ARCHBISHOP DESMOND Tutu

His Personal Support For Sanctions

he Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town and Nobel Peace Prize laureate, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, has for many years advocated increasing economic and diplomatic pressure against South Africa. Admitting he does not have a mandate to pronounce on this subject on behalf of the Anglican church in the country, he says he speaks in his "private capacity". However, because of his position, his personal views are given

extraordinary credibility abroad as if he does, indeed, have considerable backing on this issue. Unbiased research has shown that this is not the case. In South Africa he has refused to publicly debate sanctions on theological, moral and other grounds with various religious leaders and others who have challenged him to do so. Supporting proposed legislation in the US Congress and Senate that would virtually cut off economic ties between the US and South Africa, Archbishop Tutu's backing has lenconsiderable impetus to those who are attempting to push the measures through regardless of the consequences. In a recent interview the Archbishop said: "I do not want sanctions for the hell of it... the problem is apartheid and not sanctions." Archbishop Tutu's view is that black South Africans, having suffered for so long, arc prepared to suffer even more. There has been hostile reaction to this from placard-



waving black workers who recently demonstrated against his pro-sanctions stand after he returned from a visit to the United States. In Port Elizabeth a multi-racial crowd of 500 was reported to have jeered him when he arrived at the airport there. More than 50 000 Inkatha members opposed his stand at a recent rally near Durban (80 000 trade unionists said

"no" to sanctions at another mass meeting) and church groups and numerous other bodies have also made it clear that they oppose measures which will hit blacks hardest. At the Inkatha rally the following resolution was passed unanimously:

"We reject Archbishop Tutu's appeal for economic sanctions against South Africa and call on him to consult with blacks before he talks on their behalf."





Authoritative surveys, including several by the highly respected Washington-based Investor Responsibility Research Centre (independently funded by the private sector in the US), are consistently showing that sanctions will have grim consequences for South Africa's blacks and are not supported by the black masses. A senior US official, Mr Charles Freeman, deputy to the Assistant Secretary of State, Dr Chester Crocker, disclosed at a congressional hearing recently that black South African anti-apartheid activists were telling the US government "behind closed doors" that they had "strong misgivings" about disinvestment. And yet Archbishop Tutu is continually dismissing arguments that economic sanctions will hurt blacks by saying, as he did at a commencement address at Emory University in Atlanta in May, that these were the pronouncements of "those who suddenly decide they feel sorry for black people." Bishop Tutu has accused those who reject sanctions of "collaborating with apartheid" and of being "effective allies of the most immoral system in the world", which is obviously vigorously denied by those concerned, including Mrs Margaret Thatcher, Britain's Prime Minister, Mr Ronald Reagan, the President of the United States and West Germany's Chancel-

heid" (with reference to the armed support the Soviet Union gives the pro-violence African National Congress) has also created considerable controversy in South Africa. Anti-apartheid activists obviously all share Archbishop Tutu's abhorrence of apartheid and racism and his desire for the creation of a united non-racial South Africa. However, many with considerable constituencies who oppose sanctions abroad, including Inkatha's Dr Mangosuthu Buthelezi, often find themselves labelled by the Archbishop's epithets as a matter of course and wrongfully dismissed as "apologists" for white South Africa and the Pretoria Government. These smear tactics have an additional consequence of furthering black disunity which is desperately needed in the final push to dismantle apartheid once and for all. Archbishop Tutu's words have created a climate in which those who dare to disagree with him are, in many cases, unfairly stigmatised as supportive of an unjust system of Government they in fact despise. Archbishop Tutu has said he believes sanctions are "the last non-violent means available to oppose apartheid." Others believe the price of black suffering will be too high and that, ultimately, only increased investment resulting in growing black bargaining power will truly liberate South Africa's black masses. Are proponents of both points of view entitled to their opinions? Judging by the behaviour of certain politicians and groups abroad, apparently not especially if you don't support sanctions.

lor, Mr Helmut Kohl. He has equated others who oppose sanctions as being like "nazis." His statement in Moscow that the people of South Africa were "grateful to the Soviet people for backing their fight against apart-

Black workers in Johannesburg protest against Archbishop Desmond Tutu's support for sanctions on his recent return from the United States where he called for increased economic measures against South Africa. Similar demonstrations were held elsewhere throughout the country.