

FOR LIMITED CIRCULATION

WASHINGTON
NOTES
ON
AFRICA
March 1969

BY

Gary Gappert
American
Committee
on
Africa

1. South West Africa

The 15-nation United Nation Security Council adopted a resolution on March 20th which called on South Africa to withdraw from South West Africa. The resolution passed 13 to 0 with United States support and with Britain and France abstaining.

It was the first Security Council action to put into effect the General Assembly declaration of 1966 that South Africa's League of Nations mandate was terminated.

It is unclear whether our support for this action was decided at the United Nations, in the State Department or at the White House. U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Charles W. Youst, indicated that the United States found itself able to support the resolution because it "wisely does not commit the Council to the narrow path of mandatory sanctions."

Congressman F. Bradford Morse (R-Mass.) placed a statement on South West Africa into the Congressional Record on April 1st, along with the statement by Elizabeth Landis, "Is There Nothing We Can Do About South West Africa?" He indicated that "the new administration has taken an important step in our commitment to a just, stable and progressive peace throughout Africa." He referred to the Landis paper (available through the ACOA) as being "a useful demonstration of the creative thinking and constructive approach from which we may develop the diplomatic efforts that can be effectively implemented and that will allow progress in this complex and difficult situation."

It is worth noting that the South West Africa situation, with its illegal occupation by South Africa, has been a matter that has bothered Republicans for some time. Even where they might object to any actions against South Africa in terms of its so-called internal matter, internationally-minded Republicans do recognize the injustice of the South West African case. In the previous Congress, Senator Moss (R-Utah) led a small delegation to see President Johnson which requested that the U.S. take an initiative in the General Assembly about South West Africa.

In a recent issue of the Baltimore Sun (March 16, 1969), Russell Warren Howe, in an article entitled "The Fighting in Southern Africa" wrote:

To learn about the permanence of resistance operations in Namibia, one has only to read the Windhoek Advertiser, the voice of the local establishment. 'Fighting seems a daily occurrence'.

He continued that the current Johannesburg quip has it that the best way to defend South Africa is to fight to the last Rhodesian and Portuguese.

2. South African Airways

Congressman Diggs was given a Special Order on March 26th to be recognized for 60 minutes on the subject of the South African Airways service. In his speech at that time, Diggs noted the inaugural flight of South African Airways to the United States which left Johannesburg on that date, March 26. He indicated his opposition to this extension of the South African apartheid system to

this country for several reasons.

First, this new relationship with South Africa is inconsistent with our relationships with the black independent states of Africa. Not only did he cite the inconsistencies of the American government in granting South African Airways a permit to land in New York, he also indicated that American commercial airlines are practicing the same kind of callous manouevers.

He said:

Pan American Airways, for instance, flies to a number of West African states and then uses these facilities in those West African states to fly on to Johannesburg. I am sure it will not be very long before they are faced with a choice between abandoning their South African trade in order to maintain their operation in West Africa. What is particularly ironic about Pan American's action is that while they have applied for an additional route to Johannesburg, through Rio, they have also promoted one of their black employees to a high-level executive position to direct the development of black American travel through the use of Pan American facilities. How in good conscience can they advertise for the travel dollars of black Americans at the same time that they are planning to expand their services to South Africa, services that will not be available to black Americans. Black stewardesses, flying for Pan American in West Africa have also been removed from the aircraft before it proceeds to South Africa. TWA and Braniff are also playing this game. TWA has applied to the CAB for rights to fly to South Africa as an extension of its current route to Nairobi. They, too, are trying to play both sides of the color curtain in Africa.

The second reason that Diggs indicated his opposition to South African Airways was because of the manner in which it was carried out. He indicated that it was certainly bad judgement and bad government when an official agency of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, can unilaterally act to extend our relationships with South Africa.

The third reason for his opposition to the extension of apartheid by South Africa to our shores is because of the grave insult it represents to his fellow black Americans. He said that normally he considers himself to be the representative of all his constituents, both black and white, but that in this matter he felt a particular responsibility to express the outrage of black Americans.

The fourth reason which caused Diggs to speak out against this latest racial injustice was that it disregards the growing prospects of a Vietnam situation in southern Africa.

Congressman Diggs was interrupted in his discourse by Congressman Derwinski who indicated that he was more disturbed about the Soviet airline flying to New York City than about the South African Airways flying to New York. He said that we should not bother the CAB with any kind of political considerations.

Congressman Culver (D-Iowa) also spoke to the subject of the Special Order. In his judgement, the U.S. government should not be expanding official contact with the South African government at this time, but should instead be re-examining those contacts which already exist.

Congressman Rosenthal of New York then followed with a lengthy speech which enumerated some of the ways in which this move by the South African government, which owns the airlines, marks the beginning of a new propaganda offensive in the United States. He cited some of the difficulties which objective visitors to South Africa will have in trying to make inquiry into all aspects of the South African system.

He wrote:

Not only will the U.S. tourist be unable to make inquiries to black South Africans about the social system in South Africa, but such inquiries, if made, would endanger the black South African for they would be in violation of the laws of South Africa. Even if a trip to South Africa does not mean conversion to a belief in its racialistic system, it does mean aid and comfort to the white South Africans instead of aid and comfort to the depressed black South Africans and to the freedom fighters who are now launching an offensive against the terrorism and suppression of the system.

A Republican member of the Subcommittee, Congressman F. Brad Morse, indicated correctly that it was the Johnson Administration which should have called for a review of the relationship with South Africa in terms of the bilateral air agreement when South Africa first applied for an air carrier permit. The original bilateral agreement goes back to 1947, antedating apartheid.

Hearings were held by Congressman Diggs on the subject of South African Airways on April 2nd. Witnesses appeared for the Civil Aeronautics Board, the State Department and for the American Committee on Africa. The CAB, in its defense of its award of an air carrier permit to South African Airways, indicated that the diplomatic and foreign relations considerations represented by such a permit are embodied in the air transport agreement of 1947 and involve matters which are properly for the decision of the President and the State Department. They stated:

Unless and until the agreement is terminated, the Board regards the agreement as controlling on the diplomatic and foreign relations aspects of the public interests.

Congressman Rosenthal effectively lambasted the CAB on the grounds that not only are their procedures such so as to reduce the public visibility of their actions, but in addition, their procedures for accepting appeals of their actions are much too inflexible.

The representative for the State Department was the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Transportation and Telecommunications. The State Department did not see fit to send any representative from their Africa Bureau. Thus, the testimony of their witness tended to be more technical and economic and he was poorly equipped to handle a discussion of the political and racial aspects of the implications of the South African air carrier permit. He did indicate, however, that the State Department did not regard recent implementation of the 1947 agreement with South Africa as a proper occasion for a basic and fundamental "re-do" of American foreign policy towards South Africa.

Their witness, Frank Loy, stated that:

We normally do not base our economic relationships with other countries on whether we approve or disapprove of their forms of government or conduct.

This, of course, is not the basic point. The basic point is the restrictions and the discrimination which would be faced by American blacks if they sought to take advantage of the facilities recently granted to South African Airways. Congressman Culver was in a visible rage as he pressed this point again and again on the hapless witness.

George Houser testified on behalf of the American Committee on Africa. He indicated:

The heart of the case which we make is that by no stretch of the imagination can it be called 'in the public interest' to allow an institution which is an agent of a state whose basic laws are based on racial discrimination to promote itself and function in the United States.

He indicated that there are three courses of action which it may be relevant to pursue. First, it lies within the power of the Presidency to revoke the air transport agreement, if it is to be found not to be in the best interest of the United States for the agreement to continue. Second, the CAB can take action to terminate the air carrier permit to South African Airways. Under Section 402(F) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the CAB may, after notice and hearing, alter, modify, amend, dispend, cancel or revoke a permit granted to foreign air carrier under Section 402(b) whenever it finds such action to be in the public interest. Third, there may be at least two forms of action to be taken in the Congress. One could be a resolution which would express the sentiment of Congress in opposition to bilateral transport agreements with governments which condone or uphold discrimination to which the United States citizen would be subjected. The other Congressional action would be legislation which would call upon the CAB, when it makes a determination to grant an air carrier permit, to investigate the racial practices of any country whose air companies apply for an air permit. The CAB does not seem to think that it has that responsibility at this time. Therefore, it should be granted through legislation the statutory authority to use civil rights and racial considerations in determining whether air carrier permits are in the best interest of all of the people in the United States.

An additional course of action, which is being pursued by the office of Congressman Rosenthal, is to request the Federal Trade Commission to investigate whether or not the advertising of South African Airways is misleading because of its lack of any mention that its facilities are discriminatory.

3. People

Melvin O. Benson has been appointed by Congressman Thomas Morgan (D-Pa.), Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives to be staff assistant to the Hon. Charles Diggs, Jr., Chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa. Melvin Benson was hired for the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee six years ago at the behest of the Hon. Frances Bolton, who was the ranking Republican member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. At that time, Benson was serving in Nigeria with AID. Previously, Benson had worked with Pepsi Cola in setting up bottling plants in such countries as Nigeria, and South Africa. He remembers South Africa well and would like a chance to visit there again. It is believed that Diggs had someone else in mind for the staff position but that there weren't funds available to hire an additional member for the staff position.

A recent issue of the Washington Post carried an article indicating that two African specialists were being considered for

the position of Assistant Secretary for African Affairs. The two specialists being considered were Waldemar Nielsen, President of the African-American Institute and Wayne Fredericks, previously Deputy Assistant Secretary under G. Mennen Williams and now director of the African Division of the Ford Foundation. Either applicant would fit well into the Nixon pattern of selecting specialized, non-ebullient careerists. It is understood that Nielsen has expressed his lack of an intense interest in the position, thinking, perhaps, that it will be possible to do more on the outside in the next few years. It is understood that the current Assistant Secretary, Joseph Palmer, would prefer to go back to his first love, an ambassadorship. The Washington Afro-American has been conducting a small boomlet for Barney Coleman, old-time Africa hand and currently Palmer's special assistant. Coleman was the black American who accompanied Palmer to South Africa last Fall.

Additional hearings on South African Airways are being planned by Congressman Diggs. He has also scheduled hearings on the South African sugar quota for April 15th and promises to continue his active pace.

On the Senate side, Senator Gale McGhee (D-Wy.), Chairman of the Senate African Subcommittee has indicated that he expects not to be very active. Senator Fulbright, Chairman of the full Committee has indicated that he does not think that too much time should be spent on Africa.

In the meantime, Senator Edward Brooke, in spite of his lengthy speech on Africa last year, remains inaccessible on African issues.

4. Funds for International Development Association

An Administration backed bill to authorize a \$480,000,000 U.S. share of a \$1.2 billion replenishment for the International Development Association was passed by the House on March 12 by a 247 to 150 roll call vote (R-85 to 94; D-162 to 56). This bill can be seen as a possible bellwether indicating the extent of Republican support for President Nixon's international initiatives. Even though foreign aid funding has fallen into severe disrespect in Congress, and even though a similar request for funding by the previous Administration failed to receive action in the previous Congress, it was possible to muster support for this bill at this time and in this Congress.

The vote on March 12 is significant because a majority of voting Republicans joined a majority of voting southern Democrats in opposition to it. But this conservative coalition was defeated by a larger coalition of responsible and moderate Republicans voting with liberal and moderate Democrats.

On the House Subcommittee on African Affairs, the following voted for the bill: Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (D-Mich.), Robert N.C. Nix (D-Pa.), William Murphy (D-Ill.), Rosenthal (D-N.Y.), John Culver (D-Iowa), Whaley (R-Pa.), Morse (R-Mass.), and Broomfield (R-Mich.). Voting against was Derwinski (R-Ill.).

Congressman Diggs, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Africa, wants to hold hearings on foreign and economic assistance for Africa sometime in April. The AID appropriations are usually submitted sometime in May. Following the recent precedent established by the Chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee, Diggs hopes to use these hearings to explore and discover which aspects of foreign assistance for Africa have the support of the various specialists. Normally, hearings on foreign aid are held

only after Congress has received an Administration initiated bill, and then only by the full Committee on Foreign Relations. These planned hearings by Diggs would be the first separate hearings on aid to Africa. They may serve to influence some of the priorities which will be present in the Administration Bill to be introduced in May.

It is to be hoped that interested groups and individuals will voice support for more assistance in two areas which have been sorely neglected in the past years. These areas are aid to those countries of independent Africa which are beseiged by threats from South Africa. These countries would include Lesotho, Swaziland, Botswana, Zambia, Tanzania and Congo. The second area of neglect is educational and medical aid to refugees from southern Africa.

5. Right-Wing Propaganda

In addition to the multi-million dollar propaganda campaign being planned by South Africa in conjunction with South African Airways, the American right-wing lobby for the interests of white southern Africa has begun to surface again.

John Acord, of the American Southern African Council and the Friends for Rhodesia, has hired John Hightower, a free-lance journalist, to produce a newsletter. Among the items planned is a feature illustrating the failure of the Nixon Administration to lift sanctions on Rhodesia.

It is also worth noting the activities of the American-African Affairs Association. This group, which claims tax-deductibility status, has, in fact, dedicated itself to the distribution of materials favorable to the racist regimes of southern Africa. In their recent report, they have indicated that their budget for 1968 is about \$108,000, an increase of 40 percent from their 1967 budget. Their budget for publications is \$67,000, an increase of 80 percent over last year's.

Washington Office
American Committee on Africa
Suite 527, Woodward Building
733 15th Street, Northwest
Washington, D. C. 20005
Telephone: 638-0835