



UNITED NATIONS  
**CENTRE AGAINST *APARTHEID***

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS\*

10/86

September 1986

UNITED STATES STUDENT MOVEMENT  
AGAINST APARTHEID

HEARINGS AT UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS,  
NEW YORK, 27 JUNE 1986

[Note: On 27 June 1986 the Special Committee against Apartheid held hearings at Headquarters to review the grave situation in South Africa and to take stock of anti-apartheid activities carried out by students in the United States of America.

This paper, which contains statements by student representatives who participated in the hearings, is published at the request of the Special Committee against Apartheid.]

---

\*All material in these Notes and Documents may be freely reprinted.

Acknowledgement, together with a copy of the publication containing the reprint, would be appreciated.

United Nations, New York 10017

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. STATEMENT BY MR. JAI PRATAP RANA (NEPAL), ACTING CHAIRMAN OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST <u>APARTHEID</u> .....	3
II. STATEMENT BY MR. JOSHUA NESSEN, NATIONAL STUDENT CO-ORDINATOR OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON AFRICA .....	5
III. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES AT THE HEARINGS .....	8
IV. STATEMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST <u>APARTHEID</u> .....	9
A. Introduction by Mr. Joshua Nessen .....	9
B. Mr. Bryan Adamson .....	10
C. Miss Theresa Agrillo .....	12
D. Mr. David Artman .....	14
E. Mr. Patrick Bond .....	15
F. Mr. Darin Dockstader .....	17
G. Mr. Demetrius Eudel .....	18
H. Miss Irene Furuyama .....	20
I. Mr. Philip Goldman .....	21
J. Miss Charlotte Hitchcock .....	23
K. Miss Hedy Jacobiwitz .....	24
L. Mr. Keith Jennings .....	25
M. Miss Nicki Lind .....	30
N. Mr. Robert Pharr .....	31
O. Mr. Christopher Phelps .....	34
P. Mr. Dale Robertson .....	38
Q. Miss Debbie Stachel .....	40
R. Miss Jane Ungerman .....	42
S. Mr. Lemoin Werlein-Jaen .....	44

Annexes

I. Divestment actions on South Africa by United States colleges and universities .....	46
II. Shanty town protests (photograph) .....	47
III. <u>The Washington Post</u> (news item) .....	48

I. STATEMENT BY MR. JAI PRATAP RANA (NEPAL),  
ACTING CHAIRMAN OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID

It is my pleasure to welcome you on behalf of the Special Committee against Apartheid. Our Committee deeply appreciates your courageous actions within the United States in support of the international campaign against the abhorrent system of apartheid. Your peaceful demonstrations on campuses against apartheid, your steady appeals to encourage divestment in South Africa and to promote consumer boycotts are concrete expressions of solidarity with the struggle of the oppressed people against apartheid. They are also in full harmony with numerous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations.

It is indeed most distressing that the international community still remains confronted with the grave threat to peace and security posed by the practice of apartheid pursued by the racist régime of South Africa. As you know, apartheid is a negation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and defies all norms of civilized existence.

Therefore, it is most appropriate that in a year that has been declared International Year of Peace by the United Nations, student action all over the world should increasingly be directed against apartheid. We hold such moves to be valuable contributions to the fulfilment of United Nations principles in the promotion of international peace and co-operation. Your support is a significant manifestation of the determination of the international community to prevail upon the proponents of apartheid to change the course and the nature of their senseless and doomed policy.

Coming back to New York from the recent World Conference on Sanctions against Racist South Africa in Paris, I recall that participants unanimously condemned the racist apartheid régime and its collaborators and supporters. In his opening statement to the World Conference, the Secretary-General of the United Nations stated, and I quote:

"... It is high time to put an end to this policy whose tragic consequences make themselves felt not only in South Africa but also in the front-line countries, which have again recently been the subject of armed attacks condemned by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

"It is high time for the South African Government to realize that time is running out for a negotiated settlement and to understand that its defiance of the international community as a whole cannot be tolerated indefinitely.

"It is high time for it to understand and to respond positively to the appeal of the Security Council launched in resolution 569 (1985) calling for the lifting of the state of emergency and the release of Nelson Mandela and all political prisoners. Need it be repeated: only the total elimination of apartheid will restore peace in southern Africa in general and in South Africa in particular."

Most importantly, the participants of the World Conference supported unanimously the call for the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations for the elimination of apartheid.

Your activities today take on added importance in the face of the increasingly violent situation in South Africa. As all are aware, the racist régime has again imposed a state of emergency over the entire country and given to every policeman and member of the security forces the right, at will, to imprison anyone indefinitely without warrant, without charge and without recourse. Few Governments in the history of the world have assumed such untrammelled power of life and death over its citizens.

Against such a background, you have certainly seized this time to act and to call for decisive action. Believe me, the oppressed people of South Africa feel heartened and encouraged by your choice.

Your voices of protest on campuses echo those raised in South Africa. They send a powerful message of solidarity. Long ago the people of South Africa expressed their demands loudly and clearly. They want no piece-meal "reforms" for they know that these are designed only to entrench apartheid. With support such as yours, let Pretoria understand the days of apartheid are numbered and that the international community is determined to do everything to remove that blot from the face of humanity.

This meeting takes place in the midst of an ever-growing campaign against apartheid all over the world, particularly in the United States. As you are aware, at the last Security Council meeting, on 18 June 1986, the United States vetoed a draft resolution seeking to impose selective economic and other sanctions against the South Africa régime. On the other hand, the United States House of Representatives passed a resolution calling for near total economic sanctions against the racist régime. This was an encouraging indication that people from all walks of life in the United States have joined hands in a movement of opposition to the pernicious system of apartheid - as you too have demonstrated.

As such, the Special Committee against Apartheid not only views this hearing as a valuable contribution to the international anti-apartheid campaign but also as an incentive and a step towards the International Student Conference for Action against Apartheid to be held in London in September 1986, which I hope will further the objectives of dismantling apartheid and its replacement by a democratic non-racial system of government in South Africa.

II. STATEMENT BY MR. JOSHUA NESSEN, NATIONAL STUDENT CO-ORDINATOR  
OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON AFRICA

During the past 15 months there has been a significant escalation in the tactics used by students organizing for South Africa-related divestment. The emergence of what can be broadly termed "direct action" has taken the form of building blockades, sit-ins and, especially this year, the construction and defence of shanty towns. Such protests exemplify the view that appealing to or pressuring trustees to divest through traditional channels is no longer sufficient. Many students feel that "direct action" is called for to force trustees to change their policies, while heightening the overall political impact of student anti-apartheid organizing.

What follows is a brief attempt to analyze the political significance of direct action protests and problems that have arisen in the course of such escalated actions.

Political significance of direct action

Even while moving towards more direct action, organizers have recognized the critical importance of ongoing educational work and non-confrontational forms of protest, such as rallies and pickets. However, while these forms of protest help to build campus support, they have a limited effect given the undemocratic governance of the university by absentee, corporate-dominated boards of trustees. Especially on an issue like divestment - involving university finances - the formal channels are not subject to student or faculty control. In addition, while years of rallying set the basis for escalation, without direct action tactics there was limited coverage and public awareness of student organizing.

Within this context and against the backdrop of civil war in South Africa, direct action protests have been significant for a number of reasons:

(a) Such actions have increased the pressure for actual divestment of stocks linked to South Africa. Since the April 1985 upsurge of blockades and sit-ins, 40 schools have totally divested (twice the number as in the previous eight years) and about an equal number have partially divested.

(b) Most importantly, direct action protests exemplify the view that divestment is basically an organizing target rather than an end in itself. In other words, whether the trustees act or not, student protests have directly helped discourage United States investment in South Africa. The escalation of tactics, which led to over 4,000 arrests in the past year, has raised the level of media coverage and public awareness of United States collaboration with South Africa. This consciousness-raising will have important consequences in limiting United States intervention as the struggle escalates in South Africa. Certainly, defence of United States corporate interests will not be a popular basis for United States policy.

(c) Direct-action protests have helped to spread the movement as well as to radicalize many students. Police arrests and the razing of shanties, which symbolize oppression in South Africa, have exposed the undemocratic character of the university. The experience of such confrontations often radicalizes students who initially were involved on a purely moral basis, spurring examination of university links to major corporations and the State. The ideology of university political neutrality has been undermined given this use of police essentially to back up the university's continued links to the corporate sector.

#### Problems In Direct Action Organizing

The effectiveness of direct-action protests has been heightened by the emergency of shanty towns as a symbol of the movement and a means of focusing campus support for divestment. The tactic of shanty construction calls attention to conditions in South Africa while posing problems for university administrators who want to avoid bad publicity from "confrontations" but are hesitant to permit students to establish political communities of action against school policy.

Notwithstanding the growing effectiveness of direct action tactics, political and organizational difficulties have arisen in the course of such protests.

(a) In the course of direct-action protests, tactical differences often arise between "moderate" and "radical" students over the importance of confrontation and responses to university repression and co-optation. This tendency is exacerbated in the common situation where a direct action is initiated by the more political, long-term organizers and then joined by many newly involved students. Differences not only arise when police action is threatened (in fact this can sometimes have a unifying effect) but often when the administration attempts to wait students out and avoid arrests.

(b) The problem of tactical differences is related to and compounded by the question of decision-making processes in the midst of direct-action protests. Ideally, a decision-making process would allow for tactical division of labour (e.g., between those willing to be arrested and those playing support roles) while preserving political unity. However, as actions quickly escalate, the lack of agreement of how decisions will be reached impedes such flexibility. Some choice of tactical leadership often is important, particularly in an action involving a coalition of groups. Yet, formal tactical leadership might arguably impede democratic input from those who have chosen to participate in the action. This relates to the issue of whether it is practical for all participants, sometimes hundreds, to make all decisions. Certainly, in a large, fluid action, strict adherence to consensual decision-making has often proved cumbersome, and majority vote has been more effective. Whatever the process adopted, there should be some respect for participant "autonomy" - essentially the decision not to impose the tactical choice on those in the minority, for example, even if the majority want to end the occupation, those who choose to could remain. This has to be approached flexibly since acting in unison can often be critical politically.

(c) In the context of building coalitions with black student organizations, these questions of decision-making and tactics become critical. Proportionate to the student body, black students have been more heavily involved in direct action protests than white activists. Indeed, in many critical struggles, black students have been in the leadership. However, black student organizations, for well justified reasons, have usually not been the initiators of such protests. This makes it critical that there be clear processes of communication and decision-making within coalitions and in the course of direct actions. There has to be recognition that black student groups have historically been in a position of vulnerability within white institutions and have to weigh carefully their formal involvement in direct-action protests. In confronting administrations, it is important to recognize that demands for divestment and institutionalized racism are distinguishable. Divestment is decidedly not an issue for negotiation with the administration/trustees while demands focused on black studies and admissions - backed up with protest, even direct action if necessary - are likely to involve some negotiated process. Keeping these factors in mind is important in planning the timing and character of direct action protests.

(d) The very success of shanties and the movement in general has led the politically isolated campus right to engage in violent acts of hooliganism - including fire-bombings at Johns Hopkins, Utah, Washington, and the University of Michigan universities. The political effect of such acts can be to give administrations a pretext to restrict protest, while also scaring off potential support. It is important to be organizationally and politically prepared to deal with these attacks.

(e) Legal and disciplinary action by the administration is also a major concern and there is a concerted effort by schools to co-ordinate their strategies against the movement such as the fall 1985 university attorney conference on divestment and campus disruption. Legal and disciplinary proceedings tie up organizing time and resources and it is vital to share and compile student experiences on this front.

#### Co-ordinated direct action

Especially in the light of the open, although blacked-out, civil war raging in South Africa, direct action will remain a vital component of the campus movement. In order to help improve communication and co-ordination of such actions, the American Committee on Africa is proposing that Friday, 10 October be a national day of anti-apartheid protest involving shanty construction. Hopefully, such co-ordination will heighten the impact of protest, further discouraging United States investments in South Africa and building pressure against the unchanged United States policy of "constructive engagement".

III. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES AT THE HEARING

<u>Name</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>State or district</u>
Mr. Bryan ADAMSON	Purdue University	Indiana
Miss Theresa AGRILLO	University of Florida (Gainsville)	Florida
Mr. David ARTMAN	Texas Christian University	Texas
Mr. Patrick BOND	Johns Hopkins University	Maryland
Mr. Marlon CURTIN a/	Pennsylvania State University	Pennsylvania
Miss Ellie DESPREZ a/	Vanderbilt University	Tennessee
Mr. Darin DOCKSTADER	University of Utah	Utah
Mr. Demetrius EUDEL	Dartmough College	New Hampshire
Miss Irene FURUYAMA	University of Hawaii	Hawaii
Mr. Phillip GOLDMAN	University of Washington (Seattle)	Washington
Miss Charolett HITCHCOCK	Yale University	Connecticut
Miss Hedy JACOBWITZ	Arizona State Univeristy	Arizona
Mr. Keith JENNINGS	Atlanta University	Georgia
Miss Nicki LIND	University of California (Los Angeles)	California
Miss Debra MILLER a/	Michigan State University	Michigan
Mr. Robert PHARR	University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill)	North Carolina
Mr. Christopher PHELPS	Reed College	Oregon
Mr. Stacey PLASKETT a/	D.C. Student Coalition Against <u>Apartheid</u> and Racism	Washington, D.C.
Mr. Dale ROBERTSON	University of Texas (Austin)	Texas
Mr. Johan SEMAAN a/	November 29th Committee	
Miss Michelle SMITH a/	Hamilton College	New York
Miss Debbie STACHEL	Boston University	Massachusetts



Miss Jane UNGERMAN	Univeristy of Kansas	Kansas
Mr. Lamoin WERLEIN-JAEN	University of Wisconsin	Wisconsin
Mr. Matt WHIPPLE <u>a/</u>	Northwestern University	Illinois
Miss Edna WRIGHT <u>a/</u>	University of Illinois (Champaign Urbana)	Illinois

---

a/ Text of statement not available.

#### IV. STATEMENTS BY STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES IN THE UNITED STATES ON ACTIONS AGAINST APARTHEID

##### A. Introduction by Joshua Nessen (National Student Co-ordinator, American Committee on Africa)

At a time of profound crisis in South Africa, students across the United States have been playing a critical role in exposing and discouraging United States ties to the apartheid system. Since the 1976 Soweto uprising, United States students have consistently pressed for divestment of all school funds from companies involved in South Africa. The campus-based protest, in turn, has sparked state and municipal divestment efforts affecting billions in holdings linked to South Africa.

United States students have always been responsive to the intensification of the struggle in southern Africa, and since fall 1984 anti-apartheid tactics have dramatically escalated as the movement has spread to hundreds of new campuses. The building blockades, sits-ins and shanty towns have forced over 40 schools to enact policies of total divestment from United States companies involved in South Africa during the last 15 months. Most recently, on 18 July, Nelson Mandela's birthday, the University of California Regents agreed to divest \$3.1 billion from United States companies with South African ties. This dramatic victory came after years of organizing, culminating in militant protests this spring at the University of California (Berkeley) in which over 200 students were arrested while twice defending a shanty town. Students at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) have also been active in 1986.

The student actions have not only forced their schools to divest but have helped create a national climate against United States complicity with apartheid-as epitomized by the Reagan Administration's policy of "constructive engagement". The pressure on the United States Congress to enact effective sanctions has been created by persistent grass-roots organizing in which the student movement has played an important role. Whatever the outcome of the congressional debate, this pressure will make it very difficult for the United States Government to oppose the broad liberation movement as it increasingly threatens white political rule and control of economic resources.

The testimony of students on the following pages bears eloquent witness to the intensification and sophistication of the campus movement. Looking at this testimony, four major trends have emerged as the movement has developed over the past year:

- (a) An increased emphasis has been placed on linking anti-apartheid work to struggles against domestic racism;
- (b) There have been many direct action protests, often involving civil disobedience and the construction of shanty towns to symbolize the living conditions of black South African. Some 1,100 students have been arrested in 1986;
- (c) Many campus groups have broadened their focus on southern Africa to include political and material support for the liberation movements as well as opposition to United States aid for UNITA - the "Contras" of Angola;
- (d) Finally, there has been heightened co-ordination among students nationally, with the American Committee on Africa playing a major supportive role. This co-ordination has taken the form of regional and national conferences and, most critically, of joint planning for days and weeks of action - 21 March-6 April.

Indeed, the day after the 27 June hearing before the Special Committee against Apartheid, a national student anti-apartheid strategy session was held involving 50 campuses from 35 states. The meeting concluded with a call for 10 October as the National Protest Day for Divestment and Sanctions, timed to coincide with the United Nations marking of the Day of Solidarity with Southern African Political Prisoners. On this day and throughout the school year, United States students will doubtless redouble their protests in solidarity with the struggle in South Africa and Namibia.

The American Committee on Africa is very grateful for the ongoing support that the Special Committee against Apartheid has given the United States student movement, and hopes that the material published here will be both inspiring and useful to others involved in the struggle to eradicate apartheid.

B. Mr. Bryan Adamson  
(Purdue University, Indiana)

I am a member of the Student and Community Coalition Against Apartheid and Racism (SCCAAR) of Purdue University. Before I give an assessment of our goals, accomplishments, shortcomings and future, I would like to thank the members of SCCAAR for allowing me to represent them.

Purdue's anti-apartheid organization was formed just last September 1985. It began as the Free South Africa Coalition and last April we reorganized to incorporate wider groups: The Peacemaking Action Network, Black Greek Council, Association of Black Students, Hermanos Hispanos and the Iranian Student Association.

In addition to the four points on divestment, a reassessment and more "convincing" commitment to equal opportunity employment and admissions policy, democratization and a required course on social inequality, other main goals of SCCAAR are:

(a) To educate our fellow colleagues, the faculty, staff and administration of Purdue, as well as the community at large and to make them aware of the strife that has been and still is South Africa's;

(b) To participate in an open forum with significant University administrators represented who would be called upon to justify the administration's position of non-divestment of approximately \$30 million in common stocks and bonds.

In the first year, although great strides were made, our goals have only been partially realized.

By way of accomplishments, SCCAAR feels it has achieved most in the growth in membership and commitment, and especially in educating and dissolving the iron grip of apathy that had strangled our campus for so long. It is refreshing to note that in just a year, our organization grew from 7 to close to 70 members and several hundred supporters. Through table talks, educational forums, speakers such as Randall Robinson and Dick Gregory, who left incredibly affecting ideas, rational and informed decision making occurred. We taught people not so much to think as what to think about, and that is an important beginning.

Indeed, it seems as if our conviction and voices were heard by everyone except the Board of Trustees. Even with consistent lobbying, letter writing, meetings with the President and suggesting alternative portfolios, we failed to accomplish our other enumerated goals - even the open forum. Their rationale for ignoring our proposals, protests and the petitions of almost 5,000 students and over 40 per cent of the faculty - dismissing them as emotional and "irrational" efforts - revealed an undeniably reprehensible and condemnable attitude. The Board's insensitive, condescending and even vindictive attitude towards SCCAAR and the Purdue students is an out-and-out contradiction of what a university should be - a place to foster critical thinking through discussion and debate, and to gain new ideas and perspectives.

SCCAAR has some way to go in breaking down the autocracy that exists at our University. To continue our struggle and to reach our goals successfully, there are several concerns we must address:

(a) How to interrelate issues of racism effectively, both here and abroad;

(b) The role of minorities in the organization and the anti-apartheid movement;

(c) The use of the media - how to prevent events from becoming ends in themselves;

(d) Balancing our efforts to achieve all of our goals, along with the strengthening of our efforts toward addressing events occurring in Namibia, Angola and Nicaragua.

To work towards our future, building on previous years triumphs and failures, will take an incredible amount of organization, perseverance and unity. But, we are committed and will continue to fight against apartheid in South Africa and racism here and elsewhere.

C. Miss Theresa Agrillo  
(University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida)

Although the Student Coalition Against Apartheid and Racism (SCAAR) was formed in April 1985, student questioning of the involvement of the University of Florida (UF) in South Africa dated back to 1979, when UF students passed a referendum calling for full divestment.

Since April 1985, SCAAR has made great progress, particularly in educating and mobilizing both the UF campus and the Gainesville community. Through its activities, ranging from teach-ins and rallies to direct action involving the arrests of 35 people, SCAAR has widely publicized the situation in South Africa. A year ago, most people in Gainesville didn't know what apartheid was. Now almost anyone could tell you something about it. Beyond South Africa, SCAAR has successfully worked to link the actions of the United States Administration in South Africa to its actions world-wide.

Within the group itself, SCAAR members have educated and are continuing to educate themselves and have learned how to organize with such tools as flyers, phone lists and working with the media. On a larger scale, after a year's hard work, SCAAR is beginning to reap the fruit of working with other groups in the Gainesville community, including the Committee in Support of the People of Latin America (CISPLA), the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Black Student Union (BSU), the Loblolly School and several churches.

SCAAR has addressed the UF Foundation on several occasions and has finally begun to have dialogue with the Foundation, which I believe would not have happened if SCAAR members had not committed civil disobedience (or divine obedience, as we prefer to call it).

SCAAR was responsible for mobilizing more than 30 representatives of both local and national organizations who testified to the Gainesville City Commission in favour of divestment of city pension funds. Due primarily to this testimony, the City of Gainesville voted to divest fully in September 1985 - the first city in Florida to do so.

SCAAR has addressed the Board of Regents of Gainesville, Tallahassee and Pensacola, seeking a state-wide policy of full divestment by Florida's state universities, as well as working to fight tuition hikes and financial aid cuts.

SCAAR has also had the privilege of meeting and working with other activists in Tallahassee, Pensacola, Jacksonville, St. Petersburg, Tampa, Orlando, Miami, Atlanta and New York, as well as meeting activists from Chicago, Louisiana and Texas.

Finally, SCAAR has worked at both the state and the national levels for the strongest possible actions to end apartheid and to help the people of southern Africa achieve political and economic freedom.

SCAAR is unique for several reasons. Beginning with the student referendum in 1979, the anti-apartheid movement at UF has avoided the internal struggles found elsewhere over partial or full divestment. SCAAR and its predecessors at UF have consistently called for full divestment, believing that anything less supports the racist régime of South Africa.

The anti-apartheid movement at UF, which resurfaced on 24 April 1985 began with a rally in solidarity with the students striking at Columbia University. On 25 April, UF students began what became one of if not the longest university encampments. On the front porch and steps of the UF administration building, Mandela Hall (formerly Tigert Hall), students ate, slept, studied and even typed papers for 40 days and 40 nights.

On the positive side, SCAAR is unique in its level of organization as well as in the number and creativity of actions, especially given the conservative climate of Gainesville. Our chronology of events currently runs to five single-spaced pages and does not even include such day-to-day activities as staffing a literature table on the UF campus, where we share the Plaza of the Americas with the Krishnas and their free lunch every day at noon.

On a more negative note, anti-apartheid movement of UF may be unique in that the UF Philosophy Department is currently under attack by the UF administration - an attack that we believe to be directly linked to the stands taken by several professors and graduate students in that department.

While great strides have been taken in the Gainesville area, much work remains. SCAAR members used to talk about making sure that we lived up to all of our name - the Student Coalition Against Apartheid and Racism. But eventually we realized that apartheid is racism. SCAAR has fought racism-apartheid at home by speaking out against tuition hikes and financial aid cuts, which disproportionately affect minorities. SCAAR has also fought repressive legislation against the Hopi and Navajo Indians in Big Mountain, Arizona. SCAAR has also worked with local organizations such as BSU, the Black Graduate Student Organization, NAACP, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), black fraternities and sororities, and churches in the black community. On 4 April 1986, National Divestment Protest Day, one of our rally speakers was a UF custodial worker, a courageous woman who spoke on the institutionalized racism of that institution. SCAAR is currently working with the Gainesville NAACP on increasing minority representation in local government and also plans to work more closely with minority groups in actual organizing as well as in joining forces for rallies and other events.

Beyond divestment in South Africa, SCAAR recently sponsored several programmes in Gainesville by the Africa Peace Tour, whose members educated us as well as others in our community on hunger and militarization throughout Africa. We plan to continue to educate ourselves and others on the connections between South Africa and the front-line States as well as the links between all areas of the world and United States foreign policy.

Returning to South Africa, SCAAR plans to continue to work towards the goal of democracy for the people of South Africa in both political and economic areas - not only one person one vote, but also the fair redistribution of that country's economic wealth as well.

D. Mr. David Artman  
(Texas Christian University, Texas)

Texas Christian University is located at Fort Worth, Texas, and is affiliated with the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). The Brite Divinity School is on campus and is a seminary of the Christian Church.

The University currently has no investment policy related to South Africa and claims that it will not divest for several reasons. It is not sure that divestiture is effective and it fears that divesting will set a precedent for any "radical" student group pressing its issue. There is the also fear of losing money.

This past semester, a student group was formed that we named Students for a Democratic South Africa. We decided to press the university to divest for the following reasons:

- (a) In 1983, the Christian Church General Assembly (with which we are affiliated) passed a resolution encouraging divestiture as the most appropriate action for the Christian Church and affiliated institutions;
- (b) Most importantly, we are attempting to be in solidarity with South Africans who themselves are calling for divestment.

This semester we held a rally with Jennifer Davis, Executive Director of the American Committee on Africa, staged educational events and built a shanty in front of the Divinity School when the administration refused to talk about divestment in any official manner. The shanty was dismantled by the administration but has generated wide discussion on campus. No charges were pressed and no disciplinary action taken.

The situation remains at a standoff, and Students for a Democratic South Africa is attempting to co-ordinate with the national anti-apartheid movement through the American Committee on Africa.

E. Mr. Patrick Bond  
(Johns Hopkins University, Maryland)

It is an honour to testify to this important committee today on the status of the anti-apartheid movement at several schools in the Washington D.C.-Baltimore area. I represent the Johns Hopkins University Coalition for a Free South Africa, one of the campus member organizations of the Student Coalition Against Apartheid and Racism (DC SCAR), which is based in Washington, D.C.

DC SCAR is a two year-old, multiracial coalition and merits some discussion as a model for regional student solidarity. While DC SCAR members rely on the American Committee on Africa, the Washington Office on Africa, the American Friends Service Committee and TransAfrica for technical assistance, the success of our organizing depends to a large degree on our work with fellow activists in our geographic region.

DC SCAR chapters work closely together, co-ordinating joint activities and holding bi-monthly meetings. When the struggle intensifies at any one campus, groups from the other DC SCAR chapters have come in support. We found that working together was particularly important during the "forced removals" of shanty towns at the University of Maryland and Georgetown University and following the firebombing of a shanty at Johns Hopkins. DC SCAR learned a great deal from the efforts to defend these shanties, which included seeing 12 student arrests at Maryland and 35 at Georgetown. Our rights to free speech and political expression are most readily asserted when we identify the common features of repression at our universities and prevent them from being isolated.

The DC SCAR groups at George Washington University and American University put up shanty towns on a short-term basis to raise awareness and won some limited concessions on access to information. Other DC SCAR chapters - those at Catholic University, the University of Maryland at Baltimore County, Trinity College and George Mason University - have been engaged mainly in educational and fundraising work to support the South African liberation movement. SCAR members at Antioch Law School have been actively supporting the defence of Lindsay Scott, a victim of blatant domestic racism. At two DC SCAR schools - the University of the District of Columbia and George Mason University - students have been successful in winning total divestment victories. While divestment remains the immediate goal of most DC SCAR members, there are many other ways to work against apartheid and racism.

For example, DC SCAR put up a symbolic shanty town at the State Department in Washington, D.C. on 21 March 1986, the anniversary of the Sharpeville Massacre, to protest the United States Government's constructive engagement policy and its plans to assist the illegitimate UNITA forces of Jonas Savimbi in overthrowing the Angolan Government. We have worked on the local Shell Oil boycott and on other issues with community activists. We are attempting to address racism on our campuses by supporting increased minority educational programming, recruitment, enrolment, and faculty hiring and

attacking the racial division of labour. We have put out five issues of our newspaper, and have published a 100-page Resource Guide for anti-apartheid activists.

All this work has allowed DC SCAR to attain visibility and respect in the Washington, D.C./Baltimore area. We now have our first high school chapter (TC Williams in Alexandria) and are recruiting more and more students from other area campuses who are beginning to organize their own groups. Having access to the resources, political experience and contacts of a region-wide coalition like DC SCAR makes getting new anti-apartheid groups off the ground much easier, as we're seeing in Baltimore with new organizing at Towson State, Morgan State and Loyola. While the groups and individuals in DC SCAR are at widely differing levels of activism, we are all able to come together to plan democratically the future of our organization, which gives us all real hope for a more just social allocation of power and control once our struggles for social change have advanced further.

In the light of the well-publicized firebombing of our shanty town at Johns Hopkins on 24 May, it is worth reflecting on the role of right-wing "vigilantes" (as they're called in South Africa) and the university administration. At 3 a.m. that night, several Hopkin's students threw gasoline on the wall of our plywood shanty, set it aflame and ran off, not bothering to determine if the three people inside the shanty were threatened by what became a blazing inferno in seconds. One of our activists was indeed hospitalized with severe burns. Two of our fellow DC SCAR members (one from the University of Maryland and one from Morgan State) who were asleep in an adjacent shanty were able to catch one of the arsonists, and we now know the identities of two others. All have been charged with attempted murder and will stand trial in early September. Had the attack been a half-hour later, when the three of us would have been asleep in our sleeping bags, the charges they face might have been murder.

The Hopkins administration's role in all of this was not conceptually different from the role of the South Africa Government in the recent arson of thousands of shanties in the Crossroads squatter camp. Like the Botha régime, the Hopkins administration and trustees had constructed an environment of intolerance and hostility that produced a right-wing firebombing attack: (a) by refusing to discuss the divestment issue with us in public; and (b) by failing to take any action when our shanty town had been attacked on two previous occasions. Like the Botha régime, they tried a cover-up, by attempting twice the day after the firebombing to remove the burned debris. We prevented this from happening by massing several dozen supporters in front of the debris and making our disgust known to the local media. Like the Botha régime, the Hopkins administration tried to blame the victim, by suggesting that our burned-down shanty would incite further violence. Thus, in this divestment struggle at Hopkins, we are better able to comprehend the difficulty in waging a campaign to end apartheid. While thankfully we do not camp at Crossroads, we are now realizing what it means to know the fear of death at the hands of vigilantes.

At other schools in the DC SCAR network, students are denied freedom of speech and expression, as shanty towns are immediately dismantled by the university administrations. At Hopkins, we were allowed freedom of speech - we were allowed to have a shanty town for seven weeks, right through



commencement - essentially because no one of importance in the University power structure would listen to what we were saying and debate with us. We will put our shanties up again in the fall, and continue to escalate our campaign until the university no longer abdicates its moral responsibility to discourse on the issue, and ultimately divests its \$70 million in South African-related investments.

F. Mr. Darin Dockstader  
(University of Utah, Utah)

On 27 February, the first sign of direct action was on the University of Utah campus with the raising of our first "shanty". It was assembled in pieces on a trafficked area of campus at 4.30 a.m. Although previous lobbying efforts had been made, this shanty forced a public re-opening of the divesture issue and sparked interest and discussion from the university and community. The shanty also met with immediate opposition. On the evening of its construction, it was vandalized by a group comprised of mostly white South African students. A week of literature distribution, petitioning and recruiting followed. A second shanty was raised on the following Tuesday to drive home student resolve to the university administration.

An around-the-clock vigil by students continued through several acts of arson. A Molotov cocktail was directed toward a shanty being manned by five students. Luckily it fell short, exploding on the sidewalk, and no one was injured. A shanty 70 yards away from where students were staying was set ablaze with the use of a petroleum product. Both arson attempts occurred in March. Police had no leads and to date no arrests have been made.

Negotiations with the university's Institutional Council (our governing body) began on 14 April with a pro-divestment presentation organized by students using Utah State Senator Terry Williams, Lutheran Reverend Tony Hour, Black South African Pule Libe and Professor Willigain.

The most significant show of student support came on 26 March with a student march to the administration building to present a petition with some 3,000 signatures to university President, Chase Peterson. After a send-off of Geraldine Ferraro, between 250 and 300 students carried banners and signs from the shanty town across campus to the lobby of the administration building.

A third shanty was constructed on 1 April during a concert given by a local band in support of the divestment movement. Supporters from our Art Department painted freedom symbols on its walls. 1 April also marked a dubious day for student activist and artist, Benjimen Madina. While at work, his apartment was broken into and extensively damaged. His walls, carpeting, clothing, furniture and a large collect of rare first edition books were covered with the word "Pinko" in spray paint, shampoo and toilet bowl cleanser. Art work was also destroyed, including approximately 12 pieces that were to be exhibited and sold in a benefit for El Salvadoran refugees.

At the end of the spring quarter, the original shanty was knocked to the ground. It was rebuilt the following day with plans of a dedication ceremony to those who had given their lives in South Africa. The dedication ceremony, however, doubled as a press conference due to the destruction of all

shanties the night before. A vote on divestiture is pending in the Institutional Council for 14 July, a vote we do not expect to support divestment. However, we have made progress. Although our movement has been short, we have achieved a few important victories, such as the support of our Faculty Senate, which is also applying pressure on the Institutional Council to divest, and a significant heightening of education and awareness.

The direct action of the shanty building has played a crucial role in the University of Utah's divestment movement. As mentioned earlier, petitioning and lobbying had gone without notice before the shanties were erected. The shanties forced our administration to face the issue at hand. The shanties now serve as a symbol of solidarity with other students nation-wide and acts as headquarters on our campus for literature and education on the subject of divestment.

From its beginning, the divestment movement has created ties with the American Indian groups on campus. The comparison between conditions on the bantustans and the Indian reservations has been brought to our attention many times.

While shanties on many university campuses have caused negative confrontation between the activists and faculty, our administration has not done so. We commend them. Rather than taking action to remove the shanties, they have provided some over-night protection for us and even helped us clean up some of the debris.

If the vote of the Institutional Council in July is pro-divestment, we will further urge the university to carry out post-divestment recommendations that we have already put forth. These include involvement with the Investor Responsibility Research Corporation and the South African Divestiture Consortium in Research for Other Institutions and supporting lobbying efforts in the state legislature and other in-state institutions, as well as setting up a visiting scholar programme for professor and student exchange and a scholarship fund for black South African students, particularly those interested in law. This is due to the small percentage of black lawyers found in South Africa (200 out of 6,000 lawyers are black).

G. Mr. Demetrius Eudel  
(Dartmouth College, New Hampshire)

15 November 1985 will always be an unforgettable day at Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire. On that day, the Dartmouth Community for Divestment erected shanty towns on the Dartmouth Green in the centre of the campus to express repugnance with the college's continued investments in corporations transacting business with South Africa. The college's response was a tone similar to the one that came out of the Reagan Administration. They demanded the deconstruction of the shanty towns by the coming Sunday, or they would dismantle them. The shanty towns were not removed and the administration replied they could stay "as long as they provided an educational purpose". The purpose of the shanty towns was not to educate the apathetic, status-quo Dartmouth student. The shanty towns were constructed to

dramatize the living conditions of the black people in South Africa, and to make the college address the issue of having investments in corporations that perpetuate a racist régime. If anyone wanted an education, the Divestment Committee held weekly meetings, forums and many different discussion groups. Additionally, Baker Library was located 200 yards from the shanty towns. There would be the ideal place to educate oneself on the history of South Africa. So, from the beginning, the administration (like the Reagan Administration) has totally missed the point.

On 20 January 1986, after the celebration of the birthday of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, the shanty towns were violently destroyed in the middle of the night by 12 extreme right wing students. Ten of the students wrote for the radically conservative (and I would add ethnically irresponsible) newspaper, Dartmouth Review. As a result, 150 people, comprising students, faculty and local residents, sat in the administration building, Parkhurst Hall, to make the college address the issues of racism, sexism and oppression existing on campus and clearly reflected in the world. One of the demands was the temporary suspension of the racist students who had destroyed the shanty towns pending a Committee on Standards hearing. Although this was not granted, the ultra-conservative students were suspended after the first hearing. However, after three appeals, they were given amnesty because of the "hardship" they had endured from the sensationalism of the media. Everyone knows their amnesty was predicated on the influence of wealthy alumnae subscribing to their racist philosophy.

In summation, what does the college's decision say to the students who built the shanties and support divestment? First of all, to grant the right-wing students amnesty due to hardship is unequal, when there are other people, i.e., blacks, women, homosexuals and students who favour divestment who have endured genuine hardship as a result of the publication of the racist Dartmouth Review. (We see they are still missing the point.) Secondly, the college claims to teach us to question authority in the classrooms and textbooks. But when we attempt to apply that knowledge to our daily lives, we are silenced. Thirdly, it says no matter how violently one may attempt to subvert the subjectivity of an organization protesting college policy, as long as one has the backing of the conservative alumnae, you can get away with it. Instead of listening to different perspectives, the administration attempts to tell us what is best for us. This paternal condescension parallels the attitude of the United States, Great Britain and France toward South Africa. The nationals of South Africa are crying for economic sanctions. But, these super-Powers think they know what is best for the people who daily experience the effects of apartheid. If I could leave one thought with you it would be to listen. Let Dartmouth listen to its students' plea to take a stand on an issue of justice and decency. And let us listen to South Africa before it is too late, or they will no longer be interested in what we have to say.

I would like to end my statement with a quote from Frederick Douglas in 1857, which espouses the sentiment of those at Dartmouth trying to end the college's connection with the racist régime of South Africa.

"Those who profess to love freedom and yet depreciate agitation are men who want crops without plowing. This struggle may be a moral one, or it may be physical, but it must be a struggle. Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will."

H. Miss Irene Furuyama  
(University of Hawaii, Hawaii)

Even though Hawaii is half way around the world from South Africa and its neighbouring countries, even though we are 11,532 miles away from South Africa, when it comes to the issue of apartheid, we are right next door.

Why is Hawaii interested in the issue of apartheid? Well, Hawaii is the state that best reflects how different ethnic groups can live together peacefully and in harmony. We have all ethnic groups represented in varying percentages.

Not only do we live together peacefully, we also have different ethnic groups making state laws that will affect all ethnic groups equally. Because we work together productively as well as play together in harmony, many of us cannot and do not live comfortably knowing that outside of Hawaii there are millions suffering from a system of legalized racism that affects every aspect and every minute of their lives.

The Hawaii Committee for Africa is a grassroots group interested in social justice in South Africa. Not even a year old, it has been actively working in Hawaii to create an awareness of what is going on in South Africa and to gather support to abolish apartheid.

In 1985, the Hawaii Committee for Africa was instrumental in having the City Council pass a resolution declaring 11 October 1985 as Anti-Apartheid Protest Day. For that week, we organized several activities at the University of Hawaii and ended the week with our first demonstration in front of the Federal Building.

On 20 January 1986, we marched in the Martin Luther King Parade through Waikiki, holding anti-apartheid banners before 25,000 tourists and received television coverage on all stations.

On 21 March 1986, in observance of the Sharpeville Massacre, over 50 Hawaiian activists turned out for a demonstration that was full of spirit due to the active support of Elizabeth Sibeko and Twiggs Xiphu, exiled African activists from South Africa. They both received a congratulatory certificate from the State House for their visit to Hawaii as part of Black History Week in Hawaii.

Our last activity, which was a huge success, was a demonstration on 16 June in observance of the Soweto Uprising. We are gratified at the fact that every demonstration we organized grew larger in the number of individuals and groups who came and joined us in supporting the fight for freedom in South Africa.

The Hawaii Committee for Africa, as part of an ongoing process, schedules seminars and forums on apartheid and divestment issues off campus. We also lobby for state and national divestment legislation as well as send letters to all unions to support our activities.

As a non-white, born and raised in Hawaii, the last state to be admitted to the United States due to racism, I believe that the blatant racist policies of the Government of South Africa must be strongly opposed by the United States Government, because the United States is a nation that holds human rights for all races as one of its highest ideals. Other nations may be pluralistic and democratic, but few are as multi-racial and multi-ethnic as the United States. And Hawaii is the most multi-racial and multi-ethnic of all the states.

Our experience in Hawaii over the years suggests that hardline racist attitudes can change. Less than a hundred years ago, our plantation workers, virtually all of whom were non-white immigrants, were considered little more than slaves. As late as the early 1980s, Hawaii's economic and political power lay in the hands of a handful of caucasians, most of whom were descendants of old ruling plantation families. Although some of those still hold power, a radical revolution began in 1954 and victory was achieved within two decades. Now, many of Hawaii's current business and political leaders are the descendants of the plantation workers of yesterday.

Although it would be an exaggeration to equate today's racist South African leaders with the old Hawaii plantation elite, Hawaii's example of a largely non-violent revolution involving a massive redistribution of wealth over a relatively short period of time - from a handful of caucasians to a very large segment of the non-white population - does point out that peaceful change can occur without racial wars and bloodshed. The growth in Hawaii's productivity and wealth, simultaneously with the transfer in power, should not go unnoticed. This was truly a win-win situation.

South Africa, with its rich multi-ethnic heritage, can achieve true greatness in the family of nations. We did it in a small way in Hawaii. Now it is up to South Africa to show the world that it can be done on a national scale without further bloodshed, and with justice for all South Africans.

I. Mr. Philip Goldman  
(University of Washington, Washington)

On 10 May 1986, a shanty town that our group had constructed on the University of Washington campus was subjected to a dangerous attack by right-wing students. The structure was partially torn down and doused with gasoline. A timed incendiary device was placed inside the remains, and two of our members unwittingly came close to setting off the device before it was discovered and removed by a police bomb squad.

This incident is indicative of the type of opposition that the anti-apartheid movement is facing. However, it also illustrates the deep impact that the movement has had on our community. In Seattle, we have hit

United States policy in southern Africa hard, and with the highest degree of integrity and commitment. There is no question that we are fighting a winning battle.

The struggle is not simply over university investments; it goes far beyond that. Divestment is not our final goal, but the issues it raises are an excellent platform for educating the community about the real issues at hand.

At the University of Washington, we are directly confronting several business leaders who actually run corporations with operations in South Africa. In fact, the President of the Board of Regents is a director of three companies that profit from apartheid: UAL, Dart and Kraft, and Deere and Company. Several regents have extensive contact with other corporate leaders involved in South Africa, including directors of General Motors and International Business Machines (IBM). It is no surprise that the Board strongly backs continued United States investment despite overwhelming campus pressure to divest. The regents have demonstrated their determination to run our public institution as if it was one of their private assets, be it through withholding documents or lying about the amount of university investments. Student pressure is undermining this determination.

Students Against Apartheid has conducted sit-ins, demonstrations and educational activities to bring the issue to the forefront. The group has lobbied the legislature and has even brought conflict-of-interest charges against the regents to the attention of the Attorney General. In campus-wide elections, students voted for divestment by a two-to-one margin. We continually change and escalate our tactics; the result has been a massive (though partial) divestment of South Africa-related assets, a policy not to increase those investments and an offer to meet privately with student leaders in the near future.

In the past, people of conscience protested Dow Chemical's production of napalm and Nestle's marketing of harmful infant formulas outside of the United States. The divestment movement is a sharp escalation of such protests, and its success has implications that affect American corporate policy in general. Many of us look beyond corporate influence in South Africa; we cannot help but condemn the role of United States interests in Central America or in Bhopal, India. Our hope is that our demands will make multinational corporations think twice about acting responsibly throughout the world. If they do not, we are compelled to force them to do so.

When we struggle with the University of Washington, we are actually attempting to alter the machinery of an inherently racist institution. Recently, our regents consolidated all the departments that were devoted to the examination of the third world into one "ethnic studies" programme. They did this despite almost universal opposition to the move on campus. We are also witnessing a steep decline in the enrolment of black students, and a rising dissatisfaction among those students who are admitted. The President of our Black Student Union is not officially recognized by the school administration because of her attempts to organize on campus; we even have evidence of attempts by the regents to exclude her from the campus.

In the face of this racism and the attempt to bomb the shanty, we are optimistic. We are convinced that we will win total divestment and that our organizing will alter repressive school policies in general.

I would like to thank the Committee for listening to our concerns and the United Nations Centre against Apartheid for its useful and informative materials on South Africa. We hope that our efforts will keep the Reagan Administration from continuing to veto United Nations resolutions on sanctions.

In closing, I would urge you to not underestimate the significance of the divestment movement, and the support it can offer you in terms of research, organizing, phone campaigns and so on. I might even suggest that the Centre against Apartheid maintain an active list of divestment organizations across the country, so that it may contact these groups should the need arise. The Committee is more than welcome to write a letter to our Board of Regents!

J. Miss Charlotte Hitchcock  
(Yale University, Connecticut)

Allow me to enumerate the chronology of the Yale Divestment Movement:

17 September 1985	Yale Divestment Steering Committee formation
September-June 1986	Rallies outside Woodbridge Hall (administration building) during monthly meetings of the Trustees
2 November 1985	Dissenting statement released by four Trustees
February-March	Daily one-hour weekday pickets outside Woodbridge Hall
13 March	Funeral march through campus and New Haven
4 April	Construction of Winnie Mandela Shantytown
7 April	Erection of a memorial to commemorate South Africans
12 April	Open forum with trustees
14 April	78 arrested defending shanties and memorial
15 April	21 arrested in blockade of Investment Building
16 April	65 arrested in blockade of Investment Building
22 April	110 arrested in silent witness in the street
23 April	Alderpersons renamed street "Bishop Tutu's Way"

25 April	48 arrested in blockade on steps of Woodbridge Hall
25 May	2,500 balloons sent off during commencement. Sit-in on the steps of Woodbridge Hall during trustees meeting
3 June	Establishment of South Africa Free Divestment Fund
21 June	Breakfast meeting with trustee members

Three main factors have significantly contributed to the progress and uniqueness of the Yale Divestment Movement. First, the formation of the Yale Divestment Steering Committee provided an essential organizational body to direct campus action. Its structure attempted to address institutional racism by assuring black and third world leadership. Secondly, the participation of the Union dramatically increased the pressure against the Yale Corporation. Finally, the support of the New Haven community extended our struggle into a broad based coalition. The emergence of direct action on Yale's campus has heightened our political impact tremendously. While ignoring traditional channels of communication, the Yale Corporation yielded to demands for an open forum and a breakfast meeting with trustees. Both events set a precedent in the university's history. The escalation of tactics, culminating in 322 arrests, effectively succeeded in raising campus and public consciousness on the issue. This facilitated our efforts in linking domestic racism with racism abroad. The theme of "Divest from South Africa, Invest in New Haven" demonstrates our commitment to making Yale accountable to the city of New Haven. In addition, we began a self-education series this summer in order to broaden our work on southern Africa beyond divestment. Our projection for the future of Yale's Divestment Campaign is very optimistic. This year we have clearly shown that the mountain can indeed be moved. The question is no longer if Yale will divest, but when Yale will divest. Our strength has always and will continue to lie in the unity of the students, faculty, staff and New Haven community. Without doubt, Yale will be on the move in 1987!

K. Miss Hedy Jacobiwitz  
(Arizona State Univeristy, Arizona)

Students Against Apartheid (SAA) was formed on the Arizona State University campus in the fall of 1985. Amid death threats and accusations of being communists and supporters of terrorism, SAA members lobbied the Arizona State Board of Regents for complete divestment of its \$3 million holdings in South Africa. At this time, another group formed on campus opposing divestment and calling themselves Students Against a Marxist South Africa while using the threat of communism as a cover for racism. Arizona, being an extremely conservative Republican state with an irrational paranoia of communism, paid much attention to the opposition group until the Board of Regents decided to divest last November. The opposition group quickly disbursed.



After obtaining divestment, SAA concentrated on spreading information about the racist apartheid régime to the apathetic student body of the Arizona State campus. We have slowly made progress.

Of our many events, we had a member of the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC), Sepho Cele, speak at two national anti-apartheid day rallies; benefit showings of several films, including Last Grave at Dimbaza and South Africa under Seige, and two benefit concerts where we attracted reggae and punk rock crowds. On our Martin Luther King Day rally, we protested against our school for not acknowledging it and tied the civil rights movement to apartheid in South Africa. There were also a one-hour guest appearance on a local television show discussing divestment and a widely publicized picket of the South African honorary consul Duane Hall, an Arizona businessman who claimed that there is no such thing as apartheid. All of the money raised was sent to ANC in New York.

Currently, our chief function is working in tandem with the Arizona Coalition Against Apartheid based in Phoenix towards achieving city and eventually state divestiture.

L. Mr. Keith Jennings  
(Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia)

On behalf of the Atlanta Student Coalition Against Apartheid and Racism (A-SCAR), it is indeed a pleasure and an honor for me to address this great body, a committee whose tireless efforts of proclaiming apartheid a crime against humanity that must be eliminated are well documented. Your mission can only be applauded and supported. The foresight displayed in convening this gathering also represents the continuation of a creative initiative indicative of the Committee's work.

A little more than one year ago (7 May 1985), at the last gathering such as this, I stated that our being here on this platform challenged the old maxim that youth and students should be seen and not heard, that it signified our intent not to give way to the deceitful aims at home and abroad to not eliminate apartheid and that our activities had been criticized and analysed and attributed to spring fever, radicals looking for a cause and our being pragmatic idealists. At that time, I stated that we were not idealists because we knew that our efforts to get progressive legislation passed in the United States Congress or that our efforts, no matter how courageous, could not liberate the people of South Africa and Namibia because the only people who could liberate South Africa and Namibia were the people of South Africa and Namibia.

It is very important to reiterate those points today and to go a step further to say that we, the youth and students of the United States, recognizing the historical challenge that lies before our generation, will not be blinded by the anti-communist, anti-terrorist propaganda of the forces of reaction in our country aimed at diverting international pressure to isolate the Botha Government and also to discredit the legitimate people's organizations in an effort to deny them the support of the democratic forces the world over.

It is quite fitting that we should today, at this critical moment in human history, consider student actions against apartheid. As you are well aware, the General Assembly of the United Nations declared 1986 to be the International Year of Peace. Hence, it is consistent that we collectively discuss ways in which we have tried to help eliminate the apartheid system that constitutes a threat to the peace and security not only of southern Africa and the African continent but the entire world. Moreover, this meeting is taking place amidst the growing world-wide campaign against apartheid. We, too, ask how many more lives must be taken, how many more mothers must lose their children, how much more blood must be shed before the Western nations, led by the United States, stop funding murder.

It is clear to most people in the world community that the situation in South Africa is so critical that it demands an immediate response from all concerned. Yet the Western imperialist forces continue to support the murderous régime by not taking decisive action in the economic or political fields but merely offering verbal opposition to apartheid. Such a position is totally unacceptable, especially given the adopted posture of the racist to intensify its terror and brutalization of the African masses. It is also clear that a revolutionary situation exists in South Africa, for the masses are no longer willing to be governed in the same old way and the minority régime can no longer rule in the same old way. In fact, soon it will not be able to rule at all. Apartheid today is like a wounded animal striking out wildly and we in the solidarity movement must assist the liberation movement in putting the beast out of its misery forever.

The fact that the United States, after repeated calls from the world community totally to isolate South Africa, has chosen to continue to follow the policy of constructive engagement reflects a very narrow and shortsighted understanding of history. Our country prides itself on proclaiming to the people of the world that it stands for freedom, justice and democracy and that it is the protector of the free world. However, the United States today is among a handful of nations that are allied with the most brutally barbaric régime since Hitler's nazi Germany. To most observers, the policy of "constructive engagement" only serves to try to end the international isolation of South Africa and to give it an air of respectability in the world community while it attempts bogus internal reforms. The policy clearly aids the racist. Hence, what are we to assume except the logical conclusion that the policy itself is racist for it assumes that the destiny of the African majority is a matter to be negotiated between a white minority régime and Western nations. To us, the "constructive engagement" policy is an initiative influenced more by old Tarzan movies rather than by an enlightened view of the modern world.

The anti-apartheid movement has made important gains in our country and has involved persons from every walk of life. Our collective efforts under the umbrella of the Free South Africa Movement has actually placed the current administration on the defensive with respect to the question of apartheid in South Africa. Within the overall movement, the most militant actions taken against the continued collaboration has come from students.

This is the case because in one sense our movement is not hamstrung by the paralysis of analysis. Apartheid to us is not something to be intellectually debated. We are very clear that apartheid constitutes colonialist and racist oppression in its crudest and most disgusting form. It is a system where a white minority, by controlling the means of production, ruthlessly exploit the African majority and denies them any form of human dignity. We know too that the creation of the bantustans is a diabolical scheme designed to disposses the African people to their land and to consolidate the political and economic power of the white settler. Finally, we know that no compromise is possible with apartheid and that, therefore, it must be totally uprooted and power must be transferred to the people.

My organization, A-SCAR, is a representative group of different student committees at 11 institutions of higher education in the metropolitan Atlanta area. Our activities against apartheid have included sponsoring a southern regional anti-apartheid student conference, which brought together for the first time student activists working on this issue from all across the south. We have also been co-sponsors of the Africa Week of the Third World Film Festival, sponsored by the City of Atlanta, wherein we highlighted the struggles of the South African and Namibian peoples. We have organized numerous educational forums, including a regional meeting sponsored by the United Nations Council for Namibia. More recently our Committee, based at Spelman College, successfully forced the Board of Trustees to divest totally. The courageous action by the all-women's institution has set a precedent for black colleges in the deep south to follow. Our latest activity was to organize a Soweto Day march and rally that was broadly supported by labour, the church community, civil rights organizations and other democratic forces in the city.

As conscientious youths, living in a region of the United States that has historically witnessed the forced removal of native Americans from their lands, the enslavement of our ancestors - the African peoples whose blood, sweat and tears fertilized the plantation south, Jim Crow segregation, Ku-Klux-Klan terror and the economic exploitation of the poor, we can identify closely with the people's cause in southern Africa. However, at the same time, we are mature enough in our view of the situation in South Africa to avoid the intoxicating analysis of seeing the African people's struggle through the lens of the United States civil rights movement. We are aware that the call for one person, one vote in a non-racial democratic South Africa is revolutionary in the context of the present situation there.

In our view, the demonstrations, the construction of on-campus shanties, the sit-ins and the take-overs all reflect, on the one hand, our growing dissension against the administration's current policies, while, on the other, they also represent our generation's greatest contribution thus far to the peace and justice movement inside the United States, laying the foundation for a new student movement so vitally needed in the country today. We are certain that as we continue to draw strength from the fighting youth of South Africa, we will develop a movement dedicated to the principles of peace, justice, equality, social progress and development for all humanity.

In 1962, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said: "In South Africa today all opposition to white supremacy is condemned as communism, and in its name, due process is destroyed; a medieval segregation is organized with twentieth century efficiency and drive; a sophisticated form of slavery is imposed by a minority upon a majority, which is kept in grinding poverty; and world opinion is arrogantly defied." This statement is equally true today. The one difference is that the forces of reaction in the United States have resorted to the promotion of the view of "East-West" containment of communism as a justification for their support of the racists and as a way to rationalize the continued oppression of millions of black people. This way of using anti-communism to cover their racism and to safeguard the transnational corporations' continued extraction of profits from the exploitation of the African people and their natural resources was recently typified by statements made by a senator from North Carolina who received a good amount of the more than \$12 million it took to get him elected from some of the corporations with investments in South Africa. His statement was that the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) was a communist front group. He further implied that if the white racist régime did not continue to receive support from the United States, all hope for Western civilization and democracy in Africa would be lost. What he was actually saying was that the African people were not intelligent enough to struggle on their own behalf or in their own interest and that someone from hundreds of miles away had to tell them that they were oppressed. The point that the state senator represents is one where Ku-Klux-Klan murders killed several people in cold blood in front of television cameras yet went away without fear of any type of punishment.

Another dimension of the present tirade and propoganda blitz aimed at deadening the sensibilities of the American people, especially the masses of white Americans, is the attempt to discredit the organized resistance of the African people, under the leadership of ANC and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), as terrorist.

It is hoped that by doing so, there will be no outrage if and when the minority settler régime carries out massacres such as those that occurred in the Palestinian refugee camps in Sabra and Shantila in Lebanon, where over 30,000 Palestinians died. There was no outrage in the West largely because the public had been fed a diet that suggested that the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was a terrorist organization.

We today stand firm in our support of the legitimate representative of the African people and the means of struggle that they have been forced to adopt as all other channels of protest have been closed long ago. Moreover, we ask who is it that murders children, tortures political activists, bans democratic organizations, dispatches assassination squads or launches unprovoked military attacks on the neighbouring sovereign nations of Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Angola? Who is it that is giving support to the UNITA and MNR bandits? Obviously the answer to all the questions is apartheid South Africa. We are forced to conclude that the real terrorist is apartheid South Africa.

There seems to be a rather curious type of double standard being practiced today in the arena of international relations and politics, especially on the part of the Western imperialist nations. To be more specific, based on all the headlines generated and news media coverage around the condition of any one white person, especially if he or she is in a Socialist country and

against the policies of that Socialist State, compared with the relative silence over the murder of more than 2,500 Africans, we must conclude that racism is a very significant factor that causes the essential worth and value of human life to be measured differently. Moreover, the yardstick to measure democracy seems to follow a similar pattern. We are told that in Nicaragua, a progressive third world country that overthrew a United States-backed dictatorship, the Sandanistas are anti-democratic, that there is no freedom of the press, that a totalitarian dictatorship exists and that such a Government constitutes a threat to the security of the United States. The fact is that all of the claims about the Sandanistas, including the one about them being drug runners, are outright slanderous lies. But the Government of the United States, in the name of the American people, supposedly to correct their perception of the problem, mined the harbour, printed assassination manuals, funded the Contras to the tune of \$100 million and imposed economic sanctions against Nicaragua. None of these activities are termed terroristic but go under the nice heading of "covert activities". The point here is that in relation to the minority racist régime in South Africa, nothing is ever said about the absence of democracy, the Fascist nature of the South African State or the threat it poses to the security of the United States because I am sure that once the African people overthrow the racist dictatorship and Botha is run out of the country like other dictators have been recently, that should he consider coming to this country, the Black people and other democratic forces will not allow him to find a resting place. He will be placed under people's arrest like all the criminals who are practising apartheid should.

Paul Robeson, the long-time human rights activist and champion of African liberation, once said that we can learn a lot from South Africa. We in the anti-apartheid student movement already have. For instance, we have realized that it is somewhat hypocritical to protest and complain about apartheid in South Africa or the human rights violations in that country while remaining silent on the question of the homeless and the unemployed in the United States. We have also learned to view our own society more critically and have discovered how deeply imbedded in the social structure racism and racial discrimination is. In short, we believe Mr. Robeson was correct.

In the coming months, we will call upon our country, through our reasoned radicalism, to take the high ground on this issue immediately by joining with the world community in isolating South Africa. We call upon the officials of our Government, as Dr. King and Chief Albert Lutuli suggested, to support economic sanctions such as those proposed by the Dellums legislation passed in the United States House of Representatives last week. We also make a special appeal to the Western nations to stop linking Namibian independence to issues that have no relevance to the process. All that needs to be done is to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

We would like to say by way of conclusion that the media blackout will not deter our efforts, for our cause is a moral one. It is a political one as well. But more than anything else it is a historical one. We are certain that the victorious upheavals of the poor and the oppressed against the unjust systems of oppression and exploitation will undoubtedly be the written history of the twentieth century. We hope that those annuals, when written, will show

that this generation of American youth stood with the heroic people of South Africa and Namibia in their quest to regain their lands, to exercise their right to self determination, and to rid our planet of the last bastion of fascist settler colonialism.

The words of Dr. King best capture the challenge confronting my generation. He said:

"We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history there is such a thing as being too late. Procrastination is still the thief of time ... We must move past indecision to action ... Now let us begin. Now let us re-dedicate ourselves to the long and bitter - but beautiful - struggle for a new world. This is the calling of the children of God and our brothers and sisters wait eagerly for our response. Shall we say the odds are too great? Shall we tell them the struggle is too hard? ... Or will there be another message of longing, of hope, of solidarity with their yearnings, of commitment to their cause, whatever the cost? The choice is ours, and though we might prefer it otherwise we must choose in this crucial moment of human history."

We have made our choice and it is here that we stand.

M. Miss Nicki Lind

(University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), California)

I am here today to give you a brief testimony on the struggle that has been waged by UCLA students against the University of California Regents' complicity with European colonialism and neo-colonialism in southern Africa, and what the Western press has so dubiously called a struggle against apartheid.

The University of California Regents have over \$2.4 billion invested in companies doing business in South Africa. Students have confronted the Regents on the issue of divestment time and again. They have refused to reconcile the fact that their investments are used but as tools of the white oppressors.

Our first major demonstration of the 1986 school year was not against a Regents, but Professor John Hutchinson who was responsible for advising the South African Government to ban the television media. He said and I quote, "get those sjamboks [whips] off the screen" when he travelled there last summer as a guest of the genocidal régime. One month later, South Africa imposed a ban on the television media.

Two weeks later we constructed three shanties, which provoked the first confrontation with the university administration. They did not want their beautiful campus blighted with the presence of an ugly shanty town to remind them of their connection to the horrible plight of the disenfranchised African people.

Students have decided that the best means of struggle against the racist policies of United States and its institutions is in the form of education through forums, debates, speakers and films. With this in mind, in the past year, we have had numerous members of the African liberation movements as speakers, including representatives of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) the Black Conscious Movement, AZAPO, SWAPO and ANC.

The Regents, instead of addressing the real issues in South Africa, have become mired in the concept of "corporate responsibility" based on the Sullivan Principles. I do not know about you, but it seems to me the words "corporate" and "responsibility" contradict one another. Students realize the Sullivan Principles have been a rationalization for the continued profits that American corporations have reaped from the system of apartheid. And these are the same principles that the Regents have used to try and appease students through the piecemeal creation of the University Advisory Committee on Investor Responsibility.

The height of student protest came on the first anniversary of the day when 500 students occupied Murphy Hall, the university's administration building. On 23 April 1986, which marked the anniversary day, students not only decided to attack the University of California, but also the transnational corporations and the United States Government. We decided to occupy the Placement and Career Planning Center, which houses IBM, Hewlett Packard, the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and all the branches of the armed forces that have come to the military industrial complex of UCLA - a haven for recruitment. Shortly thereafter, with nearly 1,000 students surrounding the building, 24 students were arrested for trespassing and unlawful assembly, which later provoked a riot.

I would be amiss if I did not mention that, on 11 June, students participated in a programme that commemorated the tenth anniversary of the beginning of the 1976 Soweto uprisings in the light of the increased level of struggle going on in South Africa in recent weeks.

Finally, the Regents tactically scheduled meetings during our finals week of school. By so doing, they thought that that would keep students from coming out and protesting their involvement in South Africa. They were sadly mistaken and during the demonstration a 14-year old boy was arrested for assaulting a police officer.

We know that in the end, the white minority Government of South Africa will fall because apartheid, just like evil, cannot be reformed. It is the will of millions of African people to have the right to their own land and to self-determination. The struggle is inevitable, but the victory is certain.

N. Mr. Robert Pharr

(University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill), North Carolina)

In the spring of 1983, members of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) Public Interest Research Group succeeded in getting a referendum into the student elections calling for the University's divestment from companies doing business in South Africa. Of the 5,204 students who voted, 3,313 supported divestment. However, at a meeting held shortly

thereafter, the Board of Trustees rejected the students' demands, arguing that "the primary charge of the Endowment Trustees is to maximize risk-adjusted investment returns for the charitable purposes of the University community, and ... that divestment is not consistent with that responsibility". After this defeat, the divestment movement lay dormant until 1985 when a group of student leaders, mainly from black fraternities and sororities and the Black Student Movement, began meeting informally.

These students concluded that the anti-apartheid movement had been dead on the UNC campus because there was no structure to maintain it. They therefore formed the UNC Anti-Apartheid Support Group (AASG). The group drew up a list of demands, which they presented to the Board of Trustees and the Endowment Board on 22 October 1985 and which included, among other things:

(a) UNC-CH not making any new purchases of stocks or bonds in any corporation doing business in South Africa;

(b) Selling at least 51 per cent of stocks or bonds of corporations doing business in South Africa by 1988;

(c) Selling 100 per cent of stocks or bonds of corporations doing business in South Africa by 31 December 1989;

(d) Contacting all other universities in the University of North Carolina system with endowments of \$50 million or more to urge them to adopt similar investment policies;

(e) Forming a committee comprised of representatives from the Faculty Council, the Black Faculty Caucus, the Graduate and Professional Students Association, Student Government and the Board of Trustees to re-evaluate the university's investment policy.

On 14 November 1985, the Board once again rejected our demands, arguing that UNC only held stock in companies that adhered to the Sullivan Principles. They went on to explain that UNC could be a powerful force for change if it kept its stock in companies doing business in South Africa (i.e. constructive engagement). This decision by the Endowment Board actually proved to be a boon for AASG, which was by this time growing weaker and had lost much of the support it once had from black students. At the time, a controversy was raging concerning student input into the hiring and termination of university employees, therefore when the Endowment Board refused to change its position on divestment, students viewed this as yet another affront to their right to have input into the running of the university.

The faculty council responded to this decision by passing a resolution that called for the divestment of funds from companies that did direct and substantial business with the Government of South Africa. UNC-AASG immediately rejected this proposal because of its vagueness and the fact that very few of the companies in the UNC portfolio actually did direct business with the South African Government. Unfortunately for UNC-AASG, the Board of Trustees voted unanimously to accept this resolution. As a result, many people believed that the university had made considerable progress toward total divestment, while its investment portfolio remained virtually unchanged.



AASG recouped by engaging in an education campaign and a petition drive that culminated in another divestment referendum in February 1986. Seventy per cent of the students voting favoured divestment, but once again the Endowment Board refused to divest. AASG then decided that since it had gone through all the proper channels without any response by the Endowment Board, it was time to place more pressure on the Board by attracting popular attention to the campus. That is when the group decided to put up shanties.

Three shanties were placed on the lawn in front of the South Building - the university administrative building - on Tuesday, 18 March 1986. Campus police moved in immediately and instructed grounds keepers to remove the buildings. Later that day, however, the chancellor of the university met with members of AASG and the student body president and gave permission for the shanties to stay up. Opposition to the structures began almost immediately when members of the University of North Carolina College Republicans and the UNC chapter of Students for America wrote Chancellor Fordham accusing him of being indecisive and "accommodating destruction of state property". They then went on to accuse UNC-AASG of ignoring human rights atrocities in the Soviet Union, Poland, Ethiopia, Uganda, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Chile and other countries. To illustrate their point they placed a mock "Berlin Wall" behind the shanties on Monday, 31 March. At this point both sides were criticized heavily for taking away from the beauty of the campus and were instructed to remove all the structures by Monday, 7 April.

There were, however, some positive effects. The presence of the shanties forced the Endowment Board to hold an emergency meeting on 4 April, at which the authors of the faculty resolution said that they now supported total divestment. The Board then heard opposing viewpoints from members of AASG and the College Republicans and decided to delay its decision until after the term was over. This was of course seen as a stalling tactic by both groups.

After this meeting, the members of AASG decided it was imperative that more pressure be applied to the Endowment Board, therefore, a decision was made to protest the forced removal of the shanties. On the morning of 7 April, five students were arrested for trespassing when they refused to leave the shanties. The university did not press charges and the students were released later that day, but this action more than reached its goal. For the next few days a great amount of media attention was focused on the shanties and the divestment issue and support for divestment reached its highest level ever.

The Endowment Board met on 24 April and once again rejected total divestment. It still claimed that the best way to fight apartheid was to act as a progressive force within those companies that did business in South Africa. It also argued that by divesting UNC would lose \$750,000 a year on its endowment and \$350,000 in fees. It then announced six "new" investment policies. These were:

(a) The Board would not invest endowment funds in companies doing a majority of their business in South Africa;

(b) The Board would not invest in debt securities or stocks of companies loaning money to the Government of South Africa;

(c) The Board encouraged companies operating in South Africa to use employment practices that would improve the working conditions and lives of black South Africans;

(d) The Board urged firms operating in South Africa to work actively to abolish apartheid;

(e) The Board would withdraw from companies operating in South Africa if the companies' presence did more to strengthen apartheid than weaken it;

(f) The Board would dispose of stock in companies dealing in South Africa if repeated efforts to bring about changes proved futile.

It is clear that UNC AASG made a great many mistakes. We had little communication with the faculty (e.g., the unacceptable faculty resolution). We were at times fairly isolated from other progressive movements on campus, a case in point being the push to terminate the contract of the university's food service because of its unfair employment practices. Although many members of AASG supported this effort, our organization never endorsed it or offered any real support. This was especially unfortunate because the great majority of the food service's employees were poor or working-class black women.

Our organization was also plagued by racism and sexism. Within a year it changed from a group dominated by blacks to one whose "leadership" was for the most part male and whose membership was mainly white. All of these problems were of course exacerbated by the mental and physical strain of maintaining the shanties.

Despite these problems, the group was able to make some impressive gains. We effectively politicized a campus that is not known for its radicalism. We educated thousands of students, faculty, staff, et al. about divestment and apartheid. And, notably, we challenged the idea that UNC students should not take an active interest in the situation of the world and the administration of their university.

O. Mr. Christopher Phelps  
(Reed College, Oregon)

I am honoured to have the opportunity to testify before you today, at a time when discussion of how to achieve economic disengagement from apartheid most rapidly and completely is particularly appropriate.

I am a junior at Reed College where I have been a member of the South African Concerns Committee (SACC) since its inception in January 1985. Today I am speaking only as a member and not as a representative or delegate of the group.

Reed is a small, private, undergraduate liberal arts college in Portland, Oregon. Divestment was the principle political issue on campus in 1985, resulting in a number of struggles and debates. The vast majority of students favour divestment. The faculty members, with a few notable exceptions, have tried to side-step involvement in the issue, and the administration and Board of Trustees were usually unresponsive and sometimes duplicitous in responding to our concerns. The most significant moment in Reed's anti-apartheid history was the occupation of Eliot Hall, the principal administration building, by 100 students last January. Lasting five days, the occupation stopped all business activities, forced the relocation of classes, and resulted in a slightly greater role in the institutional power structure for students. I have appended a brief written history that could explain our actions more thoroughly. I will focus my oral testimony on what I believe to be the most significant and positive implications of anti-apartheid activism at Reed.

Although we have not achieved our primary goal - divestment, we have made some progress in that direction. Student activism has forced the school to adopt the Sullivan Principles as criteria for investment, an inadequate but positive response. Furthermore, the occupation resulted in the first Trustee-Student Committee in the college's history. Although we are skeptical about its possibilities, it does provide us with a forum for demanding divestment and student representation on the Board.

We have also been very successful in raising consciousness, involvement and action against apartheid, both inside and outside the Reed community. Our educational and cultural campaigns have made every Reedie aware of the connections between our endowment and the apartheid brutality, and our protests have been well-attended. Effective dissemination of information to the media during the occupation and other actions have resulted in widespread and favourable television and newspaper coverage. More importantly, an unexpectedly large number of students - a tenth of the student population - were occupants, and almost twice as many more served in our outside support group. The vast majority of these people were not members of SACC and had never before participated in a political action, let alone an act of civil disobedience. The shared experience of six tense days of close-quartered, sleepless pressure created bonds even among former strangers and gave us faith in working through consensus.

SACC has worked to place itself within a larger context of social justice, both in ideology and in practice. Sensitive to acculturated forms of domestic oppression, we have taken measures to combat sexism and racism by ensuring equal sharing of group responsibilities and power. We make decisions through a non-hierarchical process: each decision must be satisfactory to all. We have also questioned the relationship of the racial composition of the institution with current investment practices. A crisis over black studies in the early 1970s left Reed the shameful legacy of a curriculum almost exclusively limited to white, Western, male humanism, an all-white Board of Trustees, and a largely white faculty and student body (less than 1 per cent of Reedies are black). These are obviously charged issues, and we have tried to discuss them without making counter-productive accusations. We also seek to illuminate relationships between international issues, such as the irony of an American foreign policy that boycotts Nicaragua while investing in apartheid. Our members have protested American military intervention in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Central America.

Late in the semester, 14 students, myself included, from Reed, Lewis and Clark College and Portland State University were arrested in a direct action against an IBM retail store in downtown Portland, while hundreds of anti-apartheid demonstrators marched outside the store. I find this development perhaps the most encouraging of all. Co-operation among students from different schools is somewhat problematic but is also empowering and effective. Perhaps this will be the new evolution in the student movement, a co-operative endeavor to focus directly on the corporations and individual capitalists who persist in apologizing for and profiting from South African oppression.

### Appendix

#### A history of anti-apartheid action at Reed

When consciousness of Reed's ties to apartheid emerged in the winter of 1985, SACC was formed with the goal of achieving full divestment. Almost immediately, the Student Caucus and the Community Senate (comprised of faculty and students) unanimously approved resolutions in favour of divestment, and two thirds of the student body signed a petition for full divestment. Two successive student-body presidents, three successive editorial boards of the student-body newspaper and even the normally apolitical dormitory advisors have called for divestment by the Board of Trustees. SACC members presented community opinion and appeals for divestment to the Trustees at their May and October meetings. The Trustees deferred decision until their January 1986 meeting.

In conjunction with nation-wide student protests on 11 October, over 250 students joined in to encircle completely the main administration building, Eliot Hall. Three weeks later, 17 students, none of them members of SACC, occupied President Paul Bragdon's office for a weekend, calling for full divestment. Their demands were not met, but they left on Sunday evening to join a widely attended gathering of students in the Student Union, where students expressed concern over failed communication. The students decided to draft a statement clearly articulating the rationale for divestment. SACC, now 40 members stronger, within three weeks had written this statement and compiled an 80-page briefing book outlining the case for divestment, leaving the Trustees a month to contemplate the document before their January 1986 meeting.

Faculty response was mainly discouraging. After the fall occupation, four faculty members initiated an honour case, somewhat equivalent to criminal prosecution in the Reed judicial process, on the grounds that the occupation had violated academic freedom. The case was dismissed. Faculty debates have resulted in heated arguments and two defeated resolutions for divestment. However, a poll of the faculty conducted by the Dean of Students and another professor indicated overwhelming support for divestment. The professors apparently believed it was inappropriate for the faculty, as a corporate body, to take "political" stands. Of course, by voting against divestment (rather than abstaining) they have taken a political stand which has been exploited by the administration. So we are left with a faculty that favours divestment but, with a few notable exceptions, will not voice its support.

Returning from winter vacation, members of SACC initiated actions in anticipation of the 25 January meeting of the Board on campus. On Monday, 20 January, the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., nine students began a fast that lasted six days. As the Trustees walked into their first luncheon, 250 students, faculty and staff gathered in a silent protest to register symbolically that "enough has been said". The next morning, a group of 14 students representing a broad range of student organizations read a collective statement to the assembled Board, calling once again for full divestment. The Board then went back into closed session. In the Student Union, students gathered at a divestment rally and then marched, chanting "divest now", to a building where President Paul Bragdon was expected to read the Trustees' decision.

The President announced, predictably, that the Trustees had opted for the Sullivan Principles. This decision, which gave no answer to the criticisms of the Sullivan Principles raised by SACC, was seen as an inadequate answer to a year of lobbying "within the system". In immediate response, over 100 students - one-tenth of the student body - joined SACC in the occupation of Eliot Hall, calling for complete divestment.

The occupation stretched over six days, during which time we were tense and almost completely sleepless. All of our many and frequent decisions were arrived at only through consensus. The occupation shut down all principle administrative functions, such as financial aid, all business offices, and presidency, the deans, the provost and job placement, but allowed access of professors and students to computing facilities. The administration delayed beginning negotiations until Monday, when SACC decided to relocate classes that were scheduled to be held in Eliot Hall. We were heartened by statements of support from around the nation. We left the building on Wednesday, 29 January, with an agreement for establishing a committee of six trustees and six students - the first Trustee-Student Committee in Reed's history - to investigate divestment and other student concerns and make recommendations accordingly to the Board. Retrospectively, many of us are unhappy that we did not achieve a stronger agreement, and regret that the occupation was not extended. However, we had reasons for accepting the compromise, primarily due to the great pressure we were under as the Reed community became increasingly irritated and as our nerves frayed.

Since the occupation, SACC has had some difficulty in maintaining coherence and energy, although I do not want to paint too gloomy a picture. We mainly worked on educational and cultural projects, bringing films and readings to campus. The Trustee-Student Committee has met twice and our representatives reported some progress. There has not been a Trustee meeting, so there has not been an opportunity for protest. The post-occupation reaction has been mixed, but it was not an extremely popular action. A case brought against us under the honour system resulted in a decision against us, although that decision is currently being appealed. However, on 11 March, once again in conjunction with nation-wide action, a group of 14 students from Reed, Portland State University and Lewis and Clark College, were arrested in a sit-in at an IBM retail outlet in downtown Portland. During the arrest, hundreds of local anti-apartheid activists (from our schools and elsewhere) marched and chanted outside the building.

The emphasis of SACC next year will once again be on achieving full divestment, but we do not tie our evaluation of success or failure to the attainment of that goal. Although we are obviously committed to divestment, we are more interested in building long-term and broad-based coalitions for peace and justice. The strategies and tactics we employ to attempt to force divestment will obviously be tempered by our experience over the last year, and we will obviously be watching the Trustee-Student Committee very closely.

P. Mr. Dale Robertson  
(University of Texas, Austin, Texas)

The past semester, spring 1986, revealed a heightened sense of awareness amongst the student body at the University of Texas at Austin. Eyes opened wide and minds jerked from textbook mesmerization and students took a stance on the issues pertaining to our country's reprehensible role in Central America and its deplorable "constructive engagement" of the abhorrent racist ideology-based apartheid system of South Africa. The Reagan Administration's overt and covert actions in Nicaragua sparked numerous debates. Many likened the climate for debate to those days of the Vietnam era.

However, South Africa's despicable system of apartheid, which rules inequality and holds one man superior to another on the basis of the color of his skin, turned an apathetic or unawakened majority into a minority at the University of Texas. Many reasons can be given for this turnabout. Two of those reasons are:

(a) The re-emergence of the Africans' struggle for freedom as "news", therefore the media is being a bit more informative concerning South Africa;

(b) The work of groups on campus such as the Steve Biko Committee and the Black Student Alliance in disseminating information on South Africa and calling for the University of Texas to divest its funds from companies doing business there.

The latter has had the most significant effect as far as generating support and mobilizing masses to joint action. Before the drive toward divestment began, the fact that the University of Texas had \$772.6 million invested in South Africa was not widely known. So in calling for divestment, the Steve Biko Committee and the Black Student Alliance not only got the issue on the University's agenda but also on the minds of the students as well as the faculty.

"No more blood money", "U-T out of South Africa", "divest now" - these chants resounded on the west mall, the campus' frequent rally site.

Unimpeded by the reluctance of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas system to divest as proposed by the Steve Biko Committee and the Black Student Alliance in November 1984 and again in October 1985, the campus anti-apartheid movement has had a welcomed increase of the rank and file. The consequences have been a more extensive network or organization on the one hand and blatant psychological and physical assaults directed at the leaders of the movement on the other.

Community involvement has been and continues to be an integral part of the push for divestment. It contributes by organizing boycotts and picket lines at those companies that have subsidiaries in South Africa. Campus groups hold forums and teach-ins, disseminate information and support each other in the struggle for the total eradication of apartheid.

Black student leaders have been subjected to numerous death threats. Randy Bowman, former President of the Black Student Alliance, was ambushed and assaulted on his way home one evening. In another incident, a man bearing a gun stopped Randy, put the gun to his head and pulled the trigger. The gun did not fire. Without condemning the attacks publicly, the administration provided Randy and the then Steve Bike Committee Chairman, Darrick Eugene, also a recipient of death threats, with an on-campus dorm room. For security reasons, the room and its occupants were not disclosed. Nonetheless, one afternoon as Randy sat in his eighth floor room, two men wearing Ronald Reagan masks broke in and attempted to push him out the window. Again the University of Texas administration took no stance in publicly condemning these attacks, instead the validity of Randy's complaint was questioned. Undaunted by these attacks, the push for divestment and a racially proportionate campus continues.

Approximately 47,000 students attend the University of Texas at Austin. Three per cent, or 1,600, are black. Black students are recruited but feeble attempts are made at retaining and graduating them. Insensitivity to the needs of black students is a sizable part of the problem. Furthermore, we are constantly exposed to statues and buildings on campus that pay homage to persons who predicated their action or inaction on a racist ideology. Along with this, we are keenly aware of the University's investments in companies that do business in South Africa; by virtue of this relationship, the University supports and benefits from the racist policy of apartheid.

Condemnation of the University of Texas for its investments in South Africa by means of protests and demonstrations culminated this year in mass arrests made by the University's Police Department. Two hundred and twenty-four arrests were made. For three consecutive Fridays in April a wave of emotion swept the campus. The first week of April was designated "anti-apartheid week" by the Steve Biko Committee, which was permitted to construct a shanty on the west mall. That action's effect was phenomenal. Students held nightly vigils in the shanty. The vigils, aside from providing security, served to inform passers-by of the atrocities of apartheid. Other student groups also requested permission to erect a shanty, but were denied - a tactic employed by the University to minimize the already overwhelming effect of one shanty. The next Friday a group of students organized and built a shanty on the west mall without a permit. This action resulted in the arrests of 42 persons. More arrests occurred as students staged another "spontaneous rally". One hundred and eighty-two were arrested. The third Friday (25 April) no arrests were made. Throughout the "spontaneous rallies" three demands were reiterated:

- (a) An end to the University's investments in companies that do business in South Africa.
- (b) Disallowing companies that do business in South Africa to recruit on campus.
- (c) Opening the entire campus to free speech at any time.

No action was taken on the first two demands. The third is being reviewed by a committee appointed by the President of the University. In fact the last demand has been a point taken by some to claim that the mass arrests had nothing to do with the issue of divestment, instead it was a free speech issue. The media coverage of these events also tows this line.

Despite the lack of willful action on the part of the Board of Regents, the United States public at-large and the Reagan Administration to do what they can to facilitate an end to apartheid, the Steve Biko Committee and Black Student Alliance know that apartheid will fall. We simply recognize that this inaction is a manifestation of racism deeply rooted in the United States socio-politico economic system. Beyond divestment we know that the struggle will continue here as well as there.

The Steve Biko Committee's programme of action is as follows:

(a) To disseminate information and educate the University community about the apartheid system in South Africa;

(b) To struggle for the divestment of all University of Texas permanent university funds invested in United States companies with South African subsidiaries;

(c) To oppose the University's expansion into Blacklands in the East Austin community;

(d) To call for recruitment and retention of black students and professors at the University;

(e) To support programmes of Black organizations in East Austin and the University community;

(f) To support the struggles of black University workers;

(g) To demand the establishment of a black cultural centre that would benefit all students;

(h) To oppose white supremacy, sexism and national oppression;

(i) To support the freedom of all political prisoners in South Africa and the elimination of apartheid by any means necessary;

(j) To support the world-wide liberation for Africans and all oppressed people.

Q. Miss Debbie Stachel  
(Boston University, Massachusetts)

Anti-apartheid and divestment campaigns at schools in the Boston area have had a fairly similar history of tactics, including the construction of shanty towns at Tufts, Harvard, Wellesley, Boston University (BU), Brandeis, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), and other schools. There have also been less direct forms of action, such as protest rallies, marches,



letter writing campaigns to trustees, educational programmes on the issues and benefit concerts to raise material aid. The BU Southern Africa Task Force's "Fest for a Free Southern Africa and a Better Educated Boston" raised over \$300, which is being divided and sent to a Boston area reading project, the ANC sponsored Solomon Mahlangu Freedom College in the United Republic of Tanzania, and SWAPO refugee schools. We also collected almost 5,000 books and 21 large boxes of clothes to send to the Freedom College.

Although student protest actions on different campuses have followed similar tactics, administrative reaction has varied widely: for example, the differing reactions of the BU and Harvard University administrations. The BU policy toward direct action activism has been to crack down harshly and swiftly, whereas Harvard seems to have tried to tolerate and ignore student protest. Students at both BU and Harvard constructed shanty towns. At Harvard, the shanties built on 14 April were allowed to remain undisturbed through commencement until 9 June, after which students voluntarily removed the shanties. Many students lived in the shanties through the spring, and several professors even held classes there to represent the ideal of the "open university".

In contrast to Harvard's benign policy towards protestors is the harsh, repressive policy of BU. The first shanty, erected on 10 October 1985 as a rallying point for the nation-wide actions on the following day, was stormed by the campus police led by the Dean of Students and the Director of Security. While building and grounds workers tore down the shanty, campus police photographed the protesters. After the tearing down of the shanty town, students proceeded to President John Silber's office, and slept on the sidewalk to continue their protest (a tactic used many times the preceding spring). This happened hours after ANC had been barred from speaking at a University forum on the "Future of South Africa". At 7 a.m. on the morning of 11 October, the protestors were awakened by the administration, including the Dean of Students, campus police, and building and grounds workers, who were instructed to wash off the sidewalks with hoses (again, a tactic used continually the preceding year).

The second shanty at BU was planned for 24 April. Construction was never completed. Fifteen minutes after students started building, building and grounds workers were again called in by the police and the administration, who had been at the site in front of the student union before we even began to build. Eleven students were arrested as a result of this action: some for refusing to leave the shanty town, others for blocking the police cars taking the students to jail. The administration also took disciplinary action against those arrested: three were put on probation and six were suspended for a semester, and two graduating seniors had their degrees withheld until January 1987. Appeals and legal proceeding will resume in the fall.

The harshness of the university's response to activism has led to a solidification of protest by the entire university community. A support rally calling for the university to drop all charges against the arrested students was held on 29 April. Another support rally was called by the Clerical Workers Union, District 65, on 9 May, which culminated in a march to President John Silber's office to present their demand that the charges be dropped.

An earlier action this spring had the same effect of solidifying campus support. Over a two-week period beginning on 27 March, 21 students participated in a hunger strike to protest the university's investments in companies doing business in South Africa. The hunger strike served as a lead-in to a rally held on 4 April, the national day of protest against apartheid. Following this action, the campus ministry organized a three-hour meeting to discuss anti-apartheid strategies, and also called for a day of university-wide fasting.

The most marked aspect of the response of BU to the anti-apartheid movement has been the administration's lack of respect for student rights. Activists are constantly harassed by the police, who photograph and videotape all events, a practice that has discouraged many students from becoming involved in the anti-apartheid movement. Although the police say these photographs are destroyed if no disruption occurs, we have also been informed that they are used for police training films. In an ironic way, this continual repression of activism has helped to strengthen commitment within the anti-apartheid movement at BU, for it serves as a daily reminder of the oppressive conditions under which people struggle for freedom in South Africa.

R. Miss Jane Ungerman  
(Univeristy of Kansas, Kansas)

On behalf of the Kansas University Committee on South Africa (KUSA) and the Progressive Student Network, I would like to express our solidarity with all forces working for the freedom of the oppressed people of South Africa. We extend our support to the black trade union movement, the draft resistance movement, the ANC, PAC and all others.

KUSA was formed in 1978 and has had divestment as its goal from the beginning. The Committee has done extensive research on South Africa and its corporate ties to Kansas University (KU), sponsored speakers and films and held demonstrations.

Education about apartheid and the KU involvement has been an ongoing activity of KUSA, and in the spring of 1985, efforts greatly increased. The upsurge in protests were fueled not only by an increase in national activity, but more by frustration with university administration, specifically Chancellor Gene Budig, and the KU Endowment Association. Every governing body at KU has passed a resolution calling for divestment but the Chancellor refuses to ask the Endowment Association to divest or to hold discussions with groups that are concerned about this important issue. As a private corporation, the Endowment Association has shown in words and actions that it only has to do what serves the company's interests, and not act upon the wishes of the university community that it was created to serve. Since April 1985, there have been an eight-day sit-in at the administration building, 69 arrests, demonstrations and a three-week camp-in on the grounds of the Endowment Association.

What all of this has done is raise awareness of the situation in South Africa and the participation of KU in apartheid. Many people have become dissatisfied with the Endowment Association after seeing the arrogant manner in which it has ignored the desire for divestment on campus. Many young alumnae have been educated and will hopefully withhold contributions. The administration and the Endowment Association have been confronted with their support of apartheid and are being held accountable. We are told they "only have a few million dollars invested in South Africa", and our reply is that the funds should be easy to divest in that case. The concept of social responsibility has been reintroduced on campus.

Throughout the divestment struggle, some interesting parallels have emerged between the South African Government and the KU administration and Endowment Association:

(a) They are all very public-image conscious. After people had camped on their grounds for three weeks in March 1986, the Endowment Association announced that it had a long-term policy of investing in corporations abiding by the Sullivan Principles. The announcement appeared in an editorial in the local newspaper. The column was written by the managing editor who is a member of the Executive Committee of the Endowment Association. When the Endowment Association President was pressed to tell when the change in policy had occurred, he said, "Oh, well, maybe it was three or four years ago". They have refused to provide any documentation and when contacted by a national investment monitoring group in December 1985, they told the group that there had been no policy change. Any past change seems unlikely.

(b) Prosecution rather than negotiation with protesters. Even six years ago, the university would not have prosecuted those committing acts of non-violent civil disobedience. Today, it prosecutes all who are arrested and has considered suspending some from school. In addition, there is also the possibility of spending time in gaol. Some students have found copies of newspaper articles that tell of their arrest in their financial aid folder. One student in this situation was denied an extension on her loan and was unable to go back to school the following semester. There have been no acts of violence or property destruction by any protesters.

These are two of the most important parallels that can be drawn.

Perhaps one of the Committee's biggest accomplishments has been to maintain consistently a free South Africa movement over the past eight years, no matter how small the effort has been at times. We will continue to hold the university and its Endowment Association responsible for its support of institutionalized racism in South Africa.

Lastly, I would like to thank all of you for holding this hearing. It is very heartening to know that the United Nations realizes the student movement is a serious force for social change and is interested in what we have to say.

S. Mr. Lamoin Werlein-Jaen  
(University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin)

Recent developments in the struggle in South Africa have spurred the largest upsurge in the student movement since the 1960s. Using a variety of means, students at many universities have expressed their solidarity with the people of South Africa. At the University of Wisconsin, the student movement has focused on the passage of a bill that would divest the state's pension funds from companies doing business in South Africa.

With the exception of a few progressive individuals, the state legislature largely ignored the issue of apartheid until the spring of 1985 when 400 students occupied the state capital for two weeks. By taking direct action, students were able to force the legislature to confront its compliance with apartheid.

In order to save face and to defuse student militancy, the liberal establishment in the state legislature took a course of action that sought to co-opt the student movement.

Several factors contributed to this process. To begin with, students were not politically prepared to work within the legislative arena. Another factor contributing to the process of co-optation was the frustration the students felt with the slow pace of progress. Throughout the year endless committee hearings were held, in which the divestment bill was made progressively ineffectual and many students felt their energies waning in the face of bureaucratic struggles. In fact, the legislative session ended without the bill being voted on. Interested parties will now have to wait until fall 1986 before the bill can be reintroduced.

Going into this spring's actions many students began to think about redefining the parameters of the campaign for divestment. It was decided to draw attention once again, in a dramatic manner, to the issue of divestment by organizing more demonstrations and other acts of protest.

This spring's developments began on 4 April with a teach-in at the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus and a march to the state capital. Approximately 400 people attended the teach-in, which covered the history of apartheid, the situation in Angola and the Reagan Administration's support for UNITA, the situation of native Americans in northern Wisconsin, and racism in the city of Madison and at the University. Activists then marched to the state capital and erected a shanty town on the capital lawn. Police officers tore down the shanty town that evening.

In response, approximately 200 students and community activists returned the next day and re-erected the shanty town. That night 70 police officers, backed by approximately 30 other officers in riot gear, began tearing down the structure. The ensuing confrontation lasted two hours, and resulted in 18 arrests and 1 injury.

During the next three days crowds gathered. Periodic confrontation erupted, and five more people were arrested. This time between 150-300 people were involved in the protests. Finally, on 10 April, 1,000 students marched to the state capital and re-built the shanty town for a third time. The Governor reportedly placed the National Guard on alert and sent close to 100 police officers to destroy it once again. People's energies were largely spent by then and little resistance was offered. There were, however, 3 more arrests, bringing the total to 26.

Recently, on Monday, 16 June, 400 community and campus activists rallied to commemorate the Soweto uprising and pressed again for the passage of the State's divestiture bill. The event featured speeches on various related topics, South African poetry and music and hopefully it rekindled the energies of those present.

In analyzing the student anti-apartheid movement some weaknesses have come to light.

One of the major problems has been a lack of communication and joint action with blacks and other minorities. There are several possible reasons for this. First, the student movement has done little to include minorities in all phases of organizing. As someone once said, "You cannot build a house and invite others to come live in it equally with you, you must invite others to build the house". Another factor contributing to this division may be the vulnerability minorities have in white institutions. Cultural and class differences also come into play since it is unlikely that political alliances will be forged when no other contacts exist.

Another important problem has been the lack of organization. The student anti-apartheid movement has been unable to build a lasting organization to connect with and build into the various actions that have taken place.

Sexism within the movement is a third major problem. Many people feel it is not unusual for women to play an important role in the routine work, but that they are excluded when it comes to important decision-making processes. Many decisions end up being made by those at the head of the crowd, rather than through thoughtful discussion. In this day and age, the issue of sexism should not be prone to avoidance.

In conclusion, we feel optimistic that we will reach our goals and do our small part in aiding the struggle for freedom in South Africa. We are on our way towards making alliances with students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds, towards organizing a more tenacious movement free of sexism, and ultimately towards the divestment of Wisconsin's monies from companies inextricably entwined with the white South African Government.

**Annex I**

**DIVESTMENT ACTIONS ON SOUTH AFRICA  
BY US COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

Amount			Amount		
School	Affected	Year	School	Affected	Year
0 Amherst College.....	38,000,000	1978-86	0 Northeastern University.....	7,000,000	1985*
0 Antioch College.....	NA	1978	0 Northeastern University.....	14,000,000	1986*
0 Arizona State University.....	3,100,000	1985*	0 Northwestern University.....	3,500,000	1986*
0 Bernard College.....	945,000	1985*	0 North Carolina, University of.....	1,500,000	1985
0 Bates College.....	5,000,000	1986*	0 Notre Dame.....	10,000,000	1985*
0 Boston University (1st).....	6,600,000	1979	0 Oberlin College.....	NA	1980
0 Boston University (2nd).....	195,480	1985	0 Ohio State University (1st).....	250,000	1978-79
0 Bowdoin College.....	1,800,000	1985	0 Ohio State University (2nd).....	10,800,000	1985*
0 Brandeis University.....	350,000	1979	0 Ohio University.....	60,000	1978
0 Brown University.....	4,600,000	1984	0 Ohio Wesleyan University.....	850,000	1985
0 Bryn Mawr.....	700,000	1986*	0 Pace University.....	40,000	1986*
0 California State University.....	2,300,000	1985*	0 Pennsylvania, University of.....	800,000	1983
(Northridge)			0 Penn State University.....	600,000	1978-86
0 California, University of.....	12,300,000	1986*	0 Pittsburgh, University of.....	7,500,000	1986*
0 California, Univ of (2nd).....	3,100,000	1986*	0 Rhode Island, Univ. of, Foundation.....	868,000	1985*
0 Carleton College.....	295,000	1979	0 Rollins College.....	415,887	1985
0 Central College.....	210,000	1985*	0 Rutgers University (1st).....	NA	1980
0 City Univ. of New York.....	10,000,000	1984	0 Rutgers University (2nd).....	7,000,000	1985
0 Claremont College.....	4,000,000	1986*	0 Rutgers University (3rd).....	7,500,000	1985*
0 Clark University.....	5,000,000	1986*	0 St Augustines College.....	NA	1985
0 Colby College (1st).....	2,600,000	1980-84	0 San Francisco, University of.....	2,300,000	1985*
0 Colby College (2nd).....	6,500,000	1985*	0 Sarah Lawrence College.....	650,000	1985*
0 Colgate University.....	867,940	1979-85	0 Seattle University.....	2,500,000	1986*
0 Columbia University (1st).....	2,700,000	1979	0 Smith College (1st).....	697,728	1977
0 Columbia University (2nd).....	39,000,000	1985*	0 Smith College (2nd).....	550,000	1986*
0 Connecticut College.....	6,000,000	1986*	0 Spellman College.....	1,000,000	1986*
0 Connecticut, University of.....	217,000	1986*	0 Swarthmore College (1st).....	3,000,000	1981-85
0 Dartmouth College.....	2,000,000	1985	0 Swarthmore College (2nd).....	2,100,000	1986*
0 Delta College.....	NA	1985*	0 Teachers College.....	5,000,000	1985*
0 Drew University.....	50,000	1979-85	0 Temple University (1st).....	534,000	1985*
0 Duke University.....	12,500,000	1985*	0 Temple University (2nd).....	1,960,000	1985*
0 Earlham College.....	600,000	1984	0 Tennessee, University of.....	575,000	1985
0 Evergreen State College.....	NA	1985	0 Trinity College.....	800,000	1985*
0 Fairfield University.....	4,000,000	1985*	0 Tufts University.....	100,000	1979
0 Florida State University.....	2,000,000	1985	0 Virginia, University of.....	400,000	1986*
0 Franklin and Marshall College.....	1,000,000	1985*	0 Union Theological Seminary (1st).....	4,000,000	1980
0 Georgia Tech University.....	500,000	1985*	0 Union Theological Seminary (2nd).....	2,603,537	1985
0 Grinnell College.....	9,000,000	1985*	0 Union Theological Seminary (3rd).....	1,503,145	1985*
0 Hampshire College.....	40,000	1977	0 Vermont, University of.....	2,100,000	1985*
0 Hartford Seminary.....	5,000,000	1985*	0 Vassar College.....	6,500,000	1978
0 Harvard University (1st).....	50,900,000	1981	0 Washington, University of (1st).....	800,000	1985
0 Harvard University (2nd).....	1,000,000	1985	0 Washington, University of (2nd).....	4,500,000	1986*
0 Harvard University (3rd).....	2,800,000	1985*	0 Wayne State University.....	NA	1984
0 Haverford College.....	NA	1982	0 Wellesley College.....	2,900,000	1986*
0 Hebrew Union Theological Seminary.....	NA	1986*	0 Western Washington University.....	NA	1985
0 Hobart and William Smith Colleges.....	650,000	1985*	0 Wesleyan University (1st).....	367,000	1980
0 Holy Cross.....	NA	1985	0 Wesleyan University (2nd).....	750,000	1985*
0 Howard University.....	8,000,000	1978	0 Whitman College.....	190,000	1984
0 Indiana, University of.....	543,000	1978-86	0 Willamette University.....	38,000	1979
0 Iowa, University of.....	2,500,000	1985*	0 Williams College (1st).....	700,000	1980
0 Iowa State University (1st).....	130,000	1985*	0 Williams College (2nd).....	672,000	1983
0 Iowa State University (2nd).....	120,000	1985*	0 Wisconsin, University of.....	11,000,000	1978
0 Kentucky, University of.....	1,500,000	1985*	0 Wyoming, University of.....	1,400,000	1986*
0 Knox College.....	400,000	1979-85	0 Yale University (1st).....	1,600,000	1979
0 Lake Forest College.....	200,000	1985	0 Yale University (2nd).....	4,100,000	1984
0 Lawrence University.....	52,500	1979-85			
0 Louisville Presb Theol Seminary.....	NA	1983			
0 Louisville, University of.....	9,000,000	1985*			
0 Lutheran School of Theology.....	NA	1981			
0 Maine, University of.....	3,000,000	1982			
0 Massachusetts, University of.....	600,000	1977			
0 Miami, University of.....	17,000,000	1985*			
0 Mills College.....	1,000,000	1984			
0 Missouri, University of.....	5,000,000	1985*			
0 Minnesota, University of.....	35,000,000	1985*			
0 Minnesota, Univ. of, Foundation.....	5,000,000	1986*			
0 Eastern Michigan University.....	2,500,000	1980			
0 Michigan State University.....	7,200,000	1979-80			
0 Michigan, University of (1st).....	306,117	1979			
0 Michigan, University of (2nd).....	35,400,000	1984			
0 Michigan, University of (3rd).....	5,800,000	1985			
0 Middlebury College.....	1,500,000	1986*			
0 Western Michigan University.....	200,000	1983			
0 Mount Holyoke College (1st).....	459,000	1981			
0 Mount Holyoke College (2nd).....	14,480,487	1985*			
0 New Brunswick Theological Seminary.....	NA	1981			
0 New Hampshire, University of.....	400,000	1985*			
0 New Hampshire, Univ of (2nd).....	5,000,000	1986*			
0 New York, State University of.....	4,000,000	1985*			
0 New York, State University of.....	11,000,000	1985*			
0 New York, State University of.....	80,000	1978			
(Oneonta)					
0 New York, State University of.....	80,000	1985			
(Stonybrook Foundation)					

  

Actions 1977 through mid-August 1986				
Overall Total	111 Schools	3,664,160,821		
Total Divestment	47 Schools	3,359,493,487		
Partial Divestment	64 Schools	304,667,334		

  

*Actions April 1985 through mid-August 1986				
Overall Total	57 Schools	3,424,507,632		
Total Divestment	32 Schools	3,308,904,487		
Partial Divestment	25 Schools	115,603,145		

(Note: U. of California, Iowa State, Northeastern, SUNY and Temple took partial and then total divestment since April 1985.)

  

**Canada**

0 McGill University.....	33,000,000	1985*
--------------------------	------------	-------

  

**Student Actions**

0 California, Univ. of, Berkeley..	4,000,000	1979
(Associate Students)		
0 California, Univ. of, L.A.....	25,000,000	1980
(Associated Students)		
0 New York Univ. Law School.....	11,000,000	1978
(Student Bar Assn.)		

0 Total Divestment 0 Partial Divestment \* Since April 1985  
NB. \$ figure is for amount effected, as in some cases divestment has not yet been completed.

# SHANTYTOWN PROTESTS

AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA/BERKELEY  
March 31-April 3, 1986



# The Washington Post

© 1986, The Washington Post Company

SATURDAY, JULY 19, 1986

F

## California Regents Vote To Divest \$3.1 Billion In South Africa Holdings

By Jay Mathews  
Washington Post Staff Writer

LOS ANGELES, July 18—in a major victory for the national anti-apartheid movement, the Board of Regents of the University of California, the largest university system in the country, agreed today to begin divestiture of \$3.1 billion in South African-related investments.

The announcement of the 13-to-9 vote, piped through loudspeakers, sparked cheers and applause from anti-apartheid students and faculty waiting outside the Santa Cruz, Calif., meeting room. With by far the largest block of South Africa-connected holdings of any American university, the decision by the nine-campus complex increased the amount of educational divestments by more than 500 percent.

"This answers the argument we are hearing that it is too difficult to divest large sums of money," said Joshua Nessen, national student coordinator for the American Committee on Africa. He said the California decision should inspire further efforts to force divestiture by large universities, such as Georgetown and Maryland, where demonstrators have called for selling all South Africa-connected holdings to pressure Pretoria to grant majority rule to blacks.

The California university vote, following a three-hour discussion, appeared strongly influenced by the decision of Gov. George Deukmejian (R) to abandon his opposition to full divestiture. The regents agreed to give companies that had not recently increased their South African activities a one-year grace period to cut off ties to the minority white-ruled nation. University pension fund and endowment investments in companies that maintained South African ties after that would be sold within three years.

Deukmejian told the regents that their decision last year to divest only stock in companies that failed to meet certain civil rights standards in South Africa had given Pretoria a "strong, clear signal." To cheers from the crowd outside, Deukmejian concluded that "since conditions have changed in South Africa, it is appropriate to change our policies."

Deukmejian, a Republican who is seeking reelection, announced his change in position in a letter to the regents. It was made public two days before Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley, the Democratic gubernatorial nominee, was to appear before the regents. Bradley is a strong supporter of divestiture.

Some regents said they fear being sued if the divestment loses money for the university. Deukmejian promised to introduce legislation to protect them from such suits, and the regents voted to divest only if the legislation is enacted. Some regents argued that investments in a country in such turmoil is not good business practice.

According to anti-apartheid movement organizations, 109 other schools have voted to divest \$558 million. After California, the largest holder of South Africa-related investments is the University of Texas, with \$700 million. A California official estimated divestment would cost about \$118 million.

-----