April 6, 1987

Dear Harvard/Radcliffe Alumnus/a:

Within a very few days you will have a chance to cast a meaningful vote against apartheid. You will be receiving an official ballot for the Harvard Board of Overseers, and on it you will see six candidates, nominated by petition, running on a slate of full and rapid divestment. They are: Haywood Burns, '62; Jerome Grossman, '38; Ruth Messinger, '62; Victor Sidel, MD '57; Consuela Washington, JD '73; and Peter Wood, '64, PhD '72. Please see other side for biosketches of the candidates.

Harvard still has nearly $300 million invested in companies doing business with South Africa. A victory for the anti-apartheid slate will be correctly interpreted as an alumni/ae referendum on the University's investment policies and likely will produce full and rapid divestment. If Harvard divests completely, dozens of other American colleges and universities will follow suit--involving many billions of dollars and offering a clear moral and political statement on the part of the U.S. educational establishment.

I urge you most strongly to cast a vote in the Overseers election, and to cast that vote for Haywood Burns, Jerome Grossman, Ruth Messinger, Victor Sidel, Consuela Washington, and Peter Wood. Turnout in Overseers elections is not very high, and so your vote really will count! (Ballots are due to arrive in mid- to late April and Harvard must receive them back by May 30.)

If it is possible for you to send a financial contribution to help support Harvard and Radcliffe Alumni/ae Against Apartheid, that would assist their outreach and organizing work tremendously. Checks may be made out to HRAAA and sent to the address on the letterhead.

Sincerely,

Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Hon. LLD '79

Executive Committee

Jean Alonso, '59
Max Bond, '55, MAR '58
Haywood Burns, '62
1987 Overseers Candidate
Adam Cohen, '84
Susan Dynarski, '87
Todd Gitlin, '63
Herbert Gleason, '50, JD '58
Jerome Grossman, '38
1987 Overseers Candidate
Chester Hartman, '57, PhD '67
1987 Overseers Campaign Coordinator
Jane Hodes, '40
Jennifer Levin, '80
Ruth Messinger, '62
1987 Overseers Candidate
Dorothy Miller, EdM '57
John Plotz, '69
1986 Overseers Candidate
Cynthia Robbins, '80
Victor Sidel, MD '57
1987 Overseers Candidate
Kenneth Simmons, '54
1986 Overseers Candidate
Kathryn Kish Sklar, '65
Michael Tanzer, '57, PhD '62
Consuela Washington, JD '73
1987 Overseers Candidate
Peter Wood, '64, PhD '72
1987 Overseers Candidate


Ruth Messinger (A.B., Radcliffe 1962; MSW, Univ. of Oklahoma 1964). New York City. Eight-year member of New York City Council, representing Upper West Side (210,000 people). Faculty member, NYU, Hunter and Adelphi College. Original sponsor of 1985 NYC legislation barring purchase of goods and services from companies doing business with South Africa.


N.B.: If you do not receive your ballot from Harvard by May 1, phone or write Marten Liander (617/495-1534) of the Harvard Governing Boards staff, 17 Quincy Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, and keep a record of the contact. If you need help in obtaining a ballot, HRAAA will be happy to try and assist.
GET INVOLVED WITH HRAAA....

— I'd like more information about HRAAA and its work.

— I may be interested in attending HRAAA's Annual Meeting (likely late September, in Cambridge), to discuss future plans. Please send me information.

— I might be interested in becoming a Harvard Board of Overseers candidate in 1988. Please contact me.

— Enclosed is my contribution to help support HRAAA's outreach and organizing work (checks may be made out to "HRAAA"—tax-exempt status is pending).

☐ $500  ☐ $250  ☐ $100  ☐ $50  ☐ $ ______

NAME: ________________________________

ADDRESS: ________________________________

PHONE: ________________________________

Harvard/Radcliffe degree(s) and year(s): ________________________________

Please return form to: HRAAA • 3372 Stuyvesant Pl. NW • Washington, DC 20015

THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT!

Let me tell you something. We are going to be free. And we would like, we would like very much, to be able to say when we are on the other side of this liberation game, in which people have given their lives, people have been incarcerated, young children four years old have been killed, we want, when we get onto that other side, to say, "You know something? Harvard University was with us. Harvard University helped."

Nobel Peace Laureate Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Hon. LLD '79
—January 10, 1986, at the Kennedy School of Government
WHY DIVEST?
Questions and Answers on Harvard Divestment

1. Aren't Constructive Reform Efforts by Business the Way to Bring Down Apartheid?

So-called "constructive engagement" has never worked. South African business leaders—joined in recent years by foreign investors under pressure to divest—have advanced this approach for decades. Overall, however, they have few fundamental disagreements with the apartheid regime. So long as profits flow and pressures can be deflected, the business community will not force change. Without basic political changes, the net effect of economic growth will continue to be reinforcement of apartheid.

2. Won't Sanctions Merely Make the White Regime More Intransigent?

In the short run, the regime reacts to economic pressures—and to any other pressures that really hurt—with intransigence. But it already was intransigent. It will negotiate an end to apartheid only when the bases of its strength are substantially eroded. In Rhodesia, economic sanctions added immensely to the costs of maintaining the status quo and hastened the end of white minority rule. Economic pressures—including denial of needed Western technology—already are challenging the previous unity within the white community: witness the initial business talks with the ANC, and defections from the ruling National Party. Further economic pressures will accelerate this process. And, as a statement of moral disapproval, divestment helps undermine the morale and positive self-image of the minority regime and its supporters.

3. Won't Economic Sanctions Hurt Blacks Most?

Most Black political leaders (except for a minority with ties to the regime) support economic sanctions, as do a majority of the black population. They see any short-run negative effects as a necessary price to pay for freedom, in the same way they regard the strikes, boycotts, and demonstrations they have mounted in the face of incredible repression and violence.

4. Even if Harvard Divests, Won't Others Carry on Business as Usual?

To the contrary. The divestment movement is growing, nationally and internationally, and each new action encourages others. Major U.S. companies are reducing their stake in South Africa. Several European countries, as well as the U.S. Congress, have banned new investment in South Africa, and some Scandinavian countries have
barred all business dealings. Banks are reluctant to roll over loans. Some 50 U.S. colleges and universities—including Columbia, Georgetown, Duke, Smith, and the state university systems of New York, California, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Georgia—as well as 19 states and 70 cities, have completed divestment or announced their intentions to do so. By divesting the $300 million it still has invested in South Africa-related companies, Harvard would add both substantive and symbolic weight to the campaign to get corporations to break their links with South Africa.

5. Isn't Divestment a "Political Use of Funds" that is Inappropriate for Universities?

Few would argue that the University, in making its investment decisions, never should consider what corporations do with that money. In fact, the University already has a clear policy of selective divestment, supervised by the Corporation Committee on Shareholder Responsibility. The overriding moral question now is whether or not Harvard divests completely.

6. Won't Divestment Hurt the University Financially?

No. Studies of divestment and projected portfolio performances differ. But in general, portfolios without companies involved in South Africa have shown greater return. (This is because many of the major companies doing business in South Africa until recently have had a relatively small risk and low rate of return.) Moreover, scores of other schools are finding that fears of lost donations due to divestment are unfounded. In- deed, with Federal sanctions in place, corporate disinvestment mounting, and informed public support for such moves widespread, the issue turns around: an intransigent investment policy by Harvard that no longer seems defensible on moral or financial grounds may cost the University in both esteem and material support.

Divestment by Harvard, and economic pressure in general, by themselves will not end apartheid. Nor will needed change come overnight. Ultimately, the actions of South Africans themselves—Black and White—will be decisive. But stronger economic pressures can raise the costs of maintaining the apartheid system and deny its defenders needed resources, hastening the day when the Pretoria regime will agree to negotiate an end to apartheid. Without divestment, the end of apartheid will be further delayed, while the bloodshed continues.