

Southern Africa and Its Implication
for American Foreign Policy

Z. K. Matthews,

Ambassador of Botswana.

March 1, 1967.

Southern Africa & Its Implications for American Foreign Policy

1. Southern Africa comprises the following countries:-

South Africa, South West Africa, Botswana,
Lesotho, Swaziland, Rhodesia, Malawi, Zambia,
Angola, Mozambique.

N.B. (1). Zambia prior to independence was closely related economically and otherwise to the countries of Southern Africa, but since independence and especially since U.D.I. in Rhodesia, she has striven to build up her links with the East African countries of Tanganyika Kenya and Uganda.

(2). Botswana has a small outlet to the north on the Zambesi which has proved of great importance to refugees from South Africa, Rhodesia and even Mozambique.

2. Status of Countries:

(a) Independent countries in this area include:

South Africa, Zambia, Malawi, Botswana, Lesotho.

(b) Dependent countries in the area include -

- (i) Angola and Mozambique - Portuguese Colonies regarded by Portugal as integral parts of Portugal.
- ii) Swaziland, a British Protectorate scheduled to become independent before 1969.

- iii) South West Africa - a Mandated territory which the United ~~States~~ is endeavouring to wrest from South Africa.
- iv) Southern Rhodesia which declared herself independent in Nov. 1965, but whose independence has not yet been recognised by any country.

3. Population:

The population of the area consists of approximately 40,000,000 non whites, mainly Africans and approximately 4,000,000 whites of whom over 3 million are in South Africa.

4. Nature of White Settlement:

The whites in this area especially in South Africa, South-West Africa and Rhodesia regard themselves as permanent inhabitants and not as foreigners.

Area:

The Southern African countries cover an area of over 2 million square miles, although they vary in size from 6,704 sq.miles in Swaziland to 472,000 sq.miles in South Africa.

Resources:

The area has vast natural resources of great importance not only to themselves, but also to the world as a whole. Gold, diamonds, copper iron, chromium, uranium, manganese, asbestos, lead, zinc and agricultural products such as sugar, coffee, sisal, fruit, meat and meat products

(skins, hides).

Tourism:

The area has perhaps the most healthy climate in Africa, & has tourist attractions such as the Victoria Falls in Zambia, superb game Reserves such as the Kruger National Park in South Africa and the Chobe Game Reserve in Botswana.

Dominance of South Africa:

The dominant country in this area is South Africa. It is the most powerful country economically. Johannesburg is the economic centre of the whole area, but it is well to remember that the economy of South Africa has been built up by scouring all the countries of Southern Africa for African labour. Of the 400,000 African mineworkers on the Rand, 60% come from territories other than the Republic, and recruiting agencies for the mines and farms of South Africa are to be found in all the surrounding territories. South African ports have provided the main outlets for the imports and exports of most of the landlocked countries in this area which include Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Malawi Rhodesia and Zambia.

Politically, the area is dominated by the policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa (Apartheid).

The Central African Federation of Northern Rhodesia, Southern Africa and Nysaland during its brief existence, tried to set in motion what was described as a policy of partnership, but the Africans of the area recognised it as but a pale reflection of the South African policy of Apartheid, poorly disguised, and fought against the Federation until it was dismantled. All the countries which have become independent in this area, except South Africa, have proclaimed their intention to seek to build up non-racial societies within their boundaries. In the Portuguese colonies in the area, the policy purports to be one of equal rights for all civilised men but there too, the Africans are satisfied that this policy is carried out to their disadvantage as every Portuguese is automatically regarded as civilised, while Africans are dependent for the acquisition of civilisation upon the meagre efforts of the Portuguese to help them attain civilisation.

We are left therefore with a situation in which the dominant country follows a policy of permanent white supremacy in South Africa and South-West Africa, combined with Rhodesia which has by the unilateral seizure of independence by the white minority, given notice to the world that it intends to follow a similar policy of permanent white supremacy. On the other hand, the African

countries in the area which have become independent intend to follow a non-racial policy.

The struggle for Liberation:

Both the South African policy of apartheid and the Portuguese policy of the socalled assimilation of Angola and Mozambique as provinces of Portugal are condemned by Africans not only in Southern Africa, but in the whole Continent of Africa. All the independent African states have declared that they will not rest satisfied until the whole of Africa, including Southern Africa has been liberated. In other words, the stage is set in Southern Africa for an inevitable clash between the white minorities which stand for a policy of permanent white supremacy and the African majorities which are determined to achieve self-determination at all costs. With this possibility in mind, the white minorities, under the leadership of South Africa, are arming themselves to the teeth. A considerable population of the national income of South Africa is spent on the most modern arms, while whites from the age of 17 to 65 are undergoing military training. Africans from Southern Africa are also undergoing military training in various African countries further to the North and they are hopeful that once actual military operations begin in the South they will receive military

aid from African States. On the other hand, the white minorities also hope that they will receive aid from white countries. In other words, the conflict, if it should ever come - which God forbid - would be a conflict between Black and White.

African Efforts - From Violence - Non-violence -
Violence

1. First contact between black and white resulted in armed conflict between the two. This conflict between black and white lasted over 100 years and took place in different parts of the country at different times in what are commonly known in South African history as "Kafir Wars". The last such conflict took place in 1906 in Natal and was known as BAMBATH'S REBELLION.

2. It goes without saying that in all these clashes the Africans with their spears were defeated by the whites with their guns and the result of each defeat meant the loss of more land the the wider extension of white rule. The Africans having been conquered, then turned to peaceful methods of defending and protecting and promoting their rights in the lands of their birth.

The peaceful methods which they followed included the following:

(a). The formation of political organisations, first on a regional basis in the different colonies, as they then were - Natal, Cape Colony, Orange Free State, Transvaal, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Swaziland - and later on a national basis after the Union of South Africa was formed in 1910. All these organisations decided to base their struggle on peaceful non-violent agitation. The methods they used included -

(a) written representations in the form of petitions to the authorities about various matters

(b) deputations of African leaders to the authorities, including deputations to England e.g. Deputation against ¹⁹⁰⁹ South Africa Act; Deputation against the Land Act of 1913; Deputation to the Peace Conference in 1919.

(c) Litigation in the Courts in defence of their rights,

(d) strikes not only in the field of labour, but against disabilities such as the Pass Laws.

(e) peaceful demonstrations

(f) Civil Disobedience such as the Defence of Urgent Laws Campaign of 1952.

Results of these Efforts:

All these efforts were directed at the amelioration of

the lot of Africans in the land of their birth. But their result has been not the improvement but the determination of the rights of Africans -

(a) from being people who, in 1910 had limited franchise rights in one of the country they have deteriorated to the position where they have no franchise rights anywhere,

(b) from being people who had the right to own or lease land anywhere they have deteriorated to the position where they have only limited land rights in special areas.

(c) from people who had freedom of movement at least in certain parts of the country, they have come increasingly under the Reference Books, under which movements of both men and women are controlled.

(d) in the industrial field they have lost many types of work formerly open to them and have come increasingly under job reservation.

All this has led many Africans, especially among the youth, to despair of ever bringing about a change in the situation by peaceful means and they have therefore begun to prepare for armed conflict.

Thousands have left South Africa and South-West Africa, to undergo military training in various countries. In

Mozambique and Angola, armed conflict is already going on.

At present these efforts are crude, spasmodic, ill-directed and easily controlled, but can we count on this always being the case?

But what worries those engaged in the struggle for liberation even more is the feeling that they are not only fighting against their local white ~~ruler~~ but against those in other more powerful countries who support these regimes economically, militarily and otherwise, and they ask themselves the question. It is nothing to these other countries that this solution should continue in this part of the world.

This brings to the question of the attitude of the United States to this question. In this connection, certain actions of the United States have noted -

(a) the condemnation of the policies of the Govt. of the Republic of South Africa at the United Nations

(b) the stand of the U.S. on the question of arms embargo against South Africa

(c) the stand of the United States on the South-West Africa question

(d) the stand of the United States on the Rhodesia question and mandatory sanctions.

(e) the stand of the United States on self-determination for Portuguese Colonies. Ambassador Goldberg's suggestion of necessity for dialogue

(f) the stand of the U.S. on ~~the~~ U.S. ships visiting South African ports

(g) the visit of Senator Robert Kennedy which gave a big lift to liberal forces in Southern Africa

(h) multi-racial parties at the United States Embassy

All these factors give us reason to believe that the United States does not approve of the policies followed by the ruling white minorities in Southern Africa.

The question that arises is to what extent the United States is prepared to use its influence to bring about a peaceful change of direction in the policies followed. Does the United States contemplate the confrontation of South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal with the need for a change of direction in their policies?

Among the things which seem possible may be included

(a) Support for Botswana and Lesotho in their efforts to establish non-racial societies and the use of these countries as a bridge between South Africa and other independent states in Africa.

(b) The use of United States diplomatic pressure in connection with South Africa economic vulnerability - South Africa need of Capital for development such as the Orange Power Project, Electrification Road Transportation - United States influence in sources of capital such as the World Bank, IBRD, and private capital - to bring about the abandonment of illiberal economic and labour policies.

(c) The support of United Nations programmes for Education and Training of Africans from these areas for the future.

(d) Support of the United Nations Trust Fund for refugees from these areas.

(e) The encouragement of visits by South Africa political leaders to independent African States and vice versa.