

I N V E S T M E N T S C A M P A I G N

In the next week your J.C.R. will be having a meeting to decide whether you wish the University to disinvest from companies with a stake in the Apartheid system of South Africa. J.C.R. meetings are being called in all the colleges as a result of the unanimous decision of D.S.U. Council to affirm its policy of disinvestment and make this known clearly and categorically to the University. We've been talking with the University since March and there has so far been no major disinvestment. Now we want to put new life into the campaign, to get some action. D.S.U. needs a mandate from you, through the J.C.R.'s.

After the failure of negotiations and the calling of the J.C.R. meetings, this issue must be discussed fully, because it is NOW that your opinion counts. By forcing the University to disinvest in these companies, Durham students can influence the South African situation.

WHY ATTACK THE PROBLEM THROUGH INVESTMENTS?

The main buttress of apartheid is the thriving economy of South Africa. Investments in South Africa yielded an average rate return of 14% * in 1971, compared with 9 % for money invested in other countries; British investments constitute about 58% ** of all foreign investment in South Africa.

WHY IS SOUTH AFRICA SUCH A PROFITABLE INVESTMENT AREA?

- a) There is a constantly available supply of cheap labour. The average per capita income of black people in the Bantustans is £2 per month.
- b) Trade Unions for black workers are made powerless. The South African Embassy advertises through 'The Economist' "we do not suffer from militant Trade Unions in South Africa".
- c) A large proportion of black workers in South Africa are "migrants" and by virtue of this have no rights whatsoever under South African law. Some of the migrants come from other African states but a great many come from the Bantustans.

SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT

The Bantustans are "independent" black states set up by the South African government within South Africa, but they are independent in name only, for the Bantustans make up only $\frac{1}{8}$ of South Africa's territory, this $\frac{1}{8}$ containing none of the mineral sources, industrial areas or major cities and none of the ports of South Africa. This means that the male population is forced to leave its families and seek employment from white South Africans on the poorest terms. The women and children left behind have little chance of scraping together even a meagre living on the overcrowded and unproductive land of the Bantustans.

It is clear therefore that "separate Development" policies and the economic wellbeing of white South Africa constitute parts of a single system. By attacking the economic structure through trying to reduce the involvement of British firms in it, we cannot hope to change the policies, or directly help the Black majority in South Africa, but we can undermine the supreme confidence of the white South African in his system, and thereby pave the way for change from within.

A vote for the motion is a vote for disinvestment - a vote against apartheid.

A vote against the motion is a vote for investment, a vote for apartheid.

D. S. U. n e e d s a s t r o n g m a n d a t e f r o m Y O U

* South African Embassy

** South African Connection - Ruth First