

LETTERS

A.L.A. TAKES UP ARMS AGAINST D.I.A.

Dear Colleague,

The African Literature Association firmly believes that it is in the national interest of the United States to maintain a clear boundary between the military/intelligence activities of our government and the foreign area scholarly research and programs of our universities.

Specifically, we urge our Africanist colleagues to reject the latest request of the Defense Intelligence College/Agency for academics and institutions of higher education to enter into contractual arrangements to produce studies and projects on various topics, including insurgency, religious movements, instability, and coups d'etat in third world nations.

Simultaneously, the Association believes academic freedom protects the right to collaborate individually with whatever persons or agencies a scholar chooses, and the Association strongly desires for the government to be intelligent about the third world areas we study. However, the Association also believes that the intermixing of scholarly and military-intelligence institutions and projects will seriously damage (a) the access of U.S. scholars to these increasingly sensitive foreign areas, (b) the collaboration of U.S. scholars with most African and Latin American scholars both in the U.S.A. and abroad, (c) the development of high quality knowledge about these world regions and goodwill for the U.S.A. among those peoples, which are so important to this nation's long-term political and economic interests.

Therefore, in light of the national political and economic interests which the Association perceives, we urge our Africanist and other third world studies colleagues in universities, colleges, and private institutions to refrain from developing common programs and contractual arrangements concerning foreign area studies with military and intelligency agencies. Simultaneously, we affirm our willingness to increase the nation's scholarly information about these third world regions with funding through more neutral agencies such as the national endowments and foundations.

Yours sincerely,
Peter Nazareth
President

PLEA FOR PROFESSOR MAMDANI

Dear Sir:

May I bring to the attention of your readers an incident which shocked academic circles around the world.

This was with regard to the decision of the deposed Obote government in Uganda to strip Dr. Mohmood Mamdani (Associate Professor of Political Science and Dean of the Social Science Faculty at Makerere University) of his citizenship on the pretext that he was not a properly documented or registered citizen of Uganda. Any person who knows the real story knows that this pretext was just a farce.

Dr. Mamdani's woes with the Ugandan authorities began when he elucidated upon the real reasons behind pertinent problems in Africa, such as famine. This was during a Uganda Red Cross Conference on 19 March, 1985. He argued that the problems with regard

to famine in Africa with special emphasis on Uganda, which had undergone a terrible ordeal with regard to this topic five years ago, are not always "natural" but were man-made, given the contemporary political, economic and social superstructure currently existing in the country.

It seems a number of key authorities in the government, including the Minister of Security, were offended by that speech, since it highlighted their betrayal of the Ugandan people since independence with regard to social progress.

So the process immediately began to strip Dr. Mamdani of his Ugandan citizenship, and that opportunity came when Mamdani was abroad attending a conference in Spain, and now it seems he neither has a country nor a job.

Many of us who have worked with Dr. Mamdani know that he is a committed intellectual with regard to social progress in his country. He has written two outstanding books on his country, notably *Politics and Class Formation In Uganda* and *Imperialism and Fascism In Uganda*.

Dr. Mamdani is a Ugandan citizen of Asian origin. This is the second time he has suffered such plight. In 1972 he underwent the same ordeal when Amin decided to expel most Asians of Indian origin.

Dr. Mamdani, our colleague, has been an active member of the African Studies Association. In 1984 he presented a paper at the Los Angeles meeting of the Association. The framework of that paper contributed to that speech which the government interpreted as "offensive" and which cost him his citizenship.

Therefore, I urge readers who are interested in seeing Dr. Mamdani's citizenship and his job restituted to write to either or both of the following addresses, protesting this dastardly deed:

His Excellency Mr. Olara Otunnu
Permanent Representative
Permanent Mission
Ugandan Embassy to the U.N.
336 E. 45th Street
New York, NY 10017

His Excellency Mr. J. W. Lwamafa
Ambassador, Ugandan Embassy
5909 16th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20111

Those in other countries may register their letters of protest at the nearest Ugandan Consulate.

Your cooperation will be most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
Stephen Isabirye
Flagstaff, Arizona

CALL FOR RESCINDING REACTIONARY VOTE ON UC DIVESTMENT

Dear Don:

I wanted to thank you and the Association for publishing the statement by a committee of U.C. academics, dubbed the Marcum Committee (ASA News, Vol. VIII. #3), concerning the University of California and its institutional investment portfolio in South Africa.

This is, of course, an important statement by individuals affiliated with the University of California and with considerable knowledge and expertise on South African political economy and international relations. I did want to bring to ASA members' attention, however, a somewhat different position on UC divestment. While the Marcum Committee recommends selective divestment and the adoption of the Sullivan Principles, almost 2000 UC faculty, including 51 UC Africanists, have adopted a plan for *full divestment*. In response to the UC Treasurer's Report on South African Investments (June 1985), the UC Faculty for Full Divestment proposed their own "Alternative Plan." This document, which was incidentally adopted by Speaker Willy Brown and presented to the Board of Regents in San Francisco in June, 1985, revolved around a sophisticated critique of the Treasurer's concern with fiduciary responsibility, and demonstrated conclusively that a South Africa free portfolio would in terms of risk and return be both safer and higher yielding than its current holdings. All this was naturally prior to the state of emergency and the events of the summer. As you know, the Regents ultimately rejected the plan in June and adopted President Gardner's "case by case" evaluation of companies with low rankings on the Sullivan scale, and in doing so showed themselves not only to be hopelessly out of step with general sentiment in the United States but also morally bankrupt. We are, however, continuing our struggle (see letter enclosed) in the belief that the irresponsible and reactionary behavior of the Regents has no support from academic and other communities in the State.

With best wishes,
Michael Watts
Associate Professor &
Chair of African Studies
UC, Berkeley, CA. 94720

To: President Gardner and the Regents of the University of California
From: Faculty For Full Divestment (Ken Simmons, Architecture, Chair)
Re: Immediate Reconsideration of Divestment of UC Financial Holdings in South Africa.

Within weeks of the Regents meeting of June 21, 1985, the policy adopted was rendered entirely untenable by the tragic events in South Africa.

The new evidence is terrifying, urgent, irrefutable. There have been weekly, sometimes daily, accounts of demonstrators being shot and killed. The official total in the last twelve months of strife now approaches 650, and there is little evidence of any movement to improve the situation. The South African government's declaration of a State of Emergency has affirmed its unyielding commitment to repression and violence against the nonwhite majority. Throughout the summer the Botha government has systematically arrested the moderate black leaders, most recently the Rev. Allan Boesak of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, which has dramatically increased the likelihood of further violence and bloodshed. President P. W. Botha's recent speech makes it clear that the white supremacist regime has no intention of putting an end to apartheid.

For the University of California to stand by its huge financial involvement in South Africa, while it sets up machinery for a case-by-case study of how individual corporations behave, is to adhere to a fundamental misassessment of what is at stake there. It is a matter of conscience and responsibility that the June 21st decision be set aside at your next meeting and replaced by a constructive program for divestment.

In June, those opposed to full divestment suggested that investments of United States corporations in South Africa could have an ameliorating influence on the government's

abhorrent racial policies. It was further said that disinvestment would injure South African blacks and might lack their support. It was also argued that it would be financially irresponsible for the University to abandon its "sound" investments in companies doing business in South Africa. None of these arguments stand up to recent evidence.

The black majority is clearly moving for an end to apartheid now, and is evidently unwilling to be turned back despite the cost. As Bishop Tutu has said, the stronger the pressure from the international community, the greater is the chance to minimize bloodshed. In this rapidly changing situation, the Sullivan Principles are wholly irrelevant.

Finally, in view of the mounting internal and external crises that have gripped South Africa's ruling minority, it would be irresponsible in the extreme to continue gambling with major financial resources of the university now entangled in South African investments. According to Probe International, because of the diminished growth prospects in South Africa in the face of escalating violence, capital flight is currently between \$2 and \$3 billion per year. In July alone, foreigners sold \$70 million of South African securities. On August 28th the government of South Africa suspended trading in the Rand owing to the destabilizing effects of massive capital flight. The financial crisis has deepened as Pretoria has imposed currency controls and has frozen repayment of loans. We may well heed the recent comment of the Honorable Andrew Young, former United States Ambassador to the United Nations: "Nobody in their right mind is investing money in South Africa now, just as nobody was investing in Iran a year before the Shah fell."

Throughout the United States, cities, states, and universities are rapidly moving to divest; even corporations have moved to disinvest, and a bipartisan majority of the Congress has called for economic sanctions. We believe that the students, faculty, and employees of the University, and the citizens of California, have a right to expect prompt corrective action by the Regents. It would be a waste of time, money, and honor to go ahead with the process envisioned in the already obsolete resolution of June 21st. The integrity and the welfare of the University of California are at issue. We petition you to put a California plan for divestment on your next agenda and to act on it favorably. We await your reply.

AN ANTI-APARTHEID BARD FROM SANTA MONICA

Dear Sir,

I offer you what follows, in case you feel like publishing something in light—but not too light—vein on an important subject, in your next issue.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF SOUTH AFRICA IN THE YEAR A.E. 38 (THE 38TH YEAR OF THE APARTHEID ERA) ALSO KNOWN AS A.D. 1985

Apartheid
Offers a dire fate
To whites who want to
Keep away from the Bantu
Ignoring Botha's call
For more mingling of all
While that Grand Fella
Nelson Mandela
Says the Afrikaners
Have gone bananas

If they think shedding black blood is the way to
Heed the warnings of Bishop Tutu
But Chester Crocker continues to say
Just engage and be patient, it will all go away.

Sincerely,
Leslie Rubin
