

REVIEW & OUTLOOK

The Real Effect of Sanctions

Last week, Chester Crocker, the State Department's African-affairs chief, offered help in furthering negotiations between South African whites and blacks. South Africa's Foreign

Minister Pik Botha has just dis-

missed that offer: "How reliable is it? What would Congress do with any deal I made with your government?"

Welcome to the post-sanctions politics of South Africa.

Three months ago Congress overrode the president's veto and passed economic sanctions against South Africa. Until the passage there were people protesting that sanctions would make South African blacks suffer and cost the U.S. its influence over the South African government. But sanctions activists said that this concern over South African blacks was a cloak for the self-interest of people who did not want to give up profitable South African enterprises. In truth, said these advocates, the economic pain of sanctions was justified in order to press the government for political reform. :

Before the sanctions vote it was possible to throw up your hands and say, "Who knows how the South African government will react when the crunch comes? Why not do the morally attractive thing and take our chances?"

So the U.S. did.

Now the data are beginning to roil

in. Here is what they show: (1) So far there is no economic crisis in South Africa. But where disruption has taken place, blacks have borne most of the burden. (2) South African policies since the vote have been a disaster for opponents of apartheid. " - The sanctions probably gave an extra push to the movement of corporations out of the country. GM, [BM, Warner Communications. Kodak and Britain's Barclays bank have announced pullouts since the action. The corporations sold to their South African managements.

In some cases there will be em:

ployment as usual. Kodak workers, however, have lost their jobs, with compensation. Shortly after GM's announcement, its employees struck, demanding a greater say in the new corporate structure to come. The strike was broken.

Meanwhile, the government has been cracking down all over. It announced that it would start sending home Mozambican miners. For the first time in more than a year the

military has launched a raid into Angola against the SWAPO. An International Red Cross conference expelled the South African delegate, so South Africa kicked out the International Red Cross, relenting only after the organization's president announced that he disagreed with the decision of the conference.

The government has banned foreign financing to the United Democratic Front, the country's biggest extra-parliamentary opposition group. It has not released a report by the President's Council urging changes including mixed-race neighborhoods in the Group Areas Act. [t has turned down a proposal drafted by blacks and whites for a regional parliament elected by universal suffrage.

It has closed 40 more schools on the eastern cape and says the schools won't open until students and parents quiet down. And after a year's pause the government is once again forcibly relocating blacks and their homes in the name of the homelands policy and residential segregation.

No one knows what sanctions will do to the South African economy in the long run. But now we can see how the South African government will react to whatever changes take place. There is no way for a reasonable person to contend that outside pressure on the government will produce internal reform.

Maybe some pro-sanctions people do not want reform. Maybe they want the impoverishment that paves the way for sudden, radical upheaval. [f that is so, they can go on advocating more comprehensive sanctions.)
v/ If they say they want reform instead of revolution, you would think they'd have to admit that sanctions are not going to do the trick. But the sanctions advocates are incapable of this sort of analysis. They know the U.S. civil-rights techniques of 20 years ago. In which you pressed a little

harder and got a iittle more. The #f- |
fect in South Africa scarcely matters; .
the point is to enact the ritual. â\200\230

These ritualistic passions are a re- !
current feature of American politics.
\We seem to be undergoing another in
the Iran controversy, where the worst
allegations scarcely seem to explain
the extent of the furor. But in the
Iranian case. at least the costs ui sucii
bizarre behavior will be borne most
by Americans. [n the South African
case, the spirits have seized us, but
others will suffer.

~ LEON SULLIVAN

... "the winds of change have comeâ\200\235

Sullivan Unveils S. Africa Divestment Plan

12//0/Â¢%

By Michael Isikoff

Washinyton Pnst Staff Writer

Rev. Leon Sullivan, whose principles of nondiscrimination have been adopted by virtually all U.S. corporations in South Africa, said yesterday he will abandon that code in June and mount a massive divestment campaign if the apartheid system is not significantly dismantled by then.

Using impassioned language, the Philadelphia civil rights leader also accused the Pope, [srael, the World Council of ident Reagan of failing to take aggressive

action to pressure the Pretoria government

& . â\202¬ said he will for a "total economic embargoâ\200\235 as well as complete U.S. corporate disinvestment if the government of P.W. Botha fails to meet Sullivanâ\200\231s May 31, 1987, deadline for ending apartheid.

â\200\234Events have overtaken almost every kind of peaceful and nonviolent effort in that country,â\200\235 said Sullivan at a press conference here yesterday. â\200\234The winds of change have come to South Africa, and it wonâ\200\231t be stopped until apartheid is pulled up by the roots.â\200\235

The prggs conference, called to

release the 10th annual report of companies operating under the â\200\234Sullivan Principles,â\200\235 signaled Sullivanâ\200\231s intentions to switch his tactics in the South African debate next yearâ\200\224a turnaround that could have broad repercussions for the 184 U.S. firms in South Africa that have adopted his code.

For years Sullivanâ\200\231s principles have been the rallying cry for U.S. companies that have argued that

their presence in South Africa was a force for peaceful change.

But despite what he called â\200\234important progressâ\200\235 by U.S. firms in

See SLLIVAN, G5, Coly4

NGTON Post

Sullivan Talks
| Of Tactic Shift

SULLIVAN, From G1

implementing the principles over the past year, Sullivan said yesterday that time had nearly run out on their usefulness.

Yesterday, Dun & Bradstreet Corp. announced it was pulling out of South Africa because of the â\200\234direct and indirect effects of South African government apartheid policies.â\200\235 The New York firm had 900 employees in South Africa.

The latest report on compliance with Sullivanâ\200\231s principles, which was prepared by the independent consulting firm of Arthur D. Little Inc., said participating U.S. companies spent more than 333 million during the year ended June 30, 1986, on education, housing, community development and other programs designed to benefit South African blacks. The principles, which two years ago were expanded by Sullivan to include antiapartheid political lobbying, call for such contributions as well as such â\200\234basic requirementsâ\200\235 as maintaining desegregated facilities and equal pay for

all work. :

With less than six months to go, he tore it deadhine, Sullivan said he has already received pledges from pension plans, universities and other investment funds worth 360 billion that have agreed to participate in the divestment campaign.

Sullivan said this fund will grow to 3100 billion by May 31 and, when he gives the word, the par-

tweipants will hegin selling their
stocks In companies doing business
in South Africa or voting in favor of
shareholder resolutions demanding

i corporate pullouts.

i Â»
/
4
/ Â¥

Few Firms Get High Marks :

For Meeting the Sullivan Goals

By Joe Davidson \

Staff Reporter of The: WALL STREET JOURNAL

WASHINGTON-Fewer than one-third of the signatories to the Sullivan Principles, a code of conduct for U.S. businesses operating in South Africa, have made good progress in meeting the requirements of the non-discrimination code, according to a report released yesterday.

The Rev. Leon Sullivan, pastor of Zion Baptist Church in Philadelphia, who developed the principles in 1977, said the good progress category had so few members because the requirements are tough. He also complained that some companies lack the will to do better.

The requirements, however, were eased a bit when companies complained about the amount of money Rev. Sullivan expected them to spend on social justice. Spending levels were lowered to improve the grades for some firms, according to D. Reid Weedon, senior vice president of Arthur D. Little Inc., the Cambridge, Mass., consulting firm that monitors compliance with the principles.

Officials at Little don't check each company's South African operations to verify the responses, but do require each company to provide an independent auditor's

statement confirming the companies' stated spending levels on such areas as medical care and housing.

Of the 129 reporting companies, 39 are making good progress in meeting the Sullivan Principles, according to the report, while 72 are making progress and 18 need to become more active.

Sullivan signatory companies fall into five groups, under three main categories. To be in the top two categories, a company must meet nine basic requirements including equal pay for equal work, desegregation of all company facilities and freedom for black workers to join trade unions.

Category I includes those firms that score high on a point system that judges a company's involvement in four action areas: training

and advancement, community development, social justice and education for non-employees.

Companies making progress have lower, yet acceptable scores. They are assigned to Category IIA if they submit a long, detailed report of their activities. They are assigned to Category IIB if they file a short reporting form. Category IIIA firms passed the basic requirements, but received a low point rating in the action areas.

Since the principles were developed, companies have used the code to demonstrate their opposition to racial oppression and to justify their presence in South Africa. Apartheid opponents have accused the firms of hiding behind the code while supporting South Africa's white minority regime by bolstering its economy.

The report covers a reporting period that ended June 30. Some companies listed in the report such as General Motors Corp., International Business Machines Corp, Eastman Kodak Co. and Coca-Cola Co. have pulled out of South Africa or have announced withdrawal plans.

Anti-apartheid activists have criticized withdrawal schemes that permit the U.S. companies to continue supplying parts and equipment to South Africa. Mr. Sullivan said that type of withdrawal was an important step, because it maintained jobs for blacks.

He repeated, however, a call for a total U.S. trade embargo against South Africa if - statutory apartheid is not stopped by next May 31. His main objective is to end apartheid, Mr. Sullivan said, not to protect businesses or keep them there.

CATEGORY 1 |

MAKING GOOD PROGRESS

Abbott Laboratories
American Home Products
Bausch & Lomb Inc. Butterick Co.

Cigna Corp.

Caltex Petroleum Corp.

Carrier Corp.
Caterpillar Inc.
Champion Spark Plug Co.

Citicorp
Coca-Cola Co.

Baker International
Baltimore Aircoil Co.
Black & Decker Corp.

Borg-Warner Corp.

Upjohn Co.
Warner Communications
Warner-Lambert Co.

1IB. BASED ON
SHORT-FORM REPORTING
American Cyanamid Co.

(See also Category [IA)
Chase Manhattan Corp.
Coca-Cola Co.

(See also Category IIB)
Colgate-Palmolive Co.
Control Data Corp.

Dart & Kraft Inc.
DuPont Co.

Exxon Corp.

FMC Corp.

Fluor Corp.

General Motors Corp.
Honeywell Inc.
Johnson & Johnson

(See also Category IIA)
Kellogg Co.

Loctite Corp.
McGraw-Hill Inc.
Merck & Co.
Minnesota Mining
Monsanto Co.
Norton Co.

Olin Corp.

Pfizer Inc.

RJR Nabisco Inc.

(See also Category IIA)
Richardson-Vicks Inc.
SmithKline Beckman Corp.

(See also Category IIA)
Squibb Corp.

Union Carbide Corp.

(See also Category IIA)
Xerox Corp.

CATEGORY 11
MAKING PROGRESS

1IA. BASED ON
FULL REPORTING
Amdahl Corp.
American Cyanamid Co.
(See also Category IIB)

American International Group

Combustion Engineering Inc.
Deere & Co.

Dow Chemical Co.
Dresser Industries Inc.
Eastman Kodak Co.

Ford Motor Co.

Franklin Electric Co.
Gillette Co.

W.R. Grace & Co.
Hewlett-Packard Co.

ITT Corp.

Int'l Minerals & Chemical
Interpublic Group of Cos.
Johnson & Johnson

(See also Category I)

Eli Lilly & Co.
Masonite Corp.
Mobil Oil Corp.
NCR Corp.

Nalco Chemical Co.
Otis Elevator Co.
Phelps Dodge Corp.
RJR Nabisco Inc.

(See also Category I)
Reader's Digest Association
Revlon Inc.

Rexnord Inc.
Schering-Plough Corp.
Skok Systems Inc.
SmithKline Beckman Corp.

(See also Category I)
Sperry Corp. 3
Standard Oil (Ohio)
Sterling Drug Inc.
Sunland Foods Pty. Ltd.
Tambrands Inc.

Tenneco Inc.
Tokheim Corp.
Union Carbide Corp.

(See also Category I)

(See also Category I)
Cummins Engine Co.
Dow Corning Corp.
Firestone Tire & Rubber
Intergraph Corp.

JWT Group Inc.
NCNB Corp.
Raytheon Co.

(See also Category II1A)
Time Inc.

Video Vision Enterprises
Westinghouse Electric

CATEGORY 111
NEEDS TO BECOME
MORE ACTIVE

I1JA. PASSED BASIC
REQUIREMENTS BUT RE-
CEIVED LOW POINT RATING
Becor Western Inc.
CPC International Inc
Crown Cork & Seal Co.
Donaldson Co.
Federal-Mogul Corp.
Ferro Corp.
Foster-Wheeler Corp.
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.
Hoover Co.
Ingersoll-Rand Co. X
Int'l Correspondence Schoolsâ\200\235
Johnson Controls Inc.
Joy Manufacturing Co.
Midland-Ross Corp.
Mine Safety Appliances Co.
Ogilvy Group Inc.
Raytheon Co.

(See also Category IIB)
Wilbur-Ellis Co.

BRI

By DENNIS KNEALE ' \â\200\2302â\200\230
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
Some U.S. companies are quietly fighting back against universities critical of a corporate presence in South Africa by hitting the schools where it hurts mostâ\200\224in the bank account.

As more colleges sell off shares of companies with South African ties, some of the corporations under fire are refusing to contribute grants, scholarships and faculty bonuses to the schools.

The actions are intensifying the already-bitter debate over South Africa now spilling from campuses to corporate boardrooms. Even as some of the strongest advocates of operating in the troubled landâ\200\224such as International Business Machines Corp., Coca-Cola Co. and General Motors Corp.â\200\224reverse course and set plans to leave, others are growing more combative about staying behind.

Although the extent of the corporate moves is still unclear, the stakes involved are huge. U.S. companies gave \$1.57 billion to some 3,000 colleges and universities in 1984-85, according to the Council on Financial Aid to Higher Education in New York. And many of the biggest, most generous givers are big-name concerns with high-profile units in South Africa.

Hypocrisy on Campus?

Critics of apartheid say companies that withhold or implicitly threaten to withhold contributionsâ\200\224such as FMC Corp., Marathon Oil Corp., Mobil Corp. and several othersâ\200\224are imperiling academic freedom and campus debate. But some business executives counter that the schools are getting what they deserve and accuse them of hypocrisy for shedding company stocks while keeping a hand out for donations from the same corporations. 7

*In other words, if our corporation isn't good enough for you, you aren't good enough for our corporation,â\200\235 says a spokesman at FMC, a Chicago maker of food-processing equipment that in recent months has ended grants to six schools and has threatened action against several others.

The combative approach appears to be gathering momentum at a critical time. U.S. companies are fleeing South Africa in droves, further pressuring those that stay. South Africaâ\200\231s political and economic climate is widely expected to deteriorate further, fueling calls back home for wholesale U.S. disinvestment.

Moreover, the latest round of annual evaluations of corporate performance in upholding fair-employment principles in South Africa was released yesterday. (See accompanying story.) Lower corporate ratings could trigger "partial divestment" rules at some colleges, which require selling only the stocks of companies that get poor grades in fair-employment practices. A new spate of stock sales could increase tensions and prompt more companies to withhold donations. :

Finally, the number of colleges and universities adopting new stock-divestment

rulesâ\200\224a response to fierce pressure from students and facultyâ\200\224is rising rapidly. And those rules are tla:r_ toughneme ;'!s\

ial-divestment policies Ol L
i-\201pu;ulnvestor Responsibility Resegmh Center in Washington says 100 universities have sold off stock because of the South Africa issue since 1977; 39 schools have toughened their policies since last March alone, and 18 of those decided to divest altogether, regardless of a company's record

Strike BaÃ©}g'g;c Colleges That Divest

e

Educators are uncertain how far the corporate campaigns will go. â\200\230â\200\234That kind of backfire is just beginning,â\200\235 says Ester Elphick, a researcher with a consortium of 46 universities tracking the South African debate. Marathon's corporate foundation adopted a policy against contributing to divesting schools, partly due to cost cutting. It has ended donations to â\200\230under 20" schools, according to a company spokesman who won't elaborate. FMC ended \$30,000 in grants to the University of Minnesota, won't renew awards totaling \$24,000 to four California universities and cut off grants to schools in Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa and Arizona.

Though the FMC contributions might seem relatively small, the company's moves may have far-reaching effects. "It removes (those colleges) from future consideration, too,â\200\235 says an FMC spokesman. â\200\234Right away, a whole flock of schools won't be eligible for donations.â\200\235 But individual students may be hurt worst of all. Included in the grants that FMC canceled were four \$1,000 scholarships for minority engineering students.

Other companies are turning up the heat without ending grants outright. Johnson & Johnson Co. Chairman James Burke

resigned as head of a fund-raising effort at Rutgers University in New Jersey after the school adopted a tough divestment policy. And Mobil made clear its misgivings about the University of Wyoming's divestment policy in a letter to the school's president.

' *â\200\234â\200\230We are deeply distressed and confused," wrote Mobil's chairman. â\200\234*â\200\230We write to you as a company that has contributed financially to the University of Wyoming and has employed your graduates.â\200\231 The letter called the school's new total-divestment rule â\200\234unfair and counterproductive.â\200\235

â\200\234There's no blatant threat there, but they're saying something,"â\200\231 says Agnes Kubic, a reporter for the Branding Iron student newspaper who obtained a copy of the letter. A Mobil spokesman says the company doesnâ\200\231't have a formal policy on whether to give money to schools that won't hold Mobil shares but declines to comment further.

Some U.S. companies refuse to penalize colleges for their divestment strategies by cutting financial aid. â\200\234â\200\234They are two entirely separate issues,â\200\235â\200\235 says a spokesman

in the country.

Firms V â\200\230if'i%â\200\231H,'Ties to South Africa .

[
at General Motors, which doles out \$30 million a year to higher education and is in the process of leaving South Africa. His

_ comments are echoed by officials at IBM

and at Xerox Corp., which still operates in South Africa.

But the funding cutoffs may be larger than anyone knows because â\200\230â\200\230it behooves neither side to go public,â\200\235 says Brian Rom, a New York consultant to institutional investors. Companies aren't anxious to publicize their tough stand, fearful of bad public relations. Schools don't want to draw attention to the grants they have lost and hope to salvage relationships with the companies.

The measures are already affecting debate on some campuses. A recent survey by the Investor Responsibility Research Center of 70 schools with divestment policies found that eight had been threatened with lost contributions: seven said fears of lost aid prevented them from adopting

tougher stock-sale rules. The study also noted that many schools didn't want their names or their recent stock sales revealed and for good reason. Ten companies had pre-ordered the report listing what schools sold which stocks.

Fears of lost contributions or strained relations with the corporate world concern tiny and big-name schools alike. Many of these (South Africa-related) companies are substantial benefactors to U.S. universities, says John Deutch, provost at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. MIT hasn't yet adopted aggressive divestment rules for an \$800 million portfolio that includes \$150 million in South Africa-related investments. One reason: a wholesale sell-off by any school might prompt leading companies to reevaluate their attitude toward that particular school and toward higher education generally, he says.

It's a compelling dilemma for a college president " says N 1 O. Keoh president of Wellesley College, a 2,200-student women's college in Massachusetts

0/ 12./94

that just rejected a tougher stock-sale policy. She says she is pulled in several directions. She must promote open campus debate, yet defend the university's standard despite her own support for the tougher policy. Moreover, she has just joined the IBM board of directors and had warned the company that Wellesley might embrace total divestment. (IBM appointed her anyway.) Above all she must ensure the college's financial health. **All other moral vision has to be kept in perspective, she says. .

Like most university officials, Ms. Keohane insists that a school's stock-sale rules don't brand a company as morally corrupt; rather, she says, such rules reflect disagreement with just one policy. Thus, a school isn't being hypocritical when it takes money from the same company. Few schools have policies that both push divestment and refuse grants. Princeton University does but has sold shares of only one: company rated poorly in fair-employment practices and that company wasn't a contributor, anyway. 5

But many business executives say that schools do want to have it both ways and that divestment is an absurdity that does nothing to end apartheid thousands of miles away. If it's a moral issue, how in the world can you be selective about it? you're being hypocritical. says Alan.

Pifer, former president of the Carnegie Corp. of New York foundation and a divestment opponent. If schools want to get moral, he asks, why don't they boycott products, refuse donations, deny corporate recruiting and the like?

Sull, critics fault companies for retaliation and predict coming confrontations. "That kind of blackmail drastically jeopardizes universities' academic freedoms," says Richard Knight of the American Committee on Africa. If the corporate counterpunches increase, he adds. "universities will have to stick together on this one and they probably will."

X,

i1
3
| gress to overthrow.the Government.
The United Democratic Front is the

St
sÃ©g%
il
I
|
i
i
hi

;
3
B B
|
E
P
.
8F

1 â\200\235
ihid
Is

H
Â£
i

%iï¬\201
%a

i3
18
53
o8

!
:
i

T
]
g

E

i
i

Â¥
g

b

g
E
Y

1

|

fgs

A hih

St~ The Bla

*â\200\230\.\â\200\230

ple were shot last week outside their home by unknown
gunmen. Dr. Ribeiro and his wife were prominent anti-
apartheid campaigners, and their home had twice been
attacked by assailants hurling gasoline bombs.

the dock during bail negotiations
wmtepoueemenwnhpmohmmâ\200\234

" belts looked on.

|

:
%
Â£
Â\$

Years in Detention

Democratic Front had once

South African press restrictions
prohibit journalists from reporting
unauthorized information on ac-
tions of the security forces, state-
ments deemed to be subversive and
information that could be con-
strued as endangering public safe-
ty.

in its demands the dismantling of the

South African armed forces. But, he went on, â\200\234in any political process, people cast their demands wide because once the process is set in motion, compromises have to be struck.â\200\235

â\200\234â\200\234We will have to address that in the witness box,â\200\235 he said, suggesting that, as in other important trials in South Africa â\200\224 notably that of Neison Mandela in the early 1960â\200\231s â\200\224 the witness stand may become a privileged platform for precisely those political utterances that the authorities sought . to stifle by bringing charges.

Leaning over the rail in shirt-sleeves, he argued that the United Democratic Front, which says it has a following of 2 million from 600 affiliated groups, offered the authorities a credible negotiating partner in the quest for racial change.

â\200\230Normal Political Actionâ\200\231

â\200\234If I were to look at the situation and make a suggestion in terms of . what should be done,â\200\235â\200\235 Mr. Lekota expounded, â\200\234it is to release the leaders and bring the country back to normal political action, because, at the moment, with organizations not allowed to do anything, it means you have no discipline.â\200\235

Because of the Government's crackdown on the United Democratic Front, he said, â\200\230people have no point of reference.â\200\235

*â\200\234If we become irrelevant,â\200\235 he said, â\200\234if the masses lose confidence, if we have nobody to look up to, you can sort it out only on the battlefield.â\200\235

*â\200\234If you want to move to a peaceful solution,â\200\235 he said, â\200\230â\200\230you must open up now.â\200\235

The trial, at which the defence has

not yet presented its case, has also offered moments that seem closer to personal sorrow. A def thus, might be handed a child to hold from a public gallery. Or spectators might arrive, passing police security checks, laden with gifts of chocolates, oranges and cooked food for the defendants to take back to the large, single cell they share in a prison 30 minutes drive away.

Then, at the close of a dayâ\200\231s hearing, the accused and their supporters in the public gallery join together in

inging a black nationalist anthem, while policemen look on with a kind of nonchalance. Then, one day last month, a clergyman among the accused, Geoffrey Moselane, offered a blessing to those yet free before returning to his cell.

The U.N. Today

Dec. 10, 1986
GENERAL ASSEMBLY .

Administrative and Budgetary
Committee â\200\224 10 A.M. and 3 P.M.

Ticket information phone: 754-7113.
Tours are conducted 9 A.M.-4:45 P.M.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1986 A29

South Africa Quits
U.S. Correspondent

Los Angeles Times Appealing Deadline

By David Crary
Associated Press

JOHANNESBURG, Dec. 9â\200\224The
government said today it has re-
fug.ed to renew the work permit of

] , correspondent of
the Los Angeles Times, and told
him to leave South Africa by Dec.
31:

Parks is the fifth foreign journal-
ist ordered out of country since a
nationwide state of emergency was
imposed June 12 because of violent
protests against the apartheid sys-

" tem of race discrimination. The De-
partment of Home Affairs would not
give a reason for his expulsion.

In a related development, repre-
sentatives of South African news-
paper publishers met with a Cabinet
committee Tuesday about govern-
ment plans for tighter press con-
trols. One antiapartheid group, the
Black Sash, urged publishers not to
become â\200\234a party to fascism.â\200\235

Parks, 43, has been in South Af-
. rica since mid-1984. He said he had
sought renewal of his work permit

since it expired in September. He
declined further comment, saying:

â\200\234If there are any problems, I will
discuss them with the Department

of Foreign Affairs, Home Affairs
and the Bureau for Information.â\200\235
Alvin Shuster, foreign editor of
the newspaper, said: â\200\234The Los An-
geles Times, which has had a bu-
reau in South Africa for 15 years,
regrets the decision.â\200\235 He said the
paper was â\200\234appealing for an exten-

sion of the deadline to discuss the

matter.â\200\235 3

â\200\234The Times feels that Mr. Parks has carried out his duties responsibly and objectively and hopes that

-he will be able to continue to do so,â\200\235 Shester said.

V[Reuter quoted a diplomatic source as suggesting that government anger at Los Angeles Times editorial criticism of its policies may have been responsible for Parksâ\200\231 oâ\200\230t?(er.]

A US. diplomat in Pretoria, speaking on condition of anonymity,

said American officials were discussing the case with South Africa.

Four foreign reporters were ordered out of the country within three weeks of the June emergency declaration: Newsweek magazine correspondent Richard Manning, CBS News cameraman Wim de Vos, West German television reporter Heinrich Buettgen and Dan Sagir, who reported for the Israeli newspaper Haaretz and Israel Army radio.

The meeting between Cabinet ministers and newspaper executives resulted from President Pieter W. Bothaâ\200\231s announcement last week that the media system of self-policing needed â\200\234pepping up.â\200\235

He said the National Press Union, which includes executives of the four main newspaper groups, agreed that South Africa faced â\200\234a many-pronged but well-coordinated revolutionary onslaught.â\200\235

Home Minister Stoffel Botha announced after todayâ\200\231s meeting that the Press Union wanted time to review the media code of conduct and a second meeting had been set for Feb. 13.

Newspaper editorials in the past few days have expressed alarm over the government attitude, suggesting that Botha hopes to pressure publishers into greater self-censorship. It is widely believed that new mandatory restrictions will be issued if the papers balk.

The Cabinet committee was led by Chris Heunis, minister of constitutional development and plan-

ning, and included the ministers of justice, law and order, education and home affairs.

Emergency regulations adopted in June empower the government to close newspapers. They impose several restrictions on the press, including bans on publishing "subversive" statements and on reporting security force actions without permission.

South African and foreign journalists have observed the restrictions only loosely in the past few months.

Roy Innis, the executive director of the Congress of Racial Equality:

The South African consulate has â\200\234no recordâ\200\235 of his trip.

'CORE EXEC MAKES

SECRET TR

by Utrice C. Leid

Roy Innis, the executive director of the Congress of Racial Equality, secretly made a trip last month to South Africa to â\200\234reaffirm his support of pro-Botha and reactionary forcesâ\200\235 within the apartheid state and southern Africa region, well-placed sources told The City Sun.

â\200\234We learned of his trip only a few days ago, and so far as we know, its purpose was to act as a kind of unofficial ambassador for U. S. Blacks to say [to the South African government] that not all Black Ameri-

3o

cans favor sanctions or divestment. It was pretty much the equivalent of (Zulu Chief Mangosuthu Gatsha) Buthelezi's recent visit to the United States in which he tried to act as an unofficial spokesman for Black South Africa,â\200\235 said a longtime CORE member who asked not to be identified.

The South African consulate in New York denied knowing anything about Innisâ\200\235s visit. â\200\234We have no information about this. There is no record that Mr. Innis has visited South Africa,â\200\235 said a spokesman who identified himself as Duke Kent Brown.

Continued on Page

Uty Jun(bl ek, 'ty)

e p-16 *SE

REVIEW & OUTLOOK

The Real Effect of Sanctions

Last week, Chester Crocker, the State Department's African-affairs chief, offered help in furthering negotiations between South African whites and blacks. South Africa's Foreign Minister Pik Botha has just dismissed that offer: "How reliable is it? What would Congress do with any deal I made with your government?"

Welcome to the post-sanctions politics of South Africa.

Three months ago Congress overrode the president's veto and passed economic sanctions against South Africa. Until the passage there were people protesting that sanctions would make South African blacks suffer and cost the U.S. its influence over the South African government. But sanctions activists said that this concern over South African blacks was a cloak for the self-interest of people who did not want to give up profitable South African enterprises. In truth, said these advocates, the economic pain of sanctions was justified in order to press the government for political reform. .

Before the sanctions vote it was possible to throw up your hands and say, "Who knows how the South African government will react when the crunch comes? Why not do the morally attractive thing and take our chances?"

So the U.S. did.

Now the data are beginning to roll

in. Here is what they show: (1) So far there is no economic crisis in South Africa. But where disruption has taken place, blacks have borne most of the burden. (2) South African politicians since the vote have been a disaster for opponents of apartheid. " - The sanctions probably gave an extra push to the movement of corporations out of the country. GM, [BM, Warner Communications, Kodak and Britain's Barclays bank have announced pullouts since the action. The corporations sold to their South African managements.

In some cases there will be employment as usual. Kodak workers, however, have lost their jobs, with

compensation. Shortly after GM's announcement, its employees struck, demanding a greater say in the corporate structure to come. The strike was broken.

Meanwhile, the government has been cracking down all over. It announced that it would start sending home Mozambican miners. For the first time in more than a year the

military has launched a raid into Angola against the SWAPO. An International Red Cross conference expelled the South African delegate, so South Africa kicked out the International Red Cross, relenting only after the organization's president announced that he disagreed with the decision of the conference.

The government has banned foreign financing to the United Democratic Front, the country's biggest extra-parliamentary opposition group. It has not released a report by the President's Council urging changes including mixed-race neighborhoods in the Group Areas Act. It has turned down a proposal drafted by blacks and whites for a regional parliament elected by universal suffrage.

It has closed 40 more schools on the eastern cape and says the schools won't open until students and parents quiet down. And after a year's pause the government is once again forcibly relocating blacks and their homes in the name of the homelands policy and residential segregation.

No one knows what sanctions will do to the South African economy in the long run. But now we can see how the South African government will react to whatever changes take place. There is no way for a reasonable person to contend that outside pressure on the government will produce internal reform.

Maybe some pro-sanctions people do not want reform. Maybe they want the impoverishment that paves the way for sudden, radical upheaval. If that is so, they can go on advocating more comprehensive sanctions. ;
+/If they say they want reform instead of revolution, you would think they'd have to admit that sanctions are not going to do the trick. But the sanctions advocates are incapable of this sort of analysis. They know the U.S. civil-rights techniques of 20 years ago. in which you pressed a little |

harder and got a iittle more. The ef-
fect in South Africa scarcely matters:
the point is to enact the ritual. :

These ritualistic passions are a re- .
current feature of American politics. |
We seem to be undergoing another in |
the Iran controversy, where the worst
allegations scarcely seem to explain
the extent of the furor. But in the
Iranian case, at least the costs of such
bizarre behavior will be borne most
by Americans. [n the South African

-, case, the spirits have seized us, but
others will suffer.

A22 Fripay, DEcEvaEr 12, 1986

THE WaAsH

The Washingtore

AN

Post

INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER

Have Sanctions Already Failed?

foreign minister. Naturally he opposes the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, the

sancuomâ\200\224plmbdlthmgrpasedMomomm
ago over President Reaganâ\200\231s veto. So he is now playing to the misgivings that many Americans have felt about the bill by insisting that it feeds both black violence and white stubbornness and that it is costing the United States what uncertain influence it enjoyed before. Voices in the United States, pointing to reports of black travail as sanctions begin to have an effect, sound a similar refrain.

It is not too early to ask how the Anti-Apartheid Act will touch the lives of South Africans. Nor is it too early to register what did not get registered

q HREWD FELLOW, Pk Botha, South Africaâ\200\231s

earlier: that the effort by Congress to force a

reluctant administration to steer another country's whole internal transformation is unprecedentedly ambitious and bound to be awkward to execute at both the Washington and Pretoria ends. That is reason enough to dismiss early declarations that already the law has backfired and proved itself a failure. [It is also to move very carefully in putting its complex and demanding provisions into effect.

Administration doubts about sanctions remain serious, says George Shultz. With reason. The South African economy is in trouble. Some of this results from the unrest provoked by apartheid, but some follows American business decisions not necessarily provoked but hastened or confirmed by the new law.

Not too many American advocates of sanctions may have expected the impact to fall on whites alone. But many hoped for a quick shock effect or looked the other way. Now real people are losing real jobs.

Some South African blacks feel the pain is bear-

able when measured against the pain of apartheid, since the white economy is shrinking too; some who feel this way believe that deepening pain is a necessary catalyst for necessary revolutionary fervor. Other blacks believe the pain promises no commensurate gains. Until the people being hurt sort out this question better, Americans at their safe distance should impose what sanctions the law requires, but only those, and watch what happens.

[Impulse and tactic alike make Pik Botha assert that American pressure forfeits American access. He tells the American government, which is now under legislative edict to, yes, â\200\234â\200\230concludeâ\200\231â\200\235 international negotiations on dismantling apartheid by next April, to forget it. To be seen bending to foreign pressure, frightened and defiant whites believe, guarantees their doom.

But two months is hardly time to conclude that the Anti-Apartheid Act will only heighten violence and foreclose dialogue. It should be tested further whether foreign pressure may provide the rationale for compromise, which Afrikaner pride denies. The hope must be that South Africans of all races will start discovering that the whole question of foreign participation in their countryâ\200\231s affairs is a diversion from the requirement to tackle them themselves.