Questions on the U of I's stocks in companies doing business in South Africa

1. The new Board policy says they will vote proxies for withdrawal of a company from South Africa if "The company's continued presence in South Africa does more to strengthen the apartheid regime than to contribute to the welfare of the nonwhites." Why have they voted against withdrawal when the overwhelming evidence indicates they do more harm than good in South Africa? Why won't the Board give us proof that they do more good than harm? Why is the Board afraid to provide the student body with the evidence on which it based its actions?

2. The new Board policy rejects a request that the principal advisor on where to place its investments, the First National Bank of Chicago, be abandoned despite the fact that the bank has a vested interest in maintaining the apartheid system. It has millions of dollars invested in South Africa. Why does the Board allow such a conflict of interest to exist? Why does it want a South African investor to advise on investments?

3. The new Board policy rejects a suggestion that the university establish a committee of students, faculty and administrators to examine the university links with apartheid. What is the Board afraid of? Why do they seek to hide what is happening? Do they think students are incapable of judiciously investigating apartheid links?

4. The new Board policy rejects suggestions that the Board co-sponsor shareholder proposals to halt the payment of wages and salaries of soldiers fighting to preserve apartheid when they are on leave from corporations in which the university has investments. Why should the university's corporations pay soldiers while on active duty fighting to preserve a racist system? Why will the Board not tell us the reasons for its refusal to act to stop such a practice?

5. The new Board policy rejects suggestions that the Board co-sponsor shareholder proposals asking that corporations stop financing pro-apartheid propaganda organizations such as the South African Foundation. Eastman Kodak is a major supporter of the Foundation. Should the university be involved with providing propaganda to support the racist system in South Africa? Why won't the Board defend its action in this regard?

6. The new Board policy even refuses to use the profits gained from corporate exploitation of Black South Africans for educational purposes directly related to informing people of conditions in South Africa. Why? Why should they continue to use profits extracted from Black South Africans because of the apartheid system for purposes other than ending that exploitation? Why doesn't the Board tell us?

7. Why is the Board afraid to subject itself to questioning on its investments in South Africa? Isn't the exchange of information a critical function of the university? Why issue edicts without defending them to affected students?