late last year the South African Embassy in Washington sent a letter to a large number—estimates are in the tens of thousands—of US church members. It suggested that they might be interested to read the enclosed article from Reader's Digest attacking the World Council of Churches (WCC). Its title: "Karl Marx or Jesus Christ."

In September 1981, the South African Embassy in Berne, Switzerland, sent copies of the German translation of Ernest Lefever's harsh attack on the World Council of Churches, Amsterdam to Nairobi: The World Council of Churches, to a large number of pastors in Switzerland and West Germany. One of the commendations on the back cover was from President Ronald Reagan: "The advice of Lefever is factual and reasonable. If those who have the say in the World Council were also reasonable they would not give any more money to the terrorists who kill civilians and missionaries." No mention that this was written by columnist Reagan before his election.

The cover letter added that this "concentrated body of facts" clearly demonstrates that the WCC supports a "policy which is bound to lead to bloodshed and human suffering which will have to be borne by other people."

These are only two current illustrations of the obsession defenders of South African apartheid display with the ecumenical movement and its international organization, the World Council of Churches. This concern has led over the past decade to a number of bold, often secret, attempts by the South African government and its religious supporters to influence world opinion—and particularly, churchmembers' opinions—away from support for the liberation movements of Southern Africa and the South African Council of Churches (SACC), the 22-church council that remains the most important international religious symbol of opposition to apartheid. Pretoria's intent has been clear: destroy the SACC which aids the victims of apartheid and is increasingly outspoken against the regime; and discredit the WCC, which gives moral and political support to the liberation movements and the SACC.

Muldergate Targets the Churches

Influencing world-wide Christian opinion was one of several key reasons why the South African government initiated its secret propaganda effort in the 1970s to influence world opinion and discredit critics. Now known as Muldergate (after one of its instigators, Information Minister Cornelius Mulder), the operation invested more than $80 million in approximately 200 secret projects, including support for publications and organizations favorable to South Africa.

One part of the Muldergate scheme involved the churches and, in particular, targeted the WCC. The Dutch magazine, Elseviers, exposed this plan in a series of articles on Muldergate after Eschel Rhodie, South African Secretary of Information and prime architect of the scheme, fled the country and talked freely to its editor. According to Elseviers:

The World Council of Churches is one of the most important international organizations in the world with which South Africa is continually at loggerheads. In 1974 action groups within the Presbyterian and Methodist churches in America tried on a large scale buying shares of enterprises which had investments in South Africa. At the same time these groups began a campaign for the withdrawal of business investments in South Africa.

According to Rhodie, the groups booked alarming results with this campaign. In the American churches the idea began to gain ground that the faster a crisis develops in the South African economy, the faster a change of power would occur in favor of the Black population.

Pretoria initially created an Ecumenical Organization Bureau to host visitors who disagreed with the WCC's anti-apartheid stance and to publish documents around the world favorable to its point of view. But these first efforts had little visible results. So Pretoria decided to support the rabidly anti-communist Church League of South Africa (CLSA), headed by then-Methodist
minister Fred Shaw. Rhoodie and Shaw opened a London office and planned one for Washington. Shaw's tiny weekly, *Encounter*, was revamped and soon had a circulation of "several ten-thousand copies."

In 1978 Shaw and several colleagues, including Fr. Arthur Lewis, an Anglican missionary who later became a senator in the white Rhodesian government of Ian Smith, visited 16 cities in the United States. They were sponsored by a variety of people, such as Charles Keyser, United Methodist minister and key member of the conservative Good News organization; Duke Divinity School professor Paul Mickey, also related to Good News; Howard Ball, organizer of Campus Crusade for Christ and editor of the Good News magazine; and Major Edgar Bundy, former World War II intelligence officer who headed his own Church League of America until he recently joined forces with long time anti-National Council of Churches (NCC) and anti-WCC activist Carl McIntyre of the International Council of Churches. (Both McIntyre and Bundy were loudly present at the WCC Sixth Assembly in Vancouver in August 1983.)

On the tour Arthur Lewis vehemently denied then-rumors of South African-government funding, telling the Durham (NC) *Herald* that the CLSA is "not connected with any government, any political party or any political party line. ... We are merely Christians and we want to get our story across." However, in 1980 the official South African Erasmus Commission which investigated the Muldergate scandal confirmed Rhoodie's claim that the CLSA was given secret government funds.

The tour was little noticed and had scant impact. Under initiative of the CLSA and almost certain financing, Shaw and Lewis then joined with well-known evangelical Peter Beyerhaus, who spent eight years in South Africa as a missionary and teaches theology at Tubingen University in West Germany, to form the International Christian Network (ICN) in 1978. Paul Mickey and Charles Keyser were also involved in creating ICN. (Beyerhaus, incidentally, was also at the WCC Assembly in Vancouver.) The ICN was, according to British journalist Derrick Knight in *Beyond the Pale: The Christian Political Fringe*, created primarily to discredit the international support for the SACC. It had to develop a campaign that would not be seen as "an exclusively pro-South African, pro-apartheid lobby." It needed a general theological argument and an issue "which could be easily grasped."

The Berlin Declaration of Ecumenism (drawn up by Beyerhaus) provided the first, the issue of terrorism the second. As a bonus, terrorism could be equated with communism ... The strategy was simple. It might even be made to seem a spontaneous outburst of righteous indignation springing up all over the world.

In its preliminary proposal, the ICN said one of the results it wanted was to establish "an effectual alternative to the WCC." In fact it has not. Little has been heard from it since a 1980 attempt to purchase a defunct British publication, *Christian World*, failed. But it is also clear that the tactics of ICN and the Rhoodie plan—not to mention South African funds we know about and do not know about—have been used to stimulate the world-wide attacks on the WCC and the criticism here of the NCC.

**South African funds have been used to stimulate the world-wide attacks on the WCC and criticism here of the NCC.**

Ernest Lefever is one figure in the US noted for his strong attacks against both the NCC and the WCC. When he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1981 (which rejected him as a candidate for the human rights post at the State Department), he was asked several times if he had South African funding at his Ethics and Public Policy Center (EPPC). He denied it repeatedly and no proof was ever presented. What we do know is that from the early 1960s, he made sixteen trips to Africa, twelve of them to Southern Africa. Two of those trips were paid for by the Foreign Affairs Association (FAA) and he received $500 honoraria for speeches he gave there. The FAA was later identified as a Muldergate front, as were several other groups with which he had relationships.

Lefever's contacts came before the public exposure of Muldergate. But it is also apparent that his public statements on South Africa and his attacks on the WCC follow the same lines as the South African government. Take one example:

> By virtue of its mineral resources, its strategic location, its industrial sophistication, and, not the least, its eagerness to cooperate with the West, South Africa should be a de facto member of NATO. It should be accepted as a full-fledged partner in the struggle against communist expansion. (1978)

Thus it may be a source of some concern that the EPPC is preparing a book on the US churches and South Africa due to be published in January, 1984.

Although Lefever did not make it into the Reagan Administration, one of his colleagues did. Lefever commissioned Herman Nickel, now US ambassador to South Africa and then Washington editor of *Fortune*, to do a study on the Nestle boycott. Nickel never completed the assignment, but later published an article in *Fortune* in June, 1980, called "The Corporation Haters." It attacked the NCC, the WCC, and the Interfaith Council on Corporate Responsibility, calling them "Marxists marching under the banner of Christ." Lefever later reprinted that article as well as Nickel's *Fortune* article, "Why
IRD Joins the Fray

Another organization attacking the churches is the Institute for Religion and Democracy (IRD). The IRD, founded in 1981, has campaigned against the progressive foreign policy work of the mainline Protestant churches. IRD officials Richard Neuhaus and Ed Robb were prominently featured in the 60 Minutes and Reader's Digest attacks on the NCC and WCC last year.

The 60 Minutes show aired last January, which was based on innuendo and false allegations, dwelt long and hard on the WCC Program to Combat Racism's grants to FRELIMO in Mozambique, the Patriotic Front in Zimbabwe, SWAPO in Namibia, and "guerrillas" in Angola. Top officials of the NCC denounced the segment as "distorted, sensational and biased." The South African government TV ran the highly contentious 60 Minutes segment within South Africa.

Some have wondered if IRD has South African funding. IRD denies it and no evidence suggests it does. Certainly the foundations which provided 89% of IRD's financial support in its first two years are not short of money and compatible political goals.

But these foundations—John Olin, Smith Richardson, and those headed by Richard Mellon Scaife—are not without relationships to South Africa. Olin's Winchester rifle corporation had the unique "honor" of being the first company prosecuted for violation of the arms embargo against South Africa.

Scaife's association with South Africa appears even more extensive. Heir to the vast Mellon fortune, Scaife funds many New Right organizations. One of Scaife's many projects has included Kern House Enterprises, owner of Forum World Features, based in London. The Forum, which closed in 1975, has been exposed as a CIA front. Interestingly, Gordon Winter, a former South African BOSS agent, was a regular contributor to the Forum while he was based in London for the Pretoria regime.

According to the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Scaife has also had "regular and intimate contacts and business dealings" with John McGoff, the Michigan publisher who was a recipient of large amounts of Muldergate money. Scaife and McGoff were co-owners of the Sacramento Union which McGoff originally bought with South African government money.

In late 1983, representatives of the Eloff Commission, the South African government panel investigating the SACC, visited the IRD. After the visit, the IRD issued a formal statement:

The Institute on Religion and Democracy is committed to strengthening the link between Christianity and democracy. As a consequence the IRD has criticized the agencies of several American churches as well as the [NCC] and the [WCC] for supporting some organizations of the totalitarian left. For example, the IRD has exposed church aid to [SWAPO] and the [ANC], two organizations with strong terrorist and totalitarian influences.

We have no reasonable evidence that the [SACC] is significantly dominated or influenced by Marxism-Leninism. While we do not necessarily endorse all the policies and programs of the [SACC], we find nothing improper in grants which assist that organization in seeking to change apartheid, a system which denies the democratic rights to a majority of South Africans.

Slander the sources of funding for 96 percent of the SACC's budget and damn it with faint praise. No word about the radically anti-democratic nature of the Eloff Commission itself. While the Eloff Commission sought out the IRD, Lefever, and other very conservative viewpoints during its visit to the US, the NCC Africa office through which most US church money flows to the SACC, had to request a meeting to express its support for the SACC. According to Willis Logan, Africa Secretary for the NCC, the visit was "an extension of the witch hunt" the South African government is carrying out against the churches facilitated by "the very conservative elements in the church in this country."

The IRD's Richard Neuhaus is also preparing "a critical study of South Africa from an American Christian point of view" after a visit to South Africa in late 1982, according to the IRD newsletter. At least some of his contacts within South Africa were made by the quasi-governmental South Africa Foundation although his trip was made "under the sponsorship of the US-based Council on Religion and International Affairs," according to the newsletter.

Contrast the tone of the IRD statement with that of Dr. Arie Brouwer, then General Secretary of the Reformed Church in America, who in March traveled to South Africa with Dr. J. Oscar McCloud, head of the United Presbyterian Church Program Agency, to testify before the Eloff Commission:

To declare the South African Council of Churches an affected organization will not isolate the SACC. It will, however, further isolate this land, which already stands alone in the world.... Our support for the [SACC] is given for the sake of South Africa and all its peoples. In our view—more and more widely held—the [SACC] is the only surviving mass movement in South Africa where black and white can come together to speak openly to one another. It is an oasis of peace and harmony in a land of injustice, anger, guilt, and fear.

In spite of its attempts to isolate the SACC, Pretoria is fighting a losing battle in its efforts to stop US church support for liberation in Southern Africa.
Apartheid Oppresses South African Churches

Randy Nunnelee joined WOA staff in October 1983. He was in South Africa in August and spoke to several church leaders.

"I've been detained four times, once for 210 days. They tortured me by every conceivable method, except by death and electric shock. I've even been buried alive."

—South African Pentecostal pastor

"The tortures you read about in the papers are just a summary of what takes place...[A]ll in all, I had to spend 106 days in [the] hospital because of these tortures. If a dean of the church, and a deputy bishop for that matter, can go through the mill in this fashion, how much worse are the things ordinary people suffer?"

—Dean Simon Farisani, Evangelical Lutheran Church of Venda, South Africa

Pastors. Christian ministers in detention, tortured, without trial or even charges brought against them. South Africa's notorious Security Police are now bringing these and other inhuman actions against Christian churches, their ministers and members in an attempt to stifle their dissent. The churches of South Africa are increasingly standing in solidarity with the struggle for liberation of the oppressed majority in South Africa.

This anti-apartheid stance manifests itself in many ways. Most churches in South Africa, apart from the pro-government, white Dutch Reformed Churches, are taking strong stands against the constitutional "reforms" approved in the November 2, 1983 referendum. One church leader told me they "change the complexion of apartheid" without changing its substance. The churches are also strong opponents of the racist regime's "Bantustan" policy which literally dumps three-fourths of the South African population onto barren, non-arable parcels of land totalling 13% of the territory, stripping them of South African citizenship. The churches continue to speak out against discriminatory "pass laws" and the forced removal of Blacks and other race groups from center city slums to inadequate, poorly constructed lodging in "townships" far from city jobs. Ministers, acting on recent church policy decisions, perform illegal, interracial marriages. Young white males, facing compulsory military service, are urged by their churches to consider conscientious objection, even though it means a six year prison sentence. Church members employ civil disobedience tactics against the regime's dehumanizing laws.

"Unregistered Black trade unions meet in our church facilities, and we have donated office space to them," said one church leader whose denomination also gives its assent to Black political groups and outspoken critics of apartheid.

The mostly Black Roman Catholic Church is also active in condemning the Afrikaner government. A recent pastoral letter from South Africa's Catholic bishops considered the proposed constitutional reforms "an affront to the people" which "ensures that racial discrimination will continue."

Also on the increase are church condemnations of the pro-apartheid, white Dutch Reformed Churches and other religious groups that take a pro-government line. The Alliance of Black Reformed Christians in South Africa (ABRECSA) and the Broederkring ("circle of brotherhood"), two organizations drawing on Black churches which are historically related to the Dutch Reformed "family," are especially critical, calling for a rejection of the apartheid system from a religious perspective. Their efforts, and especially those of Dr. Allan Boesak, who heads both ABRECSA and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, resulted in apartheid being declared heresy by many churches worldwide.

Indeed, South African churches have taken strong leadership in opposing apartheid. As G.J.A. Lubbe in the Broederkring Bulletin states:

"It has become very clear that, although the international Christian community is very aware and supportive, we ourselves are the instruments of change and liberation. This I believe means that we must move from the defensive to the offensive. The time that we must only react and counteract should be of the past."

Another leader of the church opposition to government oppression in South Africa is the South African Council of Churches (SACC). Its longstanding condemnation of apartheid has expanded into legal aid for the families of political prisoners and providing food and clothing to residents of the growing number of squatter camps. SACC General Secretary Bishop Desmond Tutu speaks openly against corporate investment in South Africa and vocally criticizes the repressive government. As he has often pointed out, the South African churches' political action and ever more strident criticisms of the government grow out of deep theological concerns in favor of liberation and against the regime's frequent violation of human rights (see box).

The Afrikaner government is retaliating, and churches now pay a terrible price for their opposition. In Blacks-only "townships," church leases (annually renewable) are discontinued or revoked by the government when the churches become too "politically active." Security Police round up pastors, severely torture them and hold them inconcommunicado when their opposition becomes too strong.

Mail comes intermittently to local and national offices of church groups, who often use code words in phone conversations to thwart wiretaps. Funerals, increasingly political as well as religious events, are frequently cancelled by police. Sermons to be broadcast on government controlled radio and television must be submitted two weeks in advance; no live church broadcasts are now permitted.

The assault is against personalities as well: one pastor, active in sitdown campaigns against forced removals in a Johannes­burg suburb, has been repeatedly denied a passport. Bishop Tutu's passport has been repeatedly seized. Rev. Smangaliso Mkhathwana, general secretary of the South African Bishops Conference, has been "banned" on previous occasions, and was detained in late October 1983 by police in Ciskei, an
"independent" Bantustan. And Lutheran lay preacher Isaac Muofhe was beaten to death while under detention by Venda Security Police in 1981. As Rev. Govender, of the Broederkring, noted: "The church is now on the firing line in South Africa; it's the only place left to us for legitimate protest. The past shows us that as soon as we start moving beyond words of protest, we will be crushed. But we must. The gospel requires it."

The South African Council of Churches is a particular target of this government backlash. The Eloff Commission's enquiry into its activities has paid particular attention to overseas funding, which makes up virtually all of the SACC's program budget. Commissioner of Police Gen. Johan Coetzee urged the Eloff Commission to declare the SACC an "affected organization," underlining the unspoken desire of the government to shut down the Council. "Affected organizations" cannot under South African law receive funds from sources outside South Africa.

Eloff Commission lawyers, who made visits to the U.S. and Europe in their search for ammunition against the SACC on behalf of the South African government, are considering prosecuting the church agency. Speculation by SACC staff members who spoke to me about this harassment points to prosecution of the SACC for its frequent open opposition to investments by foreign corporations (a crime punishable by a minimum of five years imprisonment and a maximum of death) and its equally flagrant disregard of "banning orders" (house arrest, forbidding quotation of "banned" individuals, and severe restriction on movements).

Church opposition to apartheid is not a new phenomenon, dating back at least as far as 1960, when the massacre of 69 people at Sharpeville led the African National Congress (now banned in South Africa) and other liberation movements to intensify their struggle to end oppression in South Africa. Church concern about this event was one factor leading to the World Council of Churches-sponsored ecumenical Cottesloe Consultation in 1960, out of which grew the Christian Institute. Dr. Beyers Naude, in becoming its director, was forced out of the Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk (NGK) (largest of the white Dutch Reformed Churches), in which he had considerable power. His increasing support for the liberation struggle, based on his Christian principles, culminated in the government shutdown of the Christian Institute and the "banning" of Dr. Naude in 1977 (recently renewed).

The South African Council of Churches faces similar problems. Prominent leaders may be "banned." The organization may be forced to close down due to direct government repression. This is intended by the South African government to put more pressure on churches in South Africa to stop opposing apartheid policies.

Prime Minister P.W. Botha warned in 1981 that churches should "keep themselves busy preaching the gospel." Increasingly, however, "preaching the gospel" in South Africa means direct confrontation with South Africa's racist government.

**Liberation Theology in SA**

"Apartheid is unique. But its uniqueness does not lie in the inherent violence of the system. . . . The uniqueness lies in its claim to be based on Christian principles. It is being justified on the basis of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." This is how Allan Boesak, Chairman of ABRECSA and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, describes one of the most astounding and insidious aspects of apartheid. Many of the initial white settlers in South Africa were strong Calvinists. They saw themselves as the new Israelites moving into a new Promised Land, and they saw the Blacks as "Canaanites." Therefore, they claimed it was God's will that they should subdue the Blacks and never allow the races to mix. This rationalization of racism continues to this day and has become deeply embedded in the white Dutch Reformed Church, the backbone of the apartheid establishment.

Yet, when theologians from South Africa and the rest of the world examined this supposed biblical and theological justification closely, they found it was without foundation. As Bishop Desmond Tutu, Secretary General of the South African Council of Churches (SACC), stated in his testimony before the Eloff Commission: "Consequently from a theological and scriptural base, . . . apartheid, separate development or whatever it is called is evil, totally and without remainder and . . . it is unchristian and unbiblical." The General Council of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (of which two South African Dutch reformed Churches were members until suspended because of their support for the apartheid system) echoed that; "apartheid is a sin, and . . . the moral and theological justification of it is a travesty of the Gospel, and in its persistent disobedience to the Word of God, a theological heresy." Many other South African churches and church organizations have endorsed this statement or made similar statements against apartheid.

The theological and scriptural base to which Bishop Tutu referred is part of a broader theological movement known as liberation theology. Liberation theology contends that theology is concerned not only with the spiritual and the other worldly. It is also concerned about justice and injustice in this world, material as well as spiritual sickness and well-being.

Liberation theologians cite the Old Testament prophets who spoke out against their unjust society, saying, "Woe to those who decree iniquitous decrees, and the writers who keep writing oppression, to turn aside the needy from justice and to rob the poor of my people of their right." (Isaiah 10:1-2) And they cite the New Testament when they contend that God's ministry through Jesus Christ was always one of helping the sick, the downtrodden and the outcast of society. Black theologians in South Africa see their situation similar to that of Jesus when he was killed by the civil authorities because his ministry with the poor and oppressed presented such a threat to those who had power. It is this support for the oppressed which forms the basis of Pretoria's attack on the churches.
Interview with Anwar Barkat

An important source of moral, political, and financial support for the liberation of Southern Africa has been the World Council of Churches Program to Combat Racism (PCR). We explore this important work in the following interview with the Program's Director, Dr. Anwar Barkat.

The World Council of Churches, and particularly the Program to Combat Racism, has come under steady attack for supporting the liberation movements of Southern Africa. What role do you feel the South African government has played in these international attacks on your work?

BARKAT: The Program to Combat Racism has no apologies to make for supporting the liberation struggle in Southern Africa. Churches around the world have given their support to those organizations of the oppressed which are struggling against the forces of racism. Nowhere are these forces more entrenched, more blatant and more demonic than in the legalized and institutionalized racism in South Africa. The WCC has helped to bring to the notice of the churches both within and outside of South Africa the massive violence conducted by the system against the Black population in South Africa. It has also helped the South African churches, both Black and white, especially those who are in the South African Council of Churches, to forge international linkages which help [them] resist apartheid and point to a more just and participatory society in South Africa.

The PCR runs directly counter to the evil policies of apartheid, Bantustans and cosmetic changes. Therefore South Africa regards the World Council of Churches as a major threat to its apartheid system. . . . South Africa has tried to buy influence through massive use of state funds, as was evident in the "Muldergate" case. But since most of their campaigns are crude and are related to already discredited institutions, their impact has been rather minimal. But this is an area which the American churches must be warned against; some of the institutions are, directly or indirectly, lobbies of the financial and economic interests of the South African government and some American businesses.

Was continuing WCC support for the liberation movements a very divisive issue at the Sixth Assembly in Vancouver?

BARKAT: This is a very easy question to answer because there were hardly any divisions or conflicts at Vancouver regarding the WCC support for liberation movements. As a matter of fact, some of the representatives of the liberation movements were present as observers and had the opportunity to engage in dialogue with the WCC Assembly delegates and a large number of people in the visitor's program. They helped to dispel a lot of lies that are told about their movements. It should not be difficult for an assembly of Christians to understand these people, because they come from situations where Christians are in the majority, especially in Namibia and South Africa. The delegates were also appreciative of the fact that the focus of the Special Fund of the PCR is not only limited to Southern Africa, although this is an important aspect of it, but rather has a global focus; that groups and movements all over the globe are recipients of grants from the Special Fund. Therefore we hardly had any controversy whatsoever regarding the Special Fund. Rather, some of the church leaders told me that they are "ashamed" that their churches have been intimidated not to support the Special Fund.

Firstly, we understand of course the relevance of some of these critics regarding the use of armed struggle to free the people of Southern Africa. Please remember that the critics happen to come from societies which have used armed struggles in the past and even openly went to war in order to claim for themselves the right to independence, self-determination and freedom. We have not heard such criticism from those who have suffered from racism and colonialism in the past. But when our critics raise these questions, it provides us with an opportunity to educate them regarding the real sources of violence. It also helps us to educate our critics about the nature of liberation movements. Liberation movements are not exclusively military organizations, but rather forms of alternative governments which have to take care of their people's need for food, health, schooling and future leadership. It is these humanitarian activities of the liberation movements that the WCC has supported and will continue to support.

Secondly, racism is a massive system of violence. The real sources of violence are not those who struggle against racism, but those who want to perpetuate it. [The critics'] one-sided view of violence is rather hypocritical. We at the WCC are against all types of violence, as Christians we cannot be supportive of violence. Let the record show that the WCC support has often led to the stopping of violence in racial war, as in Angola, Mozambique and recently Zimbabwe. It is really the so-called critics who stand for violence because they continue to support the forces of racism. The only real end to violence is the establishment of justice for racially oppressed people, and their full participation in the affairs of their motherland.

Are there ways in which the WCC plans to counter the attempts to intimidate member churches to withdraw their support of the liberation movements?

BARKAT: I do not think that any intimidation will work against the WCC. How can the WCC deny its faith in Jesus Christ? How can the WCC not work for the unity of the church and the unity of humankind? Therefore, the WCC will continue to combat racism in whatever shape and mask it may appear.
**Anti-Apartheid Victories**

Victory belonged to the anti-apartheid movement on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives on Thursday, October 27, 1983 when the Export Administration Act (H.R. 3331), containing four important South Africa provisions, was passed. The South Africa sections are: 1) Gray provision ending new U.S. corporate investment in South Africa; 2) Solarz provision mandating compliance with the Sullivan fair employment principles for all US corporations investing in South Africa, prohibiting commercial bank loans to the South African government, and banning the importation of South African gold coins, including Krugerrands; 3) Berman provision reinstating controls on exports to the South African military and police; and 4) Wolpe provision expanding nuclear nonproliferation export controls to include parts and technology transfers, as well as reactors and nuclear fuel, to countries (including South Africa) which refuse to accept full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on their nuclear facilities.

This victory follows another significant success in August 1983, when the House passed the International Recovery and Financial Stability Act (HR 2957), commonly referred to as the IMF authorization bill, which mandates a “no” vote by the U.S. representative to the IMF on loans to “any country which practices apartheid.” After much political wrangling, the House-Senate conference committee for the IMF bill should meet this November. While the Senate version of the IMF authorization does not contain the South Africa provision, it should remain in the joint version if strong support from the House side continues.

The passage of the South Africa amendments in the Export Administration Act was a definite indicator of the growing strength of the anti-apartheid movement nationwide. Three months ago, the Gray amendment was thought to have little chance of passage and strong resistance was expected to the Solarz and Berman provisions. Yet, the Gray amendment was overwhelmingly supported on the floor with thirty-six Congressmembers speaking for the amendment and only four against it, and there was no challenge to the Solarz or Berman provisions. The support for Gray’s bill was bi-partisan, including some from unexpected and conservative quarters. While not committing himself to all out support of the amendment, Jack Kemp (R-NY) spoke very favorably. Other Republican supporters were Jim Leach (R-IA), Ed Bethune (R-AR), Bob Livingston (R-LA), and Guy Molinari (R-NY). Many influential Southern Democrats also spoke, including Stephen Neal (D-NC), Bill Alexander (D-AR), and Lindy Boggs (D-LA), along with our usual supporters and allies: Howard Wolpe (D-MI), Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Africa, and several members of the Congressional Black Caucus, including George Crockett (D-MI), Ron Dellums (D-CA), John Conyers (D-MI), Charles Hayes (D-IL), Edolphus Towns (D-NY), and Mickey Leland (D-TX).

Those who spoke against the amendment were Gerald Solomon (R-NY), Philip Crane (R-IL), Joel Pritchard (R-WA), and Bill Frenzel (R-MN). They ineffectually voiced their usual concerns about hurting Blacks within South Africa or hurting the US strategically. Rep. Bethune’s comments summarized the response to this, “While it is easy to sit here and fashion reasons why we should not act, . . . let us instead think about reasons to act. It is necessary to break the mindset that exists in South Africa and we Americans can have a role in that.”

The Wolpe amendment to the Export Administration Act passed on the House floor on September 30, 1983 by a vote of 196-189. While not South Africa specific, the passage of the Wolpe amendment shows the increasing influence of the campaign to stop the “apartheid bomb.” If it becomes law, it will invalidate the recently granted Department of Energy license for maintenance and service of the Koeberg nuclear reactor in South Africa. The administration was afraid that the granting of the license would produce this type of response and delayed it, according to the Washington Post, due to “uneasiness over the potential political fallout of appearing to be eager to do nuclear business with South Africa.”

None of these victories would have been possible without hard work on the part of the sponsoring representatives and their staffs. Nor would it have been possible without the continuing efforts of the coalition of national and local organizations dedicated to promoting progressive U.S. policy toward Southern Africa. The growing strength of this coalition is validated by victories like those in the Export Administration Act.

The anti-apartheid movement still has many battles to fight. Along with the House-Senate conference on the Export Administration Act, there is a strong possibility that Congress will soon debate the issue of divestment for the first time. The Washington, D.C. City Council passed a comprehensive divestment bill (#5-18) on October 4, 1983. However, because of the limitations of the Congressional Home Rule Act for the District, it is possible that the U.S. Congress could veto the bill. A few conservative members of the House, including Stan Parris (R-VA) and Phillip Crane (R-IL), have already announced their intention to oppose the bill. It is necessary to keep all members of House and Senate alert and ready to oppose any attempts to thwart this important piece of legislation.

Also, as we move into election year 1984, Southern Africa issues will become increasingly important as a glaring example of the major flaws in the current administration’s foreign policy. The Reagan administration’s “constructive engagement” policy toward Southern Africa has failed to bring about Namibia’s freedom while encouraging an increase in internal repression in South Africa and an escalation in attacks by Pretoria against its neighbors. The anti-apartheid movement must work to ensure a radical change in U.S. Southern Africa policy.
Open Letter to the Western Contact Group

From the Namibian Council of Churches

Namibia is still not free. It remains under the brutal control of the South African military occupying forces. Namibia remains a battleground despite efforts by the international community in cooperation with SWAPO, the Namibian liberation movement, and the Namibian churches to reach an internationally-acceptable settlement with free and fair elections to bring about an independent, democratic government. This has yet to happen because of continued stalling by the apartheid regime assisted by the Reagan Administration. Impatient with the slowness of the negotiations and the obstacles introduced by South Africa and the US, the Namibian Council of Churches sent this letter last winter to the members of the western Contact Group (US, Canada, Great Britain, France, and West Germany).

Your Excellencies,

As we continue to hear and experience further wanton acts of destruction of life and property in our country, we, the Executive Committee of the Council of Churches in Namibia, representing 81% of Namibian Christians, meeting in Windhoek on the 28th of January, 1983, would like to state that, because of our commitment to reconciliation, justice, peace, and the preservation of human life, we remain resolved that independence under United Nations Security Council Resolution 435 is the only just and concrete solution to our country's plight.

Having supported your initiatives, we view with mounting concern the developing stalemate of non-existent progress in regard to the negotiations on the implementation of the said resolution which are now impeded by the irrelevant linkage of Cubans to the historical colonial problem of our country.

We wish to state also that the Cuban presence in the sovereign state of Angola is not a threat to the Namibian people. The historical priority is South Africa's continued occupation of Namibia without the consent and mandate from the majority of the people. We are disturbed that certain members of your group are obstructing and undermining the negotiations by trying to make their own domestic political capital from this irrelevant linkage, and by so doing, prolonging suffering and bloodshed in our country. We reject such obstruction, and consequently are beginning to question the authenticity and sincerity of the motives of your group.

The destructive effect of the status quo continues to escalate, and we urgently appeal to you to heed the will and rights of the Namibian people and their interests alone. Do everything in your power to remove the obstacles hindering the immediate implementation of Resolution 435.

We urge you to act promptly in order to restore the diminishing hope and expectations that we originally had in your initiative.

Yours sincerely,

The Executive Committee of the Council of Churches in Namibia
February 16, 1983

Washington Office on Africa
110 Maryland Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 546-7961
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