

NOT FOR PUBLIC READING
PLEASE DO NOT LEAVE LYING AROUND

Minutes of the Committee on Southern Africa

Nov. 2, 1964 at 12 noon till 3:00 p.m. in Room 803
Interchurch Center

The Meeting started at 2:50 p.m.

Ken welcomed Dr. John D. Tomlinson (DCLW, NCC), Dick Hull (Col. Univ.) Jim Armstrong (Peace Corps trainee), Mary Dunsten and Jan Miller, Mike Kendel (GTS) and Don Morlan as visitors to the meeting.

Gail Morland gave a review of the first half of "South Africa: Two Views of Separate Development" by S. Pienaar and Anthony Sampson - published by the Institute of Race Relations in Great Britain after a huge and cry from the South African government that no voice was being given to their point of view. The book Gail said is in a sense an apology from the S.A. government. Pienaar (author of the first half) has represented the National Party since 1948.

Some of the main arguments raised in the book are:

1. Emphasis on the fact that there has never been any idea that the Bantu and those of European stock could live together. They are two different races and could not unite for the same reasons that France and Italy do not do so. The only way they can exist is to be separated and, also, this is the only way that the black nation will be preserved. Because of these facts of nationalism the only solution is apartheid.
2. The white type of government is not to be superimposed on the Bantu. A drawback to separate existence is the necessity of using black labour in industry both for the survival of the industry and the Africans. This means that the Africans have to live near the city where they have no rights and are treated as immigrant. They only have rights in the Bantustans.

The book has not mention of colour prejudice - apartheid is just considered as the only possible solution with the S.A. government doing the best thing possible in light of the situation. Neither are rights that the Africans ever had mentioned in the book - this could make it appear that it was possible for the races to live together

In the discussion following it was noted: by Dave that Hauser uses some of the same point as Pienaar: that despite the concept of two nations living side by side the Bantu have only 14% of the land: that even in the Transkei there are areas where the whites have power: that the fact that the Bantustans are scattered stops them uniting to their own advantage.

Don Segal's talk with Church leaders at the Church Center for the UN

Bob Kelly reported:

Segal started his talk by drawing attention to the stratification of the world along racial lines and that at all points of racial crisis high level politics were involved. Bob noted that Segal is quite authoritative on politics from direct sources - correspondence with Harold Wilson etc.

The main points of the talk were outlined as follows:

- 1) There has been no movement in the South African situation in the right direction for almost 50 years. This point was made to show that it is highly unlikely that S.A., left to itself, will generate enough energy to change its social structure.
- 2) The rest of Africa is not static while S.A. is.
- 3) He draws a parallel with Mississippi which he thought is a classic case of the effectiveness of external pressures on a closed society. It has opened up a break in the wall and many of the decent southern citizens will go through now. Segal believes that when integration comes to Mississippi it will be much more profound than it is in the Northern States and that the same will probably be the case in S.A. However, external pressures have to be exerted.

4. Many have thought that S.A. politicians were really committed to their actions but Segal said he felt that African nationals are no longer led by such (Dutch) politicians but by the smart city ones. He said that Verwoerd may be one of the world's biggest con men.

5) World reaction to Sharpeville shook the S.A. government so much that they revoked the pass laws for several weeks which was a major concession as such laws are part of the backbone of apartheid. However as soon as the pressure showed signs of weakening the government put them into effect again. If, therefore, the nations of the world could organize themselves and set up a realistic plan for sanctions Segal felt sure that a peaceful changeover in the S.A. government could be effected within a few months. But this will only happen if strong pressure is exerted. Segal said that it was unlikely that the US will participate in such a move until another crisis occurs. The US government were supported in this attitude by the Tories (mainly for economic reasons) however, since the new Labour government in England there is more hope. Frank Cousins has changed his policy and come out for sanctions and Wilson seems to be following him. They have also appointed Sir Hugh Foot as UN Ambassador. For these and other reasons Mr. Segal felt that international sanctions on a high level were not the pipe dream they were three months ago.

Dr. Tomlinson who was also at the meeting felt that Mr. Segal glossed over a few realities and was making a great assumption when saying that sanctions are now feasible. Dr. Tomlinson thought they would involve much political action and wondered how this was obtained. Under present circumstances it is not possible - there is no strong public interest group outside of the NCC that has ever expressed its opinion on the S.A. problem. And without strong pressure from the pressure groups of this country the State Department will not act. Ken noted that there were a few exceptions to this - the AFL CIO had called for an oil embargo and Reuther was reported in the Times as wanting an insurance that auto workers around the world get a good living wage - also Ron Segal was brought over here by the NAACP.

(* Bob Kelly said that Mr. Segal had said he was interested in making a speaking tour to different colleges. This information is to be referred to the NSA) Hilah noted that the Philip Mason article on axioms and maxims concluded by saying that the US and Great Britain will have to intervene eventually and that it would be better for each of them if they did it now before the situation overcomes them. Dr. Tomlinson said he felt criticisms of US defensiveness on the subject are quite valid - the US concepts about SA are so limited that it will take many more crises written up in the papers to make the US citizens realise the situation there and force our government to do something. Chuck noted that when Segal compared the situation in Mississippi with S.A. he said that things in Mississippi had initially been started by a small group of people. He wondered if it is, therefore, necessary to have everyone well informed before we can have effective action.

Chuck Gillet and Carl Schneider's visit to the State Department

Chuck reported that they had had a good visit and talked with Peter Hooper and Walter Campbell (just returned from S.A.) for about two hours.

When asked if there was any hope for a peaceful change in S.A. without outside pressure they said they did not think so. They both said that the State Department doesn't have the backing of an informed US public. They thought the conference in London on sanctions was superficial and that if G.B. tried to sustain any program of sanctions they would be hurt more than the S.A. government. They expressed concern about the effect of sanctions.

Mr. Williams, the under Secretary of State for S.A. (?) thought the US had its hands tied as far as South Africa was concerned until the Congo crisis was resolved. As far as US economic interests influencing action in S.A. Mr Campbell

and Mr. Hooper thought that this was not a key promoter for US action. Although US policy is one of biding for time it is because they are waiting for some legal handles to grip as well as for some bigger crisis similar to Sharpeville to occur. Carl had a favourable reaction to the S.A. department of the State Department. He thought the people concerned were all very perceptive to the situation. He felt the department was using the UN argument that there is not threat to world peace yet. Campbell and Hooper expressed the need to get the US public better acquainted with the situation. Public pressure is one of the main things that promotes action in US policy. Among other they said were: S.A. is no longer of strategic importance to the US. Great Britian should start any action - they are in that position. There were begining signs of competition between USSR and US over South African countries.

Both Chuck and Carl felt that the committee has an 'in' in Washington. Bill Minter felt that we should continue a discussion of what Chuck and Carl reported at the next meeting as US policy concerning S.A. is a crucial thing for this committee to be informed on and also we should know how foreign policy is formulated.

BUSINESS MEETING

Books

It was decided that a critical bibliography of books the committee has reviewed be formulated. Every person who has read a book should write a brief review with his opinions on a file card which will then be kept in the office.

Ken suggested Monica Wilson's article in "African Studies" Vol. 18 #4 on "Early History of Transkei and Suskei" for future study.

UN Seminar Ken distrusted draft programs of the UN Seminar for the committee's opinions.

Report of the NSCF meeting in Princeton

NSCF have agreed that we should be represented on the Consultative Council and that they will take the responsibility of the money involved. Charles Wilhelm will be the representative.

We have a list of persons in different denominations who will be correspondents for distribution, information etc. and for stirring up interest in S.A. among student groups.

Morlan Proposal

Don Morlan read the appended letter from himself and his wife.

Ken said he thought the idea holds enormous potential - as Americans it will be easier for them to set up some kind of non racial Christian community. At the moment there is only one place (near Johannesburg) where a non racial community has managed to exist. He said they should apply for visas immediately but that they would have to stop any publicised association with groups such as this. It was noted that Ed Espey is going to S.A. soon and could probably help with communications.

Hilah thought this proposal should be brought before the whole Commission to keep them informed as well as to get their support.

Dick Van Horn said that our approval should be absolutely unhesitating - it was agreed that it was.

Chester Marvey is to be consulted about getting the visas and about precautions they should take. There was some discussion about whether Gail and Don should go as missionaries (under the auspices of a mission board) or privately as some boards have not been able to get visas for their people. No decision was reached. Ken is to look for possible support.

The committee decided to 1) express full support of the proposal and 2) to empower Al and Dave to draw up a memo to be sent to the missionary boards to get their response to the idea.

Hilah thought a memo would be too public - Ken agreed and asked that this committee should not talk to just anyone about the proposal. The memo is to be strictly confidential and the minutes of this meeting are to be marked 'not to be left lying around'. There was unanimous consent to this.

Explanatory reports

Dave noted that these explanatory reports constitute the lay of the land for the committee's action.

Relations with other student movements, lay groups etc. Dick van Horn reported. 1) we are not yet at the point when we can come out on any action therefore relations with other groups at this point would be difficult as far as giving any leadership to their actions. There is no reason, however, for no contact at all. 2) Our role is to inform other groups about what we are doing and offer them help. When we make up our minds about what course of action we are going to take we should contact - the sCm s, Pax Romana (through Judy Pfeiffer), the Soyuyo (?) in Japan and Lay groups in Germany. It was questioned whether it wouldn't be better for the NSA to do all the contacting but noted that the prayer life of the world student community should not be eliminated. The groups mentioned may have members who would like to attend our meetings.

Bill Minter said that NSA would join with us in any administration connected with making contacts. We should also contact USYC as they have a large number of contacts.

It was decided that NSA should contact the secular groups and we should contact the s.C.m.s

Literature. Sharon Flynn reported.

She gave the following suggestions for the committee's reaction:

1) Mailings - a) we have sent one to NSCF campus co-ordinators b) The coming mailing to FVS alumni should include: a short bibliography, an article by Ken which was in G & C, information about Contact. It was decided that one page would be a memo with a bibliography and the other would be one of Ken's articles - depending on which we can get most copies of. Hilah suggested that there be a paragraph introducing the bibliography saying that without informed US opinion exerting pressure there is no way that the government will act and that it is encumbant on the students who receive the mailing etc. Also Hilah felt it would be better to direct the bibliography at something specific. Hilah will have the bibliography ready by Monday, November 30 and Chuck and Carl will write the introduction.

2) The next Wind & Chaff (deadline Dec. 10) will have two articles on S.A. They have one on Rhodesia and want one on S.A. - it was felt that we should try and provide it. The possibility of having a special Wind & Chaff on S.A. was raised and it was decided to try and get the edition which comes out just before the anniversary of Sharpeville. We may also be able to have a special Communique on S.A. It was suggested that Don Segal be approached to write the article for Wind & Chaff.

3) We should have an article in Communique giving the Peace Committee's view of violence and this committee's decision about violence in S.A.

4) We could reprint good articles from magazines such as a recent one by Mary Benson in Motive - it was decided that we should.

- 5) We should get the Dutch Reformed ministers mailing list in S.A. - Karl McIntyre sends them the Beacon so it would be a good thing if we could get a less slanted view to them.
- 6) It is important that we get copies of Contact and Pro Veritate to advertise around and for committee members to read.
- 7) We should all be on the look-out for pertinent articles.
- 8) We should approach NBC or the like to do a program on S.A. - the NCC contacts are to be used for this. The Protestant Council is always looking for ideas for their T.V. program. Grace Goodman is the person to approach.

Sharon also noted that at the MSM Quadrennial this December they do not have a sub conference group discussing S.A. (they have them discussing other basic issues) and we should ask that they do. It was agreed we should.

Sharon Garman reported on the letter she had received from Norman Uphoff of the NSA asking if we would participate in a nation wide student emphasis week right before the fifth anniversary of Sharpeville. Mr. Uphoff made the point in his letter that this is possibly the only time when so many students groups have decided to emphasise the same issue at the same time. He suggests 1) moral support 2) public demonstration 3) resolutions from student movements to the government 4) fund raising to get scholarships for S.A. The letter said that they felt religious groups should be particularly interested and asks us to co-operate.

It was felt by the committee that in light of Bob Segal's view of the value of external pressure it would be very good to make this a week of really strong emphasis across the country. Therefore we should not just co-operate but give enthusiastic support. It was decided to hold further discussion until the next meeting.

Carl Schneider gave a report on education and the most effective way to approach this in terms of scholarships.

There are two thrusts: 1) Specific support of IFA/ASA (see Nov 5 minutes)
2) There are already enough organisations giving S.A. students help and it would probably be better for us to channel our work in this field through the NSA.

Carl will report on Lectureships next time.

FOR THE NEXT MEETING

- 1) Hilah will give a report of the study committee
- 2) Ron will give a review of "An African Looks at Apartheid"
- 3) Everyone is to have read the UN report, Part I on repressions so it can be discussed.
- 4) Kenn will report on the two Edgar Brooks books he is reading
- 5) Hilah will review the UN report
- 6) Mary Benson's book 'African Patriots' will be reviewed.
- 7) The discussion of Carl and Chucks visit to the State Dept. will be continued

MISCELLANEOUS

Dick van Horn suggested we invite Susan Witner for the next meeting - she is well versed on the development of African views and the situation

Hilary reported that a Professor Charles Manning would be speaking on the 'South Africa Dilemma' at Riverside Church's Mens' group on December 1. She said that Manning was known as a mouth piece for the S.A. government and that as, among other reasons, the Readers Digest was probably sending a reporter to the meeting to get material for an article on South Africa, we should try and arrange to have someone at the meeting to express our view. It was strongly urged that

members of the committee attend the meeting if only to ask pointed questions. If WRVR decides to broadcast the talk at a later date we will arrange to have a speaker from the other side directly following him. Dr. Van Deusen and Al Lowenstein were suggested.

Kenneth Kanunda Premier of Zambia will be speaking at Earl Hall, Tuesday December 1, from 4 - 5:30.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

The next meeting will be December 4th, 1964 at the Interchurch Center in the Kraft Room on the 7th Floor.

respectively submitted
Hilary Gammage, Secretary

We are tied to no denomination, being free to work under any board which would enable us to embody our concern.

We have been fairly specific and have assumed a great deal in order to make our position very clear. However, let us immediately add the fact that we in no way want a long debate over this letter to hinder the work of the Southern Africa Committee. We are simply asking you to consider the possibilities of our proposal and to act accordingly. It may be that the idea is excellent but that theological students are not the persons to carry it out. It may be that the Commission on World Mission as a whole should be involved. We simply want you to know where we stand and respond as you see fit.

We are free; the details can be changed greatly. We are able to begin in June of 1965. We ask that you reflect and respond.

Don and Gail Morlan

600 West 122nd St
New York, N.Y. 10027