

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I welcome the opportunity to testify before your Committee this morning.

I start with the premise that whatever the relationship between the United States and South Africa, apartheid, the official policy of the South African government is unspeakably evil and morally and politically wrong. Further, the United States government and its citizens are accessories to this evil by virtue of our acquiescence and support of an unjust and morally reprehensible government in the country of South Africa.

The unrest and violence in South Africa continues and escalates. The political ideals of our nation, our moral teachings and, indeed, our very history require that we change our policies toward the South African government. We must support the development of democracy and complete freedom. We must end our complicity with racism and violence and recognize and support the quest of the South African majority for full political rights.

To continue our current policy is un-american. I believe that opposition to apartheid is as american as apple pie. We, in this country, believe in individual freedoms; Black people and many colored people in South Africa do not have them. We believe in the democratic process - one person one vote - but Black people in South Africa do not have that right. We believe that human beings should be able to have the freedom to travel, to marry and raise families. Black people in South Africa do not have those rights. South Africa has an incredibly high infant mortality rate caused by lack of concern, neglect, poor health care and a government which doesn't care about its Black population. These factors in South Africa must be addressed.

We have been morally remiss in not meeting our responsibilities. The situation is deteriorating and we are among the few nations that have not actively opposed the regime and its abhorrent system. There is no question that it is at least dangerous, if not impossible for Black South Africans to

seek democracy peacefully. The international community has the capacity and leverage to cause the South African government to come face to face with Black South Africa and forge true democracy through dialogue and conciliation.

The current policy of so-called constructive engagement is a failure. There is no evidence that there has been a lessening of apartheid. Thousands have been convicted of political opposition; hundreds have been shot down in the streets; millions have been resettled to rural ghettos that masquerade as "homelands". The condition of rural blacks has gotten worse. Poverty is rampant in the urban areas.

The United States must take strong steps to promote justice and freedom. We must legislate a series of actions that will withdraw our support of, and end our acquiescence to apartheid.

In 1971, Congressman John Conyers and I introduced H.R. 12330 which called for disinvestment. That position still remains the position I hold. I urge adoption of a policy of comprehensive sanctions, mandatory disinvestment, a complete ban on imports and exports, from and to the nation of South Africa, a prohibition on the sale of Krugerrands in the United States, and a denial of landing rights, except in emergencies, in the U.S. to South African aircraft. In other words, I urge adoption of a policy that demonstrates our total abhorrence of South Africa's policy of apartheid.

The key to such a policy is disinvestment. Seventeen percent of South Africa's capital comes from abroad. A State Department study puts the total U.S. investments in South Africa at \$14.6 billion in 1984. This includes direct investments, investments through subsidiaries of U.S. companies based in third countries, short term loans from U.S. banks and portfolio investments in South African stocks.

U.S. corporate investment is important in its aggregate,

but it is also important in that much of the investment is in key sectors of the economy such as energy, computers, and transportation.

South African officials are well aware of the impact of U.S. companies. A 1978 State Department cable on South African attitudes toward multi-national corporations, released by the American Friends Service Committee says: "[the South African government's] stake in the multi-nationals is very large, not only for obvious economic reasons but because they execute a restraining effect on policymakers abroad."

In November 1983, Prime Minister Botha stated "Foreign capital investment was important to South Africa because it supplemented domestic savings to finance investment affected favorably the balance of payments, often involved transfer of technology know-how, and, sometimes, immigration of managers or highly qualified technical people."

Black South Africans have for many years called for the complete isolation of the white minority government and for a corporate pull-out from South Africa. While advocacy of economic sanctions is illegal, its support by Black South African organizations and leaders that appear to have the largest followings is clear and is expanding.

In a September, 1981 Johannesburg Star poll, nearly half of all urban Blacks, coloreds and Asians who answered the poll approved of "foreign businesses stopping all operations in South Africa even if it cost many people their jobs."

Nobel Laureate Desmond Tutu said last year "It is up to the international community to exert pressure on the South African government... especially economic pressure, to go to the conference table.... This is our last chance, because if that doesn't happen... it seems that the blood bath will be inevitable."

The effect of a U.S. pull-out would affect less than 1% of the labor force. But, even if it were more, as the late Steven Biko said, "The argument is often made that the loss of foreign investment would hurt Blacks in the short run, because many of them would stand to lose their jobs. But, it should be understood in Europe and North America that foreign investment supports the present economic system of political injustice.... If Washington is really interested in contributing to a development of a just society in South Africa, it would discourage investment in South Africa. We blacks are perfectly willing to suffer the consequences. We are quite accustomed to suffering."

Steve Biko was killed in 1977 by the South African police while he was being held in detention.

Even Reverend Leon H. Sullivan, author of the Sullivan principles, understands that legislative actions regarding sanctions must be taken. He wrote to me on April 5th of this year: "For the last six years I have advocated: (1) no new investments by U.S. companies in South Africa, (2) no new bank loans to the South African government or its agencies, (3) the banning of the sale of the Krugerrand, and (4) economic sanctions that will influence the South African government to abolish all apartheid laws. I continue to support these positions and urge legislation to make them law."

The second aspect of the policy I propose is a ban on imports to and exports from South Africa. Foreign trade is vital to their economy. I am convinced that our loss of access to so-called critical resources can be overcome. South Africa's primary trading relationships are confined to a relatively small number of countries. Fifteen percent comes from the U.S. Although exports are less concentrated, four countries, including the U.S., consume 28% of South African exports. Exports make up about 25% of South Africa's gross national product.

I specifically propose a ban on the importation of

Krugerrands. Americans bought \$450 million worth of the coins last year, which is 50% of the total sold. Krugerrands are the largest export from South Africa. They account for one-fourth of all products imported from South Africa to the U. S.

Because of the impact of Krugerrand sales on the South African economy and government, and because purchase of the coins is the most direct way in which Americans support apartheid, the ban is necessary.

Additionally, I urge a prohibition on landing rights of South African aircraft and a prohibition of U.S. tax credits and deductions from money paid to the South African government.

I am urging complete sanctions. It is my belief that H.R.997 provides an outline for such action. I am also a cosponsor of H.R. 1460, introduced by Mr. Gray and Mr. Wolpe which I strongly support.

Total sanctions are a serious step. The question arises--since human rights violations, even massive ones, occur in many nations having different economic and political systems, why single out South Africa? The answer is simple: South Africa is the only nation in the world that constitutionally provides that the overwhelming majority of the population shall not be eligible to participate in the affairs of state, solely on the basis of race.

In closing, I would like to quote Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.:

"South Africa's national policy and practice are the incarnation of the doctrine of white supremacy in the midst of a population that is overwhelmingly black. But the tragedy of South Africa is not simply in its own policy; it is in the fact that the racist government of South Africa is virtually made possible by the economic policies of the United States and Great

Britain, two countries which profess to be the moral bastions of the world."

Even if the effects of sanctions cannot be entirely predicted, sanctions are necessary to remove U.S. financing of the evil of apartheid and to make our position absolutely clear to the world.

We must act before it is too late. The situation in South Africa will not improve without outside pressures. If there is not real and dramatic change in the conditions of the Black people, there is little hope for peaceful change.

The double standard toward South Africa and the other regimes we oppose is obvious. Our policy toward South Africa brands us before the world, particularly the third world. As the crisis heightens in South Africa, we will become the focal point of discontent. That is not necessary.

We must disengage and end our support and acquiescence of apartheid.