

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

## Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**Collection:**  
Green, Max: Files, 1985-1988  
**Folder Title:**  
South Africa I (5 of 7)  
**Box:** 23

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

So

---

# LEADERSHIP



RICHARD SMITH

VOLUME FIVE 1986 NUMBER THREE



# MEMO

DATE: February 28, 2025

FROM: Diane Barrie

RE: *Leadership*, v.5, no.3, 1985

TO: Memo to File

*Leadership* was a South Africa publication. This entire issue deals directly with apartheid laws in South Africa and business enterprises in South Africa. The Reagan Library was unable to digitize this issue due to preservation reasons. Opening this volume for digitizing would have broken the integrity of the spine of the publication. We suggest looking on WorldCat or in South African library sources for a digitized copy of this issue.

# A LETTER FROM SOUTH AFRICA

From:  
HERBERT BEUKES  
Ambassador

A monthly viewpoint on  
South Africa

NO. 9

SEPTEMBER 1, 1986

## FRAMING REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH AFRICA

"This is a message of hope for the  
future of South Africa."

The KwaNatal Indaba  
on its Bill of Rights

Just as the seasons are reversed in the U.S. and South Africa so it seems this year are the political emotions of despair and optimism.

Thus in Washington, Congress despairs of progress and calls for sanctions against major sectors of our economy. Yet in South Africa, blacks and whites working together have just taken another major step toward political power-sharing.

In the Zulu language, Indaba signifies a high-level assembly of wise leaders. An Indaba of Zulu, Indian, and White leaders has been meeting since early this year to create a merger of Natal and KwaZulu into a single entity to be known as KwaNatal.

Natal, one of South Africa's four provinces, is the home of the majority of South Africa's one million Indian people, and also includes KwaZulu, the area under Zulu administration. The Zulus are South Africa's largest black nation, comprising seven million people.

In its second major action, the Indaba recently published a proposed Bill of Rights for a unified Natal and KwaZulu. Earlier, the Indaba achieved agreement on constitutional provisions for a joint executive authority for KwaNatal.

The Indaba is now engaged in framing a fully representative legislative authority and an electoral system based on universal suffrage. All of these elements will be combined into a written constitution.

This is not a mere theatrical or academic exercise. The Indaba has given itself the task of creating full representative democratic government for the province. Comprising delegates from more than thirty organizations and political groups, the Indaba represents the full spectrum of interests in the



province. Moreover, the Indaba's agreement on an executive authority has been accepted by the South African Cabinet, and its approval by the multi-racial National Parliament in Cape Town is expected later this year.

The guarantees of liberty, human rights, and non-discrimination in the Bill of Rights indicate the basic approach of the Indaba's constitutional drafting. The Bill of Rights exhibits landmark provisions guaranteeing equal protection and due process of law, freedom of association and movement, free expression, the right of assembly and equal access to schools and colleges. "There will be no discrimination on any grounds and protection of individual and minority rights, enforceable by law, will form two of the cornerstones," according to the Indaba's Chairman.

The Indaba's commitment to the hard work of give-and-take negotiation and constitutional drafting stands in sharp contrast to the posture of the African National Congress (ANC). The ANC refuses to enter negotiations toward a representative government in South Africa while calling for terror and violence against those, like Indaba delegates, who seek democratic political solutions through peaceful means for all South Africans.

Those who advocate sanctions against South Africa only encourage the ANC in this destructive course. Sanctions falsely lead the ANC to believe that the Government and the broad black and white moderate center can be forced to capitulate. Nothing could be more unrealistic.

It is my hope that such important work as the KwaNatal Indaba will be recognized as an important initiative for negotiating democratic power-sharing in South Africa. Those who advocate sanctions might instead encourage the ANC to adopt the democratic principles and the methods of peaceful negotiation which are guiding the leaders of Natal and KwaZulu and to join in the work of framing a constitution for a truly representative democracy for South Africa.

*Herbert R. Brown*



# *Southern Africa*

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

### A DIGEST OF NEWS FROM THE REGION

---

#### **South Africa: Anglican Church Opposes Economic Sanctions**

The Anglican Bishop of Natal, the Right Reverend Michael Nuttal, said recently that the Anglican Church has not called for economic sanctions against South Africa.

Bishop Nuttal responded to an allegation by the Zulu King, King Zwelithini, that the Anglican and Catholic hierarchies in South Africa were supporting violence to bring about change.

The Bishop said that Anglican Bishop Desmond Tutu's call for sanctions reflects his personal view and not that of the Anglican Church.

---

#### **Zambia: Kaunda Tones Down Sanctions Threat**

During a recent news conference held in Lusaka, Zambia, President Kaunda toned down his strong call for tough sanctions against South Africa.

Dr Kaunda acknowledged that Pretoria's trade curbs aimed at Zambia, Zimbabwe and other nations will effect their economies adversely. After fending off questions on what kind of sanctions Zambia planned

to impose against South Africa, President Kaunda told the journalists that Zambia would not cut off airlinks with South Africa as it would need to coordinate any such action with other Commonwealth nations, the European Community and the United States.

---

#### **South Africa: ANC Landmines**

Soviet made landmines blew up cars in the Eastern Transvaal on August 17, 1986. The landmine explosions killed five civilians, all women and children. The dead are three black women and two black babies.

---

#### **Lesotho: Water Plan To Go Ahead**

According to the South African press, South Africa and Lesotho will sign an agreement in the next few weeks to go ahead with the multi-billion dollar Lesotho Highlands Water Scheme.

The project will provide the industrial heartland of South Africa with enough water to the year 2020. Apart from valuable foreign exchange and the creation of much needed jobs, Lesotho will also have its own source of electrical power.

---

#### **Israel: Terrorism Universally Defined Once and for All**

Israel's Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Benjamin Netanyahu, defines terrorism and terrorists in his introduction and essay in his book "Terrorism: How The West Can Win" as follows: "Terrorism is the deliberate and systematic murder, maiming and menacing of the innocent to inspire fear for political ends."

Mr Netanyahu also states: "Terrorists habitually describe themselves as 'guerrillas' but guerrillas are not terrorists. They are irregular soldiers who wage war on regular military forces. Terrorists choose to attack defenseless civilians . . . and it is here that the terrorist parts company with humanity . . . every one is a legitimate target . . . a baby is fair game . . ."

In acting against terrorists harbored by other countries, the Ambassador states: "The right of self-defense always takes precedence over sovereignty." "No deals are possible with terrorists. Terrorism is an indivisible problem, and the fight against terrorism must be indivisible as well."

---

#### **South Africa: First Indian Woman To Head Major Hospital**

Dr Anuradha Nursingh has been appointed medical superintendent of Clairwood Hospital in Durban, the largest city in the Natal province. She is the first Indian woman to hold the position of medical superintendent in Natal.

She was deputy superintendent of the hospital from 1981 and then six months ago, on the retirement of Dr Romuld Tomaszewski, she became acting chief.

Dr Nursingh was educated in Durban and studied medicine at the Grant Medical School in Bombay, India. Her specialties are ophthalmology and anaesthetics.

---

#### **South Africa: Massive Platinum Find**

The South African Geological Survey Department announced on August 20, 1986 that huge new platinum deposits have been discovered in the Transvaal province in South Africa.

Platinum is principally found in South Africa and the Soviet Union. Before the new discovery, South African known reserves were nearly five times that of the Soviet Union. The



newly discovered reserves are more than double the size of South Africa's previously known platinum deposits.

The deposits have been identified after four years of extensive seismic studies and the field work has traced the platinum bearing reefs to depths shallower than anticipated. In parts it is only 400 yards below the surface, stretching to depths of up to one and a half miles.

---

### **Zimbabwe: Mugabe Rejected Calls for a Release of Detainees**

The Zimbabwean Prime Minister, Mr Robert Mugabe, on August 20, 1986 rejected calls for the release of political and security detainees in his country. The Zimbabwean Government refuses to disclose how many people are

detained under its State of Emergency. The State of Emergency permits indefinite imprisonment of Zimbabweans without trial.

---

### **South Africa: R3,000 Million for Needy in Country**

The Minister of Finance on August 19, 1986 announced that an amount expected to exceed 3 billion Rand is to

be spent within the next three years on low-cost housing facilities for the aged and needy, and projects to improve the standard of life for the underprivileged of all races in South Africa.

The Minister also allocated funds for assisting families of state of emergency detainees.



AWARDED  
GEORGE WASHINGTON  
HONOR MEDAL  
FROM  
FREEDOMS FOUNDATION  
AT VALLEY FORGE

## Black Silent Majority Committee

Washington, D.C. Office (202) 546-0600  
Communications and Education Center (512) 340-2424  
2714 West Avenue San Antonio, TX 78201  
MAIL TO: P.O. BOX 5519 SAN ANTONIO, TX 78201



CLAY CLAIBORNE  
NATIONAL DIRECTOR

REPRINTED FROM THE



# Rocky Mountain News

128th year, No. 3

DENVER, COLORADO

FRIDAY

©APRIL 25, 1986

25 cents

26—Rocky Mountain News Fri., April 25, 1986, Denver, Colo.

## U.S. black group seeks support for South Africa

Rocky Mountain News Staff

A group that calls itself the only black conservative organization in the nation stopped in Denver yesterday for a few days as part of a 78-city U.S. tour to rally black support for the government of South Africa.

"We are trying to convince black entrepreneurs to join forces with black entrepreneurs in South

- South African schoolchildren kill suspect in slaying of classmates/66
- Botha calls political rights necessary to political solidarity/66

Africa," said Clay Claiborne, founder and national director of the Black Silent Majority Committee. "American blacks can benefit blacks of that region by opening their homes to young Africans seeking an American education."

Claiborne, of San Antonio, Texas, said his group also is trying to gather support for the "freedom fighters in Angola" who are fighting the Soviet-Cuban takeover of Africa.

"The situation in South Africa could be better helped if Americans had a better knowledge of the African problem," Claiborne said.

South Africa, a country of 22 million blacks, 6 million residents of mixed blood and 800,000 Asians is ruled by 6 million whites, he said.

"But if you turned over rule to the blacks, there would be a blood bath, both blacks against whites and blacks against blacks," Claiborne said. "The chief of the majority tribe, the Zulus, is not going to be governed by a black from another tribe."

While Claiborne said his committee doesn't support apartheid, it doesn't support sanctions against South Africa, either.

"Black Americans have an opportunity to step in and teach, to guide black Africans in how to turn their limited resources into greater economic achievements for all."

(OVER. PLEASE)



# San Antonio Light

SEPTEMBER 15, 1985

## BETTY GODFREY

### Why Clay doesn't yell over apartheid



*"He said to me, 'Clay, you're too black to be so red, white and blue.' I said, 'I'm too black not to be red, white and blue.'"*

While Clay Claiborne, national director of the Black Silent Majority Committee, declines invitations to speak locally and was reluctant to talk to me, he is speaking out,

nevertheless, against proposed U.S. sanctions against South Africa. Two weeks ago he appeared with Jerry Falwell on cable television. One day this week he agreed to be the guest of Patrick J. Timpone over radio KLBJ out of Austin. The subject: South Africa.

"Patrick, Patrick," Clay Claiborne said patiently over his telephone to Timpone, "Are you going to let me speak? Am I on the air?" Silence answered him. Moments later, after allowing two members of the Free South Africa Committee from the University of Texas to ramble on, Timpone returned to his guest.

"Mr. Claiborne, you were off the air." Clay Claiborne hung up. I was sitting in his West Avenue office, listening to him in the next room.

"I don't bruise easily," he said to me. And I don't suppose anyone who started as a reporter, or who has the high-level Republican contacts and business connections Clay Claiborne has, would bruise easily. But a lot of people, black people included, may express wonder that a man of his stature isn't out there screaming against apartheid and for sanctions against South Africa, as Jesse Jackson is, for instance.

"The difference between me and Jesse is that I've seen more of life than he has," Claiborne says. As a young man in the mid-1930's, he and Thurgood Marshall — now a Supreme Court Justice — picketed small businesses in black sections of Baltimore to hire blacks who lived there. During



**CLAY CLAIBORNE**  
Black leader

the Eisenhower

administration, Claiborne used his head and was instrumental in getting District of Columbia theater, hotel and restaurant managers invited to the White House to hear an appeal to integrate their businesses.

It was the urban riots of the 1960s that led him to motor around the country, talking to newspaper editors, and asking blacks not to join the Black Panthers, but to support the patriotic Black Silent Majority Committee. For that, he won the national Freedoms Foundation's George Washington Honor Medal.

His point, his message is that while change may come about slowly, it is best when it comes rationally, without the violence that can grow out of super-charged emotions. "This whole South Africa thing has become so emotional. People aren't thinking. Apartheid has been around for generations. Blacks are being murdered in South Africa and the government says, 'We're never going to change,' but it has a liberal side and South Africa has a free press. We don't want to get rid of apartheid just to have a blood bath. I have seen too many blacks murdered," he says of his travels in Africa, "to want any black man to jump out of the frying pan into the fire.

"People are crazy if they think apartheid is like segregation in the states. Blacks in South Africa today live all the way from the stone age to the space age," he says, mentioning a black millionaire businessman he had lunch with there who showed Claiborne the I.D. card he must carry at all times. "I hate apartheid, but the question is: *Who is going to survive; who is going to rule?* Blacks in South Africa are tribal. The Zulus, who are the black majority, are never going to be ruled by any other tribe. No, distant nations and the media should leave South Africa to work out its problems, so there will be no blood bath."

Claiborne thinks strong Congressional sanctions against South Africa and institutional disinvestment will hurt not only blacks who work in the 350 American and Western businesses under the Sullivan Plan — equal pay and equal work conditions. It would hurt all blacks in South Africa, as well as those who flock in from neighboring countries looking for jobs in a strong economy. At the same time, he praises President Reagan's less-severe sanctions. "He took a lot of people off the hook." The solution in South Africa, Claiborne says, is "Mutual sacrifice. Blacks have sacrificed and will continue to sacrifice but without losing the ambition to advance . . . whites must sacrifice to lift the burden of the blacks."

# Common Sense on Sanctions

## Mrs Thatcher's honesty, Sir Geoffrey's problem

BRUCE ANDERSON

**B**lack Africa has become a theatre of barbarism and exported political sentimentality. Throughout the continent, 'governments' are robbing, oppressing, incarcerating, flogging, torturing, and murdering their subjects — but no one in the West gives a damn. A patch of fog on the M1 makes a bigger news story.

So we can dismiss the idea that all the attention now being paid to the sufferings of South African blacks has anything to do with morality — such a selective morality is no morality at all. The emotional intensity that South Africa arouses owes far more to aggression than to pity: most of its strength of feeling derives not from love of the blacks, but from hatred of the whites.

The argument for sanctions against South Africa rests on two contradictory propositions, neither of which is true. The first is that the government's reform process is a sham, and that the South African whites are cynical monsters. The second is that if economic sanctions were applied, they would somehow turn into paper monsters.

But the truth is that most of those who advocate sanctions are as little interested in logic as they are in history. They are no more willing to think through the consequences of sanctions than they are to address the problems of implementing democracy in South Africa. They are not concerned to do good, only to feel good — moral free-lunchers, who use other countries' complex and intractable problems as political soft porn to fuel their own fantasies.

The terrible irony of all this is that the South African government is in trouble because it is trying to reform the country's institutions and share power with the blacks — the old, inevitable story of the de Tocqueville dictum, that the most dangerous moment for a previously repressive government comes when it embarks on reform. If, instead, Mr Botha had opted for repression, Mr Heath wouldn't be urging Mrs Thatcher to implement measures which he never even considered when he was Prime Minister, long before the reform process had begun. Tories for Fundamental Change in South Africa — a group infested by the kind of backbencher who not only oils his hair, but his voice and his face as well — would not have escaped from the Peter Simple column, for there would have been no opportunity for its members to smarm all over the news

programmes. And Sir Geoffrey Howe would have been spared the need to go on his travels.

As it is, Sir Geoffrey has had to spend much of the last year in preparing a damage-limitation exercise. He and the Foreign Office are fully persuaded by the case against sanctions — and even more fully aware that for Britain to argue that case would risk diplomatic isolation. So they sought a policy which would achieve a number of objectives — all apparently irreconcilable. First, they recognised the need to implement a minimum package of economic measures which would placate the Commonwealth while doing little damage to the British and South African economies. These measures would be described as 'sanctions' in Lusaka and 'signals' at the 1922 Committee. Second, they wanted to retain our influence with and leverage over President Botha, and to persuade him that Britain might have a role as an honest broker. Third, boldest of all, they hoped that these measures might defuse the whole issue, so that it would cease to dominate the agenda at Commonwealth and other conferences.

Like many diplomatic endeavours, this was open to the objection that it presupposed a world in which everyone was as subtle and sophisticated as the Foreign Office mandarins. In this case, that criticism had special force. It was entirely predictable that one of the key players would resolutely refuse to display either subtlety or sophistication.

The British Prime Minister has a thoroughly undiplomatic temperament. She knew that sanctions were a nonsense — why couldn't everyone else see reason? In the briefing meetings, Sir Geoffrey would patiently ride out the storms as he explained to her the need to make a gesture to the foreigners. But in the plenary sessions, as soon as the objection was raised that the measures which the UK was offering did not go far enough, she would break out — the whole thing was rubbish anyway.

Sir Geoffrey, however, is formidably effective at getting his own way with the Prime Minister. She flings the crockery at him: he just blinks, resumes his suede-shoe delivery, and wears her down. But in this case, reluctant acquiescence is not enough.

*Ferdinand Mount is on holiday.*

Her inconvenient honesty has been most unhelpful — indeed, it has virtually sabotaged Sir Geoffrey's efforts. Mrs Thatcher's well-advertised dislike of the whole policy has made it doubly clear that anything proposed by London will be half-hearted. So unless Mr Botha rescues Sir Geoffrey by releasing Nelson Mandela, there is major trouble ahead for the Commonwealth.

This is causing great anxiety in some sections of the Tory Party, who fear the electoral consequences of a break up. Certainly, there could be great embarrassments ahead, especially with the Palace. On Commonwealth matters, the Queen is, as it were, outside her Prime Minister's jurisdiction: Commonwealth leaders enjoy independent access to her, and can tender advice that is in direct conflict with the advice she receives from No. 10. There are no precedents to show how this problem should be resolved, so it could yet create a political and indeed constitutional crisis. But if so, it may be a crisis fought out in the upper reaches of the Establishment, with little or no popular resonance.

The Commonwealth is best defined as the British Empire converted into a subsidiary of Lomrho, and then rewritten as an *Observer* leader. As such, it has never implanted itself in the affections of the British public. If the public now discovers that the Commonwealth means sharing our Queen with those who certainly don't deserve her, indifference may quickly become hostility.

But the strongest argument against the Commonwealth is an altruistic one. One can see why these African dictators so enjoy international junketings, where they are treated as equals by politicians from proper countries. Any relief from the problems of feeding their own peoples must be welcome. But many of these problems were created by those very politicians. Since independence, most African countries have been in the throes of urban kleptocracy and rural socialism, which is why they have squandered not only aid receipts, but their populations' energies. Nothing should be allowed to distract African politicians from the task of putting that right. If they want to feel that they are jolly good fellows, let them do so by winning their peoples' gratitude — not by using the Commonwealth as a Third World playpen.



July 1986

EFFECT OF ECONOMIC SANCTIONS ON THE UNITED STATES

The Department of Commerce has assessed the impact on the United States of a withdrawal of U.S. investment from South Africa under best and worst case scenarios.

Under the least damaging circumstances, the United States will lose:

- Some \$120 million in foreign exchange annually from repatriated profits of U.S. subsidiaries;
- At least \$400 million will be lost annually in foregone export sales; another \$600 million in "associated" exports will be in jeopardy;
- Some 14,000 U.S. jobs will be lost as a result of the lost export sales; another 21,000 jobs will be at risk if associated sales were lost as well;
- Loss of \$1.4 billion in proceeds from the sale of U.S. direct investment in South Africa (valued at \$1.8 billion); assuming that the South African Government maintains the current foreign exchange control system which provides a lower exchange rate for financial monies, limiting the foreign exchange export to 20% of each dollar earned in South Africa.

Under the worst case scenario, to the above will be added:

- Loss of entire U.S. direct investment of \$1.8 billion (in terms of replacement cost, an asset of \$7.2 billion) if total foreign exchange transfer restrictions were imposed;
- Loss of all U.S. business assets (replacement cost) totalling \$7.2 billion.
- U.S. firms will be prohibited from collecting the amounts still outstanding on the intercompany loan account, due to likely foreign exchange controls.

# SOUTH AFRICA

# FACTS

Issued by: The Embassy of South Africa, Washington, D.C.

For further information: Call Pieter Swanepoel or Manus

Le Roux: (202) 232-4400 or the Consulate General

New York (212) 371-7997; Chicago (312) 828-9200;

Houston (713) 850-0150; Beverly Hills (213) 858-0380

NO. 5

SEPTEMBER 12, 1986

## THE IMPACT OF PUNITIVE ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA ON BLACK EMPLOYMENT

Congress has passed bills that will impose punitive economic sanctions against South Africa.

These economic sanctions will have devastating effects on the lives of millions of black South Africans.

The House Bill would have resulted in total trade sanctions against South Africa:

IMPACT ON BLACK EMPLOYMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA: 800,000 jobs lost that support 4 million workers and their families.

IMPACT ON BLACK EMPLOYMENT FROM SOUTHERN AFRICAN REGION:  
2 million jobs lost that support 10 million workers and their families.

The Senate Bill will impose a range of punitive economic sanctions against South Africa. It will cause massive black unemployment and rob millions of black South Africans of their livelihood by, for example:

- \* Banning the import into the U.S. of South African agricultural commodities and products.  
IMPACT ON BLACK EMPLOYMENT: At least 446,000 jobs lost that support 2.2 million workers and their families.
- \* Banning the import into the U.S. of South African coal.  
IMPACT ON BLACK EMPLOYMENT: At least 35,000 jobs lost that support 175,000 workers and their families.
- \* Banning the import into the U.S. of South African textiles.  
IMPACT ON BLACK EMPLOYMENT: 43,000 jobs lost that support 215,000 workers and their families.
- \* Banning the import into the U.S. of South African iron and steel.  
IMPACT ON BLACK EMPLOYMENT: 110,000 jobs lost that support 550,000 workers and their families.

\*\*\*\*\*



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 1, 1986

Dear Marty:

You note about the gift to Tony reminded me that I hadn't contributed. I am embarrassed that I am so late in sending you the enclosed check.

I have also enclosed a short article I wrote on South Africa--before the emergency there. I presume that you have already seen Josh's piece in the Spectator.

See you soon, I hope.

Sincerely,

Max Green  
Associate Director  
Office of Public Liaison

Mr. Martin Peretz  
The New Republic  
1220 19th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

# NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

SAUDI ARMS STALLED

CAMPAIGN '86

JEWISH APOLOGISTS FOR  
ANTI-SEMITISM

4

5

6

MAY 1986

## Striking A Blow for U.S. Power

After the defeat of Hitler's forces in the battle of El Alemein, British prime minister, Winston S. Churchill, reflected on the implications of the allied victory. "This is not the end," he said of the war against Nazi Germany, "it is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning."

President Reagan's election in 1980 marked "the end of the beginning" of the debilitating effects of the Vietnam syndrome, the paralysis that overcame U.S. defense and foreign policy after the Vietnam War. The American people had elected in President Reagan a man whom they believed would restore American pride, American strength and the primacy of America among the world's democracies.

But Ronald Reagan's election did not bring with it the reckless use of military force anticipated by his opponents on the left. For five years, his administration went to great lengths to avoid using force when U.S. interests could be protected by other means. The President tried numerous peaceful means to combat the increasingly frequent terrorist attacks against American citizens, fearing perhaps that military action might provoke a public outcry that would undermine his support in the nation.

But these approaches repeatedly failed to bear fruit, as our allies refused to join the effort to curtail the growing scourge of state-sponsored terror. As Colonel Qaddafi continued to call America's bluff over the President's threats of a military response, and continued to direct terrorist attacks against Americans, Mr. Reagan recognized that the United States had to respond, and had to respond with force.

For years, the fear of public opposition restrained the use of military force even in the most testing of circumstances. When attacked, the Marines withdrew from Lebanon; when the TWA 847 and

the Achille Lauro were hijacked, America's response was limited. By ordering a carefully-planned and -executed strike against terrorist training and support facilities in Libya, President Reagan has helped change the perception of America from that of a power whose hands are tied to that of one willing and able to use force when provoked.

However, President Reagan's measured and skillful use of force against Libya did more than show that the U.S. government is willing to exercise power.

*Continued, page 4*



*Libyan leader, Muammar Qaddafi, and Nicaraguan president, Daniel Ortega, watch military maneuvers in the Gulf of Sidra.*

## Bringing Change to South Africa

Max Green

*Editor's note: Max Green is associate director of the White House Office of Public Liaison. He has recently returned from a fact-finding trip to South Africa which he organized for a number of non-governmental public-policy experts.*

The features of apartheid are so well known that they do not need repeating.

Suffice it to say that the racial segregation and discrimination that define apartheid are politically and morally indefensible.

About that, the Reagan administration and its critics agree. About the rest—both means and ends—we disagree profoundly. For those committed to the democratic reform of South Africa, only a policy of "constructive engagement" makes sense. But those who despair of reform (or for whom reform is anathema) want us to sever our ties to South Africa.

*Continued, page 3*



## South Africa

*continued from page 1*

The record of the past ten years shows that South Africa is changing. So far, that change has been due in large part to the capitalist development of its economy. As South Africa's private sector has grown, it has required the labor of more and more blacks, at first for unskilled jobs only, but later for skilled jobs too. As a result, one of the mainstays of apartheid—the "job bar"—fell.

Influx control another of apartheid's distinguishing characteristics, has also given way for similar reasons. The apartheid ideology of 1976 dictated that the flow of blacks into urban areas be slowed and ultimately reversed. Instead, in response to new economic opportunities in the cities, it increased. As it did, enforcement of the hated pass laws began to break down and the laws ceased serving a purpose. Their recent repeal was thus a radical, but nonetheless logical, next step.

With blacks required to fill many skilled and professional jobs, the government has been forced to increase the quantity and improve the quality of education provided to blacks. Spending for black education is on the rise—up 300% since 1980. Black college students are no longer a rare breed. In 1960, there were only 2200 black college graduates in all of South Africa. This year more than ten times that number will attend college, many of them at formerly "white-only" colleges that are now integrated.

Although reforms are underway, the process is far from complete. Public schools, hospitals, and other institutions remain segregated and grossly unequal. The Group Areas Act still prohibits blacks from living in white neighborhoods. And most importantly, blacks, 70% of the population, are still denied participation in the governance of their country.

Continued progress is essential if chaos and tyranny are not to prevail. For most purposes, the government has already lost control of black townships to "street committees" of kids armed with gasoline-drenched tires with which they "necklace" black "collaborators."

This is a far cry, though, from a truly revolutionary situation. Gangs of wild teenagers wielding tires are no match for South Africa's well-disciplined and well-armed security forces. Neither is the African National Congress (ANC), South Africa's underground revolutionary organization. By all accounts, it is woefully short of everything an army needs. This is not a fact to bemoan. Whatever its

past, the ANC of 1986 is not fighting for democracy. Armed primarily by the Soviet Union and its allies, the ANC has come increasingly under the sway of the South African Communist Party, which holds between 12 and 18 out of 30 seats on its executive committee.

Revolution being both unattainable (at least in the short term), and undesirable (at least to the West), what can the United States do to promote faster

or of "The Bill Cosby Show", or their presence more likely to affect the way South Africans think about race?

American corporations can pull up their stakes in South Africa. But won't they do far more to undermine the social foundations of apartheid by hiring according to the non-discriminatory Sullivan principles? The United States can refuse to have anything further to do with South Africa unless and until apartheid is com-



*Black demonstrators at a recent funeral in South Africa.*

change? Disinvestment would slow down the economy, the most powerful engine of reform in South Africa. A serious recession caused by disinvestment would move affected blacks to the left, affected whites to the right, and bring to power white hardliners who would first stop the process of reform and then reverse it. A blood bath would soon follow.

This is not to suggest that economic growth is sufficient in and of itself. Protest against the outrages of apartheid from both within and outside of South Africa has always been and will continue to be important. But not all protest is effective. The South African government, for example, does not care about the condemnations of the Communist world which is its enemy. But, because it considers itself part of the West, it does care very much about American attitudes. Thus the following paradox: while advocates claim that Western disinvestment from and isolation of South Africa would provide incentive for further reform, in fact, either would be a disincentive.

Consider. The owners of the television series "Dallas" recently announced that, to protest apartheid, they would not allow the program to be shown on South African television. Is the absence of "Dallas"

pletely dismantled and replaced by one man, one vote. But in so doing, the United States would lose all its leverage, and no longer be able to fund training for black entrepreneurs and black trade unionists, black community-based self-help projects, or numerous other such programs.

We could hardly pick a worse time than now to give up on South Africa. At long last, black trade unions and black political parties are being allowed to organize freely. The ANC is still prohibited, but the United Democratic Front, which by all accounts is an ANC front, is legal and active in black communities throughout the country. Also, Chief Gatsho Buthelezi's Inkatha party which has more than a million members, has begun negotiating an agreement for a unitary legislature and executive in Natal province.

Blacks finally have a political voice: the question is whether they will be granted political power. If they are not, other reforms will have limited effect. But if they are, additional reforms will necessarily follow. For America to abandon the South African people at this, the most critical juncture of their history, would be an unforgivable act of political cowardice and moral irresponsibility.