



# Anti-Apartheid Movement

13 Mandela Street London NW1 ODW Tel 01-387 7966

## BRIEFING NOTE FOR PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE ON SOUTH AFRICA

MONDAY 29TH FEBRUARY 1988

### Introduction:

This briefing has been prepared for Members of Parliament wishing to intervene in the debate in the House of Commons on 29th February on South Africa.

The debate has been initiated in response to the banning orders and other measures taken by the Pretoria regime on 24th February, which are designed to suppress the democratic movement within South Africa. It examines the implications of this crack down for future developments in South Africa as well as its implications for British policy. It also sets out a series of proposals for action which the British Government could take.

### The Banning of the UDF and Other Anti-Apartheid Organisations:

The banning orders imposed by the Pretoria regime on 24th February against the UDF, COSATU and other anti-apartheid organisations have effectively closed a chapter in South Africa's history. It will prove to be as significant as the banning of the ANC and PAC in 1960 and of Black Consciousness organisations in 1977. Especially since 1983, when the UDF was founded, there has been a mushrooming of anti-apartheid organisations within South Africa campaigning non-violently on a wide range of local and national issues such as rent boycotts, the release of detainees, boycotts of elections, etc. Numerous efforts have been made to suppress these organisations, their leaders and activists and the entire democratic movement within South Africa. Despite detentions, torture and two States of Emergency (the first in July 1985-March 1986 and the second since June 1986 and still in force) the Pretoria regime has failed to suppress this movement. It has, therefore, resorted to the most draconian action possible, namely the banning of all activities of the UDF and 16 other anti-apartheid organisations and the banning of any political or campaigning activities by South Africa's major trade union federation, COSATU. In practice now, the only organisations able to speak out against the regime are the Churches and other religious groups. The only major black organisation not affected by these bannings is Inkatha.

The Pretoria regime's purpose in imposing these draconian measures appears to be three-fold:

- (1) to prohibit all anti-apartheid activities
- (2) to facilitate the imposition of its so-called reform policy involving the co-option of elements within the black community into the structures of apartheid
- (3) to prohibit opposition to the activities of Inkatha and other vigilante groups which may well result in a dramatic increase in so-called Black on Black violence.

The only conclusion which can be drawn from these developments is that P.W.Botha has closed the door totally on any genuine negotiations with representative black leadership.

### Implications for British Policy:

The Prime Minister and Government Ministers now have no credible policy towards South Africa. They have repeatedly rejected proposals to pressurise the South African authorities by adopting measures such as sanctions. They have argued that such action undermines the prospect of reaching a negotiated settlement. Their approach, they have argued, is the reasonable one of getting everybody around a negotiating table. There were few, if any, signs that Pretoria would agree to such negotiations before this crack down. Now it is impossible to argue with any credibility for such a policy.

The second element of British policy has been the so-called "positive measures". This has largely involved educational funding through the British Council and support for the European Community programme of funding non-violent anti-apartheid organisations. It is impossible to see how this programme can proceed. The key organisation involved in education, the National Education Crisis Committee, has been banned and the entire future, therefore, of educational programmes in South Africa must be at risk.

The European Community programme is even more directly affected since the organisations and activities which it is designed to support are the ones which have been targetted for action by the Pretoria regime.

In fact, therefore, the British Government has no policy except wishful thinking that some time apartheid will wither away.

Government Ministers have rejected outright proposals for more effective action. Indeed, they have even argued that this action by the Pretoria regime is in some way linked to the United States' and other sanctions measures which have been imposed over the past 2 years. All the evidence, however, points in the opposite direction, namely that the regime feels able to take such repressive measures because it is confident that there will be no response beyond words and statements by Britain, West Germany and Japan in particular.

It is important that this argument of the Government is refuted effectively. It is worth recalling, for example, that the sanctions imposed by the United States Congress in October 1986 followed the imposition of the State of Emergency in June 1986. Sanctions have come in response to repression rather than repression in response to sanctions. It is also significant that this latest crack down comes shortly after reports that the South African economy had picked up slightly during the last quarter of 1987. One cannot overestimate the real fear in Government and business circles in South Africa of the impact of sanctions. It is significant that the banning order against COSATU specifically prohibits it from advocating sanctions or disinvestment.

### Proposals for Action:

Government Ministers and officials must now be aware that their policy towards South Africa is in total disarray. They have to make a very clear choice. Either they must move down the path of adopting more effective measures or do nothing. They can no longer hide behind the figleaf of some possible negotiations or even the programme of "positive measures". The Anti-Apartheid Movement is convinced that only comprehensive and mandatory sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council can make a decisive contribution towards

ending apartheid. However, there are a number of specific proposals which could be put as challenges to the Government:

- 1) Will they recall the British Ambassador from Pretoria and seek the withdrawal of all European Community Ambassadors?  
In July 1985, following the first State of Emergency, EC Ambassadors were recalled. This is a much more serious development - why is Britain therefore opposed to such a move?
- 2) Will Britain support the convening of the UN Security Council?  
It is likely that an Emergency Debate will be held this week. Will the Government undertake not to use its veto power if there is a package of sanctions measures before the Security Council which are acceptable to other Western countries?
- 3) Will the Government go to the UN Security Council and seek mandatory action to enforce the measures which it has already agreed to, for example, an oil embargo and an embargo on computer exports?  
It makes no sense for Britain to adopt such measures and then to block their universal application.
- 4) Will the Foreign Secretary go to the European Community Foreign Ministers' meeting this week-end with a positive approach to reach agreement on additional European Community measures?  
In particular, will he use his influence with the West German and Portuguese Foreign Ministers to get agreement on a ban on coal imports?
- 5) Will the Government follow up the statement by Mrs. Chalker on the Newsnight programme on 24th February, that it will consult with its Commonwealth partners by meeting with the Commonwealth Secretary-General and supporting the convening of a Commonwealth Foreign Ministers' meeting or a meeting of the Commonwealth Southern Africa Committee, to reach agreement on further measures?

These are practical steps which the Government could take. The tragedy is that it is almost certain to veto and block action by the United Nations, the Commonwealth and the European Community. If it does, it is vital that there is widespread condemnation of this action.

There remains one crucial issue which needs to be argued persuasively in the debate, namely the need for the Government to strictly implement the measures it has already agreed to, in both the letter and the spirit. This applies in particular to the Arms Embargo and bans on collaboration in nuclear and other strategic fields.

Attached:

- 1) Statement by Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, President of the Anti-Apartheid Movement 25th February 1986.
  - 2) Letters from Archbishop Huddleston presented on 26th February to the Commonwealth Secretary-General, the Foreign Secretary, and to the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany for forwarding to the FRG Minister of Foreign Affairs.
- NB The Anti-Apartheid Movement has available the Government Gazette which sets out the banning orders imposed on 24th February and a recent publication "Sanctions Begin to Bite", which details the impact sanctions are having on the South African economy.
-

251

**STATEMENT BY ARCHBISHOP TREVOR HUDDLESTON, PRESIDENT OF THE  
ANTI-APARTHEID MOVEMENT 25TH FEBRUARY 1988**

WE HAVE GATHERED HERE TOGETHER TODAY TO EXPRESS OUR OUTRAGE AT THE LATEST DRACONIAN CRACKDOWN BY THE SOUTH AFRICAN AUTHORITIES AGAINST ANTI-APARTHEID ORGANISATIONS AND LEADING ANTI-APARTHEID ACTIVISTS.

THE PRETORIA REGIME HAS EFFECTIVELY BANNED 17 MAJOR ORGANISATIONS SEEKING A DEMOCRATIC SOUTH AFRICA THROUGH NON-VIOLENT ACTION AND HAS SO PROSCRIBED THE ACTIONS OF SOUTH AFRICA'S MAIN TRADE UNION FEDERATION, COSATU, THAT IT IS NOW PROHIBITED FROM ENGAGING IN ANY ANTI-APARTHEID ACTIVITY.

AS MY COLLEAGUE AND FRIEND ARCHBISHOP DESMOND TUTU COMMENTED YESTERDAY THE CRACKDOWN WILL BE SEEN AS A DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST THE BLACK MAJORITY IN SOUTH AFRICA.

IN ALL PROBABILITY ANOTHER IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCE OF THE CRACKDOWN, I FEAR, WILL BE RENEWED VIOLENCE BY INKATHA AND OTHER VIGILANTES AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT. SIGNIFICANTLY NONE OF THESE ORGANISATIONS HAVE BEEN BANNED AND YET UDF LEADERS SUCH AS ARCHIE GUMEDE WHO HAVE BEEN TRYING TO ACHIEVE PEACE AND RECONCILIATION HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO BANNING ORDERS. ONCE AGAIN PRETORIA'S HAND CAN BE SEEN BEHIND WHAT IT DESCRIBES AS 'BLACK ON BLACK' VIOLENCE.

HOW CAN WE AVERT A TRAGEDY WHICH COULD ENGULF THE WHOLE OF SOUTHERN AFRICA AND POISON RACE RELATIONS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD?. CERTAINLY MORE IS REQUIRED THAN RITUAL CONDEMNATIONS.

I CANNOT SEE HOW THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT CAN DELUDE ITSELF ANY LONGER THAT ITS POLICIES ARE CONTRIBUTING TOWARDS ACHIEVING A NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT. THEY HAVE HAD THE VERY OPPOSITE EFFECT. AS MORE AND MORE OF BRITAIN'S ALLIES HAVE CONCLUDED THAT EFFECTIVE SANCTIONS MEASURES ARE THE ONLY APPROPRIATE RESPONSE TO THE THE INTRANSIGENCE OF PRETORIA, P W BOTHA HAS BEEN COMFORTED BY THE KNOWLEDGE THAT BRITAIN WILL PROTECT IT FROM EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL ACTION. IT IS TOTALLY MISLEADING AND INCORRECT FOR MRS CHALKER TO CLAIM THAT IT IS THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER SANCTIONS MEASURES WHICH HAVE PUSHED PRETORIA DOWN THE PATH OF REPRESSION. NO! THE TRUTH OF THE MATTER IS THAT IT IS THE REFUSAL OF THE BRITAIN, THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY AND JAPAN IN PARTICULAR TO COUNTENANCE ANY EFFECTIVE SANCTIONS WHICH HAS GIVEN THE APARTHEID REGIME THE GREEN LIGHT TO EMBARK ON THIS OFFENSIVE.

FOR HOW MUCH LONGER CAN WE TOLERATE PATTERNS OF COLLABORATION WITH APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA BY WHICH IT OBTAINS VITAL RESOURCES INCLUDING WEAPONS OF WAR AND REPRESSION. BRITISH LANDROVERS PATROL THE TOWNSHIPS FROM WHICH SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE SHOOT TO KILL. BRITISH ICL COMPUTERS HAVE BEEN SUPPLIED TO THE SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE AND ARMAMENTS INDUSTRY. BRITISH MILITARY RADAR PROVIDED BY PLESSY AND MARCONI CONTROL ITS AIR ATTACKS INTO NEIGHBOURING AFRICAN STATES. BRITISH OIL COMPANIES, SUCH AS SHELL AND BP, CONTINUE TO FUEL THE APARTHEID WAR MACHINE. THE DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY HAS STEPPED UP ITS PROMOTION OF TRADE WITH SOUTH AFRICA.. BRITISH COMPANIES EVEN PROVIDE TRANSPARENT FILM FOR SOUTH AFRICA'S IDENTITY DOCUMENTS BY WHICH IT CONTROLS THE MOVEMENT OF THE ENTIRE AFRICAN PEOPLE. AND BRITAIN IS NOT ALONE. THE SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE RECENTLY OBTAINED MESSERSCHMIDT HELICOPTERS FROM WEST GERMANY AND IT HAS NOW EMERGED THAT WEST GERMAN SUBMARINE PLANS AND KNOW-HOW WERE PROVIDED TO SOUTH AFRICA. LIKEWISE THE G5 AND G6 ARTILLERY WEAPONS CURRENTLY BOMBARDING ANGOLA ARE OF JOINT US-CANADIAN ORIGIN.

THE TRAGIC FACT IS THAT EXISTING MEASURES ARE NOT RIGOROUSLY ENFORCED. AND BRITAIN BLOCKS THE MANDATORY ENFORCEMENT BY THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL OF MEASURES LIKE THE OIL EMBARGO WHICH IT FORMALLY SUBSCRIBES TO WHICH WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF MAKING THEM OBLIGATORY ON ALL MEMBER STATES. WE HAVE ALREADY PROVIDED CHAPTER AND VERSE AS TO HOW BRITAIN IS REFUSING TO IMPLEMENT THE SPIRIT AND LETTER OF THE MEASURES IT CLAIMS IT IS 'SCRUPULOUSLY' ENFORCING.

I HAVE SOUGHT URGENT MEETINGS WITH BOTH SIR GEOFFREY HOWE AND THE AMBASSADOR OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY - THE FRG FOREIGN MINISTER HERR GENSCHER IS THE CURRENT PRESIDENT OF THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL OF MINISTERS. A NUMBER OF SIMPLE PROPOSITIONS SHOULD BE PUT TO THEM FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION.

FIRSTLY I WANT THE BRITISH AND EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AMBASSADORS TO BE RECALLED FROM PRETORIA IMMEDIATELY AS A PUBLIC EXPRESSION OF THE OUTRAGE FELT THROUGHOUT BRITAIN AND EUROPE.

SECONDLY I WANT BRITAIN, WITH THE FULL SUPPORT OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY TO SEEK THE MANDATORY ADOPTION BY THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL OF OF THE MEASURES IT HAS ALREADY FORMALLY SUBSCRIBED TO SUCH AS THE OIL EMBARGO AND THE EMBARGO ON COMPUTER EXPORTS.

THIRDLY I WANT THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY TO IMMEDIATELY IMPOSE SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICAN COAL AND TO SEEK A UN MANDATORY EMBARGO ON COAL IMPORTS.

FINALLY THERE MUST BE HIGH LEVEL CONSULTATIONS BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH COUNTRIES; THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY; THE NORDIC COUNTRIES; THE USA AND JAPAN TO AGREE ON A PACKAGE OF SANCTIONS MEASURES TO BE IMPOSED BY THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL.

THESE ARE THE MINIMUM MEASURES THAT MUST BE TAKEN IMMEDIATELY - HOWEVER NOTHING SHORT OF TOTAL COMPREHENSIVE AND MANDATORY SANCTIONS CAN CONTRIBUTE DECISIVELY TO THE ENDING OF APARTHEID.

I HAVE ALREADY CONTACTED THE PRESIDENT OF THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL AND THE UN SECRETARY GENERAL TO PROPOSE THAT THE SECURITY COUNCIL BE CONVENED IMMEDIATELY. THE FOREIGN OFFICE MINISTER OF STATE MRS CHALKER PROPOSED LAST NIGHT ON TELEVISION THAT THERE SHOULD BE URGENT CONSULTATIONS BY BRITAIN WITH OUR COMMONWEALTH AND EUROPEAN PARTNERS. IF SHE IS SERIOUS THAN SHE WOULD SURELY SUPPORT EMERGENCY FOREIGN MINISTERS MEETINGS OF BOTH THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY. I HAVE ALREADY BEEN IN CONTACT WITH THE COMMONWEALTH SECRETARY-GENERAL AND THE FRG PRESIDENCY TO PROPOSE SUCH MEETINGS.

IN CONCLUSION I WOULD LIKE TO STRESS THAT YESTERDAYS DRACONIAN ACTIONS BY THE APARTHEID REGIME PLACE A SPECIAL ONUS OF RESPONSIBILITY ON ALL THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN. IF THE SOUTH AFRICAN AUTHORITIES INTEND TO PROHIBIT SOUTH AFRICAN TRADE UNIONISTS FROM ACTING AGAINST APARTHEID THEN BRITISH TRADE UNIONISTS MUST ACT! IF STUDENTS AND YOUTH ORGANISATIONS ARE BANNED IN SOUTH AFRICA YOUNG PEOPLE IN BRITAIN MUST ACT! I HOPE THE OUTRAGE FELT THROUGHOUT BRITAIN MUST ACT. I HOPE THE OUTRAGE FELT THROUGHOUT BRITAIN AT PRETORIA'S ACTION WILL BE TRANSFORMED INTO EFFECTIVE CAMPAIGNS ESPECIALLY ACTION TO TOTALLY ISOLATE APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA.