SCHOOL *of* GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

8-2018

America's Inconsistent Foreign Policy to Africa; a Case Study of Apartheid South Africa

Olugbenga Samson Ojewale Mr
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.etsu.edu/etd

Part of the African Languages and Societies Commons, and the Other American Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

America's Inconsistent Foreign Policy to Africa; a Case Study of Apartheid South

Africa

—————————————

A thesis

presented to

the Department of History

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Masters of Arts in History

—————————————

by

Olugbenga Samson Ojewale

August 2018

—————————————

Dr. Daryl Carter, Chair

Dr. Henry Antkiewicz

Prof. Elwood Watson

ABSTRACT

America's Inconsistent Foreign Policy to Africa; a Case Study of Apartheid South

Africa

by

Olugbenga Samson Ojewale

This study lays bare the inconsistencies in the United States of America's Foreign

Policy, and how it contributed to the longevity of apartheid in South Africa.

Michael Mandelbaum opined that America's foreign policy post-Cold War era drifted

from containment to transformation.[1] America became involved with transferring their

democracy and constitutional order to the countries they entangled with in running

those countries' internal governance. Instead of war, America preached and practiced

proper, organized governance. Thus, America's foreign policy to Europe and Asia post-

Cold War was all about democracy and protection of fundamental human rights.

However, the role of America's Foreign Policy in Africa took a turn in Africa, with

Congo in 1960, Ghana in 1966 and Nigeria with their successive military regimes. This

study intends to make sense of it all.

---

[1] Michael Mandelbaum, Mission Failure: America and the World in the Post-Cold War Era, (New York, Oxford University Press, 2016),3.

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is no how this Thesis project would have been possible without the resoluteness and support of the Thesis Chair and Adviser Dr. Daryl Carter. My utmost gratitude to my adviser, who read my various revisions and helped make some sense of the confusion. Also, to the other committee members in person of Dr. Henry Antkiewicz, and Dr. Elwood Watson who offered academic guidance.

My utmost appreciation also goes to the Department of History of East Tennessee State University for the enabling academic environment, awarding of financial aid, etc. to complete my degree and project. And finally, thanks to my parents Dr. Anna Muyiwa, and friend Abayomi Thompson who was with me during this process and always offering support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

United States of America is known to be a trailblazer, front-runner and pioneer

of democracy, rule of law, freedom and respect for fundamental human rights for

citizens of the world. It is a known fact that the United States of America stands for

democratic rule which is indeed the face of their foreign policy. Joyce P. Kaufman, in

detailing and proving democracy as the beacon of America's foreign policy, quoted the

arguments of some of the founding fathers of America, especially Thomas Jefferson and

Alexander Hamilton, on 'whether the United States be involved with the world or not?

Is it the responsibility of the United States to help spread democracy?'[2] Hence,

democracy and the rule of law are not just the foreign policy of America but the very

basis of her existence and history. Thus, America's foreign policy to Europe and Asia

post-Cold War was all about democracy and protection of fundamental human rights.

However, the inconsistency in this famed policy was laid bare in Africa. What America

preached against and discouraged elsewhere became conspicuously seen in some parts

of Africa.

Why America would support sustained anti-democratic and segregationist rule

throws up many questions which we shall try to answer in this study.

The inconsistencies in the American foreign policy contributed to the longevity

of apartheid. For almost fifty years, apartheid thrived in South Africa as the minority

---

[2] Joyce P. Kaufman, A Concise History of U.S Foreign Policy, New York, Rowman and
Littlefield, 2006.

whites controlled the affairs of the southern African nation while maligning the black majority, and committing great fundamental human rights crimes in the process. Virtually all the American presidents who were in power during the apartheid regime in South Africa refused to see apartheid as a fundamental problem, but an opportunity for alliance in the Cold War and the war against communism. The country's precious minerals, its strategic location, its government's role as a staunch supporter of American and the West's policy of blocking the growth of Soviet communism were the several excuses cited by previous United States presidencies for encouraging the National Party of South Africa and its policies in Pretoria.

This support continued until Apartheid's ultimate demise in 1994, two years after Reagan left office. It is easy to say that the U.S. decision to support Pretoria was in the interest of the United States of America. In spite of the concerns for the indignity, pains, and sufferings experienced by the vast numbers of the South African citizenry meted out by the apartheid regime; the U.S. government continuously appealed the U.N. and the world that Apartheid would peter out naturally.

Chapter Two discusses how WWII affected South Africa. The effects were not just social, but also economic as the country embraced manufacturing due to needs for various supplies as a result of the war. This manufacturing development did not affect the upsurge of the mining and gold industry already established in the country. Many blacks were employed in the manufacturing industry during the 1939 and 1945 years, and it also discusses the politics behind the after-effects of the war on South Africa and the black segregation policy.

Chapter Three looks at the role of America with the Apartheid government of South Africa, how America never criticized it because of similar policies, like the Jim Crow laws, being played out, especially Southern states in America. With trade relations and investments in South Africa, cultural exchange, particularly education, South Africa and the United States remained strange friends for much of the Apartheid era.

Chapter Four examines the position of South Africa during the Cold War, trying to gain sympathy through the hostility between the Soviets and the United States, with clear military backing from the West (despite several political rhetoric and condemnation of Apartheid, the US still supplied military hardware and personnel). Here we look at if South Africa was really neutral during the Cold War.

Chapter Five presents the Jimmy Carter years in relation with South Africa. The foreign policy of America's president, Jimmy Carter to Africa and South Africa, his message of peace, accountability and human rights and how it affected South Africa and her close neighbors and to ascertain if Carter was true to his message of respect for human rights in Africa.

Chapter Six looks at America's relationship with South Africa during the Ronald Reagan and H W Bush years, how Ronald Reagan publicly declared that he detests Apartheid, yet backed the South African government and even vetoed Congress's sanctions on the South African government. We will also look at Bush's silence on Apartheid and its effects on South Africa.

Chapter Seven reviews the process and events that led to the demise of Apartheid South Africa. America's role leading to the climax and the view of the world and Africa

on the sad effects and the development the regime brought about. This chapter also goes

further in analyzing the end of Apartheid through the scholarly contributions of

intellectuals from both the perspective of white minority and the opposition. It is thus

appropriate to cram this chapter with the historiography of black politics.

CHAPTER 2

SOUTH AFRICA AFTER WORLD WAR II, 1948-1994

One can say that South Africa is known for racial hostility. Known mixed colors

with wonderful people and diverse cultures.[3] Its very existence has been shrouded in

conflict, with the inter-white conflict between the Afrikaners and the British imperialists

resulting in the South African War of 1899-1902, splitting allegiance and sympathy

between Americans. The Afrikaners and their allies could not contain the British, and

with a British victory, the Union of South Africa was formed in 1910.[4] The British

Parliament in 1910, approved the Union of South Africa to become an independent,

autonomous state within the Commonwealth and made Louis Botha the Prime Minister

of South Africa under a parliamentary system of government, with blacks having the

privilege of becoming representatives only if nominated and supported by whites.[5]

By 1919, the first prime minister had died and Jan Christiaan Smuts had taken

his place. Smuts got South Africa into WWII on the side of the Allied forces against

Germany raising about 350,000 soldiers after the initial reluctance of volunteers to join

_____

[3] Rosmarin Ike and Dee Rissik, *Cultures of the World:South Africa* (New York, Marshall Cavendish, 2004), 5.
[4] Gann Lh and Duignan Peter, *Hope for South Africa?* (California, Hoover Institution Press, 1991), 138.
[5] Rosmarin, Rissik, *Cultures of the World,* 25.

in the war. South African troops bombarded and recorded a victory against the Italian

army which had occupied Ethiopia.[6]

South African influence rose with the military exploits of the country in WWII.

At the outbreak of the war, the South African troops rallied by Smuts were significant

during World War II as the infantry soldiers courageously stood their grounds in 1941

alongside the "British Eight Army in the Sahara Desert" against the renowned German

corps. Smuts ensured South Africa played a pivotal role during the second world war,

contributing not just its quota, but being an influence not just in southern Africa,

demonstrating that it is not a pushover across the whole of Africa. South Africa's

influence and Smuts' was reckoned with after the war, Smuts was officially recognized

for his efforts in the times of war and thereby made a Field Marshall and became

instrumental in forming the United Nations.[7]

The troops from South Africa though minimal were able to make an immense

contribution to the success of the Allied forces. Smuts' doggedness paid off as South

Africa's participation in the war ensured that the Mediterranean was reopened as

---

[6] Rosmarin Ike and Dee Rissik, *Cultures of the World: South Africa* (New York, Marshall Cavendish, 2004), 25.
[7] Rosmarin Ike and Dee Rissik, *Cultures of the World*, 25.

enemies of the Allies were chased out of Africa in a victory for the Allies.[8] Citizens of

other African countries came in large numbers into South Africa as a result of the war.

The population explosion indeed impacted South Africa in a positive way as labor for

its manufacturing industry could be had cheaply, which in fact, made its industries to

thrive.

South Africa and Mining

Indeed, one of the factors that served as a draw for the influx of people into

South Africa was the mining industry. During the war and after, there was a surge in the

economy of South Africa as need for weaponry and ammunition to be manufactured

arose and because of thriving industries such as mining, especially gold and other

minerals. For these reasons, as a result of the war, people moved from other countries to

South Africa for economic reasons and to get urbanized. Post-World War II had people

moving into South Africa seeking employment into the manufacturing industry as the

labor force had also improved by 60%. Between 1950 and 1980 South Africa witnessed

an industrial boom as the country had more products being manufactured as commerce

picked up in the region. It was then imperative that these thriving industries attract

---

[8] Amry Vandenbosch, *South Africa and the World: The Foreign Policy of Apartheid* (Kentucky, University Press of Kentucky, 2015),115.

workers from neighboring countries, especially the ones displaced by World War II.[9]

With new industries like the chemical and plastic industry springing up to be added to

already strong and thriving industries like the metal and engineering industry, these

years witnessed not just the growth of the new industries, but the consolidation of the

old ones to become even bigger and stronger.[10]

There were diverse reasons which made the industrialization of South Africa a

strong and viable one. The fact that cheap labor could be got with relative ease, access

to cheap, affordable energy and the South African government's committed policy to

the growth of industrialization in the country coupled with the funds got from the

successful gold industry all helped to make industrialization successful in the country to

the point that the country was to be known widely as a manufacturing one.[11] South

Africa became a manufacturing country and an exporting one. Gold being the major

export of the country, many countries relied on the manufacturing industry of South

Africa as the country became a superpower in commerce as trade relations with Great

Britain and the United States of America continued.[12] South Africa witnessed an influx

of people from other regions in Africa due to the draw of its manufacturing industry,

[9] Iliffe John, *Africans:The History of a Continent* (Cambridge University Press, 1995), 280.
[10] Iliffe John, *Africans: The History of a Continent* (Cambridge University Press, 1995), 280.
[11]John, *African*, 274.
[12]*Ibid,* 274.

which picked up from the time of World War II and its sustained need for products to

be manufactured and continued after the end of the War to become the mainstay of the

South African economy.

Urbanization

Contributing also to the population explosion which impacted South Africa after

World War II was the effect of the war on neighboring countries of Africa. People were

displaced from their homes, living in terrible conditions, malnourished, impoverished,

ravaged with sicknesses and diseases. They had no choice than to move South, because

of the better standards of living. With the war having a devastating effect on their

country, government and most importantly, resources, these displaced numbers had no

choice than to move to South Africa, which boasted a stable economy and a thriving

industry that assures employment, they did not mind the fact that at the helm of affairs

of the country they had chosen to move to were of European descent they simply

wanted to survive, wherever, however.[13]

South Africa thus affords them the opportunity to be urbanized, to move from

their towns and villages, to live their lives in urban centers again, with opportunities to

feel the hip and funky lifestyle and get to improve the economy of their families.

---

[13] Erlmann Veit, *Migration and Performance: Zulu Migrant Workers' Isicathamiya Performance in South Africa, 1890-1950* (Illinois, University of Illinois Press, 2014), 200.

14

Africans were motivated to move to South Africa because the War did not affect its economy and cities.

The cities of South Africa served as a draw for other Africans as the influx of people into the country continued after the war.[14] The nationalism that came to fore as the movement of other African people into South Africa began, especially rural, impoverished people moving into the South African urban centers arose because of the mixture of cultures of urban life and the rural settings. The rural immigrants saw the way of life of the urban, dropped theirs and imbibed the culture of urban lifestyle.[15] This saw the population of blacks in South Africa pick up considerably as more blacks poured into South African cities after World War II.[16]

       With blacks moving in their numbers into South African cities and urban centers, cities like Johannesburg and Cape-town felt the effects the most as they became the biggest cities in Africa due to this urbanization and the thriving manufacturing industry in the country.[17]

---

[14]12 South Africa-The Impact of World War II. The Great Depression and the 1930s. N.p., n.d. Web. 5 May 2014. www.123helpme.com, accessed on 24th of April 2017

[15] Erlmann Veit, *Migration and Performance: Zulu Migrant Workers' Isicathamiya Performance in South Africa, 1890-1950* (Illinois, University of Illinois Press), 2014, 200

[16] South Africa-The Impact of World War II, www.123helpme.com, accessed on 24th of April 2017.

[17] South Africa-The Impact of World War II, www.123helpme.com, accessed on 24th of April 2017.

Simply put, highlighting the effects of World War II on South Africa would be incomplete without recognizing factors like urbanization and the fact that people had to move south because they did not have a choice as there was nothing left in their own countries to live for or live on as a result of the war than to move south. What was intriguing was that despite that these people knew that South Africa was governed by a white minority, the perceived reason they became homeless and incapacitated in the first place, yet they migrated to South Africa anyway, placing economic gains and survival over whatever hardship and abuse they may encounter in the country.[18]

The new manufacturing industry of the post WWII threatened the already established mining and in particular, the South African Gold industry. The government clung to their gold and did not allow manufacturing to affect or kill that industry. On the outside, the world saw South Africa as the new emerging manufacturing powerhouse with a declining gold reserve, while South Africa saw itself as juggling the two, refusing to let slip its export in gold and equally maintain its immense rise in manufacturing.[19] This is obvious and a no-brainer since the country gets two-third of its Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) and three-quarter of its earnings from gold

---

[16] Erlmann Veit. *Migration and Performance*, 200
.

[19] South Africa-The Impact of World War II The Great Depression and the 1930s. N.p., n.d. Web. 5 May 2014. www.123helpme.com, accessed on 24th of April 2017.

export.[20] Increased population after World War II also affected the South African

economy in that more hands were available to work in the mining industry. Regardless

of how dangerous the mining job was, and how tedious the working condition was,

there were instances where immigrants had to work two miles underground and

temperature reaching 104 degrees with the prospect of getting the miners killed, the

immigrants still would work hard and give their best because for them, the conditions

were better.[21]

This development brought about the early days of gender equality in South

Africa as Xoliswa Vanda emerged as the first black woman to get a blasting certificate

in gold mining in South Africa.[22] As with the change in every society, this development

did not go well with male workers in the industry as they found it strange taking orders

from a woman there was little they could do though as Vanda was in charge of financial

resources and even their safety at the mines.[23] Post-World War II had so much effect on

South Africa that in the post-war years the country recorded increase in GDP to up to

6% a year, which at that time was an immense achievement, considering it being the

---

[20] South Africa-The Impact of World War II, www.123helpme.com, accessed on 24th of April 2017.
[21] Reader John, and Michael Lewis, *Africa:* (Washington, National Geographic Society, 2001), 305.
[22] John, and Lewis, *Africa,* 305.
[23] Ibid, 305

war years.[24] On the whole, World War II impacted South Africa positively as the

country experienced an economic boom. With about 1,129,000 African people moving

from their primitive farming industry into the urban cities of South Africa to move into

the mining, engineering and manufacturing industry of the country as labor hands.[25]

The effects of the War would also result in the migration of millions of other Africans

into South Africa with the promise of a better life and oddly, made the lives of South

Africans better for it as the South African government came up with innovations

socially and economically to better the lives of its citizen.[26] Another effect of World

War II on South Africa was the spectacular shift from agriculture and country life to

industrialization and urban life. After the war, as a result of people moving en-masse to

South Africa from neighboring countries who were affected by the war, when other

Africans saw this trend, they decided to follow suit and move into the urban centers of

the country. The farm hands who served as labor for the white supremacists and their

plantations also gave up on the farms and moved to the cities for a perceived better life

---

[24] Iliffe John, *Africans: The History of a Continent* (Cambridge University Press, 1995), 280.
[25] Iliffe, John, *Africans: The History of a Continent,* 280.

[26] South Africa-The Impact of World War II The Great Depression and the 1930s. N.p., n.d. Web. 5 May 2014.

for themselves, an action that had a serious effect on the white lords and their

economy.[27]

Population Explosion

      The action of the farm laborers to leave the farms and move to the cities for

better jobs was as a result of the poor remuneration from their jobs as farmhands in the

suburbs. The laborers once on the farms were badly paid and lived on about 20Euros a

year, which made them very poor and their lives very miserable.[28]In these

circumstances, eventually something had to give, and when the trend of urbanization

began, the farm laborers downed their tools and moved to the urban cities to better the

conditions of their families and themselves.

---

[27] Iliffe John, *Africans: The History of a Continent* (Cambridge University Press, 1995, 273.
[28] John, *Africans: The History of a Continent,* 274.

Table 1. Population Censuses of 1936 and 1946[29]

	1936	1946	1936	1946
	Numbers in thousands		Percentages of totals	
Whites	2003	2372	20.8	20.9
Africans	6596	7831	68.6	68.8
Coloreds	769	928	8.0	8.1
Asians	220	285	2.3	2.5

[29] B.Davidson. Africa and the Second World War. Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985, 108.

A look at the population census when these years are compared sees a change in proportions, highlighting trends exposing a cause and effect, obvious from the war. We see an annual increase in the population of the Afrikaners, with it being higher than the minority of the British descent. Africans that were urbanized during and after World War II rose to 24.3% in 1946 compared to 19% recorded back in 1936 before the war. This shows that the difference in population between 1946 and 1936 of those who moved up to the cities to have a taste of the urban lifestyle.[30]

Spectacularly between 1939 and 1945, Africans who worked in the South African manufacturing industry rose to about 245,400 from the initial 156,500, which is about a 57% improvement from years gone by before the war.[31] Change as brought about by the war continued and was visible as the cities got fuller and fuller with 80.8% of the 'urbaners' employed as unskilled labor while about 34.2% of them were semi-skilled, with only 5.8% being regarded as skilled labor.[32] This development, a system overloaded with Africans becoming the spine of the labor force in the urban industries brought about a restructuring with the 'majority' blacks as the heartbeat of the making of the thriving economy, but separatist whites as the administrators and rulers of the 'heartbeat.' The racist leadership of the day decided that to protect its interest as minorities, apartheid had to be enforced and made legally binding for it to take full effect. This new policy had a euphemism of 'separate development, but it was not long

---

[30] B.Davidson. Africa and the Second World War. Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985,. 108.
[31] Ibid,108.
[32] Ibid,109.

for it to be recognized as what it really was, an advancement and success for the

minority white and a bleak future for the Africans.[33]

This process changed South Africa as it became autonomous and less dependent

on imperial Great Britain, with its access to more capital as a result of its economic

boom through its industries. The urbanized African labor as a result of it being cheap

and accessible became a key cog in the wheel of economic prosperity for South Africa

and could not be dispensed with.[34] In effect, World War II brought the apartheid policy

on South Africa. Apartheid became a necessity as a factor of the effects of the war on

the country. The white minorities had to do something drastic to maintain their

'superiority' and control. Thus, apartheid was the answer to the puzzle. Little wonder

when the Purified National Party emerged as the new leadership of the country and

introduced full-scale apartheid, giving the nonwhites no voice to air their frustration, the

party did not bring in anything new but consolidating on the segregationist policies and

practice that was already in effect before they came into power.[35] Inevitably, the

protests started ringing out from the non-white community against the system and the

apartheid policy. That within the framework was not out of the ordinary. What was

noteworthy was the fact that the protests became efficient. The non-whites became

---

[33] B. Davidson. Africa and the Second World War. Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985, 109.

[34] B.Davidson. Africa and the Second World War. Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985,. 109

[35] Ibid, 109.

radicalized in solidarity, militant even, as they said 'no' to all manifestations of apartheid and economic relegation.

The years during and after post-World War II saw a significant increase in the protests of the African majority as about 304 strike actions were carried out over low wages and better working conditions against just 107 in the years before the second world war.[36] The non-whites continued to defy the racist, minority whites even as they were humiliated, harassed and banned. About 58,000 non-white majorities still were able to carry out strike actions and stayed committed to their radicalism to make their voices heard.[37] This culminated in 75,000 mine-workers downing tools in 1946 because of decrease in wages, though were beaten back to work by the government.[38] Everywhere in the cities, there were reasons to protest as the significant number of people who migrated to South Africa and flooded the urban cities were welcomed by the government because they were seen as cheap, affordable labor for the thriving manufacturing industry.[39] What was odd and concerning was that the South African government did not make provision for accommodation for them, making most of these lot live in shacks, huts and under terrible conditions.

---

[36]B. Davidson. Africa and the Second World War. Report and papers of the symposium organized by UNESCO at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985, 115.
[37] B.Davidson. Africa and the Second World War. Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985, 115
[38] Ibid, 116.
[39] Ibid,119.

After the second World war II, a renaissance of sorts was experienced in the

moribund, old ANC (African National Congress) as Dr. A.B Xuma was elected the

party's president in 1940. His election though did not start the era of fiery oration and

political militancy and struggle, yet started a chain of events that did culminate in the

formation of the youth wing of the ANC called the Youth League.[40] These set of young,

vibrant and intellectually sound activists emerged to change the face of the ANC and

the political history of South Africa. Nelson Mandela, Oliver Tambo, Walter Sisulu and

Govan Mbeki among others were a unique group of upstarts who were ready to take the

party beyond the inactions of the old guard of the ANC and Xuma, its leader. They

believed the era had gone beyond keeping it simple in order to make a difference and

bring back sanity in racial relations back to their beloved country they believed a long

battle in militancy, in solidarity with the protests in the urban centers that already

picked up and gathered pace to make a difference. The protests ongoing in the urban

cities and towns had become something daring and innovative. Bus boycotts seeing

thousands prefer to trek miles to and from work instead of paying the astronomical fares

asked of them by the apartheid government became the order of the day, along with

struggles against the laws.[41]

In this new daring era of protests and militancy, new townships and peri-urban

settlements came into existence. As a result of immigration, rural settlers came to the

---

[40]B. Davidson. Africa and the Second World War. Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985, 119-120.
[41] B. Davidson. Africa and the Second World War, 119-120.

city and built settlements and squatter towns in open fields and did not yield to the oppression of the police. Soweto and Mpanza's town-a town 'built' on an open spread of land close to Orlando where some of these kinds of settlements.[42] The young members of the Youth League consolidated on the protests of the Africans and armed with their realization that a great struggle is what would liberate them from the shackles of the white minority, built on it and launched their own campaign moving away from the sheer prudence of the ANC leadership and embracing militancy as the engine that could drive them towards achieving their aim.

Emancipation

Moving forward, the most significant effect of World War II on not just South Africa, but the whole of colonial Africa, on the whole, is that the war presented Africans the opportunity to see the vulnerability of the colonial masters and thus push for independence from them. Political freedom, a situation almost deemed impossible (at least before the war), almost unthinkable, was able to be achieved across Africa as a result of the war running the European Imperialists ragged and making it quite difficult for them to hold on to their colonized territories. Great Britain and France were hard hit by the war and paralyzed economically. They had used up economic and human resources in the war effort and still not got victory. These powers now looked less super in the eyes of Africa and facing up to these masters suddenly became less of suicide and more of picking up the courage to ask for what rightly belonged to them; a right to be

---

[42] B. Davidson. Africa and the Second World War. Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985, 120.

governed by themselves. So, the colonized Africans no longer saw the masters as invincible or gods they are human after all and also feel what every human feels.[43]

That the colonial masters made the Africans look like they were children who could not act nor reason like adults was not unusual, at least to the Africans, what was unusual to them and at the same time became an eye-opener for them was the way the Africans contributed to the war and fought courageously as adults. This, coupled with the war experience of the Africans as they fought side by side with their superior colonial masters during the war and saw the supposed superior white man being scared of death in the line of fire changed the mentality of the Africans toward the white supremacist and gave them belief that freedom was feasible if they asked the right way.[44]

However, the position of South Africa was unique when compared to other colonized Africa. South Africa had never been completely run by 'whites with a mother country in Europe.' The whites in charge of running the Union of South Africa were whites who had settled permanently without the prospect of going back 'home', they were South African nationals who knew no other home. Hence the need to rule with racial intentions to protect this minority group, using the resources of the millions of the majority blacks to their own economic gain.[45] Yes, the common advantage of political

---

[43] Ali.A Mazrui. Africa and the legacy of the Second World War: political, economic and cultural aspects. Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985, 13-14.
[44] Mazrui, Africa and the legacy of the Second World War,14
[45] A . Kuin'a Ndumbe III. Black Africa and Germany during the Second World War. Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab

emancipation for black Africa got from World War II impacted South Africa, but in a different way.

  To conclude, World War II had a lot of effects on South Africa. It did not just bring about freedom from Great Britain for the Union but also revolutionized the nation. The impact of WWII reverberated for decades as South Africa innovated in industry, embraced manufacturing, with the displaced from the war producing cheap labor for the thriving industry while not neglecting the mining industry as gold became their chief exports. Urbanization was also achieved as the groundwork for Apartheid was laid and effected as a result of effects from the war. Apartheid will now be fully treated in the next chapter.

Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985, 63.

CHAPTER 3

APARTHEID AND ITS RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Apartheid translates as "apartness" or "separateness." In addition to denoting spheres of physical and social demarcation it carries with it a sense of moral and spiritual imperative. The apartheid concept first emerged in the context of discussions by Dutch Reformed Church missionaries in the 1930s, only gaining wider political currency in the 1940s. In 1943 *'Die Burger'*, the Cape-Town based Africanner newspaper described apartheid as "the accepted Afrikaner viewpoint". The following year, Malan, as leader of the opposition, deployed it for the first time in the South African parliament. Later in 1944, Malan explained that apartheid was not the same as the existing policy of segregation which denoted separation in the sense of "fencing off". Instead, he characterized apartheid in more positive, totalizing terms, as a means designed to "give the numerous races the privilege of uplifting themselves on the conditions of what is their own."[46]

Apartheid was the institutionalization of policy and program of racial discrimination in South Africa. It became the implemented strategy and the national ethic of South Africa in 1948, when the National Party displaced the elder statesmen of Afrikanerdom and brought a unique vigor and vengeance to racial politics that would mark the next forty years. But the National Party put into law, and carried to extraordinary extremes in both theory and practice, what was in fact a long history of

---

[46] Saul Dubrow, *Apartheid, 1948-1994* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014), 10.

racial discrimination, brutality, and deprivation that had marked South Africa from the first day of colonialism.[47]

The most common description for South Africa's political system before 1994 was "an apartheid practice." While the National Party governments of South Africa claimed to be representative of a westernized democracy, their claim was said to be generally found to not be true on theoretical grounds. The apartheid system negated many components of democracy since it was ethnically based and divided the South Africans into four races: white, black, coloreds and Indians. It excluded most of the population from political participation so that they lacked representatives who could be held accountable. The system also denied black human rights to the majority, as citizens of the state, since there were different degrees of citizenship (white versus coloreds, Indians, and black), and because the black majority enjoyed the lowest degree of nationality. In the proposed tri-cameral reform system of the 1980s, the Indian and the coloreds were granted a higher degree of citizenship compared with the blacks.[48]

The period between the Boer War and the National Party victory in 1948 saw consistent repression of blacks, Indians, and the coloreds, though with some outwards signs of negotiation or moderations. Mohandas Gandhi began his struggle in South Africa for equal rights against British rule, suffering the same alternating pattern of audience and prison he would later experience in Indian. In 1912, John Dube and Albert

---

[47] Princeton N. Lyman, *Partner to History: The U.S Role in South Africa's Transition to democracy*, (Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2002), 9.
[48] Amneh Daoud Badran, *Zionist Israel and Apartheid South Africa: Civil society and Peace -building in Ethnic-National States,* (London, Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2010),55, 56.

Luthuli formed the African National Congress (ANC) to press for the black rights. For years the ANC sought to obtain these rights through peaceful protest and petition. All of this, however, yielded little fundamental change. In 1913, a law was enacted formally denying blacks rights to the land they once controlled, and they were instead pressured onto "reserves," the precursor to the later "homelands." The law restricted the movement of non-whites and job preservation protected supervisory, managerial, and almost all skilled jobs for whites. Political rights for nonwhites were virtually nonexistent.[49]

Segregation Laws

The South African Apartheid laws came into effect as an implied law at the beginning of the slave trade in the seventh century with about 25 million Africans sold into slavery for the next 12 centuries.[50] Although, it was in 1948 that the South African regime launched out fully on the Apartheid laws starting with the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949, which made it an offence against the state for people of different race to get married and raise children.[51]

The act affected families in South Africa after 1949, but the effect was minimal compared to the devastating effects it had on families and mix marriages which had already been standing before 1949. This situation affected the children of mixed race marriages that were standing before the Act was passed into law in 1949. Cases sprung

---

[49] Princeton N. Lyman, *Partner to History, The U.S Role in South Africa's Transition to democracy*, (Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2002), 12
[50] Robert Stock, *Africa South of the Sahara,* (New York and London: The Guilford Press, 1995), 65.
[51] Stock, *Africa South of the Sahara,* 21.

up where children of the same parents were deemed and classified as different race. Instances sprung up where a child would be deemed Colored while the brother or sister would be classified as white. A typical example of this was the case of Vic Wilkinson, who was initially classified as 'mixed race', later referred to as 'white', then changed his status to 'Colored', became 'white' again, and finally was classified in 1984 as Colored. One cannot imagine the discrimination and hardships as early as the 60s and 70s that this legislation brought upon South African families. So to speak, it brought division in many families and resulted in mental and emotional torture.[52]

Following this was the Population Registration Act of 1950 which expects everybody to be tagged according to their race, either black, white colored, or mixed. To make this happen, it was imperative that the appearance of the individual be considered. The 'pencil in the air' test was invented to determine who was who. The South African government under Hendrik Frensch Verwoerd, who was first Minister of Native Affairs, before becoming the Prime Minister of the regime, oversaw his officials placing a pencil in the hair of people to be determined their race. If the person's curly hair could hold the pencil as he bends over, then he is declared colored, but if the pencil falls out, he is declared black.[53] The classification along racial lines also featured along with the texture of hair, color of hair, facial features and the general complexion of the skin. This often became complicated and confusing, and shattering, as there were

---

[52] John Allen, *Apartheid South Africa: An Insider's View of the Origin and Effects of Separate Development*, (New York: IUniverse Inc.2005), 76.
[53] Robert Massie, *Loosing the Bonds: The United States and South Africa in the Apartheid Years*, (New York: Bantam, 1997), 21.

incorrect determination of race, which left many families divided as some colored

children were classified white and in some cases blacks branded as colored, with a lot of

children becoming outcasts in the process.

The 1950 Immorality Act which forbade any sexual interactions between the

different races of South Africa was tepid, and many South Africans was amused at it and

deliberately flouted those rules, to go ahead and mate interracially just for the thrill of

defiance at the laughable attempt of the authorities in trying to bend the rules of nature,

and general human behavior:[54]

> *If the Immorality Act was awkward to the citizens, the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 was not. It gave room for zero different, distinctive opinion of the regime on Communism. The citizens had no right to call for change, or see differently on the issue of communism. Police would brutally descend on anyone whose opinion was different from that of the regime. The Act banned parties like the Communist Party of South Africa which was communist centered and other pro-communist ideologists in a bid to dissuade them completely from communism. Defining communism as any idea that seeks to effect change, industrial, political, economic or social, or disrupting the status quo. The South African government was so in bed with the west that it was desperate to discard with communism, meanwhile also using the Act to clamp down on opposition, as anyone deemed 'communist' was first given a two-week appeal, then prevented from politics or participating in public affairs to being kept in solitary confinement and being jailed.[55]*

The apartheid government of South Africa diverted national and international gazes

from the genuine reason for frowning at racism and the deprival of fundamental human

rights by pointing fingers at the black movements and labelling them as communists

---

[54] John Allen, *Apartheid South Africa: An Insider's View of the Origin and Effects of Separate Development*, (New York: IUniverse Inc.2005), 74.
[55] Allen, *Apartheid South Africa: An Insider's View of the Origin and Effects of Separate Development*, 75.

because they were supported by the Soviet Union.[56] Taking advantage of the cold war,

indeed, both the ANC and Umkhonto Ze Sizwe in the eye of the apartheid South

African government are external Soviet agents, and not just taking up arms and

canvassing for social, political, and economical involvement like they really were.[57]

The Laws Brought Oppression

This oppression by the apartheid regime forced the pro-equal rights for blacks

organizations like the ANC and PAC underground with their activism. They were

continually oppressed and brutalized, which ironically led them to get funding from the

Communist Party.[58] The non-whites were discriminated against further with the

regime's Bantu Authorities Act 'helping them to be able to vote by creating

"Bantusians", "homelands."[59] Between 1958 through 1966 the homelands came to

accommodate blacks and colored. It created an avenue for the blacks and colored with a

dwelling place to vote, making it impossible for them to vote in the "White Parliament"

while also losing their citizenship.[60] Not contented with just breaking the citizens into

racial lines, the South African regime also divided the non-whites into four homelands,

namely, Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei.[61] This cruelty by the regime to

---

[56] Sue Onslow, Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power Black Liberation, (New York: Routledge, 2009), 9.
[57] Onslow, Cold War in Southern Africa, 9.
[58] Byrnes, Rita M. (1996). "Legislative Implementation of Apartheid". *South Africa: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress. http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.za accessed June 9 2017.
[59] William J. Pomeroy, A*partheid, Imperialism, and African Freedom, (*New York: International Publishers, 1986), 20.
[60] Robert I.Rotberg, *Ending Autocracy, Enabling Democracy,* (Cambridge: World Peace Foundation, 2002), 40.
[61]Rotberg, *Ending Autocracy*), 41.

displace the non-whites from their inheritance and frustrate any hope that they may

nurture in affiliating with the National Party, and also rid them of citizenship affected

the non-whites terribly. In driving home the displacement, then minister of Bantu

Administration and Development, Dr. P. Mulder stated that, "If our policy is taken to its

logical conclusion as far as the Black people are concerned, there will be not one black

man with South African citizenship...Every Black man in South Africa will eventually

be accommodated in some independent new state in this honorable way and there will

be no longer a moral obligation on the Parliament to accommodate these people

politically."[62]With the pretext of establishing an hierarchical succession system of

chiefs appointed by the regime with the aim of giving governance back to the traditional

natives, which the real motive was to cause ethnic differences and divisions.[63]

There are countless more laws that made it so obvious that the non-whites were

different from the whites. Extending even towards segregation in employment, and in

public places. It was impossible for non-whites to work where whites work, with the

only exception being in rare occasions when the blacks worked for the whites.[64]

Gordimer and Goldblatt in driving this point home shares the experience of a young

girl, who said, "we were made to walk, not smile, to not do anything that look like we

were having fun. They treated us like animals. To them, we were. It was just the way

---

[62]Robert I. Rotberg, *Ending Autocracy, Enabling Democracy,* (Cambridge: World
Peace Foundation, 2002), 43.

[63]John Allen, *Apartheid South Africa: An Insider's View of the Origin and Effects of
Separate Development*, (New York: IUniverse Inc.2005), 75-76.

[64] John Dugard, Nicholas Haysom, Gilbert Marcus, *The Last Years of Apartheid: Civil
Liberties in South Africa, (Michigan*: Ford Foundation, 1992), 15.

things had to be, we did not understand."[65] The Apartheid laws became so barbaric and

racial that it soon became a way of life for the non-whites. They were not allowed to

smile, nor have fun, nor even acknowledge themselves as humans. The non-whites were

made to become second fiddle, second citizens, or 'non-modern citizens' at all, as they

were deemed not civil enough to live in decent homes. The nightmare of legislation and

prejudice of the 60s and 70s consigned the homes of non-whites to suffering, in mental,

psychological, and intellectual proportions.[66]

The Separate Representation of Voters Act mixed up non-whites' more than a

hundred years voting rights and placed it on a roll in the Cape. After shifting the

'judicial goal post' several times, the Act was eventually revalidated in 1956,

successfully getting rid of non-whites from common 'voters roll'.[67]

Then came the Native Law Amendment Act which 'criminally' redefined

'natives', declaring the ones who were fit to live in towns, and the ones who were not.[68]

It also compelled all blacks to be with a means of identification all the time, carrying

with them, a pass, which bears identification parameters like, record of employment,

photograph, tax record, place of origin, and of course, any criminal record. The

regime's definition of criminal record was as discriminatory as it gets, as "any

---

[65] Nadine Gordimer and David Goldblatt, Lifetimes: Under Apartheid, (Michigan, Knopf, 1986), 13.

[66] John Allen, *Apartheid South Africa: An Insider's View of the Origin and Effects of Separate Development*, (New York: IUniverse Inc.2005), 74.

[67] Charles Villa-Vicencio, *A Theology of Reconstruction: Nation-Building and Human Rights*. (Cape Town: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 64, 65.

[68] John Allen, *Apartheid South Africa: An Insider's View of the Origin and Effects of Separate Development*, (New York: IUniverse Inc.2005), 76.

encounter with the police" was a criminal offence.[69] By late 1950s Apartheid South

Africa had mirrored the United States of America's Jim Crow laws, only surpassing it

by establishing several legalized laws that made it an act of breaking the law for any

citizen deemed 'Colored' to "walk on a Whites Only beach", "walk through a Whites

Only door", or "ride on a Whites Only bus".[70] It became a crime to be outside on the

streets after 11pm, you would be a criminal to not have your passbook on you, and also

a criminal to have the passbook wrongly signed. It was considered breaking the law to

be without a job, and also a crime to seek employment in the wrong, no-go areas. It was

considered breaking the law to not have a place to live in, and also to live in a place

considered illegal. It was almost considered a crime to be black or non-white.[71] That

was the extent of the racial, discriminatory laws of the Apartheid regime.

The outstandingly shocking Bantu Education Act passed in 1953 set up a black

curriculum tailored towards educating the blacks with their 'nature' and 'requirements'

in mind.[72] Hendrik Verwoerd felt it useless and time-wasting to allow non-whites gain

education that would get them ambitious enough to want to lay claims to positions in

the regime meant for the superior whites, and that would not be available for them to

attain anyway. So the blacks were to be educated in skills that would make them

---

[69] Allen, *Apartheid South Africa*,76.
[70]Ibid, 76.
[71] John Allen, *Apartheid South Africa:An Insider's View of the Origin and Effects of Separate Development*, (New York: IUniverse Inc.2005), 76.
[72] Allen,76
[73] Ibid, 76, 77.
[74] Ibid, 77.

suitable for homeland use, or better still, to prepare them for excellent service as laborers under the superior whites.[73] Similar to this act was the Extension of University Education Act, which made it utterly impossible, and banned black students from being enrolled in white universities. The Prohibition of Interdicts Act made it a crime to contest forced removals in the courts of law, while the Native Labor Act made it an offense for blacks to embark on strike actions.[74]

Generally, as a black person you had to accept whatever comes to you, typically, mostly, bad things of course, without complaints, and bad blood. This was the situation with blacks under the Apartheid regime of South Africa.

As if these were not enough, the Sabotage Act of 1962 trumped the rest of the racist laws yet as it became outright criminal to sabotage the regime. 'Sabotage' being defined as "trespassing" or being in possession of ammunitions. The regime also subdued and prevented the younger generation from getting familiar with the activism of people like Nelson Mandela and his colleagues by placing on ban, the reproduction of the voices, or quotes and statements of someone already banned by the regime.[75]

The notorious General Law Amendment Act in a bid to suppress the furtherance of communism, gave the regime the allowance to declare associations like Poqo, Yu Chi Chan Club, the Congress of Democrats and, Umkhonto we Sizwe as criminal and

---

[75] John Allen, *Apartheid South Africa: An Insider's View of the Origin and Effects of Separate Development*, (New York: IUniverse Inc.2005), 77.

illegal.[76] Further empowering the police to arrest with a warrant or not for crimes as

suspicion of a political crime, they could detain the suspect for ninety days without trial

or an attorney as the regime deem fit.[77] With the discrimination against the blacks,

South Africa became isolated, abandoned and shunned, like a leprous by the world due,

heavily to its legalized racial policy-apartheid. Apartheid comes to mind as one of the

worst crimes against humanity of the 20th century. Televised evidence of the apartheid

regime's barbarism was viewed by the West, and Europe of course, every day. P.W.

Botha, then prime minister of South Africa, enforced a 'state of emergency in July

1985', giving his administration sweeping powers that effectively placed South Africa

under martial law.[78]The administration of The National Party of South Africa which

was in power between 1948-1994 in 1948 imposed Apartheid on the country, which

made nations world over, in turn, implement sanctions on the regime.

Intervention and Sanctions

The United States of America in 1986 finally joined the world in imposing

'economic and diplomatic sanctions' on the Apartheid regime. The United States of

America had been engulfed with winning the Cold War against the Soviet Union, so

believed limiting the presence of the Soviets in Southern Africa would help their

cause.[79] The United States administration saw Apartheid South Africa as an enigma. In

---

[76]D.A. Kotze, A*frican Politics in South Africa, 1964-1974: Parties and Issues*,
(London: C.Hurst & Co. 1975), 37.
[77] Kotze, A*frican Politics in South Africa*, 77.
[78] Sasha Polakow-Suransky, The Unspoken Alliance: Israel's Secret Relationship with
Apartheid South Africa (New York: Random House Books, 2010), 180.
[79] Alex Thomson, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa: 1948-1994:
Conflict of Interests,* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 2.

explaining the position of the South African government, the regime was seen by the United States as a wall that stemmed the advancement of communism; due to its location, being on the Cape Sea Route, blessed with rare minerals, it also housed a lot of United States diaspora companies that found the South African market profitable.[80]

An appraisal of United States Governments' response to the beginning of the regime in 1948 to its end, showed that while they all mildly castigated the anti-human rights policy of apartheid. United States' Presidents did not entirely condemn the prejudiced government of Pretoria by enforcing complete economic and diplomatic penalties on the South African administration. Officials of the Democratic Party and those of the Republican time and time again did not get the hang on stable the white rule is, how the resistance of the black majority had garnered strength and how considerable the presence of the former Soviet Union and Cuban government involvement in the region was, which had equally damaging consequences.[81] Successive American Governments would always reply that the blacks suffering from

[80] Thomson, U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa: 1948-1994: Conflict of Interests, 2.
[81] Michael Clough, "Southern Africa: Challenges and Choices," Foreign Affairs 66, no. 5 (Summer, 1988): 1068, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/angola/1988-06-01/southern-africa-challenges-and-choices(accessed June 14, 2017).
[82]Thomas Borstelmann, *Apartheid's Reluctant Uncle: The United States and Southern Africa in the Early Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 95.
[83]John Parsons, "*On Constructive Engagement in South Africa,*" Tech, November 5, 1985. http://tech.mit.edu/V105/N47/parson.47o.html (accessed September 8, 2017).

apartheid would be the ones to suffer if they did decide to impose sanctions, when

probed as to why they failed to impose sanctions. Thomas Borstelmann postulated that,

although the United States officials knew the ills and effects of apartheid and its neglect

of human rights, Harry S. Truman's government in particular (1945-1953), was

reluctant to scold the South African government as uranium ore needed to boost the

American nuclear system can be found in abundance in South Africa, as well as other

mineral resources. Borstelmann also confirmed that other factors like the economic

advantage of trade relations, the South African army's participation in the Korean War

and the regime's dedication to containment made it easy for Truman's government to

look the other way as regards apartheid.[82]

Nonetheless, the U.S. kept the diplomatic ties with the apartheid regime intact

throughout the period of apartheid. As a matter of fact, the U.S. became Pretoria's

second biggest trading partner. Also, the United States became its second largest foreign

investor, and the source of one-third of its international credit by 1985.[83] Going

forward, South Africa powerfully assisted the United States and the west's resistance to

communism and decided to stifle the increasing presence and rise of communism in

Southern Africa, as these Southern African countries emancipated from foreign rule to

autonomy. Under Richard Nixon's government (1969-1974), a thorough study of the

United States' policy to Southern Africa branded 'National Security Study

Memorandum 39' was produced, which will be analyzed in the following chapter.

Under Jimmy Carter's government (1977-1981), the United States got stricter toward

the apartheid South African government, seeing the rise of African nationalism and awareness as a useful tool in Pretoria in aligning with the best interests of the United States.[84] It is ironical that despite Ronald Reagan's administration (1981-1989) being the toughest yet on the apartheid regime, more than any other president; it was indeed his government that impacted and would change the relationship between the two governments.

To elucidate, in the 1980s, the anti-apartheid movements in the United States and Europe gained momentum and support for sanctions against Pretoria, and for the detachment of United States companies from the apartheid region. However, in spite of the increasing domestic and worldwide movement to depose the regime, during this difficult time, President Ronald Reagan kept a strong relationship with the South African government that was showing no signs of any reformative policies or sanctions. As a matter of fact, through Reagan's administration, he devotedly was for the apartheid regime at the helm of affairs in South Africa. In 1981, President Reagan told the late Walter Cronkite, who was a reporter for CBS, that he was friendly toward the South African government as South Africa was a country that has stood by the United States of America in every war they've ever fought, it was a nation that, strategically, is important to the free world in its production of minerals."[85] After that chat with CBS, President Botha of South Africa responded the following day that: To learn that the forerunner of the new world order understands and know the strategic grandness of

[84] Rita Byrnes, *South Africa: A Country Study* (Washington, D.C.: GPO for the U.S. Library of Congress), http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.za (accessed June 9, 2017).
[85] Y.G-M Lulat, *United States Relations with South Africa. A Critical Overview from the Colonial Period to the Present* (New York: Peter Lang, 2008), 247.

South Africa is gratifying.[86] He continued by saying that South Africa appreciates this

understanding of proactiveness and welcomes it. President Ronald Reagan supported

the apartheid South African regime publicly, making the South African leader, Prime

Minister Botha look like a liberal who was willing to review the policies and support

the U.S. in resisting communism interests in Southern Africa.[87] With this public

solidarity by the Raegan's government, it is not but awkward to note that it is the same

South Africa that sanctioned its majority from suffrage, refused its major population

fundamental human rights and clamped those were brave enough to question its policies

and request sanity to the madness, in jail. It is not startling to realize that Reagan only

ceded and joined the West and the world in renouncing Apartheid South Africa after six

years as president. To be specific, until 1986, when the U.S government slapped the

South African government with economic sanctions, the government of Ronald Reagan

committed itself to standing by its resolve that the change that South Africa needed

would eventually be put in effect by the regime itself.[88]

      With the white Apartheid regime going all out to enforce barbaric laws that

obviously consigned every other race, particularly the majority blacks, to the

background and make them forever inferior to the minority whites, it is to be noted that

---

[86] Justin Elliott, "*Reagan"s Embrace of Apartheid South Africa,*"
https://www.salon.com/2011/02/05/ronald_reagan_apartheid_south_africa/ (accessed
September 8, 2011).
[87] Justin Elliott, "*Reagan"s Embrace of Apartheid South Africa,*"
https://www.salon.com/2011/02/05/ronald_reagan_apartheid_south_africa/ (accessed
September 8, 2011).
[88] John de St. Jorre, "*South Africa: Is Change Coming?,*" Foreign Affairs (Fall, 1981):
112, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/south-africa/1981-09-01/south-africa-
change-coming (accessed September 14, 2011).

the United States of America missed the chance to serve as the umpire who would have regulated the laws and stand up to the regime in favour of the maligned blacks in sanctioning the regime, and fighting the cause of the majority blacks to uphold the fundamental human rights spoken of with glee in Washington. Rather, Washington placed the victory over the Soviets in the Cold War over the moral, human fight for the blacks, and backed the South African racist regime in perpetrating the inhuman crimes against its black majority because of the regime's unwavering opposition to communism.

CHAPTER 4

SOUTH AFRICA FROM THE COLD WAR PERSPECTIVE

The 1960s was an explosive period in the annals of apartheid South Africa.

Great Britain as the colonial master started transferring power to African nationalists,

starting with The Gambia in 1957, then Sierra Leone, Nigeria, and Ghana. In 1960,

France gave up control over their colonies in West and Central Africa. Also, Belgium

withdrew from Congo (Zaire).[89] In South Africa, the decade opened with the

Sharpeville Massacre on March 21, 1960.[90] Lots of folks lost their lives when they had

a protest, albeit peaceful, the protests were to question the laws on passbooks. This

resulted from the harsh pass laws that passed by Hendrik Verwoerd's National Party.

He resumed the 1930s pro-racist reconstruction right with the world watching and

intensified racist policy by moving the black majority on to Bantustans and regulate

them using passbooks, a major source of insult and contention for black South

Africans.[91]

Violent Protests and Embargo

As well as passing even more racist laws and Bantustan regulations, the white

minority who controlled the racist government of South Africa banned the Pan-African

---

[89] Leonard Thompson, *A History of South Africa, Revised Edition* (New Haven: Yale University, 1995), 214.

[90] Iris Berger, *South Africa in World History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 122-123-127.

[91] Christopher Coker, *The United States, and South Africa, 1968-1985: Constructive Engagement and Its Critics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1986), 5-6.

[92] Annette Seegers, *The Military in the Making of Modern South Africa* (New York: Tauris Academic Studies,1996), 122, 124

Congress (PAC) and the African Nationalist Congress (ANC). Capitol Hill was

shocked by this decision, deciding that it was best to place Pretoria on the UN Security

Council's agenda permanently.[92] Kennedy also set up a highly selective arms embargo

one full year before the UN.[93](SACP) The South African Communist Party, the African

Nationalist Congress (ANC) and the Pan-African Congress (PAC) by 1961 all

abandoned the peaceful resistance earlier used to combat pass laws by embracing

violence to make their grouse known.[94] The No. 76 of 1962 of General Law

Amendment that gave the allowance to repeat jail term to 90 days with no trial was

added to legislation by the white-controlled South African regime because the parties

refused to back down on the rate of violence.[95] By 1967, laws were passed that allowed

detention without trial for indefinite amounts of time.

The Soviet Factor

  The South African regime laid the chunk of the violent protests employed by

the banned ANC, PAC, and SACP at the feet of the communist Soviets, in a bid to court

favor and goodwill from the U.S. and the West, as well as to get the United Nations off

their backs. The South African government used this ploy to court the favor of the US

by taking the side of the US in the cold war by labelling the banned parties as

sympathetic to the Soviets. This made the Union look civilized and stabilized,

irreplaceable and calculated before the U.S. and the West, and also tried to make them

---

[93] Annette Seegers, *The Military in the Making of Modern South Africa* (New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 1996), 122- 124.
[94] Annette Seegers, *The Military in the Making of Modern South Africa*, 126-127.
[95]Ibid, 122, 124.

understand the need to uproot these groups causing chaos and influencing its citizens negatively.[96]Looking at the influence of the Soviets and communism in the Union, a lot of historians believe that the realness of the danger of the Soviet was not much. As most of the extent of Soviet communism threat was a propaganda whipped up by the leadership of apartheid South Africa to gain the support and consideration of the US and the west, some contested that indeed they had minimal impact in the area, declaring that though the "Cold War paradigm was a myth," it didn't mean that leaders of the National Party, Botha and Malan did not truly believe that they were fighting on behalf of western countries' interests.[97] The government of South Africa did fear for the Soviets filling the space left by the departing colonial masters, even as they watched Portugal lose its footing in Africa towards 1974, by drastically impacting the geographical advantage the South African regime enjoyed between them and other African countries not linked with a western colonial juggernaut of some dimension.

Although the Soviets did play around in Africa, giving weapons out through East Germany to the opposition uprisings in Rhodesia, Angola, and Mozambique, the Communists were not as threatening than the event of a rebellion by a black majority against a fairly small South African white minority.[98] It is not like there was no link with the ANC, SACP, PAC, and the Soviets. A connection indeed exists between these

---

[96] Leonard Thompson, *A History of South Africa, Revised Edition* (New Haven: Yale University, 1995), 215.

[97] Sue Onslow, ed., *Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power, Black Liberation* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 51.

[98] Leonard Thompson, *A History of South Africa, Revised Edition* (New Haven: Yale University, 1995), 216.

South African political groups and the Soviets, but it was not a big harmful link Pretoria

painted before the United States of America. Sub-Sahara Africa and the early Soviet

Union indeed had a small link which dates back to 1921, the time the Communist Party

of South Africa (CPSA) had representation in Comintern, later replaced by Cominform

after WWII.[99] When African nations started claiming independence in the 1960's and

freshly found political parties showed interest in developing their societies around

socialist ideals, Khrushchev responded with enthusiasm.[100] Khrushchev, unlike his

predecessors, was more interested in Africa, Khrushchev attended the UN to welcome

the sixteen newly admitted African states in the summer of 1960. He liked the idea of

the anti-imperialist fire of the first generation of African leaders and wanted to

capitalize on it.[101]

There are a variety of views on the level of importance and aid the ANC, and

SACP received from the Soviets. The Soviets massively impacted the ANC and really

were responsible for supporting their battle with the South African government and

keeping the groups going, especially after the Massacre at Sharpeville. The ANC and

SACP got trained in guerilla warfare by Moscow in Minsk and Belarus.[102] They also

---

[99] Apollon Davidson and Irina Filatova, "African History: A View From Behind the Kremlin Wall," in Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three Centuries of Encounters, ed. Maxim Mtusevich (Trenton: Africa World Press, Inc., 2007), 112-116.
[100] Apollon Davidson and Irina Filatova, "African History: A View From Behind the Kremlin Wall," in Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three Centuries of Encounters, ed. Maxim Mtusevich (Trenton: Africa World Press, Inc., 2007), 112,116, 117.
[101] Christopher Andrew and VasiliMitrokhin, The World Was Going Our Way: The KGB and the Battle for the Third World (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 426.
[102] Vladimir Shubin, "Beyond the Fairy Tales: The Reality of Soviet Involvement in the Liberation of Southern Africa," in Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three Centuries

requested weapons and received them through Dar es Salaam and Maputo drop points.[103] The ANC was "never actually a complete Communist puppet, but it was heavily sustained by the Soviet support and KGB back channels."[104]

What did assistance from the Soviets look like? In the 1960s, Communist Soviets began giving aid to the local SACP and ANC. Much of the assistance was given to the Umkhonto we Sizwe (Spear of the Nation), known as the armed wing of the ANC and SACP. In 1963, the ANC got $300,000 in aid from Moscow, while the SACP got an addition $56,000.[105] Moscow was able to train the ANC in their camps in Zambia and Tanzania in 1964. Going further, there is little to corroborate this information. He posited that the instructors from Moscow did not start showing in ANC camps till 1979.[106] However, from 1963 -1991, over 1500 ANC activists did get trained in Soviet military institutions.[107]

of Encounters, ed. Maxim Matusevich (Trenton: Africa World Press, Inc., 2007), 242-243.
103 Shubin, 242-243.
[104] Andrew and Mitrokhin, *The World Was Going Our Way*, 430.
[105]Vladimir Shubin, "Beyond the Fairy Tales: The Reality of Soviet Involvement in the Liberation of Southern Africa," in Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three Centuries of Encounters, ed. Maxim Matusevich (Trenton: Africa World Press, Inc., 2007), 340.

[106] Vladimir Shubin, "Unsung Heroes: The Soviet military and the Liberation of Southern Africa," in Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power, Black Liberation, ed. Sue Onlsow (New York: Routledge, 2009), 155.
[107] Ibid, 158.

The Cold War

The Cold War had an enormous impact on the modern world, with virtually

every part of the world involved in this ideological tussle between two great

superpowers and the ensuing battles that followed this competition. This worldwide

tussle tremendously impacted Southern Africa. It is established that beyond question it

had a complex negative consequence for Southern Africa and its people in the south of

the continent. The Cold War enmity helped set in motion the anguish of Southern

Africa for thirty years, and it became an important ideological front in the foundation

for the white-minority regimes and the various liberation struggles. The both of them

exploited this ideological competition for their selfish interests, but in the end had

different objectives. The Cold War tensions provided an opportunity for the belligerents

to legitimize their acts. In the bid to make these aims a reality, Southern Africa

experienced a lot of destructive wars which invited interventions from both the United

States and the Soviets and also from different countries supporting either power;

prompting guerrilla revolts in several nations, and the policy of Pretoria of

destabilization against its autonomous neighbors blocked the political and economic

advancement of Southern Africa. Many of these legacies are still evident in Southern

Africa today.[108]

The Cold War was diffused with many dialogues between the U.S. and the

international community, especially the Third World. South Africa would also witness

[108]Graham, Matthew (2010), Cold War in Southern Africa, in: Africa Spectrum, 45, 1, 131-139. Accessed May 11 2017,http://journals.giga-hamburg.de/index.php/afsp/article/view/511/368

this norm. Instead of responding to the direct menace of the Soviet impact, the U.S. saw in Pretoria an important launch pad for its Navy and an environment for its space program to thrive, thereby ensuring the U.S. turn a blind eye to the antics of the racist apartheid regime and sympathize with the regime. In the 1960s and early 1970s years, the United States' foreign policy towards South Africa regarding the Cold War can be x-rayed through three different means. The three points were the docking of the USS Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1967, the American government using satellite and missile tracking ports in Johannesburg by NASA between 1960-1973 coupled with the ban on arms that Kennedy instituted, which was implemented by Presidents Johnson and Nixon from 1963-1970. These instances, as found in the U.S. National Archives, are close examinations of how Washington carried out policies that affected the government and people of South Africa.[109] Especially as regards worldwide Cold War and as regards apartheid, is important so as to really understand the impulsive component describing how the United States related to the international community in the crucial phase in World History.[110]

The Influence of Cold War on South Africa

During the Cold War, Pretoria was not the best of an ally. Supporting the government in Pretoria was a tough decision for Washington, being friends with a

---

[109] The cold war: accessed 26th of April 2017, https://www.jfklibrary.org/JFK/JFK-in-History/The-Cold-War.aspx

[110] Eisenberg, Rebecca Nicole, "Reexamining the Global Cold War in South Africa: Port Usage, Space Tracking and Weapons Sales" (2012). *Dissertations and Theses.* Paper 117.
http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds/117
10.15760/etd.117, 1.

regime that treated her citizens with contempt and terror was always going to be a big

risk, a risk they decided to take considering the huge benefits taking the side of Pretoria

would bring. South Africa with its geographical location and its political shape, was

blessed with ports that are equipped with innovative technology for Sea and Space,

which were cogent to the United States' course. So, Washington had to consistently

decide the kind of ties they had to float with Apartheid South Africa and the best way to

reach the desired balance internationally and at home.[111]

The Cold War was a difficult period for the U.S. The Cold War was a rivalry of

two ideological and political arrangements. It was a war which pits communism against

socialism with economic gains behind the motive. It was a race to determine which

nation was more developed scientifically, militarily, and regarding nuclear power. A

war to see who would have superior geographical dominance, economic power, and

political might among non-aligned states. The Cold War in the Southern African region

possessed a particular dimension which differentiated it markedly from the battle of

systems and ideas in continental Europe. This was a direct product of the particular

socio-economic development of South Africa, and it's associated class structure which

was indelibly linked to racial discrimination and exploitation. Despite the socialist

Bloc's enduring faith that the march of history was on its side, the residual strength of

the white settler regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia following the collapse of the

Portuguese Empire in 1974-1975 which saw the Portuguese army defeated by

nationalists in its African colonies, prolonged this contest and gave anti- colonial

---

[111] Rebecca Nicole Eisenberg, 1,2.

struggles a particular intensity. These white minority governments used the perceived

threat of communism, aided and abetted by the Soviet Union, to demonize African

Liberation movements and to divert domestic and international attention from the real

causes of opposition to the racist rule.

Synthesizing the consolidation of economic and specific meaningful pursuits

that the U.S. administration had with Pretoria, with the advancement of the Cold War

and the beginning of the Civil Rights movement and an examination of American aid

for the racist white minority regime of South Africa and also for the colonial masters of

the rest of Southern Africa thrust forward space on the difficult juxtaposition of two big

topics of the annals of contemporary America: racism and anticommunism.[112] The U.S.

used Southern Africa countries of Angola, Malawi, Namibia, Zimbabwe, and of course,

South Africa as an experiment to know if it would be possible to strike an alliance with

the third world in fighting against the Soviets.

The US Supports South Africa Against Communism

The Truman government provided invaluable aid to help implement white

dominance and authority in South Africa after the second world war in its desire to stem

the spread of communism and to preserve the 'free world. 'The United States became, a

reluctant uncle- or godparent- at the advent of apartheid.[113] The Truman government

doubted the South African blacks and their ability to install a South Africa free of

---

[112] Thomas Borstelmann, *Apartheid's Reluctant Uncle: The United States and Southern Africa in the Early Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 4.
[113] Thomas Borstelmann, *Apartheid's Reluctant Uncle: The United States and Southern Africa in the Early Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 197.

Soviet dominance, which was mighty important to the United States for different reasons, particularly for some raw materials Pretoria possessed. When Afrikaner nationalists just without question categorized everybody, who opposed apartheid as "communists, " and Truman did not bother to question the legitimacy of the claim seriously.[114]Ideally, Truman believed his chances were not much and did not know who to back in South Africa in stemming the propagation of Soviet impact, so decided to support the white minority, a decision he felt in his gut was the best for the United States then.

This led to a flaw in the coherence of the United States' multiracial politics with its relations with the Southern African region as the US believed supporting white minority leaders will keep the Southern African states in check. There was the concern that "the leaders in Moscow had started to entertain much more interest in advancing their impact and making it felt south of the Mediterranean Sea. The United States believed that once any racial strife is encouraged, 'it would enhance Sino-Soviet Bloc opportunity in Africa.'"[115] President Kennedy's policies towards Pretoria would continue to matter and even transcend to through to the Johnson and Nixon's administrations. His primary strategy was to choose "staunchly anti-Communist white rulers" against picking the majority black ANC or PAC, in spite of fears of how the civil rights movement in the U.S. would react.[116]

---

[114] Borstelmann, *The Cold War*, 201.

[115]Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War*: *American Race Relations in the Global Arena* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 136.

[116]Borstelmann, *The Cold War,*70.

The years between 1960 -1970s was characterized by policies and relations between Pretoria and Washington being steeled by the fear of communism spreading through the impact of the Soviets. Another school of thought believed the marriage of convenience between the U.S and South Africa from the angle of how apartheid influenced United States' establishments that have links to South Africa, like churches, educational institutions, private businesses, civil rights leaders, and diverse leaders from the United States' administration. With the administrations divided and divisive, the United States presidents were too preoccupied with the influence that the South African government wield, and were sensitive enough to want to keep them as an ally in their bid to better the Soviets during the Cold War than to be bothered about the maligned black majority going through hell under apartheid South Africa.

The American government was scared that a revolt in the Southern African country would give room for communism to creep in, thrive and take control of the southern sea routes and the leading light in the supply of gold world over. Washington read while their knees balked, the reports from CIA that communist Soviets had infiltrated the ranks of the ANC. The focus of the cold war thereby changed-, with every intelligence report warped into believing any opposition to apartheid or colonialism an act of support towards communism.[117]

While not necessarily being entirely focused on why the U.S. parleyed with South Africa in the manner it did, the expansion of communism, by the Soviets, in

<hr />

[117] Robert Kinlock Massie, *Loosing the Bonds: The United States and South Africa in the Apartheid Years* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 128.

South Africa was the foundation on which the government based its decisions so brought about a positive change for the maligned blacks of South Africa. Considering that "…Kennedy simultaneously affirmed the legitimacy of the apartheid government, not because the Cold War left him no other choice but because that was the only choice his administration was willing to see."[118] The U.S. did assume that the ruling racist South African regime was the only one to go with when an ally was to be picked among rival political parties as they were seen as the logical, safest option in the ideological battle against the Soviets.

Ultimately, South Africa's projected image as the 'bastion of the free world' did not compel the West. The unbelief of the west was based on the argument that what the Soviets sought by projecting naval power in distant waters was political influence rather than the means to provoke a military conquest of the West. The West recognized that in the improbable event of a shoot-out in the southern oceans, the Republic's anti-Communist posture would leave it little choice but to place its ports, harbors, and military facilities at the West's disposal.[119] In trying to focus on the effort to involve Sub-Saharan Africa in the Cold War, the cash-strapped Soviet Union tried to stay ahead

[118] Christian M. De Vos, "Balancing Acts: John Kennedy, The Cold War, and The African National Congress," Politikon 32, no. 1 (May 2005), 119. Accessed June 11 2017, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02589340500101782.

[119] J.E. Spence, "Southern Africa in the Cold War," History Today 49, no. 2 (Feb 1999), 46. Accessed on April 14, 2017, http://www.historytoday.com/je-spence/southern-africa-cold-war.

[120] Christopher Andrew and Vasili Mitrokhin, *The World Was Going Our Way: The KGB Battle for the Third World* (New York: Basic Books), 438.

[121] Andrew, Mitrokhin, *The World Was Going Our Way*, 443.

of the game, even as former African colonies gained independence. A primary tool of the USSR was to distribute forged letters to leaders of the blacks in Africa that were "designed to strengthen their suspicion of the United States and their trust in the Soviet Union."[120]

The Soviet Arms Freedom Movements in South Africa

The Soviet's interaction with the ANC and SACP, more specifically, even though Moscow had "only minor expectations of the possibility of national freedom movements" in South Africa, they felt that it was pertinent to keep ties with the movements that stood against apartheid and may really come to power if there comes a forceful takeover. In spite of the ANC and SACP receiving a small amount of funds to the tune of 300,000 a year to the ANC alone, "the first fifteen years of Umkhonto operations posed no significant threat to the South African apartheid regime." This was mainly due to the mass exile and imprisonment of ANC and SACP leadership.[121]

About 328 Umkohonto fighters were trained by the Soviets in Odessa from 1963-1965. The Soviets believed it was necessary for the Umkohonto to be trained in guerilla tactics that may come handy when the need arises to battle apartheid. Training continued for the next two decades, but was spotty and could not be sustained, as the USSR could not get the ANC supplies needed to stand up to militarily to the apartheid regime. It was also difficult to smuggle the fighters back into South Africa.[122]

---

[122] Vladimir Shubin*, The Hot "Cold War": The USSR in Southern Africa* (London: Pluto Press, 2008), 244-245.

The involvement of the USSR in South Africa became further complicated by the incursion and entanglement of Cuba with sub-Saharan Africa, proving the theory further that communism was not always of one accord in the Cold War years. With Cuba seeing the region as "'imperialism's weakest link.'"[123] Cuba had interests in the new post-colonialism governments as colonialism collapsed, thus raising the questions of Cuban influence in South Africa and to what extent.

Piero Gleijeses, an historian and a professor of United States foreign policy who worked on Cuban foreign policy offered answers to this. While much of his work focused on Algeria, the Congo, and Angola, he did spend some time examining South Africa. It was Cuba's interest to spread its revolution through Africa that was far more concerning to the U.S. government than Soviet intentions.[124]

There was indeed an intention to ignite a leftist revolution, but this happened through Cuba, instead of the Soviet Union, in Angola, the Congo, and other former Belgian and Portuguese colonies and not in South Africa. South Africa was indeed never a high priority for the Soviets as the major leaders of the ANC in Tambo and Nelson Mandela- were not deemed communists and were never communists, so were never seriously wooed by the Soviets.[125] A more significant parley was that of the U.S. and Great Britain with the South African regime as a result of their proposed investment in mineral resources and open trade.

---

[123] Christopher Andrew and Vasili Mitrokhin, *The World Was Going Our Way: The KGB Battle for the Third World* (New York: Basic Books), 433.

[124] Piero Gleijeses, *Conflicting Missions: Havana, Washington, and Africa, 1959-1976* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 8-9.

[125] Piero Gleijeses, *Conflicting Missions: Havana, Washington, and Africa*, 8-9.

The region was an important part of the 'international civil war' of the twentieth century, as the war between 'centre-right and left' interfered with the politics and armed battle in the Southern African region, against the theory of freedom and talks in favor of evolutionary, a socioeconomic change was effectively sidelined.[126]

South African politics of the Cold War era cannot be simply defined by placing it as a traditional definition of the Cold War. Similarly misguided was enveloping apartheid's exploits and making it look like it was all because of its interests in taking sides with the US in the Cold War. Looking closely at it, one realizes that the Cold War paradigm was a myth, a facade. This does not mean that Botha and Malan-the chief advocates and champions did not seriously believe in its fight in the Cold War and that they were fighting the West's good fight. They really did. However, as enmeshed as they were in the misconception, it blinded them from the realities of the South African struggle and the denial of human rights of the Colored citizens of the country. For the apartheid regime, communism was never really the issue.[127]

In conclusion, The United States of America was able to exert its influence in South Africa, and further its economic course and win the battle of both ideological and

---

[126] Sue Onslow, *"Introduction," Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power, Black Liberation*, ed. Sue Onslow (New York: Routledge, 2009), 1-2.
[126] John Daniel, "Racism, the Cold War and South Africa's Regional Security Strategies 1948-1990," Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power, Black Liberation, 51.

[127] John Daniel, "Racism, the Cold War and South Africa's Regional Security Strategies 1948-1990," Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power, Black Liberation, 51.

moral bragging rights on the Soviets. Even as the white minority leadership of South Africa was able to inflict more inhuman treatment on its non-white citizens in a bid to preserve its supremacy, while courting the favor of the US with its 'commitment' to stemming the advancement of communism in Southern Africa, with Washington looking the other way as its ego was continually stroked by the regime.

CHAPTER 5

HARBINGER OF CHANGE: PRESIDENT CARTER LATE 1970'S

Of all the past administrations, it was President Jimmy Carter's administration

that confronted apartheid South Africa the most. With the Kissinger initiative of 1976,

the new government of the U.S. zoomed on Southern Africa, making the region a

priority in the continent. The Carter administration committed resources to the area to

sustain its interest there. With a wind of change, the U.S. verbally condemned the

Apartheid policies, warned the Republic severely, and for a change, did not just talk, but

acted in line with its voice, and conformed with mandatory U.N. arms ban. However,

this new policy yielded little or nothing as the objective of annihilating Apartheid failed

woefully as apartheid South Africa refused to budge and effect sweeping changes.[128]

Writing about the presidential election that brought Jimmy Carter to the White

House in 1976, reporter Kandy Stroud, claimed that "not many felt like lauding

America this year…" and that "there was not that much to celebrate."[129] It was a time

when folks were dissatisfied pervasive with politics, and a predominant sense of

disillusionment among the citizens of the United States as a result of both the nation's

long engagement in the Vietnam War and the Watergate Scandal.[130] Just because of the

---

[128] Alex Thomson, *U.S Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa*, 1948-1994
(Palgrave: Macmillan, 2008), 89.

[129] Samia Kouki, The Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan Administrations' Policies
Toward Apartheid South Africa: Diverging Rhetoric, Converging Actions, The Tunis
Languages Higher Institute, Tunisia, International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 2011,
210.

[130] Morris, Roger, *Uncertain Greatness: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy*
(New York: Harper Collins, August 1977), 224.

then-Democratic candidate's campaign on a political premise that promised to further

the regard for fundamental human rights, he seemed to be the kind of man that appealed

to the United States citizenry and was a candidate that they felt could get elected. As

soon as he was elected, the new president promised to "make America proud

again,"[131]Many neutral observers believed his vision for respect for human rights would

have a significant influence on formulating the American foreign policy. Carter's repute

as a defender of human rights was further complemented and consolidated by a lot of

appointments made which gave him rave reviews internationally and of course

domestically. The strategic appointments made included Andrew Young, a human

rights activist who was appointed as the United States ambassador to the United

Nations. Another was the Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance, who canvassed for the fair

treatment of the poor before he was recognized and got the appointment. Lastly was

Zbigniew Brzezinski, who became the National Security Adviser.[132] These highly

influential officials were characterized by their ambition to minimize the grandness of

the Cold War in their means to comprehending the dispute in Southern Africa and the

rest of the world[133] Furthermore, President Jimmy Carter's unique direction toward

human rights was established with a Presidential Directive (NSC-30) of February 17,

1978. This unique policy made it known to the world that "it shall be a primary

objective of US foreign policy to promote the observance of human rights throughout

---

[131] Vogelgsang, Sandy, American Dream Global Nightmare: The Dilemma of U.S. Human Rights Policy. New York: W W Norton & Co Inc, 1980, 110.
[132] Cornwell, Rupert. "Cyrus Vance." The Independent 14 January 2002. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/cyrus-vance-729665.html .15 June 2009.
[133] Peter J. Schraeder, *United States Foreign Policy Toward Africa: Incrementalism, Crisis, and Change* (Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, January 1994), 215.

the world." President Jimmy Carter highlighted the groundwork of what he called "the

U.S. fundamental human rights policy" and explained the instances and conditions

involving the violations of human rights and thus required American intervention.

These instances comprised how successive governments abused power in illegal arrests,

torture, degrading treatments and long detention of individuals without trial[134]. In such

instances, the Democratic president promised that the United States would intervene

and leverage its influence to preserve individual freedom worldwide[135].

Going by rhetoric, Jimmy Carter's government's foreign policy looked to adopt a

completely new focus, and significant changes in rhetoric seemed to be introduced with

the dominant discourse being used. In his first address in 1977, President Carter referred

to human rights several times. He expressed the belief that United States foreign policy

should drastically alter its priorities towards a nobler "fight against poverty, ignorance,

and injustice.[136]" He also affirmed that the United States' foreign policy would

significantly prefer to deal with societies which have respect for fundamental human

rights.[137] After being president for four months, Carter declared to the distinguished

guests at the University of Notre Dame of his "reaffirmation of America's dedication to

---

[134] Samia Kouki, The Jimmy Carter And Ronald Reagan Administrations' Policies Toward Apartheid South Africa: Diverging Rhetoric, Converging Actions, The Tunis Languages Higher Institute, Tunisia, International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 2011, 210.

[135] Carter Library at www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov /documents/pod directives/ pres_directive.

[136] Samia Kouki, 211.

[137] Vogelgsang, Sandy, *American Dream Global Nightmare*: *The Dilemma of U.S. Human Rights Policy* (New York: Norton & Co Inc, 1980), 110.

fundamental human rights as a fundamental tenet of our foreign policy"[138] In his

inaugural Senate testimonial on foreign aid, Cyrus Vance, the Secretary of State's

rhetorics resonated with that of his president, offering the same commitment to

upholding human rights. Vance pinpointed two cogent objectives of what should be the

United States function abroad. His presentation again consists of conditions and words

just as those used by President Carter. He elaborated that the United States' interference

in the affairs of the world was supposed "to show America's compassion for the poor

and dispossessed around the world," and "to contribute to the cause of peace."[139] On

another instance, Vance proudly declared that "the defense of human rights has been

and will always be one of the main aims of this government's foreign policy." What was

recurrent in the lexis of different protagonists in the Carter government was that the

custom pointing to considerations for geopolitical and national interests were majorly

muted, a fact largely illustrated by President Jimmy Carter's argument that "we are now

free of that inordinate fear of communism."[140] President Jimmy Carter's direction was to

place great concentration on the United States' function and moral duty to fight to

uphold fundamental human rights domestically and internationally.

The Carter's administration's dedication to defending fundamental human rights

was strong rhetorically. "Freedom", "liberation," and "human rights" are words

---

[138] Forsythe, David. *The United States and Human Rights: Looking Inward and Outward* (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), 140.
[139] Trimiew, Darryl, *God Bless the Child that's Got its Own* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 66.
[140] Hayward, Steven. *The Real Jimmy Carter: How Our Worst Ex-President Undermines American Foreign Policy* (Washington DC: Regnery Publishing, 2004), 111.

repeatedly echoed in President Carter's speeches.[141] Through President Carter's

speeches and public talks, he came out as not just a staunch human rights activist, but

more importantly, his rhetoric displayed an obvious consistency in this commitment

throughout his presidency. Upon his nomination as the 39th president of America in

July 1976, Carter enthused: "our nation was the first to commit itself explicitly to basic

moral and philosophical principles, a new, unique development that inspires mankind's

imagination."

　　At the 1977 Notre Dame event almost a year later, his appeal to the same

principles looked unchanged when he announced that "as we know that democracy

works, we can denounce the contentions of those leaders who deny their people human

rights." This dedication to democracy and human rights, especially in Southern Africa,

did not seem to become stained at the closure of his presidency because in his farewell

speech, he prayed the new Republican presidency to stress human rights heavily like he

did because "America every time must defend these basic human rights"[142]In

considering American relations with Africa before the Jimmy Carter presidency, "the

United States policy toward Africa in the 1950's and 1960's was that of the genial

negligence of black Africa and cautious support of South Africa's white apartheid

regime."[143] President Carter's opinions about equality in racial matters, however, were

on show as early as his 1971 inaugural speech as the governor of Georgia. In that

[141]Kouki, The Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan Administrations' Policies Toward Apartheid South Africa, 210.

[142] Rosenbaum, Herbert, and Alexej Ugrinsky, *Jimmy Carter: Foreign Policy and Post-Presidential Years* (Connecticut: Greenwood, 1994), 77.

[143] Rosenbaum and Ugrinsky, Jimmy Carter, 91.

address, he declared that "After this long campaign, I say to you seriously that the time for racial injustice is done…no poor, weak, rural or black should have to bear the additional yoke of suffering deprivation of the chance of education, simple justice, or even a job."[144] What makes this statement and others by Carter necessary is the kind of expectations and inspiration it gives and raised. As a matter of fact, after Carter's victory at the polls, anti-apartheid activists and elements retained hope that an entirely new approach to United States-Pretoria relations was to be addressed. This hope was helped as a result of the president's expression of regret during his campaign that he did not in any way help the domestic civil rights campaign in the U.S, and promised that if he becomes president, he will correct the anomaly.[145] In fact, not long after being sworn in, Jimmy Carter traveled to Africa, becoming the first U.S. president to visit the continent. When he was there, he declared his oral dedication to democracy again and to uphold moral sanity. In an address in Lagos, Nigeria, he outlined his administration's policy to Africa and proudly declared to the Lagos audience that "with you, we share a dedication to majority rule and fundamental human rights…this dedication determines our position toward your continent."[146]

The oration of elements in President Jimmy Carter's government regarding racism, as described above, promised a considerable deviation from the policies of previous United States anti-apartheid policies. The Carter presidency seemed to be

---

[144] Governor Jimmy Carter inaugural address, Atlanta, Georgia. January 12, 1971, www.carterlibrary.org accessed on the June 28, 2017.
[145] Peter J. Schraeder, *United States Foreign Policy Toward Africa: Incrementalism, Crisis, and Change* (Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, January 1994), 215.
[146]Rosenbaum, Herbert, and Alexej Ugrinsky, *Jimmy Carter: Foreign Policy and Post-Presidential Years* (Connecticut: Greenwood, 1994), 256.

greatly aversed to any racism of any dimensions which thus extended toward apartheid, South Africa. Cyrus Vance reinforced this, as he delivered a speech highlighting the United States' policy Pretoria, in early July 1977.

In the speech before the yearly conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), he notified the South African administration that its ties to the United States would significantly be affected if no substantial endeavor was soon made to change the racist apartheid policy. The aim of such reversal was to let the complete and efficient participation of all citizens of South Africa in politics, not minding the color of their skin. Cyrus Vance continued by expressing his opinion that it was important for apartheid Pretoria to start negotiating with the majority blacks in the country. He further warned the white minority that failure on their part to effect the desired changes would make their relationship deteriorate; stating that Washington DC will not support a system based on racial discrimination and remain true to ourselves"[147] Andrew Young was also very vocal against the apartheid government. He was able to affirm the predominant assumption that this systemized favoritism toward the racist white was just not acceptable. He once announced that "at some junction, we've to reach the verdict that we ain't going to bankroll the apartheid regime. When we reach that conclusion, it's surprising how fast the people of South Africa will come to see the right thing to do."[148] Carter believed that encouraging democracy and sustaining respect for human rights were not different from each other. He explained further that it would have been really useless to highlight

---

[147] Massie, Robert, *Loosing the Bonds*, (New York: Talese, 1997), 413, 414.
[148] Massie, Robert, *Loosing the Bonds*, (New York: Talese, 1997), 410.

human rights abuse occurring in a precise context without considering the political

system in which they occurred.[149] It is thus only reasonable to conclude that President

Carter ought to understand that the solution to the problem of blacks in South Africa

was to try and pressure the apartheid regime, to impose a system that internationally

abhors apartheid and to effect these changes, and institute a more auspicious means for

majority rule and democracy. What is obvious is that, in theory, comparing the Ford and

particularly the Nixon presidencies, which provided ephemeral and reckless attention to

the challenge of racism in Pretoria, positive development in the means used by the U.S.

as regards the nation looked to be on the horizon. The early signs were that the

proponents of human rights and racial equality in top positions in the Carter

administration were appointed, that the review of the African foreign policy was carried

out just after he became the president, and the rhetoric and statements by Carter himself

and top members of his administration.[150]

 Although it strongly disagreed with the tactics employed by the U.S. anti-

apartheid movement, the Carter administration concurred that the time had come for the

United States to confront Pretoria. The new administration benefited from some

individuals within the higher echelons of the State Department with prior knowledge

and interest in South Africa. Anthony Lake, Director of Policy Planning, for example,

had written his Ph.D. thesis addressing U.S. foreign policy toward the region, while

---

[149] Rosenbaum, Herbert, and Alexej Ugrinsky, *Jimmy Carter: Foreign Policy and Post-Presidential Years* (Connecticut: Greenwood, 1994), 81.
[150] Samia Kouki, The Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan Administrations' Policies Toward Apartheid South Africa: Diverging Rhetoric, Converging Actions, The Tunis Languages Higher Institute, Tunisia, International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 2011, 212.

Donald McHenry, deputy representative to the U.N., had published a book on U.S. corporations in the Republic.[151] There was a renewed commitment to Africa from the Carter administration. The chief executive himself was to be the first U.S. president to make an official visit to an independent African state when he traveled to Nigeria in the spring of 1978.[152] He followed this trip by declaring, in June of that year, that we want a continent that is bereft of the control of external powers, rid of the acrimony of racist unfairness, without conflict, and without the yoke of hunger, disease, and poverty. We are certain that our best bet in achieving these objectives is through positive policies that recognize African realities and that recognize aspirations."[153] One of Carter's first acts had been to direct his vice president, Walter Mondale, to concentrate on African issues.[154] Likewise, the president's choice of ambassador to the United Nations, Andrew Young, proved to be significant. With Young as the ambassador, there came about a direct bond between the Pretoria and the U.S.' own struggle against racial discrimination. Young's experience in the civil rights movement, his association with Martin Luther King, and his simple, non-confrontational style of statecraft helped

[151] Donald McHenry, Lake, Caution and Concern; United States firms in South Africa: study project on external investment in South Africa and Namibia. Bloomington: African Studies Program, Indiana, Indiana University, 1975.
[152] David B. Ottaway, Carter arrives in Nigeria on state visit. Washington Post. 1 April 1978. A1. Prior to Carter's state visit, Franklin D. Roosevelt made an informal trip to Liberia on 26–27 January 1943, where he met President Edwin Barclay. FDR was en route from the Allies' Casablanca Conference of 14–24 January 1943.
[153] Address of President Jimmy Carter before the United States Naval Academy, Commencement Exercises, Annapolis, 7 June 1978. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=30915&st=annapolis&st1=[Accessed: 26 November 2007]
[154] Presidential news conference, 15 April 1977. DSB. 1977, 76(1976), 459.

improve the relations between the United States and African governments.[155] Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, too, paid substantial attention to the issues of southern Africa.[156]

Indeed, if Carter's initial foreign policies review process can be used as a measure, southern Africa was rated by the new administration as its fourth most pressing global concern, and it was the first region to be subject to a formal presidential directive.[157] Presidential Directives set the tone for the new U.S. policy toward apartheid. Overall, the aim was to "promote the progressive transformation of South African society," and two parallel strategies were to be explored. First, the president directed Vance, in consultation with Young, to draw up a paper recommending "specific steps" that the United States should employ against the Republic. He asked that this paper also comments on the order of implementation of these actions. The second policy path involved Michael Blumenthal, Secretary of the Treasury, developing links with the 12 U.S. corporations that had recently signed the Sullivan Principles on fair employment practices for South Africa. Blumenthal was directed to encourage an expansion of this program.[158]

This early presidential directive suggested that the Carter administration was preparing to abandon the "carrots" associated with National Security Study

---

[155] Andrew J. DeRoche, Andrew Young: Civil rights ambassador. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2003. 76, 91.

[156] Cyrus Vance, Hard Choices: Critical years in America's foreign policy (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983), 256, 313.

[157] Alex Thomson, *U.S Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa*, 1948-1994 (Palgrave: Macmillan, 2008), 92.

[158] Alex Thomson, *U.S Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa*, 92.

Memorandum 39, for "sticks": punitive sanctions included.[159] Confrontation, beyond

just rhetoric, was now on the agenda. The administration was not, however,

contemplating a complete break with Pretoria. Any punitive measures implemented

would be designed to be consummate with events in the Republic, and the South

African government's responsiveness to the administration. An effective "ratcheting up"

of pressure was the aim. The second element of the directive underlined this point of

measured confrontation. Carter indicated that he was reluctant to impose any kind of

economic embargo on the Republic. For the time being, the administration considered

that an engaged U.S. corporate community in South Africa could act as a force for

change. Officials would seek to tap into this potential influence by working with the

Sullivan signatories. Overall, it was hoped this binary approach would "offer a credible

alternative to armed struggle," and limit the opportunities for Soviet intervention in

southern Africa.[160] To intimate its new policy to the South African government, the

administration agreed to a summit. Prime Minister B.J. Vorster had suggested the need

for such a meeting in a personal letter sent to Carter during March 1977. Vorster had

asked, "Why must we confront one another, why must we quarrel with each other? Can

we not resolve our differences in a way?" He recommended that further talks should

take place through a personal envoy, as he considered "normal channels of

communication" to be "inappropriate."[161] President Carter, despite Vorster's swipe at

---

[159] Ibid, 92.
[160] Alex Thomson, *U.S Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa*, 1948-1994 (Palgrave: Macmillan, 2008)*, 92-93.
[161] Letter, Vorster to Carter, 23 March 1977. Document 1. Southern Africa (3/77–4/77). Geographic File: Box 14. Brzezinski Collection. JCL.

the State Department, concurred. He thought that it "could be mutually profitable to have a full and candid exchange of views concerning Southern Rhodesia, Namibia, and the future political evolution of South Africa."[162] A bilateral summit was accordingly arranged. The protocol behind this meeting was intricate. The United States did not wish to be seen talking to South Africa under the full gaze of the international press unless there was to be a guaranteed degree of cooperation. Diplomatic feelers were therefore deployed to help Washington DC determine the rank of the envoy selected and the venue for this summit. In the end, Vice President Mondale was dispatched. The president felt confident enough with Pretoria's continued engagement vis-à-vis the Rhodesian and Namibian negotiations to permit this. Communication before the meeting, however, indicated that South Africa was unlikely to offer any significant concessions over apartheid itself.

Consequently, the South African territory was considered inappropriate for the talks.[163] A neutral venue in Vienna was agreed instead, with representatives meeting over two days, commencing on 19 May 1977. The message that Washington DC wished to communicate to Vorster was that U.S.-South African relations had now reached a watershed. In particular, Pretoria was given notice that the United States considered the three issues of Rhodesia, Namibia, and apartheid to now be "delinked." Vorster would no longer be offered a "free ride" on apartheid, in return for cooperation elsewhere in

---

[162] Letter, Carter to Vorster, 8 April 1977. Document 13. Southern Africa (3/77–4/77). Geographic File: Box 14. Brzezinski Collection. JCL.
[163] Alex Thomson, *U.S Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa*, 1948-1994 (Palgrave: Macmillan, 2008), 93.

the region.[164] As Donald McHenry later told the Council on Religion and International

Affairs, "We cannot, on one side, try to resolve the problems in Namibia and Rhodesia,

and at the same time mute our voices on the outrageous situation in Soweto."[165] The

United States was now demanding simultaneous results. As the vice president put it:

"We don't think progress on one issue excuses no progress on another."[166] Regarding

defining exactly what this "progress" should be, Mondale was careful not to proscribe

any specific action.[167] Prior to Vienna, the administration's internal policy review had

concluded that U.S. pressure should seek "A peaceful and progressive transformation of

South African society, involving the elimination of institutionalized racism and leading

to rule by the majority of all the governed, with full and equal political participation by

all and guaranteed rights for minorities."[168] Detailed public demands, however, were not

specified. Instead, the administration, throughout its term of office, only talked about

"full political participation" as being the requirement.[169] A particular blueprint for

change was thus avoided, and no one model of post-apartheid governance favored. As

Mondale stated at the conclusion of the Vienna talks: "If there is progress within South

Africa to remove laws such as the pass laws, discrimination laws, these job set-aside

laws, laws to permit active political expression without intimidation, those things

should be encouraged and appreciated." Ultimately, however, Mondale thought it was

---

[164] Alex Thomson, *U.S Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa*, 1948-1994
(Palgrave: Macmillan, 2008), 93.
[165] ibid, 93.
[166] Vice President Walter Mondale's news conference, Vienna, 20 May 1977. DSB.
1977, 76(1982), 665.
[167] Alex Thomson, *U.S Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa*, 93.
[168] Ibid, 93.
[169] Ibid ,93-94.

up to South Africans themselves to determine their future.[170] The Carter administration

acknowledged that what it demanded of Pretoria would "profoundly change the nature"

of U.S.-South African relations.[171] This was not so much because Washington DC had

delinked the problems of Rhodesia, Namibia, and apartheid, but because the United

States was now prepared to issue an ultimatum to achieve its ends. Vice President

Mondale made it known at Vienna that in the absence of positive moves from the

Republic, in all three of these areas, the United States would "change its position of

opposing mandatory sanctions."[172] This was a threat that the Carter administration

repeated throughout its watch. Secretary of State Vance, for instance, warned Pretoria

just two months after Vienna that, "If progress is not recorded in ten days, our relations

will inevitably suffer"; a year later he told the Senate Subcommittee on African Affairs,

"We have to make it clear that a deterioration of our bilateral relations is inevitable if

progress is not made"; in 1979, William Dunfey, a member of Carter's U.N. delegation,

informed the General Assembly that if reform from Pretoria was not forthcoming his

government "will consider other ways to bring about change"; and even in 1980,

Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Richard Moose was talking about "our

relations with the South Africa Government" being "dependent upon progress toward

the elimination of apartheid."[173] The message was clear from Vienna onward: Pretoria

---

[170] Vice President Walter Mondale's news conference, Vienna, 20 May 1977. DSB.
1977, 76(1982), 665.
[171] Memo, Mondale to Carter, 8 April 1977. 2. Document 14. Southern Africa (3/77–
4/77). Geographic File: Box 14. Brzezinski Collection. JCL.
[172] Alex Thomson, *U.S Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa*, 1948-1994
(Palgrave: Macmillan, 2008), 94.
[173] Alex Thomson, *U.S Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa*, 94.

only had limited time in which to comply with international standards of racial

relations. If there was not suitable progress within this (never specified) time frame, the

United States was prepared to apply punitive sanctions. South Africa's response to the

Vienna démarche was mixed. Once again, Pretoria reiterated that it was fully prepared

to cooperate with Washington DC over the Rhodesia and Namibia negotiations. Within

bounds, the Republic was willing to exert pressure on Prime Minister Ian Smith vis-à-

vis Rhodesia. Likewise, Vorster confirmed that Pretoria was prepared to end its

occupation of Namibia, subject to details being confirmed and guarantees being

made.[174]

Under Jimmy Carter's Administration (1977-1981), the United States endorsed a

tougher stance against the South African government, seeing African nationalism as a

driving force in the region that was compatible with United States interests.[175]However,

Carter believed that the United States should expand business activities in South Africa

because business would be a force for "change."[176] In 1977, President Carter had cut the

representation of military American Defense Attaché Officers in South Africa in protest

against the South African crack down in the wake of the infamous uprisings in Soweto

---

[174] Cable, U.S. Embassy-Vienna to State, 20 May 1977. Facsimile published in Mokoena, ed. Declassified history. Document 43.
[175] Shandrá D. Hipp, *Constructive Engagement: Ronald Reagan"S Problematic Policy of Appeasement with South Africa* (Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., March 23, 2012), 22.
[176]Lulat, United States Relations with South Africa. A Critical Overview from the Colonial Period to the Present, 248.
[177]J.E. Davies, *Constructive Engagement? How Reagan's Administration Tried to support South Africa without appearing to Endorse Apartheid* (Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2007), 23.

in 1976.[177] Also, the Carter Administration banned the export of all items to the South

African military and police and prohibited the export of computers that would be used

to enforce apartheid.[178]

Furthermore, during Carter's tenure as president, it witnessed the United Nations

adopting the UN Security Council Resolution 418. On November 4, 1977, the

resolution was endorsed, imposing a compulsory arms ban against the administration of

South Africa. To President Carter's credit, he forcefully and adamantly opposed the

institution of apartheid in South Africa and called for its immediate end. However, in

spite of Carter's harder stance toward South Africa, the hardest, compared with other

presidents, it was Ronald Reagan's presidency (1981-1989) that would change the

course of the relationship between the United States with South Africa.[179]

Jimmy Carter became president of the United States of America in 1977 with

the intent of emphasizing the defense of human rights as an important feature of its

foreign policy. Stephen E. Ambrose and Douglas G. Brinkley comment that "Carter felt

the issue deeply himself and also, it provided an opportunity for him to distinguish his

foreign policy from that of Nixon and Kissinger."[180] One might expect such an

emphasis to result in rather intense pressure from the United States on the South African

regime to dismantle its apartheid system, and such an impression would have been

---

[178]Shandrá D. Hipp, *Constructive Engagement,* 22.

.
[179] Shandrá D. Hipp, *Constructive Engagement: Ronald Reagan"S Problematic Policy of Appeasement With South Africa* (Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., March 23, 2012), 22.
[180] James Lee Ray, *American Foreign Policy, and Political Ambition*, (Los Angeles: Sage, 2014), 261.

reinforced by Carter's appointment of African American activist Andrew Young as the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

And, indeed in its early days, the Carter administration did take some steps to increase the pressure for reform on the South African regime, strengthening, for example, an embargo on arms to that nation. In 1978, it also "reprimanded South African for a possible explosion of a nuclear device."[181] In the end, Carter administration refused to take any actions that would differentiate its policy toward South Africa substantially from that of its Republican predecessors. According to the Digital National Security Archive (2004), "like its predecessor, the Carter Administration...actively discouraged revolutionary change in South Africa and advocated moderate reforms."[182]

And if the Carter administration was reluctant, because of Cold War pressures, to push the South African regime too hard for a change in its policy of apartheid, the Reagan administration was even more likely to give priority to its struggle against the Soviet Union over any effort to bring about rapid political reform in South Africa.[183]Furthermore, Carter's campaign rhetoric about the importance of human rights led many, especially liberals, to believe that he was implicitly promising to take a tougher, more principled stand against the white minority governments in Pretoria and Salisbury. American grassroots organizations were optimistic; black African countries

[181] Ray, American Foreign Policy, 261.
[182]James Lee Ray, *American Foreign Policy, and Political Ambition*, (Los Angeles: Sage, 2014), 261.
[183] James Lee Ray, American Foreign Policy, 261.

were hopeful.[184] Consequently, in the struggle to end Apartheid in South Africa

President Jimmy Carter is best remembered for talking tough about human rights and

apartheid yet acted soft in effecting change to the status quo. He let slip the opportunity

to follow his oration with action by placing economic gains over the emancipation of

the maligned Southern Africans. In the next chapter, we will see if the next American

presidencies took the chance that President Carter let slip.

[184] Sue Onslow, Cold War in South Africa *White Power, Black Liberation* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 179.

CHAPTER 6

DIVESTMENT: US POLICY UNDER PRESIDENT REAGAN

The Reagan presidency also had to deal with the conundrum that was the

Apartheid regime of South Africa. The country's precious minerals, its prime strategic

location, its government's role as a staunch supporter of American and the West's policy

of blocking the growth of Soviet communism were the several excuses cited by

previous United States presidencies for encouraging the National Party of South Africa

and its policies in Pretoria. This support continued until Apartheid's ultimate demise

two years after Reagan left office.[185] It is easy to say that the U.S. decision to support

Pretoria was in the interest of the United States of America. In spite of the concerns for

the indignity, pains, and sufferings experienced by the sheer vast numbers of the South

African citizenry meted out by the apartheid regime, the U.S. government continuously

appealed the U.N. and the world that Apartheid would peter out naturally.[186]

A New Dawn

A new dawn in the policy of the United States toward South Africa was ushered

in in November 1980 with the presidency of Ronald Reagan in the U.S. The "new

right," looking to change the liberal policies of the previous administrations in foreign

policy, moved into power. Furthermore, Reagan's election to the U.S. presidency would

herald the beginning of a fundamentally new political order. Reagan's victory, therefore,

---

[185] Shandrá D. Hipp, *Constructive Engagement: Ronald Reagan's Problematic Policy of Appeasement With South Africa* (Georgetown: Washington, 2012), 15.
[186] Shandrá D. Hipp, *Constructive Engagement*, 16.

constituted no less than a "revolution." President Reagan played a major role in shaping

the administration's policy towards the Southern African nation.

President Ronald Reagan being a typical politician, deviated completely from

the Carter ideology of human rights protection oration, believing that the U.S. had to

oppose communism and protect its strategic interest in the region.[187] Under the Ronald

Reagan government, Pretoria had eventually found in the U.S, an administration ready

to take arguments about its strategic and political importance as an anti-Communist ally

seriously.[188]

The new government was supportive of the white minority government in

Pretoria, and Southern Africa as a whole. The South Africa's Foreign Affairs Minister at

that time, P.W. Botha and other members of the South African government would visit

the U.S. early in Reagan's first term as president to meet with high-ranking cabinet

officials. During this time, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Chester

Crocker, a veteran from the Nixon administration, would craft Reagan's policy towards

South Africa, Constructive Engagement.

A New Policy

Describing the terms of the tenets of the policy tagged, Constructive Engagement,

which follows a systematic, gradual reform in Pretoria. "The diplomatic relations

between Pretoria and the U.S. has now reached a crossroads of arguably historic import.

---

[187] Pauline H. Baker, *The United States, and South Africa: The Reagan Years* (New York, Ford Foundation, 1989), 8.
[188] Linda Freeman, "„Constructively" Supporting Aggression and Repression - Reagan's South Africa Policy," Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne des Études Africaines 18, no. 3 (November 1984): 627, http://www.jstor.org/stable/484775 (accessed September 25, 2017).

After two decades of generally increasing official U.S. government indifference to

South Africa and related Pretorian inflexibility, the possibility may now arise for a

much more positive and mutual relations between the two nations based upon shared

strategic concerns in Southern Africa, our recognition that the government of P.W.

Botha constitutes a unique opportunity for domestic change, and willingness of the

Reagan Administration to deal realistically with South Africa."[189]

Dr. Chester Crocker was appointed Reagan's Assistant Secretary of State for African

Affairs soon after Reagan's success at the polls in 1981. By 1988, at the end of his

tenure, Crocker had become the longest-serving Assistant Secretary of State for African

Affairs since the department's creation in 1958.[190]

    *C*rocker was then both an Associate Professor of International Relations at the

Georgetown School of Foreign Service and the Director of African Studies at the Center

for Strategic and International Studies at the same university before the U.S.

Department of State. During this time, he wrote "South Africa: Strategy for Change" a

document which highlights his favorite policy of "Constructive Engagement" to the

Southern African administrations – particularly Pretoria.[191] The Assistant Secretary of

State wondered, after 20 years of different party presidencies, if the United States even

had a working policy toward Pretoria. "South Africa: Strategy for Change" would

become the blueprint for President Reagan's diplomatic policy of Constructive

_____

[189] Y. G-M Lulat, *United States Relations with South Africa: A Critical Overview from the Colonial Period to the Present* (California, Peter Leng, 2008), 247.
[190]J.E Davies, *Constructive Engagement?: Chester Crocker & American Policy in South Africa, Namibia & Angola, 1981-8* (Johannesburg, James Currey, 2007), 23.
[191]J.E Davies, *Constructive Engagement*, 1.

Engagement toward Pretoria and the Southern African region in general. The case for

pursuing activist tactics of regional engagement relied less on the opportunities for

success than on the real costs of not trying at all.[192] "Clearly, the fundamental

objective," was the coming to fore of a Pretorian nation "with which the U.S. can pursue

its varied interests in a full and friendly relationship, without constant embarrassment or

political damage.[193]" However, the ideas of the administration were viewed by some

observers as a conceptual throwback to the previous twenty years, when Henry

Kissinger, pursued "communication" as a policy toward the Apartheid administration,

emphasizing mutual tactical and economic interests, during the Nixon administration.[194]

To not focus only on the objective of a full-blown national convention was the

way forward as shown in Pretoria's sovereignty showing that only the regime itself can

control and monitor the particular exercise since the West has all to gain if it breaks

through in pressing minority white-led change toward the direction of real power-

brokering.[195] At the base of this faith was that only the white minority of Pretoria could

effect peaceful change, and that the majority blacks canvassing for the demise of

apartheid must achieve this in a peaceful and nonviolent manner. Constructive

Engagement's focus would focus aim at a process of change and would avoid focusing

---

[192] Chester A. Crocker, Southern Africa: Eight Years Later "Foreign Affairs
Vol. 68, No. 4 (Fall, 1989), pp. 144-164"Published by: Council on Foreign Relations
DOI: 10.2307/20044114, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20044114
Page Count: 21. Accessed August 21, 2017.
[193] Crocker, Chester A. "South Africa: Strategy for Change." *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 2
(1980): 323-51. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20040728, Accessed August 21, 2017.
[194]Pauline H. Baker, *The United States, and South Africa: The Reagan Years* (New
York, Ford Foundation, 1989), 8.
[195]J.E Davies, *Constructive Engagement?: Chester Crocker & American Policy in South
Africa, Namibia & Angola, 1981-8* (Johannesburg, James Currey, 2007), 26.

on the outcome of destroying Apartheid, as this would keep the West (particularly the U.S.) immobilized by a distant objective.[196] Washington would need a nimble and sustained diplomacy, responsive to the pragmatic instincts of regional leaders.[197]

Even before Crocker joined the Reagan presidency, he was a vocal critic of the policy of Carter toward Pretoria. Crocker stated that"the Carter government enveloped itself in a straight-jacket of policies which steers and welcomes comparisons of its promises and performance."[198] Helping the decision to appoint Crocker to work on ties with Pretoria was the fact that he took exception to the previous administration's harsh opinions, its extremist and supposedly unrealistic requests to relinquish power, and its many attempts, often half-hearted, to disassociate itself from the regime in Pretoria.[199]

Making up for what he regarded as immoderate vocal rivalry toward South Africa by the Carter presidency, Crocker tried to relate with South Africa's tactical interests, particularly its anti-communism position, and to sympathize with the fear of the white minority. Emphasizing plea over pressure, he signaled in advance that there would be no significant penalties for inability to cooperate.[200] "In South Africa, it is not our job to have a choice between black and white. In this land of abundance, talented and different people, essential Western strategic, economic, moral and political concerns are

[196]J.E Davies, Constructive Engagement? 26.
[197] Crocker, Chester A. "South Africa: Strategy for Change." *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 2 (1980): 345. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20040728," Accessed August 22, 2017.

[198] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994: Conflict of Interests* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan), 112.
[199]Christopher Cocker, *The United States, and South Africa, 1968-1985: Constructive Engagement and Its Critics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1986), 154.
[200]Pauline H. Baker, *The United States, and South Africa: The Reagan Years* (New York, Ford Foundation, 1989), 72.

at stake.[201] For South Africa to obey the global demands for eliminating Apartheid, Crocker declared that the U.N, and especially the U.S., must engage with the government of South Africa. There was an opportunity to help shape a regional climate conducive to political accommodation in both Southern Africa and Pretoria if Western administrations were ready to engage in "maintained and active diplomacy" involving leadership in regional problem-solving.[202]

The questions 'how could the United States actively support Pretoria to be able to decide their future without the baggage of apartheid that takes into account the interests of the United States were inherent. He proffered a logical reaction to those who trust that wielding an imposing United States influence would be a disadvantage to the whole objective that was being worked at. Then new experience with Iran at that point in time should mute those who believed the United States should wield strong might in socially, economically, and politically weakening apartheid Pretoria. The abolishing of apartheid creating a fresh non-racial administration was not going to be actualized by an unannounced dramatic act such as banning trade or investment with South Africa or even comprehensive sanctions backed by military power.

---

[201] Freeman, Linda, and Alfred O. Hero. ""Constructively" Supporting Aggression and Repression - Reagan's South Africa Policy." Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne Des Études Africaines 18, no. 3 (1984): 627-33. http://www.jstor.org/stable/484775. (accessed September 25, 2017).

[202] Crocker, Chester A. "South Africa: Strategy for Change." *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 2 (1980): 345. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20040728," Accessed August 22, 2017.

[203] Clarizio, Lynda M., Bradley Clements, and Erika Geetter. "United States Policy toward South Africa." Human Rights Quarterly 11, no. 2 (1989): 249-94. http://www.jstor.org/stable/761958. Accessed June 29, 2017.

Pretoria had proved they could endure all those challenges from former U.S. governments. A major reason used by the Reagan government for the loss of U.S. impact was that past bans led to the loss of credibility with the South African government.[203]

Reagan in Bed with Apartheid

Constructive engagement, as highlighted by an executive order by President Reagan, rested on the assumptions underlying the ideal outcomes. First, South Africa's all-encompassing military and commercial dominance in the region of Southern Africa and its great internal security system would, shortly, allow South Africa to "control" external pressures and internal ones to achieve change. Second, the Botha administration could be stimulated to agree to a globally embraced settlement in Namibia if Pretorian withdrawal were linked to a removal of Cuban artillery from Angola and the possibility of an advancement in Pretoria- U.S. relations. A settlement in early Namibia would set a self-reinforcing spiral of positive developments in South Africa and the region in motion, thus corroborating the unique approach; so, progress could be recorded more swiftly on apartheid issues if the U.S. government used official rather than public channels for its criticism and pressure.[204] "We can work with a nation going through a rehabilitative change," Crocker controversially wrote in a Scope Paper for Alexander Haig, the Secretary of State at this point that a new American mentality

---

[204] On U.S.A. U.S. Department of State, Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on South Africa, A U.S. Policy Toward South Africa, Report (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1987).

must evolve.[205] The United States and the international community could no longer force a change in the diplomatic politics of Pretoria. Rather, the regime would need to realize that her racism was destroying its credibility.

However, there was proof in the regime that change was coming with the National Party under the control of P.W. Botha. With Western engagement absent in South Africa, and the region as a whole, it would be impossible to provide assurances that South Africa would be allowed to have a future with no apartheid. Furthermore, the Americans believed that it should strongly encourage a regional circumstance receptive to compromise and to accommodate before concerted attempts to not validate innovative change and to capitalize on the inevitable unclear and periodic "happenings" that will bring about diplomatic liberalization.[206]

Change Becomes Imminent

At that time in South Africa, the blacks got some privileges and rights, although not much. They were able to get employed in jobs that had been refused them in the past. The regime removed all the legal sanctions installed to block blacks from being on some international Sports teams of the Southern African country. The most important

---

[205] On U.S.A. U.S. Department of State, Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on South Africa, A U.S. Policy Toward South Africa, Report (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1987)
[206] Crocker, Chester A. "South Africa: Strategy for Change." *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 2 (1980): 345. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20040728," Accessed August 22, 2017.

change occurred in the labor sector. Blacks had finally been given trade union rights and were steadily moving up into more skilled employment.[207]

Perhaps more necessary, the finance of Pretoria was not flailing when Reagan assumed office. South Africa was doing fine. South Africa's economy was flush from the exorbitant sums got from gold and other mineral exports.[208] The general thought amongst those in the Reagan Administration was that the previous administration's strategy of broken relations with Pretoria was not yielding much difference within the South African National Party. Early in Reagan's presidency, he toned down on some of the bans that had been placed on Pretoria.

With the United States' concerns in South Africa, the supposed incoherence, non-efficient policies from previous governments, and the unclear change emanating from inside the racist regime, what strategy should the Reagan presidency employ on the ruling National Party? The question the government had to answer was this particular one. The U.S. could best enhance change in the apartheid regime by dealing with the minority white might structure and being conscious of white fears.[209] He said, "Our objective, is to increase the confidence of the Pretorian administration. As the convener of the Constructive Engagement policy, Assistant Secretary Crocker wanted

[207] John De St. Jorre, "South Africa: Is Change Coming?".
https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/south-africa/1981-09-01/south-africa-change-coming. Accessed on 12th of October 2017.
[208] John De St. Jorre, "South Africa: Is Change Coming?".
[209] Pauline H. Baker, *The United States, and South Africa: The Reagan Years* (New York, Ford Foundation, 1989), 9.
[210] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994: Conflict of Interests* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan), 113.

to make a centrist general agreement, some synthesis of Carter's activism and human rights concerns, with NSSM''s realist approach.[210] He would seek to make his approach to constructive engagement toward South Africa an acknowledgment of the country's importance to the United States and the West.

Even before Crocker was appointed an Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, he made it abundantly clear that he did not see that the policy of isolating South Africa or exerting unnecessary pressure on it was particularly sensible. He stated that "the United States do not want to 'unruffle' Pretoria or undermine our own tactical and economic concerns. The might force of South Africa is not in our hands."[211] To also establish these proclamations, Crocker would publicly express them, to further appease Pretoria. The policy eventually padded the soothing of South Africa. This, of course, was a welcomed view for Pretoria. In the days of the Carter presidency, they have believed the Carter's 'robust' approach to their administration as a hindrance to extending the relations with the United States. One of the first acts of constructive engagement was to repeal Carter's 1978 complete prohibition of United States trade between herself and the South African military and police. Starting in mid-1981, the companies in the United States could do business in Pretoria as a result of the Constructive Engagement policy.

---

[211] Y. G-M Lulat, *United States Relations with South Africa: A Critical Overview from the Colonial Period to the Present* (California, Peter Leng, 2008), 115.

They could now trade in basic commodities like food, clothing, nonstrategic chemicals, calculators, personal computers, and copying machines.[212] The government explained that although other parts of the arms ban remain, making sure of "a strong emblematic and diplomatic disassociation of the United States from the enforcement of apartheid," Carter's complete embargo was merely "futile" and had "zero effect."[213] Though, compliance with the U.N. arms ban and the United States' failure to utilize Pretorian defense materials were symbolic of importance to the policy and should be furthered when there is no major diplomatic change, barring a dramatic deterioration in the geopolitical situation facing the West in adjacent areas.[214] Those areas that change frequently lead to should be made possible and given priority. He further elaborated that the United States should prevent, the snare of a sweeping assault on every part of Apartheid – as if each was as odious and neither should be taken into consideration first. If there were a shift in that policy, it would be for a prolonged and orderly change. The U.S. would surely, in this sense, mix itself up with particular processes, change agents, and political forces in concrete cases.[215] The administration's new policy was a new dawn to the ties between South Africa and the United States. It was "not the clandestine embrace" of the Nixon administration nor "polecat treatment" of the Carter years.[216]

---

[212]Y. G-M Lulat, *United States Relations with South Africa: A Critical Overview from the Colonial Period to the Present* (California, Peter Leng, 2008), 115.

[213] Y. G-M Lulat, *United States Relations with South Africa,*115.

[214] Crocker, Chester A. "South Africa: Strategy for Change." *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 2 (1980): 346. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20040728," Accessed August 22, 2017.

[215] Crocker, Chester A. "South Africa: Strategy for Change." *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 2 (1980): 346. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20040728," Accessed August 22, 2017," 347.

[216] Ibid., 346.

Reagan Strongly Denies Supporting Apartheid

The victory of President Reagan had bestowed the U.S. with a fresh level of trust with Pretoria because "our desire and mandate is to see changes in diplomatic relations." Though the policy of Constructive Engagement decided to not confront with the regime in Pretoria, the Reagan presidency did not but express its opposition to Apartheid.[217] Contrary to popular anti-apartheid belief, the policy of Constructive Engagement was a positive approach to promoting change in Pretoria. Terming Apartheid as "morally unacceptable," the government was stubbornly in opposition to Apartheid. One time, in a Congressional hearing in regards to the United States stance toward Pretoria, Assistant Secretary Crocker posited that "our strong political and moral belief about a policy based on legalized racism (any policy which gives or takes political rights on this racial premise) – with the legitimacy of citizenship itself – is going to be repulsive."[218] Pretoria was using the only system globally "refusing its countrymen natural rights which are openly and legally based on racism," a fact which bestowed upon apartheid "special distinction as the world's most condemned system."[219]

Notwithstanding their dislike for Apartheid, the fact remains the strategy of constructive engagement was aimed at appeasing Pretoria. Washington, D.C. wanted the government of South Africa to know that the U.S. could "cooperate with a society

---

[217] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994: Conflict of Interests* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan), 118.
[218] J.E Davies, *Constructive Engagement?: Chester Crocker & American Policy in South Africa, Namibia & Angola, 1981-8* (Johannesburg, James Currey, 2007), 28.
[219] Y. G-M Lulat, *United States Relations with South Africa: A Critical Overview from the Colonial Period to the Present* (California, Peter Leng, 2008), 245.

undergoing constructive change."[220] The administration believed that it was in

America's interest to encourage and assist reforms and to accept that without the

reforms, the threat to American concerns would inevitably gather speed.[221] However, as

admitted by the Reagan administration, constructive engagement with South Africa had

limits regarding achieving results. The U.S. Ambassador to Apartheid South Africa

stated that: "we cannot impose any policy on any nation in the region, nor would we

want to," in an address at the American Chamber of Commerce in South Africa, in

1983.

   "At the core of U.S. serious experience in Pretoria is that we have realized that

there is a critical boundary to what any other superpower – or the United States can do

to effect change in the apartheid state.[222] "Decision-making and political exploits would

be regionally focused, while the option of whether to compete or not – when the Cubans

and the communist Soviets were seriously taking advantage of and militarizing regional

conflicts – would have worldwide implications." Constructive engagement tried to buy

the government of South Africa space and time to reform its society.[223] The

administration believed that Apartheid transitioning through evolution would suffice

and favorable to the U.S. so long as the ruling National Party's strategy represented

---

[220] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994*, 118.
[221] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994: Conflict of Interests* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan), 118.
[222] J.E Davies, *Constructive Engagement?: Chester Crocker & American Policy in South Africa, Namibia & Angola, 1981-8* (Johannesburg, James Currey, 2007), 24.
[223] Thomson Alex*, U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994: Conflict of Interests* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan), 114.

genuine reforms. The Assistant Secretary's views were summed up in a 1981 State Department memo: "Though we may still not agree on Apartheid and cannot allow a system of legalized racial discrimination, we can unite with a nation experiencing change."[224] Moreover, while sympathetic towards white South African attitudes, Washington did not react to the plight of the majority blacks and was seen in that perspective by the blacks of Pretoria, a lot of whom had come to see the U.S. as a close friend of the Apartheid regime. As well as blessing a constitution that marginalized blacks, South Africa endorsed a new policy giving limited parliamentary inclusion to the Coloreds, and Indians but excluded the black majority.

Botha, the South African prime minister, had decided to make changes, reforms that were not much. His American counterpart saw a window of opportunity that Botha's reforms brought, and decided to relate with the Southern African nation, after several years of discrepant policies toward them from the United States. With the objective of snuffing out communism in the background, the administration worked on Constructive Engagement that would seduce the white minority of Pretoria, while sustaining the United States' concerns in the nation. It was proposed, that peaceful change preponderantly would be realized through white institutions in South Africa. "There is not a great reason to contest the near-term survivability of white power in South Africa," according to the Reagan administration Constructive Engagement gave Pretoria with material benefits from early in Reagan's first term at the White House.[225]

---

[224] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994*,
[225] Shandrá D. Hipp, *Constructive Engagement: Ronald Reagan's Problematic Policy of Appeasement with South Africa* (D.C, Georgetown University, March 23, 2012), 44.

With the material incentives of increase in trade and exchange of technology between both countries, Pretoria became a friend of the U.S. Reagan hoped not to repeat previous administration's parley with South Africa devoid of a coherent policy.[226] The elements of Constructive Engagement toughened South Africa up to make the status quo remain as it is, thus encouraging the apartheid regime to elongate apartheid. Nevertheless, the known objectives of the policy of Constructive Engagement, it eliminated any serious positives for Pretoria to launder its international image by improving the conditions of its majority black African population.[227]

Desmond Tutu and Ronald Reagan

Archbishop Desmond Tutu, a fierce black South African activist, who clinched the Nobel Peace Prize in 1984, frustrated with the continued inactivity of the west and the backing of the racist government of South Africa to the detriment of the blacks, slammed the leaders of the US, Britain, and West Germany. Bishop Tutu did not mince words as he branded Reagan, Thatcher, and Kohl as racists for supporting the racist apartheid government. "I have tried to be as nice as I could be, but we're talking about children being killed by a racist government that is being protected from the consequences of its actions by Mr. Reagan, Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Kohl," The Nobel Laurate posited in an interview, in obvious swipe at Prime Minister Thatcher and Chancellor Kohl of West Germany. Bishop Desmond Tutu continued by saying that

---

[226] Shandrá D. Hipp, *Constructive Engagement: Ronald Reagan's Problematic Policy of Appeasement with South Africa* (D.C, Georgetown University, March 23, 2012), 44.
[227] Freeman, Linda, and Alfred O. Hero. ""*Constructively" Supporting Aggression and Repression - Reagan's South Africa Policy." Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue Canadienne Des Études Africaines* 18, no. 3 (1984): 627-33. http://www.jstor.org/stable/484775. (accessed September 25, 2017).

"certainly, the support of this racist policy is racist."[228] "I'm supposed now as a Nobel laureate to speak responsibly and all that sort of thing, and I try to, but I just think we are seeing closet racism coming out into the open. How else can you explain the fact that people say that sanctions will hurt the blacks, so we won't apply sanctions?"[229]

In his address at the New York General Assembly's Special Committee Against Apartheid, he aired his frustrations at the total lack of sympathy at the suffering of blacks in his country by the Reagan government. He continued by saying, "It is highly unlikely he would have the same indifference if the casualties had been white," obviously referring to the 700 mostly black people, who have been killed in racial hostilities in South Africa since August of the previous year.[230] He continued by saying that if the South African government failed to end apartheid in the following six months he would call for sanctions in line with the Commonwealth agreement in the Bahamas to impose mild sanctions and follow up with tougher ones in six months.

In his criticism of the policy of Constructive Engagement, he said, "I said when constructive engagement was put into place that it was unmitigated disaster for

---

[228] Tutu Denounces Raegan "New York Times" July 23, 1986.https://www.nytimes.com/1986/07/23/world/tutu-denounces-reagan.html (accessed March 31, 2017).

[229] Tutu Denounces Raegan "New York Times" July 23, 1986.https://www.nytimes.com/1986/07/23/world/tutu-denounces-reagan.html (accessed March 31, 2018).

[230] Tutu Denounces Raegan "New York Times" July 23, https://www.nytimes.com/1985/10/29/world/tutu-denounces-reagan-as-racist.html . (accessed March 31, 2018).

blacks."[231] On the blacks' readiness for sanctions and President Ronald Reagan's speech

on South Africa and Apartheid early 1985, he said, "Trade unions, black trade unions

have said they call for sanctions." "Over 70 percent of our people in two surveys have

shown that they want sanctions. He continues that Reagan thinks otherwise, by saying,

"No, President Reagan knows better - we will suffer."He sits there like the great, big

white chief of old can tell us black people that we don't know what is good for us," he

continued. "The white man knows."[232]

   In a speech at Hunter College in New York in 1986, Bishop Desmond Tutu

further denounced Ronald Reagan and his policy of constructive engagement by saying,

"there is no room for neutrality. When you say you are neutral in a situation of injustice

and oppression, you have decided to support the unjust status quo. Are you on the side

of injustice? Are you on the side of oppression or liberation? Are you on the side of

death or of life? Are you on the side of goodness or of evil?"[233]

The Nobel Prize winner vehemently protests that the quiet diplomacy by the

government of Reagan towards Apartheid South Africa has made life turn for the worse

for blacks in the country. The policy of constructive engagement has indeed increased

racial violence meted out on the hapless blacks in the country, and the continued

[231] Tutu Denounces Raegan "New York Times" July 23,
https://www.nytimes.com/1986/07/23/world/tutu-denounces-reagan.html. (accessed
March 31, 2018).
[232] Tutu Denounces Raegan "New York Times" July 23, 1986.
https://www.nytimes.com/1986/07/23/world/tutu-denounces-reagan.html .(accessed
September 25, 2017).
[233] https://www.nytimes.com/1986/06/16/opinion/sanctions-vs-apartheid.html

alliance between Reagan and Pretoria does not bode well for the blacks and for the end of apartheid.[234]

George Bush's Different Approach

In contrast to Ronald Reagan, George Bush comes to the South African issue vulnerable in a political sense. Note that Reagan entered his second term in 1984 on the heels of a landslide victory over Democratic challenger Walter Mondale. Bush won the presidency in the 1988 polls by a large popular and electoral majority vote, but it is serious to note– as the political experts in the administration bear in mind – that strains caused by the electoral college voting system masked what was actually a very close win by Bush over Democrat Michael Dukakis in 1988.[235]

The thing is that in the states which could have ensured Governor Dukakis win the election, Bush came on top by a small percentage. Bush won over the conservatives, which is usually comfortable for a Republican gunning for the White House against a liberal. However, Bush's strategy for winning hinged upon his call to some liberals and even moderates, who got hooked to his message of a 'kinder, gentler nation. Bush must, however, formulate a policy dependent on his political desires for his re-election of 1992. And with the elections fast approaching, the Bush administration was going to be very preoccupied with making policy in ways calculated to retain his support among moderates and some liberals. He may regard the issue of South Africa as a means of

---

[234] https://www.upi.com/Archives/1984/12/07/Nobel-Peace-Prize-winning-Bishop-Desmond-Tutu-met-President-Reagan/7281471243600/
[235] Stephen M. Davis, The Bush Presidency, and South Africa: Congress and The Sanctions Outlook (Braamfontein 2017, The South African Institute of International Affairs Jan Smuts House, May 1989), 4.

assisting in achieving that aim, as a lot of general voters in America still favors stricter anti-apartheid measures.[236]

Unlike Reagan, Bush comes to the South African issue indifferent to any policy. Bush did not request for, and neither received any mandate from voters on how to thread on the subject. In the course of his campaign, the candidate almost did not touch on the subject. However, Bush entered the fray with an address to suggest that the U.S. sanctions against the regime in South Africa was a positive one, as Pretoria now knew how serious the U.S. government was on displacing Apartheid. He said it would seem that the sanctions caused great hardship and economic stress for the blacks of South Africa. Bush refused to elucidate his statement on the discourse, only to show that he was not going to change or drum support for the repeal of the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act(CAAA). The resulting effect of that is that President Bush regarding policy towards South Africa became neutral, without venturing towards any particular direction, but he was vulnerable to pressure from any side looking to take charge of the policy.[237]

The Bush administration, however, with its continued opposition to sanctions, had a different strategy in mind. Herman Cohen's interpretation of the CAAA surfaced during a July 1991 hearing of the House of Representatives. The assistant secretary of state argued that, when it was passed, the CAAA was not meant to reward Pretoria only when a non-racial democracy was established. Instead, this legislation was about

---

[236] Stephen M. Davis, The Bush Presidency, and South Africa, 5.
[237] Stephen M. Davis, The Bush Presidency, and South Africa: Congress and The Sanctions Outlook (Braamfontein 2017, The South African Institute of International Affairs Jan Smuts House, May 1989), 5.

encouraging the National Party government to make initial steps toward negotiation. It was about persuading Pretoria to undertake the fundamental reforms that would permit constitutional talks. And this is exactly how the administration used the CAAA. Now that Pretoria had met the criteria, and continued to negotiate, the National Party was rewarded by a progressive removal of sanctions.[238] In particular, this approach was designed to help President De Klerk ward off opposition from the "white right" within South Africa, enabling Pretoria to demonstrate tangible benefits of reform. Bush continued this strategy of reward as the negotiations evolved. In October 1991, for instance, the White House removed the U.S. embargo on the sale of computers, aircraft, and petroleum products to the South African military.[239] Similarly, in February 1992, the president authorized the U.S. Export-Import (Ex-Im) Bank to once again offer loans and guarantees on South African contracts. At the same time, South Africa had reclassified a "friendly state" on the Foreign Assistance Act.[240] Again, these measures were portrayed as helping to ease the negotiations process. Effectively, the sanctions debate was now closed in the United States. The Bush administration had removed those punitive measures that were under its control, whereas the incoming Clinton administration chose not to seek the removal of any of the remaining rules.

The United States still banned nuclear transfers to the Republic; prohibited intelligence sharing; required fair employment practices from businesses seeking

---

[238] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994: Conflict of Interests* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan), 162.
[239] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994*, 162
[240] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994: Conflict of Interests* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan) ,162.

Export-Import Bank assistance; embargoed remaining gray area items being sold to the Republic's security forces; refused South African related tax credits; instructed its officials to advocate withholding International Monetary Fund Finance from countries practicing apartheid; maintained the U.N. mandatory arms embargo; and had in place a myriad of other state and local government imposed restrictions targeting purchasing contracts and investments involving businesses associated with the apartheid economy.[241] Clinton's position effectively ended any hopes that the anti-sanctions lobby had by way of continuing to chip away at this list of provisions. Clinton was not going to cede more grounds to Pretoria unless the republic was ready to be positive and forthcoming on the reforms. The new president took the view that he would only recommend the removal of these remaining sanctions when signaled to do so by the ANC. The U.S. ambassador to South Africa, Princeton N. Lyman, recalled how President de Klerk "visibly winced" when he was informed of this stance.[242]

It must be noted, however, that it's not all gloom for President George Bush. Matter of fact, he had an advantage that Reagan of 1986 never had. For one, he can refer to a successful foreign policy in Southern Africa - that is, the Angola/Namibia agreement of 1988. During his campaign, candidate Bush defended against the calls for sanctions by citing this diplomatic accomplishment. The Economic sanctions at this volatile time, he argued, would jeopardize the accord and doom the opportunity for an autonomous Namibia. When Bush becomes president, he can expectedly utilize the

---

[241] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994,* 162,163.
[242] Thomson Alex, *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa 1948-1994,* 163.

same argument - for the time - to block pressure from the embargo, from Capitol Hill.[243]

Another factor in Bush's favor is that public awareness of and concern about the South African topic had since 1986, drastically reduced. This affords the president ample political space to evolve and market a unique policy that is not as drastic as the one supported by Congress recently.

Lastly, Bush's tenure sees good relations with the Soviet Union being inherited and helped his course with the cogent relationship with the Soviets.[244] This helped open fresh, new opportunities of combined superpower process against Pretoria. The republic could no longer use the excuse of communism to court the favor of the United States while in the process continuing with Apartheid, which was unimaginable in 1986, when President Ronald Reagan and Congress had a run in at each other.

On the whole, this chapter highlights the obvious shifts from the toothless oratory of Jimmy Carter and his support for the fundamental human rights of the citizens of the world, to the pragmatism of President Ronald Reagan, who saw the need to vehemently combat communism and thus protect the United States' interest in Southern Africa. Reagan drafted the policy of Constructive Engagement, championed by Crocker, which became friendly towards the regime in South Africa, and made enemies with black South Africans. George Bush, on the other hand, came with a conspicuous neutrality, removing embargoes in the apartheid nation, especially as communism was no longer an issue to deal with.

---

[243] Stephen M. Davis, The Bush Presidency, and South Africa: Congress and The Sanctions Outlook (Braamfontein 2017, The South African Institute of International Affairs Jan Smuts House, May 1989), 6.
[244] Davis, 6.

CHAPTER 7

THE FALL OF APARTHEID

The rise and fall of the South Africa's system of racial oppression which is
known as the apartheid system really marked one of the most infamous chapters in the
contemporary world history. The consequences of apartheid on over 40 million South
Africans who were present at the inauguration of Nelson Mandela as the first
democratically elected president of South Africa in the year 1994 are indelible.[245] The
racist apartheid regime of South Africa came to fore in the year 1948, with the
ascending to power of the Afrikaner-dominated National Party and its promotion of an
ideology of racial and ethnic separatism. Apartheid officially came to an end in the year
1994, the period when the African National Congress-dominated a majority of
parliamentary seats in the first South African democratic election. However, it would be
a misconception to view the existing legal structure of apartheid, or also its
psychological and social effects, as starting abruptly and fully in 1948 or as ending
suddenly with the change of regime in 1994. It was an earlier policy of the state, and it
took the period of thirty years to establish.[246] These policies includes the relocation of
African families from their respective farms and placed them in a "native reserves"; the
segregation of living, working, and recreational spaces available within the cities; the
classification of Africans as a "temporary sojourners" within the cities; and also a range

---

[245] Richard A. Schroeder, *Africa After Apartheid: South Africa, Race, and Nation in
Tanzania* (Indiana, University Press 2012) 1.
[246] John Peffer*, Art and the End of Apartheid* (Minneapolis London, University of
Minnesota Press, 2009), 2.

of laws restricting the interaction between races, including the separation of the public services and amenities ("petty apartheid").[247]

However, it was considered that the tendencies which ought to lead to the relinquishment of apartheid from the year 1990 onwards were already made evident in the late 1970s. During this period, of course, things were not too clear, and this development was said to be seen as signs of hope by the apartheid's opponents, or, by its supporters, as major problems which must be confronted and overcome, if they were identified at all.[248]South Africa's transformation took even the National Party by surprise, as did many South Africans. "It was a cautious change as not all were enthusiastic or optimistic about changes, in South Africa. The relatively passive stance taken by the National government was a result of the priority that domestic affairs took in the years 1990-1994, and an international situation that did not allow for acts that could be interpreted as support for the increasingly shaky Nationalist government in Pretoria."[249]

The period 1990-1994 was probably the most complex and challenging period from a South African standpoint. Following the forced resignation of P.W. Botha in

[247] John Peffer, *Art and the End of Apartheid,*2.

[248] Robert Ross, *A Concise History of South Africa* (Cambridge, University Press 1997, 2008), 174.

[249] Lauren Peacock, National Ideas or National Interest: New Zealand and South Africa, 1981-1994, University of Wellington 2013,95. http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10063/3368/thesis.pdf?sequenc e=2

1989 and the assumption of the presidency by F.W de Klerk, the liberation parties were re-legalized, and negotiations to determine the future constitutional settlement of South Africa were pursued with varying degrees of success. This culminated in the 1994 election and appointment of the first ANC government in South Africa.[250]

The older segregation laws had been scrapped by the Nationalists in an attempt to show their bona fides to the outside world, and to their internal opposition. The three main apartheid laws, the Natives Land Act (1913), the Group Areas Act (1950), the Population Registration Act (1949), and the restricted franchise stubbornly remained in place, as did much of the draconian security legation and censorship laws.[251] The Homelands were still officially in existence.

Without the legitimizing context of the Cold War, White South Africa's need to find a settlement looked more pressing than ever. Political prisoners were released, including Nelson Mandela. Commenting on these events prominent anti-apartheid journalist Allister Sparks observed in 1991 "Verwoerd was right. Concessions don't ease pressure or buy time, and the introduction of piecemeal reforms do introduce illogicalities that make it harder to hold one's ground."[252] President P.W Botha's

---

[250] Lauren Peacock, National Ideas or National Interest: New Zealand and South Africa, 1981-1994. 96.

[251] David R Penna "Apartheid, The Law and Reform in South Africa" in Africa Today Vol. 37, No. 2 (1990): 5-21. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4186650

[252] Allister Sparks, *The Mind of South Africa: The Story of the Rise and Fall of Apartheid*, (London: Mandarin, 1991), 329.

"concessions," the 1983 Constitution and Tricameral Parliament, had backfired in spectacular fashion.

Resistance against the apartheid system was mainly conducted and organized by the African National Congress (ANC). Acknowledging the existence of The Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), the South African Communist Party (SACP) and the Black Consciousness Movement, and these organizations" roles in the resistance movement, choose to focus on the ANC in this brief description of the struggle against apartheid.[253]

Formed in 1912, the ANC became the first non-tribal organization of blacks promoting black interests under white rule. Up until the 1940s, the ANC"s trust in the possibility of compromise remained a platform for the organization, resulting in an attitude of aloofness, removed from the harsh realities of black people everyday life[254]. The ANC did, however, catch up with the realities, and few years after the Nationalist Party came to power the Defiance Campaign was launched, promoting peaceful, but forceful resistance against the repressive system. In this campaign, black people were urged to dress formally, act politely and behave as if they had the same legal access to public facilities as white people. They would sit in white parks, on white benches reading their newspapers in peace; they entered the first-class white carriages on public transport and used white public toilets. Another widespread form of resistance was the refusal to carry identity documents, which led to great problems for the police force, as

---

[253] Kaja Kathrine Kristiansen, The Professional Identity of Black South African Teachers *Personal and professional struggles in a disjunction between policy and practice, Master Thesis, Faculty of Education, Institute for Educational Research, University of Oslo December 2008.12.*
[254] Davis M. Stephen, *Apartheid's Rebels: Inside South Africa's Hidden War* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989), 174.

they did not have facilities to arrest the thousands of people who refused to carry their documents[255]. In 1955, the ANC drafted The Freedom Charter, which claims that: "*South Africa belongs to everyone who resides within it, either black and white, and that no government can justly claim authority on the people unless it is based on the will and consent of all the people" ....*[256]

This cooperative and non-violent agenda was continued until 1961 when Umkhonto we Sizwe ("Spear of the Nation" in Zulu, hereafter referred to as MK), a semi-independent body of the ANC with a military mission, was formed. It was the police force's relentless violence and continued attacks on the people that was the incentive to this change in tactics, and the ANC started a campaign of sabotage led by Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela.[257]

In 1960, seventeen African countries were said to have won their independence from colonial rule. This was the year in which more African countries became independent than any other year in its history, and the year 1960 went down in memory lane as the 'Year of Africa' or 'Africa Year.' At the end of his tour to the African continent in the month of February, the then Conservative British Prime Minister in the person of Harold Macmillan famously cautioned the South African parliament of a "wind of change" raging all over Africa. As the process of decolonization gathered momentum on the remaining part of Africa, the ANC, and PAC, the two most viable

[255]Kristiansen, Tomm W. (1996). Mandela's Land. En fortelling om frihet. Oslo: J.W. Capellens Forlag.
[256] African National Congress (1955): Freedom Charter. http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/charter.html. Accessed 12 september 2017.
[257] Davis, M. Stephen. Apartheid 's Rebels. Inside South Africa 's Hidden War (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989), 175.

African nationalist organizations in South Africa, increasingly associated their problems

with the struggles of fellow Africans against colonialism. Even in South Africa, the

most industrialized nation in Africa, the opportunity for freedom from the shackles of

the racist white minority did not look far off. In his address to the December 1959

Annual Conference of the ANC, its President Chief Albert Lutuli exhorted: "Africa is

very much astir. She is swift in freeing herself from the bonds of colonialism. The year

1960 could actually be described as a year of destiny and a new beginning for many

areas in Africa."[258]

In another vein, the Pan-Africanist Congress similarly associated itself with "the

progressive forces of African nationalism" some other places in Africa, whereby, as

outlined in its Manifesto (adopted in April 1959), "the breaking down of the

protagonists of oppression is a process that not even nuclear power can stop.[259]

The Historiography of Black Politics During the Struggle

The studies of the annals of black political organizations in existence until the late

1960s were the ones written by some of the intellectuals of the different opposition

movements according to the political parties they were sympathetic to. One of their aim

was to redress the general indifference of the major settler and liberal traditions in the

---

[258]Presidential Address to the 47th Annual Conference of the African National
Congress, Durban, 12 December 1959,
http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/lutuli/lutuli59.html. Original emphasis.
[259]Thomas Karis and Gail M. Gerhart, Challenge and Violence, 1953-1964, in Thomas
Karis and Gwendolen M. Carter (eds.), From Protest to Challenge: A Documentary
History of African Politics in South Africa, 1882-1964, Vol. 3 (Stanford, Indiana
University Press, 1977), 518-519.
[260]Edward Roux, *Time Longer than Rope: A History of the Black Man's Struggle for
Freedom in South Africa* (London, V. Gollancz, 1948), 7.

South African historiography to contemporary black politics as a subject matter.[260]

Leading work in this regard was the Eddie Roux's Time Longer than Rope, which was

originally published in the year 1948.[261] It was later followed by the Jack and Ray

Simons' Class and Color in South Africa which appeared in the year 1969 also in the

year as the first part of Wilson and Thompson's Oxford History of South

Africa.[262]Although it's not strictly academic because of their underlying political aim

although the Simons' rather called their book "an exercise in political sociology on a

time scale," rather than a history.[263] All these set of early Marxist works have too often

been ignored by the next generation of radical historians.[264] Some of the questions

which was introduced by these authors for instance with credence to the subject of race

and class exploitation and the relationship between national and class struggle in South

Africa are still much relevant in half a century later. However, the historical period

---

[261]Another relevant work which was authored by John Burger (pseudonym of Leo Marquand), The Black Man's Burden (London, 1943). For a non-Marxist interpretation see Jordan Ngubane, An African Explains Apartheid (London, 1963)

[262] Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson (eds.), The Oxford History of South Africa, Vol.1, South Africa to 1870, and Vol. 2, 1870-1966 (Oxford, 1969-1971). Leo Kuper's chapter in volume two (426-476) this was really the only contribution to the collection sacrificed to the history of African nationalism in South Africa. In the South African edition, even this was excluded from its publication.

[263] H.J. and R.E. Simons, Class and Colour in South Africa, 1850-1950 (London, Penguin, 1969), 9.

[264] Arianna Lissoni, "The South African liberation movements in exile, c. 1945-1970," Phd. the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, January 2008, 15. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/south-african-liberation-movements-exile-c-1945-1970-arianna-lissoni.

[265]Karis and Carter, From Protest to Challenge, Vol. 3, (Stanford, Hoover Institution Press, 1972), 15.

under scrutiny in this study was too recent to be written about by this group of scholar-activists.

From the early 1960s, the reappearance of protests of note in South Africa itself was equal with a matching concern in social and popular history by a new generation of radical-revisionist and by the Marxist-favored historians. In 'From Protest to Challenge', the foreword to the 1977 edition of Volume 3 of the impressive documentary which chronicled the annals of black revolt in Pretoria between 1882-1964, American scholars Karis and Carter while combining both archival material and analytical essays, also declared the belief that their work would be "a launch-pad for new generations of historians."[265]Moreover, in the preface to the fifth volume in the series, which seem to appeared in the year 1997 and also covers the history of the liberation struggle from its nadir in the year 1964 to its resurgence in the year 1979, however readers are told that " all these expectations are as telling today as if it were twenty years back."[266] With a small number of exceptions, such as Tom Lodge's influential survey of black resistance Black Politics in South Africa since 1945.[267] It has really in fact been one of the shortcomings of the revisionist school that only a few broadly syntheses of South

---

[266] Arianna Lissoni, "The South African liberation movements in exile, c. 1945-1970," Phd. the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, January 2008, 16. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/south-african-liberation-movements-exile-c-1945-1970-arianna-lissoni.
[267]Tom Lodge, *Black Politics in South Africa since 1945* (London, Longman, 1983),
[268]The Making of Modern South Africa: Conquest, Segregation, and Apartheid, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 2000); Robert Ross, A Concise History of South Africa (Cambridge, 1999); William Beinart, Twentieth-Century South Africa, rev. ed. (Oxford, 2001).

Africa's history have been examined,[268] And despite the amplification of many, in-depth case studies. Although black political organizations have been regarded in principle as key agents of political change and as important mobilizes of social identity by revisionist historians, their concern with social history and history 'from below' – Rather than the existing 'institutional,' history has actually resulted on the whole in a localized focus of inquiry. Bernhard Magubane has vehemently debated this point in one of the recent critiques of the liberal and revisionist traditions in South Africa's historiography:

> *When one tends to read all the inputs of the Marxist-influenced historians, the rare discourse of the national freedom group and its battles strikes one very Forcefully. The banning of the African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress seems to have recommended that the national ambition of Africans was no longer feasible.[269]*

On the other hand, the transition of South Africa's to democracy has helped historians, with many of those that participated in the anti-apartheid movement, to vehemently write and speak about the past more openly than ever before. As soon as the bans on individuals and organizations were gradually lifted after 1990, so there were many of the inhibitions which the demands of the struggle and the commitment to against the apartheid exacted. The main problem today lies, as historian Shula has argued, "in the transformation of South African history from being a morality play

---

[269]Arianna Lissoni, "The South African liberation movements in exile, c. 1945-1970," Phd. the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, January 2008, 17. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/south-african-liberation-movements-exile-c-1945-1970-arianna-lissoni

[270] Shula Marks, "Rewriting South African history: or The hunt for Hintsa's head," in Simon McGrath, Charles Jedrej, Kenneth King, and Jack Thompson (eds.), *Rethinking African History* (Edinburgh, 1997), 105.

whether in its settler version as a narrative of the confrontation between civilization and or in its humanitarian version of villains and victims."[270]

The first publication of the foremost volume of the book titled the *Road to Democracy* in South Africa in 2004 has really signified a very important step in this direction. All chapters in the volume above provide new and fresh insights into the years between 1960-1970 by focusing more on particular organizations, their activities, the evolution of their strategies and tactics, as well as those specific events and other necessary aspects which shaped and made the decade memorable. Their main aim is to challenge "the belief that the 1960s period was a decade of political quiescence."[271] However, it is actually a shortcoming of the book that the complementary chapters, which individually stand mainly on their own, seems not to form a continuous narrative, as it is common with collections of this nature. In fact, it could well argue that it was on the premises of the accomplishments, as well as of the problems, shortcomings, disagreements and the doubts that surfaced at this time, that the freedom groups ultimately emerged victorious in the year 1990.

In particular, it is recommendable that the African National Congress and all its allies managed not only to exist one another but were actually able to create a degree of unity, purpose, and thrust which in turn allowed the African National Congress to pull through one of the fragile periods in its history. The Pan-Africanist Congress in exile, was affected by some internal problems which in part overshadowed the message of the

---

[271] SADET (eds.), *The Road to Democracy*, Vol. 1: 1960-1970, (Cape Town, Struik Publishers, 2005) xv.

political tendency that the organization represented when it was founded in the year 1959. Despite all these odds, which became evident from the initial stage, the Pan-Africanist Congress never disappeared from the political scene. The Pan-Africanist Congress continued their struggle for survival, however troubled, can in part be laid at the feet of its pro-Africanist ideology and the fact it was able to generate interest within and without South Africa and at a Pan-African level.[272]

The Anc

This movement was originally called the "South African Native National Congress," the African National Congress was formed in the year 1912 as a platform to bring together Africans across what was then regarded as the Union of South Africa into a single organization which passed both 'tribal' and regional differences by promoting a spirit of African nationalism. Later In the mid1940s, the socio-economic developments unveiled by the Second World War – most essentially African urbanization, employment in the secondary sector and as well as the trade union organization – which helped bring about a double process of reawakening and radicalization of the African National Congress, under the influential impact of its Youth League.

By turning to non-violent tactics of direct action, the African National Congress grew in the following years into a truly mass organization which was now extremely steeled up, and hell-bent on achieving full emancipation and citizenship rights for

---

[272] Arianna Lissoni, "The South African liberation movements in exile, c. 1945-1970,"Phd. the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, January 2008.20, 21. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/south-african-liberation-movements-exile-c-1945-1970-arianna-lissoni

marginalized black South Africans throughout the country as clearly outlined in its 1949

Program of Action.[273]

An Alliance for a Common Cause

In the early 1950s, the Colored People's Congress (CPC) and the (white)

Congress of Democrats (COD) were formed to mobilize their respective communities in

opposition against the government and in support of the African National Congress.

However, together with the African National Congress, the SAIC and as well as the

South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU), they all came together to constitute

a large union of forces that came to be recognized as the Congress Alliance. The

Congress alliance grew out of the principle that the African National Congress, as

President Lutuli explained, was "prepared to cooperate fully by equality with any

National or political party or organization, provided they share common aims and

common methods of achieving our objectives.[274]

The Congress Alliance endorsed its manifesto, Freedom Charter, on the 26th of

June,1955, in Kliptown at the People's Congress.[275] The Charter outlined the vision of

all society that is equal which would be governed in line with the principles of

economic and social justice. Despite being often cited as evidence of the ANC's non-

[273]Arianna Lissoni, "The South African liberation movements in exile, c. 1945-1970,"
Phd. the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, January 2008,
11. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/south-african-liberation-movements-exile-c-
1945-1970-arianna-lissoni.
[274]Arianna Lissoni, "The South African liberation movements in exile, c. 1945-1970,"
Phd. the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, January 2008,
11. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/south-african-liberation-movements-exile-c-
1945-1970-arianna-lissoni 12.
[275]Lissoni, ,12.
[276] Ibid,12.

racialism, in which the Freedom Charter actually reflected as multi-racial, rather than viewing South Africa as a non-racist and racial, pluralized country of four different countries or, to use the term of the Charter, "national groups."[276]

The divisions of the African, Indian, Coloured and as well as the white, reflected the official categories that were used by the South African government. It was evident that the latter did not view all Africans as constituting a single nation, but they further subdivided the African population into a variety of smaller, ethnically defined nations. This classification system underpinned much of apartheid legislation, as well as the Bantustan project. Although this study does not really support the divisions imposed by the apartheid state, it does nevertheless make use of the words "African," "Indian," "Colored," and "white" as these were how they were named by the freedom group. When "black" was mentioned, it is often used in the same way as the post-Soweto generation wanted it to refer to African, Colored, and as well as the Indian sections of the entire populations collectively.

The same multi-racial understanding also informed the tactical union of the four, racially separate Congresses in the Congress Alliance. The Pan-Africanist Congress was established on 6 April 1959 after the internal dissension that occurred within the African National Congress led to the collapse of a group popularly known as the Africanists, who had been earlier growing more and more disgruntled with the policies of the African National Congress. The Three major reasons for the Africanists' disagreement can be identified as follows. Firstly, they had been antagonized to the

calling off of the 1952 Defiance Campaign by the senior African National Congress leadership in January 1953. Second, there was also the issue of cooperation with the Indians in the SAIC, and also with the white liberals and as well as the communists in the COD. According to them, the African National Congress had earlier came to be unduly influenced by the non-Africans within the Congress Alliance, whom they all alleged of dictating policy to the African National Congress. And lastly, the they claimed that the African National Congress had forsaken the 1949 Program of Action and renamed it with the Freedom Charter.[277]

The Ideological Shift to Armed Struggle

In spite of the widespread hope, which seemed to fill the beginning of the decade, the year 1960 turned out to be disappointing for the South African liberation struggle. The date, however, remained a watershed in the history of South Africa's. Also On 21 March 1960, the peaceful anti-pass demonstrations convened by the Pan-Africanist Congress indeed ceased in the cruel police butcheries of Sharpeville and Langa. Both the African National Congress and the Pan-Africanist Congress, which were consequently both declared illegal organizations, agreed to move underground and also to embrace armed struggle to confront the South African government's increasing ferocity and oppression. Within the next few years, the new draconian legislation was introduced which in effect later turned South Africa into a police state. The decade

---

[277] Arianna Lissoni, "The South African liberation movements in exile, c. 1945-1970, Phd." the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, January 2008.20, 21. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/south-african-liberation-movements-exile-c-1945-1970-arianna-lissoni, 13.

which preceded, on the surface a period of apparent peace, saw the efficient bashing of almost every internal political opposition by the apartheid machinery. [278]

The Frontrunner of the Struggle

One cannot discuss the ANCs fight against apartheid without including Mandela, who together with Oliver Tambo, Walter Sisulu and Govan Mbeki formed the backbone of the resistance movement. Mandela, Tambo, and Sisulu formed the Congress Youth League (CYL) in 1944 and paved the way for the mass actions of passive resistance mentioned above. Preceding the formation of MK and their sabotage actions, Mandela, Sisulu and Mbeki were charged with recruitment for guerrilla warfare for the purpose of violent revolution furthering the objects of communism, and aiding foreign military units when they hit the Republic. They were found guilty on all charges and sentenced to life imprisonment. At this time other central figures in the ANC leadership were either under banning orders or in exile. Davis (1987) states that it was the incarceration of these key executives "virtually beheaded the ANC and the organization was shattering.[279] Extremely tense and violent years followed with South Africa in a state of civil war. During this time, the ANC had to conduct most of its work underground; there were great conflicts with other liberation movements, and the government did all it could to spark possible tensions to split the resistance. The ANC did, however, manage to survive. It gained allies and created a nationwide infrastructure

---

[278] Arianna Lissoni, "The South African liberation movements in exile, c. 1945-1970,"Phd. the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, January 2008.20, 21. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/south-african-liberation-movements-exile-c-1945-1970-arianna-lissoni, 13-14.
[279] Davis M. Stephen, *Apartheid's Rebels: Inside South Africa's Hidden War* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989), 20.

of resistance against the apartheid state, which eventually led to negotiations with the apartheid government and democratic elections in 1994.[280]

As the 1980's was coming to an end local and international pressure on the apartheid government, as well as the realization that apartheid could neither be maintained by force forever, nor overthrown by the opposition without considerable suffering, both sides came to the negotiating table. The first meeting between Mandela and the National Party government came while P.W Botha was President; however, they made little progress.[281] Botha had declared that apartheid was dead, but he never rejected the policy of white supremacy; it thus follows that the common grounds for negotiations were limited.[282] In 1989, W.F. de Klerk was elected the new State President, and in his first address to parliament, he transformed South Africa by lifting the ban on the ANC and other banned organizations and political parties, and releasing Mandela from prison.[283]

In the following years, negotiations continued, but were steadily threatened by grave eruptions of violence, resulting in the ANC leaving the negotiation table accusing De Klerk's government of complicity in the Boipatong massacre where people were

---

[280] Kaja Kathrine Kristiansen, The Professional Identity of Black South African Teachers *Personal and professional struggles in a disjunction between policy and practice, Master Thesis, Faculty of Education, Institute for Educational Research, University of Oslo December 2008*.13.
[281] Kristiansen, Tomm W. (1996). Mandela's Land. En fortelling om frihet. Oslo: J.W. Capellens Forlag
[282] Heather Deegan, The Politics of the new South Africa: Apartheid and after. (Harlow, Longman, 2001), 198.
[283] Barber, James (1999). South Africa in the Twentieth Century. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

killed[284]. They re-entered negotiations, but experienced another breakdown with the

assassination of "Chris" Hani, leader of the SACP. This country was brought to the

brink of disaster, but was able to ultimately prove a turning point, after which the major

parties pushed for a settlement with increased determination. The assassination of Hani

is more often considered as an event, which really led to a shift of power in favor of the

African National Congress because of Nelson Mandela's who is said to be handling the

situation. He addressed the nation appealing for calm, in a speech regarded as

'presidential' even though he was then not president of the country[285]:

> This day an unforgivable sin has been committed, A man full of
> passion, of unsurpassed courage, has been killed in his prime. Chris Hani
> is known to all of us, loved by millions, hated only by those who are
> scared of the truth, Chris Hani had well supported the quest for peace,
> combing the nook and cranny of South Africa calling for a spirit of
> tolerance among our citizens. Our country is mourning. Our hurt and
> indignation are real. We mustn't allow ourselves be provoked by those
> who seek to deny us the very freedom Chris Hani gave his life for.
> African National Congress dips its banner in salute to this outstanding
> son of Africa.[286]

On April 27, 1994, South Africa held its first democratic elections. The entire

police force and the military were ready to handle any disruption that might occur and

damage this new beginning in the history of South Africa. They were left with nothing

to do; despite the long lines of people waiting for hours to cast their vote, the elections

---

[284] ANC (1992): Statement of the emergency meeting of the National Executive
Committee of the ANC.
http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mandela/1992/links/pr920623.html. Accessed
16.08.2007
[285] Heather Deegan, The Politics of the new South Africa: Apartheid and after. (Harlow,
Longman, 2001),198.
[286] African National Congress (1993): Address to the nation by African National
Congress President, N.R. Mandela, on the assassination of Chris Hani.
http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mandela/1993/sp930410.html. Accessed
15.08.2007.

were conducted peacefully and resulted in the African National Congress polling 62%

of the vote, and which made Nelson Mandela became the president, with De Klerk and

Thabo Mbeki as his deputies. However, the National Party, also with 20% of the vote,

joined the African National Congress in a Government of National Unity[287].

  The Transitional politics commenced again after the election, with which a new

constitution was finally agreed upon in the year 1995.

---

[287] Kristiansen, Tomm W. Mandela's Land. En fortelling om frihet. Oslo: J.W.
Capellens Forlag. (1996)

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

The inconsistencies in the American foreign policy contributed to the longevity of apartheid. For almost fifty years, apartheid thrived in South Africa as the minority whites controlled the affairs of the southern African nation while maligning the black majority, and committing great fundamental human rights crimes in the process. Virtually all the American presidents who were in power during the apartheid regime in South Africa refused to see apartheid as a fundamental problem, but an opportunity for an alliance in the cold war and the war against communism. The country's precious minerals, its prime strategic location, its government's role as a staunch supporter of American and the West's policy of blocking the growth of Soviet communism were the several excuses cited by previous United States presidencies for encouraging the National Party of South Africa and its policies in Pretoria.

This support continued until Apartheid's ultimate demise two years after Reagan left office. It is easy to say that the U.S. decision to support Pretoria was in the interest of the United States of America. In spite of the concerns for the indignity, pains, and sufferings experienced by the sheer vast numbers of the South African citizenry meted out by the apartheid regime; the U.S. government continuously appealed the U.N. and the world that Apartheid would peter out naturally.

In conclusion, it is essential to briefly describe the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) as it contributed to making South Africa's transition to democracy something out of the ordinary. The TRC was established in 1995 and intended to serve

as the instrument through which South Africa would come to grips with its discriminatory past and allow for a peaceful transition to democracy. The underlying assumption that the TRC's work was based on is that understanding history by letting perpetrators narrate their politically motivated crimes will aid in the creation of a more peaceful and democratic future. In hindsight, there is disagreement on how successful the TRC was. It was no doubt a very bold venture, consuming vast amounts of resources by holding hundreds of hearings, interviewing thousands of victims of apartheid, granting amnesty to nearly a thousand human rights violators, and producing a massive final report[288].

For further reading on the TRC process, I strongly recommend *Country of My Skull: Guilt, Sorrow and the Limits of Forgiveness in the New South Africa* by Antjie Krog, which is a gripping document on the national healing process that took place in South Africa in the first years after 1994. André Brink, professor of English language and literature at the University of Cape Town and acclaimed author, is quoted on the back cover of this book: "It's quite essential to note that trying to carefully comprehend the new South Africa without the Truth and the Reconciliation Commission would be fruitless; trying to comprehend the Commission and not relating to this book would really be irresponsible."

---

[288] Antjie Krog. Country of My Skull: Guilt, Sorrow and the Limits of Forgiveness in the New South Africa, (New York, Broadway, 1998)

According to many, the truth and reconciliation process was exceptionally

successful, believing that it prevented South Africa from erupting in a racially based

civil war. According to Gibson, South Africans themselves are not so full of hope about

the process, because many tend to complain more that the Truth and Reconciliation

Commission erupted racial tensions in the country by exposing the evil deeds of both

the then apartheid government and its agents and as well as the liberation forces. Some

were firmly against the conjecture that truth can somehow lead to reconciliation,

claiming instead that uncovering the details about the scary events of the past only hurt

people, making them far less likely to be willing to adapt with the new democratic

regime. Indeed, respite to my vivid observations of the South African media, complaints

and condemnations of the truth and reconciliation process seem too far outcasted

laudatory assessments[289].

Gibson adds that social scientists should be more agnostic about the TRC

process and that it is remarkable how little systematic investigation has been conducted

into whether or not the TRC succeeded in its objectives[290]. The TRC achieved insofar as

the emotionally injured people of South Africa experienced that they were healed and

could move on with their lives. It is, however, hard to tell how many this applies to. Did

all those involved in the hearings and interviews experience this healing? How

[289] James L. Gibson *Overcoming Apartheid: Can Truth Reconcile a Divided Nation?*
(New York, Russell Sage, 2006), 84
[290]James Gibson, Overcoming Apartheid, 84-85
[291]Stultz, Newell M. *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 35, no. 2/3
(2002): 518-20. doi:10.2307/3097652
[292] R. W Johnson, South Africa's Brave New World: The Beloved Country Since The
End of Apartheid, (New York, Overlook, 2010), 4.

extensive was the symbolic effect of the TRC? These are questions one can hopefully

gain answers to after thorough sociological research. For the formerly oppressed South

Africans, to most, the TRC has had a limited effect, and many will point to statistics of

violent crime[291] in South Africa, which is a particular sign that many hearts and minds

still need to be healed.

South Africa became an epitome of conflict negotiation in the eyes of the world

after apartheid was finally laid to rest. Reveling in this achievement, the ANC

journeyed around the world, getting the recognition they deserved along the way.[292]

According to the historian R.W. Johnson, the absolute wonder was not that the

embattled former apartheid nation attained constitutional status, it was the way they

achieved it. Mounting pressure on F.W. de Klerk, the National Party leader led the

minority white to give up power peacefully, and without bloodshed.[293]

President Nelson Mandela who successfully reconciled the blacks and the white

minority, announced a 100 Days Plan to be put into practice immediately after his

inauguration.[294] The 100 Days Plan did not work out well as a result of improper

planning, and lack of funds. It was a complete disaster, as there were no staffed clinics

---

[293] R. W Johnson, South Africa's Brave New World: The Beloved Country Since The End of Apartheid, 4
[294] Johnson, South Africa's Brave New World, 4.
[295] Ibid 5
[296] Ibid 5

and hospital.[295] Fast forward to 2001, and HIV/AIDS had become a real menace. Up to 5,000 infected patients were dying of the hazard per week, and it soon increased to 1,000 patients losing the battle against HIV/AIDS in a day.[296] The better life that South Africans saw for themselves post-apartheid soon became a mirage. Johnson writes, "life was not only not better for all, for too many, but it was also shorter, and poorer. Signs of social distress proliferated. Crime rates soared."[297]Apartheid had eaten so much into the fabric of the country that no immediate policy could set things right. It became too overwhelming for even the excellent duo of Nelson Mandela and Thabo Mbeki to fix. Blacks especially still could not live the life they expected. President Nelson Mandela set himself three goals to pursue, namely; the harmony of the state, the security of the land, and the implementation of the Reconstruction and Development Program.[298]The president delegated almost everything else to his able deputy, Thabo Mbeki, who loathe to work with the Reconstruction Development Program coordinator, as he was a stubborn man not given to anyone's opinion but his alone.[299]

The Mandela government met the best run, most efficient water system in Africa, yet was faced with the harsh reality of dealing with the supply of water to squatter camps and the black communities, an area the apartheid government failed to allocate

---

[297] Ibid 5.
[298] Ibid 5.

[299] R. W Johnson, South Africa's Brave New World: The Beloved Country Since the End of Apartheid, 56.

water to during the segregation years.[300] The new government in a bid to arrest the

development decided to adopt the idea of Kader Asmal, a minister in Mandela's

cabinet, who came up with a new "water schemes" to be bankrolled by the Independent

Development Trust, an idea completely rivaled and contested by several water resources

experts in the country.[301]These specialists and other experienced officials were sure that

the plan would not work, and warned the government against it. The project did not

work out as well as other development projects by the Mandela administration. It

proved too complicated, too late for the frail Mandela who could not do much with the

power he had.[302]

South Africa today has naturally developed since the Mandela administration but

still face inherent problems that can be traced back to apartheid. Jacob Zuma, the

incumbent president of the former apartheid state, believes that the country's woes can

be laid at the feet of apartheid and colonialism.[303] The segregation education laws,

Bantu education, are some of the roots of the socio-economic challenges present-day

South Africa faces, and according to Jacob Zuma, colonialism and apartheid are the

reason the country still battles with a low standard in education, poverty, and

[300] Ibid, 104.

[301] Ibid, 104

[302] R. W Johnson, South Africa's Brave New World: The Beloved Country Since The End of Apartheid, 136

[303] SA News (2014) Zuma upbeat about SA's future, despite challenges (online), available:http://www.sanews.gov.za/south-africa/zuma-upbeat-about-sas-future-despite-challenges [14 February 2014) (Accessed February 17, 2018)

unemployment.[304] The transition to running a democratic nation is still a problem

because of the legacies of apartheid.

[304] SA News (2014) Zuma upbeat about SA's future, despite challenges (online), available:http://www.sanews.gov.za/south-africa/zuma-upbeat-about-sas-future-despite-challenges [14 February 2014]) (Accessed February 17, 2018)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

12 South Africa-The Impact of World War II. "The Great Depression and the 1930s.

     N.p., n.d." Web. 5 May 2014. www.123helpme.com.

A . Kuin'a Ndumbe III. "Black Africa and Germany during the Second World War."

     Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi,

     Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United

     Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985, 63.

Address of President Jimmy Carter before the United States Naval Academy,

     Commencement Exercises, Annapolis, 7 June 1978.

     http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=30915&st=annapolis

     &st1=

African National Congress Freedom Charter 1995,

     http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/charter.html.

African National Congress (1993): Address to the nation by African National

     Congress President, N.R. Mandela, on the assassination of Chris Hani.

     http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mandela/1993/sp930410.html.

Ali.A Mazrui. Africa and the legacy of the Second World War: political, economic

     and cultural aspects. Report and papers of the symposium organized by

     Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980.

     Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,

     1985, 13-14.

Allen, John. *Apartheid South Africa: An Insider's View of the Origin and Effects of*

     Separate Development. New York: IUniverse Inc, 2005.

Amneh Daoud Badran, *Zionist Israel and Apartheid South Africa: Civil society and Peace -building in Ethnic-National States.* London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2010.

ANC (1992): Statement of the emergency meeting of the National Executive Committee of the ANC. http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mandela/1992/links/pr920623.html.

Andrew J. DeRoche, Andrew Young: Civil rights ambassador. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2003.

Another relevant work which was authored by John Burger (pseudonym of Leo Marquand), The Black Man's Burden (London, 1943). For a non-Marxist interpretation see Jordan Ngubane, An African Explains Apartheid (London, 1963).

Arianna Lissoni, "The South African liberation movements in exile, c. 1945-1970," Phd. the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, January 2008. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/south-african-liberation-movements-exile-c-1945-1970-arianna-lissoni.

B.Davidson. Africa and the Second World War. Report and papers of the symposium organized by Unesco at Benghazi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, from 10 to 13 November 1980. Paris, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1985,109.

Baker, H. Pauline. *The United States, and South Africa: The Reagan Years* New York:

    Ford Foundation, 1989.

Berger, Iris. *South Africa in World History* (New York: Oxford University Press,

    2009.

Borstelmann, Thomas. *Apartheid's Reluctant Uncle: The United States and Southern*

    Africa in the Early Cold War. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Byrnes, Rita M. (1996). "Legislative Implementation of Apartheid". *South Africa: A*

    Country Study. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress.

    http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.za accessed June 9 2017.

Cable, U.S. Embassy-Vienna to State, 20 May 1977. Facsimile published in

    Mokoena, ed. Declassified history. Document

Chester A. Crocker, Southern Africa: Eight Years Later "Foreign Affairs Vol. 68, No.

    4 (Fall, 1989), pp. 144-164"Published by: Council on Foreign Relations

Christian M. De Vos, "Balancing Acts: John Kennedy, The Cold War, and The African

    National Congress," Politikon 32, no. 1 (May 2005), 119. Accessed June 11

    2017,http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0258934050010178

    2.

Clarizio, Lynda M., Bradley Clements, and Erika Geetter. "United States Policy

    toward South Africa." Human Rights Quarterly 11, no. 2 (1989): 249-94.

    http://www.jstor.org/stable/761958. Accessed June 29, 2017.

Coker, Christopher. *The United States, and South Africa, 1968-1985: Constructive*

    Engagement and Its Critics. Durham: Duke University Press, 1986.

Cornwell, Rupert. "Cyrus Vance." The Independent 14 January 2002.

> http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/cyrus-vance-
>
> 729665.html .15 June 2009.

Crocker, Chester A. "South Africa: Strategy for Change." *Foreign Affairs* 59, no. 2

> (1980): 323-51. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20040728, Accessed August
>
> 21, 2017.

Darryl, M. Trimiew. *God Bless the Child that's Got its Own*. Atlanta: Scholars Press,

> 1997.

David B. Ottaway, Carter arrives in Nigeria on state visit. Washington Post. 1 April

> 1978. A1.

Prior to Carter's state visit, Franklin D. Roosevelt made an informal trip to Liberia

> on 26–27 January 1943, where he met President Edwin Barclay. FDR was
>
> en route from the Allies' Casablanca Conference of 14–24 January 1943.

David R Penna "Apartheid, The Law and Reform in South Africa" in Africa Today

> Vol. 37, No. 2 (1990): 5-21. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4186650

David, Forsythe. *The United States and Human Rights: Looking Inward and*

> *Outward*. Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.

Davidson and Irina Filatova. *"African History: A View From Behind the Kremlin*

> *Wall," in Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three Centuries of Encounters*, ed.
>
> Maxim Mtusevich. Trenton: Africa World Press, Inc., 2007.

Davies, J. E. *Constructive Engagement? How Reagan's Administration Tried to support South Africa without appearing to Endorse Apartheid*. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2007.

Davis, M. Stephen. *The Bush Presidency, and South Africa: Congress and The Sanctions Outlook.* Braamfontein 2017. The South African Institute of International Affairs Jan Smuts House, May 1989.

Deegan, Heather. *The Politics of the new South Africa: Apartheid and after.* Harlow: Longman, 2001.

DOI: 10.2307/20044114, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20044114

Dubrow, Saul. *Apartheid 1948-1994*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Dugard, Haysom, and Gilbert Marcus. *The Last Years of Apartheid: Civil Liberties in South   Africa.* Michigan: Ford Foundation, 1992.

Eisenberg, Rebecca Nicole, "Reexamining the Global Cold War in South Africa: Port Usage, Space Tracking and Weapons Sales" (2012). *Dissertations and Theses.* Paper 117.http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds/117 10.15760/etd.117.

Gibson, L. James. *Overcoming Apartheid: Can Truth Reconcile a Divided Nation?* New York: Russell Sage, 2006.

Gleijeses, Piero. *Conflicting Missions: Havana, Washington, and Africa, 1959-1976.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Gordimer and David Goldblatt. *Lifetimes: Under Apartheid*. Michigan: Knopf, 1986.

Governor Jimmy Carter inaugural address, Atlanta, Georgia. January 12, 1971, www.carterlibrary.org.

Graham, Matthew (2010), Cold War in Southern Africa, in: Africa Spectrum, 45, 1,

    131-139. http://journals.giga

    hamburg.de/index.php/afsp/article/view/511/368

H.J. and R.E. Simons. *Class and Colour in South Africa*. 1850-1950. London: Penguin,

    1969.

Hayward, Steven. *The Real Jimmy Carter: How Our Worst Ex-President Undermines*

    American Foreign Policy. Washington DC: Regnery Publishing, 2004.

Herbert, and Alexej Ugrinsky. *Jimmy Carter: Foreign Policy and Post-Presidential*

    Years Connecticut: Greenwood, 1994.

Ike, and Rissik, Dee. *Cultures of the World: South Africa*. New York: Marshall

    Cavendish, 2004.

Iliffe, John. *Africans: The History of a Continent.* Cambridge University Press, 1995.

J.E. Spence, "Southern Africa in the Cold War," History Today 49, no. 2 (Feb 1999)

    http://www.historytoday.com/je-spence/southern-africa-cold-war.

James, Barber. *South Africa in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers

    Ltd, 1999.

John Daniel, "Racism, the Cold War and South Africa's Regional Security Strategies

    1948- 1990," Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power, Black Liberation.

John de St. Jorre, "*South Africa: Is Change Coming?,*" Foreign Affairs (Fall, 1981):

112, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/south-africa/1981-09-01/south-

africa-change-coming (accessed September 14, 2011)

John Parsons, "*On Constructive Engagement in South Africa,*" Tech, November 5, 1985. http://tech.mit.edu/V105/N47/parson.47o.html (accessed September 8, 2017).

John, and Michael Lewis. *Africa:* Washington: National Geographic Society, 2001.

Justin Elliott, "*Reagan"s Embrace of Apartheid South Africa,*

"https://www.salon.com/2011/02/05/ronald_reagan_apartheid_south_afri cca

Kaja Kathrine Kristiansen, The Professional Identity of Black South African Teachers *Personal and professional struggles in a disjunction between policy and practice, Master Thesis, Faculty of Education, Institute for Educational Research, University of Oslo December 2008.12.*

Karis and Carter, From Protest to Challenge, Vol. 3, (Stanford, Hoover Institution Press, 1972) xv.

Karis and Gail M. Gerhart. *Challenge and Violence, 1953-1964, in Thomas Karis and Gwendolen M. Carter (eds.), From Protest to Challenge: A Documentary History of African Politics in South Africa, 1882-1964, Vol. 3*. Stanford: Indiana University Press, 1977.

Kotze D.A. A*frican Politics in South Africa 1964-1974: Parties and Issues*. London: C. Hurst & Co., 1975.

Kristiansen, Tomm W. (1996). Mandela's Land. En fortelling om frihet. Oslo: J.W. Capellens Forlag.

Krog, Antjie. *Country of My Skull: Guilt, Sorrow and the Limits of Forgiveness in the New South Africa.* New York, Broadway, 1998.

Lauren Peacock, National Ideas or National Interest: New Zealand and South

    Africa, 1981- 1994, University of Wellington 2013,95.

    http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10063/3368/T

    hesis.pdf?sequence=2.

Lee Ray, James. *American Foreign Policy, and Political Ambition*. Los Angeles: Sage,

    2014.

Letter, Vorster to Carter, 23 March 1977. Document 1. Southern Africa (3/77–

    4/77). Geographic File: Box 14. Brzezinski Collection. JCL.

Linda Freeman. "Constructively" Supporting Aggression and Repression - Reagan's

    South Africa Policy," Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue

    Canadienne des Études Africaines 18, no. 3 (November 1984): 627,

    http://www.jstor.org/stable/484775.

Lodge, Tom. *Black Politics in South Africa since 1945.* London: Longman, 1983.

Lulat, Y.G-M. *United States Relations with South Africa: A Critical Overview from the

    Colonial Period to the Present.* New York: Peter Lang, 2008.

Lyman N. Princeton. *Partner to History: The U.S Role in South Africa's Transition to

    democracy*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2002.

Massie, Robert. *Loosing the Bonds: The United States and South Africa in the

    Apartheid Years*. New York: Bantam, 1997.

Memo, Mondale to Carter, 8 April 1977. 2. Document 14. Southern Africa (3/77–

    4/77). Geographic File: Box 14. Brzezinski Collection. JCL.

Michael Clough, "Southern Africa: Challenges and Choices," Foreign Affairs 66, no.

    5 (Summer, 1988): 1068,

http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/angola/1988-06-01/southern-africa-challenges-and-choices.

Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson (eds.), The Oxford History of South Africa, Vol.1, South Africa to 1870, and Vol. 2, 1870-1966 (Oxford, 1969-1971). Leo Kuper's chapter in volume two (426-476) this was really the only contribution to the collection sacrificed to the history of African nationalism in South Africa. In the South African edition, even this was excluded from its publication.

Morris, Roger, Uncertain Greatness: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy New York: Harper Collins, August 1977.

On U.S.A. U.S. Department of State, Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on South Africa, A U.S. Policy Toward South Africa, Report (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1987).

Onslow, Sue. *Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power Black Liberation*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Peffer, John. *Art and the End of Apartheid.* Minneapolis London: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.

Peter and Lh Gann. *Hope for South Africa?* California: Hoover Institution Press, 1991.

Mandelbaum, Michael. *Mission Failure: America and the World in the Post-Cold War Era.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Peter J. Schraeder. *United States Foreign Policy Toward Africa: Incrementalism, Crisis, and Change.* Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, January 1994.

Polakow-Suransky, Sasha. *The Unspoken Alliance: Israel's Secret Relationship with Apartheid South Africa*. New York: Random House Books, 2010.

Pomeroy, J. Williams, A*partheid, Imperialism, and African Freedom.* New York: International Publishers, 1986.

Presidential Address to the 47th Annual Conference of the African National Congress, Durban, 12 December 1959, http://www.anc.org.za/content/47th-national-conference-presidential-address-chief-albert-luthuli.

Presidential news conference, 15 April 1977. DSB. 1977, 76(1976), 459.

R. W Johnson. *South Africa's Brave New World: The Beloved Country Since The End of Apartheid*. New York: Overlook, 2010).

Rita Byrnes, *South Africa: A Country Study* (Washington, D.C.: GPO for the U.S. Library of Congress), http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/cntrystd.za

Ross, Robert. *A Concise History of South Africa*. Cambridge: University Press 1997, 2008.

Rotberg, I. Robert. *Ending Autocracy, Enabling Democracy.* Cambridge, World Peace Foundation, 2002.

Roux, Edward. *Time Longer than Rope: A History of the Black Man's Struggle for Freedom in South Africa*. London, V. Gollancz, 1948.

SA News (2014) Zuma upbeat about SA's future, despite challenges.

      http://www.sanews.gov.za/south-africa/zuma-upbeat-about-sas-future-

      despite-challenges.

SADET (eds.), The Road to Democracy, Vol. 1: 1960-1970. Cape Town: Struik

      Publishers, 2005.

Samia Kouki, The Jimmy Carter And Ronald Reagan Administrations' Policies

      Toward Apartheid South Africa: Diverging Rhetoric, Converging Actions,

      The Tunis Languages Higher Institute, Tunisia, International Journal of Arts

      & Sciences, 2011.

Sandy, Vogelgsang. *American Dream Global Nightmare: The Dilemma of U.S. Human*

      Rights Policy. New York: W Norton & Co Inc., 1980.

Schroeder A. Richard. *Africa After Apartheid: South Africa, Race, and Nation in*

      Tanzania. Indiana: University Press 2012.

Seegers, Annette. *The Military in the Making of Modern South Africa*. New York:

      Tauris Academic Studies,1996.

Shandrá D. Hipp. *Constructive Engagement: Ronald Reagan"S Problematic Policy of*

      Appeasement With South Africa. Georgetown University: Washington, D.C.,

      2012.

Shubin, Vladimir. *"Beyond the Fairy Tales: The Reality of Soviet Involvement in the*

      Liberation of Southern Africa," in Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three

      Centuries of Encounters, ed. Maxim Matusevich. Trenton: Africa World Press,

      Inc., 2007.

Shula Marks, "Rewriting South African history: or The hunt for Hintsa's head," in

      Simon McGrath, Charles Jedrej, Kenneth King, and Jack Thompson (eds.),

      Rethinking African History (Edinburgh, 1997.

South Africa-The Impact of World War II, www.123helpme.com.

Sparks, Allister. *The Mind of South Africa: The Story of the Rise and Fall of*

      Apartheid.London: Mandarin, 1991.

Stephen, M. Davis. *Apartheid's Rebels: Inside South Africa's Hidden War*. New Haven

      and London: Yale University Press, 1989.

Stock, Robert. *Africa South of the Sahara.* New York and London: The Guilford

      Press, 1995.

Stultz, Newell M. *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 35, no. 2/3

      (2002): 518-20. doi:10.2307/3097652

The cold war: accessed 26th of April 2017, https://www.jfklibrary.org/JFK/JFK-in-

      History/The-Cold- War.aspx

The Making of Modern South Africa: Conquest, Segregation, and Apartheid, 3rd ed.

      (Oxford, 2000); Robert Ross, A Concise History of South Africa (Cambridge,

      1999); William Beinart, Twentieth-Century South Africa, rev. ed. (Oxford,

      2001).

Thompson, Leonard. *A History of South Africa, Revised Edition.* New Haven: Yale

      University, 1999.

Thomson, Alex. *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa: 1948-1994:*

      Conflict of Interests. New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Tutu Denounces Raegan "New York Times" July 23, 1986.

      https://www.nytimes.com/1986/07/23/world/tutu-denounces-reagan.html

Vance, Cyrus. *Hard Choices: Critical years in America's foreign policy* New York:

      Simon and Schuster, 1983.

Vandenbosch, Amry. *South Africa and the World: The Foreign Policy of Apartheid.*

      Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 2015.

VasiliMitrokhin and Christopher Andrew. *The World Was Going Our Way: The KGB*

      and the Battle for the Third World. New York: Basic Books, 2005.

Veit Erlmann. *Migration and Performance: Zulu Migrant Workers' Isicathamiya*

      Performance in South Africa, 1890-1950. Illinois: University of Illinois Press,

      2014.

Vice President Walter Mondale's news conference, Vienna, 20 May 1977. DSB.

      1977, 76(1982), 665.

Villa-Vicencio, Charles. *A Theology of Reconstruction: Nation-Building and Human*

      Rights. Cape Town: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

VITA

OLUGBENGA SAMSON OJEWALE

Education: Master of Arts in History, 2018.
                                    East Tennessee State University,
                                    Johnson City, TN

                                    Bachelor of Science, Politics and International
                                    Relations, 2008
                                    Lead City University Ibadan, Nigeria

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, January 2015-2018
                                    Department of History, East Tennessee State
                                    University, Johnson City, TN

                                    Professional training and Certification in Public
                                    Relations, Institute of Public Policy, Nigeria,
                                    January 2010

Outreach and Associations: Vice President SOA (Shades of Africa) – ETSU

                                    MUN (Model United Nations) – ETSU chapter

                                    Awarded Community Leader for outstanding
                                    corp member volunteer achievement