

when given blood transfusions after the removal of an intestinal growth. Despite this, he returned to Zaire in 1984 and worked with USAID on projects to increase food production, marketing and distribution. Of these last three years, his wife wrote, "He decided that what he wanted to do was to...continue with the work that he enjoyed in Africa [and to work in the area that was always his first love].... Bill's position was that the blood products he got (in 1983) kept him alive and gave him three extra years of life.... He saw his son grow from a baby into a young child and he valued highly the extra life he got".

To remember Bill Pruitt is to remember a man who was a most sensitive and caring person; someone who had a remarkable zest for life; someone who sought to see both sides of an issue without compromising his own position; someone who had a deep love and appreciation for Africa; someone who was a real fighter for the causes he believed in. He could be depended on utterly for a good humorous response no matter what he was going through or thinking, and his uncomplicated joy in his work, as well as his skills in teaching, administering, and advising were wonderful to witness. Bill risked all doing the work he loved. We, at least, never heard him regret or lament his choices. In his last years he worked for a bigger understanding of the nature of AIDS, an understanding that was not tinged with hysteria or an ostracism of the people who had been in contact with the virus. He faced within himself the presence of the virus with the same integrity that he showed throughout his life.

He is survived by his wife Elizabeth Reid, two children, John-William and Marisa Isara, his parents, the Rev. and Mrs. William F. Pruitt, Sr. of Dallas, a brother, Robert, also of Dallas, as well as a host of friends throughout the United States, Europe, Africa, Australia and South America.

LETTERS

B.U. Faculty Responds to University President's Decision

Boston University's decision to award an honorary degree to Chief Buthelezi follows closely President Silber's Op Ed to the *New York Times* (on Oct. 9, 1986), in which he strongly condemned the African National Congress (ANC) for "strident Leninism" and the use of violence in its struggle to end apartheid, and argued that "we would be better advised to support such as Chief Mangusuthu Gatsha Buthelezi." On October 31, 1986, it was announced that Boston University had decided to award an honorary degree to Chief Mangusuthu Gatsha Buthelezi, Chief Minister of KwaZulu, the semi-autonomous "homeland" of the Zulus of South Africa.

As Africanists on the the B.U. faculty, we wish to dissociate ourselves from President Silber's views on alternatives for bringing an end to apartheid in South Africa and the decision to single out Chief Buthelezi for an honorary degree. In the interests of promoting informed discussion on the crisis in South Africa, we would also like to elaborate on three particular issues raised by President Silber's recent statements.

First, it is not very meaningful to castigate the leaders of the ANC for advocating armed struggle against apartheid without even mentioning the long history of violent repression by the South African government against Blacks. To suggest that South

Africans opposed to apartheid must choose between "Leninists" in the ANC and a leader such as Chief Buthelezi is also misleading. Nelson Mandela, the imprisoned leader of the ANC, who is not a communist, enjoys broad popular support. In a poll of Black South Africans, taken for the *Sunday Times of London* in August 1986 by Markinor, the Gallup affiliate in South Africa, 49% of the respondents believed that Nelson Mandela would make the best president for South Africa. In the same poll, only 6% of the respondents named Chief Buthelezi--compared to 11% who chose the white parliamentarian Helen Suzman. Even in Durban, Buthelezi received only 27% of the polled "votes"--a result which the *Times* suggests "casts doubt on the feasibility of a multi-racial Natal based on partnership with the Zulu leader, an idea Buthelezi launched that is now being seriously considered by Botha."

Prominent South African businessmen have also advocated working with the ANC to end apartheid, as shown by the delegation led by Gavin Relly of Anglo-American Corp., who met with ANC leaders in Zambia in 1985 despite the express disapproval of the South African government. Chief Buthelezi himself has said that Nelson Mandela must be released as a precondition for negotiations. Buthelezi told the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group that "if Mr. Mandela, in a democratic South Africa, were elected by the majority, he would be ready and willing to serve under him." (Mission, p.94)--a striking affirmation of Mandela's popular support, given Chief Buthelezi's generally critical stance towards the ANC.

Chief Buthelezi opposes the use of economic sanctions to pressure the South African government to end apartheid. His arguments that economic sanctions are ineffective, and that foreign firms and governments can accomplish more to end apartheid and improve economic conditions for Blacks by remaining economically involved in South Africa, while logically attractive, are increasingly difficult to sustain. Between 1960 and 1980, while U.S. investment in South Africa increased ninefold, foreign firms succeeded in improving housing and working conditions for only a small minority of their Black employees. Even Leon Sullivan, author of the Sullivan principles which have guided foreign firms' efforts to promote racial equality through their own hiring practices, set a deadline--May 19, 1987--after which he advocated disinvestment if there has been no meaningful progress towards reform. Already, General Motors, IBM., and other major firms are beginning to disinvest, in part because they see no evidence and little hope of such progress being achieved under the Sullivan principles.

While Black employment in U.S. owned firms increased, the South African government forcibly removed over 3.5 million Blacks to impoverished homelands where unemployment rates are very high and living conditions for the majority of residents are deplorable. The South Africa government has justified forcible resettlement as part of a policy preserving "tribal" cultures--a policy to which tribally defined political movements, such as Chief Buthelezi's Inkatha, lend implicit endorsement.

Public support for sanctions is also growing inside South Africa, despite the fact that is illegal to express such support. 77% of the respondents to the *Sunday Times* poll said that other countries should impose sanctions unless South Africa gets rid of apartheid, although 48% expected to suffer personally if sanctions are imposed. Support for sanctions was as high among Blacks who held jobs as among the unemployed. Prominent anti-apartheid leaders and groups--such as Nobel laureate Bishop Desmond

Tutu, the South African Council of Churches, the Congress of South African Trade Unions, and the multi-racial United Democratic Front--also advocate sanctions.

Nor is it at all clear that reform is already under way and that sanctions are therefore superfluous. Recent gestures by the South African government towards reform, such as dismantling influx control, have been quickly followed by further restrictions on Blacks' mobility which belie the government's avowed commitment to reform. In recent weeks Pretoria has taken official measures against the UDF--the largest organization within South Africa with an explicitly multi-racial platform and constituency. Such measures, together with Pretoria's continuing military aggression against neighboring states and recalcitrance towards international initiatives, such as that of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group, further underline the futility of international efforts to work with the present South African government to bring about a negotiated end to apartheid.

In the context of 1) mounting evidence that the South African government will not be persuaded to initiate meaningful steps to end apartheid and enfranchise the people of South Africa; 2) growing support for sanctions by foreign governments, international firms and South Africans themselves; and 3) increasingly vigorous popular support among black South Africans for ending apartheid and establishing a genuinely democratic system of government based on universal suffrage; we feel that it is inappropriate to single out for special commendation a Black South African Leader whose political base is defined in terms of the tribalism which Pretoria has used for decades to deny political rights to the Black majority.

(Signed) Sara Berry, Katherine Demuth, Irene Gendzier, Jane Guyer, John Harris, Gillian Hart, Priscilla Hinckley, Shaheen Mozaffar, Jeanne Penvenne, Jo Sullivan, Ed Wilmsen, Jennifer Yanco.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Donations Needed

The Barbados Museum and Historical Society is planning a temporary African heritage exhibit for this fall, to be followed by a small permanent gallery of Caribbean African Heritage. The Museum is in the final stages of a National Development Plan and a gallery of African history, culture and art is deemed important for serving the Barbadian public.

The Museum seeks donations of publications and loans or gifts of photographic or audio-visual materials for the purpose of an exhibit exploring the West African origins of Black Caribbean Peoples. They also hope to establish working relationships with institutions and individuals interested in pursuing research or education in this area of knowledge.

For further information write to Steven Hackenberger, Curator, the Barbados Museum and Historical Society, St. Ann's Garrison, Barbados, W.I.

Working Paper Now Available

A workshop on "Africa Population and Capitalism: Historical Perspectives," organized by Dennis D. Cordell, Southern Methodist University, and Joel W. Gregory,