which a Coloured woman in Durban married an Indian. In turn, they adopted a Coloured girl who was then officially classed as Indian. The father died at about the same time that the area where the family lived was zoned for whites only. Consequently, the mother was told that she must move to a Coloured area, but that her daughter could not go with her because the daughter was Indian. The mother appealed and got the child reclassified.

Although the cases cited above do demonstrate some of the effects of the Population Registration Act, they may also serve to illustrate the workings of another act of 1950,
the Group Areas Act. Under the terms of this act, also referred to as the "Ghetto Act," the Government is empowered to divide all of the residential land in all South African cities into sectors, each sector for one racial group only.\(^3\) The aim of this strict segregation is to prohibit "members of one racial group from acquiring or occupying property in an area designated for a different group."\(^{31}\) The rationale for this act is perhaps best explained by Mr. Strijdom in 1950 when he was Minister of Lands. During the third reading of the Group Areas Bill in Parliament Mr. Strijdom said:

If this intermingling continues, clashes between Europeans and non-Europeans must result in the very nature of things. It will increase from year to year until eventually South Africa will be converted into a 'bloodbath.' . . . There is only one way to prevent it and that is the way followed by this Bill, and to carry out the policy of the Nationalist Party to secure apartheid also in regard to residential areas, between the different races so that each can live his life in his own sphere and his own area. Failing that South Africa will be turned into a 'bloodbath.' But what is more, apart from this danger, it must be obvious to everyone who knows Cape Town and other places where the races live mixed up among each other, that if we do not put an end to this--and if we do not do it as quickly as possible--it necessarily has to be a long process even though I say 'as soon as possible'--if we do not put an end to it as soon as possible, the white race will not be able to maintain itself as a white race . . . .\(^{32}\)

This Act with its various amendments which were consolidated into the Group Areas Act No. 77 is the linchpin of apartheid.
But, first, it would be worthwhile to iterate the actual provisions of the Act and how they are implemented. The law provides for the separation of the population into three distinct racial groups: white, Coloured—which includes Asians—and Africans.

The Governor-General may, by proclamation subdivide the Coloured and African groups and, whenever he deems it expedient, he may by proclamation declare that certain areas defined in the proclamation shall be for the exclusive occupation and ownership of a particular racial group. No member of any other group may occupy or own land in the proclaimed area, and may reside thereon only as a bona fide servant, employee or domestic servant.33

Some of the complications arising from this Act may be illustrated by an examination of the socio-economic aspects of the law. As Mr. Strijdom asserted, this Act is necessary in order for the white race to maintain itself as such. Conversely, as Foreign Minister Hilgard Muller admitted:

... the industry of White South Africa is to a large extent dependent on the labour of the Bantu. The converse is, of course, also true: a large proportion of the Bantu are dependent for their very livelihood on those industries being there ... 34

This Act is thus designed to maintain a viable economy and, at the same time, protect the Europeans. This last is accomplished by denying citizenship rights to the majority of its residents. (Non-whites predominate in every town in the Republic and the larger the town the greater the predominance.35 Through the technique of labor influx control,
the Government thus attempts to regulate the number of non-whites so that only those needed to maintain the economy are permitted to live in the "white" areas and then only under prescribed conditions, i.e., as a servant or employee. They are deemed to be only migrants and thus may be "endorsed out" of the areas at the Government's discretion. For Africans the impact has been profound.

Once, some of them had owned their own homes. Now these freehold rights have been abolished. Previously, a number of Africans had lived in shanty-like dwellings or more comfortable homes within the towns. Now the Government has removed these "black or brown" spots and relocated the non-whites in townships some miles away. Once an African could "qualify" to remain in a "white" urban area under certain conditions. Now all Africans must have permission to enter and remain in employment in all "white" areas and any African can be "endorsed out" if any of the following conditions prevail:

1. The Minister has decided that the number of Africans in the area exceeds its reasonable labour requirements.
2. The African concerned comes from an area from which the Minister has decided no more labour is to be recruited to the 'white' area concerned.
3. The African concerned is deemed to be 'idle' or 'undesirable.'
4. It is deemed not to be in the interests either of the employer or the employed, or in the public interest, that the contract of service shall continue.
Not only must Africans gain permission to enter and remain in employment but also the types of jobs open to them are severely restricted to the non-skilled types. The skilled jobs, the better paying positions, are reserved for whites and occasionally a few Coloured or Asians. Even in situations where whites and non-whites perform the same type of duties, the whites are paid much higher wages than their Bantu counterparts.

Heretofore, an African could live with his family in a home in the urban areas. Now these areas have been proclaimed "white." Thus, African (Bantu) families may not live together in these areas except by governmental permission. Africans who do not qualify for the family status are declared to be "single" whether or not they are legally married and even parents. The same rule applies for women as for men. Thus domestic servants (usually women) who "live-in" are designated to be single. Living accommodations are provided accordingly. Hostels provide a major means. A women's hostel in Alexandra township on the outskirts of Johannesburg illustrates a representative hostel.

It has huge iron gates to keep out unwelcome male visitors, latticed steel doors, operated from a master panel to ensure crowd control, and facilities to dispense the pill. The superintendent is white, the occupants black. . . . A stone's throw away is an identical hostel--for black men . . . .

[A] lucky few have single bedrooms; the rest share two-bed and four-bed rooms (the men have up to eight-bed rooms). They are thrown in with complete strangers and there is the
constant fear that their possessions will be stolen. Each occupant of a room is given an iron bedstead, a mattress, a narrow clothes locker, and a nail in the wall on which to hang a picture or a calendar—and that's all . . . [There are no chairs in the bedrooms.] Each room has one central light in the ceiling . . . [and] there are no electric plugs . . . to boil a kettle, . . . and no shelves, except in the locker. All other facilities are communally shared, such as washing and ironing. But to prevent thefts, the women have to sit and watch their washing dry—the guides admit this frankly. Each bath is shared by 20 women, each shower by 35, each gas burner by five. Each woman is also given a small food locker in the communal kitchen. The "common room" is a beer hall seating 300 women—the pivot of their social life.40

Africans (Bantu) who work in the mines sign contracts for a year at a time, during which period they live in concrete compounds completely isolated from their wives or any other women. Even in the cases where the families are permitted to live together in the townships family life is limited. In many cases both the husband and wife must work, arising at 4 a.m. and preparing for the 15 to 30 mile trip into the city and not returning until 8 or 9 in the evening. As a consequence, their own children are relative strangers to them. This does not make for a stable family unit.

The imposition of the Group Areas Act has had profound effects upon the Coloured and Asians as well. In some respects this Act has posed greater hardships for these groups than for the Africans. In the Cape Province, where some 90 per cent of the Coloured live, and in Natal Province, where many Asians reside, these groups once had some
voting rights. (They have never had the vote in the Transvaal and Orange Free State provinces.) Many owned their own homes and there was much intermingling between the whites and these groups. Unlike the Africans, who have native homelands to which they may return, the Coloured and the Asians have no such native lands.

E. S. Sachs asserts that when Indian laborers were imported in 1860 to work on the sugar plantations in Natal:

they were promised that if they decided to settle permanently after their contracts of labour expired they would be given full citizen rights. Many made South Africa their home, but today the half million Indian people are treated like outcasts.41

He continues:

What the application of the provisions of this . . . law mean to the victims of apartheid may be seen from the following—

In February 1961, regulations concerning the Indian community living in Witbank, a town in the Transvaal, were promulgated and a few months later these regulations were put into effect. They provide:

a) that it is a criminal offence for children over 16 to live with their parents in the Witbank Asiatic quarter without a permit.

b) Rates on properties owned by Indians are increased in some cases from 30/-to £17.10s. per month.

c) Trading lots may not provide sleeping accommodation for more than two shop assistants.

d) Lessees must notify the inspector of the names and occupations of persons who come to stay with them.
e) Any person found in the bazaar who does not live there may be ordered out by the inspector. About 25 per cent of the trade in the bazaar was with whites and 75 per cent with Africans; neither of these groups are lawful residents of the bazaar.42

The Coloured fare little better. Consider, for example, Cape Town's District Six which Joseph Lelyveld variously describes as:

a potentially valuable parcel of real estate,
a menace to the community, a slum, a warren,
a center of crime, or a community itself, home for 33,000 people, the most bawdy, vitally alive place in South Africa, a kind of casbah.43

Under the provisions of the Group Areas Act, District Six, the oldest Coloured neighborhood in South Africa, was proclaimed to be a "white" area on February 10, 1966, just four months before Robert Kennedy's visit. The Coloured were (and are being) forced to sell their homes and property on a buyer's market to white speculators. They were then and still are being transplanted to townships on the inhospitable sands of the Cape Flats. A white luxury suburb is replacing old District Six.44

As a consequence of the Group Areas Act, many areas which were previously "mixed" have been "purified" and declared "white" areas. Thus the Coloured, Asians and Africans have been endorsed out of areas where, in some cases, they had lived for generations.45 Lebuyane Motha, a 90-year old African pensioner, represents a case in point. Mr. Motha had settled in Johannesburg many years ago when it was a
rough mining town. He was ordered to leave and move to the independent kingdom of Lesotho, which he had left as a baby and could not even remember. Mr. Motha's bimonthly pension of eleven dollars for a lifetime's work in South Africa was withdrawn and his supplemental income derived as a part-time gardener in Johannesburg was sacrificed. He had been endorsed out.46

Some refuse to move back to their homelands. An Indian, Nana Sita, a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi and the former President of the Transvaal Indian Congress, is such a man. On August 29, 1967, Sita began serving his third prison sentence for refusing to move from his home in an area now designated for Whites. He had occupied this home for 37 years and chose to serve a six-month prison sentence rather than pay a fine of 200 Rand.47 Mr. Sita had already served a three-month sentence beginning in December of 1962 and a six-month sentence beginning in April of 1963 for refusing to vacate these same premises.48

A former Africa correspondent for The Christian Science Monitor categorizes the Group Areas Act as

the most oppressive legislation of all . . . .
[It is] designed to reshuffle property holdings throughout the country, consolidating various races in various blocs . . . . It has caused untold misery and almost always works to the disadvantage of the nonwhites.49

In order to buttress this Act while providing for its implementation and enforcement, several other acts were passed.
Some of the more important ones for our purposes include the Bantu Authorities Act, Suppression of Communism Act, The Natives (Abolition of Passes and Co-ordination of Documents) Act of 1952, the Separate Amenities Act, and the Bantu Education Act.

The Bantu Authorities Act of 1951, (replaced by The Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act of 1959), established a series of tribal, regional, and territorial authorities and specified their duties, functions, and powers. The purpose of this act was to provide the framework for a system of government in the Reserves. In essence this was to be a limited form of government according to tribes. Bantustans or Native Homelands were to be allocated according to tribal majority. The first of these was the Transkei Bantustan for the Xhosa tribe. Other Bantustans designated to become Bantu national homelands were the North-Sotho unit, the South-Sotho unit, the Swazi unit, the Tsonga unit, the Tswana unit, the Venda unit, and the Zulu unit.

In 1964 the Transkei, home of more than 1,500,000 blanket-wearing Xhosa, became the first (and to date the only) Bantustan to achieve "self-government." As such, it serves as a showplace. This Bantustan consists of only 16,500 square miles (approximately the size of Vermont) and only 24 per cent of this land is arable. At the same time there are few known mineral resources. Hence, the major resource of the Transkei is its labor supply for White
industries or agriculture. As for its political organization, William Frye asserts:

The constitution severely limits the field in which Africans may exercise jurisdiction. Pretoria has reserved for itself authority over matters having to do with foreign affairs, the armed forces, police, aliens, public utilities, communications (including national roads and railroads), currency, customs, and constitutional amendments. Transkei cabinet ministers all have white "advisers" with whom they rarely disagree. Decisions of [Transkei] Parliament are strongly influenced by Pretoria, which pays the salaries of a majority of the members, the hereditary chiefs. Laws may even be vetoed by Pretoria, if necessary. And the white South African secret police is active throughout . . . .52

Thus, this showplace of tribalization, the Transkei, is neither economically self-reliant nor politically self-governing.

The Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 merits special attention for our understanding of the speaking situation that faced Robert Kennedy in 1966 for at least two reasons. First, Robert Kennedy had been invited by the National Union of South African Students; its president, Ian Robertson, was banned under this act just three weeks before Kennedy's scheduled appearance. Second, Nobel Peace Prize winner Dr. Albert Luthuli, whom Robert Kennedy visited in South Africa, was also under banning. In both cases the individuals, without trial and without right to protest, had been banned on the sole authority of the Minister of Justice. (See appendix for a copy of Ian Robertson's banning orders.)
This act defines communism as "any doctrine or scheme which aims at bringing about any political, industrial, social or economic change by the promotion of disturbances or by unlawful acts or omissions." Penalties under this law apply to anyone who "is deemed by the Governor General [Minister of Justice] . . . to be a Communist on the ground that he is advocating, advising, defending or encouraging, or has at any time before or after the commencement of this act, whether within or outside the Union [of South Africa] advocated, advised, defended or encouraged the achievement of any of the objects of communism or any act or omission which is calculated to further the achievement of any such object. . . ."53

Since this act was first passed in 1950 (and amended several times thereafter, it has become a potent weapon against criticism of the government. This act has been utilized to stifle dissent whether it comes from lawyers, clergymen, industrialists, prominent men, women, students, or even members of political parties. Dissenters often find themselves jailed, exiled, or banned. Of all the laws, Africans (Bantu) view the "Pass Laws" as the most onerous. The Nationalists didn't invent these laws; rather they date back to colonial times. However, the Nationalists, and especially Dr. Verwoerd, are deemed to be the architects of the Abolition of Passes and Co-ordination of Documents Act. Dr. Albert Luthuli maintains that "Dr. Verwoerd imposed it
[the Pass System] afresh and in a far more drastic form than had ever been thought of before. He went further. He applied this system for the first time to African women."

What exactly is the Pass System? As has been previously mentioned in the discussion of the Population Registration Act, all South African residents must carry an identification card. However, only Africans must also carry an elaborate "reference book" (formerly called passbook) which Frye describes as: "[a] document of 90-odd pages, resembling in some respects a passport, [which] . . . contains a miniature life history of the owner . . . . Without it, he (or she) cannot travel, take up residence, obtain employment, or even legally exist." A South African Methodist clergyman, Kenneth Carstens, testified before a congressional sub-committee that

This reference book with the passes it contains, has to be in the possession of the 4 million urban Africans at all times and in all places; and that after curfew—which . . . applies only to Africans—they have an additional pass, which is valid for only 1 night, to avoid immediate arrest. Failure to be in possession of any single document (or pass) in the reference book means at least arrest and imprisonment or a heavy fine, and at worst, "endorsement out" . . . . Hundreds of thousands of Africans are arrested every year for offenses under pass laws . . . . Indeed, over the past 12 years, about a thousand Africans are arrested every day for these so-called offenses under laws which apply only to Africans."
In support of Reverend Carstens' statement concerning passbooks being carried by Africans at all times and in all places, Allen Drury recounts a visit to a prison in South Africa in 1966:

As we entered, the prison commandant barked a sharp call for attention in Afrikaans, a company of black bodies in plain cotton tunics jumped to their feet and stood rigid against the walls. Enormous dark eyes stared at us with a dumb uncertainty. Held up beneath each pair of eyes, at about chin level, was the inevitable accompaniment of the natives, his pass-book. They were in prison, stripped of all belongings, naked but for their tunics, held in maximum security—but here were their pass-books. And because they were required to—and also, obviously, because it was an absolute instinct with them—they presented them instantly to authority.57

It was a demonstration against the pass laws that led to the Sharpeville event in which police opened fire on Africans attempting to turn in their reference books. Sixty-nine unarmed Africans were killed by police while some 175 Africans were wounded. Sharpeville (near Johannesburg) focused world-wide attention on the apartheid government of South Africa. The United Nations Security Council issued a statement of concern shortly after the massacre and in October of 1961 the United Nations took an unprecedented step by voting censure of South African apartheid.

A fourth law which merits our attention is the Separate Amenities Act which legislated what had been custom. This act (with its amendments)
provided for the reservation of public premises and vehicles for the exclusive use of persons of a particular race or class. It authorised any person in charge of public premises or public transport to set apart such premises or vehicles or any counter, bench seat or other amenity for the exclusive use of persons belonging to a particular race or class. 58

In a number of respects this law resembles segregation laws commonly called the "Jim Crow" practices prevalent in the southern section of the United States until the mid-1900s. However, the amenities laws of South Africa are much more rigidly applied and enforced.

The Bantu Education Act of 1953 (amended in 1954, 1956, 1959 and 1961) is of special significance because this act represents the first major application of governmental apartheid policy to education. In essence, control of Bantu education was taken out of the hands of the province councils and consolidated in the central government under the Minister of Native Affairs. Its purpose was clearly stated by Dr. Verwoerd, when, as Minister of Native Affairs, he introduced this bill. He said:

I will reform it [Bantu education] so that Natives will be taught from childhood to realize that equality with Europeans is not for them. Education must train and teach people in accordance with their opportunities in life according to the sphere in which they live. . . . Good racial relations cannot exist when the education is given under the control of people who create wrong expectations on the part of the Native himself . . . . Native education should be controlled in such a way that it should be in accordance with the policy of the State . . . racial relations cannot improve if the result
of native education is the creation of a frustrated people who . . . have expectations in life which circumstances in South Africa do not allow to be fulfilled . . . .

Under the aegis of this act, the Minister of Native Affairs was given wide latitude to establish or disestablish Government Bantu schools; he was the final arbiter in decisions concerning the teachers, the curriculum, the syllabi to be used and how the schools were to be administered. Protests against the Minister's decisions were summarily dealt with by retaliation against the protesters.

In hewing to the lines of apartheid education, The Coloured Peoples Act of 1963 stipulated that education for Coloureds be removed from the provinces and vested in Division of Education within the Department for Coloured Affairs. The Indians' Education Act of 1965 was similar to the Coloured Peoples Act in that control of Indian education was vested in the Central Government under the Department of Indian Affairs.

In 1959 another law affecting education was passed. This law, known as the Extension of University Education Act, has as its purpose to replace attendance of non-Whites at the open universities with ethnic group institutions—each group, African, Asian and Coloured having its own university, while for the Africans the group would again be divided according to rough tribal divisions. The aim of the government was that as separate universities for non-Whites became available, the White universities would be prohibited from admitting non-Whites.
To recapitulate: South Africa's apartheid policy of separation of the races with control of government remaining exclusively in the hands of its White minority has been achieved by legislation. Some of its major provisions include the Population Registration Act which identifies the different ethnic categories; the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act which forbids marriages across ethnic lines; the Immorality Act which makes it a criminal offense to have carnal relations with individuals of a different racial group; the Group Areas Act which divides residential areas according to ethnic classification and sets aside for Whites a major portion of the land and the country's assets while labeling the non-Whites who work in these areas as migrants; the Bantu Authorities Act (replaced by the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act) which furnishes the framework for a system of limited government in the Reserves; the Abolition of Passes and Co-ordination of Documents Act which merely replaces the pass-books formerly required for African men with their counterpart called "reference books" while extending the law to include African women; the Separate Amenities Act which separates the races in public places; and what may be called the capstone of apartheid, the Suppression of Communism Act under which opposition to governmental policy is frequently equated with communism and punished accordingly. In education, apartheid authority is vested in the Bantu Education Act, the Coloured Peoples Education Act, the
Indians' Education Act and the Extension of University Education Act.

The apartheid policies are administered through the government. Therefore, it may prove worthwhile at this time to examine the structure of government. In certain respects, its structure resembles the British parliamentary system. Horizontally, the executive functions are vested in the State President, but actually they are exercised by the Prime Minister who is the leader of the majority party in the House of Assembly. Other ministers are appointed by the President on the Prime Minister's recommendations. Legislative power rests with the white Parliament (only whites are permitted to serve) which consists of the President, a Senate, and a House of Assembly. Usually, legislation is initiated by the Cabinet and introduced in the House of Assembly. South Africa's Senate consists of 54 members, 11 of whom are appointed while the other 43 members are elected. Of the 11 appointed members, one Senator is chosen specifically to represent the interests of the Cape Coloured. Of the remaining 10 who are appointed to represent the non-whites in Parliament (two from each of the four provinces and two from South-West Africa), four of these (one from each province) must be capable of representing the interests of the Coloureds in his province. One hundred and seventy members comprise the House of Assembly, six of whom represent the electoral divisions of South-West Africa, four represent
the Coloureds while the other 100 members are elected directly to represent the electoral divisions of the Republic.

The administrative capital of the Republic is located in Pretoria and the legislative capital in Cape Town, where Parliament meets each year from January to June.

Each of the four provinces (Cape, Natal, Transvaal, and Orange Free State) has a unicameral legislature which is known as the Provincial Council. This Council is elected on the same franchise as that of the House of Assembly. Province Council powers are limited and subordinate to the powers of the Republic. Functions of the Provincial Councils relate mainly to the administration of hospitals, education (other than Bantu, university, and technical education), roads, municipal government, and other local matters. Yet, to have the force of law, legislation requires the assent of the central government.

Since 1948 the Nationalist Party has been the majority party and thus has controlled the central government. (In 1966 they held 39 of the 54 Senate seats and won 126 of the 170 seats in the House of Assembly in the March election.) In the Republic of South Africa political parties are predicated upon their response to apartheid. The Nationalists created these policies so, as would be expected, its members (primarily Afrikaners) rigidly adhere to its dictates. The United Party, also referred to as the Loyal Opposition, advocates a somewhat less restrictive racial policy and
recommends that all groups be represented in a central federal parliament. This party draws its primary support from the English-speaking white population and is generally favored by large business interests. (In 1966 the Unionists held 15 Senate seats and won 39 House seats in the March election.) The Progressive Party split off from the United Party as a consequence of disagreements concerning racial policies. The Progressives espouse the enfranchisement of all "qualified" persons regardless of race or color and the establishment of constitutional safeguards for individual liberties and group rights. Since 1961 the Progressive Party's sole parliamentary representative has been Mrs. Helen Suzman. The Liberal Party stresses multiracial membership, which perhaps explains why it has never won an election in a white constituency. The Liberals advocate full and equal rights for all South African adults irrespective of color race. Included among the leaders of this party is the noted South African author, Alan Paton. The Liberals have been hampered by banning orders served on its executive board, and finally, in 1968 the party faced its ultimate decision: forego its multiracial identity or disband. It disbanded.

Although most of the Protestant and Catholic sects in South Africa have heeded the popular admonition that politics and religion do not mix, the Dutch Reformed Church (to which
fifty-three per cent of the white population belongs) has maintained close ties with the Afrikaner Nationalists.

As one researcher has observed:

... the Afrikaners remain one of the few western peoples of the modern era whose values and customs are established by, and expressed through, their church ... Religion has always been the most powerful formative influence in shaping the values, norms, and institutions of the Afrikaner community.63

This influence of Church upon Afrikaners may be better understood by examining some of the tenets of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa. This Afrikaans Church, which has promoted the policies of separate development of the races and has provided the theological basis for apartheid, views the Afrikaners as God-favored. As South African historian Dr. G. D. Scholtz once said:

It was his religion which enabled the Afrikaner to remain in existence among the nonwhites, because it made him compare his own position with that of Israel—and as the duty had rested on Israel not to mingle with the surrounding heathens, so it also became the duty of the Afrikaner not to associate with the nonwhites.64

The Church's concepts of the state and its functions were set forth at the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Federal Council of the NGK (Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk) in 1951. According to the Council

... God is the fountain of authority and power, irrespective of whether rulers and subjects acknowledge it ... God instituted the state to counteract the worst effects of the fall of man, and no Christian may regard the state merely as a necessary evil, as Liberalism
does . . . As regards the relations be­
tween subject and ruler, the authority of
man over man is not a human invention, but a
gracious gift of God to a fallen generation.
The authority of the state over the individ­
ual is derived from God; it must be exercised
according to God's will; it is not unlimited;
it cannot be replaced by another authority;
and it is indivisible. . . . Consequently, the
humanistic conceptions of titular, legal, po­
litical, or popular sovereignty have no valid­
ity. . . . This doctrine is opposed both to
liberal democracy and to totalitarianism . . . .
The state must ensure civic freedom by not in­
terfering in private matters, except that it
must protect the individual against exploitation
and wrong-doers even if, in so doing, it has to
interfere temporarily with individual liberty.
. . . A Christian people may not be satisfied
with anything less than the right to replace a
government that is not acting in accordance with
God's will . . . According to . . . [Rousseau's]
ideas all men are equal and, therefore, every
individual is a sovereign and a lawgiver; all,
white and black, must participate in the making
of laws. The mass of individuals then become
the servant of the people instead of the author­
ity over them, it receives its mandate from the
people, and is unseated as soon as it no longer
serves the wishes and needs of the people. This
is nothing more nor less than the myth of sover­
eignty opposed to God. To the Christian . . .
the franchise is a means of grace that must be
used with the greatest care and responsibility
to God . . . Thus being enfranchised gives the
voter the right to apply a religious test to
authority . . . Those who do not have the fran­
chise are by no means slaves or suppressed
people. They still have civic rights and are pro­
tected by government. The franchise is a treasure
which should belong to those who are of age polit­
ically and are able to use it responsibly before
God. The African does not fulfill these require­
ments, and, therefore, will not be able to use the
vote correctly. Since the franchise implies hav­
ing a say in the establishment of government, and
since government is clothed with such sacred re­
sponsibility, it is obvious that not everyone
should automatically have the vote. Not only un­
developed groups, but all those who are openly in
rebellion against God, such as the Communists, should not be given it. In a Christian state, therefore, the necessary qualification is not only that a man should be of age, but that he should be a Christian. Political parties are necessary in a state, and no Christian people will tolerate the dictatorship of a clique or of one party, as happened in Germany and Russia. But this is not the only reason why the Christian cannot do without political parties. Where political life is threatened by doctrines born of unbelief—"powerful in Liberalism, much stronger in Democracy, and most dangerous in Communism"—it is without doubt the duty of Christians to try to become the strongest political faction in the country and to establish a Christian government... In the existing democracies... not only has everyone who is of age the vote, but the holders of all forms of political thought have the right to organize and, if they are strong enough, achieve power. This is the cancer at the root of modern democracy because right and truth are made dependent on a mere majority of votes. The Christian citizen may not rest content with this. Only the Christian political faith is valid, and no anti-Christian philosophy should be given the right to form political parties. This applies particularly to Communism; but a Christian people ought to go even further and ought not to allow the right of organization to any group who aim at a dictatorship. Finally, the actual form of the state is a matter of secondary importance, because a Christian people will organize a Christian state in God's good time; and for each people there will be a particular form of state. It is obvious, then, that there is such a state for the Afrikaner people. While leaving the details of this to Christian citizens, the church declares that any form of government born of unbelief must be rejected as displeasing to God. This applies not only to Communism and National Socialism, but also to 'revolutionary democracy' with its belief in the sovereignty of the people.65

It is, therefore, not surprising that the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa has provided guidance and encouragement...
for the Nationalist's policies of apartheid. To be sure, dissent within the church has arisen but this opposition has not significantly altered policies of the church or the government.

As Alan Paton has wryly remarked: "The Dutch Reformed Church holds dear two things—apartheid and the gospel."66

Based on the premise that a country's educational system reflects that society's concepts of the roles its citizens will perform, an understanding of the roles assigned to South African citizens requires some knowledge of its system of schooling. Three years before the Nationalists assumed power one prominent Nationalist had this to say:

We should not give the natives an academic education, as some people are prone to do. If we do this we shall later be burdened with a number of academically trained Europeans and non-Europeans, and who is going to do the manual labour in the country? . . . I am in thorough agreement with the view that we should so conduct our schools that the native who attends those schools will know that to a great extent he must be the labourer in the country.67

To state it another way: Education in South Africa should be designed to reenforce and perpetuate the racial hierarchy of Whites, Coloureds and Asians, and Africans. But one is constrained to ask if this is true. Let us look at the evidence.

Education for White children between the ages of seven and sixteen is both compulsory and free. For Coloured and
Indian children between the ages of seven and fourteen school attendance is compulsory where there is a demand and accommodations permit. In the Cape Province attendance is now compulsory for those who live within three miles of the schools while in Natal, school attendance is compulsory for all pupils until the end of the school year in which the pupil reaches sixteen years of age or completes the prescribed course for Standard Eight (tenth grade). Where schooling is compulsory it is generally free. For African children education is neither compulsory nor free. Thus, many African parents cannot afford to send their children to school. In October of 1966 the Minister of Education admitted that at least 26 per cent of African children never attend school at all. Africans finance their children's education through direct and indirect taxes, voluntary "contributions" to specific educational projects and through school fees.

Africans pay income and provincial taxes on the same basis as do members of other racial groups; however, in place of the personal tax paid by Whites, Coloureds and Asians, the Africans pay a general tax. Africans are taxed for eight more years of their lives than are members of other racial groups, and while personal taxation is reduced for married men of other racial groups, African men pay general tax at a uniform rate, while an African woman is not exempt from paying the general tax when she marries. Married women of other groups are. In the lowest income groups the rate of general taxation for African men is higher than is the rate of personal taxation of other groups. In addition, Africans pay further direct taxes
which are not paid by members of other racial groups. The Local Tax, the Transkeian General Levy, tribal levies in other areas, education tax in urban areas, hospital levy in the Orange Free State.63

African parents often find it very difficult to finance secondary schooling for their children because school fees increase at this level and books are not subsidized as they are at the primary level. As a consequence of the proportionately high cost of education for Africans, the dropout rate is high. In Parliament in 1967 Mrs. Helen Suzman cited figures that indicate that of those who attend school at all "half drop out before the fourth year. Only one in 83 reaches secondary school (the eighth year), and one in 500 stays in school more than ten years."70

The medium of instruction differs according to ethnic groupings. For Whites in all the provinces it is generally a single medium, either English or Afrikaans. The particular choice depends on the language in which the child is more fluent (i.e., the child's native tongue).71 This also holds true for Coloureds and Indians. The medium of instruction for Africans is one of the seven major Bantu languages. In addition, the African child must learn the two official languages, Afrikaans and English. One of these is usually introduced as a subject during the first year of school and the other six months later.72

Inequity in the financing of education for the various racial groups may be seen from the following. In 1965 the
estimated cost per head of population was R.32.38 for Whites, R.13.37 for Coloureds and R.1.88 for Africans. Pupil-teacher ratios also indicate quality of education. In 1963 the pupil-teacher ratio in public schools was 23 for Whites, 31 for Coloured and Indian, and 58 for Africans. The Coloureds and Indians frequently have double school shifts while the Africans sometimes have three shifts at the primary levels.

At the university level the situation does not improve. There are eight resident universities for Whites, one university for Coloureds, one university for Indians, and three university colleges for Bantus. The White universities are autonomous; the Coloured, Indian and Bantu universities are not. One out of twelve White students is enrolled in a university; whereas an African student has less than one chance in a thousand of attending college.

Of the eight residential White universities four of them (Orange Free State, Potchefstroom, Pretoria, and Stellenbosch) are Afrikaans-speaking universities. These universities accept no non-White students. The other four universities (Cape Town, Natal, Rhodes, and Witwatersrand) are English-speaking universities. Rhodes University does not accept non-White students except for certain post-graduate courses. The University of Natal does accept non-White students, but the classes are segregated except for certain post-graduate ones. Both Cape Town and Witwatersrand accept
non-White students and thus are known as "open" universities.

Language, politics and religion in South Africa are intertwined. Thus one could say that in general the Afrikaans-medium universities are nationalist and Dutch Reformed Church oriented. The English-medium universities, on the other hand, are more cosmopolitan, more liberal and less religiously oriented.

These differences are reflected in the two student organizations: the National Union of South African Students, commonly called NUSAS, and the Afrikaanse Studentebond, known as A.S.B.

NUSAS, a multiracial organization committed to academic freedoms regardless of race, religion, or politics, was established in 1924. By 1932 a large body of Afrikaans students became sufficiently convinced that NUSAS was too liberal and not nationalistic enough for their tastes. Hence, they broke away and formed their own student organization which, since 1948, has been known as the Afrikaanse Studentebond. A basic issue that has divided the two organizations is the question of non-White students. Although the two student organizations several times through the years have tried to work together for the students' common good, basic differences in their philosophies precluded any real success in these endeavors. And, as one would expect, NUSAS
increasingly reflected the English-medium universities' opposition to governmental policies of apartheid while the A.S.B. reflected the Afrikaans-medium universities' support of governmental racial policies.

In 1959 when legislation barring non-white students from the "open" universities was passed, NUSAS strenuously objected to this violation of academic freedoms. This multiracial organization henceforth abandoned its non-partisan role and became politicized. In the 1960s NUSAS and Minister of Justice Balthazar John Vorster continually clashed. Vorster sought to destroy this organization which he characterized as "damnable and detestable." NUSAS not only resisted but defied the Government.

One such act of defiance was the invitation extended Robert Kennedy to deliver their annual Day of Affirmation Address celebrating academic freedoms. The student organization had chosen Robert Kennedy because of the Senator's frequently stated belief that youth has a special role to play in this world of ours.

The invitation posed a dilemma for the Government. On the one hand, the Republic claims to be a democratic country whose racial policies are beginning to win universal acceptance. On the other hand, the National Union of South African Students which is the largest multiracial organization outside the churches in the country and represents almost 40 per cent of the 50,000 university
students in the Republic, has been a constant source of irritation to the Government. The visa question exemplifies the dilemma. If the Government were to refuse to grant Robert Kennedy a visa it would appear to be admitting that it is alienating itself from the rest of the world and abrogating its claim that it is a bastion of democracy. It could also prove to be very awkward for South Africa if it were to refuse to grant a visa to the man who later became President of the United States. Conversely, if the Government treated the visa application as a routine matter seeing no objection to granting it, then it would seem to be granting the National Union of South African Students a legitimate place in the Republic's political life. The Republic of South Africa finally chose to grant the visa.

With visa in hand, in June of 1966 Robert F. Kennedy journeyed to this Land of Apartheid. But why did he accept this invitation? In order to answer this question we need to know something about the man, himself.
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CHAPTER III

ROBERT F. KENNEDY

Just as it is necessary to provide the reader with background information concerning the speaking situation, it is also important for the reader to have some understanding of the speaker. As Chaim Perelman has asserted:

Irrespective of his wishes and whether or not he himself uses connections of the act-person type, a speaker runs the risk that the hearer will regard him as intimately connected with his speech. This interaction between speaker and speech is perhaps the most characteristic part of argumentation. . . .

In other words, the speaker and his discourse are intimately related. Therefore, the weight or strengths of the speaker's arguments, especially in the epideictic genre, are determined at least to a certain extent, by the audience's perception of the orator. With this in mind, let us examine Kennedy's image. Was he perceived to be a man of integrity, of good judgment, of goodwill toward his hearers? What influences were brought to bear upon Robert Kennedy that helped to shape his ideas, his philosophy, his values, his vision of reality as revealed in his oratory in South Africa? The purpose of this chapter is to attempt to answer the above questions. It should be noted, however, that the following
discussion of Robert Kennedy will be limited to those aspects of his life and personality that relate to his conceptions and practices regarding the rightful role of the individual in society. From whence did Robert Kennedy derive his values?

**Family Influences**

First and foremost of the influences which helped mold the communicator who traveled to South Africa in 1966 were his family relationships. The strong family ties of the Kennedys are common knowledge. As Arthur Krock states:

> As has been noted by deeper thinkers and better writers, the Kennedy family is a clan, a tribe, a sovereignty, and a dynasty, tied loosely enough within a package to allow each member a good deal of independent freedom of movement. But never to the point of a fracturing collision, a limitation I have observed in the many years since 1935, when I began to be an intimate of the family under the sponsorship of the patriarch, Joseph Patrick himself.²

Nevertheless, some aspects of the close-knit family relationships may bear closer scrutiny. Robert Francis Kennedy, the seventh child and third son of Joseph and Rose Kennedy, was born November 20, 1925, in Brookline, Massachusetts. The two oldest children were Joe, Jr., and John who were followed by Rosemary, Kathleen, Eunice, Patricia, Robert, Jean, and Edward. Thus, when he was growing up, Robert was surrounded by four older sisters and one younger sister. His mother remarked that both she and her husband had been concerned, at first, that Bobby might turn out to be a "sissy" because
of being surrounded by all the girls but they soon learned that these fears were groundless. Robert was not only the smallest of the boys in the family but he was also the least coordinated. Several individuals have suggested that Robert Kennedy's highly developed sense of competitiveness and his dogged determination to succeed may have been partly an attempt to compensate for his physical frailness and lack of natural grace. It was also an attempt to emulate his older brothers who were ten and eight years respectively, his seniors. Both his parents believed that "Robert's personality was influenced by the gap of years dividing him and his older brothers and the fact he had a difficult time trying to keep pace of them." The idea that Kennedys had to win, that they couldn't settle for second best in anything they set out to do was instilled in them by their father.

Joe McCarthy suggests that:

"Most probably it [the Kennedy competitive drive] stems originally from the chafing, frustrating atmosphere of anti-Irish and anti-Catholic prejudice in Boston fifty years ago that made the young Joe Kennedy determined to push himself and his children to a place at the top of the world where they would not have to take a back seat for anybody."

Whatever the origin of this fierce competitive drive, in Robert Kennedy it was fully developed. This trait found expression in hotly contested physical encounters on the football field at Harvard, in touch football, sailing contests, mountain climbing, snorkeling, and kayak excursions
down the treacherous Snake River, to mention only a few. The need to win was also manifest in the type of political contests conducted by Robert Kennedy whether those campaigns were in behalf of his brother John or himself. This dogged determination to win against the corrupters of government and society characterized his senate investigative days and his years as Attorney General.

From both parents, but especially his mother, his religious and humanitarian beliefs were carved. Arthur Krock describes the role of Mrs. Rose Kennedy as follows:

. . . Mrs. Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy, serene, calm, beautiful, a cultivated woman keeping the peace when necessary . . .; exercising a kind of soothing influence on the many arguments and debates that went on in that extraordinary family. She was very much in charge of and intimate with her children. Of course, their father was away a great deal—in California on movie business, in New York on financial business, in government when his family was not in Washington. Hence she carried the burden of rearing the children. They owe much of what they were and are to their mother.5

In one area in particular did Mrs. Rose Kennedy exert a marked impact upon her son Robert. Herself a devout Catholic, she personally provided spiritual instruction for all her children emphasizing through words and example that religion was not just attending Mass on Sunday or on special occasions, but that it was an integral force in daily living. Of the nine Kennedy children raised in this Catholic home, Robert was the most devout and, at one time (during his three
years at a Catholic prep school) even considered joining the priesthood.\textsuperscript{6} When he married he chose a wife from a similar background, \textit{i.e.}, a devout Catholic from a large, wealthy family. Mrs. Rose Kennedy, in 1962, had this to say about her son: "Bobby has been a great joy and blessing to me and my husband always. He has taken his religion seriously and still does. We never had any worries about him."\textsuperscript{7} Robert Kennedy assessed the role of his religion in his life when he expressed the belief that his opposition toward racial and religious discrimination had its roots in "my upbringing in religion. I try to have tolerance toward viewpoints, tolerance toward ideas."\textsuperscript{8}

Jack Newfield maintains:

The two characteristics Kennedy inherited and had reinforced by his environment, that were at the core of his personality, were \textit{competition} and \textit{religion} \textsuperscript{italic}. His central values were toughness and morality, determination and discipline, neutral enough in themselves to be put in the service of either McCarrthism or the dispossessed.\textsuperscript{9}

Comingling in influence with Robert Kennedy's religious beliefs and competitive drive was his dedication to country and family. In speaking of the middle and late 1930s, Robert Kennedy contrasted his family's fortunes with those less blessed.

But it was impossible for even a child of my years not to see the contrast between the good fortune of my family and the problems and difficulties which befell other families through no fault of their own. Our parents made certain that we did. And more than that, our
father, repeatedly impressed upon us that nowhere but in the United States could he have achieved what he did; that we owed our blessings to the American system of government and therefore had an obligation to participate in public life. But I don't think any of us thought of public service as a sacrifice or as a means strictly of repaying a beneficent country. We looked to it as an opportunity for an exciting and fulfilling way of life. Since public affairs had dominated so much of our actions and discussions, public life seemed really an extension of family life.  

Joseph Kennedy set the example for his sons by deeds as well as words. The senior Kennedy served as the first chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, as chairman of the Maritime Commission, and in 1938 was appointed Ambassador to England. Robert was also influenced by the example set by his older brothers, both of whom were officers in the Navy. So, encouraged by his oldest brother who was his mentor, Robert joined the Navy when he turned eighteen on November 20, 1943. He was a V-12 officer trainee stationed at Harvard when he prevailed upon Secretary of the Navy Forrestal (an old family friend) to permit him to transfer to active duty just as his brother John had done earlier. Robert Kennedy became a seaman serving aboard the destroyer "Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr." Although Robert Kennedy did succeed in becoming an active seaman, unlike his two older brothers, he never saw combat action. In later years he often expressed regret that this experience was denied him.
Educational Influences

If academic accomplishment provides the sole measuring rod for assessing educational influences, then it must be said that educational influences played only a minimal part in shaping the communicator who traveled to South Africa in the summer of 1966. Robert Kennedy was no school scholar. His interests were elsewhere. When he was attending the Priory (Catholic prep school) his grades ranked in the lower half of his class although he did well in sports. His father became concerned that Robert might not qualify for entrance into Harvard so he transferred his son to Milton Academy for Robert's senior year. The grades did improve sufficiently to qualify him for Harvard although they were not outstanding. At Harvard Robert Kennedy majored in Government but, here again, he did not follow in the footsteps of his older brothers who graduated with honors. Neither did he exhibit any particular qualities of leadership. Ken O'Donnell, his best friend there, portrayed Robert Kennedy at Harvard as follows:

In college in those years [1946-48] most of the guys were older than Bob and he was less sure of himself. He was not a dominant factor in the group. Bob didn't go to social affairs or dances. He went with the common herd. His friends were persons who couldn't scrape twenty-five cents together. Bob was like the rest of us—finding himself. Robert Kennedy had this to say about his days at Harvard: "I didn't go to class very much. I used to talk and
argue a lot, mostly about sports and politics. I began
testing about issues about the time I went to college."¹⁴

Yet, academic high marks may not serve as the best in-
dex of intellectual capability. William Shannon explains
that "Robert Kennedy ... is what teachers call a 'late
bloomer.' His school and college grades are an unreliable
cue to the power of his mind, and his intellectual inter-
est are much richer and more diversified at forty [when he
traveled to South Africa] than seemed probable at twenty."¹⁵

At the same time, educational impact is not necessarily
restricted to the classroom. It may also be seen in discus-
sions and debates with those from different cultural back-
grounds and values derived from participation in athletic
endeavors form an important thread in the fabric of educa-
tion. At Harvard, football became paramount in Robert Ken-
nedy's priorities. As a consequence, and by sheer determina-
tion, he succeeded, where his two older brothers had failed,
in earning his varsity letter in football. The value of
athletic competition in Kennedy's view of life is perhaps
best revealed in a speech "Dinner of Champions" delivered in
New York City on October 17, 1961, when he proclaimed:

The will to win is so important to us as
individuals, and as a nation, that without it
we are lost. Without doubt, we learn it best
as individuals in athletic competition. We
have seen it in games that we have played our-
selves. I know for I have seen it at home. I
am ashamed to report that my father who is
seventy-three has never been beaten by any of
his four sons in golf. We have all become resigned to the fact that he has determined that he won't be beaten.16

It was at the University of Virginia Law School in Charlottesville that Robert Kennedy exhibited evidence that he had more than a mediocre intellect and had qualities of leadership.17 As leader of the student forum he arranged for a series of controversial speakers to appear on the campus. All shades of political and philosophical persuasions were represented. For example, his father, Joseph P. Kennedy used the forum to urge that America make itself an impregnable "arsenal of democracy" and not tie itself to military defense of western Europe; and his brother, Representative John F. Kennedy, . . . criticized foreign policy mistakes in western Europe and Indochina but favored strong military and diplomatic alliances among the nations of the free world. Other speakers included former New Deal trustbuster Thurmond Arnold, New York Times columnist Arthur Krock, Associate Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, and the distinguished Negro diplomat, Ralph Bunche.18

At that time (1950-51) no Negro had ever been permitted to deliver an address at the segregated university so there was considerable opposition to Dr. Bunche's appearance. "But Kennedy stuck by his beliefs, and Bunche made the speech. The Attorney General still cites this as one of the accomplishments of which he is most proud."19
Professional Influences

Just as his family and his educational influences helped shape Robert Kennedy, so, too, did his experiences in public life as a Senate investigator, campaign manager, Attorney General and United States Senator.

His first hand observations of how the McCarthy Committee investigative staff operated caused him to leave that position after only six months and set an example for him of what not to do. The excesses of the McCarthy Committee are so well known that no further elaboration appears to be needed here. When Robert Kennedy became chief counsel of the Senate Rackets Investigating Committee (Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field) he heed the lessons learned from McCarthy. Investigations under Kennedy were thorough; reporter's sources were protected; testimony was carefully gone over with witnesses in private before their appearances at hearings to assure, as much as possible, that truth was revealed and innocent individuals not jeopardized. The rights of individuals were also protected. Misuse of power by labor officials as revealed in his investigations,20 had a significant impact on Robert Kennedy.

By the time I became chief counsel of the Senate Rackets Investigating Committee in 1957, I knew that I would want to work for the government as long as I was able. Jimmy Hoffa provided a principal reason, for through him I
discovered for myself the consequences of irresponsible use of power, how it threatened the freedom of all of us and what was required of each of us to stand against it.

The individual man, in whose hands democracy must put its faith and its fate, is capable of great heights of achievement. He is also capable of infinite degradation. Fortunately most of our institutions have safeguards which ultimately unseat a man when power results in arrogance and corruption. But often before justice is done the very institutions and values by which we attempt to order our lives can be undermined. This is especially true in our concentrated urban society and this was especially true of Mr. Hoffa. 21

One other outgrowth of this investigation was that several individuals who were, in some capacity, involved with Kennedy during this time were later solicited by him for governmental service in the Kennedy Administration, e.g., Pierre Salinger and Edwin Guthman, both newspapermen.

As campaign manager for John Kennedy's Senatorial race in 1952, his brief fight to be the Democratic Vice Presidential Nominee in 1956, and his 1960 presidential race, Robert Kennedy learned and profited. The responsibility of conducting a political campaign for his brother in 1952 brought out administrative abilities heretofore hidden. This campaign also revealed some other character traits, e.g., rudeness. Robert Kennedy maintained that he did not have time to waste in being polite. He left that to the candidate himself. In the 1960 campaign a number of politicians protested Kennedy's rudeness. His answer was:
I'm not running a personality contest. It doesn't matter if they like me or not. Jack can be nice to them. I don't try to antagonize people but somebody has to be able to say no. If people are not getting off their behinds and working enough, how do you say that nicely? Every time you make a decision in this business you make somebody mad.  

As Attorney General in 1961 he told a group of United States Attorneys: "It doesn't matter if you hurt my feelings. The important thing is to get the job done."  

Robert Kennedy's experience in managing his brother's attempt to secure the vice-presidential nomination was educational. The knowledge he gained about why Kefauver won the nomination was utilized in the 1960 campaign. Kennedy traveled with Stevenson's campaign in 1956 constantly observing and filling notebooks with his observations of the conduct of a presidential campaign. This material was used in the 1960 contest.  

Managing the 1960 presidential campaign for his brother brought him into contact with people in all parts of the country. He saw and identified with the powerless, the helpless, the poor, the young, the elderly, as well as the average citizen. Like his brother John, Robert Kennedy was particularly affected by the plight of the poverty-stricken in West Virginia. Without Robert Kennedy, John Kennedy may not have won his Senate seat in 1952 and would not have captured the Presidency in 1960.  

John Kennedy assessed his brother's contribution in the 1952 race as follows:
My 1952 campaign was terribly disorganized. The man I had running it was having a breakdown and I was doing too much organizational work to campaign properly. Then Bobby came in. And there was a tremendous change in two or three weeks. We had a lot of fights on our hands, but he got things organized and moving. He got people working in all of the counties. It was an exceptional job. It was the first time I ever saw Bobby operate.24

Concerning the 1960 campaign John Kennedy had this to say about his brother near the close of that campaign: "I don't even have to think about organization. I just show up. Bobby's easily the best man I've ever seen. He's the hardest worker. He's the greatest organizer . . . . I'll take his word over anybody's."25

In the 1960 presidential race during the last three weeks of the campaign, the Martin Luther King problem arose. King, with a group of fifty-two other Negroes, had been arrested in Atlanta, Georgia, for attempting to integrate a restaurant on October 19, 1960. Within a few days all those arrested, except Dr. King, were released. He was sentenced (on a technicality) to serve a four month's term at hard labor and taken to the State Penitentiary. There was fear that Dr. King would never leave the prison alive— that he might be lynched. The Kennedy camp had previously been warned by at least three Southern governors that if Kennedy intruded in this matter to support King then he would lose the South in the upcoming election. According to Theodore White,26 John Kennedy nevertheless, on October 26th, placed a telephone
call to Mrs. King (who was in her sixth month of pregnancy) expressing his personal concern and, if necessary, his willingness to intervene in this matter. When Robert Kennedy learned of the command decision, he followed up his brother's telephone call with one of his own. Robert Kennedy telephoned the Georgian judge who had sentenced King and pleaded for the prisoner's release. King was released on bail. This intervention on the part of the Kennedy brothers gained many Negro votes in the election, and, considering the closeness of the victory, may have spelled the difference. It also illustrated how Robert and John Kennedy worked together.

Without John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy would never have become Attorney General nor won a seat in the United States Senate in 1964. When John Kennedy announced he had chosen his brother as Attorney General there was criticism that Robert Kennedy was not qualified. He had never even tried a case in court. Harry Golden said that he later understood why John Kennedy had taken the political risk in appointing his brother to this highly sensitive Cabinet post. Mr. Golden was a member of the civil rights committee on behalf of candidate Kennedy and he described the first meeting on October 11, 1960, in which John Kennedy outlined to the group the work he expected of his Attorney General. Kennedy stated that the Attorney General would "hire a corps of
lawyers and prepare cases against the disfranchisement of the Negroes in the South."29 Golden asserts that after he had spent some time with the Attorney General he understood why John Kennedy had selected his brother Robert. "John Kennedy knew his brother. He knew how his brother would react when confronted with a palpable wrong."30

President Kennedy provided the most cogent reasons for selecting Robert Kennedy to be Attorney General. The President said:

In the first place, his judgment is good and his interest is the same as mine. . . . He has ideas and the ability to turn ideas into action. This is a rare quality. Some people have good ideas but are unable to turn them into action. . . . Most of the time, his views and mine are in accordance. But there have been one or two times when he held different views from mine.31

The "community of interests" the President and Attorney General shared had an impact on Robert Kennedy's role in government.

Thus it is not surprising that Robert Kennedy's responsibilities as Attorney General encompassed more than serving as head of the Department of Justice and all that that entailed. He was also President Kennedy's most trusted confidante, crisis consultant, ambassador, and lightning rod. Although Kennedy was familiar with the statistics regarding Negroes and they affronted his sense of justice, he was not entirely cognizant of their full meaning. Harry Golden's comment that he did not believe that either John or Robert
Kennedy were "fully aware of the enormity of those wrongs when they took their oaths of office" was supported, at least as far as the Attorney General was concerned, by Kennedy's own comment. "I don't say I stayed awake nights worrying about civil rights before I became Attorney General." As Kennedy's awareness grew so, too, did his commitment to right these injustices. Burke Marshall, head of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department described the development of Kennedy's civil rights consciousness as follows:

The more he saw, . . . and this was true of me as well, the more he understood. The more you learned about how Negroes were treated in the South, the more you saw of that, the madder you became. You know, he always talked about the hypocrisy. That's what got him. By the end of the year [1961] he was so mad about that kind of thing it overrode everything else.

The above comment suggests that it would be worthwhile to examine one of the highlights in the civil rights struggle in the South in 1961 in terms of how Kennedy reacted to it. The first major confrontation involved the Freedom Riders. This confrontation will be considered in detail for the following reasons. First, it established a pattern of operation for human rights cases. Equally important is the fact that this was the first major crisis the Attorney General faced and his responses to the situation reveal his mind and character. And, finally, the Freedom Rides are directly related
to the issues Kennedy discussed in South Africa. The Freedom Riders, an integrated group employing nonviolent (Gandhi) tactics, was under the aegis of CORE (Congress of Racial Equality) and sought to test and challenge segregation in bus terminals and other facilities from Washington, D. C. to New Orleans, Louisians. Their journey began on May 4, 1961, from Washington and until May 14, 1961, it was without any major incident. The group had traveled through Virginia, North Carolina and Georgia without any trouble although three Riders were roughed up at the Greyhound bus terminal in Rock Hill, South Carolina on May 9, 1961. On May 14th (Mother's Day) the group, now in Atlanta, Georgia, split into two groups for their trip to Alabama. One group traveled by Greyhound; the other by Trailways bus. That night the Greyhound bus was attacked by a crowd carrying clubs, blackjacks, and chains in Anniston, Alabama, and when it was stalled six miles outside the town, the bus was destroyed by a fire bomb and several Riders were injured. Although the Trailways bus did get through to Birmingham, its passengers were attacked and beaten when they stepped off the bus. No Birmingham police were waiting at the bus terminal to protect passengers despite the fact they had been previously warned by the FBI that violence might erupt. The police arrived ten or fifteen minutes later explaining that the delay was due to the fact it was Mother's Day and they were short-handed.
At this point in time, the Attorney General was not even aware of the Freedom Riders' mission. He was occupied with investigating the intelligence activities in the aftermath of the Bay of Pigs fiasco. On the morning of May 15th the Attorney General was informed of the two violent episodes in Alabama the previous night. Kennedy's first concern was how to get the Riders out of Birmingham because mob rule was beginning to take over. He also wanted to have one of his own men on the scene to report what was happening and, if needed, to act as an intermediary with either or both of the opposing groups. He sent his administrative assistant John Seigenthaler, former newsman from Nashville, Tennessee, to serve in this capacity. He also contacted Charles Merriweather, a close political friend of Governor John Patterson, who was in the south at the time. Merriweather had just been confirmed as a Director on the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank after a blistering Senate hearing on President Kennedy's nomination. Even so, he hesitated to intercede with Patterson to promise protection for the Freedom Riders. He even demanded to know what the Freedom Riders were doing in his state. Robert Kennedy's answer was: "It's not a question of what they're doing. It's a question of their right to travel." Merriweather reluctantly agreed to act as go-between for the Attorney General and the Governor but could not reach Patterson. In the meantime,
Robert Kennedy contacted Alabama's Commissioner of Public Safety, Floyd Mann, who got assurances from Patterson that the Riders would be fully protected for their bus ride to Montgomery. Mann questioned the Attorney General about whether the Freedom Riders would be willing to leave the city so Robert Kennedy called the leader of the Riders and asked. After consulting with his group the leader called back and said they would be willing to leave under police protection on the first available bus but soon afterwards Commissioner Mann called the Attorney General to report that bus drivers refused to drive the bus and that the company had said they could not get any drivers. Mann suggested that the Attorney General contact George E. Cruit, superintendent of the Greyhound terminal in Birmingham about getting a driver. Kennedy did. Kennedy's conversation with Mr. Cruit was a frustrating one in which he finally stated

I think you should--had better be getting in touch with Mr. Greyhound or whoever Greyhound is and somebody better give us an answer to this question. I am--the government is--going to be very much upset if this group does not get to continue their trip. In fact, I suggest that you make the arrangements to get a driver immediately and get these people on the way to Montgomery. Under the law they are entitled to transportation provided by Greyhound and we are looking for you to get them on their way.37

Other Freedom Riders began to descend on Birmingham and tension in Alabama mounted rapidly amid reports that college students from all parts of the country were planning
to invade Alabama as part of the movement. In Washington, the Attorney General and the President were in frequent telephone contact, and the Attorney General and his assistants also continued telephoning white and Negro leaders in the North and South pleading with them not to inflame the explosive situation in Alabama. In the meantime Robert Kennedy had alerted twenty U.S. Marshals in Washington to be ready to move at a moment's notice. The Attorney General had been trying for two days to reach Governor Patterson but was unsuccessful as was President Kennedy on Friday, May 19th, when he attempted to contact the Alabama Governor. Later that day the Governor, through an intermediary, notified Washington that he was willing to discuss the situation with a representative of the President so President Kennedy chose John Seigenthaler who was already in Alabama. Governor Patterson was irate at the projected federal intervention and asserted there was no need, that "We have the manpower, the equipment, the will and desire to protect all the people in Alabama—whether residents or visitors. . . . We intend to give this protection on the highways and elsewhere." 38

On this basis Robert Kennedy agreed not to send Federal marshals to Alabama. Patterson promised to provide full protection for the bus ride from Birmingham to the capital Montgomery, the following morning (Saturday, May 20th). The Governor kept his word. However, when the bus arrived at
the Montgomery bus depot the situation changed. William Orrick, head of the Civil Division of the Justice Department at that time, was an eyewitness to what happened. He said:

At the Montgomery bus depot a mob—which could have been readily controlled by proper police work—rioted and attacked the group of riders, beating them with pipes, sticks, clubs, and their fists. At least four out-of-town reporters and photographers were beaten and an ambulance which arrived on the scene was chased away. People with no apparent connection to the trip were beaten, a boy's leg was broken and another boy had inflammable liquid poured over him and set on fire. Mr. Seigenthaler, who attempted to help a girl escape from the mob, was struck from behind and lay on the sidewalk for 25 minutes before police took him to a hospital. Police Commissioner Sullivan, when asked why an ambulance was not called for Mr. Seigenthaler, stated that "every white ambulance in town reports their vehicles have broken down."

A sheriff's posse of deputies assigned to control riots did not arrive on the scene until an hour and 15 minutes after the first wave of violence, thereafter 10 more police cars arrived to restore order.33

That same day (May 20th) President Kennedy issued a public statement placing the Attorney General in full command of the Alabama crisis. In his statement the President called on all to meet their responsibilities and asserted that the federal government would do whatever was necessary to return law and order to Alabama. Robert Kennedy proceeded to implement the necessary steps as follows: He ordered Federal officers40 into Montgomery immediately under the direction of Deputy Attorney General Byron White (now a Supreme Court
Justice); he notified Governor Patterson by wire of his decision recounting all the efforts the Government had made in the past week to get Patterson to protect the Freedom Riders and reminded the Governor that he (Kennedy) had been unable to make telephone contact with him that afternoon; he directed the FBI to send in an extra team to help investigate all the events in Montgomery the past week; and he obtained an injunction from a Federal District Judge in Montgomery prohibiting groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, the National States Rights Party as well as individuals from "interfering with peaceful interstate travel by buses."

In his Washington office Robert Kennedy continued to utilize the telephone "as a chain smoker uses cigarettes—talking with the President, with White, with Negro leaders, with Southerners, with others in the Government." He remained at his command post until the early morning hours when the situation appeared to be under control and then he went home.

On Sunday, May 21, 1961, word was received that Dr. Martin Luther King and his group were enroute to Montgomery. Although Robert Kennedy had been in contact with King since the tension began, he had been unsuccessful in his attempts to persuade Dr. King to stay out of the state. Tension mounted as Dr. King and the Freedom Riders gathered at the First Baptist Church. Outside, an angry mob began to
threaten the lives of those inside the church. Had it not been for the 150 Federal marshals there, the irate mob would have massacred King and the others or else incinerated them, for the mob was bent on burning down the church with the Freedom Riders inside. During the long, tense night Robert Kennedy was in telephone contact with King in the church as well as with Alabama officials in the city. Governor Patterson had called out the Alabama National Guard but was still incensed with Kennedy for sending marshals into his state. He claimed that the Guard could protect everyone except King, but Kennedy refused to accept this, whereupon Patterson reluctantly agreed that King could also be protected. A few minutes later, Dr. King called Kennedy, who impishly greeted the minister with: "Well, Reverend, are you praying for us?" The Reverend was not amused. He had just been informed that the Alabama National Guard was replacing the marshals protecting them. Dr. King accused the Attorney General of abandoning the blacks to the Alabama National Guard. In an angry voice he said: "My people are concerned for their personal safety. . . . They're frightened about what will happen to them tonight. You shouldn't have withdrawn the marshals. Patterson's National Guard won't protect us." Kennedy reassured King that he had talked with both Floyd Mann and General Graham and that he had full confidence in them. He told Dr. King that they would be kept in the church only as long as their safety required it and then the
Guard would escort them to their homes. Dr. King refused to believe it and complained bitterly that he had been betrayed. In a calm, even tone, Robert Kennedy replied: "Now, Reverend, . . . don't tell me that. You know just as well as I do that if it hadn't been for the United States marshals you'd be as dead as Kelsey's nuts right now!" After a brief pause Dr. King said "all right." A short time later Governor Patterson called and accused Kennedy of sending the Freedom Riders to Alabama and blamed him for the violence. In the same even tone of voice he had used with Dr. King, the Attorney General replied: "Now, John, . . . you can say that on television. You can tell that to the people of Alabama, John, but don't tell me that. Don't tell me that, John." Governor Patterson then "shouted that the presence of the marshals had created a 'very serious political situation. You're destroying us politically,' he said shrilly." Robert Kennedy answered: "John, . . . it's more important that these people in the church survive physically than for us to survive politically." When calm returned to the beleaguered city with a few days, the Freedom Riders were escorted to Jackson, Mississippi, where they were arrested. This was what Robert Kennedy had wanted—to get the problem into court. On May 29, 1961, he petitioned the ICC (Interstate Commerce Commission) to issue regulations requiring desegregation of all facilities in
terminals used in interstate bus travel. On September 22, 1961, the Commission issued such orders. The Justice Department filed suit against the few cities that pleaded local laws as an excuse for non-compliance, and, at the same time, proceeded against segregation at airports and railroad stations. By the end of the year travel facilities were integrated throughout the South.

In this crisis Robert Kennedy exhibited excellent judgment, never becoming emotionally involved and never losing his temper during delicate negotiations, but not backing away from his responsibilities as the chief law official of the country. In a speech that he gave at the University of Alabama Law School on May 6, 1961, just two days after the Freedom Riders began their journey, he clearly spelled out the procedures the Administration would follow in civil rights cases. Therefore, it may be worthwhile to examine briefly this occasion.

This occasion in Athens, Georgia represented the first time that a high-ranking federal official had delivered a major civil rights address in the Deep South; it was Robert Kennedy's first major address since he took office; and, finally, it was characteristic of Kennedy's public style in that whenever he had something controversial to say, he addressed his remarks to the people most directly affected. Edwin Cuthman reports that when they were enroute from the Athens airport to the university a member of the welcoming
committee (a small group) asked Kennedy why he had decided to speak on civil rights. Kennedy's reply was: "It would have been hypocritical of me to come here and not do so." Likewise, "it would have been hypocritical" for Robert Kennedy to have avoided discussing apartheid in South Africa.

Before an audience of approximately 1,800 which included Charlayne Hunter, the only Negro in attendance, Attorney General Kennedy articulated a significant element of the Administration's approach to the enforcement of civil rights laws.

We are trying to achieve amicable, voluntary solutions without going to court. These discussions have ranged from voting and school cases to incidents of arrest which might lead to violence.

We have sought to be helpful to avert violence and to get voluntary compliance. When our investigations indicate there has been a violation of law, we have asked responsible officials to take steps themselves to correct the situation. In some instances this has happened. When it has not, we have had to take legal action.

Kennedy's views on the necessity of avoiding violence found expression in the following:

We, the American people, must avoid another Little Rock or another New Orleans. We cannot afford them. It is not only that such incidents do incalculable harm to the children involved and to the relations among people, it is not only that such convulsions seriously undermine respect for law and order, and cause serious economic and moral damage. Such incidents hurt our country in the eyes of the world. We just can't afford another Little Rock or New Orleans.
His clear statement that the Government would enforce the civil rights statutes left no room for doubt as to the policy of the Administration.

Enforcement of civil rights statutes entailed instigating court cases involving violations of voting rights in the South; sending federal marshals to Montgomery, Alabama in 1961, to Oxford, Mississippi in 1962 and to the University of Alabama in 1963; federalizing the Mississippi National Guard in 1962 in order to protect James Meredith when violence erupted on the campus of the University of Mississippi; and assuring that the University of Alabama was integrated, to mention only a few of the official actions taken.

Robert Kennedy's actions, both official and unofficial, on behalf of human rights, placed him at the vortex of controversy. The Deep South, which had overwhelmingly supported the candidacy of John Kennedy, grew to detest this Attorney General. They could not forgive Robert Kennedy because he not only preached equality but, in his daily life, he practiced it. He believed that "all men are equal under the law" and set about to try and help make this a reality for all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed. Robert Kennedy's commitment may best be summed up in his own words. At the University of Georgia on May 6, 1961, the Attorney General proclaimed:
The road ahead is full of difficulties and discomforts. But as for me, I welcome the challenge, I welcome the opportunity, and I pledge my best effort—all I have in material things and physical strength and spirit to see that freedom shall advance and that our children will grow old under the rule of law.51

The importance of the rule of law to Robert Kennedy and the avoidance of its counterpart, violence, formed a thread woven throughout his life. "We cannot excuse violence from any source or from any group. . . . But our responsibility as a nation is most plain. We must remove the injustices."52 In many ways, both small and large, as a government official and as a private citizen, Robert Kennedy sought to help remove the injustices. What many consider to be a hallmark of his Attorney Generalship was the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which was formulated in the spring of 1963 largely on his initiative.

Robert Kennedy's experiences in the capacity of emissary for his brother also helped to mold the communicator who traveled to South Africa. In the summer of 1961 he and his wife were President Kennedy's official representatives at the first anniversary celebration of the independence of Ivory Coast Republic. Then, in February of 1962 the Attorney General and his wife embarked on a global tour visiting Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, Indonesia, Vietnam, Tailand, India, Pakistan, Italy, West Germany, the Netherlands, and France. President Kennedy explained that a major
reason for sending his brother abroad "was to have Robert Kennedy, himself young and vigorous, talk to students who hate the United States largely because they misunderstand it." Robert Kennedy's book is an account of this world-wide trip and includes his exchanges with people in the lands visited. According to Robert Kennedy, in every place they went the question of racial rights in the United States invariably was raised. The book concludes with reflections by Attorney General Kennedy on what understanding he gained from the trip both about the other countries and his own. Of particular interest for this writer was the chapter "A Student Exchange" which deals with Kennedy's appearances at the Japanese universities of Nihon and Waseda.

When President Kennedy was killed in Dallas, Robert Kennedy's world turned upside down. It was shortly after this that Robert Kennedy began to read poetry and to memorize long passages which he often quoted in speeches and in conversations. Finally, he began to emerge from the shadows of grief and to consider what he would do with his life. In an interview with Benjamin Bradlee, Kennedy expressed his main desire as follows:

I'd like to harness all the energy and effort and incentive and imagination that was attracted to Government by President Kennedy. I don't want any of that to die. It's important that the striving for excellence continue, that there be an end to mediocrity. The torch really has passed to a new generation. People are still looking for all that idealism. It's
permeated young people all over the globe.
And I became sort of a symbol, not just as an individual. If I could figure out some course for me that would keep all that alive and utilize it for the country, that's what I'd do.56

The course Kennedy chose to follow was to seek a seat in the United States Senate as Senator from New York. It is interesting to note that, unlike his brothers John and Ted who ran for elective office when they were in their twenties, Robert Kennedy made his first try for an elected position when he was thirty-eight years old. Robert Kennedy was sworn in as a member of the United States Senate on January 3, 1965. William Shannon reports that shortly thereafter two reporters asked him "how he felt now that he was a member of the U.S. Senate. His eyes sorrowful and his face bleak, Kennedy looked like a man who had just lost an election rather than won one. 'I regret the circumstance that led to my being here,' he replied."57

Unlike any other freshman Senator, Kennedy was already a world figure and was accorded deference in recognition of this standing. When a Senator was questioned about this deferential treatment he claimed that he would treat any future president the same way. Senator Kennedy chafed at the routine dullness of the Senate and sought escape in fact-finding missions, and in appearances before groups throughout the country.
His favorite forum was a college audience and he especially enjoyed the give-and-take sessions of question and answer. Guthman asserts:

The harder the questions were, the better he liked it. When the questions were soft, monosyllabic answers would betray his boredom. One of the reasons he liked to speak at colleges was because students usually asked tougher questions than adults. When the questions were difficult, his face would become animated and his answers spirited and detailed.58

The question and answer sessions at Stellenbosch and Natal universities as recorded in the Appendix certainly tend to support this last comment concerning spirited and detailed answers.

As a United States Senator, Robert Kennedy's molding process continued. His talks and experiences with students, children, the disenchanted, the disheartened, the dispossessed, the minorities, as well as the more fortunate, helped to reinforce his identification with the underdogs of society. Jack Newfield maintains that

Kennedy had the almost literary ability to put himself inside other people, to see the world through the eyes of its casualties. A friend once said, "I think Bobby knows precisely what it feels like to be a very old woman."59

In discussing Robert Kennedy's qualities, Theodore White mentioned the "ruthlessness" label and his "exuberance."

White continued:
Missing in this appreciation of Robert Kennedy were several other qualities of personality that had surfaced first in the administration and then later, in Robert Kennedy's years of displacement from power. They were his sheer, stunning executive ability; his intuitive sense of the use and nature of American power; and his sense of personal identification, unique among American politicians, with the victims and casualties of American society.60

In 1965 Arthur Schlesinger described Robert Kennedy as follows:

He was emotionally more intense than his older brother, but he had all of John Kennedy's laconic candor and increasing shares of his objectivity and his deadpan, throwaway wit. Indeed, as one came to know him better, what seemed most characteristic were his gentleness, consideration, sobriety, idealism, and if the word had not been hopelessly degraded by political oratory, compassion.51

Robert Kennedy's emotionalism made him more sensitive to actual experience. His walks through the ghettos, his visits to the Mississippi Delta, the American Indian Reservations, and Latin America all combined to make him "feel the question of poverty so personally and deeply. For Robert Kennedy, the sight of one hungry black child in Greenwood, Mississippi, had a greater impact than a million words or statistics."62

And yet, Robert Kennedy could be rude, curt, and short-tempered. The Senator said that the trait he most disliked in himself was "impatience." The traits he most admired in individuals were "courage" and "sensitivity." These traits point up the paradox of Robert Kennedy and suggest why it is
so difficult to categorize this man. He was not merely a complex individual, he was contradictory. Perhaps that is why the public image of Robert Kennedy was perceived so differently by admirers and detesters.

Although Robert Kennedy's public image may have been viewed oppositely, his beliefs concerning the individual and his society were clearly expressed as follows:

I believe that, as long as there is plenty, poverty is evil. Government belongs wherever evil needs an adversary and there are people in distress who cannot help themselves.

I believe that, as long as the instruments of peace are available, war is madness. Government must be strong wherever madness threatens the peace.

I believe that, as long as most men are honest, corruption is twice vicious. It hurts men and it undermines their fundamental rights. We must be doubly wary, with private and public vigilance.

I believe that, as long as a single man may try, any unjustifiable barrier against his efforts is a barrier against mankind. A government that can destroy such a barrier without erecting any others in the process is a good force. A government too weak for that is not only a waste but an evil because it holds out for false hope.

Perhaps the following quotation may explain Robert Kennedy's vision of reality

To say that the future will be different from the present and past may be hopelessly self-evident. I must observe regretfully, however, that in politics it can be heresy. It can be denounced as radicalism or branded as subversion. There are people in every time and every land who want to stop history in its tracks. They fear the future, mistrust the present and invoke the security of a comfortable past which, in fact, never existed. It
hardly seems necessary to point out in the United States, of all places, that change, although it involves risks, is the law of life.64

Kennedy was an advocate of change. His favorite George Bernard Shaw quotation, "Some men see things as they are and say: why; I dream things that never were and say: why not" illustrates this.

Conclusion

Robert Kennedy's family relationships were instrumental in shaping the communicator who traveled to South Africa in June of 1966. From both parents he derived his highly developed competitive drive, his will to win, and his deep religious beliefs. Both parents helped to instill in him a dedication to country and family as well as a sense of obligation to participate in public service. His academic accomplishments were not outstanding although they did not accurately reflect his intellectual capabilities as was demonstrated later. Kennedy's experiences in public life as a Senate investigator, campaign manager for his brother, Attorney General and United States Senator all worked to help educate him and to reinforce certain character traits. One of his less admirable traits was his rudeness. One of his more admirable traits was his commitment to right injustices. Robert Kennedy's public image was seen in contrasts. Some saw him as a ruthless opportunist. By others he was viewed
as a man of extraordinary executive ability and candor who was compassionate, witty, gentle, idealistic, competitive, active, and who was closely identified with the young and the dispossessed. This is the man who journeyed to South Africa to deliver the Day of Affirmation Address at Cape Town University.
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CHAPTER IV

DAY OF AFFIRMATION ADDRESS

This chapter will consider Robert Kennedy's speaking at Cape Town University on June 6, 1966. First, we will examine the details of the particular situation; second, we will examine the constraints operating in that situation; and third, we will appraise Kennedy's oratory by the application of Perelman's argumentative strategies.

Situation

The "banning" of Ian Robertson, NUSAS President, only three weeks before Robert Kennedy's scheduled appearance led to demonstrations, midnight vigils waiting to protest to Minister of Justice Vorster his arbitrary decision, counter demonstrations supporting the Government's decision, and apprehension concerning Kennedy's visit. Students at Cape Town, Rhodes, Natal, and Witwatersrand universities marched in force carrying signs such as: "You Can Ban Our Leader But You Can't Ban Our Thoughts," "Release Robertson," and "Arbitrary Ban on Robertson." Other banners carried by students read: "Revoke Ban on Robertson," "Intimidated, We Stand Firm," "What Are Our Law Courts For?" "We Hate Communism and Fascism." 1 When Robert Kennedy arrived at the Johannesburg
airport at midnight of June 4th, he was greeted by more than 3,000 people. Some carried signs which read: "We Love You Kennedy," "The Host Regrets" (reference to Robertson), and "Kennedy Go Home." On June 5th, the New York Senator met with a group of Afrikaans-speaking, pro-apartheid newspaper editors. One member of the group presented Kennedy with a newly published book entitled The Principles of Apartheid. Mr. Kennedy countered by presenting him a copy of The American Negro Reference Book. This set the tone for the whole tour. On June 6th, shortly before he was to deliver his address, he visited Ian Robertson in the latter's small living-bedroom apartment. Mrs. Kennedy could not accompany her husband because that would have constituted a "gathering" which was prohibited under terms of the "ban." (She did visit Mr. Robertson later in the evening.) Earlier that day Senator Kennedy had managed to sandwich in two visits to District Six (reserved for Coloured). One correspondent asserted that the demand for tickets to hear the address "has been phenomenal. Nothing like it has been known before." In the hall where the address was to be given the stage was set. An empty chair placed next to Kennedy's seat bore mute testimony to the Government's repressive measures enacted against the president of the host group. This setting also dramatized some of the constraints imposed upon the speaker.
Constraints

As Lloyd Bitzer has stated (see Chapter I), constraints may be defined as limitations imposed upon the speaker which circumscribe his effectiveness in achieving his rhetorical goals. These constraints may arise from the occasion, the audience, or the orator, himself. The occasion has been briefly described above but the audience to be affected by the speaker needs to be identified. Robert Kennedy's audience for each of the addresses consisted of the immediate audience (Cape Town, Stellenbosch, Natal, or Witwatersrand university), those in South Africa who would hear or read about it, the audience in the United States, and the so-called universal audience. Robert Kennedy's reputation, both favorable and unfavorable, had preceded him, as has already been described in Chapter III.

Robert Kennedy's set of constraints included his obligation to meet the expectations of NUSAS and address himself to the Affirmation of Freedom. He had been invited to deliver this address because of his well known and frequently expressed views on human rights. To ignore this requirement would have been irresponsible. At the same time the situation demanded that the hostility of the Government directed at him and what he stood for be alleviated or at least not exacerbated. He had to be extremely careful in what he said so as not to incite to violence or even hint that violence could be acceptable. Another constraint imposed upon Kennedy
was that he was a foreigner and, as such, it would have been presumptuous of him to try and dictate to South Africa how to run its country. At the same time, he was a representative official of the United States so that whatever he said would not only be construed as his own viewpoint but that of the United States as well. He was certainly aware that anything he said in South Africa would be chronicled in the United States and elsewhere. Therefore, adverse reactions to his demeanor could jeopardize his political future. Thus, Kennedy's handling of the constraints in structuring his Cape Town address to achieve his rhetorical goals provides the critic with useful indices for evaluation. Although a more detailed analysis of Kennedy's rhetorical strategies will be considered later, a brief summary of how he handled constraints may be appropriate here.

First of all, Kennedy never explicitly criticized South Africa alone (although he did so implicitly). He was careful in his criticism to include the United States with South Africa so he avoided any overt unfavorable comparison. Kennedy emphasized peaceful and non-violent change. He thus presented himself as a reasonable and reasoning man rather than the wide-eyed radical the Government depicted him as being. Realizing that his ideas would be seen as representing not only his personal viewpoint, but that of his country as well, he carefully avoided any implication that the United States sought to dictate solutions to South Africa's
problems or even that it had solutions. Rather, the United States recognized that different countries had different obstacles to overcome and the solutions for one could not be transported nor transplanted to another country. At the same time, Kennedy was careful to emphasize that the United States and South Africa had fought together for freedom in three wars this century. Let us now turn to a more detailed examination of Kennedy's speaking by the application of Perelman's methodology.

As has been mentioned before, Perelman asserts that the epideictic orator is effective only when his message intensifies the adherence of his auditors' minds to their commonly shared values. In order to determine how Kennedy intensified these commonly shared values it becomes necessary to identify these values. What were the values Kennedy chose to focus upon? What argumentative techniques did he utilize to enhance the intensity of adherence to these values?

Values Kennedy Focused on in Cape Town

In meeting his responsibility to address himself to the Affirmation of Freedom, Kennedy chose to focus upon those values embodied in the Constitution of the United States (and especially in its Bill of Rights) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The first two Articles of the last-mentioned document adopted in 1948 read as follows:
All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Other Articles pertinent to this study deal with education, science and culture and information.  

Robert Kennedy articulated these values in his thematic statement as follows:

This is a Day of Affirmation—a celebration of liberty. We stand here in the name of freedom. At the heart of that western freedom and democracy is the belief that the individual man, the child of God, is the touchstone of value, and all society, all groups, and state, exist for that person's benefit. Therefore the enlargement of liberty for individual human beings must be the supreme goal and the abiding practice of any western society.

As has been pointed out previously, one's hierarchy of values is even more significant than the values in and of themselves. Therefore, Robert Kennedy's hierarchy as revealed in this speech becomes singularly significant because it provides the framework for evaluation of Kennedy's efficacy. According to Kennedy, the capstone of value is the individual. The value of a society rests in its ability to assist each individual to reach his potential. In the hierarchy, instrumental values serve as means which enable the society to meet its responsibilities to its individual
members. These instrumental values include freedom of speech and its counterpart, the power to be heard; the right to participate in government; the right to worship without governmental interference; the privacy of the home; the right to recall governments to their responsibilities; no governmental infliction of punishment upon individuals without lawful process; and the right of every individual to advance his welfare by any instrument available to him, e.g. his right to an education and to select freely his vocation. This, then, represents Robert Kennedy's hierarchy of values. It is the critic's task, therefore, to determine how effective the speaker was in getting his audience to accept this hierarchy. What means did Kennedy use to achieve his rhetorical goals?

Although the writer realizes that, while in actuality, various means of effecting persuasion cannot be separated, for the purpose of analysis, an arbitrary separation will be made. This analysis will thus be divided into persuasion through personality and persuasion by means of associative and dissociative schemes followed by the interaction of arguments and how their strengths or weaknesses may be assessed in determining the speaker's effectiveness. For this analysis only, a section on the speaker's style will also be included.
Persuasion through Personality

Perelman maintains that the epideictic speaker "must have qualifications for speaking on his subject and must also be skillful in its presentation . . . and if it is necessary that he should enjoy a certain prestige before he speaks, it is to enable him, through his own authority, to promote the values that he is upholding." Another way of expressing Perelman's concept of the epideictic speaker is to say that the "image" or "ethos" of Kennedy is revealed in his speech. What impression does Robert Kennedy, by means of his words, give of himself? First of all, Senator Kennedy demonstrates that he is knowledgeable about his topic. He is qualified to talk about the rightful role of the individual in society. His authority is exhibited in references to personal experiences, to world conditions, history, and to other authorities. For example, Kennedy relies on his own authority by using the personal pronoun I thirty-two times in this speech. In terms of personal experiences, he selects the example of discrimination against his father (because he was an Irish-Catholic) to demonstrate that he has personal knowledge about this evil. His statement "[A]s I have said in Latin America and in Asia, and in Europe and in my own country--the United States--it is the young people who must take the lead" demonstrates that the speaker has traveled throughout the world and may be considered to be an authority because of his own experiences. His knowledge
of world affairs and history are displayed throughout his speech and may be illustrated in the following quotation:

There is discrimination in New York, and racial inequality of apartheid in South Africa and serfdom in the mountains of Peru. People starve to death in the streets of India; a former Prime Minister is summarily executed in the Congo; intellectuals go to jail in Russia; and thousands are slaughtered in Indonesia; wealth is lavished on armaments everywhere in the world.

In view of the fact that a man often reveals himself through the choices of authorities he invokes, Robert Kennedy's choices may shed light on the man. Those authorities that Kennedy cites exemplify those values he espouses, that is, that the individual man is the touchstone of value. He invokes absolute authority—God—and by describing the individual man as a child of God he seeks to intensify this belief in the minds of his audience and thereby enhance his own ethos. Other authorities he cites include the Constitution of the United States, broad traditions of the West, and individuals such as President Kennedy, Ian Robertson, Martin Luther King, Thomas Jefferson, and the ancient Greeks: Archimedes, Pericles, and Aristotle. The one individual that Kennedy cites most frequently is his late brother, President John Kennedy. In fact, Kennedy's peroration concludes with a quotation from John Kennedy's Inaugural Address. The following quotation illustrates how Robert Kennedy drew upon his family relationship to inspire.
But if there was one thing that President Kennedy stood for that touched the most profound feelings of young people around the world, it was the belief that idealism, high aspirations and deep convictions are not incompatible with the most practical and efficient of programs—that there is no basic inconsistency between ideals and realistic possibilities... .

Kennedy's ability to establish and maintain rapport with his audience as a means of reinforcing his arguments is exhibited by his expertise in drawing upon commonalities, his expressed commitment to the worth of the individual, and his tact or diplomacy. Referring to his opening paragraph one finds an excellent example of Kennedy's use of commonalities to achieve his desired goal.

Mr. Chancellor, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, Professor Robertson, Mr. Diamond, Mr. Daniel, and ladies and gentlemen: I come here this evening because of my deep interest and affection for a land settled by the Dutch in the mid-seventeenth century, then taken over by the British, and at last independent; a land in which the native inhabitants were at first subdued but relations with whom remain a problem to this day; a land which defined itself on a hostile frontier; a land which has tamed rich natural resources through the energetic application of modern technology; a land which was once the importer of slaves, and now must struggle to wipe out the last traces of that former bondage. I refer, of course, to the United States of America.

This first paragraph is revealing in several ways. Custom suggests that, in an epideictic speech in particular, reference to that particular audience be the first order of business. Hence Kennedy's opening statement "I come here because of my deep interest and affection for a land . . ." would
traditionally be expected to relate to South Africa. He is adapting to his Cape Town audience in that his description of this land applies to South Africa. His audience in the United States would also expect his remarks to be directed to that Cape Town audience but would draw parallels between South Africa and the United States. The jolt of expectation or what could be called the "shock of recognition" serves several functions. It illustrates a common bond of problems or "exigencies" to be met. In other words, it establishes a commonality. It permits Kennedy to enhance his ethos through his recognition that the United States has not solved her problems and that as a representative of that government he has not fully met his responsibilities. He is saying that the United States and South Africa have many faults and thereby implying that the situation calls for a discourse of a rhetorical nature. The "shock of recognition" technique enhances his ethos by depicting him as a man who recognizes and articulates nuances. But, more importantly, this technique serves as a forewarning or guide to his audience. Do not be taken in by surface reality, by the obvious. Look beneath the surface, draw implications from what I say. Make analogies.

This ability to establish rapport through commonalities, exemplified throughout the speech, is seen also in his reference to young people. He redefines youth in order to point up the shared views of men of all nations.
This world demands the qualities of youth; not a time of life but a state of mind, a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a predominance of courage over the life of ease, a man like the Chancellor of this University.

This device of extending the meaning of youth reinforces his appeal to higher values of mankind and enlarges the audience appeal. Here again, he shows that the youth of South Africa are no different from the youth of the United States or, for that matter, of any nation. "Yet as I talk to young people around the world I am impressed not by the diversity but by the closeness of their goals, their desires and their concerns and their hopes for the future."

Another means of establishing rapport is his emphasis upon the worth of the individual. This is revealed in his discussion of inequities and discrimination against those of a different religion or color or race. Specific examples of this are cited in paragraphs 12-18 in which he refers to discrimination in America against Catholics, the Irish, Polish, Italians and especially against Negro-Americans. To support his contention that the individual is worthwhile and that one man or woman can make a difference he employs historical examples.

... many of the world's great movements, of thought and action, have flowed from the work of a single man. A young monk began the Protestant reformation, a young general extended an empire from Macedonia to the borders of the earth and a young woman reclaimed the territory of France. It was a young Italian explorer who discovered the New World, and 32 year old Thomas Jefferson who proclaimed that all men are
created equal. "Give me a place to stand," said Archimedes, "and I will move the world."
These men moved the world, and so can we all.

Kennedy encapsulates his concept of individual worth when he asserts:

Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.

Tact and diplomacy, essential for persuasion, are evidenced in this speech. In his definition of the elements of a western democracy and in his description of the situation in the United States he does not explicitly exclude South Africa. However, his audience, he knows, will draw comparisons. For example, note how by the affirmation of these western values he subtly chastizes the South Africans (or Americans) for their denials of these values. Kennedy emphasizes the responsibility of governments to answer to all its people—to heed—to listen—to respond. What about the eighty per cent of South Africans who have no voice in their government? What about the many American young who protest in vain the war in Viet Nam? By specifically excluding all except those of wealth he subtly reminds his audience of the wide and tragic gaps in affecting governmental decisions between those of affluence and the majority who lack it. Exclusion of all but those of a particular religion refers to the Dutch Reformed Afrikaners specifically. Exclusion of all except
those of a particular race applies to the preferential positions occupied by the whites in South Africa or in the United States. In insisting that even in governments by the consent of the governed there must be limitations upon its powers to act against its citizens, Kennedy reminds his audience of the consequences of unbridled governmental power. In South Africa "interference with the security of the home" is common practice. "Arbitrary imposition of pains or penalties on an ordinary citizen by officials high or low" holds particular significance for this audience. There is the empty chair on the stage where Ian Robertson should be sitting. "Restriction on the freedom of men to seek education or to seek work or opportunity of any kind" calls to mind the practices of apartheid in South Africa and of discrimination against minority groups in the United States. In pointing out the accomplishments the United States has made in combatting injustices, Kennedy underscores South Africa's lack of progress. "We have passed laws prohibiting discrimination in education, in employment, in housing"--South Africa has passed laws promoting discrimination in education, in housing, and in employment. "... [A]ll of the panoply of government power has been committed to the goal of equality before the law--as we are now committing ourselves to the achievement of equal opportunity in fact." South Africa's panoply of government power has been committed to the goal of enforcing its inequitable apartheid racial policies.
Kennedy's comment that "we do not believe that any people—whether majority or minority, or individual human beings—are 'expendable' in the cause of theory or of policy" may be construed as a diplomatic way of attacking South Africa's theory of separate development of the races and her apartheid and anti-communism policies. This comment may also be viewed as a reassertion of his value hierarchy in which the individual forms the apex.

From the above discussion (persuasion through personality) it could be said that in this speech Robert Kennedy is perceived to be a man of intelligence, good moral character, and goodwill toward his hearers. This image helps to intensify the adherence of minds to those values he articulates by reinforcing his argumentative strategies. These argumentative techniques of associative and dissociative schemes will be considered next.

**Associative and Dissociative Argumentative Techniques**

As Perelman has observed, associative and dissociative argumentative strategies do not appear alone. Rather each is the counterpart of the other. Associative schemes include; dissociative schemes exclude. To illustrate: Robert Kennedy's definition of "youth" as discussed in the previous section utilizes both associative and dissociative techniques. Argument by definition is a quasi-logical strategy belonging to the associative scheme. At the same time, it is a
dissociative argumentative strategy because it defines in terms of what it is not as well as what it is. Normally, one would consider an essential element of youth to be chronological, a time of life. Kennedy denies the existence of this connecting link. He dissociates and thereby changes the structural association.

The following quotation provides an apt illustration of the associative-dissociative relationship.

I am unalterably opposed to communism because it exalts the state over the individual and over the family and because the system contains a lack of freedom of speech, of protest, of religion and of the press, which is characteristic of a totalitarian regime. The way of opposition to communism however, is not to imitate its dictatorship, but to enlarge individual freedom. There are those in every land who would label as "communist" every threat to their privilege. But, may I say to you, . . . reform is not communism, and the denial of freedom, in whatever name, only strengthens the very communism it claims to oppose.

In the above, Kennedy maintains that communism is merely the other face of fascism. Both are dictatorships however they are labeled. They are the antithesis of democracy because they exalt the state over the individual; they deny those freedoms which he has previously defined as the constituents of western democracy. Kennedy warns his audience not to mis-label reform as communism. He specifically dissociates reform and communism while "denial of freedom in whatever name" utilizes an associative technique. Kennedy's discussion of communism/anti-communism merits careful scrutiny.
He had been characterized in Afrikaner newspapers as "far-left-liberal" which, in South African terms, is equivalent to "communist." Hence, he takes special pains to identify himself as a reformer and as being "unalterably opposed to communism." At the same time, he constructs his argument in such a way that the audience will infer that the South African government by their apartheid policies and their anti-communism policies actually strengthen the communism they claim to oppose while subtly implying that his audience wears the reform label.

In paragraphs 32, 34, 36, and 37, the dissociative strategy followed by an associative one is utilized. These are the four dangers of futility, expediency, timidity, and comfort. For example, in each of the above there is a reversal of the philosophical pairs. In the argument concerning futility many (or most) people think that the state is bigger than the individual so that it is futile to try to have an impact upon it. Kennedy breaks the connecting link and reverses the philosophical pair by argument from example (from specific to general) which is an associative scheme based on the structure of reality standard. The reversal is \[ \frac{\text{individual}^2}{\text{state}^1} \] to \[ \frac{\text{state}^2}{\text{individual}^1} \]. In this argument it could also be said that he argues from direction when he asserts: "These men moved the world, and so can we all." Direction is an associative scheme of sequential relations based on
the structure of reality standard. To support his claim that the individual can prevail over the state, he resorts to the quasi-logical strategy (associative) of argument by sacrifice when he quotes Pericles:

"If Athens shall appear great to you," said Pericles, "consider then that her glories were purchased by valient men, and by men who learned their duty." That is the source of all greatness in all societies, and it is the key to progress in our time.

In the argument concerning expediency, being practical is equated with being realistic. Kennedy concedes that we have to deal with the world as it is but he denies there exists any incompatibility between realism and idealism. Reversal of the philosophical pair in this case would be:

idealism $^2$ to efficiency$^2$. He is using the quasi-logical argument of compatibility (an associative technique) when he asserts that "there is no basic inconsistency between ideals and realistic possibilities--no separation between the deepest desires of heart and of mind and the rational application of human effort to human problems." He dissociates when he maintains: "It is not realistic or hard-headed to solve the problems and take action unguided by ultimate moral aims and values." "It is thoughtless folly" utilizes the quasi-logical strategy of ridicule while "it ignores the realities of human faith and of passion and of belief; forces ultimately more powerful than all of the calculations of our economists or of
our generals" is dissociative in that an essential element of realism is omitted. Cause and effect of sequential relations based on the structure of reality standard is the argument set forth in the assertion "we also know that only those who dare to fail greatly, can ever achieve greatly."

The danger of timidity argument exemplifies the act and essence technique in which the essence of moral courage characterizes the reformer. This is a technique of argumentation which is based on the relations of co-existence and belongs to the structure of reality associative scheme. "Few men are willing to brave the disapproval of their fellows, the censure of their colleagues, the wrath of their society. Moral courage is a rarer commodity than bravery in battle or great intelligence" illustrates the dissociation of the few from the many and separates moral courage as a more precious quality than bravery or intelligence. Aristotle's quotation is an example of the use of analogy and "I believe that in this generation those with the courage to enter the conflict will find themselves with companions in every corner of the world" is an associative scheme.

When Kennedy admonishes his audience to be wary of the danger of comfort, "the temptation to follow the easy and familiar paths of personal ambition and financial success so grandly spread before those who have the privilege of an education," he dissociates by invoking history as authority. The reversal of the philosophical pair in this case is to:
take care of yourself first\textsuperscript{2}.
\begin{flushleft}
take care of your brother\textsuperscript{1}
\end{flushleft}

The following quotation exhibits the associative technique following dissociation.

Like it or not we live in interesting times. They are times of danger and uncertainty; but they are also the most creative of anytime in the history of mankind. And everyone here will ultimately be judged—will ultimately judge himself—on the effort he has contributed to building a new world society and the extent to which his ideals and goals have shaped that effort.

Other examples of associative-dissociative strategies could be cited. One of these is the reference to Dr. Martin Luther King as "the second man of African descent [in the United States] to win the Nobel Peace Prize for his non-violent efforts for social justice between all of the races." This reference is associative from the standpoint that this audience would be reminded that they (NUSAS) had invited this noted American to address their group; and it is dissociative in that they would also remember that Prime Minister Verwoerd had refused to grant a visa so that Dr. King could enter the country. The reference to one of African descent being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize would evoke the connection between Dr. King and Chief Albert Luthuli who had also been a recipient of this coveted award. At the same time, they would remember that Minister of Justice Vorster, in the name of the government, had placed Chief Luthuli under "ban" under the Suppression of Communism Act. The association scheme
involved here belongs to the model-anti-model structure of reality technique in which the model is one who has won international recognition for his nonviolent services in the name of peace.

Another example of the associative-dissociative technique may be illustrated in the following:

We must recognize the full human equality of all our people—before God, before the law, and in the councils of government. We must do this, not because it is economically advantageous—although it is; not because the laws of God command it—although they do; not because people in other lands wish it so. We must do it for the single and fundamental reason that it is the right thing to do.

Kennedy's call for equality utilizes the rule of justice argument which is a quasi-logical associative strategy. (This argument is used extensively throughout the speech.) Kennedy's claim that it is economically advantageous dissociates the apartheid practice of job reservations; "the laws of God command it" assertion is denied by the Afrikaner Dutch Reformed Church principles (see Chapter II); and the implication that "people in other lands wish it so" is countered by the assertion of the Nationalists that what they do is no one else's business. Therefore, South African apartheid advocates would reject the conclusion "that it is the right thing to do." Thus did Robert Kennedy through associative and dissociative argumentative strategies seek to achieve his goal.
Interaction of Arguments

Although this separation into persuasion through personality and associate-dissociative schemes of argumentation was an arbitrary choice, as the analysis reveals, these modes interact with one another. Each adds strength to the other. In addition, the order in which the arguments are arranged determines how effectively a speaker conditions his audience to accept his hierarchy of values. Perelman asserts that "order ensures that particular premises are given sufficient presence for them to serve as starting points of reflection." He continues: "Some arguments can only be understood and accepted if other arguments have already been stated." Consequently, Kennedy's speech arrangement merits some attention. Let us now turn to the speech order to determine Kennedy's effectiveness in achieving his goals.

In his brief introduction (paragraphs 1-3) Kennedy acknowledges the commonalities between South Africa and his country and identifies the National Union of South African Students with men of good will throughout the world. The body of the speech is divided into four sections. In the first section (paragraphs 4-11) he defines freedom, establishes a hierarchy of values to be presented to the conscious and delineates its constituent elements. In section two (paragraphs 12-22) he stresses the difficulties to be encountered in attempting to achieve liberty and freedom for all the people. In the third section (paragraphs 23-30) Kennedy
emphasizes the interdependence of societies on this planet and, after carefully defining "youth," maintains that only the "young," by virtue of their idealistic, international orientation, can fully understand this new world. Thus it is their job to build this better world. In the fourth and final section (paragraphs 31-37) Kennedy outlines the dangers or obstacles (exigencies) to be overcome in establishing the just society. He also provides some suggestions for helping to reach this goal. Kennedy concludes (paragraphs 38-40) with a call for moral action.

For this particular audience this structural arrangement appears to be especially effective. His identification with his audience serves to enhance their opinions of themselves and thereby helps to intensify their agreement with his value structure. At the same time, this recognition of NUSAS as an organization that "has brought credit to yourselves and your country" may be construed to be a covert condemnation of the Verwoerd government. The implication here is that if a leader in the world's heartland of democracy considers this group important enough to travel thousands of miles to visit, then South Africa should also listen to them. In defining his value structure in terms of the principles of democracy and freedom, Kennedy articulates shared values. His definition of "youth" enables him, without fear of contradiction, in his peroration to proclaim: "We are--if a man
of forty can claim the privilege—fellow members of the world's largest younger generation."

Style

One additional aspect of Kennedy's epideictic speaking at Cape Town which needs to be examined is what is commonly referred to as "style." Style will not be treated independently in the other speeches except where specific differences are observed. Perelman asserts that language and figures of speech may be used to promote "choice," i.e., to emphasize one element over another; to promote "presence" or make the object of the discourse present to the mind; and to promote "communion," i.e., to increase or bring about better rapport between the speaker and his audience. (See Chapter I.)

Figures of speech that are used to promote "choice" in this address are oratorical definition and periphrasis. (He does not use antonomasia or anticipation.) Figures used in such a manner as to promote "presence" include repetition and amplification but not onomatopoeia nor imaginary direct speech. Figures relating to "communion" used by Kennedy in this speech include allusion, quotation (not used as authority), and oratorical question but not apostrophe.

An example of oratorical definition used by Kennedy in his Cape Town address would be his definition of western democracy which places individual man as the capstone of value.
Kennedy's contention that "We must recognize the full equality of all our people--before God, before the law and in the councils of government . . ." could be construed as oratorical definition from the standpoint that, although other elements such as the commands of God, its economic feasibility, and the desires of others, are included, the essential element of the recognition of full equality is "right." He also employs oratorical definition to promote "choice" when he defines the weaknesses or sins of man as discrimination, apartheid, slavery, starvation, execution, and slaughter. He identifies these as imperfections of human justice, inadequacies of human compassion, and defectivenesses of sensibilities toward the sufferings of others. His definition of "youth" could also possibly be classed as oratorical. One example of periphrasis (the use of a longer phrasing in place of a possible shorter and plainer expression) is Kennedy's choice of the word "barrister" instead of "lawyer." This word choice is especially appropriate for his audience because South Africans use the British terminology. "[T]he violence of the disinherited, these insulted, the injured, looms over the streets of Harlem and of Watts and of the Southside of Chicago," also illustrates this stylistic device. In the above, Kennedy chooses to refer to Negroes as "the disinherited, these insulted, the injured" and, rather than merely stating that there is violence in the United
States, he chooses the select cities (or rather sections of cities) to illustrate that violence poses a threat throughout the United States, in the east (Harlem), in the midwest (Chicago), and in the west (Watts).

A favorite Kennedy stylistic device used to promote "presence" is repetition. Examples of repetition of phrases or words (anaphora) abound. A few examples are as follows:

"not just to . . . not just to those of . . . not just to those of" . . . ,

"if we . . . deny . . . . If we would lead . . . if we would help . . . if we would meet . . . ."

"a young monk . . . a young general . . . a young woman . . . a young Italian . . . ."

Kennedy also frequently uses repetition of ideas or concepts to promote "presence." One example of this may be found in paragraph 22 where he redefines Western society as "a society strong and flexible enough to meet the demands of all of its people whatever their race and the demands of a world of immense and dizzying change." Amplification is another favorite Kennedy stylistic tool used to promote "presence." Several instances of this use of language to elucidate have been cited in the previous sections of this chapter. Therefore, only one or two examples will be used for illustrative purposes. The first one relates to the role of leadership South Africa could play in building a new world because it is "a preeminent repository of the wealth and the knowledge and the skill of . . . [the African] continent." The second
example is an enumeration of what freedom of speech entails such as "the right to express and communicate ideas, to set oneself apart from the dumb beasts of field and forest . . . ."

Among the figures relating to "communion" used by Kennedy in this speech allusion is the most common. Several examples of allusions to common traditions and shared values have been cited previously in this chapter. Hence, only a few additional illustrations of this stylistic device will be included here. Kennedy alludes to the uniqueness of nations (and men) when he states: "Nations, like men, often march to the beat of different drummers." He alludes to the destiny of men and nations when he asserts, "What is important, however, is that all nations must march toward increasing freedom; toward justice for all . . . ." When Kennedy alludes to the thousands of Peace Corps volunteers or the thousands who resisted the Nazi occupation, he reminds his young audience that no act of courage is without influence. An apt illustration of allusion may also be seen in the following quotation:

It is this new idealism which is . . . the common heritage of a generation which has learned that while efficiency can lead to the camps at Auschwitz, or the streets of Budapest, only the ideals of humanity and love can climb the hills of the Acropolis.

In the above, Kennedy equates Auschwitz with genocide and the atrocities of the Nazis (and perhaps implicitly associates
racism in South Africa with this camp). Budapest is associated with tyranny of the Communists. Both Auschwitz and Budapest represent evil. The allusion to the Acropolis, on the other hand, is the indirect reference to democracy and justice, to that which is good. Quotation (not used as authority) is also employed by Kennedy to promote "communion" in this speech although it is used sparingly. The quotation of the Italian philosopher concerning the difficulty involved in establishing a new order is one example. The other example is the Chinese curse about living in interesting times. The third and final stylistic tool for promoting "communion" utilized by the speaker at Cape Town is the oratorical question. An example of this is found in paragraph 12, where Kennedy asks "... how many men of ability had ... been denied ...? How many sons of Italian or Jewish or Polish parents slumbered ... ? What price will be pay ... ?"

These, then, were the figures of speech that Kennedy utilized in his Cape Town Address to reinforce or embellish his arguments. The most frequently used figure to promote "choice" was oratorical definition; both repetition and amplification to promote "presence" were employed extensively; and the most frequently used figure to promote "communion" was allusion.
Conclusion

Kennedy's epideictic speech, the Day of Affirmation Address, was delivered to students and guests at the University of Cape Town on June 6, 1966. Some of the major constraints imposed upon him in this situation included his obligation to meet the expectations of NUSAS by addressing himself to the affirmation of freedom; his obligation to so conduct himself that he would not engender additional governmental hostility; his obligation as a representative of the United States to present a favorable image of his country; and his obligation to himself to conduct himself in such a way that he did not jeopardize his political future. Kennedy's function as an epideictic orator was to intensify the adherence of his auditors' minds to their commonly shared value system. The values he focused on at Cape Town were those values embodied in the Constitution of the United States and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in which the capstone of value is the individual. One means of effecting persuasion (getting his audience to accept his hierarchy) used by Kennedy in this speech was what was labeled as "persuasion through personality" in which he was perceived to be a man of good moral character, intelligence, and goodwill. Kennedy utilized a variety of associative/dissociative argumentative strategies to help him achieve his goals. For example, he employed quasi-logical argumentative techniques
such as argument by definition, by sacrifice, ridicule, argument of compatibility, and argument by the application of the rule of justice. Associative techniques based on the structure of reality standard used by Kennedy included such as argument from direction, cause and effect, act and essence, model-anti-model, authority, example, and analogy. Examination of his interaction of arguments indicated that Kennedy's speech arrangement appeared to be particularly suitable for this audience. Stylistic devices such as oratorical definition, repetition and amplification, and allusion were utilized as means of reinforcing his arguments and thereby helping him to achieve his rhetorical aims. Conclusions to be drawn from this examination of Kennedy's speaking at Cape Town will be dealt with in the final chapter. In the meantime, let us proceed to Stellenbosch where Kennedy was to address a group of students the following day.


3. "Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children." (Article 26.) Article 19 stipulates that: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." Article 27 states that "Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits. Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary and artistic production of which he is the author." As cited in *Apartheid: Its effects on education, science, culture and information* (Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), 1967.

4. Perelman, p. 52.

5. This quotation not only exemplifies the act/essence strategy but also may be categorized as argumentation by locus of quality which is characteristic of arguments employed by those who seek to change the established order. See: loci in Chapter I.


7. Ibid., p. 494.
CHAPTER V

STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY ADDRESS

This chapter will consider Robert Kennedy's speaking at Simonsberg Residence (dormitory) of Stellenbosch University at noon of June 7, 1966. In this chapter the same procedure of analysis as followed in Chapter IV will be employed. First the particular rhetorical situation will be depicted, then the constraints operating in that situation will be described and, finally, Kennedy's oratory by the application of Perelman's argumentative strategies will be appraised. Kennedy's speaking at Stellenbosch (and Natal) includes a question-and-answer session following the address, so, where appropriate, these sections will be incorporated in the analysis for purposes of evaluation.

Situation

Before proceeding to describe the immediate situation, however, a brief description of Stellenbosch appears to be in order. Stellenbosch University, located at Stellenbosch in the Cape Province (approximately thirty miles from Cape Town), is both the oldest and the largest of the universities in South Africa. All but one of South Africa's Prime Ministers have graduated from this university. As has already
been described in Chapter II, this university restricts its enrollment to students belonging to the White race. A fountainhead of Afrikaner intellectualism, this school provided the setting for Robert Kennedy's second university address.

The luncheon engagement had been arranged by students at the men's residence hall of Simonsberg after the Stellenbosch Students Representative Council had withdrawn its earlier invitation to Senator Kennedy. Earlier in the day (June 7th) Robert Kennedy had held a one hour discussion with Afrikaner students at the home of Anton Rupert, the tobacco magnate. The speaker's own words perhaps best describe the audience's reaction to Kennedy's appearance at the dining hall. In an article describing his South African visit, Kennedy wrote:

Everyone expected a cool, if not hostile, reception. But we were greeted in the dining hall by the rolling sound of thunder—the pounding of soup spoons on tables, the students' customary applause. It was clear that, although many differed with me, they were ready to exchange views.

After the host made a few introductory remarks in which he extended a cordial welcome to the Kennedy entourage and alluded to the fact that Senator Kennedy had reached the White House sooner than he had expected (because Simonsberg Residence was nick-named "White House"), Mrs. Kennedy was presented with a bouquet of South African flowers. The Senator was given a book titled White Africans Are People Too as a memento of the Stellenbosch visit. Senator Kennedy was then
introduced.

From the above it can be seen that Kennedy was operating under a number of constraints in this situation.

**Constraints**

As has been mentioned previously (see Chapters I and IV), constraints are limitations which arise from the occasion, the audience, and the speaker and which circumscribe the orator's effectiveness in achieving his rhetorical goals. The occasion has been briefly described above. The audience to be considered consisted of those auditors in the dining hall at Simonsberg Residence, South Africans and Americans who would read or hear about the speech, and the universal audience. Robert Kennedy's image was already established.

At Stellenbosch Kennedy's constraints included his obligation to his hosts at Simonsberg Residence not to embarrass them by whatever he said. They had incurred the displeasure of the Government by insisting on inviting him to speak after the Student Council had rescinded its invitation. Therefore, Kennedy had to be careful in what he said so as not to place them in an untenable position. He was appearing at Stellenbosch as a spokesman for the United States so that whatever he said would be interpreted as the official policy of the United States. Consequently, he was compelled to present himself as a man of reason and responsibility. Since he was a foreigner, he must take care to avoid giving any
impression that he was attempting to dictate South African policy. As a representative of the United States and, therefore, a foreigner, the way he conducted himself here would reflect upon his image as perceived by the audience in the United States and thus could either enhance or jeopardize his political future. Another constraint imposed upon Kennedy was the Cape Town Address the previous night. That occasion was the reason Robert Kennedy had traveled to South Africa and, consequently, was heralded as a major event. Anything that Kennedy said or advocated at Stellenbosch would be compared with what he had said at Cape Town University. If he failed to buttress the views expressed at Cape Town his credibility would be severely damaged. How Robert Kennedy handled these constraints in order to achieve his rhetorical goals constitute an important part of this analysis and will be considered in detail in the examination of his rhetorical strategies. This particular audience at Stellenbosch, however, imposed the greatest constraint upon the speaker because their views represented the antithesis of what Robert Kennedy believed. Thus, Kennedy's approach in handling this constraint in order to intensify the adherence of minds to commonly shared values (which is the function of epideictic speaking) provides the critic with useful tools in evaluating the effectiveness of the speaker. But before examining the techniques used to handle the constraints, it is necessary to know what values Kennedy chose to focus
upon and the hierarchy of those values.

**Values Kennedy Focused on at Stellenbosch**

In adhering to his own value system as depicted in Chapter III, Kennedy chose to focus upon those same values he had espoused at Cape Town, i.e., those values embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States as well as in the Declaration of Human Rights.

Although he does not articulate these values in a thematic statement as clearly as he had done at Cape Town, he does express them.

*We [United States] reject the theory that human beings exist for the benefit of the state; that the state is more important than the individual or than the family. We reject totally the restrictions on freedom of the press, of protest, of speech, and of religion.*

In the question-and-answer session he becomes more explicit.

*One of the reasons that we are the leader of the free world is . . . , in my judgment, . . . because we have the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, the Constitution of the United States, and the whole concept that everybody is created equal and that people should be treated equally and they should be allowed to develop based on their own ability, not on the color of their skin or their religion or their race. . . . [T]he individual in our society in Western tradition, the individual is what is important.*

Kennedy's value hierarchy places the individual at the apex, and, although the hierarchy is the same as that which was articulated in the Cape Town Address, the strategies he
employs in order to gain audience acceptance of his hierarchy are different at Stellenbosch. A primary reason that they are different is the nature of the audience at Stellenbosch. This audience was willing to provide Robert Kennedy a forum, but how he used that forum would determine to what extent they would accept his hierarchy of values. A major consideration in the evaluation of the merits of his position involves his projected image as perceived by his audience. Hence, Kennedy's image becomes of paramount importance in assessing his rhetorical effectiveness.

What image did Robert Kennedy project at Stellenbosch?

Persuasion through Personality

A major problem that confronts the orator speaking before a hostile audience is how to secure and maintain the goodwill of his audience, how to put them in a receptive frame of mind to listen to his arguments. For the epideictic speaker the problem becomes how to demonstrate that his hierarchy of values is, in actuality, theirs. As has already been described in Chapter IV, a primary means of accomplishing this is through what may be called "persuasion through personality." This, as we have seen, is just another way of stating that the speaker's image is a vital force in determining his effectiveness.

Kennedy seeks to establish and maintain rapport by emphasizing commonalities, by stressing his commitment to the
worth of the individual, and by his tact and diplomacy.

For example, his extensive use of the pronoun we throughout the speech illustrates the association of Robert Kennedy and the United States with the Stellenbosch students and South Africa. The parallels drawn between the two countries in terms of their historical development serves to emphasize their similar heritages and their common values as the following quotation illustrates.

   It was in the name of freedom that our forefathers and yours struck off the chains of Europe and sailed uncharted oceans three centuries ago. It was in this name the three times that we fought for our blood and treasure. And so we stand again as our children will stand in their turn, for as Goethe tells us, "He only earns his freedom and existence who daily conquers them anew."

Kennedy's reference to his grandfather also helps to establish a common bond and to enhance his image. He states:

   I mentioned, when I arrived, that my grandfather was a member of the House of Representatives, who put a resolution in the Congress of the United States praising the Boers, praising their integrity and their ability and their courage; asking for a special effort to be made for those Boers who wished to come from South Africa to come and settle in the United States. Most did not come, obviously. Some did come and made a great contribution to the communities and to the states in which they settled.

   Kennedy stresses other commonalities that the two countries share. They have the problem of trying to achieve the goal of tolerance and equal treatment for their citizens. They are important countries of the world. Their peoples are
alike. South Africa and the United States share commonalities but no nation is isolated today. Kennedy expresses it this way:

In the world of 1966 no nation is an island unto itself. Global systems of transportation and communication and economics have transformed our sense of geography and outmoded all new concepts of self-sufficiency. Whether we wish it or not, a pattern of unity is woven into every aspect of the society of man.

The Senator's commitment to the worth of the individual is enunciated in various ways in both the speech and the question-and-answer session. Particular emphasis is placed upon the responsibility of the individual to help others reach their potential, the responsibility of the more fortunate ones to help those who are "deprived and downtrodden, the insulted and the injured."

Tact and diplomacy are essential ingredients of a rhetorical discourse designed to effect persuasion. Kennedy uses them liberally.

Employing the same type of tactics he utilized at Cape Town, he states one thing but leaves it up to his audience to draw inferences or parallels as the following example illustrates.

No nation is more opposed to communism than the United States. But the United States is not afraid to hear the voices and the viewpoints of communism. We do not . . . exclude their scholars or repress their books.

Kennedy's affirmation of the position of the United States in this matter would immediately remind his audience that South
Africa's position is quite different. It prohibits the expression of communist viewpoints; it excludes their scholars and bans their books. In pointing out that the United States has not always met its responsibilities, Kennedy acknowledges shortcomings of his country when he avers that at times in our history we have acted too hastily and harshly to the fears and threats from within and without [and] any times of suppression have been times of fear and stagnation, the years which the locusts have eaten.

This statement may also be construed as a diplomatic warning that South Africa is presently reacting "too hastily and harshly" by its apartheid policies. Kennedy equates his audience with heads of state throughout the world. In the other countries he has visited he has met with Presidents; in South Africa he has been unable to talk with any government official. Only the Stellenbosch students invited him to engage in dialogue. Praise for the students is thus coupled with silent condemnation of their officials. The following statement is double-edged.

No nation should have so little confidence in the wisdom and policies and its citizens that they dare not be tested in the free market of ideas. . . . those with confidence in their own future, in their citizens in the durability of their ideal will welcome the exchange of views just as you are doing now.

On the one hand, he is implying that South Africa does not have confidence enough in its policies or its citizens to have their ideas freely tested; on the other hand, he praises his audience for their willingness to exchange views.
Gaining and maintaining rapport with an audience is necessary, but the speaker must also be credible if he is to fulfill his rhetorical purposes. How does he achieve credibility? Perelman maintains that the epideictic speaker, especially, must have qualifications for speaking on his subject. He must be knowledgeable.

Kennedy demonstrates that he is qualified to speak on the subject of the role of the individual in society by his references to world affairs, history, and his personal experiences, and to other authorities. He exhibits his familiarity with world affairs and history in numerous references to events and situations, and especially to the history, events, and situations in South Africa. His remark that a future prime minister might be sitting in the room is an indication that he knows that most of South Africa's prime ministers have been graduates of Stellenbosch and that they have important roles to play; his remark about Japanese being classified as white while Chinese are labeled coloured illustrates his familiarity with ethnic groupings; his comments regarding the differences between whites and blacks in terms of their education reveal an extensive knowledge of educational practices of the apartheid system; and his comparisons of different systems of government illustrate his knowledge of them. In terms of personal experiences he cites his visits to Mauritania and the poor conditions he saw there,
his visits to five Latin American countries and his personal knowledge about discrimination from his family's experiences.

The authorities that Kennedy selects exemplify those values he upholds. He invokes the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, Western tradition, God, and the Bible. Among the authorities he cites are Adam Tas, the Boers and the Voortrekkers, all of whom hold special meaning for Stellenbosch students because they represent Afrikaners who struck blows for freedom and liberty. Other individuals cited are Goethe, Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Lincoln, and President Kennedy.

Thus does Robert Kennedy seek to persuade through personality.

Although this discussion of the speaker's image has included examples drawn from the question-and-answer session as well as from the speech itself, it would be worthwhile to examine in more detail the function of a question-and-answer period.

A question-and-answer session following a speech is particularly useful as a means of helping the eddeictic speaker to achieve his rhetorical purpose—to intensify the adherence of his auditors' minds to their commonly shared values. This situation provides the speaker with opportunities to reiterate the values he has articulated in the speech; it gives him the opportunity to elaborate, to go into specific detail. It serves as a means of reinforcing a
speaker's credibility and thereby enhancing his ethos. A formal speech may have been ghost-written, but in a question-and-answer situation the speaker is totally on his own. His spontaneous answers reflect the man himself and lend an aura of greater sincerity to his utterances.

Kennedy uses this situation to great advantage. As has already been noted in Chapter III, whenever Robert Kennedy had something controversial to say, he addressed his remarks to the people most directly affected. Therefore, it is not surprising that his most explicit criticism of South Africa's apartheid system is voiced in the question-and-answer period at Stellenbosch.

For example he says:

*But what we [United States] stand for and what we are trying to accomplish in our own country is that everybody . . . is going to be treated equally. That is what our society is. And we are identified with other countries around the world who are moving toward that ideal. . . . [T]he individual is what is important.*

And so what is of concern for us in the outside is that as a practice here in South Africa, that is not only not the ideal, but that is not put into practice.

Kennedy continues:

*you have benches for white people and black people, . . . in many of the churches you can't go in and pray together . . . there is not as much money spent for a black student as a white student here in South Africa, . . . a colored person in Cape Town who might have great ability and great skill and might be as smart as any of us, who could contribute to the*
development of the country, is not permitted to participate in the national political process. This causes us concern.

From the above quotations it might appear that Robert Kennedy is haranguing his audience and certainly this could not enhance his ethos or help him attain his goals. However, this is not the case. He carefully couches his criticisms within the context of the close relationship that exists between the United States and South Africa. He prefaces his criticisms with remarks such as:

I say to you, quite frankly, that there is great affection, . . . toward the people of South Africa. And there is great admiration for what has been accomplished in South Africa and, as I said, I think that we feel in the United States that we are very much like the people of South Africa. But we start with that.

It is because of the close relationship that what South Africa does affects the United States in the eyes of the rest of the world, according to Kennedy. He uses this give-and-take situation to reassure his audience that neither he nor the United States is trying to tell South Africa how to run its business. Over and over again, he asserts that "what South Africa does in dealing with any kind of a problem it has got to be its business and it has to decide itself." Yet, at the same time, he emphasizes that "what you do here does have an effect on what happens just as a riot in Rio de Janeiro has an effect on student demonstrations in Saigon."
The examples cited above illustrate some of the rhetorical strategies that Kennedy employed in order to achieve his aims. They also exemplify associative-dissociative techniques of argumentation which we will consider next.

**Associative and Dissociative Argumentative Techniques**

As we have already seen (Chapters I and IV), associative and dissociative schemes are complimentary techniques of argumentation. Associative strategies include; whereas dissociative techniques exclude. The following quotation is an example of the associative-dissociative techniques.

Communist nations or other ... cannot build a modern society without exposing their citizens to the ideas and ideologies of other systems. No nation is more opposed to communism than the United States. We reject the theory that human beings exist for the benefit of the state; that the state is more important than the individual or than the family. We reject totally the restrictions on freedom of the press, of protest, of speech, and of religion. But the United States is not afraid to hear the voices and the viewpoints of communism. We do not jam their broadcasts or exclude their scholars, or repress their books.

In this example Kennedy defines a modern society as one which exposes its citizens to the ideas and ideologies of other systems. The United States qualifies in this definition (a quasi-logical associative technique). Communist nations, on the other hand, prohibit their citizens being exposed to foreign ideologies by jamming broadcasts, excluding scholars and repressing books. This is the dissociative
aspect. By the same token, South Africa prohibits the expression of Communist ideas and ideology so Kennedy is implying that this definition also excludes South Africa while it associates South Africa with communist nations. The United States enjoys freedom of press, speech, protest, and religion which is associative in that these freedoms have previously been identified as essential elements of Western democracy. South Africa, through her apartheid policies, suppresses these freedoms and the implication here is that this country is thereby dissociated from democracy. Kennedy's argument concerning the state and the individual belongs to the anti-model type which is an associative scheme based on the structure of reality standard. This is also dissociative by rejection. In this case there is a reversal of the philosophical pair so that the result would be state \( \frac{\text{state}}{\text{individual}} \) \( ^2 \).

Kennedy's argument concerning global systems of transportation, communication, and economics having outmoded all concepts of self-sufficiency may be classified as argument of cause and effect which is an associative scheme based on the structure of reality standard. There is also a dissociation by a reversal of the philosophical pair from interdependence/self-sufficiency to self-sufficiency/interdependence. To support his assertion that "a pattern of unity is woven into every aspect of the society of man," Kennedy resorts to argument by example (an associative scheme based on the
structure of reality standard).

We are protected from tetanus by the work of the Japanese scientists; from typhoid by the work of a Russian; an Austrian taught us to transfuse blood and an Italian to protect ourselves from malaria; an Indian and a grandson of a Negro slave taught us to achieve major social change without violence. Our children are protected from diphtheria by the work of a Japanese and a German; from rabies by the work of the French and cured of pellagra by the work of an Austrian.

In the above paragraph Kennedy illustrates how individuals from diverse nations have contributed to universal welfare. On closer examination we find some interesting implications in the examples he has selected. In six instances individuals protect us from physical ills while two serve as healers of social injustices (e.g. racism). Just as a physical ill (disease) is debilitating and may be even fatal to the individual, social injustice weakens and may even destroy a society. Doctors can mitigate or cure or prevent a physical disease. Furthermore, Kennedy specifies malaria and typhoid, two diseases which were once epidemic over large parts of the world and are now virtually eliminated. Is Kennedy perhaps implying that at some unspecified date in the future the disease of racism may also be eliminated from society? The two examples Kennedy cites as teachers of non-violent social change are Gandhi (Indian) and Martin Luther King (American). In apartheid terms both are non-white and both have special relevance for South Africa. Gandhi opposed British Colonialism as did the Afrikaners. Gandhi began his
non-violent opposition to discrimination in South Africa and founded the Natal Indian Congress party in 1894. Gandhi was the founder of the non-violent movement for social change. Martin Luther King opposed American racism. He served as a reminder that the United States is seriously afflicted with social injustices. Like Gandhi, he was an advocate of non-violent social change. He was also a protestant clergyman who was denied permission to enter South Africa. It is interesting to note that the only American that Kennedy uses as an example of those who have contributed to mankind is one who "taught us to achieve major social change without violence." His audience at Stellenbosch (and elsewhere) would immediately identify the speaker with this movement. (Identification is a quasi-logical associative strategy.) In the question-and-answer period Kennedy draws upon this association to point out that he has been incorrectly labeled as an enemy.

I am closely identified with the civil rights movement in the United States. I have never criticized South Africa. I have never made a speech about South Africa. I never talked about South Africa and yet I was made a great enemy.

In the above quotation Kennedy defines an enemy as an individual who criticizes, makes speeches about, and talks about South Africa. He does not qualify for this definition because he has done none of these things. And yet, he was "made a great enemy." By identifying himself with the civil rights movement in the United States, he implies that his
audience has incorrectly associated this with being an enemy of the state. He dissociates by denying that such a connection exists.

Kennedy associates when he speaks of the commonalities between South Africa and the United States. He dissociates when he states "We have, you and I, some differences of view and opinion." He reassociates when he asserts that "I have great respect for the fact that you have invited me here to speak despite those differences." "Free men . . . can engage in the great dialogue in which the Western tradition is built" is argument of including the part in the whole which is a quasi-logical associative strategy. This statement is also significant from the standpoint that it indicates what Kennedy expects to accomplish in this situation. Kennedy’s explanation of his purpose in coming to South Africa and speaking to this group also illustrates associative-dissociative strategies.

I am here in South Africa to listen as well as to talk; less to lecture than to learn. Whatever our disagreements, neither your country or mine is under any illusion that there is only one side to any issue or that either of us can coerce or quickly convert the other to share our point of view. This we all recognize. But asserting disagreement without debate is as meaningless as asserting unanimity without discussion. Let us find out where we disagree and why we disagree and let us also find out where we can agree.

"Disagreement without debate . . . unanimity without discussion" may be classified as the quasi-logical associative
strategy of argument of ridicule. The dissociative aspect is its rejection.

In paragraphs 21, 22, 23, and 24, Kennedy utilizes associative-dissociative techniques of argumentation when he asserts "Your country and mine have . . . . But we have not yet learned. . . . " The principal mode of argument in these paragraphs is that of ends and means. At Stellenbosch Kennedy employs some of the same arguments he had articulated at Cape Town University. For example, he specifically dissociates reform and communism while he associates himself with reform and the Western tradition. He emphasizes the difference between the United States and communist countries as follows: "... why we think we are different from the communists is the fact that we recognize the individual dignity of the human being." In the question-and-answer period Kennedy reaffirms his value system as belonging to that of Western tradition and dissociates South Africa's practices of apartheid as denials of those values. Another example of similarity of argument at Cape Town and Stellenbosch may be found in his references to the roles of young people, "the new children of a time of change," who have the privilege of education which equips them for service to mankind and, at the same time, serves to separate them from contact with those who desperately need their help. Other examples of associative-dissociative strategies have been discussed in the previous section, particularly in the
discussion of the question-and-answer period function. Let us now turn to the interaction of these arguments.

**Interaction of Arguments**

The previous analysis of arguments based on image and those based on techniques of associative-dissociative schemes indicate that the interaction between them plays a role in assessing Robert Kennedy's effectiveness. So does the order in which they are presented, for as Perelman has postulated, arrangement provides order to arguments and permits the continuing adaptation of speaker to audience. The orator's assessment of his audience will therefore determine how he adapts his arguments and their arrangement to elicit the desired audience response.

Robert Kennedy's assessment of the nature of his audience was essentially correct. That evening at the University of Natal he referred to his Stellenbosch speech as follows: "I am sure there was a majority of those students whom I addressed and invited me to attend, who disagreed with my position, disagreed with my point of view, disagreed with my ideas." With this in mind let us now turn to Robert Kennedy's speech arrangement with the understanding that only the speech itself will be considered. Kennedy's arrangement is determined by his rhetorical purpose in speaking. Therefore, it becomes necessary to understand his purpose in addressing this group. What did he expect to accomplish? First of all,
his purpose was a limited one for two reasons: The nature of his audience (hostile) restricted his aims; and the speech was designed as a springboard for the exchange of views which took place in the question-and-answer period.

In order to create a climate conducive to a productive exchange of ideas in the question-and-answer period, Kennedy first had to demonstrate to his audience that he was credible, that he could be trusted, and that they shared common values. In other words, his purpose was to allay fear and suspicion, to create goodwill, and to enhance the perception of like-mindedness. Thus Kennedy's perception of the nature of his audience determined his purpose in speaking and dictated the structural arrangement to be used. Realizing that his audience was antagonistic, Kennedy chose to highlight clusters of interrelated values they already embraced and to indicate that he also embraced these values. He did not develop arguments to intensify his audience's adherence to their commonly shared values as he had done at Cape Town; he merely reminded them that he and they shared these values. In this sense Kennedy's entire speech could be classified as exposition which points up the difficulty the critic faces in attempting to set forth the speech order. Consequently, this critic will merely set forth the basic line of reasoning Kennedy employed in this speech. It is as follows:

[Goethe] "He only earns his freedom and existence who daily
conquers them anew"; [Thomas Paine] "no man or country can be really free unless all men and all countries are free"; [Kennedy] "we must change to master change"; and [Lincoln] "we must think anew, we must disenthrall ourselves." Kennedy then calls on the young people, and particularly the educated to meet their responsibilities to mankind. The particular structural arrangement Kennedy uses appears to be appropriate for this audience. He reduces dissodance by appealing to Afrikaner traditions of independence and freedom which also helps to enhance his ethos. It should be remembered, however, that Robert Kennedy did not expect to convert his audience to his views on how to achieve the goal of ensuring the dignity of the individual in Western society. They could agree on the value but not on the means of achieving it.

Throughout the speech and the question-and-answer session Kennedy reiterates that the individual in Western society is the touchstone of value, that what concerns South Africa is a legitimate concern of the United States, and that neither he nor the United States wants to or even could if it wished provide the answers for South Africa's problems. At the same time, he reiterates that South Africa, rather than marching in the direction of achieving full and equal justice for all its citizens, appears to be headed in the opposite direction and that that affects relationships throughout the world but especially does it have an impact on the United States. In
this encounter with what was essentially a hostile audience, Robert Kennedy sought to allay fears and suspicions and to emphasize that only by a free and open exchange of views (as they were doing) can those who differ find out why they disagree and where they disagree and where they can agree. That was the value of this dialogue.6
FOOTNOTES: (Chapter V)

1 Prime Minister Henrik Verwoerd, for example, who originally entered the university to prepare for the ministry in the Dutch Reformed Church, received his B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. here. (His majors were sociology, psychology, and logic.) Verwoerd received his doctorate at the age of twenty-three. His thesis was described as "an experimental study in thinking processes," and was "the first of its kind to be written in Afrikaans." See: Alexander Hepple, Verwoerd (Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1967), p. 20.


5 For example, before Kennedy's appearance at Cape Town "A pro-Verwoerd newspaper pointed out that when he made his speech at the University of Cape Town, on June 6, the 'telescopes and microscopes' would be trained on him, and he would need 'the wisdom of a Solomon and the tongue of an angel not to make a mess of it.'" Cited in "The Kennedy Reception," The New Republic, June 11, 1966, p. 14.

6 No major differences in stylistic devices were noted in this speech from that used in the Cape Town Address. In other words, Kennedy relied upon oratorical definition to promote choice; he relied heavily upon repetition (especially anaphora) and amplification to promote presence; and he relied upon allusion, quotation, and the oratorical question to promote communion.
CHAPTER VI

UNIVERSITY OF NATAL ADDRESS

This chapter will consider Robert Kennedy's speaking at the University of Natal in Durban on the evening of June 7, 1966. The same general procedure of analysis will be followed, i.e., depicting the particular situation, and appraising Kennedy's oratory by the application of Perelman's argumentative strategies. At Natal, as at Stellenbosch, a question-and-answer period followed the address so, where applicable, these sections will also be incorporated in the analysis for purposes of evaluation. Let us now turn to the rhetorical situation.

Situation

After his meeting with Stellenbosch students that noon, Robert Kennedy flew to Durban where he would deliver an address that evening at the University of Natal to approximately 20,000 South Africans (2,000 in the university hall and 18,000 outside who listened over a public address system).¹ That audience, for the first time, included a large number of adults.² Immediately preceding his scheduled appearance at the University Kennedy played host at a multiracial dinner
party at Durban's Edward Hotel. Included among his guests were Catholic Archbishop Denis Hurley, an outspoken critic of apartheid and an honorary Vice-President of NUSAS; Mr. Alan Paton, noted author and leader of the Liberal Party; Mr. Knowledge Guzana, leader of the Transkei Opposition; and Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, unofficial "prime minister" of the Zulus. As we noted in Chapter II, the University of Natal is an English-medium university which admits non-whites although many of the classes are segregated. This university had chosen to honor the memory of the late President Kennedy by constructing the John F. Kennedy Room at the university hall and from which a number of people listened to Robert Kennedy's address that evening. The auditorium itself was crowded and on the stage the symbolic empty chair (for Ian Robertson) signified defiance of the Government's action in banning the President of NUSAS for inviting Robert Kennedy to South Africa. The young man who introduced Robert Kennedy warned the Verwoerd Government that "[t]he days of the docile and watery student are over and there will only be shame for those who accept wrong, indignity and human suffering for the sake of peace and quiet." He asserted:

We will give Dr. Verwoerd the challenge of our youth. We will not obey any commands or threats to conform. We will be open and courageous about our beliefs and actions as we have in the past. The rest is up to our government and their steady belief in Western traditions of civilization. He can only do his worst and we will always be ready to give more than our best.
The young man then said: "Senator Kennedy, we welcome you very much." This introductory speech of welcome suggests some of the constraints imposed upon Robert Kennedy at the University of Natal. What were the major constraints in this speaking situation?

**Constraints**

Constraints have been previously defined as limitations arising from the situation, the audience and the speaker which circumscribe the orator's rhetorical effectiveness. The situation has been briefly described above while the audience to be affected included those individuals within earshot of Kennedy's voice, South Africans and Americans who would read or hear about the speech, and the universal audience.

Kennedy's constraints at the University of Natal included many of those imposed on him at the University of Cape Town and at Stellenbosch University, i.e., his obligation to NUSAS and his rejecting violence as an acceptable solution to any problem; as a foreigner, not presuming to dictate South African policy; as a representative of the United States, presenting a favorable image of that country; and, as a politician, enhancing not harming his own political future. The Cape Town speech was another constraint as was his appearance at the University of Stellenbosch, both of which have already been discussed in Chapter V. Whatever Kennedy later said about his Stellenbosch engagement would reflect upon the
group who extended the invitation and therefore he was con-
strained to make certain they had no cause to regret extend-
ing him their hospitality. At Natal further constraints
imposed on the United States Senator from New York included
his obligations to his dinner companions, to the large number
of adults in the audience, and to his hosts whose representa-
tive had just delivered a stinging condemnation of govern-
mental policies. His dinner companions had involved their
own prestige by accepting his invitation at a multiracial
dinner and several of them were in positions that could be
jeopardized if this association resulted in an opportunity
for the Government to take action against them because of
Robert Kennedy. At the same time, their presence at the
dinner and at the University demanded some recognition be-
cause they represented leaders in the fight against apartheid,
which Kennedy had labeled as an "evil" the previous night.
Consequently, he was compelled to meet his responsibility to
this group by presenting himself as a reasonable but committed
man. The fact that, for the first time, his audience con-
tained a large number of adults would indicate that at least
some of them would be observing him very carefully for signs
that he was irresponsible and therefore not to be heeded.
Therefore, he must take care to ensure that he did not give
such an impression. As far as his hosts were concerned, he
had the same obligation to them as the obligation he had to
NUSAS. In fact, many students at Natal were actively engaged
in NUSAS activities. How Kennedy handled these constraints and thus helped to intensify the adherence of his auditors' minds to their commonly shared values, will be examined in some detail, but, first these values need to be identified.

Values Kennedy Focused on at the University of Natal

These values that Kennedy focused upon at Natal were the same values he had espoused at Cape Town and Stellenbosch. These values are those that are embodied in the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which place the individual as the capstone of value. At Natal Kennedy stated it in the following manner.

I think that we stand for something. I think we stand for something positive. . . . We [United States] stand for human freedom and we stand for human dignity and we stand for ending discrimination and ending hunger and ending illiteracy. And we stand for extending the cause for freedom and justice all over the globe.

It should be remembered that Kennedy was relying upon his audience's previous knowledge of and acceptance of this hierarchy of values. He assumed that they were aware of his value system in Western tradition and that basically most of them agreed so that his primary objective was to reinforce his hierarchy.

Before proceeding to a discussion of how Kennedy intensified beliefs by persuasion through personality and by his
argumentative rhetorical techniques, however, a few comments concerning this speech would be appropriate. Unlike the Cape Town address, this speech was not carefully crafted but rather appears to belong to the impromptu category. It is loosely structured; several sentences are incomplete; and no marked differences may be discerned between the manner of expressing ideas in the speech itself and in the answers to questions posed by the audience as the following quotation illustrates:

I don't think that any of you know, or if we think that we know, if we are going to be subject to a great disillusionment. Any of us know all of the answers to the future, any of us know what all the solutions to the problems that affect our particular country or affect the world. But at least to keep challenging, at least to keep looking for solutions, that is what youth is. That is the challenge of youth, that is the challenge of young people and that is why I am proud to be here tonight with all of you.

However, the listening audience, in their own minds, probably filled in the gaps and thus may not have realized how loosely structured this speech actually was. Nevertheless, it would be perceived that the speech had a certain impromptu quality about it which could be interpreted in at least two ways. This lack of craftsmanship might be interpreted by some to indicate that Kennedy held his audience in such low esteem that he did not bother to construct carefully his speech so that it would clearly and eloquently convey his views. Conversely, it could be viewed as an indication that Kennedy held his audience in such high esteem that his desire to communicate as one friend
to another led him to wait so that he could respond to ideas presented by his dinner companions and by the previous speaker who introduced him. (In this critic's judgment, the latter view is correct.) Kennedy assumed that his audience was already familiar with his views; they already had a favorable image of him; and they were aware of what he had said at Cape Town the previous evening as well as what he had said in South Africa prior to that appearance. Spontaneous utterances could also be construed as signaling the speaker's sincerity and lack of artifice and thereby enhancing his ethos. Let us look at how effectively Kennedy projected a favorable image to bolster his arguments.

**Persuasion through Personality**

Perelman asserts that "... if it is necessary that he [the epideictic speaker] should enjoy a certain prestige before he speaks, it is to enable him, through his own authority, to promote the values he is upholding." That Robert Kennedy did enjoy prestige cannot be denied. His prestige at the University of Natal was further augmented by the fact that he was the brother of the late President Kennedy in whose name a room had been dedicated there. Kennedy's own authority is evinced in several ways, as for example in his use of the personal pronoun I sixty-eight times in the speech. His authority is also exhibited in references to personal experiences, to world affairs and history, and to other authorities. He
relies heavily upon his personal experiences to demonstrate that he speaks as an authority. For example, he draws upon his experiences as Attorney General of the United States to describe how the Kennedy Administration handled communism. Kennedy's knowledge of world affairs and history is revealed in references to the history and heritage of South Africa as well as the United States; his discussion of why the United States provided aid for the construction of the Volta Dam in Ghana; the governmental structure in Rhodesia; conditions in Latin America; and, especially, apartheid practices in South Africa.

Those authorities he chooses to invoke exemplify the values he upholds. These authorities include the ultimate authority—God, The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, Western tradition, and individuals such as Ian Robertson, Archbishop Hurley, Alan Paton, President Kennedy, Francis Bacon, and Secretary McNamara. It is interesting to note that the South Africans he selects are Robertson, Hurley, and Paton all of whom have felt the force of governmental displeasure because of their attacks on apartheid policies. As would be expected, the individual he most frequently cites is his late brother, President Kennedy.

But not only must a speaker enjoy a certain prestige and thereby speak as an authority, he must also secure and maintain rapport with his audience if he is to effect persuasion. One means of accomplishing this is by establishing
commonalities between the speaker and his audience. Here at Natal Robert Kennedy emphasizes many of the same common bonds he had stressed at Cape Town and Stellenbosch, i.e., the tradition of friendship between their two countries; similar backgrounds in terms of their historical development and environment; being allied in the fight for freedom and democracy in three wars; and their common belief in Western tradition. An apt illustration of how Kennedy identifies with his audience is provided by his opening remarks in which he associates the challenges enunciated by the previous speaker with those articulated by students in American universities at least three times every day. He asserts that dissent or opposition to the established order is not only a right in Western tradition but an obligation as well. Kennedy expresses it this way:

If there is no opposition within a university, if those who are young do not speak out, where is the society going to rise? If those at the age of 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 are satisfied then where are we going in any of our countries, where are we going under any kind of society, where are we going to start challenging any of the beliefs or any of the ideas?

In congratulating those in South Africa who do challenge and do speak out he is reassuring them that they are following in the best Western tradition and he is proud to be associated with them. Conversely, his remarks also serve to rebut the Government's claim that these dissidents are subversives. The anecdote about the Johnstown flood survivor demonstrates
that Kennedy has wit which helps to enhance his ethos. This story also serves another function which is to suggest that he is like the flood survivor while certain members of the audience such as Bishop Hurley and Alan Paton are the Noahs. This display of modesty also reinforces his ethos. Kennedy's response to the question of whether or not he considers NUSAS to be a useful organization in South Africa provides another example of how he identifies with his audience.

... I think that the organization and the efforts that have been made by the organization have inspired men and women all over the globe, the principle that it stands for, the principles that we try to have our young people stand for in other parts, not just in the United States, but, I think, young people elsewhere in other countries.

So I accepted this invitation because I was pleased to come and be associated and identified with those who lead the organization and those who make up its body.

Another means of establishing and maintaining rapport with an audience is through tact and diplomacy. Here, too, Kennedy displays these characteristics most frequently by explicitly stating one thing and leaving it up to his audience to draw inferences. Kennedy's discussion of how, as Attorney General he was responsible for controlling communism in the United States and was appointed by his brother to lead a group which dealt with communism abroad, is a case in point. As far as domestic communism was concerned, it was felt that openly discussing it was the best procedure. Permitting everyone's voice to be heard and then letting the public
decide on the merits was the way to handle communism. As a result communism in the United States dwindled to a point that it was almost infinitesimal. As far as communism in other countries was concerned, jailing, house arrest or classifying anyone who advocated change as subversive was not the answer. The way to deal with communism was to improve the lives of the people by building roads so people could travel from one village to another, building more schools so that children could get an education, and providing more jobs so that men could get employment at a decent wage. The audience would be reminded that that is not the way communism is handled in their country. There is no open discussion among all its citizens—instead there is jail or house arrest awaiting those who advocate change. Building roads so that people could travel from one village to another would remind the audience that blacks cannot even enter certain areas without special permission and that their movements are strictly curtailed. Failure to observe these limitations on travel results in being imprisoned or being "endorsed out." Building more schools so that children can get better educations would remind the audience of the conditions prevailing in the schools for blacks and that education is not compulsory for a black child and that black parents have pay for their children's education. The reference to jobs at a decent wage would remind the audience of the Job Reservation Act (see Chapter II) which restricts the type of jobs open to blacks
and the labor influx control policy which controls the number of laboring men and women who are needed in the particular area. Mention of Kennedy's actions as Attorney General would call to mind Minister of Justice Vorster's actions in dealing with communism. There is the empty chair on the stage. Another example of Kennedy's tact may be found in his comments about his visit and dialogue with Stellenbosch students earlier that day. Kennedy uses this opportunity to express his appreciation to them for providing a forum for the exchange of ideas between those who disagree and labels this willingness to listen to and talk with those who hold different views as a hallmark of Western democracy.

Emphasis on the worth of the individual as the touchstone of value in Western tradition is manifest in references to discrimination against those of a different race, color, or religion. The role of the individual in society is emphasized with particular reference to the important roles that are assigned to the young, i.e., to lead in the fight against injustices.

One other factor (which Perelman does not treat) that contributed to this favorable image was Kennedy's display of an exceptionally retentive memory. The reader is reminded that this speech was not delivered from a text and certainly in the question-and-answer session Kennedy had nothing to rely upon except himself and his ability to recall statistics, to think and respond on his feet, as it were. His
discussion of the aid given by the United States to build the Volta Dam is one example. His discussion of voting patterns in the United States is another. So, too, are the statistics he cites regarding the deplorable living conditions in Latin America. His apt retort to a question regarding a United States President who stated that Negroes were innately inferior is another example. Robert Kennedy's talent to recall quickly and to respond reminds one of his late brother's ability along these same lines as noted by the American public when John Kennedy and Richard Nixon participated in the television debates of 1960 without the use of notes. As the above discussion (persuasion through personality) indicates, the image Kennedy projected to this audience showed him to be a man of good moral character, sound judgment, and goodwill toward his hearers. Let us now turn to the associative and dissociative strategies he employed to achieve his rhetorical goals.

**Associative and Dissociative Argumentative Techniques**

As in the previous speeches analyzed, Kennedy employs many associative and dissociative schemes to intensify his auditors' adherence to their commonly shared value system. In this speaking situation he utilizes many of the same strategies he employed in his Cape Town and Stellenbosch addresses.
A case in point is the argument concerning the way to handle communism (in other countries) as discussed in the previous section. Kennedy dissociates by rejecting South Africa's solution of putting people in jail or on house arrest or labeling as subversive anyone who advocates change. He argues from cause and effect (an associative scheme of sequential relations based on the structure of reality standard) that the way to deal with communism is to build roads so people can go from one village to another, to build more schools so that parents can be assured their children are educated, and to provide more jobs at decent wages. In other words, Kennedy is arguing that what causes a nation to turn communist is that the nation has not met the needs of its people (to secure for each individual his basic rights). By solving the problems of discrimination, poverty, etc., the attraction of communism is greatly diminished if not completely destroyed. At the University of Cape Town he had said:

The way of opposition to communism...is not to imitate its dictatorship, but to enlarge individual freedom. There are those in every land who would label as "communist" every threat to their privilege. But, may I say to you,... reform is not communism, and the denial of freedom, in whatever name, only strengthens the very communism it claims to oppose.

Ends and means (based on the structure of reality standard) is the associative technique utilized in the following:

It we are going to change the world, if we are going to make a difference in our own country, if we are going to do something in the United States
about our own illiteracy, about our own who are still our hungry in our country, for those who still can't get a proper education and the hundreds of thousands of Negroes who still can't get adequate jobs, if we are going to do that in our own country and if you are going to right the injustices in this country; if the injustices in Latin America and Asia and Africa are going to be righted, it is going to have to be led by the young people. To those who are going to say that they are dissatisfied. To those who say that they want a better world and they are not going to accept the world as it is. That they are going to say that we can do better. That we are going to do better with free tradition and that we can do better under the banner of freedom.

At the University of Cape Town Kennedy asserted:

If we would lead outside our own borders; if we would help those who need our assistance, if we would meet our responsibilities to mankind; we must first, all of us, demolish the borders which history has erected between men within our own nations—barriers of race and religion, social class and ignorance. Our answer is the world's hope; it is to rely on youth . . . . It is a revolutionary world that we all live in, and thus, as I have said in Latin America and in Asia, and in Europe and in my own country the United States, it is the young people who must take the lead.

At Stellenbosch Kennedy proclaimed:

. . . . In this fantastic and dangerous world, we will not find answers in old dogmas, repeating worn out slogans, fighting on ancient battlegrounds against fading enemies long after the real struggle has moved on. We must change to master change, we must retain what is the best of our tradition and take pride in the accomplishments of our forebears. But, as Lincoln said, "we must think anew, we must disenthrall ourselves." And for this we look to the young people. The new children of a time of change.
The rule of justice argument (a quasi-logical associative strategy) is used extensively by Kennedy at Natal (and Cape Town and Stellenbosch). One example of this is found in Kennedy’s response to a question about Rhodesia in which he argues that blacks should have the right to participate in their government, that participation should not be restricted to those of the white race.

Argument from example is another favorite associative technique employed by Kennedy. For instance, he cites the progress that the United States, under the leadership of President Kennedy, had made by facing its problems and seeking solutions. As a consequence, no longer is the United States second in space, no longer are Negroes treated as second-class citizens, and its national product is now second to none. By identifying President Kennedy with young people all over the globe, Kennedy is suggesting that by facing problems the young can find answers. He invokes authority when he quotes President Kennedy as saying, "Problems are made by man, therefore, they can be solved by man."

Another example of argumentative strategies Kennedy utilizes is contained in the following quotation:

First, I want to say that I don't think that other countries interfere with the domestic or internal affairs of their neighbor or of another country throughout the world. But I think that what happens in one country that it has an effect on another is extremely important and that the second country might have its voice heard.
In the above, Kennedy dissociates and then utilizes the associative technique of cause and effect argument. At Cape Town Kennedy had stated that "Everywhere new technology and communication brings men and nations closer together, the concerns of one inevitably become the concerns of all." At Stellenbosch he had asserted: "In the world of 1966 no nation is an island unto itself."

Other examples of Kennedy's argumentative strategies have already been described in the previous section of this chapter. In this situation, as on previous occasions (at Cape Town and Stellenbosch), Kennedy does not rely upon any one particular argumentative strategy but, rather, he draws from many.

Interaction of Arguments

As has already been mentioned, this speech was an off-the-cuff or impromptu speech followed by a question-and-answer period. Kennedy perceived his audience to be favorably disposed toward him and his ideas. Therefore, he deemed his purpose to be to intensify their belief in their commonly shared values primarily on the basis of his own authority. Here, as at Stellenbosch, the speech was designed as a springboard for the question-and-answer session which followed. Here, as at Stellenbosch, the nature of his audience dictated his structural arrangement. But here, unlike at Stellenbosch, he used his prestige to further the values he espoused rather
than to demonstrate that he and the audience shared values. A few comments concerning Kennedy's appearance at the University of Natal seem appropriate. This engagement would probably more correctly be labeled a "meeting" rather than an address. The question-and-answer session was devoted mainly to the exposition of the basic rights of individuals whether they be Black, Coloured, or White, Catholic or Jewish. Repeatedly Kennedy was questioned about whether the situation in South Africa posed a threat to world peace. Although Kennedy did criticize the apartheid system he never did so without associating it with discrimination in the United States and injustices in other countries throughout the world. At Natal he stated: "We might hate the evil, but we don't hate the individuals and the country. And we are not clean ourselves. We recognize that." This "meeting" at Natal is useful for the rhetorical critic in that it provides him (or her) with tools by which he (or she) can assess Kennedy's conversational mode of communication. Although some members of his audience could be considered hostile (as evidenced by a few questions posed for Kennedy) the majority were extremely friendly. Kennedy's answers to questions posed were usually lengthy and detailed with but a few exceptions as for example his response to the question about what United States President in 1885 said that "There is an undeniable difference between the white man and the black man." Kennedy replied:
"The one that was beaten in 1888." Another exception was his response to the charge that he was responsible for his brother's death because he had not brought charges against Oswald at an earlier time. Not only were Kennedy's answers lengthy but they were also repetitious.

In Chapter IV it was stated that the category of "style" as it relates to Kennedy's speaking, would not be considered independently unless some notable differences in his stylistic techniques occur. This is the case with the Natal engagement. Part of the reason may be simply attributable to the differences between the extempore mode of address, the conversational mode, and the formal mode. Nevertheless, some differences are observed and these differences merit attention. However, before directing attention to the differences, it would be worthwhile to note some of the similarities. At Natal, as at Cape Town (and Stellenbosch) Kennedy again relies heavily upon the oratorical definition to promote "choice." One example of this would be his defining "youth" as those who keep challenging and keep looking for solutions. His citing of the one essential element of a democracy as being the ability (opportunity) to exchange views with those who disagree with you offers another illustration of the use of this stylistic device. Other similarities in style relate to his extensive use of repetition and amplification to promote "presence." Examples of repetition
(anaphora) from the speech include the following:

"If there is . . . if those who . . . if those at . . . if those at,"

"So I congratulate . . . and I congratulate . . . and I congratulate,"

"any of you know . . . any of us know . . . any of us know,"

"Both . . . we both . . . we were both . . . we were both . . . we both,"

"We stand for . . . we stand for . . . we stand for . . . we stand for . . . we stand for . . . we stand for,"

"What we did . . . what we did was try . . . what we did was try."

Examples of repetition (anaphora) from the question-and-answer session illustrate there is no discernible difference between the speech and the question-and-answer period in terms of Kennedy's style. Examples include the following:

"didn't agree with . . . didn't agree with . . . didn't agree with,"

"not because we have . . . not because we are,"

"we stand for . . . we stand for . . . we stand for,"

"that you don't have as much intelligence, you don't have as much integrity, don't have as much ability,"

"Not turn their backs on the university, not turn their backs on teachers, not turn their backs on problems."

Kennedy's use of the repetition of ideas and concepts to promote "presence" has already been discussed so that will not be dealt with here. Neither will his use of amplification
to promote "presence" be treated for the same reason. A notable difference in Kennedy's style at Natal is found in his use of imaginary direct speech as a stylistic device for promoting "presence." The imaginary conversation between Saint Peter and the Johnstown flood survivor provides one illustration of the above. The following quotation also exemplifies the use of this device.

You can say to somebody that sees his child dying of hunger, or a child that can't go to school and say, "Well, this is fine. You are living in the Western tradition. You are not as good because you are black or you are an Indian or you are colored, but you should understand that is all right, this is the Western tradition. This is democracy. You haven't got communism."

Although several other examples of the use of imaginary direct speech to promote "presence" could be cited, only one other will be provided for illustrative purposes. It is Kennedy's imaginary quoting of an individual regarding the worthlessness of the Irish. He says: "My God, we are going to have to put up with the Irish. What do you think is going to happen? They are different. But we will put them in a separate place and keep them there." This stylistic device is particularly effective as a means of bringing about a sense of immediacy and a sense of participation on the part of the audience. It is particularly suitable for the conversational mode of communication. Figures of speech relating to the promoting of "communion" used by Kennedy at Natal are similar to those he used at Cape Town. For instance, he uses allusion and
quotation (not used extensively as authority). Moreover, he utilizes the oratorical question to promote "communion." Allusion is treated in much the same manner here (through references to a common culture, tradition, and past, etc.) as at Cape Town so there is no need to elaborate upon this figure. An example of the use of quotation to promote "communion" would be the citation of John Kennedy's quote concerning the bull fighter. At Natal, Kennedy employs the oratorical question as a stylistic tool much more frequently than he did in his Cape Town speech. In some instances, he relies on a series of such questions to promote "communion" as the following example demonstrates.

But what do we stand for in the Western tradition? What is it that we believe in? Is all that we believe in anti-communism, we are against communism? Is that all that we stand for in our own countries and in our own hearts? Is that what we are fighting in Vietnam about? Is that what we are helping and assisting other countries around the globe about, because we don't want them to be taken over by communists? That is our philosophy, anti-communism?

It could thus be said that Kennedy's stylistic mode at Natal was similar to that at Cape Town in his use of oratorical definition to promote "choice"; his use of repetition and amplification to promote "presence"; and his use of allusion, quotation, and oratorical question to promote "communion." Primary differences in his stylistic mode at Natal include his employment of imaginary direct speech to promote
"presence" and a more extensive utilization of the oratorical question to promote "communion."

It appears to this critic that Robert Kennedy's concept of the role of the individual in society is encapsulated in the following:

The question was if you have to teach political science in South Africa, what would you teach to students above everything else.

I think what the Greeks once wrote is that everything is to be brought into question, there is no limit to thought. I think that is what I would teach. I think I would teach the fact that we don't have any easy answer to any of the problems that our own countries face and that face mankind and they have a responsibility and a special responsibility to those who are less well off, that are deprived, that are discriminated against, that are of hunger, and that is the most exciting thing of life. This is the most dangerous period of the history of mankind, but it is also the most exciting time in the history of mankind.

And what difference a young person can make and the difference in the way that they can change the world and what they have to do is make an effort. Not turn their backs on the university, not turn their backs on teachers, not turn their backs on problems of their own country or the problems of the world, but make an effort to try to find solutions to them. To make an effort to try to find answers that you, as a professor, can't give any answers or can't give answers. You might give some thought as to how you can find a solution, but that they are going to have to work out the best answers themselves, they are going to have to work to find the solutions. And they have the responsibility to try, and a particular responsibility because of the fact that they have obtained the kind of an education that permits them to come to a university.

President Kennedy once said that if we cannot help the many that are poor we cannot save the few who are rich. That is our responsibility, our obligation to our own fellow-citizen and our responsibility all over the globe. And I think that we can do something about it and I would emphasize that. And I would emphasize what George Bernard Shaw once
wrote, that some people see things as they are and say why, I dream things that never were and say why not.

This excerpt which represents the heart of the Kennedy message at Natal (and elsewhere) reveals his love for the Greek culture; his recognition of the difficulties involved in finding meaningful solutions to complex problems; his conviction that the fortunate members of the society have a special obligation to help those who are in need; and his faith in the power of the young to implement change.
FOOTNOTES: (Chapter VI)


4 Perelman, p. 52.
CHAPTER VII

UNIVERSITY OF WITWATERSRAND ADDRESS

This chapter will consider Robert Kennedy's speaking at Witwatersrand University on the evening of June 8, 1966. The same general procedure of analysis will be followed, i.e., depicting the particular situation, examining the constraints operating in that situation, and appraising Kennedy's oratory by the application of Perelman's argumentative strategies.

Situation

Robert Kennedy's final full day in South Africa began at dawn when he and his wife helicoptered to the Groutville Reserve in Zululand (approximately 40 miles from Durban), where they visited with banned Albert Luthuli, Nobel Peace Prize recipient and former leader of the banned African National Congress. Dr. Luthuli had been restricted to that area for several years and the fact that the Government had granted permission for this visit was considered to be quite an accomplishment for the Senator. During the one-hour visit Kennedy and Luthuli walked out in the fields so that they could talk privately. When they returned to the small tin-roofed house, Kennedy presented the Chief with two books, a portable record player, and two records of excerpts of
President Kennedy's speeches. Included on one record was the June 11, 1963 civil-rights address which Luthuli played for the group (Luthuli, his daughter, two government agents who accompanied the Kennedys and the two Kennedys).\(^1\) On the flight from Durban to Johannesburg Kennedy described Chief Luthuli as "one of the most impressive men I have met."\(^2\) After their arrival in Johannesburg the Kennedys made a three-hour visit to the black township of Soweto where nearly 750,000 Africans live. Jill Chisholm described this visit as "Probably the most riotous and tiring of all his appearances. Mobbed by thousands wherever he went, he . . . made impromptu speeches from the steps of a church, from the roof of a car and standing on a chair in the middle of a school playground."\(^3\) Kennedy reassured the thousands who surrounded him that their banned leader Luthuli believed that changes would come by peaceful means. Later he had a round of private meetings with trade union leaders in Johannesburg and then delivered a major address to about 150 members of the Johannesburg Bar Council. His final major address was delivered to more than 7,000 people at the University of Witwatersrand.\(^4\) In the meantime, back in the United States, James Meredith, who had integrated the University of Mississippi in 1962, was participating in a "freedom walk" when he was shot from ambush on a Mississippi highway. This news received world-wide coverage.
Constraints

As we have seen in previous chapters, constraints are limitations which arise from the situation, the audience, and the speaker, and which circumscribe the speaker's rhetorical effectiveness. The situation has been described above, while the audience to be considered included members of the immediate audience, South Africans and Americans who would read or hear about the speech, and the universal audience. The University of Witwatersrand audience included many students who were actively involved in NUSAS. The constraints imposed upon Kennedy at the University of Witwatersrand included his obligation to NUSAS and its commitments to human rights; not exacerbating feelings of hostility; rejecting violence or any hint thereof as an acceptable solution to any problem; as a foreigner, not presuming to dictate South African policy; as a representative of the United States, presenting a favorable image of his country; and, as a politician, presenting a favorable image so as to help, not harm, his political future. Additional constraints imposed upon Kennedy at Witwatersrand included his obligation to speak out for those who had no voice in their government—the non-whites and the banned; and his obligation to respond to the shooting of Meredith. How Kennedy handled these constraints in order to intensify the adherence of minds to commonly shared values (the function of epideictic speaking) provides the critic with useful
instruments with which to evaluate the speaker's effectiveness. However, before examining the techniques employed to handle the constraints, one must first know what values Kennedy chose to focus upon and the hierarchy of the values.

**Values Kennedy Focused on at Witwatersrand**

In adhering to his own value system as described in Chapter III, Kennedy chose to focus upon those values embodied in the Declaration of Independence, The Constitution of the United States, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. These were the same values he had espoused at Cape Town, Stellenbosch, and Natal universities. At Witwatersrand Kennedy expressed it this way:

> And those who seek change and progress in South Africa are very special. So many of those I have seen, so many who are here in this hall, are standing with their brothers around the globe for liberty and equality and human dignity; not in the ease and comfort and approbation of society, but in the midst of controversy and difficulty and risk.

As has been described in Chapter II, Witwatersrand like Cape Town, is an "open" university and, therefore, members of this audience already subscribe to Kennedy's hierarchy of values in which the individual is the touchstone. Consequently, his purpose in speaking was to intensify these commonly shared values primarily by the force of his own ethos. What account did Robert Kennedy give of himself in this speech?
Persuasion through Personality

But before proceeding to discuss how Robert Kennedy sought to intensify beliefs by the force of his personality, mention must be made of textual authenticity regarding the introduction. It seems unlikely that the introductory paragraph of this text was actually what Kennedy first said when he was introduced. This text constitutes what could be classed as a press-release copy in which references to the specific occasion (or audience) are usually omitted. At Cape Town, for example, the written copy of the speech began "I come here . . ." but the record revealed that he started by saying: "Mr. Chancellor . . . ." Close examination of the text at Witwatersrand suggests that his opening remarks are abrupt while examination of his opening remarks at Stellenbosch and at Natal tend to add credence to this contention. At Stellenbosch he began with the following: "I am delighted to be here. I am delighted to see all of you. As I said outside, the people of the United States, myself, all of those who are with me on this trip, have the greatest admiration and greatest affection for the people of South Africa." At Natal he said: "Tony, Your Excellency the Principal, Members of the Faculty, and Students: First I want to apologize for being late. But I was upstairs just before I came down and overheard a conversation between the previous speaker and a member of the police. . . ." It was not characteristic of Kennedy to omit the niceties when he spoke to groups and,
therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that Kennedy made at least some allusions to his specific audience at Witwatersrand. Thus, this material, which might shed some light on Kennedy's adaptation to his audience, is not available for evaluation. With this limitation in mind, let us proceed to examine Kennedy's projected image at Witwatersrand.

As we have seen in previous chapters, the speaker's demonstrable knowledge about his topic and his ability to establish rapport with his audience contribute significantly to his effectiveness in achieving his rhetorical goals. The speaker's knowledge is demonstrated by referring to his own experiences, to world conditions and history, and by invoking other authorities to add prestige to his ideas. In this address Kennedy makes few explicit references to his own personal experiences with the exception of the few comments about his visit to South Africa and where he has been. For this audience, it was not necessary for him to establish his credentials. They had already accepted him as an authority on this basis. In fact, Kennedy had been invited to deliver the Day of Affirmation Address because of his frequently expressed views on human rights and his actions as Attorney General in helping to secure these rights for those who had been deprived of equal rights in the United States. Numerous references to events and world conditions indicate his knowledge about them. For example, his statement that he had gone
from Pretoria to Cape Town traversing in reverse that first journey indicates his knowledge of South African history and the journey of the Voortrekkers in the nineteenth century. His references to the inventor of poison gas, the fate of millions in Nazi Germany, the oppression under Hitler and Stalin, those who bombed and destroyed whole cities, to mention only a few examples, indicate that he is knowledgeable about what has happened in the world. They show that he is aware of the crimes against mankind that others have committed, that his own country has committed. Two other examples that would demonstrate Kennedy is knowledgeable about world affairs and history would include his reference to Averell Harriman's negotiating of the Test Ban Treaty and the association of the speaker (because his brother was President of the United States) with this accomplishment; and his reference to the just completed journey of the American astronauts as well as the aborted journey of James Meredith. Kennedy's statement that history is filled with peoples who have permitted the state to make their decisions indicates that he is familiar with the structure of totalitarian regimes and that he recognizes the differences between authoritarian governments and those of free nations.

As has been stated before, a man often reveals himself by the authorities he chooses to invoke and thus it would be worthwhile to note which authorities Kennedy selects to
exemplify his values. He invokes the Bible as representing ultimate authority and he cites President John Kennedy, Averell Harriman, the astronauts, James Meredith, and Mark Twain as individuals who typify his value hierarchy. The one authority he most frequently invokes, as would be expected, is his brother, President Kennedy. In this speech, unlike his other addresses in South Africa, the individuals he selects as authorities all are (or were) citizens of the United States. At Cape Town he had invoked Ian Robertson and the Greeks; Archimedes, Pericles, and Aristotle, as well as President Kennedy and Martin Luther King. At Stellenbosch he had chosen Adam Tas, the Boers, the Voortrekkers, and Goethe, as well as Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Lincoln, and John Kennedy. At the University of Natal, he had selected Ian Robertson, Archbishop Hurley, Alan Paton, and Frances Bacon, as well as President Kennedy and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. His choices at Witwatersrand thus suggest that in this speech he is speaking primarily as a representative of the United States.

In this capacity Kennedy seeks affinity with his audience by emphasizing their commonalities, by stressing his commitment to individual worth, and by employing tact or diplomacy. His opening remarks about being impressed with "the warmth and the interests of all the people of South Africa, of all political persuasions and races" serves to
establish common bonds between the speaker and his audience. In expressing his appreciation of his treatment by the people of South Africa he is complimenting them. Here Kennedy shows himself to be a man of goodwill which helps to generate the goodwill of his audience. This is particularly significant for those in the audience who support the policy of apartheid and had been told that Kennedy was practically a communist. Kennedy's reference to "all political persuasions" however, includes not only those who support the Nationalist government but those who dissent from it as well; and his reference to all "races" would certainly include the majority of South Africans who have no voice in their government. His particular identification is with the youth as the following quotation illustrates.

Above all, I have been impressed with South Africa youth: not just those young in years, but those of every age who are young in a spirit of imagination and courage and an appetite for the adventure of life.

As one can see, his definition of youth here is essentially the same as that articulated at Cape Town when he proclaimed that

This world demands the qualities of youth; not a time of life but a state of mind, a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a predominance of courage over the life of ease. . . .

In both instances Kennedy defines youth in such a way that it applies to him as well as to his audience (whether that audience be the specific one at Witwatersrand, that audience in
South Africa or the United States who would read or hear about the speech, or the so-called universal audience. They share common bonds. The individual he cites at Witwatersrand to exemplify "youth" as he has defined it is a man in his seventies, Averell Harriman. At Cape Town he had chosen the Chancellor of the University as an example of the young. In singling out those in South Africa who "seek change and progress" as very "special" and calling upon them to take the lead in the fight for right Kennedy reasserts his (and their) value system as being in the Western tradition. At the same time, this could be construed as a subtle reminder to the Government of South Africa that its apartheid policies and anti-communism policies are negations of this tradition it claims to uphold.

Kennedy's commitment to individual worth (the core of his value system) is expressed not only in his thematic statement but throughout the speech. In particular, this belief in the individual and his role in society is aptly illustrated in Mark Twain's answer to "What is a Country?" Kennedy quotes Twain as saying:

> It is the common voice of the people. Each--by himself and on his own responsibility--must speak. Each must for himself must decide what is right and what is wrong, and which course is patriotic and which is not. Otherwise it is to be a traitor, both to yourself and to your country.

The above quotation illustrates Kennedy's concept of the role of the individual but it also may be considered as
an example of his tact and diplomacy. The definition of a country as "the common voice of the people" is Kennedy's way of telling his audience at Witwatersrand that they represent South Africa. This would serve as a reminder that their government refuses to permit this representation by all of its people. In other words, "the common voice" is restricted to members of the white race and only those whites who are deemed by the government to be anti-communists. The assertion that a patriot is one who decides for himself what is right and what is wrong and then acts accordingly holds special meaning for this audience. Was not Ian Robertson banned for daring to act according to his own dictates? Was he not labeled a traitor to South Africa?

Another example of how Kennedy employs tact and diplomacy to further his rhetorical aims is found in the citing of his brother's words to the American people in 1963.

"If an American"—or, I would add, any man—if a man, he said, "because his skin is dark, cannot eat lunch in a restaurant open to the public, if he cannot send his children to the best public school available, if he cannot vote for the public officials who represent him, if in short, he cannot enjoy the full and free life which all of us want, then who among us would be content to change the color of his skin and stand in his place?"

In reaffirming the values of Western tradition Kennedy subtly points out that South Africa and the United States have not achieved the goal of providing equal justice for all their people. In South Africa, the laws of apartheid forbid
political participation by the vast majority of South Africans—those who are non-white. Apartheid policy also prohibits the mixing of the races in public places such as in restaurants. In South Africa schools for Blacks are not public (in the sense they are not free) and they certainly are not the best available (See Chapter II). Above all, a Black does not enjoy a free and full life. His freedoms are severely restricted. In the United States, a number of Blacks do not have full voting rights; there are still a number of public restaurants which do not admit Blacks; there is still a pattern of discrimination in education just as there is still discrimination against Blacks in housing, in job opportunities and in other areas.

Another example of the use of tact and diplomacy may be found in Kennedy's reference to the astronauts and James Meredith. His coupling of them in terms of journeys seems to imply that they are pioneers of change, that the astronauts are pioneers in the attempt to conquer space and that James Meredith is a pioneer in the fight for social justice. Mention of Meredith would not only remind the audience that he had been shot but they would also associate Meredith with Kennedy and the integration of the University of Mississippi in 1962. In turn this would cause them to contrast the speaker's actions as Attorney General of the United States with Vorster's actions as Minister of Justice of South
Africa. This would, of course, add to Kennedy's ethos and thereby strengthen his arguments.

The above discussion of persuasion through personality indicates that Robert Kennedy was perceived to be a man of good moral character, intelligence, and goodwill. Let us now turn to the associative techniques of argumentation he employed in order to intensify his auditors' beliefs in their commonly shared values.

**Associative and Dissociative Argumentative Techniques**

Compared with the other speeches, this speech yields fewer results from the analysis of associative/dissociative techniques. Kennedy chose to use few explicit arguments. This was his last appearance in South Africa and he wished to leave a favorable impression of himself and his country. His audience at Witwatersrand was already favorably disposed toward the speaker and his ideas; they were aware of and agreed with what he had said at other places in South Africa (as well as elsewhere). His purpose was to offer encouragement, to intensify their beliefs; to inspire. It was not necessary for him to enumerate a number of arguments to support his claims; nor was it even necessary for him to repeat some of them he had enumerated previously. Consequently, we find this speech to consist primarily of a series of unsupported assertions which Kennedy assumed his audience would associate with because they accepted his account of reality,
his value system. He conceived his audience to be the young as he had defined it and directed his appeal accordingly. The young are future-oriented, they are idealistic, and they are firmly convinced that, as individuals, they are not only important but that they can make a better world. Notice how Kennedy's basic theme is directed at these characteristics. The individual is of supreme importance, he is the touchstone of value. However, he does not act alone; he is a part of his nation and a part of mankind (unity of mankind theme). He cannot be fully free until and unless all men are free. He cannot have justice for himself without having justice for all (Golden Rule). What you do has an effect on what happens elsewhere and therefore, what happens in South Africa affects the United States and we have to respond.

But despite the fact that there are fewer results to be observed, there are some conclusions to be drawn about the associative and dissociative techniques Kennedy employed in this speech. Take, for example, his definition of "youth" as has already been described previously in this chapter (as well as in Chapter IV). Argument by definition is a quasi-logical associative technique. It is also dissociative in that it excludes. The following quotation also illustrates the associative-dissociative techniques.

There are those who say that the game is not worth the candle—that Africa is too primitive to develop, that its peoples are not ready for freedom and self-government, that violence and
chaos are unchangeable. But those who say these things should look to the history of every part and parcel of the human race. It was not the black man of Africa who invented and used poison gas or the atomic bomb, who sent 6 million men and women and children to the gas ovens, and used their bodies as fertilizer. Hitler and Stalin were not black men of Africa. And it was not the black men of Africa who bombed and obliterated Rotterdam and Shanghai and Dresden and Hiroshima.

In the above quotation Kennedy invokes history as authority to argue from definition. He defines as "primitive" those who use poison gas, atomic bombs, send others to gas chambers, obliterate cities, and oppress their peoples. The blacks have not committed any of these crimes against mankind, and, therefore, they are excluded from this definition. They are dissociated. It is the white people of the United States, Germany, Great Britain, Russia, and Japan ("honorary" whites), the so-called civilized people, who qualify as "primitive." Therefore, Kennedy argues, that if we whites can commit such atrocities how can we claim that the blacks who are innocent of such crimes are not capable of self government and ready for freedom? How can we label them "primitive" as South Africa has done? (This is an associative scheme.) The two previous examples demonstrate one of Kennedy's favorite forms of argument. Two other examples of this quasi-logical associative/dissociative technique of argumentation would include his definition of a "country" and of a "patriot" as discussed previously in this chapter.
Argument from consequences (an associative strategy of sequential relations based on the structure of reality standard), another technique which Kennedy utilizes frequently, is illustrated in the following.

If you can answer the great questions—if you can sweep unjust privilege into the dead past, if you can show the dispossessed and the diseased, the hungry and the untaught, that there is a better life for them and a fair place in the sun for their children—if you can do these things, then all of us will take heart from your example, and this continent can take its place in the world.

But if you cannot do these things, then your shadow will fall long across this continent—and the common cause of men everywhere, in the United States and in South Africa, will be sorely tried and deeply injured.

The first part of the quotation is the associative aspect of the argument which reflects the benefits to be accrued by taking the proposed action. The second part of the argument reflects the consequences of failing in this endeavor to achieve social justice and therefore it is dissociative. Argument from consequences is also demonstrated in the assertion that if people are deprived of their rights because their skin happens to be one color or they happen to hold one belief, then others will be deprived of their rights because their skin is of a different color or they hold other beliefs.

In this speech, as in the other epideictic addresses in South Africa, Kennedy relies upon the associative strategy
of ends and means (argument of sequential relations based on the structure of reality standard) to help him achieve his rhetorical aims. One example of this may be found in his assertion that we have no choice about whether or not change will come but we do have the choice of how we use change to master change. We have the means (knowledge and reasoning) to shape the desired ends of securing social justice for all. Force or fear are unsatisfactory alternatives according to Kennedy so they are dissociated. In this sense Kennedy associates South Africa with those who use force or fear to achieve their ends and he thus dissociates South Africa from Western tradition.

Another associative technique frequently utilized in this address (and in the others) is the argument of cause and effect (sequential relations based on the structure of reality standard). Kennedy uses this technique when he asserts that those who cut themselves off from clashing ideas and convictions cause violence to be unleashed. Another extensively employed associative strategy is the rule of justice argument which belongs to the quasi-logical technique. Asking his audience to place themselves in the shoes of the deprived illustrates this strategy.

Interaction of Arguments

Although Robert Kennedy's audience at Witwatersrand was a very favorable one and they already accepted his vision of
reality, still the order in which he presented his arguments was a significant factor in helping him to achieve his aims. Thus it would be worthwhile to examine this speech arrangement in order to determine what he did and why he chose that particular order.

In his introductory remarks (paragraphs 1-8) Kennedy emphasizes the commonalities that they share and identifies himself and the principles of Western democracy with his audience of the "young" as he has defined the word. The body of the speech consists of three parts which he labels as the three battles to which we are summoned. The first battle is the fight for the future (paragraphs 9-11); the second battle is the fight for justice (paragraphs 12-22); and the third battle to which we are summoned is that fight for individuality (paragraphs 23-25). Kennedy concludes with the assertion that he knows that his audience will join in the battle to secure justice for all.

As has been noted in the previous section, Kennedy directs his appeals to his young audience who are future-oriented. They are the future leaders of the world, a world that is constantly changing and the young are more adaptable to change. Thus they are more capable of making the changes that are necessary if the traditions of Western society are to survive.

The young are also idealistic so Kennedy's call for enjoining the battle to ensure justice would have a particular
appeal for them. In terms of the amount of time he expends in elucidating upon this aspect of his message (especially the practical dangers of social injustices), it is evident that this is the heart of his message. It is also significant that the final point he makes in this last speech is that each individual is sacred, that each has certain basic rights which must be protected and preserved.

In many respects this speech at Witwatersrand is similar to the Cape Town speech in terms of the stylistic devices utilized. For example, his definitions of "youth," of "patriot," of "country," and of "primitive" could all be classified as oratorical definitions which are figures of speech that are used to promote "choice." For promoting "presence" Kennedy relies upon repetition of ideas and concepts (which have already been discussed previously in this chapter) and anaphora as he had done in the Cape Town Address. A few examples of anaphora are as follows:

"I have been impressed with . . . I have been impressed by . . . I have been impressed with,"

"It is the question before us . . . it is the question before you . . . it is the question before all of us,"

"If you can answer . . . if you can sweep . . . if you can show . . . if you can do,"

"It is easier to fight . . . easier to have enemies . . . easier to follow blindly."

He also relies upon amplification to promote "presence" as the previous discussion of the so-called civilized peoples
illustrates. As in his speech at Cape Town, he does not use onomatopoeia to promote "presence." Neither does he employ imaginary direct speech. However, in the question-and-answer session which followed, according to Kennedy, he makes use of this stylistic device when, in reference to the Irish, he states: "Why don't we see if we can't get boats and send them back to Ireland? They obviously aren't equipped for education, and they certainly can never rule."

For promoting "communion" Kennedy stresses allusion which has been discussed already in terms of commonalities so only a few other illustrations of this device will be included for demonstrative purposes. "The day is long past when any nation could retreat behind walls of stone or curtains of iron or bamboo" is an allusion to the Berlin Wall, Russia and China. According to Kennedy, he was alluding to James Meredith when he said:

Let no man think he fights this battle for others. He fights for himself, and so do we all. The golden rule is not sentimentality but the deepest practical wisdom. For the teaching of our time is that cruelty is contagious, and its disease knows no bounds of race or nation.

The reference to Averell Harriman as being "the youngest man in Washington" is another example of this stylistic device. "The winds of freedom and progress and justice" quotation could be construed as Kennedy's allusion to the "Winds of Change" speech that Harold Macmillan as Prime Minister of
Britain delivered in South Africa in February of 1960.

Another stylistic device Kennedy utilizes at Witwatersrand (as he had done at Cape Town) to promote "communion" is the oratorical question. Some examples of this device are as follows:

... who among us would be content to change the color of his skin and stand in his place? Who among us would then be content with the counsels of patience and delay? ... if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for battle?

In this speech, as we have seen, Kennedy utilizes oratorical definition to promote "Choice"; he makes use of repetition (including anaphora) and amplification to promote "presence"; and he stresses allusion as well as the oratorical question as stylistic devices to promote "communion."

Although the critic does not have access to a transcript of the question-and-answer session that followed this speech, Kennedy mentions in his article for Look magazine some of the questions posed by his audience and his responses to them. His employment of imaginary direct speech as a stylistic device to promote "précisence" was cited. Another question asked of him at Witwatersrand was what he asserted to be the most difficult question of all. "How can there be genuine dialogue, and therefore a hope of solution, when your adversary also makes the rules and acts as referee with the power to destroy you at will?" He answered that he "recognized the terrible problems they faced, but there were basically
only two alternatives: to make an effort—or to yield, to admit defeat, to surrender."

This, then, was Kennedy's message to the young people at Witwatersrand at his final public appearance in South Africa. Early the following morning he flew from the Jan Smuts airport to a neighboring African country.
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CHAPTER VIII

RESPONSE TO KENNEDY'S SOUTH AFRICAN TOUR

Since speeches are designed to elicit certain responses from the audiences to whom they are addressed, the extent to which those responses correspond with the speaker's aims provides a measurement of his rhetorical effectiveness. In epideictic speaking, the orator's purpose is to promote commonly shared values, to intensify those beliefs already held by his auditors. As has already been mentioned, the audiences to whom this speaking in South Africa was addressed consisted of the particular audience, the general audience, and the so-called universal audience. As Perelman has noted, in epideictic speaking more than in any other type of speaking, the speaker's image is crucial because it is not merely his own view that he is expounding but that of his audience's as well. Consequently, if he is to serve as the educator of his audience then he must have a high reputation. Therefore, the image the audience has of the speaker not only as he speaks but before he speaks will help to determine his ability to persuade. In other words, what the audience perceives the man who is to address them to be plays a role in assessing how well he achieves his rhetorical aims. How was Kennedy
perceived? What did he expect to accomplish in South Africa? How well did he succeed? What were the effects of his sojourn in South Africa and how can we measure those effects? What instruments can we use to determine what impact he had upon his audiences and what impact the visit had upon him? Answers to these and other questions form the basis for this chapter.

First of all, what kind of a man was he perceived to be prior to his arrival in South Africa? In South Africa, as in the United States, there were oppositely held opinions of Robert Kennedy. The Verwoerd Government (and its supporters) viewed him as a man who created trouble and dissension wherever he went; they saw him as an agitator. They contended that he was an opportunist who sought to use the South African trip as a means of trying to embarrass the Government by attacking apartheid and thereby appealing to Blacks and "liberals" in the United States as part of his campaign to woo their votes when he ran for the Presidency of the United States. The fact that he had accepted the invitation issued by NUSAS, an organization that was highly suspect, was proof that he was not a friend of South Africa to their way of thinking. They believed Robert Kennedy to be too much of a liberal not to be tainted by communism. As a consequence, they tried to discourage his visit. When the invitation was extended in October they had attempted to persuade the National Union of South
African Students to rescind it; they had informally appealed to President Johnson to intervene and exert his influence to persuade Senator Kennedy to forego the trip; they had delayed granting the visa to permit him to enter the country; and when they did grant the visa it was with the understanding that Kennedy's visit would be in a purely private capacity, that the Government would have nothing to do with him. They had applied further pressure by "banning" Robertson in the hope that Kennedy would decide not to come under the circumstances. Finally, they had denied visas to newsmen and photographers from the United States who wished to accompany Kennedy and had lifted the visas of a number of other foreign newsmen in South Africa for a sixteen-day period (May 25th to June 10th) which covered the time of Kennedy's appearance in South Africa. In addition, pamphlets which accused Kennedy of a number of charges were circulated throughout the country just prior to his arrival. All this only served to generate more interest in Kennedy's visit in South Africa, in the United States, and in other countries, especially those on the African continent. Arthur Krock called the barring of foreign newsmen "a stupid error." He maintained that the only way the Government could prevent Kennedy's visit receiving world-wide publicity, either concurrently or eventually, would be to bar the man himself because Kennedy was "one of the most skillful and industrious harvesters of publicity in
politics, and a pretty good newsman on the side."¹ Krock further maintained that whether or not the visit developed into a build-up for Kennedy's bid for the Presidency would not depend on any actions taken by the South African Government, but on the evaluation by his fellow citizens of the quality of his performance there.² Verwoerd's critics in South Africa also voiced their views about the press ban. For example, Vause Raw, Natal vice-chairman of the United Party, declared that it was "typical of the government's ham-handed diplomacy," and Mrs. Helen Suzman, the lone Progressive Party Member of Parliament contended that "The ban makes us look childish and ridiculous in the eyes of the world."³ Others in South Africa, and especially many of the younger generation, held Senator Robert Kennedy in high esteem. They identified him with his late brother, President Kennedy, for whom they had great admiration and they identified themselves with him. Thus they were delighted that this world-famous figure was coming to South Africa. This, in brief, was Kennedy's image as seen by those who were apartheid supporters and by those who opposed the governmental policies, that is, this was the impression of him before he arrived. Whether or not his image was altered by what he said and what he did in South Africa will be discussed later in this chapter. It appears to this critic that statements made in an article in The New Republic sum up what kind of impact Kennedy would likely
have on those who defended apartheid and those who opposed it.

It is impossible for a man of Senator Kennedy's stature and political background not to become transformed from a politician into a symbol immediately on arrival in South Africa. For those who support Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd's regime, Kennedy becomes the symbol of internationalism, with all that this ominous word implies in this laager-minded country; egalitarianism, liberalism, interference, sanctions, the United Nations. For those who oppose Verwoerd's regime, he becomes the symbol of hope; reassurance of universal values, moral comfort, perhaps even a faint promise of succor.4

What did Robert Kennedy expect to accomplish by this visit? To answer this question we need to know what he stated as the reasons for making this journey and then discern what other reasons not mentioned by him should be taken into account. Of course, the invitation to deliver the Day of Affirmation Address was the justification for the visit to South Africa. That, however, does not completely answer the question of why he accepted the invitation, and particularly why he insisted on making the trip even after Robertson was "banned" and newsmen barred. At the Jan Smuts Airport upon his arrival, he stated:

We cannot, even if we would, avoid concern for one another's problems. We have all learnt, . . . that in this world prosperity--and chaos and disaster as well--are indivisible. So I come here to South Africa to exchange views with you--with all segments of South African thought and opinion--on what we together can do to meet the challenges of our time.

We will not, I expect, always agree: I expect you do not always agree among yourselves.
But what is important is that we frankly discuss the problems and prospects, the hopes and the hazards, which we share as inhabitants of the globe.5

In an article describing his visit to South Africa, Kennedy told of talking with diverse people representing diverse views. He maintained that wherever he and his wife went (Pretoria, Cape Town, Durban, Stellenbosch, and Johannesburg) apartheid was the topic of discussion and debate. He asserted that "Our aim was not simply to criticize but to engage in a dialogue to see if, together, we could elevate reason above prejudice and myth."6 In this same article, Kennedy praised the "banned" leader Robertson for his courage and this, too, was undoubtedly a reason that Kennedy chose to go to South Africa—to acknowledge his admiration for Robertson and the student group he headed. Although the critic does not question Robert Kennedy's sincerity in what he said regarding his reasons for going to South Africa, what he left unsaid is equally significant. What he failed to say is that this trip would be viewed by his fellow citizens in the United States as a part of his campaign for the Presidency. His conduct in South Africa would be interpreted within the context of his qualifications (or lack of them) to be President. In other words, his qualities displayed in South Africa through what he said and how he responded to others, would be measured against the qualities the citizens seek in their leader. It could not have escaped the Senator that what he said in
South Africa would be viewed by other African nations as representing official United States policy. He was certainly aware that his stance in this land of apartheid would be evaluated by those living in Harlem, Watts, and Southside Chicago and by liberals in all parts of the country. Although his actions as Attorney General on behalf of minority groups and others who were deprived in some manner indicated that he was truly concerned about individual rights, the stigma of McCarthy still clung. Thus, this visit afforded him the opportunity to establish fully his credentials with this group. His identification with young people in South Africa would help to reinforce his identification with the young in the United States and, considering the fact that the median age of citizens was growing younger, this, too, would increase his Presidential chances. If, as Kennedy maintained, his purpose in going to South Africa was to engage in dialogue, and if, as this critic maintains, it was also an opportunity to further his Presidential aspirations, then, in order to accomplish his aims, it was essential that he be well-informed about the country he was to visit. How did he become well-informed? How did he prepare for this trip? A former official of the Department of State described the preparation as consuming an impressive amount of time and energy. He stated that information was obtained from official sources, universities, and from private sources representing a wide variety of
knowledge about southern and Eastern Africa. Senator Ken­
nedy held discussions with businessmen, officials, jour­
nalists, churchmen, authors, scholars, Africans and South
Africans, representing a wide range of views on race rela­
tions and developments in Africa. He held a series of
Saturday morning discussions at his Hickory Hill home which
began with a breakfast. "During these and other discus­
sions, Sen. Kennedy formulated and refined the principal
themes of his speeches in the four countries he was to
visit." 7 Frank Haneckewicz, Press Secretary for Senator
Robert Kennedy, told this researcher that the procedure des­
cribed above was the usual one followed in preparing for
major appearances whether in this country or in others. 8
Thus it could be said that Kennedy prepared for his speaking
tour in South Africa with two specific audiences in mind,
the immediate audience in South Africa and that audience in
the United States who would be gaining impressions and form­
ing judgments about his potential Presidential qualifica­
tions. It could also be said that Kennedy sought to offer
encouragement to the dissenters, to engage in dialogue with
the hope of finding some answers to mutual problems, and to
further his Presidential aspirations. To answer the ques­
tion of how well he succeeded in accomplishing his aims we
must first assess how he was received in South Africa.
Overt reactions to his appearances and what he said provide
the critic with a means of assessing the immediate responses.
Before proceeding, however, two points need to be made concerning the electronic media in South Africa. First of all, South Africa has no television system so that this means of disseminating information or projecting Kennedy's image was precluded. Radio in South Africa (the South African Broadcasting Corporation) is owned and controlled by the Government and it is carefully censored. As would be expected, it gave slight notice to Kennedy's visit. It did not broadcast any of his speeches and made few remarks about the Senator. As a consequence, news about Kennedy and what he said (at the time) was either spread by word-of-mouth or by stories in the newspapers in South Africa.

What were some of the overt reactions to Kennedy? Upon his arrival at the Jan Smuts Airport at midnight (June 4th) he was greeted by a crowd of enthusiasts similar to crowds that greeted him in many parts of the United States and elsewhere. One Indian youth in his zest violated apartheid policy by hugging Kennedy and bestowing a fervent kiss on his cheek. Kennedy's response to this demonstration of affection was his comment: "Wrong Sex." On the following day (June 5th), Kennedy met with South African editors and discussed racial problems. One of the editors presented him with a book on apartheid to help him "understand South Africa better." As mentioned previously, Kennedy presented him with a copy of The American Negro Reference Book.
However, the Afrikaans-speaking editor for whom the gift was intended was not present. The editor, D. G. Scholtz of the Johannesburg paper Die Transvaler, had declined to meet with Mr. Kennedy today on the ground that his religious principles did not permit him to discuss politics on Sunday. Instead, Mr. Scholtz sent a deputy to the meeting to present to the visitor a newly published book, "The Principles of Apartheid" by Prof. H. P. Sampson.12

Regarding the above meeting, Frank Taylor reported that

the Afrikaans editors were clearly not enthralled by the senator. One of them complained later that there had been absolutely no "meeting of minds" and added rather sullenly that the young senator was very skilled at putting other people on the defensive.13

Kennedy also met with English-speaking editors, among them Laurence Gandar of the anti-apartheid paper Rand Daily Mail of Johannesburg. He also met with Opposition representatives such as S. J. Marias of the United Party who stated that Mr. Kennedy had a "most intelligent insight" into South Africa's racial problems; and Mrs. Helen Suzman of the Progressive Party, who, after a 35-minute meeting with the Senator asserted that he had "struck all of us as a very moderate man indeed, and not armed with any prejudice against South Africa."14 Later that same day the Senator was the honored guest at a dinner given by the South African Foundation, an organization of private business men whose object is to promote a favorable image of South Africa around the world. (It was this group that Kennedy referred to at Natal as having invited him to return to
South Africa the following year.) The following day he met with clergymen and non-white editors and then flew to Cape Town. At the airport he was again greeted by hundreds of cheering students and others. One young black African who appeared to express the sentiments of many yelled out: "Fourteen million non-whites are waiting to hear your magic voice tonight, Bobby. Make it good and loud." 15

At the University of Cape Town that evening the overflow crowd cheered him. Fifteen times during his speech he was interrupted by applause and at its conclusion he was given a five-minute thunderous ovation. Although applause itself is an overt expression of approval, insight into the audience's views may be gleaned by examining what they were applauding. His introductory remarks about his deep interest in and affection for a country—in reference to the United States—was greeted with laughter and applause. He was applauded when he expressed his thanks to Ian Robertson for extending the invitation, applauded when he expressed regret that Robertson could not be there, and applauded when he told the audience of meeting with Robertson and presenting him with a copy of Profiles In Courage which had been inscribed by Mrs. John Kennedy. He was again applauded when he asserted that "the essential humanity of man can be protected and preserved only where government must answer . . . to all of the people." His statement concerning the necessity of limiting the power of government
to act against its citizens by restricting their freedoms met with applause. His insistence that reform and communism were not synonymous and that denial of freedom in whatever name strengthened communism was greeted with applause. He was applauded when he mentioned Dr. Martin Luther King as a Nobel Peace Prize recipient and applauded when he asserted that "we must recognize the full human equality of all of our people . . . because it is the right thing to do." His audience audibly signaled agreement with his statement that

"... Only earthbound man still clings to the dark and poisoning superstition that his world is bounded by the nearest hill, his universe ends at river shore, his common humanity is enclosed in the tight circle of those who share his town or his views and the color of his skin."

He was applauded when he listed the evils of the world as reflecting imperfections of justice which limit our ability to use knowledge for the well-being of all. His audience clapped their hands in approval of his assertion that "... the help and the leadership of South Africa or of the United States cannot be accepted if we--within our own country or in our relationships with others--deny individual integrity, human dignity, and the common humanity of man."

They again applauded when he cited the Chancellor of Cape Town University as exemplifying "youth" as he had defined it. His contention that one man or woman can make a difference (citing examples to support his assertion) followed
by his assertion that "each of us can work to change a small portion of the events, and in the total all of these acts will be written in the history of this generation," was applauded. So, too, was his allusion to the camps at Auschwitz, the streets of Budapest, and the hills of the Acropolis. As has been mentioned previously, he was given a five-minute ovation at the conclusion of his speech. Although the recording was clear, it is instructive to note that press reports observed that approximately one-third of the audience were unable to hear the speech because some loudspeakers failed to function.

In a response to Kennedy's address, John Daniel, vice-president of NUSAS proclaimed: "You have given us a hope for the future. You have renewed our determination not to relax until liberty is restored, not only to our universities but to our land."

Reporters, on the whole, were quite favorable. For example, Frank Taylor reported as follows:

Many people here agree that the senator's speech ... at Cape Town University ... was the most stirring and memorable address ever to come from a foreigner in South Africa. For the first time since the Afrikaner-dominated Nationalist government came to power 18 years ago, South Africans heard in no uncertain terms, that their problems of race were the problems of the world and of mankind ... [H]e made a concerned and honest call for some effort and some movement towards what he called "equality for freedom." As his brother often did when he was President, Senator Kennedy urged his listeners to take what amounted to the "cosmic" view of things. The fluency with which the
senator made his points had a deep effect on those who for so long have been caught up in the tight and confining world of South African politics dominated as they always are by the race question and by the "go-it-alone" attitudes which fall short of sheer isolationism.19

According to The New York Times, "The Senator was virtually praised by Afrikaans newspapers for his address ... to Capetown University students ... . One newspaper said Mr. Kennedy had been 'sensible.' Another expressed regret that the Government had officially ignored him."20

A Reuters dispatch to The New York Times reported that many observers of the Cape Town address believed that it was the most important one made by a visitor to South Africa since Harold Macmillan's "winds of change" speech in 1960 in which the then Prime Minister of Britain condemned apartheid and warned South Africans that their policy was outdated and that it could only lead to violence.21

Editorial comment was generally favorable. The liberal English newspaper The Guardian cited Kennedy for displaying political courage at Cape Town and added that "occasionally in politics it is given to a man to say the right thing, at the right time and in the right place, and so strike a chord that is both sympathetic and lasting."22

In its editorial, The New York Times warned South Africa not to miscalculate the position of the United States. It asserted that both Senator Kennedy and President Johnson spoke for the country. It is interesting to note that
the *Times* placed both men on the same footing. Thus, from the standpoint of reaching his audience in the United States, it could be said that Kennedy received a favorable response from the country's best known newspaper. The editorial reads as follows:

South Africa's restrictive racial policies drive that Government into greater isolation from the community of nations. There is danger in such isolation. For, the long run, a major danger is that South Africa will miscalculate the state of United States sentiment.

Many supporters of Prime Minister Verwoerd believe instability, violence and a threat of Communism in new African nations, plus racial troubles here at home, will eventually persuade Americans to condone or embrace apartheid— to conclude that South Africa has been right all along.

It was therefore important for President Johnson in his first major speech on Africa to say: "We will not permit human rights to be restricted in our own country. And we will not support policies abroad which are based on the rule of minorities or the discredited notion that men are unequal before the law."

It was important for Senator Robert F. Kennedy at the University of Capetown to declare: "We must recognize the full human equality of all our people... And this must be our commitment outside our borders as it is within."

South Africans may say both statements were motivated by American political considerations, but the fact is that the United States is now committed irrevocably to building a nonracial society. Neither President nor Senator was smug about South Africa's problems; neither underestimated the enormous distance the United States still must travel to reach its goal.

Wise South Africans will recognize that both men spoke for America.

Some other world editorial reaction was mixed. For example, *The London Daily Mirror* praised Mr. Kennedy's
"moving appeal to youth to show qualities of conscience and indignation," but The Daily Express observed: "It is hard to see what useful purpose Senator Kennedy is achieving in South Africa. . . . The suspicion must be that Mr. Kennedy simply wants to advance his presidential prospects by creating a stir."24

As would be expected, government officials were very displeased with Kennedy's speech at Cape Town. One such official said after the speech that

This little snip thinks he can tell us what to do. He has only been in this country for three days, and already he has the audacity to tell us what the remedies to our problems are.25

These, then, were some of the reactions to the Cape Town address.

The rest of this tour in South Africa must be considered within the context of the address at Cape Town for it was there that Kennedy set forth his major theme and the rest of this visit was an orchestration of this theme. From this standpoint Kennedy's visit to South Africa could be designated as belonging to the campaign category26 in which the Cape Town Address formed the focus. Thus, wherever Kennedy went in South Africa his message was the same. It could also be said that wherever he went he was warmly received (except by officials who refused to see him) even though some of those to whom he spoke did not agree with him. For example, at Stellenbosch University where students
generally support apartheid, his speech drew lengthy applause. It was at Stellenbosch that Kennedy first responded to the shooting of Meredith in which he said that he was shocked and saddened. The question and answer session at Stellenbosch in which views were exchanged was described by participants there as "a draw and not in a bitter vein." The above comment would suggest that Kennedy was cordially received and that his responses to questions and comments were adequate to the occasion, that in this encounter his projected image was a favorable one.

At Durban, it was reported that Kennedy received one of his warmest welcomes. His speech at the University of Natal was enthusiastically received. Again he was applauded several times during this appearance. For example, when Kennedy spoke of congratulating the Stellenbosch students for their broadmindedness and told them he thought they were very liberal, his Natal audience laughed and applauded. His next comment that "But we all understand what we meant," was greeted with laughter. Laughter and applause followed Kennedy's story of the Johnstown flood survivor.

Other overt responses of applause which provide insight into the views of the Natal audience greeted Kennedy when he spoke of the difference between Western tradition and communism, asserting that Western tradition believes in change, in facing up to problems and solving them just
just as the youth of South Africa (as well as the youth of the United States) want to do. His audience signified their approval of his rhetorical question, "What is going to happen to us when we die if we go up and find out that God was colored or God was black?" Kennedy's assertion that in Latin America where upon one occasion he was not permitted to speak because "there were those who felt so strongly" (reference to communist students) he was not considered a communist but quite the opposite was applauded. So, too, was his announcement that he had been invited back by the South African Foundation. Kennedy was applauded when he said that "Maybe there is a black man outside this room who is smarter than anybody here." He was also applauded when he was asked about Rhodesia and stated that all the people in Rhodesia did not vote on that constitution. Applause in these places would indicate that this audience subscribed to Kennedy's values.

Another type of overt response to Kennedy's appearance at Natal is seen in the vote of thanks posed to the Senator by Archbishop Dennis Hurley, an Honorary Vice-President of MUSAS. In this brief speech Bishop Hurley commented about how South Africa had been responding to the Kennedy magic. He noted that "In some cases the responses have been ... enthusiastically favorable, and it has delighted the hearts of us to see this enthusiasm." He continued: "Favorable beyond anything that many imagined possible in our country."
Of course, as the Archbishop noted, others had managed to resist the Kennedy charm and had remained aloof but he knew that Kennedy expected "a certain coolness and aloofness in certain quarters." The Archbishop then asserted:

We thank God that at his juncture in world affairs when so much depends on the United States, it has produced men like the Kennedys, not afraid to combine the idealism of a great faith in God and in man with a realism necessary to a statesman.

Bishop Hurlay then concluded by saying that South Africa owed much to Kennedy for the visit, for the words spoken, and for the dialogue in which he engaged. After Kennedy's address at Natal University he joined a large group outside the hall where they all lustily sang "We Shall Overcome."

Another dimension of Kennedy's African impact relates to the "banned" Chief Luthuli which has been described previously in Chapter VII. According to the correspondent for Newsweek, Senator Kennedy had fallen under the spell of Dr. Luthuli. Senator Kennedy described his reactions to the former Zulu Chief as follows:

A I left the old chief, I thought of the lines from Shakespeare: "His life was gentle, and the elements/So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up/And say to all the world, 'This was a man!'"

This visit with Chief Luthuli was particularly significant from the standpoint, that for the first time in five years the people in Doweto had direct word of their banned
leader Albert Luthuli. Kennedy's comments to the inhabitants of Soweto about what Chief Luthuli had said could not be and were not reported in newspapers in South Africa because Luthuli was under "ban" and it is illegal to quote the words of a "banned" person. Of course, any such comments could be and were published outside the country. Published reports outside South Africa cited Kennedy as saying that Luthuli was "distressed, concerned, and saddened that the black man in South Africa does not have the same future and opportunities as the white man." Kennedy continued: "He feels the only change for the better will be brought about by God and that alone can improve the situation." Long also reported that Kennedy was wildly cheered by crowds of whites, Indians, and Africans on his last day in South Africa and he "drew thunderous applause" for his speech at Witwatersrand. He also stated that the audience who heard the speech from outside the hall over loudspeakers included "many students from the Afrikaans University at Pretoria." At Witwatersrand, "the audience burst into loud applause when Kennedy criticized white South Africans who say Africa is too primitive to develop and that its people are not ready for freedom and self-government." Also after this speech, "1,200 wildly excited students, Afrikaner and English-speaking, carried him off on their shoulders." Another indication of the response to Kennedy's speech at Witwatersrand is provided by Martin
Shule, a student there who spoke after Kennedy and said:

We must now cast off all self-protective timidity, and we must now willfully and deliberately descend into the arena of danger to preserve the independence of thought and conscience and action which is our civilized heritage. We must now set ourselves against an unjustifiable social order and strive energetically and selflessly for its reform.

Reactions in South Africa to the visit, that is the impression Kennedy made, ranged from the Rand Daily Mail's pro-Kennedy stance to the pro-government's Die Transvaler's comments. In an editorial entitled "Kennedy, Come Back," Laurence Gander (editor of Rand Daily Mail) asserted:

Senator Robert Kennedy's visit is the best thing that has happened to South Africa for years. It is as if a window has been flung open and a gust of fresh air has swept into a room in which the atmosphere had become stale and foetid. . . . Judged by any standards his whirlwind four-day tour has been a remarkable performance. . . . And all of it accomplished with immense grace, eloquence, sincerity and humour. . . .

The impact of it all has been immense--far beyond anything that its enterprising Nusas sponsors had dreamed of. This younger Kennedy, . . . has taken the youth of the country by storm, or a substantial part of it. He has done it not so much through the youthful zest of his own personality, although there is an immediate rapport between him and young people, nor even through the sheer professionalism of his handling of people and audiences. What is really important is that he has done it through his message of confident, unashamed idealism.

This is what so many of the young people of South Africa have been yearning for--some sort of clear and unequivocal endorsement that the hopes and ideals that all decent youngsters feel are indeed part and parcel of the great traditions of the contemporary Western world and not, as they are being told so often, something alien, unwholesome or worse. . . . Even
among those who support the Government and its policies one sensed a restless desire for communication with him. . . . All who were willing to meet him he gladly met and spoke with—not arrogantly or coldly but with the warmth of someone anxious to have South Africa on friendly terms with the world again. . . . The effects of Senator Kennedy's visit will be felt for a long time to come. He has stirred up ideas long in disuse. He has started up new, livelier controversies among us and about us. And so, as he and Mrs. Kennedy fly off today, we say to them: Thank you a thousand times for what you have done for us. Come back again. You have a place in our hearts.  

From the above comments, it would appear that Robert Kennedy had been successful in his attempts to offer encouragement to the dissenters in South Africa. On the other hand, the pro-apartheid newspaper, Die Transvaler hinted that Kennedy would not be welcome back to South Africa and said:

"A single American circus display on South African soil was more than enough. . . . We definitely don't want a second. . . . Let us say frankly that one can only have the deepest sympathy for the American people if Senator Kennedy becomes their future President."

A non-white newspaper, Post, conversely stated that "Bobby Kennedy, the supercharged senator, went through South Africa like a whirlwind. Never has any visitor--VIP, world statesman, or pop idol--made such an impression on so many hearts and minds." The afternoon newspaper, Die Vaderland (Johannesburg), commented on Kennedy’s visit as follows:
We have become wiser through his visit because we have seen the technique of liberal internationalism in action. . . . Our biggest lesson is that South Africa and all its people, white but particularly nonwhite, have nothing to gain from revivalist politicians like Senator Robert Kennedy.44

The pro-government newspaper, Die Burger, complained that the visit had degenerated into an "election campaign . . . with high-sounding slogans aimed at the yearning for justice and brotherhood . . . [a] somewhat ominous spectacle."45 News/Check wrote that even a week after Kennedy left South Africa, "the dust had still not settled." This magazine reported that during his short visit "he monopolised almost as much print as South Africa's leaving the Commonwealth, stirred up more controversy than any outside visitor had ever done."46 According to News/Check, Kennedy's South African tour was ultimately "no more than a one-night stand in the making of the President 1966/1972, but the response from thousands in South Africa was something else. His message of idealism was one that could hurt no one. . . ."47

One Nationalist Party official commented about Kennedy's remarks as being "full of platitudes that 'have been enunciated far better in the Ten Commandments and the New Testament.'" But, conversely, a security officer watching Kennedy in action was overheard to say "That man sure lit a lot of candles here. It's going to take a long time to
get these Kaffirs placid again." This last-mentioned remark would suggest that Kennedy had had a profound impact upon the Blacks in South Africa.

In the United States, the reaction to Kennedy's South African trip could be described as favorable. The Washington Post, for example, praised the Senator's performance there in an editorial which reads as follows:

To the disgruntlement of the government and the cheers of many of its citizens, Senator Robert Kennedy has come and gone from South Africa. There will be no shortage of comment on the political purposes and results of his trip. But it was more than a personal mission. As a private citizen he had the possibility of acting in a true sense as a delegate of the American people. The distaste for apartheid which he expressed, however provocative to the Verwoerd government, surely accords with the feelings of most Americans. His tumultuous reception showed that he touched profound chords in South Africa among those struggling for social justice.

Like no other man in public life today, Robert Kennedy has an almost unnerving compulsion to seek out the "excitement of danger." This was the phrase, and goal, he held out to his multiracial National Students Union audience in Capetown. He spoke as though the students were judges deciding whether to admit him, at age 40, to the fraternity of honor called youth. Do not feel that individual action is futile, he said; do not accept a becalming standard of practicality; do not be timid. His speech—his South African performance as a whole—was serious, free of self-righteousness and finally, revolutionary.

At a dinner honoring the late Adlai Stevenson, Ambassador at large Averell Harriman praised Kennedy for having visited South Africa and spoken out against discrimination. "We can take pride that one of our New Yorkers went there
with his wife and spoke of the abuse being committed against freedom," said the Ambassador. 50

The previous remarks about reactions in South Africa and in the United States to Kennedy's visit shed some light on how he was received there and how it was interpreted. Another aid for the critic in evaluating the effects of this speaking tour is some knowledge of Kennedy's own assessment. As Kennedy sipped a tomato juice while the jet taxied down the runway at the Johannesburg airport, he admitted that he probably had not changed the mind of anyone in South Africa who was convinced that apartheid was proper. 51

In Tanzania Senator Kennedy described his trip to South Africa as "unhappy." He commented that the situation there was "explosive" but he hoped that somehow "a peaceful solution could be found." 52 In South Africa, meantime, the Afrikaans-language newspaper, Die Beeld, carried a front-page story asserting that the South African Government would not permit Senator Kennedy to return for another visit to the republic. "This is the firm stand of the Government after his behavior in our country and his remarks in East Africa." 53 At Kenyatta College in Nairobi, Kenya, Kennedy's response to the question of how much he appreciated the Government system of apartheid in South Africa was: "Well, not very much." 54 Here he also asserted that solutions to racial problems
in South Africa would have to be found by men of God who determine that they cannot accept the idea that an African or a black is a second-class citizen. This idea is contrary to the teachings of the Bible or the teachings of God.\textsuperscript{55}

In Kenya Senator Kennedy declared that American business men operating in South Africa should maintain racial equality. He indicated that he would make contacts in the United States to help implement the above policy. He said, "I intend to make contacts. . . . I intend to take a continuing interest in South Africa."\textsuperscript{56} When questioned about sanctions against South Africa, however, Senator Kennedy ruled them out "at the present time." He said, "I found the majority of black South Africans were against sanctions because they, too, are benefitting from South Africa's economic boom."\textsuperscript{57}

Kennedy's reactions to the situation in South Africa were quoted in \textit{The New York Times} as follows:

The situation in South Africa is such that where one sees one's fellow human beings treated as one would not accept to be treated himself, it is heart-rending and cruel, just as our own discrimination is cruel. . . . To see such massive and sickening discrimination, it can't help but make a deep impression. I am going to take a continuing interest in South Africa.\textsuperscript{58}

Kennedy maintained that "What is needed. . . is a greater dialogue between groups in South Africa and between South Africa and the rest of the world."\textsuperscript{59} However, he cautioned people in the United States about feeling too self-righteous
about South Africa's problems. "It has taken the United States such a long period of time to accomplish what's right that we should keep this in mind on any criticisms of South Africa."^60

In this critic's opinion, the article that the Senator wrote for Look magazine not only describes the South African tour, but also sums up his assessment of the situation and the impact the visit had upon him. His closing remarks in this article indicate that he is hopeful.

In my judgment, the spirit of decency and courage in South Africa will not surrender. With all of the difficulties and the suffering I had seen, still I left tremendously moved by the intelligence, the determination, the cool courage of the young people and their allies scattered through the land. ... They are not in power now, but they are the kind of people who make a nation, who may one day make South Africa a land of light and freedom and allow it to take its full place in the world. Theirs is the spirit of which Tennyson wrote in Ulysses:

One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong
in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.^61

It should be remembered, however, that this article was written shortly after his return from his South African jaunt. Thus there is no indication of any of the long range effects this tour had upon Kennedy. What can be said about the influences this visit exerted upon subsequent Kennedy speeches and policies? In terms of the influences upon subsequent speeches he made, the address he gave at
Fordham University in 1967 provides an apt illustration of how he incorporated several sections of the Cape Town Address into the Fordham speech. In fact, were it not for a single change of word here and there, e.g. "but," instead of "and" and one or two different examples, one would believe that he were listening to the Cape Town speech.

To illustrate: At Fordham University he said

"Everywhere, new technology and communications bring men and nations closer together, the concerns of one inevitably becoming the concerns of all. But our new closeness has not yet stripped away the false masks, the illusions of difference which are the root of injustice and hate and war. . . . And therefore the survival of the human species itself depends on our ability to strip the last remnants of that ancient, cruel belief from the civilization of man." 62

At Cape Town Kennedy said:

"Everywhere. . . . And our new closeness is stripping away the false masks, the illusion of difference which is at the root of injustice and hate and war. . . . It is your job, the task of the young people of this world to strip the last remnants of that ancient cruel belief from the civilization of man."

At Fordham Kennedy said:

"Yet as I talk to young people around the world I am impressed not by the diversity but by the closeness of their goals, their concerns and values and hopes for the future. I have seen students in South Africa, risking position and daring imprisonment against the awesome power of a garrison state. I have met others in Brazil, . . . 63

At Cape Town he said:

"Yet as I talk to young people around the world I am impressed not by the diversity but by the
closeness of their goals, their desires and concerns and hope for the future.

These are only two examples but many more comparisons of the Fordham and Cape Town Addresses could be made. This would suggest that Robert Kennedy believed that the speech at Cape Town merited repeating to an American audience. His citation of South African students who risked "position and dar[ed] imprisonment against the awesome power of a garrison state" is an overt manifestation of his admiration for them. His categorization of South Africa as a "garrison state" is also an overt manifestation but not of admiration—of distaste. One other very strong indication of the value placed upon the Cape Town Address by the Kennedy family is that, of all the speeches he made, this address was chosen to exemplify Robert Kennedy. This was the address quoted from by Senator Edward Kennedy in the eulogy to his brother Robert.

In terms of the influences upon subsequent policies, his statements concerning his opposition to imposing sanctions against South Africa is an illustration. He had said in Kenya that American business-men in South Africa should maintain racial equality in their business dealings and he intended to make contacts with them regarding such a policy. Several months after his return to the United States he wrote to approximately 30 business leaders who had interests in South Africa and "invited each of them..."
to confer with him about what business could do to ease the burden of apartheid on the native population. In his letter Kennedy stressed that he did not subscribe to the idea that the United States should ban additional American investment in South Africa because that would impose the greatest hardship on the black population. However, he maintained, there were steps that could be taken that would not violate apartheid laws. He suggested, for example, that private firms could recognize labor unions formed by blacks, pay all workers minimum subsistence wages, and promote Africans to responsible positions. They could also tell the Government that apartheid is bad for business, that it is wasteful. Reactions of the recipients of the letters to Kennedy's suggestions "ranged from unenthusiastic to downright hostile."65

The above data concerning the response to Kennedy's South African speaking indicate that he achieved his desired effects with his primary audiences, i.e., the students at Cape Town, Stellenbosch, Natal and Witwatersrand universities; and he also elicited the desired response from his secondary audiences, i.e., the newspaper reporters who would disseminate his message to the reading public in South Africa and the United States. However, as noted above, the speeches cannot be said to have altered the South African government's policies. Nor was it successful
in generating support from the United States business com-
munity with interests in South Africa.
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CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this investigation was to analyze the epideictic speaking of Senator Robert F. Kennedy in South Africa in June of 1966 as a means of assessing his rhetorical effectiveness. The methodology employed in this analysis was a combination of Lloyd Bitzer's "constraints" imposed upon a speaker which circumscribe his rhetorical effectiveness; and the techniques of argumentation as posed by Chaim Perelman.

The findings of this study indicate that Kennedy's goals and expectations in this speaking situation were as follows: First and foremost he sought to reaffirm the values inherent in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in which the individual is the touchstone and thereby to offer encouragement to those who shared these values, e.g. his hosts, the National Union of South African Students who had invited him to deliver the Day of Affirmation Address. He sought to engage in dialogue with individuals representing diverse viewpoints in the hope that meaningful solutions to commonly shared complex problems could be found. By his words and actions in South Africa he sought to enhance his image and thereby elicit a
favorable response from his audience in the United States which would help to further his political aspirations.

Although the visit to South Africa was a consequence of the invitation by NUSAS, his appearances there were not limited to the University of Cape Town. However, his speech at Cape Town set forth the basic theme he would follow in his speeches at Stellenbosch, Natal, and Witwatersrand universities as well as his conversations with others. There was a continuity of the message wherever he spoke and, therefore, his tour in South Africa could be categorized as a campaign. The message he articulated in South Africa was that the individual man is of supreme importance; societies exist for the purpose of helping each individual reach his full potential; one cannot have justice for himself without ensuring justice for all; nations are interdependent on this planet so that what happens in one country has an impact on other countries and therefore the other countries must respond. Freedom is indivisible.

The findings revealed that although there was continuity of the message there were variations in the format which were dictated by the occasion and the audience addressed. The Day of Affirmation Address at Cape Town, for example, constituted Kennedy's first formal speech in South Africa and his justification for being in that country. Whatever he said at Cape Town would set the pattern for evaluating the man and his ideas. This occasion
required that Kennedy address himself to the affirmation of academic freedoms and human rights. At the same time, the controversial circumstances surrounding his appearance (e.g. the "banning" of Robertson, President of NUSAS, the barring of foreign newsmen, and the Nationalist Government's refusal to have anything to do with him) demanded that his words at Cape Town not inflame passions to the boiling point of violence, nor even hint that violence constituted an acceptable solution to any problem. As a foreigner he dared not to attempt to dictate South African policy. As a representative of the United States he was constrained to present a favorable image of his country knowing that his views would be construed as the views of the United States and chronicled throughout the world. With these considerations in mind he carefully structured his Cape Town Address so that he expounded his value hierarchy within the context of Western tradition; he avoided explicit criticism of South Africa except when that criticism was coupled with the same kind of criticism of the United States and/or other countries; he avoided any overt indication that he or the United States sought to recommend solutions to South Africa's problems or even that they had any solutions to suggest; and, finally, he exhorted his audience to follow the ideals of Western democracy in which the individual man is supreme. He maintained that one man or woman can make a difference and everyone should try.
At Stellenbosch University the essentially hostile nature of the audience required a different format if Kennedy were to attain his rhetorical goals. So, too, did the occasion. Risking Governmental displeasure, a group of students at Simonsberg's Residence (men's dormitory) had insisted upon meeting with Kennedy after the Student Representative Council at Stellenbosch, under governmental pressure, had rescinded its invitation to him. The format on this occasion was a speech followed by a question-and-answer session. In the speech Kennedy emphasized the common values they shared, acknowledged his recognition of their differences, complimented them for inviting him to speak despite those differences, and reminded them that they (and he), because of their privileged positions in society had a special obligation to help those less fortunate ones. At the same time, he warned them of the dangers involved in failing to take such action. This speech was designed to reduce dissodance in order to create a climate conducive to a frank and open exchange of views in the question-and-answer session which followed. The question-and-answer format affords an orator the opportunity to reiterate the values he has articulated in his speech; it provides him an opportunity to elaborate, to go into specific detail, and to refute opposing arguments. In this give-and-take situation the orator is stripped of speech writers; minus consultants; and totally
on his own. Thus his responses are assumed to be true reflections of the man himself. His answers can either heighten or reduce his credibility with his audience. Kennedy used this format to great advantage. He reiterated his value hierarchy as that of Western tradition; he specified elements of that value system as compared with those of totalitarian regimes; he refuted arguments in which reform and communism were equated; he denied that he or the United States sought to tell South Africa how to run its business; he reiterated the common values they shared; and, he chose this citadel of Afrikanerdom intellectual thought to criticize explicitly apartheid practices as denials of the freedoms of Western democracy; but he also freely admitted that the United States had not always met its responsibilities to its citizens.

At Natal University, his audience, for the first time, contained a number of adults, some of whom would be viewing Kennedy critically for signs of irresponsibility. Others, such as his guests at the multi-racial dinner he had hosted just previous to his appearance at Natal, would be favorably disposed toward the speaker and his ideas. They were opponents of apartheid and they already subscribed to Kennedy's value system. So, too, did the students who had invited him. Thus, the audience was predominantly a favorable one. The format Kennedy chose for this occasion was an impromptu speech followed by a question-and-answer
period. It is this critic's view that Kennedy chose the impromptu format so that he could respond to what others had said at the dinner and what the young man who welcomed Kennedy said in his introductory remarks. The impromptu format permits the speaker to utilize the conversational mode of address, to speak as one friend to another. (The question-and-answer format also utilizes this mode.) What has been said about the question-and-answer format in the previous section on Stellenbosch applies to this speaking situation. Since this appearance at Natal is the only complete record of Kennedy's speaking at a University in South Africa in my possession, I would like to make a few comments regarding this conversational mode of address. It is this critic's opinion that Kennedy was at his best with this mode. This judgment is based on listening to a number of recordings of Kennedy's formal speeches, off-the-cuff remarks, responses to questions posed by newsmen, commentators, and members of his audiences. It is also based on my personal observations of Robert Kennedy in action in Columbus, Ohio, in October of 1966. In the formal speaking situation Kennedy often appeared to be very nervous and (as the recording of his Cape Town Address illustrates) his delivery from a written text left much to be desired. On the other hand, his insertions into the written text at the moment of delivery at Capo Town (see Appendix A) as witnessed in the recording
reveal an animation and urgency to communicate that appear
to be lacking in speeches delivered from prepared texts. In
formal addresses this critic believes that the force of the
ideas he expounded overcame the faults of delivery.

Kennedy's address at the University of Witwatersrand
constituted his last public speaking engagement in South
Africa. This occasion represented the last phase of his
South African campaign. The format he used was that of a
formal speech but with an audience that already was aware
of and agreed with his value hierarchy it was not necessary
for him to reiterate the arguments he had set forth in his
first address at Cape Town and repeated in his other ad­
dresses. Consequently, he structured this final speech as
a series of unsupported assertions as a means of intensi­
fying his audience's beliefs in their commonly shared value
hierarchy. It could be said that this speech was the per­
oration of his campaign. These then are the salient points
concerning Kennedy's goals and expectations, the continuity
of his message, and the variations in the format.

The question then arises of how effective he was in
achieving his rhetorical goals. To answer that question two
other questions must first be raised. The first question
involves the perception of Kennedy's ethos and the second
question relates to the responses to the Kennedy message
in South Africa.
To determine Kennedy's ethos as revealed through his words and actions in South Africa we need to examine what he said and what he advocated in Cape Town as compared with Stellenbosch, Natal, and Witwatersrand. How does the position he took in South Africa on social injustices compare with his position on that issue in the United States or elsewhere in the world? In other words, was he consistent? The findings indicate that he was indeed consistent. His message was the same at each of the four universities, and in his conversations with people of diverse viewpoints in South Africa. This was the same position he had taken in the United States when he was Attorney General and it was consistent with his position taken in Latin America, in Asia, and in Europe. One of his outstanding character traits was his commitment to right injustices by peaceful means. It constituted an integral element of his deep religious beliefs.

Yet a man may be sincere, he may be a man of high moral character and, at the same time, be a religious zealot. It is not enough for an epideictic orator to be a man of good moral character; he must also be a man of sound judgment and goodwill toward his auditors if he is to intensify his auditors' adherence to their commonly shared values; if he is to be effective. Robert Kennedy was such a man according to the data generated by this study. His expertise was demonstrated by his references to personal
experiences, by his references to world affairs and history, and by his references to other authorities. His ability to establish and maintain rapport was exhibited in his establishment of commonalities, in his expressed commitment to individual worth, and by employing tact and diplomacy. References to his own personal knowledge of world affairs and history, for example, found expression in his allusions to his world travels. That he was well-informed about South Africa's history and governmental practices was evinced in his references to historical figures such as Adam Tas, the Boers and the Voortrekkers, and his allusions to governmental policies such as the utilization of the "ban" under the Suppression of Communism Act and the apartheid policies. His definition of "youth," was an example of how he established rapport with his predominately young audiences. His utilization of tact and diplomacy to further his ends in speaking was exemplified in the dichotomy between his explicit statements and their implicit inferences. The findings of this study reveal that Kennedy was perceived to be a man of good moral character, sound judgment, and goodwill toward his audiences.

Overt audience response to his message in South Africa indicated that with the particular audience (Cape Town, Stellenbosch, Natal, and Witwatersrand) he was generally effective in terms of his rhetorical aims. At Cape Town, Natal, and Witwatersrand he intensified the adherence of
his audiences' minds to their commonly shared values and thereby reinforced their commitment to take moral action. At Stellenbosch, he engaged in an exchange of views with those who generally supported apartheid policies and pointed out that they embraced common values even though they could not agree on the means of achieving the goals. He also elicited the desired response from his secondary audiences, the newspaper reporters who disseminated his message to the reading public in South Africa and the United States. Editorial comment concerning his South African speaking was also favorable. He was not successful in exerting an impact on the governmental policies of South Africa; nor was he successful in gaining support from United States businesses with holdings in South Africa. However, an indication of his assessment of the Cape Town Address was demonstrated in his incorporating large sections of that speech into his address at Fordham University one year later. Perhaps the strongest sign of the importance of this speech according to the Kennedy family was its citation in Edward Kennedy's eulogy to his brother as epitomizing Robert Kennedy's values.

This doctoral study poses some interesting implications for rhetorical communication. The utility of the Perelman model for epideictic oratory is one. Unlike the traditionalists who treat epideictic oratory as an end in and of itself, Perelman conceives the epideictic genre to
belong to argumentation. According to Perelman, epideictic oratory is a means of effecting persuasion through discourse. Perelman's techniques of argumentation as applied to epideictic speaking furnish the orator with a framework for constructing his discourse and the critic with an instrument for evaluating the effectiveness of that discourse. Application of the Perelman methodology for evaluating the epideictic speaking of Robert Kennedy in South Africa reveal certain strengths and weakness of this model as an instrument. A major strength is that by the analysis of the strategies of associative/dissociative schemes the critic is able to evaluate the worth of the ideas and concepts in terms of the reasoning involved. The Perelman model also furnishes the critic with a standard for measuring the speaker's efficacy in terms of his projected image or ethos. Perelman's concept that language and figures of speech may be used to promote "choice," to promote "presence," and to promote "communion" provides the critic with a standard for measuring what may be termed "style."

Perelman treats the classical canons of invention, arrangement, and style as part of his techniques of argumentation but he does not include memory or delivery. Thus, in using the Perelman model, the critic is deprived of consideration of these aspects in arriving at judgments relative to the efficacy of epideictic speaking. This is a weakness. Another weakness of the Perelman model for the critic is
that his treatment of "style" does not include some of the traditional elements generally associated with the term (e.g. alliteration, simile, etc.). Considered as a whole, however, the Perelman model for evaluating epideictic speaking may be said to constitute a significant contribution to rhetorical communication.

Another implication derived from this study is that there appears to be a universality of rhetorical strategies for the epideictic genre. Two of these strategies are argument from definition and the appeal to justice. Since epideictic speaking is an affirmation of shared values one would expect the appeal to justice to be a basic rhetorical strategy utilized. So, too with argument from definition, from the essential nature of things, as opposed to argument from circumstances. Epideictic speaking deals with universal values and the essential nature of things is changeless. Circumstances, on the other hand, vary from time to time and place to place. They are ephemeral.

A third implication for rhetorical communication is what may be termed as rhetoric as process. Robert Kennedy's epideictic speaking in South Africa constituted one segment of a long-range campaign to gain and intensify the adherence of his listeners' minds to the values he lauded. As has already been noted in this chapter, the position he took in South Africa on the issue of injustices was the
same position he had taken in other places previous to his visit there. His subsequent speeches and statements regarding the necessity of eliminating these injustices reflected this same view. In other words, this was an ongoing process he utilized as a means of educating his audience and gaining their acceptance of his value hierarchy. It was a demonstration of rhetoric as process.

This study suggests a number of possibilities for further research. First, when a more complete record of Robert Kennedy's South African visit becomes available, a more thorough analysis of this rhetorical event would generate additional evidence to support or belie the findings of this study. Another interesting research investigation for the communicologist might be to examine the epideictic speaking of an orator as compared with his deliberative speaking utilizing Perelman's techniques of argumentation. Analysis of an Inaugural Address using the Perelman model might prove useful in generating information about communication. An examination of the conversational mode of address by a speaker (e.g. Robert Kennedy) by the application of Perelman's argumentative techniques coupled with a consideration of memory and delivery in the analysis could prove enlightening. These are only a few suggestions. It is hoped that they may stimulate other suggestions for research.
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(actual speech)

(APPLAUSE)

[Mr. Chancellor, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, Professor Robertson, Mr. Diamond, Mr. Daniel, and - uh - ladies and gentlemen]

I come here [this evening] because of my deep interest and affection for a land settled by the Dutch in the mid-seventeenth century, then taken over by the British, and at last independent; a land in which the native inhabitants were at first subdued, but relations with whom remain a problem to this day; a land which defined itself on a hostile frontier; a land which has tamed rich natural resources through the energetic application of modern technology; a land which [was] once imported [the importer of] slaves, and now must struggle to wipe out the last traces of that former bondage. I refer, of course, to the United States of America. (APPLAUSE)

But I am glad to come here [and my wife and I and all of our party are glad to come here] to South Africa [and we're glad to come here to Capetown.] I am already [greatly] enjoying [my stay and] my visit [here]. I am making an effort to meet and exchange views with people from [of] all walks of life, and all segments of South African opinion--including those who represent the views of the government. Today I am glad to meet with the National Union of South African Students. For a decade, NUSAS has stood and worked for the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights--principles which embody the collective hopes of men of good will all around the world [globe].

Your work, at home and in international student affairs, has brought great credit to yourselves and to your country. I know the National Student Association in the United States feels a particularly close relationship to NUSAS [with this organization]. And I wish to thank especially Mr. Ian Robertson, who first extended this [the] invitation on behalf of NUSAS. [I wish to thank him] for his kindness to me [in inviting me]. (APPLAUSE) It's too bad he can't be with us today. [I am very sorry that he cannot be with us here this evening.] (APPLAUSE) [I was happy to have had the opportunity to meet and speak with him earlier this evening. And I presented him with a copy of - uh - Profiles In Courage which was a book that was written by President John Kennedy and which was signed to him by President Kennedy's widow, Mrs. John Kennedy.] (APPLAUSE)
This is a Day of Affirmation—a celebration of liberty. We stand here in the name of freedom.

At the heart of that western freedom and democracy is the belief that the individual man, the child of God, is the touchstone of value, and all society, all groups, the state, exist for his benefit. Therefore the enlargement of liberty for individual human beings must be the supreme goal and the abiding practice of any western society.

The first element of this individual liberty is the freedom of speech; the right to express and communicate ideas, to set oneself apart from the dumb beasts of field and forest; to recall governments to their duties and obligations; above all, the right to affirm one's membership and allegiance to the body politic—to society—to the men with whom we share our land, our heritage and our children's future.

Hand in hand with freedom of speech goes the power to be heard—to share in the decisions of government which shape men's lives. Everything that makes man's life worthwhile—family, work, education, a place to rear one's children and a place to rest one's head—all this depends on decisions of government; all can be swept away by a government which does not heed the demands of its people. Therefore, the essential humanity of men can be protected and preserved only where government must answer—not just to the wealthy; not just to those of a particular religion; or not just to those of a particular race; but to all its people. (APPLAUSE)

And even government by the consent of the governed, as in our own Constitution, must be limited in its power to act against its people; so that there may be no interference with the right to worship, or but also no interference] with the security of the home; no arbitrary imposition of pains or penalties on an ordinary citizen by officials high or low; no restriction on the freedom of men to seek education or work or opportunity of any kind, so that each man may become all he is capable of becoming. (APPLAUSE)

These are the sacred rights of western society. These were the essential differences between us and Nazi Germany as they were between Athens and Persia.

They are the essence of our difference[s] with communism today. I am unalterably opposed to communism because it exalts the state over the individual and [over] the family and
because of the [system contains a] lack of freedom of speech, of protest, of religion and of the press, which is the characteristic of [a] totalitarian states [regime]. The way of opposition to communism [however] is not to imitate its dictatorship, but to enlarge individual freedom (APPLAUSE) in our own countries and all over the globe. There are those in every land who would label as "communist" every threat to their privilege. But, [may I say to you], as I have seen on my travels in all sections of the world, reform is not communism. (APPLAUSE) And the denial of freedom, in whatever name, only strengthens the very communism it claims to oppose. (APPLAUSE)

Many nations have set forth their own definitions and declarations of these principles. And there have often been wide and tragic gaps between promise and performance, ideal and reality. Yet the great ideals have constantly recalled us to our [own] duties. And—with painful slowness—we [in the United States] have extended and enlarged the meaning and the practice of freedom for [to] all [of] our people.

For two centuries, my own country has struggled to overcome the self-imposed handicap of prejudice and discrimination based on nationality, [on] social class or race—discrimination profoundly repugnant to the thoery and [to the] command of our Constitution. Even as my father grew up in Boston [Massachusetts] signs told him that "No Irish need apply." Two generations later President Kennedy became the first [Irish] Catholic [and the first Catholic] to head the nation; but how many men of ability had, before 1961, been denied the opportunity to contribute to the nation's progress because they were Catholic, or [because they were] of Irish extraction? How many sons of Italian or Jewish or Polish parents slumbered in [the] slums—untaught, unlearned, their potential lost forever to the [our] nation and [to] the human race? Even today, what price will we pay before we have assured full opportunity to millions of Negro Americans?

In the last five years we have done more to assure equality to our Negro citizens, and to help the deprived both white and black, than in the hundred years before [that time]. But much,[much] more remains to be done.

For there are millions of Negroes untrained for the simplest of jobs, and thousands every day denied their full [and] equal rights under the law; and and the violence of the disinherit, the [these] insulted and [the] injured, looms over the streets of Harlem and [of] Watts and [of] Southside Chicago.
But a Negro American trains [now] as an astronaut, one of mankind's first explorers into outer space; another is the chief barrister of the United States government, and dozens sit on the benches of [our] court; and another, Dr. Martin Luther King, is the second man of African descent to win the Nobel Peace Prize for his non-violent efforts for social justice between [all of] the races. (APPLAUSE)

We have passed laws prohibiting discrimination in education, in employment, in housing; but these laws alone cannot overcome the heritage of centuries--of broken families and stunted children, and poverty and degradation and pain.

So the road toward equality of freedom is not easy, and great cost and danger march alongside [all of] us. We are committed to peaceful and non-violent change and that is important for [to] all to understand--though all change is unsettling. Still even in the turbulence of protest and struggle is greater hope for the future, as men learn to claim and achieve for themselves the rights formerly petitioned from others.

And most important of all, all [of] the panoply of government power has been committed to the goal of equality before the law--as we are now committing ourselves to the achievement of equal opportunity in fact.

We must recognize the full human equality of all [of] our people--before God, before the law, and in the councils of government. We must do this, not because it is economically advantageous--although it is; not because the laws of God and man command it--although they do command it; not because people in other lands wish it so. We must do it for the single and fundamental reason that it is the right thing to do. (APPLAUSE)

We recognize that there are problems and obstacles before the fulfillment of these ideals in the United States as we recognize that other nations, in Latin America and [in] Asia and Africa have their own political, economic, and social problems, their unique barriers to the elimination of injustice[s].

In some, there is concern that change will submerge the rights of a minority, particularly where the [that] minority is of a different race from [that of] the majority. We in the United States believe in the protection of minorities; we recognize the contributions [that] they can make and the leadership [that] they can provide; and we do not believe that any people--whether minority, majority [majority or minority],
or individual human beings—are "expendable" in the cause of theory or [of] policy. We recognize also that justice between men and nations is imperfect, and that humanity sometimes progresses [very] slowly [indeed].

- All do not develop in the same manner [and] at the same pace. Nations, like men, often march to the beat of different drummers, and the precise solutions of the United States can neither be dictated nor transplanted to others [and that is not our intention]. What is important, [however], is that all nations must march toward increasing freedom; toward justice for all; toward a society strong and flexible enough to meet the demands of all of its own people [whatever their race] and [the demands of] a world of immense and dizzying change [that face us all].

In a few hours, the plane that brought me to this country crossed over oceans and countries which have been a crucible of human history. In minutes we traced the migration[s] of men over thousands of years; seconds, the briefest glimpse, and we passed battlefields on which millions of men once struggled and died. We could see no national boundaries, no vast gulfs or high walls dividing people from people; only nature and the works of man—homes and factories and farms—everywhere reflecting man's common effort to enrich his life. Everywhere new technology and communications bring[s] men and nations closer together, the concerns of one inevitably becoming[e] the concerns of all. And our new closeness is stripping away the false masks, the illusion of difference[s] which is at the root of injustice and [of] hate and [of] war. Only earthbound man still clings to the dark and poisoning superstition that his world is bounded by the nearest hill, his universe ended[s] at river shore, his common humanity [is] enclosed in the tight circle of those who share his town and [or his] views and the color of his skin. (APPLAUSE)

It is your job, the task of the young people of [in] this world to strip the last remnants of that ancient, cruel belief from the civilization of man.

Each nation has different obstacles and different goals, shaped by the vagaries of history and [of] experience. Yet as I talk to young people around the world I am impressed not by the diversity but by the closeness of their goals, their desires and [their] concerns and [their] hopes for the future. There is discrimination in New York, and racial inequality of apartheid in South Africa and serfdom in the mountains of Peru. People starve [to death] in the streets of India; a former Prime Minister is summarily executed in the Congo; intellectuals go to jail in Russia; [and] thousands are slaughtered
in Indonesia; wealth is lavished on armaments everywhere [in the world]. These are differing [ent] evils; but they are the common works of man. They reflect the imperfection[s] of human justice, the inadequacy of human compassion, the defectiveness of our sensibility toward the sufferings of our fellows; they mark the limit of our ability to use knowledge for the well-being of others [our fellow human beings throughout the world]. (APPLAUSE) And therefore they call upon common qualities[y] of conscience and indignation, a shared determination to wipe away the unnecessary sufferings of our fellow human beings at home and around the world.

It is these qualities which make of [our] youth today the only true international community. More than this I think that we could agree on the kind of [a] world we [would all] want to build. It would be a world of independent nations, moving toward international community, each of which protected and respected [the] basic human freedoms. It would be a world which demanded of each government that it accept its responsibility to insure social justice. It would be a world of constantly accelerating economic progress—not material welfare as an end in [of] itself, but as a means to liberate the capacity of each [every] human being to pursue his talents and [to pursue] his hopes. It would, in short, be a world [that] we would [all] be proud to have built.

Just to the North of here are lands of challenge and [of] opportunity—rich in natural resources, land and minerals and people. Yet they are also lands confronted by the greatest odds—overwhelming ignorance, internal tensions and strife, and great obstacles of climate and geography. Many of these nations, as colonies, were oppressed and [were] exploited. Yet they have not estranged themselves from the broad traditions of the West; they are hoping and [they are] gamb­ling their progress and [their] stability on the chance that we will meet our responsibilities[y to them] to help them overcome their poverty.

In the world we would like to build, South Africa could play an outstanding role [and a role of leadership] in that effort. This [country] is without question a preeminent re­pository of the wealth and [the] knowledge and [the] skill of the [this] continent. Here are the greater part of Africa's Research scientist[s] and steel production, most of its reservoirs of coal and [of] electric power. Many South Africans have made major contributions to African technical development and world science; the names of some are known wherever men seek to eliminate the ravages of tropical diseases and [of] pestilence. In your faculties and councils, here in this very audience, are hundreds and thousands of men [and women] who could transform the lives of millions for all time to come.
But the help and the leadership of South Africa or [of] the United States cannot be accepted if we—with our own countries or in our relationships—with others—deny individual integrity, human dignity, and the common humanity of man. (APPLAUSE) If we would lead outside our own borders; if we would help those who need our assistance, if we would meet our responsibilities to mankind; we must first, all of us, demolish the borders which history has erected between men within our own nations—barriers of race and religion, social class and ignorance.

Our answer is the world's hope; it is to rely on youth. The cruelties and the obstacles of this swiftly changing planet will not yield to obsolete dogmas and outworn slogans. It cannot be moved by those who cling to a present which is already dying, who prefer the illusion of security to the excitement and danger which comes with even the most peaceful progress. This world demands the qualities of youth; not a time of life but a state of mind, a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a predominance of courage over timidity, of the appetite for adventure over the love of ease, [a man like the Chancellor of this University]. (APPLAUSE) It is a revolutionary world that we all live in, and thus, as I have said in Latin America and in Asia, [and] in Europe and in [my own country]—the United States—it is the young people who must take the lead. Thus you, and your young compatriots everywhere have had thrust upon you a greater burden of responsibility than any generation that has ever lived.

"There is" said an Italian philosopher, "nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things." Yet this is the measure of the task of your generation and the road is strewn with many dangers.

First, is the danger of futility; the belief there is nothing one man or one woman can do against the enormous array of the world's ills—against misery and ignorance or against injustice and violence. Yet many of the world's great movements, of thought and action, have flowed from the work of a single man. A young monk began the Protestant reformation, a young general extended an empire from Macedonia to the borders of the earth and a young woman reclaimed the territory of France. It was a young Italian explorer who discovered the New World, and the 32 year old Thomas Jefferson who proclaimed that all men are created equal. "Give me a place to stand," said Archimedes, "and I will move the world." These men moved the world, and so can we all. Few
will have the greatness to bend history itself; but each of us can work to change a small portion of the events, and in the total of all those acts will be written in the history of this generation. (APPLAUSE) Thousands of Peace Corps volunteers are making a difference in isolated villages and city slums in dozens of countries. Thousands of unknown men and women in Europe resisted the occupation of the Nazis and many died, but all added to the ultimate strength and freedom of their countries. It is from numberless diverse acts of courage and belief that human history is shaped. Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.

"If Athens shall appear great to you," said Pericles, "consider then that her glories were purchased by valiant men, and by men who learned their duty." That is the source of all greatness in all societies, and it is the key to progress in our time.

The second danger is that of expediency; of those who say that hopes and beliefs must bend before immediate necessities. Of course, if we would act effectively we must deal with the world as it is. We must get things done. But if there was one thing President Kennedy stood for that touched the most profound feelings of young people across the world, it was the belief that idealism, high aspirations and deep convictions are not incompatible with the most practical and efficient of programs—that there is no basic inconsistency between ideals and realistic possibilities—no separation between the deepest desires of heart and mind and the rational application of human effort to human problems. It is not realistic or hard-headed to solve problems and take action unguided by ultimate moral aims and values [although we all know some who claim that it is so. In my judgment] it is thoughtless folly. For it ignores the realities of human faith and passion and belief; forces ultimately more powerful than all the calculations of economists or generals. Of course to adhere to standards, to idealism, to vision in the face of immediate dangers takes courage and self-confidence. But we also know that only those who dare to fail greatly, can ever achieve greatly.

It is this new idealism which is also, I believe, the common heritage of a generation which has learned that while
efficiency can lead to the camps of Auschwitz, or the streets of Budapest, only the ideals of humanity and love can climb the hill[s] to [of] the Acropolis. (APPLAUSE)

[and] A third danger is timidity. Few men are willing to brave the disapproval of their fellows, the censure of their colleagues, the wrath of their society. Moral courage is a rarer commodity than bravery in battle or great intelligence. Yet it is the one essential, vital quality for those who seek to change a world which yields most painfully to change. Aristotle tells us that "At the Olympic games it is not the finest and [or] the strongest men who are crowned, but they who enter the lists . . . So too in the life of the honorable and the good it is they who act rightly who win the prize." I believe that in this generation those with the courage to enter the moral conflict will find themselves with companions in every corner of the world.

For the fortunate among us, the fourth danger [my friends] is comfort; the temptation to follow the easy and familiar paths of personal ambition and financial success so grandly spread before those who have the privilege of [an] education. But that is not the road history has marked out for us. There is a Chinese curse which says "May he live in interesting times." Like it or not we live in interesting times. They are times of danger and uncertainty; but they are also more open to the creative energy of men than any other time in history, [the most creative of anytime in the history of mankind]. And everyone here will ultimately be judged—will ultimately judge himself—on the effort he has contributed to building a new world society and the extent to which his ideals and goals have shaped that effort.

So we part, I to my country and you to remain. We are—if a man of forty can claim that [the] privilege—fellow members of the world's largest younger generation. Each of us have our own work to do. I know at times you must feel very alone with your problems and [with your] difficulties. But I want to say how impressed I am with what you stand for and [for] the effort [that] you are making; and I say this not just for myself, but for men and women everywhere [all over the world]. And I hope you will often take heart from the knowledge that you are joined with [your] fellow young people in every land, they struggling with their problems and you with yours, but all joined in a common purpose; that, like the young people of my own country and of every country [that] I have visited, you are all in many ways more closely united to the brothers of your time than to the older generations of [in] any of these nations; and that you are determined to build
a better future. President Kennedy was speaking to the young people of America, but beyond them to young people everywhere, when he said that "The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

And, he added "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

I thank you. (APPLAUSE)
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SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY AT STELLENBOSCH
June 7: at Simonberg Residence

- SPEAKER: Gentlemen, this is indeed a very, very great honor for Stellenbosch to have with us here this afternoon, Senator Robert Kennedy, Mrs. Kennedy, his wife, the members of his personal staff as well as Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Valinsky, and Mr. John Hurley.

(APPLAUSE)

I might just mention to Senator Kennedy that he has reached the White House sooner than he could think. Because this house of course, Senator Kennedy, is known, or nicknamed, the White House.

(APPLAUSE)

It definitely has come sooner than I think you had thought.

It indeed is a very, very great honor for us to have our visitors here this afternoon.

First of all, so that Mrs. Kennedy would remember her stay, I have asked Miss Mayhem, to give her a bouquet of South African flowers.

(APPLAUSE)

For Senator Kennedy, to remind him of his visit to Stellenbosch, I have a book. This book is titled "White Africans are People Too."

SENATOR Kennedy.

(APPLAUSE)
Gentlemen, I introduce to you, Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

(APPLAUSE)

SENATOR KENNEDY:

I am delighted to be here. I am delighted to see all of you. As I said outside, the people of the United States, myself, all of those who are with me on this trip, have the greatest admiration and greatest affection for the people of South Africa. I think part of that is due to the fact that we developed our countries in somewhat the same way; developed the frontier in somewhat the same way that was done here in South Africa, with great admiration for the fight for independence by the people of South Africa, was followed carefully within the United States.

I mentioned, when I arrived, that my grandfather was a member of the House of Representatives, who put a resolution in the Congress of the United States praising the Boers, praising their integrity and their ability and their courage; asking for a special effort to be made for those Boers who wished to come from South Africa to come and settle in the United States. Most did not come, obviously. Some did come and made a great contribution to the communities and to the states in which they settled.

And then we fought together in the First World War and fought together in the Second World War, side by side. So many of our young Americans came to Cape Town, got to know your country, got to know your people, and went back to the United States with great admiration. It was, I think, a strong feeling between the United States and Australia because of what happened in the Second World War. I think the same thing happened, quite frankly, with South Africa. For many young Americans who came to know South Africa and came and left here with great admiration and great affection. And then we fought together in the Korean War. So there are many things which we have in my country of admiration and great affection for South Africa.

We have, you and I, some differences of view and opinion. But I have great respect for the fact that you have invited me here, that you have invited me here to speak despite those differences. (APPLAUSE)

And I take comfort and encouragement as well to the essential difference between free men and the subjects of totalitarianism. For free men can give voice and expression to
their beliefs, that they can engage in the great dialogue in which the Western tradition has been built. So I am glad and I am proud to be here in Stellenbosch, at this town, at this university and with all of you here today. It is a great pleasure and a great privilege for my wife and I to be in your midst.

Here Adam Tas began the great fight against exploitation of the East India Company and earned a new middle name. From here the fathers of the Voortrekkers took their first step in their long and lonely road; to leave this green and pleasant place must have been a hardship in and of itself—and a measure of the sacrifice that men will make to achieve their independence and a future for their posterity.

It was in the name of freedom that our forefathers and yours struck off the chains of Europe and sailed unchartered oceans three centuries ago. It was in this name the three times that we fought for our blood and treasure. And so we stand again as our children will stand in their turn, for as Goethe tells us, "He only earns his freedom and existence who daily conquers them anew."

If we—all of us—are to conquer anew the freedom for which our forebears gave so much, we must begin with a dialogue that is both full and free.

In the world of 1966 no nation is an island unto itself. Global systems of transportation and communication and economics have transformed our sense of geography and outmoded all new concepts of self-sufficiency. Whether we wish it or not, a pattern of unity is woven into every aspect of the society of man. We are protected from tetanus by the work of the Japanese scientists; from typhoid by the work of a Russian; an Austrian taught us to transfuse blood and an Italian to protect ourselves from malaria; an Indian and a grandson of a negro slave taught us to achieve major social chance without violence. Our children are protected from diphtheria by the work of a Japanese and a German; from rabies by the work of the French and cured of pellegra by the work of an Austrian.

We all owe our very existence to the knowledge and the talents and efforts of those who have gone before. We have a solemn obligation to repay that debt in the coin in which it was given—to work to meet our responsibility to that greater part of mankind which needs all of our assistance—to the deprived and downtrodden, the insulted and the injured.
Those men who gave us so much did not ask whether we, their heirs, would be American, or South African, or white, or black. And we must in the same way meet our obligations to all those who need our help, whatever their nationality and whatever the color of their skin.

And if we live in the shared blessings of knowledge and progress, we live also in the shared dangers of a hazardous globe. World-wide contests of ideology, along with awesome developments in the speed and the range and the impact of modern weaponry, have made the very notion of isolationism obsolete. Even the traditional distinctions of diplomacy, between belligerent and neutrals, between external and internal affairs, between a state of war and a state of peace, are slowly losing their meaning.

No longer can a spectator be certain that the flood and mud of that arena will not some day engulf him as well. No longer can any people be oblivious to the fate and future of any other. And no longer can any nation, no matter how tiny or powerful, no matter how wealthy or well armed, be as free as it once might have been to ignore a far-off war or warning, to shrug off another nation's crisis or criticism, or to defy the concerns or the contempt of mankind.

Communist nations or others may build a wall of stone or a curtain of bamboo, but they cannot build a modern society without exposing their citizens to the ideas and the ideology of other systems. No nation is more opposed to communism than the United States. We reject the theory that human beings exist for the benefit of the state; that the state is more important than the individual or than the family. We reject totally the restrictions on freedom of the press, of protest, of speech, and of religion. But the United States is not afraid to hear the voices and the viewpoints of communism. We do not jam their broadcasts or exclude their scholars, or repress their books.

At times in our history we have acted too hastily and too harshly to the fears and threats from within and without. But any times of suppression have been times of fear and stagnation, the years which the locusts have eaten. We do not intend to repeat those years, even now when we are involved in the great struggle in the war in Vietnam. But we will not abolish the substance of freedom in order to save the shadow.

No nation should have so little confidence in the wisdom and policies and its citizens that they dare not be tested in the free market of ideas. Societies concerned with the importation of ideas are those which fear what Jefferson called the "disease of liberty." But those with confidence
in their own future, in their citizens in the durability of their ideal will welcome the exchange of views just as you are doing now.

I am here in South Africa to listen as well as to talk; less to lecture than to learn. Whatever our disagreements, neither your country or mine is under any illusion that there is only one side to any issue or that either of us can coerce or quickly convert the other to share our point of view. This we all recognize. But asserting disagreement without debate is as meaningless as asserting unanimity without discussion. Let us find out where we disagree and why we disagree and let us also find out where we can agree.

If history is a guide, a future prime minister of this nation may now be sitting in this room. But all of you, whether prime minister or not, you have a major role to play as educated people in the 20th Century. For beyond these walls is a world to be helped and improved and made safe for the welfare of mankind.

What kind of a world is waiting there for all of you? It is a world of change—unparalleled, unsettling, dizzying change.

The certainties of yesterday are the doubts of today, and the folly and mockery of tomorrow. Every problem that we solve only reveals a dozen more of increasing complexity. Every hill that we climb shows only a higher rise beyond.

Your country and mine have created wealth unmatched in the history of mankind; but we have not yet learned to turn that wealth to the service of all of our people.

Your country and mine gained freedom from colonial domination, and set an example for seventy nations around the globe; and we have not yet learned how to help those new nations to achieve the economic, social and political process and progress which their people demand and which they deserve.

Your country and mine and dozens of others have achieved a terrible capacity for destruction. And five nations including my own know how to destroy the whole world. But we have not yet learned to prevent those weapons from destroying the very society they were designed to protect.

In your country and mine we fought for and achieved freedoms for some of our people, but we have not yet learned, as Thomas Paine said, that, "no man or country can be really free unless all men and all countries are free." And in every continent—from Jaipur to Johannesburg, from Point Barrow to Cape Horn—men and women are claiming their rights to
share in the bounty which modern knowledge can bring, in the justice which men have sought from Biblical times onward. They look to us for help and for hope and for guidance. And the real question before all of you—and before the young people of any country—is whether we will help to give them that kind of a future.

We must begin with a light of reason—with fact and logic and careful thought, unblinkered by the shades of prejudice and myth. In this fantastic and dangerous world, we will not find answers in old dogmas, repeating worn out slogans, fighting on ancient battlegrounds against fading enemies long after the real struggle has moved on. We must change to master change, we must retain what is the best of our tradition and take pride in the accomplishments of our forebears. But, as Lincoln said, "we must think anew, we must disenthrall ourselves." And for this we look to the young people. The new children of a time of change.

Yet the very education which equips you for service to mankind also prepares you for a place in society far removed from the problems for which solutions are so desperately needed. The laboratory of the office of the medical specialist is far away from the ailing children of Peru, or Tasmania; a college graduate as far away from a man with a different color of his skin—deprived at birth of the chance to work out his destiny as an individual or a father or a human being. The philosopher's study does not feel the problems of training and education in India or Central Africa. As the skilled and the professional people of South Africa and the world, you will be largely removed from contact with the hungry and the deprived, those without hope in the present or without any hope for the future.

It will require a constant effort and a will to keep contact, to remind ourselves everyday that we who diet have a never-ending obligation to those who are starving—and to work to meet that kind of an obligation. There are opportunities for that service everywhere—in government, and in the national organizations, both public and private, and even if you choose a private profession. The English word "idiot" and the African word "idioot" both come from the Greek word for one who did not participate in public affairs. But our word "university" comes from the Latin word for all together. The need is for individual participation, for each of us to try to make a difference, as President Kennedy believed every man could do.

It would be simpler to follow the easy and the familiar path of personal ambition and of private gain. It would be
more comfortable to sit content in the easy approval of friends and neighbors instead of risking the friction and controversy that comes with public affairs. It would be easier to fall in step with the slogans of others than to march to the beat of an internal drummer—to make and stand on judgments of your own. And it would be far easier to accept and to stand on the past than to fight for the answers for the future.

But Goethe tells us that Faust lost the freedom and liberty of his own soul when he said to the passing moment, "Stay, thou art so fair." There would be no surer way for us, all of us, to lose our freedoms and the true meaning of our heritage than to make that same mistake.

Thank you.

SPEAKER: Should anyone want to ask Senator Kennedy questions, he is most willing to answer.

Any question from the house?

FROM THE FLOOR (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: Well, I think first, I am sure that there have been unfairnesses and injustices in the past and I think that countries—South Africa has received considerable amount of attention while other countries through their internal problems and their efforts to settle them are certainly no better than South Africa. I think that partially, it is due to the fact that South Africa is a very important area.

First, I would like to say that there is no misunderstanding because I have heard the question raised about antagonism that exists in the United States and amongst the government toward South Africa. There isn't that. There isn't a great conspiracy outside about South Africa and everybody hates South Africa or hates the citizens of South Africa.
I say to you, quite frankly, that there is great affection, as I said at the beginning, toward the people of South Africa. And there is great admiration for what has been accomplished in South Africa and, as I said, I think that we feel in the United States that we are very much like the people of South Africa. But we start with that.

Now South Africa has an important role to play, through its development, the strategic position it has has an important role to play. And the fact that it is strategically located within Africa gives it a very important position in world affairs.

First, facing the fact that the white people are a minority group throughout the world and we are not the majority race we are a minority race. That the United States—-I speak now about my own country—-is the leader of the free world. One of the reasons that we are the leader of the free world is because of our armaments and our production, but it is also, in my judgment, it is because we have the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, the Constitution of the United States, and the whole concept that everybody is created equal and that people should be treated equally and they should be allowed to develop, based on their own ability, not on the color of their skin or their religion or their race.

I mentioned last night about the fact that there were many imperfections in the United States. That we hadn't followed through with the Declaration of Independence, and in a
manner that through our 200-year history that we could always be proud of.

My grandfather arrived in Massachusetts and was met by tremendous prejudice against him because he was Irish and was a Catholic. My father left Boston, Massachusetts 25 years ago just a short period of time ago, 30 years ago, because there was signs as he went around trying to find work saying that no Irish need apply. He went to another part of the United States and was able to gain his own position within society and it was also the next generation that a man became President of the United States who was an Irish Catholic.

So we made that kind of a progress. But what we stand for and what we are trying to accomplish in our own country is that everybody is going to be treated on the basis not where they were born, what section of the country they were born, and what their accent might be; whether their parents came from Italy or Portugal or Africa; no matter whether they are Catholic or atheist or Jewish or Protestant; no matter what the color of their skin might be, that everybody is going to be treated equally. That that is what our society is. And we are identified with other countries around the world who are moving toward that ideal.

Perhaps they are not going to move in the same pace. Perhaps the problems are going to be somewhat different. But generally this is the direction that we are all trying, this
is what separates us from totalitarianism, this is one of our objections to Hitler, it is one of our objections to communism. That they didn't treat the individual as the important entity, no matter what his color of skin or his religion might be, but that the individual in our society in Western tradition, the individual is what is important.

And so what is of concern for us in the outside is that as a practice here in South Africa, that that is not only not the ideal, but that is not put into practice within South Africa.

Now whether it is small, petty, ex parte, when we talk about the fact that you have benches for white people and black people, or the fact that in many of the churches you can't go in and pray together or the fact that there is not as much money spent for a black student as a white student here in South Africa, or the fact that a colored person in Cape Town who might have great ability and great skill and might be as smart as any of us, who could contribute to the development of the country, is not permitted to participate in the national political process. This causes us concern. And it is not just concern because of the idealism.

If we felt that South Africa was moving in this direction and it is not just the concern about the fact that our own relationship with South Africa, but we also have a relationship with all of Africa and if it is felt within the rest of Africa that here in South Africa, with whom the United
States has this close association and affection and admiration, and yet the South African political process is that a black man when he is born is a second-class citizen and is not as good as the white man. That obviously causes tremendous difficulties and much more difficulties than it might cause otherwise. So that is our concern.

It is not a dislike of any individual and it is not a dislike of what has occurred here in the accomplishments, but it is a concern about how this kind of a system is developing. Not that we want you or suggest in coming here that everybody has to vote immediately or everybody has to participate. All of these things we feel should be developed by South Africans themselves. You have got problems, and we don't deny that, but we also feel that you could work them out and you don't need dictation from the United States to be able to work them out.

But what we would like to see is that we are moving toward recognizing that the fact that people are equal and the fact that a color of a person's skin or his religion or the fact that he happens to be Indian or happens to be Chinese, or happens to be black, that everybody is going to be treated equally. Why a Japanese is a white man and a Chinese is a colored man, I can't understand. And we can't understand that in the United States. Those are our problems.

I would be glad to have an answer given.

FROM THE FLOOR (Inaudible)
SENATOR KENNEDY: First I would like to say, you talked about the African countries. First that they have gained their independence over the period of the last few years. Many of them were not educated or trained. Many of them were all colonial nations and many of them, their white masters, never made any effort with them.

I visited them in Mauritania when I came through the Independence of the Ivory Coast. There were two people who had graduated from college. Many of these countries that really had no training, no education, and no facilities for being trained, in order to participate in government.

We would hope that with our help, with our assistance of South Africa that we could encourage this country to move along in a more democratic way. The prejudice or discrimination where they exist in many of those countries and where they exist should be condemned. I don't question that.

But where it exists is not just the fact that if somebody is a natural inferior and a second-class citizen because he is born black or born colored. I just think it is the question of whether you recognize the fact that human beings before God are equal and if somebody—I am not asking anybody here to associate with a colored man or black man unless he wants to. But there must be people all over South Africa or all over the United States who are as good as anybody in this room, who are as bright as anyone in this room, but because of the fact that they were born black or born colored have a much more difficult time than any of us.
All I say is that if we can move in the direction of recognizing the fact that somebody might have ability and might have skill and still be black, if we can move in that direction, that is all we ask, really, in the rest of the world.

But instead of moving in that direction, it appears that it is moving in the opposite direction.

In answer to your question, I raised what has concerned us. And I want to again emphasize that this is not antagonism toward any individual or the country as a whole. That doesn't exist.

I am closely identified with the civil rights movement in the United States. I have never criticized South Africa. I have never made a speech about South Africa. I never talked about South Africa and yet I was made a great enemy.

It is said that everybody in the United States and the government of the United States and myself all say that immediately there should be one-man-one-vote in South Africa. Nobody's ever said that. Nobody's ever advocated that. Nobody's advocated other than you work out your own political problems.

But as I said in my speech today and as I said last night, what you do here does have an effect on what happens just as a riot in Rio de Janeiro has an effect or student demonstrations in Saigon. We are so close together now, all
of us, and what we do in our own countries is so close together, and we are particularly suspect because we are a white nation and we have this identification and association and economic exchange with South Africa, we are more suspect by the rest of the countries, Africa and the rest around the world.

When President Kennedy had a visit from a South African in 1961, and they said, can't we do something to improve the relation?, he said, we can do something and I want to do something but just give us some sign that you are going to move in the direction of recognizing the fact that a black man or a colored person can be as good, if the skill and ability and if he has the innate talent, as the white person.

That is what the struggle is about and the effort is about.

FROM THE FLOOR: Senator Kennedy, I would just like to know; Do you think a four-day visit to South Africa will learn you enough about the country and about our problems in the country?

SENATOR KENNEDY: No, I don't think four days. I think you probably—you know you will have some impression about a country from reading. I don't know if you have ever been to my country, but you know something about the United States. You have some impression of China. You have some impression of communism, but you have never been to a communist country.
So you can have some impression about a country before you arrive there. I am not blank about my feelings about China because I haven't been there. I have been to the Soviet Union. And you are not blank about communism even though you might never have been to a communist country.

So you can have some feeling from reading and studying and talking before you visit a country. And, secondly, I think that visiting a country even for a short period of time helps. But I want to explain quite clearly that before I came to South Africa I said to the Ambassador, I asked him for help in arranging my schedule. I said I would pretty much stay as long as he felt it was helpful. That I would visit with any people that he wanted me to visit and that I would go any place that he wanted me to go and talk with anybody that he wanted me to talk to and that if he had some suggestions of things I could talk about that would improve the relationship that existed between South Africa and the United States; that I would try to incorporate them into whatever I said.

I said that I would like to see government officials and anybody else. And he came back three days later and said that my visit was on my own and that they wouldn't make any suggestions as to who I should visit. They wouldn't make any suggestions as to how long I should stay there. And the government officials wouldn't visit with me.
Now, I have been to France and I visited with Charles de Gaulle. I have been to Germany and I visited with President Adenauer. I have been to Latin American countries; I have been to five of them last year. I visited the President of each one of these countries. I am going to three African countries and I am going to see each one of those, the Presidents of each one of those countries.

I haven't been able to see one government official since I have been here. I don't say I am going to leave here anymore than I left Latin America as an expert on Latin America. I think I have a better understanding of South Africa than when I came. But I did come here in good faith and I have, as much as possible under these restrictions, made a conscientious effort to know as much about South Africa and that is why I am particularly delighted and honored that you have invited me to speak here today.

END TAPE I

TAPE II FOLLOWS

FROM THE FLOOR: Senator Kennedy, I would like to ask: You said in your speech that you don't stop communist broadcasting or papers or anything like that. Do you think that is the proper way to fight communism or don't you fight communism?

SENATOR KENNEDY: Well, I think if you ask a lot of
young men in South Vietnam they could give you the answer to that. And all the ones in your own South Africa who fought in Korea and 50,000 Americans who were killed in Korea, and 150,000 that were wounded in Korea, whether we fight communism or not.

The efforts that we made all over the globe to try to fight communism. But we think that discussing communism and exchanging views with communists will weaken them because their position is so weak. And the fact that no country, even though there is a free exchange into other countries, no country has ever freely selected communism since the end of the Second World War. We don't think that is the kind of a social, political, economic system which will appeal to people.

So I can get up and would be glad to debate with a communist as I have all over the world because I think we are right. When I was down in South America and when they threw eggs and caused disorders and threw things at me, I said that if you would just come forward I would be glad to debate with you. You give your position and I will give my position and then we will let the people decide. They wouldn't do that. And the last analysis is that communists won't have that kind of a debate, won't have that kind of freedom of expression.

So I think that we are strong enough and our system is strong enough and that Western tradition is strong enough
that we can meet and talk and discuss and exchange views and we are going to win it. That is what I feel.

FROM THE FLOOR: Do you think the same applies to South Africa, for instance?

SENATOR KENNEDY: I think, again, what South Africa does in dealing with any kind of a problem it has got to be its business and it has to decide itself.

As I say, when it comes into this realm, someone once said, these matters are your business, but when they affect my business and when they affect others, it also becomes my business.

And there are things that are happening in South Africa because of our close relation with South Africa that have a very, very difficult effect on the United States and the cause of freedom in any judgment around the world. That is what the difficulty is. It is not anybody coming in here and dictating—and people saying, what would you do and I don't have the answer. I don't come here saying what you should do in dealing with this problem.

Your problem is quite different from the problem that we have in the United States. And I am not saying that you should move in the same pace that we do in the United States: you should follow the same procedures that we do in the United States. Any of these things, we are not, my country, advocating them, but we do stand for and our Declaration of Independence stood for and our Constitution and our whole way
of life and why we think we are different from the communists is the fact that we recognize the individual dignity of the human being. No matter where he is born or what his race or what the color of his skin or what his religion is. That is what our ideal is and that is what causes us concern.

FROM THE FLOOR: Senator Kennedy, last night you said, and you repeated it again this afternoon, the way of opposition to communist is not to indoctrinate its dictatorship between large human feelings in our own countries and all over the world, the denial of freedom, in whatever name, only strengthens the very thing communists claim to oppose.

Do you believe that this statement is also particular to South Africa, where the underdeveloped, the illiterate, uneducated, are still so much in the majority and would, therefore, be so much easier to be susceptible to communism? Don't you think you must first try to raise the general intelligencw standards of the underdeveloped before we can allow the supporters of communism to advocate this idea? Don't you think that to allow the idea of communism to be spread throughout this country at this stage would lead to indoctrination of the masses rather than voluntary assumption?

SENATOR KENNEDY: It seems to me, are we going to say that communists are the only ones that want to reform? I think we stand for reform, we stand for change. We talk about the education. I mean the fact is that if you examine the figures in South Africa, if you examine
you are going to be able to participate in your political process.

But to say to a black man, you can't live with your wife and you can't live with your children. Which one of us in this room would accept that?

You know what you fought for and your forebears fought for freedom, and you fought for independence because you wouldn't accept something. How much less would you accept any of this? How much less would I accept? I wouldn't accept it. And I don't think that you can say because we wouldn't accept it a person who is colored or a person who is a black person is going to accept it anymore.

I think that we can make reforms and we can make change that is all I advocate.

Go ahead.

FROM THE FLOOR: Senator Kennedy, don't you think the fact that more and more colored universities are built in South Africa, these are movements in this direction?

SENATOR KENNEDY: Yes, I think that is helpful. I think that is helpful, but would you agree from your own—for instance, why is there compulsory education for a white child and not compulsory education for a black child? Why does a black family have to pay for part of its education and a white child doesn't? I can ask you about 10 questions about this but I am willing to answer yours.
FROM THE FLOOR: Senator Kennedy, at the moment the colored don't pay as much taxes as the white, as the Europeans do, and if they want to go to a university they don't pay as much---

SENATOR KENNEDY: Answer my question about the white child and a black child, why isn't there compulsory education for black children? Why do you have compulsory education for white children and not for black children? Why does a black family have to pay for its education, at least part of it, and a white family doesn't?

FROM THE FLOOR: (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: Black families have to pay at least for some of their books and have to pay some of their education. I will tell you this is what came from the African newspapers editors that I met with.

FROM THE FLOOR: Senator, I was born up in a free state and the many black schools and white schools and at both you don't pay for your books if you apply by the government. Therefore, if you have the money to pay for the books, you are allowed to pay for your books.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Why don't they have compulsory education for black children?

FROM THE FLOOR: It doesn't seem a mystery at the moment because in our opinion they haven't developed such.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Wait a minute. The child is five years old or six years old and it is a white child, why
shouldn't he be compelled to go to school as much as the black child?

FROM THE FLOOR: I think, Senator, it is a question of practicality. You have in South Africa 12-1/2 million black people. You have also 2-1/2-3 million white people. The problem is that if you make education at this stage compulsory for black people you, in the first place, won't have enough teachers and, in the second place, it will be one very, very great economical output which the country can't afford so readily. But I do certainly think that we are striving toward this direction to try and make education compulsory for black children as well. But at this moment it is just impractical and impossible.

FROM THE FLOOR: (Inaudible)

SENNATOR KENNEDY: Not a bit. I think that can be worked out by South Africa.

Let me say that I think that for me to try to develop a political system or a constitution for South Africa, I think would be--I am not even suggesting that we do that. But we did it within our own country.

For instance, we have in the United States, there are two senators from the state of New York. We have 19 million people. California has 20 million people, they have two senators. The state of Alaska has 250,000, they have the same number of senators in the Senate of the United States.
What you do, how you develop your political system—we have literacy tests in many of the states. How you develop that is up to you. What I am advocating and saying and what we stand for, where I think the problem rests is not how you do it and the way that it is carried out, but whether, in fact, we are moving toward greater freedom and greater respect for the individual and his integrity or away from it and of the system.

FROM THE FLOOR: Would you say that our present government is not trying to achieve that without losing our own identity?

SENATOR KENNEDY: Well, if I have to examine what is happening under separate developments, and in the practical results of separate development and what is happening to an individual—I visited Section 6—I don't want to bring up all bad things because I have seen many marvelous things—but if I visit there and they say they are going to move all of the Indians out and they are going to move all the colored people out and they are going to move all the white people in; then there was a protest committee and then the Attorney General makes the two leaders of the protest committee, makes them communist. That is a matter of concern.

I recognize the great technological development, the beauty of the country, the marvelousness of this university, and these students, and what you contribute and what you can
contribute around the world. So I am not just seeing one side, but what I am trying to describe to you as an outsider is what causes us concern.

Now, you know you can go to the park benches or the churches, whatever it might be. You could go into things and if you add it all up and you are dealing for a country and are a spokesman for a country, it certainly hasn't met all its responsibilities.

We have Negroes who are deprived, we have the poor who are deprived and we have tremendous problems. But what we are trying to do is at least rectify injustices and the ills. The concern here is whether it is moving in that direction or moving in an opposite direction.

FROM THE FLOOR: (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: There is not question in my mind about that and I don't think there is any monopoly of morality or intelligence or anything outside the United States. You feel as strongly about these things and the moral aspects of it as I do or anybody else. So I don't suggest that.
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SPEAKER: Senator Kennedy, Mrs. Kennedy, Distinguished Guests, Students in the Tower:

We have a great pleasure, indeed, to welcome here tonight, you, sir.

The time has come speaks of challenges. I do not wish us tonight to give the discussions here of the time-honored academic hearing we give to other speakers for morality and justice. To every South African, as to every nation, must come a moment to decide. We are living the challenge of tomorrow's South Africa and never has time and the hour in South Africa so demanded decision. The days of the docile and watery student are over and there will only be shame for those who accept wrong, indignity and human suffering for the sake of peace and quiet.

The time period of conscience and human crime smothered in peace and quiet must now draw to an end. The struggle for our self-respect, our moral victory, is only just now beginning in this time of protest and mental revolt.

The challenge of tomorrow's South Africa will be the challenge of the youth. To the older people here tonight I would say we are the children of your generation; do not let government threat cause you to prevent your children from shoulder their challenge. You may draw back from committing yourself, but do not stop us from committing ourselves to that belief and background which our heritage has given us. Ours is a different South Africa; a different future.

Young South Africa what shall we do? Dr. Verwoerd, the Prime Minister, has told us that this Republic is built on traditions of Western democracies devolved of hundreds of years. This may be a familiar catch-phrase. All Dr. Verwoerd does not realize is that this country is no trial and other laws do declare him false. He also said, in his Republic-today-speech, that to those who believe in some sort of multi-race in South Africa he had nothing to say. He said, he was talking to the builders and not the wreckers. It is right, it is right, that Dr. Verwoerd should be under no illusion that at any movement for a different South Africa will have as the purpose to wreck any policy of injustice and termination of the freedom of the individual.

Dr. Verwoerd, and our government should also not be under any illusion that we love our country and that we will be builders of what we believe is the greater and better South Africa. Dr. Verwoerd and our government should not question our love for South Africa or our sincerity and yet he has told us he has no patience with us.
Ian Robertson, who is symbolically occupying this empty seat behind me, Ian Robertson has felt the effect of his patience.

I ask what shall we do? We will give Dr. Verwoerd the challenge of our youth. We will not obey any commands or threats to conform. We will be open and courageous about our beliefs and actions as we have in the past. The rest is up to our government and their steady belief in Western traditions of civilization. He can only do his worst and we will always be ready to give more than our best.

Senator Kennedy, we welcome you very much.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Tony, Your Excellency the Principal, Members of the Faculty, and Students:

First I want to apologize for being late. But I was upstairs just before I came down and overheard a conversation between the previous speaker and a member of the police. And he said, "I wouldn't pay too much attention to what I say tonight, but it is a real swinger." And having sat through it, I think that would probably qualify in anybody's country.

But I would suggest that anybody who might be surprised at it, if they could come and visit a university in the United States for about 24 hours, because those kind of speeches are given, I would think, at least three times a day in every university across the United States. If there is no opposition within a university, if those who are young do not speak out, where is the society going to rise? If those at the age of 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 are satisfied then where are we going in any of our countries, where are we going under any kind of society, where are we going to start challenging any of the beliefs or any of the ideas?

So I congratulate this student body and I congratulate the previous speaker and I congratulate all those that I have seen since I have been to South Africa for their willingness to challenge, for their willingness to speak out. I don't think that any of you know, or if we think that we know, if we are going to be subject to a great disillusionment. Any of us know all of the answers to the future, any of us know what all the solutions to the problems that affect our particular country or affect the world. But at least to keep challenging, at least to keep looking for solutions, that is what youth is. That is the challenge of youth, that is the challenge of young people and that is why I am proud to be here tonight with all of you.

I have enjoyed my visit to South Africa, I have enjoyed my visit with young people and I have also been very grateful for the warm reception that we have received, my wife and
myself, as we travelled around your beautiful, beautiful country.

I was delighted last night to see Ian Robertson and I am delighted tonight to see their parents here in the audience.

My wife and I had the pleasure of visiting Salisbury [actually Stellenbosch] University this noon. We stayed overnight there. It was one of the most beautiful towns that I have ever seen. I had the privilege of addressing at least part of the student body—couldn't find a big enough hall for everybody. Once again everybody was extremely courteous and we had an exchange and we had a dialogue. For me that was very valuable, and I complimented them. Because I am sure there was a majority of those students whom I addressed and invited me to attend, who disagreed with my position, disagreed with my point of view, disagreed with my ideas. But they invited me. And they invited me to have a dialogue and we had one. We exchanged views and ideas.

That, in my judgment, is really the heart of a democracy, of a democratic system, to permit that kind of exchange, to permit those who disagree to exchange views with you, and then hope that out of that exchange will come the best possible future for their country.

So I congratulate them on their broad mindedness. I told them that I thought that I thought they were very liberal.

(LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE)

But we all understood what we meant.

(LAUGHTER)

But they were very kind and they were very thoughtful. And I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation.

There has been a long, really, tradition of friendship between our two countries. I have been asked, since I have been here about supposed antagonisms toward South Africa on the part of the United States? I don't know that there is any country in which—perhaps an individual—there is more friendship, more basic friendship, toward South Africa.

First, I think that the fact that we both came from the same kind of background, same kind of environment. Both of our countries fought on the frontier. Made our existence under very critical circumstances. We both were allies in
the First World War fighting for democratic system and Western tradition. We were both allies in the Second World War fighting for the same tradition for individual freedom and individual dignity. We were both allies in the Korean War and once again we fought together and made that effort together.

We now both face problems, somewhat alike, but in many cases very different. But there is that great feeling of affection and admiration for the people of South Africa on behalf of the people of the United States and that is why I am so proud and so pleased to be visiting your country and to be here with you tonight.

I was a little uncertain about what I might speak with you about this evening, particularly as I see Bishop Hurley down there and behind him Alan Paton. I had dinner with a group this evening and I had said that I hadn't met with so many people who were in trouble since I was Attorney General of the United States. But I look down and think of them and some of the rest of the guests in the audience, and I think of back in my own country of a man who survived the Johnstown flood.

The Johnstown flood virtually wiped out a whole community and almost everybody that lived in it. But this man survived the Johnstown flood and whenever he would get a group together he would tell them about surviving the Johnstown flood and what it was like. And if he just got two or three people and he met them in the morning he would gather them together, even if he already told them about the Johnstown flood. And if he could ever get a luncheon engagement he was really excited, or a dinner meeting. So then he died and went to Heaven, and St. Peter said, "I can't believe what a marvelous life you have lived. You are going to get any wish that you want, anything that you desire in Heaven you are going to get." He said, "Well, if you could get everybody together I would like to tell them about the Johnstown flood."

So St. Peter said, "That is a rather unusual request, but I will see what I can do. You come back at noon tomorrow."

So he came back at noon the next day and St. Peter said, "They're all here," and had them all—I don't know what you do up there—sitting on something, but they were all there.

St. Peter said, "You go right up there and talk to those people." And he said, "I just can't thank you enough."
And St. Peter said, "Well, there is just one thing I want to tell you before you begin." And the fellow said, "What is that?" And he said, "Noah is in your audience."

(APPLAUSE AND LAUGHTER)

But I am delighted to be here and even with these distinguished guests and those who know much more, perhaps—without a perhaps—know much more about the world, about the problems of the world than I do, who are in the audience. I am very pleased that they are as well as I am pleased to see so many young people.

When President Kennedy ran in 1960, I think it was really a special appeal to young people. It was a special appeal to the young people of our own country, but really all over the globe. What he ran on, the major platform that he ran on, was not just a democratic platform that was written out in Los Angeles, but it was the idea that the United States could do better. That we didn't have to be content with being second best in any field. That we didn't have to be content when our economic product was the slowest of any large industrial nation in the world. He went to the American people and he said, "We can do better than that. We can find answers. We can find solutions to that kind of a problem." And he said, "We don't have to be content with the Negroes as a second-class citizen in the United States. I am not promising that we are going to be able to deal with this problem immediately. I am not promising that the problem will disappear. But I am promising that we will face the problem, and we will do something about it and we will continue to make progress."

And he said the United States didn't have to be second in space; that we didn't have to look up at the moon and realize that there was a Russian flag on the moon, but there wasn't anything belonging to the United States up there. He said, "We can do this in the United States. We have the ability. We have the skill. We have the courage. All we have to do is face our problem. Realize our own potential, realize our own intelligence, realize the fact that we have courage and we have the integrity and that we have the ability to get this job done."

He went to the American people on that basis. And he was elected President of the United States. And then the changes began in the United States. Once again, I don't come here to South Africa, nor did I go to Latin America, go to Europe, and say that these changes that were brought about started in 1961 and continued to 1963 by President Kennedy.
and then continued so ably by President Johnson, that they made all of the problems of the United States disappear. But what they did do is indicated to the American people that we would discuss our problems that we could have a dialogue.

We wouldn't say the problem didn't exist. We wouldn't push it under the rug and say that it wasn't important. That we would go out and discuss it in public, that we would discuss it publicly amongst all of our citizens. That everybody's voice would be heard and we would listen to those who had ideas or answers or solutions so that we could try to find the best answers.

And that is what we did starting in 1961 and we waited through 1962 and 1963 and 1964 and the problems didn't disappear. But in all those areas we did make progress so that we are no longer second in space, we are no longer treating Negroes as a second-class citizen and we are the fastest growing industrial nation of any large nation in the world. And that was done and it was accomplished and it wasn't any magician's wand. It was just facing up to the fact that we can as human beings, we can find some answers, find some solutions.

As President Kennedy said, "Problems are made by man, therefore, they can be solved by man." And that is what I think is important in all of our countries. Because we face the problem still of poverty, as we still face in our own country of discrimination; that we still have domestic problems that have to be fought and faced and shaped. We have our problems with other countries around the globe.

What we are doing now in the United States and what I think is in the tradition of the West is that we are discussing them and we are trying to find answers to them. And I think that that is so important.

As I go through this country I find that South Africa also has problems. I think that what is so important for both of our countries, if we stand for anything, both of our countries is that we begin to discuss them. We begin to find out what absolutes or polarization is necessary. Perhaps there are some solutions. Perhaps there are some answers. And perhaps that the best minds and the best energy and the best talents of the country could be employed to finding those kinds of answers.

But what do we stand for in the Western tradition? What is it that we believe in? Is all that we believe in, in our allies and our relationships with other countries,
is all that we believe in anti-communism, we are against communism? Is that all that we stand for in our own countries and in our own hearts? Is that what we are fighting in Vietnam about? Is that what we are helping and assisting other countries around the globe about, because we don't want them to be taken over by communists? That is our philosophy, anti-communism?

I think we stand for something. I think we stand for something positive. What is it that we stand for? We stand for human freedom and we stand for human dignity and we stand for ending discrimination and ending hunger and ending illiteracy. And we stand for extending the cause for freedom and justice all over the globe. That is why I think we have attracted other people, those who have a difficult time in their own lives to come and follow the banner of the United States.

Not just because we are anti-communist, but because we stand for something. Being anti-communist is not enough. It is not something that one can eat. It is not a school that a child can go to. It is not a job to give a man.

You can say to somebody that sees his child dying of hunger, or a child that can't go to school and say, "Well this is fine. You are living in the Western tradition. You are not as good because you are black or you are an Indian or you are colored, but you should understand that is all right, this is the Western tradition. This is democracy. You haven't got communism." What a terrible life you would have. Can you eat it? Can you go to school at it as an anti-communist?

Something more has to be offered and that is what we have to do. Those particularly of the younger generation, to go forward before the world and say that we can do better, that we can find answers, that we can find solutions.

I travelled through Latin America last year and saw there were 50 percent, in some cases 70 percent, of the children died before the age of one. Half the people that are buried in Latin America are under the age of four. That half the people over the age of 18 cannot either read or write. And illiteracy that less than half the children can go to school.

And all we have to do is to look to the North of us here up in to Northern Africa and see the same kind of people who are calling out for help and assistance. And those who have made our own lives possible, those that have given us our tradition, have them look back to find out what our color
was or what our religion was or what our race was. They didn't look that way to us. Should we look to the future and say we are not going to help you because you are a Negro? We are not going to help you because you are black? We are not going to help you because you are colored? And we are not going to help you because you are Catholic? Or because you are a Jew?

I say that is not the Western tradition and that is not the way to deal with communism. Communism doesn't believe in change, the Western tradition believes in change. It believes in facing up to the problems that face mankind and doing something about them and that is what I think the youth of South Africa want to do as well as the Youth of the United States.

(APPLAUSE)

When I was Attorney General of the United States I had the responsibility that the Attorney General of South Africa had for communism in the United States. That was my personal responsibility. I had underneath me the police, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to deal with the problems of communism. I also was appointed by President Kennedy to head up a committee of all the departmental departments dealing with communism abroad—a counter-insurgence committee.

First, as far as our domestic communism was concerned, what we thought was the best way to deal with that was to discuss it. If somebody came in and had a different idea, let him go up and debate it and let the people decide. And the result is that the communist party is growing smaller and smaller in the United States, so that now it is infinitesimal.

What do we think is the way to deal with communism in other countries? Do we think just putting people in jail? Just putting people on house arrest? Just saying you cannot have change and anybody who advocated change saying that you are subversive?

What we did we tried to build roads so that the people could go from one village to the other. What we did was try to build more schools so that a man and woman growing up in a village could feel that their child could have an education. What we did was try to provide more jobs so that a man would know that he could get employment at a decent wage. That was the effort that we made, because that is what we felt was the way to deal with communism. Not just to be fearful of communism, not just to have this philosophy that everything that is communism is something to be concerned about.
The communism for change and the communism for reform. Our Western tradition is for change, our Western tradition is for reform. And what we stand for in the United States and what I believe you stand for is reform and change and giving a person a better life.

How many of us here who are white would be satisfied if we were colored? How many of us in South Africa or in the United States would be satisfied in being second-class citizens? How many of us would be satisfied if we had to place ourselves in a position of a black shirt? Would we be satisfied with being second-class citizens? Is there anything different between them? Did God say to them that you are a different man, you have a different soul because you are black? Or because you are colored or because you are not completely white?

I asked, the other day, what the definition of a colored person was. And I was told by some of the authorities here that it was a bastard, that was the definition. I said, "Well, what happens when a white woman and a white man have a child out of marriage, does he become one?" I said, "What a shock it is going to be for all of us if we are not going to even pray with the black person or pray with a colored person or if we don't treat our people and our own Negroes and our own minority groups in our own country, if we don't treat them right. What is going to happen to us when we die if we go up and we find out that God was colored or God was black?"

(APPLAUSE)

If we are going to change the world, if we are going to make a difference in our own country, if we are going to do something in the United States about our own illiteracy, about our own who are still our hungry in our country, for those who still can't get a proper education and the hundreds of thousands of Negroes who still can't get adequate jobs, if we are going to do that in our own country and if you are going to right the injustices in this country; if the injustices in Latin America and Asia and Africa are going to be righted, it is going to have to be led by the young people. To those who are going to say that they are dissatisfied. To those who say that they want a better world and they are not going to accept the world as it is. That they are going to say that we can do better. That we are going to do better with free tradition and that we can do better under the banner of freedom.

"This theater of man's life, it is left only to God and angels to be lookers-on," said Francis Bacon. Are we going to be lookers-on?
President Kennedy often told the young people of the United States, "Are you going to be the hammer or the anvil? Are you going to make your voices heard? Are you going to speak out against injustices? If you don't speak out, nobody else will. If you don't lead in this effort, no one else will."

So that is the task before all of us. It is the task before this group here. It is the task before the young people of South Africa. It is the task before the young people of Kenya and Tanzania and Peru, and Argentina and the United States. It is a task of young people to lead for a better world. To have a better world for all of our people. To be dissatisfied and say that we can do better.

President Kennedy once said in a time of crisis about the part and the role that an individual could play. He said, "Bullfight critics ranked in rows, crowd the enormous clouds of bull, but only one there is who knows, and he's the man who fights the bull." Are you going to fight the bull or stand in the sidelines?

Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

(end tape 1, Natal Univ.)

SPEAKER: Senator Kennedy has asked me to ask you if you wish to ask questions. He will take questions from the floor. He will be pleased to answer any questions at all.

SENATOR KENNEDY: Here I am.

Go ahead.

FROM THE FLOOR: I feel that it was wonderful that you were able to go to Stellenbosch and to discuss with the Afrikaans speaking students their ideas and their attitude and to give them an opportunity of hearing your ideas. Would it not be possible for you to ask whether we would not permit another African university in order to hear again their attitudes and to give them your opinion again? I am sure that
most of us here feel very much like you have felt about the situations that face us. It is terribly important that we should have this discussion with those who do not feel as we do.

SENATOR KENNEDY: I would agree on that.

Let me just explain a little about my visit here to South Africa and maybe it is an answer to the questions.

When I was first invited—I have visited other countries of the world and most often the reason that I have gone is that I have been invited by a student group and I think again I feel strongly about the role that young people can play.

I went to South America, for instance, because I was invited by a student group; a student group which, incidentally, didn't agree with the government, didn't agree with me and didn't agree with the United States. But I thought it was worthwhile discussing and there were some arrangements to meet with other students, some of which were not finished because there were those who felt so strongly that they didn't permit me to speak. There I was not felt to be a communist. Quite the contrary.

(APPLAUSE AND LAUGHTER)

In any case, when I received the invitation to come here I accepted the invitation and then I shortly after contacted the South African Ambassador. I said that I was coming here, that I thought the United States relations with
South Africa can improve, that there was this close bond of affection on the part of the United States' people. There were misunderstandings that I was going to speak, that if the government or anyone had any ideas of suggestions which I might incorporate in my speech which would be helpful in bringing our countries closer together that I would be certainly glad to consider any ideas or suggestions that they might have.

Secondly, I said I would be glad to see anybody that they felt would be helpful so that I received a better understanding of South Africa.

And, thirdly, I said I would be glad to go anywhere in South Africa and stay as long as a schedule permitted, so that I saw all of South Africa that they felt would be helpful for me to see in order for me to complete my understanding of South Africa.

I said that I would be glad to be placed in their hands for suggestions and ideas as to how I could conduct my visit to South Africa to insure that I understood all of the problems of South Africa as seen by the government. And three or four days later the representative from the South African government came back and said they weren't going to have anything to do with my visit and that as far as making any suggestions of where I might go, who I might see, that they wouldn't have any.
I said that I would like to see, of course, any representatives of the government, particularly the gentleman who had been my counterpart. And they felt that this was a private visit and therefore they couldn't participate.

I explained I had gone to Latin America, five Latin American countries, on the same basis and I visited with the President of each of those countries. I had a very nice visit when I went to France with President de Gaulle and I had a very nice visit with President Adenauer when I went to Germany. But I would be delighted to see anybody in the government if I came to South Africa. But they said that they didn't feel that that was possible and that the State Department got in touch with them later and still felt that it was impossible. And I sent a telegram and they still felt it was impossible.

I only received that one invitation that I was grateful for. It is a little difficult, I have always found in my life, to go somewhere where you are not invited. And I would be glad and delighted to go any place in South Africa. I would be delighted to come back. I might say that I was invited to come back by the South African Foundation the other night. They asked me to come back next year and I would like to come back next year.

(APPLAUSE)

At that time I would like to, if it is felt advisable and if I am invited, I would like to speak to any of the
African universities that would invite me. I would also like to suggest that any representative of the government or any representative of the South African Group that supports the government that wishes to come to the United States and wishes to talk to any members of the United States Senate that I would be glad to arrange it. I will have a luncheon for anybody who represents the South African government and I would be glad to arrange for any of those who are involved with the government or support the government who feel that the United States does not completely understand their position, I would be glad to arrange for them to go and, if they wished, to talk to a university. I would be glad to help them to talk to such university.

FROM THE FLOOR: (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: You say the question and then I will just repeat it.

The question was: As a pretext to interfere with the affairs of South Africa, South Africa has been liable to a threat to world peace, and the question is, if I think so and why do I think so.

First, those would not be the terms that I would use. I think that there are some situations within South Africa that cause some difficulty and I would like to explain why I think they cause some difficulty.

First, I want to say that I don't think that other countries interfere with the domestic or internal affairs of
their neighbor or of another country throughout the world. But I think that what happens in one country that it has an effect on another is extremely important and that the second country might have its voice heard. I would say that first, because of the tradition of friendship that exists between South Africa and the United States, there is that tradition. Second, both our nations have a substantial black or colored or Negro population. But yet the establishment is white. The government is run by white people.

We in the United States claim to be the leaders of the free world, not because we have more armaments than any other nation, not because we are more economically advantageous than any other nation, but also because we stand for the so-called Western tradition. What is a Western tradition? What is a democracy? That is what we stand for. That is what separates us from communism. That is what we told the world and we call our attention back to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States that all men are created equal and we say we are for equal justice all throughout the world.

We say that we are not perfect in our own country, but that we are trying to make progress toward equal justice and trying for more humanity for man in the United States; that the problems are not going to disappear immediately, but that we are making that effort and it is supported by the vast majority of American people. That is what we hold out for the rest of the world.
We are closely identified and associated with the one country really in Africa, which is a predominant black population and colored population, but is run by white population. But that white population says that black people are second-class citizens. The colored people are second-class citizens. That a black person, just because he is born black, is not as good as a white person. That there is a difference because of the color of one's skin.

If we go before the rest of the world and say this is what we stand for, we believe everybody is equal, and they say to us what about South Africa? Why do you have such a close relationship with South Africa? They don't believe that. What is the difference between what they said and what those who are your adversaries say? What is the difference between what we stand for and what your adversaries stand for? You say that your adversaries stand for breaking down the family unity. You say your adversaries say that the individual is not important. The state exists not for the individual but the individual for the state. Tell us how the black man is treated? Tell us how the colored man is treated? Can they participate in political process? Can a colored man or a black man have a family come and visit with him and bring up his children in some parts of Africa?

How do we go about explaining that? How do we explain it to the rest of Africa? How do we, as leaders of the free world, come forward and say, "Yes, we stand for freedom, we
stand for humanity, we stand for spreading freedom around
the globe, and we are against communism?"

Why don't you start in your own back yard? Why don't
you start with your friends?

So that is what is a matter of concern to us. We want
South Africa to deal with its own problems. We think South
Africa can deal with its problems. We don't think that South
Africa should follow the same procedure or the same prac­
tices or the same pace as the United States. The problem of
South Africa is entirely different in many ways than we have
in the United States. We are not coming in here and saying,
"Look at the United States. There is the perfect country.
There we dealt with our problems." Because we haven't dealt
with our problems. Many of the problems that exist here in
South Africa are far more difficult than we face in the
United States.

But what we do ask, and why there is a concern, and
what we do plead with the people of South Africa, is that we
move toward justice, we move toward understanding the human­
ity of man. That this country does move forward recognizing
that a black person is as good, innately, as a white person.

Perhaps you don't want to associate with a black person
or a colored person. But their souls are the same. Maybe
they are not equal or smart or as bright when they grow up,
but maybe they are brighter. Maybe there is a black man out­
side this room who is smarter than anybody in this room. The
chances are that there is.
How do we say that we believe in God and then we say what about your allies, do you believe in God? Is it just a white man's God? Can a black person come in and pray with a white man in many of the churches? Can he stand up? What is our explanation for that? What can we say?

If anybody from South Africa can give me an explanation of what we said then I would be delighted to hear it. What can we say? It is not because there is an antagonism toward South Africa. We might hate the evil, but we don't hate the individual and the country. And we are not clean ourselves. We recognize that.

But each of our countries and all of us and the countries to the North of here have many imperfections of their own. And they have made many mistakes and those mistakes should be labeled. But we have a special role to play. Your country has a special role to play, and our country has a special role to play.

We have advantages that many other countries do not have. When we consider two-thirds of the children of the world go to bed hungry at night; We consider all the illiteracy; 750 million people are mentally retarded in the world because they don't have enough to eat; what a privileged class we are. But we are a minority class. We are a minority because we are educated; we are a minority class because we have affluence.

But then we have a responsibility, but if we don't meet that responsibility, where are we then? How can we look
not only in the eyes of our fellow man but how can we look into the mirror ourselves and answer that question? I think that is the problem.

FROM THE FLOOR (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: I think that I did answer. I think if this situation continues as it is existing at the present time and I think that is the decision that it places it in. I do not think that I would use those words at the present time to describe the situation of South Africa. I don't believe that is what the situation is. But I do believe that unless the situation improves, unless there are changes, they are going to be major crises and not only in Africa but throughout the world because of the conditions.

FROM THE FLOOR: (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: The aid and assistance that was given to Ghana was given in connection with the dam, the Volta Dam in Ghana. The initial decision to go ahead with the dam had been made prior to President Kennedy's becoming President, but it was up for review in 1961. I was involved in the conversations in connection with Ghana and, quite frankly, I was opposed at that time at giving the assistance for the construction of the dam. I think I was wrong.

President Kennedy made the decision to go ahead. And gave the funds for the construction of the dam and the reason that he did so was because it was an effort not to help an
individual, but to help people. It was an effort felt strongly by him and I think, as I look back, in retrospect, that it was, without any question, a correct decision.

end Tape 2
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(Continuation of answer)

SENATOR KENNEDY: It was felt strongly by him that we were not going to punish the people of Ghana because of the fact that we disagreed with their government.

There are some countries that we help all over the globe. We help them because we think that we are going to help their people. We helped, quite frankly, we helped communist Poland; we have helped Yugoslavia; we have helped a lot of countries whose governments we disagree with, because we feel--

FROM THE FLOOR: What about Rhodesia?

SENATOR KENNEDY: I am going to get to Rhodesia. I will get to Rhodesia. I am going to stay here so I will be glad to answer the question.

We felt that it was worth while backing the effort on behalf of the people of that country. The countries of Latin America that we are opposing, the governments that we are opposing, their dictatorships. But we say to ourselves, "Should we stop not building the schools because we don't like the government? Stop not helping send in some food so that the children can go to school, the food for peace, because we
don't like the government? Should we not help improve the
standards of living because we don't like the Government?"

We feel that if people live well, that if people can
be helped and assisted, if they can lead a better life, then
they won't accept communism, they will throw communism out.
They will say that this is not a system for us; that we want
a free way of life. We want to have a system that will rec­
ognize the dignity and the importance of the individual.

And that is exactly what happened in Ghana. They
threw Mr. Nkrumah out. When he left the country they threw
him out. And I think the fact that we went ahead with help
and assistance, that we went ahead with help and assistance,
that we kept a hand of friendship to the people of Ghana and
played an important role in the throwing-out of Mr. Nkrumah,

(APPLAUSE)

Once again, I think we have a situation in Rhodesia
which we have a white government. Can I ask you whether the
government that is in Rhodesia at the present time was that
voted in by the people of Rhodesia?

(Demonstration from the floor)

SENNATOR KENNEDY: Wait a minute now. How many--you
asked me the question. Would you stand up?

You asked me about Rhodesia. How many people are in
Rhodesia? Let me ask you when you talk about the government;
was the government voted in by the people of Rhodesia?

Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Can I ask the question?
Was it voted in? Did the people of Rhodesia---

(Demonstration from the floor)

SENATOR KENNEDY: Well, can I just ask you a question: Was that constitution voted by all the people of Rhodesia?

(APPLAUSE)

SENATOR KENNEDY: Did somebody decide that I don't know anything about that the white men are the ones that are going to rule the world? Do they just say, "White man you are going to rule these countries, and you black men or you colored men don't have anything to do with it?" Who was that that made that decision? Can somebody tell me?

But I think that is what we basically come down to. My answer to your question, really, ---

FROM THE FLOOR (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: First, who are we to decide that we are the people to run Rhodesia? You don't know--have you been to Rhodesia and met all the black people in Rhodesia? Are you certain that there are not black people in Rhodesia that could participate in their government, that could participate in any way in their government? And maybe they are just as able as some of the white people that are running it. Are we just going to make that decision ourselves or are we going to let the black people also participate and make some decisions?

Let me just say, if you look around the world at the problems that Secretary McNamara did in his speech in Montreal,
and I suggest that you read it, the Secretary of Defense of the United States, and he stressed the fact that the problems that are facing mankind are in those countries where there is internal turmoil, where people cannot express themselves, where they don't participate in the processes of government, where there is poverty and where there is great differentiation between those who are rich and those who are poor. But that is where the difficulty lies. And if people, just as you would if you were in Rhodesia and you were a black person, wouldn't you want to have some role? I just ask you, wouldn't you want to have some role in selecting who is going to make the laws and run this political future of your country? Put yourself in their position.

Can I tell you that it is a very good question and obviously one that puzzles and troubles the people of South Africa more than, perhaps, any other.

Once again it comes down to the basic point of what we feel, whether we feel that black people should have, in some way, a right to decide their own future as well as white people. I don't think that that was given to us as white people. If you talk to a black person, exchange views with black people, all my friends, I am not coming in and saying are black people or Negroes in the United States, but some of them are. And some of the most able and most intelligent and the Wittiest, are the people who have a dark skin. And they can be as bright as me or as bright as any of my children.
And I can't say to them and look them in the eye and say because my children were born white and your children were born black that you don't have as much intelligence, you don't have as much integrity, don't have as much ability as my children. I cannot do that and I don't see how anybody can do that and still go look in the mirror.

(FROM THE FLOOR)

SENATOR KENNEDY: Well, I have been doing it all night.

Listen, I would love to have a voice like yours. If you will come back to the United States I would like to run you for governor.

FROM THE FLOOR: (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: As I said earlier, you are going to be in a damn lot of trouble if God turns out to be black.

You no longer can be governor of New York.

Go ahead.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can you tell me what President of the United States said in 1885, "there is an undeniable difference between the white man and the black man?"

SENATOR KENNEDY: The one that was beaten in 1838.

FROM THE FLOOR: (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: I think we got somebody else, you got yours.

Oh, I am sorry. Come back wherever you are.

Go ahead.
FROM THE FLOOR: (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: On the first question of what the motivation is in connection with communism, that is an internal problem of which I am not in a position to tell. I did not have the opportunity to visit with the Attorney General of South Africa and to discuss these matters with him and to exchange views about communism. So I would not be in a position to comment on that. As I think I made clear last night and I think I made clear this evening, I don't think communism is synonymous with change. And I don't think that every time anybody advocates a reform or advocates change that they are necessarily, I would hope, are not communist. And I think that is one of the problems in some of our own countries, in the United States perhaps, countries of Latin America and elsewhere that those who are in positions of power or part of the establishment and anybody that wants to make some change, make some reform and let other people participate that they are communists. But as far as the particular situation in South Africa, I would not comment.

The second question was whether I think if black people, as I understand it, are permitted to participate in the political processes, that they are going to obliterate the white people. My judgment is, without any question, that is not true. First, I think that one, again, has the ability and the integrity and the talent in this country to write a
constitution that would catch not only the wishes of the black but the wishes that protect a minority. We have that in the United States. I don't think that.

It is sufficient in any kind of a democratic system that the majority makes the final decision and the minority is not protected in some way. And I don't think, based on my own experience in the United States, for instance, if even we talk about the black or the Negro having the vote, the Negro in the United States that does not always vote for the same candidate. In the City of New York, for instance, if you break down the precincts of the last election, 40 percent of the black people voted for one candidate and 60 percent voted for his opposition. In the vote in Alabama just this past year, in a couple of counties which were 3 and 4 to 1 Negroes or black people over white people, the white candidate won over the black candidate.

So I just want to—also, as I say, talk about the kind of constitution you set up or the kind of a political process you set up. How a minority can be protected.

We had a minority in our own country which was a smaller state and we wanted to protect them and the Constitution of the United States. The result is you have a state like Alaska which has a population of maybe 250,000 voters—I don't even know if it is that many—they have two United States Senators representing them. I represent the State of New York which has 19 million voters; California has 20 million
voters; both states still have two senators representing them. The same amount of senators, in the most powerful body of the United States, each state has the same amount of representation.

We also have tests in every one of the states. Every state establishes its own test as long as it is used across the board equally with everyone, establishes its own tests.

For instance, in the state of New York we have a literacy test. If you cannot pass this literacy test you cannot vote in the election. So that there are hundreds of thousands of people over the age of 21 who can't participate in the election. There were 20 states as of eight months ago, or a year ago, that had literacy tests of some kind. Every state has some kind of standard that it established to make sure that the political process is protected.

I am not saying what should be done in South Africa and what you are going to do in South Africa, I didn't come here to make any suggestions or recommendations. I think the people of South Africa can decide these things themselves. All I want them to know is that we in the United States are not antagonistic toward this, that we have affection and admiration. We understand that there is a problem and just feel that if we could start to make some progress toward finding a solution, so that we could start finding some answers to it. That is what we want. That is what the rest of the world wants. It is nothing really more than that.
President Kennedy met with a very important South African in 1961, who came to his office and said, "Why can't you have the United States' position toward South Africa changed?" President Kennedy said, "Just give us some sign, just be doing something in South Africa which shows that you are going to move in the direction of greater freedom, humanity, and recognizing the innate importance of the individual."

That is all we ask in the United States. That is all that we ask around the world, just to move in that direction that recognizes the humanity of man.

(APPLAUSE)

FROM THE FLOOR: Senator Kennedy, I would like to touch on a subject on a matter that might cause you personal pain. But there have been pamphlets distributed throughout this country in the last few days which makes several grave charges against you. One of the charges against you—

SENATOR KENNEDY: Let me explain that nothing pains me any more.

FROM THE FLOOR: One of the charges in the pamphlet is that you were personally responsible for your brother's death because it alleges—and I might say that I don't believe a word of it—that Lee Harvey Oswald came before you when you were Attorney General and there is another charge that the crime was serious and you threw out the case and if he had been convicted your brother would be alive today.
I would like to give you the opportunity, publically, to explain this because I don't believe a word of it.

SENATOR KENNEDY: I never saw him before and never heard of him before.

FROM THE FLOOR: (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: I think you have a good point. I think we just accepted it and called it Western democracy. I think a lot of it has come from the East, whether it came from Athens or came from China, and I think there is no question that it is not confined to that part of the world and I think we make a mistake, just as we make a mistake when we call the conflict of West-East conflict. I think you have a very good point, very valid.

FROM THE FLOOR: Senator Kennedy, do you, after your intensive investigation into NUSAS's activities and leaders, consider NUSAS to be a very useful organization in South Africa, what is your opinion of NUSAS as an organization, what faults do you see in it?

SENATOR KENNEDY: As I said last night, I think that the organization and the efforts that have been made by the organization have inspired men and women all over the globe, the principle that it stands for, the principles that we try to have our young people stand for in other parts, not just in the United States, but, I think, young people elsewhere in other countries.
So I accepted this invitation because I was pleased to come and be associated and identified with those who lead the organization and those who make up its body. I don't know that there are not imperfections, if you want me to attest to that, I can't tell that. But I don't know, there might be something wrong with you. We might misbehave sometime. But I am glad to be associated and identified and I am glad to have made this trip, to have spoken to you and spoken to this organization and be identified with the members of it.

FROM THE FLOOR (Inaudible)

SENATOR KENNEDY: I would suppose, if you are just talking about black and white, I think that we are making some successful progress in living together. I hear about the violence in Africa. Let us look once again in our own consciences. When you talk about what happened in Kenya where white people were killed, which I detest, you talk about the Congo where white people were killed, you talk about the Negroes or black people who are responsible and therefore we are going to condemn black people everywhere. What kind of a responsibility do you and I have? Was Stalin black? Was Hitler black? Who killed 40 million people just 25 years ago? It wasn't black people, it was white.

Maybe we are different and maybe those who are Protestant are different from those who are Catholic; maybe
those who are Irish in the neighborhood that my family grew up, they used to fight with us, they don't fight with them any more, they get along together. Maybe various racial groups fight with one another but they can start to make an effort to try to live together.

If we decided in the United States when the Irish came, the Irish—they said the same thing that people were saying about the Negroes in the United States 10 years ago, exactly what they were saying about the Irish 40 years ago, 50 years ago, that they are unreliable, that we won't work, that they are unintelligent and that they drink too much. You look at any history of the United States.

So then if somebody there decided, "My God, we are going to have to put up with the Irish. What do you think is going to happen? They are different. But we will put them in a separate place and keep them there." Now, would that have been helpful to the development of our country? Would that have brought peace within the United States if they would have stuck all of them or all the Jews in another place; all the Italians in another place? We think that an effort can be made to get along together.

Now, I will ask you a question: You said the people can't get along together, that people might be different. So a Chinese is a colored person, and an Indian is a colored person, and a Japanese what is he?
FROM THE FLOOR: Senator Kennedy, I would like to ask you a very practical question. If you had to teach political science in South Africa, as I do, what do you think South African students would be forced to learn most above all other things?

SENATOR KENNEDY: The question was if you have to teach political science in South Africa, what would you teach to students above everything else.

I think what the Greeks once wrote is that everything is to be brought into question, there is no limit to thought. I think that is what I would teach. I think I would teach the fact that we don't have any easy answer to any of the problems that our own countries face and that face mankind and they have a responsibility and a special responsibility to those who are less well off, that are deprived, that are discriminated against, that are of hunger, and that is the most exciting thing of life. This is the most dangerous period of the history of mankind, but it is also the most exciting time in the history of mankind.

And what difference a young person can make and the difference in the way that they can change the world and what they have to do is make an effort. Not turn their backs on the university, not turn their backs on teachers, not turn their backs on problems of their own country or the problems of the world, but make an effort to try to find solutions to
them. To make an effort to try to find answers that you, as a professor, can't give any answers or can't give answers. You might give some thought as to how you can find a solution, but that they are going to have to work out the best answers themselves, they are going to have to work to find the solutions. And they have the responsibility to try, and a particular responsibility because of the fact that they have obtained the kind of an education that permits them to come to a university.

President Kennedy once said that if we cannot help the many that are poor we cannot save the few who are rich. That is our responsibility, our obligation to our own fellow-citizen and our responsibility all over the globe. And I think that we can do something about it and I would emphasize that. And I would emphasize that George Bernard Shaw once wrote, that some people see things as they are say why, I dream things that never were and say why not.

Thank you very much.

SPEAKER: It gives me great pleasure to call on Archbishop Hurley and Honorary Vice-President of NUSAS to pose the vote of thanks to Senator Kennedy.

BISHOP HURLEY: Senator Kennedy, Mrs. Kennedy, Mr. President, Mr. Principal, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I feel at this stage of the proceedings something like an anti-climax. And Archbishops hate to be reduced to the status of an anti-climax. In the old days we could handle
that situation well, but it is not so good today.

Since Sunday night South Africa has been responding to the Kennedy magic. In some cases the responses have been favorable, enthusiastically favorable, and it has delighted the hearts of us to see this enthusiasm. Favorable beyond anything that many imagined possible in our country. Others have managed to resist the Kennedy charm and have remained cool and aloof, even some, I think, in this gathering this evening.

To remind me of that story of a man who went to see his friend and noticed that the dog was missing. He said, "My friend, your dog was quite a feature of these dwellings, where is it?"

"Oh," he said, "we sent it around to the vet to have his tail removed."

"Surely," said the visitor, "that dog only had a tail about two inches long, why have it removed?"

"Well, you see," replied the host, "my mother-in-law is coming tomorrow and we wanted to remove all signs of welcome."

But, presumably, Mr. Senator, you came not entirely unprepared for a certain coolness and aloofness in certain quarters. Possibly you would have resented an unmixed reception, reared as you were in a family, so we are told, where brother and sisterly love were often communicated by the blunt argument and the bruise.
I am not ungrateful to the divine providence that in the ancient contest that constituted the national championships of our Irish forebears, before touch football was invented, that Hurleys did not live too close to the Kennedys. It is my privilege this evening to thank you for your address, the privilege I owe to the kindess of Mr. Glenn Calley, President of the Student Representative Council.

Your message to South Africa, particularly to its youth, has been a message of faith and courage, courage to pursue a path decided on in faith, faith to hold firm to the values that make the human spirit what it is, a noble reflection of divine wisdom and love capable of raising above the physical and material, above selfishness, pain, doubt, fear, to pursue all that we mean by love and justice, peace and freedom.

You have made the acquaintance with our country and its people, the 18 million of us, whose family problems, are, I think, among the most acute of the world. We do not lack material resources, we do not lack ingenuity and skill, but providence has assigned to us one of the hardest tasks demanded of any society. And that, as you pointed out Mr. Senator, is not an indication that we should sit down and not do anything about these hard tasks, but is an indication and a challenge to attempt to solve them. Whether we solve them in our lifetime does not matter, but what the world expects of us is that we attempt to solve them. To achieve under-
standing and harmony in our country, sacrifices must be made in every section of the community that I think are expected of few populations in the world today.

I think you understand this, so I shall not labor the point. It would be childish to labor it in your presence. For we know what problems your own country has to face. What a burden its leadership of the free world entails. What sacrifices it has had to make and will still have to make to help feed the countries of the world and preserve peace. What agonizing decisions have to be taken by its leaders, had to be taken by your own brother, whose memory is held in such reverence. What agonizing decisions may have to be taken, one day, by you.

We thank God that at this juncture in world affairs when so much depends on the United States, it has produced men like the Kennedys, not afraid to combine the idealism of a great faith in God and in man with a realism necessary to a statesman.

On behalf of all who have heard you this evening, I express our sincere thanks. South Africa owes you much for this visit and the words you have spoken and the dialogue in which you have engaged, the type of dialogue that we saw exemplified here this evening and that was such a delight to all of us. For, as you have mentioned, perhaps not in so many words, but as often been insisted upon by a great countryman of yours, civilization is men locked in argument.
We are grateful for your visit and for your words; South Africa is grateful. Who knows, in the future she may have every reason to be very, very much more grateful to you.

SENATOR KENNEDY: I just want to thank Bishop Hurley. And I also want to make a personal remark to all of the students at the university on behalf of Mrs. Kennedy and the members of the Kennedy family, to thank you for the construction of the John F. Kennedy Room here at the University.

SPEAKER: I would like to say, Senator Kennedy, there are people tonight in the Kennedy Room that had the privilege of listening to your address.

I would like to ask the cooperation of the congregation here, in the Senator's leaving, it is going to be very difficult task and I ask that you please stay in your seats for as long as possible so that Senator Kennedy can get away.

Thank you very much.

END

(end Tape 3)
APPENDIX D: Address of Senator Robert F. Kennedy,
University of the Witwatersrand, June 8, 1966
I have been in your country only a short time; yet you already have made a strong and deep impression. I have flown from Pretoria to Cape Town; going back in three hours over the road which was first covered with great difficulty over many years. I went up the Indian Ocean coast to Durban; and now I return to Johannesburg.

Everywhere I have been impressed with the warmth and the interest of all of the people of South Africa, of all political persuasions and races. Everywhere I have been impressed by your achievements, the wealth you have created in this continent which so sorely needs the blessings of progress.

Above all, I have been impressed with South African youth: not just those young in years, but those of every age who are young in a spirit of imagination and courage and an appetite for the adventure of life.

President Kennedy once said that Averell Harriman, who negotiated the Test-Ban Treaty at the age of 72, was the youngest man in Washington. There are many like him here in South Africa.

These young-spirited people are like young people in my country, and all over the world, seeking to build a better future—to make their mark on the tablets of history. They are restless, impatient with the past, with the vain quarrels of a day that is gone; and in this too they are more closely joined with their fellow young people than to the older generation anywhere.

And those who seek change and progress in South Africa are very special. So many of those I have seen, so many who are here in this hall, are standing with their brothers around the globe for liberty and equality and human dignity; not in the ease and comfort and approbation of society, but in the midst of controversy and difficulty and risk.

Your fellow students, and men all over the world, will take heart and example from your stand. And that is why your work is so important: for men will flock to the banners of the courageous and the right; but as the Bible tells us, "if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"
Will you sound the trumpet? And what is the battle, to which we all are summoned?

It is first a battle for the future. The day is long past when any nation could retreat behind walls of stone or curtains of iron or bamboo. The winds of freedom and progress and justice blow across the highest battlements, enter at every crevice, are carried by jet planes and communications satellites and by the very air we breathe.

So tomorrow's South Africa will be different from today's—just as tomorrow's America will be different from the country I left these few short days ago: different for the astronauts who returned from their journey—and for James Meredith who did not complete his journey. Our choice is not whether change will come, but whether we can guide that change in the service of our ideals and toward a social order shaped to the needs of all our people. In the long run we can master change not through force or fear, but only through the free work of an understanding mind—through an openness to new knowledge and fresh outlooks which can only strengthen the most fragile and the most powerful human gifts—the gift of reason.

Thus those who cut themselves off from ideas and clashing convictions not only display fear and enormous uncertainty about the strength of their own views; they also guarantee that when change comes, it will not be to their liking. And they encourage the forces of violence and passion which are the only alternatives to reason and the acts of minds freely open to the demands of justice.

Justice—a demand which has echoed down through all the ages of man—this is the second battle to which we are summoned. And let no man think that he fights this battle for others; he fights for himself, and so do we all. The Golden Rule is not sentimentality, but the deepest practical wisdom. For the teaching of our time is that cruelty is contagious, and its disease knows no bounds of race or nation. Where men can be deprived because their skin is black, in the fullness of time, others will be deprived because their skin is white. If men can suffer because they hold one belief, then others may suffer for the holding of other beliefs. Freedom is not money, that I could enlarge mine by taking yours. Our liberty can grow only when the liberties of all our fellow-men are secure; and he who would enslave others ends only by chaining himself, for chains have two ends, and he who holds the chain is as securely bound as he whom it holds. And as President Kennedy said at the Berlin Wall in 1963, "Freedom is indivisible, and when one man is enslaved, all are not free."
In the last analysis, as President Kennedy told the American people in 1963, "The heart of the question is whether all men are to be afforded equal rights and equal opportunities, whether we are going to treat our fellow-men as we want to be treated."

"If an American"--or, I would add, any man--if a man, he said, "because his skin is dark, cannot eat lunch in a restaurant open to the public, if he cannot send his children to the best public school available, if he cannot vote for the public officials who represent him, if in short, he cannot enjoy the full and free life which all of us want, then who among us would be content to change the color of his skin and stand in his place?

Who among us would then be content with the counsels of patience and delay?"

It is the question before us in the United States; it is the question before you in South Africa; it is the question before all of us in every corner of the globe.

Will we--within our own countries, and among the mass of struggling humanity--use our advantages to bring help and hope to their outstretched hands?

South Africa is the pre-eminent repository of the skill and knowledge and wealth of this continent.

If you can answer the great questions--if you can sweep unjust privilege into the dead past, if you can show the dispossessed and the diseased, the hungry and the untaught, that there is a better life for them and a fair place in the sun for their children--if you can do these things, then all of us will take heart from your example, and this continent can take its place in the modern world.

But if you cannot do these things, then your shadow will fall long across this continent--and the common cause of men everywhere, in the United States and in South Africa, will be sorely tried and deeply injured.

There are those who say that the game is not worth the candle--that Africa is too primitive to develop, that its peoples are not ready for freedom and self-government, that violence and chaos are unchangeable. But those who say these things should look to the history of every part and parcel of the human race. It was not the black man of Africa who invented and used poison gas or the atomic bomb, who sent 6 million men and women and children to the gas ovens, and used
their bodies as fertilizer. Hitler and Stalin were not black men of Africa. And it was not the black man of Africa who bombed and obliterated Rotterdam and Shanghai and Dresden and Hiroshima.

We all struggle to transcend the cruelties and the follies of mankind. That struggle will not be won by standing aloof and pointing the finger; it will be won by action, by men who commit their every resource of mind and body to the education and improvement and help of their fellow-man.

And this is the third aspect to our battle: to fight for ourselves as individuals, and for the individuality of all.

We are patriots. We believe in our countries and wish to see them flourish. But the countries we love are not abstractions. They are not the frozen in yellowed parchment or constitutions. They are not the sum total of their buildings and shops, wealth and power. We are our nations—you and me and millions like us. A great American writer, Mark Twain, once answered that question by saying, "What is the country?" It is the common voice of the people. Each—by himself and on his own responsibility—must speak. Each must for himself decide what is right and what is wrong, and which course is patriotic and which is not. Otherwise it is to be a traitor, both to yourself and to your country."

This is the heaviest responsibility of all—a burden men have often refused by turning rule and ideology, belief and power, over to an all-powerful state. History is full of peoples who have discovered it is easier to fight than think, easier to have enemies and friends selected by authority than to make their own painful choices, easier to follow blindly than to lead, even if that leadership must be the private choice of a single man alone with a free and skeptical mind. But in the final telling it is that leadership, the impregnable skepticism of the free spirit, untouchable by guns or police, which feeds the whirlwind of change and hope and progress in every land and time.

So what President Kennedy said to the youth of America, I now say to you:

That it is you who have to decide—you "who have the longest stake, you who are the most concerned for truth, who have the least ties to the present and the greatest ties to the future."

Here among you, at this great university, I know what your decision will be.
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Order #1

To: Ian Alexander Robertson
    132A, Hatfield Street,
    Cape Town


Whereas, I, Balthazar Johannes Vorster, (then) Minister of Justice, am satisfied that you engage in activities which are furthering or may further the achievement of the objects of communism, I hereby, in terms of paragraph (a) of sub-section (1) of section ten of the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950 (Act. No.44 of 1950), prohibit you for a period commencing on the date on which this notice is delivered or tendered to you and expiring on the 31st day of May, 1971, from--

(1) absenting yourself from the area comprising the magisterial districts of Wynberg and the Cape;
(2) being within--
   (a) any Bantu area, that is to say--
      (i) any location, Bantu hostel or Bantu village defined and set apart under the Bantu (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act, 1945 (Act No. 25 of 1945);
      (ii) any area approved for the residence of Bantu in terms of section 9(2h) of the Bantu (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act, 1945 (Act No. 25 of 1945);
      (iii) any Scheduled Bantu Area as defined in the Bantu Land Act, 1913 (Act No. 27 of 1913);
      (iv) any Bantu Township established under the Regulations for the Administration and Control of Townships in Bantu Areas, promulgated in Proclamation No.R.293 of the 16th November, 1962;
      (v) any land of which the South African Bantu Trust, referred to in section 4 of the Bantu Trust and Land Act, 1936 (Act No. 18 of 1936), is the registered owner of any land held in trust for a Bantu Tribal Community in terms of the said Bantu Trust and Land Act, 1936;
(b) any Bantu Compound;
(c) the premises of any factory as defined in the factories, Machinery and Building Work Act, 1941 (Act No. 22 of 1941);
(d) any place which constitutes the premises on which any publication as defined in the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950, is prepared, compiled, printed or published;
(e) any place which constitutes the premises of any organization contemplated in Government Notice No. R.2130 of the 28th December, 1962, as amended by Government Notice No. R.1947 of the 27th November, 1964, and any place which constitutes premises on which the premises of any such organization are situate;
(f) any place or area which constitutes the premises on which any public or private university, university college, college, school or other educational institution is situate, except the premises of the University of Cape Town for the sole purpose of attending bona fide lectures for the LL.B. degree;
(g) any area set apart under any law for the occupation of Coloured or Asiatic persons;
(h) any place or area which constitutes the premises of any superior or inferior court as defined in the Criminal Procedure Act, 1955 (Act No. 56 of 1955), except for the purpose of—
   (i) applying to a magistrate for an exception to any prohibition in force against you under the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950;
   (ii) attending any criminal proceedings in which you are required to appear as an accused or a witness;
   (iii) attending any civil proceedings in which you are a plaintiff, petitioner, applicant, defendant, respondent or other party or in which you are required to appear as a witness;
(i) any harbour as defined in section one of the Railways and Harbours Control and Management (Consolidation) Act, 1957 (Act No. 70 of 1957);
(j) any place which constitutes the premises of the National Union of South African Students or the World University Service;
(3) communicating in any manner whatsoever with any person whose name appears on any list in the custody of the officer referred to in section eight
of the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950, or in respect of whom any prohibition under the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950, or the Riotous Assemblies Act, 1956 (Act No.17 of 1956), is in force;

(4) performing any of the following acts, that is to say--

(a) preparing, compiling, printing, publishing, disseminating or transmitting in any manner whatsoever any publication as defined in the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950;

(b) participating or assisting in any manner whatsoever in the preparation, compilation, printing, publication, dissemination or transmission of any publication as so defined;

(c) contributing, preparing, compiling or transmitting in any manner whatsoever any matter for publication in any publication so defined;

(d) assisting in any manner whatsoever in the preparation compilation or transmitting of any matter for publication in any publication as so defined;

(e) (i) preparing, compiling, printing, publishing, disseminating or transmitting in any manner whatsoever any document (which shall include any book, pamphlet, record, list, placard, poster, drawing, photograph or picture which is not a publication within meaning of paragraph (4) (a) above; or

(ii) participating or assisting in any manner whatsoever in the preparation, compilation, printing, publication, dissemination or transmission of any such document, in which, inter alia--

(aa) any form of State or any principle or policy of the Government of a State is propagated, defended, attacked, criticised, discussed or referred to;

(bb) any matter is contained concerning any body, organization group or association of persons, institution, society or movement which has been declared an unlawful organization by or under the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950, or the Unlawful Organizations Act, 1960;
(cc) any matter is contained concerning any organization contemplated in Government Notice No.R.2130 of the 28th December, 1962, as amended by Government Notice No.R. 1947 of the 27th of November, 1964; or
(dd) any matter is contained which is likely to engender feelings of hostility between the White and the

(f) giving any educational instruction in any manner or form to any person other than a person of whom you are a parent;

(g) taking part in any manner whatsoever in the activities or affairs of any organization contemplated in Government Notice No. R. 2130 of the 28th December, 1962, as amended by Government Notice No. R. 1947 of the 27th November, 1964;

(h) taking part in any manner whatsoever in the activities of the National Union of South African Students or the World University Service.

Given under my hand at Pretoria on this 3rd day of May, 1966.

/s/ B.J. Vorster
Minister of Justice.

Note:
The Magistrate, Cape Town, has in terms of section 10 (la) of Act No.44 of 1950 been empowered to authorise exceptions to the prohibitions contained in this notice.

Order #2

To: Ian Alexander Robertson,
132A Hatfield Street
Cape Town.

NOTICE IN TERMS OF SUB-SECTION (1) OF SECTION NINE OF THE SUPPRESSION OF COMMUNISM ACT, 1950 (ACT No. 44 of 1950).

Whereas, I, Balthazar Johannes Vorster, (then) Minister of Justice, am satisfied that you engage in activities which are furthering or are calculated to further the achievement of any of the objects of communism, I hereby, in terms of sub-section (1) of section nine of the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950 (Act No. 44 of 1950), prohibit you for a period commencing on the date on which this notice is delivered or tendered to you and expiring on the 31st day of May, 1971, from attending within the Republic of South Africa
or the territory of South-West Africa—

(1) any gathering contemplated in paragraph (a) of said sub-section; or

(2) any gathering contemplated in paragraph (b) of the said sub-section, of the nature, class or kind set out below:

(a) any social gathering, that is to say, any gathering at which the persons present also have social intercourse with one another;

(b) any political gathering, that is to say any gathering at which any form of State or any principle or policy of the Government of a State is propagated, defended, attacked, criticised or discussed;

(c) any gathering of pupils or students assembled for the purpose of being instructed, trained or addressed by you.

Provided that this notice; shall not debar you from attending bona fide gatherings of students of the University of Cape Town, assembled for the sole purpose of attending lectures for theLL.B. degree.

Given under my hand at Pretoria on this 3rd day of May, 1966.

/s/ B. J. Vorster
Minister of Justice.

Note:
The Magistrate, Cape Town, has in terms of section 9 (1) of the above-mentioned Act been empowered to authorise exceptions to the prohibitions contained in this notice.

Order #3

To: Ian Alexander Robertson,
132A, Hatfield Street,
Cape Town.


Thereas there is in force against you a prohibition under sub-section (1) of section nine of the Suppression of Communism Act, 1950 (Act No. 44 of 1950), by way of a notice addressed and delivered or tendered to you, I, Balthazar Johannes Vorster, Minister of Justice, hereby, in terms of sub-section (1) of section ten quat of the said Act, order you for a period commencing on the date on which this notice is delivered or tendered to you and expiring on the 31st day of May, 1971, to
report to the officer in charge of the Caledon Square Police Station, Cape Town, on every Monday between the hours of seven in the forenoon and six in the afternoon.

Given under my hand at Pretoria on this 3rd day of May, 1966.

/s/ B. J. Vorster
Minister of Justice.
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