

---

**POLITICS & GOVERNMENT**


---

1945 consists of statements Eisenhower made 15-20 years afterward. Were these later statements true? Barring a new primary source (such as an Eisenhower diary), Bernstein believes that they cannot *definitely* be proven false. But Eisenhower, like others, was known to tailor "important remembrances to suit his needs." For example, Eisenhower in 1945 was "quite optimistic" about postwar relations with the Soviet Union—but years later he said he had tried "to warn Roosevelt about the Soviets."

---

**FOREIGN POLICY & DEFENSE**


---

### *Saving South Africa*

"A Capitalist's Conundrum" by Anthony Sampson, in *Regardie's* (Dec. 1987), 1010 Wisconsin Ave. N.W., Ste. 600, Washington, D.C. 20007.

Many American politicians argue that U.S. corporations should sell off their South African subsidiaries. "Our country is implicated in the terrible system that blights South Africa," says Senator Edward Kennedy (D.-Mass.). "Our corporations have benefited from the apartheid economy."

Sampson, British author of *The Seven Sisters* and *The Changing Anatomy of Britain*, argues that "disinvestment" from South Africa is neither a wise nor a moral policy. Foreign corporations, he contends, "must not just pull out of an evil system but work toward producing a more equitable one."

Foes of apartheid, Sampson believes, have taken "an overly dogmatic view of corporate involvement." By insisting both on sanctions by the United States government against South Africa *and* on disinvestment by U.S. business, the anti-apartheid movement "made a mistake."

Economic sanctions against South Africa, in Sampson's opinion, are useful as a tool to convince whites "that continuing apartheid won't pay off for them." But disinvestment leaves former U.S. subsidiaries in the hands of South African corporations that feel no pressure to make reforms. General Motors (GM), for example, instructed its South African subsidiary not to sell equipment to the South African Army or police and to abide by the "Sullivan Principles" calling for integration of offices and equal opportunity for blacks. After GM sold a subsidiary in South Africa in October 1986, the new owners made clear they "had little regard for unions and had no inhibitions about selling to the military."

The "most damaging" corporate pullout from South Africa has been that of foreign banks, such as Chase Manhattan and Barclays. These international banks have denied credit needed for the South African economy to expand. Without foreign loans, says one Barclays official, South Africa will find it "increasingly difficult" to "promote economic growth to employ the ever-growing non-white population."

U.S. corporations, Sampson contends, should stay in South Africa and work toward ending apartheid. "The greatest danger," he warns, is that disinvestment will allow Americans to "gratefully wash their hands of South Africa and leave its blacks to their fate."