



# TRANSFRICA NEWS

Vol. 5, No. 1 Winter 1986

The Black American Lobby for Africa and the Caribbean

## IMPRESSIONS OF APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA

*Guest Report by the Honorable Walter E. Fauntroy (D-DC)*

*From January 5 to 10, 1986, Congressman Walter E. Fauntroy was part of a six-member congressional fact-finding delegation to the Republic of South Africa. Other members of the delegation were Representatives William H. Gray (D-PA), Charles Hayes (D-IL), Peter Kostmayer (D-PA), Lynn Martin (R-IL), and Edolphus Towns (D-NY). The following notes were released by the Congressman upon his return to the United States.*

### INTRODUCTION: OUR PURPOSE

As previously announced, the purpose of our mission was to review U.S. policy towards South Africa related to measures now pending before the Congress and to review the impact of recent changes in U.S. policy brought about by President Reagan's Executive Order imposing limited economic sanctions.

To make that assessment, it was our intention to meet with both the "victims" of apartheid and those responsible for the development and enforcement of the system. Among the victims, we met with township people, young Blacks, labor, church, and anti-apartheid activists and among the ruling white minority we met with leaders in business, education, and the government. In all we talked to more than 200 persons including the State President and Foreign Minister as well as the executive leadership of the United Democratic Front (UDF), the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), and the Chief Minister of the Zulu Tribe.

We were denied by the South African government our request to meet with the acknowledged leader of the South African majority population, Nelson Mandela. Moreover, we were not able to meet with Mr. Mandela's brilliant, courageous, and harassed wife, Winnie Mandela. The delegation did not have the opportunity to meet with leaders of the banned African National Congress (ANC) as we planned when our trip was originally scheduled for December, 1985, although I did dispatch one of my staff persons to Lusaka, Zambia for two days while the delegation was touring South Africa, to have consultations on my behalf with members of the ANC general secretariat.



*Congressman Walter E. Fauntroy (D-DC)  
Co-Chairman, Free South Africa Movement*

### WHAT WE LEARNED

I shall summarize first what we learned from face to face talks with the victims of apartheid and their representatives and then summarize what we learned from those responsible for the development and enforcement of the system.

**The Victims:** Six themes were sounded repeatedly during our discussions with township leaders, Black youth, labor leaders and anti-apartheid leaders.

1. There is a perception that the United States is aligned with the Botha regime, apartheid and their continued oppression. The limited sanctions imposed are viewed as ineffective. Public statements by President Reagan and news of American support for UNITA in Angola and the National Mozambique Resistance (MNR) in Mozambique tend to reinforce that perception. We encountered both hostility and disappointment. The words of our Declaration of Independence were often quoted to us: "All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed, that

*(continued on page 2)*

(continued from page 1)



Congressmen Walter Fauntroy, William Gray, and Charles Hayes with the Reverend Alan Boesak (far right) talk with a Crossroads resident (back to camera) in Cape Town.

whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it. . . ."

In response to their disappointment with us we often quoted President Reagan's public assessment of where the American people often are on apartheid: "This issue has touched some of the most sensitive nerves in our body politic . . . All of us agree that a system that deprives 73 percent of the country's population of basic political and human rights on basis of race is an affront to our national values and (that it is) a threat to the long term stability of a region that is important to our national interest."

2. The victims of apartheid do not want to see apartheid *Re-Formed*; they want it abolished: not just pass laws, influx control, inclusion in a separate parliament, independent homelands, spruced up bantu education. They want to dismantle apartheid and establish a unitary state, not based on tribal and ethnic differences but on one person, one vote.
3. They reject constructive engagement as a policy and call upon us to implement a policy of constructive disengagement until the South African government ends the state of emergency, withdraws the security forces from the townships, eliminates the pass laws, influx control and forced removals, releases Nelson Mandela and all political prisoners, lifts the ban on the ANC, allows the exiles to return home and begins meaningful negotiations towards the establishment of a non-racial democratic government with majority rule and the protection of minority rights.

Thus, they urged that we pass stronger sanctions including a ban on all new investments even if those sanctions cause them additional suffering. Sanctions are the *only non-violent* tool available to the Free World to help them.

4. The level of South African government violence and repression is escalating. The daily arrests, brutal beatings, torture, and murder of innocent men, women and children continue. We talked to three terrified Black youths from Soweto who were arrested for attending a worship service, detained, beaten and sexually assaulted by security police as part of their routine campaign to terrorize the Black population. Black youth from Soweto told us it is unsafe to

be out after dark because blood-thirsty SADF troops have fun shooting Blacks in the township by night.

The leaders of UDF told us they are now prohibited from holding any meetings anywhere and that they are forbidden to organize protest marches.

5. The Sullivan Principles build no pressure upon the government to change and are, therefore, useless.
6. The bitterness and despair of the oppressed masses in response to government brutality is leading inevitably to greater and greater violent responses to the repression of dissent.

**The Government:** Seven themes were sounded repeatedly by government leaders:

1. They are about to institute reforms in their apartheid laws. The specifics will be revealed when the Parliaments convene at the end of January, 1986.
2. They reject a one person, one vote, majority rule government in a unitary state not based on ethnicity.
3. They resent U.S. sanctions as meddling in their internal affairs and frustrating their efforts at reform. Assistance from the U.S. in expanding the economy will make reform possible.
4. Opposition to the government's apartheid policies and proposed reforms is a radical, left-wing, liberal, communist plot to undermine the most stable, and militarily powerful ally the U.S. has in the region.
5. The government is not responsible for violence, murder, and torture; it is the communist dominated ANC and the UDF allies in South Africa.
6. They are carrying on negotiations with homeland, tribal and locally elected leaders among Black South Africans. Those leaders tell them that they want independent, self governing states and not a unitary state with one man one vote majority rule not based on ethnicity. We met with one of the leaders they mentioned, Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, and he denied not only being in negotiations with the regime, but also insisted that he is opposed to the homeland concept.
7. They have not begun to use their capacity to inflict violence upon the Black opposition and their "collaborators," and if the violent resistance escalates they will use considerably more!

**The Business Community:** Four themes were struck repeatedly by white business leaders in South Africa:

1. Present U.S. limited sanctions are innocuous but are dangerous in that they may lead to stronger sanctions that would cause the rand to fall and plunge the economy into chaos. They oppose further sanctions.
2. The reforms being talked about by the Botha regime are good but are too little, too late.
3. Negotiated settlement is the only constructive course and thus Nelson Mandela needs to be released, the ban on the ANC needs to be lifted, exiled South Africans returned and good faith negotiations begun.
4. The escalating violence increases the need to talk to the ANC.

## FREE SOUTH AFRICA MOVEMENT LAUNCHES CORPORATE CAMPAIGN

After one year of daily demonstrations at the South African Embassy, the Free South Africa Movement (FSAM) has shifted its focus to the private sector, embarking upon a campaign against corporations conducting business in both the United States and South Africa. The new FSAM Corporate Campaign is an addition to previously launched anti-apartheid initiatives endorsed by FSAM, calling on corporations to terminate their business relationships in South Africa. These include: the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's boycott of the Winn Dixie Corporation, the Northern Virginia Coalition Against Apartheid's demonstrations against the Control Data Corporation, and the National Council of Churches campaign against its list of "dirty dozen" corporations active in the U.S. and South Africa.

Like the Embassy demonstrations, which heightened the American people's awareness of the unholy alliance between the Reagan Administration and the government of South Africa, the Free South Africa Movement Corporate Campaign is designed to educate. The lesson which the Corporate Campaign will teach through nationwide protest activities is the pivotal role transnational corporations play in supporting the system of apartheid. The Free South Africa Movement private sector campaign aims to be a catalyst for generating popular support for complete corpo-

rate withdrawal from South Africa (unless the South African government negotiates with legitimate black leaders for a new political and economic order), much in the same way as the South African Embassy demonstrations helped achieve overwhelming support for the imposition of U.S. sanctions against South Africa.

### The Royal Dutch/Shell Group of Companies

The corporation that has been selected as the initial focus of the FSAM Corporate Campaign is the Royal Dutch Shell Group of Companies—the largest corporation in the world in terms of assets (\$69.071 billion), and second only to Exxon in terms of sales (\$84.865 billion).

Royal Dutch/Shell consists of approximately three hundred subsidiary and affiliate companies operating in more than one hundred countries. The company is engaged in the exploration, production, transportation, and marketing of crude oil, natural gas, gas liquids, coal, and non-ferrous metals and ores; the manufacture, marketing, and transportation of oil and chemical products; and the research and development of alternative sources of energy, such as solar energy, synthetic fuels, tar sands, and oil shales.

An energy company, like Royal Dutch/Shell, is an appropriate first target for the FSAM Corporate Campaign be-

*(continued on page 4)*



**SHELL BOYCOTT ORGANIZERS** (left to right): Randall Robinson Co-Chair FSAM; William Lucy International Secretary-Treasurer, AFSCME; Richard Trumka President, United Mine Workers; Owen Bieber (partly covered) President, United Auto Workers; and Roger Wilkins FSAM Steering Committee, at the January 9 press conference that launched the beginning of the boycott campaign.

## CORPORATE CAMPAIGN (cont'd.)

cause of the critical role petroleum and petroleum products play in buttressing apartheid. South Africa has no significant oil deposits of its own and it therefore must go to great lengths to maintain a continuous flow of petroleum for one of the major consumers of liquid fuel in the South African economy—the armed forces. For example, the South African government has spent approximately 9 billion dollars to develop three synthetic fuel facilities (SASOL) which convert South African coal resources into oil (much to the chagrin of the regime in Pretoria, the three SASOL plants will provide South Africa with less than a third of its fuel needs over the next ten years). The government also pays large subsidies to companies like Royal Dutch/Shell that refine oil in South Africa. It does so in order to offset the exorbitant prices these companies must pay to import oil to South Africa in the face of international condemnation.

### Royal Dutch/Shell in South Africa

Royal Dutch/Shell has extensive holding in South Africa and Namibia. As of 1985, company investments in the region amounted to approximately R1,000 million (\$750 million). Wholly-owned subsidiaries of Royal Dutch/Shell that conduct business in South Africa include:

- **Shell South Africa**—a manufacturer and marketer of petroleum products, chemicals, metals, and coal;
- **Shell Oil South West Africa**—a marketer of petroleum

products in Namibia;

- **Billiton Exploration**—a U.S. based company that has been prospecting for zinc, copper, nickel, and lead in southern Africa since 1972;
- **Unifoam Industries**—a manufacturer of urethane foam blocks.

Royal Dutch/Shell is also involved in many joint ventures in South Africa. The most notable is the Group's fifty percent share in the Shell and BP (British Petroleum) South African Refineries (SAPREF). SAPREF owns the largest refinery in Africa with a daily capacity of 200,000 barrels of crude oil.

South Africa's largest lubricant plant is also located on the site of the SAPREF refinery. This plant refines heavy oils and produces various lubricants which are critical to South Africa's heavy industry. The plant is owned by the South African Lubricant Company (SAMCO). Shell owns 25 percent of the stock in SAMCO. BP has 25 percent of the shares, and Trek Belegging, the only privately owned South African oil company, owns the remaining 50 percent. Shell's interest in SAMCO is actually larger since Shell has a 17.5 percent stake in Trek.

Royal Dutch/Shell owns 50 percent of the Rietspruit Surface Mine which in 1984 produced 5.1 million tons of thermal coal. In addition, the Group has a 12.5 percent interest in the Richard's Bay Coal Terminal (which handles 39 million tons of coal a year), and a 25 percent share of Styrochem—a plastics firm.

(continued on page 5)

## HAITI'S NATIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT

On February 7, 1986, President-for-Life Jean-Claude (Baby Doc) Duvalier and twenty-one members of his family, fled Haiti aboard a United States Air Force C141 transport plane. The departure of Baby Doc concluded twenty-nine years of ironhanded rule by the Duvalier family. Duvalier's abdication of power followed several weeks of widespread civil unrest in Haiti that had made the country virtually ungovernable.

TransAfrica joins other human rights groups in welcoming the end of the Duvalier dynasty in Haiti, for it was a dictatorship notorious for its corruptness, and flagrant disregard for human life. Yet it would be unwise to conclude that Duvalier's departure will lead directly to much needed political and economic restructuring in Haiti. Our apparent skepticism stems from the make-up of the new ruling body which succeeds Baby Doc. The National Council of Government, as the body is called, consists of six men who were chosen by Duvalier to head the new government prior to his fleeing the country. Five of the six council members are loyal Duvalierists, having served as high ranking officials in the governments of both Jean-Claude and Francois (Papa Doc) Duvalier. These men are: Army Chief of Staff, Lt. General Henri Namphy, who has been named president of the council; Inspector General of the Army, Colonel William Regala; Alex Cineas, Minister of Public Works; Colo-

nel Max Valles, Commander of the Presidential Guard; and Colonel Prosper Avril (designated as an adviser to the National Council), an aid-de-camp to Jean-Claude Duvalier. The remaining member of the National Council, Gerard Gourgue, is the only official in the new government that was a staunch opponent of the Duvaliers. Before February 7, Gourgue was the head of the Haitian Human Rights League.

With the predominance of key Duvalier officials in the new Haitian government, we are concerned that the National Council will prove to be merely a reincarnation of the old regime. Our concern was heightened when, on February 11, the council appointed only former Duvalier associates to its new thirteen member cabinet.

In a public address, General Namphy pledged that the new governing body will "... work for the blooming of real and functional democracy founded on absolute respect for human rights, press freedom, the existence of free labor unions and the functioning of structured political parties." However, until the National Council establishes a timetable for holding elections and instituting a new constitution; lifts the ban on the return of political exiles who were deported or fled the country during the Duvalier era; and aggressively prosecutes members of the Duvalier regime noted for their human rights abuses, the council's commitment to social and political reform in Haiti will be in question. □

## CORPORATE CAMPAIGN (cont'd.)

### Royal Dutch/Shell in the United States

In the United States, Royal Dutch/Shell conducts business through four wholly-owned subsidiaries—Scallop Developments Inc., Scallop Holdings Inc., The Scallop Corporation, and the Shell Oil Company. Of these companies, the Shell Oil Company is the largest and most profitable U.S. subsidiary of Royal Dutch/Shell. In 1984, Shell Oil earned \$1772 million, making it the third largest oil company in the U.S. (behind Exxon and Standard Oil of Indiana) in terms of net income.

Free South Africa Movement activity condemning Royal Dutch/Shell's involvement in South Africa are in large part directed at the Shell Oil Company. This is because of the public's familiarity with Shell (particularly the company's gasoline products and famous logo depicting a sea shell) and the potential for a successful boycott campaign against the large number of consumer products offered by the company (for a Shell company product list, see next article).

Corporate Campaign initiatives are not, however, limited to Shell Oil nor to the products the company sells to the average consumer. Individual and institutional investors are urged to divest their holdings in *all* of Royal Dutch/Shell's U.S. subsidiaries. Institutions such as schools, municipalities, state governments, and private businesses, which purchase large quantities of oil, coal, chemicals, natural gas, and other products from Royal Dutch/Shell subsidiaries and their affiliate companies, are also asked to cease their relationship with these companies until Royal Dutch/Shell pulls out of South Africa.

Nationwide activities against Royal Dutch/Shell in the United States are being organized by a broad coalition consisting of the United Mine Workers, the AFL-CIO, the NAACP, the Free South Africa Movement, church groups, and other progressive organizations dedicated to ending apartheid. Protest activities include: boycotting Shell products; picketing several of the more than 11,000 Shell service stations across the country; and cutting Shell credit cards in half and exchanging them for the Shell Discredit Card (see next article).

It is important that everyone desirous of a free South Africa become involved in the campaign against Royal Dutch/Shell and other corporations conducting business in South Africa. By doing so, we will be sending an important message to transnational corporations: they cannot do business in South Africa, thereby supporting the system of apartheid, and expect to conduct business as usual in the United States. □

### BOYCOTT SHELL PRODUCTS

The following is a list of popular consumer products manufactured by the Shell Oil Company:

#### Gasoline Products:

Piba (additive) \* Shell Dieseline \* Shell of the Future \*

Shelldyne \* Silver Shell \* SU 2000 \* Golden Shell (lubricants).

#### Motor Oils:

Mysell \* Aeroshell \* Rimula \* Rotella \* Shell Super X \* Fire and Ice \* Shell X-100.

#### Automotive Products:

Comfort Ride \* Shell Radial Ride \* Shell Radial II \* Shellride \* Super Shell Aramid \* Super Shell Snowshoe (tires) \* Meridyne (radios) \* Sentinel (batteries, repair service) \* Shell Superlife (batteries).

#### Home Products:

Heritage (furniture polish) \* Shell Flea Collar \* Shell No-Pest Strip \* Child Protector Tops (safety lids) \* Home Freshener (room deodorizer) \* Citrus Blossom, Open Air, Wild Flower (open air fresheners) \* Tegon (roofing).

### THE SHELL DISCREDIT CARD

As part of the FSAM campaign against Royal Dutch/Shell, we are requesting that Shell credit card holders terminate their accounts with the Shell Oil Company. If you have a Shell credit card, and you wish to participate in the Shell boycott, please cut your credit card into two pieces and mail one half to Shell Oil corporate headquarters at the following address:

P.O. Box 2463  
One Shell Plaza  
Houston, TX, 77001

Included with the halved credit card should be a letter stating that you will no longer purchase Shell products until Shell Oil's parent company, Royal Dutch/Shell, pulls out of South Africa.

Send the remaining half of the credit card to:

The Free South Africa Movement  
545 Eighth Street, S.E.  
Washington D.C., 20003.

When you send in the second half of your credit card to FSAM, we will replace it with a Shell *Discredit* Card. The Shell *Discredit* card is similar in size and design to the actual credit card, however, on the front of the card is the following statement:

*I want to help end apartheid, which both enslaves South Africans and undercuts American jobs.*

*Royal Dutch/Shell (the parent company of Shell Oil) plays a key role in supplying fuel for the apartheid system.*

*Therefore, I pledge not to buy any Shell products until Royal Dutch/Shell withdraws from South Africa.* □

**FAUNTROY (cont'd.)****WHAT I RECOMMEND**

I have been traumatized by what my eyes have seen, what my ears have heard and what my heart felt as I visited with a broad cross-section of the people of South Africa. The spectrum of those with whom we had lengthy talks stretched from terrorized, embittered and determined Black youth from Soweto to the State President, P.W. Botha, on vacation at the Wilderness Hotel in the town of George; with many business, labor, church, education, government and anti-apartheid activists in between.

The picture that emerged for me is that of a white minority government and people on the one hand who are determined not to dismantle apartheid and who believe that with a combination of some reforms that will make its savage cruelties more palatable to its victims and the raw, naked power of their military, they will never have to give it up. On the other hand, there is a Black majority with allies in the mixed-race, Asian and white communities of South Africa who will not accept the reforming of apartheid but are demanding that it be abolished and replaced with a system in which every citizen has an equal opportunity to participate in the political, social and economic life of the country.

In the middle stands the United States and the rest of the world urged by the Black majority to impose stronger sanctions as the only non-violent tool left to us to help dismantle apartheid, and warned by the white minority that stronger sanctions will only create a situation where the government will have to become more violent in its repression of dissent, sparking a bloodbath that could destroy the nation.

I have heard both arguments in depth now from the indigenous authors of them, and I have concluded that it is worth the risk for us as people of conscience to deploy what I believe is the only non-violent tool left to us to bring about a peaceful solution to this wretched situation. Accordingly, I recommend as the future course of our nation's public policy and our people's private actions the following:

1. That we impose stronger sanctions on South Africa; at the very least a ban on all new investments.
2. That we as a matter of policy reject the proposal by some in our country that we provide aid to UNITA in Angola and the National Mozambique Resistance (MNR) in Mozambique in an effort to destabilize those countries or overthrow their governments.
3. That individual U.S. citizens of conscience should cease their cooperation with the system of apartheid by refusing to purchase goods and services from those who underpin the present government and system with their investments.
4. That we expand our program for stockpiling essential natural resources which we purchase from South Africa in anticipation of the time when the government's stubborn refusal to negotiate makes it impossible for South Africa to make those resources available for sale.
5. At the request of COSATU, I recommend that General Motors and the Ford Motor Company cease purchasing

platinum from Impala Platinum Holding, Ltd. until 20,000 mine workers fired by the company last week are rehired and collective bargaining with the National Union of Mineworkers resumes. □

**LETTERS TO THE EDITOR**

12-10-85

Reference is made to an article entitled "Somalia Reported to be in South Africa Deal" published in *TransAfrica News* Vol.4, No.1 Fall 1985.

This Embassy was surprised to see the publication of this article when it made quite clear to your paper that there is and has never been any negotiations between Somalia and South Africa, as claimed by your paper.

This Embassy reiterates once again that these allegations are baseless and unfounded, and are merely designed to damage the image of Somalia.

Somalia's position on the policy of apartheid by the Pretoria regime is well known in the world, and its support of liberation movements in Africa especially those in South Africa such as the ANC and SWAPO is a matter of record.

May we request you to refrain from publishing propaganda material in your esteemed paper in the interest of your readers and reputation of your paper.

*Ahmed A. Gure*

First Secretary, Press Affairs

Embassy of the Somali Democratic Republic

**TRANSAFRICA LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

TransAfrica is proud to introduce a monthly publication that will provide TransAfrica members with a one-page review of noteworthy events on Capitol Hill. The new publication is called *TransAfrica Legislative Update* and it will offer readers such valuable information as: descriptions of newly introduced legislation; status reports on pending legislation; legislative action alerts; and insights into the political motivations and maneuverings in Congress and the White House.

The premiere issue of the legislative update has been included in this newsletter (see following page). Henceforth, TransAfrica members can look forward to receiving the one-page update each month with the exception of the months in which *TransAfrica News* is released. We certainly hope *TransAfrica Legislative Update* proves to be a useful resource and we welcome whatever comments and suggestions our readers may have to help improve future printings of the update. □

Vol. 5, No. 1

Winter 1986

**TRANSAFRICA NEWS**®

545 Eighth Street S.E., Suite 200

Washington, D.C. 20003

(202)547-2550

Executive Director . . . . . Randall Robinson

Legislative Liaison . . . . . Cecelie Counts

Editor . . . . . Glenn McKeown

Production . . . . . Maryse Mills

# TRANSFRICA

The Black American Lobby for Africa and the Caribbean

## LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

A SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES

Vol. 1, No. 1 January 1986

### Intelligence Committee Chairs Oppose Covert Aid to UNITA

The chairmen of the Senate and House Permanent Select Committees on Intelligence have expressed their opposition to covert U.S. assistance to UNITA, the South African backed-rebel group attempting to overthrow the government of Angola. The position taken by David F. Durenberger (R-MN) chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, and the House Intelligence Committee chair Lee H. Hamilton (D-IN), marks a major setback for the Reagan Administration's plans to provide UNITA with military and other forms of assistance to be distributed by the Central Intelligence Agency.

The chairs of the Intelligence Committees stated that if the United States is to give UNITA military and humanitarian aid, it should be overt rather than covert aid. The committees appear to be wary of equipping UNITA through the CIA given the agency's infamous attempt to topple the current government of Angola when it attained control of the country in 1975. The CIA's role in the Angolan civil war led to the 1976 passage of the Clark Amendment which prohibited any form of U.S. assistance to warring factions in Angola. The Amendment was repealed in July, 1985.

The Reagan Administration has been in favor of covert aid to UNITA because debate on the matter would be restricted and hearings before the Intelligence Committees would be secret. The Administration would rather have the discussion on aid to UNITA limited to the Intelligence Committees than debate the issue under public scrutiny on the floors of the House and Senate. Furthermore, the Select Committees on Intelligence have no authority to prohibit the Administration from giving UNITA assistance once the Administration provides the committees with an assesment of why such aid is alleged to serve U.S. security interests.

Despite the Intelligence Committees' inability to prohibit the CIA from equipping UNITA, the Administration would be reluctant to implement a covert program in the face of strong Intelligence Committee opposition. By acting contrary to the advice of the committees, the Administration may find committee members less than receptive

to future Administration proposals that will require Intelligence Committee support for political legitimacy.

If the Reagan Administration's efforts to give UNITA covert aid prove to be too great a political liability, then it is likely to back one or more of the UNITA aid bills currently pending in Congress. These bills are:

**H.R. 3472**—introduced by Claude Pepper (D-FL) and Jack Kemp (R-NY), would provide 27 million dollars in "humanitarian aid" to UNITA.

**H.R. 3609**—introduced by Mark Siljander (R-MI), would provide 27 million dollars in military aid to the rebel groups.

**H.R. 3725**—introduced by Bob Dornan (R-CA), calls for a 27 million dollar humanitarian aid package and 19.1 million dollars in military assistance.

**H.R. 3598**—introduced by Bob McCollum (R-FL), would prohibit trade, bank loans, and new investment in Angola.

We are strongly opposed to any U.S. assistance to UNITA. By aiding the Angolan rebels the United States would be directly allied with the South African government which aims to destabilize bordering states in order to protect the system of apartheid. Pretoria is also desirous of prolonging the turmoil in Angola in as much as it would delay the end of its illegal occupation of Namibia.

*It is critical that you inform your congressional representative of your opposition to U.S. aid to UNITA. In addition, express your support for H.R.3690, a bill introduced by Congressman Ted Weiss that would prohibit direct and indirect U.S. aid promoting "military or paramilitary operations in Angola."* □

### House Leaders Urge US Banks not to Reschedule SA Debt

Fifteen members of the House of Representatives have sent a letter to the chairmen of the U.S. banks that on February 20, 1986, along with major European banks, will decide whether or not to reschedule over \$13 billion in short term loans extended to the Republic of South Africa. The letter strongly urges the banks to maintain their "... current position of refusing new credits or any renewal, modification, or extension of existing credits to South Africa ..." until the South African government commences negotiations with legitimate black leaders and takes major steps to dismantle apartheid. Signatories to the letter are:

Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D-MA) Mickey Leland (D-TX)  
Thomas S. Foley (D-WA) Richard A. Gephardt (D-MO)  
Fernand J. St. Germain (D-RI) Dante B. Fascell (D-FL)  
Bill Alexander (D-AR) Stephen J. Solarz (D-NY)  
Howard Wolpe (D-MI) Doug Bereuter (R-NE)  
William H. Gray (D-PA) Benjamin A. Gilman (R-NY)  
Tony Coelho (D-CA) Jim Leach (R-IA)  
Buddy Roemer (D-LA)

**Hold the  
Date**

**June 6  
1986**

**TRANSAFRICA FORUM**

**Fifth Annual Policy Conference**

*"Rethinking Economic Development in Africa and the Caribbean"*

**Friday, June 6, 1986**

**8:00 - 6:00pm**

**Howard University  
Blackburn Center**

**Washington, D.C.**

Conference Chair

**Dr. Joyce Ladner**

Chairperson, TransAfrica Forum Board of Directors

*Keynote Speakers*

The Honorable

**Michael Manley**

*"Restructuring the International Economic System"*

United States Senator

**Gary Hart**

*"U.S. Foreign Policy and its Impact on Economic  
Development"*