Scholarships: Education or Indoctrination?

The Reagan Administration is once again moving to thwart South Africa's liberation struggle. Over the past year, the White House and Congress have advanced characteristically different approaches to the educational needs of Black South Africans. Congress, rather than increasing funding for refugee education, has initiated a new scholarship program to permit Black South Africans to study in the US. Reagan, consistent with his strategy of "constructive engagement," has petitioned Congress to discard its policy of opposition to oppressive apartheid education and divert funds directly to Pretoria to "improve" educational facilities for Blacks. The Reagan plan faces dismal prospects on Capitol Hill, however, so conservative ideologues in the administration have begun an effort to make the Congressional program meet the goals of "constructive engagement." That effort involves a suspicious, new private agency, the African American Educational Foundation, which could undermine the struggle for majority rule.

The Reagan proposal is a $2.3 million "internal education program" put forth as a part of its Supplemental Foreign Assistance Authorization request for 1982. The program, designed to support teacher training, management training, and "open universities" within South Africa, has been promoted by Assistant Secretary Chester Crocker as a complement to scholarship opportunities. Crocker has condemned solely "external" programs which bring South African students and refugees to the US because they "benefit the top achievers within apartheid education, while writing off apartheid's saddest victims."

Actually, the Reagan proposal plays directly into Pretoria's hands, pouring US tax dollars into apartheid education, a system both racially segregated and racist in its orientation. The plan would not only assume some of the growing costs of educating that nation's rapidly increasing Black school-age population, but would consequently unencumber funds for expenditure in the white regime's campaign of escalating repression. Internal assistance would also aid Pretoria's efforts to create a buffer class of skilled Black workers with a stake in South Africa's economy substantial enough to lure it away from support from for the liberation movement.

Seeking to distance themselves from this program, Congressional liberals will almost certainly block the Reagan plan. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has already added language to the bill which would render implementation of the program virtually impossible. The new restrictions require that the appropriated funds be used "only if the recipients of the
training will be able to receive the training in non-segregated institutions, will be allowed to use all the facilities of these institutions on a racially non-discriminatory basis, and will not be prohibited from using their training in racially integrated organizations and institutions." No existing South African educational facility can satisfy these requirements.

Scholarship Plan Prevails

An alternative program, sponsored by Rep. Steve Solarz (D-NY), received Congressional approval in December of last year. The measure, which allocates $4 million in both FY 1982 and FY 1983 to provide scholarships for Black South Africans to study in the US, received strong bipartisan backing because it offers training opportunities outside of the rigid and oppressive structures of apartheid education. However, unlike established scholarship programs which assist South African refugees, the new plan selects recipients from within South Africa to study in the US.

The program has been criticized in some circles as a retreat from refugee scholarship assistance, signalling the lessening of even token US support for those fleeing the oppression of apartheid. While there may be no direct link, during the 1982-83 academic year the total number of South African refugee students in the US on government-funded scholarships has dropped.

The program also gives the South African government a de facto role in the selection process by virtue of its control over student exit visas. By requiring that participants go back to South Africa following their studies, the program further limits selected students' freedom to speak out against apartheid.

More importantly, the implementation of the program by the Reagan administration has subverted its liberal intent. The $4 million appropriated under the bill originally seemed destined to be allocated to the Institute for International Education (IIE), an organization which has regularly funded students under the auspices of the Fulbright program and the South African Educational Program (SAEP). (SAEP selects students from within South Africa with the help of the Educational Opportunities Committee, chaired by Bishop Desmond Tutu, Secretary General of the South African Council of Churches.) IIE competed with only one other agency for the funds, an unknown and inexperienced agency named the African American Educational Foundation (AAEF).

In April, 1982, the Agency for International Development's (AID) Assistant Administrator for Africa, Frank Ruddy, authorized the then International Communications Agency (now, once again, called the US Information Agency [USIA]) to allocate the program's funds. That agreement further stipulated that both the IIE and "the African American Educational Foundation (AAEF) or other qualified organization" should receive grants. One month later, IIE was awarded $2.7 million to place 57 to 72 students, while $1.3 went to the AAEF to support 18 students.

AAEF: Collaborator or Pawn?

Unlike IIE, an organization with a consistent track record of assisting South African students, the AAEF is an untested agency. It was founded in July, 1981 by its director, Kevin Callwood, a 24-year-old native of the Virgin Islands and a recent graduate of George Washington University. It was not because of Callwood's background in educational services that the AAEF received funding. He has no prior experience in administering such a program and has only limited knowledge of the South African situation.

The right-wing ideologues whom Reagan has appointed to run the USIA (in particular, Ron Trowbridge, Associate Director of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs) may have seen in Callwood an opportunity to further the administration's strategy of slow, non-disruptive change in South Africa—an opportunity that would otherwise be lost if Congress rejects the Reagan "internal education" proposal. Through the AAEF, the USIA could select politically naive, malleable students, indoctrinate them with an accommodationist perspective, and return them to South Africa to undermine support for the liberation struggle.

"Through the AAEF, the USIA could select politically naive, malleable students, indoctrinate them with an accommodationist perspective, and return them to South Africa to undermine support for the liberation struggle."
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mission, not shaped solely as resistance of oppression, but affirmatively with appreciation of making the freedom of the Western social and economic system open to all.” (Emphasis added.)

Although Callwood argues that this rhetoric was included in the proposal merely as a political move to make his request more palatable to the current administration, according to one board member he has made doctrinaire comments about “showing South African students the greatness of the American way of life” at recent board meetings.

Callwood may also have been selected as a result of his ties to the Heritage Foundation, the right-wing think-tank influential in Reagan Administration circles. The Heritage Foundation’s Director of Foreign Policy Studies, Jeff Gayner, met Callwood through mutual friends two years ago and has served on the AAEF board of directors, playing a leading role in the development of Callwood’s funding proposal. Gayner left the AAEF board when he was appointed to the USIA Board of Foreign Scholarships, but he was replaced by Ian Butterfield, the Heritage Foundation’s analyst on African affairs.

The USIA has been careful to promote the illusion that the scholarship program is under the administration of an independent AAEF. The USIA asked Callwood to change his original funding proposal, which called for the USIA to carry out the student selection process, and to make AAEF responsible for the task instead.

Callwood, however, has been far from independent of the USIA. He apparently received an unusual amount of assistance and critique from USIA officials in developing his funding proposal which was rushed through USIA in much less than the 16 months usually required. In South Africa Callwood met with USIA contacts in the Black community. In addition, the AAEF scholarship selection process relied heavily on the U.S. embassy (unlike the IIE process which employs the respected Bishop Tutu). The interviewing panels convened in Durban, Capetown, Johannesburg, and Pretoria consisted of a Black community leader recommended by the embassy, the embassy’s cultural attache, a South African employee of the embassy, and Callwood himself. These panels undoubtedly influenced Callwood’s final selection of the 18 students who recently arrived in the US to begin their undergraduate work.

Possible Intelligence Ties

The USIA may have had additional plans for Callwood and the AAEF—plans devised by Roy Godson. Callwood met Godson, a Georgetown University law professor, shortly after returning from his first trip to South Africa in 1980.

That trip, which Callwood claims motivated him to establish the AAEF, was sponsored by the US Youth Council (USYC), an amalgam of conservative youth organizations which is funded by the USIA. Godson has served for many years as the “academic advisor” to the Council.
Apartheid Targets Wolpe

“When the survival of South Africa is at stake, rules don’t apply.”

— Connie Mulder, former South African Minister of Information

With the November Congressional elections just a few weeks away, Pretoria and her allies have mobilized to defeat their number one opponent in the US Congress—Rep. Howard Wolpe from Michigan’s third district.

In the nearly two years he has chaired the the House Africa Subcommittee, Wolpe has been Congress’ most outspoken opponent of the Reagan Administration’s “constructive engagement” policy toward South Africa. On such issues as Reagan’s foot dragging on the Namibia negotiations, loosening the export controls, increasing military cooperation, supporting South Africa’s invasion of Angola, and attempting to repeal the Clark Amendment, Wolpe has led the subcommittee as a highly visible and vocal opponent of Pretoria. Because of his criticisms, Wolpe appears to be targeted for defeat in the upcoming elections.

Those involved in the anti-Wolpe campaign include John McGoff, Michigan publisher and key American recipient of South African Department of Information “Muldergate” money (See “Moon Shines on Apartheid,” “Washington Notes on Africa, Summer 1982); Marion Smoak’s US-Namibia (Southwest Africa) Trade and Cultural Council, the registered agent in the US of the South African-backed Democratic Turnhalle Alliance (DTA) of Namibia; and the South Africa Foundation, the pro-apartheid South African lobbying group. Wolpe has also been targeted for defeat by the National Chamber of Commerce, the Republican National Committee, and the National Conservative Political Action Committee (NCPAC). Although no conspiracy is evident, pro-apartheid interests have converged to stop Wolpe’s re-election.

John McGoff Returns

John McGoff hit the public spotlight in 1978 when he was named as a key figure in the controversial “Muldergate” influence-buying scandal. McGoff received nearly $12 million from Pretoria to use in his unsuccessful $25 million bid to buy the Washington Star in 1974. The scandal, which forced the resignation of Prime Minister John Vorster, Minister of Information Cornelius Mulder, Information officer Eschel Rhoodie, and Bureau of State Security (BOSS) head General Hendrik Van den Bergh, exposed the

South African government’s secret expenditures of over $73 million in an effort to buy politicians, secure media outlets, and prop up pro-apartheid groups around the world.

McGoff, a Michigan media magnate, has a huge power base from which to influence Wolpe’s re-election efforts. His Global Communications, Inc. controls several newspapers in the state, some of which were acquired when McGoff’s Panax Corporation dissolved in August 1981.

Moreover, he is a long time friend of Wolpe’s Republican opponent, Richard Milliman. Milliman, a former press aide to former governor George Romney, is also a newspaper publisher and once served as Vice President of publications for Panax. Federal Election Commission (FEC) documents show that McGoff and his wife, Margaret, each gave the maximum $1000 to Milliman’s campaign. McGoff’s teenage sons, David, Andrew, and Steve also gave $1000 each to the campaign, although Milliman returned this $3000, perhaps fearing a scandal. Far right multimillionaire and former McGoff business partner Richard Mellon Scaife also gave $1000.

This summer, McGoff and Romney sent a letter to Michigan residents on Milliman’s behalf which began: “Michigan voters this year have the opportunity to rid the Congress of one of the country’s most free-spending, liberally-oriented social experimenters, and to replace him with a sound, solid, successful bootstrap Michigan businessman . . . ” The letter condemned Wolpe for his “ultra-liberal activism” and praised Milliman as “a self-made man.” The letter steered clear of Wolpe’s views on Africa.

Milliman’s initial campaign manager, Ron Cordroy, also has ties to both McGoff and South Africa. In August 1977, Cordroy, then a Panax employee, prepared a four-part series with co-worker Tom Ochiltree on “Southern Africa in Crisis.” They wrote: “The private enterprise system in Southern Africa could be replaced by chaotic Marxism, as already has happened in much of black Africa.”

The DTA Lends a Hand

The US-Namibia (Southwest Africa) Trade and Cultural Council began campaigning against Wolpe’s re-election last summer. The council, run by Republican Party activists
The South African government spends millions of dollars a year on lobbying and propaganda distribution in the United States through paid agents— influential members of the business, legal, and political communities. The following is a list of those firms registered at the Justice Department as agents of apartheid:

**Basin and Sears.** Since John Sears resigned as Ronald Reagan's campaign manager, he has been running a lucrative business as lobbyist and propagandist for the South African government. Sears' contract puts him at the disposal of the South African ambassador to help "with any and all of his responsibilities." For his efforts, Sears receives $500,000 a year, plus expenses.

**Smathers, Symington, and Herlong.** In 1981, this prestigious law firm received the handsome fee of $300,000 for activities such as lobbying against the Gray and Solarz divestment bills and last summer's resolution opposing the Springboks rugby tour. The Rand Daily Mail called the hiring of Smathers and Symington "a spectacular public relations coup" because both are ex-Congressmen who have important contacts with Congress and the administration. The firm was hired in 1979 when Pretoria terminated the contract of its chief lobbyist, Donald de Kieffer. De Kieffer, however, has continued activities on behalf of Pretoria as General Counsel for the US Special Trade Representative, he participated in the administration's decision to loosen export controls against South Africa.

**Kimberly Cameron Hallamore.** Hallamore recently signed a new 12-month contract with the South African government, effective April 1, 1982. He assists Pretoria "in carrying out its congressional, governmental and business relations programme in the United States. This includes educating members of Congress about "the vital political, strategic and economic role of South Africa in the Free World." Hallamore is paid $63,000 a year.

**The South Africa Foundation.** South African John Chettle directs this private organization for and on behalf of the Pretoria regime. From December 1, 1980 until November 30, 1981, the Foundation received $192,518, the bulk of it from its parent organization in Johannesburg which is widely suspected of receiving government funds. During this period, the Foundation lobbied vigorously in Congress and in various state legislatures against the enactment of pending divestment bills.

**Ngqondi L. Masimini.** This official representative of "The Republic of Transkei," South Africa's first "homeland" to be declared independent, received $165,000 last year. Masimini's activities include promoting "trade, commerce with and investment in Transkei," as well as encouraging the establishment of diplomatic relations.

**Kenneth H. Towsley** joined Masimini as Transkei's second representative on June 10, 1982. For his services he will be paid $9500 a year. Towsley was Ian Smith's agent in Washington for a number of years.

**Jay A. Parker and Associates.** Formerly the representative of Transkei, Parker now represents Venda. He received $45,000 last year for promoting Venda as an independent state. Parker is active in rightist circles as chairman of the South African Department of Information-funded American African Affairs Association (see "Moon Shines on Apartheid," WNA, Summer 1980).

Reinerio Torres, Jr. According to the latest Justice Department documents, Torres represents the "Republic of Bophuthatswana." Torres lists Myrna Torres, Sandra Banks, and Stanley Branche as his associates, and Michael Marr, based in New York City, as the "government representative for economic affairs." Although Torres lobbies US government officials on behalf of Bophuthatswana, he fails to report how much he is paid for his services. Former agent Ronald Greenwald, connected with Bophuthatswana International, terminated his contract with Bophuthatswana in June 1981, receiving $116,666 for six months work.

**Donald G. Johnson.** Johnson signed a three-year contract on March 1, 1982 with Ciskei, the newest "independent homeland." Johnson has already received $43,761 to encourage trade and cultural ties with Ciskei.


**US-Namibia (Southwest Africa) Trade and Cultural Council, Inc.** The team of Marion Smoak and Carl Shipley continues to represent the South African-backed Democratic Turnhalle Alliance (DTA) of Namibia. The Council receives approximately $400,000 a year for publishing the Namibia News Gazette and lobbying on behalf of the DTA. It has conducted a vigorous letter-writing campaign promoting the DTA and condemning SWAPO, aimed at members of Congress and church leaders.

Wolpe rebuked the News Gazette's attacks: "These McCarthy smears are ironic since my whole thrust is based on the belief that apartheid in South Africa and South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia offer the greatest opportunities for expansion of Soviet influence in Southern Africa," Wolpe told Africa News. "It won't be effective," he predicted, "since American voters don't take kindly to attempts by any foreign interests to influence the outcome of any American election."

**South Africa Foundation Begins Michigan Speaking Tours**

The South Africa Foundation (SAF), a private, pro-apartheid South African lobby in the US, has lent its voice to the anti-Wolpe cacophony. SAF representatives have been seen speaking in Kalamazoo, Battle Creek, Grand Rapids, and Lansing, Michigan, mainly to Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs. In August 1981, South African Johannes G. Pienaar, midwest director of SAF, addressed the Kalamazoo Rotary Club attacking Wolpe's "teary eyed emotionalism" on Southern Africa and the statements the congressman made following (continued on page 8).
South Africa Escalates Angolan Destabilization

In the last few months, almost every independent country in Southern Africa has been the target of South Africa's aggressive and calculated foreign policy of destabilization. Over the summer, one-third of Zimbabwe's airforce was destroyed in a sabotage attack, and one destabilization team from the South African military was caught inside Zimbabwe on a secret mission. Likewise in Mozambique, the South Africans have increased their assistance to the guerrilla Mozambique Resistance Movement (MRM) in its attempts to destabilize the legitimate government of Samora Machel. Pretoria has also continued assassinations of opponents in neighboring countries; Ruth First, an ANC activist, was brutally murdered by a letter bomb in Maputo on August 17.

Angola, however, remains the main target of South Africa's destabilization plans. On August 12, Major General Charles Lloyd of the South African Defense Force (SADF) announced that his army had killed 418 SWAPO guerillas since beginning its most recent invasion of Angola on June 11, penetrating more than 175 miles north of the Namibian border. In actuality, South Africa has never left portions of southern Angola occupied since the August 1981 "Protea" invasion and has launched armed incursions on several subsequent occasions. The Angolan government claims the apartheid regime has caused thousands of deaths and more than $6.9 million in damages. South African attacks have often focused on Angolan infrastructure, such as the late May attack on the Cassinga iron mine power station, which increase the country's economic problems.

South African destabilization of Angola is proceeding on other fronts as well. According to the August 14 edition of the Portuguese newspaper, Expresso, South Africa, with the assistance of Angolan dissidents, foreign mercenaries, and anti-Castro Cubans living in the US, is planning a two-pronged invasion of Angola to be concurrent with a coup in Luanda against the MPLA government. Involved in the plottings have been high level officials of the SADF ad the South African Department of National Security (DONS), representatives from UNITA and the FNLA, dissident members of the MPLA, and right wing Cubans represented by Frank Sturgis of Watergate infamy.

Sturgis was one of four men arrested for breaking into the Watergate in 1972. In their book All the President's Men, Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward note that the four men "all had been involved in anti-Castro activities and it was said that they had connections with the CIA."

Savimbi: "I do not hide my ties with South Africa."

The Expresso article also notes that Sturgis was attached to the CIA in the mid-seventies as an assistant to John Stockwell, head of the CIA's Angola Task Force during the civil war.

According to Expresso, the plot calls for the South African military to back up a UNITA push from the south, while the FNLA pushes from the north through Gabon and Zaire. When the two armies approach Luanda, dissident members of the MPLA are to stage a coup.

South African officials, of course, denied the existence of the plot saying the allegations were "without substance whatsoever." However, the charges fit into the scenario that has developed over the past year: UNITA has gained "control" over large areas of southern Angola due to the South African military's on-going occupation and "scorched earth" exercises; Holden Roberto's FNLA has received a new lease on life from foreign benefactors, and has linked up with the secessionist Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda (FLEC), and the new Military Committee for Angolan Resistance (COMIRA). (See "Constructive Engagement for Angola?", WNA, Spring 1982.) What contact these forces have with dissident MPLA members is unclear; however, the July 26-31 UNITA conference in Mavinga, Angola appealed to "patriotic forces within the MPLA to identify with common national objectives." Furthermore, the Angolan government has taken the report seriously as evidenced by its September 7 statement alerting the population to the danger of a new invasion from "across the northern and southern borders of the country."

Jonas Savimbi, UNITA's leader, has not denied reports of collusion with apartheid. In an August 23 interview with Ton Vosloo, a close political ally of PW Botha and editor of the Afrikans newspaper, Beeld, Savimbi described himself as an ally of Pretoria. Savimbi stated that the "West's frontline" in the struggle for Africa against the Soviet Union is in southern Angola. He added: "I do not hide my ties with South Africa." Savimbi was similarly interviewed by the editors of the South African Sunday Times and the Afrikaans Rapport and Die Vaderland. This flurry of press coverage is significant because it shows Pretoria's continuing support for Savimbi; the SADF obviously had an important role in setting up the interviews in South African-occupied southern Angola and these newspapers have close ties with the Pretoria government.

The Reagan Administration's response to this summer's (continued on page 8)
IMF Loan to Apartheid

South Africa, facing a serious balance of payments crunch as a result of falling gold and diamond prices, has requested a $1.1 billion loan from the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The loan, scheduled for consideration by the IMF on November 3, will be the largest ever received by South Africa from any source.

The Reagan Administration has indicated that it will support the loan. At a press conference on October 5, Treasury Secretary Donald Regan said the US would judge the loan strictly on its economic merits.

The South Africans strategically requested the loan after the annual IMF meeting recently held in Toronto. A recently leaked State Department memo from last summer cautions Pretoria that a loan request during the Toronto meeting may draw too much international attention: "We are concerned about yet another issue such as this arising which could serve as a basis to again attempt to politicize the Fund." South African membership in the IMF is becoming an increasingly political issue, however. A December 1981 UN General Assembly resolution calls on the IMF to consider expelling South Africa.

Technically any member country using funds in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the IMF may be denied access to financial resources. In 1976-77, however, the Fund loaned $464 million to South Africa, a sum which may have increased the ability of the minority regime to mobilize its forces to crush the Soweto uprising. The $1.1 billion requested this time equals exactly the increase in South Africa's military expenditures from 1980 to 1982.

Whether it likes it or not, the Reagan Administration cannot evade the politics that a loan to prop up the apartheid regime would entail.

Is South Africa Ship Shape?

An eight-member delegation of the House Armed Services Committee which completed a fact-finding tour of Africa and the Middle East this spring has recommended that the US Navy once again use South African ports. The US Navy halted its use of South African ports in 1967 when it learned that shore leave entailed a visit to the 3,800 crew members of the USS Franklin Delano Roosevelt, some 200 of whom were black, was to be segregated. Navy personnel have since gone ashore in South Africa only in cases of medical emergency, the last time being in February 1969.

In May, 1982, members of the House delegation sent a letter to Secretary of the Navy John Lehman noting the ports' suitability for the large hulled vessels of the interventionist Rapid Deployment Force (RDF). That letter also conveyed Pretoria's assurances that US Navy personnel would be considered "honorary whites" on South African soil and urged Lehman to reconsider the Navy's 15-year-old policy. In its official report to House Armed Services Committee Chair Melvin Price, the delegation repeatedly stressed South Africa's "strategic importance" and cited the supposed dangers of "Soviet" inroads into Africa.

Such a visible restoration of military ties with the US would represent a major propaganda victory for Pretoria. The regime decided in the early 1970s to improve its military defense by luring naval allies to its coasts with lavish port facilities. As a result, it poured over $60 million into expanding and upgrading its dockyards at Simonstown and Durban. In addition, South Africa opened Silvermine in 1973 near Simonstown. Silvermine's extensive computerized communications and operations control center boasts the capacity to track all military and commercial sea traffic from Venezuela to Bombay.

South Africa's facilities offer the US military and intelligence agencies incentives enticing enough to urge a retreat from the Navy's 1967 decision. Given the Reagan Administration's continuing cordiality toward Pretoria, the Department of the Navy may snap at the opportunity.

SACC Investigation

The current investigation of the ecumenical South African Council of Churches (SACC) vividly reflects the determination of the South African regime to lash out at opponents of its racist and inhumane policies. On behalf of the South African government, the Eloff Commission was authorized to launch a comprehensive investigation of the SACC, focusing particularly on its financial affairs.

Pursuing its policy of "constructive engagement," the Reagan Administration has once again danced to South Africa's tune by granting entry visas to two lawyers from the Commission. These investigators arrived in August to assess the level of support for the SACC among American churches who, together with their counterparts in Europe, contribute 90% of the organization's funds. These revenues have angered Pretoria because they are earmarked for the defense of political prisoners, education of children, and refugee assistance.

The SACC's stinging attacks on apartheid have elicited increasingly harsh responses from Pretoria. Incensed by statements made by Bishop Desmond Tutu, the general secretary of the SACC, the South African regime denied him the right to travel abroad for many months. During the SACC's national conference in July, John Rees, Tutu's predecessor, was arrested and charged with fraud in connection with the Council's financial disarray; SACC financial records are purposely imprecise in order to protect recipients of assistance from police reprisals.

Rev. Peter Storey, president of the SACC, stated that South Africa's investigation of the Council was like watching "the grand strategy of apartheid unfold like some horror movie before our eyes." Apartheid's grand strategists are now clearly intent on silencing the SACC's bold and outspoken opposition to their racist policies.
Scholarships, continued from page 3

report, credited with shaping much of the political and administrative structure of the Reagan Administration, recommended drastically increased covert intelligence activity.

An advocate of increased intelligence activity at all levels of government, Godson has written: "[C]overt action should be integrated into the bureaucratic structure. That means that all relevant parts of the government must be involved, either directly or in supporting roles."

For obvious reasons, the extent to which Godson has been able to put into practice his theories on broader covert functions will never be known fully. Godson has remained close to the executive branch, however. This summer he was once again on the political stage when he was hired by the USIA as a consultant on International Youth Year. According to the New York Times, the USIA, fearing “Soviet exploitation” of the ceremonies, called on Godson “to assess the world youth situation and recommend ways the United States could counter Soviet propaganda.” As a result of Godson assuming this post, the USIA then appointed a new coordinator for the observance: the US Youth Council.

USIA Still in Program’s Future

When legislative staff members began this summer to question the legitimacy of the AAEF grant, AID ended USIA’s responsibility for next year’s selection process and authorized the IIE to screen next year’s applicants. AID plans to solicit funding proposals from other interested organizations as well. This measure is only temporary, however. USIA officials are proposing an “independent” scholarship award plan which would allow them final say in the selection process.

Thus a well-intentioned, liberal plan has been quietly subverted by the administration to create a program with the potential to advance “constructive engagement.” Moreover, the spectre of intelligence lurking around the AAEF raises the terrifying possibility of US-trained students gathering intelligence on American student anti-apartheid groups and returning to South Africa to infiltrate labor, student, and liberation movements. At the same time, the program has diverted attention from the critical educational needs of South African refugees, the casualties of the continuing cozy relationship between the Reagan Administration and South Africa.

Apartheid Targets Wolpe, continued from page 5

his investigative trip to the region. Pienaar spoke in favor of Reagan’s policy of “friendly persuasion” to bring change to Southern Africa. The local Kalamazoo news carried the speech widely.

South African intervention in US electoral campaigns is not new. Compelling evidence indicates that Pretoria played a major role in Iowa Senator Dick Clark’s 1978 defeat at the hands of the conservative Roger Jepsen. As the Senate’s Africa Subcommittee chairman, Clark was Pretoria’s most vociferous opponent on Capitol Hill, much as Wolpe is now.

The campaign against Wolpe recalls the ominous prediction made by Anthony Sampson in his March 1979 London Observer article: “The South Africans’ determination to bring down Tunney and Clark brings a new dimension to the problems of foreign intervention; for whatever the involvement, Rhoodie was clearly intent on using any available pressures, and many groups could be vulnerable to infiltration without their knowledge. In the future, even without Rhoodie, this kind of South African subdiplomacy may well continue to be equally ruthless.”

Angolan Destabilization, continued from page 6

invasion of Angola is similar to last summer’s—consenting by silence. The administration continues to court Pretoria despite any real signs of lessening repression within South Africa or movement toward a Namibian settlement. Reagan and Botha have conspired to shift the blame for the lack of a settlement away from South Africa onto SWAPO and Angola, raising the demand that the Cuban troops leave Angola before a settlement is reached. Both Reagan and Botha view the removal of Cuban troops from Angola as a potential foreign policy victory to satisfy their respective right-wing supporters.

The State Department’s glib pronouncements on “progress” in the Namibia negotiations, however, are a perverse reflection of the death and destruction inflicted by the apartheid regime in Southern Angola. Although Reagan and Botha see eye-to-eye, the administration has isolated itself again from its Western European allies in the Contact Group who have all condemned South Africa’s invasion. The Contact Group may very well fall apart as some of its European members tire of South Africa’s stalling and Reagan’s failure to bring about any change while Pretoria increases its destabilization of the region.
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