

SA US STATE ACTION - General

PUBLIC INVESTMENT AND SOUTH AFRICA

Dear friends,

June 1, 1987

The past six months have seen many developments both inside South Africa and in the U.S. movement for people's sanctions and the isolation of the apartheid regime. Here in the U.S. we have seen frequent corporate announcements of their exodus from South Africa, increasing pressure on those companies that are ending their direct investment to also cut all other links to the apartheid economy, an increase in selective purchasing actions and the continuation of active campaigns for state and local divestment. In fact, as I sat down to write this letter reports were coming in that two more state victories had been won. Oregon has just passed divestment legislation making it the twenty-first state to take action against apartheid. In addition, Connecticut passed a complete divestment bill that updates and strengthens its divestment stance from one keyed to the "Sullivan Principles" to a position of total divestment of all state funds.

Selective purchasing actions have also been scoring big victories, as demonstrated by the experience of Los Angeles and the Ashland Oil Co. After L.A. had passed its selective purchasing law, an engineering firm that was owned by Ashland Oil wanted to bid on a large city contract. Los Angeles took the position that for the engineering firm to be eligible to bid on city contracts, its parent company, Ashland Oil, had to pull out of South Africa. The contract was allowed with the understanding that within two months, Ashland had to be out of South Africa completely or begin to forfeit an ever-increasing portion of the \$1 million bond it had put up as insurance. The result was that Ashland Oil pulled out within the allotted time and has now cut all ties to the apartheid economy.

The successes of divestment and selective purchasing are only one part of the story, however. During the next few months we will have another important opportunity to further isolate the apartheid regime. As you all know, last year anti-apartheid forces succeeded in getting an imperfect but momentous sanctions bill passed, over a presidential veto. The bill was weak because it was not comprehensive and did not put an end to U.S. involvement in underwriting the apartheid economy. The bill was momentous in that it finally turned away from the Reagan Administration's policy of constructive engagement and moved the U.S. towards a policy designed to exert some real economic pressure on the apartheid regime.

This year Rep. Ron Dellums and Senator Alan Cranston have introduced comprehensive sanctions bills in the House and Senate. This legislation is similar to the strong sanctions that passed the House last year (see background sheet on sanctions) and would make all U.S. investment in and most U.S. trade with South Africa illegal. Last year it was the efforts of the anti-apartheid movement that made the difference in the passage of sanctions. The divestment, selective purchasing, and pro-sanctions furor that we were able to generate prior to the debate in Congress was able to turn the tide. This year we can put teeth into the sanctions we fought for last year.

Under last year's sanctions bill, the Administration is charged with reviewing its policy on South Africa and Namibia, in early October. President Reagan fought hard to thwart the sanctions effort last year, so we can be fairly certain that whatever evaluation comes out of the Administration will try to portray sanctions as a failed policy. This is why it is absolutely essential that we start now to generate the momentum for passage of comprehensive sanctions.

We can begin this process by getting resolutions passed at the state and local level that call for the imposition of full and comprehensive sanctions. Such action can highlight the reality that the people of the U.S. are in favor of cutting all ties to apartheid and that this must become national policy. You will find a sample resolution among the enclosures to this letter.

Inside South Africa, there is a rising tide of resistance to apartheid. Just last month a national youth and student organization was launched, in total secrecy. Trade union militancy is increasing and rent and other boycotts are continuing. However, the apartheid regime's brutalization of the South African people in response to this rising resistance in South Africa has also been growing. The mass firing of thousands of striking transport and railway workers late last month and the ensuing violence that was unleashed both against the transport workers union and COSATU, the leading trade union federation, provide graphic examples. Union members were rounded up and some killed for protesting against the firings. COSATU house which is home to the national offices of the federation as well as a number of member trade unions was bombed and nearly destroyed. The regional offices of the transport workers union were bombed as well. Clearly, these attacks were meant to show the Black trade union movement that in future, they too will be targets of the type of repression that to date had been aimed mainly at community-based mass organizations such as the United Democratic Front.

As painful as these images are, for us they become even more painful when we remember that one of the main reasons that the apartheid regime has the ability to unleash this kind of violence on the resistance of Black South Africans is that our government is still firmly committed to supporting minority rule in South Africa, and will continue that support unless and until we force it to stop.

Yours in Solidarity,

Rob Jones

Rob Jones
Projects Director

P.S. Apartheid has a regional effect as well. One of the most chilling aspects of this is the South African government's destabilization of neighboring Angola through the proxy group UNITA led by Jonas Savimbi. With the help of the Reagan administration, U.S. support is growing for this group which bombs schools and hospitals, and is attempting to undermine the Angolan government. I have enclosed some material on UNITA that I hope will be helpful as we confront South Africa's destabilization of the entire region of southern Africa.

PUBLIC INVESTMENT AND SOUTH AFRICA

June 1, 1987

STATE AND LOCAL ACTION ON APARTHEID

21 states, 14 counties, 72 cities and the Virgin Islands have passed some form of "peoples' sanctions" legislation against South Africa. This legislation has entailed the sale of \$20 billion in investments in U.S. corporations and banks involved in South Africa.

STATES

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| California | Colorado | Connecticut |
| Illinois | Iowa | Kansas |
| Louisiana | Maine | Maryland |
| Massachusetts | Michigan | Minnesota |
| Nebraska | New Jersey | New Mexico |
| North Dakota | Oregon | Rhode Island |
| Vermont | West Virginia | Wisconsin |
| Virgin Islands | | |

CITIES

| | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Alexandria (VA) | Amherst (MA) | Ann Arbor (MI) |
| Atlanta (GA) | Atlantic City (NJ) | Baltimore (MD) |
| Berkeley (CA) | Boston (MA) | Boulder (CO) |
| Brookline (MA) | Burlington (VT) | Cambridge (MA) |
| Camden (NJ) | Charleston (SC) | Charlottesville (VA) |
| Chicago (IL) | Cincinnati (OH) | Cleveland (OH) |
| College Park (MD) | Columbus (OH) | Davis (CA) |
| Denver (CO) | Detroit (MI) | Durham (NC) |
| East Lansing (MI) | Erie (PA) | Fairmont (WV) |
| Fort Collins (CO) | Freeport (NY) | Fresno (CA) |
| Gainesville (FL) | Grand Rapids (MI) | Harrisburg (PA) |
| Hartford (CT) | Houston (TX) | Jersey City (NJ) |
| Kansas City (KS) | Kansas City (MO) | Los Angeles (CA) |
| Madison (WI) | Miami (FL) | Middletown (CT) |
| Minneapolis (MN) | New Haven (CT) | New Orleans (LA) |
| New York City (NY) | Newark (NJ) | Oakland (CA) |
| Omaha (NE) | Palo Alto (CA) | Philadelphia (PA) |
| Pittsburgh (PA) | Portsmouth (VA) | Rahway (NJ) |
| Raleigh (NC) | Richmond (CA) | Richmond (VA) |
| Rochester (NY) | San Diego (CA) | San Francisco (CA) |
| San Jose (CA) | Santa Cruz (CA) | Seattle (WA) |
| St. Louis (MO) | Stockton (CA) | Topeka (KS) |
| Tucson (AZ) | Washington (DC) | West Hollywood (CA) |
| Wilmington (DE) | Youngstown (OH) | Ypsilanti (MI) |

COUNTIES

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Alameda County (CA) | Bergen County (NJ) | Cuyahoga County (OH) |
| Hennepin County (MN) | Howard County (MD) | Monroe County (NY) |
| Montgomery County (MD) | New Castle County (DE) | Prince Georges County (MD) |
| Rockland County (NY) | Santa Barbara County (CA) | Sonoma County (CA) |
| Tompkins County (CO) | Westchester County (NY) | |

Copyright 1987 The American Committee on Africa.

June 1987

PRESSURE NEEDED TO STOP U.S. SUPPORT FOR UNITA

South Africa has carried its defense of apartheid well beyond its borders by launching devastating attacks on neighboring countries and causing more than \$10 billion worth of damage just since 1980. The white minority government sees the black ruled states of the region as a threat to its survival and believes their example inspires the rebellion in South Africa. Pretoria has used its regional economic and military power to destabilize the Frontline states and has supported surrogate armies fighting against both Angola and Mozambique.

The Reagan administration has been particularly active in supporting South Africa's regional war against Angola by backing apartheid's proxy group UNITA, led by Jonas Savimbi. Last year the administration provided \$15 million in covert aid to UNITA and this year it is providing additional military aid. Although few details about the type and quantity of this aid are available, the devastating impact of UNITA's actions are readily apparent.

There is well documented evidence of UNITA bomb attacks against schools, day care centers and innocent civilians. In a long article on UNITA's tactics, the Washington Post reported in 1986 that "because antipersonnel mines have been planted in fields used to grow staple and export crops and on the paths leading to those fields from the villages...heavy casualties, especially of the lower extremities, are caused." Tens of thousands of Angolans have had their legs or arms blown off by UNITA land mines. Additional hundreds of thousands of Angolans have been driven from their homes by UNITA and South African attacks.

Despite all this evidence, the Reagan administration has used anti-communist, cold war arguments to rationalize support for UNITA because of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. These arguments ignore the historical facts of the situation. In 1975 South Africa, with U.S. support, launched a massive military invasion of Angola just as the newly independent MPLA government came to power. It was after this invasion that the MPLA invited Cuban troops into the country to help defend the nation against the South African armored columns that were moving toward the capital. Although the Angolans, with Cuban support, prevented South Africa from taking over the country, the South African Defense Force continues to occupy parts of southern Angola. South Africa's continuing attacks have forced Angola to ask the Cuban troops to remain.

With support from the administration and other right wing forces, UNITA is now traveling throughout the U.S. soliciting support from community groups, church leaders, mayors and others. UNITA spokesmen regularly portray themselves as Black "freedom fighters" and use anti-communist rhetoric to suggest they are fighting for freedom in Africa.

There is well documented evidence that Savimbi collaborated with the Portuguese colonialists during Angola's war for independence. And by 1987 Savimbi had been denounced by the Organization of African Unity, the Frontline states which surround South Africa and by most of the countries of the world. Savimbi is seen as a willing agent of the white minority government in South Africa. The MPLA government in Angola, which Savimbi seeks to overthrow, is recognized by every country in the world except South Africa and the United States.

It is important to oppose South Africa's destabilization of southern Africa as part of our efforts to eradicate apartheid. The first step is to educate ourselves and our communities about the regional effects of apartheid.

Aid to UNITA is Aid to South Africa
Support the Peoples of Southern Africa in the Struggle to End Apartheid!

SAMPLE RESOLUTION CALLING FOR STRONG FEDERAL SANCTIONS

Whereas, the system of apartheid is one of minority rule where political expression is denied to the Black majority solely on the basis of race;

Whereas, apartheid is constitutionally enshrined racism that extends into every area of Black South African life, and has been declared by the United Nations and other international bodies as a crime against humanity;

Whereas, the white minority government has shown itself capable of the most extreme brutality against any and every attempt of the Black majority to move the country away from apartheid and towards a unitary state based on one-person-one-vote;

Whereas, South Africa illegally occupies Namibia, maintains one South African soldier for every ten Namibians, and is subjecting the Namibian people to the crime of apartheid;

Resolved, that we the citizens of city/county/state _____, call on the U.S. government to impose comprehensive, mandatory economic sanctions on South Africa, including a total trade embargo and the complete withdrawal of all U.S. corporations from South Africa and a severing of all licensing and franchise arrangements;

Resolved, that we call especially on the congressional delegation from our state to co-sponsor and vigorously work to ensure the passage of such legislation. The city/county/state of _____, requests that members of the state delegation send copies of all such legislation they are co-sponsoring and supporting to the mayor/governor/county administrator where it shall be available for public inspection.

Copies of this resolution will be sent to all representatives and senators from our state and to the President of the United States.

"The National Union of Mineworkers of South Africa resolves to once again reaffirm its support for all forms of international pressures including sanctions and disinvestment"

— National Union of Mineworkers (the largest single Black trade union in South Africa) February 1987

Build Support For Strong Sanctions

June 1, 1987

Last year Congress passed partial sanctions against South Africa, joining hundreds of local governments, trade unions and religious organizations in taking action to distance the U.S. from apartheid South Africa. The Congressional action sent a strong message of official U.S. government disapproval to the white minority government. But these measures only banned about 18 percent of trade between the U.S. and South Africa and did not call for American companies to pull out of South Africa.

The key to effective sanctions last year was the strong grassroots movement that pressed Congress to pass sanctions. The actions of state, county and municipal legislators in passing divestment legislation, of religious and trade union organizations in selling stocks in companies in South Africa and of students in pushing to distance universities from apartheid all played an important role in signaling to Congress that people in the U.S. felt strong action was needed. This year we need to build an effective grassroots movement that can work for passage of strong, comprehensive sanctions in Congress.

In February, Representative Ron Dellums and Senator Alan Cranston introduced legislation for comprehensive economic sanctions. This legislation, House Bill 1580 and Senate Bill S556, calls for:

- * a complete U.S. corporate withdrawal from South Africa and Namibia within six months;
- * a ban on most U.S. trade with South Africa, and;
- * a ban on U.S. intelligence sharing with the South African government.

Despite the daily death tolls and rising detentions, many members of Congress are not convinced that further sanctions are needed at this time. Debate on this legislation isn't expected until later this year, perhaps in October when the Administration is required to undertake a one year review of last years sanctions law. But in order to have substantive action later this year, we need to begin building support for strong, comprehensive sanctions now. We can act by:

- * Educating local communities about the impact of the sanctions that have already passed and the importance of further sanctions.

- * Campaigning to encourage Congressional Representatives and Senators to co-sponsor the Dellums/Cranston legislation now in order to build up support in the Congress. Write your Representative, House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515 or your Senator, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510.

Economic sanctions against South Africa are working

By William Minter

Only six months after the U.S. Congress passed limited economic sanctions against South Africa, many commentators and even the cover of *Forbes* magazine have already decided that "sanctions aren't working."

The conclusion is premature, and it is based on a misunderstanding of how sanctions work. Judged by realistic criteria, sanctions are working. And stronger sanctions could work even more effectively.

Opponents of sanctions point to the failure of P.W. Botha's regime to concede an end to apartheid, and to its repression of protest and belligerent defiance of outside critics. Sanctions, they say, have put a halt even to talk of reform, and the economic penalties are being felt above all by blacks.

But no serious advocate of sanctions ever contended that the regime would give in easily, especially when the sanctions adopted fall so far short of the comprehensive measures anti-apartheid activists call for. Sanctions or no sanctions, blacks suffer disproportionate and massive poverty, and will continue to do so until they gain full political rights. The Botha regime's repression did not begin with sanctions, and, as the Commonwealth Eminent Persons' Group concluded in 1986, it has shown no sign of readiness for substantive negotiation on basic issues.

The fact is that nothing—not sanctions, not negotiations, not protest, nor even guerrilla warfare—has a chance of quickly dislodging such a deeply entrenched racial system as South Africa's. To end apartheid will inevitably end the National Party regime, since it is fundamentally based on confining power to whites. The regime's reforms have been designed to reinforce its dominance, not to begin the surrender of power.

Significant change can come only when those who defend this racist system are so undermined that they are replaced by others who at least are willing to

William Minter is a contributing editor of Africa News Service and author of "King Solomon's Mines Revisited: Western Interests and the Burdened History of Southern Africa" [Basic Books, 1986].



Feder/The Star, Johannesburg
C&W Syndicate

negotiate. Sanctions will contribute to this—in the long run. And the first fruits are already apparent.

Outside economic pressures, despite their limited character, have already shaken confidence in the regime's intransigent policies. The shock of suspended bank loans in 1985 helped produce willingness in the white business community to talk with the banned African National Congress. And the white election campaign this year is marked by internal Afrikaner disarray on a scale unmatched since the National Party took power in 1948.

Much attention has been focused on Botha's critics to the right, and his attempt to appease them by a hard-line approach. But even more significant are the

defections of the so-called "New Nats," who have despaired at Botha's failure to implement or even chart a significant reform strategy. The roster includes Anton Rupert, one of the leading Afrikaner businessmen; Denis Worrall, who just resigned as South African ambassador in London; Wynand Malan, a member of Parliament; influential scholar Saampie Terreblanche and a host of others from Stellenbosch, the Harvard of Afrikanerdom; and leading newspaper editor Willem de Klerk.

It is no accident that these men come precisely from the sectors of white society most sensitive to international pressure. International sanctions imposed on South Africa over the last two years have shown—for the first time—that leading Western nations and businessmen are losing confidence in South Africa. Botha and his generals may convince themselves that the iron fist will eventually restore order and Western confidence. But the New Nats are not persuaded.

These dissenters, even in conjunction with the largely English-speaking Progressive Federal Party, have little prospect of victory in white electoral politics. Their views, for the most part, still fall far short of black demands for a nonracial democracy. But such tremors in white politics are a necessary preliminary to the more basic shifts before negotiations even make it onto Pretoria's agenda.

The most profound effects of sanctions will only be felt in the long run, as the economy tries to cope with the cumulative costs and more and more whites begin to question whether it is worth the price. Even comprehensive sanctions would not bring apartheid down overnight. But, short of massive military aid to apartheid's opponents, it is the most effective option open to the international community. Increased international pressure can shorten the time of bloodshed and strife.

Limited sanctions have had—as expected—only limited effects. Comprehensive mandatory sanctions are still bitterly contested by Western governments, as witnessed by the U.S. veto of a United Nations package comparable to that passed by Congress. If they should be adopted, however, stronger sanctions could have a powerful impact, perhaps forcing negotiations within a few years. Without them, the effort to bury apartheid may well take decades.