

Apartheid

The United Nations and the International Community

A Collection of Speeches and Papers

E. S. Reddy

**Former Principal Secretary, United Nations Special Committee
against Apartheid**

[Published by Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi, in 1986]

Introduction

I have put together this collection of my speeches and papers, as the United Nations official in charge of apartheid from 1963 to 1984, at the suggestion of a number of friends, as a record of the growing commitment of the United Nations in support of the liberation struggle in South Africa.

For me it is also a personal record of the discharge of my responsibilities, as an international civil servant and as a national of India, in support of freedom in Africa.¹

I became interested in the freedom movement in South Africa as a student in India in the early 1940s. Then, in 1946, I was privileged to meet the multi-racial delegation from South Africa, led by the President-General of the African National Congress, Dr. A.B. Xuma, which came to attend the United Nations debate on the Indian complaint against South African racism. The passive resistance campaign of the Indian community, the African mine labour strike and the United Nations debate had that year generated international concern over the situation in South Africa. I began seriously to study the developments in that country. I was greatly impressed both by the long struggle of the African majority for its inalienable rights and by the identification of the Indian community - under the leadership of Dr. Yusuf Dadoo and Dr. Monty Naicker - with that struggle.

In 1949, when I joined the United Nations Secretariat as a political affairs officer, I was assigned to Africa and the Middle East and was able not only to continue my study of South Africa but to follow the development of freedom struggles in other African countries. From 1963 - as Secretary of the Special Committee against Apartheid, then Chief of Section for African Questions and finally Director and Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Centre against Apartheid - I was privileged to be able to contribute directly to international action in support of freedom in southern Africa.

In all my work at the United Nations, I was moved by my convictions as a youth in India under colonial rule - detestation of racism in all its forms, without hatred of any racial group; rejection of any compromise on the principle of racial equality; respect for the freedom movements as the primary means for change; and faith in the victory of freedom,

¹ NOTE: As a civil servant, I was required to exercise great restraint in my statements and could not, for instance, criticise any governments. It will be seen that I tried to overcome this difficulty by conveying the views of the Special Committee against Apartheid and its Chairmen, as expressed in their reports and declarations which I had drafted and fully agreed with.

however long the struggle, however mighty the adversaries and whatever the reverses in the course of the struggle. I have tried to secure the widest understanding and support for the liberation struggle, irrespective of the cold war and other differences in the world, and in particular to encourage not only the governments but the people in all countries to support the just cause.

I have come to know and respect many patriots of all racial origins from South Africa and numerous persons from all continents who have made great contributions and sacrifices because of their solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa. They have become dear friends; their appreciation of my work and their advice have always been a great source of encouragement to me.

There has been a tremendous advance in international understanding and support of the South African freedom struggle since 1946. In fact, rarely has a freedom struggle received such wide-spread support. But during this long process, the unscrupulous racist regime in Pretoria has acquired enormous military power and it is still able to count on the support or connivance of some powerful forces in the West. The forces of liberation are stronger than ever but there are gravest dangers in the final stage of the struggle.

I believe that the world must understand that apartheid in South Africa is not merely an evil, but a menace far beyond its borders and a vital link in the concert against human progress. Governments, organisations and individuals must not only dissociate themselves from this evil but must try to prevent others from reinforcing it.

The Government and people of India have a proud record in support of the freedom struggle in South Africa. But perhaps we too should go beyond the feeling of human solidarity and recognize the struggle of the South African people as our own. For, our own freedom is diminished so long as South Africa and Namibia are not free, and the oppression of the people of Indian origin in South Africa is a constant affront to India. Any support to the Pretoria regime, by any Power or vested interest, must be seen as a hostile act against India. India is as much a frontline State in this struggle as any African country.

E.S. REDDY

CONTENTS

THE UNITED NATIONS AND APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA

Speech at the National Conference on South African Crisis and American Action, Washington, DC, March 21-23, 1965

APARTHEID AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the African Studies Association, United States of America, 1973

THE UNITED NATIONS WORLD CAMPAIGN AGAINST APARTHEID

Article in *Unesco Courier*, Paris, November 1977

INTERNATIONAL ANTI-APARTHEID YEAR (21 March 1978-21 March 1979)

Statement at briefing for non-governmental organisations at the United Nations, New York, March 2, 1978

TRIBUTE TO PERCY QOBOZA

Speech at the New York Society of Ethical Culture on the occasion of the presentation of the 1978 Ethical Humanist Award to Mr. Percy Qoboza, editor of the *World*, Johannesburg, May 14, 1978

SOLOMON MAHLANGU: FREEDOM FIGHTER AGAINST APARTHEID

Speech at the meeting held by the World Peace Council's Presidential Committee in memory of Solomon Mahlangu in Prague, April 1979

THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND THE CHALLENGE

Speech at the Conference of the British Anti-Apartheid Movement on its twentieth anniversary, London, June 26, 1979

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP AMBROSE REEVES

Speech at meeting on the 80th birthday of Bishop Reeves, Ambassador Hotel, London, December 10, 1979

ARMED RESISTANCE IN SOUTH AFRICA

Paper prepared for the Anti-Apartheid Movement, May 1980

WOMEN AND APARTHEID

Statement at public meeting in Montreal in connection with Seminar on Women and Apartheid, May 10, 1980

ROLE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS IN PROMOTING SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

Statement at the International NGO Action Conference for Sanctions against South Africa, Geneva, June 30, 1980

TRIBUTE TO DR. W.E.B. DUBOIS

Statement in the Panel at the Dedication of the Papers of Dr. DuBois, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, September 19, 1980

SIGNIFICANCE OF SOUTH AFRICAN STRUGGLE

Speech at the Conference on "The Case for Sanctions", Dublin, October 24, 1981

MY LIFE AND WORK

Statement at the meeting of the Special Committee against Apartheid, January 13, 1983, in connection with appointment as Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations

NO ONE CAN BE NEUTRAL ON APARTHEID

Speech at meeting of Special Committee against Apartheid on receipt of Frederic Joliot-Curie medal from the World Peace Council, March 30, 1983

SAVE THE LIVES OF FREEDOM FIGHTERS

Statement at Mahlangu Day Meeting at the Church Centre for the United Nations, New York, April 6, 1983

ROLE OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Remarks at the Annual Conference of the American Society of Public Administration, Panel on "South Africa: Implications for Public Administration", Hilton Hotel, New York, April 19, 1983

SPIRIT OF LUMUMBA

Speech at the Patrice Lumumba Friendship University, Moscow, on the occasion of the presentation to him of the memorial medal of the University, May 30, 1983

TRIBUTE TO ARCHBISHOP TREVOR HUDDLESTON

Speech at the meeting of the British Anti-Apartheid Movement to observe the Soweto Day and the seventieth birthday of Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, Toynbee Hall, London, June 16, 1983

INTERNATIONAL ACTION AGAINST RACISM

Speech at the opening session of the International NGO Conference on Action against Apartheid and Racism, ILO Headquarters, Geneva, July 5, 1983

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND MICHAEL SCOTT

Speech at memorial meeting for the Reverend Michael Scott at Church Centre for United Nations, New York, September 29, 1983

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP DESMOND TUTU

Speech (as representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations) at the dinner of the Society for the Family of Man for the presentation of the "Family of Man" gold medallion to the Right Reverend Bishop Desmond Tutu, Sheraton Centre, New York, December 7, 1983

CULTURAL BOYCOTT AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

Introductory statement at a Press Briefing at Royal Commonwealth Society, London, January 11, 1984

GREETINGS TO TRADE UNIONISTS

Speech at the "Evaluation Symposium of ICFTU Programme of Action in Support of Independent Black Trade Union Movement in South Africa" DGB-haus, Dusseldorf, January 19, 1984

YEAR OF WOMEN OF SOUTH AFRICA

Speech at a public meeting organized by the Black Studies Department of the City College of New York and the New York Southern Africa Solidarity Coalition to launch the "Year of Women of South Africa", City College, New York, January 30, 1984

CRISIS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Speech at the Seminar on South African Aggression and Destabilisation against Frontline States, organised by the United Nations Association and Anti-Apartheid Movement, London, February 29, 1984

RELIGIONS AND APARTHEID

Speech at the opening session of the Interfaith Colloquium on Apartheid, Church House, London, March 5, 1984

ABOLITION OF RACISM - AN URGENT TASK

Speech at the Launching of Anti-Racist Year by the Borough of Hackney, Hackney Town Hall, London April 27, 1984

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STRUGGLE IN SOUTH AFRICA AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF INDIA

Lecture at India International Centre, New Delhi, May 19, 1984

UNITED NATIONS AND THE ANTI-APARTHEID MOVEMENT:
A FRUITFUL PARTNERSHIP

Article in the Anti-Apartheid News Supplement for the 25th anniversary of AAM, June 1984

WESTERN POLICY ON APARTHEID

Speech in a Commission at the "National Convention against Apartheid and for Freedom in South Africa" organised by the Anti-Apartheid Movement at City University, London, June 23, 1984

ONE HUNDRED YEARS - NO MORE

Speech at the Non-governmental Organisations Conference for the Independence of Namibia and the Eradication of Apartheid, Geneva, July 2, 1984

APARTHEID AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

Speech at the concluding session of the Seminar on the Legal Status of the Apartheid Regime and other Legal Aspects of the struggle against Apartheid, Lagos, Nigeria, August 16, 1984

THE UNITED NATIONS AND APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA²

The question of South African racial policies has been before the United Nations, in one form or another, since 1946. At first, it came up in the wake of the Asiatic Land Tenure Act and the Passive Resistance Campaign of the Indians as the complaint by the Government of India on the treatment of people of Indian origin in South Africa. From 1952, after a spate of apartheid legislation under the National Party Government and the launching of the "Campaign of Defiance against Unjust Laws" by the African National Congress and other organizations, a number of Asian and Arab States inscribed a broader item entitled: "The question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Union of South Africa". These two items were combined in 1962.

Meanwhile, the question of the mandated Territory of South West Africa has also remained on the agenda every year from 1946.

Year after year, the United Nations organs held discussions, passed resolutions and made appeals to the South African Government to adjust its policies in accordance with the principles of the Charter. Again and again, the South African Government has reiterated that the matter was essentially within its domestic jurisdiction under the terms of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter and that the resolutions of the United Nations were *ultra vires*.

The practical results of United Nations action on this question have so far been disappointing. Not only has the South African Government not abandoned the policies of apartheid and racial discrimination, but it has filled its Statute Books with more and more apartheid laws, and implemented them with increasingly severe measures against those resisting these laws.

I would submit, however, that it would be quite erroneous to jump to the conclusion on the basis of this disappointing record that United Nations action has little positive value or to accept the argument of some South Africans and others that it has, in fact, a negative effect.

World Concern after Sharpeville Incident

² Speech at the National Conference on South African Crisis and American Action, Washington, DC, March 21-23, 1965

I wish to go back for a moment to the event which took place five years ago and which is on everyone's mind here - the shooting by police in Sharpeville of peaceful demonstrators against the pass laws. The Sharpeville incident and its aftermath not only shook South Africa and the world out of their complacency but formed a turning point in the United Nations consideration of the South African problem.

Exactly five years ago today, on March 22, 1960, the United States State Department took the extraordinary step of issuing a statement in which it declared:

"While the United States, as a matter of practice, does not ordinarily comment on the internal affairs of governments with which it enjoys normal relations, it cannot help but regret the tragic loss of life resulting from the measures taken against the demonstrators in South Africa."

It expressed the hope that "the African people in South Africa will be able to obtain redress for their legitimate grievances by peaceful means."

In March and April 1960, the Parliaments of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands - the two countries with the most intimate connexions with the people of European origin in South Africa - expressed their sorrow at the events in South Africa and their hope that the situation would be resolved by peaceful means.

Similar expressions of concern came from Canada, New Zealand, India, Nigeria, Denmark, and numerous other countries.

The worldwide concern was reflected in the fact that the matter was considered urgently by the Security Council of the United Nations at the request of 29 Member States. On April 1, 1960, the Security Council adopted a resolution recognising that the situation in South Africa was one that had led to international friction and which, if continued, "might endanger international peace and security." It deplored the policies and actions of the South African Government which gave rise to that situation and called upon that Government "to initiate measures aimed at bringing about racial harmony based on equality in order to ensure that the present situation does not continue or recur and to abandon its policies of apartheid and racial discrimination".

The South African Government did not accept this resolution and instead proceeded with the declaration of the State of Emergency, the banning of the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress, and the

strengthening of its security forces in an effort to bring the situation under control.

Since then, increasing attention has been given in the United Nations and outside to the possibility of action to ensure the fulfilment of the purposes of the Charter.

While there remain serious differences as to the appropriateness, desirability and effectiveness of some of the concrete measures which may be taken by the United Nations, a very wide area of agreement has been achieved by practically the entire membership of the Organization and is reflected in unanimous or almost unanimous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

There is no more hesitation regarding the competence of the United Nations to consider the situation in South Africa, nor any conviction that mere appeals and exhortations to the South African Government would be fruitful.

The United Nations has proclaimed that the situation in South Africa is seriously disturbing international peace and security, and that this situation has been brought about by racial policies which are contrary to the principles and purposes of the United Nations and incompatible with the obligations of South Africa as a Member State of the United Nations.

The United Nations is firmly convinced that a positive alternative to apartheid and racial discrimination must be found through peaceful means and that this alternative should ensure the full, peaceful and orderly application of human rights and fundamental freedoms to all inhabitants of South Africa, regardless of race, colour or creed.

The United Nations is also convinced that a peaceful solution requires free consultation among all the people of South Africa, thus enabling them to decide the future of the country at the national level. A prerequisite to such consultations is the liberation of all persons imprisoned, interned or subjected to other restrictions for having opposed the policies of apartheid.

Ever since Sharpeville, the United Nations has been concerned with action which may be taken by Member States, separately or collectively, in conformity with the Charter, to dissuade the South African Government from its present racial policies and to persuade it to go forward towards a positive alternative.

Economic Sanctions and Arms Embargo

Many African, Asian and other States have advocated economic sanctions as the only effective peaceful means available to the international community to achieve these purposes. The General Assembly had recommended economic sanctions by a substantial majority, in resolution 1761 (XVII) of November 6, 1962, and they were also supported, in principle, by the Group of Experts headed by Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden in 1964. Many States have broken off diplomatic and commercial relations with South Africa after the Sharpeville incident or after the General Assembly resolution. These States, however, account for a small part of the foreign trade of South Africa. The main trading partners of South Africa have expressed reservations or opposition to economic sanctions. A report has just been prepared by an Expert Committee of the Security Council on the feasibility, effectiveness and implications of economic sanctions and other measures.

As of now, the position is that economic sanctions have been recommended by the General Assembly but these have not been supported by the main trading partners of South Africa and have not been endorsed by the Security Council which alone can take mandatory decisions on this matter under the United Nations Charter.

The Security Council, however, solemnly called upon States in 1963 to stop the sale of arms, ammunition of all types and military vehicles to South Africa, and also equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition in South Africa. The decision of the United States Government in August 1963, and of the United Kingdom Government in November 1964, to stop all arms shipments, except those under earlier contracts, and similar decisions by many other States, are evidence that these States are prepared to take into account the implications and consequences of their relations with South Africa and to sacrifice profitable trade if necessary. According to the Defence Minister of South Africa, the British decision represented a loss of some \$140 million in arms orders.

Assistance to Victims of Apartheid

I wish to refer to General Assembly resolution 1978 B (XVIII) of December 16, 1963, inviting Member States and organizations to contribute generously to provide relief and assistance to families of all persons persecuted by the South African Government for their opposition to the policies of apartheid. The Special Committee against Apartheid, which suggested this resolution, sent an appeal to all Member States to make contributions, and to encourage organizations in their countries to make contributions for this purpose. It emphasized that such contributions would not only serve a humanitarian purpose, but would help counter the growth of

racial bitterness in South Africa. In response to this appeal, the Government of India announced a contribution of \$5,250 and the Government of Sweden pledged \$200,000.

Even before this appeal, many organizations and individuals have contributed for legal assistance to political prisoners, for the maintenance of their families and for the relief of the refugees. There have been some contributions from private organizations in the United States. But the needs have increased beyond the level of private contributions, and that was why the Special Committee considered it essential to appeal to Governments as well. The response to the appeal of the Special Committee has so far been rather disappointing and I would express the hope that this Conference will help generate a greater response.

In June 1964, the Security Council invited the Secretary-General to establish a programme for the education and training abroad for South Africans. This programme should be in operation soon, and there is much that private organizations, universities and individuals can do to supplement and support efforts by the United Nations.

The educational situation in South Africa today is one of the most distressing aspects of the effect of the racial policies. Not only are schools and colleges strictly segregated on racial and even tribal lines, but the facilities available to non-whites are most inadequate and inferior.

The Government grant to African education has been pegged at a fixed amount since 1953. Meanwhile, the enrolment in schools has doubled with the result that *per capita* expenditures on African pupils have declined to about one-fourteenth of the expenditures on white pupils. The African children, moreover, have been obliged to learn one more language than the white children. The result has been a very high rate of failures, affecting practically half a generation of Africans. The Bantu schools and colleges are not able to train even a fraction of professional men, technicians and teachers needed to fill the limited number of such jobs available to Africans. There are only a little over a hundred doctors, very few lawyers and hardly any engineers.

Discussions in the South African Parliament and press indicate that there is a widespread realization that the inadequacy of educational facilities is affecting economic growth in the country as a whole. South Africa has abundant resources and it can surely devote more to education. Let us hope that there will be a speedy and radical improvement.

The United Nations Group of Experts has recommended international assistance for education and training abroad for

South Africans so that by positive action, world opinion may have an influence on the South African Government.

By concentrating on the issue of economic sanctions, we have perhaps not given sufficient attention to practical measures such as these. Surely, contributions for relief or education do not solve the basic problem. But they do reflect the seriousness of international concern and the readiness to assist and to sacrifice. They help create an atmosphere conducive to the peaceful and just settlement we all seek.

Peaceful Solution

Because of the incalculable dangers of violent conflict in South Africa, the urge for a peaceful solution is a common feeling in the United Nations.

Those who advocate economic sanctions call for them as a means for a peaceful settlement. The purpose of economic sanctions, in their view, is not to damage the economy of South Africa or to create chaos or to take revenge. It is perhaps fortunate that this matter is within the purview of the United Nations, for the United Nations cannot develop a consensus for revenge for the past but only for a solution for the future.

The logic of economic sanctions is based on the assumption that if the world will make clear its determination to prevent the combination of prosperity and discrimination in South Africa, the privileged group will be compelled to reassess the situation and choose prosperity and equality, rather than poverty and inequality.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, has often emphasized the grave danger that the continuation of the efforts to impose the policies decided by one racial group in South Africa and the closing up of possibilities for a peaceful change may increasingly lead to violence which is likely to have widespread international repercussions. He has said that in comparison to a "race war", the religious and ideological wars of the past may look like family quarrels. He has made earnest appeals for the search for peaceful solutions to the South African problems.

Role of World Opinion

Despite the seeming defiance of world opinion and the many acts contrary to United Nations resolutions, the South African Government is perhaps not so immune to what Dr. Verwoerd calls "the movement of men's minds" in the world. Indeed, in a policy statement on June 5, 1964, Dr. Verwoerd declared:

"...the situation in the world changed after World War II. A new outlook developed and that new outlook spread across the world and it had the effect of emancipating States in Africa. One cannot escape from it that the change in outlook also reached our country."

He continued that his Government sought a solution by moving towards speedier separation and speedier self-rule to the bantustans. Whatever one's view on these moves, it is perhaps not entirely without significance that policy adjustments are made in the light of changes in world opinion even if they have to be explained as refinements of the same ideology.

The South African Government may regard the new arrangements in the Transkei and other bantustans as "safety valves", but in the politics of nations, the safety valves often have dynamics of their own, beyond the intentions of their creators.

I feel that it is not without significance that the National Party and the Dutch Reformed Churches have taken steps to stop insulting references to African States and to the non-whites in South Africa; that we hear no more of "baasskap"; that the term apartheid itself is being replaced by "separate development" and "separate freedoms"; that liberalism is no more such a bogey that it was a year ago; that South Africa is no longer described as the outpost of Western civilization in Africa; and that there is greater insistence that South African Whites are Africans as much as the non-whites. All this may well be for propaganda reasons, but even a change in propaganda cannot but have a deeper effect on the psychology of the people.

Perhaps it is not without significance that the courts and politicians do not sneer at the leaders of the non-white organizations who have openly admitted leadership of movements which organized acts of sabotage, but reserve their most uncomplimentary epithets to those who testified against their colleagues as State witnesses. Perhaps the Afrikaners, when they look back on their own history, will understand and appreciate those who fight for their convictions and rights and are prepared to take the consequences. For, as an Afrikaner poet wrote: "If you enslave a proud people, resistance to the law becomes its right."

Let us Persevere

There is a crisis in South Africa today. It may be that the pressure of international opinion holds the key to preventing bloodshed and promoting a peaceful adjustment. In the course of my duties, I have met many non-white leaders from South Africa in exile and I am convinced that there is

still time for a peaceful settlement, that the fears and doubts of the Whites can be allayed and that a smooth transition without chaos is possible, if only the representatives of all the people of South Africa are able to come together to consider their common destiny. International opinion can play a role in promoting such free discussions.

But international opinion can only be effective if it is informed objectively of the situation in South Africa, and if it approaches the problem without self-righteousness but with due respect for the pride of the people of South Africa.

Despite the intentions of the international community, the fear of international pressure may have tended to drive the Whites in South Africa into the *laager*. The few who refuse to move into the *laager* and identify their destinies with the non-whites are praiseworthy and perform a very useful historical function. But the march into the *laager*, by itself, should perhaps not unnerve and mislead the world. The tragedy of South Africa in the twentieth century was that the two White groups have tended to make compromises without due regard to the interests of the non-whites and at their expense. It may be a new and hopeful day when the Whites face the problem of race relations as one group and deal with it earnestly.

A really peaceful solution in South Africa can only come with the agreement of the Afrikaners, and not against their resistance. I would like to hope that by a study of the lessons of their own history and the realities of the present day South Africa, and by the pressure of informed world opinion, they will soon begin to look ahead to the promise of the future instead of harping on the outmoded traditions of the past.

Let us, therefore, never tire of repeating that we seek no humiliation of the Afrikaner people, that we look forward to a society where the interests of all men and women are respected, that we do not seek to impose any external solution but stand ready to help in the fulfilment of a solution based on the wishes of all the people of South Africa, and that we are determined to do all we can to see to it that this problem is solved without delay.

APARTHEID AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY³

Rarely has the policy of an individual government attracted as wide attention throughout the world as the racial policy of South Africa. It has been discussed in several organs of the United Nations, in specialised agencies of the United Nations, and in several other international and regional intergovernmental organisations; in the Parliaments of many countries; and in numerous non-governmental organisations. A number of countries have broken diplomatic, consular and trade relations with South Africa or refrained from establishing such relations. Actions protesting apartheid have involved hundreds of thousands of people outside Africa. The publications and documents on apartheid fill a good-sized library. Apartheid has been defined by the United Nations General Assembly as a "crime against humanity": and even a special "International Convention for the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid" has been opened for signature by governments. Judging from the actions of the United Nations, the South African government is more isolated than any government in modern history.

Yet the Government of South Africa seems as determined as ever to continue to pursue its policy of apartheid. It has acquired sophisticated equipment and developed local manufacture of arms, from bullets to rockets. The economy of the country is growing, and the recent sharp rise in the price of gold has been a boon. The National Party has become entrenched in power, while to some extent repression and the bantustans appear to have succeeded in hindering and disrupting national resistance on the part of blacks. The apparent failure of the United Nations and the international community has aroused cynicism and created disillusionment. Some people have become so impressed with the might of the South African regime that they see no solution but, rather, a compromise with the racist institutions of the oppressors. For those who appreciate the proper role of the United Nations and the international community, however, there is little cause for cynicism or despair.

Has the United Nations Failed?

³ Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the African Studies Association, United States of America, 1973.

It is often felt that the United Nations has failed in its attempts to induce change in South Africa and that the progressive strengthening of the resolutions only reflects increasing frustration among the Afro-Asian delegations. Whether the United Nations has in fact succeeded or failed can only be determined in relation to an understanding of the proper role and responsibility of the organisation.

It is perhaps correct that the provisions of the United Nations Charter on the promotion of human rights were based on the assumption that certain objectives could be achieved through exhortation and education and through the gradual development of international norms. Exhortation, however, has failed with respect to South Africa, and the development of international norms has only led the South African government to adjustments in the forms of racial discrimination. There has been an inevitable escalation of resistance and repression leading to an aggravation of the crisis.

Over the years there has also existed a hope, or faith, among the black people of South Africa that the United Nations would somehow see to the fulfilment of its purposes and principles in relation to racism in South Africa. This reflected a lack of understanding of the limitations of the United Nations and of its Charter.

Such an illusion was perhaps fed by the assertion of some South Africans and many friends abroad that economic sanctions alone could lead to important changes in the racial policies of that country. This proposition, particularly attractive to pacifists, has not been proved or disproved since economic sanctions have not been imposed by the United Nations Security Council and since measures recommended by the United Nations General Assembly and by the Organisation of African Unity have not been universally applied.

It must be noted that the liberation movement in South Africa has not subscribed to that simple formula. It has given the central place to the struggle of the people. The purpose of economic sanctions is to weaken the oppressors, in the context of a struggle of the people, and to render that struggle easier. After the initial disillusionment with the sanctions against Rhodesia, a more realistic appreciation has emerged.

Total economic sanctions must be universally applied if they are to be truly effective. But any measure which contributes - however slightly - towards economic isolation has a significant political effect. A series of such measures can retard the development abroad of vested

interests which tend to counteract international action. In the case of South Africa, these vested interests have been particularly powerful since South Africa has very substantial foreign trade and since foreign investment in South Africa is sizeable.

The dissipation of early illusions concerning the impact of United Nations opposition to apartheid has led to a realistic redefinition of the role of the United Nations. The Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid declared in 1967:

"The main role in the liberation of southern Africa should rightfully go first to the oppressed people themselves. The international community can assist them and help create the conditions in which they can secure the liberation with the least possible violence and delay, but it cannot aspire to deliver liberation to them. The efforts of the international community should only complement the efforts of the oppressed peoples.

"It is essential to recognise that popular revolutions take their time, face reverses and even lose battles but will ultimately succeed. The international community cannot formulate the methods of the liberation struggle or determine its timetable. Perseverance and determination are essential if it is to play a helpful role.

"...while the United Nations can play a significant role in the international field, its role is not exclusive. States individually, as well as collectively through the Organisation of African Unity and other inter-governmental organisations, can make additional contributions. Non-governmental organisations of various sectors of public opinion can also play an important role. It is essential to co-ordinate these efforts in order to promote maximum effectiveness of the totality of international effort."

By that test the United Nations has succeeded rather than failed. It has created a world conscience which is a great support to the South African liberation movement in its struggle. It has kept the issue alive even when the liberation movement suffered serious crises. It has provided assistance to the victims of persecution and to the organisations in exile, thereby bolstering the morale of those who oppose apartheid. South Africa cannot hope to obtain international support and sympathy should its policies result in large-scale conflict.

The effects of the international efforts of the past quarter century may be intangible; for instance, the restraint on the South African government in its repressive measures and the moral support to opponents of Apartheid.

But there has occurred a very clear and historic shift in the balance of forces against apartheid. Twenty-five years ago, it was difficult even to obtain the required majority for a discussion of apartheid in the United Nations. Many powerful Western and other States blocked any condemnation of South Africa. Africa was mostly under colonial rule: South Africa and the colonial powers were engaged in discussions on co-operation based on the premise that the continent would remain an appendage of Europe, producing raw materials for Europe and for the "white Christian" civilisation of South Africa. Today, the United Nations and the international community are committed to the total eradication of apartheid. There is no government which admits to friendship with the Pretoria regime. Even Western governments contribute funds for the legal defence of persons charged under such offences as "communism", "sabotage", and "terrorism", ignoring South African protests. Many governments assist the liberation movement in its struggle against apartheid, even the armed struggle.

There is, indeed, need for constant vigilance to counteract efforts to confuse and divide the ranks of the international forces against apartheid, but it may be said with confidence, especially after the failure of the South African moves for dialogues with African States, that despite all the statistics on the military budget, trade and investment - the South African regime is increasingly isolated from the rest of the world. The decisive role in ensuring the end of apartheid and the beginning of a new course in South Africa belongs to the South African people themselves, but the international conditions for such a development are rapidly being created.

This optimistic evaluation does not mean that there is not much more that needs to be done, but only that a favourable trend has been created by the changes in the world situation and the efforts of many governments, organisations and individuals. In order to ensure that the favourable trend will be utilised, a fresh analysis of past action and the possibilities of further progress is essential.

This paper is not intended to review developments over the past twenty-five years with respect to

international action against apartheid, or even United Nations action which has been described in various documents, nor is it intended to indicate future courses of action. It attempts to deal with only a few specific aspects of international action, with special reference to those on which scholarly research would perhaps be useful.

Effect of the Cold War

One area in which research may be desirable is the effect of the "cold war" on moves for international action against apartheid - especially in view of the current debate as to whether present trends towards *détente* are favourable to liberation from colonial and racist rule.

A study of the post-war period would perhaps show that the cold war had created great difficulties for the movement of the African people in South Africa by providing allies to the white regime and encouraging divisions within the movement.

The National Party won the general elections of May 26, 1948, by obtaining only 40 per cent of the total vote, and a slight majority of the membership in the Parliament with the support of small parties. Many of its leaders had associations with the Nazis during the Second World War and the party established a government which was for the first time composed entirely of Afrikaners, excluding the English-speaking group which dominated the economic life of the country and had strong links with Britain. It could have been expected that this government would be short-lived as it would be vulnerable to pressure from the opposition inside the country and opinion outside. But the governing party gained strength in subsequent years, mainly because it was able to paralyse or prevent effective opposition from the business community and to build links with the Western powers.

The Government of South Africa was able to wield its State power effectively not only in order to strengthen Afrikaner influence within the business community but also to neutralise the political role of the English-speaking capitalists by a combination of inducements and pressures. The big business and mining houses found that the government encouraged private business and enabled it to make profits even while developing the State sector. If some prominent businessmen gave contributions to the opposition parties or made statements in favour of the liberalisation of race policies, they proceeded at the same time to link themselves with State corporations and to take Afrikaner capital into partnership. These companies also established the South Africa Foundation and have been active in propaganda against international

action. Because of their relatively liberal image and flexibility and because of their contacts abroad, they were perhaps more effective than the government itself in discouraging international action.

Meanwhile the emergence of the cold war mentality militated against any effective external pressure on South Africa to change its racial policies. The Nationalist government was quick to utilise the cold war in order to obtain international support. One of its first acts was to widen military contacts and to approach countries other than Britain. It offered to participate in the Western-led alliances in return for military equipment and political support.

Between May and June 1949, a South African ambassador-extraordinary visited a number of African colonial territories, as well as Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Great Britain, to discuss military co-operation. In August 1949, the Defence Minister of South Africa, Mr. F.C. Erasmus, accompanied by the Chief of General Staff, visited the United States to purchase equipment, particularly for an expansion of the air force.

In 1950, the South African government contributed a fighter squadron with ground personnel for the Korean War. In the same year, it offered to contribute forces for the defence of the Middle East.

South Africa became involved in a series of international conferences and discussions on military co-operation in Africa and received sizeable military equipment in recognition of its cooperation. In September-October 1950, Mr. Erasmus visited the United Kingdom, the United States, France, and Portugal for talks on military co-operation. From 25 October to 16 November 1950, a conference on central and southern African transport problems was held in Johannesburg with the participation of a number of countries. In August 1951, defence talks were held in Nairobi, under the sponsorship of the United Kingdom and South Africa. A communiqué issued at the end of the conference stated that it had made a series of unanimous recommendations designed to ensure the rapid movement, if required, of troops and military supplies to the eastern and central parts of Africa.

The South African government was also included in consultations in 1950 and 1951 on the proposal for a Middle East Command. The United States State Department announced on October 24, 1951, that the United States intended to establish a Middle Eastern Defence Command in collaboration with the United Kingdom, France, Turkey, New Zealand, Australia and the Union of South Africa. (Egypt

had rejected an invitation to join the Command.) It added that the question of the relationship between the Middle Eastern Command and NATO would be considered. In March 1954, a seven-power conference to co-ordinate defence arrangements in Africa south of the Sahara was held at Dakar under the sponsorship of Britain and France. South Africa was one of the seven participating countries.

After the Anglo-Egyptian agreement for the withdrawal of forces from the Suez Canal Zone, South Africa made renewed efforts to establish closer military links with Britain, the United States and NATO. It could not obtain association with NATO but the Simonstown Agreements were signed with the United Kingdom in July 1955 as a result of a series of conversations. It was announced on July 4, 1955:

"Both Governments have agreed jointly to sponsor a Conference to develop the planning already begun at the Nairobi Conference in 1951, on the improvement and security of the lines of communication around southern Africa and between South Africa and the Middle East."

Both sides agreed that "defence of southern Africa against aggression lies not only in Africa, but also in the gateways to Africa; namely, in the Middle East."

The South African Government repeatedly approached other governments to move towards a regional defence organisation but failed, largely because of the racial policies and the reactions generated in other countries. The hopes of Malan for an "African Charter" of colonial powers - Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal and the Union of South Africa - to ensure that Africa would develop as part of "Western Christian civilisation", voiced in an interview on January 17, 1953, were not fulfilled because of the advance of the freedom movements in Africa and Asia. South Africa was against any arming of Blacks while Britain and other countries contemplated the raising of African forces.

Because of its virtual alliance with one side in the cold war, however, South Africa was able to obtain military equipment and to make sure that a large bloc of powerful countries would prevent any effective international action, at least until the Sharpeville Massacre of 1960 and the attaining of independence by a large number of African countries beginning in 1960. In 1963, the United States government decided, partly in response to the birth of the Organisation of African Unity, to impose an arms embargo against South Africa. It also supported resolution 1881 (XVIII) of October 11,

1963, in the United Nations General Assembly, calling for the release of political prisoners, many of whom were involved in sabotage and several of whom were well-known communists. That same year, the Labour Party in Britain came out for an arms embargo; the embargo was imposed in 1964 when the Labour Party came to power.

A *détente* among the major Powers may perhaps be expected to weaken resistance by States to international action and to promote more united public opinion against apartheid. There is already a clear trend among the smaller countries in Western Europe, which are not particularly concerned with strategic considerations outside the continent, to support stronger action against apartheid.

The Role of Non-Governmental Organisations

An important aspect of international opposition to apartheid is the significant role played by non-governmental organisations in many countries in promoting and carrying out programmes of action. Some of these non-governmental organisations have played a more important role than many governments.

Anti-Apartheid movements have sprung up in a number of countries and have engaged in a variety of political and other activities. Defence and aid funds have been established in several countries, especially since the Defiance Campaign of 1952. They have been sending funds to people accused in South Africa of a variety of offences under the repressive legislation, ranging from communism to treason and terrorism. The campaign for the boycott of racially-selected sports teams from South Africa has led to the establishment of special committees and the involvement of hundreds of thousands of people, especially in the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia and New Zealand. Older non-governmental organisations with an interest in human rights, churches and trade unions have participated in various programmes.

Apartheid became a national issue in some countries and has even affected general elections. Many public figures achieved prominence by their participation in anti-apartheid movements. Fortunately, the efforts of certain groups to promote a backlash, by accusing anti-apartheid movements of breaking law and order, have almost always failed.

It is perhaps correct to state that the resolutions of the United Nations on apartheid are supported by many governments and by a substantial segment of the population in countries where governments are not yet ready to support them.

The question of apartheid has attracted such wide public attention because of a number of factors.

In the early post-war period, the struggle in South Africa took the form of passive resistance campaigns under the leadership of the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress. The effectiveness of such campaigns generally depends, first, on the number of volunteers who are prepared to risk imprisonment and persecution for their beliefs and, second, on the public support they gain both from the victims of oppression and from privileged groups. In the South African context, and because of the existence of the United Nations, the movements sought support not only from the white community within the country, which monopolised all State power, but also from the rest of the world.

In 1946, when the strike by African miners and the Indian passive resistance campaign brought large sections of both communities into action, a complaint against South Africa was lodged in the United Nations by the Government of India. At that time, a multi-racial delegation composed of Dr. A. B. Xuma, President-General of the African National Congress, H.A. Naidoo and Sorabji Rustomjee of the South African Indian Congress and Senator H. Bassner arrived in New York to seek international support. Shortly thereafter, the Rev. Michael Scott campaigned in the Western world in support of the struggle in South Africa. The Campaign of Defiance against Unjust Laws in 1952 attracted much wider attention and led to the establishment of support groups and fund-raising in the United Kingdom, the United States and other countries.

Support came from a variety of groups: the pacifists, such as the Rev. Michael Scott, the Rev. Canon L. John Collins, and the Rev. George Houser; the radicals, such as Dr. W.E.B. DuBois, Paul Robeson, and Fenner Brockway; and a number of liberals with an international interest.

The African National Congress in particular paid great attention to obtaining such broad support. Its emphasis on multi-racialism and on the principles of the Freedom Charter was perhaps partially influenced by the friends it had gained.

However, because of the cold war, there were circles in the West, including some governments, which found it in their interest to try to discredit the movement by focusing on alleged communist participation or domination. But the pacifists and other supporters of the ANC were not alienated by their propaganda.

The solidarity movements were faced with problems of adjustment after the banning of the African National Congress and the Pan Africanist Congress in the aftermath of the

Sharpeville Massacre in 1960, and they were presented with even greater difficulties after both of these African organisations gave up their adherence to non-violence and moved in the direction of an armed struggle. It is to the credit of the leaders of the solidarity movements, including the pacifists, that they did not abandon their role but adjusted to the new situation. Even if opposed to violence themselves, they recognised the right of the African people to choose their own means of struggle.

More recently, the direct action tactics of anti-apartheid groups appear to have led to a few desertions from their ranks. Campaigns against corporations involved in South Africa seem to affect much wider interests. Some liberals who had earlier advocated economic sanctions changed their attitude and began to advocate greater "communication", together with pressure for wage increases, as the direction for change. But it appears that this development has not caused any significant weakening of the anti-apartheid forces, since direct action brought new recruits.

Meanwhile, the development of public action on apartheid has contributed greatly to the creation of movements of solidarity with the struggles of the colonial peoples in Africa.

The United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid has actively encouraged non-governmental action against apartheid since its inception in 1963. Such action was also encouraged later by the Organisation of African Unity.

More research on the role of the non-governmental groups against apartheid and the interaction between these groups and the inter-governmental organisations would be particularly useful at this time.

Repercussions of International Action against Apartheid

In the absence of the fulfilment of United Nations resolutions on apartheid, it is difficult, as indicated earlier, to describe precisely the effects of international action on the situation in South Africa. Nevertheless, some effects on the international level are highly significant. For instance, it was perhaps the international opinion created by opposition to apartheid that made it possible for States to set up funds for the support of liberation movements. The decision of the African States to set up a Liberation Fund and a Liberation Committee might have been widely denounced as a violation of international law if the proper climate had not been created over the years by campaigns against apartheid. By 1965, even Western governments were prepared to contribute funds to support legal and other assistance to persons persecuted in South Africa for their political activities.

International assistance to victims of oppression and their movements has become acceptable at the governmental and inter-governmental level. There is now a proposal, in the context of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, for the establishment of a fund for action against racism in general.

The realisation that the attitudes of the Western countries could be influenced only through the development of public opinion has led the United Nations to undertake active information campaigns within the Western countries and to maintain close liaison with various opposition groups in those countries. Such intervention by the United Nations has been accepted by the governments concerned, thus enhancing the role of the United Nations.

The action against apartheid and colonialism in recent years reveals a growing recognition by the smaller countries of the potential usefulness of United Nations machinery in spite of the right of veto enjoyed by the Great Powers in the Security Council. On their initiative, the United Nations has granted the right of petition which has been valuable to the leaders of the oppressed people. It has also recognised the legitimacy of the struggles of the liberation movements and called for assistance to the movements, thereby encouraging individual States to contribute to the liberation movements without any fear that this will be regarded as a violation of current international law. More recently, the movements have received observer status in United Nations bodies.

United Nations action against apartheid has also had some important side effects which are significant in relation to the total change in the balance of forces. It has stimulated, for instance, the growth of anti-racist movements in such countries as Australia and New Zealand. Action initiated by anti-apartheid groups against companies investing in South Africa has spurred the movement for the recognition of corporate responsibility in general. Concern over the torture of prisoners in South Africa has encouraged action on the wider problem of the torture of prisoners in general.

The Prospects

It is impossible to predict the course of major changes such as those sought in South Africa. Revolutions take their own historical time, and international action is only a secondary factor in determining the course of events.

The international community has come a long way since 1948 when it was impossible even to adopt the mildest resolution in the United Nations General Assembly on the racial problem in South Africa. The United Nations is now committed - or at least the great majority of Member States are committed

through General Assembly resolutions - to promote the total eradication of apartheid in South Africa. It is committed to the support of the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people, irrespective of the means they choose, including armed struggle. The resolutions are moving in the direction of non-recognition of the Government of South Africa. Apartheid has been declared a punishable crime under a new Convention. The commitment of the United Nations is shared not only by many governments but also by large segments of public opinion.

The balance is constantly turning against apartheid - *with* the independence of every territory in the Third World, with every victory against racism in other countries, with every confrontation against forces collaborating with South Africa, and with every advance of the liberation movements in the colonial territories in southern Africa.

With the recent developments in Africa and the rest of the world, there may well be more concerted and more widespread public action against apartheid. The results of the International Trade Union Conference against Apartheid, held in Geneva in June 1973, reflected the possibility now of unity against apartheid transcending sharp divisions on other matters.

This is not to say that the struggle on the international level has been completely won. There are still illusions and hesitations, as well as resistance, which need to be overcome.

The illusion that apartheid can be abolished by international persuasion and exhortation is perhaps no longer alive. But the hope that apartheid can somehow painlessly wither away as a result of economic development, industrialisation and modernisation seems very attractive to some elements and has recently been propagated with vigour. While a strategy against apartheid will need to involve pressures on many fronts, and while pressures for wage increases or civilised working conditions may be useful in the context of a broad strategy, concentration on these pressures can be harmful if they are posed against economic sanctions or the policies of the liberation movement and the United Nations.

There can be no real progress without the movement of the people in South Africa. And a policy of promoting dialogue with the accessible Africans - that is, those who are able to move around when the leaders of the struggle against apartheid are successively jailed and banned - can only steadily lead to compromise with apartheid, not to its elimination or to a settlement.

The statement that one often encounters, that apartheid persists because of support by the governments or economic interests abroad, is, in my view, not quite accurate. There is

little support from outside, unless one considers loans at substantial interest rates as support. In fact, some foreign governments and economic interests have benefited from the isolation of South Africa by driving hard bargains. What the United Nations and the liberation movement seek is really the withdrawal of any economic or other dealings with South Africa and the isolation of that regime. Such a course is intended to weaken that regime and prevent the existence and development of lobbies in favour of that regime.

Apartheid has been a challenge to the international community. Opposition to it has led to many healthy developments in international life, such as an acceleration of international action against racism, the development of solidarity with the black people struggling against colonialism and racism, and the growing recognition of corporate responsibility.

Will the changing balance of forces on the international level lead to an early solution in South Africa? The answer depends on the development of the movement of the oppressed people and the reaction of the white minority and its government. But perhaps two things are certain: first, South Africa cannot resist the world, and the end of white supremacy is assured even if the next round is lost by the opponents of apartheid; and, second, international action will have contributed to the minimising of violence and casualties in this struggle.

THE UNITED NATIONS WORLD CAMPAIGN AGAINST APARTHEID⁴

Of all the crises in the world today, the growing conflict between the minority regimes and the liberation movements in southern Africa is of most direct and urgent concern to the United Nations. At stake are the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the imperative need to eliminate colonialism and racial discrimination, which are major sources of international tension and conflict.

The African people in Rhodesia, South Africa and Namibia patiently tried for decades, by peaceful and non-violent means, to obtain their legitimate rights. But the authorities consistently rejected peaceful change to full equality, and met the African demands with increasingly ruthless measures of repression. The African political movements were obliged to abandon non-violence and organise underground activity, sabotage and armed struggle.

Rhodesia is now the scene of an armed conflict between the illegal regime and the liberation forces in which, according to official accounts, over 5,000 people have been killed. Encounters between the South African forces and the freedom fighters of the Namibian liberation movement, the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), have become a frequent occurrence.

In South Africa, many hundreds of Africans have been killed and thousands wounded since the killings of African school children demonstrating against racial discrimination in Soweto in June 1976. The violence has been entirely by the police, but the beginnings of armed resistance by the black people have appeared.

These conflicts have spilled beyond national boundaries. South African and Rhodesian forces have repeatedly committed acts of aggression against Angola, Mozambique and Zambia in pursuit of freedom fighters and to intimidate the neighbouring African States which support them.

In 1946 the United Nations was seized with the problem of racial discrimination in South Africa and with South Africa's moves to annex Namibia. Since then, United Nations action on southern Africa has evolved from mere appeals to attempts to apply sanctions and other forms of pressure, and finally to wide-ranging programmes of international action at governmental and non-governmental levels.

⁴ Article in *UNESCO Courier*, Paris, November 1977.

Until 1960, the United Nations annually appealed to the South African government to end racial discrimination in the hope that it could be persuaded by world opinion. These appeals failed, but the United Nations debates were not without value.

They resulted in the gradual acceptance by all Member States of the competence of the United Nations to consider the situation in South Africa, in greater world awareness of the aspirations of the black people of that country and in the moral isolation of the South African government. The discussions on Namibia - reinforced by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice affirming the international status of the territory and the accountability of the South African government for its administration - helped prevent an annexation of that territory. The Namibian people were enabled, despite strenuous South African objections, to approach the international community through petitions to United Nations organs and hearings before them. By 1960, the rapid advance of Decolonisation in Africa and the entry of newly-independent African States into the United Nations drew greater world attention to southern Africa.

The South African government, determined to resist the "winds of change" sweeping the continent, stepped up repression against the growing movement for freedom in South Africa and Namibia. On December 10, 1959, Human Rights Day, the South African police opened fire on a crowd of Africans in Windhoek, peacefully demonstrating against a forcible move to a segregated location, killing 11 and wounding 44. On March 21, 1960, in Sharpeville, South Africa, police shot indiscriminately at a peaceful demonstration against racist "pass laws", killing 68 and wounding over 200. These tragic events heightened world concern over the situation, especially in Western countries which had earlier resisted strong condemnations.

On April 1, 1960, the Security Council considered the situation in South Africa for the first time, and called on the South African government to abandon apartheid and racial discrimination. In December of that year, the General Assembly adopted the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, solemnly proclaiming the need to bring colonialism in all its forms to a speedy and unconditional end.

As the South African government continued to defy United Nations resolutions, the African States, supported by Asian, Socialist and other States, pressed for economic and other sanctions against South Africa.

They felt that South Africa would pay little attention to United Nations resolutions so long as it was able to count on

continued political, economic and other relations with the Western countries and its other major trading partners. The latter resisted sanctions, arguing that they were neither feasible nor appropriate, and that they could not achieve the desired results. United Nations deliberations began to reflect a consensus on the objectives but sharp differences on the means of promoting them.

On November 6, 1962, the General Assembly adopted a resolution requesting Member States to break off diplomatic and economic relations with South Africa, and to refrain from supplying arms and ammunition to that country. This resolution was opposed by the main trading partners of South Africa, and many other States abstained. The Security Council decided in 1963-1964 to recommend an arms embargo against South Africa but could not agree on mandatory sanctions.

In 1966, the United Nations General Assembly decided by an overwhelming vote to terminate South Africa's mandate over Namibia and declared that the territory was henceforth under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Following South Africa's refusal to withdraw from the territory, the General Assembly and the Security Council recommended a number of measures to secure its compliance but again there was no agreement on mandatory decisions.

Meanwhile, the United Nations became increasingly concerned with the situation in Southern Rhodesia as the minority regime in that territory attempted to obtain independence without granting equal rights to the African population.

After that regime made a unilateral and illegal declaration of independence in 1965, and on the proposal of the administering power, the United Kingdom, the Security Council imposed mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The effectiveness of these sanctions was, however, limited by the fact that South Africa (and Portugal until the independence of Mozambique in 1975) enabled the Rhodesians to circumvent the sanctions.

Most nations of the world have broken, or refrained from establishing diplomatic relations with South Africa, but 21 countries, including the main trading partners of South Africa, maintain diplomatic representatives in Pretoria. All countries have recognised the illegality of South African administration over Namibia and almost all have terminated official relations with it. No country, except South Africa, maintains diplomatic relations with the illegal regime in Rhodesia.

But in the economic field, the results have been particularly disappointing. Though many countries complied

with United Nations resolutions, some at considerable sacrifice, South Africa was able to increase its economic relations with its main trading partners.

Even more alarming was the military build-up by South Africa, despite the arms embargo. While most governments prohibited the supply of arms and military equipment to South Africa, a few arms exporting countries delayed action or followed restrictive interpretations of the United Nations recommendations. South Africa increased its military budget from \$168 million in 1962-63 to \$1,900 million in 1977-78. It acquired an enormous amount of sophisticated military equipment, and developed local manufacture of arms and ammunition.

While continuing to press the powers concerned to disengage from the minority regimes, the United Nations organs began to push for greater action in directions where there was broader agreement. Particular emphasis was placed on assistance to the oppressed people of southern Africa and their liberation movements, on dissemination information on the situation in southern Africa and on encouragement of action by intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations to reinforce United Nations efforts.

Two important world conferences were held in 1977 with impressive participation of governments, liberation movements and intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations: the International Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique, from 16 to 21 May; and the World Conference for Action against Apartheid, held in Lagos, Nigeria, from 22 to 26 August.

The United Nations has recognised the legitimacy of the struggles of the national liberation movements for freedom, and has granted them observer status in its deliberations on southern African problems. It has encouraged the specialised agencies and other intergovernmental organisations - as well as churches, trade unions, anti-apartheid and solidarity movements and other non-governmental organisations - to take all appropriate action, each within its mandate, to isolate the minority regimes and assist the struggles for freedom. In 1967, it established the office of the Commissioner for Namibia to help execute the decisions of the Council for Namibia, administer assistance to the Namibian people and mobilise public support to press for South Africa's withdrawal.

It also established a Centre against Apartheid, to help the Special Committee against Apartheid develop an international campaign, to expand information activity and to administer humanitarian and educational assistance to the victims of apartheid.

As a result of persistent efforts by the United Nations and other organisations, as well as by African and other Member States, the minority regimes are increasingly isolated.

The specialised agencies of the United Nations and other intergovernmental organisations have all excluded Southern Rhodesia, and have refused to recognise the South African administration in Namibia. Many of them accepted the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal authority for Namibia, and have invited the national liberation movements from the three countries to their conferences and meetings. South Africa withdrew from UNESCO in 1955 and has since been expelled from or obliged to leave many other intergovernmental organisations. None provides any assistance to South Africa or Rhodesia.

An important aspect of the effort to isolate the minority regimes is the encouragement of public action, especially in countries which continue to maintain relations with South Africa. Non-governmental groups have organised boycotts of South African and Namibian goods. They have exerted their influence to dissuade transnational corporations from collaborating with South Africa and from practising racial discrimination in their operations in southern Africa. The campaign to boycott racially-selected sports teams from South Africa has involved hundreds of thousands of sportsmen and sports enthusiasts in many countries, and has brought home to the white communities in southern Africa the extent of world-wide abhorrence of racial discrimination.

Several Western countries and other main trading partners of South Africa have taken further steps, however cautious and moderate, towards the implementation of United Nations resolutions. France, for example, announced in 1977 that it was halting supplies of military equipment to South Africa, and the Federal Republic of Germany has decided to close its consulate in Namibia. Scandinavian and other States have taken steps to stop new investments in South Africa.

The United Nations and related agencies undertook humanitarian and educational assistance to the victims of colonialism and apartheid in the early 1960s when repression greatly increased and sizeable numbers of refugees began to come out of southern Africa. In subsequent years, they established and encouraged programmes of direct assistance to the liberation movements, including help in preparing cadres for the future development of these countries.

The United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa - established in 1965 to assist political prisoners and their families in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia - has received over \$5 million in voluntary contributions.

The United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, also financed by voluntary contributions, has received over \$10 million to train inhabitants of the three territories. It now administers over 1300 scholarships.

The Fund for Namibia, established in 1972, has received over \$9 million. Part of this goes to the Namibia Institute, established in Lusaka in 1976, to train cadres for the future administration of Namibia.

The United Nations Development Programme has allocated substantial funds for assistance to national liberation movements, to be administered by UNESCO, the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the World Health Organisation (WHO), and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has been assisting tens of thousands of refugees from the three territories. UNICEF provides assistance to mothers and children through the national liberation movements.

Few liberation struggles in history have received greater political support and concrete assistance from the international community.

The minority regimes in southern Africa are increasingly isolated and face mounting pressure. This has resulted in some movement towards settlements in Zimbabwe and Namibia, with United Nations participation in the process of transition to independence.

But the South African government remains adamant in rejecting majority rule and so long as it and its supporters resist change, there can be no secure peace in the region. The threat of a widening conflict, perhaps even a race war, with enormous casualties and inevitable repercussions beyond the region, will remain.

The United Nations is attempting, as a matter of utmost urgency, to maximise international efforts to avert this danger. Full observance of International Anti-Apartheid Year in 1978 can make an effective contribution to this effort.

INTERNATIONAL ANTI-APARTHEID YEAR
(21 MARCH 1978-21 MARCH 1979)⁵

The International Anti-Apartheid Year which will begin on March 21, 1978, has a rather negative title - but nothing can be more positive than this year which was unanimously endorsed by 148 Member States.

It will begin with the onset of spring in the Northern Hemisphere - on a day which is also observed as the Earth Day - on a day which is the New Year's Day in many communities of the world.

Unfortunately, it is also the anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre of 1960 in South Africa - when scores of unarmed men, women and children were killed and wounded for a peaceful demonstration against pass laws.

Tragic though that event was, the Sharpeville massacre opened the eyes of much of the world to the danger of racism and led the United Nations and international community in action not only against apartheid but also against racism in general.

I may recall - especially as we are at the mid-point of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination - that one of the first resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in 1946 was a resolution against racial discrimination. Nothing further seemed to happen while the Member States were preoccupied with other problems until the Sharpeville massacre and the independence of African States put racism near the top of the agenda. The General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in 1963, to be followed by a Convention against Racial Discrimination, a Convention against Apartheid, an International Year against Racism, a Decade against Racism and so on.

The anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre of March 21, 1960, has been observed since 1967 as the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. This year, it will also be the day of the launching of the International Anti-Apartheid Year - at the United Nations Headquarters in New York, at the European Headquarters of the United Nations in Geneva, at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris and in many capitals.

⁵ Statement at a briefing for non-governmental organisations at the United Nations, New York, on March 2, 1978.

I said at the outset that this is a year of positive action, for a positive purpose, even if the title seems somewhat negative.

For a long time, a small minority in South Africa has dominated the country and appropriated most of its wealth. It established racism as a State doctrine, and tried to suppress all demands by the African people for human rights.

As the resistance of the black people increased - and as the whites began to lose faith in their so-called superiority - the successive governments began to resort to ever increasing repression and even massacres to keep the blacks down.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Africans owned most of the land in South Africa. Today they are excluded from nine-tenths of the land. By the beginning of the twentieth century, Africans and other blacks had a few rights, including limited voting rights and the right to property and residence. Today they have none.

The purpose of the campaign against *apartheid* is to end these inequities and injustices, which are the cause of the conflict in the country, and to enable *all* the people to enjoy their human rights.

Instead of a small minority governing the country, let the country be governed by representatives democratically elected by *all* the people. Let the destiny of the country be decided by *all* the people on the basis of equality. That is what the United Nations means by genuine self-determination.

The time has passed - not only in South Africa, but also in the whole world - when the darker skinned people will continue to minister to the needs of the lighter skinned people and accept crumbs from their tables. That is a legacy of the era of slavery and colonialism which cannot continue any more.

In the case of South Africa, this effort to widen the enjoyment of human rights from a small minority to the whole nation is not only a struggle for justice and to prevent a catastrophic conflict, but has come to assume tremendous historical significance.

Freedom in South Africa will mean that at last - after centuries of slavery and humiliation which resulted in tens of millions of deaths - the whole continent of Africa has achieved emancipation. It will mean a decisive turning point in the struggle to end racism all over the world.

The purpose of the International Anti-Apartheid Year then is not just to fight a repressive regime or system but to take a crucial step in building the basis for a new world order.

I have wished many times that the whites in South Africa would try to play a role in the resurgence of Africa and its re-emergence on the world stage. They think they are a kind of pioneers who developed a part of Africa. They have produced some great liberal thinkers. The Afrikaners, in particular, have been proud that they had carried on a brave struggle against oppression and imperialism, exactly eighty years ago, and built monuments in memory of that struggle. But then, as in the United States two centuries ago, they forgot that the blacks were equally human, and tried to consecrate racial inequality, a sure prescription for a civil war.

I come from a former colonial country, India. During the course of our long freedom struggle tens of thousands of people were imprisoned every few years. But again and again, the colonial regime tried to negotiate with the leaders - like Gandhi and Nehru - even when they were in jail. In South Africa, however, the minority government has consistently refused to sit down and talk to the genuine leaders of the people -and only recently began the farce of meetings with the tribal chiefs it designated as leaders. When it puts people in jail for political offences, there is not even a remission. A life sentence means a sentence for life.

Thus, the government in South Africa has so far excluded a negotiated settlement.

Since there are no legal means for change, and since the government refuses to negotiate, the black people have no choice except to resort to illegal means - whether non-violent or violent or both.

The rest of the world has no choice except to exert all the pressure it can - to force the government to negotiate or, if it is far too intransigent, to surrender.

The International Anti-Apartheid Year is a means to mobilise the will and the strength of the international community for this purpose.

TRIBUTE TO PERCY QOBOZA⁶

I believe it is most appropriate that the Ethical Humanist Award is being presented this year to Percy Qoboza.

Mr. Qoboza is an outstanding editor who built up the *World* as the voice of the black majority. Under his leadership it acquired the largest readership of any newspaper in South Africa, estimated at more than a million. This was not an easy task in a country where the press has to function under scores of restrictions, laws and regulations, where black journalists have to operate under constant harassment and serious practical difficulties and where the press is prohibited from even quoting Chief Lutuli, the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, not to mention many other eminent black leaders like Nelson Mandela, Robert Sobukwe and Steve Biko.

Events following the massacre of African school children in Soweto two years ago with the massive police violence, the seething resentment of the black people, and their undaunted resistance confronted Mr. Qoboza with a challenge as a black intellectual and as an editor. He tried faithfully, within the laws, to report the events, to call for a dialogue by the authorities with the real leaders of the black people and to arrest the rapid drift towards a disastrous racial conflict. He upheld the conviction of all the black leaders that a lasting solution can only be based on justice, on the recognition that South Africa belongs to all its people. That is what the authorities bent on perpetuating racist domination could not tolerate.

Soon after the Soweto Massacre on June 16, 1976, the police sealed off the huge African township of Soweto, with a population of close to a million, and prevented white journalists

⁶ Speech at the New York Society of Ethical Culture on the occasion of the presentation of the 1978 Ethical Humanist Award to Mr. Percy Qoboza, editor of the *World*, Johannesburg, May 14, 1978.

from entering the area. It fell on the few black journalists living there to report the events to South Africa and to the world. We have a record of numerous black journalists who faced grave risks, and who were repeatedly assaulted by the police and detained for performing their duty. Many of them are still in jail without charges and without trial, held *incommunicado*.

In honouring Mr. Qoboza, we honour all the black journalists for their sacrifice and their outstanding service to truth.

It will be thirty years later this month since the apartheid regime came to power on the slogan of the "black danger". The real danger to the white supremacists was and is, however, the principles of the United Nations and the ethical values professed by humanity. The apartheid regime persecuted Percy Qoboza, not so much because he was a black editor, but because he was a voice of sanity and of truth and indeed of moderation as understood elsewhere. He could not be allowed to communicate with his own people and with the white people. By persecuting the courageous journalist, the apartheid regime has not succeeded in suppressing the truth or in containing resistance to injustice. In fact, underground and armed resistance by the Liberation Movement has greatly escalated in the past few months.

SOLOMON MAHLANGU: FREEDOM FIGHTER AGAINST APARTHEID⁷

Solomon Mahlangu, the young South African, joined the ranks of the freedom fighters when the racist regime resorted to massacres of black school children. He was captured and executed by a neo-Nazi regime denounced by the entire world.

His last words speak for his courage and for the determination of his generation to make supreme sacrifices for the elimination of apartheid and the liberation of their nation.

On this occasion we extend our sympathy to his mother and our expression of solidarity to the African National Congress of South Africa.

There has hardly been a parallel in history to the indiscriminate killings of school children in Soweto and other South African townships.

The Pretoria regime thought that by its massive brutality, it could subdue the resurgence of resistance by the youth of South Africa. But, according to its own accounts, no less than four thousand young men and women left South Africa in the wake of the Soweto massacre to join the freedom fighters.

It executed Solomon Mahlangu in the hope of intimidating the freedom fighters - but if the past is any guide, the death of this young man will only swell the ranks of those who will be persuaded to take up arms, and to refuse to lay them down until they destroy the system of racist domination.

Many Heads of State and Government - including several from the Western countries - as well as numerous organisations around the world,

⁷ Speech at the meeting held by the World Peace Council's Presidential Committee in memory of Solomon Mahlangu in Prague, April 1979.

appealed to the South African regime to spare the life of Solomon Mahlangu.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations made three appeals, and the Security Council of the United Nations held an unprecedented meeting to address a unanimous appeal to the Pretoria regime.

Yet, the South African regime went ahead with the execution in defiance of the world, the first execution of a political prisoner in more than ten years.

This execution is not only one more act of brutality or one more crime by the apartheid regime, or one more sacrifice by the liberation movement.

It is the unfolding of a new stage in the confrontation between the forces of freedom and the forces of oppression in southern Africa - and it must be the unfolding of a new stage in international action to destroy the forces which have engulfed southern Africa in conflict and threaten to bring about a holocaust.

Threat to Peace

The great majority of the Member States of the United Nations - the Asian, African and other non-aligned States, Socialist States and others - have constantly emphasised for many years, along with the World Peace Council and other organisations, that the problem in South Africa is not merely racism, colonialism and violation of human rights - obnoxious and intolerable though they are - but a threat to international peace and security. It was as long ago as 1952 - when the African National Congress launched the "Campaign of Defiance against Unjust Laws" - that the United Nations recognised that apartheid would inevitably lead to conflict.

It was twenty years ago that the African National Congress appealed for sanctions against South Africa - an appeal which was endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in 1962.

Yet many people - even those who were firmly opposed to racism and recognised the legitimacy of the struggle for liberation - did not

perceive the scale and potential of the danger to peace - just as, in earlier years, they did not recognise the menace that a self-styled Feuhrer represented in Europe.

The military budget of South Africa rose from 40 million rand in 1960-61 to 1550 million rand last year and is being increased to 1857 million rand in 1979-80 - an increase of no less than 3600 per cent.

Where can one find a parallel to this - and what more evidence does one need for recognising the existence of a serious threat to the peace?

In this period, the world has witnessed the massacres of Sharpeville, of Soweto and of Cassinga and many others in Zimbabwe, as well as in Zambia and Mozambique, against unarmed Africans.

Ever since 1961, there have been constant violations of the territorial integrity of neighbouring States by the South African regime, escalating into a massive invasion of the People's Republic of Angola in 1975 and repeated acts of aggression by the illegal regime in Rhodesia against Zambia, Mozambique and Botswana.

There is no more pretence of the non-existent right of "hot pursuit", but calculated aggression deep into the territories of other States - even States which are not contiguous, as in the case of the recent Rhodesian attack on Angola.

Nowhere can one find a parallel to such massacres and aggression with so little international response.

The South African regime has openly declared that when its security is involved, no rules would apply.

It was the present Prime Minister, P.W. Botha, who proposed the law to authorise the South African armed forces to move anywhere south of the Equator.

In the past few days we have again heard official assertions by him of an intention to

establish regional hegemony and to fight the forces of freedom beyond the Zambezi.

The illegal elections in Rhodesia and the manoeuvres in Namibia are part of that strategy.

So is the execution of Mahlangu.

In this context, the evidence that the South African regime has already secretly acquired, or can soon acquire, nuclear weapons, underlines the enormous danger to peace. The situation in southern Africa, therefore, requires, the utmost attention of any organisation dedicated to peace.

Mobilise against Apartheid

The United Nations has called for an international mobilisation against apartheid - a mobilisation of all forces of freedom and peace - for the cessation of all collaboration with apartheid and to provide all necessary support to the national liberation movement of South Africa.

This mobilisation must encompass world-wide action for a full implementation of the arms embargo against South Africa, for an end to all nuclear collaboration with South Africa, for an end to all loans to South Africa and investments in South Africa.

We must make world public opinion aware of the enormous danger to world peace posed by the policies and actions of the apartheid regime.

We must also publicise the progress of the liberation struggle in southern Africa, including the beginnings of an armed struggle in South Africa itself.

We must demand that captured freedom fighters must at least be treated as prisoners of war.

The execution of Mahlangu must be viewed as a desperate act by a dying system in the face of the advances of the liberation struggle and of international mobilisation against apartheid.

The Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid said in a statement after the execution of Mahlangu:

"More than three centuries ago - on April 6, 1652 - Johan van Riebeeck, a Dutch commander, landed in the Table Bay to begin settler colonisation of South Africa.

"The Vorster-Botha regime chose the anniversary of that fateful day - April 6th - to execute Solomon Mahlangu.

"From now on, the Riebeeck Day, celebrated by the racists, should be observed as Mahlangu Day by the fighters against racist domination, and all their allies and friends, in order to bring a speedy end to the long era of oppression and humiliation of the African people in their own continent."

THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND THE CHALLENGE⁸

The Special Committee and the Anti-Apartheid Movement have both been established in response to the needs and requests of the national liberation movement.

They have both recognised that the primary role in the struggle for liberation belongs to the national liberation movement, and that their own work is supportive.

They have both tried to build broadest support to the liberation struggle - irrespective of differences on any other issues.

They have both moved ahead in response to the changing requirements of the struggle, overcoming all distractions and pressures.

Their work has been totally complementary.

The United Nations and the Organisation of African Unity - together with anti-apartheid movements, especially in countries which continue to collaborate with the apartheid regime - form the core of the solidarity movement which today has to meet immense challenges.

The Special Committee against Apartheid has for a long time recognised the Anti-Apartheid Movement as the conscience of the British people and as an indispensable ally of the United Nations.

It began effective cooperation with the Anti-Apartheid Movement soon after its own establishment in 1963. It has not only consulted the Movement on numerous occasions and sent representatives to its meetings, but has repeatedly invited representatives of the Movement to its own meetings, seminars and conferences. Several of the leaders of the Movement were honoured guests of the Special Committee and of the Nigerian Government at the World Conference for Action against Apartheid held in Lagos in August 1977.

Even more important, many of the initiatives of the Special Committee have resulted from consultations with the Anti-Apartheid Movement.

We have cooperated on numerous campaigns - from the World Campaign for the Release of South African Political Prisoners at the time of the Rivonia Trial in 1963-64 to the recent launching of the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa.

Three months ago, the Special Committee organised an important seminar on nuclear collaboration with South Africa in cooperation with the Anti-Apartheid Movement and in the next few months another important seminar on the role of transnational corporations in southern Africa will be

⁸ Speech at the Conference of the British Anti-Apartheid Movement on its twentieth anniversary, London, June 26, 1979.

organised by the Movement, at the request of and in cooperation with the Special Committee.

I must pay tribute to the Anti-Apartheid Movement for its valuable and consistent support to the efforts of the United Nations in the cause of African liberation.

I must, in particular, express our great appreciation to the many leaders of the Anti-Apartheid Movement whom we have known and come to respect - people like Bishop Ambrose Reeves, Barbara Castle, David Steel, Joan Lestor, Jeremy Thorpe, David Ennals, Bob Hughes and Abdul Minty - as well as its officials from Dorothy Roberts, Rosalynde Ainslee and Ethel de Keyser to Mike Terry and his colleagues.

In paying tribute to the Anti-Apartheid Movement, we cannot but pay tribute to the national liberation movement of South Africa - one of the noblest movements of this century, and a pioneer, an inspirer and often a guide to other liberation movements.

It is the righteousness of its struggle, and the heroism and sacrifices of its militants, which have inspired a world-wide solidarity movement.

Where else can one find nobler documents of freedom than in the programmes of the South African liberation movement? Where else can one find more inspiring epics of freedom struggle than in the Defiance Campaign of 1952 and the defiance of children after Soweto - not to go back to the Battle of Isandhlawana in the last century?

Great Movement of Solidarity

But I would like to point out that if the liberation movement has its numerous martyrs, the solidarity movement too has its own share of heroes.

Hundreds and thousands of people in many countries have gone to jail, or have been subjected to assaults by the police or racists, or risked their careers, not to speak of the sacrifices of their time and money because of their convictions. I believe that on this occasion, we must also pay tribute to them, and be inspired by them.

The movement of solidarity with the South African people has a long history.

The Pan African Movement - at its very inception here in London in 1900 - called for international support to the rights and aspirations of the African people of South Africa.

The Indian National Congress proclaimed its solidarity long before the Indian Government raised the South African problem in international forums in 1946.

Freedom in South Africa was a major concern of the Garvey movement in the United States and the Caribbean in the 1920s. The struggle in South Africa was the foremost concern of the International Committee, later renamed Council on African Affairs, established by Paul Robeson in 1937, until it was paralysed during the cold war in 1951.

One can cite many other antecedents to the Anti-Apartheid Movement - most notably the Defence and Aid Fund led by the Reverend Canon L. John Collins, and the tireless labours of people like Lord Fenner Brockway.

But I believe that the Anti-Apartheid Movement, relatively young as it is, has had a special role. Its experience in Britain, as well as the experiences of similar movements which developed in many other countries, provide useful lessons for future action.

Twenty Years of Struggle

I would like to recall briefly the situation in 1959 when this movement was launched.

It was a time when the liberation movement - after the Defiance Campaign, the Congress of the People, the Women's anti-pass agitation and the resistance against forced removals - was subjected to severe repression through the notorious Treason Trial and the banning orders under the so-called Suppression of Communism Act.

The liberation movement had spread throughout the country, in the cities as well as the reserves, and had earned the right to recognition as the authentic representative of the people. But the apartheid regime was determined to stifle it by repression, and disorganise the people through the creation of so-called homelands under headmen and chiefs.

At the same time, driven by cold war calculations, the major Western Powers had reinforced their links with the apartheid regime. The Simonstown Agreements had been concluded only a few years earlier. The Western media had constantly tried to libel the liberation movement with the communist label.

It was in that context that the liberation movement appealed for support of decent men and women abroad - particularly to deprive the apartheid regime of its external support.

The sanctions resolutions of the Conferences of Independent African States and the Conferences of African peoples organised by the late Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, were the African response.

The Anti-Apartheid Movement here, with its boycott campaign, was the response in the West, and it helped establish anti-apartheid and solidarity groups in many other countries.

The response from the United Nations was to come soon - with the 1962 General Assembly resolution on sanctions, which established the Special Committee against Apartheid.

The sanctions campaign was thus launched at a time when the liberation movement was obliged by the apartheid regime to take the fateful decision to go beyond non-violent and legal struggle.

Today, twenty years later, we face a new situation, after the tremendous escalation of repression and resistance. Will the international community enable the liberation movements of southern Africa to destroy the racist regimes and emancipate

the whole of the African continent - or will external forces allow the apartheid regime to bring about a wider conflict?

The new stage of the crisis in southern Africa, and of the liberation struggle, requires new strategies.

The United Nations and its Special Committee have called for an international mobilisation against apartheid - to isolate the apartheid regime and to lend full support to the national liberation movement, so that apartheid can be destroyed and the threat to the peace averted. They have made this call after consultation with the anti-apartheid movement and other public organisations.

In the past twenty years, as the solidarity movement developed at the governmental and non-governmental level, the situation in South Africa itself has grown from bad to worse.

There has been a great intensification of racist domination; the establishment of bantustans; a series of obnoxious repressive laws; the massacres of Sharpeville and Soweto; the executions of patriots from Vuyisile Mini to Solomon Mahlangu; and the tortures and killings of eminent leaders in detention.

There has been a tremendous military build-up, accompanied by numerous acts of aggression against independent African States. There is now the imminent danger of acquisition of nuclear capability by the apartheid regime.

Some people tend to feel despondent that the solidarity activities have been in vain. I believe that is very wrong. We should not underestimate the tremendous victories of the international campaign against apartheid.

The unanimous condemnation of apartheid by the international community - however hypocritical or superficial in the case of some - is of no small significance.

The arms embargo against South Africa, the funds for assistance to the oppressed people and the international convention against apartheid have hardly any precedents in history.

Here, in the United Kingdom, the abrogation of the Simonstown Agreements - essentially because of public pressure - was not an insignificant achievement.

I see the "Muldergate scandal", above all, as a tribute to the international campaign, and a sign of decadence in the apartheid regime.

We must recognise the growth of the anti-apartheid forces in the past twenty years and their potential strength if they are mobilised and concerted. Africa is no more a colonial preserve.

The climate in Western European countries is very different from that in 1959 when they were still fighting colonial wars or had not become reconciled to the loss of colonies.

Even the major Western Powers are conscious that their economic interests in independent Africa are more important than their stake in apartheid.

I do not ignore the danger ahead.

Ever since the debacle of the apartheid regime and the Western secret services in Angola, and especially since the

Soweto massacre, there have been frantic attempts to stem the tide of revolution in southern Africa. The recent trends in some Western countries, and the resurgence of racist lobbies, are certainly a cause for concern.

It seems that some powerful politicians here and in the United States would like to hitch the future of their countries to the fortunes of the apartheid regime, and violate solemn commitments in the United Nations.

We must, of course, persist in our efforts to persuade everyone to join the campaign against apartheid.

But the struggle for liberation cannot wait until all the racists, the militarists and the profiteers from apartheid see the light. The anti-apartheid forces must be mobilised to block the overt and covert alliances with apartheid.

Public opinion in the Western countries must be made aware that the forces which seek to cement links with apartheid are a menace to the future of their own countries. They endanger the survival of the Commonwealth, weaken the United Nations, risk the growing economic relations with African countries and create a gulf between their countries and vast regions of the world.

They are also building a Frankenstein which may well become a menace to themselves, as Nazism was exactly forty years ago.

New Strategies

Twenty years is a short time, but these past twenty years have been too long a time for the oppressed people of South Africa to suffer increasing tyranny while other African countries became free. It is too long a time for the non-fulfilment of the decisions of the United Nations.

But perhaps no time is lost. Twenty or thirty years ago, the African people asked for little more than consultation by their rulers, the abrogation of some racist laws, and the beginnings of a move towards democracy.

Today, they are struggling for much more - the total destruction of the apartheid system and the transfer of power to the people.

The time lost will be made up in the speed and extent of transformation of the South African society.

Solomon Mahlangu, who was born around the same time as the Anti-Apartheid Movement, has become symbolic of the spirit of the liberation movement today. His last testament calls on us to rally all the potential strength of anti-apartheid forces - among the governments, in the trade unions and churches, in the campuses, among the communities of African origin all over the world - and wield it for a decisive confrontation with apartheid and its allies.

The United Nations, the OAU and the anti-apartheid movements will need to retool their strategies and structures, in cooperation with the liberation movements, for this international mobilisation against apartheid.

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP AMBROSE REEVES⁹

I consider it a special privilege to come here to join in the tributes to Bishop Ambrose Reeves - and to Mrs. Reeves - and to bring to them and all their friends greetings from the United Nations.

Throughout his life, Bishop Reeves personified the principles of the United Nations.

I refer not only to his rejection of apartheid, but also to his concern for the underprivileged in this country and for peace in Vietnam.

I do not know if it was a mere coincidence that Ambrose Reeves became the bishop of Johannesburg when the liberation movement decided on a positive action programme for freedom.

After the Sharpeville massacre - when the liberation movement decided to send its representatives abroad - I wonder who persuaded the apartheid regime to deport Bishop Reeves so that he could assist them with all his vigour in promoting international action against apartheid.

But it was no accident that at a critical time in October 1963 - soon after Nelson Mandela and others were charged in the Rivonia trial - Bishop Reeves visited the United Nations as the first "petitioner" in the General Assembly against apartheid. That was the year when the United Nations established a Special Committee against Apartheid and assigned me as its secretary. That was the year of the appeal of Chief Lutuli to the conscience of the world.

Bishop Reeves came to the United Nations to make a magnificent response on behalf of the men and women of conscience around the world - to denounce the hypocrisy of the collaborators with apartheid and to call for the solidarity of the international community with the oppressed people of South Africa.

The Special Committee and I had the great privilege to honour Bishop Reeves and Oliver Tambo at the

⁹ Speech at meeting on the 80th birthday of Bishop Reeves, Ambassador Hotel, London, December 10, 1979.

United Nations Headquarters - the first time a "petitioner" and a leader of a liberation movement were so honoured.

That, indeed, was the beginning of the formal recognition of African liberation movements by the United Nations - and of our long and fruitful association with Bishop Reeves and the British Anti-Apartheid Movement.

This observance is taking place most appropriately on Human Rights Day - a day which has a very special significance to South Africa, to Bishop Reeves and to the United Nations.

I have the great privilege to convey to you the greetings from the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and the presidents of three United Nations bodies on southern Africa.

ARMED RESISTANCE IN SOUTH AFRICA¹⁰

One of the most significant developments in South Africa - and the least reported in the world press - is the growth of armed resistance by the national liberation movement since 1977.

A series of skirmishes have taken place in the border regions between the freedom fighters and the South African security forces. There have been many armed attacks against police stations, Security Police and informers in South Africa. South African police have announced the discovery of tens of arms caches at widely separated locations, indicating that the movement has succeeded in infiltrating large numbers of freedom fighters and considerable quantities of arms.

Though evidence of growing armed resistance is available from South African press reports and the proceedings of a number of political trials, the international press has only briefly reported a few incidents. It continues to convey the impression that the South African regime has succeeded in stabilising the situation after the uprising in Soweto and its aftermath - as it presumably did after the Sharpeville massacre two decades ago. This picture, of course, facilitates renewed foreign investment in South Africa which has rapidly increased after the interregnum following the Soweto massacre.

Admissions by the South African Regime

The South African regime itself does not minimise the seriousness of the situation, though it seeks to avert panic by persuading its supporters that its police are capable of dealing with it. It has taken extraordinary measures to counter the growing threat.

Brigadier C.F. Zietsman, Chief of Security Police, told the press on April 16, 1978, that police manning the "steel ring", which had been instituted on the borders in 1977, had been involved in several gun battles with ANC "terrorists" attempting to infiltrate the country from bases in Mozambique. He

2. Paper prepared for the Anti-Apartheid Movement in May 1980.

said: "The ANC is attempting to smuggle people into the large cities for urban terrorism while keeping up running attacks on the border to pin our manpower down."

J.T. Kruger, then Minister of Police, told the House of Assembly on May 12, 1978 that there had been 31 cases of sabotage in which 6 people had died and 41 injured. Ninety-one "trained terrorists" and 594 "untrained terrorists" had been arrested: 66 cases were before the courts under the Terrorism Act. He could not be expected, he said, to listen to essays on human rights while "terrorist bombs" were exploding in South African cities.

Brigadier Zietsman said in an interview on June 1, 1978, that an estimated 4000 black South Africans were undergoing military training in Angola, Libya, Tanzania and Mozambique.

Colonel H. Mulder, head of Johannesburg Security Police, warned on June 21, 1978, that South Africa was in a "virtual state of war".

Mr. Kruger said in May 1979 that 26 caches of weapons had been seized in the northern and eastern Transvaal alone.

Speaking in Potchefstroom on October 10, 1979, the new Minister of Police and Prisons, Louis le Grange, said that the South African Police had found large quantities of Russian and Czechoslovak arms and ammunition in the country. He said the ANC's activities during the past few years had been marked by an increase in the number of arms caches along and just inside South Africa's borders.

A New Stage of Struggle

It appears that this armed resistance has been carefully planned by the national liberation movement for several years, even before the liberation of Mozambique and Angola in 1975-76. The Soweto massacre, and the national uprising which followed, not only created a new situation in South Africa but led to the swelling of the ranks of freedom fighters by large numbers of youth. The resistance greatly increased since the end of 1977 when the first detachments of new recruits completed training and began to return to South Africa.

The armed resistance is clearly under the direction of the national liberation movement. The black

consciousness movement and other groups, though they have played and continue to play an important role in the political struggle, seem to recognise that armed resistance can only be conducted by national liberation movements.

Available evidence also indicates that the armed resistance is almost wholly by the ANC and its military wing, *Umkhonto We Sizwe* ("Spear of the Nation").

The current resistance is, moreover, of different character from that of 1961-64 when there were hundreds of cases of sabotage and violence.

In the earlier period, South Africa was surrounded by colonial territories. The national liberation movement had little experience in clandestine activity. It had been legal until 1960 with large and open membership, as well as a long tradition of non-violence. There was no independent State on the borders of South Africa and the militants had little training. The regime resorted to mass arrests and ruthless torture of known supporters of the movement, in order to extricate information and suppress the resistance. Some members of the movement turned out to be informers and several succumbed to torture.

In the present phase, however, the resistance is led by well-trained freedom fighters who have apparently been carefully screened. The statements of the South African Police indicate that they are well armed - mainly with arms of Soviet and Czechoslovak origin - and that the bombs they have manufactured, presumably inside South Africa, are highly sophisticated. In many cases, the police have been unable to capture the freedom fighters in spite of all efforts. Few of those captured appear to have turned informers.

Equally important is the difference in the international context of the struggle. Since 1961, there have been momentous developments in Africa. Not only have most African countries become independent - three of them on the borders of South Africa by armed struggle - but have established an Organisation of African Unity with a commitment to the support of liberation movements for the total emancipation of the African continent.

The United Nations and the international community have recognised the legitimacy of the struggle of

the national liberation movement of South Africa, including armed struggle, and called for the treatment of captured guerillas as "prisoners-of-war". While the Western Powers continue to provide strong support to the apartheid regime, they have become increasingly vulnerable to pressures by African and other States which recognise the liberation of Africa as a matter of national priority.

Counter Measures by the Government

Faced with this resistance, the South African regime has embarked on a number of measures to counter the growing threat.

On July 13, 1977, it announced that police from all parts of the country would be called up for border duty, in order to ensure intensive patrolling of the entire 2,000 km. border with Botswana, Rhodesia, Mozambique and Swaziland. This step was taken to prevent people leaving illegally for military training and to prevent further infiltration of people who had left for training after the Soweto massacre.

P.W. Botha, then Minister of Defence, told Parliament on March 28, 1978, that a 600 km. strip up to 10 km. wide along South Africa's border had been secured for the country's defence and for the prevention and suppression of "terrorism." Speaking during the second reading debate on the Defence Amendment Bill, Mr. Botha said that although the legislation was being introduced only then, the Defence Force had been carrying out the operation since January 1977.

The biggest military exercise ever undertaken by the South African Defence Force - Operation Quicksilver - was staged from May 2, 1978, on the border with Mozambique and Swaziland.

A new air base was inaugurated on July 2, 1978, at Hoedspruit in eastern Transvaal, 50 km. from Mozambique and 150 km. south of the Rhodesian border. Mirage fighters were stationed in the base.

This base, the tenth belonging to the South African Air Force, was described by Mr. Botha as an "extraordinary" achievement. He said there were plans during the coming two years to enlarge and develop the base.

In November 1978, another South African air base was opened at Madimbo in Venda, northern Transvaal, a bantustan which was to be granted "independence" in 1979.

In 1978, the government established a committee to investigate proposals to stop the depopulation of border areas. It includes representatives of the Departments of Agriculture, Defence, Planning and Statistics, the Police, and the South African Agricultural Union.

Kobie Coetzee, Deputy Minister of Defence, told the Senate on March 2, 1979, that the government intended to establish Kibbutz-type farms on the borders as a security measure. The State would buy farms and lease them to prospective farmers who had military training and undertook to become farmer-soldiers. Small defensible towns would be established on the borders and those towns may be used by the Defence Force as military bases.

A Marnet (Military Area Radio Network) was established by the Army in early 1979 in the northern Transvaal for communications linking the armed forces, police reservists, commando units, civil defence units and farmers. The system is to be extended to other border areas. *U.S. News and World Report* reported from Pretoria on March 17, 1980:

"The escalation in terrorism has forced officials in the capital of Pretoria to order the mainly white army onto a war footing for the first time in the confrontation between blacks and whites.

"Some rural areas already resemble battle zones, just as did regions in neighbouring Rhodesia at the height of that country's civil war.

"Schools in the Middelburg area, 100 miles east of Johannesburg, have been issued sandbags. In northern Natal Province, close to the border with Mozambique, farmers carry weapons wherever they go and keep in contact with each other by radio. Police stations on the isolated frontier with Botswana have been attacked, and many farms in the region have been deserted by whites fearful of guerilla raids.

"Even in the cities, black terrorism has become a fact of life, particularly in the Pretoria-Johannesburg area.

"Additionally, the country's wide-open borders are being strengthened by a new network of military-designed roads. A thick fence of sisal plants is being grown along a 100-mile stretch of the boundary with Rhodesia to block infiltration. The Army also has moved into the Kruger National Game Park, which runs for 200 miles along the eastern border with Mozambique.

"On the drawing boards is a sizeable expansion of South Africa's standing Army of 48,500, about 70 per cent of them draftees. The increase probably will be achieved by inducting more non-whites, who now make up less than 5 per cent of the total men under arms. Overall strength of the SADF is 63,250, up 25 per cent from 1975. Active reservists number about 280,000, almost all white."

The Perspective

In the aftermath of the Sharpeville massacre, the national liberation movement decided to give up its strict adherence to non-violence, and declared that the regime could not be allowed to engage in violence without fear of retaliation. While "retaliation" may well be the short-term objective of the national liberation movement, the present resistance appears to be tied in with a longer-term strategy for "seizure of power."

On present evidence, the perspective would seem to be an escalation of infiltration of freedom fighters, establishment of arms caches inside South Africa, training of freedom fighters inside the country and a combination of armed resistance with struggles by workers, students and others.

The link between political struggle and armed struggle is clearly seen in the timing of guerilla operations demanding the release of Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu when a national campaign for their release was in progress. The massive public support among blacks for the guerillas killed at Silverton shows that the primary condition for the development of guerilla warfare - that is, public support - exists at the present time.

It may be expected that appropriate guerilla activities will be linked with struggles of workers and designed to force disengagement of foreign economic interests with South Africa.

Contrary to the propaganda of the South African regime, the national liberation movement is not involved in "urban terrorism." The incidents are as much in rural areas as in large urban centres. A number of incidents in urban areas took place when freedom fighters were apprehended as they were in transit.

Equally contrary to the propaganda by the Pretoria regime, the conflict is not on the borders with the independent African States with guerilla groups hitting at South African security forces and finding sanctuary, when required, in African States. It is inside South Africa, with incidents on the borders taking place only when small groups of infiltrators are attacked by the Security Forces.

The reaction of the South African regime, however, seems to be to threaten independent African States in order to pressure them to deny asylum to refugees and to prevent any transit of freedom fighters.

The large-scale counter-measures taken by it are focused not only on preventing infiltration through the international borders but at preparation for a "conventional war." "Operation Quicksilver" is illustrative.

These measures are coupled with the continuation of repression in South Africa, as well as "reforms" to divide the black people and entice a section into collaboration. These reforms have been encouraged and pressed by the military establishment which considers that military measures alone would be ineffective and costly.

The South African regime is also pressing its scheme for a "constellation of States" in southern Africa in order to integrate the bantustans fully into its military plans and to induce the neighbouring States to abandon their support to the national liberation movement.

The question arises as to whether the South African regime intends to use its military power against the neighbouring States in the hope of preventing them from providing sanctuary to freedom fighters and refugees, or to transform a war against guerillas

into a conventional war against States in the region.

The defence of the frontline States will, therefore, need to be recognised as an indispensable complement to support for the national liberation movement.

Moreover, in the context of the enormous military build-up of South Africa, and its nuclear capability, there exists a grave danger to international peace which requires effective international action.

Meanwhile, inside South Africa itself, the prospect is a further escalation of repression in response to the growing resistance, as well as the capture of increasing numbers of freedom fighters.

The campaign for the release of South African political prisoners will need to acquaint world public opinion with the new trends. Its effectiveness will depend, in part, on convincing people of the implications of the recognition by the United Nations and the international community of the legitimacy of the struggle of the South African people, under the leadership of their national liberation movement, to eradicate apartheid, to seize power and to enable *all* the people of South Africa to exercise their right of self-determination. There will need to be awareness that despite all the precautions by freedom fighters, some innocents may suffer in the confrontations between them and the security forces.

The demand for the treatment of captured freedom fighters as prisoners of war, in terms of the relevant Geneva Conventions assumes particular importance.

WOMEN AND APARTHEID¹¹

We must recognise, first of all, that the black women of South Africa have not been discriminated and oppressed by black men but by the apartheid system, by the white minority in power which is poisoned by that system.

In saying this, I am in no way idolising or glorifying tribalism and traditionalism but merely analysing the present situation.

It is not black men who deprive the black women of education, of health care and of family life. It is not the black men who confine the women to barren reserves, who cause enormous illegitimacy rates.

It is the apartheid system and not the black men who have enforced the Natal Code which treats African women as children - just as women were treated in European codes some generations ago.

It is not the black men who have repressed women's movements, who have made "widows" of hundreds of thousands of women whose husbands are confined in mine compounds and so-called single men's hostels for migrant labour, or have been jailed and tortured for their opposition to apartheid.

Apartheid is an anachronistic and totally reactionary system which pervades all areas of life. The test of reaction in all societies is, indeed, the treatment of its women. Apartheid is perhaps the worst.

Under apartheid, all women are discriminated against. There is a gradation, with the white men at the top and the African women at the bottom - with the African women earning no more than 8 per cent of the wages of white men.

So the women in South Africa understand that their struggle is not against their men, who are

¹¹ Statement at public meeting in Montreal in connection with Seminar on Women and Apartheid, 10 May 1980

themselves oppressed and helpless, but against the system.

It is not a women's problem but a problem of the destruction of an antediluvian and oppressive system, which regards black men as beasts of labour and black women as "superfluous appendages." It is part of a national and socio-economic revolution in southern Africa, to destroy slavery and neo-slavery, and create conditions in which human equality can be established.

Women have played an important role in all African liberation struggles, but perhaps nowhere have they played as important a role as in South Africa over the past many decades. They have fought not only because they are brutally oppressed, but for their children, for the integrity of their families.

Women have contributed scores of effective leaders of the trade union movement and the liberation movement. They have been great organisers of the people. Many of them have suffered harassment and brutal torture, but did not succumb. They have been an inspiration to their men and to their children.

Western Responsibility

There are many cases of discrimination and oppression in the world and one might wonder why the people of Montreal, of Canada and of North America should be concerned about oppression in distant lands - in South Africa and Namibia.

I will try to attempt to provide a few answers.

First of all, the continent of Africa has suffered many centuries of slavery, mass killings, plunder, and humiliation - largely at the hands of European and North American interests.

In our time, the African people have struggled at great sacrifice to regain their dignity and their rights.

Most of Africa has today achieved independence - except for South Africa and Namibia.

The unfinished struggle today is not only for the liberation of two territories but for the

emancipation of the African continent – and, indeed, for burying a shameful era of world history.

Secondly, the Western countries bear a tremendous responsibility for the situation in South Africa and Namibia – and therefore, for facilitating the elimination of the apartheid system without massive bloodshed and suffering.

They have been constantly reminded of this responsibility by the national liberation movement of South Africa, by the African States and by the United Nations.

I would like to express my appreciation to the Government and people of Canada for recognising the international responsibility for the situation in South Africa, and for taking a number of concrete measures.

But there is much more that Canada can do and should do – both as a member of the Western community and as a nation – and there is much more others can do.

Only recently, we have had disclosures that a company which is located a few miles from here – on both sides of the border with the United States – the Space Research Corporation – has shipped tens of thousands of shells to South Africa. It had, in fact, supplied a powerful artillery system to South Africa.

The South African regime announced a few months ago that it had developed a 155 mm. artillery piece – and there is no doubt that it was obtained from the Space Research Corporation. A few days ago, the South African Prime Minister announced that they have an artillery rocket system.

South Africa is not so far from Montreal!

Is there any doubt that this artillery system is intended to massacre black South Africans, to attack independent African States and even to kill helpless refugees?

Yet, there is not an outcry from the outraged conscience of the people of Canada and the United States of America.

The people and nations of the world have, as a minimum, a duty to refrain from any assistance to the oppressive regime in South Africa – a duty to

end all military, political, economic and other collaboration with that regime. They have a duty to stop supplying murderous weapons and nuclear technology to South Africa; to stop smuggling petroleum to oil its war machine; and to impose sanctions against South Africa.

Even that minimum duty has not been discharged.

Action by Women's Organisations

As I have said, I do not regard the problem of women and children in South Africa as a matter of concern to women or women's organisations alone. But there was reason to hope that the recent rise of consciousness of women, especially in the Western countries, would help the oppressed women in southern Africa.

The World Conference of Women, held in Mexico in 1975, called for solidarity with women under apartheid. But the results have been disappointing.

The women and their organisations have not fully recognised that their own struggles for equality cannot be fully just unless they help the liberation of women in southern Africa.

At the turn of the century, the Afrikaner people of South Africa fought heroically against the British for their own freedom, but the result has been a consolidation of the freedom of whites to oppress and exploit the black majority.

The struggle of women in the West cannot be for an equal sharing with men of the benefits from the oppression and exploitation of the black people of South Africa. Let them call on their Governments to boycott South Africa - let them boycott the gold and diamonds of South Africa which are produced by slave labour!

I would like to make a special appeal to women and women's organisations to consider special programmes of solidarity with the women of South Africa.

The simplest thing perhaps is to write letters and send greeting cards to women in restriction and to the dependants of prisoners who are isolated and constantly harassed. These letters and cards mean much to them.

A few days ago in Paris, I met a French woman¹² who was imprisoned with her husband in South Africa on the charge of assisting freedom fighters. She was detained for several months, although she was pregnant, and then released, but her husband was sentenced to twelve years in prison. She was not even allowed to go to South Africa to visit her husband in prison.

In Christmas 1978, she received some 600 cards and letters – mostly from Canada, because of the efforts of an organisation in Montreal – and she told me how much they meant to her and to her husband in jail.

Fortunately, her husband was able to escape from prison last December with the assistance of the underground movement.

I would suggest to you to adopt and assist women in jail or restriction or women dependants or widows of prisoners, and the women's sections of liberation movements.

You can assist the liberation movement projects for refugees – such as clinics and crèches. You can help meet the urgent and special needs of women and children in the refugee camps – school books, footballs, sewing machines and the like.

But above all, I would appeal to you to provide all the political support needed by the women of South Africa and Namibia to destroy apartheid.

¹² Mme. Moumbaris

ROLE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS IN PROMOTING SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA¹³

There is hardly any need in this forum to discuss the so-called pros and cons of sanctions or the various diversions from the basic issues of liberation. It is more than twenty years since the national liberation movement of South Africa appealed to the world for sanctions against the racist regime. It is more than twenty years since anti-apartheid movements were formed in response to that appeal. It is 18 years since the General Assembly of the United Nations called by a large majority for individual and collective sanctions - and set up the Special Committee against Apartheid to promote action. Already in April 1964, the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa - organised in London by the British Anti-Apartheid Movement and others - proved conclusively that sanctions were feasible, effective and essential. What has been lacking has been the *will* of certain governments and economic and other interests to cease collaborating with the apartheid regime. Constantly they find excuses to oppose or delay sanctions against South Africa. When some partial measures are adopted by the United Nations - measures like the arms embargo - they find means to evade such measures. To quote a former Chairman of the Special Committee:

"One wonders if the South African regime is a very favourite illegitimate child of the West - a love child - which is always protected, even if somewhat surreptitiously."

Sanctions Frustrated

The Charter of the United Nations solemnly signed in San Francisco thirty-five years ago, cries out for sanctions against the South African regime.

After scores of attacks by the South African regime against other States, after an increase in the South African military budget by 5000 per cent, who can honestly deny that there is a threat to the peace - indeed a breach of the peace - in southern Africa?

After the Sharpeville massacre, the Soweto massacre, and the recent killings of school children, who can deny that there is a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter which must outrage world conscience?

Yet, there are no sanctions against South Africa.

Governments which have imposed sanctions against other countries, often without any United Nations decision, tell us that they cannot support sanctions against South Africa because sanctions are ineffective and have always failed - ever since the Italian invasion of Ethiopia and even the Napoleonic wars.

When a mandatory arms embargo has been imposed against South Africa, when the oil producing countries have prohibited supply of oil to South Africa, we hear reports of a conspiracy, masterminded by South Africans and involving companies from many countries, to keep South Africa supplied by the black market

This black market, which represents an international threat, operates without the slightest interference by the intelligence services of major Powers which protest their abhorrence of apartheid and their love of peace.

Role of Non-governmental Organisations

The problem today is not only the liberation of South Africa and Namibia.

The situation has developed to a stage where South Africa has tried physical occupation of the territory of Zambia and Angola.

What is at stake is a programme by South Africa to undo the liberation of frontline States and establish a so-called "constellation of States" under its hegemony.

¹³ Statement at the International NGO Action Conference for Sanctions against South Africa, Geneva, June 30, 1980

What is at stake is the enormous danger of a racist regime - which has defied scores of resolutions of the United Nations - wielding a nuclear bomb to reinforce its defiance of the world.

What can we expect from the Western States and the peoples of those countries in this situation? Part of the answer must come from the anti-apartheid movements and other non-governmental organisations.

Sanctions against South Africa are not a matter for governments alone or for the United Nations alone.

They are a matter for everyone committed to solidarity with the struggle for liberation in southern Africa.

Non-governmental organisations have played an important role through consumer boycotts which develop public consciousness.

They have mobilised the people in various countries in support of sanctions so that several of the smaller Western countries are now, in principle, in favour of sanctions.

They have also played a very important role in policing the implementation of measures already announced by governments - performing a role which the governments concerned have failed to do.

I would like here to pay tribute to organisations and the media which have exposed blatant violations of resolutions against South Africa.

Three Lines of Action

I would say that there are three ways in which sanctions will come about.

They can come by a vote of the United Nations Security Council. But it is clear that there is no prospect at present of such mandatory sanctions.

During this month, on two occasions - in connection with the killings of school children and the aggression against Angola - the African States proposed in the Security Council some modest measures to strengthen the implementation of the arms embargo and the imposition of an oil embargo. On both occasions, these proposals had to be dropped - even without being tabled in the Security Council - because of the strong resistance of the Western Powers.

Because of this resistance, the alternative is to develop a powerful public movement for sanctions, especially in the major Western countries, in close cooperation with OAU and Non-aligned countries, and the Socialist States.

That, as I see it, is the purpose of this Conference.

There is, of course, a third way - and that is for the people of South Africa and their national liberation movement to force sanctions by their own struggle.

You may remember that the national uprisings after the Sharpeville massacre and the Soweto massacre forced a flight of capital from South Africa.

In recent consultations with certain Western governments, I find that no development had greater effect in promoting positive thinking than the attack by freedom fighters against the SASOL installations last month.

All these three ways are interlinked, and we should view them in perspective.

The topmost priority should, of course, be for the strengthening and full implementation of the arms embargo, and an end to nuclear collaboration with South Africa.

An oil embargo has now become crucial as an indispensable complement to the arms embargo.

At the same time, attention will need to be given to a number of other aspects in a comprehensive programme.

For instance, the increasing import of coal from South Africa, even by the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, which are major producers of coal, calls for urgent action.

I will not make a catalogue of these issues as relevant papers are before the Conference and we will have an opportunity to discuss and consult in the Commissions and in group meetings.

I would, however, like to make special reference to the need for consultation on co-ordination of campaigns for sanctions.

Many national campaigns - for instance, the campaign on the oil embargo in the Netherlands - need to be internationalised.

Cooperation of Governments and Non-governmental Organisations

In conclusion, I would like to thank the NGO Sub-Committee for its initiative in organising this Conference and to express my delight that this Conference is being presided by you, Mr. Sean MacBride, whose activity in the struggle for liberation of peoples covers a span of more than half a century - even before the Anti-Imperialist Conference of Brussels in 1929.

I have always felt that we should not draw a rigid distinction between NGOs and Governments and inter-governmental organisations. In fact, close cooperation among committed NGOs, UN and OAU, as well as individual governments, has become crucial in the struggle against apartheid.

We are all born non-governmental and most of us die non-governmental.

The life of Sean MacBride has covered both governmental and non-governmental responsibilities, and I am sure his guidance at this Conference will be of great value.

TRIBUTE TO DR W.E.B. DUBOIS¹⁴

I was particularly happy to accept the invitation to participate in this ceremony because Dr. W.E.B. DuBois—and his colleagues and friends, Paul Robeson and Alpheus Hunton—had a great influence on my own life and my career in the United Nations.

I met those great men in 1946, as a young student from a colonial country, at a small gathering to welcome a delegation of the African National Congress of South Africa and to plan a demonstration in front of the South African Consulate-General in New York to protest against racism in South Africa and the massacre of Africans during the historic African mineworkers' strike. I became concerned with African freedom movements as an extension of the freedom movement in my own country. Since I joined the United Nations Secretariat in May 1949, most of my work has been with African liberation. I still draw inspiration and guidance from the works of Dr. DuBois. I had, of course, known of Dr. DuBois even before 1946—as one of those Americans who supported our own freedom struggle.

It was my privilege many years later, in 1977, to accompany the officers of the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid to Accra to pay tribute to the late Dr. W.E.B. DuBois at his grave—and in February 1978, to organise, for the Special Committee, an international tribute to Dr. DuBois at the United Nations Headquarters.

The *Encyclopaedia Africana*, a cherished dream of Dr. DuBois, is now being published in Ghana.

The UNESCO is bringing out volumes of the history of Africa, inspired largely by the pioneering work of Dr. DuBois on African history. The UNESCO and the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid are now planning a project to promote the preparation of an objective history of southern Africa from the point of view of the indigenous African people rather than a travesty of history beginning with the arrival of white settlers in the seventeenth century.

For us, Dr. DuBois was not a dissenter, or a representative of a minority community, but the spokesman of the great majority of humanity, and his vision is being fulfilled in our time.

I would not venture to add to what the distinguished panelists have to say on Dr. DuBois and Africa—his pioneering work on the history of Africa, his influence on the national leaders of Africa, his leadership of the Pan African movement and his tremendous contribution to the dignity and freedom of Africa. But I would like to remind you that it would be a mistake to see Dr. DuBois mainly in the black context or in the African context in the narrow sense. Dr. DuBois belongs today not to the blacks of America alone, nor to Africa and people of African origin—but to humanity, as one of the beacon lights for building a new world.

To the extent that the African people and the people of African origin were the most oppressed and humiliated, their liberation will mean not some "reverse discrimination" but the true liberation of all mankind so that history will cease to be a catalogue of oppression of one segment of humanity by another. It is in that context that the struggle of the African people and people of African origin assumes tremendous significance.

¹⁴ Statement in the Panel at the Dedication of the Papers of Dr. DuBois, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, September 19, 1980

The historic time has come at last for victory in the struggle to destroy racist domination in South Africa and Namibia, to complete the emancipation of Africa, to break the colour line and build a common humanity. The last stage of a struggle is never easy—but what was a distant vision of Dr. DuBois in 1900 is today a realistic goal and an imperative duty.

This archive cannot be a morgue or a museum or a collection of memorabilia. It contains precious documents of a revolution which is not yet completed—a revolution to end racism, oppression and exploitation, and to build a new international economic and social order. It must be and can be a source of reference and inspiration to those engaged in the struggle for redemption.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SOUTH AFRICAN STRUGGLE¹⁵

The struggles for independence have an impact far beyond the borders and shores of the countries directly involved. In my country, in my own childhood, we were greatly inspired by the Irish struggle and learnt from that struggle. I mention this particularly because the struggle for freedom in South Africa is one which had a tremendous international impact.

Next year it will be one hundred years since the first modern political organisation of Africans was established in South Africa— and seventy years since the African National Congress was founded.

The ANC is perhaps the oldest liberation movement in Africa and a movement with an inspiring history of sacrifice, statesmanship and heroism.

The ANC inspired the establishment of liberation movements in many other African States. It had a tremendous impact on India through Mahatma Gandhi and later on the struggle of the black people in the United States of America.

It has given birth to anti-apartheid movements which have become an important moral force in the world. Many leaders, especially in Western countries, have had their early training in these movements. Hundreds and thousands of people have risked their limbs and their liberty to express solidarity with the African people of South Africa—as has happened only a few weeks ago in New Zealand—because the struggle of the African people involves great moral issues and has been a great moral struggle.

The struggle in South Africa has a long history. The movement of solidarity with that struggle too has a long history. Massacres of Africans have a long history—long before Sharpeville and Soweto.

Twenty years ago, on December 11, 1961, the world recognised the righteousness of the struggle of the African people and its contribution to the whole of Africa and the world, when Chief Albert Lutuli was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

Soon after, when the liberation movement felt obliged, in the face of inhuman terror, to give up its strict adherence to non-violence and embark on armed resistance, under the leadership of Nelson Mandela, the world has shown understanding. If there was any time in history when people were forced to take up arms to enforce peace, then this was it.

The struggle in South Africa is not a mere political conflict in one country. Apartheid is not and can never be politics. It is a crime. The issue is not political but deeply moral.

I am reminded that five hundred years ago—in 1482 to be precise—the Portuguese built a fort at Elmina in the Gold Coast, now Ghana—and the next year they began colonisation at the mouth of the Congo river.

These are some centenaries we will not celebrate, but we will not forget. For they began an era in world history—a shameful era of the rape of Africa, of murder, exploitation and humiliation of a great continent which gave birth to human civilisation. Tens of millions of human beings were killed in raids for slaves and in the mid-passage to the Western Hemisphere and whole areas of the continent depopulated. The end of slavery was soon followed by the cruel century of colonialism—especially after the Berlin Conference of 1884—and the institutionalisation of racism against the indigenous Africans in the form of apartheid.

What the people of South Africa and Namibia are fighting for—and what we are striving for in our movement for solidarity—is nothing less than the closing

¹⁵ Speech at the Conference on "The Case for Sanctions", Dublin, October 24, 1981

of this tragic chapter in human history and the building of a new world in which human beings are not tortured and humiliated because of the colour of their skin.

It is, therefore, not surprising at all that in this righteous and moral struggle, the churches and other religious bodies have an important role and that my good friend Father Austin Flannery has been leading the Anti-Apartheid Movement here. We wish there were many more like him.

It is not surprising at all that the trade union movement—a movement based on the principle of human equality—was among the first to support the call for sanctions against South Africa more than twenty years ago. The Irish trade union movement, I believe and hope, is accepting today's challenge, namely, that the trade union movement should play the leading role in imposing and implementing sanctions against South Africa.

MY LIFE AND WORK¹⁶

I would like to express my gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman,¹⁷ and the members of the Special Committee, for your very kind words on my appointment to the post of Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations.

I cannot find words to convey my feelings fully to the Special Committee and to you personally—but I hope you will bear with me if I use this opportunity to say a few words about my life and my work.

I was born in a colonial country—in fact the largest colonial country under the rule of the then mightiest colonial power. We suffered the humiliation of racism in my own country, though much less than the blacks have suffered in South Africa. To contribute to the eradication of racism and apartheid is, for me, not a job but a privilege, perhaps an irresistible passion.

So while I am immensely grateful to the Secretary-General for appointing me the Assistant Secretary-General for the Centre against Apartheid, it is not the title or what goes with it that is important but the responsibility.

I cannot forget that the post has been upgraded on the recommendation of the Special Committee in the belief that an upgrading was essential to enhance the effectiveness of the work of the United Nations against apartheid in this crucial period. That is a demand that does worry me, but I will try to meet the challenge, under your guidance.

As you know, the European settlement in South Africa began more than three centuries ago—as a mere way station, on the route of the colonialists to the riches of the Indies.

Long before I was born, the national movement of India began to support the oppressed people of South Africa—not only because people of Indian origin were humiliated in that country but also because our leaders recognised their international duty.

¹⁶ Statement at the meeting of the Special Committee against Apartheid on January 13, 1983, in response to congratulations on appointment as Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations

¹⁷ Alhaji Yusuff Maitama-Sule of Nigeria

I myself became involved in the struggle against the abomination of racism and colonialism at an early age.

My father was a follower of Mahatma Gandhi and courted imprisonment. I recall collecting money when I was only six or seven years old for Mahatma Gandhi's campaign to assist the so-called "untouchables". I rebelled against the caste system as a child.

In 1943 I happened to obtain and read a pamphlet by a leader of the liberation movement in South Africa who described how the gold of South Africa, instead of becoming a treasure of all the people, was used to tighten the shackles on the blacks. Around that time the African Youth League was formed in South Africa with a militant programme of action, and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru called on the people of Indian origin in Africa to identify themselves fully with the indigenous people. I developed an interest in South Africa and Africa.

In 1946, when I came to the United States as a student, I was overwhelmed by the affection of the black people and was able to learn more about Africa from the great black leaders. In that year, I met Dr. A.B. Xuma, President of the African National Congress of South Africa, attended the United Nations debates on South Africa and Namibia, and helped organise a demonstration to protest the killing of African mineworkers during the historic strike in South Africa. When I joined the United Nations Secretariat in 1949, my first assignment included South Africa. And since I was appointed principal secretary of the Special Committee on March 9, 1963, it has been my privilege to serve this Committee. I use the term privilege not as an expression of courtesy, but in its full meaning. In this Committee, I found representatives of governments who shared my convictions, and I have always found friendship and, indeed, affection.

Many kind words have been said about my work. I have, I believe, worked harder than I was required, and made some personal sacrifices. But they are nothing compared to the sacrifices of many friends in the anti-apartheid movements who have given up their careers, who have suffered injuries and imprisonment, and who have even risked their lives, not to speak of people in the liberation movement whom I have known—fine men and women who have been assassinated, tortured and imprisoned.

I was able to make a contribution, as a member of the Secretariat, especially to the recognition of the liberation movements; to the development of close relations with anti-apartheid and solidarity movements and other public organisations; and to assistance for the political prisoners and their families. I have made many friends, including many great men and women of our time.

I can look back at my career with great satisfaction.

What has been most satisfying to me was the fact that the Special Committee and I shared the same convictions. We have hated racism, but never the so-called races which are the oppressors. Mr. Chairman, you have stressed this again and again, with your deep religious conviction, even at this meeting. In all the numerous documents of this Committee or of the Centre, one can never find hatred of the whites of South Africa, or of the Afrikaners.

I have said that if only the Afrikaners will remove their blinkers and study their own history, they will understand and respect the struggle and sacrifice of Nelson Mandela and other leaders, and recognise that freedom and equality will inevitably triumph.

They lost 30,000 lives—of men, women and children—in the so-called Anglo-Boer war at the turn of the century. They were defeated in the battlefield but prevailed.

I firmly believe that something like the same will happen again in South Africa. As the apparent might of the regime and its aggressiveness have reached a climax, that is the beginning of the end of apartheid.

NO ONE CAN BE NEUTRAL ON APARTHEID¹⁸

That the World Peace Council has chosen to award me the medal named after Frederic Joliot-Curie can only be a token of friendship of its many eminent leaders whom I have known and respected, and **with** whom I have had occasion to co-operate in my official duties. The gesture of the World Peace Council, and the kind words spoken today about my own contribution, are indeed far too generous. But I am most gratified that this award is a recognition of the work of the Centre against **Apartheid** to which **all** its present and former staff have contributed, often at some sacrifice, because of their regard for the Special Committee, their commitment to non-racialism and their respect for the national liberation movement of South Africa.

The contribution of the Centre, within the structure of the United Nations, and under the guidance of the Secretary-General and the Special Committee, was possible because of the cooperation of numerous governments, national liberation movements, non-governmental organisations and individuals. I find it most appropriate, therefore, that this award is being made at a meeting of the Special Committee on its twentieth anniversary when we have the great pleasure of the participation of many guests. Our lives have coincided with the historic march of peoples of our two continents for liberation from colonial and racist domination. We have seen great struggles and great triumphs. We have looked forward to the dawn of a new world order. But this historic process, during which millions of people have given their lives, has been arrested, especially in southern Africa. The resurgence of racism in some parts of the world cannot be unrelated to the paralysis of our efforts and the dark clouds on the international horizon. There is a need for renewed determination to see that freedom is irreversible, that emancipation of Africa is soon completed and that a new era of world history is opened—an era of human equality and of genuine international cooperation. When we are committed to a cause, and there is no greater cause than the defence of the dignity of the human person, irrespective of so-called race or colour, it is not enough merely to affirm our support verbally. It is not even enough to demonstrate our conviction by individual action. The final test is whether we join with all those who are equally committed, in decisive action to ensure the triumph of justice.

At the behest of the Special Committee, the Centre against Apartheid has cooperated with numerous public organisations committed against apartheid irrespective of their ideological and other orientations so long as their commitment is sincere. We have tried constantly to promote concrete action by all such organisations. The World Peace Council has not only consistently and unconditionally cooperated with the Special Committee and the Centre against **Apartheid**, but through its President helped to bring together many other non-governmental organisations to join with the Special Committee in the international campaign against **apartheid**. For that we are grateful. In my work with this Special Committee since its inception, I have been inspired by the guidance I received from the late Secretary-General U Thant. I have acted on the assumption that no one, not least a servant of this Organisation, can be neutral on **apartheid**. I have felt that we must totally reject and hate racism without any equivocation and compromise, but we must never hate the communities which the racist doctrines have poisoned. I have in mind particularly the white people of South Africa, and especially the Afrikaner people of that country; they too have produced some of the great fighters for freedom.

While the oppressed people have every right to fight against oppression, by arms if they have no other choice, it is our task by international action to avert conflict and human suffering in the inevitable process of liberation. I have had no illusions about painless and swift victories.

I was most fortunate that the Special Committee, at its very inception, proclaimed its policy which I could fully share and respect. In attempting to obey fully the oath of my office, and at the same time to follow my convictions without succumbing to any pressures whatsoever, I found no contradiction. I can look back with

¹⁸ Speech at meeting of Special Committee against Apartheid on receipt of Frederic Joliot-Curie medal from the World Peace Council, March 30, 1983

satisfaction that I have made no enemies but numerous friends; that this Organisation has been very generous to me; and above all, that I could make some contribution to the cause of freedom. I am most grateful to the Secretariat and to the Secretary-General, to the Special Committee and its successive Chairmen and to all its friends. I have felt that I should say this, despite any impression of a lack of modesty, because I feel deeply the moral imperatives of the civil service. I believe that the civil service cannot be neutral on great human issues and that objectivity should not be allowed to degenerate into insensitivity. This is true, above all, of the international civil service bound by the principles of the United Nations Charter. Many of us owe our jobs, our advancement and our security - even our lives - to those who have struggled and sacrificed to end colonial domination and discrimination on the basis of race, colour, sex or creed. We have a duty to them. In the course of the past two decades, the Special Committee and the Centre have made many friends. Many of the great leaders of the movement for peace, including many of the laureates of the Nobel and Lenin Peace Prizes, have appeared before this Special Committee and cooperated with the Centre. I have known and been inspired by several of the great leaders and martyrs who are among the recipients of the Frederic Joliot-Curie medal, from the great Dr. W.E.B. DuBois who passed away twenty years ago, to Dr. Amilcar Cabral, the leader of liberation struggle and a dear friend of ours who was assassinated ten years ago. For my part, I can assure you and the Special Committee that this beautiful medal will only be a reminder to serve even better this Special Committee, this Organisation and the cause of freedom and peace in southern Africa.

SAVE THE LIVES OF FREEDOM FIGHTERS¹⁹

Today, on the anniversary of the execution of Solomon Mahlangu, a young freedom fighter, we not only pay tribute to his memory and to the memory of others who were executed. We are concerned about six other freedom fighters of the African National Congress who are in the death cells.

You have just seen, on film, the spirit of the freedom fighters and their families. They have knowingly and willingly risked their lives for the freedom of their people. They do not seek pity. They ask for solidarity not only for themselves but for their people.

The United Nations has condemned apartheid as a crime. It has demanded for more than thirty years that the authorities in South Africa abandon apartheid and seek a just solution based on consultations among the genuine representatives of all the people of South Africa. It has also declared that the struggle of the people of South Africa for freedom and human dignity is a legitimate struggle.

It is in the context of the consistent rejection by the South African regime of all appeals by the world, and its resort to increasing repression and indiscriminate killings, that we should view the current death sentences.

We ask for clemency to the six young men on humanitarian grounds. We also point out that they are not common criminals and that, even in the course of an armed struggle, they had taken care to avoid loss of life, as shown during the trials themselves. But the charges and trials are not the basic issue. There cannot be a just verdict or sentence under unjust laws in a system like apartheid which enshrined injustice.

In the course of the struggle for African freedom in our own lifetime, millions of lives have been lost. Many leaders of Africa have been assassinated, tortured to death and fallen in battle—leaders like Patrice Lumumba of the Congo, Eduardo Mondlane of Mozambique, Herbert Chitepo of Zimbabwe, Amilcar Cabral of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde and Steve Biko, Joe Gqabi, Ruth First, Neil Aggett and many others in South Africa. Their deaths have deprived Africa of precious leaders, but have not stopped the irresistible course of liberation.

We are entitled to ask whether the South African regime and the whites in South Africa are so blind as to think that more killings will stop the destruction of apartheid and the emergence of a democratic society.

In South Africa, on the one hand, you have a national liberation movement, supported and admired by the world, which has rejected racism despite all provocations, which has demonstrated respect for life, which has led great non-violent struggles and which, even when it felt obliged to embark on an armed struggle, took great care to avoid undue loss of life. Tens of thousands of black people paid tribute to Neil Aggett, a young white man who gave his life for his principles.

On the other hand, the authorities in Pretoria and their police have been responsible for numerous deaths—not only for the untold number of deaths from malnutrition and disease resulting from racism, but also for the massacres of unarmed demonstrators and the killings of detainees and even refugees in neighbouring States.

The South African forces have killed more men, women and children in their attack on Maseru last December than perhaps all those killed in the armed struggle in the past several years.

The Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid has been warning the whites to wake up. If the regime can kill unarmed blacks, the blacks are certainly capable of killing whites. Is that what they seek?

The execution of captured freedom fighters, in contravention of Geneva Conventions, cannot but arouse anger. It cannot but aggravate the situation.

We do hope that the authorities in South Africa and its white supporters will heed reason and retreat from their suicidal course. But from past experience, we do not have much reason to entertain hope, unless there is tremendous pressure on them.

The Special Committee against Apartheid believes that the government and people of the United States can exert decisive pressure on South Africa.

The United States has a tremendous responsibility. It could have acted in 1948 when the apartheid regime came to power. It could have taken energetic action in 1952 when

¹⁹ Statement at Mahlangu Day Meeting at the Church Centre for the United Nations in New York, April 6, 1983

the South African people launched the non-violent defiance campaign. But the preoccupation with the "cold war" acted as a break. There was a tendency to see the Pretoria regime as a "natural ally", rather than a liability.

With the recent increase in international tension, some people in the United States are calling for closer relations with the Pretoria regime than with the African States and peoples.

It is essential that every effort should be made to see that the United States will not become a source of comfort and strength to a doomed racist system, but will lend active support to freedom and peace in southern Africa.

The campaign to save the lives of the six freedom fighters, the campaign to free Nelson Mandela and the campaigns for all forms of sanctions against South Africa can be an important step in that effort.

ROLE OF PUBLIC SERVICE²⁰

As an international civil servant for over thirty years, I have been constantly concerned with the moral and social responsibilities of the public service. The public service can do much to help or harm the community by its commissions or omissions—by the way it assists the legislative and executive bodies and implements legislation, regulations and other directives.

The public service has a tradition of neutrality, perhaps less so in the United States than in some other countries. But I believe that no public servant—especially one serving under a system governed by principles such as those enshrined in the United Nations Charter and the United States Constitution—can be neutral on the great moral issues of our time such as peace and war, discrimination against people because of race, religion or sex, and human rights for all. Let us also remember that many of us owe our employment, security and advancement to those who have made great sacrifices in struggles for justice.

It is in this context that I would like to deal with the implications of the situation in South Africa.

South Africa, like some other countries, has a legacy of racial discrimination following European settlement and conquest. The regime which came to power in South Africa in 1948 was committed to extend, consolidate and perpetuate racist domination while the United Nations was committed to promote human rights for all persons.

The United Nations has, therefore, adopted numerous resolutions calling on South Africa to abandon apartheid. The authorities in Pretoria have rejected the United Nations resolutions for over three decades and continued their policy at the cost of great human suffering and increasing violation of basic human rights. In view of this, and at the request of the national movement in South Africa, many governments imposed diplomatic, economic and other sanctions against South Africa.

My own country, India, cut off its substantial trade with South Africa in 1946 at considerable sacrifice at a difficult time. There was full support of public opinion for this action. One of the first actions of most African States, on attainment of independence, was to break all relations with South Africa.

Sanctions are now supported by an overwhelming majority of States—including majority of Western Powers. A great majority have imposed sanctions, and many others have expressed willingness to impose sanctions if there is a binding decision by the Security Council...

What may be a minority concern in this country is a majority concern in the world....

Enforcement of Sanctions

The case for sanctions has been argued endlessly in the United Nations and outside. I will only stress at this stage that the overriding consideration is moral. It is immoral in any way to assist the perpetuation of the system of apartheid.

All governments in the world, including the United States Government, are committed to the implementation of the binding decision of the United Nations Security Council, adopted in 1977, for an arms embargo against South Africa. But there have been many loopholes in national implementation.

South Africa has been able to obtain foreign assistance and technology to expand its military apparatus despite the arms embargo. From the United States and Canada, it was able to obtain shells and technology to develop a powerful artillery. One wonders whether the responsible administrators have been lax or negligent or ready to give the benefit of doubt to South Africa.

Last year, a South African company was able to obtain two or three thousand electric shock batons from the United States. It was reported that there was an error in administration. That could not have happened if the public service was aware and alert.

²⁰ Remarks at the Annual Conference of the American Society of Public Administration, Panel on "South Africa: implications for Public Administration", Hilton Hotel, New York, April 19, 1983

Divestment Campaign

Even more crucial is the question of economic sanctions.

The United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid has been watching with great interest the development of the campaigns in universities and communities, and in trade unions, city councils and state governments for action to stop purchases of goods made in South Africa, to stop contracts to corporations involved in South Africa and to remove pension or other funds from corporations and banks involved in South Africa. The last is generally known as the "divestment campaign".

Divestment legislation has been passed or is pending in 24 States, 18 cities, 2 counties and the District of Columbia.

As a result of legislation passed in 1982, more than \$300 million of public money will be divested from corporations and banks involved in South Africa.

Many of the legislative measures concern investment of pension funds, and there is a great deal of propaganda that these measures will reduce the income of these funds. But the public service employees and teachers have shown understanding of the issues. I would like to pay tribute to them.

SPIRIT OF LUMUMBA²¹

I have visited this university ten years ago and followed its progress since its inception because it is a unique international university and bears the name of a great martyr of the struggle for independence from colonialism. I will cherish the memorial medal of this University.

For, Patrice Lumumba has meant much to me. And I would, with your indulgence, make a brief personal statement.

When the news of the brutal assassination of Patrice Lumumba arrived, in February 1961, some of us from Asia in the United Nations Secretariat met to share our grief.

Some of us felt ashamed and guilty to work in an organisation which had been accused of a share of blame for the death of Patrice Lumumba and which was viewed by many African leaders as a neo-colonialist organisation. The question was raised as to whether we should submit a collective resignation on moral grounds.

I argued that the United Nations is *our* organisation, not the organisation of the imperialists, colonialists or racists who are at best a small minority in the world. If it does not function in the interests of freedom, we should not leave and hand it over to those who have little attachment to its purposes and principles. We must struggle with all our energy and resources to make it an effective instrument for Freedom, peace and justice.

The establishment of the Special Committee against Apartheid in 1963 and my appointment as Principal Secretary of that Special Committee provided me with a challenge and an opportunity.

I do not exaggerate my contribution—it was within the limits of my functions as a civil servant—but I believe I have done my duty in fulfilment of the pledge I took in the name of Patrice Lumumba in 1961. I have been reassured by leaders of African liberation that the decision I took in 1961 was right.

The address delivered by Patrice Lumumba on the day of independence of the Congo will remain one of the greatest documents of African history. He recalled the iniquities of colonialism and the long struggle by the Congolese people for their dignity, and yet extended a hand of friendship to the erstwhile metropolitan Power and to all nations of the world.

It was said that the Belgian authorities resented his reference to the humiliation

of colonialism. The crisis began on the very day of independence of the Congo because Lumumba spoke the truth.

As one who was born and raised in the largest colonial country, and one who has made a modest contribution to the struggle for its freedom, I would like to say: We can let no one deprive us of the tragedies and the glories of our history.

In the struggles for liberation from colonial and racist oppression in Asia and Africa, all our movements and leaders have had a vision of an international order of justice and equality. They have tried to seek and retain the friendship of the erstwhile colonial Powers, while developing relations with all other nations.

They have been forgiving.

²¹ Speech at the Patrice Lumumba Friendship University, Moscow, on the occasion of the presentation to him of the memorial medal of the University, May 30, 1983

They have not demanded compensation for the crimes of colonialism and racism—for nothing can compensate for the slavery, the famines, the exploitation and the indignities our generation and our forefathers have been subjected to. But we can never, and must never, forget our history, or fail to honour our martyrs—for we can and we must never allow the return of colonialism in any form.

How can Africa forget the savage atrocities and the despoliation of the Congo under King Leopold II, when the hands of Africans were cut off if they did not fetch their quota of rubber, coffee or ivory for the foreign masters?

The name of Patrice Lumumba reminds us of many other leaders and patriots who have been assassinated at a young age in the course of the struggle for national independence in Africa—such as Amilcar Cabral and Eduardo Mondlane. I have personally known several of them.

I feel that their lives, and the noble causes they professed, should be made widely known to the youth all over the world. I recall that in January 1979, the United Nations General Assembly, on the proposal of the Special Committee, recommended that the world honour the memory and publicise the lives and contributions of leaders of the oppressed people in their struggles against apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialism, and for peace and international cooperation.

I hope that this great university and other institutions will give serious consideration to the matter.

TRIBUTE TO ARCHBISHOP TREVOR HUDDLESTON²²

I have come here on three missions.

First of all, it is my duty and honour to convey to you, Father Huddleston, the greetings and best wishes of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Javier Perez de Cuellar.

Secondly, it is a great pleasure to carry the message of greetings from one of your best friends—or shall I say admirers—the Chairman of the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid, Alhaji Yusuff Maitama-Sule, who would have loved to be here to greet you personally if only he could.

Finally, as head of the United Nations Centre against Apartheid, I would like to say a few words on my third mission.

Only a few years ago, we observed the seventieth birthday of your co-laureate in South Africa, Dr. Yusuf Dadoo, who has not only been a fighter and a leader of people, but became an institution through his historic contribution in forging the alliance of Indians and Africans of South Africa and helping to extend it to all decent and democratic people of that country.

Only a few years ago, we observed the seventieth birthday of Canon L. John Collins, the conscience of Britain, who not only became an institution but left behind the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa.

Only last year, we observed the seventieth birthday of another great institution, the African National Congress of South Africa.

When we think of seventy years, we cannot but recall how long this struggle has been.

The world has been warned for many years of the danger of racism in South Africa. Governments and those with power to bring about peaceful change have been warned for decades. But so far without success.

In these decades, the situation has become ever more serious. The Sharpeville massacre may have been the doing of jittery constables. Soweto may have been that of ruthless security police. But Matola and Maseru were acts of deliberate and callous killing of unarmed men, women and children, as was Cassinga.

Sharpeville convinced the South African leaders, who had preached and practised non-violence and inspired many of us in distant lands, to abandon strict adherence to non-violence.

Soweto convinced them that a few spectacular acts of sabotage are not enough to make the rulers wake up to reality—to make the ostriches to get their heads out of sand—and that it was necessary to try to overthrow the regime.

The recent incident in Pretoria in which several people were killed and injured should, therefore, come as no surprise.

We need to think carefully and act even more effectively.

So I came to tell you, Father Huddleston, that I am very happy that you will now be leading the British Anti-Apartheid Movement personally in London. I am glad you will be leading IDAF as Chairman of its Council. But I want to remind you of a third obligation.

The United Nations has formally recognised the contributions of the South African liberation movement to the purposes and principles of the United Nations. It has also commended the work of the anti-apartheid movements. The people struggling for freedom in South Africa, and the anti-apartheid movements abroad, are figuratively marching with the United Nations flag.

²² Speech at the meeting of the British Anti-Apartheid Movement to observe the Soweto Day and the seventieth birthday of Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, Toynbee Hall, London, June 16, 1983

We are confident, because of your contribution to peace, freedom and human rights, that the UN flag is most appropriate in your hands. Father Huddleston, you do not belong to the Anti-Apartheid Movement and IDAF alone. You also belong to the United Nations, especially to the Special Committee and the Centre against Apartheid. Many happy returns.

LONG AND DIFFICULT STRUGGLE²³

June 26 is an important date for the United Nations. It was on that day in 1945 that the Charter of the United Nations was signed in San Francisco. It has been an important date in the struggle for freedom in South Africa since 1950—as the day of dedication, the day for the launching of campaigns, and the day of the Freedom Charter.

I am happy to greet the ANC on the Freedom Day this year—a year which may well mark a crucial stage in the long and difficult struggle of the liberation movement and of the movements in solidarity with it.

I recall 1943 when, as a student in India, I read about the struggle of the African and the Indian people in South Africa and was deeply moved.

That was the year when the African leaders met in South Africa to plead that the principles enunciated in the "Atlantic Charter" should be applied in South Africa as well, and produced a document called "African Claims."

If only the Allied Powers were seriously and unequivocally committed to their own Atlantic Charter, the tragedy and misery that ensued in South Africa could have been avoided.

But regrettably, some of the Allied leaders had no desire to apply the Atlantic Charter to the black and brown and other people who constitute the great majority of humanity.

Indeed, the then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom declared that he did not become the First Minister of Her Majesty to liquidate the British empire and rejected India's demand for independence.

How then could they liquidate racism in South Africa which was so immensely profitable?

1943 was also the year when young patriots in South Africa got together to form the African Youth League—an organisation in which the present leaders of the national liberation movement, in prison or in exile, began their schooling.

That was the year when the Council on African Affairs in the United States, led by Paul Robeson, called for the application of the war aims declared by the Allied Powers to Africa, especially South Africa.

That was forty years ago.

In 1953, in the wake of the Defiance Campaign of South Africa, the United Nations fully recognised the justice of the demands of the Congress Alliance and warned of the danger if apartheid was not abolished and a just settlement reached by negotiations among leaders of all the people in South Africa in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

That was thirty years ago.

In 1963, the Special Committee against Apartheid, established by the General Assembly, began its work.

From its inception, it has repeatedly warned of the grave threat to the peace resulting from the situation in South Africa and called for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

That was twenty years ago, the year of the Rivonia trial.

Since then, the United Nations General Assembly and numerous leaders of governments all over the world have warned of the danger of violent and escalating conflict with incalculable international repercussions. Even leaders of Western Governments, who were not prepared to go beyond appeals to the Pretoria regime, uttered grave warnings.

²³ Speech at the meeting of the African National Congress for South Africa Freedom Day, Westminster Cathedral Conference Centre, London, June 26, 1983

The inevitable conflict that the world has warned against for so long is today on the daily headlines. I need only mention Angola, Maseru, Matola and Pretoria.

We have failed to avert this situation.

Can the international community act even today to minimise violence, to prevent a catastrophe, and eliminate apartheid in cooperation with the people of South Africa?

This is the issue that preoccupies the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid which has for twenty years been tirelessly pressing for international action.

BOYCOTT OF APARTHEID SPORT²⁴

The Special Committee and the Centre against Apartheid are committed to promote all action for the elimination of apartheid— and the boycott of apartheid sport is one important component of such action. We make no apologies for that.

The boycott of apartheid sport began before the establishment of the Special Committee in 1963. I must pay tribute to the sports bodies, for instance in the Soviet Union and India, and to the anti-apartheid movements for their early initiatives.

For several years, the Special Committee refrained from promoting the sports boycott in order to avoid any accusation of governmental interference in sport.

It was only after the South African regime began to enforce apartheid in sport by administrative and police action that the Special Committee, at the request of SAN-ROC and others, called for the boycott, in 1968.

Since then, the South African regime, its sports bodies and its external friends have constantly been spreading propaganda about the end of racism in South African sport. The more they end racism, the more racism is left in sport. Blacks are now legally prohibited in the parks and playgrounds in Pretoria and that is the capital of the country.

Our position has always been clear and consistent. It is not a matter of black versus white. When South Africa sent segregated black teams abroad, we called for a boycott of those teams. We demand non-racialism in sport and society. The changes that are made are perhaps meant not only to undo the boycott but to divert attention from a more diabolical plan to deprive South Africa of all its black citizens. There is no parallel to that, except in Nazi Germany. Already over eight million Africans are denationalised.

As South Africa makes more "changes", all the other Africans will be denationalised—and then, of course, there will be little discrimination among the citizens.

Meanwhile, the boycott of apartheid sport has made tremendous progress and has had a great impact, educating and involving millions of people all over the world in the campaign against apartheid.

Action has been taken by many Governments; by the International Olympic Committee and international sports federations; and even more important, by the public in mass demonstrations to prevent apartheid teams from playing in other countries.

We still have some work to do to make the boycott complete.

The boycott is not very effective as regards professional sport.

In those sports which are rich people's games, or in sports played mainly in the West and administered by international sports federations with weighted voting, there has been little progress.

I do not see why rich people or people in the West should be insensitive to the problem of racism, but we face this problem.

We must also take action on the large-scale buying of sportsmen by South Africa.

But let us see this in perspective.

The money is being spent on enticing sportsmen beyond their prime and black sportsmen who, only a few years ago, were not even allowed to play in South Africa.

²⁴ Speech at the International Conference for Sanctions against Apartheid Sport, London, June 28, 1983

The money that South Africa spends is also a sort of tribute to the register of sports contacts with South Africa that the United Nations has been publishing since 1981.

There has been criticism of this "blacklist" which is merely a factual record. I cannot understand that.

Some sportsmen or sports bodies defy all appeals and go to South Africa. Why should they object to the register if they feel they were right and not guilty of anything? If they go to South Africa for money, how can they object if other countries do not allow them to make more money in their countries?

As I said, we need to continue action on the remaining sports—by governments, by sports bodies and the public at large.

We need to expose and fight the undemocratic constitutions of some sports bodies which are collaborating with South Africa. The International Tennis Federation is even penalising countries which boycott South Africa.

We need to expose and fight sports promoters who are making money by breaking the boycott. They are greater culprits than the sportsmen.

We need to act on Western television networks whose payments make possible the spectacles in Sun City.

The action must, above all, be in Britain and the United States which are responsible for most of the sports contacts. We have circulated a consolidated sports register here and you will see that these two countries account for almost half the sportsmen and sportswomen going to South Africa.

INTERNATIONAL ACTION AGAINST RACISM²⁵

At the turn of the century, in 1900, the Pan African Conference in London warned, in the words of Dr. W.E.B. DuBois, the great black American scholar and leader, that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the colour line."

The great majority of the people of the world who have been victims of racism—and of colonialism and slavery which are but gross forms of racism—have struggled together with decent people in the West, to destroy the colour line and build a universal community.

Millions of people have sacrificed their lives in this struggle and great advances have been made.

But even today, eighty-three years after the prophetic warning of Dr. DuBois, we are far from solving the central problem of the twentieth century. We are far from uniting humanity in determined action to wipe out racism and build a new world order.

Racism is not only a crime against human beings, but one of the main causes of conflict and war.

In 1915, Dr. DuBois wrote an article on "African Roots of War" showing how colonialism and racism were one of the main causes of the First World War. The major governments of the world did not heed the warning and with the rise of Nazism, even Europeans, even the so-called "master races", became the victims of racism. Tens of millions of people perished because of the shortsightedness of those who believed that racism is only a menace to black and brown people and perhaps even profitable to the "master races", if only they can close their eyes to the moral implications.

The United Nations was born with a pledge to eliminate racism and abolish the scourge of war. One of the first resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly in 1946 was on the problem of racism.

After the independence of African States, the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in 1963, to be followed by an International Convention. It observed the International Year of Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in 1971, and proclaimed a Decade in 1973.

But United Nations action has become paralysed because of controversy over one aspect and the announcement of non-cooperation by a number of States. Meanwhile, we are even confronted with a resurgence of racism in some countries.

We hope that the Second World Conference will overcome the problems. If the world is united in abhorrence of racism, and if all States are determined to abolish it, differences of opinion on one resolution²⁶ should not lead to paralysis of all activities.

Vision of Pan-Africanism

When we discuss racism, we can never forget that the people of Africa—and people of African origin—have suffered the most. The ravages of the slave trade and the neo-slavery that followed are beyond imagination.

But the African people and their leaders have always upheld the vision of a future in which all the people of the world will be free and equal. They

²⁵ Speech at the opening session of the International NGO Conference on Action Against Apartheid and Racism, ILO Headquarters, Geneva, July 5, 1983

²⁶ General Assembly resolution on Zionism

believed that when people of African origin are freed from racist domination, racism will soon disappear from the globe.

The people of African origin have made enormous sacrifices in their long struggle for freedom from bondage, for human dignity and equality, and for the redemption of the African continent.

We cannot but pay tribute to the vision of the great leaders of Africa and of the Pan African Movement.

I would invite all the Governments and organisations present here to consider means to honour these leaders and publicise their lives—through radio and television, publications and postage stamps—in accordance with the resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in January 1979.

Struggle at Various Levels

The struggle against racism must be waged not only at the national, local and community levels, but also at the international level, for racism is an international crime.

Discrimination against people of African origin and Asian origin, and against indigenous people and migrant workers, occurs in many countries and requires international action.

We must also keep in mind that the persistence of racism in the world is one of the main hindrances to effective action against the inhumanity of apartheid in South Africa.

The struggle against racism must be conducted on all fronts. Legislation alone is not enough. Equally important is the education of public opinion.

But let us be clear as to what we mean by education. It must be education of the public, not of racist criminals. The victims of racism cannot afford to wait until the racist regimes and organisations, and their leaders, are converted by education, if that is at all possible.

We need a sense of urgency on this matter. We must reject the conclusions of those well-meaning persons who claim that the elimination of racism will take many more decades. While we must extend our efforts to educate those who are not informed, there must be the closest cooperation with all those struggling against racism, especially the organisations of the victims of racism, in all our efforts.

The United Nations has set a precedent by granting observer status to the liberation movements struggling against apartheid and colonialism. Some governments and organisations have provided support and assistance to anti-racist organisations. The World Council of Churches, for instance, through its Programme to Combat Racism, is providing valuable assistance to organisations of victims of racism and apartheid. I hope that many other groups will emulate the example. I also hope that this Conference will seriously consider the important role of trade unions, religious bodies, public organisations, and the mass media in the efforts to eliminate racism.

Action against Apartheid

My own special concern as the head of the Centre against Apartheid in the United Nations is the situation in South Africa and the international repercussions of apartheid.

For four decades, the United Nations, as well as many Governments, organisations and public leaders have warned that unless apartheid in South Africa is abolished, there is a grave danger of violent conflict with incalculable international repercussions.

The warnings have now become a reality.

Not only have the national liberation movements felt obliged to resort to armed struggle, but there is an undeclared war all over southern Africa, as the regime in South Africa, bereft of buffer States, tries to consolidate apartheid.

Human lives are in danger. The aspirations of the people of newly-independent countries are frustrated. Peace is in grave peril.

The execution of three ANC freedom fighters on the 9th of June, despite world-wide appeals, demonstrates that the authorities in Pretoria continue to pursue their disastrous course.

We have come to this perilous state because scores of United Nations resolutions have not been effectively implemented.

We cannot but place special responsibility on the few States which have not even attempted to harmonise their positions with those of the overwhelming majority, and which have continued their collaboration with the Pretoria regime.

Even the mandatory arms embargo, adopted unanimously by the Security Council in November 1977, is not being scrupulously implemented.

Member States of the United Nations are now greatly concerned over the authority and credibility of the Organisation. In this context, let us recall that the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa was a unique decision under Chapter VII of the Charter and was indeed supported by all the Great Powers. Implementation of the embargo is the supreme test of loyalty to the United Nations.

We can never accept the contention that the security of supplies of strategic minerals of South Africa or the security of the sea lanes around the Cape, require the guardianship of a regime following a policy which has been denounced by the United Nations as a crime.

We can never accept that any number of so-called "reforms" in South Africa are meaningful so long as the leaders of the people and other opponents of apartheid are in jail and so long as the indigenous African majority is being deprived of citizenship of South Africa.

Frontline States

I must make special mention of the plight of frontline States neighbouring South Africa.

They have faced aggression and intimidation because of their support to liberation in South Africa and Namibia.

They have no more moral responsibility than all other States committed to the Charter of the United Nations. They are in danger purely because of their geographical location.

That is why the United Nations and the OAU have declared that an attack on the frontline States is an attack on Africa and an attack on the United Nations and the international community. We must find means to translate this declaration into action by providing all necessary support to the frontline States.

When apartheid is the issue, all States committed to freedom and to the United Nations Charter must become "frontline States."

Sense of Urgency

As we meet near the end of the Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, let us recall that it is twenty years since the United Nations adopted the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

It is thirty-five years since the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

It is fifty years since the Nazis came to power in Germany.

It is 150 years since Britain abolished the slave trade.

It is five hundred years since the European settlement in Angola and the beginning of the humiliation of the great continent of Africa.

These anniversaries should remind us of the enormity of the crime of racism and the long struggle to destroy racism.

We dare not ask the victims of racism for any more patience. Let us act with determination, with unity and above all, with a sense of urgency.

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND MICHAEL SCOTT²⁷

I have known Michael Scott for three decades, and particularly since I became secretary of the Special Committee against Apartheid twenty years ago. His friendship and his appreciation of my work in the United Nations have been a great source of encouragement to me all these years.

He was one of those who not only espoused the cause of the oppressed people, but identified himself with them and lived with them. He was never intimidated by attacks nor frustrated by failures.

His greatest achievement was perhaps not even his own work, but the way he inspired so many others to join the struggle against apartheid.

I do not intend to reminisce about Michael, but to express two thoughts.

When we pay tribute to Michael for his life's work, we cannot but remember that Michael was not only moved by the suffering and injustice in South Africa and Namibia, but was himself inspired by the nobility of the struggle of the oppressed people, as he was earlier by the Gandhian movement in my own country.

The involvement of Michael and other great men of our time in the struggle against apartheid is, therefore, a tribute to the struggle of the people of South Africa and Namibia, which must remind us always of the historic and moral significance of that struggle and of our duty in seeing to its triumph. Secondly, while Michael was a very modest man, his contribution was monumental.

Coming from a former colonial country, I have felt that there is a need to write our own history of our times. In that history, prominence will be accorded not to the members of the establishment in the metropolitan countries, but to those who helped change the world, even though they had no titles and though many of them suffered neglect, derision and even persecution in their countries for espousing the cause of freedom of Asia, Africa and the Caribbean.

Michael Scott deserves a place in that history.

²⁷ Speech at Memorial Meeting for the Reverend Michael Scott at Church Centre for United Nations, New York, September 29, 1983

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP DESMOND TUTU²⁸

I have the great honour and privilege—on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar—to join with you in honouring one of the great fighters for human rights, human dignity and peace. Since he became the Dean of Johannesburg in 1975 and especially since he was elected General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches in 1977, the Right Reverend Bishop Desmond Tutu has been a courageous spokesman of the black people of South Africa. It has been a stormy period in South Africa with the minority Government forcibly uprooting African people from their homes and intensifying repression against all opponents of apartheid. It has been the time of the Soweto massacre, and the indiscriminate killing and maiming of thousands of school children. Above all, the regime sought to deprive millions of people—the indigenous African people—even of their citizenship. It has also been a time of unprecedented resistance by the people—and of executions of young freedom fighters in defiance of appeals by the international community. Throughout this period, Bishop Tutu has sought—with unfaltering courage and in defiance of intimidation, harassment, persecution and even threats to his life—to articulate the true aspirations of the oppressed people of the country, espousing a peaceful, non-violent and just solution to the grave crisis in South Africa. Indeed, he has been not only a spokesman of the wretched and the poor, but the conscience of *all* the people of South Africa—the oppressed as well as the oppressors. His testimony has been a powerful force in arousing the conscience of the world to the inescapable moral challenge of apartheid and racial discrimination. He is a man of the mould of Mahatma Gandhi who served his apprenticeship in South Africa.

I congratulate the Council of Churches of the City of New York for deciding to present the award to Bishop Tutu. In honouring Bishop Tutu, we honour a person who has struggled without compromise, without fear but with humility, for the community of humankind—and may I say, we also honour his courageous companion, Mrs. Leah Tutu. We also pledge our concern and our commitment to the people of South Africa—all the people of South Africa—black, brown and white—at this perilous time. It is a great privilege for me to present the "Family of Man" gold medallion, on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to Bishop Tutu.

²⁸ Speech at the dinner of the Society for the Family of Man, presenting "Family of Man" gold medallion to the Right Reverend Bishop Desmond Tutu, on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Sheraton Centre, New York, December 7, 1983

CULTURAL BOYCOTT AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA²⁹

Because of several reports which have appeared recently about a United Nations "blacklist" of entertainers and other cultural personalities visiting South Africa, I thought it would be desirable to brief the media about the United Nations role in the campaign against apartheid in the cultural field. Statements by some entertainers and others that the United Nations is attacking their freedoms have been spread widely by South African propaganda. It is rather strange, to say the least, that the South African regime which denies all freedoms—including freedom of residence, movement and employment—to the African majority, which deprives them even of their citizenship rights, and which restricts and jails people without due process or rule of law, should become a defender of the freedom of artistes and sportsmen of the world.

United Nations Lists

The United Nations has no "blacklist."

The Special Committee has a list of cultural personalities who have made sacrifices by boycotting South Africa because of their abhorrence of apartheid. They deserve appreciation and honour and we are considering means to recognise their contribution to the struggle against apartheid. We have a list of people who have performed in South Africa because of ignorance of the situation or the lure of money or unconcern over racism. They need to be persuaded to stop entertaining apartheid, to stop profiting from apartheid money and to stop serving the propaganda purposes of the apartheid regime.

We also have lists of artistes whom we are approaching for cooperation in educating public opinion about apartheid and in organising performances for the benefit of the oppressed people of South Africa.

And I would like, here, to thank the many artistes who have performed for the benefit of the anti-apartheid movements in this country and in other countries.

I do not see why artistes who go to South Africa, in spite of appeals by the United Nations and the black people of South Africa, and whose performances are reported in the media, should object if we keep their names on file. If they believe they have done right, let them have the courage to be counted. I am not familiar with Spike Milligan who is very much in the press. He said that he performed before mixed audiences, whatever that means; he even performed before some black audiences, whatever that means; and he also spoke with a taxi driver who said that things in South Africa are improving. I understand that Spike Milligan is a comedian—so I will leave it at that. When one refers to blacklist, I think of Paul Robeson, one of the pioneers of the anti-apartheid campaign who suffered from persecution and blacklisting. I think of many South African writers, entertainers and others who are banned arbitrarily; and artistes from other countries prohibited from entering South Africa—for example, Jane Fonda.

The lists we produce are not lists for persecution, but essentially lists for persuasion. We want the people concerned to be informed of the situation in

²⁹ Introductory statement at a Press Briefing at Royal Commonwealth Society, London, January 11, 1984

South Africa and of the implications of their involvement, so that they can be persuaded not to perform in South Africa.

If they undertake not to perform in South Africa, their names are immediately deleted. If they insist on continuing collaboration with apartheid, I believe that all those who are outraged by apartheid are entitled to the freedom and the right not to patronise them. The choice is between profiting from apartheid oppression and patronage by the opponents of racism.

Origin of Boycott

I recall that the cultural boycott of South Africa was not started by the United Nations, but in fact, initiated by the artistes themselves and their unions—by the British Musicians Union in 1961, by the British Screenwriters Guild and British Equity in 1965, by British, Irish and American playwrights between 1963 and 1965 and by the American Equity in the 1960s. The United Nations commended the boycott and tried to dissuade some artistes who were planning to perform in South Africa.

The Special Committee against Apartheid began taking more active initiatives only in 1980 because of new developments and in consultation with the British Anti-Apartheid Movement.

The South African regime, isolated by the cultural boycott, began to make some changes in the 1970s to deceive world public opinion—such as allowing some mixed performances in a few theatres, on permit.

It began to use secret funds to break the boycott—as revealed in the Muldergate scandal.

And Sun City—in the bantustan of Bophuthatswana—started to entice artistes by paying enormous fees. Sometimes one wonders where they get the money to pay these artistes because the income from the tickets is often less than what is being offered to the artistes.

I understand that a commercial counsellor of Bophuthatswana wrote a letter to *Evening Standard* on this cultural boycott. I did not know that there is a so-called "commercial counsellor" of a so-called "Bophuthatswana" in Britain because the British Government has voted for resolutions denouncing the bantustans and undertook not to have relations with them.

Through bribery and propaganda, South Africa was able to attract several entertainers from abroad—especially because of the unemployment among entertainers. Those who were enticed included a number of black entertainers, mainly from the United States of America, and even some entertainers who had reputation of being socially conscious—people who would have had difficulty getting visas to South Africa a few years ago.

That is why the United Nations General Assembly adopted a special resolution on the cultural boycott in December 1980. The Special Committee announced that after due notice, it would publish a list of entertainers who perform in South Africa from the beginning of 1981. The first list was published in October 1983, after giving sufficient opportunity to those concerned to undertake not to perform in South Africa again.

The United Nations action was also a response to appeals by black organisations in South Africa which courageously and effectively demonstrated against several foreign entertainers who defied the boycott.

Encouraging Results

The efforts of the United Nations and of anti-apartheid and other groups have had very encouraging results.

As you probably know, the American singing group "O'Jays" have not only pledged not to go to South Africa again but have supported the boycott campaign. They organised a seminar and offered to give performances for the benefit of the oppressed people of South Africa. There are others like James Moody, Lou Donaldson and William Benton who have undertaken not to go to South Africa. In the United Kingdom, I understand, the group "Real Thing" have said that they will never again go to South Africa. I am expecting letters from other entertainers offering not to go to South Africa. Artistes and Athletes against Apartheid, a committee established in the United States under the chairmanship of Harry Belafonte and Arthur Ashe, is doing good work in persuading their colleagues. Several entertainers have now offered to appear in benefit performances for the black people of South Africa and donate their South African royalties when they cannot completely boycott South Africa, as in the case of royalties from the sale of records.

Wider Issues

I would like to emphasise that the issue in South Africa is not mere segregation of audiences and performers by race. That is only the superficial manifestation of an inhuman system. Its character does not change because a few blacks are allowed into concert halls on permit and a few blacks are brought into Sun City, even without tickets which are beyond the means of the blacks.

In fact, these so-called reforms and the enticement of foreign artistes are a deliberate cover to divert attention from the entrenchment of apartheid—the forced removals of hundreds of thousands of African people from their homes and the exclusion of the African majority from the political institutions and even citizenship rights, from the manoeuvres to turn an African country into a non-African country.

There is no parallel to this in history except to some extent under Nazism. The issue in Germany then was not segregation of audiences, but inhumanity and genocide and that is the issue in South Africa today

Collaboration with the ruling power in South Africa or with the authorities of bantustans, when there is national resistance by the oppressed people, is involvement with apartheid.

Performances in bantustans—which are recognised by no country and which are the mechanisms to dispossess the African people of their rights—is a particularly serious affront to the black people and their liberation movement.

Some entertainers claim that they are visiting South Africa to educate the whites against apartheid. We feel that this is worse than hypocrisy. We have confidence that most of the entertainers of the world will join the boycott of South Africa when they know the facts about the situation in South Africa and the strong feelings of most of humanity.

As regards entertainers like Frank Sinatra who have deliberately chosen to become virtual propagandists for evil, or those who even entertain South African troops engaged in a war, like Geraldine Branagan of Ireland, we can only rely on public outrage.

I would like to conclude, however, not with any criticisms, but by paying tribute to entertainers who have made sacrifices because of their opposition to apartheid and racism—like Roberta Flack, who turned down an offer of two million pounds to perform in South Africa.

GREETINGS TO TRADE UNIONISTS³⁰

One of the most significant developments in South Africa in the past decade or so has been the impressive resurgence and growth of the independent black trade union movement. Breaking through the brutal suppression of many years, especially since apartheid became state policy in 1948, this movement has become a force to be reckoned with.

The development of this movement – perhaps we should say, the revival of this movement since the Africans have a long tradition of trade unionism – required great determination, courage and sacrifice by the trade union leaders, as well as organisational ability.

I believe the solidarity of the international trade union movement – both in exposing and counteracting manoeuvres by the government or employers to suffocate the emergent trade unions through obnoxious regulations, police violence and mass victimisation of employees and in providing educational and material assistance as required – has also been crucial.

I would like once again to congratulate the ICFTU and its affiliates for the central role they have played in this respect – and to commend your Southern Africa Committee and all members of the staff who serve that Committee, particularly, my friend, Andrew Kailembo, as well as Gerd Muhr and Ms. Shirley Carr who speak for the ICFTU in the ILO very effectively.

I was privileged to attend your special conference in London in November 1980 which prepared a concrete and comprehensive programme of action in support of the independent black trade union movement in South Africa. I have followed your work in implementation of that programme and have been gratified that the words have been matched by action. The situation in South Africa continues to be grave in the trade union field as in the political and other fields.

In fact, the relentless moves to denationalise the Africans and exclude them from the political life of their country, the horrendous policy of bantustans and the use of some African chiefs to do the dirty job of inhuman repression, the forced removals, the new constitution designed to entrench white domination and divide the black people, the destabilisation and acts of aggression against neighbouring States, including the killing of unarmed men, women and children in raids into independent African States, have created a very explosive situation.

³⁰ Speech at the "Evaluation Symposium of ICFTU Programme of Action in Support of Independent Black Trade Union Movement in South Africa", DGB-HAUS, Dusseldorf, January 19, 1984

I believe the current talks between South Africa and neighbouring States cannot by themselves avert the danger of escalating conflict in South Africa and in Southern Africa as a whole, unless there is a radical change in South Africa itself towards the total elimination of apartheid and all its manifestations.

Unilateral solutions by the white minority will only aggravate the situation.

If the white minority, as I believe, shares the desire to avoid ghastly violence, the first step is for the authorities to have the courage to meet with Nelson Mandela and other leaders in prison to discuss a just and peaceful solution.

They should hold genuine consultations at the highest levels with the trade union, religious and other leaders who have emerged as the trusted spokesmen of the oppressed majority.

YEAR OF WOMEN OF SOUTH AFRICA³¹

We have discrimination against women, and even oppression of women, in many societies, but there is nothing like the inhumanity in South Africa.

Women have played a heroic role in the struggle against injustice in many countries – there have been great heroines in the struggles for liberation in colonial countries, and in the struggle against slavery and racial discrimination in this country from the days of Sojourner Truth – but rarely have women played such a crucial role as in the liberation struggle of South Africa.

The "Year of Women of South Africa" should certainly highlight the humiliation of black women in South Africa – which is a crime and an outrage – but it is not an occasion for pity, but a time to pay tribute to them and do our duty to them.

The economy in South Africa is based on the so-called migrant labour system. African men are recruited from the reserves to work in the mines and factories. But their wives and families are not allowed to go with them. If the women want to visit their husbands, they have to go to an official and apply, for instance, that they need permission to "conceive".

There is no place in the world that I know where women are so humiliated.

Every year, tens of thousands of African men and women are being deported from cities; shacks built by Africans to have some family life are being bulldozed by the police and the army; and women are being deported to starvation in reserves – sometimes men and women to different regions because they come from different ethnic backgrounds.

I cannot think of such inhumanity anywhere and at any time except during the shameful period of slavery.

Tribute to Women

But I want to speak not of oppression but of resistance. I might recall that the African women were the first to carry on large-scale, organised resistance against the obnoxious pass laws, way back in 1913 – and that was the first glorious episode in the modern national movement in South Africa.

In the 1920s and 1930s, for various reasons, the African women were the most militant leaders in the trade union movement which organised a million workers in struggle. On August 9, 1956, the women organised a national, multi-racial demonstration in Pretoria against pass laws – a

³¹ Speech at a public meeting organised by the Black Studies Department of the City College of New York and the New York Southern Africa Solidarity Coalition to launch the "Year of Women of South Africa", City College, New York, January 30, 1984

historic demonstration which required tremendous organisational capacity. That was one of the greatest demonstrations under very difficult conditions in South African history.

I remember also a demonstration of Indian women on United Nations Human Rights Day in 1962. Police sent their dogs to attack and pull their saris, but they stood firm. You know of the great demonstration of African school children in Soweto on June 16, 1976. The children decided to defy the police batons and guns, and many hundreds were killed and wounded. I can think of nothing like that massacre of children in history.

But what did their mothers do? Did they stop and scold their children for getting into trouble with the police? No, they stood by their children, in spite of all the pain and anguish, and brought out the adults in support. All of us, all over the world, should bow our heads before them. You have heard of young freedom fighters – Solomon Mahlangu and three others – who were executed in South Africa. They are heroes.

But equally heroic are their mothers who stood by them. They did not tell their children to confess or beg for mercy to save their lives. They declared that they are proud of their children and will carry on the struggle until they meet their children in heaven. They too deserve our humble tribute.

Some Heroines

A few months ago, this City College bestowed an honorary degree on Nelson Mandela, who has spent more than 21 years in prison for leading the liberation struggle and whose stature in South Africa and the world grows with every passing day. The United Nations has described him as a "prince among political prisoners" and he has, I believe, received more honours than any living person. But we cannot think of him without thinking of his wife, Winnie Mandela.

They were married in 1958 and they have had hardly three years of normal married life.

Winnie Mandela has been restricted almost continuously since 1962, except for a brief spell in 1975. She has been constantly harassed and jailed. In 1970-71, she was detained for more than a year – and kept under solitary confinement for many months, although she had a heart condition, and cruelly interrogated.

At the time of the Soweto uprising, the African children looked up to her when she organised a committee of parents. The Government then banished her to a remote and small town. Until last year she was not allowed to see more than one person at a time. Three white women were even jailed for visiting her. Her bedcovers were confiscated as they had ANC colours. But she has remained steadfast as a magnificent symbol of the spirit of liberation, and of African womanhood.

She deserves honour, but I am sure that she would be the first to say that there are others who deserve it equally, if not more.

I think of Mrs. Albertina Sisulu – wife of Walter Sisulu, who is in prison with Nelson Mandela.

When the Sisulus were married, Anton Lembede, a leader of the movement, warned the bride:

“You are marrying a man who is already married to the nation.”

But Mrs. Sisulu has been married to the nation as much as her husband.

She became a women's leader and founder of the Federation of South African Women. She was arrested many times and has been under restriction from 1964 to 1981. Her daughter, Lindiwe, was tortured in prison and escaped from South Africa.

But after the restrictions were lifted, Mrs. Sisulu has been travelling the nation organising all the people against apartheid. This grandmother of 66 is now charged with furthering the aims of the ANC, and faces imprisonment. That is the spirit of defiance of this great woman.

I think of Rita Ndzanga, a trade union leader, and wife of

another trade union leader, Lawrence. They were both detained for over a year in 1970-71 with Winnie Mandela, and tortured. They were again detained a few years later. Her husband died in prison, presumably of torture. But as soon as she came out of jail, Rita went back to organise the new trade unions.

I met her a few years ago and if I did not know, I could not have imagined what she had gone through.

I think of Emma Mashinini, a trade union leader, she was detained in solitary confinement for several months a couple of years ago. She had to be sent from prison to the psychiatric ward of the hospital. After her release, she was still very sick and fortunately the trade unions in Denmark arranged for medical treatment in Copenhagen. She went back to plunge herself in the trade union movement.

When I saw her a few days ago, she was full of spirit, as if nothing had happened or nothing could ever move her from her struggle.

I think of Shanti Naidoo, an Indian woman detained with Winnie Mandela in 1970. She was kept in solitary confinement for five months, and deprived of sleep for several days, to force her to testify against Mrs. Mandela. She refused and was sentenced to prison. Her father was the adopted son of Mahatma Gandhi. For three generations, every member of her family has been in jail for opposition to apartheid – some of them are now freedom fighters.

She is in London now and she never asks for sympathy for herself or her family, but only solidarity for the struggle.

I think of Ruth First, a journalist. Her 117 days in solitary detention in 1963 were recorded in a book and in a BBC documentary. After leaving South Africa, she was a tireless and effective campaigner for liberation. She wrote many books and became a professor in England and then in Mozambique. She was killed by a parcel bomb a couple of years ago.

I think of Mamphela Ramphele, a young doctor who set up a self-help clinic for black people in King William's Town in the 1970s.

She was banished in 1977 to a remote area, some thousand miles from her town and dumped there. A few weeks later, she learned that the father of her unborn child, Steve Biko, the black consciousness leader, had been brutally tortured to death.

But she recovered from the tragedy and set up in the impoverished land a day care centre, a clinic, a feeding scheme, a library, a bursary fund, a literacy programme, a crèche, and a co-operative to serve the 50,000 people. She was named the woman of 1983, by the *Star*, the major white newspaper of Johannesburg.

I think of many, many others:

Helen Joseph
Mary Moodley
Florence Matomela
Dora Tamana
Frances Baard
and so on.

We Must Act

If they were not *black* women of South Africa, there would be an outrage in the world. The major Western Governments would be denouncing apartheid and imposing sanctions. But in this case, we have occasional condemnations but little action.

I have often wondered, have we, who belong to the third world or to the oppressed peoples, done enough?

One hears of border problems and other conflicts in Africa, but do they matter at all when the dignity and honour of the African man or woman are at stake? When Winnie Mandela and others were being tortured, did any government warn the South African police against touching a black woman?

We can retaliate if we are determined.

If only the black people of this country are *angry* enough and committed enough not to tolerate the crimes against the black women of South Africa, we will very soon see the end of apartheid.

We should observe the Year of Women of South Africa by letting all the people know the atrocities in South Africa so that they will act. We should pay homage to the heroic women of South Africa.

But, above all, we should get *angry* and demand that all governments, all organisations, all institutions break with the regime in South Africa and unequivocally support the struggle for freedom.

CRISIS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA³²

The United Nations and the international community – and public opinion and public action in metropolitan countries – have played an important role in minimising violence and suffering in the process of Decolonisation of Africa – though the people of Algeria had to lay down a million lives and the people of Kenya, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau and Zimbabwe were to suffer the martyrdom of their sons and daughters – and also in ensuring reconciliation at the end of the struggle.

This has been the achievement of the United Nations in the past and its concern in the case of South Africa and Namibia, the two countries which must gain freedom before the continent of Africa is emancipated from the shameful humiliation of five centuries.

If international public action was important in the case of the struggles in the colonies, it is even more important in the case of South Africa where a settlement by the sword within the national boundaries can lead to a catastrophe. In the course of this colonial revolution in Africa, wherever the oppressed peoples had to resort to armed struggle, they have, of course, made enormous sacrifices. Many of the newly-independent countries also made sacrifices, and suffered pressures and acts of aggression, because of their support to the people of neighbouring countries.

Tunisia and Morocco, and even Nasser's Egypt, were attacked for supporting the Algerian revolution.

Guinea, Zambia and Tanzania suffered numerous acts of aggression for supporting freedom in the Portuguese colonies, as did Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana and Angola for supporting freedom in Zimbabwe.

It is in that tradition that the frontline States in Southern Africa have made tremendous sacrifices because of their abhorrence of apartheid.

This spirit of solidarity and sacrifice of the African States has added a new dimension to the struggle for human freedom and demands our respect.

I would also like to emphasise that neither the oppressed people nor the newly-independent African States have ever initiated violence for the liberation of territories under colonial or racist domination.

It was invariably after the outlawing of peaceful movements and, indeed, after peaceful demonstrators were massacred,

³² Speech at the Seminar on South African Aggression and Destabilisation against Frontline States, organised by the United Nations Association and Anti-Apartheid Movement, London, February 29, 1984

when they were left with little choice but to fight or surrender, that the national movements decided to go underground and take up arms.

In the case of South Africa, for instance, it was only after the Sharpeville massacre, and after the banning of ANC and PAC, that there was consideration of armed struggle by the national liberation movement. It was only after the gruesome massacre of school children in 1976 that the armed struggle was pursued in earnest.

Despite scores of acts of aggression by South Africa, there has never been a hostile crossing of the South African border by the armed forces of neighbouring States.

Constant Aggression since 1960

The Sharpeville massacre of 1960, and the subsequent actions by the South African Government, were a warning by that Government that it would not tolerate efforts by the oppressed people to end apartheid, however peaceful they may be.

The South African Government also decided in 1960 to rely on force to stop the march of freedom southwards from the Congo of Patrice Lumumba, and embarked on an enormous military build-up.

We have been faced with the threat of aggression and acts of aggression since that time – the kidnappings of refugees from neighbouring territories since 1960, the intervention by the mercenaries in the Congo in 1961, the building of a military base in the Caprivi Strip in 1965 in violation of the mandate agreement, the war in Namibia since 1966, the intervention in Southern Rhodesia in 1967, the subsequent cooperation with the Ian Smith regime in attacks on neighbouring States and so on.

But a new stage was reached with the Portuguese revolution in 1974 and the accession of Mozambique and Angola to independence.

In 1975, South Africa launched a major invasion of Angola with the secret support and encouragement of external forces and since then, there has been an endless series of acts of aggression described by the frontline States as an "undeclared war" in the entire region.

This state of undeclared war has involved the violation of elementary canons of international law. Refugee camps have been bombed, killing unarmed women and children as in Cassinga. South African forces crossed borders, deliberately and callously killing unarmed persons who were asleep, including women and small children, cutting off their limbs, as in Maputo and Maseru.

Peoples who have secured independence after centuries of inhuman oppression were prevented from devoting attention to their economic and social development. In fact, their countries were devastated.

United Nations Action

The United Nations has dealt with southern Africa for decades, recognising as early as 1952 that apartheid would inevitably cause conflict, and taking up the matter in the Security Council in 1960 as a clear danger to peace. It has adopted numerous resolutions, and taken many initiatives, often by unanimous votes.

It is fashionable in some quarters to mock at the United Nations for its ineffectiveness and the non-implementation of its resolutions.

I would like to say that the United Nations, as an assembly of sovereign States, has to act through resolutions.

Some of the resolutions lead to direct action by governments. Some of them have an effect over a period of time. But most of them depend for effectiveness on the informed support of public opinion and its influence in persuading governments to act in accordance with the resolutions.

There is thus a partnership – or what the present Secretary-General of the United Nations has termed an alliance – between the United Nations and organisations like the sponsors and participants in this Conference.

This alliance has had significant achievements.

The South African Government has become increasingly isolated.

The United Kingdom terminated the only military agreement of South Africa – the Simonstown Agreement.

A mandatory arms embargo has been instituted against South Africa.

Rarely have liberation movements received as extensive moral, political and material assistance from as many sources as the movement in South Africa.

It was the isolation of South Africa, and the strength of public opinion, that prevented open support to South Africa in the invasion of Angola in 1975, forcing it to withdraw unconditionally from Angola in March 1976 and from Southern Rhodesia in 1979.

But, as we all know, international action has hardly been commensurate with the needs and the urgency.

Twenty-five years after the South African people and the African continent appealed for sanctions against South Africa – and I might add, twenty-five years after the boycott movement was established here in London by Archbishop Trevor Huddleston and others – most of the world governments, including a majority of Western States, agree in principle that sanctions are essential. But there are as yet no mandatory sanctions.

Thus, the international community has been unable to take the one effective and peaceful measure to deal with the situation in South Africa which is the source of the conflict all over southern Africa.

I recall that in 1976, the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid and then the Summit Conference of OAU declared that any aggression by South Africa against the

frontline States must be regarded as an act of aggression against Africa, against the United Nations and against the international community.

This call, designed to prevent the widening of conflict, failed to obtain universal response — since powerful Western States resorted to the concept of "cross-border violence", making no distinction as to the cause of violence, and thereby shielded South Africa.

The United Nations has been able to play a key role in promoting an impressive world alliance against apartheid—an alliance of governments and organisations — but powerful vested interests have been able to frustrate concerted and decisive action.

As a result the crisis in southern Africa has escalated since 1975. The frontline States have suffered from aggression, subversion and economic pressures.

More recently, their suffering has been aggravated by an unprecedented drought which has affected all the southern African States.

The government of Angola has estimated the damage from aggression alone at over ten billion dollars. The government of Mozambique has estimated the damage from subversion, economic pressures and natural disasters at about five billion dollars, not to mention the loss of a hundred thousand lives. Zimbabwe has suffered not only from direct economic pressures but also from the destruction of communication lines in Mozambique.

I do not, therefore, intend in any way to try to convey the impression that the United Nations has been very effective in countering South African acts of aggression.

But it would be utterly wrong to scoff at the persistent efforts of the United Nations, with the support of a growing and now overwhelming majority of States.

In the United Nations, we certainly need to analyse the recent developments and consider any changes of strategy which may be necessary. There should be a new level of concerted action by governments and organisations in support of the international decisions.

If the United Nations has not succeeded, that is because some powerful governments have not been willing to impose effective sanctions against South Africa or to support all appropriate action under the United Nations Charter. They alone have the power to restrain the Pretoria regime and thereby restore the peace, or at least minimise and confine the conflict. Their policies have been confused and public opinion in their countries has not been effective enough. I do not believe that they support apartheid. They would even be happy if it disappeared. But there is a feeling that apartheid will last for a long time, though with some changes, and that it may be possible to restore respectability to the Pretoria regime. Meanwhile, there are lobbies that profit from apartheid and the governments are reluctant to go against them.

Then there is, of course, the desire of those who see world affairs as a function of the cold war, and of inveterate racists who are not yet reconciled to the end of slavery and colonialism, to build South Africa as a bastion and a junior imperialist Power in southern Africa.

It appears that the lessons of the past have not yet been learned by some governments.

Pretoria Regime is Not Victorious

South Africa, however, is not coming to the negotiating table with the frontline States as a victorious Power dictating its terms to vanquished and devastated countries suing for its mercy – as its propaganda would ask us to believe.

Let us look back a little.

After the withdrawal of South African forces from Angola in 1976, there was no major aggression on that scale until 1981.

South Africa then escalated aggression because of its calculation that the change of administration in Washington and the intensification of the "cold war" provided it with immunity. A resolution condemning South African aggression against Angola was vetoed by the United States, while Britain abstained. But in the last few months, when the Security Council condemned South African aggression against Angola, and rejected linkage, there have been no American vetoes.

During recent years, the Pretoria regime became increasingly isolated, while Angola and Mozambique have extended their international relations. It became dependent on one Power – a super-Power, no doubt – but the interests of that Power are not identical to those of South Africa and it does not cherish isolation from its allies.

The South African regime was also unable to suppress the liberation struggle in Namibia, or to contain the growth of the resistance in South Africa, while the human and material costs of military operations in Namibia and Angola have caused growing concern within the white community.

On the other hand, the frontline States have always been exploring the possibilities of peaceful solutions.

The severe economic and other difficulties they have encountered are not the only reason why they embarked on direct talks with the South African regime to find means to facilitate the independence of Namibia, to strengthen their security and independence, and to avert an escalation of conflict.

The African States have never been opposed to negotiations and peace. In fact, they have always shown utmost concern for peace.

The special situation of the frontline States has always been recognised by the international community, ever since the independence of Lesotho and Botswana. As Non-aligned States, they have sought to avoid bringing in external

Powers into the region at the risk of plunging the whole area into a wider conflict. For States bordering on South Africa to negotiate with the authorities in that country on economic matters, or on avoidance of war, is not unnatural. It would have been unfair to expect them to depend on third party mediation on every problem on the border. The issue is not whether contacts or negotiations with the authorities in South Africa are appropriate, but the content of those negotiations. From all available evidence, the frontline States remain firm and united in their opposition to apartheid, and in their support to the national liberation movements. To me, it is inconceivable that the African States will ever forsake the national liberation movement of South Africa. No government in Africa can survive if it betrays the honour of Africa. And, despite the present economic difficulties of African States, I do not believe that there will ever be a constellation of States in southern Africa dominated by a racist regime.

Need for Greater International Action

There is, however, genuine concern in many quarters that the arrangements resulting from the talks to prevent an escalation of conflict may create some difficulties for the liberation struggle in South Africa. There will no doubt be consultations between the frontline States and the national liberation movement on this matter. I am confident that the great national liberation movement of South Africa can overcome any difficulties, given the increased support of the international community. Armed struggle is only one component of the liberation struggle. It is essentially inside the country: bases and transit facilities in neighbouring countries are only one factor in the strategy for an armed struggle. Whatever the arrangements which may result from current negotiations, the struggle inside South Africa will go on – and assistance to that struggle will need to be intensified, especially by governments and organisations which are distant from the scene of conflict and by those which can exert maximum pressure on the authorities in South Africa. Support to the liberation struggles and support to independent African States must remain the twin priorities of the international community in southern Africa. It is not fair to expect the newly-independent States to bear unlimited burdens in support of a cause for which the entire international community has proclaimed its solemn responsibility. The present situation requires both assistance to the independent African States and a massive increase in political and material aid to the national liberation movements.

The needs of frontline States to overcome the effects of drought and other disasters are very modest – and it is shocking that the assistance from the international community is inadequate and hundreds of thousands of people are suffering starvation.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that the situation in southern Africa has been aggravated by the current international tension and the international economic situation.

The people of Asia, Africa and Latin America have frequently suffered from the intensification of the cold war. But this can be a temporary phenomenon – as in the case of the long struggle in Vietnam.

Meanwhile, every effort must be made to secure the unity of Africa and the Non-aligned movement, and an alliance of all committed States with the public opinion in major Western countries, in order to break the linkage between racism in southern Africa and its collaborators abroad.

RELIGIONS AND APARTHEID³³

This gathering of representatives of world religions, is a unique event of the United Nations to deal with a unique moral problem, the problem of apartheid, an outrage against God and the human person.

The new constitution of South Africa, which has been imposed by decision of a white Parliament and endorsed by a white referendum, mocks all faiths as it invokes the Almighty while excluding the great majority of the people, the indigenous African people.

Millions of men and women have struggled for justice in South Africa for many decades by non-violent means. When Mahatma Gandhi launched his first "Satyagraha" in South Africa early in this century, Count Leo Tolstoy recognised it as the most significant moral movement in the world. It is not surprising that men and women of religion have played a prominent role in the struggle for redemption in South Africa and Namibia, and in the international campaign against apartheid.

Our determination to rid South Africa and the world of apartheid is matched by our attachment to the vision of a non-racial society – our concern to avert a ghastly race conflict and promote reconciliation.

I salute those like Imam Abdullah Haron who gave their lives in this struggle, and the many who are today upholding their faith, defying incarceration and intimidation. They belong to many faiths, Christian and Moslem, Hindu and Jewish, Parsi, Sikh and traditional.

I salute the memory of the Reverend Michael Scott, Bishop Ambrose Reeves, the Reverend Canon L. Johns Collins and many others who have, at great sacrifice, helped persuade Western Christian societies to reject totally the pretensions of the rulers of South Africa to represent Western Christian civilisation.

I pay tribute to Archbishop Trevor Huddleston who has earned respect and reverence across the lines of colour and religion, in South Africa and in the world, by his total rejection of apartheid and racism, and his love of all human beings.

Humanity can no more afford the survival of apartheid in South Africa. We must be moved not only by the enormous suffering endured by the people of South Africa and Namibia, and of the neighbouring African States, but by the gravest dangers ahead of us if apartheid is not abolished and if the racist tyrants can wield the nuclear weapon. We must counter

³³ Speech at the opening session of the Interfaith Colloquium on Apartheid, Church House, London, March 5, 1984

the efforts of apartheid to corrupt the weak and the greedy in the rest of the world.

The struggle of the people of South Africa is a righteous struggle for a community of all men and women, without distinction as to race, colour or creed. It deserves and demands our unequivocal support whatever the means they choose.

We have a moral duty to cease all cooperation with the forces of evil and support the conscientious objectors in South Africa.

The religions of the world can and must play a key role in the mobilisation of governments and peoples of the world to destroy this evil system.

We thank those who have come to the colloquium. We seek their blessings and their guidance – and, above all, their commitment to persuade the short-sighted governments and vested interests to desist from collaboration with apartheid and facilitate the most speedy and peaceful elimination of apartheid.

From this great metropolis, which was the site of the first Pan African Congress of 1900 and the All Races Conference of 1911, in which delegates of many faiths urged the world to eschew racism – from this Greater London which has this year proclaimed itself an anti-apartheid zone – let us send a message of hope, faith and solidarity to the people of South Africa and Namibia.

ABOLITION OF RACISM—AN URGENT TASK³⁴

I am honoured and very happy to join you at this festival where the Borough of Hackney recommits itself to the anti-racist programme launched by the Greater London Council. By this particular act you are also committing yourself to the efforts of the United Nations against all manifestations of racism. By fighting for a just society in Hackney you are also fighting for justice in the whole world. You are part of the world where those who are called ethnic minorities in Hackney are not mere minorities.

I would like to express particular satisfaction at the impressive programme of action you have formulated and at the fact that you have recognised the importance of active participation by ethnic minorities and voluntary groups in the implementation of that programme.

Racist Alliances

As head of the Centre against Apartheid in the United Nations Secretariat, I would also like to express particular satisfaction that you have linked your efforts to eliminate racism in your society with action against apartheid in South Africa.

History has shown that no country can practise racism abroad or profit from racism against other peoples, and protect itself from the contamination of racism.

Most of humankind has suffered from racist humiliation, domination and exploitation during the past centuries. Africa and the people of African origin all over the world have been the worst but not the only victims of the crime of racism during the shameful era of slavery and under colonialism.

Racism became pervasive, affecting all aspects of life, and then corroded the metropolitan countries, undermining their cherished values of justice and fair play. It has polluted the environment in which the peoples of these metropolitan countries in Europe and North America have had to live and grow.

In my work against apartheid in South Africa for more than two decades, I have become increasingly conscious of the international dimensions of racism, the power of the international alliances of racism, the influence of the vested interests profiting from apartheid and racism, and

³⁴ Speech at the Launching of Anti-Racist Year by the Borough of Hackney, Hackney Town Hall, London, April 27, 1984

the effect of racism on the outlook and foreign policies of powerful nations.

On the other hand I have also become very conscious of the tremendous impact of the long and heroic struggle of the South African people in making people in other countries, near and far, conscious of the problem and making them part of the struggle against racism.

The struggle for the liberation of South Africa from racist tyranny has had to be fought not only in South Africa but in the capitals and communities of many other countries. The regime in Pretoria is well aware of this, and has been blatantly interfering in the Western countries.

The struggle against apartheid must be carried on at the international, national and community levels and in all relevant institutions.

It must be carried on in all aspects of life it affects – in education and housing, health care and employment – and also in international affairs, for racism has been and continues to be a menace to peace and security, and a source of war. The struggle must be carried on by governments and international organisations and by local authorities and voluntary organisations.

As a civil servant, I must particularly emphasise the key role of members of the public service in this context. We must all see that no one is blind to racism and no one profits from racism.

An Urgent Task

The abolition of racism has become an urgent task of our time. It is a hundred and fifty years since the slave trade was abolished and over fifty years since the rise of Nazism. After the completion of the colonial revolution, at least in its first stage of independence of nations, the main task of the international community has been to confront the problem of southern Africa where colonialism and racism have been intertwined, and to deal with racism and racial discrimination all over the world.

We attach utmost importance to the education of public opinion against racism in every country. But let us be aware that the victims of racism cannot patiently wait until all the people are educated, until even the racists are converted. Education cannot be an excuse for inaction; it must be a supplement to concrete action.

The oppressed majority of humankind and all other decent people must act together to promote legislative, administrative and other action without delay.

I would like to point out that while the colonial revolution has dealt a major blow to racism in the world, racism has in some respects become a more serious problem than before.

In South Africa, for instance, a racist regime has been able to acquire an enormous military arsenal and even nuclear capability, thereby posing a grave danger to world peace.

The racist elements have lost their conviction that they are superior and are now desperately trying to deny equal opportunity to the victims of racism. The poor black people are obliged to pay school fees in inferior institutions, while the whites enjoy free education.

A new constitution is being enforced to entrench and perpetuate discrimination, and to prevent participation of black people in political life.

We are, therefore, obliged to deal with a racist offensive in South Africa and in somewhat different forms in certain other countries of the world.

Build with Faith

It was here in London at the dawn of this century in 1900 that the first Pan African Congress declared, in the words of Dr. W.E.B. DuBois, that: "The problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the colour line." We are still confronting that problem. But in the course of the struggle against racism, long before 1900, the oppressed black people had a vision in Britain, in the United States and in Africa. They all felt that when racism against the black people - against the people of African origin who are at the bottom of the pile - is abolished, all oppression will disappear against all groups. And they have looked forward to a society, a non-racial society, in which there is freedom and equality for all the people.

And they have shown consistently, in spite of all the provocations, in spite of all the oppression, that they are still moved by that vision. And you see that today very clearly in the national liberation movement of South Africa. It is the national liberation movement of South Africa and its friends who show concern for the white people of South Africa. While people who profit from apartheid in South Africa are driving the white people to suicide, the national liberation movement of South Africa has shown the path for security, freedom and the future of the white people.

But you cannot ensure the security or the freedom of the white people in South Africa if they insist on sitting on top of the volcano.

I would also like to point out that at the end of slavery in the United States, when the black people obtained a share of power in the southern States, the period of reconstruction was one of the most socially progressive periods. It was the enfranchisement of the black people which brought compulsory education to the whites in the American South.

When you confront racism, you confront all the forces which are opposing progress and you open the way for progress all over the world. When you abolish racism, you will make it easier to solve all other problems – the problem of women, the question of the aged and the disabled and all other social problems – because the forces that are against progress are the same on all these issues.

Finally, I would like to say that although this year has a negative name - Anti-Racist Year – the purpose of the anti-racist year or of the anti-apartheid campaign is very positive. It is to build a new world in which everyone will enjoy freedom and human dignity. Let us try to build it with faith, not with hatred, because we are sure that we will succeed.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STRUGGLE IN SOUTH AFRICA AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF INDIA³⁵

I hope you will excuse me if much of what I have to say is a matter of common knowledge and common agreement to this audience.

Much of my adult life, as a United Nations official, has come to be devoted to promoting international understanding and support for the struggle for freedom in South Africa and at times, in other African countries. I have been inspired in my work by the conviction that solidarity with the oppressed people of Africa was not only my official responsibility but my duty as an Indian, and I have been guided by my own experience as an adolescent and youth in the Indian national movement in the thirties and early forties. That experience has taught me not to lose hope and faith in victory whatever the reverses in the course of a freedom struggle. It has also taught me to regard our own struggle for freedom as unfinished until imperialism and racism are abolished on this planet.

Parallels between National Movements

The national movement of South Africa has many similarities with our own movement in India.

In both countries, there were prolonged struggles against alien occupation and settlement led by the native rulers – climaxed in India by the War of Independence in 1857 and in South Africa by the famous battles between the Zulu Kingdom and British colonial troops in 1879-80.

After these acts of local or regional resistance failed, the people built up united national movements cutting across ethnic, religious, class and other barriers to struggle for their rights.

The founding of the African National Congress in 1912 – it was originally named the Native National Congress – paralleled the founding of the Indian National Congress nearly thirty years earlier. Both Congresses went through similar development – passing the stages of mere annual meetings of notables, petitions and appeals, to the organisation of the masses of people for resistance against oppression and humiliation.

The African Youth League was formed in South Africa in 1943 by the late Anton Lembede, Oliver Tambo, Walter Sisulu, Nelson Mandela and others. It was able to take over the leadership of the African National Congress in 1949 and obtain endorsement of its programme of positive action. And in 1952, the African National Congress, in alliance with the South African Indian Congress, led the historic Campaign of Defiance against Unjust Laws – a passive resistance campaign

³⁵ Lecture at India International Centre, New Delhi, May 19, 1984

similar to our movements in the 1920s and 1930s – in which over 8,000 people courted imprisonment by defying segregationist laws.

Both the South African and Indian national movements were inspired by a common ideology – an admixture of Gandhism and Socialism.

But the course of the South African movement in recent years had to be somewhat different from that of the Indian movement since the white minority regime resorted to brutal repression and even massacres to suppress peaceful resistance and outlawed the African National Congress, as well as the Pan Africanist Congress, in 1960. The national liberation movement then felt obliged to give up its strict adherence to non-violence, and to organise underground and armed resistance.

The situation in South Africa in 1960 may best be compared to the situation in India in 1942. But while India was able to attain independence in a few years after 1942, the liberation movement of South Africa had to carry on a prolonged struggle under very difficult circumstances.

Role of Armed Struggle in South Africa

I believe that it is important to understand the role of armed struggle in South Africa, and I would like to make some remarks.

In South Africa, the liberation movement decided on armed resistance when the national movement had already spread all over the country and when various segments of the population had been organised. Armed struggle was *one* of the components of the struggle, supplementing legal actions wherever possible, as well as other non-violent means of struggle (even if extra-legal or illegal).

The situation in South Africa cannot be compared to that in the

Portuguese territories where armed struggle was the main focus of struggle and nations were practically created through guerilla warfare.

Secondly, the national liberation movement in South Africa decided on an armed struggle at a time when the African people were seething with anger and there was a prospect of local or unorganised violence by the people.

The national liberation movement, by organising armed resistance, averted the danger of senseless terrorism and racial war, and channelled the urge for freedom into a united and purposeful movement to secure the transfer of power from a racist clique to *all* the people.

Thirdly, the problem in South Africa is not a colonial problem as in the rest of Africa, though the system of racist domination is a product of colonialism, and the dual economy in the country is colonial in nature.

Moreover, since the National Party, greatly influenced by Nazi ideology, came to power in 1948, the legacy of racism was reinforced by fascism.

The successive governments have not merely tried to preserve racist privileges but have attempted to dispossess and denationalise the African majority in order to ensure perpetual white domination.

The national liberation movement, for its part, has always seen the struggle, not as a struggle of the Africans or the blacks against the whites, but as a struggle of all the people against a racist-fascist regime. It has tried to organise not only the African, Coloured and Indian people but also the democratic whites in a united coalition for a non-racial democratic society.

The national liberation movement is the custodian of the interests of *all* the people of the country, while the racist regime is not only the oppressor of the great majority of the people, but undermines the security of the white minority.

This broad perspective has determined the strategy of the liberation struggle, including the armed resistance. That is why the freedom fighters have taken exceptional care, even risking their own lives, to avoid the killing of innocent persons.

Indiscriminate killing of whites in South Africa is not difficult. If the racist regime continues cowardly killings of the black people and the refugees in neighbouring territories, and if the white people support such killings, it is not inconceivable that there may be a bloodbath, despite all the restraint of the national liberation movement, with enormous international repercussions.

But for the present, as I see it, the perspective is not one of guerilla forces coming from across the borders and liberating South Africa, nor of uncontrolled and unorganised violence leading to an unpredictable outcome. It is rather a combination of national resistance, including armed resistance, under the leadership of the liberation movement, coupled with effective international action, leading to the overthrow of the racist regime and the establishment of a democratic government.

I felt it necessary to emphasise this since concentration of attention on the armed struggle as an isolated phenomenon would lead to erroneous conclusions.

Present Crisis in Southern Africa

The present crisis in southern Africa has resulted, not from any recent incidents, but from the developments over the past decade or two.

On the one hand, the South African national liberation movement recovered from the severe reverses of 1963-64. There has been a phenomenal growth of popular mobilisation and resistance in the past decade. The independent black trade unions grew in membership from less than 50,000 to over 400,000. Students and youth, churches and communities have developed militant movements. The armed actions, led by

the ANC, became more and more sophisticated and were closely linked with the popular mobilisation.

On the other hand, the Pretoria regime increased its military power, came increasingly under the dominance of the military establishment and escalated aggression, subversion and destabilisation against the neighbouring independent African States.

The military budget of South Africa which was less than forty million dollars in 1960 is now over three thousand million dollars.

South Africa, which could not even manufacture a rifle in 1960, is today the tenth largest arms producer in the world and is aggressively seeking markets for its military equipment in order to ensure the viability of its arms industry. It has even acquired nuclear capability.

After blatant acts of aggression, destabilisation, terrorism and economic warfare against neighbouring independent African States – in defiance of all international morality and law, and of numerous resolutions of the United Nations – the Pretoria regime has been able to oblige some of those States to negotiate agreements with it.

The Nkomati Accord between Mozambique and South Africa, and the revelation of an earlier agreement between Swaziland and South Africa, in particular, have caused grave disappointment among the black people of South Africa. Many ANC refugees and representatives have been removed from Lesotho, Swaziland and Mozambique. SWAPO has been restrained in Angola.

When one realises the enormous scale of South African aggression and destabilisation in the entire region, one cannot but appreciate the compelling reasons which induced some of the independent African States to negotiate with South Africa.

Angola and Mozambique have known no peace since their independence and their fragile economies have been devastated.

The material destruction in Angola, resulting from South African aggression, has been estimated at ten billion dollars at the end of 1982.

Mozambique has estimated its losses from South African aggression and natural disasters at four or five billion dollars.

South Africa has organised and equipped the M.N.R. for sabotage, kidnapping and murder in Mozambique – and the M.N.R. was recently estimated to have 12,000 men. Subversion in Angola has been on an even larger scale.

The South African regime has exerted enormous economic pressure against land-locked Lesotho, and assisted the so-called Lesotho Liberation Army in attacks against that country. Zimbabwe has been subjected to economic and military pressure, while the so-called "Radio Truth" is engaged in psychological warfare. Botswana and Zambia have not been spared.

The frontline State Summit in March 1982 described the situation as one of "undeclared war" by South Africa all over the southern African region.

Faced with the threat to their very survival, some neighbouring States have agreed to reduce or terminate the modest support they provided to ANC in its armed struggle – in accordance with the resolutions of the OAU and the decisions of the frontline State Summits – in return for an undertaking by South Africa to abandon the massive subversion against them.

Insofar as the international community was unable to prevent South African aggression and destabilisation, it can only express sympathy with the States concerned and, indeed, appreciation that they had not tried to plunge the region into a wider war with the involvement of Great Powers. It must, in fact, express gratitude for the sacrifices made by those States for the cause of freedom in South Africa and Namibia.

At the same time, it must seriously analyse the situation and reassess its strategy for freedom and peace in southern Africa.

Strategy of the Pretoria Regime

The gravity of the crisis in southern Africa stems from the fact that some powerful forces in the West have found a community of interests with the racist regime in South Africa. They have condoned, if not connived at, the blatant acts of aggression and destabilisation by the South African racist regime.

Their sympathy for the Pretoria regime is not entirely new. but they have shown less hesitation in overtly associating with that regime, in attacking the national liberation movements and in exerting pressure on frontline and other States to abandon sanctions against South Africa. They thereby assist South Africa in the implementation of its "forward strategy."

Racist white South Africa cannot exist and does not intend to exist as a mere appendage of Europe or an isolated enclave on the African continent. Its objective is hegemony or dominance in the whole of southern Africa – as the central or the most powerful entity in a constellation of dependent States.

The recent acts of aggression and destabilisation were not intended merely to restore the buffers destroyed by the collapse of Portuguese colonialism, but to establish a South African "co-prosperity sphere" in southern Africa.

The Pretoria regime seeks, first of all, to utilise the difficulties of the neighbouring States to undermine the sanctions imposed on it since the Sharpeville massacre and break out of its isolation.

Secondly, it seeks to pressure the neighbouring States to accept the so-called independent bantustans, thereby

violating unanimous resolutions of the United Nations and compromising their opposition to apartheid.

Thirdly, it hopes to extend its economic dominance in the whole area.

South Africa already has a substantial export trade in the area. Several of the African States have become dependent on communications through South Africa, especially as other means of communication have been destroyed by sabotage and subversion.

The transnational corporations play a key role in supplementing the regional economic policy of the South African Government, and a close cooperation has developed between the Government and private business since P.W. Botha became Prime Minister.

You may recall the Cape-to-Katanga axis – a complex of multinational companies with interlocking directorates – which dominated the economies of southern Africa and played a nefarious role in the Congo crisis of 1960. That axis was only partially disrupted by later events. The members of that complex are now playing a very active role in the region, in line with South Africa's strategy.

The independence of African States is in grave danger as is the aspiration of the African people for the total emancipation of their continent, and of the people of African origin all over the world for their human dignity. There is also a grave threat to the Non-aligned Movement, in which Africa holds a special place as a continent of non-alignment.

If the southern zone of Africa were to come under the hegemony of the Pretoria regime, wielding nuclear weapons and acting as the gendarme of a Western alliance in southern Africa and the Indian Ocean, the Non-aligned Movement may encounter its greatest reverse.

I

Effect of the Nkomati Accord

The Nkomati Accord may hopefully provide some much-needed respite to Mozambique.

But neither Mozambique, nor any other independent African State unwilling to accept the hegemony of South Africa, can be really secure so long as apartheid persists in South Africa. The independence and security of southern Africa can only be attained by the elimination of apartheid.

Many people around the world have jumped to the conclusion that the Nkomati Accord would make it impossible for the ANC to continue its armed struggle and that the liberation struggle would be set back by ten or twenty years.

I believe that is not the prospect, though the Accord does create difficulties for the ANC.

The ANC had no military bases or training camps or any concentrations of freedom fighters in Mozambique, and hardly any incursions of freedom fighters have been reported across

the border between Mozambique and South Africa. The ANC can perhaps sustain the armed struggle inside South Africa at the present level even if that border is sealed.

In fact, I would be more concerned with the prospect of unorganised violence and killings inside South Africa if the black people feel frustrated and provoked by repression. The talks and accords will become a serious problem only if the independent African States become so enmeshed with South Africa as to enable it to undermine sanctions against that country, or become so hostile to the national liberation movements as to deny even sanctuary to refugees, or abandon their commitment to total liberation of South Africa and advocate compromises and encourage third forces in conjunction with Western Powers.

There is no such prospect, as may be seen from the communique of the frontline States on April 29th.

The New Racist Constitution of South Africa

The authorities in South Africa do not see the accords as the beginning of a process of peaceful resolution of the situation in the region - especially inside Namibia and South Africa - in accordance with the United Nations resolutions. They see it as a means to gain time for the implementation of their master plan for South Africa and for southern Africa as a whole.

Inside South Africa, behind the cover of all the propaganda about adaptations of apartheid or relaxations of racist laws, their primary objective has been to entrench white domination by denationalising the African majority through the creation of so-called "independent" bantustans. Already, four such sham "States" have been created and over eight million Africans have been deprived of citizenship under South African law.

The new constitution, which is now being imposed, is designed to facilitate the process of turning South Africa into a white bastion by co-opting Coloured and Indian minorities, and excluding the African majority. The Coloured and Indian people will become subject to conscription into the armed forces when the constitution is implemented. This Constitution, designed to widen the base for racism, has instead provoked widest opposition among the black people of South Africa. When the Coloured Labour Party decided to participate in the proposed elections, its leaders encountered such hostility among the Coloured people that they could not hold public meetings. Among the Indian people - 90 per cent of whom boycotted the last elections to the South African Indian Council - there has been a resurgence of political activity, with only a few members of the rump Indian Council agreeing to participate in the proposed elections. Among the African people, even those who had worked within the system of apartheid had to declare opposition.

The regime felt obliged to abandon referenda among the Coloured and Indian people. It has announced elections to the segregated Parliaments of the Coloured and Indian people in August, and is trying through repression, as well as various inducements, to counter a total boycott.

A serious crisis is, therefore, brewing inside South Africa and the authorities may well resort to severe repression of all opponents of apartheid.

The Indians in South Africa are faced with a critical choice.

While appreciating the pressures on them, I hope that no Indian will in any way cooperate in the manoeuvres of the regime to divide the black people and other opponents of apartheid, and dispossess the African people.

The great majority of Indians will no doubt boycott the elections, but I hope that even those who are considering participation will be persuaded by public opinion in South Africa and in India to recognise that the destiny of the people of Indian origin is with the indigenous majority, and that only a non-racial democratic system can provide them security.

Complex Situation

The situation in southern Africa has become rather complex, though the basic issues are simple and our own choice is clear.

At a time when the mobilisation of the oppressed people in South Africa has reached an unprecedented level, the frontline States have been forced to abandon some of their own commitments to the liberation struggle in that country. At a time when the international movement against apartheid has scored further advances, especially in the major Western countries, the international forces ranged against genuine liberation of South Africa have been able to regain the initiative. The problem of apartheid has become enmeshed, more than ever before, in a tense international environment. The national liberation movement of South Africa and all its friends – Governments and organisations – need to increase their cooperation to retake the initiative and launch a determined offensive against apartheid, its practitioners, promoters and protectors.

I believe that in recent years, there has been some lethargy and indecision among the friends of liberation. There has been some illusion that the talks on Namibia and the advance of the struggle in South Africa would lead to progress without much additional international effort. There has been a serious lack of appreciation of the aggressiveness of the South African regime and the determination of its allies. Both in the Non-aligned Movement and in the Organisation of African Unity, there have been suggestions that the struggle for liberation is near its end and that they should give priority to economic issues.

I believe that that assessment was totally wrong. Liberation can never be allowed to take second place. So long as the struggle for liberation is not completed, there is a constant danger of reversal in one form or another.

Africa Must Unite

For more than two decades, the United Nations, on the recommendation of the Special Committee against Apartheid, recognised that the elimination of apartheid is a vital interest of the Organisation. It has followed a three-pronged strategy: (a) sanctions against South Africa to demonstrate to the white minority that apartheid will not be permitted to be entrenched in any form, and to weaken the military and economic power of the racist regime; (b) assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and their national liberation movement in their legitimate struggle; and (c) mobilisation of world public opinion in support of international action against apartheid.

The Special Committee has pointed out with grave concern and distress that the policy of the present administration in the United States of America is diametrically opposed to this strategy. That administration has espoused "constructive engagement" with South Africa - of support to the alleged forces of peaceful change which seem to include the military-industrial complex of South Africa and the blacks who have agreed to work within the system of apartheid. It opposes the ANC and SWAPO as some kind of "Soviet-sponsored terrorists." It opposes United Nations efforts to mobilise public opinion for sanctions against South Africa and support to the national liberation movement of South Africa.

This approach of the United States is against that of the overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations, including a substantial majority of Western States, so that the United States has been alone in opposing most of the General Assembly resolutions on apartheid.

The Special Committee has called for concerned efforts to persuade the United States to harmonise its policy with the views of almost all other States. In this connection, it has stressed the need for united action by Africa and the Non-aligned world, by Western countries and by public opinion in the West, especially in the United States.

While significant efforts have been made in this respect, regrettably they have fallen far short of the requirements. It has been distressing that Africa in particular has suffered from bilateral disputes, aggravated by external forces, which have weakened the Organisation of African Unity.

I may recall that there have been disputes and differences in Africa which have threatened the OAU ever since its inception in 1963. But the over-riding concern of Africa for freedom and dignity, again and again enabled Africa to

overcome the divisions and retain the unity of the continent in the struggle for liberation.

Unless Africa can now make a supreme effort to restore its unity for the emancipation of the continent, the liberation struggle in South Africa will continue to face great difficulties.

What applies to Africa and the OAU applies also, to some content, to the Non-Aligned Movement.

Forces For and Against Liberation

Hardly any movement in human history has attracted such wide support and solidarity in the world, from governments as well as people, as has the national liberation movement in South Africa.

It has received support from the international trade union movement, from religious bodies and from numerous other organisations.

Many countries have made substantial sacrifices to impose sanctions against South Africa and assistance has been provided to the oppressed people and their national liberation movement from many governments, organisations and individuals. Over one hundred cities in Britain have recently taken action against apartheid, as have many States and major cities in the United States – and these include Greater London and Washington, DC.

Nelson Mandela is perhaps the most honoured political prisoner in history.

The Anti-Apartheid Movement has been one of the most significant and effective public international movements of our time. Tens of thousands of people have made sacrifices in support of campaigns led by that movement in solidarity with the liberation struggle in South Africa.

But at the same time, the liberation struggle in South Africa has faced great odds—not only from the white minority which has been poisoned by racism and utilises the great economic resources of the country for repression, but from a triumvirate of powerful international forces – namely, the transnational corporations, the racist elements all over the world and the cold war mentality.

Transnational corporations not only strengthen the forces of racism in South Africa, but form lobbies against anti-apartheid action in the metropolitan countries, thereby corrupting their own societies.

While much has been written on the activities of the transnational corporations, we have not paid sufficient attention to the role of what we may call the “racist international.”

Our hopes that the advance of the colonial revolution would lead to the demise of racism have not been fulfilled. I believe that until apartheid is eliminated in South Africa, we will not reach the turning point in the struggle against racism on this globe.

I am concerned that even some of those who are strongly opposed to racism believe that the elimination of racism will be a very long process with education as the main instrument. The victims of racism cannot wait for such a leisurely process, certainly not until racists are educated against racism.

A welcome development has been the development of an anti-racist movement in Britain, France and other countries with a programme which includes the abolition of institutional racism; a recognition that the issue is not one of rights of migrant labour, treatment of immigrants and other specific matters, but the acceptance that their societies are multiracial and that people of all racial origins must learn to live together in peace as equals; and finally dissociation from apartheid South Africa as a complement to the struggle against racism at home.

The third greatest source of sustenance to apartheid has been the cold war mentality in the West, and this has been long-standing.

I may recall that racist South Africa was a participant in the discussion of military plans by the colonial Powers in Africa after the Second World War, and one of the main promoters of the Middle East Pact in the 1950s. The Western Powers showed hostility to the ANC as early as the 1950s. United States policy, in particular, has been influenced, except for brief intervals, by cold war calculations and supposed strategic concerns.

The South African regime has greatly benefited from the acute international tension in recent years by projecting the bogey of a Marxist belt in southern Africa.

It is because of the involvement of these international forces that the liberation movement in South Africa needs and deserves effective international assistance.

Action by Non-aligned Movement

The situation in southern Africa is critical, but I believe that the glee of the racists *can* be made very brief.

The unity of the Non-aligned movement and its close cooperation with the national liberation movements is crucial for this purpose.

Radical rhetoric and ritual condemnations at international conferences must be replaced by concrete action.

There is an urgent need to increase assistance to the national liberation movements.

There is an urgent need to provide political and material support to the resistance inside South Africa.

Above all, there must be concerted action against the policies of the transnational corporations and the governments providing assistance to South Africa.

I may recall that, in 1981, the Non-aligned movement decided to take retaliatory action against transnational corporations collaborating with South Africa.

But that decision remains unimplemented.

I would suggest, as a single first step, that Non-aligned countries undertake not to purchase any military supplies from corporations providing such supplies to South Africa – and not to purchase oil from corporations which make illicit supplies of oil to South Africa.

India Must be on Frontline

We can justly feel proud of the contribution made by Indians to the great freedom movement in South Africa, beginning with Gandhiji's *Satyagraha* in South Africa early in this century.

Dr. Yusuf Dadoo, the leader of the South African Indian Congress and Chairman of the South African Communist Party, who passed away last year in exile, played a tremendous role in mobilising the people of Indian origin in joint struggles with the African people, recognising that the interests of the oppressed African majority must be paramount. The people of Indian origin have contributed their share in blood and suffering in the cause of freedom and justice – as can be seen from the many who were brutally tortured to death in detention, who have spent long years in prison and who have made material sacrifices.

The leaders of the African Youth League in the 1940s were rather wary of cooperation with people of other racial groups, but three decades of common struggle and sacrifice have forged such unity that the term "black" became popular in the 1970s, encompassing the African people, the so-called Coloured people and the people of Indian origin.

I would like to submit that for India, as much as for African States, support for the liberation struggle in South Africa is not mere solidarity but a vital interest.

India must be on the frontline – as, indeed, it was in the 1940s when it called for international action against racism in South Africa and when it imposed sanctions against the racist regime of South Africa at considerable sacrifice. The independence of African States and the establishment of the Organisation of African Unity demand of us close cooperation with them, but do not reduce our responsibility for action or initiatives.

Historic Significance

The world today is confronted with injustices and brutal repression in many countries. There are massive killings, tortures and jailings in several countries where the people have risen against oppressive systems.

In some small countries in Latin America alone, many more people are killed or jailed than in South Africa.

Some people who oppose action against apartheid, ask why the United Nations should devote special attention to South Africa, why it should "pick" on South Africa.

I have often asked myself that question, though for different reasons, because all of us need to be concerned with oppression anywhere in the world.

To me, the answer is clear. The struggle for freedom in South Africa has assumed a historic significance.

We, in India, should be able to appreciate this since we were conscious that our own struggle for freedom – in the most populous colonial country, the “jewel in the Crown” – had more significance than a struggle of one nation for independence. We believed that in fighting for our freedom, we were also fighting for the freedom of other colonial peoples.

The struggle in South Africa is the last stage of the struggle for the emancipation of the continent of Africa from five centuries of slavery, humiliation and inhumanity. It is the last stage of the struggle against imperialism and colonialism – at least in their formal aspects – and a vital battle in the effort to rid the world of the scourge of racism.

The oppressed people of South Africa, in fighting for their own rights, are today also fighting for humanity, for ending a shameful chapter of human history and for facilitating a new world order.

That is why their struggle has been so difficult and prolonged. That is why their national movement – which has inspired and assisted freedom movements all over the region – has not yet succeeded but faces further odds today.

The recognition of the historic significance of the South African struggle demands of us to identify ourselves totally with that struggle. Our duty is not only to assist the national liberation movement of South Africa but also to confront the forces ranged against it – the international complex of profiteers, racists and militarists.

UNITED NATIONS AND THE ANTI-APARTHEID MOVEMENT: A FRUITFUL PARTNERSHIP³⁶

The Anti-Apartheid Movement and the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid were established around the same time, in response to the appeals of the leaders of the movement for freedom in South Africa. They were both intended to meet the need for constant efforts to inform public opinion of the crimes of apartheid and the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa, to promote the isolation of the apartheid regime; and to encourage moral and material assistance to those struggling for freedom in South Africa.

They have both recognised that the primary role in the struggle for liberation belongs to the national liberation movement, and that their own work is supportive. They have both tried to build the broadest support for the liberation struggle – irrespective of differences on any other issues – in the broader context of the struggle for the emancipation of Africa.

While the Special Committee as an intergovernmental body and the AAM as a public organisation had different mandates, they were both conscious of the need to combine diplomatic and public action and to concert action by governments and peoples committed to freedom and equality in South Africa. Out of this common recognition developed a fruitful partnership between the two bodies. The Special Committee began effective cooperation with the Anti-Apartheid Movement soon after its own establishment in 1963. It has not only consulted the Movement on numerous occasions and sent representatives to its meetings, but has invited representatives of the Movement to its own meetings, seminars and conferences. It also assisted the AAM in developing close cooperation with other UN bodies.

Even more important, many of the initiatives of the Special Committee have resulted from consultations with the Anti-Apartheid Movement. The historic resolution 1881 (XVIII) of the General Assembly, on the release of South African political prisoners, was adopted on October 11, 1963, during the Rivonia Trial, when the late Bishop Ambrose Reeves, former president of AAM, visited the United Nations. The Special Committee and the AAM cooperated on the World Campaign for the Release of South African Political Prisoners which was launched at that time.

The Special Committee sent a high-level delegation to the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, organised by the AAM in April 1964, helped publicise its

³⁶ Article in the *Anti-Apartheid News*, Supplement for the 25th anniversary of AAM, June 1984

results and pressed for action by the United Nations in the light of the conclusions of that conference.

The Special Committee decided to promote the sports and cultural boycott of South Africa as a result of consultations held during its special session in London in June 1968.

More recently, the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa was launched by the AAM, with the encouragement of the Special Committee. The Special Committee and the AAM have co-sponsored or cooperated in organising many important international conferences – such as the World Conference for Action against Apartheid (Lagos 1977), the International Conference for Sanctions against South Africa (Paris 1981), and a series of seminars on military, nuclear, economic and other collaboration with South Africa.

These joint activities have resulted in almost daily contacts between the Centre against Apartheid in the United Nations Secretariat and the AAM. As head of the Centre, I have valued the cooperation with the leaders and staff of the AAM for over two decades.

Five years ago, I had occasion to say:

"The sanctions campaign was launched at a time when the liberation movement was obliged by the apartheid regime to take the fateful decision to go beyond non-violent and legal struggle.

"Today, twenty years later, we face a new situation, after the tremendous escalation of repression and resistance. Will the international community enable the liberation movements of southern Africa to destroy the racist regimes and emancipate the whole of the African continent or will external forces allow the apartheid regime to bring about a wider conflict?"

Our hopes at the time that the international community would ensure that the liberation of the former Portuguese colonies would in turn lead to Zimbabwe's freedom were realised in 1980. However, the emancipation of the racist strongholds of Namibia and South Africa now appears more distant than ever. The South African regime has been able to plunge the entire region into conflict and crisis while intensifying its efforts to entrench apartheid through forced removals, creation of bantustans and the enactment of the new racist constitution.

It has found powerful friends to protect it from effective international action and assist it in massive propaganda to divert attention from the implementation of its "master plan" against the black people. Thus the crisis has deepened despite the tremendous growth of the movement for freedom in South Africa and the notable advances in the international mobilisation against apartheid.

The 25th anniversary of the AAM is, therefore, an occasion for a thorough study of the forces of freedom and those

ranged against it, and for the formulation of new strategies. A redoubled effort for freedom and peace in southern Africa will require even greater cooperation between the United Nations and the Anti-Apartheid Movements of the world.

WESTERN POLICY ON APARTHEID³⁷

The United Nations is committed to support the *total* elimination of apartheid and the establishment of a non-racial democratic State in South Africa. It affirms that apartheid is a negation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and an affront to the conscience and dignity of mankind. It recognises the legitimacy of the struggle in South Africa toward this objective. It condemns repression in South Africa and demands the release of all political prisoners, and the abrogation of bans on the liberation movements.

These statements are from unanimous resolutions of the General Assembly to which the Western Powers have subscribed. They did not vote for other propositions adopted by very large majorities declaring that the Pretoria regime is illegitimate and that the liberation movements recognised by the Organisation of African Unity are the authentic representatives of the overwhelming majority of the people of South Africa.

We need to ask whether the Western countries have acted in accordance with the propositions to which they have repeatedly subscribed.

For instance, how many of the Western countries which have met with leaders of the racist regime received or held discussions with the leaders of the liberation movements? I believe the United States and the United Kingdom are not among them.

If the Western States do support the total elimination of apartheid, how can they regard the new constitution of South Africa which entrenches apartheid and totally excludes the African majority as a step in the right direction – as the United States does?

Why is the United Kingdom almost alone in withholding contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa – a fund set up to provide humanitarian assistance to the victims of persecution in South Africa, a fund which has been unanimously endorsed by the United Nations and to which almost all Western countries including the United States of America, France and the Federal Republic of Germany make contributions?

(The United Kingdom has not contributed to this Fund. which was set up in 1965, except on two occasions, in 1966-1967 and 1978-1979.)

Western Responsibility

³⁷ Speech in a Commission at the "National Convention against Apartheid and for Freedom in South Africa" organised by the Anti-Apartheid Movement at City University, London, June 23, 1984

A second theme in many of the United Nations resolutions for almost twenty years is the assertion that the Western States – particularly the main trading partners of South Africa, and more particularly the Western Permanent Members of the Security Council and the Federal Republic of Germany – are largely responsible for the tragedy in South Africa, together with the transnational corporations, financial institutions and other vested interests in their countries, because of their collaboration with South Africa. This is a “controversial” assertion because the Western delegations oppose it, while most of the others vote for it. The reference is not to historic responsibility, for instance of the United Kingdom, but to the actions since the apartheid regime came to power in 1948, since the oppressed people of South Africa and the African States appealed for sanctions against South Africa in 1958, since the United Nations General Assembly voted for sanctions on November 7, 1962.

The trade of some of the Western Powers with South Africa and their investment in South Africa have shot up. Supplies of military equipment, technology and training have also been massive, despite the United Nations arms embargo since 1963, which was made mandatory in 1977 by a unanimous vote of the Security Council.

Since 1960, the South African military budget has increased from 36 million rand to over 3,000 million rand, and South Africa has acquired billions of dollars of military hardware. All of it comes from, or is produced with the assistance of, Western States and Israel.

I remember that when the Special Committee against Apartheid was established in 1963, some Western countries were claiming that they were not supplying arms for repression. They were not supplying rifles and batons which the Pretoria regime did not need, but only military aircraft, warships and so on.

Now some of them claim that they are not supplying finished and polished military equipment but only everything short of that so that the South Africans are obliged to assemble, polish and stamp the equipment as made in South Africa. If anyone can prove that a bomber can be used for a civilian purpose – to spray pesticides or even to kill a few flies – that becomes dual purpose equipment according to recent statements from London and some other capitals and may be licensed for sale to South Africa.

Three Reasons

Thirdly, the Special Committee against Apartheid has given three reasons why the Western Powers and interests concerned collaborate with apartheid and block international action for the elimination of apartheid.

The first is the profit motive. Billions of dollars of profit is derived from the exploitation of the people of

South Africa, and that in turn develops lobbies for apartheid.

The second is the continued influence of racism in Western and other countries. The racist elements in the West support and feed on apartheid in South Africa – so that the struggle against apartheid in South Africa is linked to the struggle all over the world against racism.

The third is the cold war which seems to persuade some Western Powers or leaders or military brass that apartheid South Africa is a valuable ally, and must be accepted as a member of the “free world” – even at the risk that its admission will totally discredit the “free World” in the eyes of most of humanity.

United States Policy

The Special Committee against Apartheid has expressed dismay and distress at the policy of the present administration in the United States – which is diametrically opposed to the position adopted by the United Nations for over two decades, namely: (a) end collaboration with the apartheid regime; (b) support the national liberation movement; and (c) mobilise world public opinion for these purposes.

That three-pronged approach was endorsed unanimously by the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris in May 1981, with the participation of a majority of Western States.

The Special Committee is convinced that the other Western States do not agree with the approach of the present United States administration.

But perhaps because of loyalty to their alliances, many of them have been influenced by the United States position, thereby drifting backwards or becoming less active in the campaign against apartheid.

The Special Committee has analysed the votes in the General Assembly. The votes of the United States have been almost wholly negative, and the United Kingdom follows. These two countries have become conspicuous even in comparison to other Western States.

The Special Committee can only depend on public opinion in the Western countries to persuade the governments to dissociate themselves from the current approach of the United States – to persuade the United States and not to be influenced by its errors – so that the Western world can count on respect and goodwill in the rest of the world.

Break the Unholy Alliance

The fact that the Pretoria regime has been able, because of the protection by Western Powers, to bully some neighbouring States and oblige them to accept the offer of a truce, does not make the regime peaceful.

The arrogance and aggressiveness of the Pretoria regime – or the propaganda in the West – should not persuade anyone that

the racist regime has become more powerful or that it has been able to reverse history by a quarter century. That regime is faced with a growing crisis and, in the face of growing resistance in South Africa and Namibia, its survival depends entirely on the benevolence of some Powers and forces in the West. This is not a time to adjust to the prospect of the survival of apartheid. I hope that the programme of action which will emerge from this Conference will not focus on responding to the propaganda and the moves of the Pretoria regime and its friends, but on means to break their unholy alliance and to ensure that all the needs of national liberation movements for external assistance are promptly met.

New Constitution of South Africa

Even if I have to depart from the subject somewhat, I want to say a few words on the new racist constitution of South Africa – and speak as an Indian. We too have kith and kin in South Africa – a million of them – as do Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia and Malaysia, not to speak of Africa. This new constitution was meant to place the Indian and Coloured communities in a most difficult position, to force them to betray the African majority. The Indian community in South Africa has a long tradition of struggle against racism in South Africa, beginning with Mahatma Gandhi almost a century ago – and India has a long tradition of support to that struggle. I need only recall that the late Dr. Yusuf Dadoo, who is buried here in London, symbolises the commitment of the Indian community to link its destiny with the aspirations of the indigenous African majority. In a somewhat different way, Abdul Samad Minty, founder and honorary secretary of the Anti-Apartheid Movement, also symbolises that commitment. When any Western leader welcomes the racist constitution of South Africa as a step in the right direction, we have reason to resent that as an insult to India and people of Indian origin. I would like to take this opportunity to express my great pride at the appeal by India to all people of Indian origin in South Africa to reject and refuse to cooperate with the new constitution. I hope the whole world will unequivocally denounce that constitution when it is brought into force on September 3rd.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS — NO MORE³⁸

This conference has been organised in the context of the centenary of two tragic and shameful events of world history — the German invasion of Namibia from August 7, 1884, and the Berlin Conference later that year at which the imperialist Powers agreed to carve the Continent of Africa for their occupation.

It gives us an opportunity to consider the struggle for freedom in Namibia and South Africa, and for the total emancipation of Africa, in its proper context and from a longer perspective.

The history of Africa in the past century, as indeed of most of the world called the "Third World", has been the story of both the inhumanity, pillage and hypocrisy of the imperialist Powers, and of the heroism and generosity of the peoples struggling for freedom.

There are not many parallels in modern world history to the calculated and deliberate genocide of the Namibian people under the occupation of Imperial Germany, followed by the brutal racist domination of South Africa.

At the same time, the resistance of the Namibian people ever since 1884 is an epic in which the heroic and nation-wide struggle under the leadership of SWAPO since 1960 is only the last chapter.

In how many countries of Europe, for instance, have people fought for freedom with the same odds that the Namibian people have faced — a million people scattered in a huge territory struggling against a brutal regime which respects no law and no morality, and which has been allowed to build up a gigantic military machine?

In how many countries have 94 per cent of the people boycotted elections as they did in Ovamboland in 1972 despite all intimidation?

How many parallels are there to the deliberate and cowardly massacre of refugees in Cassinga?

There has been questioning by the Pretoria regime and a few Western Powers as to whether SWAPO is the authentic representative of the Namibian people — as if the aspirations of any oppressed people can be represented by any other than the organisation fighting for their freedom. In any case that will be decided by the Namibian people if only they are allowed to exercise their right to self-determination.

³⁸ Speech at the Non-governmental Organisations Conference for the Independence of Namibia and the Eradication of Apartheid, Geneva, July 2, 1984

But there is no question that for most of humanity which has suffered colonial oppression, and for all those who detest colonialism, SWAPO has already earned an honoured place among the great liberation movements of the world.

Soon after the invasion of Namibia, Bismarck's Germany played host to the infamous Berlin conference of imperialist Powers to carve up Africa – a continent that had until recently been ravaged by slavery, entire regions of which had been depopulated, whose great empires and civilisations had been destroyed – ostensibly to bestow the benefits of Christianity and civilisation to the African people.

At around the same time, diamonds and gold were discovered in South Africa – diamonds in 1866 and gold in 1886 – and greedy forces descended to subject the African people to new indignities in order to force them to extract the wealth from the bowels of Africa.

The leg irons of slavery were soon replaced by the *sjambok* and the whip, not to mention the cutting off of hands in Leopold's Congo or the instruments of torture used against so-called idle natives in territories colonised by Portugal. Africa has not demanded retribution or reparations or even restitution for the century of humiliation, exploitation and genocide – for the so-called white man's burden.

But some of the Powers concerned do not even seem to recognise – even after subscribing to the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights – the obligation to turn a new page and show sensitivity to African aspirations and feelings.

They continue to fraternise with the racist regime of South Africa and some of them even try to defame great African liberation movements.

They hold the birthright of the Namibian people to freedom and independence hostage to the blackmail of the illegal occupiers of that country.

And the racist Pretoria regime has now even begun to claim that some Western Powers recognise it as a regional Power – and there has been no denial from Western capitals.

It is in this context that this Conference – and other conferences planned for this Centenary – will need to define the moral responsibilities of the peoples of the world, especially the peoples of the Western countries, towards the people of South Africa and Namibia, and indeed of the African Continent.

Sixty years ago, in 1924, the Stallard Commission in South Africa declared that the African can enter the cities and towns only to minister to the needs of the whites. It is this inhuman ideology, in all its manifestations, whether in South Africa under apartheid or on a wider level, that we must fight and destroy. That is a task not only of the people of South Africa and Namibia, but of all decent human beings.

Time for a Counter-offensive

The colonial revolution in Africa in our time – as yet unfinished – has in its course encountered many attempts to undo the hard-won victories of the African people and to reverse the tide of history.

In the 1950s there were attempts towards military cooperation by the colonial Powers and apartheid South Africa to prevent or retard independence of African nations. From 1960, there have been a series of invasions of newly-independent States – of Zaire, Angola, Benin, Comoros and Seychelles – by mercenary criminals.

In 1975, after the collapse of Portuguese colonialism, there was the invasion of Angola by the racist forces of South Africa, in collusion with the secret services of Western Powers, in an attempt to extend the dominion of apartheid northwards.

The past few years have again seen an incessant series of acts of aggression, subversion and economic strangulation of the newly-independent States of southern Africa with a view to making the entire region subservient to a racist order in South Africa.

Africa and the world are today obliged not only to assist the oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia in their just struggle for independence, but to counter and defeat the plot to restore southern Africa to perpetual servitude. The offensive of racist-colonial forces must be met by a counter-offensive of all friends of African freedom.

The declarations of African States that they do not regard their freedom as complete so long as any part of Africa is oppressed, and that the struggle for liberation in dependent territories is the struggle of all the governments and peoples of Africa; the teachings of the leaders of freedom struggle in Asia and the Americas that their struggles are part of the world-wide effort for the elimination of colonialism and racism; the solemn commitments of the United Nations; and indeed the cherished values of all nations and all faiths – are, in a sense, put to the test in this last stage of the struggle for the elimination of colonialism and for the emancipation of Africa.

So-called quiet diplomacy is not enough, to say the least. Hospitality to the leaders of the Pretoria regime – ostensibly to convince them of the need for flexibility and pragmatism and of the wisdom of gradually mitigating apartheid – are hardly the answer.

Namibia must be fully free.

Apartheid must be totally eradicated.

The frontline States must be compensated for the enormous damages they have suffered because of aggression by the Pretoria regime and the unwillingness of responsible Powers to stop the aggression.

I have just come from a visit to Nigeria, and I feel that the wounds inflicted on their continent are not forgotten by the African people and the invitations to the leader of the apartheid regime by the very same countries which despoiled Africa have caused a deep hurt.

No Need for Pessimism

Despite the very critical situation in southern Africa, I do not believe that there is any need to feel pessimistic or to be resigned to the prospect of a prolonged racist domination in southern Africa.

The collapse of colonialism has taken place in many countries – in Algeria and Mozambique, to give but two examples – soon after the oppressors launched massive and seemingly triumphant offensives against the freedom fighters.

The present offensive of the Pretoria regime is taking place at a time when the national resistance in South Africa has made unprecedented advances, when that regime is unable to subdue the armed struggle of the Namibian people, and when it is faced with serious political, economic and other problems.

The movement against the new racist constitution has led to unprecedented mobilisation and unity of the great majority of the people against apartheid. We must pay tribute to the courageous leaders of this movement – such as Bishop Desmond Tutu, the Reverend Alan Boesak, Mrs. Albertina Sisulu, who is again sentenced to imprisonment, not to mention Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu, Govan Mbeki, Zephania Mothopeng, Ahmad Kathrada, Dennis Goldberg and many others who inspire the people from behind the prison bars.

The strength of that regime rests mainly on the short-sighted and disastrous policies of some external Powers and interests which can, if they had the will, undermine the racist system in South Africa.

The demonstrations against the visit of Prime Minister Botha to some European countries, and the groundswell of anti-apartheid activity in the United States of America show that the committed governments, organisations and individuals can, by concerted action, force the external Powers and interests concerned to break their links with racism in southern Africa.

It is idle merely to criticise and condemn the racists and their friends. What is required is a determined effort to secure united and effective action at all levels. Let us concentrate our attention on what the countless friends of African liberation all over the world can and will do.

I believe that an undertaking by all committed countries not to buy arms or oil from any corporation supplying arms or oil to South Africa – and to boycott any bank which lends to South Africa – can by itself be an effective beginning.

Our Moral Duty

At the risk of possible misunderstanding, I would like to make a distinction between our sense of solidarity with those struggling for freedom and our higher moral duty.

The struggle for freedom in South Africa and Namibia is waged by the people of those countries, under the leadership of their respective national liberation movements. Our actions in solidarity with those legitimate struggles are only supportive.

But our moral duty transcends this spirit of solidarity and is irrespective of attitudes towards the ideologies or strategies of the national liberation movements.

I may recall that the great majority of Member States of the United Nations denounced South African occupation of Namibia long before SWAPO was established.

I recall that a great English writer³⁹ divested himself of gold mining shares in the 1920s when he heard of oppression in the gold mines of South Africa. The South African national liberation movement was then little known abroad. The overriding moral duty is to dissociate from evil, from the system of apartheid which is an unmitigated evil.

The first task of non-governmental organisations is to mobilise world public opinion to demand that every government, corporation or institution dissociate itself from the system of racism in South Africa in every field. There can be no moral justification for collaboration with apartheid.

That is why we have repeatedly called on all governments and organisations – irrespective of any ideological and other differences – to implement sanctions against the Pretoria regime.

History will Speak

During the course of the struggle of African nations for freedom and national independence, many lives have been lost.

Nearly two million people died in the Algerian revolution alone.

Many precious leaders of the African people have been assassinated in their youth so that they could no longer lead their nations in the struggle for the redemption of Africa.

I think of my dear friends like Amilcar Cabral, Felix Moumie, Eduardo Mondlane, Ruth First, Joe Gqabi and many others.

But, above all, today, I think of that great symbol of African dignity and African spirit, Patrice Lumumba. For today is his birthday. He would have been only 59 years old if he were alive.

I believe that Patrice Lumumba was killed not because of his mistakes but because of his virtues – because he spoke the truth about the history of Africa, because he saw the Congo as the base for the total emancipation of Africa, and because he had faith that Africa would write its own history, a history of struggle and glory.

³⁹ E.M. Forster

In his last testament from jail, he wrote to his wife:

"The day will come when history will speak.
"Africa will write its own history and in both north
and south it will be a history of glory and dignity."

That history is being written today by the peoples' struggle for freedom in South Africa and Namibia.

Africa will be free with or without the honest support of some erstwhile colonial Powers. It will be free even with or without effective support and solidarity from those who profess to be friends of Africa.

It is for us to decide whether we discharge our moral and human responsibility for our own sake and to help reduce the suffering and the consequences of a bloody conflict in southern Africa.

The United Nations has repeatedly and unanimously defined apartheid as a crime against the conscience and dignity of mankind. This crime has continued for too long, causing immense suffering to the people of southern Africa and undermining efforts for a just international order. It is time that all those who are outraged by apartheid will not only renew their commitment to freedom, but prevent all collaboration with apartheid, and ensure all necessary assistance to the oppressed people to destroy apartheid and gain their inalienable right to freedom and human dignity.

APARTHEID AND INTERNATIONAL LAW⁴⁰

The Seminar on the Legal Status of the Apartheid Regime and Other Legal Aspects of the Struggle against Apartheid is coming to an end, and it is my duty to thank all those who have made this important Seminar a great success. We have spoken and written for many years of the inhumanity of apartheid, and of the many external forces which buttress apartheid. But I believe many of us have not fully comprehended the enormity of the injustice, the ferocity of the enemy and the unscrupulousness of the collaborators with apartheid. That is the reason for the present critical situation and the reason why even after decades of international condemnation of apartheid, there are suggestions that we must accommodate ourselves with apartheid in the name of realism or whatever. On the other hand, many of us have perhaps not fully comprehended the nature and scope of the great liberation movement of South Africa – with many streams flowing into a mighty river – which has not only written a glorious chapter in the history of struggle for freedom, but has inspired liberation struggles in many African countries and also in far-away India and the American South. It deserves not only our support but our faith in its inevitable triumph. Although this is a legal Seminar, it has gone into the fundamental issues involved, because we cannot discuss law in isolation. It has been said – and I confess I had also said it – that the struggle in South Africa is different from the struggle in the American South – because the law of the land was in favour of freedom in the United States of America while the law in South Africa is racist. This Seminar has shown that even in the case of South Africa, there is a higher law, an international law, overriding the obnoxious and illegal racist laws. The Seminar makes clear that those who collaborate with and sustain apartheid have been undermining the very fabric of international law. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights – which was not accepted by the apartheid regime, but endorsed by the liberation movement – is a revolutionary document. It not only lays down the rights of people, but recognises the right to rebellion when those rights are denied. Participants have made frequent reference to the Nuremberg principles and to the designation of apartheid as a crime against humanity. In this connection, I would like to recall that as early as 1966 when colonialism and apartheid were denounced by the General Assembly as crimes against humanity, the

⁴⁰ Speech at the concluding session of the Seminar on the Legal Status of the Apartheid Regime and other Legal Aspects of the Struggle against Apartheid, Lagos, Nigeria, August 16, 1984

Chairman of the Special Committee on Decolonisation,
Ambassador Collier of Sierra Leone, said:

"The world should not sit idly by and wait until events have culminated into a disaster of unthinkable proportions to proclaim in an international tribunal afterwards that crimes had been committed against humanity."