Comprehensive Sanctions Bill Considered

Comprehensive sanctions legislation is receiving serious consideration by lawmakers as anti-apartheid groups press Congress to go beyond the current sanctions law to put more pressure on South Africa to dismantle apartheid.

Sanctions in 1987

In October of 1986, Congress voted to override President Reagan's veto of the "Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act." This was an important first step toward strengthening U.S. policy against apartheid. Unfortunately, despite its name, the 1986 Act was a package of only limited, easily circumventable sanctions. Furthermore, the Reagan Administration, which has opposed sanctions against South Africa all along, has not strictly enforced the letter of the law, and business continues as usual between the United States and most of the South African economy.

In February 1987, in response to the escalating repression in South Africa and Namibia, and the calls of black South Africans for increased international pressure on the apartheid regime, the Washington Office on Africa held a press conference with Congressman Ronald V. Dellums (D-CA) and Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA) as they introduced HR 1580/S 556, a bill for truly comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. HR 1580/S 556 would impose a virtually total trade embargo, would force all U.S. companies to disinvest from South Africa within one year, and would bar U.S. intelligence cooperation with the South African government. HR 1580/S 556 remained the basis for Congressional consideration of sanctions throughout 1987-88.

Although the Dellums/Cranston bill slowly gained co-sponsors throughout 1987, there was little Congressional action on the bill. In October 1987, President Reagan reported to Congress on the effect of the 1986 Act, and refused to impose additional sanctions against South Africa, claiming that the 1986 sanctions had only made things worse. (See Washington Notes on Africa, Fall/Winter 1987.) Following the President's report, the Africa Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on sanctions and general U.S. policy toward South Africa, but did not specifically focus on HR 1580/S 556. The House Africa Subcommittee held similar hearings in November.

Passage of the Rangel Provision Closes Loophole

1987 ended with one small, but important, victory in the fight for tougher sanctions against South Africa. HR 1005, Congressman Charles B. Rangel's (D-NY) bill to close a tax loophole in the 1986 Anti-Apartheid Act, passed in December as part of the Budget Reconciliation Act. In 1986, Congress abrogated the treaty for avoidance of double taxation between South Africa and the United States. That treaty made it possible for American companies doing business in South Africa to deduct the taxes they paid to the South African government from their U.S. taxes. By abrogating the treaty, Congress made it clear that U.S. companies should not get a tax break for paying apartheid taxes. However, the 1986 Act neglected to change the U.S. tax code, so the exemption was still allowed. Congressman Rangel's bill simply closed the loophole in the 1986 Act by amending the U.S. tax code to eliminate the tax break for U.S. companies doing business in South Africa. This provides another disincentive for U.S. companies doing business with apartheid.

Congressional Interest in Sanctions Revived

Shortly after Congress reconvened in January 1988, the South African regime moved to stifle all anti-apartheid opposition. On February 24, the South African government "restricted" (effectively banned) 17 non-violent anti-apartheid organizations from any activity whatsoever and the trade union federation COSATU from all political activity. On February 29, 25 religious leaders, including Archbishop Desmond Tutu and the Reverend Allan Boesak, were arrested for trying to deliver a petition protesting the restrictions to the South African parliament.

Faced with this sweeping, highly-publicized crackdown, and pressure from the anti-apartheid movement, Congressional interest in the sanctions issue revived. In March 1988, the House Africa Subcommittee held hearings on the effect of South African press restrictions on U.S. media coverage of the situation. Despite the fact that practicing South African journalists were willing to testify, many Americans, including former CBS News anchor Walter Cronkite, declined to appear before the Committee for fear
that the South African government would retaliate. The Wash-
ington Office on Africa and other groups criticized this action as
yet another example of how the U.S. press bows to South African
pressure.

The media hearings were followed by hearings on the possible
effects of HR 1580. Along with many South African and American
witnesses testifying on the situation in South Africa, a Namibian,
Rev. Zedekia Kapi Mujoro of the Lutheran Church of Namibia,
spoke on how sanctions would affect the struggle in his country.
The Washington Office on Africa has been working very closely
with members of Congress, especially Representative Mervyn
Dymally (D-CA), to make sure that Namibia is included in the
sanctions bill and Congress' southern Africa agenda.

House Action on Comprehensive Sanctions

In late April, the Africa Subcommittee, along with the Inter-
national Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee (IEPT),
"marked-up" HR 1580. In a mark-up session, Congressional
committee members discuss a particular bill, add any amend-
ments they feel are necessary, and vote on the bill. At the
subcommittee mark-up, several strengthening amendments were
added to HR 1580. Using language originally offered by Con-
gressman Robert Wise (D-WV), the subcommittees added a
 provision to keep multinational companies that sell or process
petroleum products in South Africa from bidding on new U.S.
federal oil, coal, and natural gas leases. Another amendment,
based on Congressman William Gray's (D-PA) bill, HR 2443,
directs the President to close South African military attache
offices in the United States and withdraw U.S. military attaches
from South Africa. Another amendment authorized $40 million to
be spent on programs for black South Africans and Namibians,
with $4 million of that money set aside for programs for South
African and Namibian refugees. The subcommittee amendments
made implementation of UN Resolution 435 for the indepen-
dence of Namibia one of the conditions for lifting U.S. sanctions
against South Africa. The subcommittee also rewrote HR 1580 so
that instead of repealing the 1986 Anti-Apartheid Act, it amends
and strengthens the existing law.

... HR 1580 is the strongest
anti-apartheid legislation ever to
make it through the committee
process.

On May 3, 1988, the full House Foreign Affairs Committee
marked-up HR 1580. Along with adopting the amendments.
offered by the Africa and IEPT Subcommittees, the Foreign
Affairs Committee passed three weakening amendments. The
first, offered by Congressman Doug Bereuter (R-NE), exempts
U.S. agricultural exports from the trade ban. Historically, the U.S.
only sells about $150 million worth of agricultural goods to South
Africa per year, and generally only in times of drought. However,
the Bereuter amendment is potentially a very large loophole in the
trade embargo. The second amendment, offered by Congress-
man Jim Leach (R-IA) and John Miller (R-WA), exempts imports
from wholly-owned black South African businesses.

One of the most objectionable amendments was offered by
Congressman Gerald Solomon (R-NY). The Solomon amend-
ment would prevent any of the $4 million set aside for South
African and Namibian refugee assistance from being used in
ANC or SWAPO-controlled or administered areas (such as
refugee camps), or from being channeled through the ANC,
SWAPO, or "any group or individual affiliated with the ANC or
SWAPO." The prohibition on the ANC can be waived if the Presi-
dent determines that it is in U.S. national interest to do so, or if
the ANC provides "assurances that it does not support any form
of violence against individuals who are not members of the South
African military. . . . There is no such waiver for SWAPO. This
amendment could potentially block aid to church-sponsored
refugee relief programs, if the programs employ members of the
ANC or SWAPO.

The committee also adopted a strengthening amendment,
offered by Congressman Stephen Solarz (D-NY). The Solarz
amendment directs the Secretary of State to study the extent to
which South Africa is involved in international terrorism. This
could be an important first step toward having South Africa added
to the list of countries that sponsor international terrorism.

HR 1580, with amendments, was passed 27-14 by the Foreign
Affairs Committee. All Democratic members of the Foreign
Affairs Committee voted in favor of the bill, along with four
Republicans—Benjamin Gilman (R-NY), Jim Leach (R-IA), Chris-
topher Smith (R-NJ), and John Miller (R-WA). Despite the
weakening amendments, HR 1580 is the strongest anti-apartheid
legislation ever to make it through the committee process. It is a
significant step forward in the struggle for an anti-apartheid U.S.
foreign policy, and should be supported.

Since the Foreign Affairs committee has primary jurisdiction
over the bill, the version of HR 1580 that was passed by the
Foreign Affairs Committee will be the bill that goes to the floor.
However, there are several other House committees that were
assigned jurisdiction over particular sections of the bill. These
committees had the option of marking-up amendments to their
sections of the bill to be offered on the floor. The first committee
to meet and craft an amendment was the Select Committee on
Intelligence. After listening to CIA witnesses in a closed hearing,
the Intelligence Committee decided to offer one amendment to
allow U.S.-South African intelligence cooperation in areas that
have to do with Cuban or other communist troops in Angola.

The Armed Services Committee wrote an amendment that
would allow the United States to cooperate with the South African
military if the President certifies that it is in U.S. national interest
to do so. This sort of Presidential waiver language is common in
foreign policy-related bills; many members of Congress feel that
there are constitutional constraints on restricting the President's
power to conduct foreign policy. It is, however, another potential
loophole.

The Banking and Finance Committee approved one amend-
ment, offered by Congressman Bill McCollum (R-FL). The
McCollum amendment would not only prohibit importation of
any South African goods into the United States, but would also
ban all goods from third countries, if the goods have South African
components. For instance, West German drill bits containing
South African industrial diamonds would be banned under the
McCollum amendment. While the McCollum amendment would
greatly strengthen the international anti-apartheid effort, it is
widely believed that Congressman McCollum offered it as a "killer
amendment"—an amendment that is so strong that it would
frighten away Congressional moderates and prevent the entire
bill from being passed. Congressional supporters of sanctions
have discussed working with the Rules Committee to have the
McCollum amendment struck down on the grounds that it is not
germane to the Banking and Finance Committee's
jurisdiction. As the name suggests, the Banking and Finance
Committee deals with financial issues, not the trade issues
addressed in the McCollum amendment.

Two other committees were given partial jurisdiction over HR
1580—Ways and Means, and Interior. The Interior Committee has
jurisdiction only over the Wise amendment that deals with federal
oil, coal, and natural gas leases being denied to multinational oil companies that do business in South Africa. Ways and Means has wider jurisdiction, since it has responsibility for trade and revenue issues. On July 7, the Trade Subcommittee of Ways and Means marked up HR 1580 without amendments. As this issue went to print, Congressional supporters of sanctions and the House leadership were working with Ways and Means Chairman Dan Rostenkowski to see if the Committee's full schedule could be rearranged to allow a full committee mark-up of HR 1580 before August. The anti-apartheid movement is lobbying Congress to pass HR 1580 without any further weakening amendments when the bill comes to the floor.

Comprehensive Sanctions in the Senate

The Senate has been much slower to act on the sanctions bill than the House. On May 13, Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA), took HR 1580 as amended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and introduced the bill into the Senate as S 2378. S 2378 has the support of the original sponsor of comprehensive sanctions legislation, Senator Alan Cranston, as well as the Senators who co-sponsored S 556. Between October 1987 and May 1988, there was no Senate action on sanctions. On May 19, the Senate Africa Subcommittee heard testimony from key U.S. religious leaders on the plight of the religious community in South Africa. In June, the Lawyers' Committee on Civil Rights under Law Southern Africa Project released a report, detailing the lack of enforcement of the 1986 Act, and calling for further sanctions. By late June, with the House bill nearly ready for a floor vote, the full Senate Foreign Relations Committee was ready to turn its attention to South Africa.

June 22-24, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on sanctions against South Africa. The committee heard testimony from a wide range of witnesses, advocating everything from the comprehensive sanctions in S 2378, to repealing all U.S. sanctions and increasing U.S. investment in South Africa. Damu Smith, Executive Director of the Washington Office on Africa, testified on black South Africans' support for comprehensive sanctions and disinvestment.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not yet scheduled a mark-up of S 2378. Along with the difficulty of scheduling around the political party conventions and the August recess, the committee has to consider the health of one of its members. Senator Joseph Biden (D-DE), a supporter of sanctions, has been ill for several months, and is not always able to attend committee meetings. The balance between supporters and opponents of sanctions on the committee is very close, and Senator Biden's vote could be crucial to insuring committee passage of S 2378.

The Right Wing Mobilizes to Fight Sanctions

Lobbying around the issue of further sanctions against South Africa has been intense. The right wing has mobilized its forces to convince Congress that sanctions do not work; that sanctions are the principle cause of black suffering, or that the real threat in southern Africa is not apartheid, but communism. The Wall Street Journal reported that U.S. companies in South Africa have set up a "war chest," with each company contributing $5,000 to hire lobbyists. Congressional staffers report that South African government officials and paid South African agents have stepped up their lobbying efforts to convince them to block further sanctions against the apartheid regime. Cleverly conceptualized video tapes, featuring a black American named J. Morgan Hodges, and condemning the sanctions legislation, have been circulated to Congressional offices.

The right wing is resorting to outright lies in some of its lobbying efforts against the sanctions bill. For instance, a group called "Operation Heartbreak" asked a black elementary school in Washington, D.C. if it would be interested in sending its children to Congressional offices to express concern about the plight of children in South Africa. The school, which supports the liberation of South Africa, agreed. The children went to Capitol Hill, delivering black dolls symbolic of the children of South Africa, and passing out "Operation Heartbreak" literature. A photograph of one of the students was prominently displayed in the conservative Washington Times, with a caption indicating that she was part of an anti-sanctions effort. It was only after the children had been used that the school discovered that "Operation Heartbreak" is actually an anti-sanctions, right wing organization. The right wing has also engaged in counter-demonstrations at peaceful anti-apartheid rallies. In May, a right wing group vandalized the door of the Washington Office on Africa with a "necklaced" burned baby doll and signs claiming that WOA supports terrorism.

Anti-Apartheid Activity Increases in the U.S.

Anti-apartheid activists in the United States have worked very hard throughout 1987-88 to see that comprehensive sanctions are passed, and U.S. support for apartheid is ended. Congressman Dellums, in conjunction with the Washington Office on Africa, has convened several national strategy meetings for passage of HR 1580/S 2378. These meetings have been attended by national religious, union, student, anti-apartheid, human and civil rights leaders. On June 16, 1988, people throughout the country joined in the National Anti-Apartheid Action and Lobby Day. In over 35 cities in every region of the country, there were demonstrations, press conferences, visits to Congressional district offices and other activities to call for passage of comprehensive sanctions legislation. Over 100 religious and civil rights activists came to Washington, D.C. to lobby members of Congress.
Several hundred people came to a rally on the Capitol steps to hear the Reverend Jesse Jackson and Congressional, religious, and anti-apartheid leaders speak for passage of HR 1580/S 2378. (See photos, page 8.)

**Outlook for the Rest of 1988 and Beyond**

The anti-apartheid movement will continue to press for comprehensive sanctions. Along with fighting apathy, ignorance, and the right-wing in Congress, we are fighting the calendar. Since 1988 is an election year, Congress will adjourn early, and is also taking time off for the party conventions. The American public must pressure Congress to make HR 1580/S 2378 top priority, if there is to be any hope of getting comprehensive sanctions passed this year. As this issue goes to press, the bill has 127 co-sponsors and dozens of other members of Congress have committed themselves to vote for its passage.

Also as we go to press, the Democratic Party Convention is preparing to meet in Atlanta. The Democrats will consider a strong platform plank on southern Africa, which among other things calls for support of comprehensive sanctions and defining South Africa as a terrorist state. If Congress does not pass HR 1580/S 2378 this year, and the Democrats win in November, the anti-apartheid movement must work diligently to ensure that campaign promises become a reality in U.S. policy.


---

**Savimbi Visit Condemned**

On June 23rd Jonas Savimbi, leader of the South African-backed terrorist group, the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), began a second U.S. tour in an effort to obtain additional political and military support from the United States.

The timing of Savimbi's visit was no coincidence. Talks have been underway between the United States, South Africa, Angola, and Cuba, aimed at ending hostilities in Angola and implementing a plan for independence in neighboring Namibia. The talks take place just months before the U.S. presidential election, after which Ronald Reagan will no longer be in office to ensure support for UNITA. Governor Michael Dukakis, the Democratic party nominee, opposes aid to UNITA. The possibility of a U.S. administration taking office in January that does not support UNITA worries Savimbi, his right-wing backers and the Reagan administration. Reportedly the administration is requesting $40 million in military aid for Savimbi in 1989.

On the day Savimbi arrived, a group of prominent black American leaders denounced his visit and criticized U.S. backing for UNITA terrorism (see photo, page 7). Presidential candidates Michael Dukakis and Jesse Jackson issued statements condemning Savimbi's visit. On the same day, Jackson met with a visiting high-level Angolan government delegation, led by Minister of State Pedro de Castro Van Dunem. The Washington Office on Africa held a reception in honor of the delegation and there was a rally for the group in Harlem, New York. President Reagan did not meet with the Angolan representatives.

Savimbi was met with protests throughout his tour. He began his visit in New York at the Council on Foreign Relations and then toured selected southern states and Washington, D.C. On June 25th, he travelled to Mississippi, where Fayette Mayor Charles Evers, brother of slain civil rights leader Medgar Evers, presented Savimbi with the Medgar Evers Humanitarian Award. Upon hearing the news of the presentation, Medgar Evers' widow, Merlie Evers, protested the award saying, "...most people know of the great work of my husband; this is a travesty in his name." Speaking in black American communities is a key part of UNITA and South Africa's strategy. Savimbi's ties to racist South Africa and the overwhelming condemnation of UNITA by the Organization of African Unity make it necessary to show that he has black support. Evers and other blacks such as Reverend Ralph Abernathy, Attorney Clarence McKee, and Republican Senatorial candidate Reverend Maurice Dawkins are used by UNITA to spread its propaganda.

In Washington, Savimbi met with the Senate Angola Task Force, a bi-partisan group led by Senator Dennis DeConcini (D-AZ). The task force supports aid to UNITA and "national reconciliation" in Angola. Savimbi was also warmly received by President Reagan. Savimbi's meeting with Reagan was designed to elevate his status politically during the talks and reaffirm strong U.S. backing at a time when future American support is uncertain.
On Thursday, August 11, the House of Representatives voted 244-132 to pass HR 1580, Congressman Ronald V. Dellums' bill for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. Passage of this legislation is a major victory for the anti-apartheid movement, and if it becomes law it would bring about a decisive shift in U.S. policy toward the apartheid regime.

HR 1580 is the strongest anti-apartheid legislation ever to make it through the Congressional committee process. Generally, the committee process leads to compromise, and many bills are amended beyond recognition before they are released by committee. HR 1580 was reviewed by a total of eight committees. Although many attempts were made to weaken or gut it, HR 1580 remains a forceful measure to sever economic ties between the U.S. and South Africa. When the House passed HR 1580, members knew that they were voting for a strong trade embargo and complete divestment of U.S. companies from the apartheid economy.

The anti-apartheid movement and the determination and vision of Congressman Ronald V. Dellums (D-CA) deserve much credit for passage of this legislation. From the day HR 1580 was introduced, Congressman "insiders" claimed that it would never clear even the committee process. They pointed to South Africa's restrictions of the media and Congressional apathy after passage of the 1986 Anti-Apartheid Act, and said that the "mood in Congress" was not ripe for passage of a truly comprehensive sanctions bill. Anti-apartheid activists proved these "experts' wrong. Throughout the country, people mobilized to pressure Congress to impose comprehensive sanctions against apartheid. Even though scenes of violence in South Africa were not on television every night, Americans remained aware of the horrors of apartheid, and insisted that their Congressional members act. This mobilization paid off with a victory in the House.

Anti-sanctions lobbying and right wing attempts to destroy the bill increased as HR 1580 entered the final stages of the committee process. The Trade Subcommittee of Ways and Means met to mark-up the bill, Congressman Phil Crane (R-IN) tried to have Namibia (illegally occupied by South Africa), exempted from the sanctions. When the subcommittee broke for lunch, the Washington Office on Africa rushed information on the situation in Namibia to committee members, who were then able to successfully argue against Crane's amendment when the subcommittee reconvened.

Another attempt to destroy the bill came when the Interior Committee met to mark-up the section of HR 1580 that prohibits oil companies that do business in South Africa from bidding on new federal natural resource leases. The large multinational oil corporations, including Shell and British Petroleum, were lobbying heavily against this provision. Many supportive members of the committee have Shell or BP operations in their districts, and had found it very difficult to resist this pressure. Churches, trade unions, and anti-apartheid groups quickly contacted citizens in these members' districts, and generated letters of support to Interior Committee members who were then able to ignore Shell and BP's scare tactics, which included the false argument that Americans would lose jobs.

The final anti-sanctions push came from the Administration. National Security Advisor Colin Powell and Assistant Secretary of State Chester Crocker met with Congressman Dellums and the House leadership the day before the vote. Powell and Crocker urged that a vote on HR 1580 be delayed on the grounds that passage of sanctions would jeopardize the on-going negotiations between South Africa, Angola, the United States and Cuba over ending the war in Angola and implementing the U.N. Namibian independence plan. Anti-apartheid leaders and Congressional supporters of sanctions rejected this argument, pointing out that South Africa is negotiating because it is under pressure from the international community, and that international pressure will be needed to hold South Africa to any promises that it might make at the bargaining table. Inside sources say a delay in the vote could have received serious consideration, if in exchange Reagan agreed not to veto sanctions. Crocker could not make such a commitment. A delay would have guaranteed that no legislation would have emerged from Congress before the election break.

When HR 1580 finally reached the floor of the House for debate, anti-sanctions members made four attempts to weaken or destroy the bill. The first attempt was an amendment offered by Congressman William Broomfield (R-MI). The Broomfield amendment would have prevented U.S. sanctions from taking effect until all the major European nations and Japan enacted similar sanctions. This amendment would have stalemated the entire international sanctions effort, since these other countries are waiting to see what the United States will do against apartheid before they impose sanctions of their own. After much debate, the Broomfield amendment was defeated, 236 to 155.

The second attempt was an amendment offered by Congressman John Kyl (R-AZ), that would allow the United States to cooperate with South Africa in intelligence matters, if the President determines that it is in our national interest to do so. The "national interest" waiver is a popular legislative term, that is usually used to create a loophole in otherwise stringent legislation. Members of Congress recognized that the Kyl amendment would create a large loophole, and they rejected the amendment, 214 to 169.

The third attempted amendment came from Congressman Dan Burton (R-IN). Burton offered substitute legislation that, instead of imposing sanctions against the apartheid regime, called for increased U.S. investment in South Africa. The Burton substitute was based on the theory that black economic "empowerment" will bring an end to apartheid. This theory ignores the fact that even the wealthiest black South African still has no political rights or constitutional protection, and can be detained without charge indefinitely. The Burton substitute was rejected, 259 to 125.

The final attempt to prevent passage of HR 1580 came in the form of a motion to recommit. This procedural move is used to send a bill back to committee—and in this case to keep it from returning to the floor before Congress adjourns at the end of the year. When Congressman Broomfield made the motion to recommit, he again raised the Administration's argument that sanctions would endanger the talks on Angola and Namibia. The motion to recommit was defeated, 240 to 137.

At 7:45 pm, the House of Representatives voted to pass HR 1580. While most Democrats voted yes, the bill had bipartisan support, with some Republicans joining their Democratic colleagues. The bill passed because of the strong commitment of
anti-apartheid members of Congress, especially Ronald Dellums (D-CA), Howard Wolpe (D-MI) and Bob Wise (D-WV), and because the anti-apartheid community mobilized support for comprehensive sanctions. It was a victory for the U.S. anti-apartheid movement, and a victory for the people of southern Africa.

The focus of Congressional action has now shifted to the Senate, where the battle for sanctions will be more difficult; several key Senators have expressed strong opposition to disinvestment. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has scheduled a mark-up for September 8 on sanctions legislation. On October 1, Congress will recess for the elections. Now pressure must be put on Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd (D-WV) to place the bill on the Congressional calendar for early fall. Senator Lloyd Bentsen (D-TX), the Democratic Party’s vice-presidential nominee, must also be pressured to exert leadership on this issue. Governor Michael Dukakis has indicated specific support for the Dellums bill and the Democratic party platform is committed to comprehensive sanctions against South Africa.

Sanctions Are the Price of Freedom
by Allan Boesak

As a black South African and a Christian, I must ask at this crucial moment in the freedom struggle in South Africa why some members of Congress and even the “liberal” U.S. press are refusing to support stronger economic sanctions against Pretoria.

The limited sanctions passed by Congress in 1986 and the House support on Thursday for comprehensive sanctions confirm my faith that the majority of the American people are with us in our struggle. Yet I am disturbed by editorials and legislation opposing sanctions, with an important Senate vote on comprehensive sanctions yet to come.

The white-minority government continues to choose a path that leads to more violence, instability and bloodshed. By imposing further restrictions, President Pieter W. Botha tried to seal the lid on a boiling caldron. Without positive change, this caldron is destined to explode. Last February the South African regime severely restricted 17 anti-apartheid organizations. In so doing it has closed off virtually all nonviolent avenues of opposition.

Having waited 40 years for a peaceful resolution to this institutionalized oppression, we now see our children shot down in the streets of Sharpeville, Soweto and Uitenhage and wasting away from malnutrition in the townships and Bantustans. We cannot and must not remain submissive, and some understandably resort to armed resistance. Without condemning their action, I continue to seek peaceful change.

Freedom for South Africans will ultimately be won by South Africans themselves. But the international community has a critical role to play in our struggle to eradicate apartheid. The United States, Great Britain, West Germany, Japan, France and Italy have imposed only limited sanctions against South Africa. For sanctions to be effective, they must be total, mandatory and monitored.

For that reason I support efforts by Rep. Ronald V. Dellums (D-Berkeley) and Sens. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) to pass comprehensive sanctions against South Africa.

Americans have witnessed the determination of the apartheid regime to escalate the level of violence and bloodshed since the 1986 sanctions were imposed, while the South African govern-
NAMIBIA UPDATE

Namibia Strikes Back

The Namibian people are giving South Africa's occupying forces a taste of the escalating resistance they can expect if the South African government fails to agree to Namibian independence during its current rounds of multi-lateral negotiations. For the past four months, the country's economy and administration have been severely disrupted by Namibia's largest general strike in over a decade.

The strike began with a school boycott on March 17 at the Ponhofi Secondary School of Ohangwena, and within weeks has spread to about 40,000 students in over 45 schools throughout Namibia. The students were protesting the South African occupation forces' policy of locating military bases next to Namibian schools, churches and hospitals.

Locating South African Defense Forces (SADF) bases near civilian areas serves primarily to prevent SWAPO's military wing from attacking the SADF. SWAPO is discouraged from attacking SADF bases near churches and schools, because the SADF responds with reprisals against the nearby civilians. In addition to the casualties of civilians caught in such "crossfire," students have been harassed, abducted and raped by the South African military forces. Bombs have destroyed school buildings which once housed over 19,000 pupils.

Parents' groups, the Council of Churches in Namibia (CCN), the 60,000-member National Union of Namibian Workers (NUNW) and the leadership of SWAPO have issued statements supporting the students' demands, and calling for the removal of all South African troops from the country altogether.

The occupying forces responded to repeated requests by the NUNW that the students' demands be honored by suggesting that the students build bomb shelters. They attempted to force the students back to school using tear gas, rubber bullets and whips, and by jailing over 50 students. In response to this SADF action, workers staged a massive two-day sympathy strike. The strike, held on June 20 and 21, involved 70 and 80% of Namibia's black workers. Uranium and diamond mines were forced to shut down operations, while production in other industries was disrupted.

In addition to their support for the students' concerns, the workers demanded that Namibians being detained without trial be released, and that the police counterinsurgency units (Koevoet) withdraw from the townships. They also demanded that their employers voice their opposition to South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. Several hundred strikers were fired for their participation.

According to Ben Ulenga, general secretary of the Mineworkers Union of Namibia (MUN), the miners' strike was instigated by parents of striking students, not by the NUNW leadership. The decision of the rank and file of the NUNW to strike demonstrates considerable courage. The strike was held less than a year after the MUN staged a prolonged strike during which over 40% of the participating miners were fired. Moreover, according to documents leaked to the opposition newspaper The Namibian, the South African government is proposing to extend to Namibia the same kind of oppression and censorship it imposed on South Africa beginning in February of 1986.

Call the Africa Hotline for up-to-date information on sanctions legislation and other measures affecting southern Africa! The anti-apartheid action hotline provides a 3-minute, taped message, changed weekly, providing information and suggestions for action. On 24 hours a day, call (202) 546-0408.
STOP PRESS!

On July 13, negotiators for Angola, Cuba, South Africa and the United States agreed that a settlement of the conflicts in southwestern Africa must include: Namibian independence under UN Resolution 435; South African troop withdrawal from Namibia and Angola; and Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola. This agreement does not yet mean an end to the war in Angola or South African occupation of Namibia, but it does create a framework for future talks. If the U.S. pressures South Africa to negotiate in good faith, the talks might possibly be successful.