

# CALL TO ACTION

We call upon the Board of Trustees to come to campus on Monday evening May 8, to attend a forum on the issue of corporate withdrawal.

Why should the trustees come to campus? Because they don't have the facts. Despite the fact that they hold the final authority to

## A VOTE FOR WITHDRAWAL?

The Board of Trustees has voted for a Phelps-Dodge withdrawal proxy--but this vote doesn't signal realization that corporate props for apartheid must be removed. Instead, the trustees have applied the "progressive force" argument. Board Chairperson Peter Bing said that "the Board's judgement is based in large measure on the unlikelihood that Phelps Dodge will be able to act as a progressive influence in South Africa. This inability results from Phelps Dodge's relinquishing to a South African mining company a controlling interest in its major South African operation." Such reasoning, unfortunately, will impel other U.S. firms to tighten control over their South African subsidiaries, further reducing chances for withdrawal.

President Lyman said that John Grey (Pres. of Standard Oil of Calif.) wouldn't vote on proxies directly concerning his business interests. But oddly enough, despite equally scathing CIR reports on Texaco and Phelps Dodge, the trustees voted yes on Phelps Dodge and no on Texaco (Texaco and Standard Oil jointly run a subsidiary in South Africa.). Apparently John Grey needn't raise his hand at board meetings to make his presence felt.

## HASTA LA VICTORIA SIEMPRE

The time to act is now! The trustees ask us to wait yet another year, while South Africans also wait--for the chance to be free of the "progressive influence" of U.S. corporations.

reject CIR calls for withdrawal, many trustees have never read the CIR report on which they "are so dependent" (Bing). The trustees have admitted time and time again that "they simply aren't familiar enough" with the issue to adequately deal with the proxies. Now, suddenly they feel they know more than their own CIR and millions of black South Africans. In the words of President Lyman, these calls and these recommendations "are only paper."

Last March, the CIR held a public forum on the issue of U.S. corporations in South Africa. Members of the CIR later stated that the forum was one of the key factors in their decision to adopt a general recommendation supporting withdrawal. No trustees, not even Pres. Lyman, were there.

We believe that for the trustees to make sound, reasoned judgements on the issue, they must be presented with the facts, not through reports which are thrown away or ignored, but in a humane, personal, and public forum.

Why won't the trustees attend a forum where the facts will be presented? Why won't they adopt a position supporting withdrawal? Perhaps they feel that they understand the situation better than do the African National Congress, the South African Student Organization, the Pan African Congress and the black labor leaders who call for withdrawal of U.S. corporations. Perhaps they're making too much money off them.

The Stanford Community has exhausted every possible way of rationally convincing the trustees to open their eyes. Last year they would only listen to us when 294 people were arrested in Old Union. Student protests caused the removal of ROTC and chemical/biological warfare research at Stanford. Their efforts led to the establishment of the CIR and special admissions programs. We have a responsibility to act now, because inaction is de facto support.

**mass rally**  
**noon monday**  
**may 8 white plaza stanford**

It is our firmly considered view that liberal opinion--however well intentioned it may appear--that opposes our campaign for this withdrawal is, in the long run, only delaying the change that is essential if South Africa is to be rid of apartheid and slave labor. It is not enough to grant higher wages here, better conditions there, for this leaves the apartheid system intact, in fact it props it up--the very source of our misery and degradation.

--The African National Congress (ANC)



50% of all black  
S. African children  
die before age 5

PROPS TO APARTHEID

U.S. corporations are active elements of the apartheid system. 350 have subsidiaries in South Africa, which accounts for 16% of direct private investment and combined holdings of at least \$1.6 billion. Corporations such as IBM, Caltex, and Ford supply products to the military and police who maintain apartheid. As foreign investment has increased, black and white wage levels have grown more disparate. Due to South African laws and customs, foreign corporations can achieve only minor reforms. Apartheid will end only after South Africa's government has lost the political and economic power to defend it. Thus foreign companies--including America's--must withdraw their investments. Withdrawal will weaken the government's ability to maintain apartheid since foreign nations will no longer implicitly support it by their presence and since the economic and military aid on which the government depends will be cut off.

SASO [South African Student Organization] sees foreign investments as giving stability to South Africa's exploitative regime and committing South Africa's trading partners to supporting this regime. For this reason, SASO rejects foreign investments.

--1972 SASO policy statement.  
SASO is now banned

After a nightlong vigil in White Plaza, over 40 protesters met Richard Lyman at his office door. An extraordinary conversation ensued.

Lyman began by labeling the CIR reports and other Stanford community evaluations as "mere pieces of paper." He admitted that the trustees had no new evidence on South Africa to justify rejecting CIR's stand on corporate withdrawal--they'd simply interpreted the evidence differently.

What could convince the trustees that U.S. corporations support apartheid and that they can't act as a progressive force in South Africa? "A persuasive argument," replied Lyman. When asked what he considered a "persuasive argument," he said he didn't know. Well, would he come to the community forum Monday night? No, he already had all the information he needed to make a decision. He also predicted that his fellow trustees wouldn't come: "They just aren't interested, especially now that the proxies are over."

Noting that "Stanford is not a democratic institution," he defended the trustees' right to make any decisions they pleased. He denied that the majority of the Board had intimate corporate interests when in fact the board is laden with corporate attorneys, officers, and investment councilors.

How could we be sure, asked Lyman, that most South African blacks didn't really support continued U.S. investment, but were intimidated by anti-investment peer pressure? Apparently, this "peer pressure" (for which he cited no documentation) overpowers the oft-used Terrorism Act, which views anti-investment talk as terrorism--punishable by five years to death by hanging.

This isn't a debate between reasonable people; it is dishonesty, belying Lyman's claim to membership in an intellectual community.

(These are, we feel, the most important proxies.)	Company	Stockholder Resolution	CIR Recommendation	Trustee Action
	U.S. Steel	South Africa non-expansion	Yes	Yes
	Bank of America	No loans to South Africa	Yes	Abstain
	E. Kodak	Stop sales to S.A. govt.	Abstain	No
	Motorola	Withdrawal from S.A.	Abstain	Abstain
	Texaco	Withdrawal from S.A.	Yes	No
		Investigate alleged oil sales to Rhodesia	Yes	No
	Std. Oil of California	Cut oil shipments to S.A. by 1/3	Yes	No
	Mobil	Cut oil shipments to S.A. by 1/3	Yes	No
	Phelps Dodge	Withdrawal from S.A.	Yes	Yes

**South Africa:**  
**The corporations must go.**