

### Proposed American Initiatives

An over-all view of U.S. policy brings the conclusion that in practice, as opposed to its declarations, the United States has a stake in defending the status quo in southern Africa. The black majorities that are struggling for freedom in all these countries cannot believe protestations of sympathy and can more readily decide that the U.S. is in fact, and along with the rest of the white world, the enemy. A positive U.S. policy in the situation would include:

1) Disengagement. An end to all official aid to these regimes and the discouragement of private investment, trade and support; this means transferring the space-tracking stations to free Africa; ending the South African sugar quota, and ending cooperation with South African nuclear development. In addition, all aid which furthers Portugal's military policies in Africa should be terminated.

2) Racial equality and reciprocity in whatever relationships remain; i.e., if white South Africans are to come for training or higher education to the U.S., Africans should be able to come, too. Since the U.S. accepts racists and fascists because they are accredited diplomats, the southern African countries must accept multi-colored American staffs without discrimination.

3) Positive aid to the freedom movements. Where this may not be possible within the country, it is not only possible but urgent to aid refugees and their families and to support educational facilities for them. The U.S. present contribution to the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa, for instance, is infinitesimal.

4) Aid through the specialized committees and agencies of the U.N. to further the independence of the various countries. This will take different forms, i.e., in South West Africa, to tax American business there for the benefit of South West Africans and to recognize international and not South African visas; in Rhodesia, to encourage the British to turn from the Smith regime to look for a legitimate government for Rhodesia among the black majority and to support it; and in regard to the Portuguese territories, to withdraw all support for Portugal's colonial policy and ask the U.N. to aid the establishment of independent regimes.

5) Support for U.N. action directed against colonial and racist regimes, particularly the implementation of economic sanctions, including the total blockade of all Mozambican ports to prevent oil from entering Rhodesia.

6) Extension of economic aid to independent African countries most threatened by or dependent on the white minority regimes: Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, virtual enclaves in South Africa; and Zambia, which is particularly vulnerable.

The effect of such a change in policy would be far greater than the sum of its parts indicates, because of the greater power of the United States. To use that power positively, on the side of freedom in southern Africa, instead of negatively, in defense of the status quo, would change the atmosphere

and all the possibilities. With the increased opposition against them, the minority regimes would have to come to terms with reality. War, which has begun already and may explode into a major catastrophe, could be limited, controlled, ended.

This is not a policy of non-involvement. In our interdependent world, there is no longer such a possibility. The United States is involved heavily in southern Africa today, and mostly on the wrong side. The change in policy would involve us consciously, and not by drift, on the side of freedom and against racist oppression, and with the best hope of peace in our time.

---

American Committee on Africa  
164 Madison Avenue  
New York, N. Y. 10016

..... Please send ..... copies of the United States and Southern Africa.

..... Please send further information about your work.

..... Enclosed is \$..... to help the cause of freedom in southern Africa.

Single copies free; quantity orders, \$3.00 per 100; \$12.00 per 500; \$20.00 per thousand.

Name .....

Address .....

City..... State..... Zip.....

---

American Committee on Africa  
164 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10016

## THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTHERN AFRICA

### A Position Paper for the 1968 Campaign

#### The Race Issue and Southern Africa

The crucial issues for which the nation must find solutions today are the same issues which disturb the whole world: war, poverty, and race, which are inextricably bound together. Our particular concern is with United States policy towards southern Africa, but its ramifications run deeply through other domestic and international questions, influencing them and being influenced by them.

Though the crisis in our cities is rooted in poverty, the bitterness, the alienation, and the violence that characterize it are linked to racial antagonism. For centuries, whites have been suppressors. Today, rising black consciousness and rebellion seek to redress the balance. As generations of white Americans have identified with the values of Western (European) civilization, so black Americans are increasingly identifying themselves with Africa. The new nations are a source of new hope and new pride. But all of Africa is not yet free. White supremacy continues in its cruelest form — imperialism in the Portuguese territories and apartheid spreading from South Africa to South West Africa and now to Rhodesia.

## **Can Conflict in Southern Africa Become Another Vietnam?**

White Americans are racially myopic. Few, regardless of their views about the war in Vietnam, think of it in racial terms. Many Vietnamese and other Asians, many Africans, and many black Americans see it as the latest episode in a continuing race war. Men who are not white remember that it was yellow men on whom the first atomic bomb was dropped. It is yellow men and their country that now suffer napalm, defoliation, and other forms of ever more savage warfare. The presence of 540,000 Americans in Vietnam is seen as a continuation of the old imperialism — the white world ruling the non-white.

Black Americans bear unique burdens in the war. Proportionately more black Americans are poor. Proportionately more of them are drafted because the deferment system penalizes the poor. Proportionately more re-enlist because, compared to civilian opportunities, military service seems advantageous. Proportionately more of them volunteer for the high-risk, high-pay jobs. Proportionately more of them die.

A basic and disturbing question in Vietnam is, how, without deliberate decision or declaration of war, did we get where we are? In southern Africa, an earlier stage of the same process can be seen. The threat of war spreading is great. The magnitude and form of United States involvement are little understood. In southern Africa there is still time; but a continuation of present policies may find the U.S. blundering again into an unwanted war.

## **White Minority Domination in Southern Africa**

In the subcontinent of southern Africa, a white minority dominates a black majority. In Portugal's colonies of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea, less than 455,000 Portuguese rule more than 12 million Africans, and open war has been under way in Angola since 1961 and in Guinea and Mozambique since 1964. In Rhodesia, where Africans outnumber whites by 4,080,000 to 224,000, increasing oppression of Africans since the Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) in November, 1965, has led to increasing guerrilla action against the illegal government. In South West Africa the continuation of South African control and apartheid, despite U.N. termination of the South African mandate, has resulted in rising opposition. In South Africa itself, where 3,563,000 whites rule 15,170,000 non-white peoples, revolt has been checked temporarily by the controlled terror of an efficient police state; but with peaceful channels of protest closed, violence becomes assured.

Both inside and outside the United Nations, U.S. government pronouncements favor self-determination and freedom. But the heavy U.S. economic involvement in southern Africa is on the side of the status quo. In the long run, the freedom movements will succeed. In the short run, these movements must find help where they can get it. When Communist countries offer that aid, a further parallel with Vietnam emerges — the alleged threat of international communism to justify support of the white colonial or totalitarian status

quo. There is another parallel with Vietnam, that of treaty obligations. The U.S. is allied with Portugal in NATO, and NATO countries make the Portuguese military effort in the colonies possible. Undergirding all is the size and strategic importance of U.S. investment in and trade with all the countries of southern Africa. A country-by-country analysis will make this clear.

## **Portugal's Colonies: Angola, Mozambique, and (Portuguese) Guinea**

Portugal has consistently refused to report to the United Nations on the grounds that her colonies were not non self-governing territories but integral parts of metropolitan Portugal. After more than a year of study, the U.N. in 1962 affirmed the right of the Angolan people, already in revolt, to be free. In 1965, the U.N. asked all nations to break off diplomatic relations and trade with Portugal on behalf of the suppressed peoples of all the Portuguese territories, but the United States opposed mandatory sanctions. Such opposition is still an important factor in the failure to implement U.N. policy.

Even though the U.S. insists that its military equipment supplied to NATO countries not be used in Africa, any aid given to Portugal frees resources for use in the African wars; and similarly, the direct military assistance given by other NATO powers (Germany, Belgium) is in part made possible by U.S. assistance to them. In 1965, the U.S. gave Portugal \$15 million to build three warships. Since 1961, the Export-Import Bank has loaned Portugal \$55 million (and private U.S. banks have added \$20 million more). U.S. trade with Angola alone approximates \$55 million a year. Since Portugal revised its foreign investment policy in 1965, U.S. industries have begun heavy investment in the territories. Thus the character of American involvement has broadened to include both military and increasing economic interests. Most important is the Cabinda Gulf Oil Company, which will develop Angolan oil resources (on a 50-50 profit basis); this may free South Africa from her only serious dependence on outside supplies (she has had no oil). Cabinda Gulf has asked for a phosphates concession, and there is also a Gulf subsidiary in Mozambique engaged in exploratory operations. In Guinea, Standard Oil of New Jersey will invest ten million dollars over the next five years in oil and gas exploration projects. Firestone Portuguesa and Allis Chalmers are other familiar industrial names, while less known companies are processing major commodities such as fish and cashews.

## **Rhodesia**

The U.S. has been strong in denunciation of the Smith regime in Rhodesia — its illegal declaration of independence, its moves away from equality toward apartheid, its ruthless executions of freedom fighters. But the U.S. has temporized on the question of action that might effectively bring down that regime. In the U.N., the U.S. has followed Britain's lead, moving only under pressure from voluntary to limited

mandatory sanctions, and most recently to comprehensive sanctions. Although the U.S. has implemented sanctions with a resultant drop in total trade with Rhodesia, both penalties for sanctions-breaking and public supervision are inadequate to be effective deterrents. Despite the U.N. resolution establishing comprehensive sanctions, consular relations are still maintained (as of June 15).

## **South West Africa**

The situation is similar to that of Rhodesia in that protest resolutions in the U.N. are supported by the U.S., but there is no active policy either to restrain South Africa or to aid South West African independence. American investment in the territory is concentrated in base metals mining. Two U.S. companies profited by 26 million dollars in the single year of 1965 from these mines and U.S. imports include lobsters, diamonds and persian lamb. In view of American support for the U.N. resolution of October, 1966, which terminated South Africa's mandate, and opposition to the trial of South West Africans in Pretoria, there are strong reasons why the U.S. should take a positive role in implementing U.N. resolutions. Such action in essence requires confronting the reality of South African power.

## **South Africa**

South Africa is the keystone of the whole southern African situation as the most highly industrialized country in Africa and, because of the police state apparatus, the most stable in southern Africa. Aside from formal protests against apartheid, the United States is expressing opposition to South Africa in only two ways. The U.S. supports the arms embargo, although loopholes permit indirect aid to the development of South Africa's military potential, for instance, motor vehicle industry products. And the 1968 balance of payments regulations include South Africa along with western Europe as countries in which new investments are limited.

On the other hand, the U.S. maintains full diplomatic relations with South Africa, conforming to its racist policy by sending only white staff and employees. It makes no public effort to have U.S. companies operating in South Africa follow fair employment policies. The arrangements for tracking stations for space projects increase South Africa's prestige and help her economic position and scientific development. South Africa even has a quota in the U.S. sugar system so that her white farmers benefit from U.S. subsidies. The pre-1968 "neutrality" policy towards U.S. investments in South Africa has permitted that investment to reach an approximate \$800,000,000 and trade to increase; in 1965 the U.S. share of South Africa's trade was 18.8 per cent, topped only by Britain's 28.2 per cent. Sixty per cent of U.S. exports to South Africa are of capital goods which further her industrial development. U.S. investment has advanced South Africa's drive towards self-sufficiency and her militarization: rubber, steel, auto, the first nuclear reactor. It has also included border industry investment whose function is to strengthen apartheid.

A preliminary list of prominent Americans who have endorsed this position paper includes:

IRVING ACHTENBERG, *President, American Civil Liberties Union, Western Missouri*; CONRAD AIKEN, *Poet*; SADIE T. M. ALEXANDER, *Attorney*; BIL BAIRD, *Marionettes*; STRINGFELLOW BARR, *Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions*; NORMAN R. BENNETT, *Assoc. Prof., Boston University*; DAVE BING, *Professional Basketball Player*; T. BRUCE BIRKENHEAD, *Assis. Prof., Brooklyn College*; HORACE MANN BOND, *Director, Bureau of Educational and Social Research, Atlanta University*; PAUL BOOTH, *Research Director, United Packing House Workers of America*; WILLIAM H. BOOTH, *Chairman, N.Y.C. Comm. on Human Rights*; JIM BOUTON, *Professional Baseball Player*; ROBERT S. BROWNE, *Assis. Prof., Farleigh Dickinson University*; ELSIE F. CARRINGTON, *Director, Community Participation Educational Program*; RONALD H. CHILCOTE, *Assis. Prof., University of California (Riverside)*; WINIFRED F. COURTNEY, *Editor, The Reader's Adviser*; WAYNE H. COWAN, *Editor, Christianity and Crisis*; GEORGE M. DANIELS, *Director, Interpretive Services, Board of Missions, United Methodist Church*; RUBY DEE, *Actress*; ARMAND DERFNER, *Staff Counsel, Lawyers Constitutional Defense Committee*; STANLEY DIAMOND, *Prof., New School for Social Research*; R. HARCOURT DODDS, *Deputy Commissioner in charge of Legal Matters, New York City Police Department*; THOMAS I. EMERSON, *Prof., Yale Law School*; TOM J. FARER, *Assis. Prof., Columbia Law School*; DONALD M. FRASER, *United States Congressman*; ALAN GEYER, *Director, International Relations, United Church of Christ*; CARLTON B. GOODLETT, *M.D., Chairman, California Negro Leadership Conference*; JOHN J. GROGAN, *President, Marine & Shipbuilding Workers Union*; THE REV. HERSCHEL HALBERT, *Officer for International Affairs, Episcopal Church*; DAVID HAPGOOD, *Writer*; THE REV. DONALD S. HARRINGTON, *Community Church, New York*; WILLIAM B. HARVEY, *Dean, Law School, Indiana University*; NAT HENTOFF, *Writer*; RABBI ISIDOR B. HOFFMAN, *Exec. Director, Jewish Peace Fellowship*; TERENCE K. HOPKINS, *Assoc. Prof., Columbia University*; JOSEPH JABLOW, *Assoc. Prof., Brooklyn College*; JAY JACOBSON, *Attorney*; THE REV. FORREST JOHNSON, *United Church of Christ*; NEIL A. JOHNSON, *Professional Basketball Player*; CLARENCE B. JONES, *Attorney*; FARRELL JONES, *Exec. Director, Nassau County Commission on Human Rights*; DR. TRACEY K. JONES, JR., *Assoc. Gen. Secretary, Board of Missions, United Methodist Church*; SIDNEY D. JOSEPHS, *President, Repair Services Management Company, Cleveland*; THOMAS KARIS, *Chairman, Political Science Dept., City College, New York*; THE REV. DANIEL KILFOYLE, S.J., *Assis. Prof., St. Peter's College*; MARTIN KILSON, *Assis. Prof., Harvard University*; THE REV. DANA E. KLOTZLE, *Director, Unitarian Universalist United Nations Program*; ELIZABETH S. LANDIS, *Attorney*; WILLIAM B. LANDIS,

(OVER)

Attorney; JOHN LEWIS, Former Chairman, SNCC; THE REV. JOHN A. MACKAY, President Emeritus, Princeton Theological Seminary; JOHN MARCUM, Director, African Language and Area Center, Lincoln University; CHESTER L. MARCUS, Regional Secretary for Africa, United Church of Christ; WILL MASLOW, Exec. Director, American Jewish Congress; SAUL MENDLOVITZ, Prof., Rutgers University; THOMAS MERTON, Author; ASHLEY MONTAGU, Anthropologist; FRANK E. MOSS, United States Senator; DAVID McREYNOLDS, Field Secretary, War Resisters League; ROBERT N. C. NIX, United States Congressman; DR. JUEL NORDBY, Africa Area Secretary, World Division, Board of Missions, United Methodist Church; ANDREW E. NORMAN, President, Scholarship, Education, Defense Fund for Racial Equality; FREDERICK O'NEAL, President, Actors' Equity; F. D. PATTERSON, President, Phelps Stokes Fund; THE HON. SAMUEL R. PIERCE, JR., Judge; DANIEL H. POLLITT, Prof., University of North Carolina Law School; CARL RACHLIN, Legal Director, Scholarship, Education, Defense Fund for Racial Equality; A. PHILIP RANDOLPH, President, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; CLEVELAND ROBINSON, Secretary-Treasurer, District 65 RWDSU, and President, Negro American Labor Council; THE REV. HERBERT W. ROGERS, Assis. Prof., Fordham University; THE REV. J. METZ ROLLINS, JR., Exec. Director, National Committee of Negro Churchmen; LESLIE RUBIN, Prof., Howard University; BAYARD RUSTIN, Exec. Director, A. Philip Randolph Institute; THE RT. REV. MSGR. OWEN J. SCANLON, St. Charles Borromeo's Church; WILLIAM X. SCHEINMAN, President, Scheinman Divergence Analysis Report Corporation; ADELAIDE SCHULKIND, League for Mutual Aid; LEON SHULL, National Director, Americans for Democratic Action; EDWARD A. SCHWARTZ, President, National Student Association; MASON SEARS, Former Ambassador; EDWARD J. SPARLING, President Emeritus, Roosevelt University; MARK STARR, Chairman, Esperanto-Information Center; HOPE R. STEVENS, Vice President, ACOA; RICHARD P. STEVENS, Chairman, Political Science Dept., Lincoln University; DR. HOWARD THURMAN, Dean Emeritus, Marsh Chapel, Boston University; RABBI ANDRE UNGER, Rabbi, Temple Emanuel, Westwood, N. J.; PIERRE L. VAN DEN BERGHE, Prof., University of Washington; IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN, Assoc. Prof., Columbia University; ROWLAND WATTS, President, Workers' Defense League; THE REV. GEORGE W. WEBBER, Assoc. Prof., Union Theological Seminary; PETER WEISS, President, ACOA; HERMAN WILL, JR., Assoc. Gen. Secretary, United Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns; ALVIN W. WOLFE, Prof., Washington University; ARTHUR D. WRIGHT, Exec. Director, Catholic Interracial Council of New York; I. WILLIAM ZARTMAN, Prof., New York University; ELLIOT ZUPNICK, Prof., City College, New York; (list incomplete; organizations for identification purposes only.)