

done - by Washington.

Indeed, the Eagleburger, addressing spoke of "the responsibilities which the United States bears for the great crisis areas of the globe - Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Latin America."

Washington's methods, over the past $2\frac{1}{2}$ years, have been uncomplicated: support fascists anywhere and everywhere; support and defend racists and neo-nazis - no matter what they do - even if they emulate Adolf Hitler in their crimes.

Crush the liberation movements. Confront the Soviet Union and socialism. Promote an arms race and prepare for to envelop the globe with a nuclear war from which, miraculously, the U.S.A. and her allies will come off unscathed to inherit what remains of humanity and the earth.

But what is Europe's role? Is there a European consciousness equivalent to American consciousness? Can Europe take a collective stand? or are we confined to individual or group of countries for example Benelux, Nordic etc.? Can we speak of Europe's power and influence in relation to the Southern African situation?

Refer Memorandum 39.

Fascist-/...

Southern Africa is "a community of sovereign states (excluding Namibia). But sovereignty of South Africa is only de facto - like that of Ian Smith. Rests on flagrant violation of most elementary principle of democracy. U.S. strategy rests on a fallacy.

"The region, unfortunately, suffers from a current and aggravated temptation to depend upon the instruments of violence."

The people of the region do not want violence. For centuries, they excluded (?) violence. (For decades) ultimately forced to take up arms - like the American colonies against Briton. The liberation wars over, then sought peace. What did they get? Against whom have any of them used violence?

Who, alone, in the region, is depending "upon the instruments of violence?" Eagleburger is dishonest. Misleading editorial writers. Why? How does this make U.S. "uniquely" situated to be honestly involved?

In talking of the region, and elaborating U.S. strategies, Eagleburger carefully and quite deliberately ignores the most fundamental issue of Southern Africa - an issue which dates back to the ~~fixx~~ first decade of this century and is both the root and the basis of the current situation in the whole of Southern Africa.

No strategy can lead to anything but a complete catastrophe for so-called western interests if it closes its eyes, ears and mind to this reality. Peace and peaceful co-existence between South Africa and other states presupposes a liberated South Africa - a scrapping of the 1909 South African Constitution with all its subsequent amendments.

No/...

+++ a peaceful change—away from apartheid is a wishful
look-away from reality. +++

There are

+++ Those who claim (dominium over) (to possess) us as fully
and effectually as *ever* a white master possessed his
slave. +++

The cynicism of the U.S. administration. Their ally has turned the landscape of South Africa into an increasingly crowded cemetery with an intake of upward of 1000 corpses each week.

Lies have become the staple food for the public's ears. Honour and honesty belong to an earlier epoch. The world has become a sophisticated jungle in which the strong and wealthy tells every one else what to like or dislike, who to have for an enemy and which puppet should govern.

Small nations must keep looking over their shoulders to ensure what they think, say and do accords with the will of a greater power - lest they are denied food, or their Governments *are* overthrown.

Europe, not always without resistance, agreed on independence. An outsider, taking over from Europe assumes responsibility for countries formerly attached to European countries - for whose benefit? "To keep the Soviets out". Is Africa a cattle kraal - and whose?

"U.S. ... proceeds from conviction : that our national interest and the interests of the West - demand an engagement in the affairs of Southern Africa" (This means the U.S. is not an outsider!) "The U.S. (rather than Europe) is, I believe, uniquely situated to speak to all sides in the conflict." What could be more cynical. For whose benefit is U.S. to speak to all sides? Listen to what follows: "....If we wish to shape events, ... we must make investments and support those things we believe in - e.g. exploitation of blacks."

Southern/...

Fascist-Portugal racist-Rhodesia apartheid South Africa - all of them differing versions of colonial dominations were the protectors of western interests. The removal of the first exposed some of these interests and brought in greater western involvement while RSA tried to reverse the process by force of arms - in Mozambique and Angola. Activity centred on the situation in Zimbabwe while RSA faced new challenges from SWAPO (after 1975). In South Africa, the Soweto uprising blew off the heavy lid of suppression and confronted the regime with a new internal and external pressures.

At that point in the history of Southern Africa the forces of the old order, of colonialism, racism and apartheid, were confronted with combined liberation forces representing and supported by the people of Southern Africa, the Continent and the progressive world.

The sudden collapse of Portuguese colonialism should have been taken as a signal for rapid transformation and acceptance of a new reality. It was not. Instead of dismantling the apartheid system, Vorster tried to woo African states into alliance with it. Worse! He invaded Angola, while Smith avered "not in a 100 years ...". The collapse of Smith should have been a signal to Botha. It wasn't. Today he is pulling white civilians to the battlefield. When apartheid suffers its sudden collapse, there will be chaos in Europe unless that collapse occurs with Europe's involvement and participation on the side of the liberation forces - nothing ^{new} for a Europe which only recently fought for its own liberation.

South Africa and her neighbours NOT between South Africa and the people of South Africa. Therefore he addresses his constructive economic policy to promoting mutual understanding and friendship between South Africa and the Frontline States, pointing to the mutual disadvantages of insecurity and the mutual advantages of friendly relations. Like the J.B. Vorster strategy of the early 70's, their strategy operates over the heads of the oppressed masses and ^{seeks} ~~speaks~~ to isolate them. In particular, the strategy aims to destroy internal oriented activity outside South Africa.

The Reagan Administration declares its determination to protect gradual change against external intervention. To the impatient masses he offers money for small business and scholarships in the USA. Special tutors from the USA will be attached to students doing their final year in Matric, to help them pass the exams and select the best for the USA. Also to deal with student radicalism in the colleges. For the workers : the AFL-CIO. Naught for Europe!

+++ The ANC is no stranger to the language of prayer to the ruling master for considerate treatment and an improvement in the lot of the oppressed. The ANC is no stranger to methods of gentle and patient persuasion. Our struggle has in its history, invaluable pages taken from Mahatma Ghandi's passive resistance in South Africa and in India.

+++ Unfortunately for Reagan's Administration, we know exactly what it is up to, and therefore we know the hidden meaning of the sweet and tantalising language it employs. +++

+++ a/...

policies are then tailored to the acquisition of this wealth against the will of the owners.

+++ using - "Influence" : what does it mean? Money? weapons? belligerence?

Who wants violence - USA or USSR? Socialist countries ~~ix~~ are "outsiders!" USA are not outsiders!

"Our interests demand an engagement - constructive and peaceful - in the affairs of Southern Africa."

"The US is, unlike Europe, uniquely suited to speak to all sides in the conflict."

N.B. What they say about Nicaragua. "Cross border actions wrong on principle". Nicaragua?

Exactly in what way is Lesotho/Mozambique etc. distabilising South Africa?

What about the CIA army against Nicaragua? What about US *with* Manoeuvres on the borders of countries?

+++ Attack key positions - find them.

1. Speaking to "an issue of common interest to the western world"

US has responsibilities for Europe, Middle East, Latin America and Southern Africa. Therefore Southern Africa is of interest to Europe at a lower level than it is to the US, and only to the extent that it is of interest to the US. In other words, Europe's interest is subordinate to that of the US.

Reagan sees Southern Africa in terms of a conflict between

To say, therefore, that regional co-existence with Pretoria is "the only path to peace and stability" is to put forward a false equation. The path to peace and stability is the transfer of power to the majority in South Africa. There are no problems of co-existence among the African independent states of Southern Africa. The fact that this co-existence is impracticable with Pretoria is not accidental.

Putting his reasoning into reverse, Eagleburger says "Unless there is peace and stability in Southern Africa, it will prove impossible to encourage essential change in South Africa (meaning) ..." a basic shift away from apartheid." In reality, it is the uprooting - not just a basic shift - of the apartheid system which will ensure peace and stability in Southern Africa, and hence co-existence with South Africa on the pattern currently existing among the African states.

ceases
When South Africa ceases to be a European regime in Africa and becomes an African country within itself and among African countries, there will be peace, stability and co-existence and co-operation of the closest possible nature between it and all its neighbours.

War in Southern Africa will polarize "attitudes ... (and) ... distort internal South African debate about the means and forms of change".

++Issue of human dignity, decolonisation, democracy in a non-racial society, freedom in one's Motherland is subordinated to and transformed into an issue of East-West global relationships. - the struggle to end racism and genocide ^{are} ~~++~~ is communism or Soviet-inspired, would not

into purely regional issues. Secondly, to reduce the liberation struggle to a purely internal and domestic ripple not worth the attention of African states in the least of all the attention of a whole continent and the whole world.

++ Eagleburger: "No regional state or external power can or should define our relations for us."!!!

++ A new complication in the African situation is the role of the U.S. - internationally and in South Africa.

Eagleburger and others talk pompously about a "peaceful change - away from apartheid" as if they have invented a new phrase, a new concept, even a new word:

Refer: Pik in 74

Koornhof in '80?

- Editorials and leading people in South Africa over non-violent struggle:

No Messiah arrived on earth on January 20, 1981. If indeed there was a messianic arrival on that day, it was the most disastrous arrival since Adolf Hitler's ascendancy to power this year half-a-century ago.

So much violence, so many regional wars, so much killing that protest has been blunted.

+++ "Who would deny that I have spent 30 years of my life knocking peacefully and patiently in vain at a barred door?" - Chief A.J.

A peaceful change had started with Smuts. Africa was only just beginning to get on her feet then. Apartheid took

over and fought violently to reverse the trend, attacking every aspect of our human existence.

Today it is defending itself with its armed forces and ~~then~~ *with* proceeds from the economic exploitation of its victims. The victims have decided after more than a $\frac{1}{2}$ century of patience, to fight the monster; to stop the criminal and the crime. Who, in this hour, is talking of a "peaceful and evolutionary change-away from the perpetration of the crime? It is those who benefit from the crime, not those who are the victims of it.

Southern Africa is teeming with armed bandits and a country's territory is occupied by an invader. U.S. is saying nothing about stopping these criminals. It is the ANC they want to stop, to destroy. They are doing nothing to stop the South African regime. Instead they are asking independent states to ally themselves with Pretoria, against the liberation struggle in what Washington claims is the interests of Southern Africa.

No where is Africa more misunderstood than in the notion, so repeatedly expressed, that we are willing - even enthusiastic pawns in a game about spheres of influence. Alternatively, none could be more mistaken about the future of this region than those who, looking at it, see, not people, not communities and nations in their own countries, but the diamonds, the copper, ⁱⁿ chromium, *manganese* uranium, gold, platinum and other minerals, and whose

policies/...

victims of this crime be grateful for that inspiration? Would they see the Soviet Union as anything but friends? Were they not the decisive friends of occupied Europe and beleaguered Britain? Is it perhaps some residue of the slave master's instincts which leads the South African regime to suppose that an African does not have the instinct or the will, and cannot stand up and fight, to destroy a dangerous beast if a socialist country does not tell him to do so?

How do we promote Dutch expansionism by seeking and receiving moral, political and material support and assistance from the Government and the people of the Netherlands?

Why is Europe so silent on this absurdity?

RSA not an equal among equals but a stranger among friends,
Foreign intervention by USA and supportive friendship/
 participation/involvement.

Eagleburger seems to remove ANC from the scene and place it etc. as guilty of cross-border violence. This is a patent falsehood. And where has there been cross-border violence against South Africa? and by whom?

Perhaps he sees us simply as Soviet surrogates and nothing else; in which case it's not African countries crossing borders but the Soviet Union!

Good guys and bad guys South Africa and African states support the one or the other. No . Conflict is between the regime and South African people and Namibian people. Beyond that, it is between the regime and Africa, of which Southern African states are members.

USA trying to isolate Southern African struggle from that of whole continent - to make OAU irrelevant. Turn issues into/...

No strategy has any meaning if it rests on the pretence that 86% of the population of South Africa does not exist because it consists of people who are not white.

A strategy which wishes away the ANC or seeks to liquidate it suffers from a fatal misreading of the history of the liberation struggle in Southern Africa, and a wish-inspired belief that the struggle the ANC is involved in is not the struggle of the entire people of Southern Africa and of Africa and of the international community against an unspeakably evil system. In what way can Southern Africa, the Frontline States stand in an embrace with Pretoria and face a hostile world - to what end? In exchange for what?

No! The peace and co-existence Eagleburger is talking about is that between a rider and his horse - a white rider.

South Africa is not a sovereign state in the same sense that Botswana or Zambia are. South Africa's sovereignty is a weapon of domination and not an expression of the popular democratic will. It is, by definition, a rejection of the right of the people of Africa to sovereignty. South Africa sought to incorporate the BLS countries and engaged its armed forces in opposing the independence of Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Angola. It is fighting to retain Namibia as a colony. It is not an African independent state among African independent states.

It derives this character directly from the fact that in South Africa political power is in colonial hands, not in the hands of the popular majority. It is being used against this majority by the employment of "the instruments of violence".

To/...

The University of Amsterdam is one of those few institutions of learning which have sought and found an identity with individual South Africans whose great national and international stature has been denied exposure by lesser men, placing exclusive reliance on differences of race and colour. For, Dr Govan Mbeki, might have become an outstanding South African Prime Minister, or an economist of world renown. Instead, by the conscious act of a racist minority, he is on Robben Island, awaiting the end of his life. The Dr Govan Scholarship Fund serves to place his thoughts, his aspirations and the cause he espouses among the intellectual community of the Amsterdam University, so closely bound to the land for whose freedom he has suffered and suffers.

The life story of Govan Mbeki applies ~~to~~ equally to millions of others. Generations upon generations of people in South Africa have had their lives distorted, their experience turned into an enduring tribulation, and their life-span restricted, not by the accident of circumstance or some adverse twist in the normal run of history, but by a carefully conceived and conscious decision of a racial group which has used doctrines, concepts and practices which had their origin in Europe - not in America, Asia or Australia, and least of all in Africa.

Today in South Africa and Southern Africa, Europe has recognised the Nazi features of apartheid, the distortion of socio-political values. The effect tells on the majority in South Africa and rest of Southern Africa. The burden is borne by the oppressed. Clearly, the quest for peace and social progress must involve Europe - the source and cause of these crimes. That is the measure of Europe's responsibility for the prevailing situation in Southern Africa and for peace and social progress in the region. And yet today, it is not out of Europe that we hear pronouncements on the situation. Rather, it is Washington explaining to Europe what needs to be