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The subcommittee met at 1:40 p.m. in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Stephen J. Solarz (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. Solarz. The hearing of the Subcommittee on Africa will come to order. Today we are privileged to have with us and to be hearing testimony from Rev. Jesse Jackson, the president of Operation PUSH, concerning his recent extraordinary trip to South Africa.

Reverend Jackson is an internationally respected civil rights leader and an eloquent advocate of economic and racial justice. Earlier this summer he traveled in South Africa for 2 weeks, assessing the state of South African race relations and studying the prospects for change.

In South Africa, Reverend Jackson met with a wide variety of people, including black leaders, residents of Crossroads and Soweto, government officials, and American corporate executives. Having sparked a significant and spontaneous positive response among many black South Africans, he is in a position to make a very valuable contribution to the dialog within our own country which flows out of our fundamental opposition to the principles of apartheid.

In his discussion with us today, we hope Reverend Jackson will share his perceptions concerning the possibility of meaningful and peaceful change in South Africa. We want to ascertain whether he detected any degree of flexibility within the white political leadership on the central issue of black participation in the political, social, and economic life of the country. We want to explore his suggestions for new directions and new initiatives in American policy toward South Africa.

When Congress and the administration consider African policy, our attention is often focused on crises and flash points—for example the war on Zimbabwe-Rhodesia; conflicts in the Horn of Africa, Zaire, Uganda; the spiraling number of refugees throughout the continent. But these pressing and immediate problems must not cause us to lose sight of the day-to-day damage inflicted on millions of nonwhite South Africans by apartheid. The continued existence of the apartheid system remains the underlying and fundamentally most serious problem confronting Africa today. A moral issue of extraordinary dimension, apartheid must be addressed by our Nation in a manner consistent with the highest values of our democratic system.
While there may be disagreements in the Congress, even within our committee as to how best to deal with this problem, I think I can sincerely say that the apartheid system in South Africa and the existence of a racist and repressive regime in that country is a matter of deep and abiding concern to all Americans, white as well as black.

Reverend Jackson's appearance before us today will be the prelude to an extensive series of hearings on South Africa which our subcommittee intends to hold next year. At that time we will examine the assumptions underlying U.S. relations with the South African Government and consider several pieces of legislation with respect to U.S. private investment in and U.S. foreign policy toward South Africa.

Reverend Jackson, I want to thank you for coming here today to give us the benefit of your observations and analysis.

STATEMENT OF REV. JESSE L. JACKSON, NATIONAL PRESIDENT OF OPERATION PUSH

Reverend Jackson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Gray, and members of the Subcommittee on Africa. First, I want to express to you my sincere thanks on behalf of the board of directors of Operation PUSH and our South African delegation, for the invitation extended by you to present testimony on our recent trip to South Africa.

In its oversight and legislative functions, this subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Congress can do an enormous amount of good in helping to shape our Nation's foreign policy, in particular in our relationship to South Africa, and making that foreign policy consistent with the human rights sensitivities of the American public.

This is particularly important, in my judgment, because the clock of history is ticking away in South Africa. We have reached the countdown stage in the long struggle between the forces of freedom and institutionalized racist oppression.

The United States, in its own national interest, is required by historical circumstances to choose sides in that struggle and it would be very unwise, to say the least, for our country to be on the side of supporting moral bankruptcy and institutionalized racism.

Mr. Chairman, as you and the distinguished members of this committee well know, much has been written and said about conditions in South Africa. The range of national and international organizations that have addressed the problem of apartheid are quite extensive and the information they have published is considerable. This range includes such bodies as the United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid and the World Peace Council, as international bodies, and national organizations like PUSH, the American Committee on Africa, Clergy and Laity Concerned, the NAACP Task Force on Africa, and the International Freedom Mobilization, which last April convened a Summit Conference of Black Religious Leaders on Apartheid at the U.N. Church Center in New York.

Of course, this legislative body has access to voluminous amounts of published information by these and other organizations. In addition, many persons are available to this committee with particular expertise on African and international affairs. One calls to mind Mr. Johnny
Makitini, the North American representative of the African National Congress of South Africa; Bishop H. H. Brookins, chairman of the board of PUSH, who resided over an episcopal district of the AME Church in Lusaka earlier in this decade; Dr. Samih Farsoun, the current president of the Association of Arab-American University Graduates, who is professor of sociology at the American University here in Washington, D.C.; and Mr. Randall Robinson, executive director of Trans-Africa, to mention only a few such persons.

The focus of my remarks today will be on observations made in connection with our 17-day visit to South Africa in July of this year, and in this context, I will also address specific questions of interest to this committee that were raised in Chairman Solarz' letter inviting our testimony.

Our three-member delegation had an extensive and intensive visit to South Africa in July of this year. We made this trip in response to an invitation from the United Congregational Church of South Africa, and from the general secretary of the South African Council of Churches, Bishop Desmond Tutu.

During this trip, our delegation talked with people living in squatters camps, as well as executives of U.S. corporations. We met with factory workers in Port Elizabeth, scholars from various universities in South Africa, leaders of the Natal Indian Congress in Durban, "banned" leaders like Mrs. Albertina Sisulu, high school students from Soweto, clergy attending the Annual Conference of the South African Council of Churches in Johannesburg, and many others, including many who have experienced arbitrary detention by the police for long periods of time. We spoke at a mass meeting, which the press estimated at 15,000 people, at the Regina Mundi Catholic Church in Soweto and had similar meetings in each city we visited. We met in Kwazulu with the Chief Minister, Gatsha Buthelezi, as well as with the National Council of Inkatha, which he heads.

We came away from this trip with impressions deeply felt, both of the hope and sense of determination that is so alive in the hearts of the people, as well as with a sense of the tragedy of apartheid. Above all, as citizens of these United States, we feel the urgency of the need for our country to have a coherent Africa policy, which is understood by the people of that continent, as well as by the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to attempt to describe, in some measure, the South African arrangement. The apartheid system in South Africa is brutally enforced by the police and upheld by racist laws which represent a daily violation of the humanity of the black population in South Africa. We talked with a number of business leaders among white South Africans who fully agree with that estimate. Above all, as citizens of these United States, we feel the urgency of the need for our country to have a coherent Africa policy, which is understood by the people of that continent, as well as by the American people.

Apartheid, as we know it, is a political system. The South African Government does not recognize black humanity. There are 25 million people in South Africa, 18 million of whom are classified as African Blacks, another 2 million who are officially classified as "coloureds," but who are black as well; and another half million classified under apartheid definitions as Indians.

In addition, there are 4.5 million whites, and although all are classified as white, in terms of the existing power relationships in South Africa, the 2.5 million Afrikaners rule the country and do not share power with either the 20 million nonwhites nor the other 2 million English-speaking white population.
One could say, "Well, this is bad and we oppose it, but what does this have to do with U.S. foreign policy?" The U.S. involvement with that racist regime—the economic, political, diplomatic, military, and cultural ties between our Government and the apartheid regime of South Africa—constitutes a partnership of serious import.

The United States has official diplomatic relations with the South African Government. This legal cover allows 350 U.S. business corporations to operate there. The highest returns on foreign investments in the world are in South Africa, and about 2 percent of total U.S. foreign investment is in that country. The greatest share of this investment by U.S. companies is concentrated in five U.S. corporations—General Motors, Ford, Caltex, IBM, and Mobil. These 350 U.S. corporations employ about 60,000 blacks, in mostly menial, low-paying jobs with no union, and another 40,000 whites, mostly in upper salary, white collar occupations and managerial positions.

These circumstances put the U.S. Government, and our corporations, in an uneasy partnership with South African apartheid; 60,000 black jobs, and no union or citizenship rights, cannot serve as a trade-off or a buffer for the quest for full and equal citizenship rights for 20 million black people in South Africa.

The partnership between the United States and South Africa is an uneasy one because it represents the most blatant violations of President Carter's human rights policy. Diplomatic recognition of the apartheid regime by the United States paves the way and sets the climate for business investment and market outlets. It also encourages other nations to relate to South Africa, since they have our example to follow.

This partnership is a policy which places our country on a collision course with most of the countries of Africa and with world public opinion. That policy must be fundamentally changed in the national interest.

Mr. Chairman, in your letter of August 10, among the questions you asked is, "To what extent are alternatives to apartheid and separate development being seriously considered by the South African Government?" My observations are that they are not being considered at all. Apartheid and separate development are two sides of the same coin. The regime in South Africa is making some cosmetic changes in some of the grossest expressions of apartheid, and gambling on these changes to help them escape world condemnation and censure. Through this tactic they hope to preserve intact all of the basic functions and operations of the system of apartheid.

"Separate development" is an updated version of this policy which, in content, is designed to strip the majority of South Africa's black population of any suggestion that they are citizens of South Africa by imposing a paper citizenship on time in the Bantustans. On the other hand, there does exist some degree of flexibility in attitudes in the white community, which are worthy of note.

Our observations of the South African scene convince us that the economic system and the political system there are on a collision course. The economic system needs trained workers. Apartheid will not train them. The economic system needs people who work and pay taxes and consume. With millions of blacks unemployed, they cannot pay taxes, and they cannot consume. So the few whites who are working have to
pay extremely high taxes for the military and the police apparatus needed to control the unemployed. Apartheid as a political system is failing the economic system.

The economic system needs money, bank loans and investments from the outside. But, because of the uncertainty of that system, it makes investment more difficult to come by. South Africa’s expanded trade and diplomatic relations with Israel, which are designed to circumvent the effects of world economic sanctions, will not succeed either.

Economically, the apartheid regime needs a 7-percent-a-year growth rate. From their own capital they can generate 3 to 3.5 percent a year, or about one-half what they need. The system needs $600 million to $2 billion a year in new capital to grow. If we insist upon disinvestment because of disenfranchisement, and only support investment when there is full enfranchisement, we could make a valid contribution to the liberation of black people in South Africa. For we would force the business order, even though they are now gutless and scared, and do not want to face the political wrath of the rural classical capitalists over and against the urban industrial capitalists, into conflict with the political order and adjustments would have to be made.

This is not unlike what happened in our own Nation 100 years ago, when the rural classical capitalism of the South confronted the industrial capitalism of the North. That was the basis of the Civil War; deciding which economic system would prevail. In South Africa, it will not be their conscience burning because of the enslavement of blacks that will bring about change. It will be because we stimulate a confrontation between the economic and political order.

There is hope, because there is academic unrest, basically among the whites. White leaders are hemmed in by apartheid as well. Tyranny is similar to cancer. Racism, hatred, and fear are like cancer. If it ever comes near the heart, it soon goes all over the body. Tyranny cannot be localized. And so the academic leaders sit there saying, “Reverend, the fact is, we don’t have academic freedom. Books are banned. We can’t do research on energy supply. We cannot do research on our own Government. Our freedom has been taken,” these white people are saying, “by apartheid.”

The same cancer that was designed to eat up black folk is now climbing up higher into the broader body politic. These academic leaders at universities told us they were prohibited from doing research into police behavior or the judicial process; their access to books is limited, not by money but by Government policy. So they are seriously restricted in their academic pursuits. They are not free to look into the functions of foreign corporations, and informed us that section 2 of the Terrorism Act prohibited any South African citizen or “noncitizen,” that is blacks, from arguing the case for disinvestment, under penalty of a minimum of 5 years in prison.

We met with church leaders. Some blacks had paid for a church. The church property was confiscated. They then had to rent the church that they had already bought. But Bishop Desmond Tutu is now preaching civil disobedience, arguing that the church must make a higher witness and be willing to face a crucifixion in order to get a resurrection. The very involvement of a visible church, with black and white clergy, which by definition breaks the law, is hope.
It is in these developments that there may be some hope or prospect for peaceful change in South Africa. Nevertheless, it must be underscored that apartheid is violence, daily violence, implemented by brutal terrorist methods. It is a state of war against the human rights and citizenship of the black majority population and a repression of the rights of most white citizens.

What do South African blacks think U.S. companies should be doing? Although opinion is divided, most think they should be divesting. We talked with dozens of workers in American-owned plants and none of them were willing to compromise a few token concessions of an affirmative action type, as a substitute for their full human rights in South Africa. For, if an American company were to give a plant to black South Africans today, the white-ruled minority government could take it back tomorrow.

Black South Africans who talk of divestment do so in private conversation, for to do so publicly would be to risk jail. However, even those who favor foreign investment admit that the pressure for divestment is useful to all who want to abolish apartheid.

Apartheid is an authoritarian form of government for blacks and a limited democracy for whites. Apartheid, the official policy of the Government, will not grant citizenship to the majority of the population. Black Africans do not have the right to vote. Black Africans have no official power. They are in the pre-Dred Scott days, because a black has no right that a white is bound to respect. They run parallel societies. They are separate, but there is no pretense of their being equal. In South Africa, blacks cannot live in the city. Blacks cannot own any property. Coloureds can get property on a 99-year lease. In the downtown areas there are areas of "coloured preferential," which means that blacks cannot work downtown, except when there are not enough coloureds to go around.

The $5.7 billion of direct or indirect investment that U.S. corporations hold in South Africa is an economic pillar for the apartheid regime. The attitudes of these U.S. corporations are such that we can understand South African blacks saying that they should divest.

For example, we met with the leaders of the Mobil Corp. of South Africa at Mobil House in Capetown. Mr. Nichols is their chief representative. It should be noted that after 85 years of operating in South Africa, the Mobil Co. in 1971 had a situation in which all nonwhite employees were making the absolute minimum wage, and none were in any advanced training programs. Mr. Nichols opened his remarks in our conversation by putting forward a distinction between apartheid and separate development. It seems that Mobil is opposed to apartheid, at least in giving lip service to same, but does not take the same position on separate development, which I have noted earlier is apartheid's alter ego.

Mobil employs 3,000 workers, of whom about 1,600 are white. After 93 years in South Africa, Mobil has 1 African district manager and 8 sales managers, out of a managerial force of about 200. When we asked the company leadership if the oil they sell to the South African Government is resold to Rhodesia and was thereby in violation of the embargo that is supposed to be in effect, they replied that the South African "Official Secrecies Act" prevents them, by law, from answering any questions regarding where they get their oil, or to whom they sell it.
Furthermore, he said that the General Law Amendment Act of 1974 requires them to apply to the Minister of Economic Affairs to get permission to answer questions like the one we were asking, and they informed us that they could not continue the conversation unless we changed the subject. This is an example of the extent to which U.S. corporations accommodate to the rules of the apartheid regime, and are in effect willingly held hostage to the regime's legislation.

We visited Ford in South Africa, in Port Elizabeth, and found that 80 percent of its labor force is nonwhite. But 88 percent of its supervisors and managers are white. This is another example of the employment pattern of U.S. corporations, which fully fit into the design of apartheid in that they provide a majority of white workers with the best paying jobs and thereby make them beneficiaries of apartheid, rather than allies of the black workers in a common effort to improve conditions for all.

We asked the representatives of the Ford plant management if their company was in compliance with U.S. Commerce Department regulations issued in February of 1978 regarding sales to the South African Government. Their reply was the following: “Our company has told us that these regulations apply to U.S.-origin products only, but that products licensed elsewhere can be sold to the South African Government.”

They went on to say that about 10 percent of their sales are to the South African Government, and that they hesitate to refuse sales because the Government has the power to effect a general boycott of Ford products in the South African market.

We visited General Motors of South Africa, their assembly and manufacturing plant in Port Elizabeth. I believe General Motors has been in South Africa since 1924. Today 52 percent of their labor force is nonwhite. They have one African foreman and no black employees in such white-collar jobs as the timekeeping department. We asked the leaders of the GM plant how would they describe their relations with the South African Government. Their response was, “Good. The South African Government is a big customer.”

So these U.S. giant corporations have good relations with the apartheid regime. But the indigenous African National Congress of South Africa, founded in 1912, is banned by that same regime, and their leaders are either in exile or in jail on Robben's Island. The National Convention Movement is banned. The Black People's Convention Movement is banned, and Steve Biko, its founder, assassinated. African trade unions are banned. The Natal Indian Congress, founded by Gandhi, enjoys only semilegal standing and some of its leaders are among those individuals banned. Banned, Mr. Chairman, by the same Government that General Motors, Ford, and Mobil say they have good relations with, and in the latter two, that the Government is a good customer.

So South African blacks think U.S. companies should be disinvesting. “Is there a role for U.S. private investment in South Africa?” your letter asked me. Not if they are in partnership with the official policy and regime of apartheid and separate development and are willing hostages to apartheid law and customs. And that is their present posture, as it is the posture of the U.S. Government.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of emphasis, I do wish to underscore again the point that South Africa, as an apartheid regime, does not
recognize black humanity. It does not recognize us legally. No black
in South Africa has citizenship status or any protection under the
law: No right to vote; no right to protest or assemble. For only
citizens have that right and blacks are not citizens by the operational
definition of apartheid.

Economically, we are not recognized. We experience either low
wages or no wages. No African union is recognized. Businesses there
are shielded by business protection acts externally and official secrecy
acts internally. Socially, blacks are in the category of the "untouch-
ables." Apartheid assumes that a black person cannot dream, hurt, or
aspire. It destroys family life. Religiously, apartheid assumes God
made a creative error when he made a black man. The human com-
munity cannot coexist with apartheid. It is a moral illegitimacy that
we must fight.

Now in terms of assessing current U.S. policy toward South Africa.
It is clear that the United States is a partner with South Africa, with
its capital in the form of investments and loans. And capital attracts
capital. The United States contributes to the social acceptance of
South Africa. U.S. companies exploit cheap labor. U.S. companies
abide by South African law. Ford and GM sell cars and trucks to the
Government of South Africa, thereby circumventing the intent of the
Commerce Department's regulations by getting parts from Britain
and England, but producing paramilitary equipment for South Africa.

South Africa makes $1.2 billion a year from the sale of the gold
Krugerrand, and more than half of this amount, roughly $600 million,
is money or foreign exchange earned by South Africa from sales of the
Krugerrand in the American market.

The United States and South Africa exchange scientific personnel.
The United States collaborates with South Africa in the expansion of
South Africa's nuclear capabilities, including the development of
uranium capability, and so forth. So, America must make a decision
about South Africa. The United States must determine which side of
history it chooses to be on.

Mr. Chairman, in your letter of invitation you asked me to comment
on how black political leadership in South Africa and the black
community there responded to the proposed changes embodied in the
Riekert and Wiehahn reports. The information we received suggests
that with respect to the Wiehahn commission report, it is obvious
that many of the recommendations sound very good. I would say that
there is a wait-and-see attitude on the part of black leadership because
as you probably know, it is an old ploy of ruling circles in white
minority regimes to respond to the uprising of a people byj creating a
commission. Then the commission comes forward with a white paper
and this white paper proposes that things be looked into further. The
issuance of the white paper is usually accompanied with a great deal
of demagogic speeches, and then the paper is promptly shelved and
no more is heard about it. Because by that time, they hope, the so-
called natives will have calmed their restlessness. This is one of the
classic styles of Western parliamentary rule, so we know that the
Wiehahn commission report does have some very positive recom-
recommendations.

Of course, again if one looks at the details, we need to take into
account that South Africa is an industrially developed society. Thus,
there is really no necessity for any government in South Africa that
wishes to conform to democratically accepted norms of behavior to
reinvent the wheel. Since all industrial countries have a generally
accepted set of labor relations that govern the democratic rights of
the laboring population—for example, to have unions, organize, and
these sorts of elementary rights—it is not necessary for South Africa
to invent anything new.

So the Wiehahn commission report suggests that they know what
needs to be done with respect to establishing universally recognized
norms of relationships between labor and business. The question is:
What will it take to make them do it?

However, one must also look at the Wiehahn commission report
from the standpoint of a couple of their recommendations. They say
that all persons, irrespective of race, color, or sex, who enjoy permanent
residence in South Africa and who are in fixed employment qualify
for membership in a registered trade union.

Now that is very interesting because those qualifications, of course,
mean that the large pool of migrant laborers, people that are classi-
fied as migrants, not as permanent residents, would not be covered
under the Wiehahn definitions. People from Mozambique, Angola,
and so forth, who work in the gold mines would not be covered.

The question then becomes who enjoys permanent residence in
South Africa? If the Bantustan proposal is further pushed, this would
mean that a majority of black people would not be given permanent
residence in South Africa. So, whatever changes the Wiehahn com-
mision represents, it would not apply to them.

It is also interesting that one of the clear provisions of the Wiehahn
commission report is that the closed shop practice is suspended. That
is, the union protection pattern which has in all industrial countries
protected the rights of industrial unions to organize, is suspended,
and no further agreements in South Africa for closed shops may be
permitted. The National Manpower Commission will be instructed
to investigate the need for this practice to be retained, but as of now,
the closed shop, as a union protection instrumentality, is abandoned
in South Africa, even under the Wiehahn commission report.

So again, the fact remains that this report is perceived of as an
evolutionary process by which South Africa will eventually arrive at
some universally recognized standards of democratic rights for work-
ing people. The possibility that under apartheid such a thing will
eventually happen is as good as the possibility that it will never
happen. So again, I emphasize that the black leadership that we talked
with seem to have a wait-and-see attitude with respect to it because
there is no basis for looking to it as some type of emancipation
proclamation.

The same is true of the Riekhert commission report. We can dis-
pense with it for the time being by saying categorically that since no
legislation implementing the Riekhert commission recommendations
is expected before 1980, we will simply have to wait and see that
legislation is formulated that represents implementation of this report
before we could place any real judgment on it. But at any rate it is
hardly a point on the agenda at the moment simply because there is
not going to be any legislation covering their recommendations before
1980, if at that time.
So, it is clear that neither of these reports represents much with regard to the ills that plague South Africa. It is the will for freedom among the South African people themselves, combined with international pressures, that will ultimately decide the course of events in that country. I repeat, it is the will for freedom among the South African people themselves, combined with international pressures, that will ultimately decide the course of events in that country.

Now I will respond to the other question you raised about the issues involved in the controversy surrounding the world championship boxing match set for October 20 in Pretoria. This is a major sporting event in South Africa. South Africa has gold power and military power, but South Africa does not have world acceptance. Seventy nations of the world have said that apartheid is an international crime against humanity. In South Africa, blacks must operate with passes and permission slips. There is no policy of multiracial sports in South Africa. And even when there are mouthings from the top of the Government, at the very bottom every city still has the right to determine whether or not to obey the statement. And thus, it amounts to states’ rights.

In Pretoria, where the fight is being held, if a black person were to go there on any other occasion, other than the night of the fight, that person would have to use a pass to get in; would have to sit in a section for blacks only; would have to use lavatory or toilet facilities for blacks only, as distinguished from coloured, Indian, and white. They could not use any of the social areas. And, without a special permit, they would be locked up going home because no black can be on the street after 9 p.m. To be found on the street thereafter is to break the curfew laws.

But, because South Africa wants to change her face and attract money, as opposed to changing her heart and bringing human rights to all human beings, on the night of the fight, for this massive international facelift, South Africa will give blacks a one-night rendezvous with dignity. One night they can come to the fight without a pass. One night they can use the toilet of their choice. One night they can sit anyplace, while the cameras of the world, operating between the developed cities, in that one-night rendezvous with dignity, they can say, "Things are not what they ought to be in South Africa, but they are getting better. Therefore, we should invest money in South Africa."

We in PUSH have joined with other human rights organizations in a commitment to fight to stop that fight. The reasons behind our commitment and determination are the following:

First, a heavyweight boxing match held in South Africa fills the most desperate need that the apartheid regime has for world acceptance. The sports route is the main highway through which the regime hopes to gain acceptance and reduce world criticism.

Second, multiracial sports is a myth in South Africa. It is non-existent, So NBC-TV will be televising a sports match in South Africa, which makes it a party to selling a fraud to a worldwide audience. The Pretoria stadium arrangement, which I just referred to, underscores this fact.
Regardless of the outcome of the fight, the apartheid regime will gain from this event if it is held in Pretoria: international prestige, tax receipts, and a propaganda victory that will make it more difficult to isolate South Africa from participation in the 1980 Olympics, which is only 10 months away. So the timing of this fight is very important to take into account. The leaders of the few organizations which still enjoy legality in South Africa feel very strongly about having the fight canceled. The one thing they asked of us in Durban and elsewhere was that we would put forth every effort to see to it that this fight was canceled.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, regarding recommendations that we have arrived at in relation to our partnership with South Africa, our delegation met with President Carter on August 9, 1979, and we submitted the following recommendations to the President:

One, we urged that the President instruct the Commerce Department to closely monitor the activities of General Motors, Ford, Caltex, Mobil Oil, and IBM in South Africa. The purpose of such monitoring is to establish that these companies are in full compliance with the intent of the U.S. Commerce Department's regulation 135, regarding the selling of supplies to the South African Government, and also with regard to maintaining the embargo against Rhodesia. This requires, at a minimum, strict monitoring of activity by the executive branch of the Government.

Two, the second reform recommendation asked that the Justice Department look into the scandal now shaking the South African Government, the Rhodesia investigation with which we are all familiar. We asked that the Attorney General investigate the use of South African Government funds to influence election campaigns in this country, such as the defeat of Senator Dick Clark, of Iowa, former head of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa. We feel that the American public needs more information on this, as well as an investigation into the South African Government's attempts to use their funds to buy up U.S. news media—the Washington Star and the Sacramento Union—and influence public opinion here.

Three, we recommended to the President that any further negotiations between the United States and South Africa on the SASOL project be based upon the condition that universal adult suffrage and full citizenship for the black majority population of South Africa be recognized and established as a matter of law. And that we would not continue any negotiations on the SASOL project with South Africa until there was an understanding and a commitment to extend these democratic rights to the black majority population.

Four, we recommended to the President that he convene a White House Conference on Southern Africa within the next 6 months. This level of focus on the situation in that region of the world would help to mobilize public opinion and help shape a coherent United States-southern African policy.

The present policy of imposing economic sanctions on Zimbabwe-Rhodesia which is changing to majority rule, while being in partnership with South Africa, is a blatant contradiction in U.S. foreign policy.
This point is extremely important as are the others with respect to the executive branch of the Government in the light of the resignation of Ambassador Andrew J. Young. I think we all recognize the enormous contribution to public awareness that Ambassador Young made during his tenure as Ambassador to the United Nations and it has made the work of all of us easier.

The great debt that we owe to this distinguished public servant can only be fulfilled if we renew our efforts to place our country on the side of justice and human rights. The acid test of this posture is our relationship with the racist apartheid regime of South Africa.

Also it seems to me that the Congress has some very concrete things it can do and I want to include in our recommendations that the U.S. Congress legislate that the sale of the Krugerrand in this country be banned.

The vast amount of foreign exchange that the South African Government earns from the sale of the gold Krugerrand covers its oil bill and its defense budget and those are two very significant items in apartheid’s survival.

The banning of the sale of the Krugerrand which, for us, also adds to our problems of a trade deficit, adds to our problem of a balanced budget and contributes to the high price of gold on the world market because of the speculation in gold, would be a role that the Congress could play in helping concretely and in setting a climate that says, “This partnership with South African apartheid is being dissolved.”

It is very important for the Congress to contribute to such a climate because the Congress, according to the Constitution, is supposed to be the most representative of the three branches of Government.

I might add at this point it is the church organizations that have been making their appeals through stockholders’ resolutions on disinvestments; the student movements on major college campuses for disinvestment of university funds from corporations doing business in South Africa; mass-based movements against bank loans; the summit conference of black religious leaders and activities like these that tell us where public opinion in America is on this question.

The American people oppose apartheid. They will support concrete actions by the Government in breaking the relationship with apartheid.

The Congress and the President must act. I am appealing to the Congress today to take steps that would represent giving some leadership to this mass sentiment. One concrete step that could be taken is that the Congress could legislate against the sale of the Krugerrand in the American market. We urge that you do so.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted a very personal word, some persons were very critical of us because they said, “You have not been here long enough and you do not understand apartheid. There are just some things that you do not understand.”

There may be some things that I do not understand about South African apartheid. I doubt if there are many. For you see, when we arrived at the airport and I saw the signs “Black” and “White”, that was nothing new for me. It was simply a reminder.

I told the press when they challenged me,

You apparently do not understand. I was born and bred in apartheid, not in South Africa but in South Carolina. I have an advantage on you. I have known apartheid from both sides. I grew up under apartheid but with the help of God, I rose above it. I know your side but I also know the underside. I understand the rejection. Separate schools by law is nothing new to me. It is a reminder. Teachers making dual salaries while black teachers make less by law is a reminder.
The ANC is banned in South Africa but the NAACP was banned in America. They call ANC Communist but they called the NAACP Communist. I know rejection.

This division of color is nothing new to me. I waited tables. I caddied and shined shoes while the white boy was the cashier. I grew up where it was against the law for a black boy to know what a white boy knew. I know about signs in buses reading “Colored from the rear.” I know about “three-fifths human,” *Plessy v Ferguson*, “separate but equal,” *Dred Scott*, “a black’s got no rights that a white man must respect.” I told them, maybe you all don’t know me, but I know y’all.

Change is going to come in South Africa. Whether it will be essentially economic, political, and peaceful, or whether violent and relatively sudden is yet to be determined. That lies largely in the hands of those with power in Pretoria.

I am also convinced that the United States for moral, economic, political, national interest, and national security reasons ought to help facilitate the change there. We should use our diplomatic, economic, political, and military leverage to foster change for black and white South Africans.

Chairman Solarz and members of the committee, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to share with you our experience and views relative to our recent visit to South Africa.

Your patience and interest in a rather lengthy testimony is very much appreciated.

I am now ready to entertain any questions that you or the committee members may have.

Mr. Solarz, Reverend Jackson, I want to thank you for what must surely be one of the most moving and meaningful statements on the situation in South Africa which this subcommittee has heard.

We now have a vote in progress. I am going to recess the meeting of the subcommittee for about 10 minutes so the members can vote. When we return we will put some questions to you.

Thank you.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee recessed for a vote on the floor.]

**AFTER RECESS**

Mr. Solarz. The meeting of the subcommittee is called to order. Reverend Jackson, you did not in your series of recommendations concerning possible American actions toward South Africa specifically address the question of disinvestment or prohibition on new investment or any legislation in some way regulating American investment in South Africa although you did speak about the whole question at some length in the body of your testimony.

Could you give us the benefit of your opinion as to whether or not you think it would be helpful for the Congress to enact such legislation and, if so, whether you make any distinction between the desirability of legislation requiring disinvestment as compared to legislation prohibiting new investment or some variation of those two possibilities?

Reverend Jackson. First of all, as a general rule, I endorse all forms of economic pressures which at one level is no more bank loans, no new bank loans, prohibit the sale of the Krugerrand in this country because of our own economic interest in what gold is doing to the dollar but also in terms of our ability to fight apartheid by using economic leverage.
I think our country, Mr. Chairman, has three options in South Africa. One option is to remain there as a partner as we are now, an enforcer of apartheid, a pillar of apartheid and think the world is so stupid that it does not know the difference. That is the present posture which is the status quo position.

The second position would be to use our strength in South Africa, our economic strength, our scientific strength, our military strength, and our diplomatic strength to establish some immediate timetables for negotiation for the liberation of people there, just as we have our Camp David Summit trying to bring peace in the Middle East, the use of our powers to bring about change now.

If we are not willing to do that, if it involves an offensive action, we should immediately disinvest and disengage totally.

In my judgment we have one of those last two options, to either disengage totally and frankly, I am far more impressed with the use of power and the public commitment to end apartheid because in one real sense simply to leave no responsibility is to rape and to run. We are part of the rapism in the arrangement.

Mr. Solarz. What was your opinion about the effectiveness of the Sullivan code? Do you think that code has served any constructive purpose in terms of improving the economic position of blacks in the country or is it essentially irrelevant?

Reverend Jackson. It represents no fundamental impact upon that system. The labor leaders told us that in 1971 those were the principles that they put forth but they fought diligently for them because their agenda now has shifted to dignity and shared power and not just some more rands to buy more time.

In effect they are saying does it matter if a few more rands and a few more blacks cannot own land, that a few more rands and a few more blacks can be arrested without any show of cause for 5 years.

The fundamental struggle there is not an affirmative action struggle. It is a liberation struggle. Affirmative action in my judgment is not a negative. It is not the problem nor is it the solution.

You are sitting on a different wavelength from the issue. We have looked north to the liberation struggle since the movement and what is happening in Namibia and their agenda is somewhat different than a better job.

Mr. Solarz. In your view, would it be constructive if the Congress were, for example, to legislatively implement the Sullivan code in its revised form by requiring American corporations doing business in South Africa to comply with such a code or do you think for the reasons that you just mentioned it really does not make much of a difference?

Reverend Jackson. I think that would be an impediment to progress because it creates an illusion that something fundamental is happening where something superficial is happening.

The fact of the matter is if our country is there and has 100,000 people, about 60,000 of them are black, they help a few blacks but they help the 40,000 whites much more. The 40,000 whites really help to stabilize the middle class white oppressors of South Africa.

For this country to simply fight on level B for an affirmative action plan, it is irrelevant particularly when the real issue is IBM, Caltex, Mobil, General Motors, and Ford engaging in relationships with the
South African Government for the sale of military and paramilitary equipment or the use of the South African Government as a conduit for oil to Rhodesia.

These are errors that are far more fundamental. The fact that the American company is there is to recognize that no African union is there. They have committees instead. There are unions that cannot bargain for themselves and there are unions that have no right to protest.

Mr. Solarz. Would you support legislation which prohibited all new American investment in South Africa or would you feel that did not go far enough and unless it required disinvestment that it would not be particularly helpful?

Reverend Jackson. No new investment is obviously a step in the right direction. The prohibition of the Krugerrand being sold here is a step in the right direction. A move to stop that fight from being broadcast is a step in the right direction.

We have to keep on stepping until we step up to a liberation date.

Mr. Solarz. I have one other question before I yield to my colleagues on the committee. You indicated in a certain sense it was too early to make a judgment on the Weihahn and Reikert commission reports because they have not been implemented.

Hypothetically, assuming that virtually all of the recommendations in those two reports are implemented, would you consider that significant progress or would that, too, be in a sense a kind of illusion which masks the continuing realities of the apartheid system which you described in your testimony?

Reverend Jackson. One man putting a timetable on the date of another man’s dignity is realized as extremely arrogant and sick. It is unkind.

Black South Africans need their citizenship affirmed tomorrow and the right to vote, at which time all of the commissions could be disbanded. You could take care of your own business from that point.

I think in contrast to our own struggle for the right to vote here as late as 1965, there were commission reports going around. There were some real interesting articles that blacks really should have the right to vote but since voting required intelligence, we should have at least a sixth grade literacy level. There was a lot of debate in these halls about whether or not we should have a sixth grade education.

It finally came on down to the fundamental issue of one man and one vote. If you pay taxes you should have the right to vote. If you are subject to military draft, you should have the right to vote. If you are a citizen you should have the right to vote.

All of these commissions to me are just clouds to separate the people from the sunshine. We need to get on down to the issue of the citizenship of black South Africans, the affirmation of their humanity. If their humanity is affirmed and the bill of human rights is affirmed, logic will take its course.

Mr. Solarz. Thank you very much, Reverend Jackson.

Mr. Diggs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, Reverend Jackson, I would like to join in complimenting the many people who have given you due recognition for the contribution you have made toward educating the American public about the conditions with your high visibility and your articulation.
It has put a new perspective on this issue which is absolutely necessary if we are going to be able to address some of these questions realistically. This has certainly been true in the last 2 or 3 weeks, growing out of the wake of what is now called the Andy Young affair which has given a new focus to international issues and to their interrelatedness to domestic concerns particularly of black Americans but not confined to that.

I observed in your comments during the past few weeks that in almost every instance when you made reference to the implications swirling around Andy Young and tying it into your recent experience on this trip that you made a reference to the partnership between Israel and South Africa.

I wondered if you would comment on that? I noted in your testimony that you did single them out. I wondered if you would comment upon your interchange with the very influential Jewish community in South Africa, what their attitude is toward their Government’s policy, the basis upon which they rationalize their continued support outside of the apartheid but the way they rationalize when you ask them questions about the relationship between Israel and South Africa and whether or not you see any prospective changes in attitude there among Helen Suzman and her associates and finally, whether or not you feel this has any bearing upon the considerations in the black community as it relates to the credibility of people who are involved in this process?

You have mentioned it. You have emphasized the meeting of black American leaders in New York. You have made several references to it as being part of the tension generating elements within the relationship between the black American and the Jewish community as it relates to Israel.

Reverend Jackson. No. 1, we were also very concerned about the relationship with Germany, France, England, and other nations with South Africa as well.

It is very important to note that most of the nuclear collaborations were coming from France. One of the reasons why our strong feeling is that Rhoodie was finally extradited from France back to Africa is because of the nuclear relationship. They had to reach back and get a 102-year-old antiquated law. They had to do something to satisfy the France-South Africa relationship and that is a factor. That is a piece.

As we communicated with Mr. Oppenheimer, we talked with him and Helen Suzman and it appears that she is representing a liberal factor but not a liberation factor. People are making a choice between people who are with us and people who are not with us because the revolution is going on in South Africa.

You have many of your English-speaking whites and Jews who are willing to fight for some measure of decency for blacks but not willing to fight for dignity and power. It is at that point that their tongue gets tripped up and they start talking about one man and one vote.

For example, the statement Mr. Oppenheimer made, in spite of his pronouncements about blacks having a certain measure of dignity was we do not want to be oppressed any more by the cause we lose than we want to be oppressed by the Afrikaners.
Once you shift from discussing indecency which the Afrikaners represent, the decency which some of the liberals represent and discuss dignity and power, then there is a break between blacks and the consciousness movement.

There is a concern about the direction of Israel and South Africa. There has been upgrading of diplomatic standing between Israel and South Africa from consular to ambassador levels. There is an upgrading of the relationship. Since 1975 trade between Israel and South Africa has increased 1,000 percent.

Israel has become the conduit for the gold and diamond element that Oppenheimer represents.

There is a concern on the one hand about the general European relationship with South Africa but in some specific sense black Americans are concerned about the Israel matter because of the historical relationship we have had with Jews in this country and also because we heavily invest in Israel in ways that we do not heavily invest in France and Germany and England and Canada.

There is a peculiar relationship that must be seen, it seems to me, in that context. It is a source of irritation and displeasure.

Mr. Diggs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Solarz. Mrs. Collins.

Mrs. Collins. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Reverend Jackson, I share a great many of your views on this subject and other issues. I am particularly interested in the Sullivan code which I have observed to be nothing more than a negated leaf covering and what corporations are doing in South Africa and your remarks on General Motors and other corporations from America there.

Some 4 or 5 years ago, Congressman Diggs and I were in South Africa and we had a meeting at the Ambassador's house. At that meeting we had representatives of the American business community.

I wonder if you had the same response I did from them. My reaction was I could not tell them from Afrikaners. I just could not. Their thinking was the same; their way of doing business was the same. They made excuses for the way the Government was run. They made excuses for the way their operations were run under those rules.

I wonder if you got the same kind of feeling when you were there.

Reverend Jackson. Fundamentally, but there were some interesting distinctions. The American corporations are under the pressure of meetings like this and Afrikaner businesses are not. The American business leaders there are managers and not owners. They operate more with a sense of being held hostage between the kind of pressures we apply here, political and economic, over and against their partnership with the South African Government.

I found a greater willingness by the Afrikaners business leaders like Mueller from Nedbank and AP Glass & Co. and others to stick clearly to the issue because the Afrikaner business leaders know that the economic order is on a collision course with the political order.

There are some very definite needs that the Afrikaner business leaders have for the apartheid being on a collision course with. They need new investment. It is becoming more difficult to get. They need markets. They need productive workers who are trained. The apartheid education system says you cannot get trained here.
They need workers who produce and apartheid really slows down production because there is no inspiration or incentive to produce.

One did get some distinction, Mrs. Collins, in this sense that the American companies are just kind of partners in bed without a marriage license. The Afrikaner business leaders operate on middle ground, the American business leaders assume.

They can discuss in a very healthy way their affirmative action approach and try to contrast their overt conduct with Afrikaners generally in the sense that those businesses now have the black and white signs down inside the building. Integrated toilets and the like are inside the building.

They assume no responsibility for conduct outside the building but once you leave discussing affirmative action, the Sullivan code and discuss the question of citizenship and the right to vote and fundamental questions, they are just the same.

Ford and General Motors now no longer deny the fact that they sell paramilitary equipment to the Government. They have simply given reasons for why they have to do it, to compete.

IBM, Caltex, and Mobil operate a little differently. They do not say it as boldly, at least Caltex and Mobil do not. They hide behind the business protective and secrecy acts but there is no fundamental difference between our companies' contact there and South African companies' contact there.

Mrs. Collins. Reverend Jackson, I wondered if you had any recommendations to the White House?

Reverend Jackson. On August 9, the President received them all and said that we were going to have a followup meeting with Ambassador Young and talk about it. The events changed rather radically the next week.

We have not had any kind of followup meeting. I am appealing to him for another meeting to further discuss this matter and intend to discuss this matter with Ambassador McHenry as well.

We found the conversations with him and Mr. Jordan of some considerable interest on the question of a White House conference on South Africa. I contend that we need to have such a conference because apart from the moral matter, our national interest is at stake and is jeopardized by the incoherent policy.

It is obvious that the message Nigeria sent to Britain over the southern African situation is not in our future as it relates to Nigeria and other African nations as well.

The time clock is ticking against our having a partnership in South Africa. All of the other African nations including those are in an economic bind and do some business with South Africa and are all against apartheid.

The threat to American interest in South Africa is not Communist, it is racism. Somehow we found for obvious reasons it far more difficult to fight a very present internal spirituality than we do a so-called foreign economic ideology but the threat to the relationship there, people down there are not dealing so much with Marx and Engels as they are dealing with standard black-white conduct.

Mrs. Collins. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Solarz. I hope the gentlewoman from New Jersey will understand if we depart from our custom of alternating between majority and minority to give those members who were here at the beginning of the hearing an opportunity to ask questions first.
I would like to now call upon the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Gray.

Mr. Gray. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I certainly want to welcome Rev. Jesse Jackson to the committee and thank him for his testimony.

Reverend Jackson, it seems that the essential thrust of the path you are suggesting is somehow America or its corporations ought to totally disinvest in South Africa.

Of course the argument that has been heard is, there will be a loss of a great number of jobs and black African leaders are concerned about the loss of those jobs if American corporations totally withdraw from South Africa.

Am I correct in understanding your testimony, that based on your firsthand observation black leaders and leaders in Africa who are involved in this struggle for what you have termed as human dignity, clearly state that is not an acceptable trade-off and they would like to have American corporate interest withdrawn in order to bring pressure to change the Government of South Africa and the apartheid system?

Reverend Jackson. First of all, I said our Government has two options. The third option is mute. The third option is to stay there and pretend to be immoral. The other option is to do what we did in the Middle East situation when we perceived to have a national interest there. We did not disengage. We used the sum total of that power to convene the national convention, the international convention, and began to hammer out a relationship that both protected our interest, our future interest, and our investments.

If this country took the position that it would use its leverage to convene the forces, that is ANC, PAC as well as the Afrikaner Government toward the affirmation of citizenship rights, that would be the highest and best use of our power.

I think we ought to do that. If we are not willing to do that then we ought to leave because we are in the way of that meeting being called, but being called under other conditions. In my judgment that meeting will be called one day either with us as a catalyst for it or us as being determined to be on the wrong side of it.

That meeting will be called one day. There is a difference of opinion among leaders there about the disinvestment situation. There is no threat in terms of a trade-off between that and dignity, the hiring of some black workers in Port Elizabeth who then if their children speak out have to be exiled. They are tired with that.

We had two meetings with the workers. One meeting we had on a Sunday afternoon after church. They told us what was actually going on and told us they would meet us the next day in the plants for the first time and act like we were strange.

Their concern at one level was that there be a moving toward the day when a final decision would be made.

I would think they would accept the first priority of this country using its power to bring about the change but right now that is not happening in any measure of any significance or in any fundamental way.

The other option is for us to get out of the way in my judgment. Seventy-five nations have made a decision to disengage, to just leave.

Mr. Gray. In that context I would take your statement with regard on page 6 and the mention of Israel that you also, taking what you
have said, that we then ought to urge the disinvestment by other
nations and quite a number such as Switzerland and even perhaps
some African nations that have economic relationships.

Would you say that would be another step to bring about pressure
to move from apartheid to human dignity?

Reverend Jackson. I agree and the reason why I agree that Israel
and other nations need to do it is because no one nation at this point,
given the price of gold, can quite do it economically alone. It will
take a combination of nations moving in concert because of the
perceived interest, for example, of the Western alliance as a case
in point.

I think this country for reasons of its history, ideology, and matters
in Israel ought to assume some leadership and not follow the pack.

Mr. Gray. That would not only be applied to Western nations
but would that also be applied to Mozambique, Botswana, and some
African nations?

Reverend Jackson. The situation is a little different inasmuch as
the people who are under the direct heat of economic survival find
themselves assuring a marriage of their souls with the Devil in des­
peration, not in luxury.

You see the relationship this country has with South Africa is not
one based upon necessity. It is identification with racist oppression.
That becomes fundamentally different.

The backbone of the Israeli economy is not expanding with South
Africa. It is the $5 million investment in this country. The best it
can do for people in this country who support Israel's right to exist is
to support us. We support it.

I have contended for a long time that the State of Israel is an
irreversible fact of history and since it is such a fact of history, there
are three reasons why it should probably be supported.

One, America's word is there. A nation can be no stronger than
its word; second, because of the $5 million a day investment which
is substantial; and third, because of the military options it represents
for us there and the geopolitical location.

Having said that, we ought to be able to expect the highest and
best humane conduct as a result of that support.

Mr. Gray. One further question, you mention on page 5 that you
noticed the flexibility in attitudes of the white community which are
worthy of note.

Could you expand on that? Do you see the possibility of change of
the apartheid system vis-a-vis the kinds of nonviolent struggle that
you were one of the major participants in in this country as a civil
rights movement?

Reverend Jackson. Only if it is a mass struggle and not a series of
parties around certain liberals' houses. It has to be a serious mass
dramatic struggle much like Dr. King led and much like Gandhi led.

One of the things that pleasantly surprised me was an expanding
witness of the church, white and black leaders in rather high visible
profile relationships. Bishop Tutu's call for people to react in civil
disobedience was a major step forward toward the theology and the
theological sense of apartheid. There was a conference of 6,000 minis­
ters and church leaders the week before we got there.
About the only thing they had agreed on was that apartheid is a state of sin. Many of them had been embracing apartheid because they had been the state church supporters of that arrangement.

That is a step forward in my judgment. The church began to become visible, to resent as opposed to enforce.

As it went to the academic community, you had men and women who had been trained at Oxford and Harvard and other places around this country and Europe who were intimidated by the process. Their books had been banned. Their research areas had been limited. That is the dissension.

I might say we found an English-speaking press struggling to represent the highest and best of a free speech tradition and that is they really carried most of what I said even if some of them editorially disagreed every now and then. Even though some writers are banned, there is a real struggle by the press to represent what I call the highest and best in the free press tradition.

The party now has 17 members, far too few to make a significant difference in terms of a major vote. There is a very definite constituency of white people who recognize that apartheid is uncivilized and they want to change.

Another evidence is about 200 doctors in the last 4 or 5 years have left the country. They feel that the tension is too much to bear.

I would say to assume that there is this great unanimous consent among whites that support apartheid really is not so. There are some Ralph McGill’s in South Africa and there are some whites that are calling for a constitutional convention. We need to know more about who they are. They need to be identified.

Mr. Gray. Thank you, Reverend Jackson.

Mr. Solarz. Mr. Wolpe.

Mr. Wolpe. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Reverend Jackson, I think the statement you have presented to this committee represented one of the most effective and persuasive critiques of both what is happening in South Africa and American policy toward South Africa.

There are two points I would like to focus attention on briefly before asking a question. One is the point that you made very effectively in response to an earlier question which is the coincidence of American self-interest with American principles in terms of human rights.

I think it is frequently perceived that considerations of national self-interest are inconsistent with honoring our commitment to human rights. I think this is one of those instances where it is very clear that the American self-interest happens to coincide very clearly with what makes sense in terms of what America has, at least on paper, advocated for some time.

The other point that I think bears repetition is the significance of the U.S. role in addressing the issue in South Africa because of the ways in which any national relationships prop up the South African regime.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask permission at this point if we might insert in the record the data available for the year 1978, the details of the economic relationships of many countries of the world with the South African regime both in terms of exports and in terms of imports.
Mr. Solarz. Without objection, the relevant material supplied by Mr. Wolpe will be inserted in the record at this time. [The documents referred to follow:]

**South African trade—1978**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exports:</th>
<th>In millions of U.S. dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFS total</td>
<td>12,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1,709.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,389.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>885.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>815.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>418.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>407.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>330.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>310.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>216.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>172.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>153.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>115.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of China</td>
<td>114.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imports:</th>
<th>7,203</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFS total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,528.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1,218.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,218.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>950.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>557.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>268.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>195.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>173.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>155.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>134.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of China</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: IMF Direction of Trade, 1979.*
Mr. Wolfe. I think it is striking, for example, that the United States appears at the very head of the list in terms of South Africa, being the recipient of South African exports. The United Kingdom is second and Japan is third and Germany is fourth; France is fifth. Italy is sixth.

Israel, which has been referred to, is somewhat down that list. The United States, the United Kingdom, Japan, and Germany are at the top of that list because they have such an overwhelming amount of economic trade that is involved in South Africa.

It just seems to me absolutely crucial that our country recognize the significance of our trading relationship to that regime.

I am pleased you have drawn attention to that relationship.

The question I would ask relates to other recommendations that have been made. You focused on four suggestions in terms of U.S. policy vis-a-vis South Africa. Others have suggested that the Carter administration can and should do much more. The January 1978 issue of “Foreign Affairs” is where William Cotter, the past president of the African American Institute and C. Clyde Ferguson of the Harvard Law School proposed 41 steps the U.S. Government might take to indicate our continuing growing displeasure with apartheid.

Could you react to those proposals? I am sure you are aware of them.

Reverend Jackson. Yes; I have read those statements.

In my recommendation of the White House conference on South Africa, the substance of those recommendations would be in such a conference because you could have 41 steps or 141 steps but you must establish the fundamental foundation that South Africans who are black are human beings and human beings have human rights and those rights involve citizenship and the right to vote and legal status.

Once we establish that one thing, the rest of it falls in line. Just establish this one point. You have the right to vote and you have that judicial protection, and from that, you can organize labor operator unions and you can then begin to demand wages and then you can begin the whole position in government.

You can make your own recommendations about how to have the rest of it. That is why I try not to deal with a laundry list. I try to deal with the fundamental thing and that is the citizenship and legal status.

I would like to back up on something you said about what we did in Nicaragua and Iran and are about to do in the Middle East. We are again as a Nation allowing the tail to wag the dog. We are allowing special interests to jeopardize the national interests. In the national interest, we are relating to all of Africa which tremendously outweighs the special interest to protect a few of South Africa alone.

We are bucking the rhythm of the rest of the continent to protect South Africa’s illegal, immoral, illegitimate relationship with people. It seems to me that is foolhardy.

What America can do if it chooses to provide positive leadership is if we could help aid South Africa beyond the curtain of fear which separates the blacks from the whites and has both of them in the shadows of the tree and neither in the sunshine, South Africa being able to march militarily from the Cape to Algeria and nobody can
stop South Africa but economically, if South Africa becomes a civilized society toward other human beings, it could probably march from the Cape to France without being stopped economically and be healing the rest of Africa all along the way.

When one considers just 25 million people and the wealth beneath the soil in South Africa and all that land and her neighbors and her industrial development and the strategic position being on the Continent of Africa, the Cape with the Atlantic and the Indian Ocean coming together and kissing and that tremendous trade route, that really could be the treasure of the Earth. That could really be a southern African economic market. It could be a tremendous asset to world development if they could get beyond the racial relations there. It could have much to offer itself and the world.

It seems to me as opposed to trying to buy time and the caveman conduct, it ought to be spending for its interest and ours a way to relieve it of its fears. It has far more today in the new world to gain than it does trying to protect the old world.

Mr. WOLPE. I share those sentiments fully. I would add a footnote and I would be interested in your reaction.

Might it not also be argued that even those corporate special interests that perceive themselves as having an interest in the status quo in terms of American foreign policy and in terms of their investment in South Africa, I would argue it is to their enlightened self-interest to recognize that unless we make changes in that policy and break the partnership between this country and that regime that their longtime economic interest in the African Continent which are beginning to be much greater relative to that of South Africa or are they going to be harmed?

Reverend JACKSON. The psychological factor is someone said why did you single out America and Israel? It is for a very psychological reason. People have high hopes in those two nations. That is a psychological factor. Where there are no previous expectations, there is no basis for disappointment. There are people who really look forward to this country for being what it is on paper, a leader of the free world.

It is the same way with people who have some sense of Israel’s longing to be a rejected stone that turns into a cornerstone, economic harmony in the Middle East.

Even as people appeal for a positive leadership in those two nations, the isolation really grows out of a certain real desire for those nations to be leaders as opposed to enforcers of a very vicious status quo.

Mr. WOLPE. Thank you very much.

Mr. DIGGS. I think that last point is very important because you have to look at it in that context. If you are going to put the gentleman’s insertion in the record in proper perspective, the fact that Israel may be 10th or 12th or 15th on the list as opposed to us being No. 1 and England being No. 2, unless it is put in the proper perspective in view of our historical relationship and the differences between our relationship with South Africa and England’s historical relationship with South Africa which is entirely different, France’s relationship not only with South Africa but in a competitive sense with us, in other parts of the world, the historical World War II relationship with Germany and South Africa and then the more modern relationship that South Africa has had with Israel, the differences are so fundamental that to look at a list like that and say the United States
is first and therefore the implication in some people's mind is that we ought to clean up our own shop and put pressure on England and France without making any reference to the basis upon which these other relationships are made and I think that would be unfortunately misleading.

I do not subscribe to that view, gentlemen, because I know of his personal interest in this matter. I know his conceptual purity on this matter. I do think the point that was just made by Reverend Jackson has helped to put the statistics that he proposed in the record at this point into some kind of perspective.

I have seen that very list or a similar list used before. When I say "used" I do not mean that in a disrespectful way. I mean it was offered before as an explanation that when you look at the list of our trade with South Africa as opposed to someone else’s trade, we are not so bad. They do not go on to explain or to answer the question as to why their relationship is and what it is based on.

I just wanted to make that point.

Mr. Wolpe. Mr. Chairman, if I could respond?

Mr. Solarz. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. Wolpe. I think he may have misconstrued what I was saying. My concern is that we recognize that there are an awful lot of countries that are helping to prop up the regime in South Africa by their relationship to it.

Reverend Jackson in response to a question from the other gentleman from Michigan indicated that indeed your concern was not only with Israel but concerned with all the other countries.

It seems to me it makes some sense to realize that there are a lot of countries that are in my judgment contributing or supporting the apartheid regime. My interest is that we deal specifically and immediately with that which we have immediate control over which is the American involvement and second that we recognize the support of the regime no matter where it is coming from and that we be consistent and clear in trying to provide the kind of leadership that will turn all of that support around.

Reverend Jackson. Mr. Wolpe, you will remember President Carter went to the Western nations a few weeks ago and discussed the energy situation and I believe it was Japan where the conference was held. They even had a premeeting to determine what they were going to do. He came in with a factor called "leadership" and the pecking order fell in line and they followed No. 1.

Not only can we measure what is happening in South Africa by what we have invested but by the signals we send other people that it is our right. We are leading other nations to invest there saying it is our right and the right thing to do.

Capital draws capital. That is why our responsibility and that of our allies in line with their relationship to us must be very different in my judgment.

Mr. Solarz. When the second bells ring we will recess to vote and then we will come back for more questions.

Given the extent to which the gentlemen from Michigan as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has entered into an interesting colloquy with the witness concerning the economic relationship between Israel and South Africa, I do think it would be in order to make a few observations as chairman of the subcommittee.
Basically, what I would like to say is that for those of us who are deeply concerned about the survival and security of Israel, as well as the struggle for racial equality and justice in South Africa, it is particularly important to muster the broadest possible base of support for the efforts which are needed on behalf of those very important objectives here in the Congress.

In those terms, I think it is terribly important for us to be especially sensitive to the very legitimate concerns and sensitivities of the respective elements of those coalitions. At a time when there has been a lot of talk in this country in the last few weeks about the differences between the black and Jewish communities in America, I think it might not be inappropriate to call attention to the fact that there have been areas in which those two communities have worked very closely, particularly in the context of the Congress, when it comes to foreign policy.

I think it is especially important to take note of the fact that on vote after vote of real importance to Israel, the overwhelming majority of black Members of Congress voted on behalf of legislation which is strongly supportive of the survival and security of Israel, just as on vote after vote involving measures relating to questions of racial justice and equality and majority rule not only in South Africa but in Rhodesia as well, the overwhelming majority of Jewish Members voted on behalf of legislation which was designed to foster the struggle for majority rule and decency and racial justice throughout southern Africa. I think we have been working very closely in the past and hopefully we will continue to work very closely in the future.

I gather on the basis of your testimony that it is your feeling that it would be helpful, in the interest of racial equality in South Africa, if Israel reduced the level of its diplomatic representation which it had recently increased as well as reduced or eliminated the level of its economic activity with South Africa?

Reverend Jackson. It would be fair to say that almost all of my testimony was on America's conduct there. When I singled out this country, I mentioned Israel as an also.

I would think this would be the time for us to build upon those relationships that we have had in the past and also deal with that which in fact does threaten them.

Mr. Solarz. I appreciate that. I just want to clarify for the record the fact that it was my impression that it was your testimony that you were not calling upon Israel to do anything with respect to South Africa that you were not also calling upon the other Western countries which have significant economic relationships with South Africa to do as well.

Would that be a fair statement, Reverend Jackson?

Reverend Jackson. That is right.

Mr. Solarz. I think that is a very helpful and constructive way of putting it. I think that serves to minimize whatever sensitivities are created in the process of making that observation. I think frankly it is a much more productive way of putting it because if international pressure is going to play a role in the struggle for racial equality in South Africa it is going to take action, not only by Israel, but by many other countries as well.
If Israel was the only country to cease dealing with South Africa, while it may make a contribution to the objectives you spoke about, it would obviously be a relatively modest contribution compared to the impact that disinvestment or minimization of diplomatic relations between many other countries and South Africa would have as well.

Having said that, let me recess the hearing for 10 minutes. I have several other questions. You might want to respond to that observation or the other members might want to say something as well.

The subcommittee is adjourned for 10 minutes.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee recessed for a vote on the floor.]

**AFTER RECESS**

Mr. Solarz. How do you respond to the argument which a number of people have made that if international pressure including American pressure against South Africa is substantially increased through disinvestment, derecognition diplomatically, and that sort of thing, that it would only have the effect of driving the Afrikaners deeper into the laager and it would make them more resistant to change than they have been up to now?

Reverend Jackson. People may resist pressure but they change because of it. We asked a number of Afrikaner business leaders who are arguing that a lot of change has taken place in the last 10 years, we said if that is true, what is the basis for the change?

They said four things essentially. This is like six different groups of people. They said one, the fall of the French, British, and Portuguese to the North has had an impact on that society. They say disinvestment has slowed down economic growth potential enough to cause the business leaders to reconsider apartheid and its incompatibility to the economic system.

Third, the uprisings created a climate of economic uncertainty and the isolation which has forced the generation of youth who want to join the world to say they want to participate in the Olympics. They said they cannot join the world representing this antihuman proposition.

Those four factors or events have had as much to do with change as anything else. That is why I encourage disinvestment because even the people who said they are for change, the urban bank people and that crowd would say all right, if you want that to happen and if you think it would encourage investment, even they had to admit, investment would simply take off the pressure for them to change.

That is why we finally decided on disinvestment.

Mr. Solarz. You said in your testimony there was divided opinions among the black leaders and the black community about the question of foreign investment in South Africa. Is it your view that the great majority of black people in South Africa would prefer a policy of disinvestment or are you not sure as to how the percentages would be?

Reverend Jackson. The workers, for example, in Port Elizabeth at the Sunday meeting before the official meeting said suppose the plants were taken over by the Government. They said it would not make any difference to us except they will not be able to run them for a long period of time. It would make no fundamental difference in their lives. There were some who were willing to say more openly than others that it was making a fundamental difference.
Mr. Solarz. Did you say during the course of your visit to South Africa that you detected differences in the attitude toward change in South Africa on the part of the older whites on the one hand in comparison to the younger whites on the other?

Reverend Jackson. The young whites are obviously more educated than some of the older whites. They feel the pains of isolation. They have looked back and they have come here to American universities and have been together with black people and white people and other kinds of creeds of people.

There is a restlessness there.

Even the Jewish and the English speaking and the British element, there is some noticeable difference there. There is nothing that America is doing that is forcing the matter to a head. We are giving the people a choice, shall we choose between the American recommendations for change and shared power or shall we resist them?

We are not recommending anything. We are just indistinguishably connected with the status quo.

Mr. Solarz. One of your recommendations, Reverend Jackson, was that we prohibit trading in the Krugerrand. Do you have any reason to believe that if we took such an initiative that any other country would follow suit and if no other country was prepared to follow suit, would such an unilateral action on our part make a difference and if so, in what way in terms of the prospects for change in South Africa?

Reverend Jackson. It would make a difference because the amount of the Krugerrand sale here is a tremendous asset on their society.

Mr. Solarz. Do you know how much?

Reverend Jackson. $600 million a year.

Mr. Solarz. From the United States.

Reverend Jackson. Out of a total of $1.2 billion sales in Krugerrand which is about $600 million here.

Mr. Solarz. About 50 percent?

Reverend Jackson. About 50 percent and it helps keep the price of gold up. It helps keep the value of the dollar down. Just this whole inflated value attached to gold is also attached to the Krugerrand. It is one of those kinds of innocent odorless and tasteless forms of chemical warfare. I really would not support South Africa but just give me a little lobster. That is a terrible regime but a Krugerrand is kind of innocent.

The fact is it is not very innocent. It is a very heavy part of their ability to leverage gold.

Mr. Solarz. Did you have any discussions during your trip to South Africa with Mr. Koornhof?

Reverend Jackson. Pete Koornhof, yes.

Mr. Solarz. Did you get any indication in your meeting with him of an intention on his part to enter into serious and substantive discussions with leaders of the black community in South Africa with respect to trying to evolve some kind of meaningful power sharing arrangement in the country?

Reverend Jackson. I was impressed with Mr. Koornhof's delivery but not impressed with his ability to deliver. In one sense he appears to be a man of great convictions, a trained man who is much too intelligent to try to embrace apartheid in some philosophical sense.

The fact is he does not speak for that government. They simply tolerate his advocacy. He cannot decide anything and make a difference.
One has to support his standing up but one cannot put a lot of confidence in his ability to change anything.

Mr. Solarz. Was it your feeling that he personally was committed to what you would call a meaningful change but he is unable to deliver on that or is it your feeling that Mr. Koornhof is only concerned about cosmetic changes rather than meaningful power sharing arrangements?

Reverend Jackson. I think he would like to bring about meaningful change but I think he underestimates two forces. I think he underestimates the fears and the entrenchment of the Afrikaners. I think he underestimates the people with whom he has grown up.

I am convinced he underestimates the quest for black people to get free. I think there is no real appreciation by whites in South Africa as to the boiling point of most blacks there.

I detect rather clearly on the tongues of the very young and those who are not so young an acceptance of the fact that they have to die to live. They have to fight to live. They have to use some of the same tactics that were used in SWAPO and by the people up north to live.

Many of the young people know that, and the day they fight for, they might not live to see. That has to be their price for social change.

I think there is a fundamental underestimation of the revolutionary quest for liberation by blacks.

Mr. Solarz. In the absence of the kind of meaningful political, social, and economic changes which would satisfy the aspirations of the black people of South Africa, in your judgment how long do you think it will be before an indigenous liberation movement begins to operate militarily in South Africa?

Reverend Jackson. I would not want to say that because it might hurt their chances of being successful.

The two choices that are there now is a serious economic political rationale process of change and shared power.

I might add even though it is a minuscule level, back in the South, what essentially happened, Congressman Diggs and you and others recall, we raised the moral question of our dignity and of the economic and political order but the political order in a very demagogic fashion disregarded us so we did some marching and some praying and some dying and it still disregarded us.

We started using economic boycotts and we finally forced the economic order to convince the political order that southern apartheid cost too much. The economic bosses made decisions and the political people fell in line.

You are either going to have that kind of process where the economic order finally stands up and moves in unison with some serious economic challenge to Afrikaner Government.

You are either going to have that kind of radical change or you are going to have a bloody black-white confrontation that will be protracted. When that starts, no one can tell—except it is inevitable.

My reading of this is there is something within the people that tells them that they ought to be free and something on the outside like north of them tells them that it is possible.

When children at crossroads, in spite of all of the oppression the squatter's camp represents, can be at a one-room schoolhouse that they have constructed called "peace" and they can still have a clear vision and sing a song, it is clear nothing that has happened has been successful in altering the quest for liberation.
The funerals have simply been platforms that say it has to come quicker. Nothing has happened there that impedes the liberation struggle. Most of the negative stuff is a stimulus for it.

Mr. Solarz. Thank you very much, Reverend Jackson.

Mr. Diggs. I have one question, Mr. Chairman, relating to Reverend Jackson's suggestion to the President that we have a White House conference. Could you tell us your perception or your concept of the kind of conference you had in mind, what it might cover in general and what you would expect to come out of it and who would you expect to participate in it?

Reverend Jackson. The first thing to come out of it would be giving the South African issue visibility. I think the American press for example has failed us in covering southern Africa. That is why they are not here today which is part of the problem. People do not know about it.

NBC is anxious to cover a fight in South Africa and sell some soap and dogfood and stuff but they are not here to cover the business. That is why they should not be there either.

A White House conference would put much on the minds of the American press which becomes a way of educating the American public. I see that as the first level of accomplishment.

Second, I would think the Subcommittee on South Africa for example ought to help fashion such an agenda. There are certain things that cannot be left out of the South African scene because South Africa to Rhodesia and Namibia is a part of a package of concern. We are just a few miles from Rhodesia.

The fact that we could have distinct policies in Rhodesia and embargoes and all that and right across the fence, a completely different policy, that just shows the foolishness of the incoherence of the policy.

It seems to me that these things are not apparent to the public unless they are lifted up in a certain kind of way. At some point in time you have what you call expert witnesses' analysis and at some point conclusions and recommendations from a very broad base of people and I have not conceptualized the details of such a conference.

I have some sense of White House conferences that are representative in their impact. Out of that comes a strong position paper that does begin to educate people, not only on college campuses but in the major public at large. That is what I would see.

If the President gives his full weight to that, it just makes things happen in the United Nations and it makes things happen in South Africa. It makes things happen here that would otherwise not happen with the South African question which would still be under the rug because the President has not come forth with an authoritative position as he has on other issues. The President essentially ignores it and forces it to operate under the impetus of its own power.

Mr. Diggs. Do you get the impression that Chief Butulezi's position on disinvestment is really his personal position or do you think that is a rationalized position based upon counterpressures from the Government or other kinds of forces that might make his position counterproductive?

Reverend Jackson. I think the Chief, because of the number of people he represents, considerably more at one level than most
others, most others in South Africa are of the position where if he calls for disinvestment, one of the first things a company would do is to fire something off to him and say you are forcing a lot of black folks to move out. He has to be mindful of that as a tactic.

On the other hand, to call for disinvestment down there and to be taken seriously is a step right into the land mines of the various business protective acts—which is another factor.

On the other hand, I think the Chief does not see the disinvestment versus investment argument as pivotal to the ultimate end of the liberation struggle there. That is why, for example, even though my position is different than his, we relate very well.

He was in Chicago last week. I think he is still in the country. We agree on almost everything except that because what is fundamental to me, he will accept the practical political idea of protect jobs right now but the most fundamental thing is he publicly and privately avows to not go the Bantu route. It seems everything else is methodological and temporary as compared with 6 million people finally conceding in some trade-off for a piece of desert.

I left there after meeting with him with a tremendous respect for his integrity and some awareness of the fact that I think he is operating on a hot stove without shoes, a very delicate position and with some challenging him and saying if you can say some things and get away with them, why does the Government let you do that and not others?

The consequences of moving on Butulezi will be more severe than to move in on some other people. It is just the fact that he is a very well-organized, disciplined politician and there are some people who represent nothing but ideas. If they are moved on, some folks will be upset but they are not organized to do anything.

If Butulezi is moved on, there are some people who might bring some immediate damage and I think he is more protected by the number of people he has organized than by any protection he gets from the Government.

I have real regard for his integrity.

Mr. Diggs. According to the press report release there were some of the younger elements who perceived themselves to be of the left of you and there are only three types of people involved in liberation movements—that is, militant, more militant, and most militant—which are to the left of you and it does not mean you are subject to that characterization of moderate and they made some critical remarks about you and your motives and so on.

What do you think is the basis for their feeling you did not go far enough in what you said and where are these people when you are not around? You would think these would be the people who would be throwing bombs around there at night.

Reverend Jackson. The fact is that is an expression of the American population being misled by a press report. The fact of the matter is, when we got there, a broad cross section of preachers, black and white, met us, the Bishop Tutu element. By the time we got to Capetown, the black consciousness element and the writers and the academic types and the workers from plants greeted us warmly. People were stopping cars in the middle of the street getting autographs saying keep on saying what you are saying.
We went down to Port Elizabeth. A church was designed to seat 1,000. They had 3,000 people there and they were all on the outside. By the time we got to Regina, there were 3,000 people there. That was the sentiment of the people. When we got to Kwazulu, it was the same thing. There were two press reports that misled people.

It was said that Bishop Zulu got up and said that outsiders really could not lead them. That was out of context. He congratulated us for coming and had this big celebration for us all day and he said no black American leader had ever come out in the rural areas to Kwazulu and furthermore, the urban leaders from Johannesburg had never come to Kwazulu and they were tired of people trying to tell them how to make decisions, coming from an urban situation, whether it was America or South Africa, who had not been to the delta or the Mississippi of that nation.

He was congratulating us on having come. In the meeting we had with Bishop Zulu and Bishop Tutu, one of the points of contention was neither Motlana nor Bishop Tutu had been to Kwazulu. The whole idea that he let us down is not accurate. That is completely taken out of context.

The idea about that being an element in Soweto, they said they did not need a preacher, they needed a pastor, and that was nothing but lies. When we got to Soweto those kids took us and carried us on their shoulders for a block right into the church. I guess you saw some of it on television. When we left it was the same thing.

Interestingly enough, there was no talk by any of the major three black leaders except praise whether it was Tutu, or Motlana. As a result of all three of them taking positive positions, it enabled us to pull off the unity meeting between the three of them. When we pulled off the meeting between them and they, really for their own reasons, did not want to come together but they finally tried to come together that night and no white leader who could immediately be condemned as a racist for challenging the unity meeting attended the meeting.

A black nameless, without an organization and without a portfolio, a black from Soweto said unifying black leadership was a diabolical Western plot. How can one interpret the unity of divided black leadership as a plot except for liberation?

It just so happens this guy was not a youth, he was 56 years old, just out of prison 3 months and worked as a marketing representative for a milling company whose boss was upset with us because we took a position against the fight.

Mr. Diggs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Solarz. Mr. Gray.

Mr. Gray. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Reverend Jackson, you mentioned earlier if South Africa basically got itself together and dealt with this fundamental question of human dignity and empowerment of all its people that South Africa could have a healing role throughout all the rest of Africa.

Could you expand on what you meant by “healing role”?

Reverend Jackson. If South Africa ceased to embrace apartheid and thus make it really eligible and appealing to Nigeria as an industrial partner, between the developing process in Nigeria and the developed process in South Africa and since there would be no fundamental ideological conflict with any other African nation, you would just have the healing process and Africa would be inherent in such a relationship.
It could never take place as long as apartheid exists because apartheid and the aspiration of those black people could never be reconciled. It seems to me that when President Carter pulled together Begin and Sadat, and everybody was saying it could not be done, it could only be done because there was a regard by the both of them for what this country had to offer through its President.

I think we need a Camp David type of concern for South Africa and it can be argued reasonably well that forces from within South Africa identifying with the argument as to the advantages of moving beyond apartheid, not only is it morally bankrupt but it is economically unfeasible. It no longer has a theological underpinning.

In other words, you do not have people walking around saying God really meant for this to be. You do not even have that kind of underpinning. That is gone. It does not have an economic underpinning. It does not have anything protecting it right now but a raw military underpinning.

Basically white people there know that a change is going to come. They just want to know when and how much bloodshed will be involved, hopefully none.

It is just that tender in my judgment.

Mr. Gray. You mentioned also in your testimony that blacks have no official power. Did you detect in your visit any signs that blacks may have a power to bring about change if not “official”? Reverend Jackson. Obviously as the labor base, if it would bring up work strikes, it could do to South Africa what happened in Iran. The Government uses its power to make that very unlikely, the way it locks up leaders unilaterally, the way it detains leaders, the way it assassinates leaders, the way it makes any political organization illegal.

The amount of money spent on surveillance and wiretapping and that type of thing simply discourages that kind of a rational process. That is why the only movement that can survive now other than an economic legal rationalizing process would have to be a bloody one because people's rational options have been eliminated by the system.

Mr. Gray. How would you characterize the present administration’s policy toward South Africa with past administrations’ policies? Are there any significant substantive differences and if so what?

Reverend Jackson. I think the Nixon-Ford White House just embraced South Africa as an African ally. The expanding of relationships occurred during those regimes.

The support of the SASOL energy process was kicked underway in those regimes. In other words right now Nixon said they are going to be heroes. They got a lot of play in the press.

There is just a real hope in South Africa that Carter will use the idea of his advocating human rights as a threat because they never know at what point he is going to turn the human rights sermon into a program of substance. The sermon threatens them. The substance could do them in in a very significant kind of way.

They celebrated Andy Young’s being removed from the U.N. but they would celebrate even more if Carter himself was going to be removed. That is their perception, that this administration is in conflict but the feeling is this administration is not politically moved to do anything beyond advocacy.

That is why I think that is the one error this administration is making, by underestimating the extent of the South African Watergate and its influence peddling in this country. Six months ago I read this
country was doing some surveillance in South Africa. They screamed loud and made a big international stink of it but the fact is there is circumstantial evidence. The South African Watergate scandal has tentacles in this country and perhaps in the last Government. There has been no call by a committee of Congress or by this administration for the Justice Department head, Mr. Civiletti, to attempt to meet with Mr. Rhoodie to find out to what extent his testimony could bear light on this situation.

I would hope, Mr. Solarz and Congressman Gray, that one of the things this committee would call for would be a meeting with Mr. Rhoodie. I think he would be instructive to us.

Mr. Gray. Let me thank you, Reverend Jackson, for being here. I am sure I am joined by the other colleagues that your testimony has certainly been helpful and certainly your firsthand observations of South Africa will be helpful to the whole deliberative process establishing policy throughout this Nation.

Thank you very much.

Reverend Jackson. Thank you.

Mr. Solarz. Let me conclude by saying if Mr. Rhoodie is prepared to meet with us, we would be delighted to meet with him. I will ask the staff to prepare whatever communications are necessary in order to convey to Mr. Rhoodie our interest in having him testify before our committee if he is in a position to come over here and testify. If he is not, we would be prepared to speak to his representatives and we would certainly be prepared to have either some of the members or the staff go over and meet with him if such arrangements could be made.

I want to assure you we are concerned about the implications of the South African information scandal for our own situation.

This subcommittee is pursuing in a variety of different ways its own investigation of that situation.

Reverend Jackson. I think that those of us who take high profile positions, I think our lives and careers are in jeopardy so long as foreign governments feel they have some freedom to in fact violate our national security. Given the stakes that are involved in the South African economics, wiretapping and buying media and investing money in political campaigns, threatening life and limb is very much within the purview of their conduct.

That is why, Mr. Solarz, I have taken some aggressive positions to determine the extent of that influence peddling system in this country.

Mr. Solarz. I quite agree with you. I want to assure you we have already taken steps to pursue this matter and we will continue to pursue it very vigorously.

We certainly would appreciate any suggestions or recommendations which you or anybody else might have from time to time about how we can constructively proceed on this matter.

If I may close by giving a little sermon on some of the matters that were discussed today. I simply want to conclude by saying that, in my judgement, those of us who are very much committed not only to the survival and security of Israel but to racial justice and equality in South Africa need all the help we can get if we are going to muster the kind of support within our own country for policies which will help achieve both of those objectives.
If Jewish-Americans could count on the support of no other groups for policies favorable to Israel other than the Jewish community, it would be a sad day for the future of Israel, just as it would not bode well for the future of racial justice and equality in South Africa if the black community in this country could not count on support from any other group for their concerns with respect to South Africa.

I think if we have learned anything over the course of the last decade it is that you do not have to be Jewish to support Israel just as you do not have to be black to be concerned about the current situation in South Africa.

I think those of us in positions of leadership and responsibility and visibility have a special obligation as we deal with these problems to conduct ourselves in such a way as to maximize the support which we can muster for our respective positions on these issues.

I am sure that in that effort we will be able to count on your own continued efforts and leadership just as I know the members of this subcommittee who have been deeply concerned about both of those problems, and other foreign policy issues as well, will continue to play a responsible and constructive role.

I think this has been a very useful hearing. We very much appreciate your taking so much time to share your views with us.

I do hope, now that you have testified before the subcommittee, that you will feel free from time to time if you have any suggestions about ways in which we can be helpful in these matters to let us know about it.

As I indicated at the beginning of the hearing, we are planning to have an extensive series of hearings on this whole question next year. Perhaps we might even look forward to your participation again at that time.

The hearing is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:30 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]
APPENDIX

LETTER FROM GENERAL MOTORS CORP., TO REPRESENTATIVE SOLARZ;
REGARDING TESTIMONY OF REV. JESSE L. JACKSON

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
GENERAL MOTORS BUILDING,

Hon. Stephen J. Solarz,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Solarz: This refers to the testimony of the Rev. Jesse Jackson before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa on September 6, 1979.

In his prepared testimony, he stated, "Ford and GM sell cars and trucks to the government of South Africa, thereby circumventing the intent of the Commerce Department's regulations by getting parts from Britain and England, but producing paramilitary equipment for South Africa." We disagree with the accuracy of that statement.

By way of background, GM stockholders considered (but rejected) a proposal at its 1979 annual meeting that would have prohibited the sale of any vehicles or spare parts or provide any services to the South African police or military. The proponents of the GM proposal relied, in part, on a letter from the U.S. State Department indicating sales by a U.S.-owned company of non-U.S. origin commodities and technical data to the South African police and military might circumvent the intent of U.S. law.

The State Department subsequently indicated this letter may have been subject to misinterpretation and, in clarification, advised that such sales by overseas subsidiaries of U.S. corporations are not affected by U.S. law. Moreover, the United States has not made it a policy objective to keep such commodities and technical data from reaching the South African military and police.

As you are aware, the Commerce Department regulations prohibit the export or reexport from the United States to South Africa or Namibia of commodities, technical data or product of the data if they are to be delivered to police or military entities. It should be noted that GM South African only sells to the police and military in South Africa regular commercial vehicles with neither U.S. content nor U.S. sourced technology exported after the effective date of the regulations.

The commercial vehicles produced by GM South African are general purpose, similar to those available at dealerships. Equivalent products are readily available from other manufacturers in South Africa which are not subsidiaries of U.S. companies, and it is clear that the refusal of GMSA to sell such vehicles would not affect the operations of the military or police.

Please include this letter in the official record of your hearings.

Sincerely,

R. F. Magill.