BANK CAMPAIGN HITS SOUTH AFRICA

One of the most important U.S. campaigns of solidarity with Southern Africa is the fight against loans from U.S. banks. This campaign has existed for a number of years, but it is now moving decisively beyond the token stage. As old Southern Africa support groups find ways to persuade churches, unions, other organizations and increasing numbers of individuals to join, some banks are giving in to pressure and restricting or ending loans. This--to regimes already in trouble financially and worried about their international images--is a real blow. Moreover, with the Carter administration dragging its heels on legislation against South Africa and claiming there's not enough support to pass any, those who boycott banks which invest in South Africa are voting with their feet--demonstrating a clear desire to end U.S. aid to white minority regimes.

Many people argue against curtailing investment in South Africa, asking whether Africans will benefit from jobs in expanded industry. Of course, some of them will. But these benefits will be far outweighed by what the investments will mean in strengthening the South African regime's self-sufficiency and ability to repress protesters. Most of the recent loans either go directly to the South African government--freeing money for defense--or to several state corporations developing South Africa's fertilizer, energy, iron and steel capacities. Finally, the opponents of apartheid in South Africa--from "moderates" thru the Black People's Convention and the (continued on page 3)

NEW ADMINISTRATION: NEW POLICY?

We of CCAL are deeply doubtful concerning the Carter-Young policy on Africa. True, it has its good points. The recent recognition by Washington that Africans too have a right to self-government is very welcome. Appointing Andrew Young as U.N. Ambassador is a very useful gesture. Carter has come out clearly for majority rule in Zimbabwe and Namibia, in contrast to previous administrations' waffling. Young has even come out for majority rule in South Africa itself. He has also criticised paranoia about communism, hailed the "stabilizing role" of the Cubans in Angola, and asserted that the West can beat the communists via economic assistance anyway.

The administration seems to be promising generous economic aid to future black regimes in Zimbabwe and Namibia. It closed some of the loopholes in U.S. compliance with sanctions against those two countries--for example.

ZIMBABWE NOW

LATEST FROM ZIMBABWE: Ian Smith won a large vote of confidence--from a 97.4% white electorate. This has encouraged him to reject the Owen-Young plan for majority rule. But just because Smith is against the plan doesn't mean we should be for it. It is the same sort of "peace-keeping" scenario that cost Patrice Lumumba's life in the Congo in 1961. It's certain the guerrillas will not repeat Lumumba's mistake. Moreover, the economic side of the plan bears a striking resemblance to the plan which brought independence to Kenya but ensured continued western economic domination. We will discuss this more fully in our next issue, with a review of Colin Leys' brilliant (Continued on page 6)
SOWETO REMEMBERED

On June 16, 1976 police fired on a crowd of 12,000 Soweto students who were protesting the requirement of instruction in Afrikaans. Protests spread quickly to other townships outside Johannesburg and all over South Africa. In all 1000 people were killed and thousands more were arrested during the month of June.

The first anniversary of the Soweto uprising was marked by demonstrations and commemorative programs both in South Africa and the United States. To demonstrate continuing determination, the African National Congress, oldest liberation movement in South Africa, and the Soweto Students' Representative Council launched a 3-day strike and stay-at-home call for June 16-18, 1977. In anticipation, the police arrested 25 leading student activists the weekend before and placed them in preventive detention. Widespread school boycotts followed, and a vast majority of the population of Soweto, in response to the strike call, did not stir from their homes except to attend memorial services for those who had died the year before.

In the United States, the most frequent targets for protest demonstrations were the large banks which, just as in the aftermath of the Sharpeville massacre in the sixties, were hastening to give financial support to the South African regime. In Chicago, the Continental and First National banks were the objects of a midday demonstration protesting their loans to South Africa. The Chicago Southern Africa Coalition, which organized the demonstrations, also sponsored an evening program at which representatives of the ANC and of SWAPO, the liberation movement in Namibia, spoke.

Banks were picketed in Philadelphia and Boston to protest their policies of loans to South Africa and of redlining and school cutbacks at home. Clear connections thus were drawn between imperialism in South Africa and oppression at home. Demonstrations focusing on bank loans and on the sale of the South African gold coin, the krugerrand, were also held in Washington, New York, and Atlanta. Thus, on Soweto Day, 1978, it was clear that South Africa's prisons and police have not succeeded in silencing the spirit of Soweto.

ADMINISTRATION

(continued from page 1)

in successfully pressing Congress to repeal the Byrd Amendment which had let in Rhodesian chrome as a "strategic necessity." In more general terms, this administration is certainly paying more attention to Africa than did its predecessors— even if a disproportionate amount is paid to Uganda and the Central African Empire. Carter has repeatedly said he's for human rights in Africa, and for peace. Still, we may be forgiven for wondering whether all this adds up to a new policy.

U.S. World Policeman

One may note that there has been no real challenge to the legitimacy of the South African regime. But far more important, there is no challenge to the fundamental presumption that the U.S. has the right to play policeman to the world. We have heard all the traditional arguments for intervention applied to Southern Africa.

---We must protect U.S. investments.
---We must protect the sea routes around the Cape.
---We must uphold human rights.
---We must defend democracy (white minority regimes cause a few problems) against communist subversion.
---We must counter growing Soviet influence (the dominoes are lining up again.)
---We must keep the peace.

Readers will remember these objectives all too well from Vietnam—and remember to what lengths the government went in pursuing them. "Ah, but we've learned from Vietnam," says the administration; "this time we'll do it right." But if something goes wrong—does the administration recognize any limits?

(Continued on page 7)

"U.S. military journals call for increasing our economic stake in South Africa precisely so there will be clear interests to protect and a clear rationale for military intervention. Increasing development of South Africa as a supplier of nuclear fuel is thus especially alarming."
KRUGERRAND FALTERS

"An ounce of pure love"...or blood money? An average of 3 miners per shift die in the South African gold mines. To sell this gold to the American people, the South African government has undertaken a sophisticated campaign of full page newspaper ads and radio show giveaways. The gold krugerrand coin is South Africa's latest answer to falling revenues (particularly falling gold prices) and a worsening public image. It hopes that sales will help its economy and will also increase the number of Americans kindly disposed to the regime.

These coins are being widely sold in Chicago, most notably at Merrill Lynch, leading banks, coin dealers and the coin department of Carson, Pirie, Scott. Efforts to halt sales are having some effect. Picketers, organized mainly by the Revolutionary Socialist League, led Carson's to remove store-wide ads but not to halt sales (they said the coin dealership was independent of store policy). A WLS giveaway campaign of the coins was halted when the station was occupied by members of the Revolutionary Student Brigade, Youth in Action, and Vietnam-Veterans Against the War. Several banks, under pressure to halt loans to South Africa, tried to win points by announcing they'd stop handling the krugerrand.

But protesters were surprised when the Chicago City Council voted unanimously to condemn the South African re-gime and to oppose the sale of krugerrands in Chicago. Sponsoring Alderman Martin Oberman told the Chicago Southern Africa Coalition that "a couple" of his constituents had requested the resolution. We wish we knew more about what prompted it. The resolution is a victory even if it lacks teeth, even if it is designed as insurance against pressure to pass more radical resolutions of the type passed in Gary, Ann Arbor and other cities. These citizens have voted not to do business with corporations and banks with investments in South Africa.

The advertising campaign has attracted a lot of attention—but that attention offers a foot in the door to opponents of South Africa. We can talk about the cost of gold to South African miners—their low pay, denial of trade union rights, the contract labor system which makes them leave their families and live in barracks for 18 months, the extremely hazardous working conditions. We can point out that the ads, for all their cheerful tone, reflect South Africa's increasingly desperate search for money and legitimacy. Thus the krugerrand sales campaign is both something to be fought and something to be used.

Bank Campaign

freedom fighters—have consistently called for full economic sanctions against South Africa, deeming the cost to themselves in jobs well worth the destabilization of the regime.

Make no mistake about it—the South African economy is in trouble, and even small decreases in U.S. business confidence in it can tip the balance. Soweto did not lead to the huge drop in foreign confidence and investment that Sharpeville did: there are a few international banks prepared to back South Africa to the hilt. But they've had to scurry around to raise the loans, and have raised less than South Africa wants. South Africa's whites must impose austerity measures and rising unemployment on a black population already poor, out of work, and increasingly disposed to protest.

As George Sheppard, Denver University professor and author of a forthcoming book on South Africa, put it:

"Bank loans are unquestionably the most effective economic sanction employed by the Western world in the South African situation. They are doubly, if not triply effective today because of the deteriorating balance of payments situation and external investment problems. The anti-bank loan campaign is one of the most effective forces against the South African government by non-governmental organizations."

(continued on page 9)
Among the wars currently raging in Africa is that in Ethiopia. Although the events in south-eastern Ethiopia have been in the news more recently, the older and more substantial conflict is in the northeast. This is the fight for the independence of Eritrea. On this and the facing page we are bringing you two positions on this conflict. We hope to bring you a third view in a future issue.

THE ETHIOPIAN REVOLUTION

There is a revolution going on in Ethiopia today, and its outcome will have a profound effect on the Horn of Africa. Until 1974 Ethiopia was a feudal country controlled by Haile Selassie and a small aristocracy. Life for the 25 million peasants was marked by famine, disease, and short life.

Imperialism was the prop that kept this aristocracy in power. The U.S. gave more aid to Ethiopia than all other African states combined - primarily guns, tanks, and aircraft ($600 million since 1953). A large U.S. communications base at Kagnew monitored the Middle East, East Africa, and the Indian Ocean.

The protests of peasants and workers against feudalism and imperialism finally broke into open revolt in February 1974. Demonstrators demanded "land to the tiller," universal education, religious equality, the overthrow of Selassie and his cabinet.

The progressive section of the military came forward, electing members to a Coordinating Committee to guide the revolution. The goals of the Committee could not simply be "declared" or implemented overnight. They began a step-by-step campaign to make "land to the tiller" a reality.

The Committee began to popularize the revolution. Supporters of feudalism were arrested. Selassie's lucrative beer factory and bus company were nationalized. By September the Coordinating Committee, or "dergue," had exposed the Emperor enough to be able to depose him. Thus the Provisional Military Administrative Council (PMAC) assumed state power.

Since then the revolution has been characterized by mass mobilizations of the population to institute long-needed reforms. Land reform was proclaimed and peasant associations formed. Peasants are being armed and trained to defend their gains. Thousands of students were sent to the countryside to do political and literacy work. Works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin have been translated into several Ethiopian languages and are important in politicizing the workers and peasants. International solidarity is encouraged by the government, as shown by large-scale demonstrations greeting visitors from the OAU, African National Congress, Angola, Vietnam, Cuba, and the USSR.

Most importantly, large sections of the economy have been nationalized, based on the December 1974 declaration establishing socialism as the guiding principle of the revolution. Banks, insurance companies, and several extractive industries have been nationalized. Reforms such as the right to unionize, the 8-hour day, and maternity leave have been implemented.

This Spring the PMAC took strong measures against imperialism, ordering the U.S. to close its facilities, including Kagnew, and ordering U.S., British (continued on page 6)
THE ERITREAN REVOLUTION

Eritrea has almost won its 16-year struggle for independence. The E.P.L.F. (Eritrean People's Liberation Front) is a major element of a united front with the E.L.F. (Eritrean Liberation Front) gathered to oust the troops of Ethiopia's military junta -- the Dirgue.

Both Haile Selassie -- the former Ethiopian Emperor -- and the Dirgue now led by Col. Mengistu have used arms, including U.S. napalm, to suppress the Eritreans. Although the Dirgue now claims to be socialist and relies on Soviet arms, its policy toward Eritrea remains unchanged.

Ethiopia's history is that of an expanding and contracting empire, whose center of power shifted from province to province as the military tactics of the feudal lords failed or succeeded. In the 1890's Italy occupied Red Sea Coast. This area, geographically isolated from the rest of Ethiopia and never more than marginally under Ethiopian rule, is now called Eritrea. On Mussolini's defeat, Britain occupied Eritrea. A politically educated and militant working class had developed, and was seen as a threat by Britain and, later, by Ethiopia.

A parliament controlled by feudalists, clergy and the bourgeoisie was established in Eritrea by Britain. In 1952 a U.S.-engineered U.N. resolution preserved Eritrean "autonomy" while federating it with Ethiopia. Under this federation all political parties were banned and labor unions suppressed. Eritrean languages were replaced with Amharic, language of the dominant group in Ethiopia. Eritrean factories were moved to Ethiopia. The rights of local autonomy were gradually eliminated. In 1962 the legislature was bribed and pressured by the Selassie regime into dissolving, thus acquiescing in Ethiopia's overthrow of the federal arrangement in favor of annexation. The Eritrean people were never consulted.

Eritrean dissidents exiled in Arab states formed the E.L.F. (Eritrean Liberation Front) in 1962. Selassie responded to their guerrilla activity with napalm.

In 1974 the Dirgue overthrew Selassie but continued to repress Eritrea. In the summer of 1974 the Dirgue proposed a peace settlement, claiming that the Eritrean struggle had been caused solely by Selassie's corruption and maladministration.

The Dirgue concocted their own 38-man committee of Eritreans to negotiate with, rather than the liberation movements. Simultaneously they poisoned water supplies and strangled students. The E.L.F.-E.P.L.F. united front rejected this offer.

Meanwhile the Dirgue's own savage in-fighting, its leftward drift, resurgent armed action in other provinces and the success of the Eritrean struggle forced U.S. imperialism to question the Dirgue's viability. U.S. aid was cut. New Dirgue leadership declared Ethiopia socialist and began to get aid from the Soviet Union and Cuba. But Eritrea's socialism started from the military junta, not from the masses. Progressive Ethiopian groups such as the E.P.R.P.-Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party -- independent trade unions and student groups are harshly suppressed. Ethiopian reforms such as nationalizing industry and imposing top-down bureaucratic cooperatives on the peasants strengthen the Dirgue's hand and will lead -- unless the masses are democratically mobilized -- toward state capitalism, not socialism.

Dissension within the Eritrean ranks has impeded the liberation struggle, although it is slowly being overcome. The E.L.F. originally encouraged Arab and Muslim chauvinism and had no clear commitment to improving the lives of the workers and peasants. In 1970 three dissident groups merged to form the E.P.L.F. The E.P.L.F. has consistently fought against religious and ethnic chauvinism and emphasized the rights of the poorest people. It formed cooperative, democratically-controlled institutions in its liberated areas, similar to those formed in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau. After more than two years of civil war, the E.L.F. agreed to a united front in 1974. Closer unity is impeded by the two groups' different degrees of commitment to social justice and to different foreign alliances. The E.L.F. continues to accept aid from Arab countries, including the most conservative. The E.P.L.F. relies mainly on itself, but has ties to Palestinian, Omani and Iranian movements, to South Yemen, and to the socialist bloc (no longer to the Soviet Union). The E.P.L.F. approach to its liberated areas strengthens its position in the front, and the growing successes of both groups has encouraged unity.

Critics of the Eritrean liberation move- (continued on page 6)
ETHIOPIA

(continued from page 4)

and French officials to leave. Demonstrations hailed the expulsion of the U.S. as "the end of slavery." In May the government announced agreements with the Soviet Union, including arms aid.

The "left" critics of the revolution, both inside and outside Ethiopia, denounce the gains of the revolution as rhetoric and window dressing. But it is difficult to see how a 300,000-man peasant army with AK-47's in their hands and "land to the tiller" on their lips, are going to be satisfied with window dressing. They want land reform, and now they have the wherewithal to get it. The Western press would have us believe that the new army is a reactionary force that marched through the streets of Addis Ababa chanting "Death, death." The actual slogan was "Revolu-tionary Ethiopia or Death."

It is classes that make revolution, and classes will not willingly retreat from the gains they have made. Thus far the PMAC has been able to organize the demands of the working classes and to establish programs to carry them out. As long as it does so, it should be supported by all progressive people.

U.S. imperialism remains the greatest danger to the revolution. The U.S. is unlikely to intervene directly, but it has promised more arms to its agents, the Sudan, Saudi Arabia, and most recently, Somalia. The danger of war is still present.

The aid of reactionary Arab countries to the various secessionist movements, particularly Eritrea and Ogaden, is designed to partition and landlock Ethiopia by closing the Red Sea ports. The further partition of Africa is in the interests of the imperialists, for it weakens potential African unity.

Because the Eritrean struggle was progressive when directed against Haile Selassie, certain "left" groupings now find themselves making common cause with the imperialists and echoing their arguments. But, we must take into account the changed conditions. When Ethiopia was an ally of U.S. imperialism, attacks on it were progressive. But attacks on revolutionary Ethiopia are counter-revolutionary, and history will deal with them as such.

ERITREA

(continued from page 5)

ment often term it "secessionist"—serving to weaken another poor country and to encourage further break-away attempts elsewhere. To this Eritreans answer, first, that Eritrea was formed as a nation largely under colonialism—when Eritrea was separate from Ethiopia. Second, Eritrea is thus a special case in Africa and not analogous to such secession attempts as Katanga, the "Kingdom of the Bakongo," or Biafra. Eritrean nationhood is based on modern economic and political ties, not merely on traditional ethnic identity, and, in fact, Eritrea is made up of several nationalities. Third, federation as an autonomous region of Ethiopia has been tried—and Eritrean rights brutally overturned. Actions by various factions in the Dirigue have not won the trust of the Eritrean masses; offers of autonomy were accompanied not by ceasefires but by brutal attacks. If the current movement in Ethiopia does create a genuinely popular, socialist system, the E.P.L.F., as sincere internationalists, will work toward closer relations, which might well include federation. But this must be voluntary. Finally, as long as the Ethiopian state represses Eritrea, it will not serve the Ethiopian people; money and lives will be spent in a futile war.

In summary, the character of the Dirigue and of the E.P.L.F. dictate that we should support the Eritrean liberation movement under the leadership of the E.P.L.F.

ZIMBABWE

(Continued from page 1)

Underdevelopment in Kenya: the political economy of neo-colonialism. We just point out: keeping a large number of the present white advisers (as opposed to recruiting from a wide spectrum of countries, advisers sympathetic to the new government) and saddling the Zimbabwe people with paying for all the white plantations (instead of confiscating those abandoned) are the main elements of this plan. Finally, the unanswered question for Owen and Young is: "If the guerrillas say No, will you fight?"
CARVER—YOUNG

(Continued from page 2)

on what the U.S. is to do if its policies are frustrated. In Zimbabwe, the freedom fighters see socialism as the only route out of dependence and underdevelopment. Carter and Young are pushing western investment and "free enterprise," and looking for blacks in Zimbabwe who agree. What happens if the freedom fighters won’t accept the American solution?

To which the administration will doubtless reply, "Yes, but we're going to make them an offer they can't refuse. We'll get rid of Smith and the South African occupation of Namibia (somehow). We'll offer economic and technical assistance and maintain U.S. investments there, in the name of staying off economic crisis. We'll even bring pressure to bear on South Africa to pay its black workers better and to create black managers and businessmen—and to liberalize apartheid. Once we get enough development in South Africa, all the deserving blacks can attain these privileges. Any other way means protracted war, great destruction of the economy and a flight of skilled personnel."

A Peaceful Solution?

It is wise to remember that all the current talk of reform flows from armed revolt by the guerrilla movements. It takes a true leap of faith to believe that if armed revolts ends, the reforms will continue. The guerrillas for Southern Africa bear a striking resemblance to John F. Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. As ex-CIA agent Philip Agee points out in his book Inside the Company, the high ideals of the Alliance in practice meant anti-communist cold war throughout Latin America. Its main achievements were the toppling of democratic governments and the creation of a Latin America ruled almost entirely by military dictatorships where torture is a daily tool of policy and poverty is worsening. Africans' lack of trust in the U.S. commitment to human rights seems prudent in the face of this.

Just what does the administration mean by a peaceful solution? It is not violence when peaceful demonstrators are shot? It is not violence when children starve because their parents' wages fall well below the poverty line? It is not violence when "superfluous appendages" are sent to barren resettlement areas? Mark Twain put it well when he spoke of the two terrors of the French Revolution: the one lasted mere months, the other a thousand years...a city cemetery could contain the coffins filled by the brief terror which we have all been so diligently taught to shiver and mourn over; but all France could hardly contain the coffins filled by the older and real terror—that unspeakably bitter and awful terror which none of us has been taught to see in its vastness or pity as it deserves.

Even on its own terms, the Carter administration is hardly going all out for solutions. In all its search for peaceful solutions, it has steadfastly resisted economic sanctions against South Africa. (They would be counter-productive, Carter told the South African whites. At home, he excuses himself to liberals by saying he could never get sanctions through Congress.) Even now that there's some commitment to sanctions in Zimbabwe and Namibia, Carter has used nothing but diplomatic pressure to stop an enormous loophole—South Africa's continued aid to her two neighbors.

In spite of all these problems, the Carter-Young team has disarmed a lot of its critics. The Congressional Black Caucus is now reluctant to attack the administration policy. The racist attacks on Young have rallied people to his defense. He's been using his civil rights background for all it's worth. As one South African student here put it, "It's hard not to believe Andy Young is a brother." Our concern is that the administration could gain a lot of credibility if it took almost any concrete action against Zimbabwe or Namibia. The danger is that they will then build on this a whole rationale for massive U.S. intervention to protect "our solution."

NEWS NOTE

On Aug. 21, the South African government told members of its ruling National Party of a new plan to widen the role of minorities in government. The plan admits nominal participation by Asians and people of mixed race (Coloureds) but excludes the 18.6 million black inhabitants of the country. The main points of the plan are: 1) separate parliaments, dealing with internal affairs, for the 4.3 million whites, 2.4 million Coloureds and 750,000 Asians. 2) A central executive council to handle national problems, with 6 white delegates, 3 Coloureds and 2 Asians. 3) A council president with sweeping powers, elected by the council (so certainly white) but not significantly responsible to it.

Asians and Coloureds feel the plan won't work because it excludes blacks. The blacks themselves have not deemed it worthy of comment. (New York Times, Aug. 21.)
THIS IS THE TIME
AN INTERVIEW WITH TWO NAMIBIAN WOMEN

This attractive new booklet describes the participation of women in the struggle for liberation in Namibia. It is based on an interview conducted by a member of C.C.A.L. with Netumbo Nandi, Deputy Representative of SWAPO in Zambia and member of SWAPO's Central Committee, and Mathilda Amooom, Secretary in the Defence Office. They describe the conditions of women in rural and urban Namibia and the role they play in SWAPO.

The pamphlet also includes historical background, map, bibliography, action projects, and many attractive photographs.

Price 75¢ (add 25¢ per copy postage)
(1/3 discount in bulk of 10 or more;
add 10% postage, 20% outside U.S.A.)

by CHICAGO COMMITTEE FOR AFRICAN LIBERATION
1476 W. Irving Park Road
Chicago, Illinois 60613

NEW RESOURCES FROM C.C.A.L. (for use in Chicago area)

1. SLIDE SHOW: South Africa and the U.S. Global Corporations by Sarah Lynch.
   80 slides with script, 25 minutes.
   Shows living conditions for Africans under apartheid, and how U.S. corporations influence South Africa's economic and political policies. An excellent introduction to multinationals.

2. PHOTO EXHIBIT: Southern Africa: The Imprisoned Society from International Defence and Aid. 80 unmounted photographs from Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa, with map and comprehensive text. (May be purchased directly, inquire.)

3. PHOTO AND POSTER EXHIBIT from Angola and Mozambique. 20 panels of mounted photos and posters from the liberation struggle of FRELIMO and MPLA, with brief commentary. May be used for special events, libraries and classrooms.

NEW BOOKS

All available from New World Resource Center, 1476 W. Irving Park, Chicago, Ill. 60613. Open Tues.-Fri., 2-8 pm, Sat. 12-6 pm. Mail orders, add 10% postage, must be prepaid.


2. RHODESIA TO ZIMBABWE: A CHRONOLOGY: 1830-1976 (George Houser) (Africa Fund, 1977) 50¢


5. TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE: U.S. CORPORATION EMPLOYMENT MANIFESTO FOR SOUTH AFRICA (Jennifer Davis) (Africa Fund, 1977) 4pp. 10¢ Critique of U.S. corporations' "reforms" in S.A.
Bank Campaign
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CAMPAIGN BUILDS IN U.S., CHICAGO

The campaign has grown from the days when a few churches and universities were pressed to vote their stock for resolutions condemning banks and corporations for investing in South Africa and eventually to divest themselves of bank accounts and stockholdings in such banks and corporations. Recently, Africa Nesbit of the Washington Office on Africa persuaded a number of large U.S. unions to condemn bank loans and pull union funds out of banks with South African investments.

Here in Chicago, the Chicago Southern Africa Coalition is trying to build a campaign against First National and Continental Banks. Starting with stockholders' resolutions--accompanied by picketers--the coalition has several times sent delegations to the banks and distributed leaflets outside them. Interest in the leaflets has been very high, even among bank employees, and always unsettles the bank officials. Their very sensitivity to their public image means that even a small amount of bad publicity can influence the banks.

Still, the campaign has not succeeded yet in persuading any significant numbers of institutions to withdraw, nor in involving enough people to do the necessary persuading. This is partly the result of not paying enough attention to organizing campaigns. We are hereby appealing to our readers to give some time to this campaign. The campaign has also not yet found ways--beyond using slogans like "No more South African apartheid loans/spend the money for jobs at home!"--to ally with groups opposed to the banks because of banks' insensitivity to domestic needs. In Philadelphia, where Southern Africa supporters have more links to poor people fighting bank-enforced cutbacks, an alliance has strengthened both campaigns.

Up-coming steps in the campaign focus on a demonstration on Monday, October 3 (noon at First National, then Continental). All during September a drive will be on to persuade organizations to:

--withdraw deposits from First National and Continental
--help organize the campaign
--come to the demonstration
You can help:
--by informing yourself further on the role of bank loans in South Africa (New World Resource Center has a lot of material, including a packet for $1.50)
--by calling the banks to protest and by closing any account you have (close them on October 3rd, if you can)
--by persuading any organization you belong to into joining the withdrawal campaign.

--by giving some time to the Coalition--either to office work or to outreach to other groups. (Call 427-4351)
--by joining other struggles against the banks--e.g. the anti-redlining fight--and helping unite the bank loan campaign with these campaigns.
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