Will the United States intervene on the side of the minority government when the struggle for South Africa escalates, as it inevitably will?

Will the United States shape its policy on opposing minority rule, or opposing "communism" in Africa and the liberation movements which get support from socialist states?

The political atmosphere in which these questions will be answered is being shaped now. Many politicians in Washington are defining the issues in southern Africa in dangerously simplistic ways: If blacks are included in a settlement, that must be majority rule. If elections are held in Zimbabwe or Namibia, that must be democracy. If the Soviet Union and Cuba support the liberation movements in southern Africa, shouldn't the United States be on the other side, even if that means siding with racism and repression?

The 1978 Congressional elections are in many ways a dry run for the 1980 Presidential race, so how southern Africa is dealt with this fall is very important. Phil Crane, a tireless supporter of colonialism and white rule in southern Africa, has already started running for the Presidency for 1980. The American Conservative Union, of which he is President, is deeply involved in current plans to bring Ian Smith to this country. Southern Africa has become a significant issue in some Congressional campaigns. Senator Dick Clark of Iowa, for example, faces a conservative Republican challenger who has accused him of serving the interests of the Soviet Union in Africa. The South African Embassy has meddled in his campaign, telling Iowans Clark should spend more time on Iowa and less on South Africa. In another race in Pensicola, Florida, Michael Williams ran for Congress on his record as the "senior" U.S. mercenary fighting in Ian Smith's army in Rhodesia. (Fortunately, he got only 4% of the primary vote.)

The right wing has already made some headway in defining how American Congressmen and journalists, if not the American people, look at southern Africa. We think the Congressional campaigns provide an important forum to formulate the issues in a different way. Now is the time to tell potential members of Congress, whose votes we may need in the future, how we see the critical choices facing the United States in the liberation of southern Africa.
There are some situations that will provide more impact for raising the southern Africa issue with candidates than others. The larger the forum the better. Many candidates hold "town meetings" where individuals have an opportunity to ask candidates where they stand on issues. If you can't find such a forum, try to create a public event or arrange a special meeting for community groups to talk with the candidate in detail about Africa. You might also contact "experts" or reporters who have a chance to raise these questions on radio or TV shows. Or these questions can be used in making a written questionnaire for candidates.

The questions supplied here fall into two categories. The first three are general questions on southern Africa; the rest relate southern Africa to issues which might be of special concern to your group or may already have been given some visibility in the campaign.

All candidates should be pushed to say on the record where they stand on these issues. This can help to differentiate between candidates during the campaign, and provide a basis for lobbying with the person who is in the end elected.

When you receive answers from candidates, please pass that information along to us at the Washington Office on Africa. It will help us in our efforts in Washington to lobby for a progressive Africa policy in Congress.

**Questions for Candidates**

**U.S. & South Africa**

Do you believe that, to help attain the goal of majority rule in South Africa, the United States should cease its assistance to the minority government by prohibiting new investment and bank loans, ending Export-Import Bank financing and tax credits to American companies operating there?

The US should do everything possible to discourage corporate economic support for South Africa until apartheid is eliminated. US corporations argue that investment will bring about improved economic conditions for South Africa's blacks and eventually mark the downfall of apartheid. The income gap between white and black workers has reached 13:1 and continues to widen, while apartheid grows stronger each year. Black unemployment runs at 25%. The white government continues its geocidal policy of making Africans foreigners in their own country, turning 70% of the population into migrant laborers. Many African leaders have expressed their people's willingness to make sacrifices to defeat apartheid. The majority of Africans demand corporate withdrawal. Only 100,000 blacks out of 18 million work for US companies, so the damage from withdrawal would be minimal.

**Internal Settlement**

As we have seen from recent press reports, the so-called "internal settlement" in Rhodesia has not succeeded in ending racial discrimination or stopping the war. Moreover, it will give the white minority a veto over every significant political development for at least a decade. Under these circumstances, do you think the US should seek to work with the Patriotic Front and the Front Line states toward a more just solution?

American conservatives who are trying to lift sanctions against Rhodesia argue that the internal settle-
ment is a just, democratic solution. But the 97% African population will not be given a chance to ratify the agreement. Africans are disillusioned with the agreement because conditions for them have not improved: racial discrimination has not ended, and more than 500,000 people are still penned up in concentration camp-like "protected villages". The army, police and judiciary will remain in white hands. The brutal repression these state instruments have meted out provide every reason to think that any elections which might be held under the settlement will not be free and fair.

**U.S. Strategic Interests**

South US politicians argue that southern Africa is of great strategic importance and that the US must therefore support the white minority governments. Others believe that minority rule is unjust and therefore unstable, and that US interests would be best served by supporting the political movements working for majority rule. Do you think US interests will be more threatened by the emergence of non-aligned African governments or by the continuation of minority rule?

A secret policy study conducted for Henry Kissinger in 1970 concluded that the region was "important but not vital" to US security interests. Following this conclusion, no government in South Africa or Zimbabwe, socialist or otherwise, could threaten strategic interests where none exist. The independent southern African states have committed themselves to a policy of nonalignment. Even Mozambique and Angola have sought better diplomatic and economic relations with the United States. After fighting colonialism for 500 years, Africans will not tolerate foreign domination, no matter what its ideology. US political interests could suffer more from continued minority rule and the cycle of resistance and repression which it brings than from a transfer of power to socialist governments.

**Namibian Settlement**

The US and four other western powers have spent 18 months forging a settlement on Namibia. The US put tremendous pressure on the Front Line states to get SWAPO to agree to the proposal. SWAPO agreed with the understanding that the US would convince South Africa to abide by the settlement. But now South Africa has refused to relinquish its control of Namibia, and African states are calling for United Nations economic sanctions against South Africa. Do you believe that the United States should agree to such sanctions against South Africa until it gives up control of Namibia? If not, why not?

There have been numerous efforts to break the South African hold on Namibia. The US has agreed that South African rule there is illegal. South Africa's refusal to give up Namibia has resulted in increased international admonishment and an escalation of armed conflict. Now stronger steps must clearly be taken. The international community is justified in the call to apply sanctions against South Africa as the only effective non-violent pressure left at its disposal. The US can only, in good conscience, support such sanctions.

**Sanctions Violations**

Recently Great Britain has been shaken by a scandal in which high government officials, including a former Prime Minister, were implicated as participants in transferring oil to Rhodesia from British affiliates in South Africa, in violation of United Nations sanctions. It has been well documented that US oil firms, most notably Mobil and Caltex, have supplied oil to Rhodesia through their subsidiaries in South Africa, in spite of the formal US agreement to comply with sanctions. What actions would you be prepared to support to see that sanctions are made effective?
Oil supplied to Rhodesia by South African subsidiaries of US firms undermines efforts to force the rebel regime to give up power. It has encouraged the Smith regime to believe that the US and Britain will in the end lift sanctions to rescue it. Tightening sanctions so they apply to all subsidiaries of US firms is one step the US should take immediately. To maintain any credibility, the US government must see to it that Mobil and Caltex stop supplying oil to Rhodesia.

Mercenaries in Rhodesia

The US has legal restrictions against the recruitment of US citizens to fight in a foreign army. Yet it is common knowledge that at least 400 Americans are serving in the Rhodesian army. The Justice Department claims to have been investigating mercenaries going to Rhodesia since 1975, but not one person has been prosecuted. How do you think Justice Department enforcement of the law against US mercenaries in Rhodesia can be improved?

According to Title 18, Section 959 of the US Code, the US has the right to prosecute American nationals who enlist in a foreign army or recruit others to do so. The law also applies to foreign recruiters operating in the US. American citizens fighting for Ian Smith's army must be prosecuted under these laws.

U.S. Recognition of Angola

Recently Angola has played a crucial role in helping to bring peace to southern Africa, by encouraging a settlement in Namibia and by making a rapprochement with Zaire. In light of these actions which have supported US interests in the area, do you think that the US should normalize diplomatic relations with Angola? If not, why not?

The United States attempted to undermine the Angolan government, beginning with covert CIA military operations. It was this CIA involvement that led to the South African invasion of Angola and the subsequent Angolan request for Cuban support. The US has applied a double standard in criticizing Cuban support for the MPLA-led government. The US has argued that the Cuban presence undermines Angolan sovereignty -- the very sovereignty that the US attempted to destroy. The US has never claimed that the presence of French troops calls into question the authority of more conservative African governments.

Since Angola has assisted recent US efforts in southern Africa, the least the US can do is afford Angola diplomatic recognition, as all our western allies have done, and grant humanitarian assistance.

Nuclear Aid to South Africa

South Africa is becoming a world nuclear power. It already has the technology to build a bomb, and in 1977 tried to test a nuclear explosive. Because of its large supplies of raw uranium, South Africa could become the "OPEC" of the nuclear energy age, threatening Europe with a fuel embargo unless it backs its continued minority rule. Since South Africa has also refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, should the US end its technical cooperation and supply of nuclear fuel without which South Africa cannot develop its nuclear capacity?

In the area of nuclear proliferation, it is obvious that "less" is preferable to "more". South Africa's refusal to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty should be reason enough to deny it any further nuclear cooperation. South Africa's attacks on its own people, on Angola and Zaire and its apparent determination to fight to the end to retain minority rule make its access to nuclear technology extremely dangerous for southern Africa.