What YOU can do about racial discrimination in SOUTH AFRICA
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- Has sent $55,000 to help the defendants of the Treason Trial in South Africa.
- In the first months after Sharpeville sent $15,000 to help the survivors and other victims of the Emergency.
- Maintains close contact with the leaders of opposition to apartheid in South Africa.
- Its American sponsors include: Harry Belafonte, Norman Cousins, Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Rabbi Israel Goldstein, Lorraine Hansberry, Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Clarence E. Pickett, Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, A. Philip Randolph, Walter Reuther, Jackie Robinson, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Roy Wilkins.
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Introduction

America, however removed from South Africa, has the task of aiding in the establishment of real democracy there. I say this not because America is so pure herself. None of us needs to be reminded of the stigma of racism which is in our midst. However, I see the struggle against race supremacy and racial inequality as world-wide. The fight against Jim Crow here is part of the same struggle in South Africa, and if I were in South Africa, I would hope to be numbered among those either threatened with or actually in prison for opposing the apartheid policy being followed by the government there. I take very seriously what Alan Paton wrote in the New York Times Magazine of May 10, when he said, referring to the white Afrikaner nationalist in South Africa: “One thing is certain: he won’t change just by persuasion, or out of the goodness of his heart. He will change only when the pressure inside and outside the country becomes unendurable. . . . What he needs to bring him out of his pipedream is a decisive order from the outside world. It must be an order to bring to an end the second greatest Christian apostasy of the twentieth century or to take the consequences of it. Many of us pray that such an order will soon be heard.”

The question of apartheid is not an internal issue as South Africa claims in the discussions in the United Nations. Apartheid is an international issue. If there is a chance of bringing about democratic change in South Africa without overwhelming violence and bitter bloodshed, it will be because external forces—international forces—are at work in the situation, and because everything is not left up to the internal forces in isolation from the rest of the world. It is only those who oppose change in South Africa who cry out against outside influences. But this is something with which we are very familiar in the United
States, for it is not the Negroes of the South who protest against influences in the North. Rather it is those segregationists who wish to maintain their special privileges. And so it is in South Africa too. The Africans and the other non-whites and the liberal white people who know that change must come about do not protest against the pressures from the outside which play upon the South African situation. They welcome it and ask for it.

We must help to devise a program that can assist in mobilizing the people in the United States to stand behind their brothers in South Africa in their desire to establish a democracy that will know not the differences of race, just as we are attempting to establish such a democracy here. This South Africa Emergency Campaign can make more effective American participation in the world-wide effort to stamp out racism.

Jackie Robinson

NEW YORK, NEW YORK
Action Against Apartheid

U.S. Boycott of South African Goods

Economic boycott is one means by which pressure can be brought to bear on a government whose policies have become obnoxious to the entire world. By refusing to buy products exported from South Africa, Americans would join people of other nations who have already launched a boycott. The purposes of a boycott are not only economic; they are moral and educational. A boycott would hearten the opponents of apartheid inside South Africa; also, a boycott would educate many Americans for the first time about the mechanics and evils of apartheid.

In the year 1959, the U.S. imported from South Africa $104 million in goods. This figure does not include uranium, since the amount remains classified.* This figure does not at present include gold, since the U.S. has virtually ceased to import gold and has become a gold-exporting nation.

Major imports from South Africa include the following products:

Metals ($35 million imported in 1959). Ferroalloy, copper, and lead ores reach the U.S. shipped in their raw form primarily through the ports of Philadelphia and Baltimore. They are refined for a variety of uses, and it is virtually impossible to recognize a South African ore in a finished product. Boycott of metal imports is only feasible if the large importers are approached. Two large New York import companies are American Metal Climax, Inc. and Philipp Bros., Inc.

Unmanufactured Wool ($20 million). Raw wool is the largest single commodity in dollar value imported from

*In 1958, South Africa exported $152 million worth of fissionable materials, with probably at least half of the amount reaching the U.S.
South Africa. The great bulk of it goes to Boston where it is spun and manufactured into a variety of finished products, including sweaters and suits. It is again impossible to identify South African wool in the finished product. The U.S. wool fabricators belong to the Boston Wool Trade Association.

**Precious and Semi-Precious Stones ($15 million).** Diamonds are the most important minerals in this category, being used both for industrial purposes and jewelry. Harry Winston & Co. and Tiffany & Co. import South African diamonds, but there is no way to identify a cut diamond as coming from South Africa.

**Shellfish ($9.9 million).** South African rock lobster tails are the fastest-growing African export to the U.S. This industry has burgeoned recently because of this product’s increasing popularity with the American consumer. The South African Rock Lobster Association is the only importer, at least in the New York City area. Its distributors include the San Juan Fishing and Packing Co. and Wouka Distributing Co. They sell to wholesalers, such as the Fulton Market Seacoast Fish Co., which in turn sells to the retailers—primarily supermarkets and restaurants. South African lobster tails are clearly recognizable in supermarkets due to a distinctive label, and in restaurants they are usually indicated as a South African product on the menu. This industry lends itself to a convenient boycott since the product is clearly identified and substitutes are available as other countries (especially New Zealand and Cuba) increase their lobster exports to the U.S.

**Non-Metallic Minerals ($7 million).** Manganese and chrome ores are imported primarily through Philadelphia and Baltimore for greater access to the Midwest smelting facilities. Asbestos comes into New York.

**Furs ($2.7 million).** The importation of karakul fur—Persian lamb—has declined markedly from a vigorous trade during World War II.

**Clothing ($2 million anticipated).** A new item is clothing, primarily sports jackets and blazers made in South African factories. Each garment will be labelled, “Made in Cape Town, South Africa.”

**Fruit.** The importation of South African fruits is quite small, less than 200,000 boxes a year. These include grapes
plums, apricots, and peaches.

The present boycott of South African goods started in South Africa itself when the non-white leaders urged a boycott by non-whites of certain goods. The All-African People's Conference at its first meeting in Accra in December 1958 announced a world-wide boycott. Certain Caribbean countries began the boycott outside South Africa and this spread to the independent African states and to certain African nationalist movements (TANU in Tanganyika and the UNIP in Northern Rhodesia). In March 1960 there was a month-long boycott in the British Isles. In May 1960 the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions launched a two-month boycott.

It has been suggested that a boycott will injure the non-whites in South Africa who can least afford economic injury. Nevertheless, Chief Albert J. Luthuli, President of the South African National Congress, and Dr. G. N. Naicker, President of the South African Indian Congress, have encouraged a boycott. In a joint statement they observed: "It has been argued that non-white people will be the first to be hit by external boycotts. This may be so, but every organization which commands any important non-white support in South Africa is in favor of them. The alternative to the use of these weapons is the continuation of the status quo and a bleak prospect of unending discrimination. Economic boycott is one way in which the world at large can bring home to the South African authorities that they must either mend their ways or suffer for them."

**Recommendations**

- A general consumer's boycott of South African products should be launched in the U.S. as part of the existing international boycott.

- American labor unions should study the possibility of an industrial boycott of South African goods through refusing to unload ships from South Africa and to handle South African products.

- The U.S. Government should be urged to declare as official policy that no future purchase of gold or strategic materials from South Africa will be made where there are alternative sources of supply.
The 1964 World's Fair in New York City should be urged to exclude a South African pavilion because of existing conditions in South Africa.

The U.S. Government should be asked to prohibit imports from South Africa under the U.S. Code, Title 19, Section 1307, which forbids the importation of goods made by forced or convict labor.

**U.S. Investment in South Africa**

For many decades British investment played a dominant role in South Africa's economic development. In the past decade the South African Government has made a major effort to attract private U.S. capital. In 1956, for example, the U.S. contributed 15.7 per cent of the £807 million of foreign direct investment. The South African Government insists that domestic sources could increasingly finance South Africa's own economic development, but they have tried to replace dwindling British investment with American investment.

South African Government spokesmen have repeatedly tried to reassure outside investors. For example, Dr. M. H. de Kock, Governor of the South African Reserve Bank, observed (before the Sharpeville massacre) that the events in the newspapers are "purely temporary developments which may be misleading if taken out of their general context. . . . American companies are working with Natives every day. They know what to expect from them. They understand their psychology and certainly are not expecting trouble from them. Isn't it significant that these companies are investing more capital in this country?"

Some Americans are quoted as saying the same thing. Thus W. H. Rodkey, general manager for General Motors operations in South Africa, said before Sharpeville: "This country has a marvelous potential. I am not one of those who believe we are headed for a catastrophe because of the racial and political situation. We may not be in sympathy with some of the things that are being done, but we know this country well enough to be certain it is on extremely stable feet." Charles W. Englehard, Chairman of the Board of American-South African Investment Co. (a Newark, New Jersey businessman who is a member of
the Port of New York Authority) said on April 25, 1960: "The gold mining industry has been practically unaffected by the recent civil disturbances. There have been no disturbances on the gold mines themselves and we do not believe that their operating profits have been adversely affected." Mr. Englehard is the American chairman of the new South African Foundation, the purpose of which is to "promote international understanding of the South African way of life, achievements and aspirations" and — hardly incidentally — to present to the world a "true picture of South Africa...the great economic upsurge...opportunities for investment." On the other hand, Harry Oppenheimer, leading South African industrialist, in June 1960 admitted that under present circumstances "no thinking South African can look to the future without misgiving." Indeed, 10 days after Sharpeville, local shares dropped a total of 11/2 billion dollars.

Investment by American firms in South Africa increased from $140 million in 1950 to $329 million in 1958. This includes $119 million in manufacturing, $93 million in mining, $63 million in oil refining and distribution, and $44 million in trade. In 1958 U.S. corporations in South Africa expanded plant and equipment by $24 million. In that same year the earnings and income of these U.S. corporations from their direct investment in South Africa was $47 million (down from $65 million in 1957).

What kinds of American firms open branches and invest in South Africa? Port Elizabeth has many American firms. As early as 1924 the Ford Motor Company opened a plant there. In 1926 General Motors followed and in 1949 Studebaker entered the field. Over the years Firestone, International Harvester, Goodyear, and General Tire have all come to Port Elizabeth. In recent years over 100,000 vehicles have rolled off U.S. sponsored, South African-manned assembly lines.

Johannesburg, not Port Elizabeth, is the center of the mining industry where American investment is even higher. Also a number of American banking institutions, such as Chase-Manhattan, have recently opened branches in South Africa.

What should be the attitude of U.S. investment in South Africa? Should policy differ between capital already in-
vested in South Africa and new capital entering the country? Should there be a different policy between U.S. capital invested in South African firms and U.S. capital invested in branches of American firms? If a U.S. industry continues to do business in South Africa, should it adhere to South African business patterns or insist on non-discriminatory patterns as the price for continuing? What pressures can be put in the U.S. on American firms to follow the latter course? Should U.S. firms with branches in South Africa be told by consumers and stockholders that their goodwill is more important than continuing a minor operation in South Africa?

The Import-Export Bank, created by the U.S. Congress, has been granting credits and loans at a favorable rate to many South African corporations, including mining companies. Most of such credit has gone for the purchase of U.S.-built machinery and the hiring of U.S. technicians. Some $90 million is still owed to the Bank by South African firms. Also the World Bank has lent huge sums to South Africa, one loan going to the South African railroads. Part of this loan may be used to build segregated railroad facilities in the Cape Province. What should U.S. policy be in these instances?

**Recommendations**

- U.S. businesses which now have investment in South Africa should use their economic position in that country to oppose *apartheid*.
- Further U.S. private investment in South Africa should be discouraged until South Africa decides to honor the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights.
- All Americans who are stockholders or otherwise involved with American industries or banks doing business with South Africa should urge the adoption by such enterprises of non-discriminatory policies of employment, remuneration, training, upgrading, and housing in their dealings with the indigenous South African people; if this is impossible, they should curtail their activities in South Africa.
- The U.S. Government should reconsider the conditions under which U.S. funds are lent to South Africa through the Export-Import Bank and other international finance institutions.
• The U.S. Congress should consider legislation to withhold financial privileges from U.S. businesses practicing racial discrimination in South Africa.
• U.S. investors should distinguish between South Africa and self-governing African states for desirable investment; while new investment might be discouraged in South Africa, it ought to be encouraged in the emerging independent states.

Contacts between Americans and South Africa

Tourism is the fourth largest source of foreign capital for South Africa. American tourists, however, contribute only seven per cent to South Africa’s tourist income. American tourists to South Africa are a small percentage of all American travellers abroad and constitute less than three per cent of all world tourists who visit South Africa. The number of American tourists to South Africa has increased, however, from 2,300 in 1951 to 6,000 in 1959. The South African Tourist Corporation encourages tourism, stressing South Africa’s “agreeable climate” and “primitive customs of the blacks.” It seeks to attract more American tourists and develop “positive attitudes” toward South Africa. Few if any American Negroes have been granted tourist’s visas to South Africa.

In South Africa, apartheid extends to sports: no sport is interracial. By custom, a “European” team may not have among its members an African or another non-white individual. Neither may white nor non-white teams compete against one another. Here are examples of absurdity and trouble caused by the color bar in sports: Jake Tuli, a South African non-white, was excluded from representing South Africa in the boxing ring. He later won the Empire flyweight crown in Britain. The South African Amateur Weight-Lifting and Body-Building Federation, mainly a non-white Association, was denied participation or representation in the British Commonwealth Games and the 1956 and 1960 Olympic Games. Also a non-white tennis champion from South Africa, who was allowed as an individual to
compete at Wimbledon, could not play in a mixed match in Johannesburg.

Despite these and other publicized discriminations, Avery Brundage, President of the International Olympic Committee, said in 1958 that he was satisfied that “there is no racial discrimination in South African sports.”

Certain difficulties exist in trying to reach American sportsmen. Soccer, cricket, and rugby are the major non-white mass sports in South Africa, and these have virtually no U.S. following. In England, on the other hand, protests against the color bar in cricket matches against South African teams have been somewhat successful. Concentration on other sports—e.g., boxing, wrestling, bowling, and table tennis—might be more successful by Americans, but as yet these have few South African non-white participants.

Every year scores of university professors, teachers, journalists, and artists exchange visits between South Africa and the U.S. Almost all are whites. These exchanges involve relatively few individuals, but those going to South Africa frequently work within the system of apartheid. How can one appeal to the grantee of an award not to go to South Africa? How can one counteract the feeling by the grantee that he is involved in a “higher goal” than contemporary human rights issues?

Classical and jazz artists have toured South Africa, including Jan Peerce, the Westminster School Choir, Yehudi Menuhin, and others. However, members of the British Musicians Union and Actors Equity may not accept work in theaters where there is a color bar. Theater managers in South Africa have challenged this ruling. In one case, South Africa turned to American actors to cast “Pajama Game,” but U.S. Actor’s Equity upheld the British actor’s group. Such stars at Sibyl Thorndike, Larry Adler, and John Gielgud have gone on record in protest against apartheid on the South African stage.

There are two methods of protesting apartheid in cultural fields. There could be a total boycott, ending all tourist, sports, intellectual, and artistic contacts between America and South Africa until such time as the South African Government abandons its racist policies and conforms to the U.N. resolutions on these issues. A selective boycott, on
the other hand, would not discourage journalists and perhaps jazz musicians from going to South Africa. But what would be the criteria for urging some Americans to travel to South Africa and others not to do so?

**Recommendations**

- All American tourists, athletes, artists, and intellectuals should be informed that their travel to South Africa might be interpreted as supporting the suppression of non-whites there, and thus they should either (a) withhold their participation in tours and programs in South Africa until such time as South Africa abandons its racial policies or (b) take every opportunity to protest *apartheid* inside South Africa.
- The International Olympic Committee and member countries should ban South African participation in the 1960 and 1964 games so long as *apartheid* exists in South African sports.

**U.S. Government Policy Toward South Africa**

For many years the U.S. regarded *apartheid* in South Africa as the domestic concern of that country and not a legitimate matter for U.N. debate or action. During the 13th session of the U.N. General Assembly in 1958, the U.S. position was reversed and the U.S. delegate voted in favor of the perennial U.N. resolution against *apartheid*. The U.S. continued this position at the 14th General Assembly in 1959.

The U.S. responded admirably to the Sharpville massacre in March 1960. A spokesman of the State Department issued a strong, precedent-shattering statement as follows: “The U.S. deplores violence in all its forms, and hopes that the African people of South Africa will be able to obtain redress of their legitimate grievances by peaceful means. While the U.S. as a matter of policy does not ordinarily comment on the internal affairs of Governments with which it enjoys normal relations, it cannot help but regret the tragic loss of life resulting from the measures taken against the demonstrators in South Africa.”
The U.S., as a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, voted after Sharpeville in favor of putting the South African item on its agenda. At this meeting the U.S. representative, Henry Cabot Lodge, made a speech attacking South Africa. He said: "We appeal once again to the government of the Union of South Africa that it reconsider policies which prevent people of certain races in the Union from enjoying their God-given rights and freedoms. In former years we have made that appeal in the name of justice. Today we make it also in the name of peace." Ambassador Lodge voted in favor of the resolution deploiring the "policies and actions" of South Africa and asking the Secretary-General to negotiate with South Africa to reduce the threat to "international peace and security."

President Eisenhower himself has not, however, made a similar condemnation of apartheid—as Prime Minister Macmillan and other world leaders have done. The State Department also did not use the device of temporarily recalling its ambassador to Pretoria back to Washington for consultations—as it has occasionally done as a diplomatic rebuke to an erring nation.

The U.S. has increasingly taken a stronger position in the U.N. on South West Africa than on South Africa. The U.S. Mission to the U.N. has granted certain courtesies to U.N. petitioners from South West Africa. In the 14th General Assembly the U.S. voted for a resolution urging that the World Court be asked to decide whether South Africa has misgoverned South West Africa in violation of its agreement with the League of Nations.

The U.S. State Department in its diplomatic missions in South Africa has apparently feared to violate the apartheid pattern. Only on very rare occasions have Africans been invited to attend American Embassy social functions. (The U.S.S.R.'s mission to Pretoria was closed by South Africa several years ago, reportedly because Africans were regularly invited to their social affairs.) American Negroes have apparently never been assigned to American diplomatic work in South Africa. On the other hand, the U.S.I.A. Library in Johannesburg has been operated on a non-segregated basis for years. And the present U.S. Ambassador to Pretoria broke certain diplomatic niceties by visiting Chief
Albert J. Luthuli, President of the African National Congress, in his home while the Chief was under a ban.

South Africans coming to the U.S. on State Department leadership grants have, as far as known, been white. If non-whites have been chosen, but not been given a passport for this purpose by the South African authorities, this information has not been made public.

The U.S. Government is not welcoming to America non-white and white refugees who are escaping from South Africa today. Certainly it has made no special provisions for refugees from Africa as it made for those from Hungary who escaped several years ago.

Recommendations

- The State Department should be commended for its immediate and strong statement and U.N. action in response to the Sharpeville massacre and it should be encouraged to take similar action if future incidents arise in South Africa.
- The U.S. at the U.N. should pursue with utmost vigor efforts to obtain compliance by South Africa with previous U.N. resolutions against apartheid and on South West Africa.
- The President and the Congress by Joint Resolution separately should declare U.S. policy to be unequivocally opposed to apartheid in South Africa.
- Both U.S. major political parties should adopt forthright planks pledging themselves to support an active Government program to end apartheid in South Africa.
- The U.S. should take strong action to separate South West Africa from South Africa in compliance with any future recommendation by the World Court.
- The State Department in its Embassy and consulates in South Africa should integrate its social functions and its personnel.
- U.S. Leadership Grants should be given in greater number to non-white South Africans, including those who, though opposing the present South African Government, may be the future leaders of South Africa.
- The U.S. Government should aid escapees from South Africa and South West Africa in a manner comparable to U.S. aid given Hungarian refugees.
Defense and Aid to the Opponents of Apartheid

One of the essential ways in which those who are outside South Africa can best help those carrying on the struggle for justice and equality is by sending them funds for legal defense and welfare purposes. The urgency of this aid has mounted as the result of the emergency in South Africa declared March 30, 1960, when the so-called Public Safety Act went into effect. The Government was empowered to arrest anybody with or without a warrant, if it felt that such a person should be detained in the interest of public safety. Anyone arrested in this way can be detained as long as the Minister of Justice desires. And it is an offense to disclose in any manner the name or identity of any person arrested without the written permission of the Minister of Justice, except as the Government itself issues lists of detainees.

Thousands have been arrested and the legal defense and welfare needs are tremendous. The task seems overwhelming when in one year the Treason Trial Defense Fund in South Africa spent more than $173,000 for the defense and relief of only 30 defendants. To cope with the new Emergency, relief committees and funds have been established in the larger South African cities. For example, in Cape Town a State of Emergency Relief Fund was formed and registered with the Department of Social Welfare. The Fund found 300 families left destitute by arrests, detentions, and injuries suffered during police raids. The Liberal Party and the Black Sash group initially took the leadership in meeting these needs. During the stay-at-home just after the Sharpeville massacre, over $5,000 worth of food was distributed in a week to these Africans outside Cape Town. Now it is estimated that $5,600 a month will be needed to meet the minimum requirements of the destitute families. Legal help may not be great, since those arrested are rejecting legal aid, according to a principle of the Pan-Africanist Congress: “no bail, no defense, no fine.”

The present emergency is but a symptom of the problem arising when a government attempts to fasten upon millions of people a policy of apartheid. There will continue to be
emergencies and there will continue to be mass arrests. There will probably continue to be police violence as long as unjust laws exist in South Africa.

Every single year in South Africa, one out of seven African men is convicted of an offense against the pass laws. This is a chronic emergency in South Africa. The Treason Trial, which entered its preliminary stages after the original arrests were made in December, 1956, has now entered its fourth year. Thirty of the accused are still on trial and nobody knows how much longer the case may continue. Already there have been more than a 1,000 hours of court proceedings, over 300 witnesses testifying, 12,000 miles of travel for the defendants between their homes and the court, and 10,000 documents certified. The necessity for welfare and defense aid to South Africa will exist as long as apartheid laws are on the statute books. These include the Bantu Education Act, the Suppression of Communism Act, Criminal Laws Amendment Act, The Group Areas Act, the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act, the Immorality Act, the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act, the Population Registration Act, the Native Land Act, and others.

There is a new problem of refugees. Hundreds of opponents of apartheid have escaped into Swaziland, Basutoland, and Bechuanaland. Some plan to remain and need supplementary assistance. Others need travel papers (generously supplied by friendly states) and travel funds to reach a temporary haven in Africa, England, or elsewhere.

Various defense funds have been established in South Africa and in various parts of the world. The Legal Defense and Aid Fund of Christian Action, headed by Canon L. John Collins of London, has collected and transmitted to South Africa several hundred thousand dollars. A new fund has recently been established in Canada and $5,000 has been sent to South Africa since the Emergency. Other funds have been started in India and several African countries. In the U.S. the South African Defense Fund was established in 1957 to help the defendants in the Treason Trial. More recently this Fund has been transformed into the Africa Defense and Aid Fund. This transmitted $15,000 to South Africa in the weeks following the Emergency. It is urged that a total of $100,000 be raised in the U.S. in the months
ahead to help meet the legal and welfare needs in South Africa, which will total a million dollars in the year ahead.

**Recommendations**

- A South Africa Emergency Campaign should be established out of the Emergency Action Conference on South Africa to implement resolutions of the Conference, to defend arrested South Africans, and to aid their families, with the immediate aim of raising $100,000 for such aid.
- This Campaign should consist of representatives of the organizations officially sponsoring this Conference as well as others who may become interested, the steering committee to include official and non-official representatives from sponsoring organizations.
- The American Committee on Africa should organize this Campaign with financial contributions requested from participating organizations and the general public to provide the overhead costs.

**Note**

This booklet is a summary of the Emergency Action Conference on South Africa held at the Carnegie International Center, New York City, on May 31 and June 1. The Conference was sponsored by the American Committee on Africa in cooperation with the following organizations: Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Americans for Democratic Action, American Society of African Culture, International Ladies Garment Workers Union (Local 23), Jewish Labor Committee, N.A.A.C.P., and United Automobile Workers (Region 9). Jackie Robinson was chairman of the Conference and excerpts from his opening speech have been used in the introduction to this pamphlet.

The American Committee is also indebted to the following individuals for writing background papers which were used as the basis for material in this pamphlet: Thomas L. Blair of State Teachers College, New Paltz, New York; Everett M. Kassalow, Research Director, Industrial Union Dept., AFL-CIO; Steven Lowenstein, student at Yale Law School; John Murra, Professor of Anthropology, Vassar College; and Peter Ritner, author of *The Death of Africa*. 
YOU can act against apartheid

AS A CITIZEN,

2. Do not invest in business in South Africa if it will further strengthen the government program of apartheid.
3. If you own stock in an industry or bank doing business in South Africa, urge it to adopt non-discriminatory policies there or curtail its activities.
4. Do not go to South Africa as a tourist or in any other capacity; if you go, protest apartheid there.
5. Write a letter to the President, your two senators, and your congressman about your suggestions for U.S. policy toward South Africa.
6. Write to your local newspaper about the Emergency Campaign and the South African situation.
7. Contribute to the Africa Defense and Aid Fund for South Africa.
8. Keep in touch with the South Africa Emergency Campaign: help support its education and action budget, send for literature.

AS A LEADER (of church or synagogue, labor union, NAACP, political club, or civic group),

1. Bring a qualified speaker on South Africa to your group and community.
2. Sponsor a one-day conference on action against apartheid in South Africa.
3. Establish an informal chapter of the South Africa Emergency Campaign in your community.
4. Launch a consumers' boycott of South African goods in your community.
5. Form a committee to interview your two senators and congressman on U.S. policy toward South Africa.

For help with any of the above activities write or phone

SOUTH AFRICA EMERGENCY CAMPAIGN
801 Second Avenue
New York 17, N. Y.

MUrray Hill 6-7263
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