



the Anti-Apartheid Movement

89 Charlotte Street London W1 580 5311

OCTOBER 1967/JULY 1968

<u>Hon. President:</u>	David Steel MP	<u>Sponsors:</u>	Lord Brockway
<u>Hon. Vice-Presidents:</u>	Humphry Berkeley		Lord Collison
	Sir Dingle Foot QC MP		Jack Jones MBE
	Jeremy Thorpe MP PC		T.O. Kellock QC
	Ben Whitaker MP		Lord Willis
<u>Chairman:</u>	John Ennals		Angus Wilson
<u>Vice-Chairman:</u>	Andrew Faulds MP		

ANNUAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Ten Years of Political Campaigning

On 26 June 1969, the Anti-Apartheid Movement will have completed a decade of sustained political campaigning in Britain in support of the cause of South African freedom and against apartheid and race rule in Southern Africa. Following closely the freedom struggles of the peoples of Southern Africa, the Movement has worked to educate the British people about their critical responsibilities for winning major and substantial changes in Britain's policies towards apartheid, to campaign persistently for such changes, and to widen the area of support for the Southern African peoples' struggle to overthrow their oppression.

Over these ten years the Movement has undoubtedly achieved much in its efforts to expose the evils of the apartheid system. Our work had certainly created the necessary climate for the formal adoption of the arms embargo against South Africa. Our joint campaigns with other organisations made a sell-out in Rhodesia considerably more difficult. The consumer boycott and our campaigns for the isolation of apartheid in the cultural, sporting and other fields provided a framework for international action through the United Nations based on economic and political sanctions against South Africa. The Movement's initiatives and campaigns on behalf of political prisoners and opponents of apartheid certainly helped to stop the South African authorities from imposing the death sentences on Nelson Mandela and his fellow freedom fighters in the Rivonia Trial. The unresolved crisis arising from South Africa's annexation of the territory of South West Africa has been an issue of continuous campaigning by the Movement. Throughout these years we have maintained the closest relations with the major freedom movements of Southern Africa; mounting campaigns in support of their struggles we have provided them with a regular platform to address and inform the British people about their aims and policies.

Despite these achievements, we cannot claim to have won for the anti-apartheid cause what has always been central to our tasks: the

reversal of Britain's policies of cooperation with South Africa and the ending of the country's enormous economic involvement in the Southern African apartheid system. Britain's trade and capital exports to South Africa have grown massively in the past decade. Britain's direct and indirect defence of South Africa internationally, and its mutual military arrangements with the apartheid regime have remained broadly unchanged. South Africa's enforced departure from the Commonwealth has not affected the many-sided economic and political cooperative agreements that evolved under Commonwealth arrangements.

Britain's dealings with the former High Commission Territories and with Rhodesia remain conditioned by the interests and wishes of apartheid South Africa. The British government has pointedly refused to mount the necessary pressures to secure South Africa's expulsion from South West Africa as required by the United Nations. Britain has tolerated, if not encouraged, South Africa's military intervention in Rhodesia in defence of the illegal Smith regime. Hence, over these ten years, we have witnessed the crystallisation of Britain's policies and objectives towards race rule in Southern Africa; such as to expose much of the hollowness of the anti-racial and anti-apartheid expressions sometimes found in official statements.

This experience certainly reflects the continued power and influence of the numerous pro-apartheid lobbies operating in this country and abroad. Financed by the high return on capital investment in apartheid, addicted to racialism and race rule, and concerned with holding the march of freedom and independence in Africa in close check, these groups are in collusion with apartheid South Africa and assert their formidable influence over Britain's policies, making absolute nonsense of the many promises and undertakings of the Labour Party when in opposition. The pro-apartheid power groups in industry, finance and in government have signally increased their perverse role in recent years; they have joined up with the South African information services abroad to whitewash apartheid, sabotage the programme of sanctions and other measures against South Africa and Rhodesia agreed at the United Nations, and to undermine the independence of those African states who justifiably oppose the strengthening of South Africa's hold over Southern Africa.

The New Period of Armed Resistance

The historic new phase of armed resistance which opened in August 1967 when the principal African liberatory organisations announced that their freedom fighters had engaged the Rhodesian colonial troops, quickly shattered the carefully cultivated myths that had been created about South Africa's alleged peaceful aims, and neutrality in Britain's dispute with the Smith regime. South African troops, in increasing numbers, have entered Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies of Mozambique and Angola. The African people and their freedom fighters are confronted by a formidable combination of colonialist and white settler forces today. South Africa has actively taken over the military leadership in Southern Africa in defence of apartheid

and white settler colonialism.

The progress of the armed resistance in the past year has won important victories for the freedom fighters. African fighting units have been reported to have penetrated Rhodesia as far as Salisbury, and to have established themselves among the people in the country areas. They have been shown to be skilled and capable in withstanding the heavy concentration of South African arms. Their continuous incursions have created a major crisis among the ruling authorities, who are feverishly increasing their armaments, and scouring the international arms market for military equipment. Clearly, the armed resistance of the African people is shaking the stability of the apartheid structures built around South Africa's armed power. In Mozambique, well over one-fifth of the territory has been liberated and a well developed administration has been created in these areas. South Africa's military support has in no way eased the desperate plight in which the Portuguese colonial authorities now find themselves.

This new and historic development is matched by a sharp increase in the activities of the pro-apartheid lobbies in Britain. Their efforts to condemn the freedom fighters as "terrorists" has been coupled with sustained campaigns for the rescinding of the arms embargo, and for the explicit alignment of Britain with South Africa in her war against the African peoples. British industrialists and politicians are being invited in increasing numbers to South Africa where they are promised fat war contracts, large export orders and other economic opportunities. In response to these pressures, the British Government has been particularly equivocal. The reassertion of the arms embargo during the past year has not stopped Britain's military cooperation with South Africa. The Simonstown Agreement remains; South African military personnel continue to come to Britain, and British capital continues to go towards the development of South Africa's arms producing industry. Mr Wilson's Government has condemned the African peoples' armed resistance, arguing that Britain does not believe that the Rhodesian crisis can be solved by force. And yet Britain does nothing to stop the violent employment of Rhodesia's resources and those of South Africa in defying Britain and the world, despite the United Nations resolution calling for moral and material assistance to the liberation movements.

The Role of the Anti-Apartheid Movement

The African peoples' armed resistance and their struggle for liberation in Southern Africa will certainly grow and become more intensive and widespread in the coming year. This resistance will increasingly become the focus of international attention, and hence, we must anticipate corresponding efforts from South Africa and the pro-apartheid lobbies abroad, in Britain and the United States in particular, to swing international opinion towards the recognition of the Smith regime and for the renewed supply of arms for containing the African freedom fighters.

It must now be the duty of the Movement, with the support of the many

anti-racialist bodies that exist in the country, and with all progressive forces, to mount sustained campaigns to educate and inform British opinion about the armed resistance, to counter the pro-apartheid lobbies, and to win solidarity actions for the African freedom fighters and their struggle by intensifying our efforts within the trade union movement, the youth and students and the political parties.

Believing that the best support that Britain can render to the cause of freedom in Southern Africa is to impose an all-embracing anti-apartheid boycott, the Movement must persist with its policy for the strengthening of economic sanctions against Rhodesia, the imposition of a ban on British capital exports, on cultural and sports exchanges and on the emigration of skilled labour to South Africa in the coming year. We must give paramount attention to mounting campaigns for these objectives. Finally, the Movement must find the means to ally more closely with the freedom fighters all the progressive forces in Britain and to suggest ways in which these forces can actively manifest their support.

THE UNHOLY ALLIANCE

The nature of the alliance between the white racist regimes of South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal and, in particular, South Africa's aggressive role, has emerged more clearly over this past year.

We have therefore placed an increasing emphasis on the "unholy alliance" in Southern Africa and the growing forces of resistance to white racist domination.

On November 7, we circulated a letter to all Members of Parliament noting that two years after UDI, South African security forces were operating in Rhodesia; that there were persistent rumours of a relaxation of the arms embargo against South Africa; that the forces of African resistance were fighting against white minority rule and the least we could offer was our moral support. We called upon the British Government "to ensure the removal of apartheid South African forces from Rhodesia and under no circumstances to reach a settlement in Rhodesia without the direct involvement of the African majority."

Rhodesia, South Africa: The Challenge to Britain

November 14: Meeting, Central Hall Westminster, attended by nearly 3,000 people, co-sponsored by the United Nations Association, The Africa Bureau and the Movement for Colonial Freedom.

Through extensive mailings and personal contacts we aroused interest among members of all political parties, the Churches, the Trade Unions, the Co-operative Movement, women's organisations, and youth and student groups. Oliver Tambo, Acting President-General of the African National Congress, spoke on the efforts made over many years to effect a change within South Africa and why it had become necessary to resort to armed struggle. He also spoke, as did Nicholas Chitsiga of ZAPU, on the historic nature of the military alliance between these two liberation movements. The meeting was chaired by David Steel MP and other

speakers included Humphry Berkeley, who spoke on the position of Zambia; the Rev. T. Beetham, representing the British Council of Churches; Canon Collins, President of the International Defence and Aid Fund; Jeremy Thorpe MP and Andrew Faulds MP.

A statement from the four sponsoring organisations was issued suggesting specific proposals for British Government action: urging HMG to ensure the expulsion of the South African forces from Rhodesia; deploring any suggestion of lifting the arms embargo against South Africa; and calling on HMG to reaffirm their pledge of NIBMAR.

On February 29 the appellate division of the Rhodesia High Court refused to grant a perpetual interdict to restrain the illegal Smith regime from executing three of the more than 100 Africans under sentence of death.

On March 5 the Anti-Apartheid Movement arranged a delegation to the Commonwealth Office, led by Humphry Berkeley. We asked that the reprieve granted by the Queen to these three men on March 2 should be extended to include the additional 110 condemned men; that if the three men were executed this constituted a breakdown of law and order and that the British Government should take all necessary steps, including the use of force, to restore it.

On the morning of March 6 it was announced that, despite the Queen's reprieve, the illegal Smith regime had hanged the three Africans. We immediately called a demonstration outside Rhodesia House to which there was an impressive response. As part of this demonstration a group of MPs, led by David Steel, laid a wreath on the steps outside Rhodesia House.

On March 26 we again wrote to Mr Wilson pointing out that HMG bore final responsibility for the murder of the Rhodesian Africans and that, in view of previous indications by HMG that force would be used in the event of a breakdown of law and order in Rhodesia, these executions certainly constituted such a breakdown and that force should now be used to remove the Smith regime. We also urged reconsideration of Zambia's plight and suggested practical support to compensate for the severely undermining effect of sanctions on the Zambian economy. This letter was released to the press.

On the afternoon of March 6, Dr Mondlane, President of FRELIMO (Mozambique Liberation Front), arrived in London for a brief visit. Again, the Anti-Apartheid Movement, Movement for Colonial Freedom, United Nations Association and Africa Bureau worked together on a programme for his visit. The Anti-Apartheid Movement also sponsored the highly successful National Students Conference held in Oxford at which Dr Mondlane and other representatives of the African liberation movements spoke. His programme included a press conference, a one-day conference on "The Unholy Alliance" and a public meeting on March 13 at Church House Westminster on "The Conflict in Southern Africa". Unfortunately Dr Mondlane had unexpectedly to leave London before the last meeting. Despite his absence, this was a well attended and successful occasion. Speakers included

Sir Dingle Foot MP; Lord Gifford who, in the absence of Dr Mondlane, spoke about FRELIMO; Judy Todd, Lord Collison, General Secretary of the National Union of Agricultural Workers; Robert Resha of the African National Congress of South Africa; Kotsho Dube, the new representative of the Zimbabwe African Peoples Union, and John Ennals, Director-General of the United Nations Association. David Steel MP again chaired this meeting.

Inevitably great emphasis was laid at the meeting on the Rhodesian situation and a resolution was passed condemning the murder of the Africans by the illegal Smith regime and expressing concern for the lives of those under sentence of death. The meeting also demanded that HMG assert its authority in Rhodesia and bring about majority rule as a necessary step towards independence.

Dr. Mondlane made a considerable personal impact in this country at the public meetings he addressed and in interviews in the press and on television. Little publicity has been given in the past to the armed struggle in Mozambique, which started in 1964, and to the impressive achievements of the freedom fighters in this area. Dr Mondlane's visit helped to fill this gap. A result of his visit has been the formation of the Committee for Freedom in Mozambique, who are now represented on the National Committee of the Anti-Apartheid Movement.

Throughout this period we have made intensive efforts to keep the Rhodesian issue before the public, to point out that sanctions would be a long drawn out and meaningless exercise unless Britain and the United Nations were prepared to deal with South Africa and Portugal, who have consistently ignored the UN call for sanctions against Rhodesia and have substantially assisted in the survival of the Smith regime.

END COLLABORATION

At a National Committee meeting towards the end of 1967 we decided that since the confrontation between the forces of white oppression and national liberation had already begun, it was now of even greater importance that Britain should not be lined up with the white oppressors but that the weight of her political and moral influence, and all the practical pressures available to her, should be used to bring race rule in Southern Africa to an end. The collaboration between this country and South Africa in the economic, military, sport and cultural fields must be exposed and more actively discouraged since all such collaboration indicated aid and support for the apartheid regime.

As part of this campaign we produced a leaflet "Are you a collaborator"; a list of British firms with subsidiaries in Rhodesia; a number of duplicated sheets on why we should boycott South African goods and numerous stickers with different slogans on this theme.

Two firms - Garfield Weston and Cyril Lord - were chosen, not only

as having large investments in South Africa but also because their managing directors had publicly declared their support for apartheid. Pickets took place outside these firms and their subsidiaries between 18 and 23 December. The 'End Collaboration' leaflet aroused interest and was widely distributed. It also resulted in a number of new members. This leaflet is still in great demand.

Arms Embargo

In November there were reports that the Cabinet was considering lifting the arms embargo against South Africa called for by the UN Security Council in June 1964 and implemented by the Labour Government in November of that year. The arms embargo is Britain's biggest gesture, the only really practical act she has taken against apartheid.

In our efforts to avert a possible relaxation of the embargo we alerted all our members urging them to write and send telegrams to the Prime Minister, to George Brown (then Foreign Secretary), to Lord Caradon at the United Nations and to individual MPs. We produced background papers on the history of the arms embargo, and others exposing the fallacy that the weapons South Africa wished to purchase were 'for external defence only'. These were circulated to our membership, to MPs and to public figures.

On December 7 an Anti-Apartheid Movement delegation, led by Jeremy Thorpe MP and including David Steel MP, Humphry Berkeley, Ben Whitaker MP, S. Abdul and the Rev. Elliott Kendall of the British Council of Churches, met George Brown to establish whether these rumours were true. As a result of this visit and the Foreign Secretary's refusal to give a firm commitment, the press drew their own conclusions. Within a few days the issue made headline news. During this period we were actively lobbying within the House of Commons and an early day motion was put down.

On November 11 we wrote to Mr Wilson: "It was at a rally organised by this Movement that you personally committed the Labour Party to support the policy of an arms embargo..... The South African conflict has already become an international conflict. Any increase in the military strength of the South African Government is capable of influencing the course of that conflict. Any British contribution to the military strength of the South African Government would be a hostile act against all those who are involved in that conflict, on the side of democracy."

The majority of Labour and Liberal MPs felt strongly that the embargo should not be lifted. The press reported divisions within the Cabinet. On December 11 we issued a press statement calling on all members and organisations to do everything in their power to dissuade the Government from defying the UN resolution on the embargo on the supply of arms to South Africa.

On December 18 Mr Wilson, in a speech to the House of Commons, affirmed that the arms embargo would be maintained. The AAM

publicly welcomed the Prime Minister's statement.

We subsequently sent a telegram to President de Gaulle and followed this up with a letter urging him to refuse to sell arms for profit to a racist regime which had tried and failed to obtain arms from other Great Powers. We wrote, "We would, with great respect, remind you of the time when you led a patriotic resistance movement of your countrymen against the Nazi oppression; we earnestly plead that you do not allow France to strengthen another racist regime led by men who supported Hitler in World War II."

We have, since this time, sent letters to the Prime Minister in response to reports in the press that Britain planned to sell Beagle aircraft to South Africa. We have also written to the Prime Minister protesting against the supply of arms to Portugal under the NATO agreement which assist her in the struggle against the African liberation forces in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea Bissau.

Trade Unions

The Movement's efforts to win trade union support have made some headway this year, but our overall impact on the Trade Union Movement remains slight. Not only are relatively few of our members active in trade unions, but few are concerned with this aspect of our work. In addition, the unions have their own immediate problems, and are in any event large structures which are difficult to penetrate from outside, especially at national level. Many of our letters do not even get acknowledged.

The number of trade union members of the Movement has increased from 7 to 14. More unions have been invited to support us in this way, and at the time of writing replies from over a dozen are awaited. All member unions, and some others, have been offered the leaflet produced specially for trade unionists; most have responded.

A Trade Union Action Group was set up. It has produced and distributed information and articles for trade union journals. Memoranda on "Apartheid in Transport" and "TUCSA and the TUC" have been supplemented by articles in AA NEWS on industrial conditions and trade union developments in South Africa.

As a source of political and financial support for our policies, the Trade Union Movement is potentially fruitful. Sustained pressure, locally and nationally, will probably be necessary to achieve significant results.

Cultural Boycott

Since the cultural boycott pledge, forbidding the performance of plays before segregated audiences and signed by the majority of playwrights in this country and America, was announced in June 1963, South African commercial managements have found themselves seriously affected. They have been lobbying intensively in an effort to get playwrights to reverse their decision.

As a result of this boycott, the South African Government in 1965

passed an amendment to the Copyright Act, in effect allowing South African theatre managements to 'pirate' plays. A few months ago an amateur dramatic society in Johannesburg decided to implement this clause and 'pirate' three plays, including "Fiddler on the Roof". Legal action against this group is at present being taken by the authors.

In February Lord Willis, one of the original signatories to the boycott pledge, circulated a document through the League of Dramatists to playwrights in this country urging them to abandon the boycott. Some who received this document contacted the office and it was decided to write to as many playwrights as possible to restate the arguments and to ask them to reaffirm the boycott pledge. A number of new playwrights have emerged since 1963 and we also wrote to them. To our knowledge two playwrights have reversed their original decision and one who did not sign the boycott pledge has permitted one of his plays to be performed in South Africa.

Since the TIMES Diary had publicised the views of Athol Fugard, who no longer felt himself committed to the cultural boycott, we circulated a letter for signature to a number of leading playwrights which was printed in the TIMES and created some controversy. Included among the signatories were John Osborne, Margaretta D'Arcy, John Mortimer, David Mercer, Harold Pinter, John McGrath, John Arden and Robert Shaw. We have subsequently received letters and phone calls declaring support from a number of playwrights, including Robert Bolt, Peter Schaffer, Edward Bond, Johnny Speight, Henry Livings and Arnold Wesker.

Throughout we have been greatly assisted by the playwrights themselves who, on the whole, feel strongly on this matter. We must in particular mention and thank David Mercer and John McGrath.

Obviously the cultural boycott makes an impact on the general public, since it involves people who are well known and often featured in the press. This is only one aspect of its importance. Far more important is the aspect raised in Robert Bolt's personal letter to the TIMES (16.5.68): "...However an artist, like a footballer, may become well known. Then he can express political opinions not only in the polling booth but also in a more resounding forum.... The most effective way in which a playwright can declare his disapproval of racial segregation is to refuse to have his play performed for segregated audiences. To weight the tiny political effects of such action against the tiny political effects of the play's being seen would require delicate scales. But the very brave South Africans, black and white, who are actively resisting their own Government do favour the action of artists and athletes who refuse to take part in segregated events. And I think that we here from our position of safety should use our little influence as directed by them from their position of danger."

Sport

The degree of co-operation in sport between Britain on the one hand and South Africa and, until recently, Rhodesia on the other is wide ranging. We have been active in relation to South Africa's

participation in tennis and athletics but have concentrated more particularly on the BRITISH LIONS' tour of Rhodesia and South Africa and, together with organisations such as the South African Non-Racial Open Committee for Olympic Sports (SAN-ROC), the American Committee on Africa and the Irish Anti-Apartheid Movement, did a great deal of work to reverse the International Olympic Committee's decision to readmit South Africa to the 1968 Olympic Games.

Cricket: We learned in February that a team from the aircraft carrier Hermes, berthed in Cape Town, was to play an all-white South African cricket team. Though unsuccessful in preventing this match from taking place, our protest to Mr Healey (Minister of Defence) and Mr Howell (Minister for Sport) put out in press statements, received wide coverage.

Lawn Tennis: As in every South African sports body, membership of the South African Lawn Tennis Union is restricted to whites only. During the Davis Cup fixtures, we wrote formal letters of protest to the Secretary of the International Lawn Tennis Federation and to representatives of a number of the countries whose teams were drawn to play against South Africa. Although efforts to prevent the tie between Iran and South Africa failed, the Rumanian team withdrew. We picketed the Savoy Hotel on July 4 during the meeting of the Davis Cup Nations and Dennis Brutus, President of SAN-ROC, delivered a formal letter of protest against South Africa's participation.

Athletics: Also in July, we arranged a picket of the White City AAA Championships. The South African athletes sent to participate in these Championships belong to the South African Bantu Athletics Association, which accepts racial discrimination in sport and is affiliated to the exclusively white South African Amateur Athletics Union.

Following reports that HM the Queen, a patron of the AAA, was to attend these Championships, we wrote a letter urging her not to attend as her presence "could easily be construed by some members as lending support to the racialist doctrines of the South African Government." Representatives of the Anti-Apartheid Movement and SAN-ROC delivered the letter to Buckingham Palace. This, together with the picket, was noted both in the press and on television.

Rugby: The campaign against the visit of the British Lions to South Africa started in October 1967. Letters went to the secretaries of the four Rugby Unions from which the team was chosen and to the Hon. Secretary of the Four Home Rugby Union Tours Committee. A letter from Dennis Howell indicated that though at that time it was not an offence to visit Rhodesia, representations had been made indicating that the Lions' visit to Rhodesia was "against the public interest". Despite these and numerous other protests, both by SAN-ROC and the Anti-Apartheid Movement, the British Lions went ahead with the tour. In a press statement we called upon the British Government "to act in accordance with their declared principles against apartheid sport".

More successful were the demonstrations against the Shimlas (Orange Free State University) Rugby tour. Both at St Andrews University and at Newcastle there were demonstrations by the students, which held up the game for some time; a number of universities, including Essex, Sussex, Durham and Exeter, cancelled the matches they had arranged. In a statement put out by students from Durham, Newcastle, Cambridge, Edinburgh and Dundee who took part in the demonstration at St Andrews University, they wrote: "...the point of the demonstrations must be understood as an attempt to combat the political intent of this government-supported tour. University autonomy and the sportsman's ethic of independence from politics seem by comparison very marginal issues."

On May 16 a deputation from the Anti-Apartheid Movement, including Dennis Brutus, saw the Minister for Sport in connection with the MCC tour of South Africa, the Lions tour of South Africa and Rhodesia, South Africa's readmission to the Olympic Games and, more generally, the subsidy given to British sports bodies who played against teams from Southern Africa chosen on a racial basis. In 1966 in a statement to the House of Commons, Mr. Howell maintained that no subsidy would be given to any British team to play games overseas against teams in whose choosing racial discrimination was a key factor. As a result of this visit Mr Howell again agreed to look into the subsidy given to sports bodies in this country on the basis of his original statement.

Olympics: Despite strenuous efforts to prevent South Africa's re-admission to the Olympic Games, on February 15 the International Olympic Committee announced its decision to do so. We wrote to Mr Avery Brundage, President of the IOC, protesting against this decision; and to the Marquis of Exeter, President of the British Olympic Association. We asked that the British team be withdrawn from the Games if the decision to include South Africa were maintained. The Marquis replied that the 'concessions' made by South Africa were an encouraging sign and sufficient to permit South Africa's participation. We also wrote to every Ambassador and High Commissioner in this country requesting that they bring our concern on this issue to the notice of their government and national sports bodies asking for their dissociation from "this attempted condonation of racialism in sport". Many favourable replies were received and we followed this up by writing directly to a number of Olympic Committees in different countries.

A brief background document on the IOC decision was prepared noting that the IOC had failed to enforce its own conditions for South African re-entry, viz that the South African Olympic Committee should do everything in its power to end racial discrimination in sport. This was attached to a pledge deploring the IOC decision and joining with the protest of the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa against South African participation. The document was widely circulated and many thousands signed the pledge. David Steel MP also raised the matter in the House of Commons.

On February 23 we picketed South Africa House and the British Olympic Association. All in all pressure was maintained, not only by the British AAM but by AA Committees throughout the world and, in particular, by SAN-ROC. Above all, the decision by the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa to withdraw from the Games if South Africa participated was a key factor in the decision finally announced by the IOC on April 22 that the invitation to South Africa to participate in Olympic Games would not now be issued.

Our work on apartheid sport has throughout been assisted and often prompted by SAN-ROC. We have also been requested to note their appreciation of our efforts in this field.

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

This Conference took place in New Delhi in January of this year and included South Africa as a Member State of the United Nations. We sent cables of protest to the United Nations Secretary General, to Mr Prebisch, Secretary of the UNCTAD; and to Mrs Gandhi, the Indian Prime Minister. We also visited the Indian High Commissioner to discuss this matter and to press for South African exclusion. The majority of delegates to this Conference refused to participate in any discussion involving the South African representative and, though it is not possible under the present UNCTAD charter to exclude South Africa, recommendations have been made to the United Nations by UNCTAD that the charter be revised to permit South African expulsion.

SUPPORT RESISTANCE

South Africa's aggressive role in Africa, her attempts to penetrate economically and thereby weaken independent African states; her military aggression in South West Africa, Rhodesia, Mozambique; her threats to Zambia and her current change in policy, which is an out-going, colonising one - presents the greatest danger in Africa today.

The Anti-Apartheid Movement has now to work more intensively in mobilising support for all who oppose apartheid, including those who are fighting in the field.

South West Africa

Our work on the illegal arrest and trial in Pretoria of 37 South West Africans was detailed in last year's Annual Report. Further work included an additional briefing on the trial, issued in December and sent to MPs and Trade Unionists. In January, letters were sent to General Secretaries of Trade Unions urging them to write to the Minister of Justice in Pretoria calling for the abandonment of the trial and release of the accused; to send cables to the Prime Minister and UN Secretary General asking them to intervene personally. Many responded to this appeal.

On February 5 sentence was announced: 19 were sentenced to life imprisonment, 9 to twenty years, 2 to five years, 3 to five years suspended; one was found not guilty, one died in prison and one hanged

himself.

The AAM participated in a protest demonstration outside South Africa House called by the World Campaign for the release of South African Political Prisoners. Members were urged to write to the Prime Minister, to the Foreign Secretary, to the South African Ambassador and to the UN Secretary General. A statement was issued to the press noting that the "Security Council resolution demanding the abandonment of the trial and the immediate return of those held to South West Africa was one for which Britain voted." We urged the British Government to intervene directly and make further efforts through the UN to obtain the release of these men.

The appeal of the 28 sentenced to life imprisonment and twenty years is to be heard on September 25. In a report issued by the International Commission of Jurists on August 16, the Commission's observer at the trial noted that many, if not all, the defendants were tortured in prison: "The reality of prison torture contrasts with the inadvisability of registering such a complaint," Professor Falk wrote. "It was generally agreed that to complain about torture in the setting of the terrorism trial would inflame the prosecution and the judge. It was not in the best interest of the defendants - on trial for their lives - to assume this risk in an atmosphere of oppression such as prevails in South Africa." Professor Falk also said that there were widespread reports that up to 250 other South West Africans were being held in secret detention. They were held incommunicado and as far as even their families were concerned they had simply disappeared. (GUARDIAN 17.8.68.)

South Africa Freedom Day (June 26) Rally:

Oppose Apartheid - Support African Freedom Fighters

The preparatory work done on the Rally, which took place on Sunday June 23, was extensive. We printed 50,000 leaflets and 30,000 stickers. These were sent with letters asking for support for the Rally to our membership and a wide spectrum of political organisations and parties, many of which undertook special mailings for us. A background sheet on the history of June 26 was sent to the national and local press and to representatives of the foreign press in this country - our emphasis throughout was "Solidarity with the freedom struggle in Southern Africa".

A letter signed by David Steel MP and Andrew Faulds MP was sent to members of the House of Commons; and one signed by John Ennals and Lord Collison was sent to Trade Unions, asking them to support the rally. We also wrote to Heads of States and their representatives in this country for messages of support, of which many were received. Messages of support were also received from the American Committee on Africa and anti-apartheid bodies throughout the world; from Canon Collins, chairman of Christian Action; the United Steel Workers of America and from His Excellency Achkar Marof, chairman of the UN Special Committee on Apartheid. A number of MPs and other personalities in public life joined in the march which preceded the rally and which was organised by the Ad Hoc Youth and Students Committee.

David Steel MP chaired the Rally and speakers were Paul Oestreicher, representing the British Council of Churches; George Kiloh for the Youth & Students Committee; Andrew Faulds MP; Jack Jones MBE, Assistant Executive Secretary of the Transport & General Workers Union; Joan Lester MP; and Oliver Tambo, Acting President-General of the African National Congress of South Africa, who explained why the ANC had decided upon a policy of armed struggle and the need for the British people to support the freedom fighters.

This rally, co-sponsored by The Africa Bureau, Campaign Against Racial Discrimination, Committee for Freedom in Mozambique and Movement for Colonial Freedom, passed a resolution, which was sent to the Prime Minister and which included the following points:

Noting Britain's grave responsibility in Southern Africa, and its obligations to the United Nations, this rally urgently calls on Her Majesty's Government to:

- a) end Britain's economic and political collaboration with apartheid, actively support international efforts to expel South Africa from the territory of South West Africa, and to demand that South Africa immediately ends its economic and military support for the illegal Smith regime, its aggressive acts against Zambia and threats to other neighbouring independent African states;
- b) ...to bring down the Smith regime and to support the establishment of a free and independent government in Zimbabwe based on majority rule.

In South Africa the significance of June 26 - Freedom Day - was noted in a most dramatic way. The South African press reported that leaflets and pamphlets were distributed in both Johannesburg and Durban by followers of the African National Congress, and tape recordings calling for support for the African freedom struggle were played in the streets of Johannesburg.

Students and Youth

Student and youth activity on Southern Africa has been maintained at a high level. The Movement actively assisted in the organisation of a national student campaign in February and March: "Support Resistance for Human Rights in Southern Africa", which culminated in a deputation to the Commonwealth Secretary, a "Day of Solidarity with the Freedom Fighters in Rhodesia", and a spirited and well attended conference on "Revolution in Southern Africa" in Oxford. Students were well to the fore in many of the demonstrations organised by the Movement during the year, and we have enjoyed the support and co-operation of many national and local student and youth organisations.

An Ad Hoc Committee of youth and student organisations was set up to mobilise support for the Annual Rally, and to hold a demonstration on the same day. The demonstration was successful and the prospects for further joint efforts of this kind seem to be good.

Sharpeville : 21 March 1960

Among the activities arranged to commemorate this day, also designated by the United Nations as a day dedicated to the ending of racial discrimination, we held a silent, all-day vigil outside South Africa House. Our posters declared that the grim events of Sharpeville, when the South African police fired on an unarmed crowd of men, women and children demonstrating against the Pass Laws killing 72 and wounding over 100, would be avenged. In our press statement we expressed the hope that the British Government would "not only do all in its power to end racial discrimination in this country, but also lend its support and influence to those seeking to end racial discrimination in Southern Africa."

ANTI-APARTHEID NEWS

The past year, the fourth of the paper's life, has seen two editorial innovations in ANTI-APARTHEID NEWS. Both have met with approval from regular readers, but neither, as yet, has helped to improve the paper's circulation.

The first innovation concerns the introduction of middle page special surveys which we have had printed as separate tearsheets, and which have been successful as posters and factsheets in this form. These have dealt with Human Rights, separately in South Africa, Rhodesia and South West Africa. In all these cases we were fortunate in drawing on special reports made by the United Nations to coincide with Human Rights Year. We also did a special survey on Portugal in Africa, and on the visit to London in June of the United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid.

The second innovation, less spectacularly, has concerned the involvement of ANTI-APARTHEID NEWS to some degree in British racial problems, in line with a resolution taken at the Annual Meeting of 1967. Our first comments in this respect were editorial and dealt with the February Commonwealth Immigrants Bill relating to the entry of Asians from Kenya to this country. The editorial board of AA NEWS saw this Bill as the introduction of apartheid into out hitherto non-discriminatory laws. Subsequently the paper carried news and comment on the disruptions in the wake of Enoch Powell's inflammatory racial speeches. We also carried one or two reports from the American racial scene. We propose to continue using material on these non-Southern African aspects of race relations in order to relate them to the fight against apartheid and to arrest any feeling there might be in this country that local problems supersede the need for work on Southern Africa - so far away and so indirectly a part of British life.

It is apparent from the reports we receive for the paper from local Anti-Apartheid Committees that many of them are already in the forefront of local battles for better race relations. We feel it is the duty of the paper to reflect this dual activity and thus to keep the question of Southern Africa ever-present in the minds of those also active on the home-front.

Our major problem this year has been the absence of an increase in the readership of AA NEWS. We earnestly urge all members and supporters of the Movement to act as subscription agents for us among their friends. We have not raised our subscription fee of 10/- a year in the four years of publication (unlike all other newspapers!) and until we have considerably more regular subscribers the huge burden of ever-increasing printing costs rests heavily on the overstrained budget of the Movement as a whole.

INTERNATIONAL

The United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid*

The United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid concluded its session in Western Europe on June 29 having held meetings in Stockholm, London and Geneva. The Committee had one informal meeting with representatives of the Anti-Apartheid Movement and a public hearing on June 24. The Anti-Apartheid Movement submitted a detailed memorandum in which we made many specific recommendations. The United Nations was asked to demand an end to all future economic investment in South Africa; that all Members should place effective restrictions on the flow of immigrants, particularly skilled and technical personnel, to South Africa; that a ban should be placed on all cultural, educational, sporting and similar exchanges between South Africa and United Nations Member States; that freedom fighters in Southern Africa should be recognised as prisoners of war under the Geneva Convention and a General Assembly resolution be adopted to that end; and that the United Nations should pay greater attention to the question of educating world public opinion on the evils of apartheid and the measures necessary to help combat it.

The London communique of the Special Committee stated that all proposals would be carefully studied and appropriate recommendations would be made to the General Assembly and the Security Council.

*(NB: See ANTI-APARTHEID NEWS, September 1968)

The Committee was reminded of the letter sent by the Anti-Apartheid Movement on 1 December 1967 urging the United Nations to pass resolutions:

- a) recognising the belligerent status of the national liberation organisations of Southern Africa;
- b) demanding that their forces be accorded the protection of the Geneva Conventions;
- c) appointing a suitable Member State to act as a protecting power for the purposes of the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War.

UN International Conference on Human Rights, Teheran, 22 April - 13 May

A memorandum on The Anti-Apartheid Movement and the Struggle for Human Rights was prepared for this Conference and presented by our representative, John Ennals. It was agreed by the Conference that the document, which was well received, be widely circulated. We noted

"that the Anti-Apartheid Movement of Britain has actively worked for the creation of parallel movements in West Europe and North America and regularly exchanged information with them."

A Proclamation of Teheran containing 26 resolutions, many of them dealing with apartheid, had been adopted. The Conference did not have the power to implement these but a report would be submitted to the UN General Assembly and to the Security Council.

FINANCE

The audited accounts of the Movement for the financial year ending 30 September 1968 will be laid before the Annual General Meeting. Our basic financial problem continues to be the lack of a regular monthly income. Membership subscriptions cover a mere fraction of our routine expenses and only a small proportion of our members and supporters have signed banker's stop orders. Until this problem is solved, financial difficulties will continue to hinder the work of the Movement.

A number of fund-raising functions were organised during the year, both by Head Office and by a few Anti-Apartheid Committees. More support from the latter is needed.

IN CONCLUSION

In view of the many requests for more information about the work of the Anti-Apartheid Movement, we have in this report gone into greater detail than in the 1966/67 report. However, the limitations of space and time have compelled us to omit certain areas of work and activity.

We can only touch upon our work in the Labour Movement. In March we mailed a background information sheet on the pressures exerted by the South Africa lobby in this country; on the insidious campaign being conducted for a British sell-out in Rhodesia, and in particular for British cooperation with South Africa and the Smith regime against African freedom movements fighting in Southern Africa. We stressed the need for all constituents of the Labour Movement to counter these pressures and made specific suggestions. This document also contained points for resolutions with a view to bringing to the notice of the Government, all political parties, trade unions, the TUC, the Co-operative Movement and other groups, the support available "for a more active policy of opposition to apartheid and to the illegal Smith regime in Rhodesia." On publication of the resolutions for the 1968 Labour Party Conference, only three of which concerned Rhodesia, we sent out an additional mailing suggesting amendments.

Speakers have been sent all over the country to address meetings: in schools and universities, in Young Liberal, Labour, Conservative, Communist and other groups.

We have on a few occasions written to Members of Parliament suggesting questions to be asked in the House and giving a background briefing to

these questions.

We have also given support to the anti-racialist groups working in this country (see AA NEWS report). At the time of the Commonwealth Immigrants Bill, which enshrined racial discrimination for the first time in British law, we joined with other organisations in delivering a letter of protest to the Queen.

The Anti-Apartheid Movement is primarily concerned with apartheid and race oppression in Southern Africa. It opposes minority rule and supports the African liberation movements in their struggle for freedom. But the Movement cannot ignore racialism in this country. When the Commonwealth Immigrants Act wrote into the statute book the sort of racialist discrimination that is prominent in South African laws, the Movement spoke out.

Many of our members and supporters are active in demonstrating their opposition to racialism in Britain. We hope they will continue to do so whilst intensifying their efforts to isolate the regimes of Southern Africa and publicising their solidarity with the African freedom movements.