American attention has been focused on South Africa as never before through the Free South Africa Movement (FSAM). Thousands have demonstrated against apartheid across the country and well over 1,800 people have been arrested in civil disobedience to show their solidarity with the 24 million black South Africans who live under apartheid. Among those arrested have been 18 members of Congress and Senator Lowell Weicker (R-CT), the first Senator in US history to be arrested for civil disobedience while in office.

The FSAM was launched on November 21 with the arrest of Rep. Walter Fauntroy (D-DC), Randall Robinson, Executive Director of TransAfrica, and US Civil Rights Commissioner Mary Frances Berry at the South African Embassy in Washington, D.C. The FSAM is a broad umbrella for national anti-apartheid actions. The Washington Office on Africa serves as its legislative and research arm.

Since demonstrations and arrests began in Washington, D.C. on November 21, the FSAM has spread across the United States, and some important local victories have been achieved. But the goals of the FSAM—the end of apartheid and a change in US policy—have not yet been achieved. The greatest challenge remaining before the FSAM is to translate this groundswell of public outrage into effective national policy to end US support for apartheid.

Why Now?

Several factors led to the development of the Free South Africa Movement, including:

- Events in South Africa. The year 1984 saw the implementation of South Africa's so-called "new constitutional dispensation," leading to widespread unrest and police violence, including at least 200 deaths and over 4,000 arrests. The army invaded three black communities near Johannesburg. Over 80 percent of black high school students refused to take their final exams in protest of the apartheid educational system, and there was a mass stayaway strike in which over half a million blacks demanded an end to apartheid. In retaliation, the South African government-controlled SASOL oil-from-coal plant fired over 6,500 workers for participating in the stayaway. While some detainees have been released, over 200 remain in detention without charge, and many face increased government harassment.

- The award of the 1984 Nobel Peace Prize to Bishop Tutu focused worldwide attention on the unjust apartheid system. Tutu criticized US policy, calling again for international economic pressure against South Africa to dismantle apartheid. Tutu also called for Americans to "get your act together" in opposing apartheid.

- The candidacy of Jesse Jackson. Throughout the 1984 Presidential campaign, Rev. Jackson consistently raised the issue of US support for apartheid, urging other Democratic candidates to do the same. For the first time, South Africa became a part of the national debate during an election year.

- The prospect of four more years of "constructive engagement" upon the re-election of President Reagan gave an added sense of urgency to the need for speedy action to end US support for apartheid. Reagan's first term was marked by a dramatic increase in
economic, military and diplomatic ties to South Africa (see page 3).

- The failure of the Export Administration Act in the closing hours of the 98th Congress provided an added frustration. Congressional opponents of apartheid had shepherded a significant package of economic sanctions against South Africa through the House of Representatives, but it unfortunately was defeated on the Senate floor. A new, strengthened national anti-apartheid movement was needed to pass serious sanctions legislation (see page 4).
- The success of anti-apartheid actions on the grassroots level was also critically important. Local activists around the country have succeeded in obtaining divestment legislation in five states and 17 cities, as well as other successes. Church, labor and university action against apartheid have all steadily increased. The ongoing grassroots anti-apartheid campaigns over the past several years provided a firm foundation to the current protests.

What has Happened?

Although the FSAM has not yet achieved its overall goals, significant developments have taken place both in South Africa and in the US. Five of the 21 labor leaders detained since August have been released, although many more remain in detention and two have been charged with "high treason," and two others with "subversion." State President Botha has also indicated that some changes in restrictions on black political rights and the stoppage of some forced removals may be introduced, but insisted the changes would only affect urban blacks not in the "bantustans." Bishop Tutu condemned the announced changes as "crumbs of concessions" and, therefore, unacceptable.

In the US, the FSAM has been an important factor in pressing for increased Reagan Administration action. But there is as yet no sign that "constructive engagement" is on the way out. There has been significantly increased pressure on the administration from Congress, including Congressional Republicans, who may for the first time support in large number initiatives for economic sanctions in the 99th Congress. Partly in response to this increased Congressional pressure, President Reagan for the first time publicly condemned apartheid in a speech on Human Rights Day, December 10.

On the grassroots level, the FSAM has directed new attention to state and local divestment initiatives and other anti-apartheid activities. The increased awareness of the apartheid issue and its linkages to local issues is sure to aid divestment activities in 1985 in Pennsylvania, New York, Wisconsin, Michigan, Maryland, New Jersey and other states. Protests linked to the FSAM have already helped to stop some Krugerrand sales in Pittsburgh, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Miami, and Indianapolis and closed down honorary consulates in Boston, Massachusetts and Portland, Oregon in addition to the one closed in Pittsburgh last spring.

Student action is increasing, as well. Demonstrations at the University of California's Berkeley campus resulted in 38 arrests. The University of Texas will soon decide on the divestment of the $600 million of its investments in South Africa-connected firms. Such actions are taking place in universities around the country.

Trade union activity against apartheid has also escalated. In December, three organizers of the black South African trade union federation, FOSATU, visited Washington, D.C., speaking to American labor leaders and others about the repression of black trade unionists in South Africa. Leading representatives of the AFL-CIO and its affiliate unions joined the picket lines at the South African Embassy, and many leading union officials were arrested.

**Translating the grassroots momentum into concrete policy changes remains the greatest challenge to the movement.**

Support from rank and file trade unionists across the country is also rising. One of the most striking examples of this grassroots union support is the decision last December by 200 members of Local 10, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) in San Francisco, California, to refuse to unload South African cargo. The Pacific Maritime Association (a shipping company group) has obtained a court injunction ordering the ILWU workers to unload the apartheid cargoes.

The American religious community has also participated in the FSAM. Besides their presence on the picket lines, church persons have been among the over 1,800 arrested at the South African Embassy and around the country. A letter from over 300 leading American religious figures, initiated by Clergy and Lay Concerned, was delivered to Congress on February 25 urging the passage of strong anti-apartheid legislation, including mandatory disinvestment, in the 99th Congress.

The FSAM has generated not only a great deal of momentum and favorable public opinion, but also some significant results which can generate increased support for the passage of economic sanctions legislation in the 99th Congress. Translating this support into concrete policy changes remains the greatest challenge before the FSAM and its Congressional supporters.

The process has already begun. In hearings on US corporate investment in South Africa before the House Africa Subcommittee on January 31, Jean Sindab, Executive Director of the Washington Office on Africa, testified that "the anti-apartheid movement is determined to see sanctions passed in the 99th Congress. We implore the Congress to act before it's too late." She added: "Political and economic pressure must be imposed immediately .... We must remove the support this country gives to the maintenance of apartheid .... We strongly urge Congress to pass sanctions and disinvestment legislation." The chances are better now than ever before.
Round Two for “Destructive Engagement”

The mood could not have been more euphoric. Following Ronald Reagan’s re-election as president on November 6, South Africa’s white press establishment bubbled with excitement. *Die Volksblad* called Reagan’s victory “good news.” *Die Burger* called it “reassuring.” For *Rapport*, Reagan’s “triumph” was “a relief.” The Friend stated that Reagan’s “historic victory . . . is wonderful news for South Africa.” President Reagan has the same strong views on Soviet expansionism as South Africa does, and here the two have joined considerable forces in putting a stop to it in Southern Africa. *The Star* editorialized that “South Africans can be thankful for another four years” of Reagan’s policies. *Die Vaderland* urged that Reagan’s re-election be a “bilskreig so that the iron can be struck while it is hot—before the [anti-apartheid] activists have again dug themselves in solidly.”

Although Reagan’s re-election was welcomed by South Africa’s white minority regime, black South Africans and anti-apartheid activists in the US shuddered—but then moved to “dig in.” Indeed, Reagan’s re-election was a major factor in the formation of the Free South Africa Movement.

The Reagan Administration’s misnamed policy of “constructive engagement” towards Southern Africa will likely continue as before. As Chester Crocker, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs and the policy’s architect, told *Africa Now* before the election, “I think we will be following the same course as the first term.” It may be worse, however. Reagan’s large election victory and the fact that he does not have to run again may make the administration less inhibited in strengthening his alliance with Pretoria. Reagan’s ominous statement following his re-election that “you ain’t seen nothing yet” could have serious implications for Southern Africa policy.

Policy changes in the coming four years will depend on a variety of factors. First and foremost, Washington and Pretoria will both be forced to respond to the escalating black resistance in Namibia and South Africa. Second, the Reagan Administration will have to respond to the growing anti-apartheid movement in the US and its demands for an end to US political and economic support for South Africa and freedom for Namibia. It will also have to respond to intensifying Congressional attempts to impose sanctions on Pretoria. Third, the administration’s policies will be affected by pressures from the US right-wing and the on-going struggle for control of the Republican Party.

Reagan’s large election victory and the fact that he does not have to run again may make the administration less inhibited in strengthening its alliance with Pretoria.

We have seen examples of all these pressures in the last few months. The South African government’s new constitution, denounced as a “sham” by the opposition United Democratic Front, was, in part, an attempt by the regime to stem the growing strength and unity of the black opposition movement. The Reagan Administration supported Pretoria in this effort and praised the new constitution as a significant “reform.” That neither Pretoria nor Washington anticipated the black uprisings in response to this scheme shows how myopic their policies really are.

The Reagan Administration has responded somewhat to the pressures of the Free South Africa Movement, although it has thus far refused to shift its policies. On December 7, 1984, Reagan received Bishop Desmond Tutu, winner of the 1984 Nobel Peace Prize, in the White House. That such a meeting took place at all is a victory for the anti-apartheid movement. But Reagan’s statement following the meeting showed that there was little hope for a change in policy. Reagan arrogantly told Tutu that Pretoria has achieved “solid progress towards dismantling apartheid.” For those who are criticizing, they don’t know what gains have been made,” he said. The president also said that “it is counterproductive for one country to splash itself all over the headlines demanding that another government do something,” apparently forgetting the US government’s on-going war against Nicaragua. Patrick Buchanan, then a syndicated columnist and recently appointed as Reagan’s Assistant for Communications, added further insult by calling Bishop Tutu a “political ignoramus.”

Three days later, on International Human Rights Day, Reagan publicly criticized South African apartheid for the first time in a major address. He said that “we view racism with repugnance” and urged both “the government and the people of South Africa to move toward a more just society.”

Reagan’s December 10 statement was, in part, a response to Senate Republicans who urged a more vocal administration opposition to apartheid, and a letter signed by 35 Republican conservatives in the House pushing for some kind of sanction. Reagan’s statement may signify a temporary change in style, in an attempt to defuse the issue in the newspapers, without affecting the policy’s substance. The administration will have to juggle pressures from Republican conservatives, who argue for a strengthening of the US-South Africa alliance and stronger measures against the African socialist countries, with pressures from moderates who do not want to be identified with a racist policy.

Personnel changes can also be expected to have some effect on policy. Jeane Kirkpatrick has already been replaced by Vernon Walters as UN Ambassador. Walters, ex-CIA deputy director and Reagan’s roving ambassador, shares Kirkpatrick’s conservatism. Whether Chester Crocker will survive Reagan’s second term remains to be seen, although many in the Republican Party’s right-wing oppose him for being “too liberal” and causing the administration embarrassment in his public failure to remove the Cubans from Angola.

No one has a crystal ball in predicting future policies. But in brief, we may be able to expect the following:

- Namibian independence will remain hostage to the US and South Africa’s insistence that Cuban troops be removed from

(continued on page 8)
Congress to Consider SA Bills

As the 99th Congress opens, opponents of apartheid are in a good position to push for strong anti-apartheid legislation. An extensive package of anti-apartheid measures is being introduced in the House and, for the first time, strong anti-apartheid measures are being introduced in the Senate. This new level of anti-apartheid initiatives in Congress is due partly to the momentum generated by the Free South Africa Movement (FSAM), but it is also based on the strong support which developed for the South Africa provisions of the Export Administration Act in the 98th Congress.

In November 1983, the House passed the Export Administration Act, which contained four South Africa provisions. They included a ban on new corporate investment, an end to commercial bank loans to the South African government, a ban on the importation of Krugerrands, and a ban on all exports to the military and police, as well as commercial bank loans to the South African government, and Krugerrand imports. One point of special interest is that Rep. Solarz has responded to the concerns of the anti-apartheid community and agreed to drop the Sullivan Principles disinvestment bill, sponsored by Rep. Walter Fauntroy (D-DC), which would require all US corporations to pull out of South Africa if apartheid has not been dismantled in four years. Congressman William Gray (D-PA), Howard Wolpe (D-MI), and Steve Solarz (D-NY) are together introducing a bill banning new investment, bank loans to the government, and Krugerrand imports. One point of special interest is that Rep. Solarz has responded to the concerns of the anti-apartheid community and agreed to drop the Sullivan Principles disinvestment bill from his bill. Rep. Berman has strengthened his export controls bill so that it cuts off all exports to the military and police, as well as computer and “munitions list” exports to any sector of the government or its agencies.

For the first time major anti-apartheid initiatives are also being introduced in the Senate. Senator William Proxmire (D-WI) introduced a bill with provisions on ending investment and bank loans, Krugerrand imports, and mandating the Sullivan Principles. Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA), fresh from his recent fact-finding trip to South Africa, and Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA) are considering introducing a similar bill without the Sullivan Principles.

The Composition of the New Congress

During the 1984 elections, President Reagan’s “coat-tails” did not spread very far into the Congress. In the Senate, the Democrats gained a net of two seats, which puts them within striking distance of gaining the Senate back in 1986. In the House, the Republicans gained only 15 seats, far short of the 26 odd seats they needed to return to the “ideological majority” they obtained in 1980.

The election results in the Senate produced big changes in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Sen. Charles Percy (R-IL), who...
eventually turned down the position. This left the chair to Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN), also a conservative. For the Democrats on the Foreign Relations Committee, Sen. Paul Tsongas (D-MA), the Democrats' Africa "point man," has retired, leaving open that slot on the committee. As we go to press, it is uncertain if Sen. Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS) will retain her chair of the Africa Subcommittee.

In the House, two anti-apartheid allies lost. Rep. Jerry Taylor (D-CA), who sponsored the 1983 amendment stopping US support for IMF loans to South Africa, was defeated, as was Rep. Clarence Long (D-MD), who had been Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Conservative Rep. Dan Crane (R-IL), sympathetic to Pretoria, also lost; his brother, Phil Crane (R-IL), was re-elected. Several of our allies won close re-election campaigns, including Africa Subcommittee chairman Howard Wolpe (D-MI). Wolpe was "red-baited" during the campaign and his margin of victory was less in this election than in the last. The Congressional Black Caucus lost one member, Rep. Katie Hall (D-IN), and membership now stands at 20. Rep. Mickey Leland (D-TX) became the new chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.


**Will the New Congress Pass SA Legislation?**

There is a new climate in the country with respect to apartheid, but whether it will be turned into legislative policy remains to be seen. The move in the House for economic sanctions has received aid from some unexpected quarters, however. Shortly after the demonstrations began, 35 conservative Republican Congressmembers sent a letter to the South African Ambassador stating that they would support economic sanctions if there was not significant change inside South Africa. The signatories included Rep. Robert Walker (R-PA), Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-GA), and Rep. Ed Zschau (R-CA) who voted against sanctions in the House-Senate conference on the Export Administration Act. (See box for complete list of signatories.)

Two Senators, Mark Hatfield (R-OR) and Carl Levin (D-MI), also sent a letter to South African Ambassador Fourie calling for the release of Nelson Mandela and an end to apartheid, although they did not threaten sanctions. Also, Sens. Lugar and Africa Subcommittee chairwoman Nancy Kassebaum (R-KS) wrote to President Reagan saying that he should be more vocal in his opposition to apartheid. Meanwhile, another Republican, Sen. Lowell Weicker (R-CT), was the first Senator to get arrested at the South African embassy during anti-apartheid protests there.

Why are the Republicans suddenly speaking out against apartheid? The 35 conservative members of the House are mostly younger conservatives who are fighting for ascendency in the Republican party in preparation for picking a successor to President Reagan. They are trying to show that the Republican party is the party of "morality," and apartheid is one issue where morality cannot be debated. The letter is also a way to deflect criticism that conservatives are "racist," without addressing other concerns of blacks here at home.

**The Road Ahead**

Although things look bright for the anti-apartheid movement in the 99th Congress, the battle to end US support for apartheid will be neither swift nor easy. Camouflage measures like the Sullivan Principles will gain new supporters in an effort to avoid real sanctions. Pretoria's pretense to be "changing" will also be more evident, as shown by recent speeches on the part of President Botha. Also, both the South African government and the US corporations operating in South Africa will begin to mobilize their lobbying efforts against sanctions measures in Congress. Already, the South Africa Foundation has sponsored a Congressional junket to South Africa for four Congressmembers including Rep. Steve Gunderson (R-WI) who signed the conservative letter to Ambassador Fourie.

However, if the grassroots movement continues to grow, and can be translated into votes in Congress, we can expect to see strong legislation against the apartheid regime pass in the 99th Congress.
## Chronology of 1984 US-South Africa Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 18</td>
<td>US sets up liaison office in Windhoek, Namibia to monitor South African troop withdrawal from southern Angola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23</td>
<td>Sam Nujoma of Southwest African People’s Organization (SWAPO) meets with US Assistant Secretary of State Chester Crocker in Washington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 25</td>
<td>South Africa and Angola form joint commission to monitor “ceasefire” in southern Angola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>Pretoria releases prominent Namibian freedom fighter and SWAPO leader Herman Toivo Ja Toivo from prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>Washington, DC divestment bill survives Congressional review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16</td>
<td>South Africa and Mozambique sign nonaggression pact, called the Nkomati Accord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Two US diplomats, part of US mission in Windhoek, are killed in Namibia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>Leaders of Namibia’s Multi-Party Conference meet with Secretary of State George Shultz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21 and 28</td>
<td>Elections for “Coloureds” and “Asians” for new tricameral election. Elections boycotted by over 80 percent of the electorate. Africans excluded altogether. Leading black opponents arrested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2</td>
<td>Black unrest erupts in townships near Johannesburg, accompanied by increased police violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3</td>
<td>New South African constitution goes into effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13</td>
<td>Six anti-apartheid activists seek refuge in the British consulate in Durban.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>Black mineworkers stage their first “legal” strike in South Africa. Over eight killed by police.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4</td>
<td>US Embassy in South Africa denies request for “refuge” from six anti-apartheid activists in British consulate in Durban. Eventually all six leave consulate and are charged with “high treason.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12</td>
<td>Senator Jake Garn (R-UT) and Reagan Administration kill Export Administration Act, containing several sanctions against South Africa, on Senate floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16</td>
<td>Bishop Desmond Tutu is awarded Nobel Peace Prize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>South African army is used to quell black unrest in townships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5 and 6</td>
<td>Black workers in Transvaal region of South Africa stage massive general strike in protest of government policies. In response, Pretoria detains scores of black trade unionists and fires 6,500 workers at government-controlled SASOL coal-to-oil plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7</td>
<td>Reagan meets with Tutu in White House, and restates his belief in policy of “constructive engagement.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 10 and 12</td>
<td>Eight United Democratic Front activists charged with high treason in South Africa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Stop Press

### Pretoria’s Biggest Crackdown in 30 Years

Eight officials of the United Democratic Front (UDF) and its member organizations were charged with “high treason” on February 19 as South African police conducted pre-dawn raids on the homes of 70 leading UDF members and black trade union officials. At least 13 were detained. UDF and trade union offices around the country were raided and their documents were seized. According to UDF spokespersons, all the senior leaders of the opposition Front are now either in detention or hiding.

The crackdown on the UDF, which is the most severe on a black opposition group since the 1956 Treason Trial which led to the banning of the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) and the imprisonment of Nelson Mandela and many others, was accompanied by a wave of unrest in black townships across the country. In two days of clashes with police in the Crossroads squatter camp near Capetown, 18 died and over 200 were injured, according to police estimates. Two miners' strikes held February 16 and 17 resulted in over 100 more injuries as police opened fire on the strikers. Police describe the unrest as “endemic” in many areas of the country.

Noted Popo Molefe, UDF general secretary: “Do not mistake these arrests [and other actions] for a sign of the strength of the South African government. They are instead a sign of the government’s disarray. The people are strong.”
NEWSBRIEFS

Citizens Lobby Against Apartheid

The anti-apartheid movement has the opportunity to seize the moment and translate the growing outrage against apartheid into legislative action. As part of the April Actions for Peace, Jobs, and Justice there will be a Citizens Lobby Day on Monday, April 22, 1985. As part of the coalition activities, activists from across the country will meet with their Representatives and Senators on that day to actively show the need for immediate Congressional action against the apartheid regime in South Africa.

This is an especially important opportunity to show our strength to the Senate, which is more insulated from the current demonstrations. The more conservative Senate is where the Export Administration Act was lost last year and it is where the real battle over sanctions will be again this year.

In addition to Monday's activities, there will be a lobby training conference on Sunday, April 21. The training session will include workshops on the current anti-apartheid legislation and on issues such as corporate involvement in South Africa and the implications of disinvestment. There will also be an opportunity for state caucusing in order to prepare for the Monday lobby visits.

People wishing to participate in the Sunday training conference should pre-register by contacting the Washington Office on Africa. If you plan to lobby, the only advance work necessary is to make an appointment with your Representative and your Senator. You can help hasten the day of freedom in South Africa by coming to Washington for this one weekend!

Famine Relief Action Still Needed

As famine continues to threaten millions of lives in 24 African nations, American relief coffers ran dry on March 1. Several new bills await urgent action in the Congress.

The Reagan Administration requested an additional $185 million in emergency food aid and $50 million in non-food aid, one-fourth of the amount most international relief agencies say is needed. A compromise House bill, HR 1239, passed on February 28, providing $825 million in emergency food and transportation aid and $175 million in non-food famine recovery and refugee aid.

In the Senate, the US response to the African famine has once again been held hostage to extraneous issues threatening a presidential veto, as happened in 1984. Last year, the problem was aid to Nicaraguan rebels; in 1985, it is emergency farm credit programs that threaten African famine relief. Administration opposition to these programs, attached to S 457, the major Senate famine bill, provoked a rally of 14,000 farmers in Iowa, a filibuster by farm state Senators, and the visit of South Dakota and Nebraska state legislators to Washington. S 457 would provide $175 million in non-food emergency famine relief and refugee aid. It passed on February 27, but S 370, containing $492 million in emergency food aid, had still not come to the Senate floor as of March 1.

On March 1, according to previous US estimates, American relief coffers ran dry for 1985 with no final action on these bills. Action is urgently needed as soon as possible to ensure that Africa does not continue to starve while the US fiddles.

Catholic Bishops Condemn Apartheid and Famine in Africa


The bishops stated that the famine, caused by a devastating drought and complicated by a number of social and political factors, currently endangers more than 150 million lives across the African continent. The bishops also categorically condemned apartheid. Bishop Reilly, Chairman of Catholic Relief Services, said that apartheid is, "evil, diabolical, and must somehow be eliminated."

The bishops also addressed the pending trial of Dennis Hurley, Archbishop of Durban and President of the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference. Hurley had been charged for exposing South African military atrocities in occupied Namibia. The charges were eventually dropped on February 18. The bishops urged an end to the Reagan Administration's policy of constructive engagement toward South Africa and demanded a re-ordering of priorities in Africa to focus on the underlying causes of famine.

Dr. Jean Sindab, Executive Director of the Washington Office on Africa, commended the bishops' action and noted that, "this statement is of special significance because of the South African government's claim to base its policies on the Christian gospel. As the bishops make clear in their statement, such claims are blatantly false."

WOA Literature List

SOUTH AFRICA INFORMATION PACKET. Basic fact sheets (with glossary) explain apartheid. Also includes action sheets on divestment and tips for organizers. ($2.50 for 1-50, $2.00 each for over 50, teacher's discount available.)

THE STRUGGLE FOR JUSTICE: IN SOUTH AFRICA AND HERE AT HOME. Making the links between US and South African struggle for peace, justice and majority rule. (25¢ for 1-10, 15¢ for 11-50, 10¢ each for over 50.)

AMERICAN STEEL JOBS AND SOUTH AFRICA. A 4-page resource on steel imports from South Africa and the impact on American workers. Co-produced by the United Steelworkers of America. (Free for 1-25, 10¢ each for over 25.)

STOP THE APARTHEID BOMB! A 6-page resource on US-South Africa nuclear collaboration. (25¢ for 1-10, 15¢ for 11-50, 10¢ each for over 50.)

35% for postage and handling for all literature.
Tutu Slams Foreign Investment

"I give notice that if [within 18 months to two years] apartheid is not being actively dismantled, then ... I will myself call for punitive economic sanctions [against South Africa] whatever the legal consequences may be for doing so," said 1984 Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Desmond Tutu at his enthronement as the first black Anglican Bishop of Johannesburg on February 3, 1985. For the record, we provide some of Bishop Tutu's earlier statements on the issue of economic pressure against the apartheid regime:

"It is up to the international community to exert pressure on the South African government ... especially economic pressure, to go to the conference table. ... This is our very last chance for change because if that doesn't happen ... the bloodbath will be inevitable." (October 17, 1984)

"Foreign companies in South Africa should stop kidding themselves by saying they are there for our benefit. That's baloney. Whether they like it or not, they are buttressing an evil system." (April 14, 1984)

"The Sullivan Principles ... are there to help make apartheid more acceptable, more comfortable, and we do not want apartheid made more comfortable, we want apartheid dismantled. These principles are saying nothing more than the kind of things that a good employer ought to be doing in any case ..." (July-August 1983)

"Anything short of talking about political power-sharing in South Africa would be playing a game of marbles." (March 1981)

"Basically, the South African crisis is one that hinges on political power. ... That is why it is such a charade to talk about improving the quality of life of blacks. ... No matter how wonderful the improvements in the black person's lot may be ... they will always be mere concessions that are always at risk." (March 1980)

"We need firm pressures on South Africa, and don't want to be told horror stories of blacks suffering, because blacks are suffering already. I will just say that those investing in this country are upholding one of the most evil systems the world has known since Nazism. In the end, it's a moral decision they must make." (July 1980)

"[F]oreign investment ... is supportive of an oppressive system. ... We do not in fact look for an improvement in the South African situation. We want fundamental change. ... [The Sullivan Principles] are ameliorative, they make improvements. They shift the furniture around in the room, instead of changing the furniture." (September 1979)

Destructive Engagement, continued

Angola. In December 1984, South African Foreign Minister Pik Botha added a new demand—that UNITA, the Pretoria-backed guerrilla movement in Angola, be brought formally into any regional settlement. The Angolan government, the Frontline states, and SWAPO have adamantly rejected this move.

- The war against Angola will likely escalate. The so-called "ceasefire" between South Africa and Angola signed in February 1984 has never been implemented and Pretoria never withdrew militarily from Angolan soil. The Reagan Administration is under pressure from its conservative constituency to give support to UNITA, despite the legal bar on such aid.

- The administration will continue efforts to keep alive the Nkomati Accord between Mozambique and South Africa. The accord, brokered by the Reagan Administration, was supposedly designed to stop African National Congress use of Mozambican soil from attacks on South Africa, and Pretoria's destabilization campaign against Mozambique using the puppet Mozambique National Resistance (MNR). Although Maputo has kept its side of the bargain, the MNR is as strong as ever, and Maputo is losing patience with the accord. Both Washington and Pretoria want to keep the accord alive both as a propaganda tool to show that they are "peacemakers" and to have some influence over Mozambique. The Reagan Administration has already promised Mozambique a small amount of "non-lethal" military aid.

- Military, nuclear, and economic support for South Africa will likely continue, if not escalate. In addition, more US tax money may be poured into "education" and other projects inside South Africa to accommodate US critics and to attempt to coopt black forces inside South Africa.

Only if the momentum of the Free South Africa Movement can be kept going and translated into pressure on Congress will this administration be forced to limit its support for the apartheid regime. Otherwise, "you ain't seen nothing yet."