

Those of us who do not agree with the Board's resolution may well believe that it has chosen to endorse a relatively ineffective course of anti-apartheid action as a result of conformist pressures within the ASA.

Yours sincerely,

Richard L. Sklar
Professor of Political Science
UCLA

UC INVESTMENT AND UC AFRICANISTS (continued)

Dear Sirs,

The University of California Investment Policy in South Africa statement that the Committee of UC Africanists prepared for the UC Board of Regents, and which you published as an editorial position in the *ASA News* (July/Sept. 1985), is very disappointing in its content. Events are far and away in advance of the committee's position. Its members used as their guidelines the Sullivan Principles, among other investment policies, but even Rev. Sullivan has advanced his earlier position, having given a deadline for the dismantling of apartheid, and failing that he is prepared to support full divestiture.

What would have been more useful than an expounding on Sullivan and the American Chamber of Commerce would have been a measured account of how the University of California (and more importantly its Africanists) can, in these scholars' own words, "safeguard against complicity with racism [by being] responsive to black South African opinion in the pursuit of its investment policy".

The neighboring African states and the recently formed Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) have stated their willingness to see divestiture used to bring about a collapse of the apartheid economy in order to force the whites to abandon apartheid and transfer political power to the majority. The Durban-based Institute for Black Research found in a survey taken this past summer that almost 75% of the blacks support disinvestment. Around the same time, the Markin poll that almost 80% of the black South Africans favor sanctions.

These are not new revelations. Earlier polls indicated similar opinions. Over 20 years ago the late president-general of the African National Congress and Nobel Peace Prize winner Chief Albert Luthuli said about the economic boycott proposal that "if it is a method which shortens the day of bloodshed, the suffering to us will be a price we are willing to pay".

In September Rev. Alan Boesak became the first South African to be charged with sabotage for publicly calling upon foreign states and companies to withdraw their investments. The United Democratic Front, whose leaders are presently on trial for treason, is on record for favoring an economic boycott. That really only leaves Chief Mangosuthu Gatscha Buthelezi in favor of continued investment. Buthelezi and his Inkatha organization enjoy only limited support, much of it coerced, not popular.

There is, therefore, a substantial and growing body of evidence upon which the committee could have drawn to inform the UC Regents about the African opinion. The committee simply ignored that evidence and instead chose to conclude that it would be "irresponsible for Americans to walk away from South Africa, leaving their plants and

technology in the hands of those who dominate". This is a specious statement. These plants and technology are already in the hands of those who dominate, for the U.S. businesses are partners in this oppression; they are not innocent bystanders. Another poll this summer revealed that blacks in South Africa rate American businesses as no better than South African businesses on matters of "social responsibility", which the Sullivan Principles, *et al*, purport to assess.

The argument that American plants and technology would pass to the white South Africans is no more plausible a reason for supporting continued investment than the older arguments that disinvestment will hurt Africans more than or before whites or that the Japanese and Western Europeans will fill the gap. As Elijah Barayi, president of COSATU recently said, "They [the U.S. and British governments] tell us they are against disinvestment because the black people would starve, but black people have been starving here since the first white settlers arrived in 1652". Chief Luthuli said much the same thing 25 years ago, when talking about the suffering blacks will have to undergo if there is ever an economic boycott: "In any case, we suffer already, our children are often undernourished, and on a small scale (so far) we die at the whim of a policeman". Moreover, the call for disengagement is not limited to U.S. businesses, and even South African businesses are facing an ever growing threat of internal boycotts.

One would have hoped that the Africanists who advised the University of California about its investments would have shown more knowledge of the gathering storm and had more of a vision of a future. As it stands, they have only reiterated "constructive engagement" and have therefore failed to "extend the discussion" that the ASA Board commended them for doing at its May 1985 meeting (*ASA News*, same issue).

Sincerely,

Gloria Waite, Assistant Professor
African and Afro-American Studies
Brandeis University

ASA ELECTIONS 1986

***ASA BY-LAWS*, ARTICLE II**

Section 7. **Election of Directors.** The Directors shall be elected annually from among the Members, in accordance with the procedures hereinafter set forth in Section 8 and shall be divided into three (3) groups, as equal in number as may be, so that the terms of only one such group shall expire each year. A Director shall be elected to serve until the third ensuing annual business meeting following the Director's election or until his or her successor shall have been duly elected and qualified, or the Director's earlier death, resignation, or removal in accordance with the By-Laws. Additional Directors to fill vacancies caused by any increase in the number of Directors or by reason of death, resignation, or the removal of Directors may be elected by a majority vote of the remaining Directors to serve temporarily until such time when said vacancies will be filled in accordance with the regular procedures for Directors hereinafter set forth in Section 8 hereof.