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PREFACE

In his *Cry, the Beloved Country* Alan Paton commented that "the world has never let South Africa alone." The present study is one more of a great many works which have been written in recent years on topics related to South Africa; these works give continuing proof to the truth of Paton's statement. In the course of preparing this dissertation I had the very good fortune to receive an appointment to lecture in American history at the University of Natal in Durban, South Africa, for six months. For this I am deeply indebted to K. H. C. McIntyre, the Chairman of the Department of History and Political Science at the University of Natal. Jeffrey Horton, Bill Guest, Andrew Duminy, Michael Spencer, and Tony Lumbey of the same Department assisted me in gaining a better understanding of South African history and were most hospitable to an American family very far from home. I am likewise indebted to many other South Africans for what they revealed to me about their society. South Africa is still a relatively small country, and it was possible for me to meet Prime Minister B. J. Vorster and Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, and to see and hear other prominent political figures. Many South Africans were more than willing to tell me as much as they could about their country. Newsmen discussed their activities and gave me access to the clippings files of their newspaper. A Xhosa tribesman who lived in Idutywa described landholding and tribal authority to me in the Transkei. A
student took me to visit the Cato Manor magistrate's court so that I could learn more about the administration of justice in South Africa. A retired Afrikaner psychologist gave me a personal tour of the Voortrekker Monument. These and many other acts of kindness contributed directly and indirectly to this study and made me understand why Paton called it the beloved country.

I would also like to acknowledge the assistance of John Preston Moore with whom I began this study, David H. Culbert who assumed the responsibility for advising me after the retirement of Professor Moore, and John Loos, Chairman of the History Department of Louisiana State University. Appreciation must be expressed, too, for the cooperation given me by officials at various pro- and anti-South Africa organizations including the South Africa Foundation, the South African Information Service, the American-African Affairs Association, the American Committee on Africa, the Southern Africa Committee, and the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ. Some of these officials were understandably reluctant to reveal their activities to an inquisitive researcher of unknown political views, but they did provide valuable information which I have acknowledged in greater detail in my footnotes. I have also acknowledged in the footnotes the assistance of a number of newspapers which sent me, in response to my request, copies of the editorials they printed at the time of the Sharpeville crisis in South Africa in 1960.

The pursuit of my topic took me to several libraries where librarians were helpful in finding materials relating to South Africa.
These included the libraries at Louisiana State University, Duke University, the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill), North Carolina Central University, and the University of Natal, the Philadelphia Free Library, and the New York City Public Library. Finally, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my wife, Kay, for her patience, assistance, and typing, and to my son, Patrick, who showed consideration and understanding to a busy father.
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ABSTRACT

Since the Nationalist Party gained political control in South Africa in 1948, the South African government has been criticized for its policy of apartheid (or separate development) by nearly every country in the world. Many countries have endorsed the use of economic sanctions or other measures against South Africa. Except for implementing an arms embargo, the United States has opposed the use of collective measures to bring about change in South Africa. It is the purpose of this study to develop the reasons why some Americans in the 1960s came to believe that the United States should take strong action against South Africa, to discuss the views of other Americans who opposed such actions, and to examine various factors affecting American views on South Africa. Source material for this study included news magazines, journals of opinion and reportage, newspapers, books, Congressional hearings, brochures and pamphlets of organizations both hostile and favorable to South Africa, publications of the South African government, and personal interviews.

After an introduction which suggests an analytical approach to the study of views on, or images of, other countries, this dissertation is divided into two parts. Part I begins by describing American criticism of apartheid and the Nationalist government primarily in the period from 1948 to 1960. Although the American press was very unfavorable to South Africa in this period, few American citizens or
publications advocated changes in American policy on South Africa prior to 1960. The remainder of Part I discusses the developments that led to a movement in the United States for measures against South Africa. Problems in American race relations in the late 1950s and early 1960s led some Americans to believe that the United States had to prove its opposition to racism and segregation by denouncing apartheid or by taking stronger action against South Africa. The coming to independence of numerous African countries around 1960 increased this belief. The killing of a number of Africans at Sharpeville, South Africa, in 1960 intensified American fear of a racial war in southern Africa and precipitated a movement for strong measures against South Africa. This movement went through several phases that began with calls for governmental policy changes and turned finally to putting pressure on American corporations to "disengage" from South Africa.

Part II of this dissertation describes the efforts of a number of groups to improve South Africa's image in the United States and focuses upon the activities of the South African government, the South Africa Foundation, and the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program. It then discusses the views of Americans more favorable to, or less critical of, South Africa than those discussed in Part I. These Americans were to be found particularly among three groups: anti-Communist conservatives, white Southerners, and businessmen. The conclusion suggests that the "climate of opinion" in the United States became more favorable to South Africa in the late 1960s because of the Viet Nam War, a conservative reaction to American race
problems, disillusionment over the record of the first decade of African independence, and the work of the opinion influencing groups.

This dissertation seeks to demonstrate an interrelationship between American perceptions of South Africa and views on policy towards South Africa. Evidence is not yet available to show that the factors which played a role in shaping the views of members of the public on South Africa were the same factors that influenced the views of policy makers. The study does, however, provide a perspective on the South African policy of the United States through analysis of many different American views on South Africa, and it describes the efforts of various groups to influence those views.
INTRODUCTION

South Africa is a land of controversy. Virtually every government on earth has strongly condemned its government and racial policies. A majority of the countries of the United Nations have endorsed the use of strong collective measures against South Africa to bring an end to those policies. The opposition of the United States and several countries of Western Europe for more than a decade has prevented the implementation of measures which could lead to massive social change in South Africa. Because of its own racial difficulties, the question of policy on South Africa has had a special significance for the United States. The question of South Africa has created an additional international dimension to a domestic problem. Although relatively few Americans have concerned themselves actively with South Africa, the views that have been expressed by Americans on South Africa are of interest for what they reveal about certain aspects of American society and about an element of the policy-making process. It is the purpose of this study to develop the reasons why some Americans in the

1 American views on South Africa have not appeared very important to many Americans but they have been quite important to South Africans. As an Afrikaans paper, Die Burger, once commented: "In [South Africa's] information battle the American front is the chief line in the West." Quoted in Eschel Rhodie, The Paper Curtain (Johannesburg, 1969), 14. This spirited attack on American (and other) criticism of South Africa is of considerable interest because Rhodie has since become Secretary of Information for South Africa and thus has the responsibility for improving foreign opinion of South Africa.
1960s came to believe the United States should take strong actions against South Africa, to discuss the views of other Americans who opposed such actions, and to examine various factors affecting American perceptions of South Africa.

For the reader whose familiarity with South Africa is limited, it will perhaps be helpful to begin with a brief description of the features of South Africa which are pertinent to the present study and to clarify some of the terminology which will be employed. A wealth of material is available in English on South Africa to the reader who wishes to explore its recent or more distant history in greater detail. Much of it is, however, strongly polemical in character.

As its name suggests, South Africa is located at the southern tip of the African continent, a fact which has given it strategic significance from the days when the Dutch used it as a way station to the East Indies to the present. Without taking into consideration South West Africa (renamed Namibia by the United Nations), South Africa is about the same size as the combined area of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. The country has long had a reputation for wealth which has been based primarily on its extensive mineral resources, notably diamonds, gold, platinum and other precious metals. The South African economy also has a very modern manufacturing

---

sector.\(^3\) The range of manufacturing activity has increased considera-
ably since the mid-1930s; diversification has been stimulated by economic
conditions and by government encouragement to the point that the coun-
try is virtually capable of self-sufficiency.

South Africa's population of over twenty-one million people is
one of the most racially and culturally diverse of any country.\(^4\) The
different groups have been classified in a variety of ways and thus
many terms are used in this study in reference to different elements
of the population. These terms should be explained in order to avoid
confusion.

Slightly less than one-fifth of the total population is of
European extraction. Generally referred to as Europeans in South
Africa, they are often spoken of simply as the whites in American pub-
lications. They are subdivided by language, history, and self-identi-
fication into two groups, Afrikaners and English-speaking South
Africans.

The Afrikaners predominate numerically over the English-
speaking and politically over all other racial groups. Approximately
65 per cent of the whites are Afrikaners which means they speak

\(^3\)D. Hobart Houghton, *The South African Economy* (2nd ed.; Cape
Town, 1967), 118-37. On the interaction of politics and economic
development in South Africa, see Ralph Horwitz, *The Political Economy
of South Africa* (London, 1967), 12, 380. A fact often overlooked by
foreign observers is that conditions for agriculture and livestock are
generally quite poor throughout South Africa. David L. Middrie, *South

\(^4\)On the population groups of South Africa, see Leo Marquard,
28-81. Marquard's book is probably the best single volume available
on South Africa.
primarily the Afrikaans language and have a consciousness of being Afrikaners. The Afrikaans language is derived from the Dutch of the early white settlers of South Africa, once known as the Boers (farmers). A group consciousness has arisen from generations of struggle with the South African frontier, African tribes, British imperialism, and, more recently, hostile world opinion. Afrikaners overwhelmingly form the constituency of the Nationalist Party, the party which has had control of the South African Parliament since 1948.

The English-speaking South Africans came to South Africa somewhat later than the Afrikaners, but they have played a greater role in the development of the South African economy. They have tended to be more "liberal" on questions of race policies than the Afrikaners and have primarily belonged to the United Party or the smaller Progressive Party. However, their sense of group identification has not been so strong as Afrikaner nationalism. Both groups of whites enjoy a standard of living equal to that of most Americans. Conflict between them has persisted from the bloody Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902 to the present.

The largest racial group in South Africa consists of more than fifteen million Africans. Officially called the Bantu, they will


usually be referred to here as Africans or as blacks, the latter especially when it would be clumsy to refer to the African South Africans. Use of the term Africans should not obscure the fact that the group is actually made up of a number of diverse subgroups. There are four distinct African language groups and within these principal language stocks there are various language clusters and tribal groupings. Some of the African nations have fought each other just as bitterly as Afrikaners have contended with the English-speaking, and today they are united only in their domination by the whites. The Africans' claim to being the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa is not much better than the Afrikaners'; both groups were preceded by the Khoikhoi (Hottentots) and the San (Bushmen). Many Africans still engage in the subsistence agriculture of their ancestors while others are partially or fully integrated into the industrial economy of South Africa.

The Coloureds are another distinct racial group in South Africa. A catch-all classification that includes all who are known to be of "mixed" race, it is an old saw that the Coloureds came into existence nine months after the landing of the first whites in South Africa. More than two million South Africans are so classified, and

7The date of the African migration across the Limpopo River into present South Africa remains obscure and controversial. Recent scholarship suggests that it was about 1300 A.D. John Cope, South Africa (2nd ed.; New York, 1967), 67; Wilson and Thompson, Oxford History, 38-39. Successive waves of African migration drove earlier Africans from their areas of settlement.

most are culturally similar to the whites, though having lower status and standard of living.

Finally, there are about 700,000 South Africans termed Asians or Indians. Most are of Indian origin, brought to South Africa by the British to perform labor tasks for which African labor was not available. Despite their relatively limited numbers, Asians have played a prominent role in non-white (or non-European) opposition to white domination. Not only have they been more advanced educationally and economically than the Africans, they have had the support of Indian spokesmen at the United Nations since 1945.

Although this dissertation will discuss many American opinions on South Africa's peoples and policies, it does not purport to be a study of American "public opinion" of South Africa within the meaning that this term has acquired. While historians have studied American opinions on other societies for generations, the works of many of these historians have been severely criticized for mistaking editorial opinion for public opinion and for attributing to such opinions a policy influencing or determining role which could not be demonstrated. 9

The development of scientific techniques of public opinion polling has

been thus far of relatively limited usefulness to historians. First, accurate polling data concerning public opinion on foreign policy issues is available only for a limited number of topics. After investigation and various inquiries to public opinion research centers, the author was unable to locate any American opinion polls that may have been conducted directly pertaining to South Africa. Secondly, most social scientists agree that only a small percentage of Americans keep informed on foreign affairs, and the foreign policy public is unlikely to be representative of the general populace. The expressions discussed in this study, although diverse, are not necessarily representative of the sentiments of all Americans on matters pertaining to race and foreign policy. Finally, foreign policy decisions remain primarily in the control of small groups of individuals in the executive branch of the government. Even with access to their papers, and assuming that the papers would accurately reflect the decision-making process, it seems most doubtful that anyone can make a direct correlation between public opinion on a country and policy decisions on the country. The author cannot claim to make any such correlation aside from subjective judgment.


11 Bernard Cohen, after studying the "mountainous" literature on public opinion and foreign policy, has commented: "We are left . . . with the unsatisfactory conclusion that public opinion is important in the policy making process, though we cannot say with confidence how, why, or when." Bernard C. Cohen, The Public's Impact on Foreign Policy (Boston, 1973), 7.
Despite these problems it is believed that study of views of members of the American public on foreign countries and foreign policy can be of use to the historian, and can contribute to a better understanding of American society and the development of foreign policy. Other historians who have reached the same conclusion have been groping for a rationale and method for studying this aspect of American history. Their efforts have pointed to a "diplomatic" history which makes use of the techniques of intellectual history. Peter G. Filene, in his *Americans and the Soviet Experiment, 1917-1933*, employed many traditional sources of American opinions in developing the early history of American attitudes towards the Soviet Union. He stated that the study of these attitudes would "indirectly describe Americans' conceptions of democracy, of capitalism, and of themselves as a society and nation." Utilizing sources of a similar nature, Ernest R. May studied American views on colonialism to gain insight into American foreign policy decisions in the late 1890s. Akira Iriye likewise focused on what he termed "mutual perceptions" between Americans and East Asians to show "how policy makers and thinking people in America, China, and Japan have viewed each other, the world and their common problems--how, in short, they have tried to define their respective realities." These are only a few of a number of recent studies which

---


13 Ibid., 3.


have made use of public expressions on foreign countries for the perspective they can give on a society and its foreign policies.\textsuperscript{16}

The present study borrows from the works of Filene, May, and other historians, but the author has also found helpful the approaches to the study of "images" offered by several social scientists, in particular William A. Scott, H. C. Kelman, and Kenneth Boulding.\textsuperscript{17}

They have provided a framework for analysis of American expressions on South Africa. As used here, the term "image" includes within its meaning the whole range of concepts about and feelings towards another country which might be designated attitudes, opinions, beliefs, sentiments, or views. The term "views" is more often used in this study because it suggests expressions by individuals which are less complete than a fully structured image, or, to put it another way, a view suggests an articulation of a part of an image of a country held by a person. As explained by Scott, an image can be described as

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
consisting of three analytically distinct aspects:

First and primary is the set of cognitive attributes by which the person understands the object in an intellectual way. This is his view of its "inherent" characteristics, which he regards as independent of his own response to them. Second, the image may contain an affective component, representing a liking or disliking for the focal object. This is usually associated with perceived attributes that the person either approves or disapproves. Finally, the image may carry an action component, consisting of a set of responses to the object that the person deems appropriate in the light of its perceived attributes.¹⁸

In analyzing the views or images of South Africa held by Americans, the author has attempted to focus on the elements discussed by Scott. With regard to the cognitive, the effort has been to determine the sources of information that contributed to American knowledge of South Africa, the content of those sources, and American perceptions of the characteristics of South Africa's political and racial order based on those sources. As to the affective element, the author has attempted to show how Americans have felt about South Africa and what factors have influenced their feelings. Finally, with reference to the action component, the author has described the various policies that Americans have advocated on the basis of their perceptions of South Africa and their views on related issues of domestic and foreign problems.

Reflecting the above approach, the first part of this study describes critical American information on, and views of, South African politics and race policies in the period from the Nationalist victory in 1948 to the early 1960s; it then traces the growth of a movement for sanctions against South Africa and the developments in

the United States and abroad that contributed to the growth of such a movement. The second portion of the study discusses the conservative response to the criticisms of South Africa and the policy measures advocated by the critics. The conclusion notes the changed climate of opinion on South Africa that appeared at the end of the 1960s and suggests reasons for the change.

This study has sought to draw upon as broad and diverse a range of sources as possible. With the tremendous amount of information published today on world affairs, it has not been possible to examine everything available that might be relevant to the subject. This is particularly true of newspapers which remain the basic source of news for most Americans. In the late 1940s and early 1950s when the implementation of South Africa's racial policies was beginning to make news, there were over seventeen hundred morning and evening newspapers in the United States. It would be an impossible task to examine even a small number of these papers for material on South Africa over the quarter century covered by this study. However, it was possible to gain some insight into what went into American newspapers by examining the report of a South African government commission which investigated press activities in South Africa.

Soon after the Nationalists were elected in South Africa in 1948, the new government undertook a lengthy study of press operations. A Commission of Inquiry into the Press was appointed with Jacobus W. van Zijl as its chairman. The Commission's Report, published in 1964, provides a great amount of data on the news flowing to the

\[ \text{International Press Institute, } The\ Flow\ of\ the\ News\ (Zurich, Switzerland, 1953), 15. \]
American press from South Africa in the periods from May 1950 to July 1955, and from February to April 1960. It also reprints many of the cables sent by newsmen.

Throughout the period covered by this dissertation, most American newspapers, and some American periodicals, received nearly all of their foreign news from two American news agencies, the Associated Press and the United Press (United Press International after its merger with International News Service in 1958). As the van Zijl Report reveals, most of the news on South Africa transmitted by these services was supplied by stringers and sub-stringers serving on the English-language press in South Africa, that is, by journalists employed full-time by the English-language newspapers and serving the American agencies only on a secondary basis. Reflecting the long-standing divisions between Afrikaners and English-speaking South Africans, the English-language papers have moderately to sharply opposed the Nationalist government and its policies. Thus most of the news stories sent to the United States on political and racial matters in South Africa were written by, or based on the reporting of, newsmen whose language group and newspapers were in opposition to the

---


22 The Associated Press and the United Press received 87 per cent and 81 per cent respectively of their news cabled in the 1951 to 1955 period from stringers and sub-stringers serving on the English-language press. Van Zijl Report, 1029, 1054. Most of the remaining amount was cabled by correspondents sent to South Africa to cover particular stories.
government. Although several American newspapers and the Luce publications (*Time, Life*) sent their own correspondents to South Africa in the periods covered by the van Zijl Report, these correspondents apparently worked closely with the English language press while in South Africa and had few contacts with the Afrikaans press.²³

The result of this situation was that the great bulk of daily news flowing from South Africa to the United States was critical of the government and its policies. A correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, Arthur Veysey, commented on this in a cable to his paper in 1952:

> The flare-up [racial friction] is being magnified abroad largely through the activity of Britons [English-speaking South Africans] who want to get the republic-speaking Nationalists out of power. News reports going out from South Africa are compiled by Britons or by opposition party adherents. The Nationalist politicians hinder their own cause by foolish barriers which they erect between themselves and foreign visitors and thus tend to throw visitors into the sole hands of their political opponents.²⁴

As will be seen later, some newspapers in the United States receiving and printing critical articles on South Africa could still take an editorial position favorable to South Africa; and readers, too, could react favorably to South Africa despite critical news stories. Nevertheless, it does help to understand American criticism of South Africa to know that much of the news had something of a slant to it from the beginning. For American views expressed in newspapers,

²³Ibid., 1338. The newspapers which sent correspondents to South Africa for brief periods between 1951 and 1955 were the Chicago Tribune, the Christian Science Monitor, the New York Times, and the New York *Herald Tribune*.

²⁴Cable of Arthur Veysey from Cape Town, May 16, 1952, in van Zijl Report, Annexure XX, 1543-44.
the author has also consulted the New York Times over most of the period covered by this study and other newspapers for more limited periods, in particular for editorial opinion at the time of the Sharpeville crisis in South Africa in 1960. 25

Other sources consulted by the author have included periodicals, a variety of books, publications of the United States and South African governments, the clippings files of a South African newspaper, the materials distributed by a number of groups attempting to influence American opinion, special business reports, personal interviews, and several unpublished papers. Particular attention has been paid to periodicals because, unlike newspapers, they generally have had a national audience, and they are quite useful for noting changes in viewpoint over a period of time. The author doubts that there is any truly scientific approach to the study of ideas through the use of such materials; the reader has to rely on the informed judgment and the honesty of the historian.

Race has been an agonizing domestic problem; it is difficult to assess the role it has played in international affairs. It is hoped that this study will shed some light on a complex and sensitive issue in American foreign policy and can contribute to a better understanding.


26 The author has made use of periodical indexes and citations in other materials to locate articles touching upon South Africa or related topics. Of use in judging some of the periodicals utilized have been John H. Schacht, The Journals of Opinion and Reportage (New York, 1966) and W. A. Swanberg, Luce and His Empire (New York, 1972).
understanding of how peoples of different countries interact. Americans' views of South Africa have been closely related to their views of their own society, and for many Americans the problem of South Africa has simply been an extension of a domestic problem. If some Americans have not understood the problem of South Africa, it has been because they have not understood fully their own society.
When the voters went to the polls throughout South Africa on May 26, 1948, it had been expected that Prime Minister Jan Christiaan Smuts and his party would have no problem in retaining control of Parliament. Much to the dismay of Smuts's United Party, however, the Nationalist Party succeeded in taking twenty-five seats from them. This gave the Nationalists five more votes than could be mustered by the United Party. The Nationalists thus were able to gain effective control of the House of Assembly and to make their leader, Daniel F. Malan, Prime Minister. A watershed in recent South African history was marked by this election.  

The Nationalist Party, composed predominantly of Afrikaners, has had control of the government from that date to the present. Any consideration of American policy in South Africa since 1948 has had to depend upon some assessment of the South African political system. The arguments advanced in the 1960s by Americans for a strong policy against South Africa were based in part on views established in the 1940s and 1950s on the Nationalist Party (as personified by its leaders), on the possibility of change through the white political structure, and on the racial policies implemented in South Africa.

---

in those years. By the 1960s, South Africa's political system was, as
*Time* magazine declared, the world's "Symbol of Oppression."² By the
1960s the Afrikaans word apartheid had become in all languages, as an
American official told the United Nations, "a stigma, symbolic of the
whole range of the discriminatory racial legislation and practices of
the Union of South Africa."³

The reaction of the American press to the Nationalist victory
of 1948 was immediate hostility.⁴ The reason for this was not so much
that the Nationalists were about to implement a purportedly new racial
policy with the ugly-sounding name of apartheid (pronounced apart-
hate), although this was a factor. Rather, the reasons go back to
Afrikaner opposition to South African participation in World War II.
The Nationalists in their victory were burdened by a "pro-Nazi" reputa-
tion they had acquired during the war against Germany, a burden they
have carried to the present. To understand this, and why it has been
something of a distortion, it is necessary to go back briefly to World
War II.

When Britain decided in September 1939 to go to war with Ger-
many after the German invasion of Poland, the question arose whether

---

²"South Africa: The Great White Laager," *Time*, August 26,
1966, p. 18.

³Francis T. Plimpton, in Department of State *Bulletin*, April
24, 1961, p. 600.

⁴A South African newspaper surveyed the reactions of the Ameri-
can press to the election. It quoted at length from various news-
papers and periodicals and stated: "The result of the Union's general
election, and particularly the defeat of General Smuts, has evoked un-
usually widespread press comment in the United States. This comment
varies from excited alarm at the alleged possibility of civil war to
the view that the result was symptomatic of the world-wide clash of
Britain's action committed other members of the Empire and Commonwealth to war as well. The resolution of the question produced a crisis in South Africa where an important segment of the population deeply resented the Commonwealth connection. Prime Minister J. B. M. Hertzog strongly favored neutrality and announced this as the government's policy. Deputy Prime Minister Jan Smuts refused to accept Hertzog's decision and carried six other Cabinet ministers with him. When Hertzog and Smuts put their rival policies before Parliament, that body sided with Smuts by a vote of eighty to sixty-seven. Smuts became Prime Minister and declared war against Germany.

There were Afrikaners who favored South African participation in the war, but others felt the war was Britain's war and was of little concern to South Africa. These others believed that participation in the war signified continuing subservience to a foreign power whose interests did not coincide with the interests of most Afrikaners. They remembered that Germany had shown them sympathy when British imperialism had begun its attacks on the Afrikaners in 1895. Like the Germans, the Afrikaners had known defeat at the hands of the British. Some Afrikaners thought that a German victory would allow South Africa to become a republic entirely independent of Great Britain. It is not surprising then that Prime Minister Smuts found himself faced with strong opposition to the war.

After the war began, it was Daniel F. Malan who led the

---


parliamentary opponents of the war. Outside Parliament an organization called the Ossewabrandwag (the OB) took the lead in representing Afrikaner hostility to the war. The OB had begun as a cultural group in 1938, but soon it became clear that its leaders had been influenced by the ideas of German National-Socialism. For a brief period the OB and Malan's party cooperated in opposing the war. However, the agreement fell apart in August 1941 because the Nationalists remained committed to a form of parliamentary democracy while the OB reflected a totalitarian spirit. Malan broke the back of the OB by banning participation in OB activities for all Nationalist Party members.

Despite Malan's rejection of the ideology and tactics of the firebrands of the OB, the legend grew up in World War II that the Nationalists, and the Afrikaners generally, were working for a Nazi victory. During the war American publications took a very favorable view of Prime Minister Smuts, depicting him as struggling desperately against a Nazi movement which was strong among the Afrikaners. The New Republic praised Smuts in 1941, and noted the odds against which he was struggling. It asserted its belief that the leaders of the Nationalist Party had formed

a full-fledged Nazi movement aimed at the creation of a dictatorship by the Afrikaners in the Union. If Britain should be defeated, it seems certain that the Union of South Africa would be a Nazi state, anti-American in spirit and


run largely from Berlin.9

Newsweek, after South Africa's 1943 election, similarly portrayed Smuts as defeating Nazism in southern Africa. Smuts was called the "grand old man of South Africa"; his foe, Malan, was described by the magazine as a "determined implacable Dutchman who seldom jokes or laughs yet can sway a crowd by his fanatical oratory" and who was the head of a political party supported by the Axis powers. Reviewing the course of the war in South Africa under the headline "Nazis Find 'Ou Baas' Smuts as Tough at Home as Abroad," Newsweek said that Hitler had looked to South Africa as the most inviting place to stir dissen­sion within the Empire. But, it continued, "scheming Adolf reckoned with Slim [shrewd] Jannie" who had rallied the Parliament behind him and built an army "despite the fact that South Africa was for a time overrun with spies, fifth columnists, and Nazi propagandists."10

After Smuts's government was secured in power in the 1943 election and after the war turned against Germany, little more was heard of the Afrikaner dissidents who had opposed the war. South Africa was not a major theater of the war and it attracted little American attention. However, when editors and journalists of the American press looked through their files in 1948 for background information on the new Prime Minister and the party he represented, they found clippings and stories similar to those which have been


cited; these seemed to put the election results in perspective. The Afrikaner leaders who had opposed Smuts and the war were elected to office, and to the American press it appeared that they were embarking on the Nazi program that the earlier news stories had reported.

In response to the Nationalist victory the New Republic editorialized that South Africa had turned backward and claimed that "out-and-out Nazis in the ranks of the Dutch Nationalists who run South Africa are beginning to throw their weight around." It called Nationalism a "brand of extreme Nazi-type reaction." To Time, the election meant that South Africa "had suddenly embarked on a perverse, isolationist, acutely race-conscious road," under a party tainted with anti-Semitism and pro-Nazism. The Nation said that the Nationalists who came into office "are not easily distinguished from Nazis," and headed a subsequent story with the question "Will South Africa Go Fascist?"

Some developments in South Africa appeared to confirm the worst suspicions of these periodicals. Prime Minister Malan released from prison Afrikaners who had been put there for opposing the war. A ban which Smuts had placed on membership of government officials and employees in the Broederbond, a secret organization of Afrikaner leaders, and the Ossewabrandwag was lifted. A new race policy was announced which sounded to many like Nazi theories. Thus the "pro-

12"These Things Happen," Time, June 7, 1948, p. 34.
The "pro-Nazi" label which had originated during the war seemed most appropriate. The Nation was able to answer its own question about South Africa's going Fascist with an editorial on "South African Hitlerism."\textsuperscript{14}

In spite of the existence of a factual basis for the "pro-Nazi" label, its use in the postwar period and repeated application to Nationalist leaders seriously distorted the realities of South African politics. In the context of the war, the charge of "pro-Nazi" largely signified opposition to participation in the war. There clearly were Afrikaners who hoped for a German victory, but their sympathy was prompted by their own long struggle with Great Britain.\textsuperscript{15} They had long wanted to be independent of the British; having to fight for the British seemed to deny their independence. Germany was very far away, and the Afrikaners had heard British horror stories about German barbarism in the First World War.

The revelations after World War II of the savagery of Nazi rule and the hideous atrocities against the Jews gave the label "pro-Nazi" intensity and connotations it had lacked in the first years of the war. Use of the term after the war suggested that those to whom it was applied had themselves favored concentration camps and were strongly anti-Semitic. If the Nazis were anti-Semitic and the Nationalists were "pro-Nazi," then it followed that the Nationalists were also very anti-Semitic. Thus to complete the "pro-Nazi" image, American publications exaggerated anti-Semitism in South Africa.


\textsuperscript{15}The American ambassador to South Africa during part of World War II recognized this; see Lincoln MacVeagh to F. D. Roosevelt, Thanksgiving Day, 1942, in Munger Africana Library Notes, XII (March, 1972), 14.
To be sure there have been some indications of anti-Semitism among some Afrikaners. Examples could be found in 1948 in campaign references to the stock figure of Hoggenheimer and British-Jewish-Capitalist-Imperialism. But the American press greatly magnified the extent of such sentiments. *Time*, for example, said that when "Prime Minister Daniel Malan's Nazi-aping Nationalist government came into power last spring, it promptly launched an anti-Negro, anti-semitic propaganda campaign of which Goebbels himself would have been proud." Later *Time* went so far as to claim that Malan's victory had "sent Boer hooligans on a looting spree directed at Jewish stores." Similarly, a report in the *Nation* asserted that the Nationalists were "to the last man virulent anti-semites"; no direct actions had been taken against South African Jews, it said, because the Nationalists were "too weak at this stage to attack the Jews openly." Despite signs of anti-Semitism, American publications continued for years to link the "pro-Nazi" past of Nationalist leaders with an alleged anti-Semitism which might manifest itself in strong measures against South

---

16 "How to Advance Communism," *Time*, December 6, 1948, p. 32.

17 "Of God and Hate," *Time*, May 5, 1952, p. 37. This report is probably derived from an earlier report in "To Relieve the People," *Time*, June 28, 1948, p. 21. The author doubts the authenticity of this story after checking relevant issues of the Cape Town *Cape Times* and the clippings file of the *Natal Daily News* (Durban, South Africa), and after asking several South African political scientists and historians about such incidents. Brian Bunting, who discusses anti-Semitism in South Africa in his highly critical *The Rise of the South African Reich* (London, 1964), 64-65, makes no mention of such incidents. W. A. Swanberg in *Luce and His Empire* (New York, 1972), 261, has noted that *Time* "was famous for its ability to find unidentified politicians or bystanders who would make statements on news events providing the very point of view *Time* sought to promote." It seems possible *Time* made up an event in this instance.


Frequently American publications mixed the elements of pro-Nazism and anti-Semitism with descriptions of the Nationalist leaders that made them appear crude, even comical. Declaring that anyone who understood Nazism could also understand South Africa, a writer for the \textit{American Mercury} said that both the Nazis and the Nationalist leaders were low-comedy figures through whom history had chosen to work its evil:

\textit{[T]he melancholy truth is that the Broederbunders [sic] are lower-case rascals, creatures endowed with, at best, a second-rate social and political concupiscence. No Machiavellis here. Misplaced farceurs rather. President Malan for instance—superficially, a most unwholesome figure, a pretender to first-class political venality. But the fellow is flawed, daubed with the irrevocable stain of comedy, having been born . . . on a farm called \textit{Alles Verloren}. . . . Malan's principal aides are even less prepossessing. His right bower, Mr. Johannes Strijdum, for all his noisy, mainly anti-semitic, demogogy, is forever cursed by the fact that he was at one time an unsuccessful ostrich farmer. Then there is Doctor Verwoerd, who as director of Broederbund [sic] propaganda, must be must be accorded first place among these racist comedians.}\footnote{Robert de Koch, "Foreign Intelligence: Night Over South Africa," \textit{American Mercury}, LXXII (February, 1951), 199. Robert de Koch, said the magazine's editor, was a pseudonym of a well-known South African journalist who used the name out of fear of reprisal.}

When \textit{Time} put Prime Minister Malan on its cover in 1952 and printed a feature story on South Africa, it similarly linked unattractive personal characteristics with political, religious, and racial extremism. Malan's chief political attributes were said by \textit{Time} to be his religious zeal and his ability to provide scapegoats for the
Afrikaners' depression troubles—Jews and Africans. According to Time's report, Malan was an "aging, ailing, absent-minded" religious fanatic who relied on his wife for political advice and to "wipe his head when he sweated over his meals."21

Malan's successor, Johannes G. Strijdom was described in similarly unflattering terms. An article in the Nation reported that Malan was resigning because of his health and queried, "Could anyone be worse than 'the world's most hated man'?" It asserted that Strijdom was worse. Malan's followers had been deeply attached to a parliamentary system of government, but the men behind Strijdom, said the report, were "in ideology the heirs of the Goebbels Ministry of Propaganda."22 Life called the new Prime Minister "a steel-hard, super-fanatical white supremacist," while its sister publication, Time, more strongly declared that the Nationalists had elevated "a man with the racist principles of Adolf Hitler and some of the Nazi leader's frenzy ... a fanatic apostle of racial segregation who represents the extreme anti-British, anti-Negro, anti-Jewish wing of the party."23

As suggested earlier, some of the intensity of the hostility of the American press to South Africa's political leadership is attributable to the fact that the news of South Africa came primarily from the English-speaking press in South Africa, and to the role some Afrikaners played in opposing South African participation in World War

21"Of God and Hate," Time, 32-38.
II. However, much American criticism also arose from hostility to the Nationalist implementation of apartheid, a policy directly at variance with American ideals, if not practice. It was that policy which led to the virtually universal condemnation of South Africa.

In the view of many white South Africans, the apartheid policy is an attempt to reconcile the white desire for continued control over political and economic matters affecting their lives with the need to hold out some promise for the present and future fulfillment of African aspirations for self-determination. According to the South African sociologists N. J. Rhoodie and H. J. Venter, who have set forth most thoroughly the rationale of apartheid, the concept of apartheid has as its ideal "the comparatively permanent and complete separation of White and Black in South Africa." Ultimately each race is to live in its own homelands. The idea of physical separation of the races apparently did not originate with the Nationalists; however, they did make apartheid a key element in their 1948 campaign, and they were the first to enact a systematic policy of race relations for all South Africa.25


Americans generally found the apartheid policy abhorrent in practice; they viewed its ideal as undesirable and unattainable.

As a body of legislation, apartheid consists of dozens of individual acts, most of which have been passed or amended since 1948. These regulate virtually all relations between whites and non-whites and many other aspects of life in South Africa. The bulk of these laws makes it rather difficult to discuss them adequately in a brief space. Conceptually, it is helpful to observe the useful distinction that the sociologist Pierre L. van den Berghe has made between three types of segregation which are embodied in the acts. He uses the term micro-segregation to describe segregation in public and private facilities, meso-segregation to refer to physical separation into racially homogenous residential areas within multiracial urban areas, and macro-segregation to identify legislative measures aimed at achieving total separation. Others often refer to micro-segregation as petty apartheid and macro-segregation as grand, total, or ideal apartheid. To give the reader some appreciation of the content of these laws and the intensity of American criticism of their implementation, the principal features of the major acts will be noted together with representative comments that appeared in regard to them in American

---

26 A useful summary is Muriel Horrell, Legislation and Race Relations: A Summary of the Main South African Laws Which Affect Race Relations (rev. ed.; Johannesburg, 1971), which is published by the South African Institute of Race Relations. The Institute also publishes an annual Survey of Race Relations which gives fuller accounts of legislation and developments within South Africa.

Among the first of the apartheid acts were the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 and the Immorality Amendment Act of 1950. Together these acts prohibited marriages and illicit intercourse between white and non-white individuals. *Time* declared that South Africa's banning such racial mixture was contrary to the law of God. Anne Bauer, a free lance writer who toured South Africa shortly after the Nationalists began to enact apartheid, likewise criticized South Africa's new racial order. Race discrimination was not new in South Africa, she noted, but the Mixed Marriages and Immorality Acts struck her as a rigid enforcement of caste and were "legislation for which no precedent can be found in the twentieth century, with the possible exception of Hitlerian Germany." Others too claimed the acts were unparalleled, despite the fact that at the time similar legislation could be found in the statute books of some thirty-one American jurisdictions.

28Although it never mentioned apartheid, Alan Paton's novel *Cry, the Beloved Country* undoubtedly influenced many American views on South Africa's race policies. See below, p. 79, n. 73. The author has also seen or read accounts of television shows dealing with South Africa and apartheid. The author has been unable to go into television treatment of South Africa in any depth, but it can be said that those programs which have come to his attention generally presented a very harsh picture of apartheid. For example, in late 1954 Edward R. Murrow and Fred Friendly did a two-part program on South Africa on the highly-acclaimed "See It Now" series. Jack Gould, who reviewed it for the *New York Times*, said it was "not unlike a return visit to darkest Nazism." *New York Times*, December 19, 1954, Sec. 2, p. 13.


31Pauli Murray, ed., *State Laws on Race and Color* (Cincinnati, 1950), 18. These laws continued to be enforced in some of the states, and miscegenation statutes were not declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court until *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967).
The Population Registration Act of 1950 was even more closely akin to caste legislation. It systemized the classification of the entire population of South Africa into race groups more thoroughly than had any previous act in South Africa. A complete register of the population was to be compiled and each person was to be issued an identity card. The criteria for classification were appearance, general acceptance, and repute. Grown men suffered the humiliation of having combs passed through their hair to determine their "color" and thereby their legal, political, and economic rights. Brothers, noted one publication, could be separated if the comb tangled in the hair of one and not the other and their lives entirely changed. Another periodical said that the act was to "add precision to the barbarism of apartheid." It cited the example of a seventy-two year old woman who was reclassified to Coloured after her white husband died; the reclassification meant her pension was cut in half. A writer in the New Republic called the Population Registration Act "the most virulent and arbitrary racism since Hitler . . . ."32

The Group Areas Act of 1950 is an example of what van den Berghe has referred to as meso-segregation. It created a Group Areas

However, the Court had invalidated an act similar to South Africa's Immorality Act in McLaughlin v. Florida, 379 U.S. 184 (1964). For the view that the Immorality Act has served to prevent the exploitation of non-white women, see Stanislav Andreski, "Reflections on the South African Social Order from a Comparative Viewpoint," in Adam, ed., South Africa: Sociological Perspectives, 28.


Board through which separate areas in urban centers could be marked off for the residence, occupation, and trade of the different racial groups. Once an area was designated for a particular group, members of other groups could not own or occupy places within the area except by permit. Typical of the American reaction to this was an editorial in the Catholic magazine America which declared: "No more hellish plan for dealing humanity out in neat little piles according to pigmentation has ever been concocted." Even its more positive aspects were strongly criticized. When Africans were moved from shacks to government-built houses under the Group Areas Act, Life and the New York Times condemned the tactics employed and the motivation for the slum clearance.

Among the most notorious of the apartheid measures was the so-called pass law, ironically entitled the Abolition of Passes Act. It has been used to control the movement of Africans between tribal areas and urban areas by requiring them to carry reference books showing their authority for being in a place. Chester Bowles, a former governor of Connecticut and ambassador to India, wrote in 1957 that the pass law was the cruelest of the apartheid regulations. Others said the pass system was "a hangover from slavery days" and "symbolical to the Africans of their helot status." In the year of the passage of the Act,

35 "Other Victims of Apartheid," America, April 23, 1960, p. 94.


37 Chester Bowles, Africa's Challenge to America (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1957), 21.

38 "South Africa," Atlantic, CCV (June, 1960), 21.
1952, the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor de­
nounced the Malan government for adhering to "a Hitlerite racial policy without regard for basic human values or the devastating consequences of such a reprehensible course."

Still another piece of legislation which met with widespread criticism in the American press was the Bantu Education Act of 1953. The Act transferred responsibility for African education from the central government and terminated government subsidies to mission-run schools. Under the Act, African education was to conform to the policy that Africans could rise only to a certain level in the white community but to any level in the African homelands. As interpreted by Life, the government had "limited the education of black Africans to schools where the curriculum is designed to convince them that they are inferior." America claimed the Bantu Education Act was "designed to prevent the Negro people of South Africa from even aspiring to rise above their present state of subjection."

Finally, the most important legislative measures of the apart­
heid program in terms of giving it a unifying concept and a theoretical justification have been the acts designed to provide for African self­
government in African homelandä (Bantustans), or macro-segregation. Before the Nationalists began their program, previous South African governments had designated the lands which were to be reserves for

40 "Locked Door to Learning," Life, September 12, 1955, pp. 81-82.
African occupation. In 1951 the Nationalists passed the Bantu Authorities Act which provided for the establishment of tribal, regional, and territorial authorities for the governance of Africans in these regions. Certain executive and administrative powers were to be delegated gradually to the various authorities; the powers of chiefs, headmen, and tribal councillors were enhanced by the Act. The Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act of 1959 and subsequent legislation went further in setting up national self-government units for different African groups and in granting limited autonomy to such units.

Although ideal apartheid might, as Rhoodie and Venter suggest, be regarded as "an enlightened and comprehensive programme, for up-lifting the Bantu so that they may become an independent national entity," not many Americans have so viewed it.\(^2\) Very few Americans commenting on the South African plan for macro-segregation have thought the policy moral, desirable, feasible, or practical. Homer A. Jack, a prominent American religious leader, called a South African Bureau of Racial Affairs (SABRA) pamphlet on the concept "SABRA's Mein Kampf." Nobody, he said, "can take this SABRA plan seriously, yet nobody took Hitler seriously either."\(^3\) Other American observers criticized the policy strongly on the ground that under it the overwhelming majority of the country's population would be allotted only 13 per cent of the land, the poorest land at that. The implementation of the plan for

\(^2\) Rhoodie and Venter, Apartheid, 17.

\(^3\) Homer A. Jack, "What is this Apartheid?" Christian Century, September 24, 1952, pp. 1092-94.
African homelands was seen as an attempt to keep the Africans in a tribal state, both to keep them from advancing and to prevent them from becoming a cohesive political force. It was also interpreted as an attempt to rationalize old-style white domination (baasskap) in an effort to pacify world opinion.

One of the most widespread and strongest criticisms of the idea of total apartheid was that the white dependence on black labor was too great to permit complete separation. The New York Times regarded the idea as unworkable, editorializing: "Prime Minister Malan preaches segregation while every economic force in the country has made and makes for ever-growing interdependence between white and black." An Atlantic report on conditions in South Africa regarded plans for complete segregation as "nonsensical double talk"; it commented that in "its complete divorce from any observable or possible facts, the talk of total separation reveals a dreary imperviousness to reality." Similarly, America thought that the efforts to bring out complete segregation were futile; it stated: "They pass laws against the sea, and as the sea rises they flay it." Others who thought a thriving economy and apartheid inconsistent said that South Africa had to choose one or the other; they doubted that white South Africa would make the economic sacrifices required to accomplish full

---


\[46\] "South Africa," Atlantic, 18.

\[47\] "Lament," America, May 1, 1953, p. 89.
The sociologists George E. Simpson and J. Milton Yinger took this view in their textbook on race relations. They stated:

South Africa is undertaking extensive industrialization. There is need for skilled workers, rationally organized into productive enterprises, and sufficiently well-paid to be able to afford the products of their own making. The whites of South Africa, therefore, face a dilemma: They can have apartheid or they can have an expanding, modern industrial society; they cannot have both. Having chosen the former, the government now faces serious obstacles to the achievement of the latter.

In the late 1960s this view was transformed from a criticism of South African policy to a justification for the continuation of American economic involvement in South Africa.

Although this brief discussion of apartheid has been able to cover only a few of the thousands of reports that appeared on Nationalist race policy after 1948, it does suggest that Americans had very good reasons for criticizing South Africa. The restrictions on nonwhites have been very severe and incidents of injustice and cruelty have often occurred. Many white South Africans have been myopic or insensitive about the harshness of the administration of the government's policies. But has the apartheid program been so ignoble and devoid of merit as American criticism of it would indicate? There are many decent whites in South Africa who have supported apartheid, and they have not understood why they have been presented abroad, in the words of the influential Afrikaans newspaper Die Vaderland, as "bloodthirsty oppressors when we only wish to uphold apartheid from a

---


Christian standpoint."\(^{50}\) Even some of South Africa's severest critics have agreed that at least part of the criticism of South Africa was unfair and mistaken. Some exaggeration and distortion resulted from the fact that Americans' views of South Africa were strongly conditioned by their views of race relations in the United States.

From the 1930s through the 1960s American studies on race relations were generated and sustained by a melioristic interest in improving relations between racial groups, primarily between white and black groups. As sociologist Pierre van den Berghe has observed, "specialists in race relations became the vanguard of liberal intellectuals eager to expose the folly and crimes of the past."\(^{51}\) In exposing the "folly and crimes" their work demonstrated less a concern with an understanding of race relations than with stigmatizing certain race attitudes and beliefs and the practice of racial segregation. A pattern of public attitudes on race matters resulted from their publications which found expression in the national media.\(^{52}\) I. A. Newby, a historian who is no friend of the segregationists, commented on the general attitudes of American organs of news and opinion on race

\(^{50}\) Die Vaderland, December 12, 1957, translated in Thought: A Journal of Afrikaans Thinking for the English-Speaking, II, No. 1, p. 5. As T. Dunbar Moodie has observed: "Separate development [apartheid] is to the Afrikaner believer what their 'errand into the wilderness' was to the New England Puritans; it is his mission and calling, his salvation and his justification." Moodie, "Power, Apartheid, and the Afrikaner Civil Religion," 350.


\(^{52}\) The author is relying to a considerable extent on Herbert Blumer, "United States of America," in UNESCO, Research in Race Relations (New York, 1966), 87-133; van den Berghe, Race and Racism, 1-31; and Heribert Adam, Modernizing Racial Dominance: South Africa's Political Dynamics (Berkeley, 1971), 16-20.
questions in one of his works:

In their zeal to further the Negro's cause, the national press, the communications media, and other molders of mass opinion invariably present segregationists in the worst possible light, and more often than not select irrational persons with a Ku Klux Klan mentality to present the anti-Negro point of view. The result is to ridicule segregationists to the amusement and satisfaction of integrationists, but not to help Americans understand the appeal of racist ideas.53

The predominant view in the United States as South Africa began its apartheid policies was that segregation had very detrimental effects, both material and psychological, on the group which was segregated. There was a widespread public belief that discrimination or segregation of any sort was harmful. The United States Supreme Court in 1954 held unanimously that separate schools for black and white children were inherently unequal.54 Presumably segregated facilities of any sort were likewise unequal, and subsequent cases so held. Some writers took the view that integration could only prove beneficial to all concerned. Thus, an editorial in the Nation chided the ignorance of the whites of both the United States and South Africa who continued to act as though they were being dragged into the future caterwauling, haggling, grimacing, hemming and hawing, bargaining, resisting, hedging and rolling their eyes. Their attitude is only the more curious in that the evidence is now clear that integration is good for the nation, good for business, good for the arts, for religion, for sports, for labor, for education, for government; good also for our immortal souls.55

Americans' views on apartheid were also shaped by their explanations of the reasons for segregation; they thought segregation to be the result of racism or prejudice among the dominant group.

53I. A. Newby, Challenge to the Court (Baton Rouge, 1967), viii.
American social scientists treated racism as an ideology and sought to dispel the underlying scientific, philosophical, or religious rationale for it. When racism maintained that black people are genetically inferior in intellect, social scientists used scientific data to argue that members of all races have essentially the same intellectual and social capacities. When master or chosen race philosophies were put forth, supporters of integration attempted to demonstrate the irrationality of such doctrines or the lack of a scriptural basis for them. Racism, in fact, came to be seen not only as an indication of ignorance but also as a sin against God. At its meeting in Evanston, Illinois in 1954, the World Council of Churches declared:

Any form of segregation based on race, color or ethnic origin is contrary to the Gospel and is incompatible with the Christian doctrine of man and with the nature of the church of Christ. Whenever and wherever any of us Christians deny this by action or inaction, we betray Christ and the fellowship which bears his name.

Examples of this attitude often appeared in religious periodicals in the 1950s and 1960s, and the attitude in part explains why religious groups were in the vanguard of the movement against South Africa as well as in the civil rights movement in the United States. It also explains the zeal, the fervor, the moral self-righteousness with which some attacked South Africa, urging a holy war, as it were, against the infidels.

56 See, for example, I. A. Newby's "dialogue" with racists in his The Development of Segregationist Thought (Homewood, Illinois, 1968), passim.

The other explanation given for segregation, prejudice, was viewed by social scientists as a psychological phenomenon arising from basic personality characteristics. It was treated as an outgrowth of, or compensation for, a personality deficiency. In the view of social scientists who took this approach, prejudice was pathological; the prejudiced individual was seen as insecure, disillusioned, and projecting hate toward another group to compensate for suppressed drives. The attitude which developed from a focus on prejudice was the view that members of the discriminating group were sick people, even vicious and brutal. The Christian Century, a periodical which frequently criticized apartheid, gave an example of this attitude when it commented on segregationists:

What affects these mixed-up, hag-ridden people is a virulent species of mental and emotional illness: an addiction of the spirit born of a deep illness in the body politic, that is no less powerful than the addiction to alcohol or marijuana.58

American views on race and prejudice were reflected in their interpretations of the factors giving rise to apartheid in South Africa. One frequently asserted explanation was that apartheid was the implementation of a Herrenvolk (master race) philosophy. Apartheid, some Americans concluded, grew out of a white conviction of an innate white biological superiority. The ideology of apartheid, under this interpretation, came from a benighted Afrikaner culture or was borrowed from Nazi Germany, or it arose out of a combination of the two.

Although he made numerous comparisons between South Africa and Germany, John Gunther attributed apartheid to Afrikaner institutions

and culture. Gunther, the ubiquitous journalist who was well-known in the 1940s and 1950s for his Inside series on various parts of the world, went Inside Africa in 1953. Describing the South African government as the ugliest he had ever encountered in the free world, Gunther found its highest officials to be "prisoners of an ideology that must seem demented to most outsiders, and several are wildly vociferous fanatics." The backwardness of the government Gunther believed, was due to the sinister influence of the secret Broederbond of Afrikaner leaders and the Dutch Reformed Church. Only Nazi Germany had ever had an organization which exerted the sort of influence that the Broederbond did, he claimed. The Dutch Reformed Church's role in society he compared to that of the Catholic Church in medieval Spain. Gunther did not foresee any improvement for South Africa after Malan stepped down because Strijdom, who Gunther said believed frankly in a master-slave relationship between races, was even more a fanatic than Malan: "The difference between the two is almost that between Hindenburg and Hitler."

Several other American journalists who visited South Africa at about the same time as Gunther reached similar conclusions. One of these, Oden Meeker, asserted that Malan's belief in white superiority stemmed from the theological doctrine of "election" by God. He noted that the Dutch Reformed Church was against equality, speech, the fox trot, two piece bathing suits, drinking, Christmas

60Ibid., 459, 470.
61Ibid., 449.
parties, smoking, and many other aspects of modern life, and said that the Afrikaner's "messianic, Fundamentalist" approach to problems could not easily be modified. On the theory of apartheid he commented:

The religion of segregation is nourished by a vigorous school of apologetics, and places like the University of Stellenbosch are full of men, many of them perfectly sincere men, expatiating on the racial-mystical philosophy of apartheid and proving by every device of scholarship that black Africans are twice as happy with apartheid as without it.  

The other journalist mentioned was Robert St. John, who similarly asserted that "the heavy hand of the Calvinists [of the Dutch Reformed Church] has written much of the country's legislation." St. John thought Afrikaans was like "baby talk" and described the Afrikaner as "an eighteenth century man in a twentieth century world who has some of the psychological problems of a nude man walking down Fifth Avenue, New York, wanting other people to accept him as one of them, though not possessing any clothes."  

Similarly blaming religious ignorance for apartheid, Newsweek claimed that Prime Minister Strijdom was "convinced that Negroes are sons of the scriptural Ham, accursed of God and ordained to be hewers of wood and drawers of water." Chester Bowles, who later became Under Secretary of State in the Kennedy administration, said that apartheid was based on the assumption "that any white man is superior to any black man."

---

64 St. John, Through Malan's Africa, 73-74.
to any non-white." Another writer, who later became the American ambassador to Burundi, described apartheid as "a political-theological doctrine postulating God-given superiority for the white man." As previously indicated, many reports on South Africa traced the "pro-Nazi" past of the Afrikaner leaders. When Nazi influence on Nationalist policies was not asserted expressly, it was at least implied. This interpretation of apartheid was made most explicit and thoroughly by William Henry Vatcher in his study of the development of Afrikaner nationalism. Vatcher stated:

Nazi ideas undoubtedly influenced the conception of the proposed apartheid policy that helped Malan into power in 1948. The Herrenvolk (master race) philosophy of Hitler justified control by the European (baasskap) and more especially by the Afrikaner, since, in the Afrikaner view, English-speaking South Africans could not be trusted to carry out such a scheme. Hitler's philosophy certainly stiffened Afrikaner pride of race, and the Nazi ideas of nationalism corresponded amazingly to the Afrikaner's own unorganized thinking.

This thesis is dubious and lacks firm evidentiary support. Indeed, more recent scholarship traces the origin of the apartheid concept.
back to English colonial policy in the province of Natal in the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, the view adopted by Vatcher and others was influential.

If Afrikaner culture and nationalism were the sole reason for apartheid, it could be argued that Americans might look to the English-speaking minority, acting in cooperation with dissident Afrikaners, to bring about change in policy through the electoral process. For a few years after the 1948 election this did appear possible. The United Party criticized the Nationalists strongly, and vigorous protests against repressive legislation were raised by organizations formed to work for the defeat of the Nationalist Party and its policies. However, even before the strength of the opposition to the Nationalists was tested in 1953, American observers doubted that a challenge could be successful. A report in the New Republic just before the election stated that the controversy between the white parties was "not dictatorship versus democracy, but whether political supremacy shall be vested in the whole white community or in the Nationalist section only." A similarly jaundiced view was taken by Life which observed that Malan's opposition "feared not so much a

70 David Welsh, The Roots of Segregation: Native Policy in Colonial Natal, 1845-1910 (Cape Town, 1971), 318-22. The author believes that apartheid can also be traced in part to American segregation, see below pp. 75-77.


loss of dark men's rights but their own." Several more scholarly analyses reached virtually the same conclusion.

After the 1953 election, in which the Nationalists increased their seats in Parliament, Newsweek commented that the victory had "knocked the guts out" of all the opposition. The United Party, which non-whites had seen as their only hope, was shattered said Newsweek; South Africa had rejected the "middle way." Similarly, Basil Davidson, a journalist and historian writing in the Nation, observed that the defeated opposition had simply been the "moderate racialists," and they had suffered a smashing defeat. Both the white and the non-whites, he commented, had shifted ground with the election, and there was little middle ground where they could join. Thereafter, political reports on South Africa were generally on the theme of white against black, not "good" white versus "bad" white.

The interpretation of apartheid as the product of Afrikaner culture was then inadequate. Others were advanced which complemented the Afrikaner Herrenvolk interpretation. One of these was the view that apartheid was the white response to their fear of the overwhelming numerical superiority of the Africans. This interpretation

73 "One Fifth of a Nation Celebrates," Life, April 21, 1952, p. 27.


75 "South Africa: Mandate for Malan," Newsweek, April 27, 1953, p. 56.

can be called the "White Laager" thesis.

In frontier days in South Africa, the Boer pioneers would draw their ox-wagons into a circle called a laager for protection against attack by African tribesmen. American observers in the 1950s and 1960s increasingly came to the view that all the whites of South Africa were drawing into a political laager. Professor Gwendolen M. Carter apparently reached this conclusion in her *Politics of Inequality: South Africa Since 1948*, one of the most thorough and well-respected studies of South African politics in recent history. Although Carter noted important differences between the United Party and the Nationalists, she found more significant the increasing polarization of sentiment between white and non-white. She suggested that their polarization "could all too easily bring South Africa into the situation of an armed camp in which all non-Europeans are so antagonistic to all whites that the latter feel forced to stand together on all counts as the only hope of self-preservation." 77 William Henry Vatcher, in his study entitled *White Laager*, likewise saw all whites in South Africa coming closer as non-whites increasingly resisted Nationalist race policies, although he did find the origins of apartheid in Afrikaner nationalism. 78

There were two types of fear responsible for apartheid which were suggested in American publications, personal fear for physical safety, and the fear of being "swamped" politically and culturally.


The belief that personal fear prompted much of apartheid was asserted in an important article in *Time* in 1951 entitled "City in Terror: A Report from Johannesburg." The *Time* correspondent presented a grim picture of conditions in the city, describing increasing terror and murder in the streets. Apartheid resulted from the fact that the blacks had suddenly become a major internal foe; the whites were frightened. Blacks were being separated, the article said, so that the Nationalists would know where to bomb if there was trouble.79

The idea of personal fear being widespread among the whites of South Africa was also played up in the repeated statements in the press that South Africans slept with guns under their pillows and by the printing of pictures showing white women in South Africa taking pistol lessons. The journalist Robert St. John felt that it was this same fear that made the whites smoke and drink at an abnormal rate:

The excesses seem to be outward manifestation of the nervousness and fear which hang over South Africa. Many South Africans do not realize it themselves. Yet fear is here, like a London fog, everywhere.80

79 Alexander Campbell, "City in Terror: A Report from Johannesburg," *Time*, September 3, 1951, pp. 32-33. Originally from Scotland, Campbell moved to South Africa and became a journalist. He was responsible for many of the critical reports that appeared in the Luce publications in the early 1950s. Later he became managing editor of the New Republic. Apparently, while he was sending highly critical material to *Time* and *Life*, he was also working for the South African Tourist Bureau and writing highly laudatory material on South Africa. Cable of Arthur Veysey from Cape Town [to Chicago Tribune], May 21, 1952, in J. W. van Zijl, Commission chairman, Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Press (Pretoria, 1964), Annexure XX, 1541; Meeker, Report on Africa, 227.

Most white South Africans would probably deny that this sort of fear has existed or they would say that the press reports have been greatly exaggerated. But they would not deny that the second type of fear has been the major basis of, and justification for, apartheid. Their claim has been that to give the African political rights in his present socio-economic position would result in the downfall of civilization, as the whites know it, in South Africa. ⁸¹

Some American publications grudgingly conceded that conditions prevailing in South Africa might require temporary restrictions on human rights and a gradual process of liberalization. However, most Americans writing on South Africa denied that there was any real basis for white fear over the granting of political rights to the Africans. A writer in Atlantic said that the whites were clinging to a dream of domination, "more frightened of the common daylight than they are of the horrors they have themselves evoked." ⁸² An article expressing a similar idea appeared in Christian Century under the title "South African Racists Fear the Light." ⁸³ A white fear of being swamped

---


⁸² "South Africa," Atlantic, 21.

was generally regarded by Americans as being irrational, no more than "paranoid suspicions and repressions" in the words of the historian David Brion Davis. This view was reinforced by the publication in the American press of interviews with or writings of African leaders from South Africa such as A. B. Xuma, Z. K. Matthews, and Nobel Prize winner Albert J. Luthuli, leaders who were articulate, educated, and reasonable, leaders who asserted that they favored a progressive non-racial democracy for South Africa. Gwendolen Carter in her Politics of Inequality took the position that South African whites had nothing to fear from the Africans, stating:

In South Africa, in contrast [to the Mau Mau in Kenya], non-European political organizations seek changes within the existing system, not its overthrow. They want a share in political power, not to oust the Europeans. They want a fuller return for their contribution to the economy, not to change its character. They want to become more Western, not less.

The significance of this view was that if white fear was unfounded, then the primary justification for apartheid was invalid. Thus, when a witness before a Congressional hearing on American policy on South Africa asserted restrictions on the Africans were necessary for white survival, Congressman Donald Fraser quickly rejected the argument. He stated that

the non-Europeans in South Africa don't seek to drive out the whites, they seek a multiracial society. They are not

86 Carter, Politics of Inequality, 379. See also, Karis, "South Africa," 507.
imprisoned, as the whites are by their fear. 87

Finally, some Americans viewed apartheid as a vast scheme for rationalizing the economic exploitation of the Africans. It was obvious to those looking at South Africa that Africans made up the great majority of the labor force, and it seemed that the apartheid legislation simply facilitated a continuation of this fact. A writer in the Nation declared that the government's race legislation was "a blueprint for turning South Africa into one vast slave labor camp."88 George Shepherd, Jr., one of the first of the anti-South African activists, declared that "exploitation of cheap labor is the taproot of the evil system of racism."89 Similarly, Sidney Lens, the director of a Chicago AFL-CIO local union, wrote that there was strong suspicion "that the total enforcement of pass-book laws is aimed at recruiting slave labor for white landowners."90

The theme of economic exploitation did not contradict the Herrenvolk interpretation, but rather reinforced it for some observers. For example, America combined the two, stating that under apartheid the "Bantu are to remain a race of helots upon whose backs the favored


90 Sidney Lens, "Passbook Revolution," Christian Century, April 6, 1960, p. 407. For similar discussions by other labor union representatives see United States-South African Relations, 131-64.
of God can build a prosperous economy." However, the views were contradictory in that a person who believed that economic exploitation was the mainspring of apartheid could not believe that white South Africans genuinely intended to bring about complete territorial separation of the races.

By the late 1950s, the image of South Africa as a benighted land was fairly well entrenched. Hendrik Frensch Verwoerd had replaced Strijdom in 1958 but he was regarded as being in the same mold as his predecessors, despite his brilliance and more affable nature. South African politics seemed to have settled into a pattern. Pro-Nazi Prime Minister followed pro-Nazi Prime Minister, and repressive measure after repressive measure was "jammed" or "railroaded" through Parliament. English-speaking whites timidly offered superficial, ineffective opposition to the harsher pieces of legislation, secure in the knowledge that the Nationalists would not be diverted from their course. South African policies were viewed as abhorrent, and Americans doubted that change could come about from within the existing political system.

Despite the fact that most people writing on South Africa condemned apartheid, few Americans called for their government to do anything about South African oppression. South Africa was wicked, Americans agreed, but this did not mean the United States should take


92 "God's Man," Time, September 15, 1958, p. 30. See also "Unanimity," Nation, November 2, 1963, p. 270: "To talk of South Africa, under the Verwoerd regime, as barbarous, is to slander barbarians."
action to oppose it. In the term used in the introduction to this study, the American image of South Africa lacked an "action component." The factors in the United States and abroad that gave the image an action component in the 1960s will be taken up next. These factors caused South Africa to be perceived as threatening American interests.
Until it became a republic in 1961, the official name of South Africa was the Union of South Africa. Americans looking at South Africa noted from time to time that there was another U.S.A. in the world. In many respects the two U.S.A.'s were similar. They had a frontier tradition, gold rushes, and boom towns in the wilderness. Both had fought British imperialism. And both had a "color" problem. In fact, they were the only two countries in the world in which significant numbers of blacks and whites lived together within the same country and in which there was a political problem of segregation. This last point could not help but be noted, and it inevitably drew comparisons between the two countries. For many years Americans and South Africans, white and black alike, have examined each others' societies for relevant ideas on race relations; it is the author's belief that the two countries have influenced one another on race policies. Others in the world, too, have noted similarities between the race problems of the United States and South Africa. The need to convince the world that the United States was not like South Africa became a reason for the United States to denounce apartheid or to take further action against South Africa.
After the Nationalists assumed power in 1948, South Africa and its policies were in the news, and people began to observe that what the Nationalists called apartheid was similar to racial segregation in the American South. Thomas Sancton, a journalist who had long covered Southern politics, discovered in 1949 the existence of "South Africa's Dixiecrats." What drew his attention to the "fundamental parallelism" between the American South and South Africa was a debate then underway at the United Nations. The Nationalist victory, he said, was "roughly analogous to the rise of the Dixiecrat movement."¹

In the debates at the United Nations the position of the South African spokesman was based, in Sancton's view, on the same systematic political racism that the Dixiecrats were using to kill the Truman legislative programs. "Like our own political racists," wrote Sancton,

> the white South African leaders subvert every process of law and every principle of patriotic honor and civilization to the stuifling task of perpetuating human injustice. Point by point Mr. Louw [the South African representative] repeated the spurious arguments for injustice—using at times the same phrasing—which were offered recently by Senators [Richard] Russell, [Walter] George, [Allen] Ellender, and others who were active in the filibuster.²

Living conditions among African miners in South Africa were almost indistinguishable from those of the poorer American Negroes in Southern cities.

Disconcerting similarities did exist, but for Sancton as for others in the early 1950s, the similarities were at the same time

²Ibid.
reassuring. Although the United States still had a blemished record, the federal government had embarked on a different course from that taken by South Africa. Despite the similarities it was clear that the American race problem was only a Southern problem, one that other Americans were working to solve. By comparison with South Africa, conditions for black Americans were not too bad and were improving. Sancton stated that the standard of living for Southern blacks had "risen substantially in the past decade as a result of their employ­ment in war industries. The living conditions of natives in South Africa remain a disgrace to the modern world." 3

The existence of South Africa's race policies gave proof to the belief that the American government was making progress in dealing with the race problem. Roderick Peattie, an American geographer whose work with the Office of War Information took him to South Africa in World War II, said that his first reaction to Richard Wright's Black Boy was to cry "For shame, America!" But then he thought of South Africa, and it gave him a "grand and glorious" sensation. Such a book could not be published there. 4 He viewed race problems as only an "infection on the body corporate" in America, while race hatred was a "congenital disease" in South Africa. Another visitor to South Africa, Pulitzer Prize novelist Martin Flavin, found many similarities in the race problems of the two countries; many aspects of the South African color line were painfully reminiscent to him of those at home. But, like Sancton, Flavin concluded that "there is one important

---

3 Ibid.
fundamental difference: every step the black man is able to take forward in America has the support of the law—of national law at least; in South Africa every step he takes is in violation and defiance of it." Even a publication such as the New Republic which found American progress in race relations very limited could not help but note that the "United States is losing its grim distinction as the country where racial discrimination is worst. The Union of South Africa now seems to be the number one place." The New York Times similarly editorialized that "the racial situation in South Africa makes the relationship between our own white and colored races seem simple and hopeful indeed."

Not only was there a feeling that the federal government was bringing about progress, there was also an assurance that the South itself was changing. Reporting that while the Klan may have freshened up its sheets and the Dixiecrats were successfully filibustering in Congress, a writer for Harpers magazine concluded that, nonetheless, in the South "there is a transformation going on, on the surface and deep down." White supremacy, she said, was being attacked on all sides and was suffering badly. Christian Century, which only a few years earlier had printed articles equating the South with Nazi Germany, similarly declared:

8 Mary Heaton Vorse, "The South Has Changed," Harpers, CX CIX (July, 1949), 31.
Racial barriers are falling throughout America and nowhere more noticeably than in the South. . . . The progress of the Negro in the eighty-five years since the end of the war between the states has hardly been equaled in history.⁹

Within a short time after the 1948 election, the Dixiecrat movement died away, and it seemed to some that by 1952 white supremacy was a dead letter in the South. Life said editorially that there had been no Northern liberal-Southern Bourbon schism at the Democratic convention of 1952 because the issue of civil rights had become "unreal." Up until twelve, eight, even four years before, Life observed, the question of Negro rights had united all Southern whites. But no longer was this true for "the majority of Southerners now know it [white supremacy] to be a lost cause. The Bourbons themselves are adjusting to the new emancipation of the Negro as fast as they have to. That means pretty fast."¹⁰ Now the majority of Southerners and the majority of Northerners thought alike on the issue, and the black man was gaining his rights. As a result, concluded Life, white supremacy had "lost its political importance, and the Democratic convention of 1952 proved it."¹¹

The nagging doubts that remained in some minds seemed to be dispelled in 1954 by the Supreme Court's decision in Brown v. Board of Education.¹² Once and for all the question of civil rights for black Americans had been ended, at least as a matter of public law and policy. In the spirit of self-congratulation that surrounded the

¹¹Ibid.
decision, *Time* hailed Brown as part of "one of the greatest success stories the world has ever known: the American Negro's 90-year rise from slavery."\(^{13}\)

In light of the widespread feeling that the United States had made tremendous strides in securing the rights of black Americans, South Africa could not help but seem backward by comparison. Americans writing about South Africa or about the American South grew more positive about the progress in race relations in the United States and noted that the two countries appeared to be moving in opposite directions.

Americans, said the Catholic magazine *Commonweal*, enjoyed some satisfaction viewing the difficulties with segregation in Africa, particularly in South Africa, "for here was one matter on which our own record was comparatively good."\(^{14}\) It said the reelection of Malan's government had meant a further reduction in the rights of the "natives" and a strengthening of apartheid. *Commonweal* found that it was all too easy "to contrast this folly of the Boers with the strides we are making in this country," although it might be premature "to judge from these advances--and from the contrasting directions in the United States and South Africa on racial matters--that all is well in the matter of interracial justice in this country."\(^{15}\) The magazine said there had been marked change within the United States since World War II; there

\(^{13}\)"To All on Equal Terms," *Time*, May 24, 1954, p. 21.


had been notable advances for black Americans in employment, housing, health, and education.

The belief in American progress in race relations caused some to feel that the United States could serve as a model for South Africa and could thereby encourage liberalization of South Africa's policies by America's good example. The contrast itself suggested that progress in race relations was possible and that South Africa might be deserving of some sympathy. Noting the "astounding progress" of the United States against racial injustice, the editors of America expressed the belief that this progress could be the basis for encouraging the Christian-minded in South Africa. They made the same point a few weeks later after the Urban League issued a report showing that more blacks were working in firms which had not previously employed blacks; at about the same time Tuskegee Institute announced that it was discontinuing its lynching report. Commenting on these announcements, America observed that while the color bar was preventing Africans from getting skilled jobs in South Africa, "precisely the opposite situation is coming to prevail in the employment field in this country." The professor at South Africa's Stellenbosch University who had recently said a change in his government's race policies was necessary should look to the United States as a model to be emulated; the magazine stated that a "study of the practical benefits American business and industry find in fair employment practice may indicate to him what


direction such a change in policy should take." The editors of America later quoted favorably South African Bishop Denis E. Hurley's statement that "America's magnificent show against segregation . . . is bound to affect South Africa as well.

C. Vann Woodward, one of the most thoughtful and sensitive students of Southern history, made what was probably the most significant statement of the contrast between the differing directions of the American South and South Africa in his Strange Career of Jim Crow. The third of the four chapters of the book was entitled "The Man on the Cliff," a phrase taken from the writings of Alan Paton. Woodward showed that the American South and South Africa were identified by observers as being very similar in the early part of the twentieth century. The two regions had seemed to be following essentially the same policies. Now, however, the similarities were coming to an end and they could no longer be identified together; the two were traveling along different paths into the future:

At some point along their parallel ways it is now clear that the paths of the South and of South Africa diverged. At the time of the First World War it had seemed that both regions were going roughly the same way. But by the time the Second World War was over it was very plain that they were no longer traveling together. Indeed, as the tragic destination of South Africa became more and more apparent, and as more hopeful events transpired on the other side of the Atlantic, it began to seem as if the two great regions might be traveling in opposite directions.

18 Ibid., 391.
21 Ibid., 108.
Woodward suggested that the South might glance back at South Africa, the country with which the South had once identified itself and had seemed to see eye to eye, and perhaps it would observe South Africa with more pity and less reproachfulness than others:

The South no longer identifies herself with South Africa and no longer has reason to fear the madness of self destruction. The South somewhere along the way took a different path. It has joined the spectators who are watching the tragic dilemma of the man on the cliff.22

If all of America's race problems had not been solved, it at least appeared that the great steps necessary for their solution had been taken and the future was quite bright. The course that South Africa was following proved it. To be sure, there were some dissenters in the early and mid-1950s, some who were highly critical of the American record on questions involving race. But they could be dismissed, as Life magazine did, as "opportunistic liberals" trying to make political capital by turning civil rights into a moral issue.23 Foreign criticisms were acknowledged to have some validity, but editorialists and writers asserted that Communist propaganda was wildly distorting the facts to serve its own purposes. Of course the United States had problems but what country did not; the Communists were exaggerating the few incidents of racial injustice all out of proportion. Or so it seemed.

The events of the latter part of the 1950s began to undermine the earlier confidence and optimism that many Americans had felt about race relations in the United States. The growth of the civil rights

22Ibid., 152.

movement and the national trauma of the process of desegregation are immense subjects in themselves and cannot be treated adequately in a study such as this. However, one component of this bears strongly on the present subject and must be emphasized; that is the important role that the awareness of foreign opinion played in the American realization of a need for reform.

Americans, reputedly isolationist, have throughout their history been acutely conscious that they were but one country among many others, and that people in those other countries were observing and passing judgment on them. Americans have often equated power with virtue and moral integrity; because of this and their desire to find abroad reassurance of their own essential goodness, they have always wanted to have foreign approval of their institutions and their way of life. The words of John Winthrop written aboard the Arbella were but the first of many over the centuries which demonstrated this American sensitivity to the opinions of people in other countries: "wee must Consider that wee shall be a Citty vpon a Hill, the eies of all people are vppon vs; soe that if wee shall deale falsely with our god in this worke wee haue vndertaken and soe cause him to withdrawe his present help from vs, wee shall be made a story and a byword through the world . . . ."24 One of the convictions that sustained Abraham Lincoln through the Civil War was his faith that the war was to vindicate democracy in the sight of all mankind, as he so eloquently indicated in the Gettysburg Address.25 Woodrow Wilson in his appeal

---

to the voters to return a Democratic Congress in 1918 told the American people that he sought their support not for the sake of a political party, "but for the sake of the nation itself in order that its inward duty of purpose may be evident to all the world."26

In light of this tradition of wanting foreigners to believe that the United States was upholding the democratic principles that it professed, it is not surprising that one of the key arguments of the Department of Justice in its brief to the Supreme Court on the question of school segregation was that it was hurting the American image abroad:

It is in the context of the present world struggle between freedom and tyranny that the problem of racial discrimination must be viewed . . . . Racial discrimination furnishes grist for the Communist propaganda mills, and it raises doubt even among friendly nations as to the intensity of our devotion to the democratic faith.27

Not only was American prestige damaged by segregation, but it was aiding communism everywhere in the world.28 The Brown decision briefly seemed to end that threat. As Newsweek expressed it, segregation in American public schools had become a symbol of inequality to people all over the world and was a weapon of world communism; now, with


Brown, "that symbol lies shattered." 29

The optimism that accompanied Brown was soon undermined by a worsening of race relations in the South. 30 In 1955 there were three lynchings of blacks in the state of Mississippi, the first such incidents in the United States since 1951. One lynching in particular received world wide attention, that of Emmet Till, a fourteen year old boy who allegedly had whistled at a white woman. The next year, the ugly incidents that accompanied desegregation of the public schools in America began to occur. Vicious mobs arose and rioted when Autherine Lucy attempted to enter the University of Alabama in February 1956. The actions of the mob ultimately had the desired effect of postponing the integration of the University, but it also led to hostile criticism of the United States from abroad. Later in the year mob action opposed the integration of public schools in Clinton, Tennessee, with the same effect on world opinion.

Such events as these and the resulting foreign criticism could not be dismissed simply as the product of Communist propaganda. Americans began to doubt they were making as much progress as they had previously imagined, and they were increasingly concerned that this was

29 "Supreme Court: Historic Decision," Newsweek, May 24, 1954, p. 26. It is interesting to note the priorities indicated by even so strong a supporter of the civil rights movement as Christian Century. In a report which contrasted the good news of 1954 from the United States with the news of Strijdom becoming Prime Minister in South Africa, it commented that "there is satisfaction that the courts should have moved against racial segregation, partly because this brings our social practice somewhat more into accord with our democratic pretensions, but even more because of the improvement in the position from which we can deal with the world of color." "Retrospect," Christian Century, 1576.

hurting the United States abroad, Americans had told the world that their country was the home of freedom and the hope of the oppressed everywhere. The uncommitted peoples of the world were told to look to the benefits of American democracy as their model for a new order and not to the virtual enslavement of communism. What conclusions could they draw from the examples of Emmet Till and Autherine Lucy? America editorialized in 1956 on "U.S. Racial Bias and Asia," saying that bias was not only a moral evil in itself, but was also damaging the United States in Asia and thus did not even make good common sense. "Ask any U.S. Information Service employee," the magazine suggested, 

whose task is to make known to Asia's colored millions the virtues of American democracy. . . . That these tensions are blown up out of all proportion both by the Communist and Asian press is quite beside the point. They exist. The fact of their existence does us untold harm throughout Asia. The argument that the United States should make reforms at home to aid its foreign policy and fight communism was most clearly stated by George F. Kennan in an article in Harpers in 1956 entitled "Overdue Changes in Our Foreign Policy." Kennan wrote that "we are all aware

31 Polling data confirm this conclusion dramatically. A National Opinion Research Council poll taken in 1947 asked respondents "Do you think the way Negroes are treated in this country has any effect on the attitudes of people in foreign countries toward us?" Thirty-four per cent of adult Americans felt that it did; but forty-six per cent felt that it did not. A Harris poll of 1963 asked a similar question. In it, seventy-eight per cent believed foreign attitudes towards the United States were adversely affected by American race policies and only eight per cent believed that they were not. Polling data on foreign attitudes indicate that the seventy-eight per cent were correct. See Hazel Erskine, "The Polls: World Opinion of U.S. Racial Problems," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXII (Summer, 1968), 299-312.

32 "U.S. Racial Bias and Asia," America, May 12, 1956, p. 152. Only Asia is mentioned; Africa was not considered by many Americans to have any bearing on the civil rights question until several years later. See also "Contrasts in Segregation," Commonweal, 137-38.
of the vicious distortions and exaggerations peddled by the Communists throughout the world about the state of race relations in this country."

He had no desire to condone such irresponsibility that caused the Communists to mislead other people, but he had to ask if Americans did not "pour oil on these fires" instead of putting them out. The problems that remained were difficult and there was no quick, easy solution to them. But he wanted Americans to think about

the effect on hundreds of millions of colored people in other lands of direct reports from this country of what goes on here in the field of race relations. What do we suppose is the effect of the news photograph of Authurine Lucy's car surrounded by the mob with a man jumping up and down on its roof, apparently trying to break it in with his heels?—and all this purveyed to the world as an example of what happens to a colored girl who tries to get a higher education in this country? That one photograph is worth more to Communists than all the lies they could invent in a decade.33

If foreign opinion had seemed important in 1956, it assumed much greater significance the following year, for it was then that the most traumatic events in race relations in almost a century began. It was then that news media all over the world reported that in cities in various parts of the South black children attempting to go to formerly all white schools were cursed, threatened, intimidated, spat upon. Little Rock became the symbol of it all, for it was there that the situation became most critical. Arkansas's governor, Orval Faubus, called out the national guard, ostensibly to maintain order but in actuality to maintain segregation in defiance of court ordered integration of Little Rock's Central High. The Justice Department sent the F.B.I. in to investigate why the integration order was not being carried

33George F. Kennan, "Overdue Changes in Our Foreign Policy," Harpers, CCXIII (August, 1956), 31-32.
out. Finally the national guard was withdrawn and the handful of black children attempted to enter the school. Mob demonstrations prevented the integration, and President Eisenhower felt it necessary to take the step that several months earlier he had declared unthinkable; he sent a thousand paratroopers to Little Rock and put the Arkansas national guard on federal service to prevent the mob from obstructing integration any longer. Both Americans and foreigners were dis-abused of illusions they may have entertained about the state of race relations in America. *Time* magazine stressed the importance of the situation for foreign affairs, stating that Faubus and his followers were giving aid and comfort to Communists. Reviewing foreign criticisms of the United States for the Little Rock incidents, the magazine observed that "millions of brown-skinned Asians, unaware of great U.S. constitutional issues, saw only dark-skinned American children being held away from school by rifles of white American soldiers." The editors of *America* asked the people of Little Rock to "remember that not only the eyes of the nation but the eyes of the whole world are intently watching them. For Little Rock is, alas, not the least of the battlefields of the Cold War." Policy makers were even more acutely aware of the enmity and hostility engendered abroad by American racial incidents. When Vice President Nixon made a visit to Latin America, mobs in Venezuela shouted at him "Little Rock! Little Rock!"

The State Department was flooded by dispatches from American embassies

and consulates all around the world describing the damage done to American prestige. 37

The incidents of racial animosity did not end with Little Rock; instead, they continued and were exacerbated. The South became still more recalcitrant. The rest of the country grew increasingly disturbed about the South's unwillingness to accept the change that had been decreed for it and about what this signified for American and foreign conceptions of the meaning of America. This had considerable significance for American thinking on South Africa.

After 1956 parallels continued to be drawn between the United States and South Africa, but now there was a marked difference. As Americans began to realize that their own racial problems were more serious than they had previously thought, attention was drawn to South Africa to emphasize the worst qualities in American life, not to show the favorable contrasts between race policies in the two. In other words, South Africa became the paradigm of racism, the vision of evil of what the United States was or could be. Thus when Daniel Friedenberg reviewed John Gunther's Inside Africa for the New Republic he did not praise the United States for its liberalism while condemning apartheid, but instead asked the reader:

Have you had a single sleepless night over the murder of Till in Mississippi? Has your hand shaken when you read that a minister in the South was shot down in broad daylight because he urged his fellow citizens to vote, and that no one has even bothered to search for the killers? . . . Is it really Inside Africa or more likely Inside Ourselves? 38

37 Vernon McKay, Africa in World Politics (New York, 1963), 404.

The shift in comparisons could also be seen in the *Christian Century* early in 1956 when it commented on a new book by a South African Dutch Reformed Church theologian which denied any Biblical sanctioning of segregation. The magazine suggested that it be read by "the fomenters of our own southern apartheid . . . . If they can't believe northern 'radicals' on this, maybe they can learn from equally conservative, equally embattled South Africans." The *Nation*, editorializing on "Arkansas and Another Union," suggested that if Governor Faubus was feeling lonely in his struggle to maintain "apartheid--Arkansas variety," he might roam the corridors of the United Nations with his South African "companions in distress." Calling attention to the fact that white South Africans had sent Faubus $18.75 to help him fight integration, the editors said that the racists in the United States and in South Africa should get together just to exchange such pleasantries as "How would you like your daughter to marry a Kaffir?" Continuing in the same vein a few months later, the *Nation* discussed the effort being made in Arkansas to make integration and communism synonymous. The tactic was "in the savage repression pattern of the Union of South Africa." American Jim Crowism had contributed to apartheid and was now, the magazine said,

---


41 Ibid. "Kaffir" is the South African equivalent of the term "nigger."
aping apartheid racism. Once again Governor Faubus has obligingly confirmed the most serious charges of his most severe critics. As rapidly as circumstances will permit, he is busily proving that he is a racist in the Strydom mold.

This same issue of the *Nation* contained a long article by Anthony Sampson on "Little Rock and Johannesburg." Sampson had just completed his study of the recent treason trials in South Africa, *The Treason Cage*, and was now reporting on how strongly similar the South and South Africa were; he concluded that "the resemblance is astonishing." He found the same brooding atmosphere, the same stock phrases and shibboleths, the same obsession with race, the same type of character in both Southerners and Afrikaners, the same consciousness of defeat in the Civil War and the Boer War, and other similarities. If anything, the South came off worse in the comparison:

> If there seemed to be a difference, it was that West Ninth Street in Little Rock was more, not less, segregated than Victoria Road, Sophiatown [an African shanty town just outside Johannesburg]. A white man was a rarer sight in Red's Pool Hall than in the Back O' The Moon in Sophiatown. In Little Rock, if you wanted to have lunch with a Negro, you had to bring sandwiches into your office. No one there whom I met had heard of a white man meeting a black man at dinner, as white and Negro sometimes meet in the smart liberal homes in Johannesburg. Even in material things, the Negroes in West Ninth Street seemed more forlorn, more left-behind than the Sophiatowners. The clothes were shabbier, the furniture more shaky, the young men less confident and less articulate—unmistakably downtrodden. . . . Even the regional headquarters of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Little Rock seemed more defensive, and less confident, than the African National Congress.

As the American civil rights movement grew in intensity in the

---

44Ibid., p. 24.
early 1960s references to South Africa in connection with the South continued to be made but now with a greater sense of alarm at the parallels. Both South Africa and the American South were, said a writer in the New Republic, "caught in a rule of 'rednecks.'"\(^5\) A study of the attempt to redraw the boundaries of Tuskegee, Alabama, in such a way as to exclude most of the blacks from the voting district and the case that followed was entitled Gomillion v. Lightfoot: Apartheid in Alabama.\(^6\) One Catholic priest's sermon against racism in Mississippi occasioned the statement by the editor of America that "in a solution that reminds one of South African apartheid, whites [in Mississippi] are trying to overcome their fears by systematically refusing to allow Negroes their human and civil rights."\(^7\) The British writer D. W. Brogan, writing on "The Impending Crisis of the Deep South" in Harpers, drew the distressing parallel that both the South and South Africa were joined in the same siege mentality; both were trying to shut out a hostile outside world.\(^8\) An even harsher statement was an article by the civil rights activist Father Daniel Berrigan comparing Selma, Alabama, with Sharpeville, South Africa, the site of the massacre of sixty-nine Africans by police. For Berrigan,


\(^7\)"Courage in Mississippi," America, July 6, 1963, p. 2. Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon similarly declared that Birmingham, Alabama, was like South Africa when Martin Luther King was jailed there in 1963 for leading demonstrations against segregation. David L. Lewis, King: A Critical Biography (New York, 1970), 16.

the brutality was essentially the same in both cities; both were "stereotypes of brutal power." Alabama and South Africa were again likened to one another in an editorial on the assassination of Prime Minister Verwoerd in 1966. The New Republic said that there was no possibility for change in South Africa because all the leaders were fanatical and whoever was selected to succeed Verwoerd "will strive to promote the kind of race policy that George Wallace would in Alabama, if the state and the federal government let him."  

By the mid-1960s people were concluding that race problems were not simply confined to the South; increasingly they were perceived as a national phenomenon. Now South Africa came to be held up by some liberals as a vision of evil for the whole nation. Thus a "T.R.B." column in the New Republic in 1966 editorialized on "Vorster and Dirksen." The columnist made use of the association with South Africa to condemn Senator Dirksen's position on the open-housing provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1966. As if to show that liberals could use smear tactics as well as Joe McCarthy could, the article preceded discussion of the bill with the statement that:

In South Africa a racist pro-Nazi prime minister, Vorster, succeeded a racist pro-Nazi premier, Verwoerd. In Grenada, Miss., a crowd of screaming white men, swinging ax handles and chains, forced a 12-year-old Negro school child with a broken leg to crawl away from school while police stood by. After this, the editorial began going over Dirksen's stand in leading

---


50 "Death of Apartheid?" New Republic, September 17, 1966, p. 9.

the opposition to the open-housing provision. Dirksen was little different from Vorster in the columnist's view:

It is not the color of tenants in Chicago that he objects to, he explains; it is their conduct. (South Africa's new premier says he doesn't object to blacks either; it's just their general inferiority.)

As the *New Republic* pointed out, desegregation was now moving from Atlanta and Birmingham to Boston, Detroit, and Chicago. The phenomenon of racial housing segregation was nationwide, and its existence led to a national legal conference on equal opportunity in housing at Berkeley, California, in 1965. The immediate cause of the conference was California's Proposition 14, a measure requiring community approval before any low income housing projects could be built in that particular community. The book which resulted from the conference was entitled *Apartheid American Style*. The author indicated that although the United States did not have the systematic laws that South Africa had, the effect was virtually the same because minority groups almost without exception found that they did not have free choice of residence in any part of the nation. The California bill had to be viewed in that context, said the author, for "Proposition 14 can only be fully understood if it is seen as the latest in a long series of devices developed by the real estate industry to support and develop the American style of apartheid."  

South Africa became the vision of the real America, the brutal, hidden America of the imagination that sometimes emerged from

---

52 Ibid. (emphasis in original).

the psyche and showed itself to the world as it really was. Thus Stanley Kauffmann, after reading Ernest Cole's *House of Bondage*, claimed that "the Afrikaners are acting out the unacknowledged dreams and fantasies of many white Americans." When Ramsey Clark was Attorney General, he and his aides envisioned the possibility of a few black militants conspiring together to kill whites simultaneously in a number of American cities. Their fear was that this would lead to immediate widespread suppression of blacks throughout the country. Clark said grimly that if this were to happen, then the United States would more closely resemble South Africa than any other country. Every effort had to be made to avert that prospect. More recently, an article in the *New York Post* declared the need to defeat President Nixon was a moral imperative because Nixon was moving the country ever closer to a totalitarian police state. The article found that it was significant that the only two countries in which the free press is under attack from its elected government are South Africa and the U.S.A. It's significant that in both these countries, the intellectuals, the artists, the "communicators" and the socially active clergy are considered "enemies of the regime." There are other parallels, including South Africa's secret police and controlled courts. I, for one, find the Nixon Administration frightening.

Similarly, a Carolina Symposium debate on busing between Senator Sam Ervin and constitutional law authority William W. Van Alstyne produced

---


the statement by Van Alstyne that President Nixon's proposed moratorium on busing would "lock in apartheid in the neighborhood school system." 57

What is the significance of all of this? In domestic matters, it is possible that the existence of South Africa's policies and the fact that they were regarded with almost universal opprobrium served to encourage a more liberal approach to race relations in the United States than had previously characterized American views and policies. The phenomenon of cross-national political linkages has been noted and discussed by various political scientists, in particular by James N. Rosenau. 58 Stripping the concept to its essentials and disregarding distinctions between different types of linkages, the theory is that events and ideas in one country influence thought and action in another country. Political scientists are familiar with the phenomenon, and historians have also from time to time demonstrated the principle in their writings. For example, Bernard Bailyn has effectively shown that the polemics of English "country" politicians and publicists influenced profoundly thinking among the American colonists which ultimately led to the American Revolution. 59 Likewise Ernest R. May has discussed at length how English thinking on colonialism had an impact in the 1890s on American thought and policies on


Examples of cross-national awareness and linkages can be found between the United States and South Africa over a long period of time. The impact has been more greatly marked in South Africa than in the United States simply because there has been a much greater awareness of America in South Africa, but there can be no doubt that the phenomenon has existed for both countries. In action the effect of the principle is not to bring about a revolutionary change in an individual's thinking but rather to reinforce, encourage, or substantiate a preexisting attitude or mode of thought.

Alfred H. Stone, a Mississippi plantation owner and polemicist for segregation, found justification for his views on race relations by looking to South Africa. Stone's book, *Studies in the American Race Problem*, showed a great awareness of race policies in South Africa, which he said he followed with as close attention as the problems confronted nearer home. Developments there supported his "fundamental proposition that the attitude of the so-called Anglo-Saxon people toward the Negro the world over is essentially the same under similar conditions." The parallel developments in the two regions as well as in other parts of the world convinced him that segregation was part of a fundamental law of human relations, not a perverse phenomenon confined to the American South. Stone said in


essence that the North should not criticize the South for its policies, for the South was only acting according to universal and immutable principles—as proved by South Africa. Events in South Africa were discussed to show that the disfranchisement of the black American was a wise policy, as were other forms of segregation.

If South African segregation may have influenced or justified American segregation for individuals like Stone, American segregation also had an impact on South African race policies. Sir George Campbell, an Englishman, toured the South in 1878 in an effort to obtain useful information which might aid Britain in dealing with the black masses in its southern African colonies. In the South he found that social segregation was growing; the implications for southern Africa were clear when he discovered that a "certain friendly familiarity and association was possible and common . . . when the parties met on acknowledged terms of superiority and inferiority." Maurice S. Evans likewise visited the United States for insight into dealing with racial problems. He found the South strikingly similar to his own South Africa, and that the problem of both was the same. The South he felt had lessons to teach South Africa. The Southern experience convinced him that the Native should not be given the vote in South Africa. Similar lessons were learned by a South African visitor to the United States in the early 1930s, J. E.

---

63 Ibid., 405-406.

64 Sir George Campbell, "Black and White in the Southern States," Fortnightly Review, XXV (April, 1879), 588-607.

Holloway. He found that prejudice, in the final analysis, had nothing to do with race or color. He noted that black Americans were freely admitted to hotels and theaters in the North until large numbers of blacks moved into an area, then attitudes hardened, friction grew, and segregation became the usual solution. After discussing the development of race riots in Northern cities, he concluded:

The Americans, who have followed a policy of assimilation of Negroes with better conditions for its complete fulfilment than any nation is ever likely again to have, are as far from a solution of the problem of social and racial assimilation as we are in South Africa . . . . The failure of assimilation in its final stages in America, and the inter-racial bitterness which the failure is bringing in its wake, is, to my mind, a serious warning of the danger of pursuing a policy of assimilation in this country.66

Still another South African visitor's views may have directly influenced the growth of the apartheid concept. Two ministers, J. G. Strydom and Johan Reyneke, made a tour of the Southern states in 1938 to study segregation there. The visit convinced Strydom that separate development was the only possible solution to South Africa's problems.67 Strydom's advocacy of a separation policy played an important role, according to Rhodie and Venter, in the growth of an intellectual rationale for apartheid. More directly, the Minister of the Interior made use of the American legislation prohibiting mixed marriages as an argument for similar legislation in South Africa. On


May 25, 1949, he told the House of Assembly:

Look at the experience of other countries in this very same sphere of mixed marriages. Is it not something for the other side to think about that in thirty out of the forty-eight States of the United States they have legislation on similar lines to this? Is that not an argument to show that it is no reason for discarding such legislation, because it is not so effective as one would like it to be? I take it the difficulty is as great there as it is here, but thirty states have decided on legislation on these lines; thirty states have found it necessary to take legislative steps to keep down this social evil. And let me remind hon. members that the numerical position in the United States of America, in those thirty states is not a half or a quarter so serious as the position in South Africa.68

In more recent years American racial disorders and rioting have served as additional justification for apartheid.69 Many more examples of this phenomenon at work in South Africa, encouraging both conservatism and liberalism in race questions, could be cited but that is beyond the scope of the present study.

In a sense, most of this chapter has been devoted to demonstrating how South Africa may have encouraged greater liberalism in the United States. Each time that a writer compared apartheid in South Africa with segregation in the United States, it was with the purpose of showing what the United States should not be like.


69 Even very liberal white South Africans had reservation about integration because of the American experience. Denis Cowen, a noted law professor at the University of Cape Town, told an audience at Cornell's law school that "when I see the travail of the United States in making integration a reality, and when I think of the different proportions of the South African population, I am almost tempted to believe that total partition or separation might be the only way of establishing peaceful race relations in South Africa, despite my own strong preference for the way of integration." Denis Cowen, "Cry, the Divided Country," New York Times Magazine, May 17, 1959, p. 75. See also A. S. Mathews, Law, Order and Liberty in South Africa (Cape Town, 1971), 309.
References to South Africa were made to encourage Americans to follow or continue on a different course of action. A striking example of the phenomenon was furnished by a Christian Century editorial on the 1954 American school desegregation decision. The magazine was strongly opposed to letting the parochial schools in the South become segregation academies. It warned that to allow this to come about would make the church the last bulwark of racism in a society which is rapidly moving toward integration. It would bring Christianity into discredit in the United States in exactly the way it is being compromised in South Africa. It would invite the terrible judgment of racial strife which is hanging over that continent.*

Reviewing the provisions of some of the segregation legislation in South Africa, the New York Times said that South Africa "may be a lesson to us as we try to make headway against segregation, bias, and prejudice in this country . . . . If we are rightfully shocked by what is happening in South Africa we must be more than ever determined that no part of it can ever happen here."\(^7\)

The mere fact that news items appeared in the press and elsewhere on South Africa's racial problems may have drawn more attention to American race problems.\(^7\) A writer in This Week magazine took note of the parallels:


\(^7\) New York Times, May 27, 1957, p. 30. A few months later Christian Century similarly declared that South Africa was "a standing object lesson in how not to do things. For us the answer to this negation of human rights must be the positive pursuit of integration in all aspects of our common life." "Using the Human Gauge," Christian Century, October 9, 1957, pp. 1191-92.

\(^7\) Reading through the materials on South Africa in American publications, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that South Africa was used to indicate criticism of the United States indirectly. For example, the New Republic would sandwich editorials on South Africa between similar ones on American racial injustices. See New
of this in 1950 in a discussion of Alan Paton's *Cry the Beloved Country* and the opening of a Broadway musical based on it, *Lost in the Stars*. He stated that Paton's story was immensely popular and that it had "made Americans understand something of what life is like for the 11,000,000 people of many races and origins in South Africa. And as they have set the book down or walked away from the theater, they have felt a bit more conscious of our own problem over here . . . ." An article in *Time* on apartheid led a reader to call for more liberal American laws:

I am struck by too many unhappy similarities in attitude between white South Africans and Americans. I hope that with the aid of enlightened governmental legislation within the next generation, I shall never again hear statements similar to the one made by a four-year old neighborhood child to the effect that she is glad not to be colored because "Negroes aren't people!" Allard Lowenstein, who later became a Congressman, wrote in his book, *Brutal Mandate*, that the fact "that each new racial atrocity in the United States encourages South Africa's misbehavior should provide

---


73 Howard Young, "Dixie in South Africa," *This Week*, February 26, 1959, reprinted in *Negro Digest*, VIII (June, 1950), 29-31. Paton's novel was very popular in the United States; by 1968 the book alone had sold more than 1.2 million copies, according to statistics provided by the publisher, Charles Scribner's Sons; Theodora Poulos to author, October 30, 1969. The novel and the play reached millions of other Americans after being made into a motion picture. Although *Cry the Beloved Country* was probably the single greatest source of information for most Americans about South Africa, it did not suggest that it was important that the United States take any action against South Africa. Rather, its effect seems to have been simply to increase American awareness of race problems in both the United States and South Africa.

added incentive—as if any should be needed—to speed progress at home.\textsuperscript{75} Attorney General Ramsey Clark's fear of the United States becoming like South Africa encouraged him further to take steps to avoid the possibility. Although there is as yet little to support it, it seems possible that South African apartheid at least indirectly influenced \textit{Brown v. Board of Education}. The United Nations had discussed racial segregation in South Africa since 1946 and the General Assembly had gone so far as to resolve in 1950 that racial segregation was necessarily based on doctrines of racial discrimination. If this meant then that South Africa stood in violation of Article 55 of the United Nations Charter, presumably so too did the United States. It was obvious to some people that if the United States did not bring its domestic policies in line with the United Nations declarations on South Africa, the United States could be very embarrassed.\textsuperscript{76}

A more direct influence of South Africa on American policies can be seen in several of the opinions of Justice William O. Douglas in cases involving American civil rights questions. Holding up South Africa's policies as the very epitome of evil, Douglas argued in two "sit-in" cases that the United States must not accept apartheid. "When the doors of a business are open to the public," he said, "they must be open to all regardless of race if apartheid is not to become ingrained in our public places." Apartheid, he went on, was "foreign to


\textsuperscript{76}See, for example, the petition to the United Nations by the Civil Rights Congress, William L. Patterson, ed., \textit{We Charge Genocide} (New York, 1951), xiii, 38-39; "South Africa Challenged," \textit{Nation}, August 17, 1946, p. 172.
our constitution." In another case he asked why "should apartheid be given constitutional sanction in the restaurant field?" He feared that to allow private companies to discriminate would be "fastening apartheid on America." No doubt Mr. Justice Douglas would have cast his vote the way he did even if he had never heard of South Africa; nonetheless, the vision of evil in South Africa reinforced his views and gave at least rhetorical strength to his argument.

What has been discussed thus far is how South Africa's policies may have stimulated the white conscience in America to do something more about American segregation. The extent of the influence was not very great, but it was at least one factor among many others at work. Black Americans also equated South African apartheid with American segregation, and the effect of this was probably to encourage greater militancy among some.

Black Americans have seldom argued that conditions for the black man were better in the United States than in South Africa. Rather the American South and South Africa were both examples of white racism, and the two were generally associated together in any writing on South Africa. This can be found in some of the earliest issues of the publication of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Crisis, which began in November 1910. A report in 1913, for example, stated that the

Union of South Africa, in imitation of the United States, and especially the southern section thereof, having decreed that a white skin is always to be the sine qua non to the realities expressed by the high-sounding phrases about "life, liberty

and the pursuit of happiness," has been so industriously pointing to the black man the way to become white that the government of the South African Union has had to make a special investigation of the so-called black peril . . . .

Another article, this one by a black South African, was entitled "James Crow in Africa," and was preceded by the statement of the editors that the story showed "the almost dead parallel between Jim-crow methods in South Africa and America, even to the attempts of native African 'leaders' (even as some American Negro 'leaders') to persuade their brothers to accept a segregated colony." The same author, Jameson G. Coka, had another article on political segregation the next year and it was preceded by a similar statement: "American Negroes should recognize easily the situation described by Mr. Coka and the pronouncements of South African whites, for the same political philosophy, with but few exceptions, holds away in Dixie."

Other black publications likewise equated the United States and South Africa. An article by Ernest Cole was printed in Ebony together with pictures from his book House of Bondage; Cole stated that the pictures would show why he felt somewhat at home in the United States. A letter to Ebony said that the article and the photographs brought to me a startling revelation of the inhuman conditions perpetrated by South Africa's racist minority white regime. The
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79"Foreign: South Africa," Crisis, VI (September, 1913), 231.


81Jameson G. Coka, "Political Segregation in South Africa," Crisis, XLII (September, 1935), 266.

similarity is quite evident in America's racist attitude toward her black minority. Who is the carbon copy of whom? One of the chapters in South of Freedom, by the black journalist Carl Rowan, was entitled "Apologies to South Africa." Why the apologies? Because he found that Birmingham, Alabama, and not Johannesburg or Cape Town, was the world's most race-conscious city. American civil rights leader James Farmer described how on his visit to Africa people repeatedly asked him what the difference was between apartheid and American segregation. He attempted to explain that segregation was not official policy in the United States as it was in South Africa. He was himself not convinced that there was a great distinction and commented that those with whom he talked "were not particularly impressed by the argument, but then most of the people I know in Mississippi aren't impressed by it either." The antipathy that most black Americans felt toward South Africa was indicated by Rayford Logan's statement that an "increasing number of American Negroes [were becoming] more hostile to the Union of South Africa than to any part of the world except the state of Mississippi." 

---

83 Letter of W. C. Jones and C. L. Billings from Chicago, to the editor, Ebony, XXIII (April, 1968), 20.

84 Carl T. Rowan, South of Freedom (New York, 1952), 158.


The way in which knowledge of South African apartheid may have influenced black action on civil rights matters in the United States was indicated by the reaction of one reader of *Ebony* to an article there by a Coloured South African. After reading Peter Abraham's discussion of the effects of the Bantu Education Act, a man from Pittsburgh wrote: "Think of what it would mean to those black peoples today if the Negroes here in America commanded such power and respect that we could demand such an injustice not be allowed to pass undone." Of a more direct effect on black Americans were the events surrounding the killing of sixty-nine Africans in Sharpeville in March 1960. Following the shootings, the regional director for the NAACP in Atlanta, Georgia, told a reporter that "more and more of our people are talking about South Africa and relating what is happening there to their own situation." An incident more grimly indicating the influence of the Sharpeville events took place in Portland, Oregon, on April 3, 1960. On that date, three blacks assaulted several whites, killing one of the whites. The blacks told that they had been reading about both South Africa and the American South and had wanted to do something about it. Indeed, Sharpeville taught some blacks the

---


89McKay, *Africa in World Politics*, 405. In Philadelphia at about the same time, a white boy was stabbed to death by a gang of twelve black youths. The city's mayor, Richardson Dilworth, partly attributed the murder to Sharpeville, stating that the "shooting of Negroes in South African race riots and the arrest of American Negroes demonstrating against discrimination at lunch counters in the southern states have their effects in Philadelphia." *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, March 24, 1960, p. 3 [the quotation is a paraphrase of the
folly of using nonviolent means to seek justice from the white man. One of the letters of Angela Davis to George Jackson clearly showed this. The black revolutionary wrote:

"Above all, we do not want to repeat past errors . . . . Concerning nonviolence: the specter of Sharpeville, South Africa—thousands machine-gunned, kneeling in the streets, protesting apartheid, nonviolently. Nonviolence . . . is a philosophy of suicide."  

The similarities between the United States and South Africa were also important because this had significance for American foreign policy. People both in the United States and abroad felt that apartheid had much in common with American segregation. When American race relations worsened in the latter part of the 1950s, it could be said of the United States, just as Alan Paton had said of South Africa, "the world looks at us in astonishment, wondering what madness has possessed us."  

In the eyes of the world there were two men on the cliff, both the United States and South Africa. Many Americans were concerned about their image abroad and wanted the world to know that they were opposed to racism. The United States government felt it had to make it clear that the country opposed segregation. But in the dialogue between the world and the United States the world could challenge American sincerity by pointing to American failure to oppose apartheid in South Africa. A country without race problems could say that it did not condemn apartheid because it was an internal matter within

Mayor's remarks by the newspaper].


South Africa's own jurisdiction. But the United States was open to the charge that it failed to say anything because it really was not committed to ending segregation and was still infected with racist notions. So there was considerable incentive, both at home and abroad, for the United States to try to disassociate itself from the other "man on the cliff."
CHAPTER III
THE NEW AFRICA AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN RACE WAR

If worsening American race relations provided an argument for a more critical policy toward South Africa, that argument was strengthened by an apparent increase in the importance of Africa to the United States and by a widespread belief in the imminence of a racial blood bath in South Africa. The way in which these latter two developments came together was indicated in an article in Commonweal in 1955 which stated:

Africa today stands before the Gates of Destiny, the keys of which are held by Mr. Strijdom. These could open to a glorious future of progressive endeavor, but in the implement of Apartheid they may prove to be the Gates of Hell, leading to a conflagration of hate and bloody revenge. In its atavistic urge to savagery, such an outbreak could not only engulf the Union of South Africa but sweep through the whole continent, utterly destroying a century of civilizing.¹

For many years observers of South Africa in the United States and elsewhere have predicted the outbreak of a violent and bloody race war in South Africa.² A crisis in South Africa in 1960 following a


²See Martin Legassick, "Guerrilla Warfare in Southern Africa," in Wilfred Cartey and Martin Kilson, eds., The Africa Reader (2 vols.; New York, 1970), II, 381: "Hardly a book has appeared on South Africa in recent years which does not predict the inevitability, or strong likelihood, of a violent confrontation between the white minority and the oppressed African majority; a confrontation usually described as
violent incident at the police station at Sharpeville, a town near Johannesburg, made many Americans believe the war had entered its first stages. This crisis occurred at the same time that numerous African countries were becoming politically independent. Americans thought it important that the new countries should not come under the influence of communism, but South Africa seemed to pose a threat to these countries and to American interests in them.

The race war thesis resulted from a combination of simple mathematics and elementary political wisdom. The reasoning was as follows. Blacks outnumbered whites in South Africa four to one; numerical strength was overwhelmingly with the former. Like all men, the blacks deeply resented segregation and the denial of their rights. When men are denied their rights, they rise up in revolt, seize the powers of the state, and restore rights to themselves. Since segregation and the denial of rights was increasing rather than decreasing in South Africa, a bloody race war was inevitable. Added to this analysis was the feeling that evil is visited with retribution; the wages of sin is death. In much this spirit, the New York Times declared that the 1953 election which increased the Nationalists' strength was a "Victory for Evil," and stated:

That the vastly outnumbered white man has a practical problem of enormous difficulty and complexity in South Africa is not denied, but that it should be rationalized into the monstrous doctrine of racism is wicked. Therefore, there will be a day of reckoning for these men, since human beings will not endure a 'bloodbath,' but which would lead to African rule." Making the same point but coming to a different conclusion from Legassick about the inevitability of the blood bath is Heribert Adam, Modernizing Racial Domination (Berkeley, 1971), 13-15.
injustice and the loss of freedom interminably.3

The predictions of the inevitable war began years before apartheid became a word in the international vocabulary, but they became more widespread when the Nationalists began the implementation of their race policies.4 Apartheid would, it seemed obvious, only exacerbate the existing tension and racial friction.5 Observers looking to events in South Africa for confirmation of the dire predictions found substantiation.

Just a year after the Nationalists had taken office, race riots occurred in Durban, a coastal city with a large Indian population. Several hundred people were killed, and millions of dollars worth of damage done to property. The rioting by the Africans was directed, however, at the Indians and not at the whites of Durban. How was this to be explained? Since both the Indians and the Africans had been subjected to apartheid, it would have seemed that they would be making common cause against the whites. The interpretations had to fit in with the image of black-white conflict; thus, it was generally concluded that the Africans were venting their frustrations against the whites and apartheid by turning upon the Indians. The Africans did this because the Indians were unable to retaliate but still were a more privileged group than the Africans. Life took this position,


4See, for example, Christian Century which thought in 1944 that the racial situation was moving rapidly to the breaking point. "Racial Tension Growing in South Africa," Christian Century, December 6, 1944, p. 1403.

stating: "Fearing the whites, Durban's Zulus had struck blindly at the more vulnerable Indians."\(^6\) The \textit{Nation} even hinted darkly that the whites had encouraged the African rebellion against the Indians: "There is good reason to believe that much of the hostility between these two unfortunate groups was deliberately fanned by their overlords, who dread the Negro masses and who have a score to settle with the Indians for bringing South Africa's condition to the attention of the United Nations."\(^7\)

Incidents continued to occur throughout the 1950s which reinforced the theme of conflict and provided the basis for predictions of the coming holocaust. The forecasts of violence appeared in all the major news magazines and in the reports of traveling journalists. Many people believed that the Passive Resistance Campaign of 1952, supported by leaders of the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress, would erupt in violence. \textit{Time} announced that the "restless and politically awakening Negroes" had scheduled nationwide demonstrations; it stated that "the possibility of civil war hovered over South Africa, and a desperate decision faced Daniel Francois Malan, who had sown the whirlwind."\(^8\) The government put about eight


thousand of the protestors in jail, and no civil war erupted. A visiting American journalist, Robert St. John, felt that instead of quelling revolt, the government's action encouraged revolution: "By listing and banning and hog-tying the . . . men of moderation, Malan was inviting the bloodbath everyone feared." Oden Meeker, another American writer, discussed the defiance campaign in his Report on Africa. He praised the leaders for remaining non-violent, but he repeated the warning in Paton's Cry, the Beloved Country that when the whites some day turn to loving, they will find that the blacks have turned to hating.10

Many other reports of events also emphasized conflict in South Africa. Rioting at an African beer hall was seen to have been caused by apartheid. The killing of a nun by Africans, and the eating of her flesh by her murderers, also demonstrated the race hatred that apartheid was breeding.11 A bus boycott in 1956 by Africans that was accompanied by rioting received attention in the American press.12 Relocation of African families from the slums around Johannesburg to government-built housing led to some incidents of violence in the mid-1950s. Newsweek reported one such moving under the headline "South Africa: Racial Showdown." The lead sentence of the story was: "The fuse of racial


11Indicating how far some Americans would go to present the Africans in a favorable light, one writer commented on this act of cannibalism that it represented "admiration for the victim because it express[ed] a desire to absorb the spirit of the fallen one." John Considine, Africa, World of New Men (New York, 1954), 271.

hatred burned shorter in South Africa last week."13 Harold Issacs, an American journalist and political scientist, gave the following statement on conditions in South Africa in a 1953 report:

> With the police under orders to shoot first and investigate afterward, killings, riots, and pillage have occurred whenever trivial incidents have fanned into quick flame the highly combustible accumulation of fear, terror, and desperation on both sides.14

Over and over such stories as these appeared in the major news media, each reinforcing the predictions of coming massive violence. The forces of racial conflict were, as the *Christian Century* expressed it, "driving implacably toward national doom."15

The conflict in South Africa came to be perceived by American observers as having importance to the United States for several reasons. One of these was that apartheid and racial friction could encourage communism within South Africa. Soon after the Nationalist victory in 1948 the *New Republic* said that the denial of rights to Africans would create a situation that was "tailor-made for Moscow propaganda."16 *Newsweek* featured a story in 1955 on Soviet plans for world conquest and indicated that the opponents of apartheid in South Africa would be given full support by the Kremlin.17 *America*, which

---


was critical of the Bantu Education Act because it cut off subsidies
to parochial schools, warned that "unless a genuine Christianity can
fill the moral vacuum [created by the secularization of the schools],
it will be filled by a fanatic nationalism or communism."\(^{18}\) Another
writer asserted that South Africa's Suppression of Communism Act was
forcing well-meaning liberals into the arms of communism.\(^{19}\)

Conflict in South Africa appeared to be important to the United
States also because it seemed to threaten other parts of Africa. As
colonial powers relinquished their authority in Africa and new coun­
tries appeared throughout the continent, American interest in Africa
increased greatly. Americans felt they had a special relationship with
Africa and were intensely optimistic about the future of the new states.
However, it was feared by many observers that South Africa's racial
conflict could have disastrous consequences for Africa and for Ameri­
can interests in Africa.

The new American interest in Africa was reflected in many ways
in the late 1950s and early 1960s. The articles and issues of period­
icals devoted to Africa grew in number. Foreign policy organizations
turned their attention to African issues, and new Africa-oriented
organizations were formed.\(^{20}\) African studies programs were instituted

\(^{18}\) "Apartheid Hits the Schools," \textit{America}, February 12, 1955, p.
499. See also "Black Extremists in South Africa," \textit{America}, February

\(^{19}\) John Scott, "Last Chance in Africa: An American View,"
\textit{Atlantic}, CCIII (April, 1959), 92.

\(^{20}\) A partial listing of such organizations by Vernon McKay in
1963 included the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy
Association, the African-American Institute, the African Studies
Association, the American Society of African Culture, the Africa
League, the Africa Research Foundation, the African Service Institute,
at major American universities. The State Department in 1958 created a Bureau of African Affairs and the office of Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. President Kennedy stressed the importance he attached to Africa by announcing the appointment of G. Mennen Williams as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs before any other State Department appointments. The New Republic reflected on the new "climate of opinion" on Africa in 1960 in a passage that bears quoting at length:

The new African-consciousness in the US begins at the grass roots: 1960 has been named "Africa year" in American churches, and every Sunday School class and Ladies Aid circle from Pine Creek, Oregon, to Eagle Creek, Maine, has been conscientiously holding study sessions on the political situations below the Sahara. Congressmen's offices have been flooded with requests for data on the awakening continent. These discussions are augmented by materials received by local churches from their missionaries, who convey an image of Africans as individuals with aspirations comparable to those of anybody else.

The over-familiar stereotype of African nationalists as potential Mau Maus has been broken down by the appearance on American television this year of such impressive leaders as Tom Mboya and Julius Nyerere—whose cultured British accents, remarkable social presence, and obvious intellectuality have relieved thousands of viewer-voters of many of their anxieties about post-independence Africa. American magazines have been outdoing each other to bring out bigger and better "special issues" on Africa. This is one case, then, where public opinion

the African-American Students Foundation, the Foundation for All Africa, and the American Committee on Africa. Vernon McKay, Africa in World Politics (New York, 1963), 253-54.


is very nearly abreast of the experts in recognizing that Africa deserves an independent American appraisal.24

In the great outpouring of literature on Africa that accompanied this strong interest, there was a new image of Africa. Americans writing on Africa knew that they were dealing with a dramatic new force in world affairs. They struggled to reject older images of Africa—images of savage natives in primordial rain forests and jungles—and to replace them with an image which would better fit the post-colonial era. In the new image, the Africans were a progressive, democratic people. Now that colonialism was ended, the great weight holding the Africans down had been removed and they could unite to confront the tasks before them. It seemed that they were creating a new civilization on a pristine continent where the beauty of nature remained unviolated, and that they would avoid the excesses of commercialism and industrialism that had characterized Western development.25

The new image of Africa was significant not only because it made South Africa appear all the more backward and foolish in its fears, but also because Americans believed the "new" Africa to be very important to the United States. The economic and strategic importance of Africa were asserted by Rupert Emerson, a Harvard political scientist and former government official, in the American Assembly's


A collection of essays on The United States and Africa:

The stake of the West and of the United States in Africa is great. Negatively, the primary concern is to ensure that the Communist bloc secures neither the prestige nor the material gains that would flow from enlisting Africa, or any substantial part thereof, in its camp. Strategically, the vital importance of North Africa to Europe was demonstrated in World War II, and Dakar, offering potential command over South Atlantic shipping lanes, juts out as the nearest point for an invasion of the Western hemisphere. . . . To a crowded Europe, Africa holds the promise of a frontier land still susceptible of great expansion, both as a market and as a source of raw materials, plus an almost unexplored industrial potential. Its riches in strategic and other minerals are impressive. In industrial diamonds, columbium, cobalt, chromium, and beryllium, Africa either heads the list of world producers or stands close to the top; it is a significant producer of tin, manganese, copper and antimony; and its large reserves of iron ore and bauxite are just beginning to be tapped.26

Newsweek called Africa "the richest prize on earth."27

Africa also seemed important to the United States because to some Americans Africa was a test of the American character. For many generations Americans had held themselves up as a nation of revolutionaries, men and women dedicated to the cause of human freedom everywhere. How real could this claim seem in the postwar world, when the United States was proving itself committed to the status quo in country after country? Communism now claimed to be representative of the revolutionary spirit that was so much a cherished part of the American heritage. The United States had already lost Asia; it had made a


sorry record for itself in Latin America; commitments in Europe had forced it into an uneasy complicity in the policies of the colonial powers with possessions in Africa. Now, with Africa coming to independence, it seemed that the United States had one last opportunity to demonstrate its continuing commitment to all that it said was its heritage. Africa was America's challenge to prove to itself and to the world that it was in reality what it claimed to be. Americans believed they had a special identification with Africa because ten percent of the American people were from Africa and because Americans and Africans shared the same ideals, the same revolutionary spirit and purpose. Over and over this appeared in writings on Africa.

Chester Bowles, whose views on South Africa have already been mentioned, said that Africa's anti-colonial revolution was based on "our traditionally American principles." He felt that, because of the revolutionary origins of the United States, "we have a clear moral, ideological, and--one might say--historical responsibility to play a constructive role in Africa or repudiate one of the most basic elements in our American history." Adlai Stevenson similarly asserted that it was up to the West to determine whether the future of Africa, "the most innocent of all the continents," would be good or evil. Stevenson said that "what is being tested is, in the last analysis, the moral capacities of our society." A writer in the Christian Science

28 Chester Bowles, Africa's Challenge to America (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1957), vii, 106.

Monitor thought that "the United States should be uniquely equipped to understand African problems and aspirations—having in its early years faced many of the same."30

If Africa's new countries appeared to hold a promise and challenge for the United States, South Africa seemed to pose a threat to American interests in several different ways. To begin with, South Africa's continued existence as an apparent vestige of colonialism stood as an obstacle to good relations between the United States and the rest of Africa. The United States, many felt, could not maintain normal relations with South Africa and still expect other African countries to be friendly toward the United States. Rupert Emerson asked if the United States "looks the other way when South Africa elbows its African majority aside, can it expect better than a suspicious neutrality when it seeks to rally Africa's people to the free world's standards?"31 He felt that Africa had yet to be convinced that the American concern for freedom and equality embraced the black man as well as the white. Similarly an article in Africa Today arguing for a stronger American policy on South Africa said that the "great significance of Southern Africa for us lies in the fact that it involves issues of racial and political justice so stark and so closely related to our own greatest shortcomings that our failure to respond adequately raises doubts about the sincerity of our avowed commitments, at home as well as abroad."32 Thus South Africa stood in the way of

convincing Africans that the United States really did believe in human freedom; and if Africans could not be convinced of this, it was feared they might choose communism over democracy.

A more direct threat to Africa seemed to arise from the threat of a race war originating in South Africa. A special issue of Life magazine in 1953 pointed out the dangers to Africa which South Africa posed. One article said that apartheid was turning the blacks of South Africa into a cruel and bitter people, and it raised the possibility that

these aroused Negroes, linking hands with their brothers all over the continent, may yet blow all hopes for Africa sky-high. There is still time to avert this, but not too much time. In Africa, both white and black stand at a fateful crossroads. Working together, they can pass from darkness to light. If they clash, Africa will pass back into jungle night.33

A Foreign Policy Association pamphlet in 1952 said that any aggressive action by South Africa in the event of a war between the West and communism would arouse concerted African resistance "and automatically create in Africa a major ally for the Communist foe."34 Chester Bowles feared that a racial explosion in South Africa would "turn much of Africa against the white man, create new tensions in Asia and hasten the swing to Communism throughout the world."35 Newsweek spelled out the threat to American interests even more starkly and graphically than did Bowles in this special "box" from a feature story.


35 Bowles, Africa's Challenge to America, 66-67.
on South Africa:

**Powder Keg: Reasons Why**

**The Problem:** The Determination of Prime Minister Strijdom and his South African Government to enforce total segregation of 12 million blacks, impose complete control by 2.8 million whites.

**The Danger:** Strijdom's policies could touch off an African explosion which would lay the continent's vast untapped wealth and human resources open to Red ambitions.

**The Stakes:** South Africa is the free world's largest uranium producer, source of 40 per cent of its gold, 14 per cent of its diamonds. Ultimately in the balance are the loyalties of all Africa's 210 million people; its natural resources which now supply the U.S. with 60 per cent of its cobalt (jet engines, super-hardened steel); 36 per cent of its chrome (steel alloys and platings); and 35 per cent of its manganese (alloys for aircraft components).

The Seattle Times similarly saw South Africa as aiding communism in Africa. It put South Africa and the Soviet Union in the same category, stating that the policies of both were exacerbating the political atmosphere throughout Africa. Apartheid, it said, "can be compared to tightening the lid on a steaming teakettle." Still other Americans took the view that South Africa was so great an affront to the rest of Africa that the work of nation-building could not progress until white domination was ended there, or that the Africans of the new countries would invade South Africa to end apartheid.

South Africa's threat seemed to some Americans to extend even beyond the African continent. As early as 1948, the Christian Century warned that "the storm that will eventually burst over South Africa

---


37 *Seattle Times*, February 27, 1959 (clipping provided to the author by the newspaper).

is not likely to blow itself out until it has loosed a cloudburst of
blood over that continent, and over most of the other continents."39
Malcolm Ross, the former chairman of the Fair Employment Practices
Commission, told a 1951 conference in New York that violent conflict
in South Africa "would harm race relations all over the world.
Communists would be the only ones to benefit."40 Such fears increased
after a series of events in 1960 made a race war seem inevitable and
imminent.

No one knows for sure exactly what happened outside the
Sharpeville police station that Monday afternoon, March 21, 1960.
The guns spoke only briefly, and many of the demonstrators at the
back of the crowd did not even hear them at first. But before the
day was over, the whole world had heard them. Had the Africans thrown
stones and begun an attack on the police station, or had they been
protesting peacefully, waving their hated passes? Had the gunfire
been started by a nervous and inexperienced young policeman, or had
it been a callous massacre, a premeditated plan to show Africans that
they should not attempt further protests? The result was the same
regardless: sixty-nine Africans were dead and over two hundred lay
wounded. Whatever actually took place within the crowd and the ranks
of the police, the nationwide anti-pass campaign organized by the
newly-formed Pan African Congress and its dreadful yield outside the

39"South Africa's Witches' Brew," Christian Century, November

40Malcolm Ross, "Emotional Aspects of the Civil Rights Issue,
in Lyman Bryson, ed., Foundations of World Organization: A Political
and Cultural Appraisal (New York, 1952), 108.
police station made Sharpeville a household word on five continents.\(^\text{41}\)

When Sharpeville occurred, there were already a number of foreign correspondents in South Africa, for Africa was big news in 1960. Prime Minister Verwoerd had announced in January that there would be a plebiscite to determine if the country should become a republic. Only two weeks later the British Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan, told the South African Parliament while on a widely publicized tour that the "winds of change" were sweeping through Africa.\(^\text{42}\) The anti-pass campaign had been announced in advance; reporters had been sent to cover it or had been instructed to stay for it after covering the other events. One reporter was able to take pictures of the crowds fleeing the police at Sharpeville and pictures of two policement with guns standing over the field of dead. These photographs were featured prominently in many papers and news magazines and added immeasurably to the sense of horror and outrage that people everywhere felt.

There was immediate and widespread condemnation of South Africa throughout the world.\(^\text{43}\) Even before most editorial writers in the American press had time to assess the situation, their papers were reporting that Lincoln White, the State Department's press officer, had told an Indian journalist at a press conference that:

> The United States deplores violence in all its forms and hopes that the African people of South Africa will be able to obtain

\(^\text{41}\)For a study of world reactions to Sharpeville, see Peter Calvocoressi, *South Africa and World Opinion* (London, 1961).


\(^\text{43}\)Calvocoressi, *South Africa and World Opinion*, 3-4. On the United States, see *ibid.*, 6-8.
redress for legitimate grievances by peaceful means. While the
United States, as a matter of practice, does not ordinarily
comment on the internal affairs of governments with which it
enjoys normal relations, it cannot help but regret the tragic
loss of life resulting from the measures taken against the
demonstrators in South Africa. 44

Editorials appeared in newspapers all over the country simi-
larly condemning South Africa; they were given a continuing opportunity
to do so because the crisis in South Africa went on for weeks. Huge
demonstrations were staged by Africans in several cities in South
Africa. An African work boycott began in many areas, and, when the
police responded sharply, headlines such as "Whips Drive Africans to
Their Jobs" appeared in American papers. 45 A state of emergency was
declared by the South African government; this was followed by an
assassination attempt on the life of the Prime Minister, Dr. Verwoerd,
by an unstable English-speaking farmer.

The crisis was seen as the inevitable result of apartheid.
The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin said that "with the inevitability
of a Greek tragedy, the South African policy of apartheid . . . is
producing the ugly fruits that nearly everyone but its sponsors had
foreseen." 46 To the New York Herald-Tribune "it was obvious that the
harsh injustice of the South African government must sooner or later
exhaust the stoic patience of the Negroes of the Union . . . ." 47
It was, said the Washington Post, "a warning inscribed in blood,"

44 Quoted in Washington Post, March 23, 1960, p. 6. On the
background of this statement, see McKay, Africa in World Politics,
299-300.


that an entire people "cannot be kept in permanent subjugation and
denied all outlets for peaceful redress without inviting exactly the
calamitous incident that has now occurred."\textsuperscript{48} In a statement re­
leased by the AFL-CIO, George Meany declared: "These official mur­
ders—they can be called nothing less—are the bloody fruition of a
program of terror and inhuman racialism."\textsuperscript{49}

The events in South Africa seemed to have a special signifi­
cance for the United States. The same publications commenting on the
South African racial problems were reporting on the discussions in
Congress of a new civil rights bill for the United States and on civil
rights sit-in demonstrations that were taking place in the South and
in cities of the Northeast. The Toledo \textit{Blade} said that the American
protest to Sharpeville "offers an occasion to ponder the relative
barbarism of suppression in a frontier African nation and the more
sophisticated means of glossing over the problem at home."\textsuperscript{50} The New
York \textit{Herald-Tribune} took Sharpeville as a reminder that the United
States was not moving fast enough in civil rights, and observed that
"it is no use pretending that there are not a good many white Ameri­
cans who would feel at home in South Africa."\textsuperscript{51} Unless South Africa's
racial policies were tempered, the newspaper asserted, it was "more
than likely that the temper of racial disputes will be sharpened in

\textsuperscript{50}Toledo \textit{Blade}, March 24, 1960 (clipping provided to the
author by the newspaper).
\textsuperscript{51}New York \textit{Herald-Tribune}, March 24, 1960, p. 16.
many places . . . . We, too, have explosive situations that a spark might ignite.\textsuperscript{52} Calling South Africa a "Sick Country," the New York Times said that "there was no doubt whatever that the trouble in South Africa was a contagious malady that might sweep across frontiers just as other diseases do."\textsuperscript{53} Two days later the Times made it clear that it was the United States' frontiers that it was worried about:

What happens in South Africa touches half a continent immediately. It crosses the frontiers of every Asian country. It affects our own country, where the Federal courts and the Federal Executive are committed to the doctrine of equal rights before the law, but Southern Senators invoke the Constitution to prevent the passage of laws which make the Constitution effective.\textsuperscript{54}

"South Africa's Southern Colonels" thus threatened the United States.\textsuperscript{55} Repeatedly the point was made in American publications that Sharpeville was not a single historical event but simply the beginning of a larger one; it was only a prelude to the race war that would follow and become ever larger and bloodier. Time, for example, reported as things calmed a bit, that "it was clearly just the end of a skirmish; few doubted that the real battle lay ahead—perhaps not too far ahead."\textsuperscript{56} The St. Louis Post-Dispatch asserted that the more the whites intimidated the moderates, the more likely it was that the leadership of the Africans would fall to younger and lawless elements.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{52}Ibid., March 31, 1960, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{53}New York Times, April 1, 1960.
\textsuperscript{54}Ibid., April 3, 1960, Sec. 4, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., April 4, 1960, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{56}"The Assassin of Milner Park," Time, April 18, 1960, p. 24.
\textsuperscript{57}St. Louis Post-Dispatch, April 5, 1960 (clipping provided to the author by the newspaper).
The Denver Post expected the violence to spread and to have effects elsewhere in Africa: "Each outburst of violence, each new edict that pushes down on non-whites in the Union makes it harder for native African politicians to the north to advocate programs of moderation toward the white man." In a similar vein the Toledo Blade said that "the stakes in the rising nationalism of Africa are global."

The relative peace which came to South Africa after Sharpeville was repeatedly said to be a deceptive calm. The government's strong measures were seen as simply encouraging further extremism among Africans, as demonstrated by the formation of the militant organizations Pogo and Umkhonto we Sizwe—both rejecting nonviolent tactics—after the banning of the Pan African Congress and the African National Congress. But there were no more large scale African demonstrations and consequently nothing was to replace Sharpeville as the image of violent conflict in South Africa. Sharpeville continued to be used as the symbol of this conflict, both as a manifestation of the existence of racial turmoil and as a sign of the imminence of the coming blood bath. A decade after Sharpeville newspapers and magazines continued to run pictures of the field of bodies at Sharpeville; they

58 Denver Post, March 24, 1960 (clipping provided to the author by the newspaper).

59 Toledo Blade, April 12, 1960 (clipping provided to the author by the newspaper).

60 The New Republic said that the formation of Umkhonto signified "a final turning away from hope that peaceful change might be accomplished by traditional protest and reconciliation." "South Africa Underground," New Republic, February 12, 1962, p. 11. See also "Hate Against Hate," Newsweek, April 8, 1963, p. 41; and James S. Coleman, "The Character and Viability of African Political Systems," in Goldschmidt, ed., The United States and Africa, 70.
warned of the possibilities of "another Sharpeville massacre."

Sharpeville not only convinced many that a race war was likely in South Africa but it also persuaded some that action against South Africa was desirable or necessary. It was Sharpeville more than anything else that set in motion a movement in the United States for some type of action against South Africa.
CHAPTER IV
THE MOVEMENT FOR AMERICAN ACTION AGAINST SOUTH AFRICAN APARTHEID

In the first decade of apartheid in South Africa under the Nationalist Party, few Americans felt that it posed any problems for the formulation of American policy. Apartheid did not seem to involve Americans directly or touch strongly on American interests. Even for those who became very interested in the racial situation in South Africa, the only action that seemed to be called for was to make the American public aware of apartheid and on occasion to extend private aid and encouragement to some of the "victims" of South Africa's policies. Sharpeville, worsening American race relations, and the appearance of new African states made stronger action seem appropriate. However, even before Sharpeville there were some Americans who called for action against South Africa's race policies. Several black American groups became critical of American policy on South Africa at an early date, and a broader "public" became interested in a policy decision on one occasion when it directly involved black Americans.

Black Americans, as suggested earlier, have long had a very harsh attitude regarding South Africa. It represented to them in an acute form the racial supremacist views and denial of rights which they faced in the United States. Because they believed the two systems to be related, black Americans began to attempt to influence
policy on South Africa in an organized way with the formation of the Council on African Affairs in 1937. The Council was established under the guidance of Max Yergan, a black sociologist who had spent a number of years working in South Africa, and Paul Robeson, a black activist singer and actor. At its inception, the Council announced that it had three purposes to accomplish: to give aid to the struggles of the African masses; to disseminate information concerning Africa and its peoples; and to influence the adoption of governmental policies designed to promote the advancement and freedom of African people and preserve international peace.

To further its goals, the Council on African Affairs published a monthly bulletin, New Africa. South Africa received much attention in the pages of New Africa. During World War II the bulletin focused on the oppression of the Africans by the South African government rather than on that government's participation in the war. That is, unlike most other American publications which concentrated on the conflict between the "good" followers of Prime Minister Smuts and the "bad" Afrikaner Nationalists, New Africa portrayed an oppressive white government without differentiating significantly between the white groups. It printed stories of police brutality and described the government police as being like the German

---


2 Ibid.

3 The author examined most of the issues of New Africa and its successor Spotlight on Africa for the period from 1944 through 1952 in the files of the New York City Public Library.
Even as the war was drawing to a close, *New Africa* depicted South Africa as being on a course toward Fascism and turmoil.\(^4\)

The Council on African Affairs attempted to influence racial policy in South Africa and American policy towards South Africa in a variety of ways. It tried to make information on South Africa more widely available and opposed South African injustice editorially. It supported efforts to raise funds for Africans living there. It reported that it "repeatedly urged South African officials to remove the burden and shame of the pass regulations from African society."\(^6\)

An example of such urging occurred in 1944 after race rioting took place in Johannesburg. Max Yergan, the executive director of the Council, wrote the South African minister to the United States, S. F. N. Gil, a long letter deploring the rioting. In part, the letter stated:

> Whether such riots occur in the Union of South Africa, in the United States, or elsewhere, they are a matter of concern to all democratic peoples of the United Nations who are fighting to destroy the concept of racial inferiority and the practice of racial oppression. Continued failure to take effective action against these evils, it appears certain, spells disaster for both Europeans and non-Europeans in South Africa.\(^7\)

Officials of the Council on African Affairs had meetings with

---

\(^4\)See, for examples, the articles in *New Africa*, III (February, 1944), 2. *New Africa* evidently had good sources of information. It regularly quoted from South African papers and publications, and it made references to correspondents in South Africa.


\(^6\)*New Africa*, III (May, 1944), 1-2.

\(^7\)Max Yergan to S. F. N. Gil, in *New Africa*, III (December, 1944), 1.
State Department officials during World War II and sought to influence postwar planning on African questions. In April 1945 the Council issued a memorandum for consideration by the delegates to the conference drawing up the United Nations Charter. Entitled *The San Francisco Conference and the Colonial Issue*, the pamphlet called for an end to colonialism and declared principles of international responsibility for colonial peoples.\(^8\) In furtherance of these principles, Yergan wrote Edward R. Stettinius, soon to become the American delegate to the United Nations, voicing strong objections to the inclusion of South Africa as a member of the temporary trusteeship committee of the United Nations.\(^9\) Although unsuccessful, such efforts did call attention to the issues of race before the United Nations.

In the postwar period, the Council on African Affairs grew increasingly radical, and it was placed on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations in 1948. The Council continued to urge United Nations action on South Africa, but, in a pattern to be repeated by other organizations two decades later, it became more highly critical of American policy on South Africa and American business activity within South Africa.\(^10\) "Apartheid in South Africa," said one Council pamphlet, "pays big dividends to the few—not only in that


country and in Britain, but also in the United States of America.\textsuperscript{11}

The author of the statement, Alphaeus Hunton, the Council's Secretary, asked: "How much of the blood of South Africa's oppressed black people is on America's own hands?"\textsuperscript{12}

The reason for the Council's concern over South Africa was repeatedly given in its publications: the struggle of black South Africans and of black Americans was the same struggle, not only against the same racial ideas, but also the same economic forces and individuals. The enemy was white American capitalism, and it was, in the Council's view, responsible for black oppression all over the world.

An editorial in \textit{Spotlight on Africa}, the successor to \textit{New Africa}, stated in 1952:

\begin{quote}
The South African government is aiding in "preserving democracy" in Korea by sending its Jim Crow air force to help kill Koreans. South Africa is a part of President Truman's "free world." Yes, dozens of America's biggest auto, oil, mining and other trusts have highly profitable holdings in that country. . . . Hence it is clear that in raising our voices against the Malan regime we simultaneously strike a blow at the reactionary forces in our own land who seek to preserve here, in South Africa, and everywhere else the super profits they harvest from racial and national oppression. United support for our brothers' struggles in Africa is an integral part of our task in achieving freedom for all Americans and peace for the world.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

The Council on African Affairs portrayed the Passive Defiance Campaign of 1952 in South Africa as part of the struggle of black Americans for equality and dignity. It printed the text of an African


\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Tbid.}

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Spotlight on Africa}, XI (February 25, 1952), 1.
National Congress and South African Indian Congress memorandum to the United Nations concerning the campaign and appended to it a postscript urging American action. Answering the question of why Americans should respond, the postscript's author said: "If you hate Jim Crow, if you hate fascism, that is enough." The problem of the United States, he continued, could not be divorced from that of South Africa: "Can the octopus of racism and fascism be killed by simply cutting off one menacing tentacle?" The Council's *Spotlight on Africa* put it more forcefully:

A people's victory in South Africa will mean a victory for PEACE—a decisive set-back to those interests in Washington, whose profits-and-war schemes depend upon racial and rational oppression. On the other hand, the defeat of the Civil Disobedience Campaign in South Africa will mean OUR defeat, too—a set-back for OUR struggle for democratic rights.

The increasing radicalism of the Council led to defection from its ranks by its more moderate members, including Max Yergan, and to further harassment by governmental officials. Finally, it was dissolved in 1955.

In the meantime, however, other civil rights groups began to take up South Africa as a cause. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, for example, began demonstrating more concern over South African issues at the United Nations and American policy on South Africa. In 1955 the NAACP challenged American policy
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by demanding that a United States Navy ship, the Midway, refrain from calling on South African ports where black American sailors would be segregated. Although the Navy rejected the demand, the NAACP found some degree of support in the press because it was a situation in which South African apartheid directly affected American citizens. The New York Times agreed with the NAACP, editorializing that either South Africa should have agreed to waive apartheid in respect to American sailors, or the Midway should have stayed out of Cape Town.

That an element of national self-interest was beginning to be perceived in policy questions on South Africa was seen in the argument in support of the NAACP position made by Commonweal. It observed that "surely a refusal by the U. S. to allow its personnel to be humiliated by South Africa's apartheid laws would be a striking demonstration to the world's non-white peoples of the official opposition of the United States to racism." It was, however, obvious that if the United States government attempted to accede to the NAACP demand, it would have been put in the incongruous position of demanding of Cape Town, South Africa, something it could not demand of the Midway's home port of Norfolk, Virginia, or of other naval installations at Charleston, New Orleans, and other locations in the South.

---

Apart from one or two other isolated instances, there were few questions raised publicly about American policy on South Africa until the end of the 1950s. For those disturbed by apartheid, American progress in race relations in the early 1950s seemed to offer the possibility of progress elsewhere. America, it seemed, could do more to end unjust race practices in South Africa by its good example than in any other way. And interference in the internal affairs of a friendly, non-Communist country was unprecedented. There were individuals and groups who voiced concern over South Africa, but they directed their efforts at making Americans aware of South Africa's race problems and into alleviating the conditions of some of those suffering from apartheid in South Africa. In the late 1950s, they began showing greater concern over American policy.

One such group was the American Committee on Africa (ACOA), one of the oldest and most important of the Africa-concerned organizations. The ACOA had contacts with many people in the United States interested in Africa. The Committee's techniques of operation were typical of special interest groups operating on limited budgets. Its publications illustrated changing views on policy of liberal Americans concerned about South Africa.

The American Committee on Africa was founded in 1953 by a group of liberal-minded persons who had broad experience in the civil rights movement in the United States. These included Donald Harrington of the International League for the Rights of Man, Rayford Logan, a professor at Howard University, Harold Isaacs, a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, George Carpenter of the National Council of Churches, Walter Offutt of the NAACP, Homer Jack, an
Evanston, Illinois minister, and George M. Houser, formerly executive
director of the Congress of Racial Equality and national projects
secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Houser, the son of
American missionaries, had been secretary of another organization
formed the previous year by some of the same people who founded the
ACOA. Called Americans for South African Resistance, it had been
organized to arouse American interest in the Passive Defiance Campaign
of 1952 and attempted to do this through demonstrations and mass
meetings. The ACOA, on the other hand, expected to engage in less
direct tactics. It planned to act, its founders stated, principally
"as a clearing house for information about present day political and
economic events in Africa in order to create a concern for intelligent
and constructive American action in Africa." Although it thus
claimed all Africa as its interest, its major emphasis from the be-
inning was on South Africa.

In its first years, the American Committee on Africa acted as
a "clearing house" for information rather than as a policy advocate.
It attempted to reach a broad public by writing letters to the editors
of various publications, and it published its own periodic newsletter,

22 *Africa Today*, I (April, 1954), 1. For much of the material
on the ACOA, the author is indebted to the assistance of several of its
personnel who sent materials to the author. In addition, the author
visited the New York offices of the ACOA and received further such
assistance in June 1972.
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Africa Today. It held conferences and coordinated meetings with other liberal groups, including, among others, the NAACP, the International League for the Rights of Man, the Congress of Industrial Organization, Americans for Democratic Action, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the National Ethical Union, and the American Jewish Labor Committee. It set up informational activities for visiting African leaders, including controversial South African figures such as the Reverend Michael Scott, a spokesman against South African control of South West Africa, Peter Abrahams, a Coloured writer, and Ellen Hellman of the South African Institute of Race Relations. It undertook special projects to assist South Africans. After the passage of the Bantu Education Act, for example, it set up a fund to support missionary schools that might otherwise have lacked sufficient funds for operation. When a number of opponents of apartheid were arrested and tried for treason in 1956, the ACOA raised money for a Defense and Aid Fund to help defray defense costs and to support the families of the defendants.

In addition to these activities, the American Committee on Africa began to establish contacts with public officials. ACOA personnel met with members of Congress and with other elected and appointed government officials to provide them with information on African issues. Officials were also given the opportunity to present their views in ACOA publications. Thus the ACOA carried on informational activities on three levels: it attempted to filter information down to a broad public; it attempted to work through other opinion influencing organizations; and it reached "up" to embrace policy leaders and

makers.

With the passage of time, the American Committee on Africa began to express increasing concern about American policy on colonial Africa and South Africa. Writers in Africa Today began asking harsh questions about American policy. Harold Isaacs, for example, wrote an essay for a 1957 issue in which he predicted disaster for the "blind" racists of South Africa. He asked what the United States should do if the showdown came. Isaacs had no answers but urged "Let's start groping, hard."^26

In the same issue another author indicated how the image of South Africa was becoming tied up with the American image abroad and American policy on South Africa. Commenting on the world wide publicity given to the denial of a glass of orange juice to an African diplomat in a road-side restaurant in Delaware, the author of Africa Today's "Talking Drums" column stated:

It is fitting in an issue devoted to the dangers and evils of South African racialism that we should state for the record our increasing opposition to all manifestations in the United States of racial discrimination and segregation. Our situation might be comparable to South Africa if the attitude of the citizens of Mississippi prevailed in all America. Fortunately, it does not, however, not because we are more virtuous but simply because the Negroes in other areas are in a minority rather than a majority. We have yet to prove to the world that America has any better claim to fulfilling the rights of man than the Union of South Africa.^27

Increasingly it seemed necessary to such people to state "for the record" official American opposition to discrimination and segregation

---


in both South Africa and the United States.

The implications of Isaacs's article and the "Talking Drums" statement began to be formulated into specific policy proposals by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, a member of the ACOA's National Committee, in a subsequent Africa Today issue. Senator Humphrey was critical of the fact that for years the American government had annually been foregoing the opportunity "to make clear where we stand on the racial issue" by failing to denounce South Africa at the United Nations.28 He continued:

[O]n the issue of apartheid our representative failed to get up on his feet before the nations of the world to point out that we in the United States, administratively, legislatively, and judicially, have recently launched a new effort to eliminate segregation in a wide variety of fields from schools to public transport. We might have made it perfectly clear that we believe in putting one's own house in order first on this matter, but that deliberately putting it in disorder by cultivating racism, whether under Hitler or as apartheid, is an evil humanity will not tolerate.29

Senator Humphrey claimed that communism threatened Africa, and urged that the United States should do all it could to forestall the advance of communism. Opposing apartheid officially was one way of hindering the spread of communism into Africa, said Humphrey.

As these articles in Africa Today indicated, changing conditions in the United States and Africa were leading some Americans to argue that a more critical policy on South Africa was necessary. Criticism of apartheid could, it was believed, convince foreigners of American "sincerity" on civil rights issues and also forestall the
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spread of communism. Given the assumptions of these articles, the arguments for policy change were plausible, indeed persuasive. Apparently personnel in the Department of State thought so too, because in 1958 the United States made its first important change in policy on South Africa.

Prior to 1958, the United States carefully avoided taking an official stand against apartheid at the United Nations. Official statements indicated that the United States opposed every form of racial discrimination, but the proper method of dealing with it was to let each member state work to solve it in its own way.\(^{30}\) The United States generally abstained from voting on resolutions dealing with South African apartheid. However, in October 1958 the United States voted in favor of the perennial resolution denouncing apartheid, on this occasion one expressing regret and concern that South Africa had not responded to United Nations appeals to revise its policies.\(^{31}\) Much of the announcement declaring the American position was devoted to the race problems of the United States and explaining how the government was moving to a multiracial society without discrimination.\(^{32}\) Thus both domestic and foreign political developments combined to produce a shift in American policy on South Africa.


\(^{32}\) Department of State Bulletin, November 24, 1958, pp. 842-44.
For a brief period, the decision to join in the criticisms of South Africa at the United Nations seemed an adequate change in policy to meet the country's foreign policy needs. However, the Sharpeville crisis of March–April 1960 brought about new and much stronger demands for changes in American policy on South Africa.

As discussed earlier, the State Department reacted immediately to Sharpeville with a strong statement deploiring the African deaths. Through its immediate criticisms of the police shootings, the State Department was able to seize the initiative in responding to the crisis in South Africa. That is, the government's statement preceded the public outcry against the police actions; it was not made in response to American public opinion. Not only did Lincoln White deplore the incident in his news conference a day after it occurred, but the American ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, acting in his capacity as President of the Security Council, called the Security Council into session to consider the situation. The American Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter, at a press conference also put the United States on record as opposed to South Africa's actions and policies and in favor of United Nations discussion of the matter.33

Although the United States was thus issuing rather extraordinary statements on the internal affairs of another state, there were few, outside the South, who disapproved of them and many who commended them. The Seattle Times, for example, commented on the government's

statements:

It is necessary and fitting that all major nations of the free world make clear, not only that they regret the bloodshed in South Africa, but that they abhor the doctrines that led to the bloodshed.34

The Seattle newspaper suggested that apartheid should now come to mean the segregation of South Africa from the rest of the world. The New York Times likewise saw nothing to criticize in the government statements. It went so far as to editorialize that international pressure would be required to "cure" the "sickness" of South Africa.35

Some groups and publications not only commended the American response but went on to call for stronger policy measures. In a declaration signed by many prominent citizens praising Secretary Herter's statements, the liberal Americans for Democratic Action called for taking the further steps of halting gold purchases from South Africa and recalling the American envoy to South Africa.36 Similarly, Christian Century called for a boycott of South African gold, suggesting that this could be a means of averting civil war in South Africa. Proclaiming that the United States had the means to "bankrupt" South Africa, the periodical declared that if the United States

34Seattle Times, April 6, 1960 (clipping provided to the author by the newspaper).

35New York Times, April 1, 1960, p. 32. The Christian Science Monitor urged that it was no longer enough to condemn apartheid. "If Americans," it said, "take a forward position against it in the United Nations, they obligate themselves to offer clear ideas for a pertinent American policy." Christian Science Monitor, April 12, 1960, p. 18. Approving of United Nations debate on apartheid, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch said that South Africa's objections to such discussions carried "a vague echo of states' rights." St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 31, 1960 (clipping provided to the author by the newspaper).

refused to buy gold,

the Verwoerd government would have to yield or fall. ... A boycott threat by Washington and London might end the madness which threatens to plunge South Africa into a blood bath. If the threat is not heeded, an imposition of a boycott on gold would soon paralyze the country which threatens world peace more seriously than any other.37

The close correspondence between American race problems and American views on South Africa was effectively symbolized in a joint demonstration by the American Committee on Africa and the Congress of Racial Equality. After picketing a New York City Woolworth's store in protest against Woolworth's exclusion of blacks from lunch counters in the South, leaders of the two organizations marched directly to the South African consulate in New York to picket it in protest against the Sharpeville shootings.38

In addition to its demonstration, the American Committee on Africa held an Emergency Action Conference on South Africa in cooperation with representatives of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Americans for Democratic Action, the American Society of African Culture, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, the Jewish Labor Committee, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the United Auto Workers. The avowed purpose of the Conference, which was held in New York City at the Carnegie International Center on May 31 and June 1, 1960, was to find ways to bring about change within South Africa. The Chairman of the Conference was Jackie Robinson, the first black to play major league


baseball. In his opening statement Robinson told the participants that

America, however removed from South Africa, has the task of aiding in the establishment of real democracy there. . . . I see the struggle against race supremacy and racial inequality as world-wide. The fight against Jim Crow here is part of the same struggle in South Africa.  

The Conference made a number of recommendations for actions against apartheid. These included a consumers' boycott of South African products sold in the United States, discouraging American tourism in South Africa, a ban on South African participation in the Olympic games, nondiscrimination by American businesses operating in South Africa, having local groups sponsor conferences on South Africa, and calling for donations to the Defense and Aid Fund which had been set up several years earlier. As for government policy, the Conference commended the State Department for its condemnation of Sharpeville. It urged that the President and Congress by joint resolution declare that United States policy was opposed to apartheid, that both major political parties pledge themselves to seeking an end to apartheid, that State Department operations in South Africa be integrated, that aid be given to refugees from South Africa and South West Africa, and that "no future purchase of gold or strategic materials from South Africa will be made where there are alternative sources of supply."

A shortcoming of the Conference was that it adopted an all-inclusive approach to its calls for action against South Africa, a
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broad listing of all types of measures that might be taken to show disapproval of South Africa's policies. The organizations supporting these proposals lacked the means of following up on their exhortations except through educating their members about South Africa. It should be noted, too, that there was an assumption implicit in the proposals that the government, with some prompting from the public, could be induced to take a much stronger policy against South Africa. It is interesting to observe that the Conference expected the South African government to continue to provide the United States with strategic materials even after harsh policies would be adopted.

The Emergency Action Conference represented only one of several phases through which the movement for action against South Africa went after 1960. Before proceeding with the subsequent phases of the movement, it should be pointed out that participants in the movement, although united in their hostility to South Africa, were not entirely in agreement on the ultimate purposes of the movement; that is, they were not clear on the rationale for action against South Africa. Lack of clarity on the point did not necessarily lead to disruption between the critics of South Africa, for they often could agree on method if not ends. But to understand better how changing perceptions of South Africa, Africa, and United States race problems were linked to changing views on policy, it is necessary to understand the different reasons given for the movement for action against South Africa. These have been touched upon already and will emerge again in the materials that follow. But for purposes of clarity they will be summarized briefly.
First, there was the argument from national self-interest.\textsuperscript{41} Because of its poor image abroad, the United States needed to show the world that it was truly opposed to racism. If the United States opposed racism at home, it also had to oppose it abroad. Only by effective opposition to South Africa's race policies could the American image be rehabilitated abroad and the spread of communism to the strategically important continent of Africa be forestalled. A significant problem which inhered in this rationale was that no opposition to apartheid could be considered adequate until apartheid was ended. Each step in opposition required further steps in order to prove the United States's sincerity.

A second rationale for a stronger American policy against South Africa was that it could help bring about change within South Africa. This argument proceeded partly from humanitarian and ideological concerns and partly from considerations of self-interest. American policy, some felt, could be a means of convincing the whites of South Africa that their racial policies were futile and had to be abandoned in favor of advancing human freedom. Alternatively, it was believed by some that the United States could encourage black South Africans in their struggle, and once majority rule was established the new leaders would be favorably disposed towards the United States. The difficulty with this rationale was that it depended upon a belief that American policy could bring about a change in policy in South Africa or that majority rule was soon forthcoming.

The third principal rationale for a stronger American policy against South Africa was essentially moralistic. Some participants in the movement for action against South Africa, particularly those with strong religious affiliations, believed that it was necessary for the United States to disassociate itself from South Africa so as to avoid complicity in the evil system of apartheid. The argument was that the United States should "disengage" itself from South Africa so that it was no longer upholding an unjust regime and no longer prof­iting from the economic and racial policies of the South African govern­ment. This element of the movement against South Africa came to focus on American business activity there, and it continued as a rationale for urging group action even after the other two became less per­suasive.

In the same year as Sharpeville, a book was published which evidenced aspects of each of these rationales and which brought together, in a sometimes exaggerated form, many of the ideas preva­lent about South Africa upon which the movement for a stronger American policy depended. This book was *The Death of Africa* by Peter Ritner, an executive editor at the Macmillan publishing company.  

In Ritner's view, the Afrikaner was cruel, perverted, even bloodthirsty. South Africa's government he described as "a constitu­tional freak, the only polity left which is based on readings from ancient scriptures." The country was governed "the way the United States would be run if only Daughters of the Confederacy had

---
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Ritner declared that the Afrikaners had decided that they would "prefer to die horribly rather than surrender the pleasures of kaffir-beating."\(^4\)

It was Ritner's belief that the continent of Africa was so important to the United States that it should set up an Institute of African Affairs within the American government with eight billion dollars a year in funding. The Institute should then "build itself up to become the virtual world center of all things African."\(^5\)

One might have thought somewhere in Africa would have been more convenient for the Africans. It was in the national self-interest of the United States, he believed, to look out for the well-being of Africa. South Africa's impending race war threatened all of Africa and Ritner wanted the United States to step in and impose a settlement as the only way a total disaster could be averted.

Indeed, Ritner viewed forcing a settlement of the race problems of South Africa as an admirable goal. Ritner wrote of riding in a chauffeur-driven car along a South African highway. When the African driver continued calling him *baas* he told the driver to stop it; he was an American and did not like being called *baas*. The driver then pulled off the road and stopped to tell Ritner he had not realized that Ritner was an American. When, the driver asked him, were the Americans coming to South Africa to aid the Africans? Ritner was moved by this and commented:

\(^4\)Ibid., 28.
\(^5\)Ibid., 292.
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It had been a long time since I had heard the word "American" used like this, like a sort of invocation of the Great Spirit; Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt used it this way, and so did this African man. He knew almost nothing of our country, but he did know of the radiant glories of our dream which has so changed the world—though not yet his world. To this man, and to hundreds of millions of men like him around the world, America shall forever be the great and gentle Paladin of the North, feeder of children and liberator of fathers. What more does anyone ask of life? 7

Ritner's dream of being a liberator of course involved freeing Africans from racism, but there was an economic element in his viewpoint that was not fully spelled out, though it did emerge as an important rationale for action later. Ritner was antagonistic to what he called the New Capitalism, an economic development which stood in contrast to Old-Fashioned Business. "As everyone knows," he said, "the chief structural difference between the New Capitalism and the Old has been the substitution of the business decisions of one individual, who possessed the resources he was hazarding, of the decisions of a group, hired to manage these resources in behalf of a faceless multitude of shareholders." 8 Hostility towards the New Capitalism itself became a basis for sanctions against South Africa.

In the initial phase of the movement for action against South Africa, groups and individuals sought to demonstrate personal opposition to apartheid. They also urged the United States government to criticize apartheid, either on its own or together with other countries through the United Nations, and to take steps to manifest the criticism through some token demonstration of disapproval. It soon became obvious, however, that the United States government was very

7 Ibid., 75.
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reluctant to go beyond verbal condemnation of South Africa's race policies, and with this the movement entered into a new phase. Rather than calling for new American initiatives, activist groups and publications now criticized the United States government for its inaction, focusing on the government's unwillingness to join in the policies urged by a majority of the countries at the United Nations.

With the addition of many new African states to the General Assembly, the United Nations had quickly gone beyond a policy position to which the United States would agree. This became clear in the spring of 1961 when the initial draft of General Assembly Resolution 1598 was offered for passage. The draft condemned apartheid policies and stated that the General Assembly "considers it to be the responsibility of all members of the United Nations to take separate and collective action to bring about the elimination of these policies . . . ."49 Paragraph Five, the key provision of the Resolution, recommended that all states consider taking the following steps to eliminate apartheid:

(a) To break off diplomatic relations with the Government of the Union of South Africa, or to refrain from establishing such relations;
(b) To close the ports of each State to all vessels flying the South African flag;
(c) To enact legislation prohibiting the ships of each State from entering South African ports;
(d) To boycott all South African goods and to refrain from exporting goods to South Africa;
(e) To refuse landing and passage facilities to all aircraft belonging to the Government and companies registered under the laws of the Union of South Africa.50
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The United States was quite unwilling to approve of this. A vote was taken on this draft; forty-two members favored it, thirty-four opposed, and twenty-one abstained. Thus the draft failed because two-thirds had to approve it for passage. A much milder paragraph was substituted for Paragraph Five and this draft was approved.

The American delegate to the United Nations, Francis T. Plimpton, explained to the Assembly why the United States opposed the proposals of Paragraph Five. Although the United States condemned apartheid, the United States believed, he asserted, that the measures proposed simply will not accomplish what they are intended to do. If sanctions as extensive as these were to be approved and carried out, the effect could be an internal explosion in South Africa.

The relationship between American domestic problems and foreign policy on racial matters was again demonstrated when Ambassador Alex Quaison-Sackey of Ghana opened discussion of Resolution 1598. He began by throwing down, in essence, a challenge to the United States on 1598. He did this by reading to the Assembly a letter he purportedly received from an American calling himself Count Albert von Hohenzollern. The letter read:

Dear head nigger:
The white people of the world should boycott all you niggers and put you cannibals out of business. What right have you half-ape niggers to dare to question the policy of South Africa on racial segregation. Furthermore, we don't need you niggers here in the U.S. to tell us how to run our business, and we are getting fed up with supplying you black apes with blackmail for your nigger friendship.

(signed) A white American for South Africa.

United Nations, General Assembly, 15th Session, Official Records: Plenary Meetings, April 13, 1961, p. 267. It was in poor taste to read this, but the implication was clear: if the United States did not support the stronger draft of Resolution 1598, it would be refusing to repudiate the views of the letter.
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the brunt of which could be borne by the very Africans we are striving to help. Beyond that, the peace of the whole continent of Africa could be in jeopardy.  

Plimpton argued that adoption of the stronger draft of the resolution would not "bring an end to apartheid or improve the lot of the victims of that abhorrent policy."  

The shift in attitude among the anti-South African activists produced by the American position was seen in a new pamphlet published in 1962 by the American Committee on Africa. Commenting on the failure to get the necessary two-thirds majority for the first draft of Resolution 1598, the authors of the pamphlet said that the key to the defeat was the opposition of the United States and the abstention of South American states favorable to the United States. Although they expressed a hope that the United States might change its position, they said that the United States was showing the Afro-Asian states that it was not willing to "go beyond pious words of 'regret' concerning the situation in South Africa." In so stating, they were echoing the question put by Ambassador Usher of the Ivory Coast in the General Assembly: "What is the purpose of deploring, of deprecating, if nothing is done to end this catastrophic state of affairs?"

53 Department of State Bulletin, April 24, 1961, p. 603.
54 Ibid.
56 United Nations, General Assembly, 16th Session, Official Records: Plenary Meetings, November 28, 1961, p. 888. Putting it even more strongly that same day was Mr. Amonoo of Ghana who criticized the "apostles of moderation" who opposed sanctions because they had "economic, military, diplomatic and political interests in sustaining the white regime in South Africa. Moreover, there are blood ties
The ACOA critics were unwilling to accept the arguments advanced by Ambassador Plimpton against sanctions. Engaging in a dialogue of sorts with the American government, the pamphlet's authors attempted to counter each of the points Plimpton had made in the General Assembly. Although his speech had been a "model" of condemnation of apartheid, words were no longer enough. In reference to American ostracism of Communist states such as Cuba and China, the pamphlet stated that "in a period when examples of the use of economic and diplomatic sanctions by the U.S. are multiplying, the condemnation unaccompanied by action could not be taken seriously."^57

Since these critics did not find Plimpton's arguments convincing, they sought the reasons for American opposition to sanctions elsewhere. They placed the blame for it on American military relations with the South African government and on American economic activity within South Africa. They noted that the United States Navy made good will stops in South Africa and participated in training exercises with the South African Navy, and that the American military was becoming deeply involved with South Africa through the installation of space tracking stations in South Africa. They also observed that American economic involvement in South Africa had increased substantially in recent years. The pamphlet urged that military relations with South Africa be curtailed or terminated entirely, that further private American loans and investments be discouraged, and that economic sanctions be adopted against South Africa. By these measures, the between them and South Africa." Ibid., 885.

^57Gonze, Houser and Sturges, South African Crisis and United States Policy, 45, 56-58.
United States could contribute to the breakup of the South African government and commit itself "as the champion of equality and freedom" while there was still time. However, the authors did not think it likely that the United States would do so.

Others joined with the American Committee on Africa in criticizing the United States for its position at the United Nations on the sanctions questions. In 1962, the United Nations, despite American opposition, mustered the two-thirds majority necessary to pass a resolution (General Assembly Resolution 1761) containing the provisions for sanctions found in Paragraph Five of the rejected draft of Resolution 1598. Attempting to shame the United States for its vote against this resolution, Stephanie Gervis, the United Nations correspondent for the Village Voice, commented that without the backing of the United States, Britain, and France, the resolution could not be effective. She stated:

Ironically enough, the very democracies that taught the Africans the principle of majority rule are now about to instruct them in the art of breaking it, because there is little doubt on either side that those who did not vote for the resolution will not implement it—or least not the paragraph on sanctions.

The New Republic also noted a disparity between American words condemning apartheid and American actions on South Africa. Although admitting to doubts about some aspects of economic sanctions, the editors declared that the case for ending arms sales to South Africa was impeccable. The magazine stated editorially:

---
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The Nationalist policies seem bent on plunging the whole of Southern Africa into a blood bath. Are the NATO allies, through their sales of arms, to provide support for those very policies of apartheid for which they so eloquently proclaim their loathing? If this course is pursued, the Africans can turn in only one direction for aid. And the Communists surely will provide it.60

A few weeks later another writer in the New Republic commented that the sooner the United States began cooperating with the African states at the United Nations "to demonstrate that its exhortations about democracy match its exertions for democracy," the sooner the United States would get out of "low gear" in Africa.61

Criticisms of American policy such as these at home and abroad probably had an effect on policy makers. William C. Attwood, for example, in his memoirs of his experiences as a diplomat at the United Nations and in Africa during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, wrote that he never understood why the United States never took the initiative with a resolution that it could support "without always appearing negative and reluctant." Even though he believed sanctions were impractical, he felt "morally and politically, we needed to do more than deplore apartheid in speeches that many Africans considered hypocritical in view of our massive investment in South Africa."62

The element of posturing on Southern African policies for purposes of placating world opinion came out in Attwood's comments about when he persuaded the Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson, to take a different,


stronger position on a South West Africa resolution at the United Nations:

[O]ur African and Asian friends were delighted. Our vote cost us nothing—we supported a moral principle without committing ourselves to a course of action—and gained us considerable goodwill and publicity.63

Something of the same spirit—the triumph of form over substance—was present in an American decision to support an arms embargo against South Africa. The United States first decided it would adopt a policy of providing South Africa only with arms that could not be used to enforce apartheid. This was a category of weapons that was very difficult to define, and it satisfied few people who wanted the United States to adopt a stronger policy against South Africa. In the summer of 1963, the United States decided to go further and support a total arms embargo of South Africa, even though this was contrary to a treaty with South Africa. According to Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., who apparently took part in the arms embargo decision, the State Department favored a United Nations resolution that all member states refrain from supplying South Africa with arms that could be used to suppress the African population. President Kennedy, in what Schlesinger described as a "brilliant stroke," went a step beyond this. The President proposed that the United States declare unilaterally, as a matter of national policy, that it would supply no more arms to South Africa so long as the policy of apartheid was enforced.64 Such an embargo policy, effective January 1, 1964, was announced in August,
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1963, and in that same month the United States voted in favor of Security Council Resolution S/5386 calling upon all states "to cease forthwith the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition of all types and military vehicles to South Africa . . . ." 65

Although American support for Resolution S/5386 was a step further than any previous policy change by the United States on South African policy, it was still far short of the more stringent measures that the General Assembly had called for only a year earlier. In short, it was unlikely to satisfy any critics of American policy. Just a few days before the American vote on S/5386 a group of black Americans, with William M. Worthy of the Baltimore Afro-American as spokesman, staged a protest at the United Nations against American policy. Worthy was given the opportunity to meet with Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, and Worthy presented him with the protest group's demand that South Africa be expelled from the United Nations. 66 American support of S/5386 was considerably less than Worthy had demanded. Typical of the critics of the American position was the response of the Nation to S/5386:

The Security Council's recent approval of a resolution barring the shipment of arms and ammunition to South Africa is no answer to the challenge posed by that country's maniacal pursuit of its apartheid policy. At best, it can provide a temporary respite. . . . Bloodshed on a scale that would constitute war by any standard is inevitable unless the United Nations takes more drastic action than it has so far shown.


any signs of doing.\textsuperscript{67}

The \textit{Nation} suggested that the United States support economic sanctions against South Africa, a naval blockade of its ports, and the severing of diplomatic relations.

The effort to promote American participation in United Nations sanctions against South Africa reached its high point in 1965-1966. Strongly anti-South African groups made their views known and urged American support of United Nations measures in several different forums that should be noted as indicative of the strength of the movement for action against South Africa.

As usual, the American Committee on Africa was in the forefront of organizations in opposition to South Africa. By 1964 it had taken steps to set up a Consultative Council on South Africa, a "clearing house" consisting of more than thirty major American church, union, civil rights, and student groups.\textsuperscript{68} The ACOA served as Secretariat of the Consultative Council. Representatives of some thirty-eight participating organizations met in Washington on March 21, 1965, the fifth anniversary of Sharpeville, to take part in a national conference on "The South African Crisis and American Action."\textsuperscript{69} These

\textsuperscript{67}"A Wrong Remedy," \textit{Nation}, August 2\textsuperscript{4}, 1963, p. 81.

\textsuperscript{68}American Committee on Africa, \textit{Annual Report: 1964} (New York,

\textsuperscript{69}Included among the group were representatives of the ACOA, the National Council of Churches, the Catholic Interracial Council, the American Jewish Congress, the AFL-CIO, the United Auto Workers, the National Farmers Union, the United Federation of Teachers, the Congress of Racial Equality, the National Student Association, the NAACP, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the student division of the Young Women's Christian Association, Students for a Democratic Society, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, and Americans
representatives listened to Congressmen, ministers, exiled South African leaders, union officials, academics, and others who appeared as speakers or took part in group discussions.70

The purpose of the national conference appears to have been twofold: to educate and to advocate. The conference was to make the participants, the groups they represented, and the general public more aware of the nature of the South African race policies and the character of the white ruling class. The conference took the position that South African apartheid was "a totalitarian system strongly reminiscent of Hitlerism."71 Speakers stressed the intractibility of the whites and said that change in South Africa could only come from outside pressure.72 A warning was issued by the conference that if change were not brought to South Africa, apartheid would "lead inevitably to violence and bloodshed and possible escalation into world conflict."73

---


72 E.g., Leslie Rubin, "The White Man in South Africa—The Politics of Domination, Isolation and Fear," 2-3 (paper among the materials on the conference lent to the author by the American Committee on Africa).

73 "National Conference Requests Economic Sanctions Against South Africa" (press release); Aurbakken, "What Did the Conference Accomplish."
Another educative function of the conference was to make the public more aware of American involvement in South Africa through its trade and investment policies. The American Committee on Africa had begun to attempt to fulfill this function in 1963 after the United States had adopted an arms embargo against South Africa. The ACOA's annual report for 1963 had commented on the embargo and said that the organization should now turn to focus its campaign "on awakening Americans to the extent of their economic involvement with South Africa." Its efforts did produce some results. For example, in March 1964 the ACOA published a special issue of Africa Today on "United States Policy on South Africa: Partners in Apartheid" which contained information on American business activity in South Africa. Several months later, the editors of the Catholic publication America called the attention of their readers to this ACOA report and observed:

This country has opposed the use of economic boycott by the U. N. to force South Africa to change its racial policies. Question: To what extent have American business interests determined our attitude?

Other publications responded similarly to such reports by anti-South African activists. Now, at the 1965 national conference, several papers and discussions were directed at American trade and financial

---


76 "Boom in South Africa," America, May 9, 1964, p. 622.

involvement, and others touched on the subject tangentially.  

The views of South Africa's policies and American business activity in South Africa presented by the speakers were the preconditions of, and basis for, arguments for stronger measures against South Africa. After covering these views, the conference turned its final discussions to the question of what the United States and the participating groups could do to bring about change with regard to South Africa.

Peter Weiss, a New York attorney and President of the American Committee on Africa, criticized the United States strongly for its policy on South Africa at the United Nations. "So far as the South African issue in the United Nations is concerned," Weiss told the conference audience, "the United States has been the country that just can't say yes." He reviewed the "sorry record" of the United States on the issue and rebutted the arguments made by American officials against collective measures. In a statement which demonstrated how each further step the United States took on the issue became simply the basis for arguing that more steps had to be taken, Weiss said:

[If we determine, as a matter of national policy, that the
government of South Africa is so repressive, so insensitive to
world opinion, as to warrant the drastic and unusual measure of
placing a ban on the sale of arms through private channels,

---


79 Peter Weiss, "U. S. Policy and South Africa," 2 (paper among the materials on the conference lent to the author by the American Committee on Africa).
how can we go on denying that the situation warrants the withholding from South Africa of other forms of private American assistance which the South African minority used to perpetuate its reign of terror against the overwhelming majority of the citizens of that country?®0

Weiss and the others at the conference urged that the United States take steps to implement the United Nations proposals for sanctions against South Africa. Referring to the war in Vietnam, and raising the specter of the United States coming down on the "wrong side" in a similar war in South Africa, Weiss asked:

[I]f we fail to bring the Nationalists to their senses by the withdrawal of American economic support and by collective action through the United Nations, thereby making an armed uprising inevitable, how many Chinese guns, Soviet ambulances and Algerian volunteers will we allow the African freedom fighters to receive (in the absence of any support from us), before we decide that theirs is "a Communist-inspired war of liberation"?®1

Weiss's statement assumed, of course, that economic sanctions or other forms of international ostracism could "bring the Nationalists to their senses." A year earlier a similar conference had been held in London which had concluded that sanctions could be effective and would not work undue hardship on the countries imposing sanctions.®2

®0 Ibid., 4.
Others besides Weiss at the American conference attempted to show that the proposed sanctions could be effective. For example, Alvin W. Wolfe, an anthropologist at Washington University, spoke on "The South Africa Trade and International Sanctions" and declared that if the United States, Great Britain and West Germany "would so much as breathe the threat implied in the word 'sanctions,' South Africa's economy would not hold a candle against that 'wind of change.'" It was necessary to believe this would be the effect of sanctions in order to support sanctions, if the focus of such support was on bringing about reform within South Africa. For if economic sanctions would not cause the whites to change their policies, then the non-white population might well be the hardest hit by sanctions, just as the American officials argued. Those at the conference were not radical enough to argue publicly that sanctions should be used to bring about a "cleansing" blood bath in South Africa from which majority rule would result.

There was, however, another reason why a person could support sanctions even in the absence of a belief that sanctions could bring about change in South Africa. This was the belief that moral principle could not condone the United States continuing to support a racist regime or to participate in profits realized from an undemocratic and oppressive society. Several speakers asserted this point, but it was

---

83 Alvin W. Wolfe, "The South African Trade and International Sanctions," (paper among the materials on the conference lent to the author by the American Committee on Africa). See also "Stop South Africa Now," New Republic, May 16, 1964, pp. 3-4: "if the United States and Britain quit filling [Prime Minister Verwoerd's] pockets whilst shaking a finger at him, he might take them seriously enough to introduce reforms also."
the conference chairman, the Reverend James A. Pike, who made it most
clearly. He argued at the close of the conference that the United
States must impose an economic boycott on South Africa as a matter of
conscience even if this did not bring about an immediate change in
South Africa's racial policies.\footnote{\textquotedblright National Conference Requests Economic Sanctions Against
South Africa,	extquotedblright 3 (press release). Similarly, George M. Houser told
the House Subcommittee on Africa that even if sanctions did not bring
change to South Africa, "they would help to save the soul of our own
country." \textit{United States-South African Relations}, 194.}
This rationale could sustain an
argument for sanctions even after the efficacy of sanctions became
very doubtful. And, to be sure, even some of the sharpest critics of
South Africa had doubts about sanctions.

In the same month as the national conference on the South
African crisis and American action, a study was published which raised
very serious questions about the feasibility of sanctions as a method
of promoting constructive changes in South Africa's racial policies.
The whole range of options open to the United Nations on the South
African issue were examined in depth in a study sponsored by the
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, \textit{Apartheid and United
Nations Collective Measures}.\footnote{Amelia C. Leiss, \textit{Apartheid and United Nations Collective
Measures} (New York, 1965).} The foreword to the study indicated
that it had been prompted by the fear of a revolution in South Africa
and the effect of such an outbreak of violence on world peace. The
contributors examined the nature of South African society (though
specifically declining to "pause to make the case that apartheid is
wrong, undesirable, and at odds with international standards of human
rights and justice"), its amenability to internal and external pressures for change, and the steps and measures available to the United Nations should its members wish to employ them. 86

No specific recommendations for American or United Nations policy on South Africa were made by the contributors to the study. Nevertheless, they did make it fairly clear that they believed that collective measures against South Africa could be justified under the United Nations charter, and that South Africa did constitute a threat to world peace through the application of its racial policies. But looking on the objective of sanctions as "inducing or forcing the government of South Africa to remove racial barriers to full and equal participation in the political, social, and economic life of the country," the contributors were skeptical about the ability of sanctions to fulfill their objective. 87 As one of them viewed it:

While there are numerous uncertainties present, the greatest of all is the psychological response of white South Africans. Based on purely economic calculations and assuming determination on the part of the South African government to resist the measures taken, it becomes reasonably clear that no single economic measure would be likely to have a sufficiently powerful impact to force acquiescence [sic]. Indeed, South Africa could probably hold out against a complete boycott and embargo reasonable [sic] well for several years, possibly longer. 88


Given the likelihood of white intransigence in South Africa even in the face of economic sanctions and the probability that some countries would not comply with sanctions, the study's contributors felt it necessary to look into the possibility of a naval blockade of South African ports and armed invasion of the country. The study went so far as to calculate the number and types of warships and aircraft necessary, the numbers of men required for amphibious and air assaults, the costs of these for varying periods of time, and the casualties expected (19,000 to 38,000 killed and wounded among the United Nations forces alone) so as "to defeat the South African military forces and break the will of the government and the people to resist in order that the political system could be altered to meet the U.N. demands." 89

Concluding that collective military measures were practical from a purely military point of view, Amelia Leiss said that the major question about the use of such force was political. Summarizing, she stated: "Put simply, U. N. collective action will be feasible when and if those states with the capacity to carry it out [i.e., the United States, Great Britain, West Germany, and France] make the political judgment that it is required." 90

Although the Carnegie study did suggest the need for some type of collective action against South Africa, supported the legitimacy of such action, and tried to show the feasibility of strong measures, its

89 Leiss, "Efforts to Alter the Future: Military Measures," in ibid., 150.

90 Leiss, "A Summation," 156. There was also a United Nations report by a special committee which came to about the same conclusion as the Carnegie study. See New York Times, March 2, 1965, p. 6; and March 20, 1965, p. 10.
overall effect was to cast doubt on the efficacy and desirability of the United Nations proposals. This was because it indicated that change could be brought about in South Africa only with considerable bloodshed and with considerable sacrifices on the part of the Western powers.

Others who were hostile to South Africa backed away from sanctions because of these considerations. Peter Ritner, for example, who had earlier called for strong measures against South Africa, now reassessed his position. Several months after the publication of the Carnegie study he said he found something "faintly unedifying" about the elaborate plans which had been drafted to involve the whole world in the destruction of South Africa's whites. Commenting further, he stated:

Even the most extreme anti-Afrikaner agrees that to achieve its aims such a campaign [of sanctions] will require an unparalleled degree of synchronized action on the part of all the other nations of earth. Here is something like the whole world falling upon the city of Philadelphia. Is the world justified in taking so lofty a line?91

One of the reasons why Ritner changed his mind about sanctions was that now he believed the Afrikaners to be very "tough" and would resist change strongly.92 Great bloodshed would be required to bring change. Ritner now decided that time should be the great liberator, not the United States.93

Despite such misgivings about sanctions on the part of some of


92 Ibid., 318.

93 Ibid., 319.
the anti-South African activists, further efforts were made to induce
the United States to go along with the United Nations proposals. These
efforts were perhaps encouraged by steps taken by the United States
government with regard to South Africa in mid-1965, a time at which
relations between the two countries became more strained than at any
time since the American statement deploving Sharpeville. In May 1965
the United States cancelled a visit by the aircraft carrier
Independence after the South African government indicated that black
crew members would not be particularly welcome.94 A belief that the
United States might try to integrate some of its South African facil­
ities led Prime Minister Verwoerd to announce that black Americans
would not be welcome as personnel in the American space-tracking
stations.95 The South African government was also disturbed by an
American decision to hold multi-racial diplomatic receptions and other
official functions, by American blocking of the sale to the South
African air force of French-made jets which employed American-built
engines, and by the Canadian government's blocking of sales of Ford
Motor Company's Canadian subsidiary's four-wheeled vehicles to the
South African government on the ground that this would violate the
arms embargo.96 Because of the growing differences, the American
ambassador, Joseph C. Satterthwaite, was recalled to the United
States for consultations and an intensive review of American policy

94 New York Times, May 14, 1965, p. 3; "South Africa Bars


96 Natal Daily News, July 16, 1965 (all citations to this news-
paper are from the paper's clippings files in Durban, South Africa).
in August 1965. These developments would have indicated the possibility of significant changes in American policy.

An additional factor which suggested to anti-South African activists that change in American policy could be forthcoming was the prospect of a judgment against South Africa by the International Court of Justice with respect to its administration of South West Africa. South Africa had acquired South West Africa, a former German territory, as a Class C Mandate at the end of World War I. After World War II South Africa made a request at the United Nations that it be allowed to incorporate South West Africa as an integral part of its own territory. This proposal met with strong opposition and was defeated because of concern over South Africa's racial policies. The United Nations then began to assert that it had jurisdiction over South West Africa, and South Africa denied the competency of the United Nations to treat on the subject.

The issue of South West Africa was still unresolved in 1960 when Ethiopia and Liberia, the only African states which had been members of the League of Nations, took the question to the International Court of Justice. They sought a binding decision that the League Mandate was still in force and that South Africa had failed to live up to its obligations to provide for the material and moral welfare of its indigenous population. Two years later the Court ruled, by a vote of eight to seven, that it had jurisdiction to hear the

---


case. The litigation then proceeded in very lengthy inquiries with volumes of evidence produced by South Africa's legal team. Ethiopia and Liberia were represented by an American attorney, Ernest A. Gross.

By 1965, people were anticipating an imminent decision by the International Court, and many expected it to be adverse to South Africa. Critics of South Africa believed that once such a verdict was rendered there would be no legal barrier under Article II, Paragraph Seven of the United Nations Charter (the paragraph prohibiting intervention in the internal affairs of member states) to collective United Nations actions, since the United Nations would then clearly have authority over South West Africa. The United States, it was felt, would have to go along with United Nations measures with regard to South West Africa. This in turn, particularly if opposed by South Africa, could be the basis for further activities against South Africa itself. A clear statement of this scenario for action was made by Elizabeth S. Landis, an attorney and an official of the ACOA, in an editorial in Africa Today. Writing in reference to the possible refusal of the South African government to accept United Nations control of South West Africa, she stated:

Such a refusal would send the enforcement problem to the Security Council under Article 94 of the Charter; and the Council, like Eisenhower at Little Rock, might feel obliged to vindicate the Court's authority by drastic measures... The moral for the United States is clear. In the event of a potentially favorable decision, it must cut through legal technicalities, bureaucratic inertia, and Europe-oriented dogma to help implement the Court's decision swiftly and effectively. For the second time in a single generation our country may have the chance to prove by action its belief in equality and the brotherhood of man. Domestically we are gingerly grasping the opportunity. Internationally we can do no less: indeed, with the experience in our own country to guide us, in both purpose and compassion, we must take the lead in helping to

It was against this background that the Subcommittee on Africa of the House of Representative's Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on American policy on South Africa. According to the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Representative Barratt O'Hara of Illinois, the hearings arose from his own embarrassment over the American position on South Africa when he served as a delegate to the United Nations. Stating this and the purpose of the hearings, he opened the inquiry with the following:

As a delegate to the United Nations, I was called upon to present the position of the United States as regards apartheid. I stated, as had other delegates from the United States to previous General Assemblies of the United Nations, that it was a practice which the American people could not condone.

Yet despite that positive position on the immorality of apartheid, our Government took the position that apartheid did not constitute a threat to peace, the kind of threat that would properly bring the matter of sanctions before the Security Council of the United Nations. This resulted in a growing misunderstanding with the emerging nations of Africa. . . . Whether that position is valid or not I do not know. That is the reason these hearings were scheduled.\footnote{United States-South African Relations, 1. O'Hara had lived long enough to come full circle on his views on the Afrikaners. As he told a South African reporter in Washington, Ken Owen, he once tried to join a unit to fight on the side of the Boers in the Anglo-Boer War, \textit{Natal Daily News}, April 19, 1966.}

A report from Washington appearing in a South African newspaper suggested that the real driving force behind the hearings was not O'Hara but Arthur J. Goldberg, then the American Ambassador to the United Nations. According to the report, Goldberg cornered O'Hara.
in a hotel suite in New York and suggested that O'Hara hold the hearings, hoping that such Congressional action could influence American policy to the point where President Johnson would drop opposition to sanctions. Thus an American policy maker was attempting to influence public opinion so as to gain support for a foreign policy position. Goldberg later made quite explicit his support for sanctions.

Activist groups were also probably in part responsible for the decision to hold the hearings. Both Goldberg and O'Hara had come under pressure from such organizations. For example, on Christmas Day, 1965, members of the NAACP and the Du Bois Club picketed the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York where Goldberg made his residence, protesting the American position on South Africa. And the ubiquitous American Committee on Africa had some influence. After the national conference which the ACOA had more or less hosted in 1965, delegates from the conference had called on O'Hara to urge policy

101 Natal Daily News, March 10, 1966. The author had occasion to ask Goldberg about the truth of this report, and Goldberg admitted that he had been responsible for O'Hara's calling the hearings. Goldberg said his reason for this was that he did not feel that the American people knew enough on the subject, a subject which was very important at the United Nations. Personal interview with Arthur Goldberg, Durham, North Carolina, November 29, 1973.

102 Bernard Cohen has found after extensive interviews that an overwhelming proportion of foreign policy officials accept the desirability or necessity of shaping the public opinion environment along supportive lines. Bernard C. Cohen, The Public's Impact on Foreign Policy (Boston, 1973), 181.


At the 1966 hearings George M. Houser, Executive Director of the ACOA, testified: "I guess it wouldn't be out of place to say that in a discussion some of us had with Ambassador Goldberg at the United Nations shortly after he had taken office last fall, he seemed to favor a very strong policy and agreed with many of the things which we presented to him . . . ."  

The hearings were stacked rather heavily against South Africa. The Subcommittee heard the testimony of some thirty-six witnesses who appeared as private citizens, as representatives of organizations, or as spokesmen for the government; it also received written statements from many other groups and individuals.

Nine witnesses were government spokesmen or former officials who explained the position of the American government on South Africa. Some of their testimony will be discussed further in a later chapter, and it will be sufficient at this point to observe that the general position they took was that South Africa, although its racial policies were abhorrent, offered certain benefits to the United States and that circumstances did not, as of the date of the hearings, warrant considering South Africa so great a threat to peace as to justify Security Council sanctions.

---


106 United States-South African Relations, 203. The influence of the ACOA appeared in the hearings in other ways. It was obvious from the statements of some of the Congressmen that the ACOA had prepared background material for their use; e.g., see ibid., p. 31. And several of the witnesses had been participants in the 1965 national conference on sanctions.

107 See, for example, the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, G. Mennen Williams, ibid., 2-12.
Of the other twenty-seven witnesses, twenty-one were private individuals, or representatives of private organizations, who were hostile to South Africa and favored a stronger American policy against South Africa. The spectrum of opinion in this group ranged from advocates of moderate sanctions to those advocating very harsh measures.

Waldemar Nielsen, the President of the African-American Institute, was a good example of an advocate of relatively mild sanctions. He was unambiguous in his criticism of South Africa, stating that "the racial policies of the South African Government in the mid-1960's confront all decent and democratic individuals in the world with the same essential issue as nazism posed in the 1930's." He made it clear that South Africa presented a dangerous threat to world peace. And he believed that it was in the national interest that the United States show the world its strong condemnation of apartheid:

Nothing [he said] could so foul the principles and prestige of the United States in the eyes of the world as collaboration with—even an ambivalent attitude toward—the political and social philosophy symbolized and flaunted by the Government of South Africa.

Despite his strong feelings, Nielsen advocated only limited measures against South Africa. He called for ceasing to encourage investment in South Africa, warning business of the dangers of investment there, controlling the flow of South African "propaganda" to the United States, increasing contacts with the non-white majority

108United States-South African Relations, 72-73.

109Ibid., 77.
in South Africa, and giving further assistance to refugees from South Africa. As he put it, he believed that until the whole problem of southern Africa came to a head, "we must allow this stench in the nostrils of decent humanity to continue to exist."\textsuperscript{110}

Others were not so generous as Nielsen. Irving Brown, Director of the New York office of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and Executive Director of an AFL-CIO project called the African-American Labor Center, called for much stronger measures through the United Nations. He indicated his belief that South Africa constituted a present threat to world peace and introduced into the record ICFTU and AFL-CIO statements that all actions short of war should be used to change or eliminate the white regime in South Africa. Congressman Ross Adair of Indiana pursued this latter point, asking Brown:

\begin{quote}
How far should the United States go? Mr. Brown, you said in your statement . . . "employ every action short of war." That is pretty clear. You are not, then, advocating the use of armed force, is that correct?
\end{quote}

Mr. Brown: No, I think that you will find in my statement that I quoted to the United Nations that any effective boycotts would require certain military means at the disposal of the United Nations to enforce such a boycott.

Mr. Adair: Well, then you would favor the use of armed force.

\textsuperscript{110}Ibid., 78-80. Nielsen drew back from stronger measures because he feared that war would result. As he had stated in a book published a year earlier, "any other course than rejection [of mandatory sanctions] would be a violation of [the United States's] own responsibilities as a world leader and contrary to the interest of its own citizens and of all mankind." Waldemar A. Nielsen, \textit{African Battleground: American Policy Choices in Southern Africa} (New York, 1965), 86.
Mr. Brown: I would favor, if this boycott is adopted by the United Nations, that in order to implement it, that they have sufficient force to make it effective.\footnote{\textit{United States-South African Relations}, 161.}

Similar positions were taken by several other witnesses.

Chairman O'Hara came close to this himself. At one point he told a witness:

There is an American spirit. We are fighting for something in Vietnam. We are fighting for exactly the same thing in South Africa, and we must be consistent.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 41.}

Such observations suggest that perhaps the Vietnam war was not an aberration, but instead an outgrowth of a general view of world affairs that was prevalent among American leaders. The "lesson" of World War II was that events limiting freedom anywhere in the world had an immediate impact on and directly involved the interests of the American people. This point was repeatedly made by Congressman Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota. He told one witness that he kept thinking back to the 1930s and Germany and had concluded that "never again can we say that what happens inside another nation can remain beyond our concern no matter what."\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 339.} To another witness who said apartheid was an internal matter, Fraser commented, "I find it hard to believe that on this planet we can ignore what happens to our fellow human beings."\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 185.}

There was another "lesson" too that played a part in the thoughts of Fraser and others on sanctions against South Africa. This
was the "lesson" of the history of race relations and the civil rights movement in the United States. Fraser noted that blacks in the American South had achieved rights only through war and federal legislation. "The realities," he said, "are that the North imposed its will through Federal legislation upon the South."\textsuperscript{115} Other Americans too were convinced that persuasion was not a useful method of dealing with racism. Edward Crowther, for example, was a clergyman who had engaged in civil rights activities in the United States and had then gone to South Africa as the Anglican Bishop of Kimberly and Kuruman. In the \textit{Christian Century} he wrote that the church's "participation in the civil rights movement in the U. S. . . . has a great deal to teach us in South Africa about direct confrontation of wrong, about standing up and being counted."\textsuperscript{116} In the same publication, several other activists argued in favor of sanctions, saying:

\textit{Martin Luther King, Jr., would not have obtained integrated public facilities in the south if he had simply written letters to the mayors of all U. S. cities asking them to work toward integrated seating in their municipal bus systems; he had to begin in Montgomery, Alabama. The church has accepted the validity of this kind of thinking in most areas; on what basis does it pull back when the problem of its investments [in South Africa] arises?}\textsuperscript{117}

Among the twenty-one witnesses clearly hostile to South Africa were four former South Africans who strongly opposed the Nationalist

\textsuperscript{115}Ibid., 327.


They favored the strong actions against South Africa. There were also six witnesses not associated with the federal government who gave what could be considered testimony favorable to South Africa at the 1966 hearings. This is not to suggest that they necessarily favored apartheid, but instead that they opposed a harsh policy on South Africa. The testimony of several of these will be taken up in later chapters. It is only pertinent to note here that several of the Congressmen were openly hostile to them for their statements on South Africa. Congressmen O'Hara, Benjamin Rosenthal of New York, and John C. Culver of Iowa attempted to put several of these witnesses in a bad light by asking rather demeaning questions about who had paid for their travel expenses to visit South Africa, or whether they had been reimbursed for their testimony in the South West African case.  

Indicative of the attitude of several of the Congressmen towards these witnesses were several remarks made to General S. L. A. Marshall, a noted writer on military affairs. After Marshall stated he did not believe that the United States would necessarily be committed to observe or implement a decision on the South West Africa case if it should be contrary to American interests, Congressman Rosenthal commented: "If your position is that individuals or nations should not be bound by court decisions, you are perfectly entitled to

---

118 These were Leslie Rubin, a professor at Howard University and former Senator in the South African Parliament; Kenneth Carstens, a Methodist clergyman; Gladstone Ntlabati, a student at the Harvard Divinity School; and Mary Benson, an author.

that position."\textsuperscript{120} Later, Marshall was quizzed by Congressman Fraser on apartheid, and Marshall indicated to him his disapproval of apartheid. Nonetheless, Fraser showed his distaste for Marshall in an exchange that followed a few minutes later:

\begin{quote}
Mr. Fraser: I would think that one's moral sensibilities would be offended greatly by the logic of apartheid as it has unfolded in Africa.

General Marshall: Sir, you already asked me that question. You asked me if I am sympathetic --

Mr. Fraser [cutting Marshall short]: I perhaps feel more strongly about it than you do.\textsuperscript{121}
\end{quote}

Anticipation of such treatment at the hands of hostile Congressmen is undoubtedly a major reason why more witnesses favorable to South Africa did not appear at the hearings. The Subcommittee did indicate a desire to hear from American business leaders, but only one (Clarence B. Randall, President of Inland Steel Company) was interested, and he was too ill to attend.

Nothing came out of the hearings of the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee made no policy recommendations, and no visible policy changes were made as a result of the hearings. They stirred no great interest in South African policy in Congress.\textsuperscript{122} The testimony of the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[120] Ibid., 323.
\item[121] Ibid., 328.
\item[122] For an excellent analysis of sentiment in Congress on South Africa and other African issues, see Gary Gappert, \textit{An Africanists' Guide to the 91st Congress} (Washington, 1969) (mimeograph available from the American Committee on Africa; copy in possession of the author). For an earlier analysis, see Stanley Meisler, "The U. S. Congress and Africa," \textit{Africa Report}, IX (August, 1964), 3-7. Both confirm that while some Congressmen were active on African issues, Congress did not play a significant role in policy making.
\end{footnotes}
witnesses did not mobilize American public opinion against South Africa. The hearings were simply inconclusive. This was not primarily the fault of the conduct of the hearings; rather, it was due to events extrinsic to the hearings.

Even as the Subcommittee on Africa was hearing testimony the drama of the South West Africa case was reaching a denouement at the Hague. The long-awaited decision of the International Court of Justice was handed down on July 18, 1966. By an eight to seven decision (with the President of the Court having to break a tie by casting a second vote) the Court held that the complaining parties--Liberia and Ethiopia--lacked standing; that is, they lacked legal capacity to bring the suit before the Court.

The Court's decision was unexpected, and it infuriated a number of South Africa's critics. The Subcommittee on Africa had Ernest Gross, the American lawyer who had represented Ethiopia and Liberia, appear before it to discuss the decision. Representative Rosenthal declared that in his judgment world order suffered substantially from the decision. At the United Nations, the Afro-Asian group of states decided to proceed to place South West Africa under

123 The Subcommittee on Africa held further hearings on Southern African issues after Charles C. Diggs, a black Congressman from Michigan, became its Chairman. In 1969 there were hearings on the granting of a permit for the planes of the South African Airways to land in New York, and on the continuation of a quota for South African sugar. In 1971 and 1973 there were extensive hearings on American business involvement in South Africa. None of these produced significant policy changes.

United Nations authority despite the decision.\textsuperscript{125}

Whatever the merits of the decision of the International Court, it altered the complexion of the policy questions which faced the United States. The decision removed the prospect of clear legal justification for American intervention in South Africa, and it strengthened the hand of those who felt sanctions inappropriate. When the United Nations attempted to "override" the decision through its resolution, it made the African bloc appear to be the side to the controversy which was unwilling to adhere to the rule of law. The International Court's decision was thus a significant factor in reducing or eliminating the prospects for success of the movement for American participation in United Nations sanctions against South Africa. There were other factors contributing to this which will be discussed in the final chapters of this study.

Before turning to these other factors, it will be necessary to consider briefly what became of the movement for sanctions after it became apparent that the United States would not initiate a stronger policy against South Africa. The movement did not die with the International Court's decision and the termination of the 1966 Congressional hearings. It simply took a new tack. Paradoxically, while the movement lost the possibility of bringing about broad change within South Africa, it gained somewhat in effectiveness in limited areas and grew in the volume of materials its spokesmen put out on matters pertaining to South Africa.

The anti-South African movement now followed a course of

\footnote{\textsuperscript{125}United Nations, General Assembly Resolution 2145 (XXI) (1966).}
action implicit in its earlier criticism of American business involvement in South Africa. Instead of devoting further substantial efforts to getting the United States government to use American business as a diplomatic tool (through sanctions) against South Africa, the movement now turned directly against business itself. Although bringing about change within South Africa remained a stated goal of the movement, the emphasis of the movement shifted to the apparent goal of cleansing the United States of a collective guilt from earning profits from apartheid and from giving support to South Africa through business involvement.

The dissatisfaction with government policy and the extent to which business was blamed for policy was seen in the reaction of the liberal journals of opinion to a speech attacking apartheid by President Lyndon B. Johnson in May 1966. Speaking at a White House reception for African leaders on May 26, President Johnson had made a "model" denunciation of apartheid and racism. The New Republic quoted a portion of it on American support for majority rule and opposition to South Africa's "narrow and outmoded policy" and commented that this was America talking out of the left side of its mouth. Out of its right side, American business was saying

126 This is not to say that activists ceased to urge policy changes by the federal government. Some continued to call for the same policy changes advocated earlier; e.g., John Marcum, "Southern Africa and United States Policy: A Consideration of Alternatives," Africa Today, XIV (October, 1967), 5-13; Lincoln Bloomfield, The UN and World Order, Foreign Policy Association Headline Series No. 197 (New York, 1969), 56. Rather, the focal point of activity shifted in the manner described below.

something else, said the New Republic, adding: "The sheer scale of existing business investment itself offers assurance that the U. S. government will not act 'rashly' by putting too much pressure on South Africa to alter her 'narrow and outmoded policy.'" Commonweal noted President Johnson's words against apartheid and commented:

If they had been accompanied by equivalent action, say by the economic disengagement of the U. S. from South Africa, we might celebrate. . . . [I]nstead of celebrating, the President's speech is an occasion to reflect on how little reason Africans have to believe our stated good intentions.29

The Nation similarly noted that American investments spoke louder than American words denouncing apartheid.130

Because of sentiments such as these, the main thrust of the anti-South Africa campaign since about 1966 has been against American business operations in South Africa. The movement has been directed primarily at forcing reduction of business involvement regardless of governmental policy. The details of this movement for "disengagement," as it has been commonly called, are somewhat beyond the scope of this study and are of too recent a date to be readily accessible. Nevertheless, the activity itself is germane to this study in that it has been an outgrowth of the harsh image of South Africa and a sense of guilt among some Americans over alleged complicity.


129"African Investments," Commonweal, June 10, 1966, p. 327. It should be noted that the American Committee on Africa had published an updated "Special Report on American Involvement in the South African Economy," as a special issue of Africa Today, XIII (January, 1966), and that the Commonweal editorial, and probably the New Republic editorial, relied on it.

in apartheid. One of the leading proponents of disengagement,

Henry P. Van Dusen, President Emeritus of Union Theological Seminary,

enunciated a basic premise of the policy when he stated:

Every American investor or employee in American firms doing
business in South Africa, every American depositor or employee
of virtually every major American bank involved with South
Africa, every American educational, philanthropic or religious
body holding similar investments or deposits is, however
unwittingly and unwillingly, a profit-taking partner of
apartheid. Let Americans of conscience declare to those
who administer their money: "This sordid involvement must
cease."131

The ethical demonstration of such action, he said, would be epochal.

The activity against American business aimed at disengagement
is also pertinent to this study because it has further stimulated
efforts to produce more favorable images of South Africa, or at least
of American business activity in South Africa. Thus it would be
worthwhile to examine some examples of the campaign against American
businesses operating in South Africa that have developed in recent
years.

The types of activities engaged in by anti-South Africa groups
have been quite varied. They have ranged from simple demonstrations
staged to embarrass individual businessmen—such as mining entrepre­

131Letter of Henry P. Van Dusen to the editor, Life, December
2, 1966, p. 29. See also Van Dusen's statement on western "guilt" in

132On such a demonstration against Engelhard, see "News and
Africa by a consortium of American banks.

In 1951, a revolving credit agreement for about $30,000,000 (later increased to $40,000,000) was set up for South Africa in which a consortium of American banks participated. It did not begin to draw serious criticism until the mid-1960s after attention was drawn to it because of its renewal during the critical period after Sharpeville.\textsuperscript{133} Even then, it was not the more established opponents who began the attack on the credit agreement. Instead, it was a newer generation of activists who transformed the growing concern of the opponents of South Africa over business involvement in South Africa into specific initiatives against such business involvement.

Foremost among the student activist groups of the 1960s was the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). It is perhaps indicative of the prominence of South Africa as a target for liberal groups in the mid-1960s that the first time that the SDS's national council singled out a program of action for chapters throughout the country it chose to demonstrate against American investment in South Africa. At a meeting of the national council in New York in December 1964, the SDS endorsed a program of demonstrations against the Chase Manhattan Bank and other banks which had participated in the loan to South Africa.\textsuperscript{134} Demonstrations against the banks took place in at least

\textsuperscript{133}It should be noted that the Council on African Affairs had strong criticism for the loan. Alpheus Hunton, "Postscript," Resistance Against Fascist Enslavement in South Africa, 60-62. Also, the Nation had registered its disapproval of the loan. Editorial, Nation, February 3, 1951, p. 98. For other background material on the loan, which was really one of several loans made at the time, see S. D. Greenberg, "United States Policy Toward the Republic of South Africa, 1945-1964," 108-114.

\textsuperscript{134}Alan Adelson, SDS: A Profile (New York, 1972), 212.
six cities in March 1965. In New York, some four to six hundred members of the SDS and other organizations took part in a five-hour demonstration at the Chase Manhattan building. Five of the demonstrators were allowed to meet with a member of the bank's board of directors to express their protest. Forty-nine of the demonstrators who staged a sit-in at the back doors of the building were arrested.\textsuperscript{135}

Student militancy against the loans to South Africa also resulted in the formation, at the Union Theological Seminary, of the Southern Africa Committee of the National Student Christian Federation (which later became the University Christian Movement). These students began calling on Protestant church bodies to stop depositing, and to withdraw, their funds in banks which took part in the South African loan or had operations in South Africa. For example, in April 1966 a number of Union Theological Seminary students jointly condemned the Methodist Church's Board of Missions for depositing its funds in the First National City Bank of New York. The Board declined at this time, but did call for American businesses operating in South Africa to work against apartheid, and for the American government to review its relations with South Africa.\textsuperscript{136} In the same month, three hundred students and others took part in a march down Broadway to a branch of the First National City Bank where seventy of the group withdrew their


The student activities were united with the work of the American Committee on Africa in the summer of 1966 when members of the National Student Christian Federation and the ACOA jointly formed the Committee of Conscience Against Apartheid. The ACOA was thus drawn somewhat to the left by more radical student groups. Direct activity against business was, however, a logical outgrowth of its criticisms of business policy in South Africa. And, as it became obvious that the 1966 Congressional Subcommittee hearings would have little effect on policy, the ACOA had no other direction in which it could turn, except perhaps to close up shop. It was too long established an institution for that. But in moving further to the left it incurred the risk of losing its more moderate support, just as the Council on African Affairs lost its audience when it grew increasingly radical. It may be doubted though whether the formation of the Committee of Conscience Against Apartheid (CCAA) was perceived as a radical step.

Named as Chairman of the Committee of Conscience was A. Philip Randolph, a veteran black civil rights leader and a Co-Chairman of the ACOA. Plans were made to generate public pressure to bring about the withdrawal of institutional and individual funds from banks participating in the credit agreement. The Committee of Conscience and other organizations which joined in the campaign printed pamphlets, wrote letters to elected officials, called on personnel at the banks, staged demonstrations against the banks, made use of bank shareholder 

137 American Committee on Africa, Summary Report on the Bank Campaign, 2.
meetings to protest the involvement of the banks, called on universities to divest themselves of stock in the banks, circulated petitions, and called for boycotts of the banks by individuals. The campaign of the CCAA attracted attention and support in the liberal periodicals which had long been critical of South Africa. In lending its support to the campaign, the Christian Century stated:

The long range purpose of the C. C. A. A. campaign against the New York City banks is to compel the United States to alter its South Africa policy radically and to stop allowing U. S. dollars to finance abroad the racism it seeks to eliminate at home. This is a cause worthy of the sympathy and support of conscientious men.

Within a short time, the Committee of Conscience began to achieve a measure of success. By December 1966 Chairman Randolph was able to announce that almost $23,000,000 in funds had been withdrawn by groups and individuals from the two principal targets of the campaign, Chase Manhattan and First National City Bank. In September of the following year the Methodist Church's Board of Missions, in a reversal of its earlier position, voted in favor of transfer to another bank a $10,000,000 investment portfolio that was held by the First National City Bank. Mrs. Porter Brown, the Board's General Secretary, indicated that the purpose of the action was moral; it was not expected to bring about change:

138 Ibid., 2-6.
140 American Committee on Africa, Summary Report on the Bank Campaign, 3.
Even the most enthusiastic supporters of the board's decision recognize that the mere transfer of a portfolio amounting to a little more than $10 million would probably not bring radical changes in the policies of either the bank or the government involved. On the other hand, it is a moral obligation of the churches to throw whatever light they can upon the dark wounds of suffering in the world.141

Other churches withdrew funds or began inquiries into whether they should do so.142 After radical student activities, Cornell and Princeton Universities sold their stock in the target banks.143

The ultimate success of the bank campaign came in November 1969 when a South African official announced in a terse statement that the credit agreement would not be extended. The expenses incurred in the loan, he said, were no longer warranted because of South Africa's strong gold and foreign exchange position.144 He might well have said that the benefits of the loan no longer outweighed the embarrassment and inconvenience which the loan caused both the South African government and the bank consortium. After the South African announcement, the American Committee on Africa suggested that the banks themselves may have been responsible for initiating the termination of the loan. But even if the South African government took the initiative it seems very possible that it was doing so to save the American banks from


142 Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa, The Church Makes a Decision on South Africa/Banks (New York, 1969) (special report in possession of the author). This organization, founded in 1956, is one of the oldest of the activist religious groups on South Africa.

143 American Committee on Africa, Summary Report on the Bank Campaign, 4.

144 Ibid., 1.
further disturbance that might jeopardize more important areas of business activity.

The bank campaign as such ended with the termination of the consortium credit agreement. However, activity did continue against the principal New York banks which operated in South Africa. In addition, the bank campaign spawned activities against other areas of business involvement in South Africa; the techniques employed against the banks were utilized against other businesses; and groups formed in opposition to the bank loan continued to operate afterwards, focusing on other targets for protest. For example, when students challenged university officials because of university holdings of stock in the banks, they went on to challenge them for holding shares in other corporations which invested or operated in South Africa. And the technique of voicing opposition to the credit agreement in bank shareholders' meetings came to be employed against other corporations with activities in South Africa.

After the bank campaign several of the anti-South African organizations turned their attention to the automotive industry.

Timothy H. Smith, writing as an official of both the Southern Africa Committee (University Christian Movement) and of the Council for Christian Social Action (United Church of Christ), published a lengthy pamphlet entitled *The American Corporation in South Africa*.\(^{145}\) Very

\(^{145}\) Timothy H. Smith, *The American Corporation in South Africa: An Analysis* (New York, 1970) (pamphlet in possession of the author). In an interview with the author, Smith indicated that the purpose of sanctions was to bring about a change to a more just society in South Africa (personal interview with Tim Smith, New York City, June 10, 1972). Two other officials of the Southern Africa Committee indicated to the author that they looked to sanctions more as a means of opposing the activities of American business abroad; South Africa was
critical of the role of American business in the South African economy, the study contained a considerable amount of material on the automotive industry. Some of Smith's research was utilized by another organization, the Council on Economic Priorities, when Smith served as a consultant in the preparation of a special report on "Chrysler, Ford and General Motors in South Africa." The American Committee on Africa then produced a smaller pamphlet on General Motors and South Africa, apparently based on the earlier two studies.

With this background information compiled, religious organizations now turned to direct action against General Motors. In 1971, the Social Criteria Committee on Investments of the Episcopal Church submitted a resolution at the annual shareholders meeting of General Motors Corporation which requested the Board of Directors to adopt resolutions to amend the corporate charter to forbid operations in South Africa. Ostensibly, the reason for proposing such a resolution was fear for the church's investments if apartheid should lead to turmoil. The Committee had found that some thirty-one companies in

focused upon simply because it was a particularly egregious example of such activities (personal interview with Reed Kramer and Tami Hultman, Durham, North Carolina, December 20, 1972).


American Committee on Africa, General Motors and South Africa (New York, 1971) (pamphlet in possession of the author).

which it had investments carried on business in South Africa. But it
decided to single out General Motors, probably because it had the
highest degree of visibility. Although unsuccessful, the action by
the Committee did raise the question of corporate activity in South
Africa to a higher level of public debate.

Later in 1971, members of the Episcopal Committee on Social
Criteria for Investments (subsequently renamed) joined with repre­
sentatives of groups from four other Protestant denominations to form
what became known as the Church Project on United States Investments
in Southern Africa. A group of these churchmen made a visit to South
Africa to investigate activities of a number of American corporations
operating there. After the visit, the Project undertook to solicit
proxies from the shareholders of General Motors, Goodyear, and Gulf
Oil in support of resolutions requesting the boards of directors of
these corporations to provide reports to their shareholders on details
of the corporations' activities in southern Africa. The Church
Project was no more successful than the Social Criteria Committee had
been the previous year.

Still other corporations have come under attack for various
aspects of their operations in southern Africa. The Polaroid Corpora-
tion has been challenged by several organizations, including one

\[1\] Church Project on United States Investments in Southern
Africa, "Proxy Statement" (March, 1972) (copy of proxy statement for
General Motors, Goodyear Tire and Rubber, and Gulf Oil, with
appendixes, in possession of author). For a copy of the report of
the Churchmen after their visit to South Africa, see the Congressional
Record, 92nd Cong., 2nd Sess., E 2950-55 (March 23, 1972). See also,
formed from among its own workers, the Polaroid Revolutionary Workers Movement. The American Committee on Africa has criticized General Electric and International Business Machines for their operations in southern Africa. Proxy resolutions with reference to southern Africa have been filed with the Newmont Mining Corporation and American Metal Climax by church groups.

Activists continue to bring pressure on American corporations at this time. It would be premature to attempt an assessment of their success or lack of success. They have forced the corporations operating in South Africa to respond and perhaps to examine more closely their policies in South Africa. They have not, however, resulted in the disengagement from South Africa that their proponents have advocated. The activist groups have been troublesome irritants to the corporations over which they have asserted their moral superiority. It is doubtful that anything positive has come from their attempts to impose their consciences upon the people associated with these corporations and upon all the people of South Africa. And if they were successful? One can only speculate, and the activist groups, after all, need not be too concerned, for they would not have to live with the consequences of their actions.


151 American Committee on Africa, Power to the Portuguese Empire from General Electric (New York, 1971); American Committee on Africa, I.B.M. in South Africa (New York, 1971) (these are ACOA "fact sheets" in possession of the author).
CHAPTER V

EFFORTS TO IMPROVE SOUTH AFRICA'S IMAGE:

PIERCING THE PAPER CURTAIN

The movement for sanctions against South Africa was not without opposition in the United States. There were Americans who were favorably inclined towards South Africa and who opposed criticism of and measures against South Africa. The remarkable thing is not that there were such individuals and groups, but that they so seldom gave expression to their views during the first decade of Nationalist rule in South Africa. In the late 1950s and the 1960s, however, some Americans came to see the situation in South Africa and American policy towards South Africa as involving issues touching upon or threatening their own interests. Also, favorable information on South Africa became more widely available to those Americans who might be willing to reject or oppose the hostile image of South Africa.¹

¹It was not, of course, necessary to have favorable information on South Africa to have a favorable image of the South African government and the policy of apartheid. Indeed, some of the sympathy that did appear in the United States for South Africa in the 1960s grew out of a reaction to the fact that "liberal" publications had been criticizing South Africa so severely. See, for example, the letter of the New York Times reader, A. F. P. Moyler of West Redding, Connecticut, who found his "sympathies increasingly with the Afrikaners, which is probably one result of the shrill and intensive propaganda against the regime from liberal sources throughout the world." New York Times Magazine, May 1, 1960, p. 6. Likewise, an author of an article favorable to South Africa in American Mercury said that his work had been "inspired by the mendacious newspaper coverage of the recent riots, which gave an intentionally distorted picture of those heroic people whose early
The activities of several South African and American agencies and organizations were a significant factor in the creation and promotion of more favorable images of South Africa among Americans in the 1960s and opposition to a hostile American policy towards South Africa. The background and work of the more important of these groups will be discussed before going over the specific views of Americans who were favorable to South Africa.

In the period since World War II the governments of many of the nations of the world have grown increasingly concerned with the way they are viewed by people abroad. The growth of the mass media has had a profound effect on the conduct of politics and diplomacy, and, in response to this, government agencies have been created to carry on public relations work abroad for their countries, either specifically in the hope of exercising political influence through the creation of favorable public opinion or to promote tourism, trade, and investment. The South African government has recognized for some time the importance of foreign opinion and has carried on an active campaign for a number of years to influence American views of South Africa.

The South African Information Service which is in operation today began as an Information Bureau instituted in 1937 in the administration of Prime Minister J.B.M. Hertzog. It had only three information branches abroad during World War II, one of which was a New York office opened in 1942. The Bureau was succeeded by the State


Information Office created by the government of Jan Smuts in 1947. This Office was reorganized when the Nationalists came into power in 1948, and its operations were placed under the authority of the Department of Interior. The Nationalist government stepped up the activity of the Information Office abroad and increased the money allocated to the foreign operations. An office of the Information Service was opened in Washington, D.C. in 1951 to complement the work of the New York office created earlier.

In the first years of the operation of the Information Office by the Nationalist government the primary technique of attempting to influence opinion was through the distribution of various publications, including a weekly Digest of South African Affairs, "Fact Papers," and other pamphlets and sheets aptly known as "throw-aways" among public relations people. An early example of the sort of work carried on by the Information Service was its distribution to news media and interested persons in the United States of a letter by Prime Minister Malan to an American clergyman.

In 1952 Reverend J. H. Piersma of Grand Rapids, Michigan wrote to Malan asking for a frank description of apartheid which he could use in discussing the policy and the problems of South Africa with his fellow Americans. The response was a rather defensive plea by Malan for an understanding of South Africa's dilemma.

---


stressed the vast differences between the ways of life of the white and black populations, and the small numbers of the whites in the country. It made little sense, the letter said, to criticize apartheid in the abstract without regard to the extraordinary conditions in South Africa, and that it would be just as immoral to consider only the rights of the blacks as it would be to have regard only for the rights of the whites. Attempting to counter the harsh image of the white population, Malan's letter stated:

I must ask you to give White South Africans credit for not being a nation of scheming reactionaries imbued with base and inhuman motives, nor a nation of fools blind to the gravity of their vital problem. They are normal human beings. They are a small nation grappling with one of the most difficult problems in the world.5

Describing apartheid as a tremendous experiment, Malan pointed out that his government was doing a great deal to improve the living standards and education of the non-white population.

Another technique employed by the South African Information Service to influence American images of South Africa was to write letters to the editors of publications in response to articles they published which were hostile to or misrepresentative of South Africa. An illustrative example of this was the letter by Conrad Norton, the assistant director of the New York office of the Information Service, to Time, in 1954. Time had published a report about the conviction in South Africa of two young white farmers for flogging an African to death.6 The magazine's writer quoted a "Boer farmer" who had said after the trial that it was a deep humiliation to see white men sent

5Ibid., 81

to prison for killing a thieving Kaffir. Norton's letter to the editor said: "Had your correspondent used a fraction of the diligence he showed in tracking down and recording an anonymous 'Boer farmer's' comments on the case, he could not have failed to mention in passing the countless numbers of South Africans—both 'Boer farmers' and others—in whom the crime aroused the same shocked views as those held by the trial judge." 7

In spite of the fact that the Nationalist government attached considerable importance to foreign opinion, its early efforts (such as those described above) at international public relations work were ineffective. The repercussions from Sharpeville and the independence of other African countries spurred the South African government to devote still more attention to improving South Africa's image abroad. In 1961 Prime Minister Verwoerd established a State Department of Information and Wentzel C. du Plessis, at one time the Ambassador to the United States, as its first Secretary. 8 The standard activities of the Information Service—the printing and distribution of information on South Africa—were increased, and new approaches were implemented that had a somewhat different focus.

Over the years, the South African Information Service had basically two tasks to accomplish. The first of these was to counter

---

7 Conrad Norton to the editor of Time, ibid., June 21, 1954, p. 8. For several more typical examples of such letters by Information Service officials see the letter of W. J. Le Roux to the editor, Atlantic, CCX (July, 1962), 33; and, more recently, the letter of L. E. S. de Villiers to the editor, New York Times, August 3, 1971, p. 29.

an existing bad image. The effort to reject the tenets of the harsh image is apparent in much of the material put out by the Information Service. As described by the information counselor of the South African Embassy in Washington, W. G. Meyer, the media in the United States often portrayed South Africa in a most unfavorable light: "At every possible occasion South Africa has been presented to the world as a despicable monster, governed as a police state by racists practising a policy of oppression contrary to all accepted moral standards and religious concepts; no less than a threat to world peace." The Information Service sought to convince people that such views were incorrect.

It was not enough, however, just to try to counter the poor image of South Africa. A second task was to create a positive image to replace the negative one. The government had to try to show that South Africa has positive value to those whose goodwill it sought to retain or win, as well as attempting to demonstrate that its racial policies were misperceived. In the 1960s the Information Service focused more

---

9 For example, a pamphlet published in 1961 and distributed in the United States, began its discussion of "Race Policy" by saying:

The policy of Apartheid—of separate development—and its implications as far as White-Black relations are concerned are not always fully understood.

Firstly, it is sometimes erroneously contended that the Whites robbed the Bantu of a fatherland, that apartheid is the system under which the White population exerts a cruel domination over the Bantu, and that it implies the eventual herding together of all surplus Bantu workers into barren reserves, where they will be kept in perpetual subservience to the whims of the Whites. Nothing is further from the truth. South African Quiz (Pretoria, 1961), 25.

on this second task, and was able to undertake somewhat more effectively both tasks as it made use of new approaches to influencing opinion.

Some of the principles guiding the South African Information Service were brought out by Derick de Villiers, a United Party member of Parliament, in an article published in the South African periodical *New Nation*. Describing the overseas information service as the "cowcatcher of diplomacy" which "sweep[s] obstacles from the line of advance," he said that the service had to restrict its activities to the accomplishment of a few carefully selected aims. These objectives had to be chosen with a view to "the country's main strengths— for example, economic rather than political in the case of South Africa—and the impact these are likely to make on a particular foreign audience." The correct medium, he observed, had to be chosen to make the message effective, and personnel had to be selected with an eye to their "ability to reconcile the political, economic and cultural interests of their own country with those of the country in which they will work." De Villiers recognized that the limited financial resources and manpower available to South Africa meant that the overseas information officer had to reach the many through the few. Finally he said that services offered by the information agency had to be reliable, fair, objective, and continuously offered. These standards enunciated by de Villiers are sound from the standpoint of public relations work, and they describe correctly the basic working

---


12 Ibid., 17.

13 Ibid.
principles in recent years of the South African Information Service in the United States.

In the 1960s the New York office of the Information Service continued to make available published information on South Africa though increasing the amount it produced from what it had previously distributed. Three regular publications were prepared and sent out by the New York office: a weekly news release which summarized news from South Africa, a Business Report which stressed material and data of interest to American investors or potential investors in South Africa, and a monthly called Scope which varied in content and format. Another three publications were sent to Americans from South Africa: the South African Digest, a weekly containing news and statements of government officials; Bantu, a monthly with information on black South Africans; and Panorama, a slick paper monthly with attractive pictures on South African life. These last three publications were not produced specifically as propaganda for the American market but were circulated among readers in South Africa as well as abroad. Department of Justice data on the circulation of these six periodicals in the United States, according to Vernon McKay, showed that they were reaching only a very small audience. In December 1965 circulation ranged from a high of 14,000 for Scope to a low of 1,200 for Panorama. In addition to the periodicals, hundreds of pamphlets were produced for public consumption.\(^4\)

The content of the publications of the South African Information Service varied from the colorful to the highly political. In

general, nearly all tried to project the image of a stable country facing immense problems which the government has attempted to alleviate through an enlightened policy of the separate development of the races. They frequently sought to persuade the reader of South Africa's strategic importance to the West as an anti-Communist ally, and emphasized that South Africa was an area of prosperous industrial development. One such pamphlet, for example, made the point that apartheid was both necessary and moral, quoting Dr. Verwoerd as stating:

"Cannot you understand us fighting to the death for our existence? And yet we do not only seek and fight for a solution which will mean our survival, but seek one which will grant survival and full development, politically and economically to each of the other racial groups as well, and we are even prepared to pay a high price out of our earnings for their future."^15

Another pamphlet produced about 1964 was entitled South African Prospects and Progress: Economic Survey of an Industrial Giant in Africa. The image of South Africa that it sought to convey was expressed succinctly on its first inner page, as well as in the pamphlet's title:

"On the southern tip of Africa, in one of the greatest mineral treasure houses of the world, a new industrial giant is arising. Already this land of golden opportunity, the Republic of South Africa, has far outstripped all other countries in Africa in output and living standards; and is poised for new spectacular economic advances."

---

^15 *Progress Through Separate Development: South Africa in Peaceful Transition* (New York, n.d.), 15 (pamphlet in possession of the author). A "fact sheet" produced at about the same time, probably 1964, in the possession of the author, stated "South Africa is firmly committed to the cause of the Free World and has outlawed the Communist Party. The Republic fought on the side of the Allies in two world wars and against the Communists in Korea."

These examples were typical of much of the material which was published by the South African Information Service.17 Many governments with diplomatic representation in the United States publish the same sort of pamphlets and periodicals. It is doubtful that this kind of activity influences many. The publications reach relatively few people, and they are usually regarded by the people who receive them as propaganda. Nevertheless, many information agencies continue to churn out such material because it does reach some people, and it is tangible evidence that the agency has been at work.

Recognizing the limited effectiveness of the information agency's activities in the 1950s, Piet Miering, the director of the Information Service at the time, sought the advice of American public relations firms. After contacting four firms in 1955, Meiring concluded that they could not effectively represent South Africa's interests in the United States.18 Five years later, however, he signed a contract with a New York public relations firm, the Hamilton Wright Organization.19 The Wright Organization was begun in 1908 as a public relations agency; over the years it came to specialize in representing foreign governments, including Mexico, Nationalist China, Morocco, 

17For more on the publications put out by the South African Information Service, and a point by point refutation of the facts they contain and arguments they make, see John Laurence, Seeds of Disaster, 80-168. Laurence, a British subject, worked for ten years in an advertising agency in South Africa which had been engaged by the South African government to develop such material for distribution abroad.


Italy, and the Ivory Coast. The South African government agreed to pay the Organization $250,000 to represent it in the United States.\footnote{Piet Meiring to J. William Fulbright, August 1, 1963, in \textit{ibid.}, 1508-1509.}

The approach used by the Hamilton Wright Organization differed somewhat from the standard published fare that the Information Service had been producing. The philosophy of the Organization, as Hamilton Wright, Sr. explained to Meiring, was to make use of "positive non-political propaganda to create an effect essentially political."\footnote{Hamilton Wright, Sr. to Piet Meiring, November 22, 1961, in \textit{ibid.}, 708-709.}

The public relations firm worked through newspapers, magazines, newsreels, television, short films, and other media. It concentrated on what it felt were the positive elements of South Africa: the progress of the country, the economy and the extent of foreign investment, the natural resources, the culture and folklore, the tourist attractions, and South Africa's social accomplishments.

Films on South Africa were produced by the Hamilton Wright Organization, including "A Touch of Gold" on gold mining, "South African Frontier," and "South Africa Today." These were turned over to Twentieth Century Fox, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Universal-International, and firms in Spain, the Netherlands, France, Germany, Belgium, and elsewhere for distribution to theaters. Some of the films were distributed also to television stations.\footnote{For example, "South African Frontier" was distributed for the Hamilton Wright Organization by Radiant Films and shown at stations in Birmingham, Alabama, Houston, Texas, Great Falls, Montana, and Tampa, Florida. \textit{Activities of Mondiplomatic Representatives}, 759.} The Organization sent still-photos of South Africa and articles to several thousand newspapers.
with, said the head of the firm, an eighty per cent acceptance rate. 23 Still another activity of the Organization was to make contacts with American news editors with a view to arranging trips to South Africa for them through the South African Information Service. 24

The contract between the South African government and the Hamilton Wright Organization was not extended when it came up for renewal in 1963. The reasons for this are not clear. Hamilton Wright, Sr. told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that South Africa had wanted him to use "hard-core" political propaganda, and he was unwilling to do this. The South African government had already had him release one such film on the Transkei against his better judgment, and it had been unsuccessful. 25 But it is likely that the South Africans did not feel that Wright was delivering as much as he claimed to be. No doubt the Hamilton Wright Organization was embarrassed when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee printed a letter from Hamilton Wright, Sr. to an agent for Warner Brothers Pictures Distributing Corporation requesting that the agent send him a "rave" letter commending him for "A Touch of Gold" so that Wright could use it to demonstrate his effectiveness to the South African government. 26

23 Wright to Meiring, November 22, 1961, in ibid., 708. In testimony, Wright, Sr., said that National Geographic magazine printed a number of photos contributed by the Organization. This was undoubtedly in reference to photographs in Kip Ross, "South Africa Close-up," National Geographic, CXXII (November, 1962), 641-81.

24 Hamilton Wright, Jr. to Willem Le Roux, April 12, 1962, in Activities of Nondiplomatic Representatives, 1476. The author has been unable to ascertain whether any such trips were made at this time.

25 Activities of Nondiplomatic Representatives, 717-18.

26 Hamilton Wright, Sr. to Charles Bailey, September 12, 1962, in ibid., 1492.
The South African government tried another public relations firm in 1965 when it entered into an agreement with a Washington consultant, T. A. McInery. This arrangement was terminated upon the death of McInery before the agreed-upon work was completed.27

Even as the South African Information Service was attempting to work through American public relations firms, it was broadening the range of activities that it carried on. It began producing films of award-winning quality for television and for motion-picture theaters. In 1965 short wave facilities were opened to broadcast the "Voice of South Africa" around the world.28 Officials of the government at all four of the South African posts in the United States (New York, Washington, New Orleans, and San Francisco) participated in television and radio interviews and delivered public lectures. The Information Service also used new approaches to reaching an American audience through newspapers.

In the spring of 1965 the Information Service purchased three full-page advertisements in the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Houston Chronicle, the San Francisco Chronicle, and the Chicago Tribune.29 The first showed one hundred thousand people in one of South Africa's football fields. This represented the number of Europeans who had immigrated to South Africa because "there is stability,


29Natal Daily News, March 25, 1965 (all citations to this newspaper are from the paper's clippings files in Durban, South Africa).
peace and progress in this Republic, one of the fastest growing economies in the world." It said that capitalism was taken for
granted in South Africa, and that South Africa, as a strongly anti-
Communist country, had supported the United States in the Berlin air
lift and in the Korean conflict. The other two advertisements in the
series emphasized South Africa's economic progress and the political
development of the Transkei. The chief information officer of the
Information Service in New York, J. O. Adendorff, said that the ads had
drawn a strong response and that most letters commenting on them had
been very favorable. It was estimated that these advertisements
probably reached more than seven million people in the areas served by
the newspapers.

Even though the South African government was able to reach more
people through newspaper advertising of this sort, it still was a form
of propaganda and was likely to be received as such by most of the
people who read it. To be effective, favorable information on South
Africa had to be in the form of news or opinion by Americans not em-
ployed by the South African government. A means of achieving this was
found which in part depended, for its success, upon the harsh image
that was predominant in the American media.

One of the repeated themes that can be found in the published
writings and statements of Americans who have visited South Africa is
that the country and the government are not nearly so bad as they had
been led to believe by the reports on South Africa that they had read

1965, A 31.
before going to South Africa. For example, a visiting American businessman, the president and general manager of a San Francisco savings and loan institution, was interviewed in Durban in 1954. He told the reporter: "Somehow the picture obtained overseas is one of great unsettlement, which a personal visit serves largely to dispel." 32

One of the main reasons why groups opposed to the South African government have tried to discourage American tourism has been because, as one critic put it, tourists to South Africa "often leave the country with a very 'white' picture of her racial situation." 33 Or as the writer E. J. Kahn, Jr., expressed it with regard to his own reaction to apartheid: "after a few weeks there, whatever one's views about apartheid, one gets used to it. It simply becomes part of the environment . . . ." 34

The South African government, and several other groups,

---

32 Quoted in Sunday Tribune (Durban, South Africa), April 13, 1954 (Natal Daily News clippings file).

33 Tim Smith, "Suggested Actions," in George M. Daniels, ed., Southern Africa: A Time for Change (New York, 1969), 93. A similar position was taken by Joseph C. Kennedy in a paper presented at the national conference on "South African Crisis and American Action" (March 21-23, 1965) in Washington, D.C., entitled "American Private Involvement in South Africa," 36 (paper among the materials on the conference lent to the author by the American Committee on Africa). His research showed that Americans constituted the second largest group of tourists to South Africa throughout the period 1960 to 1964, and that many of them reacted favorably to the country. Ibid., 2-3. Kennedy's study discusses the activities of the South African Tourist Corporation (SATOUR) in the United States. These activities have not been discussed in detail here because they have been guided by the same considerations operative with regard to the South African Information Service. The two have worked together and used some of the same approaches.

apparently observed this phenomenon and undertook a public relations program based on it. The Information Service began bringing journalists and other opinion leaders to South Africa to see the country for themselves. The hope was that such visitors would be favorably impressed, or at least conclude that the country was not so bad as they had been led to believe, and would return to the United States to write and speak favorably of South Africa. Although the Hamilton Wright Organization did make some contacts for the Information Service for such a program, the author has been unable to find any examples of people who made the expense-paid tours of South Africa prior to 1965, and officials of both the South African and the American governments were unwilling to provide him with information on the program.

People chosen to make the tours were usually newspapermen with occasional business, religious or military leaders taking part. Many were conservatives whose views could be expected to be more favorable to South Africa even before they visited South Africa. However, South African officials recognized that some critics had to be brought to South Africa as well as friends so as to lend credibility to the program.

Normally the visitors and their wives were flown to South Africa for a fifteen to twenty-five day tour which included sojourns in the major urban centers, stop-overs in the Transkei, and lectures by various government officials at the sites of government programs. The

---


36Du Plessis, "South Africa's Image Abroad," 75.
visitors were generally allowed to see whatever they wished to and to talk to anyone they wanted to. Often they left the country favorably impressed. For example, the education editor of the Philadelphia Bulletin, Peter H. Binzen, made the tour in 1966 and was impressed by the self-government program for the Transkei. He told a reporter that his group of fourteen had met white civil servants who were obviously dedicated and sincere in their approach to the problems of the Transkei. Binzen had thought that there would be more overt repression than he had seen, and he said: "I didn't expect the prosperity on the scale which all races seem to enjoy." 37

American visitors on the Information Service tours would frequently publish their views in their newspapers. Binzen's reports appeared on the front pages of the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin and Evening Bulletin, February 20-25, 1966. Binzen concluded inter alia that separate development deserved close study, that the solution to South Africa lay somewhere between complete separation and proportional representation, and that South Africa "with its enormous mineral wealth and key location at the foot of Africa, is of great importance to the West in the Cold War." 38 On one trip to South Africa of this nature, George N. Crocker of the San Francisco Examiner wrote that he had found that the economic boom in South Africa was so great that Africans from neighboring countries were clamoring to get in. He continued:

More importantly, the South Africans are anti-Communist and loyally pro-West. They are the most reliable opposition to Communism on the African continent and to the outflanking

---

of Europe, which is known to be a major objective of the Russian and Chinese apparati of the World Communist conspiracy. 39

Although the Information Service tours occasionally resulted in unfavorable publicity for South Africa, they generally worked effectively. 40 The program had immediate returns in that visitors would write favorably in their publications, giving the Information Service a wider audience than it could have through advertising, and the "message" was more credible than if it had been prepared by the Information Service. The Information Service would sometimes reprint the views of the visitors and distribute them to people on its mailing list or to people who wrote to the Information Service for material on South Africa. 41 But the program also resulted in the creation of a body of American journalists with generally favorable views of South Africa and a sense of personal involvement with the country who were likely to speak up for South Africa when issues arose in the future. Thus when a film "South African Essay" produced by Henry Morgenthau III was shown on television in 1966, Thomas R. Waring of the Charleston News and Courier criticized it in his columns; Waring had made the Information Service tour in 1965. 42


40 For an example of an unfavorable response to the trip, see Richard Atcheson, "South Africa: It Could Have Been Arcadia," Holiday, XLVI (November, 1969), 32-33, 74, 76-77, 81-83.

41 E.g., the articles of Ross MacKenzie, an associate editor of the Richmond News Leader, which appeared in his paper after a sponsored tour in April-May 1969 were reprinted in an attractive format with pictures and distributed by the Information Service under the title "A Report on Southern Africa" (pamphlet in possession of the author).

Because the author has been unable to obtain data about the numbers of American brought to South Africa by the South African Information Service, it is not possible to assess fully the success of this program. After reading South African newspaper accounts of Information Service tours and inquiries to various American newspapers, it appears that hundreds of such visitors have participated in the tours and that the program has been fairly effective in mobilizing a segment of conservative opinion in the United States in favor of South Africa.

The idea of bringing American visitors to South Africa to gain a better understanding of its problems from personal observation did not originate with the South African Information Service. Instead, the use of such a method was begun by the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program (US-SALEP), an organization which first brought American leaders to South Africa in 1958.

The man responsible for the creation of the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program was Dr. Frank S. Loescher who became the Program's first director. An authority on inter-group relations, Loescher had served as a consultant to the Fund for the Republic and as the director of Philadelphia's Commission on Human Relations. He was the author of *The Protestant Church and the Negro* and of articles on race relations in the United States and South Africa.

Dr. Loescher's first visit to Africa was in 1953 when he served as a consultant for a program of the South African Institute of Race Relations. After this experience he began to consider ways in which American voluntary organizations could provide constructive
help for South Africa's problems. One way, he believed, of accomplishing this was through the exchange of influential persons from the two countries.\textsuperscript{43} Friends of his in South Africa encouraged the idea, and he enlisted the aid of the American Friends Service Committee in the United States. A conference sponsored by the Service Committee was held at Haverford College in May 1955 to inquire further into the possibilities of an exchange program and to explore the resources that might be called upon for such a program. Eighteen representatives of eleven religious, philanthropic, educational, and cultural exchange organizations attended the conference. They appointed an Interim Committee to carry on with the idea; it called a second conference two years later. In January 1958 Dr. Loescher was named director of the newly created US-SALEP and exchanges were begun a few months later.\textsuperscript{44}

The Program had criticism from liberals in the United States and from conservatives in South Africa.\textsuperscript{45} This was due to the very nature of the Program. On the one hand, it tried to serve the purpose of making South African leaders more liberal. It tried to make them aware of currents of thought in the United States on race relations and to break down intellectual isolation in South Africa. But from the standpoint of many of the South African supporters of the Program, it also had the function of showing to American participants that South Africa's problems were highly complex, far more difficult than the

\textsuperscript{43}\textit{Natal Daily News}, December 17, 1959.

\textsuperscript{44}Carol Ann Weisenfeld, \textit{The First Decade} (n.p., 1968), 2. This publication was provided to the author by Dr. Loescher.

problems of race relations in the United States. The International Management Committee of US-SALEP, made up of an American and a South African Executive Committee, reflected the diversity of purposes that the organization has tried to serve; it consisted of individuals of very different backgrounds and political persuasion, ranging from black Americans to strong supporters of the Nationalist Party in South Africa. All, however, undoubtedly shared the assumption that communication with South Africa was preferable to its isolation.

Between 1958 and 1968 there were 228 individuals or families who participated in the exchange programs, most of which were for periods of three months. Of these, 160 were from South Africa and sixty-eight were from the United States. Six types of exchanges were sponsored by US-SALEP. University faculty exchanges had the highest priority; a third of the exchanges in the first decade of the work of the organization were associated with universities. A second type of exchange was functional, that is, dealing with specialized projects such as conferring on the role of small business in economic and community development. Science exchanges were arranged in cooperation with the National Science Foundation. Another activity of US-SALEP was to sponsor South African newspapermen as Associate Nieman Fellows at Harvard University. A fifth type of program was to support two-way exchanges of clergymen, a South African minister serving an American's congregation and vice-versa. Finally, there were Independent Exchanges, visits to each other's country by American and South African leaders from various fields.

---

46 Weisenfeld, The First Decade, 5-7.
47 Ibid., 3-4.
American visitors to South Africa under the US-SALEP exchanges were often surprised to find that South Africa was not so bad as they had expected from their reading on the country in the United States. To cite an example, one such exchange was the Reverend William H. Felmeth, a Presbyterian minister from New Jersey. He took his wife and daughter to South Africa in June 1967 when he exchanged pulpits with Dr. J. Dalziel at St. Columba's Church in Johannesburg. He told a reporter in South Africa that he had found from his visit that the situation was at variance with the harsh impressions gained abroad. He said that he was returning home after his ten week visit to "marvel at how much was being done, frequently with concern and compassion, to implement the policy of separate development." Participants in the Program gave expression to similar views in important publications and places. Although the Program did not issue a regular publication and did not adopt any particular "line" on South Africa, it is possible to speak of a US-SALEP image of South Africa in bringing out some of the main points in the published views of several Americans who participated in the exchanges.

The most prominent feature of the US-SALEP image of South Africa was the view that white South Africans were not depraved and that there was hope for constructive change in South Africa through the more enlightened members of the white community. The people associated with the program often expressed the belief that racial prejudice is based on social and economic differences between racial groups rather than irrational reactions to differences in skin color or psychological

---

abnormalities. William O. Brown, director of the African Studies Program at Boston University and later a member of the US-SALEP International Management Committee, wrote in 1955:

Even in South Africa, where great importance is attached to race per se, the significant factors in race relations are not the physical differences, existing or imputed, but the basic divergencies in history and culture as between the so-called racial components in the South African complex. The emphasis on race as a physical reality conceals the Europeans' fears that Africans, Asians, and Coloreds as social groupings may share with them a common society and compete for place and status in a common world. 49

This approach was most prominently and often expressed by Edwin S. Munger, a professor of political geography at the California Institute of Technology who published widely on South Africa. In contrast to John Gunther who viewed the South African Bureau of Racial Affairs (SABRA) as being at the extreme right wing of the Nationalist Party, Munger found that "SABRA believes that all men are equal in the sight of God and potentially equal in practice, and that no Christian solution in South Africa can be based upon an assertion of inherent superiority of Afrikaner over African." 50 Indeed, he said that many of the speeches he heard at a SABRA meeting were liberal. It was Munger's belief that the world press had overstated the importance of the race issue in elections in South Africa, that the Nazi label on the Nationalist Party was an "anachronistic epithet," and that South Africa


was by no means a police state under the Nationalists.\textsuperscript{51}

One of Munger's most important statements of the theme of hopeful developments within the white groups was his 1969 article in \textit{Foreign Affairs}: "South Africa: Are There Silver Linings?"\textsuperscript{52} There he discussed the development of a split within the Nationalist Party between the verligtes (enlightened ones) and the verkramptes (narrow or cramped ones). The fact that the Nationalist Party was moving to a verligte position on key issues (immigration, mixed sports, open discussion of issues, enlightened Separate Homelands instead of baasskap) was bringing about change in South Africa. Economic forces were serving as a liberalizing influence, living standards were rising among the Africans, and the "victory" of South Africa at the World Court gave the whites a sense of relief which permitted a freer discussion of future policies and permitted the government to embark on a new foreign policy friendlier to the African countries to the north. A hundred Free State Afrikaner farmers, he noted, had recently taken their tractors to aid the plowing in the African state of Lesotho, and he quoted Professor N. J. Olivier (who served on the International Management Committee of US-SALEP with Munger) from a speech at Stellenbosch where he said: "We are not monsters and I believe it will be realized that discrimination based on colour is untenable.

\textsuperscript{51}Ibid., 542; Munger, Notes on the Formation of South African Foreign Policy, 51; Munger, \textit{Afrikaner and African Nationalism} (London, 1967), 64.

It will take time, but we have seen many changes in South Africa, and I believe that this one will come. 53

In a later issue of Foreign Affairs George F. Kennan, the historian and diplomat whose views on race and foreign affairs in different context have already been noted, expressed judgments similar to those of Munger. Kennan said after a US-SALEP visit that he was inclined to agree with those who felt that "the results of the recent election, repudiating the right wing of the Nationalist Party and strengthening somewhat the position of its more moderate opponents, is the beginning of a trend in the direction of greater liberality and maturity of official policy—a trend bound to become strengthened as more young people come into the picture as voters." 54

The fact that the whites of South Africa were not evil people did not mean that the policy of apartheid was a desirable one. On the contrary, people associated with US-SALEP often concluded that apartheid was very harsh, inexcusably so, and that ultimately the aim of complete separation could not be achieved. Kennan, for example, stated that the evils of apartheid were "real, ubiquitous, shocking and depressing. . . No merits of theory could justify, and no deficiencies of execution excuse, the inequities and inhumanities which the present system obviously produces." 55 Munger similarly found that the hard, legal facts of life for the Africans did not present either a new or

54 George F. Kennan, "Hazardous Courses in Southern Africa," Foreign Affairs, XLIX (January, 1971), 224. See also Kennan's earlier and shorter statement of his views on South Africa in his Democracy and the Student Left (Boston, 1968), 181-82.
a creditable picture. He felt that the program of separate homelands had not made much headway and indicated that only about one-half of the total African population might eventually live within the enlarged Bantustans. Nonetheless, Kennan, Munger, and others connected with US-SALEP said that the whites of South Africa faced grave problems; and they had a right to maintain their own historical and cultural identities.

Finally, American action against apartheid, in the US-SALEP view, would be not only inappropriate but foolhardy and counterproductive. This position has been put forth by various US-SALEP people since the organization was founded, but it was given its most forthright expression by George F. Kennan who stated:

No changes in official South African policy will ever be successful unless they spring in the main from the workings of the country's own public opinion and political process. It is inadvisable and unproductive for outsiders to relieve the South African authorities of even the smallest degree of their own responsibility by forcing their hand and trying to tell them what to do. Let the friends of the various South African peoples hold the white rulers of the country to the recognition that to the outside the present pattern of South African apartheid is abhorrent in aspect and unconvincing in rationale; but beyond that let it be the task of those rulers, who know their own situation better than any outsider can, to find the conceivable alternatives.

The director of the Program, Frank Loescher, had also stated on

---

56 Munger, "South Africa: Are There Silver Linings?" 379.

57 See, for example, the letter to the editor of the New York Times Magazine from US-SALEP exchangees Lorus and Margery Milne. While on their visit they "saw a very different South Africa from the one we had visualized. . . . The Afrikaners need help in solving their problem. But the answer has to be one that leaves them there, in control of their possessions." New York Times Magazine, April 24, 1960, p. 8. See also the views of US-SALEP visitor Hodding Carter discussed below, p. 249.

58 Kennan, "Hazardous Courses in Southern Africa," 226.
occasion the wisdom of refraining from efforts to impose the American way of life on other peoples. And it was Dr. Loescher who, at the time of Sharpeville, revealed one of the links between views on civil rights questions in the United States and views on the proper course of policy on South Africa. He wrote a letter to the New York Times about the whites in South Africa he had seen in a visit just after the Sharpeville incident, stating that there were thoughtful groups which face the same problem in South Africa that their counterparts in our Deep South are trying to deal with—how to bring along the indifferent, the fearful and the hostile whites.

In our rightful concern for human dignity for people of every race, creed or national origin in South Africa we should keep in mind our own Deep South and test a proposed course of action by first asking whether it would help the movement for justice in the Deep South. Does ostracising moderate leaders in the South, South Africa or an other area of tension help or hurt what they are trying to accomplish?

Loescher, and others of US-SALEP like him, concluded that force was not a proper tool for implementing race policy in the United States or in South Africa.

It should not be doubted that the United States—South Africa Leader Exchange Program played a role in influencing some American thinking on South Africa both through the exchanges it sponsored and through the published and other expressions of the exchangees. But it should be observed that the views put forth by such people were largely restricted to scholarly analyses of the forces at work within the white community and arguments against American activity against the South African government. The exchangees seldom spoke of the


self-interest of the United States in its relations with South Africa. Instead they sought in general to promote a greater understanding of, and sympathy for, the problems of white South Africans. 61

If the South African Information Service attempted to influence journalists and mass opinion and the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program brought academics to South Africa for a better view of the country, there remained a gap in American opinion that might be influenced in favor of South Africa. This was a gap in American business, military and what might be termed "establishment" (for lack of a better word) opinion. The gap was filled by the creation of the South Africa Foundation. The purpose of this organization has been not so much to change the image abroad of South Africa's racial policies as it has been to convince people that South Africa offers both economic and strategic advantages to the West. 62 The aggressiveness of the Foundation and the tenor of its approach are suggested by its symbol and motto: MM, which stands for Man-to-Man. It is probably one of the most sophisticated and well-financed operations of its kind in the world.

The South Africa Foundation was launched at a December 1959 meeting in Johannesburg attended by twenty-five leaders of finance, 

61 There were several other programs that took Americans to South Africa that are not discussed here because of the small number of people involved or because it has not been possible to perceive any significant statements on South Africa growing from them. These include visits sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation (which has a world-wide travel grants program), the United States State Department Educational and Cultural Exchange Program, the Smith-Mundt program, the People to People program started by President Eisenhower in 1956, and the American Field Service (which sponsors student exchanges).

62 See Colin and Margaret Legum, South Africa: Crisis for the West (New York, 1964), 112-16, 244-46.
commerce, industry and culture in South Africa. Presiding at the meeting was Sir Francis de Guingand, Chief of Staff to Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery during World War II. De Guingand explained to those present that South Africa was being undermined abroad by an organized campaign of misrepresentation, that it was time that all public-spirited South Africans, together with those who had a stake in South Africa, to mobilize their forces to present the real South Africa to the world.63

One of those with a stake in South Africa present at the meeting was Charles W. Engelhard, an American industrialist who had extensive holdings in South Africa. He was elected as one of the four vice-chairmen chosen by the group. American business was thus involved in the South Africa Foundation from its inception. Two days after the initial meeting of the Foundation, Engelhard left South Africa to return to his home in New Jersey, stating that once there he would work to "put the South African record right." He would work through private contacts, he told a reporter, and added, "I also have connections in Washington, among Congressmen and Senators and I will talk to them."64

64 Ibid. Engelhard did have good connections. He was an influential member of the Democratic Party and represented Presidents Kennedy and Johnson on a number of special missions abroad, including heading the American delegation to Zambias independence ceremonies. In addition to his support of the South Africa Foundation, the Charles Engelhard Foundation was a contributor to the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program. For several critical articles on his business ties in South Africa and his possible influence on policy making, see Paul Jacobs, "Charles Engelhard: Our Man in Africa," Ramparts, IV (November, 1966), 23-39 and "Our Man—Still in Africa," Africa Today, XVII (September-October, 1970), 26-29.
The first year of the Foundation's operation was limited to consolidating its organization and laying the groundwork for future campaigns. Initially, its organizers intended that the Foundation would serve as a trust fund to finance publicity and public relations operations on behalf of South Africa. It attempted to influence mass opinion by placing promotional information in magazines and newspapers and by making material available to television. An example of this type of activity in the United States was the publication of a twenty-four page brochure entitled "This is South Africa" which was distributed as a supplement to the New York Times of June 4, 1961. As time passed and the Foundation gained experience it found that it was becoming an operational public relations firm itself. It also began to limit its activities to attempting to influence the higher echelons of government, private enterprise, and the communications industry. As one of its annual reports described the Foundation, it became a "unique organization which combines the functions of publicity, public relations and unofficial diplomacy." Although it continued to produce a magazine, brochures, newsletters and the like, it limited its efforts to influence mass opinion and instead concentrated on

65 South Africa Foundation, Annual Report for 1969, 1 (copy in possession of author provided by the Foundation's Johannesburg office).


67 The advertisement does not say that it was paid for by the South Africa Foundation, only that it was by South African and American business interests. However, it seems most unlikely that it was not the South Africa Foundation which was responsible for it.

The Foundation was slow in getting started in the United States in spite of the support of Engelhard and of American industries located in South Africa. It opened an office in London in 1961 and shortly thereafter one in Germany. A part-time representative was appointed in Paris in 1963 and a full-time office opened there in 1966. It was not until 1968 that a permanent Foundation representative, John H. Chettle, was appointed for the United States.Originally opening an office in New York, Chettle soon moved the Foundation's American headquarters to Washington.

There were several reasons why the Foundation was slow in developing its American operations. The United Kingdom was of higher priority because of the strong political and economic ties it had with South Africa. Germany and France were also of higher priority than the United States because it seemed that there were better possibilities of successful links with them. It was much more expensive to undertake a full-time operation in the United States than in Europe. In addition, it took longer to build up a network of friends of the Foundation in the United States because there were fewer initial contacts between South Africans and Americans, despite a sizeable American investment in South Africa.

Although Britain and Europe were of higher priority than the United States, the Foundation did make some efforts beyond the New


70Interview of author with J. de L. Sorour, Deputy Director General of the South Africa Foundation, and Solly Press, Information Officer, Johannesburg, South Africa, December 1, 1972.
The New York Times advertisement to influence American thinking on South Africa even before Chettle was sent to New York. Within South Africa, steps were taken to bring about contact with influential people by the formation of "Man-to-Man" committees made up of leaders of the various foreign communities located there. One of the twenty committees represented the United States, and it eventually included representatives of most American companies operating in South Africa. At least as early as 1962, the Foundation began bringing Americans to South Africa to gain first hand knowledge of the country and began assisting other Americans who were visiting South Africa.

Although the South Africa Foundation did provide some information on its activities, it was unwilling to release the names of the Americans who were brought to South Africa by the Foundation. Nevertheless, it has been possible to gain some insight into the workings of the Foundation's visitors program from the Foundation's publications, from Congressional materials, from newspapers, and from other sources. The Foundation regarded the visitors program as the most successful of its undertakings, one "which yielded remarkable results and enabled the Foundation to make many important and influential friends for South Africa abroad."  

---


72 South Africa Foundation, Annual Report for 1969, 2. The first such visitor that the author has been able to learn of was Clarence B. Randall, President of Inland Steel. He became a strong advocate of greater understanding of South Africa, and his views appeared in several prominent publications. He also became a member of the International Management Committee of the United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program. His views are discussed in the next chapter.
One such friend was Charles Burton Marshall, a professor at Johns Hopkins University and a spokesman on foreign policy and military matters in Washington. The way in which he was selected to visit South Africa affords a glimpse into the methods employed by the Foundation in locating and cultivating friends for South Africa. At a Congressional hearing, Marshall testified that his interest in South Africa began at a closed meeting in a private club in Washington which had as its focus South Africa and American policy on South Africa. He had been asked to comment on the paper delivered by the main speaker for the evening, and he found it replete with unsound propositions. Apparently a member of the South African Embassy who was present at the meeting passed Marshall's name on to the Foundation; several weeks later the Foundation cabled him an invitation to visit South Africa. Marshall accepted after setting down several ground rules: he wanted no guided tour; he should go where he wanted and talk to whom he pleased; and he should be able to see South West Africa. These were agreed to, and he went in June 1965.  

While in South Africa, Marshall saw a great deal of the country and met with many whites and non-whites, including the Prime Minister and Cabinet ministers. The trip had the desired effect; Marshall returned to the United States to become a strong advocate against sanctions and for a lessening of American criticism of South Africa. He told the House Subcommittee on Africa:

Portentous talk of a bloodbath in the offing is idle. Obviously the society there faces a great many difficult problems. In

---

the large, they are being handled with a fair amount of skill and patience combined with ruthless energy. Time is more likely to help than to aggravate the problems. Chivvying from outside is unlikely to do any good. The portrayal of the dominant group in Nazi-like terms is quite inaccurate. 74

Marshall called for greater contact with South Africa, rather than ostracism of the country, and for an end to the policy of "pinpricks":

"If we are not going to move in on this place and capture it, conquer it, and hold it and attempt to govern it, then let us desist from the line we are following--the line of petty annoyances." 75

One famous visitor with whom the Foundation met was Robert F.

---

74 Ibid., 436.
75 Ibid., 451. Marshall's brother, General S. L. A. Marshall, also appeared before the Congressional Subcommittee. General Marshall's interest in South Africa was aroused by his brother's interest, and he, too, was a Foundation visitor to South Africa. His views are discussed in the next chapter. Among others from the United States who were brought to South Africa as visitors by the Foundation, who were assisted by the Foundation, or who met with Foundation personnel in South Africa were the following: Generals James Doolittle, Mark Clark, Albert Wedemeyer, and Lauris Norstad, Admiral Arthur W. Radford, John Davenport (editor of Fortune), Allen Drury (author), staff writers for Business Week and the Wall Street Journal, an editorial writer for the Cincinnati Enquirer, E. C. Birsck (Professor of Business Administration at Harvard and editor of the Harvard Business Review), M. A. Samuels (Senior Staff Officer at the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University), W. E. Griffith (Professor of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology), F. H. Harbison (Professor of Economics and International Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton), Kevin Phillips (columnist and former assistant to Attorney General John Mitchell), N. M. Stultz (Professor in the Department of Political Science, Brown University), Harvey Glickman (chairman of the Department of Political Science, Haverford College), George F. Kennan (probably while visiting with US-SALEP), visiting Congressmen and State Department officials, four executives of the Polaroid Corporation (who were investigating whether Polaroid should continue operations in South Africa), and a commission from Princeton University (who were investigating whether Princeton should divest itself of its portfolio of stock in companies doing business in South Africa). South Africa Foundation, Annual Reports for 1969, 1970, 1971; Natal Daily News, October 2, 1967; Allen Drury, A Very Strange Society (New York, 1967), 193, 345.
Kennedy who went to South Africa in 1966 at the invitation of the National Union of South African Students. While its treatment of Kennedy may not have been typical, it does give a little more insight into the way the Foundation has worked. Shortly after Kennedy's arrival, the Foundation sponsored a dinner for the Senator in Pretoria and tried to impress upon him the great ethnic and political diversity of the country. The Foundation's directors tried to convince him that South Africa was entitled to the support of Western countries because it was strongly anti-Communist. He argued with the directors, but when he returned to the United States he wrote letters to thirty American business leaders making clear his opposition to financial disengagement from South Africa.

The results that might be achieved by assisting visitors to South Africa and impressing upon them the economic and strategic significance of South Africa can be suggested by looking into the published views of another of the visitors with whom Foundation members met in 1969, Ernest W. Lefever. A Senior Staff Member of the Foreign Policy Studies Division of the Brookings Institution, Lefever published a book on tropical Africa a year after his visit to South Africa. It was entitled Spear and Scepter, and in it Lefever observed that South Africa was of greater importance to American political, strategic, and economic interests than was all of Central Africa.

---


South Africa was much more advanced than tropical Africa by all comparative indicia:

Economically South Africa is more important than tropical Africa. U.S. private investment in the republic in 1966 was $601 million, compared to $1.5 billion for the rest of the continent combined. South Africa produced 95 per cent of all the gold mined in Africa and approximately 75 per cent of that produced outside the communist world. An industrialized state, South Africa has a per capita GNP of $530, about three times higher than the average for Africa. It generates more than half of Africa's electrical power with a per capita consumption equal to that of Western Europe. It produces ten times as much steel as all other African countries combined.79

It would appear that the Foundation's visitors program was quite successful. However, the Foundation was able to accomplish even more with a Foundation director in the United States on a full-time basis. The Foundation's representative, John Chettle, undertook a wide variety of activities to improve South Africa's image in the United States and to counteract the work of critics of South Africa.

Chettle's office produced an analysis of the Congressional resolution to end the South African sugar quota and placed it with an influential (unnamed) Democrat. He appeared on radio and television in various parts of the country, including the Today show and The Advocates. Chettle and his assistant attended meetings of the African Studies Association to rebut critics of South Africa. They pointed out errors in the television documentary "Black View of South Africa" shown on CBS in 1970 in a letter of protest to CBS President Frank Stanton. The letter was then placed in the Congressional Record by Representative O. C. Fisher of Texas and sent also to the Federal Communications Commission.80 The Annual Report of the Foundation

79Ibid.
80Interview of author with John H. Chettle and Michael
for 1969 summarized some of the other activities of the American
office as follows:

Moreover, in the first year of the Foundation's activities
in the United States, contact was made with more than 150
businessmen, including the Chairman or President of more than
30 companies, more than 30 academics, including the directors
of 5 schools of international studies and 4 schools of African
Studies; the present and a former Secretary of State; the present
and a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee;
members of the Executive including a Cabinet Member, the
Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs and several
of President Nixon's advisers on the National Security Council,
half-dozen Congressmen, numerous journalists, including the
editors or publishers of 12 newspapers or magazines; and
ambassadors, theologians, community leaders, lawyers,
foundation representatives and student leaders. 81

It should be clear from the foregoing that by 1969 the South
Africa Foundation was operating as a full-time lobbyist for South
African interests in the United States, and, indeed, as a very capable
one. The Foundation was in the advantageous position of being able
to dissociate itself from many of the more outrageous aspects of the
race policies of the South African government, while at the same time
acting as a spokesman against the critics of South Africa. It was
able to concentrate on the economic and strategic benefits which
South Africa offered to the United States and on showing the folly of
sanctions against South Africa.

By seeking out influential individuals, the Foundation reached
up to policy-making circles and at the same time the views of some of
those individuals trickled down to influence larger bodies of opinion.
The Foundation did in fact reach the highest level of policy makers.

and the FCC was not expected to produce any sort of action but it
could serve to harass critics.

The President of the Foundation had a long discussion about South Africa with President Nixon and Henry Kissinger at a time when the Administration was in the process of re-evaluating American policy on Southern Africa. The Foundation reported of the meeting that "the occasion was taken to bring to the President's notice some points which have received too little attention in the past. It would be hard to overestimate the importance to South Africa of this discussion."

Without question, the public and private groups discussed in this chapter did enjoy some success in influencing American opinions on South Africa. Yet the sinister picture painted of their activities by some of their critics was rather inaccurate. The efforts of these organizations came about largely in response to the high level of criticism of South Africa in the United States and elsewhere, criticism which often was exaggerated, shallow, and misinformed. In many instances these groups did not try to induce a belief that apartheid was a positive good; they often tried only to convince the American observer that South Africa's problems were complex and that outside pressure was undesirable as a means of promoting useful change. Those who attempted to improve the image of South Africa felt they were motivated by the desire simply to present the other side of the South African story, or to improve the chances for South Africa's survival in a hostile world. There were limitations on their efforts.

To be effective, the views promoted by the South Africa-connected groups had to have some intrinsic plausibility and merit.

---

82Ibid. It should be noted too that during the 1966 Subcommittee on Africa hearings on American policy towards South Africa, the Foundation sent each member of the Subcommittee a booklet containing essays which gave arguments for American-South African cooperation, United States-South African Relations, 524.
There was no way they could hide or avoid the many harsh realities of apartheid. Secondly, they could only influence one aspect of the image creation process; that is, they were only able to add to the information available to an individual on South Africa. They could do little to alter the basic value structures of the individuals and groups that they sought to persuade. Nor could they control events external to South Africa that played a role in the formation and alteration of images of South Africa. These factors and views of conservative Americans will be discussed in the final chapters of this study.
As the South African government and the South Africa Foundation knew when they made selections for their visitor's programs, South Africa's friends or potential friends in the United States were to be found in three discernible groups. When individual Americans came forward to speak favorably of South Africa, they usually could be identified as strong opponents of communism, as Southerners, or as businessmen associated with large corporations. The lines of distinction among these groups often blurred so that there was an overlapping of membership, particularly as to the first two categories. These Americans saw South Africa not as threatening the United States but rather as being threatened. Their favorable attitudes towards South Africa sprang from several motives: they felt that their enemies were South Africa's enemies; it was in their self-interest to present a less critical view of South Africa; or they had a generally conservative view of life. Prior to the 1960s American policy had appeared sound to these people. They felt no need to defend South Africa until activists began to pose a serious threat to a continuation of good relations between South Africa and the United States. These three groups all agreed that American policy should be to seek
cooperation with, not criticism of, South Africa.

A. The Anti-Communist Ally

If some Americans viewed South Africa as a continuing invitation to communism in Africa, there were others who believed just as strongly that South Africa was the strongest, if not the only, bastion against communism on the entire continent. To such Americans, South Africa was the only bright spot on a still dark continent not yet emerged from cannibalism. They saw South Africa's whites as the only real friends of the United States in Africa. South Africa's political stability and its strategic value, both for its resources and its position on two oceans, convinced them that South Africa was too important as an ally of the United States to engage in what they believed to be petty carping at the country's race policies.

One of the infrequent articles on South Africa that did appear in a conservative publication prior to 1960 was an essay in the July 1957 issue of American Mercury.¹ The title itself, "The Untold Story of South Africa," suggested that favorable reports on South Africa were not appearing in the 1950s. The mere fact that the Soviet Union was opposed to the Nationalist government was sufficient to indicate to the author of the article, Kent Hunter, that perhaps South Africa was not so terrible a place as the mass media made it out to be.

¹Kent Hunter, "The Untold Story of South Africa," American Mercury, LXXXV (July, 1957), 37. American Mercury was the only periodical the author examined which exhibited a complete reversal of attitude towards South Africa. Until 1952 it was very critical of South Africa. Then the magazine was purchased by Russel Maguire, and became highly conservative; see John H. Schacht, The Journals of Opinion and Reportage (New York, 1966), 12.
Hunter stated: "Incitement against the governments of the free world by Soviet agents is a story too well understood around the world to permit failure to look at both sides of the story in South Africa."²

The "other side" of the story was that Communists had been responsible for rioting by Africans in East London, South Africa, in 1952, and that many members of the multi-racial Congress of Democrats had a Communist background. A TASS radio news broadcast concerning the activities of the Congress was evidence to the American Mercury writer that "Moscow was fully informed about the operational plan of the South African agitators."³ The "other side" of the story was also that South Africa was liberal by comparison with the Soviet Union. To support this proposition the writer pointed out that Russia's ruling class amounted to only 3.4 per cent of the population whereas in South Africa the ruling whites constituted 18 per cent of the total population. Thus, the ruling class was five and one-half times greater in ratio in South Africa than in Russia.

Hunter's article in American Mercury was primarily an attempt to counter the existing negative image of South Africa. This was to be the pattern for anti-Communist conservatives writing on South Africa into the mid-1960s. Such Americans who wrote favorably on South Africa tended to do so within the framework of the unfavorable image that the critics of South Africa had been expressing throughout the previous decade. Many or most of the conservative writings on South Africa singled out specific critics of South Africa or attacked

²Hunter, "The Untold Story of South Africa," 42.

³Tbid., 41.
the views of the "liberals" generally. Often, they were not so much pro-South Africa as they were anti-liberal.

In the 1960s conservative periodicals, including the National Review, U.S. News and World Report, Human Events, American Mercury, and others, began devoting more attention to South Africa. The image of South Africa as a valuable ally of the United States against communism appeared in editorials in conservative newspapers like the Manchester, New Hampshire, Union Leader and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and in the syndicated columns of conservatives such as Senator Barry Goldwater, John Chamberlain, Ralph de Toledano, and the Robert S. Allen-Paul J. Scott Report. Some radio and television broadcasts presented this image of South Africa. Existing anti-Communist organizations, including the John Birch Society, the

Examples from each of these are cited elsewhere in this chapter.

For a publication which reprints excerpts from these papers and commentators and others, see Frank S. and Elsie B. Meyer, Some American Comments on Southern Africa (New York, 1967), 19-27; see also Vernon McKay, "Africa and the American Right," New Republic, March 26, 1966, pp. 13-16.

Vernon McKay has noted that the right-wing had a virtual monopoly on political radio programs. Such programs concentrated on Eastern Europe and Communist China in the 1940s and 1950s and turned to the cause of the whites in Southern Africa in the 1960s. Vernon McKay, "Southern Africa and Its Implications for American Policy," in William A. Hance, ed., Southern Africa and the United States (New York, 1968), 20. In addition to the television programs promoted by the South African Information Service previously discussed, the author has found that television stations occasionally gave South African officials the opportunity to answer critical programs or showed pro-South African films in response to network shows hostile to South Africa. Several shows of this nature were noted, for example, in the Natal Daily News, October 13, 1967; and October 19, 1967 (all citations to this newspaper are from the paper's clippings files in Durban, South Africa).
American Security Council, and the Liberty Lobby, took up the cudgel against South Africa's liberal critics, and new organizations were formed to disseminate more widely the anti-Communist image of South Africa.

The development of the American organization that was most prominent in expressing the anti-Communist image of South Africa, the American-African Affairs Association, reflected well the growth of interest in South Africa among conservatives. The Association, which had close ties with the conservative *National Review*, first issued its prospectus in September 1965; however, it had its origins in the mid-1950s in other Cold War issues. The Association grew out of the American Asian Educational Exchange, an organization originally concerned with Nationalist China. With the coming to independence of African countries in the late 1950s and the early 1960s, the A.A.E.E. included Africa in its interests and became the American Afro-Asian Educational Exchange.

The addition of African controversies, including that of South Africa, to the issues on which the Exchange was interested in taking a stand proved disturbing to some of the organization's members, especially to those affiliated with labor unions and to vice-chairman Senator Thomas Dodd of Connecticut. As a result the Exchange split and the American-African Affairs Association was created. 7

Co-chairmen of the Association at its founding were William A. Rusher, the publisher of the *National Review*, and Max Yergan, the

---

7For this information on the background of the Association, the author is indebted to Mr. William A. Rusher, whom he interviewed in New York City on June 12, 1972.
black sociologist who left the Council on African Affairs because of his anti-Communist convictions. The list of directors and prominent members of the Association included a number of the nation's better known conservatives such as the novelist John Dos Passos, the educator Russell Kirk, the author and columnist Victor Lasky, Henry Regnery, a publisher of conservative books, and Senator James L. Buckley, to name a few. Many so listed in the publications of the Association were writers or editors for the National Review. A comparison of several of these lists with the names of individuals who toured South Africa as guests of the South African government or the South Africa Foundation indicated that a number of the A.A.A.A. members had been chosen to make tours of South Africa.

The American-African Affairs Association was modestly funded, and its activities from its beginning resembled in method those of the anti-South African organizations in attempting to influence public opinion. The Association issued a periodic newsletter entitled Spotlight on Africa, eleven issues of which were released from 1965 through December 1968. Like its anti-South African counterparts, the Association printed a number of pamphlets on Africa; although the Association took all Africa as its concern, most of these publications were on South Africa. Because of the close, though unofficial, relationship between the Association and the National Review, members'  

8For an essay indicating a growing favorability toward South Africa by Yergan, see his "Communist Threat in Africa," in C. Grove Haines, ed., Africa Today (Baltimore, 1955), 262, 269-70. Another black anti-Communist associated with the American-African Affairs Association was George S. Schuyler. A Director of the A.A.A.A., Schuyler was also a prominent figure in the John Birch Society.
views appeared from time to time in that periodical. Publications of the A.A.A.A.A. were distributed to all members of the African Studies Association, editorial writers of all major American newspapers, syndicated columnists and commentators, all members of Congress and many other government officials (including members of the diplomatic corps), two thousand other opinion leaders, and various foreign political and public opinion leaders.9

As the prospectus of the organization indicated, the Association's activities were prompted by a desire to undo the work of the "liberals." It said that the situation with regard to Africa was similar to that of China and American intellectuals from the 1930s on:

The field is largely in the hands of semiprofessional "liberals." Through various "scholarly" publications and organizations—such as the American Committee on Africa—they repeat the same intellectual blunders in regard to developments in Africa as did the IPR [Institute of Pacific Relations] in regard to developments in China: emotionalism, naivete, wishful thinking, and a Pavlovian "liberal" view of history. Through a default in the exposition of differing points of view, another intellectual and political vacuum is being created which is capable of doing as much damage as was done by the IPR.10

The purpose of the Association was to fill that vacuum, to further the cause of knowledge concerning Africa without regard to the "prevailing shibboleths." Fate, the statement declared, had imposed an obligation on the American people "to defend the cause of human


freedom everywhere against the worldwide Communist onslaught . . . .

The fact that the Association was a response to the actions of the critics of South Africa was further indicated by the organization's first publication. It was a reprint of portions of the Carnegie Endowment's study of Apartheid and United National Collective Measures; this was an effort to expose what the Association's directors considered to be the dangerous wrong thinking of the "liberals."

South Africa's value to the United States as an ally against communism was brought out in a publication of the American-African Affairs Association written by General S. L. A. Marshall.12 Marshall had been a guest of the South Africa Foundation on a tour of South Africa and had testified before the House Subcommittee on Africa and before the International Court of Justice in favor of South Africa. In the pamphlet that he wrote for the Association he said that the United States needed all the friends it could get. South Africa, he pointed out, was an especially important one because it served both strategic and commercial purposes for the United States by virtue of its position. Quoting Admiral Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Marshall said that South Africa stood "at the crossroads of the world, both economically and militarily."13

The closing of the Suez Canal in the Arab-Israeli war of August 1967, and the possibility of American involvement in the Middle Eastern conflict, underscored and increased the importance of the Cape route.


13Tbid., 11.
Marshall expressed amazement at the capriciousness of the United States government for its policy "to exorcise South Africa, to destroy it with incantations if possible, if not, to go on to something worse, and the failure to review, or in any way modify that policy, despite developments in the Middle East that make manifest its frivolousness, hypocrisy, and dangers."\(^{14}\)

South Africa also appeared to be a very desirable friend for the United States to Anthony Harrigan, a military writer, newspaperman, and prominent figure in the conservative, anti-Communistic American Security Council. In his highly laudatory book on *The New Republic (South Africa)*, Harrigan expressed apprehension over strife and disorder in the southern hemisphere of the globe which posed a threat to North America and Europe. South Africa, he said, was important to the United States if the West were to be "fully protected against the ambitious proletarian aggressor states of the backward regions of the world."\(^{15}\) George N. Crocker, a journalist for the San Francisco *Examiner* who made a tour of South Africa as a guest of the South African government, made similar observations in his newspaper.\(^{16}\)

Not only was the South African government preventing Soviet and Chinese takeover and exploitation of the country's strategic and economic potentials, but a continuation of white rule was also forestalling the growth of communism among the Africans of South Africa.

\(^{14}\)Ibid., 2.


\(^{16}\)See above, p. 190.
As Thomas Molnar, a professor of French at Brooklyn College and a
director of the American-African Affairs Association, expressed it,
there was "little doubt that if the African National Congress and
fellow organizations came to power in South Africa, they would set
up a Communist-sympathizing 'neutralist' regime or an outright
Communist satellite."\(^{17}\) The conservative periodical *Human Events*
said of Nobel prize winner Chief Albert Luthuli, leader of the
African National Congress, that his cause was "inextricably lined up
with the cause of Communism."\(^{18}\)

How many American military and diplomatic leaders shared these
views as to South Africa's strategic value to the United States? At
this point, it is impossible to suggest what influence such individuals
had on policy. General Marshall said that he talked with a number of
military officers and defense officials and they agreed with him that
South Africa was important.\(^{19}\) Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who apparently
had a role in the decision to impose an arms embargo on South Africa,
reported that high officials in the State Department did feel that
American defense interests in South Africa outweighed the political
advantages to be gained from participation in an arms embargo.\(^{20}\)

Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, according to Schlesinger,

17 Thomas Molnar, *Africa: A Political Travelogue* (New York,
1965), 278.

18 "Bobby's African Safari," *Human Events*, June 18, 1966,
p. 4.

19 United States-South African Relations, 312; Marshall, *South
Africa: The Strategic View*, 12.

20 Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., *A Thousand Days* (New York, 1967),
536.
disagreed and said defense considerations should not stand in the way.\textsuperscript{21}

There is other evidence also that American military officials regarded South Africa as important to American defense strategy. Important South Africans indicated from time to time that they believed that this was the case. \textit{Die Transvaler}, the newspaper of which Prime Minister Verwoerd had been editor, stated that South Africa never had asked the United States for aid and yet was willing to help in the fight against communism; it went on to say:

That America in this respect has a single ally in Africa is greatly appreciated by American military circles. One can only hope that the truth will in time penetrate from the Pentagon to the Capitol and the White House.\textsuperscript{22}

As has been observed, the South Africa Foundation and the South African government sought out American military leaders for their tours of South Africa. Still another indication of the views of the military is the fact that despite the decision to stop allowing ships of the American Navy to call on South African ports, some U. S. naval vessels continued to put into South Africa.\textsuperscript{23} Finally, it should be observed that some naval officers took the view that a cessation of visits to South African ports aided United States-South African relations.

South Africa clearly did have some strategic value for the United States. Government officials and even publications critical

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., 537.


of South Africa, such as the New York Times, asserted this.\textsuperscript{24} Moral
issues aside, the question then became whether South Africa's
liabilities to the United States outweighed its advantages. A key
element in judging this was an individual's assessment of the prospects
for continued stability in South Africa.

For years, as already observed, critics of South Africa pre-
dicted revolution within South Africa. In contrast to the Americans
who saw South Africa as on the verge of a blood bath, anti-Communist
conservatives described South Africa as among the more stable countries
of the world. Less than a year after Sharpeville, two writers in the
National Review challenged the "burning fuse" thesis and showed why
they thought conditions were less suitable for an uprising in South
Africa than in any other part of the African continent. These were
Peter Duignan and Lewis Henry Gann, both scholars associated with the
Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace.

Specifically attacking the expressions of Chester Bowles in
his Africa's Challenge to America, they gave the following analysis
of conditions in South Africa:

South Africa, with by far the most mature economy, the most
highly integrated industrial apparatus, and the strongest
state machinery in Africa, is further removed from a revolu-
tionary situation (as opposed to sporadic rioting) than any
other part of the continent; nowhere are conditions less
suitable for a rising than in the land of Verwoerd.

The myth of a spontaneous revolt setting off other risings
in Africa is based on a misreading of history. It shows a
complete misunderstanding of the way revolutions are made.
. . . Revolutions must be planned, they require organization
and carefully trained cadres. Before the first shot is fired,
a successful infiltration into all positions of power, whether

\textsuperscript{24} New York Times, November 9, 1959, p. 30; United States-South
African Relations, 106, 111-12.
military, administrative or economic must have been made. The state machinery must have been fatally weakened, either by foreign war or complete internal decay. And none of these conditions apply in the Union of South Africa. The Union Government is neither weak nor seriously divided. Its armed forces and administration are both loyal and reasonably efficient. Its economy is expanding at a rate that would cause shrieks of admiration among fellow travelers, if achieved anywhere east of the Iron Curtain.  

Because there would be no revolt, American action against South Africa, such as a boycott, would accomplish little except to "deprive NATO of one of its most vital strategic positions."  

The first years of political development in the newly independent African countries did little to undermine the conservative view of South Africa's future stability. By comparison to the disarray to the north, South Africa's political and social order was placid. A writer for the John Birch Society's publication American Opinion lauded the "steadfast Union," either taking poetic license or ignorant of the fact that four years earlier the Union had become the Republic:

> From A to Z—betrayed Algeria  
> To fallen Zanzibar—a world goes down;  
> No longer the lion and the unicorn,—Hyena and jackal fighting for the crown!

Ben Bella, Nasser, Holden Roberto, slip  
The leashes from their mangy curs of war;  
They serve the Masters of the Shadow, so  
The light recedes that once shone more and more.

---

25 Peter Duignan and Lewis Henry Gann, "White and Black in Africa," National Review, January 28, 1961, p. 48. Duignan and Gann possessed certain "liberal" credentials, such as membership in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the American Civil Liberties Union, which were atypical of the anti-Communist conservatives. However, their views are included here because they conformed to the conservative viewpoint, and because they appeared in the National Review.

26 Ibid., 49.
Yet brave sun-loving men, yea-saying men,
Stand proudly firm although the sky may fall:
The steadfast Union of South Africa
The slender gallant lance of Portugal. 27

Another writer for American Opinion likewise contrasted South Africa with the rest of the "Dark Red Continent." Writing in 1966, the staff writer criticized the liberal press and called attention to:

Seven coups [in Africa] in a year, at last count, plus a few they didn't call coups. The Western Press, at such pains to make the black-ruled States seem advanced and respectable, averted its eyes from the spectacle in embarrassment. 28

South Africa's stability was attributed to the Suppression of Communism Act: "As long as it is [effectively enforced], South Africa will remain the chief bastion of sanity on the African continent." 29 Karl Marx, wrote another American Opinion contributor, was the new witchdoctor in Africa. 30

The instability in Africa indicated to General S. L. A. Marshall that there would be no great washing of the spears by Africans from north of the Limpopo in the blood of white South Africans. The belief in an African threat to South Africa, he asserted, was "pure phantasmagoria," for in the previous three years (1964-1966) twelve African governments had been shot down "like ducks in a gallery." 31 None of the African countries, said Marshall, even

29Ibid., 58.
31Marshall, South Africa: The Strategic View, 2.
had enough force to keep its own interior tranquil, much less say mount an attack on the strongest country in Africa; none showed promise of continued stability.

As the preceding discussion would suggest, those with favorable views on South Africa often took a rather dim view of the results of African independence. Conservative publications frequently spoke of black Africa in deprecating terms; indeed, they went so far as to assert that independence was a mistake. Writers in Human Events, a conservative periodical, often compared the new countries of Africa to children. For example, the publication quoted one American newspaper (the Cincinnati Enquirer) in 1960 to the effect that giving aid to Africans was like giving money to juvenile delinquents. Other articles in the magazine expressed the conviction that independence had come too soon, and that even the Africans themselves longed for the good old days of colonial rule. One such piece was entitled "White Man Come Back," and stated that the "average African republic is about as well-prepared for popular self-government as any kindergarten." After praising South Africa for its development, another writer told her readers in Human Events that to expect the Congo to make a century of progress in a decade was like expecting a newborn infant to get up from the cradle to pilot a space ship.

An American Opinion writer, Jack Moffitt, made similar

34Alice Widener, "Most of Africa is Not Ready for 'One Man, One Vote,'" Human Events, May 14, 1966, p. 6.
observations. Commenting on reports of slavery in black Africa, he stated that these were "more evidence that colonialism was ended so that barbarism could flourish." Tom Anderson, president and publisher of Farm and Ranch publications, found his own government responsible for the retreat of the West from Africa and the creation of a conglomeration of cannibal nations there who take from us with one hand and throw spears at us with the other. South Africa and Rhodesia, however, have stable, peaceful, prosperous, Christian governments. There aren't even any people-eaters there.

As might be expected from these anti-African comments, some of the anti-Communist friends of South Africa were racist in their views. Several of the more prominent members of the American-African Affairs Association were in the forefront of the historian I. A. Newby has called "scientific racism." One such individual cited by Newby was Ernest van der Haag, a professor of social philosophy at New York University and a director of the American-African Affairs Association. Van der Haag, who wrote articles in defense of American segregation, was a witness for South Africa in the South West Africa case at the International Court of Justice and testified favorably on South Africa before the House Subcommittee on Africa in 1966. Two other members of the Association, Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan T. Possany, were authors


of an important tract of scientific racism, The Geography of Intellect. In this work, Weyl and Possony indicated that they were gravely concerned about the genetic deterioration of the human race; that is, they feared that intellectually inferior races were reproducing at a faster rate than were intellectually superior races. South Africa's progress seemed to be proof of this superiority and showed the dependence of the blacks upon the more advanced whites; they rejected the view that colonialism was the cause of poverty in Africa for the "African Negro enjoys higher living standards in the Union of South Africa, where the white presence is most numerous and massive, than elsewhere." Because of this, action against the whites could only hurt the blacks of South Africa since they were incapable of maintaining the economic progress of the country: "There is nothing in the slothful and insecure progress of the Negro that suggests that he will be able to replace this elite in Africa from his own ranks at any time in the foreseeable future."

Opponents of integration in the United States were among the members of the American-African Affairs Association and were prominent in other organizations favorable to South Africa. The John Birch


39 Weyl and Possony, The Geography of Intellect, 284; see also 248-49.

40 Ibid., 284-85. See also the review of this book in Human Events, February 22, 1964, p. 8, which argued that the "masochistic racial policies of the West" involved genetic catastrophe and castigated Western policy for aiming at the subjugation or annihilation of the whites of South Africa.
Society whose publication *American Opinion* defended South Africa occasionally equated integration of the races with communism. The Citizens' Councils of America, a Southern group to be discussed shortly, similarly fought integration. Some of the leaders of the American-Southern African Council, an organization created in 1966 for increasing support for the white regimes of Southern Africa, were instrumental in setting up a racist-oriented society called the Racial Studies Committee and the American Lobby, an organization designed to offset the influence of what it termed "the ubiquitous 'civil rights' organizations."  

Apartheid was simply ignored by some of the anti-Communist conservatives. They did not discuss it in detail, suggesting in passing that South Africa was just following the only sane course available to the whites. George S. Schuyler, a black John Bircher and director of the American-African Affairs Association, expressed understanding of "the refusal of the Southern African whites to commit suicide by surrendering rule to surrounding Senegambians via One man, one vote . . . ."  

Alice Widener, who wrote for *Human Events*, similarly did no more than comment that if South Africa were to follow the policies urged on it by the West it would go the way of the Congo into chaos and steady deterioration.  

Another approach taken by some strongly anti-Communist

---

41 Undated (1968?) flyers and brochures of the American Lobby and the Racial Studies Committee in possession of the author.


43 Alice Widener, "Most of Africa is not Ready for 'One Man, One Vote,'" 6.
conservatives was to praise the wisdom of South Africa's policies while condemning the egalitarian beliefs of the countries of the West. Anthony Harrigan in his *New Republic* described South Africa as "healthy because it has rejected the levelling philosophy of so many modern nations." Criticizing the liberal intelligentsia which had an "enormous hold" on American scholarly and journalistic writing on South Africa, Harrigan said that that levelling philosophy had led to a spirit of civil disobedience and an outlook that was almost anarchist. South Africa, in contrast, had avoided "the shattered nerves, the crippling philosophy and the suicidal impulses" of the West.

Playing upon a theme similar to Harrigan's was Revilo P. Oliver, a professor of Classics at the University of Illinois and an associate editor of *American Opinion*. On several occasions Oliver wrote favorably on South Africa, portraying it as one of the Last Outposts of Western Civilization:

> I have heard of Americans who have migrated or are now migrating to South Africa or Australia, not as a permanent refuge, but in the hope that they may live a little longer and can, at least, die as men should, fighting their enemies. Are those who despair of America wrong? I cannot say categorically that they are, although I believe that we still have a chance--believe perhaps with an optimism as futile as Cicero's, that despite our churches, our schools, our Press, and our government, there is yet left in our nation enough moral integrity and intelligence for a desperate and victorious effort.

Harrigan, more hopeful, believed that South Africa could save the

---

46 Revilo P. Oliver, "Cicero," *American Opinion*, VIII (May, 1965), 71. The author met several people such as described by Oliver while he was in South Africa.
West by leading it back to light and health of mind, back "into the fruitful use of pride in vital, differentiating inequalities in mankind." 47

Still other conservatives sought to praise South Africa's policies, but from the standpoint of the benefits such policies conferred upon the black South Africans. Thomas Molnar and Russell Kirk, each a conservative educator and member of the American-African Affairs Association, both wrote favorably of aspects of the apartheid program in National Review. Molnar found desirable features in the achievement of self-government in the Transkei. He viewed the Bantustan program as a form of decolonization and foreign aid, although he did find many manifestations of apartheid grotesque and irritating. 48 Apartheid, he explained in one of his books on Southern Africa, "must not be viewed as an anomaly in a harmonious world, but as a method— one among several possible methods— of solving a particular problem by taking all the concrete elements of a situation into consideration." 49 Similarly, Russell Kirk, after visiting the African College of the North at Turfloop, said that he found much good coming from the government's efforts to educate the Africans. 50

Finally, there were conservatives who were very troubled by

47 Harrigan, The New Republic, 47.
49 Thomas Molnar, Africa: A Political Travelogue, 142-43.
apartheid but who felt that, under the complex circumstances of South Africa, few alternatives were available. The best example of this outlook was an article written by William F. Buckley, editor of *National Review*, written in late 1962 after he had spent several weeks in South Africa. Although he noted the material advancement of the Africans under apartheid, he observed:

What Dr. Verwoerd considers to be indispensable psychological conditioners for separate statehood—rigid discouragement of any social intercourse between white and black—come from the drawing boards ugly and shocking and if they are not accepted as indispensable to the introduction of a radically new regime which strives for beneficent and realizable ideals, they are indefensible.  

Buckley felt that the ideals were beneficent but he had strong doubts about the ultimate feasibility of separate development, and, as a libertarian, he feared the excessive state regulation that would be necessary to make it work.

B. The Other Laager

South Africa had a second group of friends or potential friends in the United States. These were white Southerners who felt a bond of sympathy with the white South Africans who were besieged like themselves. As with South Africans, the American news media seemed to be very hostile to them, misrepresenting them and their way of life. People who knew little of their problems were telling them how to conduct their lives, and attempting to force them to restructure their society. Governments all over the world were criticizing them, undoubtedly, thought Southerners, with much Communist encouragement. South Africa, alone of the many countries

---

of the earth, seemed to offer a parallel to the plight of the American South. It is not surprising then that white Southerners, even those who did not support segregation in the South, tended to be favorable to South Africa and to sympathize with its problems.

White Southerners often had a favorable image of South Africa despite the fact that most of the major news media was critical of apartheid. Other than newspapers (which depended on wire services that presented a harsh image of South Africa), the South had few distinctively Southern publications. Yet Southerners did develop sympathy for South Africa even from hostile reports in the media. For example, a very critical 1953 article in Life magazine on South Africa prompted a man from Winter Garden, Florida, to write to the editors of the publication: "It is good to know that a great man [Prime Minister Malan] and his people in another part of the world believe as we do here in the South. I refer to apartheid (separation of the races)."52

Prior to 1960, Southerners said little on South Africa. Nevertheless, there are indications that Southerners who had some awareness of foreign affairs did have favorable attitudes towards South Africa. The most thorough student of Southern views on international political matters, Alfred O. Hero, brought this out in his excellent study of The Southerner and World Affairs.53 Public opinion polls, examined by Hero, which were taken in the period between World


53 Alfred O. Hero, Jr., The Southerner and World Affairs (Baton Rouge, 1965).
War II and 1957 showed that Southerners were more inclined to support colonialism than were other Americans. This in itself would indicate that Southerners were more likely to be favorable towards South Africa. The tendency was intensified after 1957 as white Southerners became more and more sensitive to criticism of their society.

A study made by Hero of Southern newspapers and interviews of Southerners in the period from 1959 to 1963 revealed that Southerners did sympathize with South Africa. Although Southerners were often apathetic to foreign affairs and the interviewees were drawn from the leadership elite, Hero did find white Southern approval of and support for South Africa and its policies. The fact that his interviews showed this at the time of the Sharpeville tragedy, when most of the national news media was highly critical of South Africa, is itself revealing on the extent to which Southerners were alienated from the rest of the country. Hero said that he found segregationist newspapers and Southerners of like mind who knew something of events in Africa "were identifying to a significant extent with whites in the Congo, Angola, the Rhodesians, and especially the Republic of South Africa." The Southern sense of identity with South Africa was not, however, limited to supporters of segregation; it extended also to moderate Southerners who opposed racism.

---

54 Ibid., 186-87.
55 Ibid., 188.
56 Ibid., 188, 190, 419-20. Hero interviewed approximately 1,100 white Southerners chosen from subscription lists of some seven national and international publications that dealt with foreign affairs.
57 Ibid., 419-20.
The reason why Southerners sympathized with South Africa was not only because they felt that whites in both areas had the same outlook on race or shared a similar race problem—although this certainly was often an important element—but also because they believed that South Africa was threatened by the same forces threatening the South: liberalism, communism, the United Nations (often expressed as "world government") and the United States government. In this they were much like the anti-Communist conservatives who valued South Africa's friendship. Indeed, many Southerners were to be found among the anti-Communist group, and the distinctions between the two groups were non-existent for some individuals.

The sense of being besieged by the same forces as those threatening South Africa came out clearly in the Southern response to Sharpeville. The anti-pass demonstrations by blacks in South Africa came just as civil rights "sit-in" demonstrations were beginning in the United States. Southerners who opposed the theory of civil disobedience, rejecting the belief that unjust laws do not have to be obeyed, saw parallels between the incidents in South Africa and the demonstrations against segregation in the United States. Bringing out this position was David Lawrence, founder and publisher of U.S. News and World Report. Shortly after Sharpeville, Lawrence editorialized that the "right to demonstrate" was being abused in both the United States and South Africa. What was, he asked,

---

58 It may be open to doubt whether Lawrence should be included with Southerners. He was born in Philadelphia in 1888 and went to Washington in 1910. Washington is, or was for many years, a Southern city; Lawrence's views on many issues were essentially Southern and he was sympathetic toward the South.
the "right to demonstrate" when public officials are challenged? Did the mob of 20,000 which "marched" on the police station in South Africa—containing only 25 policemen—have the right to throw stones and taunt and threaten so that the police grew frightened and opened fire? This was an example, not of a "peaceful assembly" but of a mobocracy.59

One of the "indefensible" acts of lawlessness which Lawrence cited was the burning of passes by the Africans; these were, he thought, "identity papers required of all citizens . . . ."60

Southern newspapers did not give Sharpeville the prominence that many newspapers in other parts of the country gave it. Stories concerning Sharpeville appearing on the front pages of other newspapers were printed in the inner pages of Southern papers. Although Southern newspapers relied on the same wire services as other American papers for their stories, they indicated a somewhat different emphasis in their headlines.61 While other papers stressed white violence and American condemnation of the policies of South Africa, some Southern newspapers focused on black violence. The day after news of Sharpeville first broke, the Atlanta Constitution put the story on page two under the headline: "Africans Set Fires, Stone Firemen."62 That same

60 Ibid.
61 Some observers maintain that headlines are more important than the content of the story itself. Gay Talese in his excellent book on the New York Times, The Kingdom and the Power (New York, 1970), reports that in 1915 the Times was printing much pro-German material but the cumulative effect was very anti-German because of the subtle control of display of the news. A British citizen employee of the Times explained to another Times man, "let me control the headlines and I shall not care who controls the editorials." Ibid., 205.
day, the New Orleans Times-Picayune ran the story on page ten under the heading: "S. Africa Mobs Fired On; Negroes Burn Buildings [subhead]: Rioters Stone Firemen in New Violence." The Charlotte, North Carolina, Observer carried all of its stories on the South African turmoil on its inside pages until March 31, 1960, when it gave front page coverage to the mobilization of reserves in South Africa.

Editorial comments on Sharpeville did appear in some prominent Southern newspapers. The Atlanta Constitution printed a cautious and ambiguous statement about the West being on trial in South Africa. The Miami Herald implicitly deplored violence by both whites and blacks in South Africa, noting, however, that the criticism of South Africa by the United States government "violated the recognized international principle of non-interference in internal matters." More direct was the New Orleans Times-Picayune which criticized the State

---


65 Atlanta Constitution, April 1, 1960, p. 4. But the Constitution also printed more critical editorials on the subject which had appeared in the New York Times.

Department's action deploring the violence. It asked, "Did it [the State Department] want the policemen to surrender their authority and their lives?" The sense of identity with South Africa came out most clearly in the editorial of the Columbia, South Carolina, State, entitled "Resentment," which stated:

It seems to us that the Union of South Africa has a strong point when it tells our State Department not to concern itself with its [the Union's] domestic affairs.

There is entirely too much meddling these days, Outsiders are trying to tell the South how to run its affairs. And we rightfully resent the intrusion. So we can see how the people of South Africa would resent interference from our State Department, which the Union charges has entered the explosive race picture there without knowing all the facts regarding attacks by many thousands of Bantu (Negroes) on a small police force to whom was entrusted the duty of maintaining law and order."

As to how much the State Department knew about South Africa we are not aware, but we do know that the South is all too often criticized by those who do not have facts. And so we sympathize with the Union of South Africa.

The response to Sharpeville by the legislature of the most embattled of the Southern states indicated how extreme the views of some Southerners had become. Instead of deploring the slaying of sixty-nine Africans and the wounding of hundreds more, the Mississippi state legislature passed a resolution praising the white South Africans for their strong stand in favor of segregation. Introduced by a student at the state university, Phillip D. Bryant, the resolution

---

67 New Orleans Times-Picayune, March 24, 1960, sec. 1, p. 16. The Times-Picayune conceded that there might be just grievances against the pass system but said that this did not warrant interference. The paper thought that the State Department was attempting to curry the favor of the new African states.

was passed by a vote of seventy-eight to eight in the House and forty-five to none in the state Senate. The resolution said that mob demonstrations and disorders had been part of an effort to overthrow South Africa's segregation policies and that "there exists a definite parallel between events in that country and recent disorders in the Southern States of the United States." It commended the South African government for "its steadfast policy of segregation and the staunch adherence to their traditions in the face of overwhelming external agitation." Copies of the resolution were sent to South Africa, to the American Secretary of State, and to the press.

Also expressing criticism of the State Department for its Sharpeville statement was Olin D. Johnston, United States Senator from South Carolina. Johnston called on the Congress to censure the State Department for its criticism of South Africa. He urged the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to investigate the American government's action and to "put an end to the development of any policy within the State Department to continue meddling in our internal affairs by other nations." A year or so later, the Jackson, Mississippi, Clarion-Ledger expressed more colorfully the same fear of a precedent for foreign intervention in American racial problems: "If and when South Africa's hide is nailed to the U. N. barn door, African extremists can use the same pressure tactics against Mississippi

69 General Laws of the State of Mississippi 1960, Chapter 519, House Concurrent Resolution No. 67.

70 Congressional Record, 86th Cong., 2nd Sess., 6363 (March 23, 1960).
and other Southern states."71 Dixie's turn, the paper warned, might come later.

It should be pointed out that the fear that American criticism of or action against South Africa might lead to greater foreign criticism of the United States was not peculiarly Southern, and it probably did act as a real restraint on American policy. The Cleveland Plain Dealer expressed misgivings about United Nations discussions of South Africa after Sharpeville (and, by implication, American approval of those discussions). It asked: "If the U. N. can intervene in South African racial situations, what is to prevent the Soviet Union, or South Africa, for instance, from introducing a resolution in the U.N. Security Council demanding condemnation of the United States because Negroes are deprived of the right to vote in certain sections of Alabama and Mississippi?"72 The Christian Science Monitor likewise stated that "in taking such a position [approving United Nations discussion of apartheid] the American Government invites some searching questions as to its own attitudes toward the racial problem in the southern states."73 Writers in several other non-Southern newspapers expressed similar sentiments.74

Various members of Congress from the Deep South, in addition to Senator Johnston, went on record in the 1960s in favor of Southern

---


African causes or actively opposed American policy in that part of the continent. Senator Strom Thurmond, a South Carolinian who headed the Dixiecrat movement in 1948, and Representative Albert Watson, also of South Carolina, both took part in American-Southern African Council activities. Senator James Eastland, a conservative Mississippian, maintained a correspondence with S. E. D. Brown of South Africa. Brown was the publisher of the most conservative English language publication in South Africa and was a contributor to the John Birch Society's American Opinion. Representative John Bell Williams, also of Mississippi, spoke out occasionally on the importance of South Africa to the United States, stating that it was the "only effective pro-Western nation on the African continent." After George M. Houser of the American Committee on Africa and others attempted to fly into South Africa against that government's wishes, Representative Thomas G. Abernathy, another Mississippi Congressman, spoke against their being allowed to use their American passports to meddle in the affairs of another country.

77 E.g., S. E. D. Brown, "From Africa," American Opinion, VIII (June, 1965), 47-49. An examination of old copies of the South African Observer indicated that Brown had other correspondents and readers in the South.
Senator Allen Ellender of Louisiana caused a furor in 1962 by expressing favorable views on South Africa during a tour of Africa. While in South Africa he announced that from what he had seen of Africa, Africans were not ready for self-government. South Africa, he was quoted as saying, "seems to have the right idea with its policy of racial separation." He later amplified these views in a long report in which he concluded that apartheid was the only possible policy for South Africa. Ellender's fellow Senator from Louisiana, Russell Long, spoke strongly in favor of granting South Africa a larger sugar import quota after the House had reduced the administration's recommended amount. South Africa, he pointed out, had stood by the United States at a time when the United States had faced a sugar shortage. In addition, Representatives Joe D. Waggonner and John R. Rarick, both from Louisiana, went on record as strong supporters of South Africa as an anti-Communist ally of the United States.

Prominent state politicians in the South who were exponents of segregation likewise expressed sympathy for South Africa. Governor Lester Maddox of Georgia met with three members of the South African Parliament touring the United States in 1968. The South Africans were

80 "Foot in Mouth Disease," Newsweek, December 17, 1962, p. 42.
82 Congressional Record, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 27,526 (October 20, 1965).
83 Ibid., 90th Cong., 1st Sess., 18,601 (July 12, 1967); 24,079 (August 24, 1967).
told by Governor Maddox: "I want you to know that the Government of Georgia is standing with you." George Wallace declared in 1968 that if he were elected president, one of the first acts of his administration would be to end the sanctions being enforced against South Africa and Rhodesia.

Spokesmen for segregation in the South who did not hold public office also expressed sympathy and support for South Africa. James J. Kilpatrick, for example, was an Oklahoma-born journalist who went to work for the Richmond News Leader in 1941. He gained notoriety in the mid-1950s for espousing the revival of the old states-rights theory of state "interposition" to nullify federal laws and supreme court decisions. In the 1960s he became a strong advocate for South Africa in the Richmond paper, in his nationally syndicated column, in the National Review and Human Events, and as a member of the American-African Affairs Association. Similarly, Thomas R. Waring, editor of the Charleston, South Carolina, News and Courier, was a defender of Southern segregation in the 1950s who became a spokesman for South Africa in the 1960s.

Strong too in support of the white government of South Africa were the Southerners whose views were aired in the Citizen. The Citizen was the publication of the Citizens' Councils of America, an organization based in Jackson, Mississippi, which was in the forefront

---
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of the organized opposition to desegregation of the South. The *Citizen* began to support South Africa and Rhodesia with enthusiasm after William J. Simmons, the Councils' administrator and editor of *Citizen*, made a tour of those countries in 1966 as a guest of the South African government.

Simmons summarized his views on South Africa in an address to a joint meeting of the Association of Citizens' Councils of Mississippi and the Jackson Citizens' Council. After commenting on the growing Southern interest in South Africa (and South African interest in the South), Simmons told those assembled that it was increasingly clear "that our destiny here in the South is entwined with that of South Africa." If South Africa succeeded, he said, the South's cause was helped; and if it failed, the South's cause was hurt. This was in part because the same tactics were being used against both: "Sanctions have been and are being used against both Southern Africa and the Southern states in an undisguised campaign to bring about black rule . . . ."  

Apartheid to Simmons was a worthwhile and successful method of fostering racial harmony and engendering racial pride in both black and white groups. He found South African blacks "more settled and stable than American Negroes," and possessing more human dignity. South Africa, he continued, did not have a race problem "any more

---


than we in the South had a race problem." Wistfully, Simmons reflected in his address on how different things would have been in the South "if United States leaders [had] exhibited a fraction of the wisdom, realism, and restraint shown by South African leaders, and if the same integrity of purpose [had] permeated lower echelons of our government . . . ."

Apparently one of Simmons' colleagues on the Citizen, Robert B. Patterson, the Executive Secretary of the Citizens' Councils, did not believe it was too late for the United States to begin emulating South Africa. In reference to the United States, Patterson asked in an editorial: "Why Not Separate Development?" Six months later he wrote a similar editorial under the heading "Separate Development Seen as a Solution."

It is not surprising that strong advocates of segregation or white supremacy were favorable towards South Africa. But it would be a mistake to believe that such support was limited to racial extremists in the South. Moderate Southerners who accepted or favored integration in the South also often had sympathy for South Africa. Such individuals, however, seldom had occasion to express their views in print.
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They knew, too, that to speak out favorably on South Africa meant that they were almost inevitably associated in other people's minds with those who joined the Citizens' Councils and the John Birch Society.

In spite of the fact that the published expression of few such moderate Southerners have been found, it is worthwhile to look in depth at the views of three of these. The individuals represent different parts of the South and vary in degree of sophistication and education. Their views illustrate some of the factors involved in image creation with regard to South Africa. While the fact that all three visited South Africa made them somewhat atypical, nonetheless their opinions are indicative of the ways in which thoughtful Southern moderates probably regarded South Africa. The three whose views will be discussed are Frederick Willetts, a Wilmington, North Carolina businessman; Hodding Carter, the publisher of a Greenville, Mississippi newspaper, and Rene Williamson, a professor of political science at Louisiana State University. Common to their views were a feeling of affinity with the Afrikaners, a belief that conditions for Africans were improving under separate development programs, a distaste for various aspects of apartheid policies, and a belief that the whites of South Africa were capable of making reforms essential for racial peace and stability in that country.

Frederick Willetts made a business trip to Johannesburg in September 1959. He was attending an International Congress of Building Societies and Savings and Loan Associations, of which he was a Council member. Upon his return he wrote a small book on his journey and had it published in his home town. In it he brought out his admiration for the Afrikaners, whom he found to be "wonderful
people possessing many stalwart virtues . . ."\(^{92}\) They were, he continued, "well equipped by temperament and tradition to cope with the 20th Century."\(^{93}\)

South Africa was not quite as Willetts had expected it to be. He discovered that the reporting on South Africa with which he was familiar had portrayed only the worst aspects of the situation there; the reporting was too sensational. Prospects for the future were, in his opinion, hopeful for improving race relations rather than worsening them. Racial tensions, he said, were becoming less as the African realized "the interest of the government in helping to raise his standard of living and to improve his economic life generally."\(^{94}\) For two decades the whites had "performed economic and social miracles" for both black and white. He believed that the government was doing everything possible to provide proper housing, medical care, and recreational facilities for the Africans.

Willetts did not feel that the existing policy of apartheid was suitable for South Africa's future; instead, he believed change would be necessary. The policy was, he believed, the result of fear on the part of the whites. But that fear was justified, because the Africans had barely been brought into civilization. They were, he said, backward, indifferent toward work, and reluctant to make use of the good farmland (some of the best in the country) that they had.\(^{95}\)


\(^{93}\)Ibid.

\(^{94}\)Ibid., 58-59.

\(^{95}\)Ibid.
The second Southern moderate to be discussed was considerably more prominent. He is Hodding Carter, the editor and publisher of the Greenville, Mississippi, Delta Democrat-Times. For his courageous opposition to segregation in the South through his newspaper he won a Pulitzer Prize in 1946. Carter made a visit to South Africa in 1959 under the auspices of the United States-South African Leader Exchange Program. His views appeared in, among other places, an article in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "We Never Felt More at Home."

The Carters felt at home in South Africa because of the strong similarities in the histories of the South and South Africa. The Boers of 1900, Carter wrote, were the outnumbered Confederates of the 1860s. The English were the Yankees, and just as in the United States up to the time in which Carter wrote (and later) "the English-Yankees still have most of the money in the land that the Boer-Southerners run." He found that in background, behavior, and outlook the Afrikaners were more like Southerners than any other people in the

____________________

96 It should be pointed out that Carter had favorable views of South Africa before going to South Africa. As he told the House Subcommittee on Africa:

Two of my uncles were mining engineers in South Africa. One fought on the side of the Boers in the Boer War. Another one lived out his life there. I had six first cousins born there. I have known about South Africa, even though I have visited it only once, ever since I could remember. I grew up full of admiration for the Zulus as well as the others.
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98 Ibid., p. 45.
world. The folk similarity was, he said, all but complete: they both had a farm background, the Dutch Reformed Church was much like the Presbyterian Church of the Scots-Irish who settled in the South, there was respect for patriarchial authority in both regions, and both peoples had the same "strong self-identifying affection for their beset land."  

Carter was very critical of some aspects of apartheid, just as he was critical of the South. In fact, he said South Africa was a police state with respect to surveillance of the Africans. Nevertheless, he apparently believed that apartheid was in part justified, for he said he agreed with most white South Africans that there should not be an immediate end to segregation nor unrestricted suffrage for the Africans. Carter appeared before the House Subcommittee on Africa in 1966 and made this point more strongly when he stated that suffrage for the Africans would have to be limited:

otherwise you would have more than three million people, who have built a culture of which anyone could be proud, and who are building an industrial society and much else besides who I know would go down tomorrow if this Uhuru went the full way and the 12 million black Africans would have the right to vote completely on racial grounds. The white man would be run politically and other ways into the sea.  

In Carter's view, there were liberalizing forces at work in South Africa and other signs that were encouraging for the future.

99 Ibid., 45-46.

100 Despite his strong denunciation of much of apartheid, Carter's story drew letters to the editor suggesting that Carter and like-minded Southerners should all emigrate to South Africa. See the letters to the editor, Saturday Evening Post, March 5, 1960, p. 6.
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Contributing to this view was the contrast that he found between the South and South Africa. There was more academic freedom in South Africa's state-supported institutions than in similar institutions in the South. South African newspapers were more critical of the inequalities of the segregationist system than were their Southern counterparts. There were black publications as well as white publications in South Africa. Moreover, the parties in South Africa in opposition to the government "provide[d], to a far greater degree than [was] the case in our South, persistent opposition to immoderate race policies." Indeed, he saw the possibility of apartheid being ended by the white groups voting it out of the system. As he told a disbelieving Subcommittee member, Representative Benjamin Rosenthal of New York, in the 1966 Congressional hearings: "[M]any white South Africans, including the Dutch, the Boers, are inclined to make concessions."

The final Southern moderate whose views will be treated here is Rene Williamson, a professor of political science at Louisiana State University. In the spring of 1969 Williamson spent two months in South Africa as a visiting professor at the University of Natal. As a result of his stay there he was moved to write a paper entitled "Impressions of South Africa," which was one of the most sophisticated discussions of South Africa by anyone with a Southern background.104
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Like nearly all Southerners who were favorable to South Africa, Williamson felt especially warm to the Afrikaners because of the historical parallels between the whites of the two regions:

In many ways the Afrikaner resembles our own white Southerners, and that is probably why I felt a strong sense of kinship with him despite the language difference. Like our Southerner, the Afrikaner is an agrarian, a fundamentalist church-centered Protestant, a race conscious individual, a victim of a lost war and painful reconstruction, and the object of economic inferiority.  

But he also found attractive the peoples of other races in South Africa, and the land itself. The country was "a fairyland of bright blue skies and golden sunshine . . . ."106 Added to this was the fact that there was "none of the sharp 'Yankee Go Home' or bitter criticism of American policies that one finds in most other countries nowadays."107

As was true with other moderate Southerners, Williamson found that there were aspects of apartheid that he did not like. The security measures he pointed out had "all the earmarks of a police state"; the worst of these was the provision for ninety-day detention of individuals without trial.108 Indeed, he did not believe that complete separation could ultimately be achieved because of the interdependence of blacks and whites in the economy.

In spite of his dissatisfaction with apartheid, Williamson believed that limitations on the franchise, segregation, and white leadership were politically necessary for the foreseeable future.

105Ibid., 6-7.
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Echoing Carter, he stated: "I can see no other way to avoid retrogression into barbarism or a descent into massacres like those taking place in Nigeria [during the civil war there between the Ibos of secessionist Biafra and the rest of the country]." Williamson rejected the notion that segregation was inherently evil. Segregation was philosophically and politically acceptable if it was beneficial to all concerned, conducive to the common good, and not contrary to the will of the people concerned. The South African argument for segregation was strengthened, in Williamson's view, by the fact that black nationalists in the United States were making essentially the same argument for racial separation. The test, he said, of segregation lay not in its concept but in its practice:

It is the implementation of segregation that determines whether it is good or evil, and the test lies in its effects on human welfare and happiness. There is a liberal orthodoxy that gets in our way here, and we need to study the question with fresh minds.  

South Africa, concluded Williamson from his visit, had been at least partially misrepresented abroad. One of the reasons for this was that Americans viewed black South Africans and black Americans as though they were politically and culturally the same. This was far from the truth, he felt, because black Americans were culturally part of Western civilization. Black South Africans were, for the most part, not, a consideration which gave justification for a limitation of political rights and for segregation.

Williamson, together with the other moderate Southerners
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discussed here, saw certain beneficial results from the South African government's policies, and he expected future liberal developments within the white groups in South Africa. Although harsh in its implementation, he observed that the pass system was preventing the further growth of shanty towns and ghettos. Government officials were working very hard to improve African agricultural techniques, and at times were trying to aid the Africans by manipulating employment categories to permit higher pay for them. He found hopeful the government's "outward" policy of seeking dialogue with other African countries and the growth of a verligte (enlightened) wing of the governing Nationalist Party. Also encouraging was the opposition of many English-speaking South Africans to the harshness of the government's race policies. Such opposition stood in considerable contrast to what he had known of segregation in the American South. Describing a demonstration at the University of Natal in Durban he commented:

I doubt very much that even the most liberal, progressive, and academically distinguished universities in our South would have gone this far when the segregation crisis was at its height—and we had the federal government on our side!11

As a desirable political development, Williamson expressed the hope that the verligtes of the Nationalist Party would break away and join with the United Party to bring about a more moderate race policy.

White Southerners, then, whether conservative or moderate on race issues in the South, tended to identify with South Africa and to have sympathy for the plight of white South Africans. They drew parallels between their own background and the history of the Afrikaners. Although some of them disapproved of American segregation, 

11Ibid., 11.
they were willing to accept, at least temporarily, a policy based on segregation in South Africa. They were much more inclined to see progress in South Africa and hope for future political liberalization than were other Americans. Perhaps this was because they saw that racial progress in the United States was being identified, rather falsely, with symbolic victories over prejudice, and thus they were more keenly aware of the economic focus of South African efforts at racial progress. Perhaps, too, they had seen how much white Southerners had changed in attitude in a generation and thus saw this possible in South Africa. Indeed, there was an ironic inversion of C. Vann Woodward's view of the contrast between Northern optimism and Southern pessimism.\(^{112}\) It was the South that saw the possibility of progress in South Africa; it was Southerners who were optimistic for the future.

C. The Only Real Industrial Complex South of Milan

The third identifiable group which had or was likely to have favorable attitudes towards South Africa was American business. Americans were economically involved in South Africa at least from the time when diamonds were first dug at Kimberly and gold first discovered on the Witswatersrand. South Africa was regarded favorably by businessmen as an important trading partner for the United States and as a place for profitable financial investment. Moreover, they viewed South Africa as a country possessing a responsible business community which looked to the future welfare of the country.

After World War II there was a rush to riches in South Africa

just as there had been earlier gold and diamond rushes. Individual fortuneseekers now, however, had been replaced by the polished representatives of large business and industrial concerns. For a variety of reasons South Africa appeared to be an excellent area for investment, for expansion of existing industry, and for export marketing.

During World War II South Africa not only had been far from the fighting fronts, but had also experienced an expansion of its industry and economy as a result of the war. Business Week listed some of the reasons why South Africa looked so attractive after the war. Because of its annual gold output worth over $400,000,000, South Africa had a strong dollar exchange position. Local industries were available for subcontracting and for supplying raw materials when needed. A helpful government, favorable to foreign investment, was more than willing to aid American firms getting started in South Africa. Skilled workers were emigrating from Britain and Europe to the country, and cheap, unskilled labor was readily available. In addition, the periodical pointed out that there was a growing market for all sorts of goods within the Union and elsewhere in southern Africa. Such favorable conditions were virtually unduplicated in any other country in the world. Dozens of major American firms started or expanded operations in South Africa.

Typical of the outlook of businessmen viewing South Africa in the immediate post-war period was a report on "Why South Africa Rates A-1 for Export" by Raymond L. Hoadley, the financial editor of

Aviation magazine. The Union of South Africa, he wrote, was an exporter's dream—a wealthy young country where the importer may purchase any product from the United States in any amount he sees fit—without government import or exchange permits required. The trade is unfettered by any artificial restraints. What other markets fit this description?114

In many respects, said Hoadley, South Africa was "the best country in the world for our manufactured goods."115

Another business periodical, Fortune, reported on the success of the O'okiep Copper Company in South Africa. This was an American firm which took part in a United States government program in World War II to expand production of strategic materials.116 The company had been able to repay its loan quickly and had continued to make substantial profits after the war. Fortune noted that a consequence of O'okiep's experience had been to make American capital think well of South Africa, and that American investment companies were sending representatives to the country to examine the prospects for further activities in South Africa.117

Business expectations were more than fulfilled. Total American exports to South Africa rose from $69,000,000 in 1939 to
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$227,000,000 in 1946, an increase of three hundred per cent.\textsuperscript{119}

Although rising less dramatically thereafter, the figure for total exports increased to $285,000,000 in 1957 and by 1965 it was at the level of $438,000,000.\textsuperscript{120} More significant than the amount and value of the goods exported to South Africa was the fact that the United States almost always imported less from South Africa than it exported there. This meant that the United States maintained a favorable balance of trade with South Africa throughout most of the period after World War II. For example, in 1957 the United States imported only $101,000,000 worth of goods and materials from South Africa; the 1965 figure was $226,000,000.\textsuperscript{121}

The amount of direct American private investment in South Africa also increased considerably in the postwar period. It rose from $87,000,000 in 1943 to $194,000,000 in 1952.\textsuperscript{122} By 1966 it was more than $601,000,000 with almost 300 American businesses operating...


\textsuperscript{121}As Alexander Trowbridge, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business, told the House Subcommittee on Africa, the "surplus for the United States stemming from our trade with South Africa in 1965 furnished over 4 percent of our global trade surplus in 1965. Thus, U.S. trade with South Africa contributes to the favorable U.S. balance of trade position." United States-South African Relations, 44.

directly in South Africa. The return on investments there throughout the postwar period has been quite high, with firms enjoying a return of twenty-seven per cent or more. By the mid-1960s annual earnings on American investments in South Africa were over $100,000,000, and South Africa ranked as the seventeenth largest area for American private investment in the world. With such rewards available for American industry, it is not surprising that President Eisenhower's Secretary of Commerce, Sinclair Weeks, praised South Africa for its "adherence to free trade principles and its firm belief in the private enterprise system."126

Throughout the century South Africa has been the most important area in sub-Saharan Africa for both trade and investment. In spite of the fact that some Americans looked to black Africa as a region for growing American economic activity, South Africa held on to the largest share of American business even after the independence of most of the African countries. It continued to be the most attractive field for business. To be sure, Sharpeville did cause some consternation in the business community. For several years afterward there was a net flight of capital from South Africa. Nevertheless, it was only

a few months after Sharpeville that a large loan was extended to South Africa by American bankers and businessmen, and within a year or two after the 1960 tragedy a number of American firms, particularly the large automobile manufacturers, authorized major expansion in South Africa.\footnote{127}

The first decade of African independence did little to change the views of American business about the attractiveness of South Africa as compared with other countries on the African continent. In contrast to the revolutions taking place in black Africa and the socialist nature of many African countries' economies, South Africa remained prosperous, stable, and essentially capitalistic.

American businessmen and business publications contrasted South Africa with the newly independent countries elsewhere on the continent when they looked to the prospects for business activity in South Africa. For example, a Vice-President of the American-owned Newmont Mining Company, Marcus Banghart, was quoted in 1962 as commenting that South Africa "offers better promise for stability than untried social and political reforms in other areas."\footnote{128} Making similar observations, a journalist reported in the \textit{U.S. News and World Report} that South Africa was in the midst of a boom and was not facing imminent revolution. The economic picture was highly favorable for investors, he said, and the standard of living was improving for all.


the races in South Africa. As to the future of the country, he stated:

South Africa's resources remain vast. Internal unrest is negligible. The impression you get here is of a country that is in the midst of dynamic expansion—and rolling along on the crest of a boom unequalled anywhere else in the world at this time.129

Even more effusive in his praise of South Africa's accomplishments was John Davenport, the editor of the business publication Fortune. The very title of his report was designed to draw the reader's attention to the contrast between South Africa and the rest of the continent: "The Only Real Industrial Complex South of Milan."130 Complaining of the "angry clouds of rhetoric" raised against South Africa, he said that the controversy over the country's race policies had obscured the achievements of its dynamic economy. He reminded his readers of those achievements. Half of all the automobiles on the entire African continent were registered in South Africa. Half of the continent's telephones were in South Africa, and half its electricity was generated there. With only six per cent of the total population of Africa, he continued, South Africa created twenty-five per cent of its industrial output. In average income per capita South Africa led all other African countries by a wide margin.131

The difficulties encountered by multinational corporations attempting to do business in the newly independent African countries were spelled out in detail in a Business International research report
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entitled Prospects for Business in Developing Africa. Business International is a special publication which provides business firms with up to date information on world business developments. The 1970 report said that black Africa's "short history has been characterized by political and economic chaos, set-backs, and disappointments, as well as bright examples of solid progress." The publication predicted some movement in the 1970s away from the "ostentatious politicking" of Africa's rulers but warned:

Despite the breakthrough to realistic economic thinking, one cannot assume that Africa will now settle into the business-like mold of Western industrial powers. African business dealings are often still paralyzed by people who feel that "if we can't do it our way, it's best not to do it at all." The necessary change in attitude, the report said, would come to Africa only slowly.

Business International listed a number of specific problems that businessmen would have to deal with in Africa. One of the most important of these was the "almost universal lack of entrepreneurial spirit among African people." The concept of trade and commerce was, it said, essentially alien to the masses of black Africa. It warned of the political headaches that they would have to face, stating "day to day domestic politics will continue to hinder progress and present multinational companies with serious problems for years
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Bribes, or their equivalents (such as hiring relatives of politicians or paying "consulting fees" to political figures), had to be considered as part of normal business expenses.

In contrast, a report on South Africa two years later by the same business reporting service stated that South Africa "has a favorable attitude toward the free enterprise system and has a record of efficiency and honesty in its dealings." It found the possibility of future internal or external turmoil "very unlikely." The report noted that despite external criticism of South Africa, more and more foreign business firms were setting up manufacturing operations in South Africa. An Information Guide for Doing Business in South Africa by the American multinational accounting firm Price, Waterhouse similarly gave favorable comments on business prospects in South Africa. It stated one of the important reasons why the country was attractive to foreign investors:

For the reason that its legislative and business structure and the traditions of its people of European descent are those of the western world, it follows the general business concepts of that world and thus its economy is mainly one of private ownership and free enterprise.

All this is not to say, however, that American business was entirely happy with South Africa. Investment there by American firms, it should be pointed out, was not completely voluntary. Concerned about the country's trade deficits, the South African government at
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various times severely limited the repatriation of capital. With nowhere else to go the money was reinvested in South Africa. Local content laws made demands on American businessmen, requiring them to make extensive new outlays of capital within the country. In 1962 the government began a local content program that required that by a set date a certain percentage of each automobile sold in South Africa be made from locally produced components. Manufacturers were forced then to choose between withdrawing from South Africa and expanding their plants. They chose the latter.

Local content requirements perhaps reflected a certain hostility to outside investors. But they also manifested the strong South African desire to be self-sufficient in all areas of the economy. Self-sufficiency was an effort to prepare for sanctions as well as an attempt to forestall them. In order to encourage the growth of South African-based business, the government was often unwilling to grant long-term permits to foreign firms for carrying on business. This, of course, did not please American firms which were faced with uncertainty about whether they should expand their activities or whether it would be more profitable in the long run to sell their operations before their facilities became obsolete.

In addition, American business spokesmen and publications expressed the view that the government, and the Afrikaners as a group, let ideology or prejudice get in the way of good business. Restrictions on African migration, job classification, and other aspects of apartheid did not promote optimal conditions for the conduct of business. Indeed, the Afrikaners were portrayed frequently as backward and unprogressive in outlook. The English-speaking, by
way of contrast, were seen as progressive, enlightened and good businessmen.

Just after the 1948 Nationalist victory, the "Business" section of Newsweek brought out the differences between the two groups of whites and explained what these meant for the American business community. The article stated:

Until two weeks ago the Union of South Africa looked to a growing number of American businessmen and bankers like a promising field for expanding trade and investment. Then came the sudden election turnover. Field Marshal Jan Smuts and his British-oriented United Party were turned out of office by a narrow majority. Power passed to Dr. Daniel Malan and the ultra-isolationist, racist, and anti-British Nationalist Party, a strong group of Boers who speak more for the Afrikaan farmer than for finance and industry.139

South Africa was, it said, on the "threshold of a great boom," but the rosy prospects had been clouded by the Nationalist victory.

This approach continued to be taken by business publications throughout the period after 1948. Reporting on civil unrest in South Africa in 1952, Business Week expressed the opinion that the source of racial strife was to be found in the differing business outlooks of the Afrikaners and the English-speaking:

At bottom, the struggle today is the same as it was 50 years ago. On one side is the Afrikaans farmer who hates industrialization, urbanization, and political liberalism. On the other side is the British business and professional man who wants to promote a modern industrial society.140

Editorializing some eight years later on the Sharpeville deaths, Fortune magazine expressed virtually the same view:

---


The difference between English-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking whites is better explained by the fact the latter group is dominated by its farmers, who are relatively isolated from world currents and who utilize Negro labor for tasks requiring little education or skill. The English-speaking community, on the other hand, is business-oriented. 141

Because of these different orientations of the two white groups, said Fortune, the government was pursuing backward race and business policies while business, i.e., primarily the English-speaking, took a more progressive attitude. Similarly, Business Week observed a year later:

Organized commerce, dominated by English speaking South Africans, is trying to head off this fate [racial chaos] by urging the government to shelve its Bantustan projects, to allow Africans to develop productive skills in urban industries, to increase African purchasing power through higher wages, and generally to adopt a more enlightened policy. 142

The pattern of portraying bad Afrikaners versus good English-speaking businessmen was modified in the 1960s as economic conditions changed somewhat in South Africa. Afrikaners rose to higher levels in businesses as more of them moved from the farms to the urban areas.


and as Afrikaner groups proved more successful in uplifting the volk, with the help, of course, of the Nationalist government. Afrikaner businessmen, such as Anton Rupert, who controlled one of the largest tobacco industries in the world, and Jan Marais, who introduced more progressive banking practices to South Africa, received some favorable treatment from the press in the United States, particularly as they expressed opposition to apartheid.  

Some statistical data is available on views of American businessmen on South Africa. Although not very reliable, it is at least some indication of how American businessmen in South Africa felt towards the government and its race policies. The information is the result of several surveys undertaken in 1968-1969 by the South African firm, Market Research Africa, Ltd. In the July 1969 survey three hundred questionnaires were sent out to American and Canadian businessmen based in South Africa. Only about thirty-five per cent of the forms were returned by the respondents. The businessmen in this poll and in the poll taken the previous year indicated that if they were South Africans they would have supported the three principal (white) political parties in the following percentages:  


The businessmen were also asked whether South Africa's racial policies represented "an approach that is, under the circumstances at least, an attempt to develop a solution." In 1968 eighty-one per cent responded affirmatively and in 1969 seventy-seven per cent gave the same answer.145

These polls provide some confirmation for the conclusions derived from reading the published views of businessmen on South Africa. American businessmen tended to prefer the English-speaking South Africans to the Afrikaners, and they believed that conditions in South Africa gave at least partial justification for apartheid. On the latter point it should again be pointed out that Americans who spent any length of time in South Africa were inclined to be less critical of its race policies than others. John Davenport, the editor of Fortune, observed and commented on this after his 1966 journey to the country. He stated:

Living in daily contact with the realities of South Africa, businessmen tend to be more relaxed and more open-minded about its race problem than many critics at home, precisely because they realize its complexity.146

Some American businessmen clearly did favor apartheid; perhaps some who were sent to represent their corporations in South Africa were selected because of their racial views. But this is not to suggest that most American businessmen thought that apartheid was the most desirable policy. Rather, they saw it more as a necessary evil,
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one which got in the way of sound business practices, which was often harsh, but which produced benefits for blacks as well as whites and adjusted relations between peoples of differing levels of civilization.

Typical of this approach was Clarence B. Randall, a former president of Inland Steel Corporation and author of several books on public affairs and capitalism. Randall visited South Africa in 1962 with the assistance of the South Africa Foundation. Much that Randall observed during his visit was not to his liking. He "boiled with hot anger" at some of the requirements of the South African government.¹⁴⁷ He declared that he could not

stomach the intrusions into personal liberty; the constant carrying of identification cards; the requiring of passes for both the white man and the black man when either enters territory reserved for the other; house arrest and detention solely upon accusation of the police; the separation of husband and wife after years of wedded life; judicial determination of race; the denial of nonwhites of the right to own land in freehold in an urban area; the recent decree that requires professional societies such as law and medicine to enforce segregation; and the Sabotage Act.¹⁴⁸

But he went on to say that the doctrine of apartheid had to be considered in light of the population differences. Some sort of restrictions had to be placed on the exercise of political rights by the Africans. As he saw it:

Only the incredibly naive can honestly believe that political democracy--"one man, one vote"--will at once solve this complex problem. The sober truth is that it would probably create chaos.

¹⁴⁷Clarence B. Randall, "South Africa Needs Time," Atlantic, CCXI (May, 1963), 77. This was reprinted as "Why South Africa Needs Time," in Reader's Digest, LXXXIII (August, 1963), 151-55. See also Clarence B. Randall, "Do We Understand the New Africa?" in Sarah Gertrude Millin, comp., White Africans Are Also People (Cape Town, 1966), 79-99.

from which the country might never recover.\textsuperscript{149}

Apartheid also had to be weighed against the "highly creditable record of conduct" of the white population in providing benefits for the blacks. The blacks had the highest per capita income for Africans on the continent. Some eighty per cent, he observed, of the children were in school, with many Africans studying at the university level or practicing in professions.

Time, said Randall, would provide solutions to the problems of South Africa. He felt that the Bantustan program was proving successful and would continue to move forward. There were liberalizing forces at work within the Dutch Reformed Church, the business community, and the press. Expressing the conviction that the whites of South Africa knew they had a great responsibility and would live up to its demand, he stated: "At heart they are our kind of folk. In the end, they will do right."\textsuperscript{150}

Another businessman who held opinions similar to Randall's was Stanley Shaw, editor of the Whaley-Eaton Service (a service reporting on foreign political and economic developments affecting American business). Shaw had also made a trip to South Africa at about the same time as did Randall, and he found the country "trying desperately to improve the economic status of its so-called downtrodden."\textsuperscript{151}

Conditions for Africans were improving, and Shaw believed that political
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\item \textsuperscript{151}Stanley N. Shaw, "The Truth About South Africa," \textit{U.S. News and World Report}, November 19, 1962, p. 115. This was evidently a shortened version of Shaw's business newsletter.
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advancement would accompany economic progress. In time, he said, apartheid would be modified: "From separateness will come unity and equal rights."¹⁵²

Randall, Davenport, Shaw and others were of the opinion that economic forces in South Africa were working to mitigate the harshness of apartheid and to lay the foundations for greater trust and cooperation among the races of the country. Business, in their view, was working against apartheid rather than apartheid supporting business. Foreign trade and investment were aiding racial progress in South Africa rather than shoring up an oppressive system. Assistant Secretary of Commerce Alexander Trowbridge took this position while testifying to the House Subcommittee on Africa in its 1966 hearings on American policy on South Africa. He asserted:

[T]he presence of U.S. business in South Africa has, in certain limited areas, exerted a positive influence on some aspects of racial practices in South Africa, particularly in the industrial sphere. In many instances, U.S. firms have been in the forefront in introducing progressive labor-management practices, such as employing nonwhite labor at high job and skill classifications.¹⁵³

Some American businesses operating in South Africa themselves began putting forth the argument that they were promoting progressive change in South Africa as liberal groups increasingly brought pressure on them to withdraw from South Africa. To some extent, public statements by these businesses were self-serving. American corporations had much invested in South Africa and did not wish to be forced to divest themselves of their holdings there. Statements about their

¹⁵² Ibid.
¹⁵³ United States-South African Relations, 46.
opposition to apartheid became necessary so as to answer some of the questions of critical shareholders and to forestall boycotts of their products. For example, a proposal that General Motors should withdraw from South Africa resulted in a report on "General Motors and South Africa" by Elliott M. Estes, Group Vice President with jurisdiction over the Overseas Operations. He explained to an audience at a conference on General Motors's performance in matters of public interest:

The General Motors position is that its economic presence in South Africa is our greatest contribution to progress in that country. We believe that through the steps we are taking and the good working conditions and facilities at General Motors South African, we are providing an example for other employers to accelerate the pace of progressive change.

We feel that the black man would be the first to suffer from any serious failure in the process of economic growth in South Africa. Further, any attempt to damage the South African economy or isolate South Africa from the rest of the world may only produce a deeper commitment by the white population to the perpetuation of apartheid.

Estes went over the steps General Motors was taking in South Africa to improve conditions for Africans. These included wage increases, job training, medical services, and scholarships for non-white children. The Polaroid Corporation made similar representations in newspaper advertising in major American newspapers and in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Africa in 1971.

---
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Although such statements by business can be regarded as self-interested rationalizations, they are nonetheless consistent with the views of businessmen and business publications that appeared occasionally in the 1950s, that is, before there were strong pressures for business withdrawal from South Africa. Indeed, they are consistent with what critics of South Africa had been saying for years, albeit with a different emphasis: a dynamic economy and apartheid were incompatible. Some of the businessmen who came forward on behalf of South Africa had only negligible or no financial interests in the country. For some businessmen, their views on South Africa were clearly a reflection of their belief that economic well-being is a precondition of democracy. Clarence B. Randall, for example, argued that "no man can be free unless he eats."  

Finally, it should be observed that there have been black South Africans who have agreed substantially with the spokesmen for business that American business activities in South Africa have produced benefits for blacks as well as whites. Gatsha Buthelezi, leader of the Zulu nation, has gone on record in opposition to a discontinuation of the American purchases of South African sugar as part of its quota program.  

Lucy Mvubelo, secretary of the National Union of Clothing Workers, expressed pleasure at Polaroid's refusing to pull

---
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An African librarian in Umtata, the capital of the Transkei, asked this author to try to encourage American investment in the Transkei when he returned to the United States. His people, he said, needed jobs. While American critics of South Africa may have regarded the arguments put forth by business as unconvincing, those who would be most affected by American economic disengagement from South Africa found them more persuasive and were reluctant to give up the benefits of American investment so as to ease the consciences of the Americans claiming to speak on their behalf.

Although the three groups and the individuals discussed in this chapter differed in important aspects of their views, such as in their attitudes towards Afrikaners and the Nationalist Party, they all shared the opinion that American policy on South Africa after 1958 was misguided and unsound. However, the criticisms of American policy varied somewhat in emphasis.

For the anti-Communist conservatives and the more Negrophobic Southerners, American policy on South Africa was another example of the blundering incompetence and destructive naivete of the "liberals" in the State Department. The publisher Tom Anderson, writing in the John Birch publication American Opinion, said that "the fruit flies in our State Department" were constantly making trouble for South Africa and Rhodesia because they were stable, prosperous and Christian. Continuing, he contrasted American policy on Southern Africa with policy towards other parts of the continent:
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Prehensile characters a generation out of the trees tear down our flag, stone our Embassies, and spit on our Ambassadors as we continue to deliver billions of dollars worth of our grandchildren's seed corn to them. As for our real friends, such as South Africa and Rhodesia, we spit on them. We boycott them. We give no foreign aid to them. We even threaten--through the United Nations--to invade them.\(^{161}\)

An editorialist in the Citizen complained bitterly that American policy was being directed against the"only remaining areas of peace and stability in Africa--our own natural allies--anti-Communist South Africa and Rhodesia."\(^{162}\) Commenting on the American government's refusal to allow the carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt to put into a South African port, the writer said that he thought the decision was "an interesting case history, in miniature, of the concoctions served up at the Mad Hatter's Tea Party on the banks of the Potomoc."\(^{163}\)

For the more moderate Southerners and for people associated with American business, criticism of South Africa seemed likely to have the opposite effect from that which was desirable; that is, it would cause the progressive whites in South Africa to lose strength to the more conservative elements and would limit the possibilities of fruitful communication and interchange with the South Africans. Thus, Hodding Carter and Clarence B. Randall both felt that South Africa should be given time to work out its problems without outside interference.\(^{164}\) J. Irwin Miller, a prominent manufacturer, found

\(^{161}\)Ibid., 78.
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\(^{163}\)Ibid.; see also "U.S. Carrier Caper Confuses Cape Town," ibid., 10-15.

\(^{164}\)United States-South African Relations, 333; Randall, "South Africa Needs Time," 77-78.
the arguments for economic disengagement from South Africa like arguments against "financing atheism" by trading with Russia; if sanctions were imposed against South Africa, he said, it would destroy the possibility that trade and cultural relations might help bring about change in South Africa.  

There is no reason to belabor the point covered here and elsewhere in this chapter: those with favorable views of South Africa or who believed that South Africa's benefits to the United States outweighed its liabilities did not feel that a hostile policy towards South Africa served a useful purpose. Although it is not possible to say what influence the groups and individuals treated on here may have had on policy formulation, one can note that their arguments seemed more persuasive and they found greater support as the 1960s grew older. The reasons for this will be taken up in the final chapter of this study.

---

CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

For a time in the mid-1960s it appeared that the United States might participate in measures that had as their goal the destruction of apartheid. The United States did not, however, act to bring apartheid in South Africa to an end. There are many reasons why it was unwilling to support United Nations sponsored sanctions or to take unilateral measures against South Africa, but it may be generations before these are publicly known. However, based on presently available materials and the analysis of American views on South Africa that has been employed in this study, it is possible to suggest some factors that caused the arguments in favor of American sanctions to lose much of their force.

By the late 1960s and early 1970s it seems clear that many Americans were looking upon South Africa more favorably, or at least less critically. Numerous observers have commented on this. South African reporters in the United States asserted that the movement for sanctions had lost its vitality.\(^1\) William A. Hance, a professor of economic geography at Columbia University, spoke of the movement in the past tense in 1968. In a collection of essays on American relations with South Africa he wrote:

Several years ago there was very considerable interest in the possible application of sanctions as a way of bringing about desired change in South Africa. Some would not agree that there has been a reduction of this interest, but it seems clear that the major powers have rejected sanctions as a method of forcing change in South Africa.\(^2\)

The novelist James A. Michener after a visit to South Africa concluded that "everyone is agreed" that there should be no withdrawal of American business from South Africa.\(^3\)

Bishop C. Edward Crowther, an American clergyman once expelled from South Africa, commented on the shift in American views on South Africa and attributed the change to the South African government's efforts to improve its image:

A massive propaganda attempt has been more successful than anyone could have dared to hope, presenting a benign new image for South Africa. Suddenly, South Africa projects herself as yearning to be understood, exuding international goodwill and extended toleration. It is as if the polecat had been a mink all along, and understandably the world is puzzled.\(^4\)

Others too have asserted that the activities of the South African government and South Africa Foundation have been responsible for a new "climate of opinion" on South Africa.\(^5\)


There seems to be no doubt that the pro-South Africa agencies and organizations have contributed to more favorable views on South Africa. However, a lobbying group can do little more than marshall facts and present arguments. The soundness or persuasiveness of the arguments turn on factors beyond the control of opinion influencing groups. It has already been observed that even some of the harshest critics of South Africa doubted that sanctions could have the effect of improving conditions for blacks in South Africa. Other developments in both the United States and South Africa made the arguments for sanctions seem still less sound.

Probably the most important single factor tending to lessen support for sanctions against South Africa was the Viet Nam War. That war has undoubtedly altered the outlook of Americans on world affairs in many ways. For years it was the primary foreign policy concern of the American people and drew their attention away from other issues. As one critic of South Africa complained in 1966:

One of the unwelcome side effects of the Vietnamese war has been to drain U.S. energies to such an extent that any attempt to launch an anti-apartheid campaign in 1966 will probably fail if it depends largely on the United States. Although official American sympathies are firmly on the side of the African nations and against South Africa, American thinking on foreign policy is completely entangled in the jungles of Vietnam. Until the Vietnamese issue is resolved, there is little chance of the United States opening a second front in equally remote southern Africa.

As Viet Nam dragged on, Americans increasingly doubted their claim to moral leadership in the world, and many doubted their

---

6See above, p. 144.

essential goodness as a people. The war caused them to seek a smaller role in world affairs. It caused them to question strongly their ability to bring a better society to a foreign country through the use of force. It exposed the limitations on power theretofore thought to be virtually limitless. Speaking on Viet Nam and many aspects of post-World War II policies, Secretary of State William P. Rogers told the graduating class of Colgate University in 1971 that American idealism had been "too grandiose." He stated:

We presumed a degree of omnipotence for good which has led to considerable disillusionment. We found that we lacked the power to affect others as we thought we might. We often approached political problems with an excessively moralistic and self-righteous attitude.

As American opinion turned against the war in Viet Nam, Americans were not prepared to take actions in southern Africa that could lead to war there for the sake of getting South Africans to adopt policies more in line with American concepts of morality.

Indeed, Americans began to doubt that their policy of integration or assimilation was the most moral policy to follow on race relations. There was in the mid-1960s a shift in the thrust of the civil rights movement in the United States. After achieving victories for equality of treatment in the courts and in Congress, the movement shifted from an emphasis on equal opportunities to an emphasis on black power or black separatism. Large masses of blacks rioted in a number of American cities, especially in the summer of 1966, causing millions of dollars in damage and a white backlash. Black leaders

---

rejected white paternalism and democratic homilies in favor of self-
determination and a new sort of segregation.

In the mood of dismay over this turn of the civil rights
movement, commentators began to suggest that integration had failed
in the United States. The vice-president of the liberal Center for
the Study of Democratic Institutions, W. H. Ferry, reflected the
pessimism about the prospects for peaceful race relations when he
declared in a speech that the United States was irremediably disunited
on race. He said that the United States had to discover "a philosophy
and machinery for the democratic government of a separated country."9

An editorial in *America* described well the shift that took place in
the civil rights movement and the response of white Americans to the
shift:

Black nationalism became the cry, and in place of pleas for
integration came rejection of white society as a whole.

The reaction was first one of incredulity. On the right came
a counter-cry for "law and order" at any cost, even the harsh
repression, not only of violence and crime, but of dissent
and agitation, too. Some on the extreme left were driven
by desperation and a sense of guilt to "burn down America"
in quest of justice and reprisal. Many moderates or liberals
sought to regain the old myths by redefining or abandoning
policies to which they had been committed. While integration
was all right for the South, conditions in the metropolitan
North made it impracticable in the foreseeable future. A
new-style "separate but equal" policy suddenly became
acceptable.10

The magazine then counseled Americans to heed C. Vann Woodward's plea

---

9 W. H. Ferry, "Farewell to Integration," in Barry N. Schwartz
and Robert Disch, eds., *White Racism: Its History, Pathology and
Practice* (New York, 1970), 505. See also "Grasping at Chaos," *Nation*,
November 27, 1967, p. 547; and "An End to Self-Deception," *America*,
March 16, 1968, pp. 344-45.

10 "The Burden of American History," *America*, November 23, 1968,
p. 511.
that the United States abandon its childish holier-than-thou myths.

The implications of the changing views of American race relations for American perspectives on South Africa very soon became apparent. If race relations were bad in South Africa, they were, as America noted, "far more bloody" in the United States. 11 If the United States was unable to cope with its own race problems, how could it improve South African race relations? Indeed, black Americans were proposing a black cultural (or even geographic) separation that shared much of the ideology of South African apartheid. Discussing the increase in demands in the late 1960s for black studies programs at American universities, John Hatch, a South African "banned" for his opposition to apartheid, expressed his surprise and shock at such demands:

This year, my fifth in America's academic world, I have sensed there a closer approximation to the apartheid spirit than in any society since I was last in South Africa. . . . Some aspects of the demands I have heard or read from black students on American campuses could have been copied from the words or writings of white South Africans—with the words "white" and "black" transposed. 12

The new black attitude towards separatism caused some Americans to reconsider apartheid and suggest that it might have some merit, at least in theory. To take one example, James A. Michener spent a month in South Africa in 1971 and wrote of his views of South Africa. After noting separatism of ethnic groups in Canada, Cyprus, Belgium, and Ireland, he commented on "grand" apartheid:

One must not therefore contemptuously dismiss South Africa's


effort to achieve something which many areas in the rest of the world have tried. One must also remember that many black leaders in the United States advocate precisely what South Africa is recommending—that defined areas like Alabama and Mississippi be turned over to the blacks for their control.  

If a change in the civil rights movement in the United States made apartheid appear to have a moral and ideological basis, developments in Africa made the white fear of "swamping" appear more valid than it had appeared in 1960. The record of the first decade of independence of the black ruled countries of Africa proved to be a disappointment to Americans who had been optimistic about the potential for democracy in those new states. The hopes of 1960 turned to profound disillusionment. As the historian Cornelius W. de Kiewiet observed in 1970, "a pall of doubt has descended upon Africa."

Revolutions were frequent, and the typical form of government became the military dictatorship or the one party state. Time magazine, for example, noted in 1966:

The Congo has been in perpetual chaos, the Sudan has been unable to cope with the rebellion of its anti-Moslem south against its Moslem north. Three east African nations have had to put down military uprisings, and the governments of eight countries have fallen before military coups. In addition, only a handful of Africa's new countries have maintained any resemblance of the multiparty democracy that they inherited from their departing European colonists.

Newsweek, commenting on the tenth anniversary of the Organization of African Unity, called it a "dismal and disillusioning decade."

---

13Michener, "The Five Warring Tribes of South Africa," 47.


Political instability in the African states was often compounded by cupidity in the leaders. Meaningful reform did not accompany revolutionary rhetoric. Tribalism continued in post-colonial Africa and was at times associated with racism far worse than any that had ever appeared in South Africa. Even publications or individuals sympathetic to Africa began to express their misgivings about the new states. For example, a writer in the New Republic observed with some distress that "although most African leaders condemn racism, immigrants have been expelled on 24 hours notice, forced to leave friends and livelihood behind, and even the small minority of Asians and Europeans who have become citizens of the East African countries are discriminated against in employment." The same writer suggested that in the future leaders might use racial scapegoats to divert mass frustrations. The Asians became such scapegoats in Uganda when General Amin dispossessed and/or expelled nearly all Asians from the country in 1972 with much violence. When African countries called for South Africa's exclusion from the 1968 Olympic games because of its racial policies, even the liberal Christian Century noted that it was unlikely members of the Ibo tribe would be found on the Nigerian teams or Asians on the Kenyan teams. There were mass tribal slaughters in Rwanda and Burundi for more than a decade, with a death toll amounting to an estimated one hundred to


two hundred thousand systematically murdered in 1972 alone. These developments in black Africa made white South African fears of rule by black Africans appear well founded. Rupert Emerson, a noted authority on Africa at Harvard University, commented in 1967:

"It is a wide open gamble what manner of governments and societies might emerge in southern African countries if their economies were ruined and their present regimes overthrown by force [i.e., enforcement of sanctions] . . . .

The simplest realism demands recognition that the way in which the black African states have conducted their affairs since independence can inspire no abundant confidence that southern Africa, liberated from white domination, will develop stable democratic governments which promote development."

The discouraging developments in black Africa caused Americans to play down the importance of Africa to the United States. They also caused Americans to look to the more positive aspects of the political order in South Africa. Thus, the author of a study of the world's outstanding newspapers observed in 1968 that despite certain reactionary social practices, "South Africa has the freest press on the entire African continent." Time magazine observed that under the Verwoerd government the Africans of South Africa had become "the best-paid and best-fed blacks on the continent." Even the New

---

19Stanley Meisler, "Rwanda and Burundi," Atlantic, CCXXXII (September, 1973), 6. Meisler suggested the possibility of an American boycott of the two countries or that the United States and others "refuse to support all African resolutions on southern Africa in the United Nations unless these resolutions also condemned the disaster in Burundi and Rwanda. . . . At the least, it would expose African hypocrisy." Ibid., 16.


Republic felt compelled to say that "this crazy system—a superstructure of political and social segregation erected on a base of economic integration—works in the sense that there is stability and prosperity . . . ."  

In this new climate of opinion, Nationalist leaders began receiving more favorable treatment in the American press. After Prime Minister Verwoerd was assassinated in 1966 he was succeeded by B. J. Vorster. During World War II, Vorster had been a leader of the Ossewabrandwag and had been interned by Jan Smuts for his opposition to the war. When Vorster became Prime Minister the American press was initially hostile to another "pro-Nazi" Nationalist. After a short time, however, it began to treat Vorster more favorably. Vorster proved to be accessible to the press; he had a sense of humor and was not aloof like Verwoerd. Moreover, he seemed willing to make changes in South Africa's policies. Observers saw signs that Vorster was taking steps to limit apartheid, and that this reflected a change in the racial views of other Afrikaners. In foreign policy, Vorster embarked on an "outward" policy, seeking friendlier relations with black African countries.  

References:


Time magazine reported that Vorster had been a "considerable surprise." It observed that Vorster was proving far more reasonable than his predecessors and was injecting humanity into South Africa's heavy ideological climate. The Afrikaans word for his style, it said, was "billikheid—sweet reasonableness." Time noted that Vorster was taking steps to ease apartheid, removing new apartheid bills from the legislative docket, receiving black trade delegates from an African state, and holding secret trade talks with other African delegates. The magazine predicted no overnight scuttling of apartheid, but did believe that Vorster had "given moderate South African whites the first hint of encouragement in nearly two decades of Nationalist rule."27

Going further than Time was an editorial in America, a publication that had long been critical of South Africa. It found that Afrikaners were becoming less tightly knit and less racially conscious, suggesting that apartheid was logically the next to suffer from the erosion of the old values of the Afrikaners.28 Similarly, Newsweek interpreted the results of the 1970 South African elections as signifying a trend toward moderation, and it saw "a real prospect that without abandoning the concept of white supremacy, South Africa might begin to move toward a slight relaxation of apartheid in the nation's economic life."29 This view appeared to be confirmed by a


study conducted by Donald E. Pursell, an associate professor of economics at Memphis State University. Pursell's study of South African wage policies from 1925 to 1968 concluded that the government's Wage Board had since 1957 been improving non-white earnings significantly. The author stated that the Wage Act under which the Board operated has ceased to support white workers and has instead adopted the policy of increasing non-white earnings. In its current policy objective, the Wage Board stands to guarantee that the non-whites receive a portion of the growth of the economy. Seen from this point of view apartheid, or separate economic, social and political development, can be interpreted as far removed from baaskap, or complete domination by whites.\(^{30}\)

All this is not to suggest that Americans suddenly decided that they had been all wrong about apartheid or that they embraced it as an acceptable or desirable social policy. They continued to criticize apartheid and to call for abandonment of the oppressive policies of the Nationalist government. However, now they did acknowledge that the policy of separate development was not without some degree of justification and that under it some benefits had been passed to the Africans. There seemed to be a basis for believing that the situation could be improved in South Africa from internal change, that catastrophe could be averted without resort to intervention from the outside. In addition, the possibility of a race war lessened as Americans came to the realization that the expected revolution in South Africa would be much longer in coming than had been predicted.\(^{30}\)

Vernon McKay, himself a strong opponent of apartheid, observed in 1968 that "instead of talking about change in three to five years, numerous opponents of apartheid now speak of twelve to twenty-five years."31 Another strong critic of South Africa, Joseph Lelyveld of the New York Times, similarly asserted that there was "no power inside the country or on the African continent that the whites for the present need fear."32 If there were to be no revolution in South Africa, then American withdrawal might be a futile gesture; there would be only limited benefits to the United States in its relations with black Africa and whatever beneficial effects there were from an American presence would be lost. Spelling out the policy implications of the view that there would be no revolution, William A. Hance stated:

If the evidence suggests . . . that no crisis is likely to occur in the foreseeable future, then the United States might, by a policy of unilateral economic disengagement, not only reduce its own ability to influence change in South Africa but weaken to some extent those economic forces which are working against certain of the stated goals of apartheid.33

The implications for policy were also brought out by Jim Hoagland who wrote a series of Pulitzer Prize (1971) winning articles on South Africa for the Washington Post. Hoagland suggested that the

31Vernon McKay, "Southern Africa and Its Implications for American Policy," in Hance, ed., Southern Africa and the United States, 17. McKay also called attention to the fact that as the realities of power have become more widely understood, numerous shifts in attitudes toward the white redoubt [southern Africa] have occurred, both inside and outside Africa." Ibid., 15-16.

32Joseph Lelyveld, "Where 78% of the People are the 'Others,'" New York Times Magazine, June 19, 1966, p. 28.

33Hance, "The Case For and Against United States Disengagement from South Africa," 160.
predictions of a successful black revolution had been dangerously facile, and said that the prospects for such a revolution "seemed to be growing dimmer with each passing year as the nineteen seventies began." As a result, he felt that a coherent American policy on South Africa could flow best from a decision that white power would survive over at least another half-century. The only other alternative he saw was to support revolution. This he was not prepared to do, so he saw the "white power option" as the only realistic policy. As of the date of this study, it appears that for the present the United States has adopted a "white power option."

What can be drawn from this study? Hopefully it has shown the wide variety of views that have been taken by Americans on South Africa since 1948 and how strongly these reflected the domestic concerns of the individuals asserting them. Hopefully too it has shown something of the complexity of the issue of American policy on South Africa and the range of factors that might be taken into consideration by a policy maker; it has attempted to place these factors in a historical perspective. However, a study of public views on a country cannot show what considerations actually led to particular policy decisions. The reason for this is not only that each individual is

34 Jim Hoagland, South Africa: Civilizations in Conflict (Boston, 1972), 77-78.
35 Ibid., 383.
subject to differing influences but also because there is a fundamental difference between members of the public and the makers of foreign policy. A member of the public may express a view and his statement will be only a few more drops in the sea of words that wash over the United States daily. A policy maker knows that the position he takes on an issue may influence the lives of millions and have consequences that will be felt for generations. The responsibility of the policy maker is much greater, and, if he takes his task seriously, he must work diligently to get at the truth of a situation. And what is the truth about South Africa hiding in all the conflicting views that have been presented on South Africa in this study? The author can only repeat what another visitor to South Africa, the novelist Allen Drury, has said of his own book:

If it has made you as confused and uncertain as the visitor about a most complex and difficult situation, then the effort has been well-spent: because with uncertainty may come humility, with humility understanding, with understanding compassion, and with compassion that patience indispensable if the Republic's problems are ever to be worked out in a way that will satisfy both her peoples and the conscience of her sincere and decent critics.37

I. Periodicals

The author consulted two or more articles on South Africa or American policy on South Africa in the periodicals listed below in the period from 1940 to 1972, or for shorter periods if the periodical was published for only part of that time. In each instance he attempted to find every article relating to South Africa through the use of periodical indexes or through use of the periodical's own index. Since some magazines had hundreds of articles on South Africa, it would be impractical to list each separate article consulted. Full citations to many articles used are given in the footnotes.

**Africa Report**

**Africa Today**

**America**

**American Mercury**

**American Opinion**

**American Scholar**

**Atlantic**

**Aviation**

**Business Week**

**Christian Century**

**Citizen**

**Commonweal**

**Ebony**

**Foreign Affairs**

**Fortune**

**Harpers**

**Holiday**
Human Events
Independent Woman
Interracial Review
Life
Nation
National Geographic
National Review
Natural History
Negro Digest
New Nation
New Republic
Newsweek
New York Times Magazine
New Yorker
Reporter
Rotarian
Saturday Evening Post
Saturday Review
Science
Scientific Monthly
Senior Scholastic
South African Observer
Southern Africa
Time
Thought
U.S. News and World Report
Virginia Quarterly Review
Yale Review
II. Newspapers

The author consulted the following newspapers through microfilms, files, or clippings supplied by the newspapers for the dates given. Where the year 1960 is listed, it refers to March and April, the time of the Sharpeville crisis in South Africa.

Atlanta Constitution (1960, 1971)
Cape Town, South Africa, Cape Times (1948, 1960)
Charlotte Observer (1960)
Chicago Tribune (1960)
Christian Science Monitor (1960)
Cleveland Plain Dealer (1960)
Columbia, South Carolina, State (1960)
Denver Post (1960)
Durban, South Africa, Natal Daily News (clippings files of the newspaper covering 1948-1972)
Durham, North Carolina, Morning Herald (1960)
Miami Herald (1960)
New Orleans Times-Picayune (1960)
New York Herald-Tribune (1960)
New York Times (1940-1972)
Philadelphia Inquirer (1960)
Raleigh News and Observer (1960)
St. Louis Post-Dispatch (1960)
Seattle Times (clippings supplied by the newspaper for various dates 1957-1972)
Toledo Blade (1960)
Wall Street Journal (1960)
III. Government Publications

A. United States


B. South Africa

Coloured Peoples of South Africa (n.d.).

Indian South Africans (1964).


News from South Africa.

Panorama.

Progress Through Separate Development: South Africa in Peaceful Transition (n.d.).

The Republic of South Africa (1964).

Scope.

Setting the Record Straight: The United Nations and South Africa (1967).

South Africa--Sportsman's Country (n.d.)


South African Digest


This is South Africa (1971).


IV. Supreme Court Cases


V. Brochures, Pamphlets, and Miscellaneous

A. Africa Research Group
   Fasulo, G. The Powers Behind Apartheid.

B. American Committee on Africa
   Action Against Apartheid (1960).
   Aid Victims of Southern Africa's Rule of Terror (n.d.).
   Don't Buy South African--Watch the Label (1960).
   General Motors and South Africa (1971).
Papers presented at 1965 National Conference on The South African Crisis and American Action (located in offices of American Committee on Africa)

Franck, Thomas M. "The Effect of American Policy Towards South Africa on Black Africa's Policy Towards the United States."


Kennedy, Joseph C. "American Private Involvement in South Africa."


Weiss, Peter. "U.S. Policy and South Africa."


Power to the Portuguese Empire from General Electric (1971).


South West Africa Information Sheet (1967).


Trial Under the Terrorism Act (1967).


The U.S. Should End the South African Sugar Quota and Stop Buying Sugar from South Africa (1967).

U.S. Subsidy to South Africa: The Sugar Quota (1969).


C. American-African Affairs Association


Lee, Pamèla Reynolds. Tribalism: A Decade of Decision in Southern
Africa (1971).


Meyer, Frank S. and Elsie B. Some American Comments on Southern Africa (1967).


D. American-Southern Africa Council


E. Council on African Affairs

The Job to be Done (1947?).


Resistance Against Fascist Enslavement in South Africa (1953).

The San Francisco Conference and the Colonial Issue (1945).


What Do the People of Africa Want? (n.d.).

F. Council on Economic Priorities


G. Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa

Periodic reports under title Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa.

H. National Council of the Churches of Christ


I. Polaroid Revolutionary Workers Movement

Polaroid and South Africa (1971).

The Polaroid Experiment: A Farce and Betrayal of Africans (1972).
Polaroid Imprisons (1972).

J. South Africa Foundation
South Africa International.

K. South African Institute of Race Relations

L. Southern Africa Committee

M. United States-South Africa Leader Exchange Program
Weisenfeld, Carol Ann. The First Decade (1968).

N. World Student Christian Federation
The Banks and Apartheid (1967).

VI. Unpublished Studies


VII. Books and Articles


Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXII (Summer, 1968), 299-312.


Kelman, H. C., ed. *International Behavior: A Social-Psychological


Sampson, H. F. The Principle of Apartheid. Johannesburg:
Voortrekkerspers, 1966.


Weyl, Nathaniel. *Traitors' End: The Rise and Fall of the Communist*
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