Reagan Defends South Africa Policy

This summer the Reagan Administration issued a major policy statement on Southern Africa in an attempt to counter the popular perception that the administration supports apartheid. In a June 23 speech delivered to the National Conference of Editorial Writers in San Francisco, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Lawrence S. Eagleburger defended the administration's policy of "constructive engagement" toward South Africa. With the 1984 presidential elections fast approaching, the administration is concerned at the lack of a significant diplomatic victory in Southern Africa and the increasing congressional opposition to "constructive engagement."

The speech initially succeeded in its goal of stemming growing media criticism of "constructive engagement." Newspaper coverage focused on Eagleburger's depiction of South Africa's racial policies as "morally wrong" and on his assertion that administration policy stood "against injustice." They highlighted his condemnation of South Africa's system of repression and the administration's rejection of Pretoria's "Bantustan" policy, the backbone of apartheid's land and labor laws, quoting him as saying, "We do not and will not recognize these areas." The conservative Washington Times called the speech "a blistering attack on South Africa."

The statement, however, also served to underline the administration's continued alliance with South Africa. Behind the criticism of apartheid lay the same concern with "regional security" to ensure continued corporate investment and strategic mineral extraction in South Africa and Namibia and access to the Cape Sea route. Eagleburger made it clear that the administration continues to oppose sanctions on Pretoria for its racist policies. He denounced legislation now pending before Congress that would limit US economic support for white minority rule in South Africa as moves that would "assure our irrelevance" in the region. Eagleburger was unable, however, to cite one concrete achievement of a policy which, after two and a half years, has managed to do little more than alienate Black Africa while strengthening US military and political ties with Pretoria. He ignored mentioning how Reagan's "constructive engagement" policy has encouraged Pretoria to intensify its crackdown on opponents inside South Africa, escalate destabilization of the Frontline states, and back away from ending its military occupation of Namibia.

Grasping at Straws in South Africa

Eagleburger's touting of superficial "advances" in South Africa to justify Reagan's floundering policy underlines the degree to which the administration is increasingly on the defensive. Citing Prime Minister PW Botha's "reforms," particularly his proposed constitutional changes to include "Coloureds" and Asians—but not Africans—in a separate parliament, Eagleburger said it was "an indisputable fact... that the South African government has taken the first step toward extending national political rights beyond the white minority."

"There is a tendency," he continued, "to reject all incremental improvements... in South Africa that are not explicitly linked to a full-blown democratic blueprint." Although he was referring to critics in the US, it equally applies to opponents of apartheid inside South Africa. The majority of Black South Africans have rejected the constitutional "reforms" as a sham.

Eagleburger commended Botha for putting his "own political base in jeopardy" with this "bold step." While it is true that South Africa's white community is seriously divided over Botha's constitutional changes, Eagleburger failed to recognize that Botha is simply trying to concede as little as possible to quell the rising tide of Black discontent. As African National...
Congress (ANC) President Oliver Tambo noted in August, rather than arising from a change of heart, these reforms "are an adjustment to a new reality which consists in the ever-growing effectiveness of the liberation struggle..." Thus the changes within South Africa which Eagleburger praised are efforts to modernize and further consolidate apartheid, to entrench white power rather than eliminate it.

Eagleburger failed to note that these "reforms" exist side by side with increased repression inside South Africa. Church,

Botha: "Certainly the government would not comply with any demand for one man, one vote in a unitary system."

trade union, and community leaders who speak out against the regime are still systematically banned, detained, tortured, and sometimes killed. Last year Afrikaner writer Andre Brink graphically summed up how little has really changed in South Africa:

[Neil] Aggerts still die and security police are still allowed a mandate to do unto others what may be done to them under another regime. [Saul] Mkhize is still shot when they dare to publicize the fact that their people are uprooted from their traditional homes, and hundreds of thousands of people are still dumped in pseudo-concentration camps in the wastelands of allegedly independent states. Beyers Naude and Winnie Mandela and the Reverend Maquina of Port Elizabeth are still silenced. The place of one's abode and the choice of one's marriage partner are still determined by one's pigmentation. If Black trade unions are now legal their leadership is still being harassed and persecuted and driven into exile or death. If the new dispensation allows Coloureds and Indians the vote (on separate rolls of course), they will still remain second-class citizens.

Eagleburger's condemnation of South Africa's repression rings hollow in the face of administration decisions to allow the export of computers and shock batons to assist in such repression.

Eagleburger believes it is incumbent on the US to "avoid the arrogance of rejecting" individual steps inside South Africa because Americans cannot "expect South Africa's would-be reformers to announce their game plan and their bottom line to the world at large." The "bottom line" of South Africa's white rulers, however, is not secret. Following Eagleburger's speech, Prime Minister Botha emphasized that "certainly the government would not comply with any demand for one man, one vote in a unitary system." As South African journalist Barry Strieck writes: "[T]hose in power are not even trying to devise a system that could be acceptable to the majority of South Africans. In short, the fundamental aim of 'Grand Apartheid'—to prevent Black majority rule over the whole of South Africa—is inherently maintained in whatever reforms are being proposed." Administration praise for these measures has only reinforced white minority intransigence in South Africa and has sought to obscure the fact that so-called "incremental improvements" are means of avoiding fundamental changes, not moving toward them.

Regional Security: Frontline States Lose Out

Eagleburger conceded that "regional stability in Southern Africa is unlikely to take root in the absence of basic movement away from a system of legally entrenched rule by the white minority in South Africa." However, he claimed that "peaceful change toward social justice and equality for all South Africans is unlikely to happen in a regional climate of escalating strife and polarization." He advanced "reciprocity" and "patience, restraint, and dialogue" between South Africa and its neighbors. Both South Africa and the Frontline states, he continued, have a duty to stop use of their territory by guerrillas "planning acts of violence in the territory of another state."

Administration support for "quiet diplomacy," however, has totally failed to restrain Pretoria's growing military aggression in the region. South Africa has ignored "patience, restraint, and dialogue" in utilizing its military might and economic power to destabilize neighboring countries. "Constructive engagement" has merely allowed Pretoria a carte blanche to engage not only in overt military actions, but also in covert destabilizing activities employing surrogate forces such as the Lesotho Liberation Army, the Mozambique National Resistance, and UNITA in Angola.

Lesotho has been especially hard hit by this aggression. Totally surrounded by South Africa, Lesotho is a graphic case study of South African regional destabilization. As Lesotho's Prime Minister Leabua Jonathan has emphatically stated: "Lesotho's immediate problem is apartheid aggression."

In addition to restricting overland border traffic to and from Lesotho, Pretoria this summer cut off all electricity in the capital, Maseru, for several hours each evening. The restrictions on the flow of migrants and supplies along the Lesotho border, Jonathan stated, are evidence of Pretoria's attempt to "economically intimidate the Basotho into docility."

Lesotho has been especially targeted because, despite its
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dependency on South Africa, it has for years maintained a policy of hosting refugees fleeing the apartheid regime. Pretoria has claimed that Lesotho and other Southern African states are being used as springboards for ANC military operations inside South Africa. South African Defense Force General Constand Viljoen warned states in the region: "If their rulers wish to aid the ANC, then they must pay the price." Chester Crocker, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs and a prime architect of "constructive engagement," implicitly approved Viljoen's warning in a statement to the Voice of America. The newspaper Oostereer paraphrased Crocker as saying: "If South Africa's neighbors hoped to bring the Republic to her knees by giving more support to terrorists, they themselves would be the first victims."

Lesotho has paid and continues to pay a high price for harboring refugees. Pretoria launched military attacks on Maseru in December 1982, killing 42 South African refugees and Lesothoans, and again in May 1983. As the ANC noted after the December raid, the South Africans "hope to intimidate the people of Lesotho and other countries into seeing their support of the ANC as a liability. They want the people of independent Africa to feel their security as a nation will be assured by the racists but only if they expel the ANC from their territory."

Lesotho informed the United Nations in August of its reluctant decision to expel up to 3,000 Black South African refugees because it was being "strangulated and suffocated" by South Africa's military and economic intrigues. In early September, Lesotho began deporting some of those refugees. In an appeal to the international community for effective counter-pressures on South Africa, Lesotho Foreign Minister Evaristus Sekonyana remarked, "unless pressure can be brought to bear on South Africa, there is nothing we can do—Lesotho has no options." Direct discussions between Lesotho, representatives from Frontline countries, and the US State Department have evidently produced no results. A State Department spokesman has said that the US is simply playing the "broker" in the region and had to be sensitive to both sides. South Africa will continue to squeeze Lesotho and the other neighboring states as long as the Reagan Administration's concern for "regional security" is so lopsided in favor of protecting the apartheid state.

This lopsided policy has had an especially devastating effect on Namibia as well. Suffering under illegal South African military occupation, the Namibian people must bear the brunt of Reagan and Botha's continued stalling on reaching an internationally-acceptable settlement for the independence of their country. Agreement is no nearer than it was two years ago; the US and South Africa continue to insist on an agreement for the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a precondition to a settlement. Indicating it has no intention of settling soon, South Africa has recently pursued another internal settlement forming a new Namibian state council. John Kirkpatrick, a White House politician, summed up the plan by stating: "It is a pointless exercise if you are expecting a settlement, and makes sense only if you are not."

"Constructive engagement" has failed miserably in its efforts to bring about Namibia's independence.

"Kissinger's Enforcer"

At the core of the administration's plan for "regional security" is its concern to keep South Africa free from Soviet influence. "Historically it is a zone of western influence and has been so for 300 years," Eagleburger said, retrospectively projecting East-West conflict back over three centuries of colonialism and white settler rule. The advent of decolonization, he stated, has opened the region to the danger of collapse and penetration by the USSR, "the advocates of violence." "If we wish to shape events," he continued, we must be involved and "prepared to oppose those from outside Africa who claim a right to violent intervention." Eagleburger is singing a refrain from the same old Cold War song.

Eagleburger ignores the fact that the principle cause for regional instability is not Soviet penetration but the very existence of white minority rule, its economic domination of the region, and its destabilization of the majority-ruled Frontline states. Because the administration's first priority is to stop "Soviet encroachment" wherever it occurs, it has aligned itself with the pre-eminent "anti-communist" regime in Africa—South Africa. This is no "honest broker" role; as long as "constructive engagement" continues to help South Africa economically and politically and resists calls for fundamental change, the administration will further alienate Black Africa and will undermine its own credibility.

Constructive engagement is little more than a rehash of Kissinger's discredited policy of a decade ago.

The selection of Eagleburger to deliver this policy statement was highly significant in itself. The number three person at the State Department and one of the administration's top experts on East-West relations, Eagleburger's role emphasizes the importance of the administration gives to its Southern Africa policy. It also emphasizes the continuity of administration policy with that of the Kissinger era. Eagleburger is a former Kissinger protege who served as Kissinger's executive assistant in the National Security Council and State Department during the Nixon and Ford years. He has been variously described as "Kissinger's Kissinger," "Kissinger's alter ego," and "Kissinger's enforcer."

Eagleburger's defense of "constructive engagement" is little more than a rehash of Kissinger's discredited "Tar Baby" Southern Africa policy of a decade ago. Kissinger's policy was
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Congress Considers South Africa Bills

On August 3, 1983 the House of Representatives took a major step forward in opposing apartheid by passing the International Financial Stability and Recovery Act (commonly referred to as the International Monetary Fund [IMF] Authorization Bill). The bill included a section directing the US representative to the IMF to "actively oppose" any IMF loans to "any country which practices apartheid." Proponents of the bill argued that "the practice of apartheid results in severe constraints on labor mobility and other highly inefficient labor supply rigidities which contribute to balance of payments deficits in direct contradiction of the goals of the International Monetary Fund."

The South Africa provision was introduced following last November's $1.1 billion IMF loan to South Africa. The Reagan Administration supported the loan despite economic arguments made by other member countries of the IMF and many members of Congress that the loan would contravene the IMF's own conditions and would contribute to Pretoria's ability to expand its military program. The amendment was offered in the Subcommittee on International Trade, Investment, and Monetary Policy on May 5 by Reps. Jerry Patterson (D-CA) and Mike Lowrey (D-WA) in cooperation with Rep. Julian Dixon (D-CA), chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. It passed both the subcommittee and the full Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs the following week.

During the bill's floor debate, there were no attempts to weaken or delete the South Africa provision. In fact, those Congressmembers who mentioned the provision highlighted it as one of the positive aspects of a controversial bill. The fact that conservative members did not try to extract the provision on the floor was an indication of how much support the amendment had.

South Africa's paid lobbyists have geared up to defeat these bills.

However, one conservative, Rep. Phil Gramm (R-TX), attempted an end-run around the South Africa issue by offering an amendment mandating US opposition to IMF loans to "communist dictatorships" as well as to countries which practice apartheid. The administration and the ranking Banking Committee members from both parties opposed the amendment fearing further " politicization of the Fund and the effect it would have on "friendly" Eastern-bloc IMF members such as Yugoslavia, Romania, and Hungary. The anti-communist amendment was defeated by a voice and standing vote but when Gramm demanded a recorded vote, the amendment passed 242 to 185. Apparently, Congress members were afraid to go on record as voting for legislation which could be construed as supporting communism. Their fears were justified when the National Republican Congressional Committee sent news releases to the districts of 20 Democrats who voted against the Gramm amendment stating that these representatives were voting to support communism with US tax dollars.

Gramm's amendment complicates further an already controversial bill. The administration has requested that Congress authorize $8.4 billion as the new US contribution to the IMF. Both conservative and liberal Congressmembers object to this huge sum which they see as a bailout to the banks which have made loans abroad way beyond their capacity. When the bill came for a final vote on the House floor it passed by only six votes. Gramm's amendment and the subsequent press releases were intended by some in the right wing of the Republican party to further squash the bill's chances. Rep. Patterson, one of the targeted Democrats, has demanded that President Reagan, who desperately wants the bill passed, formally disassociate himself from the Republican attack or he would be forced to change his vote from support of to opposition to the bill. Because the Senate did not include the provisions in its bill, the House-Senate conference committee must reconcile the difference between the two versions. Any attempt to extract either the anti-apartheid or the anti-communist provision will probably result in a refusal by the House to pass the bill.

Export Bill Expected Soon

The Export Administration Act (HR 3231) is also scheduled for floor debate in September. It currently contains two provisions dealing with South Africa and a third is expected to be offered on the House floor.

The first provision, offered by Rep. Howard Berman (D-CA), would reinstate controls on exports to the South African military and police put in place by the Carter Administration in 1978, and lifted by President Reagan in 1981. These controls cover so-called "non-lethal" goods such as computers, light aircraft, and helicopters which increase the efficiency of the police and military.

Berman has also introduced language which will strengthen existing export controls on goods sold to South Africa. The pending version of the Export Administration Act contains a provision calling for "contract sanctity," excluding controls on contracts agreed to before those controls were instituted. For example, the parts and service contracts for the computers exported to South Africa during Reagan's relaxed policy would not be affected by the new controls. Berman's language
would prohibit this "contract sanctity" for the export of goods directly related to "actual or imminent acts of aggression, or of international terrorism, to actual or imminent gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, or to actual or imminent nuclear weapons tests." While this would apply to certain cases in South Africa, it is not iron-clad in that the goods exported must be "directly, immediately, and significantly" related to such violations.

Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-NY) has introduced the second South Africa provision in the bill. The Solarz provision would: 1) mandate compliance with the Sullivan fair employment principles for US corporations investing in South Africa; 2) prohibit commercial bank loans to the South African government or its agencies; and 3) prohibit the importation into the US of South African gold coins, including Krugerrands.

The first section of this provision has not received support from the traditional anti-apartheid community, including the Washington Office on Africa. The Sullivan principles, a fair employment code devised by the Rev. Leon Sullivan who sits on the board of General Motors, are unenforceable within the context of apartheid. The essence of apartheid is labor control and it operates to prevent fair employment. Also, less than one percent of the Black population is employed by US corporations in South Africa, so this portion of the bill would affect only a negligible number of Black South Africans. Activists also fear that mandating the Sullivan principles will be used as a smokescreen for refusing to divest. For these reasons, Solarz has agreed to withdraw his provision if the Sullivan principles are the only part of the amendment maintained on the House floor.

Anti-apartheid lobbyists are worried because it is likely that the latter two provisions will be hardest hit by conservatives on the House floor. South Africa's paid lobbyists have geared up to defeat these and other provisions. Kruggerand dealers around the country have bombarded Congressional offices with letters calling for the defeat of the Solarz bill. The International Gold Corporation of South Africa has hired new lobbyists to defeat the bill, spending over $3 million in just two months this summer on its US representatives. Pretoria knows that the passage of both this provision and the third amendment—offered by Rep. William Gray (D-PA) banning any new corporate investment in South Africa—will significantly reduce US economic support for apartheid.

Rumors around Capitol Hill indicate that certain conservative members of Congress will try to substitute weaker provisions in place of those introduced by Solarz, if they cannot eliminate them altogether. Rep. Gerald Solomon (R-NY) may try to substitute language calling for a two percent surcharge on Kruggerand imports to go for an education fund for Black South Africans. This idea originated with Senator Paul Tsongas (D-MA) who offered a similar amendment in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Strongly opposed to this substitute, staff in Rep. Solarz's office called it "two percent opposition to apartheid." Another possible amendment is the banning of the importation of gold coins from communist countries.

Support for the IMF, Berman, Solarz, and Gray provisions has come from church, trade union, Black, and community groups as well as Southern African solidarity organizations around the country. Many of these groups participated in the National South Africa Lobby Day on July 19 organized by the Washington Office on Africa. They lobbied their representatives through phone calls, letters, and Congressional visits. The lobby day did much to raise the visibility of those bills. If passed, they could help reverse the trends of Reagan's "constructive engagement" policy of support for South Africa and strike a blow against apartheid.

---

Anti-Apartheid Victories!

**DC Divest**

The most comprehensive municipal divestment bill to be considered anywhere in the nation was passed by the Washington, DC city council on September 6, 1983. The bill, Number 5-18, would prohibit the District of Columbia government from depositing or investing funds in banks, financial institutions, or corporations which do business in South Africa or Namibia.

Although approved unanimously by the city council, the bill could still be defeated by the US Congress which oversees the District's affairs. Admitting that "we might face a battle in Congress," John Ray, the bill's sponsor, remains optimistic, predicting that with mass support, "we are certain to win."

The bill is expected to be sent to Congress sometime in October after which the Congress has 30 legislative days within which to act. If it does not adopt a resolution of disapproval within this time, the bill automatically becomes law.

The legislative debate will mark the first time a complete divestment bill will be debated in Congress. It is critical to the divestment movement nationwide that the DC divestment bill not be defeated in Congress. Write your Congressmember today to oppose any attempts to thwart this important legislation in Congress.

---

**Dennis Brutus**

Scoring another victory for the anti-apartheid movement, a US immigration judge on September 6 dismissed deportation proceedings against Dennis Brutus, granting the poet and anti-apartheid activist political asylum in this country. The decision ended Brutus' three year bureaucratic ordeal to remain in the US. Brutus was born in Zimbabwe of South African parents and the deportation proceedings in this country arose as a result of unavoidable delays in visa transfers once Zimbabwe became independent.

Although the Immigration and Naturalization Service presented classified evidence during the hearing in an effort to deport Brutus, this evidence obviously was no match for the flood of publicity and international appeals on Brutus' behalf. Agreeing with the defense's expert testimony that South African agents would pose a threat to Brutus' life should he be forced to return to Zimbabwe, Judge Irving Schwarz refused to bow to last year's advisory opinion from the State Department that Brutus not be allowed to remain in the US.

Dennis Brutus, who has been vocal in the fight against apartheid for over 20 years stated: "I regard this as a victory for me, as well as for the people of South Africa who are struggling to achieve a just society."
Drought and Destabilization Confront Southern Africa

Washington Office on Africa Associate Director Kenneth Zinn has just returned from a six week trip to Southern Africa where he attended the SADCC summit.

Heads of state, cabinet ministers, and observers came from all over Southern Africa when the fourth annual summit of the Southern Africa Development Coordinating Conference (SADCC) convened in Maputo, Mozambique on July 11. Participants of the nine-member organization (Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Zambia, Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, and Tanzania) directed their attention to the two most serious problems suffered by the region: South African destabilization and drought.

Mozambican President Samora Machel opened the conference by congratulating SADCC on the progress it had made since its inception in 1980 following Zimbabwe’s independence. “SADCC, just a few years ago a mere aspiration,” he said, “has today become a palpable reality, an important instrument in our struggle.” SADCC was established to coordinate regional development to lessen South Africa’s economic stranglehold. Because of this drive for economic independence, South Africa has launched a major campaign of destabilization against the Frontline states.

“We inherited dependence on the hegemonic regional position colonialism conferred on South Africa,” Machel declared, “and today it still affects the life of our countries. The prospects of economic liberation opened up by SADCC are behind the South African racists’ renewed aggressiveness and the policy of destabilization they are pursuing.”

This South African aggression has taken a brutal form during the past year. Talk of South Africa’s May 23 air raid on Matola, an industrial suburb of Maputo, was still in the air during our stay. Six people were killed and 39 were wounded in what Pretoria claimed was an attack “on military bases” of the African National Congress (ANC), the liberation movement of South Africa. A visit to the bombing site showed how patently false South Africa’s claims were — civilian houses and a jam factory were bombed. Mozambican Minister of Information Jose Luis Cabaco has repeatedly denied the claim that there are any ANC bases in Mozambique, saying: “The ANC’s bases and training camps are inside South Africa.”

Other attacks have included the brutal December invasion of Maseru, Lesotho killing 42 Lesothoans and South African refugees; South Africa’s continued military occupation of southern Angola, including numerous bombing forays deep into central Angola; the destruction of one-third of Zimbabwe’s air force in a bomb attack last summer; and the repeated sabotage of rail lines, roads, and pipelines leading from Zimbabwe to Mozambique. The South African regime uses both its own military force and puppet organizations such as the Mozambique National Resistance (MNR) in Mozambique, UNITA in Angola, and certain dissidents in Zimbabwe to carry out its campaign of terror. Pretoria’s targets have been strategically chosen to impede SADCC’s progress and maintain the Frontline states’ economic dependence on South Africa. “We are aware that the fundamental objective of these acts of destabilization against our countries is to make SADCC no longer viable,” Machel said at the summit.

Pretoria’s targets have been strategically chosen to impede SADCC’s progress and maintain the Frontline states’ economic dependence on South Africa.

The emphasis on South Africa’s destabilization at the SADCC conference is a new development. Leaders of the SADCC states have tried to maintain a separation between it as an economic institution and the organization of the Frontline states as a political one. But as a recent SADCC publication stated, “dependence on South Africa, compounded by South African economic and military hostility against SADCC member-states, is an economic fact that it must face.” The feeling among many journalists and observers at the summit was that, contrary to Pretoria’s aim of destroying SADCC, South Africa’s destabilizing attacks have increased the solidarity among its members.

Dr. Quett Masire, President of Botswana and current chairman of SADCC, called on countries with influence to pressure South Africa to stop its aggression. “[T]hose who claim to be our friends should exercise those constraints which are within their power to force South Africa to desist from its actions,” he said. “Without such intervention, we fear the situation will deteriorate to the stage where international conflict becomes inevitable and orderly development impossible.”

Drought Hinders Development Efforts

The second major impediment to SADCC’s development efforts has been the drought affecting much of Southern Africa for the past two years. Expected to continue for another two years, the drought is thought by meteorologists to be the worst this century. As usually happens with natural disasters in the Third World, it is the rural poor who are hit the hardest.

In Mozambique, we witnessed the problems first hand. There was a near total failure of the summer crop in southern Mozambique and severe reductions in central Mozambique causing massive shortages of food. According to the Internal Trade Ministry, lack of rains and water for irrigation and a shortage of seeds greatly hindered planting of the winter crops. In touring different cooperatives and state farms in Gaza Province, we saw that crops were shrivelled or extremely
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South African Agents Proliferate

The South African government is spending record sums of money in its efforts to influence US public opinion, lobby, and promote tourism. According to US Department of Justice records, the South African government and the so-called independent "Bantustans" of Transkei, Ciskei, Bophutatswana, and Venda, spent just under $2 million last year on foreign agents in the United States. Among the new agents is Stuart Spencer, public relations millionaire who is expected to be an official in President Reagan's 1984 campaign. Spencer joins John Sears, another South African agent and Reagan confidante, and fifteen other well-paid agents in promoting apartheid's interests in the US. In addition to this money, the South African government spent over $2 million last year urging Americans to visit South Africa. The South African Tourist Corporation and a number of US firms distribute films, brochures, and guide books promoting South Africa as an ideal tourist spot.

South African gold interests have also begun a heavy promotion campaign in the US. South African International Gold Corporation and its American agents, Kirkpatrick, Lockhart, Johnson, and Hutchison, spent well over $3 million just for the months of May and June promoting Krugerrands and lobbying against the Solarz bill (stopping Krugerrand imports) in Congress. Even these huge sums do not tell the entire story. In addition to these paid agents, South Africa spends more money on its embassies and consultates in the US which are working full time against the divestment movement. Feeling threatened by this national movement, the apartheid regime has attempted to counter it with an onslaught of propaganda and heavy lobbying.

WCC and March Condemn Apartheid

Two major events this summer provided a platform for the denunciation of apartheid. The first was the sixth General Assembly of the World Council of Churches (WCC) held in Vancouver, British Columbia from July 24 to August 10. Two major South African theologians addressed the 3,000 persons attending the gathering: Rev. Allan Boesak, President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, spoke at the opening plenary session cautioning that "one cannot use the issue of peace to escape from the unresolved issues of injustice, poverty, hunger, and racism." Bishop Desmond Tutu, Secretary General of the South African Council of Churches, emphasized his concern about the growing militarization in his country, particularly South Africa's nuclear capacity and the threat to world peace. Tutu was at first denied permission to attend the assembly by the South African government. But at the last minute, Pretoria, under intense international pressure, granted him a temporary passport.

At the assembly the WCC urged the international community to implement mandatory sanctions against South Africa, reiterated its support for SWAPO and Namibia's independence, and called support for apartheid "heretical." The WCC also stood up to its attackers who have criticized the organization for supporting Southern African liberation movements. The church body reiterated its support for the liberation movements and urged churches to increase their financial support to them. In addition, the American churches attending the assembly issued a harsh statement condemning the Reagan Administration's policy of "constructive engagement."

The August 27 March on Washington for jobs, peace, and freedom also served as a forum for statements against South Africa and Reagan's support for it. Part of the march's legislative agenda consisted of several bills restricting US support for apartheid, including HR 1020 which would stop US-South Africa nuclear collaboration. Rev. Boesak, one of the speakers at the march, warned the 300,000 people gathered that Blacks in the US would not be free until Blacks in South Africa attained their liberation. Several of the leading speakers, including Rev. Jesse Jackson and NAACP Executive Director, Benjamin Hooks, also denounced apartheid in South Africa and continuing US support for the racist regime.

Cultural Boycott Picks Up Steam!

The apartheid regime has drastically intensified its efforts to woo US entertainers and athletes to perform in South Africa in the hope of strengthening apartheid and giving it international legitimacy. Pretoria is sparing no expense offering as much as $2 million to artists to come and perform. While those who succumb to the huge sums of money basily justify their visits to South Africa by arguing the separation between culture and politics, the racist regime is shrewdly combining politics and culture as an additional weapon in its propaganda arsenal.

Local US groups (spearheaded by two community-based organizations, the Patrice Lumumba Coalition and the African Jazz Artist Society) have been successful in countering this cultural collaboration by organizing boycotts of artists who appear in South Africa. These important efforts have generated increased activity around this issue. The lobby group, TransAfrica, has now launched a national campaign with the formation of Artists and Athletes Against Apartheid which is designed to inform the entertainment industry about the UN-sanctioned ban on tours of South Africa. The cultural boycott offers an excellent opportunity for raising the visibility of the apartheid issue and mobilizing large grassroots constituencies for political work. As Washington Office on Africa Executive Director Jean Sindab recently stated: "We must tell these entertainers who dance to Pretoria's tune that they will pay a higher price than the huge sums of money they receive from that racist regime."
Drought and Destabilization, continued

The Mozambican government has said that about four million people are affected by the drought, some one-third of its total population. As in all of the region, health care has suffered tremendously with malnutrition spreading. The director of a rural hospital at Chicumbane in Gaza Province said his biggest problem in treating people was “no milk.” Mozambique is seeking 300,000 tons of grain in aid this year over and above the usual 400,000 tons imported.

In Zimbabwe and Botswana some six million people are affected by the drought. In Zimbabwe, the hardest hit areas are the already arid south and southwest regions of Matabeleland. As in Botswana, Matabeleland is traditionally a cattle-raising region. However with the drought, livestock cannot find food or water. Peasants are thus forced to sell their cattle (their source of money for other food) at lower prices or slaughter them. With the livestock gone, these peasants will be without a source of income. In addition, although it was a food exporter during the last two years, Zimbabwe will be unable to produce enough grain to export this year, greatly reducing foreign exchange earnings and eliminating a close source of food for the other Frontline states suffering from drought.

Maputo port is vital to SADCC’s development. Photo: Kenneth Zinn

The disturbances in Matabeleland, caused by dissidents and Zimbabwe’s Fifth Brigade, have aggravated the desperate food situation. Some food stores have closed and some relief workers, fearing for their safety, have been reluctant to stay. In addition, according to Africa News, the Zimbabwean government has cut off food aid to some drought-stricken areas in Matabeleland to quell dissident activity.

South Africa, also hard hit by the drought, is using the hardship to increase its economic hold on the region. For example, during our visit, the Companhia do Rio de Oro, a company with a majority stake from the South African side of the river, preventing the normal flow of water into Mozambique. Likewise, because South Africa is able to subsidize its white commercial farmers, Pretoria is able to offer maize and other grains to the Frontline states at cheap prices undercutting other sources such as Zimbabwe when it was exporting, thus increasing dependency. In addition, it is no coincidence that the rail lines from Harare, Zimbabwe to Beira and Maputo ports in Mozambique are constantly being sabotaged, thus hindering Zimbabwe’s ability to export its grain and encouraging the Frontline states to import from South Africa.

Despite these tremendous problems, there was an upbeat mood at the Maputo SADCC summit. President Masiye noted the substantial progress the organization has made in the past three years. By the end of 1982, more than 50 projects dealing with transportation networks and port improvement had been completed or were underway, despite the fact that only 25 percent of the needed funds had been pledged by donor countries or institutions. Mozambique has been successful in stemming the MNR sabotage in many areas of the country through the creation of people’s militias, widely supported by the Mozambican public, thereby greatly increasing its rail and port traffic from Zimbabwe and Malawi. SADCC is slowly pushing forward toward the goal of true economic independence.

Reagan Defends Policy, continued

laid out in Option Two of National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM) 39 commissioned by the National Security Council in 1969. Arguing that “the whites are here to stay” in power in Southern Africa, Option Two called for a policy which would “relax political and economic restrictions on the white states” and “increase communication and selective involvement” with them in order to contain the escalating liberation struggle. “We would indicate our willingness to accept political arrangements short of guaranteed progress toward majority rule, provided that they assure broadened participation in some form by the whole population,” it stated. Kissinger’s policy rested not on a commitment to human rights or majority rule but on an effort to maintain the status quo in the region—and ensure that US corporate interests would not be threatened. “Constructive engagement” is nothing but “Tar Baby” by another name. Unfortunately for both Americans and Black Southern Africans, the Reagan policy has been just as much a disaster as Kissinger’s.
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