

Statement of MICHAEL D. JAFFE, Chairman, AMERICAN-SOUTHERN AFRICA COUNCIL  
20 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 783-2250

Before the 1972 REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION PLATFORM COMMITTEE

Miami Beach, Fla., August 14, 1972

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Michael D. Jaffe, Chairman of the AMERICAN-SOUTHERN AFRICA COUNCIL, a voluntary organization dedicated to promoting friendly relations between the United States and the nations and people of Southern Africa.

The COUNCIL is a non-partisan American organization, not connected with any government, and it is solely financed by voluntary contributions from individual Americans who agree with our position on African issues. That position, put briefly, is based on a belief that the United States and the nations of Southern Africa are natural allies in the worldwide struggle for the preservation of Western civilization and against Communist aggression. We believe that American policy under the past several administrations has been responsible for an artificially distorted state of affairs, whereby this country has taken an antagonistic and aggressive stand toward those nations, and particularly toward Rhodesia. We are determined to do whatever we can to correct that situation, and to work for a more sensible and realistic policy toward a vital part of the world.

Before going into our specific recommendations for the 1972 Republican platform plank on Southern Africa, I would first ask this committee to consider the motivation of the anti-Southern Africa agitation so prevalent in this country. I do so because those who advocate continuation or intensification of the present punitive policy always begin by stressing the racial factor. Yet the three nations concerned, South Africa, Rhodesia, and Portugal, have markedly divergent policies in that regard.

South Africa's policy is one of strict separation of the races, with each race, or nation, being guaranteed its freedom and individuality within its own territory. Those parts of South Africa historically belonging to the Black (or Bantu) groups are well on their way to full independence. Rhodesia's policy, while rejecting the artificial forcing of vastly divergent peoples into a single mold, contrasts with that of South Africa in that it calls for the sharing of political power in a single state. As Rhodesia's Africans take advantage of the educational and economic opportunities open to them, they will gradually increase their polit-

ical power, eventually reaching a position of full equality, or parity, in the affairs of government. The portuguese, in still further contrast, refuse flatly to make any distinction between Portuguese citizens on the basis of race. Portuguese policy in the African provinces of Angola and Mozambique is designed to make full integration a reality, and objective observers report that this policy is being implemented in practice.

The common denominator between these nations is that they are united in a determination to halt the spread of Communism and barbarism, and to preserve the civilized values and standards of Western civilization on a continent where those values and standards are most notable by their absense. This, I would contend, is the real reason for the concerted attempt to isolate, and in somes cases destroy, the free nations of Southern Africa. The real "crime" of those nations is that they stand in the way of Communist revolution. In considering its platform plank on Southern Africa, this Committee should clearly understand that continuation or intensification of the present policy will work against American interests by fostering the spread of Communism in a region which is now a bastion of the free world.

#### PRESENT AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD SOUTHERN AFRICA

America's present policy toward Southern Africa has best been characterized by the late Dean Acheson. It is a policy, said Mr. Acheson, of "harrassment and folly, designed in the United Nations to coerce Portugal into setting adrift territories over which it has had political responsibility for twice the time of our own country's independent life; to separate South Africa from South West Africa over which its claim to rule is as good as ours over any of our territory...and to change its whole social system; and to pressure Rhodesia into submitting to... colonial rule."

Mr. Acheson made those comments in early 1969, at the beginning of the present Administration, but they are even more appropriate at this time. Our aggressive policy toward our friends in Southern Africa has not changed; it has, however, been made to appear even more ludicrous by comparison with the new policies this Administration has adopted toward our avowed enemies. What can one say about a policy which subjects law-abiding Americans to 10 years imprisonment and a \$10,000 fine for trading with anti-Communist Rhodesia, while at the same time actively promoting expanded trade with the Soviet Union and Red China, vicious tyrannies dedicated to the destruction of the United States?

I am directing the bulk of my testimony today to the Rhodesian question, because our policy toward that country represents the most extreme manifestation of the Administration's unfortunate tendency to interfere in the internal affairs of friendly nations. In the case of Rhodesia we are, as we have for the past six years, been blindly complying with the dictates of the United Nations in enforcing so-called "mandatory sanctions" against Rhodesia. These sanctions were imposed to force Rhodesia to submit to the U.N.'s demand that Rhodesia cease to exist as an independent nation. That is the stated demand. But Rhodesians believe, rightly in my opinion, that the success of U.N. sanctions would also mean the end of Rhodesia as a civilized society, and its reversion to the primitive backwardness in which the Rhodesian Pioneers found it in 1890.

As Dean Acheson put it: "It will surprise some...to be told that the United States is engaged in an international conspiracy, instigated by Britain and blessed by the United Nations to overthrow the government of a country that has done us no harm and threatens no one. This is bare faced aggression, unprovoked and unjustified by a single legal or moral principle."

It is the COUNCIL's contention that, in imposing sanctions against Rhodesia, the United Nations acted beyond the powers granted it by its Charter, and that its "mandatory sanctions" resolutions are ultra vires, and therefore void. We also contend that the President's Executive Orders on Rhodesia, issued without reference to Congress, are in direct conflict with the Constitutional reservation to Congress of the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign nations," and are thus unconstitutional.

In the time available to us here, it will not be possible to go into detail on the legal and constitutional principles backing up these contentions. It would, however, be instructive for this Committee to consider, dispassionately if possible, the ludicrous reasoning by which the U.N. set out on its crusade to bring an end to Rhodesian independence. The pretense for U.N. intervention, it will be recalled, was that little Rhodesia, with a combined army, air force, and police force of about 25,000 men, was a "threat to world peace." There was, it should be emphasized, no contention that Rhodesia itself menaced the peace. Rather, as the masters of sophistry in the State Department and at the U.N. see it, Rhodesia's manner of organizing its internal affairs so offends some of its neighbors that they may be tempted to invade Rhodesia. Ergo, a threat to world peace, and justification for the attempted destruction of a peaceful and pro-

gressive nation.

Such nonsense hardly merits rebuttal, but I ask the Committee to consider an analogy which should throw some light on the subject. There exists, in another part of the world, another nation whose very existence is offensive in the extreme to its neighbors. That nation's existence has proven so disruptive to the peace of its region that three wars have erupted in the 25 years since it declared its independence. Yet no responsible person has, to my knowledge, suggested that the best way of curing the explosive instability of the Middle East would be "mandatory sanctions" designed to wipe out the existence of Israel as an independent nation. I challenge any proponent of anti-Rhodesian sanctions to try to explain exactly why Rhodesia is a "threat to the peace" of its region, while Israel is not!

Again because of limitations of time, I cannot go into detail on the factual and statistical information available to refute the misinformation about Rhodesia which constitutes the bulk of press reporting on that country. I will be glad to answer any questions the Committee may have on that subject. I would, however, like to make a few comments on the futility of anti-Rhodesian sanctions, and the ridiculous position America finds itself in due to its blind obedience to U.N. orders. Two main points come to mind here. The first is that Rhodesia's ability to survive and flourish in the face of U.N. sanctions is no longer news, but is a well-established fact. The second is that, until Congress had the good sense to adopt the Byrd Amendment, the United States was virtually alone in the world in abiding by the U.N.'s "mandatory sanctions."

This latter point was made apparent to me on a trip to Rhodesia two years ago. One example, out of many possible, should suffice to illustrate it. American automobiles, while highly popular in Rhodesia before sanctions, are now few and far between. But cannot do much walking and driving in Salisbury, Rhodesia's beautiful capital, without noticing the large number of Renaults, Fiats, and Toyotas crusing the streets. I have no idea where these cars materialized from, but it is apparent that a number of our allies (equally committed on paper to the U.N.'s sanctions policy) are profiting from under-the-table trading with Rhodesia while encouraging "Uncle Sucker" to religiously obey the U.N.'s orders.

While it is true that American trade with Rhodesia has never been a major factor in our economy, our balance of payments position is hardly so favorable

that we can afford to thumb our noses at Rhodesian business. One such prospective transaction involves commercial aircraft. Rhodesia's national airline needs replacements for its aging fleet of Viscounts, and the logical choices for its routes are Boeing's 727 and 737 medium and short range jets. If an offer is made, will this Administration, which is encouraging the sale of jet aircraft to Red China, ignore the depression-level unemployment situation in Seattle and refuse to allow the sale? Or will it put American interests ahead of ideological prejudices and reverse a harmful and discredited policy?

The abysmal failure of the United Nations, with the full support of the United States, to crush Rhodesian independence, should convince any person not totally blinded by ideological mania that our policy should be changed, and that Rhodesia, whatever one may think of its internal policies, should be accepted as the independent nation it is in fact. The failure of anti-Rhodesian sanctions should also warn those responsible for formulating our foreign policy that any attempt to extend sanctions to the other nations of Southern Africa, as suggested by certain extremist elements, would not only be immoral and contrary to the most elementary principles of international relations, but would also be doomed to certain failure.

#### SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM PLANK ON SOUTHERN AFRICA

1) The platform should commend the Congress for its action in adopting the "Byrd Amendment," ending American participation in U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia as they apply to chromite and certain other strategic minerals. This would be particularly appropriate in view of the fact that congressional Republicans have overwhelmingly voted against sanctions every time the issue has come before Congress.

2) In view of the incontrovertible fact that Rhodesia has, for the past six years and nine months, exercised unchallenged control over its own territory, and is by all accepted tests an independent nation in fact, the platform should pledge to end in its entirety the present anti-Rhodesian sanctions policy, which is both violative of our Constitution and repugnant to the conscience of the American people, and to extend to Rhodesia the full diplomatic recognition to which that nation is clearly entitled.

3) Recognizing the grave threat posed to our national security and that of

our NATO allies by the rapid expansion of Soviet naval power in the Indian Ocean, and the constructive part being played by the Republic of South Africa in meeting that threat, the platform should pledge to work for close cooperation in military and naval planning between this country and South Africa. Most Americans do not realize the crucial strategic importance of South Africa to the security of the free world, particularly in regard to the absolute necessity of safeguarding the Cape shipping lanes against hostile Soviet action. But, as reported by the prestigious Swiss journal of military affairs, International Defense Review, "There cannot be a military leader in either Britain or America who does not violently disagree with his own government's policy over South Africa, yet these nations quite happily continue to rush towards potential disaster."

4) In line with the above commitment, the platform should pledge to end the current American embargo on the sale of weapons and military equipment to South Africa. Those who would oppose such a plank because of their opposition to South Africa's internal policies should recognize the fact that South Africa is more than self-sufficient in the manufacture of weaponry designed to meet any conceivable domestic insurgency. It has, in fact, become an exporter of such weapons. The equipment I refer to here is needed for the protection of Cape shipping lanes (which, since the closing of the Suez Canal, carry one-fifth of the world's oil supply, and virtually all of the oil used by our allies in Western Europe). The change of policy recommended here is at least as much in our own interest as that of South Africa, and any political party concerned with stopping Communist aggression without American involvement should be willing to support the sale of all necessary military equipment to a nation willing to do its share in the defense of the free world.

5) The platform should pledge an end to American participation in the ridiculous United Nations attempt to force South Africa out of South West Africa. That territory came under South African control by right of conquest during the First World War, after its liberation by South African troops as part of the Allied war effort against Germany. The South African approach of "separate development," leading to eventual independence for the various Black groups of the territory, meets with the approval of those groups, and the U.N., as evidenced by its refusal to accept South Africa's offer to hold a plebiscite in South West, is well aware of that fact. The current American policy of harassment consists of refusal to

provide import-export guarantees for American trade involving South West Africa. This nonsense has absolutely no effect, as American businessmen hardly need protection against a South African government dedicated to free enterprise, but a new Administration should call a halt to this kind of absurd and futile gesture, which accomplishes nothing, but strains relations with a nation which is a friend, and an increasingly important ally, of the United States.

6) The platform should reaffirm the importance of Portugal as a NATO ally of the United States, and pledge to halt all American aid to the forces of Red terrorism in Angola, Mozambique, and Portuguese Guinea. The Portuguese, in fighting off Russian and Chinese led terrorist attacks in their African provinces, are engaged in a struggle equal in importance to that being waged by American forces in Southeast Asia. The Portuguese want no material aid, but the United States should offer all possible moral support to the brave Portuguese troops, black as well as white, who are fighting a crucial battle on the front line between freedom and Communism in Southern Africa.

7) The platform should take note of the fact that a number of American foreign aid projects in Africa serve no conceivable interest of the United States but, rather, seem designed to assist the Communist drive to infiltrate, and eventually subjugate, the African continent. Two such projects come immediately to mind. One is a highway built with American foreign aid funds paralleling the Red Chinese "Tanzam Railway." That railroad project, with no economic justification whatsoever, is being built by the Chinese between the Tanzanian port of Dar-es-Salaam, their main base in Africa, and the Zambian copperbelt. It has been the excuse for the introduction into those two countries of as many as 100,000 Chinese, and the danger they pose is apparent. The second American foreign aid project I refer to is a ferry connection across the Zambezi River, designed to connect Botswana to Communist-dominated Zambia. The result of successful completion of this project can only be the spread of Communist influence deep into Southern Africa, and I seriously doubt that the American taxpayer wants his hard-earned tax dollars spent for such a purpose. I urge the Committee to report a platform pledging a complete reappraisal of our foreign aid programs and, specifically, the elimination of projects such as these which serve only the interests of our enemies.

## CONCLUSION

I recognize that the planks we advocate here entail a major departure from the policies presently being carried out by a Republican Administration. As I pointed out earlier, however, the overwhelming majority of Republican members of Congress have consistently voted in opposition to the Administration on the Rhodesian chromite issue. No other issue to come before Congress in the past four years has produced such widespread disagreement with the Administration within the Republican Party, and we believe that the Platform Committee should take this into consideration in formulating its plank on Southern Africa.

How, I ask, can the present aggressive policy toward South Africa and Rhodesia possibly be reconciled with the friendly, almost obsequious attitude which has been adopted toward the Soviet Union and Red China?

Apologists for the new China policy take umbrage when that policy is described in terms of sympathy with Red China, rather than as a realistic recognition of the fact that Red China exists and must be dealt with. But the nations of Southern Africa also exist, and must also be dealt with. The Administration's contrasting policies toward Rhodesia and Red China do leave the unavoidable impression that the murderous totalitarian society in Red China is preferred to Rhodesia's free enterprise parliamentary democracy! This, surely, is an untenable position for a Republican Administration.

While the present Administration must justly take the responsibility for the outrageous policies I have discussed here today, it is a fact that these policies were inherited from past Administrations. A platform plank pledging a more realistic African policy, oriented to American national interests rather than to a futile attempt to please "world opinion" and unappeasable domestic pressure groups, can reasonably be seen as a way to get the Administration "off the hook." Such a plank would give the Administration an excuse to abandon an aggressive and discredited policy which, besides its immorality and its inconsistency with our national interest, is also wildly inconsistent with the President's expressed intention to lower America's profile in our dealings with the rest of the world. If America is no longer to be the "World's policeman," then surely the power of this country should not be brought to bear in an attempt to impose questionable political stand-

I thank this Committee for the opportunity to appear here today to present the views of the AMERICAN-SOUTHERN AFRICA COUNCIL on American policy toward a part of the world which will become increasingly important in the closing years of this century.