Dear Friend of the Coalition,

The struggle for majority rule in southern Africa may well be the next flash point for United States foreign policy. In many ways, we are in the same position as the early days of the Vietnam war, when the stage was being set for U.S. intervention but few understood the dangers that lay in store.

The conflict in southern Africa is escalating daily. Since the fall of Portuguese colonialism in 1974, it has become evident that minority regimes in South Africa and Rhodesia would not be able to hold out indefinitely against the tide of anti-colonialism sweeping through the continent. Armed struggle by liberation movements in Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) and Namibia has expanded after years of non-violent action brought only more repression. In 1976 South African youth activated a new phase of resistance when unarmed high school students in Soweto and all over the country stood up to police bullets. As resistance increases, the days of white rule in Zimbabwe and Namibia are clearly numbered. Soon the focus of attention and conflict will shift to the bastion of apartheid: South Africa.

In order to clarify the role of U.S. foreign policy in southern Africa and to alert you to 1979 Congressional battles, the Coalition has prepared this resource mailing on Zimbabwe. In it you will find an analysis of the U.S. role in negotiations, a detailed description of the "internal settlement," and action guidelines for 1979. As the press continues to distort the struggle for majority rule in Zimbabwe, we decided to include the pamphlet, "Zimbabwe: Winning Hearts and Minds," as background for demanding a more balanced coverage of the Zimbabwe conflict.

As the conflict in southern Africa escalates, the question of where the United States will stand becomes more urgent. Today, the U.S. still stands largely on the side of white minority rule. Massive U.S. corporate involvement -- backed by federal tax credits, Eximbank financing and large stabilization loans from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) -- has been helping South Africa become more economically self-sufficient, militarily strong and psychologically defiant. The U.S. has often sided politically with the South African government, even while giving rhetorical support to majority rule. Along with its European allies, the U.S. has consistently vetoed economic sanctions against South Africa at the United Nations. In October, President Carter lent his prestige to the new South African Prime Minister, P.W. Botha, by inviting him to the United States in return for cooperation on Zimbabwe and Namibia, suggesting a "carrot" rather than a "stick" policy approach to South Africa.

The U.S. has become deeply involved in trying to find a "moderate" solution to end the liberation struggles in Zimbabwe and Namibia. But time is quickly running out. In Zimbabwe, white minority leader Ian Smith has formed a transitional government without the Patriotic Front. He talks peace and negotiations, but the war and the political repression against the African majority worsens. In Namibia, the U.S. took the lead in trying to convince South Africa to accept U.N.-supervised elections, but South Africa has insisted on going ahead with its own "internal settlement" scheme. While the West professes advocacy for majority rule in Zimbabwe and Namibia, it has not demonstrated any willingness to enforce sanctions against the minority regimes. Without such pressure, neither Ian Smith nor the South African government is likely to yield power unless they are militarily defeated.

Right now, THE FOCUS IS ON ZIMBABWE. Progressives and conservatives alike know that what happens there will dramatically affect the larger struggle for South
Africa. Right-wing members of Congress started a campaign to lift sanctions against Rhodesia last summer, and in October sponsored a major propaganda tour for Ian Smith. Organisations of the New Right are focusing in on southern Africa. As one official of the American Conservative Union said last spring, "We've been up to our ears in alligators on the Panama Canal so far, but we expect to start raising the Rhodesian issue."

Where will the United States end up? Will the U.S. continue to collaborate with minority regimes in order to prevent popular liberation movements from coming to power, under the guise of stopping "communism" in Africa? The American Right has already begun building a major campaign to see that anti-communism becomes the foundation of U.S. policy toward southern Africa.

It is our responsibility to point out to the American people the real issue in southern Africa: ending U.S. support for minority rule. Minority rule will end, because the vast majority of Africans are committed to ending it by whatever means are necessary. It is not in the interests of the American people to support an oppressive system which is morally wrong and politically doomed.

We at the Coalition hope that the enclosed materials will help clarify many points concerning the current conflict in Zimbabwe. We also hope that they will help you prepare for the battles ahead.

Sincerely,

The Coalition Staff

P.S. We just won our first Congressional victory on South Africa!! On October 15, the last day of the legislative session for 1978, the Senate agreed to language passed by the House in June to restrict financing by the Export-Import Bank to South Africa. All financing to the South African government will now be prohibited, as will financial support to private companies which are not "proceeding toward implementing" fair employment practices. This is the FIRST time Congress has ever taken economic action against South Africa, and it is due in large part to the organizing and lobbying done across the country. Thank you for your work!
The Right in this country is having a growing impact on U.S. policy toward Zimbabwe and the rest of southern Africa that threatens to entangle the U.S. in opposition to human rights and majority rule. However, some voices within the Administration and increasingly in Congress favor phony solutions like the “internal settlement” in Rhodesia in which Africans would have nominal political control, but would not be able to fundamentally change the institutions which sustain the privilege of the white few amidst the poverty and powerlessness of the black majority.

As the liberation movements in Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) and Namibia have come closer to winning self-determination, the Right wing has placed a high priority on opposing what they regard as “communist, terrorist Africans backed by the Soviet Union.” Since the March 3rd agreement, the Right has been wooing organizations, members of Congress and influential media which consider themselves moderate or even liberal. The Washington Post, the New Republic and the Coalition for a Democratic Majority have all expressed sympathy for the Rhodesian “internal settlement,” indicating the success of this strategy.

At the same time, the Administration is caught in the dilemma of espousing self-determination for the people of Zimbabwe while trying to ensure that this process does not endanger Western economic and strategic interests. The Carter Administration broke new ground in announcing its support for majority rule in all of southern Africa. But it has done little to force the Smith regime to yield power to the African majority in Zimbabwe.

Right Wing Initiatives: The Push to Lift Sanctions

In early 1978, the Republican party declared that the Carter Administration’s failure to stop “marxist terrorists” in southern Africa would be a key issue against the President’s record. Rep. John Ashbrook (R-Ohio) summarized this view: “President Carter is... more willing to embrace terrorists and guerillas than a moderate anti-Communist government in Rhodesia.”

What followed was an array of Right-wing initiatives in Congress to help Ian Smith’s regime. Led by Sen. Jesse Helms (R-NC), a long-time enemy of the civil rights movement, the goal was to end U.S. compliance with sanctions against Rhodesia. The United Nations, with U.S. support, had imposed mandatory international diplomatic and economic sanctions against Rhodesia in response to Smith’s unilateral declaration of independence in 1965. On June 28, 1978, an amendment to unconditionally lift sanctions against Rhodesia for one year failed by only six votes.

One month later, a second attempt to lift sanctions resulted in the adoption of the compromise “Case-Javits amendment.” It requires the President to lift sanctions if he determines that the Smith regime is committed to an all-parties conference and free elections have been held under international observation.

Ian Smith’s visit to the U.S. in October was a fitting climax to the 1978 Right-wing campaign. Invited by Sen. S.I. Hayakawa (R-CA) and 27 of his colleagues, Smith and other members of the Rhodesian executive council launched a major propaganda campaign aimed at Congress and the public. The Right organized and programmed Smith’s show—from Senate press conferences to prime time TV talk-shows and interviews.

Receptions for Smith were sponsored by such groups as the Coalition for Peace Through Strength, the American Security Council and the American Conservative Union. Among Republican notables who met with him and generally supported the internal settlement were Gerald R. Ford, Henry Kissinger, David Rockefeller, John Connolly and Ronald Reagan.

(continued on back)
Analysis of the Internal Settlement

On March 3, 1978 Ian Smith and three leading African moderates, Abel Mazorewa, Ndabinini Sithole and Jeremiah Chirau, agreed to commit Rhodesia to ten more years of white domination of its government and economy.

The March 3rd Agreement promised a new constitution and elections by December 31, 1978. However, elections have been postponed at least until April 20, 1979, and the promise of democracy continues unfulfilled. If and when elections are held, blacks will not be registered to vote; whites will be. Blacks will have to vote a straight party ticket: whites will vote for whomever they please. Whites will be permitted a referendum on the new constitution; blacks will not. In addition, the two Patriotic Front parties which control one-half to two-thirds of the country are banned and, therefore, excluded from the elections.

The March 3rd Agreement included constitutional provisions which could not be altered for ten years. For at least ten years the civil service, police, military and judges appointed by Smith's Rhodesian Front Party will stay intact. Property and pension rights, the only rights enumerated in a proposed Declaration of Rights, are also immutable.

The Agreement mandated a legislature in which black representation would increase but be circumscribed by the white minority's power to veto any legislation involving substantive change. The black 96% of the population would vote for 72 of the 100 seats in the legislature. The 3-4% white population would vote for all 100 seats with 28 seats reserved for whites. Even if all black legislators supported a proposed change, 21% of the white legislators would have to support it for it to be enacted. Under these provisions each white vote will have nine times the weight of each black vote.

Political Participation and Majority Rule

The most glaring defect in the Internal Settlement is its exclusion of the people who have struggled since 1961 first to reform and later—when banned, persecuted and imprisoned—to overthrow the Smith government. The Patriotic Front is a union of two political parties, ZANU and ZAPU, which combine diverse political philosophies and share a commitment to immediate transfer of power to the African majority.

The Patriotic Front took up arms against Ian Smith more than six years ago. Robert Mugabe and Joshua Nkomo, leaders of the Patriotic Front, were imprisoned by Smith for ten years for opposing minority rule. They have consistently offered to negotiate with Smith and his colleagues on the basis of the British-American proposals. The Patriotic Front has not accepted the ten-year framework for majority rule set forth in the March 3rd Agreement since its goal is a society in which blacks and whites can contribute and benefit equally, and where white privileges will be ended.

Smith continues to oppose the British-American proposals. In October 1978 he said he would negotiate with no preconditions. The Patriotic Front, knowing Smith as they do, are suspicious of such an offer. They maintain that Smith only wants the West to perceive his offer as reasonable and a just cause for lifting sanctions. With the war costing his government $1 million a day and with whites emigrating at a rate of 1500 a month, Smith needs Western support to continue in power.

In moments of candor Smith himself admits that his seeming acceptance of eventual majority rule is a myth designed for Western consumption. In an interview with the South African newspaper, The Rand Daily Mail (6/1/78), he said:

"...[1976] was the first time we had indicated we were prepared to accept this thing called majority rule. Before that we had been opposed to it. I believed rightly so. In principle I am still opposed to it. I think it is the wrong thing."

Maneuvers to Lift Sanctions?

In 1977 Britain and the U.S. proposed a plan to create an independent Zimbabwe with majority rule and protection of the minority. The plan was accepted as a basis of negotiation by the Patriotic Front and the Front-Line States which border Rhodesia. The plan included 1) surrender of the Smith government to a British-supervised transitional administration, 2) appointment of a British Resident Commissioner to oversee a six month transitional period, 3) all-parties negotiations to design the new country's government, and 4) creation of a U.N. Force to maintain peace in the six months prior to elections.

In proposing the March 3 Agreement Smith rejected those British-American proposals. Rather than six months to majority rule, he agreed to ten years; rather than surrendering, he admitted three black leaders into his government. In effect, Smith maintained the institutions which have prevented black participation in Rhodesia's government and economy for 14 years. Smith hoped the presence of Africans in his government would lend credibility to the minimal concessions he was making and would quiet international clamor for a transfer of power to the African majority.

Smith hoped to persuade the West to lift the economic sanctions which had been imposed in 1965 by the United Nations at Britain's request. Sanctions require a complete embargo on relations with Rhodesia: no trade, no transfer of money, no recognition of passports. The U.N. embargo was expected to force Smith to resign. But its effectiveness was undermined by the deliberate violations of five Western oil companies: Mobil, Caltex (Texaco), Royal Dutch Shell, BP and Total (French). Disguising their law-breaking through paper corporations, these five firms continue to supply Rhodesia with oil.

Despite these violations, sanctions combined with six years of armed resistance by the Patriotic Front have taken their toll. Smith was forced to look for a way to persuade the West to end sanctions. Bringing Africans into his government and allowing a limited increase in black representation in the legislature seemed to be his answer.
Conditions Under the Internal Settlement

The internal settlement has made conditions worse, not better, for the majority of Zimbabweans:

**Political Repression:** Nothing approaching political freedom exists in Zimbabwe today. All security legislation enacted by the Rhodesian Front regime since 1965 is still on the books, and the State of Emergency was renewed for another year in 1978. Around 300,000 Africans live in "protected villages," which even Ian Smith called "prisons" in September. Curfews, as long as 22 hours a day, are imposed in virtually all tribal trust lands; curfew-breakers are summarily shot. Since September 1978, martial law has been imposed on almost 75% of the population. New military courts will have the power to sentence alleged guerrillas, and those accused of helping them, to death. Every member of the army and police has the power to impose indefinite detention without trial.

**Racial Discrimination:** The promise of an end to racial segregation was one of the strongest arguments in support of the internal settlement. But steps in this direction have been slow and insignificant. While Smith was in the United States, the Executive Council announced that it was considering ending official segregation in white residential areas, schools and hospitals. But racial segregation will be replaced by a legalized multi-tiered system of "monetary discrimination," according to Rowan Cronje, white commissioner of health and education. In a country where white income is 11 times that of Africans, *de facto* segregation will rule.

**Freedom of the Press:** In October 1978, the transitional government closed the only remaining black-operated paper in Zimbabwe, the *Zimbabwe Times*. Journalists are forbidden to mention the Patriotic Front or its leaders, and censors routinely replace the word "guerilla" with "terrorist." Journalists who don't follow the government line are silenced. Black reporters critical of the internal settlement have been arrested or have disappeared.

**Detentions and Political Prisoners:** In April and May more than 700 political detainees were released by the transitional government. But, according to testimony of the well-respected International Defense and Aid Fund for Southern Africa before the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in August: "New prisoners have replaced those freed... police harassment and arrested have intensified." Since then, an additional 700 people, mostly ZAPU supporters, have been detained. The release program never included at least 1,570 political prisoners convicted under the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act and other repressive legislation.

**The War and Its Atrocities:** Since the signing of the internal settlement, the war has intensified and the army and police have continued their attacks on the people. In the Gutu Tribal Trust Land in May 1978, security forces fired on an unarmed crowd listening to a representative of the Patriotic Front. According to reliable church sources inside the country, as the crowd of about 150 lay face down on the ground, the regime's forces shot directly at them. At least 60 people died immediately. The government communique on the incident read simply: "In the resulting firefight 50 curfew-breakers were killed, and another 24 wounded."

The Rhodesian army has also continued its devastating attacks on Mozambique and Zambia, killing hundreds of Zimbabweans. In five major attacks since March 3rd, the Rhodesian military has killed and wounded mostly civilian refugees, claiming attacks on guerrillas. While Smith promised in Washington to go to an all-parties conference, he simultaneously launched the largest single cross-border operation of the war into Zambia.

Who's Who in Rhodesia

**Groups Participating in the Internal Settlement:**


ANC (African National Council-Sithole) Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole, President. Sithole was President of ZANU until 1974 when he was deposed. Sithole still calls his organization ANC (Sithole) and "ZANU" interchangeably.

ZUPO (Zimbabwe United People's Organization) Chief Jeremiah Chirau, President. Chirau, a traditional chief, has long participated in the Rhodesian Front government. ZUPO was formed in 1976.

Rhodesian Front Party, Ian Smith, leader. Has held power since 1964. Unilaterally declared independence from Britain in 1965, leading to imposition of U.N. sanctions.

**Groups Opposed to the Internal Settlement:**

ZAPU (Zimbabwe African People Union) Joshua Nkomo, President. Formed in 1961 after other opposition groups were banned. Engaged in peaceful protest which was harshly repressed, then turned to armed struggle. Carries out guerrilla activity from Zambia.

ZANU (Zimbabwe African National Union) Robert Mugabe, President. Created in 1963 after split within ZAPU. Carries out guerrilla activity from Mozambique. ZAPU and ZANU have united for negotiating purposes, forming the Patriotic Front.

Front-Line States. Five countries surrounding Zimbabwe involved in negotiations since 1976: Tanzania (President Julius Nyerere), Mozambique (President Samora Machel), Angola (President Agostinho Neto), Zambia (President Kenneth Kaunda) and Botswana (President Seretse Khama).