



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 12, NO. 4, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

NOVEMBER, 1978

The Battle For Africa

Every President hopes that history will remember him favorably for some great or unique achievement of his regime, although few have such ambitious designs as Thomas Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase or Theodore Roosevelt's building of our Panama Canal. The names of some Presidents will, unfortunately, be forever tied to unhappy events.

It is beginning to look as though President Carter may be known as the President who allowed the Communists to take over Africa. His policy has become clear: put political and economic pressure on anti-Communist governments to force them out of office, and sit immobile when Communist troops advance.

The result is to give the green light to the Communist conquest of Africa. The Communists' plan is to proceed from Angola across to the Horn of Africa at Somalia and South Yemen. This will give them control of the narrow south end of the Red Sea through which oil from Saudi Arabia passes.

Even Senator Abraham Ribicoff, a longtime supporter of our no-win foreign policy, is getting alarmed. He said recently, "whoever controls that oil will control the economic lifeblood of the West. Let the Soviet Union control that oil . . . and where will the United States be?"

The partnership of Soviet arms and Cuban troops to conquer African countries of enormous size is mind-boggling in sheer audacity. But the Carter policies are permitting it to succeed. The result is to reduce the unhappy victims to a reign of terror and to administer military, economic and psychological defeats to the West.

The invasion of the copper-rich province of Shaba (formerly Katanga) was launched from Communist-controlled Angola. The invaders massacred hundreds of Europeans and blacks, and looted and raped. The Carter policy in the face of such aggression and atrocities was to do nothing, pleading that the President's hands were legally tied.

Ambassador Andrew Young praised the Administration because it "has not overreacted to the appearance of Communist influence." He said, "I think the slowness to respond has been very much in our favor." This is the update of the Owen Lattimore "let the dust settle" policy under which our State Department cut off aid to our ally, the Republic of China, and allowed the Communists to take over Mainland China.

Fortunately, the French and Belgians did not fol-

low Young's do-nothing advice about Zaire. They sent paratroopers who quickly recaptured Kolwezi, the copper-mining center of Shaba province, and drove the invaders back to their bases in Angola.

Cuban soldiers have now been stationed in 14 African nations including Mozambique and Ethiopia. Arms have been shipped and flown from the Soviet Union, including tanks and MIG fighter planes, to enable the Cubans to form new armored brigades.

Local guerrillas are being trained in Mozambique to step up the invasion of Rhodesia. A military airport has been constructed in Mozambique near Rhodesia's southern border. The Carter Administration is assisting by imposing its economic boycott on Rhodesia (at the same time that it pleads it can do nothing in Angola and Zaire).

The International Institute for Strategic Studies, a London research organization known for not emphasizing the Communist threat, stated in its recent annual review of world strategy: "It is the capability for the global dispatch of military equipment and forces, coupled with a readiness to become actively involved and American reluctance to reciprocate in kind, which will provide opportunities for Soviet influence in a period of conflict in Third World areas."

In plain language, the equation is simple: Soviet aggression plus American inaction equals Communist conquest of Africa.

Carter in Africa

If President Carter's 1978 April Fool's Day speech in Nigeria ever achieves its purpose, it won't be any joke. It will cause the tragedy of turning over Africa to Communist control. The calamity of Communist control over key African areas will exceed even the hypocrisy of Carter's message.

Speaking in Nigeria on April 1, President Carter called for an immediate acceptance of black rule in Rhodesia and South West Africa, and for United Nations peacekeeping forces to "help bring a peaceful transition to majority rule in both countries."

There is no majority rule in the country where President Carter spoke. Nigeria has not had an election for more than 10 years. Elections were promised for 1976, then cancelled. All power is held by a military dictatorship.

In Rhodesia and in the Union of South Africa, elec-

tions are regularly held, although everyone is not eligible to vote. However, it ill becomes a U.S. President to get too sanctimonious about that, when the historical fact is that universal suffrage is a relatively recent accomplishment even in our free and democratic United States.

It is strange that our President would select Nigeria as the platform for his speech criticizing white governments in Africa. Nigeria committed one of the worst crimes of genocide in the 20th century. In 1967 Nigeria massacred thousands of Ibos who were largely Christian. Then followed a three-year civil war with the seceding Republic of Biafra in which an estimated one million people died. Nothing that has occurred in Rhodesia, South West Africa, or South Africa, involved even a tiny fraction of the immense bloodshed and property losses inflicted by Nigeria on its black Biafran population. Nigeria backed the Communists in Angola in 1975-76 and even cancelled a scheduled visit by Henry A. Kissinger, then U.S. Secretary of State.

The biggest threat to Africa today is the Soviet and Soviet-backed Cuban invasions of Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Eritrea, and Somalia. Communist control of these key countries will give the Soviets control of very important land areas plus control of the vital Red Sea oil exit.

Divestiture

The hottest issue on college campuses today is divestiture: agitation to force university trustees to divest their institutions of all investments in South Africa. This has replaced the Vietnam War, civil rights, and other issues about which college students have marched, demonstrated, and held sit-ins in administrative offices.

With tuition fees increasing every year, one would think that the students would be glad to have college endowment bringing in as high a return as possible in order to keep the charges to students as low as possible. But some students want political decisions to replace financial decisions.

Africa is a tremendous continent, more than 6,000 miles long and 5,000 miles wide. It is rich in gold, diamonds, uranium, chrome, coal, copper and other minerals, as well as agricultural land. Many believe that whoever controls Africa will control the world. It would be a Western default of responsibility to let this rich prize fall into the hands of the Soviet Union and thereby tip the scales of world control in its favor.

The Horn of Africa is one of the two most strategic parts of Africa. On the northeast side of the continent and extending out into the Indian Ocean about 700 miles, the Horn controls the Red Sea, the Suez Canal, and the oil coming out of the Middle East. The Suez Canal is not large enough to accommodate the modern oil tankers, so they go southward around the Cape of Good Hope to reach Europe and the West.

The little country of Somalia on the point of the Horn became a priority target of Soviet-Cuban aggression. On its own, it was doing a good job of defeating Ethiopia and Eritrea and establishing anti-Communist control over the entrance to the Red Sea.

However, when the United States abstained from giving any help to the anti-Communist Somalians, the Soviets sent bombers, arms and heavy equipment, and attacked and defeated Somalia without protest from our State Department or UN Ambassador.

The Soviets now control Ethiopia, Somalia and Eritrea on the west side of the Red Sea, and Aden and South Yemen on the east side. The question is, are we also going to encourage the Soviets to do likewise at the other strategic point in Africa, the southern tip?

South Africa has a developed technical civilization with the highest standard of living anywhere in Africa, for blacks and whites. Historically, the whites settled South Africa first; the blacks came south later to share in the growing and productive economy which the whites had carved out of the wilderness.

South Africa has been consistently pro-Western and anti-Communist, but American policy, from the State Department to the campuses, has been to treat it like a pariah. It is a strange liberal double standard that apartheid excites student demonstrations, while the millions in Soviet slave labor camps (so well described by former inmates such as Alexander Solzhenitsyn and John Noble) produce only yawns.

Most of the African nations are ruled by one party or by a military dictatorship which has eliminated free elections, outlawed opposition parties, and trampled on individual rights. Their future is even bleaker; it is moving toward the total enslavement so characteristic of Communist countries. In South Africa, however, the momentum for black advancement, although slow and halting, is at least in the right direction.

South Africa has the most press freedom and the most newspapers in all of Africa. It has 21 dailies and none of them is government owned. Any visitor to South Africa is amazed at the sharply critical attacks on the government which are published in the newspapers there, more vehement than most U.S. newspapers' criticism of the Carter Administration. U.S. and European newspapers are freely sold in South Africa.

Divestiture of university investments in South Africa would not have any effect on the policies of the South African government or on the life of the blacks who live there (except perhaps to jeopardize the jobs of the tens of thousands of blacks who work in U.S.-owned companies). As long as South African investments make money for their owners, there will be plenty of buyers for any stocks divested by the universities.

Rhodesia and One Man, One Vote

U.S. policy toward Rhodesia, which includes economic sanctions, the shifting of our chrome purchases from Rhodesia to the U.S.S.R., and President Carter's snubbing of Prime Minister Ian Smith, is supposedly justified because Rhodesia does not have an electoral system based on "one man, one vote." President Carter even refused to allow Ian Smith, a highly decorated fighter pilot of World War II, to pay tribute to our Unknown Soldier.

Why do we demand "one man, one vote" as the sine qua non for doing business with Rhodesia, or sipping tea with its head of state, when we impose no such prerequisite on other economic or diplomatic contacts? Even now, Carter is making plans to issue a cordial invitation to Brezhnev to visit the White House to put the finishing touches on the SALT II treaty.

No one suggests that the lack of one man, one vote in the Soviet Union will be any impediment to the warmth of Carter's hospitality. Yet current U.S. policy requires us to buy higher-priced, lower-quality chrome from the Soviet Union, where there are no free elec-

tions, and to boycott lower-priced, higher-quality chrome from Rhodesia where there are free elections and rapid progress toward a democratic government.

We don't demand one man, one vote in other countries we trade with. We don't even ask for it in countries to which we loan American money! The State Department encourages trade and trade-plus-credits with the Soviet Union, East European satellites, and Red China, none of whom have the slightest intention of granting free elections.

Only five out of 43 African countries have any semblance of individual freedom or free elections. In Idi Amin's Uganda, there is only one vote in the entire country, yet we continue to support him with our coffee purchases. Why does the Carter Administration insist on one man, one vote only in countries resisting Communism?

Even in our own country, it took generations to extend the right to vote to women, blacks, Indians, and non-propertied whites. Literacy tests were legal here until 1970, and the elimination of literacy tests was accompanied by the near-elimination of illiteracy. How can we demand that Rhodesia achieve in a couple of years what took us a couple of centuries?

One man, one vote became the national rule in the United States only with the 1962 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Baker v. Carr*. Although this rule governs state legislatures and the U.S. House of Representatives, of course it does not apply to the U.S. Senate. A Senator from California represents 66 times as many people as a Senator from Alaska.

Our nation was born because our Founding Fathers combined the vision of freedom with political reality. The Great Compromise between the large and small states produced the two Houses of Congress, with one House based on the vote of the people and the other on giving the minority faction (the small states) the incentive to cast their lot with the new Republic.

The political reality in Rhodesia was spelled out by Ian Smith on *Meet the Press*. If the whites are not given sufficient political incentive, they will flee the country. With them will go most of the technological, professional, academic, and managerial skills without which Rhodesia will lose whatever political freedom and economic prosperity it now has or could hope to achieve. This is why Rhodesian blacks, except for the Communist-backed guerrillas, are willing to cooperate with Ian Smith on a workable plan for Rhodesia's future.

Rhodesia has abolished all statutory racial discrimination. Blacks have better education, better housing, and better medical care than anywhere in Africa except in South Africa. Sixty percent of the army and police force is already black -- a tremendous gesture of good faith on the part of the minority whites.

The Carter policy toward Rhodesia is not only consummate hypocrisy. It will result in shoving another African nation into the waiting arms of the Soviet Union.

U.S. Boycott of Rhodesian Chrome

One of the follies of U.S. policy toward Rhodesia is our boycott of Rhodesian chrome, a policy mandated by the United Nations. Quite apart from the impertinence of the United Nations' attempting to dictate whom Americans may buy products from, the boycott policy itself is morally, diplomatically, and commercially in-

defensible. We are in the ridiculous position of placing an embargo on the importation of a strategic material from a free-world country while we import that same material from a Communist country.

We have only a little indigenous chrome and it is of almost no commercial value. Chrome has not been mined in the United States since 1961. The embargo on imports from Rhodesia forces us to get most of our chrome from the Soviet Union.

U.S. reliance on Rhodesia is much greater than current import tonnage figures indicate because Rhodesia supplied the higher-grade metallurgical chrome and the ferrochrome. Rhodesia supplied 26 percent of ferrochrome and 17 percent of our chromite needs.

There obviously is no moral reason to embargo Rhodesia and buy instead from Russia, since the Soviet Union is one of the most repressive regimes in the world today. Neither is there any commercial reason. Russian chrome is more expensive because Russia ignores the UN embargo, buys some of its chrome from Rhodesia, adds a middleman's markup, and then sells to us at a higher price.

The importance of stainless steel and the folly of relying on the Soviets for one of its essential ingredients indicate that the Congress has sacrificed American interests to a propaganda ploy.

How Rhodesia Could Join the UN

There are 16 Communist countries that are members of the United Nations. All these countries are governed by a tiny minority. The ruling minority consists of the members of the Communist Party. Communist Party membership ranges from about three percent in Red China to about five percent in most of the others. These countries are all dictatorships in which the head of the Communist Party, such as Leonid Brezhnev or Fidel Castro, exercises near-total power.

The UN made it clear that dictatorships are apparently more welcome in the UN than republics when it admitted the dictatorship of Mainland China and expelled the Republic of China.

The Republic of Rhodesia has never been admitted to the UN. Why? It surely can't be because it has a white minority government because 12 Communist nations in the UN have exactly that. Neither can it be because of apartheid, because this doesn't exist in Rhodesia.

Here is a list of 25 policies, programs, or practices that the government of Rhodesia would have to initiate in order to meet the standards for UN membership set by that leading member of the UN General Assembly and Security Council, the Soviet Union.

Rhodesia would have to build a Gulag Archipelago and install a network of slave labor camps. Rhodesia would have to install torture chambers, such as have been so graphically described by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, and send its most intelligent political opponents to psychiatric clinics for political and mental treatment. Rhodesia would have to suppress all opposition to government policies by killing its opposition leaders and relocating ethnic minorities.

Rhodesia would have to institute a program of confiscation of private property and collectivization of the farms that would cause thousands of deaths. Rhodesia would have to reduce the wages paid to workers and force the women to do the heaviest and dirtiest manual

labor such as mining and street cleaning. Rhodesia would have to manipulate currency exchange in order to bring it under complete control of the minority government, and then resort to periodic confiscation of personal savings accounts.

Rhodesia would have to prohibit religious education of all children from ages six to eighteen, and close down 92 percent of all churches. Then Rhodesia would have to inaugurate a system of totalitarian indoctrination of all school children.

Rhodesia would have to deny exit permits to all who want to emigrate, and indulge in blatant anti-Semitism. Rhodesia would have to install a system of internal visas so that all persons would have to have special permits to travel even short distances within the country.

Rhodesia would have to impose a radical censorship of the press, ban the importation of most foreign books, censor all movies, stage plays and art, and decree severe punishment for listening to foreign radio stations. Rhodesia would have to reduce communication among its people by banning the public possession of telephone books.

Rhodesia would have to enforce discipline on the populace by a rigid discrimination in the distribution of food, basic medicines, and other essentials. Rhodesia would have to send troops to occupy and take over neighboring countries.

If Rhodesia did all these things, then it might make itself acceptable to the United Nations which has welcomed the Communist countries that practice these severe violations of liberty and justice.

The Francophone Family

France's reaction to the 1978 invasion of Zaire provides an inspiring contrast to the usual vacillating American response to Communist aggression. The decisiveness and deft footwork of President Valery Giscard d'Estaing contrasts sharply with President Carter's indecision.

While Andrew Young, President Carter's adviser on Africa, ignored the invasion and continued to call for the overthrow of Rhodesia by its neighbors Zambia and Mozambique, France acted speedily to defend Zaire. French paratroopers were flown to the copper-rich district of Kolwezi, where they stopped the orgy of killings, rapes and looting by Communist and Cuban invaders from Angola and drove them back across the border.

Zaire is the solar plexus of Africa. With an area of more than 2.5 million square kilometers and a population of 24 million, Zaire is Africa's third largest state. Centrally located in the heart of Africa, it borders on ten countries.

If Zaire had fallen to the rebels, the largest obstacle to the Soviet plan to march from Angola to the Red Sea would have been eliminated. The chances of Zambia's remaining independent would have been next to nil. Rhodesia would have been fatally exposed and South Africa would have been threatened.

Unlike the United States and Britain, France was not intimidated by Soviet charges of colonialism. Giscard's government took the position that its intervention was in the best interest of the Africans as well as of French investors in Africa, and that Cuban-Soviet aggression is bad for all.

As a writer in the influential *Paris-Soir* explained,

France dared to send troops to Zaire "not because it necessarily believed that President Mobuto's regime was a good one, but because it believed a rebel army that shot men, women and children of all colors drunkenly and indiscriminately was even worse. The fact that coincidentally French investment had been protected was jam on the bread."

France has had a long history of influence in Africa. Unlike the British colonial administration, which was essentially pragmatic and decentralized, the French integrated the peoples of their colonies into the political and cultural systems of the mother country.

Instead of encouraging local culture and institutions, France developed a small African elite steeped in French culture and educated in France. They mixed freely with the whites and were often allowed to take prominent positions in France as well as in the colonies. Two current African heads of state are products of this policy: Felix Houphouet-Boigny of the Ivory Coast and President Leopold Senghor of Senegal. Both are former members of the French government.

The sentimental ties to France resulting from this policy have efficiently continued French influence even though the colonies are fully independent. The "Francophone family," as the French-dominated states are popularly known, includes Mauritania, Senegal, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Upper Volta, Mali, Togo, Benin, Niger, Chad, Cameroon, Central African Empire, Congo, Gabon, Ruanda, Burundi, and now Zaire. Several of these countries have permanent French military bases.

Fortunately for the West, the French military presence is also strong in Djibouti, which borders the south end of the Red Sea, where oil passes from the free world's largest producer, Saudi Arabia. The French have 5,000 troops there, reinforced by jet fighter planes and naval vessels.

It's beginning to look as though the only chance Africa has to avoid Communist control is to line up with the French and forget the United States.

Phyllis Schlafly is the co-author of five books on defense and foreign policy: *Kissinger on the Couch* (1975) and *Ambush at Vladivostok* (1976) covering the Kissinger years, and *The Gravediggers* (1964), *Strike From Space* (1965), and *The Betrayers* (1968) covering the McNamara years. Her first book, *A Choice Not An Echo* (1964), sold three million copies without a single advertisement. Her other books are *Safe Not Sorry* (1967), *Mindzenty the Man* (1972), and *The Power of the Positive Woman* (1977).

Sworn Statement of Ownership

The Phyllis Schlafly Report is published monthly at Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Publisher: Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois, 62002.
Editor: Same. Owner: Same. Known bond-holders, mortgagees, or other security holders: none.

Information on circulation not required as no advertising is carried.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund -- \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15 cents each; 8 copies \$1, 50 copies \$4, 100 copies \$8.