NEW STATE DEPARTMENT APPOINTMENTS MAY SIGNAL HARDER-LINE U.S.-SOUTHERN AFRICA POLICY

On Wednesday, February 19, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will consider the nomination of Nathaniel Davis as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.

The Davis appointment is no routine shuffle within the Africa Bureau. Davis has been nominated to replace Donald Easum, an Africanist who served only nine months in the post. Mr. Davis, however, has no African experience, and the experience he does bring to this job is cause for greater concern.

Mr. Davis was Ambassador to Chile during the coup which toppled the Allende regime, and Ambassador two years earlier to Guatemala, when official U.S. policy was to support an anti-insurgency program in which 20,000 Guatemalans were killed.

Davis' appointment emerges as part of a recent pattern of assigning several diplomats with counter-insurgency and destabilization experience in Latin America to key posts in southern Africa. In June, President Nixon sent Deane Hinton to Zaire as U.S. Ambassador. Hinton served in Chile and Guatemala as AID Director. At the same time, Jeffrey Davidow, another of Davis' colleagues from Chile and Guatemala, was sent as first political officer to South Africa. On February 12, the White House announced that the new Ambassador to South Africa will be William Bowdler, who served in Cuba when Castro came to power, and who followed Davis as Ambassador to Guatemala in 1971.

African leaders have greeted the Davis appointment with dismay. President Mobutu of Zaire, one of the African leaders most friendly to the United States, opened the recent African-American Institute conference in Kinshasa by saying that he was "very surprised to learn not only that Mr. Easum was fired, but also that his successor is the former U.S. Ambassador to Chile at the time President Allende died." Congressman Diggs cabled from Africa that "At every stop on my current study mission to Africa, African leaders have voiced their strong opposition to this nomination."

A closer look at Davis' experience in Chile justifies the Africans' concern. During Nathaniel Davis' tenure in Chile, over $5 million of C.I.A. money was authorized to fund anti-Allende candidates and for general "political destabilization". William Colby, C.I.A. Director, has testified that the C.I.A. informed diplomatic personnel in Chile of all
C.I.A. activities there. The United States also used overt economic measures to undermine the Allende government. The Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and World Bank denied loan requests, except for military projects, in order to weaken the economy. Immediately after the coup, loans were released.

Secretary Kissinger defended Davis' role in Chile by saying, "Ambassadors are not the creators of policy... These decisions may later become unpopular; we cannot, however, stigmatize the Ambassador or Foreign Service Officer who did what he was told to do."

Secretary Kissinger has now appointed Davis to a position in which he will have a greater share in the creation of policy, and Davis can be expected to apply his past experience to his reading of political developments and policy recommendations.

In Angola, the United States could find a fertile field for political intervention. The three main liberation movements, MPLA, FNLA, and UNITA, have coalesced in a transitional government to bring the country to independence on November 11. These movements have a history of diverse ideologies, programs and bases of support. The U.S. has given technical and financial support to one of the movements in the past, and is carefully watching the post-colonial picture. The London Times of October 20, 1974 reported that C.I.A. men in Portugal were intent upon seeing that "the right guys" emerge as leaders of Angolan independence. The United States may well promote a political party friendly to Gulf Oil's large investment in Cabinda, rather than accept and support the delicate coalition.

In Mozambique, Frelimo faces a tremendous task of building a viable economy out of the legacy of colonial dependence on Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia. Mozambican ports draw substantial revenue from South African and Rhodesian exports. Some 100,000 Mozambicans, paid partly in gold, earn important foreign exchange from their work in South Africa's mines. Frelimo will be seeking outside assistance to build a base for a self-reliant economy. If the United States and western multilateral financial institutions which the U.S. largely controls respond with large amounts of aid, the United States could have considerable leverage in demanding economic and political moderation.

In Rhodesia and Namibia, the crumbling of Portuguese rule has brought majority rule so close that even the South African government has recognized its inevitability. So South Africa is trying to pave the way for moderate forces to gain political power, to provide a buffer zone protecting her from the rest of independent Africa and to derive large benefits from continued economic co-operation.

The pressing question for U.S. policy is: Will the United States use the leverage it has with South Africa to ensure that South Africa withdraws its military, para-military and police forces from these countries and does not interfere with the political decisions of the Rhodesian and Namibian people? The even larger question is whether the United States will press South Africa to change its Apartheid policies of economic exploitation and political disenfranchisement.
These new diplomatic appointments suggest that the United States is hardening rather than improving its policy toward southern Africa. Secretary Kissinger is putting in a team of trusted diplomats who share his global, "real-politik" outlook to give him hard-nosed intelligence on the economic and political direction taken by the new governments in Angola and Mozambique, and by the growing opposition in Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa. These are people with experience in destabilizing governments which become hostile to U.S. economic investment or which provide a successful socialist model to part of the Third World. These are people with experience in supporting repressive regimes in countries where U.S. companies benefit from a policy of economic injustice and exploitation.

The fundamental basis of U.S. policy toward southern Africa revealed in the National Security Council consideration in 1969-70 seems even more relevant to U.S. policy-makers today than when it was formulated: balance our relations in the area by compensating for—rather than abandoning—our tangible interests in the white states; use whatever means necessary to turn the sights of the black states away from total liberation of the continent, so that the United States can continue to pursue its perceived economic and strategic interests in both the independent Black states and in South Africa.

Senate confirmation of the Davis nomination will be controversial. At the February 19 hearing, Congressman Harrington will ask some hard questions about Mr. Davis' Chile background, and Congressman Diggs plans to testify to the folly of appointing Davis to head the Africa Bureau in the face of strong opposition from African leaders. Representatives of the Washington Office on Africa, the American Committee on Africa, the National Council of Churches and the Maryknoll Sisters also plan to testify.

The full Senate will vote on the Davis confirmation in about two weeks. Please write to your Senators expressing your deep concern about the Davis appointment and the policy he might recommend for southern Africa.

NEW SANCTIONS BILL PROGRESSES
BUT ENCOUNTERS TROUBLES IN 94TH CONGRESS

The Congressional drive to restore U.S. compliance with Rhodesian sanctions continues. Congressman Don Fraser, joined by Congressmen Diggs, Biester and Buchanan, introduced the same bill which died in the 93rd Congress on the opening day of the 94th. A breakfast for new Representatives at the end of January was well-attended and provided a fresh impetus. Twenty-six first-term members are now co-sponsors, along with enough of the former sponsors to bring the list up to 106 as of this writing.

Because of the slow process of re-organizing the Foreign Affairs Committee, hearings on the bill, originally scheduled for January 30, have had to be postponed until the Subcommittee of which Don Fraser is the head
is fully constituted. Hearings are expected to take place in early March. Witnesses invited include Senator McGee, E.F. Andrews for the stainless steel industry, a spokesman from the State Department, and Canaan Banana, Deputy President of the African National Council of Zimbabwe.

Meanwhile, the opponents of sanctions have renewed their tactics of obstruction and delay. On February 4, the Armed Services Committee directed its chairman to ask the Speaker to refer the sanctions bill to it for "concurrent" jurisdiction with the Foreign Affairs Committee or for "sequential" jurisdiction after the Foreign Affairs Committee has acted. The latter type would have a time limit, so the Armed Services Committee could not kill the bill by inaction. The Speaker has committed himself to no delays on the Byrd Amendment repeal, but any type of consideration by the conservative Armed Services Committee will probably complicate the bill with amendments that will severely cripple it on the floor. Since the rules on this process are new, predictions as to the outcome are difficult.

Until the procedural questions are decided, door-to-door lobbying for floor votes on Capitol Hill will be minimal. However, constituency work with several members could be very helpful. Canvas supportive members of the Foreign Affairs Committee to ensure that they will again support the bill when it comes before their Committee, and urge them to oppose crippling joint jurisdiction with the Armed Services Committee. Talk with the few co-sponsors from the 93rd session who did not join on again to urge that they still cast their floor vote in favor of sanctions. These include, among others, Edward Boland (MA), Les Aspin and David Obey (WI), Ike Andrews, Charles Rose and Richardson Preyer (N.C.), Edwin Forsythe and Edward Patten (N.J.), and Joseph Gaydos (PA). If your Representative was newly elected in November, urge him or her to make a commitment to support the sanctions bill.

REPUBLICAN LAWMAKERS RETURN FROM SOUTH AFRICA WITH PLANS FOR CLOSER U.S.- SOUTH AFRICA MILITARY LINKS

The Ranking Minority member of the House Armed Services Committee, Bob Wilson of California, and five Republican colleagues have just returned from an all-expenses-paid 13-day trip to South Africa. They are enthusiastic about the progress South Africa is making and seem ready to recommend to Congress a much closer military alliance with the racist regime.

Ostensibly paid for by a Pretoria businessman, Werner Ackerman, the trip is clearly the result of the continuing efforts of South Africa’s Ministry of Information to foster U.S. Navy use of South Africa’s ports and to eliminate the arms embargo.

Despite attempts by the group to label the trip as purely tourism, its itinerary, carefully planned by Dr. Eschel Rhodie's department, had a clear political agenda. Not only did the group get a briefing from South Africa's military, they were shown the Simonstown Naval Base, the top-secret Silvermine Communications facility in the Cape's mountains and the Atlas Aircraft plant.
Congressman Bob Wilson, who acted as spokesman for the group, called Simonstown a "substitute or better substitute" for Diego Garcia as a naval base "if we are unable to legislate a base in the middle of the Indian Ocean."

Wilson told Die Burger on January 23: "There are members of Congress who feel that America must not increase its presence in the Indian Ocean, but since the oil crisis of last year I think it has become necessary that we protect the important trade routes of the free world. I would like to hear how the people here feel about the possibility of such a base /for a U.S. fueling depot/.

Wilson and the group appear to favor eliminating the U.S. arms embargo against South Africa. After meeting Kaiser Matanzima, the Transkei Homeland Chief, the South African Indian Council and the Editor of the white-controlled black paper The World, Wilson said, "These sanctions, such as the arms embargo, were the central theme of our discussions. The sanctions are meant to help the Blacks, but we found we are really striking at them. Matanzima is the only Homeland leader who has accepted independence for his fragment of South Africa. His regime and the Indian Council are widely regarded as puppets of the South African government.

Wilson dismissed the racism inherent in Apartheid: "The race question is not as serious as extremists would have the public think." "Look, we have our problems with race discrimination, problems with crime, inflation - we don't have all the answers. We don't expect that you have all the answers to your problems." Loosening the arms embargo would in fact be helping a friend at the United Nations and a nation which has made extraordinary progress in race relations, according to Wilson. He views South Africa's government as "enlightened".

The English-language Rand Daily Mail raised questions as to whether the trip was not in fact a "subterfuge" and an evasion of U.S. law. The House Ethics Committee has ruled that members of Congress are barred by the Constitution from making trips financed by foreign governments unless Congress consents. Clearly, the South African Ministry of Information arranged the trip, but did it in fact also pay for it, using Ackerman as a channel?

While Congressman Ketchum of California dismissed the Constitutional requirement as "farcical", the participants were at pains to see that the trip had the cover of apparent legality. But discrepancies suggest that Ackerman was only a conduit. While the South African businessman claimed that he had invited Congressmen whom he had met on a previous visit to the U.S., several in the group, including Wilson, said that had never met Mr. Ackerman before. Furthermore, Ackerman's participation seems to have been introduced only after the question of legality surfaced, according to Bill Chappell, a Florida Democrat who was deterred from making the trip at the last minute.

South Africa's Nationalist Party organ, Die Vaterland, attacked the Rand Daily Mail's expose of the visit as part of a "backdoor campaign", calling their coverage an unpatriotic assault on the national interest fomented by the Africa Bureau of the State Department.

In the United States, however, the Norfolk, Virginia Virginian-Pilot
attacked the junket and Congressman Whitehurst's participation in it. "What is certain ... is that neither South Africa nor South Africans are picking up the tab without expecting something in return. The Congressmen have shamed themselves."

Other Congressmen on the trip besides Wilson, Ketchum and Whitehurst were Clair Burgener (San Diego), Philip Crane (Chicago), Norman Lent (Long Island). Whitehurst and Wilson are on the Armed Services Committee. Ketchum and Burgener have large Navy bases in their districts.

This visit should be seen in the context of the plan by the South African Department of Information to cultivate friends at the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill. Last January, Dr. Cornelius Mulder, Minister of Information, visited Vice Admiral Ray Peet, the senior officer responsible for International Security Affairs and the Indian Ocean. In May, South Africa's top military officer, Admiral Hugo Bierman, met with Admiral Thomas Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and with J.W. Middendorf, Acting Secretary of the Navy. To help win friends in Congress like Bob Wilson, Mulder has hired a Washington law firm, Collier, Shannon, Hill and Edwards, to lobby for them and has beefed up its Information offices in Washington and elsewhere.

While it is too early to tell what results these efforts will yield, the Congressmen's expressions of support for South Africa during their junket raise considerable concern, given Congressional support for a strong U.S. defense posture in the Indian Ocean.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
ELIMINATES REGIONAL SUBCOMMITTEES

The House Subcommittee on Africa is no more, victim of a re-organization plan of the Democrats on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. On February 3, they decided unanimously to re-organize the work of the Committee by function alone rather than partly by function and partly by region. Chairman Diggs, who was touring Africa for a month, found that he was the only opponent of the plan. He will return to find himself the Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Resources, Food and Energy.

The Committee re-organization re-enforces a trend in the Administration to consider foreign affairs in terms of global strategies and world-wide economic relationships based on the primary consideration of U.S. interests.

Anyone who has followed the debates on U.S. policy toward the white regimes in southern Africa is aware of the gold mine of information and exposure which Chairman Diggs and his Subcommittee on Africa has provided through a process of hearings during the last five years. It is difficult to see how Mr. Diggs will be able to continue this kind of Congressional focus on U.S. policy in Africa.