

SANCTIONS AGAINST APARTHEID

P. Tlale

IN DECEMBER 1958, the first All-African Peoples' Conference, meeting in Accra, issued the first resounding call for a world-wide trade and diplomatic boycott of South Africa. Fifteen months later, in April 1960, the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference held in Conakry and attended by delegates from fifty African and Asian countries, including the Soviet Union, China and other socialist states, renewed the call and demanded that the Afro-Asian countries take immediate steps to sever all trade and diplomatic relations with South Africa.

From these meetings there emerged what has since become a world-wide movement of struggle for all-embracing sanctions against South Africa. The movement has not only been a protest against the vile and hated apartheid regime in South Africa; it has become a powerful demonstration of active solidarity and support with the great South African struggle for freedom and liberation. More than that, the movement has been a signal force in converting the issue of apartheid into a major international question—into, what the United Nations Security Council recently called, 'a serious disturbance to international peace and security'.

The South African liberation movement and the African National Congress in particular, have always regarded the boycott of South Africa as an invaluable aid to the struggle against apartheid and the Verwoerd colonialists. While rightly believing that the liberation of our country will ultimately be achieved by the South African people themselves, our politically conscious liberation fighters have not only welcomed outside demonstrations of solidarity and support through trade and other boycotts, but have themselves called for such actions. For as our movement recognizes every outside pressure for boycott and sanctions reinforces the confidence of our non-white people, raises their spirit and enables them to face the formidable power of the South African ruling class in the firm conviction that they can and will win the seemingly unequal struggle for freedom and liberation.

THE AFRICAN STATES REACT

The policies of the emerging independent African states quickly embraced the demands for solidarity and support of the South African struggle. In June 1960, Ministers from ten independent African states, meeting for the first time in Addis Ababa adopted a ten-point programme for sanctions against South Africa. This programme not only accepted the demands for a trade and diplomatic boycott, but went further by calling for the closing of air and sea ports to South Africa, securing the expulsion of South Africa from the Commonwealth, approaching 'the oil companies to stop the sale of Arab oil to South Africa', and for the intensification of the struggle for United Nations' action.

The African states at the same time became increasingly preoccupied with the threatening course of South Africa's policies: policies which by their nature were becoming increasingly provocative and insulting to the people of the continent, as well as seriously undermining Africa's peace and security. Inside South Africa, the colonial system of white supremacy and racial oppression was intensified by the ruthless application of the policy of apartheid: law after law was added to the already race-packed statute books to remove whatever little rights, opportunities and justice the non-white peoples possessed, and the police state with all its trappings of arbitrary power and Nazi-style ruthlessness, was enforced to the full.

At the same time, the Verwoerd regime commenced a massive and unprecedented build-up of its military power. Since 1960, expenditure on the country's armed forces increased from £40 million to £104 million. The all-white Permanent Force was increased from 9,000 to 15,000 in the short period of four years, in addition to the creation of a Citizen Force of 40,000 and a Commando network in which every white male was required to serve for four consecutive years. The South African armed forces acquired new and the most modern arms and equipment: aircraft of formidable range, flexibility and striking power were added to the country's air force. A large domestic armaments industry was created making the country virtually self-sufficient in a whole range of small arms and ammunition. And to support this powerful and increasingly offensive military posture, the South African government developed close ties of alliance with the Portuguese colonialists who control the adjacent territories of Angola and Mozambique, and with the white settler government of Southern Rhodesia.

The threat to free Africa which these military preparations now presented became a further and serious source of concern to the African states. For, as President Nkrumah explained:

'The military machine that is being built up in South Africa, presents a

most threatening danger, not only to the struggle for independence in Central, East and South Africa, but to the safety of the already independent states.'

Africa Must Unite.

South Africa had become more than a stronghold of colonialism and an outpost of imperialism in Africa. The Verwoerd regime's aggressive programme of militarization was now seen to be determined not only by its acknowledged plans to use the weapons of war to crush the anti-apartheid resistance movement in the country, but to create through the force of arms a vast zone of colonial domination in Southern Africa and in this way to undermine and threaten the independence and security of the free African nations.

And thus, when the Head of States of independent Africa met in Addis Ababa in April 1963, they were faced with a new and considerably more serious situation than they had three years earlier. They now decided to take new and more far-reaching and decisive measures to oppose South Africa. They called for the immediate implementation and enforcement of their own trade and diplomatic boycotts, which though previously decided upon, were by no means universally or uniformly applied by the African countries. Further, they decided to launch a concerted campaign for the removal of South Africa from all international organizations including those concerned with cultural and sports exchanges, and, next to request for the early convening of the Security Council to 'consider the explosive situation in South Africa' with a view to demanding the imposition of all-round sanctions including an immediate embargo on the flow of arms and strategic material to the South African Republic.

The campaign to remove South Africa from all international organizations found its first important expression in the May 1963 Conference of the International Labour Organization. Here the African delegates, supported by the socialist countries, left the meeting in a collective protest when the South African official delegate tried to speak. The Nigerian President of the Conference resigned and the conference broke up in disorder when the African delegations returned home.

In February 1963, the African members of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa forced the resignation of South Africa. In July, Kenya which was host to the United Nations Conference on Cartography refused to admit the South African delegates into the country. In August, pressure from the African delegations caused the United Nations Conference on Tourism to 'invite' the South African delegation to withdraw. The Thirteenth Session of the African Regional Conference of the World Health Organization had to be abandoned

altogether when the African representatives refused to sit with the South African delegates. In September, the African countries walked out of the conference of the Food and Agricultural Organization when they failed to secure the immediate removal of the South African delegation. The International Monetary Fund meeting in Washington in the same month saw a similar African outburst at the presence of the South African Finance Minister. This battle against South Africa has even been extended to non-governmental organization. In October, a group of airline representatives from Africa walked out of the meeting of the International Air Transport Association. At the last session of the United Nations General Assembly only six Africans were present when the South African delegate rose to speak.

The most telling example of this African drive has been the persistent pressure to exclude South Africa from participation in the Olympic Games. Here, despite the obstruction and prevarication tactics of the Anglo-American representatives, South Africa's participation in the forthcoming Games in Tokyo has been made conditional on firm evidence being provided that apartheid in sport is abandoned in South Africa and that equal sports facilities are made available to the non-white people. South Africa's failure to provide such evidence now makes its exclusion from the Olympic Games inevitable.

The force and persistence of the drive to exclude South Africa from these organizations, has gone a long way towards isolating the Verwoerd colonialists from the international community. And whether the Anglo-Americans like it or not, the future months will see continued and intensified pressures to drive Verwoerd's delegates out of all the important inter-governmental and other organizations. The African nations are uncompromisingly determined to achieve this aim.

The Addis Ababa decision to secure an early meeting of the Security Council on the South African question was the culmination of the long struggle which the African and Asian nations, supported by the socialist countries had conducted in the United Nations for all-embracing sanctions against South Africa. This article analyses the movement towards sanctions arising out of this struggle.

THE UNITED NATIONS MOVEMENT FOR SANCTIONS

For well over seventeen years now the United Nations has been 'discussing' the South African question. In 1946, at the very first session of the United Nations General Assembly, the Indian Government lodged a complaint against South Africa on its treatment of the people of Indian origin. From 1952, the issue of apartheid has been before every session of the General Assembly. In March 1960, the

Security Council for the first time became directly concerned with the South African question as a result of the large-scale killing of unarmed and peaceful demonstrators at Sharpeville. It then came to the conclusion that the situation in South Africa had 'led to international friction, and if continued, might endanger international peace and security'. By 1962, the General Assembly and Security Council had adopted no less than twenty-seven resolutions condemning South Africa's racial policies and urging the South African government to revise these policies and initiate measures 'aimed at bringing about racial harmony based on equality'.

Despite all these discussions and resolutions, the Verwoerd regime neither relented nor relaxed its policies; rather, these seventeen years have seen, more than any other period in South Africa's history, the most ruthless and systematic application of the rule of apartheid. And in the mandated territory of South-West Africa, the South African authorities, in gross and continuous violation of all their international obligations, forcibly extended their colonial rule over the people, evicting them from their traditional lands and applied their policies of apartheid in favour of the privileged white minority and the South African and foreign monopolies who now control, through concessions, over one-half of the territory.

Thus when the United Nations General Assembly met in November 1962, it was confronted with a situation of extraordinary gravity: never has a member state defied its resolutions and recommendations for so long a period with such brazen and reckless impunity. This was a direct threat to the existence of the United Nations and its peace-keeping functions. But this was not all. Apart from there having been no let-up in the tempo of apartheid legislation, there was the intensive military build-up in South Africa supported by the increasing flow of arms and equipment from the NATO bloc countries—a fact which severely aggravated the South African question for the whole of free Africa. The issue, thus, was no longer whether the United Nations should respond to the South African question with a purposeful policy of economic sanctions and other measures against the Verwoerd government; this was now a settled issue, and not even the Anglo-American imperialists found it possible to continue to lobby and mobilize opposition against such a United Nations policy. And accordingly, the General Assembly in November 1962, took its first decisive step towards the imposition of collective sanctions. It now recommended *specific measures* against South Africa, which as the United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid explained, represented a 'new stage' in the seventeen-year 'confrontation' between the United Nations and South Africa.

The operative paragraph 4 of the November 1962 Resolution called upon all member states to take the following measures against the South African government:

- (a) **Breaking off diplomatic relations . . . or refraining from establishing such relations.**
- (b) **Closing their ports to all vessels flying the South African flag.**
- (c) **Enacting legislation prohibiting their ships from entering South African ports.**
- (d) **Boycotting all South African goods and refraining from exporting goods, including arms and ammunition, to South Africa.**
- (e) **Refusing landing and passage facilities to all aircraft belonging to the government of South Africa and companies registered under the laws of South Africa.'**

Further, the General Assembly set up a special committee to keep South Africa's apartheid policies under review and requested the Security Council 'to take appropriate measures, including sanctions' and to consider taking action under Article 6 of the United Nations Charter which provides for the expulsion of a member-state which persistently violates the principles of the Charter. This resolution was adopted *in toto* by a majority of sixty-seven to sixteen with twenty-three abstentions. The countries voting against the resolution were made up of the imperialist and capitalist countries of North America and Western Europe and certain other countries, like Spain, which were renowned for their fascist and reactionary regimes. These countries were either members of the NATO or the SEATO war blocs. And they, together, as Eric Louw, the late South African Foreign Minister, was quick to calculate, 'bought 79.8 per cent of South Africa's exports, excluding gold, and provided 63.7 per cent of her imports'. The abstaining countries were largely South American—under the pressure of the purse strings of the United States, and the Anglo-American lobby at the United Nations, the bulk of the Latin American delegations were not permitted to vote for the resolution.

But the November 1962 resolution of the General Assembly did represent a 'new stage'. The combined power of Africa, Asia and the socialist world had come out decisively to put the issue of sanctions well within the scope of realization and implementation. The South African 'sanctuary of colonialism and racialism' which (in the words of the Soviet delegate at the General Assembly) the imperialists had tried to make 'inviolable' had suffered its first effective and important breach, as country after country announced the measures it had or would take against the Verwoerd Republic in accordance with the United Nations resolution.

At the request of the African countries, the Security Council met twice in 1963 to consider the South African question. At its first meeting it called for an embargo on the supply of arms, ammunition and military equipment to South Africa. That paragraph of the Afro-Asian resolution which called for a boycott of South African goods had to be deleted as a result of the refusal of the United States, Britain, France, the Chiang Kai-shek representative, Brazil and Norway, to give it their support. In December, the Security Council decided to extend the sanction on arms supply by calling on all member states to ban the shipment of equipment and material required by South Africa for the domestic manufacture of arms and ammunition. Further, the Security Council added its influential voice to the world-wide demand for the release of political prisoners and for abandoning the trials of anti-apartheid leaders now taking place in the country. The 1963 session of the General Assembly added to its 1962 recommendation of specific measures for sanctions by calling upon member states to stop the supply of oil to South Africa. This resolution was adopted by a majority of eighty-four to six.* The report of the United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid of September 1963 went a step further in its recommendations to the Security Council and the General Assembly: 'The Special Committee feels that they should consider, without further delay, possible new measures in accordance with the Charter, which provide for stronger political, diplomatic and economic sanctions, suspension of rights and privileges of the Republic of South Africa as a member state, and expulsion from the United Nations and its specialized agencies.'

THE AFRICAN BOYCOTT

These important developments gave concrete shape to the international movement for sanctions against South Africa.

Algeria announced a total boycott of South Africa on April 30, 1963 and at the same time broke off all relations with Portugal.

Cameroon closed its sea and airports to South Africa on July 12.

Ethiopia which had no diplomatic relations with South Africa announced a total trade boycott and closed her air space to South African aircraft.

Ivory Coast closed her sea and airports to South Africa on July 16.

Libya closed her sea and airports to South Africa on August 31 and denied overflying rights to South African aircraft.

Mauritania announced a trade boycott and the closing of her sea and airports to South Africa.

* Unfortunately the six included the United States, Britain and France—the only suppliers of oil to South Africa.

Sudan broke off all trade with South Africa in 1962 and now announced the closing of her sea and airports to South Africa.

Tanganyika finally ended all imports and exports, direct and indirect, from and to South Africa, on September 30.

Uganda whose Prime Minister had announced a boycott of South African goods in November 1962, also banned Ugandan exports to that country.

United Arab Republic denied landing and overflying rights to South Africa on August 7 and on September 23, announced the ending of all economic relations with that country. The U.A.R. government informed the United Nations Secretary-General on October 9 that it had banned South African ships from entering U.A.R. ports and had instructed U.A.R. vessels not to call at South African ports. While South African ships would still be allowed to use the Suez Canal, they would be denied all facilities such as taking on water, food or fuel, loading or unloading cargo, embarking or disembarking passengers or being towed.

Several other African countries— **Congo (Leopoldville), Dahomey, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Sierre Leone, Somalia, Tunisia**—informed the United Nations Secretary-General and the Organization of African Unity that they had by September 30 fully complied with the November 1962 resolution of the General Assembly.

On November 13, the **Kenya** Government announced that it would impose a total ban on trade with South Africa from December 12, the day on which Kenya became independent.

The bulk of South Africa's exports to the rest of Africa is concentrated in the neighbouring territories of Mozambique, the Rhodesias and the Congo (Leopoldville). Together these countries account for well over 90 per cent of South Africa's exports to the African continent and about 11 per cent of South Africa's total exports.

South Africa's Trade With Neighbouring Countries (in £ millions)

| | <i>Imports to S.A.</i> | | <i>Exports from S.A.</i> | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | <i>January-August</i> | <i>January-August</i> | <i>January-August</i> | <i>January-August</i> |
| | 1962 | 1963 | 1962 | 1963 |
| Congo | 7.9 | 6.5 | 2.9 | 2.7 |
| Rhodesias and Nyasaland | 9.0 | 10.5 | 32.3 | 28.2 |
| Portuguese East Africa . . | 0.8 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 5.8 |
| TOTAL .. | 17.7 | 19.0 | 40.2 | 36.7 |

Southern Rhodesia dominated by the white minority regime and the Portuguese colony of Mozambique can, of course, hardly be expected to join in the all-African movement against apartheid; as is well known the oppressive régimes of these territories are the staunchest upholders and allies of Verwoerd's dictatorship on the African continent. It is a different matter, however when it comes to the newly self-governing territories of Northern Rhodesia (Zambia) and Nyasaland (Malawi). The oppressed South African people look forward eagerly to Mr. Kaunda and Dr. Banda, who head the governments of these territories, to show their solidarity with the South African struggle by complying with their obligations to carry out all-African decisions on ending trade and other relations—and also cutting off the stream of Nyasa migrant labour to the gold mines of the Witwatersrand. But there have been disturbing reports to the effect that the government of Mr. Kaunda has contracted to purchase a large quantity of South African maize, that it has issued a statement welcoming South African tourists and visitors and that it would co-operate with South African business enterprises stationed in Northern Rhodesia. According to *Newsweek* (February 3, 1964) 'Kaunda even goes so far as to state that he would be willing to establish diplomatic relations with South Africa, if his envoys are assured normal diplomatic treatment'.

Nor is the Northern Rhodesian government the only one to disappoint so far. The Government of the Congo informed the United Nations Secretary-General that it had complied with the General Assembly resolution of November 1962, but as the figures in the above table suggest, trade has continued between that country and South Africa up to August last year and that the export of Congo copper and other raw materials to the South African Republic has been maintained at a high level.

THE ASIAN COUNTRIES

Many of the important trading countries of Asia have joined the sanctions movement, and have complied with the November 1962 resolution of the United Nations General Assembly. In May last, the *Burmese* Government announced that it was not renewing its contract for the purchase of 300,000 tons of coal from South Africa. The *Indian* Government announced on July 13, that it was cutting off its last remaining links with South Africa by refusing landing and passage facilities to South African aircraft. In August, the *Indonesian* Government severed diplomatic and commercial relations with South Africa and announced the closing of Indonesian ports to South African vessels. In early October, the *Kuwaiti* Government, announced that it intended breaking off diplomatic relations with South Africa, would

cease all commercial relations and that Kuwaiti air and seaports would be closed to South Africa. Kuwait is the first of the oil producing states to announce its boycott of South Africa. The *Philippine* Government informed the United Nations in August that economic sanctions, including a ban of strategic materials, had been imposed on South Africa. This action has already affected the supply of Philippine hardwoods to South Africa, valued annually at £2 million. Several other governments in Asia, *Malaya* being the most prominent among them, have informed the United Nations Secretary-General that they have fully complied with the November 1962 resolution of the General Assembly.

Of the countries which have taken no action so far, *Japan*, *Ceylon*, *Pakistan* and the oil-producing states of the *Middle East* are the most important.

Driven by self interest and profit, the Japanese capitalists and their government, in their dealings with the South African racialists, have allowed themselves to become 'white Asians' accepting separate and privileged treatment for their representatives in Verwoerd's Republic, while Verwoerd applies his insulting race laws to the other Asian and non-white communities. The Japanese Government gives regular support to the resolutions of the United Nations and yet with barefaced hypocrisy becomes one of South Africa's most important trading partners. Japan takes well over 7 per cent of South Africa's exports and maintains a flourishing two-way trade with that country. After delaying for a year their response to the letter from the United Nations Secretary-General (requesting information on the measures they intend taking in fulfilment of the 1962 Resolution) the Japanese Government in December last made a 'formal' statement of their so-called 'strong opposition' to South Africa's apartheid policies and that they will 'co-operate' in the implementation of all measures to 'combat' them. Unless the African states bring sustained pressure on the Japanese Government, supported by the democratic forces inside Japan, this 'co-operation' will remain a dead letter.

Ceylon is in a no less similar position. At the United Nations and elsewhere the representatives of the Ceylonese Government have been vehement in their condemnation of apartheid and have consistently supported the campaign for sanctions. But in actual practice, Ceylon's trade with South Africa has continued with little change: while there has been a decline of Ceylon's purchase of South African goods, Ceylon's exports—mainly tea and rubber—have increased between 1962 and 1963.

South Africa's imports of oil from Iran amount to over £18 million a year. Oil also flows to South Africa from Aden, the Bahrein Islands

and Saudi Arabia, apart from certain countries in Europe and Latin America. The United Nations General Assembly session of 1963 specifically called for an oil embargo. But as is well known, these oil-producing states have had little control over the distribution of their oil exports; this has been largely in the hands of the international oil monopolies. But the states concerned have the power, through their organizations and in other ways to bring pressure on the oil monopolies to stop the flow of oil to South Africa. At the same time the trade unions of the Arab countries, who have given their support to the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa, can be called upon to request their dock workers to declare oil shipment to South Africa 'black' and in this way to force their governments to officially impose the oil embargo.

South Africa's Trade with certain Asian Countries (in £ millions)

| | <i>Imports to S.A.</i> | | <i>Exports from S.A.</i> | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | <i>January-August</i> | <i>January-August</i> | <i>January-August</i> | <i>January-August</i> |
| | 1962 | 1963 | 1962 | 1963 |
| Ceylon | 3.9 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| Japan | 14.0 | 18.5 | 23.5 | 21.7 |
| Hong Kong | 1.6 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.6 |
| Iran | 12.1 | 10.9 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| Pakistan | 6.7 | 4.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Philippines | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 1.5 |
| Saudi Arabia | 1.3 | 0.8 | — | — |
| Aden | 3.3 | 3.3 | — | — |

When the Indian Government stopped trading with South Africa in 1946, the Pakistani Government followed suit and a crisis in South Africa's requirements of jute products developed. But with the re-opening of Pakistan's trade and other relations with South Africa, the crisis was quickly overcome. Although Pakistan has supported the call for sanctions at the United Nations, she has not as yet informed the United Nations Secretary-General of the measures she intends taking to implement the Resolution of 1962.

THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

The socialist countries have now effectively ceased all relations with South Africa. Early in 1961, the *Soviet Union*, which had been a big buyer of South African wool, imposed a full trade embargo at the request of the South African liberation movement. In 1962, the Soviet trade organizations instructed their buying agents abroad not to include South African products in their purchases on international markets. The Soviet Union has no diplomatic or political relations with South Africa. The *Chinese People's Government*, again in response to requests from the South African liberation movement, announced a severance of all trade with South Africa in 1961. However, early in 1963 South Africa had shipped over £1 million worth of maize to China. The Chinese Government has since explained that these imports were made through various Hong Kong and British intermediaries. Since then all the Chinese trade organizations have been instructed to refuse acceptance of South African products and there is now a complete Chinese trade ban on South Africa. At the end of July the *Czechoslovak* Government announced the closure of its consular offices in Johannesburg and the severance of all commercial relations. On July 12 the *Hungarian* Government similarly broke off commercial relations with South Africa. The Governments of *Bulgaria, Albania, Mongolia, Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumania* and *Cuba* have all informed the United Nations Secretary-General that they have fully complied with the resolution of November 1962. The socialist *German Democratic Republic* broke off all commercial relations with South Africa in June 1963 and since October 20 has stopped its ships from calling at South African ports.

By the time the 1963 session of the General Assembly was convened, forty-six countries had formally severed all trade, political and other relations with South Africa and had closed their airports, airspace and seaports to South African aircraft and vessels. Another twenty-one countries, though not having replied to the United Nations Secretary-General's requests for information, had publicly declared, at various times, that they either had not maintained or had ended their trade and political relations with South Africa. And so over a half of the countries of the world have moved in the direction and are now implementing all-round sanctions against South Africa. This is a notable achievement in the struggle to isolate the apartheid Republic internationally.

THE IMPERIALIST SABOTEURS OF SANCTIONS

And yet, despite this achievement, South Africa's foreign trade is expanding and its economy is going through what is claimed to be an unprecedented boom. The armaments programme continues its relent-

less build-up and Verwoerd maintains his defiance of the United Nations. For only recently the South African government refused to allow the United Nations Expert Group set up by the Security Council from entering the country. Why?

The answer is found in the shameful policy of direct support which the imperialist countries, Britain and the United States foremost among them, give the Verwoerd regime; they sustain and provide the necessary props for the apartheid system with extended trade and capital investments and the supply of arms and equipment. In numerous other ways they sabotage the boycott of South Africa. Between 1962 and 1963 the imperialist and capitalist countries of North America and Western Europe pushed up their exports to South Africa by well over a quarter, increasing their share of South Africa's import trade from 65.8 per cent to 70 per cent. Further, they continued to maintain their high volume of purchases of South African products, taking over 60 per cent of South Africa's exports. The sharp rise in South Africa's imports from Britain, the United States, West Germany, France and Canada between the first eight months of 1962 and 1963 reflect, in part, the increased flow of arms and military equipment. What South Africa has lost through the trade boycott of the African, Asian and socialist countries, she has more than replaced by the increased economic co-operation she receives from the imperialist states.

South Africa's Trade with certain Western Countries (in £ millions)

| | 1962 | <i>Imports to S.A.</i> | | <i>Exports from S.A.</i> | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | <i>January-August</i> | | <i>January-August</i> | | |
| | 1962 | 1962 | 1963 | 1962 | 1962 | 1963 |
| Britain .. | 155.2 | 99.1 | 118.2 | 145.2 | 99.4 | 111.3 |
| U.S.A. .. | 134.5 | 57.4 | 65.3 | 42.9 | 27.1 | 27.2 |
| France .. | 13.9 | 7.3 | 12.1 | 15.7 | 8.4 | 8.7 |
| W. Germany .. | 51.3 | 34.3 | 43.1 | 21.3 | 13.6 | 15.6 |
| Belgium .. | 7.2 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 19.2 | 12.3 | 13.5 |
| Holland .. | 12.5 | 8.1 | 8.7 | 13.0 | 12.4 | 8.2 |
| Italy .. | 14.5 | 10.1 | 11.8 | 22.1 | 16.0 | 15.3 |
| Canada .. | 12.8 | 8.2 | 15.2 | 4.9 | 2.8 | 3.9 |
| TOTAL .. | 401.9 | 228.5 | 279.0 | 284.3 | 192.0 | 203.7 |
| Per cent of Total Trade | 65.8 | 68.2 | 70.0 | 55.6 | 60.0 | 61.5 |

IMPERIALISM: VERWOERD'S COLLABORATOR

The role of imperialism in South Africa is not only considerable but possesses certain special features. In the other colonial countries, imperialism forcibly took control and monopolized the wealth and profits derived from the exploitation of the people and their resources, thus leaving the colonies poor and underdeveloped. Not so in South Africa. Here, British imperialism, through its massive investments in gold and diamond mining, found it increasingly necessary to create and develop an infra-structure of secondary industry and communications not only to meet the needs of the mining industry, but also to exploit the market opportunities provided by the white settlers and the flow of immigrants from Europe. Thus already in the early stages, British imperialism was devoting a share of the profits derived from the mining industry for the development of this infra-structure. But the basis of profit remained the intense exploitation of the African population who provided the cheap labour for the mines.

The immigrants and settlers came from countries already in the advanced stages of capitalism. Their ideas were determined by the production relations prevailing in the countries from which they came. They now superimposed these ideas and relations on the African people through the violence of numerous punitive wars, ultimately joining with British imperialism to create the special kind of colonialism which today rules by the name of apartheid. Economic and political power was shared between the privileged white population and the foreign imperialists on the basis of the gross exploitation of the African people. A vast social and economic superstructure of race and colour segregation was instituted; the people were evicted from their land and forced into the large pool of cheap labour to meet the labour needs of the mines, the white-owned farms and the growing industry. In this way the present partnership between foreign imperialism and the alien colonialist group inside the country came into existence, and as explained in the Programme of the South African Communist Party, *The South African Road to Freedom*:

'Effective economic domination in South Africa is thus exercised by an alliance of the local white monopoly interests in mining, farming and industry together with foreign imperialism and representatives of white monopoly capitalism. These interests have conflicts among themselves which are reflected in the main white political parties and groupings. But they find common ground in the perpetuation of the colonial-type subjugation of the non-white population.'

The collusion between foreign imperialism and the local monopoly groups for the maintenance of apartheid is today reflected in several crucial ways. The imperialists, mainly Britain and the United States,

continue to hold a substantial capital stake in precisely those industries mainly dependent for their high profits on cheap African labour. And in recent years they have regularly added to this stake by pumping fresh capital into the country. The seven mining and financial corporations, which together control the entire gold and diamond mining industry are in essence giant consortiums in which the British and the American imperialists hold a 25 per cent interest, the balance being shared by South African, French, Belgian and more recently West German monopoly interests. Together these corporations employ over half a million African workers.

Some 70 per cent of the estimated £1,600 million foreign capital invested in the country is owned by Britain and the United States. Foreign capital absorbs in profits, dividends, interest and other returns on capital, something like 10 per cent of the country's national income or about £240 million a year. Britain's share of this amounts to £145 million. Apart from the mining industry in which one-third of Anglo-American capital is invested, the imperialist countries have a foothold and stake in virtually every strategic sector of the South African economy: heavy engineering, chemicals, agricultural implements, motor assembly, textiles, shipping, etc.

The collusion between the foreign imperialists and the local upholders of apartheid is not confined to the private sector of the economy alone. Many of the state-owned monopolies created by the South African authorities to develop the petroleum, chemicals, arms, cellulose and other industries as well as the extension and modernization of the railway and communications network are jointly financed with foreign official and unofficial interests, various British overseas finance corporations, the United States Import-Export Bank and the International Bank.

For the main imperialist countries, South Africa has become considerably more important as a centre of profitable capital investment than for trade, though the latter is not unimportant to the imperialist economies. Britain's capital investments estimated currently at over £1,100 million produces goods and services within South Africa considerably more than the actual size of British exports to that country. A more accurate estimate of this relationship is available for the United States interest in South Africa: according to the United States Department of Commerce, the \$700 million of United States investments had produced goods and services more than double the value of United States direct exports to South Africa. In 1960 the value of the production of *manufactured goods* (i.e. excluding mining products and services) by United States direct-investment enterprises operating in South Africa amounted to \$305 million. In that year, the value

of *total* United States exports to South Africa amounted to no more than \$200 million.

United States Direct Investments in South Africa

(in the form of Plant and Equipment Expenditures in dollar millions)

| | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 (Planned exp.) |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|
| Mining and Smelting .. | 15 | 12 | 10 |
| Petroleum | 10 | 12 | 28 |
| Manufacturing | 8 | 7 | 9 |
| TOTAL | 33 | 31 | 47 |

THE POLICY OF SABOTAGE AT WORK

The stakes of imperialism, concentrated as they are in those sectors of the economy heavily dependent on cheap labour and the apartheid system which sustains it, have risen and become more entrenched despite the political crisis in the country and the growing outside pressures for boycotts and sanctions. Rather than be deterred, the imperialists have gone to great lengths to protect South Africa and stave off these outside pressures; they have used every conceivable trick and subterfuge to sabotage and block all the international efforts to effectively deal with the South African question. As *The Times* recently put it, they 'skilfully manoeuvred to obtain innocuous wordings' to United Nations resolutions. Indeed, the imperialist conspiracy to block and negate United Nations action on the South African question is one of the most sordid examples of double-talk and deceit in the recent history of international relations. Let us look at some of the ways in which the policy of sabotage has been operated.

In 1946 a small delegation of representatives of the South-West African people arrived in New York to inform the First Session of the United Nations General Assembly about the plight of their people under the rule of the South African racialists and about South Africa's gross violations of the mandate under which she administered their territory since 1920. At the time, James F. Byrnes was the United States Secretary of State. And to quote the words of the American economist, Victor Perlo, this is what happened:

'The South-West African leaders demanded United Nations assistance in their struggle for release from the racist South African colonizers. The

United States delegates in the United Nations sabotaged effective action. The South African Government rewarded the Anglo-American imperialists by turning over to them the rich Tsumeb copper mines of South-West Africa, a former German enterprise confiscated during the Second World War. Morgan and Searle's Newmont Mining Company (one of the six largest copper mining monopolies in the United States) received a two-thirds share. With a one-million dollar investment, the new British and American owners cleared 9 million dollars in three years. In 1947 Mr Byrnes left his job as Secretary of State and soon thereafter was appointed a director of Newmont Mining Company.' (Perlo—*American Imperialism*, p. 39.).

The American journal *Fortune* called Tsumeb an 'outstanding example of Wall Street enterprise'. The 4,000 Ovambo and Herero workers at Tsumeb were paid 2s. 6d. a day with quarters bringing the costs of mining the ore to about 12s. 6d. a ton. At the then current price of copper ore, the net profits amounted to £4 a ton or over twenty-five times the abominable wages paid to the African workers. This fantastic super-exploitation of the local population of South-West Africa was made possible only by the system of forced labour and apartheid which the South African authorities enforced in the territory. Recently, the Newmont Mining Company announced that the annual profit from its South African operations amounted to 27 per cent of the capital invested.

Equally dramatic is the very much more recent example of the way in which profit and investment have continued to dictate the policy of Britain and United States towards apartheid. The United Nations Trusteeship Committee and the General Assembly threatened last year to plug the international pipe lines feeding oil to the South African Republic. This was how the Anglo-American imperialists reacted.

Sasol, the South African state-owned oil-from-coal plant currently produces some 40 million gallons of motor fuel which is less than 10 per cent of the country's annual requirements. The Verwoerd Government has embarked on a huge expansion programme in the light of a threatened oil embargo, but even if Sasol were to double its productive capacity it will never make South Africa self-sufficient in oil. And so, the South African Government invited several important and influential monopolies in the United States and Britain to search for natural oil in South Africa and South-West Africa. The foreign monopolies, encouraged by their governments, were not slow in showing interest or in agreeing to work with South African capital in what has turned out to be one of the most intensive oil explorations in the continent at the present time.

Within South Africa, three foreign oil companies working with South African companies have been granted extensive oil concessions.

In the mandated territory of South-West Africa, seven different enterprises are working over thousands of square miles searching for oil. Today about a half of the 318,000 square miles of South-West Africa is covered by mainly foreign-held concessions. Paul Getty, the American oil tycoon, operating through the locally registered subsidiaries, Tidewater Oil and Veedol Minerals, is exploiting diamond and the possible oil resources in the area of the North Western Cape Border as well as a part of the continental shelf on the Atlantic Coast. Another enterprise, the Artnell Mining and Exploration, a powerful American organization with headquarters in Chicago, has obtained rights for twenty-five years over the vast interior basin of South-West Africa as well as a concession running north-south along the coast. The Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation has formed the Etosha Petroleum to search for oil in what is the biggest single concession area—a stretch of many thousands of square miles running up to the Angola border. Apart from other American-owned concessions, the British interest is represented in the Consolidated Diamond Mines (De Beers) concession over the area of the mouth of the Orange River. The value of the foreign capital invested so far is estimated at over £30 million and in the light of the reports that the exploration so far ‘gives cause for confidence that oil in sizable quantities will be found’, the inflow of Anglo-American capital is expected to reach well over £200 million in the next five years. But even if the oil search turns out to be a damp squib, each of the concessionaires have rights for diamond prospecting especially along the coast. The Anglo-American oil monopolies are not only receiving every encouragement from their governments and, of course, from the Verwoerd regime, but are themselves rushing in to exploit the payable oil deposits they find. And in this way they are forestalling the likely impact of an oil embargo, and safeguarding the huge stake they have built up over the years in South Africa. The *New York Times* (August 18) had to admit the hollowness of the official American condemnation of apartheid:

‘Adlai Stevenson, the United States representative at the United Nations deplored apartheid as a “bitter toxic”. . . . The American investor calls it “politics” and hastens to point out that his decisions are “business decisions”.’

These ‘business decisions’ have in the period June 1960 and June 1963—a period of mounting attack on the Verwoerd colonialists at the United Nations and elsewhere—led to an unprecedented increase in American capital investments in South Africa. In this period the value of the American capital stake rose from \$590 million to \$700 million. This is already more than the size of total United States investments in the rest of Africa.

The British have necessarily been more direct and disruptive in their activities to protect South Africa from the threat of boycott and sanctions, despite the strong feelings of the British people as manifested in the anti-apartheid movement in Britain. Like the Americans they find it increasingly difficult to openly support South Africa or to maintain their opposition to the resolutions condemning apartheid. However, the British imperialists persist in their now heavily discredited view that the South African question is not within the competence and jurisdiction of the United Nations; they employ the full weight of their diplomacy and political resources to lobby and line up countries against effective United Nations action; they engage in diversions and tricks at the United Nations and elsewhere to blur the issues at stake. They have openly refused to be bound by the resolutions of the United Nations. Under the heavy fire of a recent African attack, the British had to admit that their policy on South Africa was determined by what Sir Patrick Dean, the British representative at the United Nations, has described as 'our considerable trade with and investments in South Africa' which was 'of great importance to the external economy of the United Kingdom' and the 'long historical connections, ties of kith and kin which compelled Britain to a deep concern for the alignment of South Africa'.

And no doubt in pursuance of these connections, British capital exports to South Africa since 1959 have continued at a lively pace. The British Board of Trade working on a sample of firms engaged in foreign direct investment (excluding those concerned with oil, banking, insurance and finance) through overseas branches estimates that some £18 million of British capital flowed to South Africa in 1960 (the year of the Sharpeville massacre), £8 million in 1961, £14 million in 1962. The earnings of these British overseas branches rose from an annual rate of £21 million in 1959 to nearly £29 million in 1962. Of the estimated £240 million paid out by South Africa in interest, profits and dividends on foreign capital, about 65 per cent accrues to British capital.

Britain has remained South Africa's most important trading partner, supplying 30 per cent of the country's imports and taking 34 per cent of its exports. Britain has continued to accord tariff preferences over a range of South African products and has renewed her contracts for South African sugar on preferential Commonwealth terms—and this, despite South Africa's enforced departure from the Commonwealth. South Africa's continued allegiance to the sterling currency system provides that country with a variety of important foreign exchange facilities and credits; the flow of capital from Britain to South Africa is not subject to any of the official controls on capital exports applying to the countries outside the sterling system and the Commonwealth.

Of the other capitalist countries which maintain extensive economic and political relations with South Africa in defiance of the United Nations policy, West Germany is the most important and deserves special mention. Within five years this country's trade with South Africa has more than doubled and today West Germany supplies over 11 per cent of South Africa's import needs. In July last, the Bonn Government extended a £10 million loan to South Africa. Herr Abs, the influential West German banker, head of the powerful Deutsche Bank, and representative of the large financial trusts currently concerned with what they euphemistically call 'overseas development', paid a visit to South Africa in September last for the purpose, as officially described, of 'preparing the way for the increased flow of private capital'. Already, the West German trusts are actively concerned with financing several investment projects in South Africa: they are now participating in the massive £37 million copper mining and refining project in the north-eastern Transvaal.

The Bonn Government is also reported to be actively supplying arms and modern military equipment to South Africa. Being outside the United Nations and at the same time an important member of the NATO bloc, the Bonn Government suffers from little restraint in either itself supplying arms or becoming the channel for the flow of NATO arms to South Africa in general. Recently the *Ghanaian Times* revealed that a group of West German firms headed by the firm Boelkow were working on the development of rockets in South Africa. This has since been confirmed by the South African Government.

Contrasting with this disgraceful policy of the Bonn Government are the inspiring actions of fraternal solidarity of the socialist German Democratic Republic. Apart from breaking off all trade with South Africa, the German Democratic Republic held a month of solidarity in November last, in which mass meetings and demonstrations were organized throughout the country in support of the South African freedom struggle.

THE ARMS EMBARGO

The imperialist conspiracy to support South Africa is nowhere more shameful and pronounced than in the matter of the arms embargo. Despite the demands of the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council, several Western countries continue to connive with the Verwoerd Republic to maintain the flow of arms and capital and technical 'know-how' for the development of South Africa's armaments industry. So far only 43 of the United Nations' membership of 111 have pledged themselves to respect the arms embargo.

Soon after the Security Council meeting of August last, the London *Daily Telegraph* (October 24) reported that British, French, West German and Canadian aircraft companies were competing to supply the South African air force with jet training planes required to replace obsolete aircraft. 'But because the sale of military equipment to South Africa may raise objections', so the report ran, 'the firms are also investigating the possibility of their aircraft being made in South Africa under licence.' A Swedish firm, reportedly working with or for an international arms trading organization in which all the capitalist and imperialist countries participate, offered to sell South Africa machine guns, ammunition, big calibre guns, armoured vehicles and other military equipment including aircraft. The large Belgian armaments firm, Fabrique National d'Armes de Guerre, controlled by the Société General trust has opened a branch in South Africa to manufacture the F.N. rifle which presently is standard equipment for the armed forces of NATO. The £20 million deal between the South African Government and African Explosives, a subsidiary of the British Imperial Chemical Industries will put South Africa well on the way to becoming self-sufficient in small arms, including automatic weapons, and bombs and shells for its more heavier armoury. Under this deal, British blueprints, designs and specifications will become available to South Africa apart from the capital contribution for the construction of a complex of armament-producing factories in the country.

And in this way, the imperialist countries conspire to undermine the United Nations call for an arms embargo.

The Americans and Canadians have informed the United Nations that they will honour their commitments to maintain an embargo, but this is still to be seen to be effectively put into operation: both these countries are considerable operators in the seemingly elusive international traffic in arms. The other capitalist states have been calculatingly vague in their response to the arms embargo; they make the unwarranted and impractical distinction between arms capable of use for external defence and arms for use against the local population, and in this way have found what for the moment is an escape from their United Nations obligation and a way to continue their profitable trade in supplying the weapons of oppression to the Verwoerd fascists.

The British imperialists have by their own interpretation of the United Nations resolutions virtually repudiated the arms embargo. The British representative at the United Nations while on the one hand supporting the resolution for an arms embargo, claimed on the other, that;

(a) the resolutions were not mandatory on the United Kingdom;

- (b) the British 'ban' would not extend to 'items of a general or a dual purpose character';
- (c) the 'ban' would operate 'without unacceptable dislocation or complications to our export trade';
- (d) and, as subsequently explained by the British Government, the 'ban' would exclude equipment and material required for the maintenance of arms in South Africa.

Earlier in August, the present British Prime Minister announced that Britain was 'committed to supply naval aircraft to South Africa', and so in the light of all these interpretations, we can expect a continued flow of British arms to South Africa, including spare parts for the Saracen armoured cars (which fired on the demonstrators of Sharpeville), for the Centurian tanks, aircraft and other equipment which have been supplied recently to the Verwoerd Government.

And so, as we see, the political survival of the Verwoerd dictatorship is no more than a function of and dependent on the extent to which the colonial system of apartheid is being maintained through the continued economic, political and military support of the imperialist countries, Britain and the United States foremost among them. It is this fact which enables the Verwoerd regime to defy world opinion and the United Nations, to persist in its policy of unrestrained violence on our people and to incite the whole of Africa by its provocative arms build-up. It is this fact which the Security Council denounced when in its resolution of July last, it expressed its 'regret' that 'some states are indirectly providing encouragement in various ways to the Government of South Africa to perpetuate, by force, its policy of apartheid'. And, above all, it is this imperialist support which undermines the effectiveness of the sanctions measures so far instituted against South Africa through the United Nations.

STRUGGLE TO ENFORCE SANCTIONS

The enforcement of the United Nations programme of sanctions cannot be achieved by the mere passing of resolutions at the United Nations General Assembly or by hoping that the governments of the imperialist countries, especially Britain and the United States, will abide by or comply with their obligations under these resolutions. Only the most sustained struggle by the people of the world can bring about the conditions for the effective enforcement of all-embracing sanctions against the South African apartheid republic. And such a struggle has now become profoundly urgent and important for the maintenance of peace in Africa and the world.

This is no trite or pious contention. The United Nations has repeatedly warned in its various resolutions that South Africa's policies

have created 'friction among states' and 'international tension', that these policies have led to 'serious international repercussions' and have given rise to 'provocations' which are 'a serious threat to international peace and security'. Verwoerd's abusive and contemptuous disregard of world opinion threatens disorder and anarchy in the international community and has become, as the report of the United Nations Committee on Apartheid recently put it, 'a provocation of people everywhere'. The Charter of the United Nations is flouted and relations among states severely aggravated. The imperialists persist in linking their support for the apartheid regime with their cold war aims by claiming interests of strategy in South Africa and in this way continue to supply arms to Verwoerd. In turn, South Africa claims the avowed role of being the bastion of reaction and counter-revolution, determined to hold fast against the aspirations of the African people to complete the liberation of their continent and build their lives in peace and freedom. And, today no other issue agitates and causes more tension and insecurity among the people of Africa than the presence of this aggressive apartheid regime in their midst. Thus the fight against apartheid, through enforceable international sanctions, has become a vital aspect of the general fight for peace.

In this struggle the responsibility of the people of Britain and the United States is all-important and great. For it is in their own deep interests that their governments immediately abandon their policies of betrayal and sabotage of the United Nations call for sanctions and implement a policy of total boycott of South Africa. These governments have brought discredit to the United Nations and have imperilled their relations with the emergent forces of independence and freedom in Africa and elsewhere; they are earning the disgust and wrath of civilized people everywhere. Their claims of trade benefit and of dependence on trade with the present South African regime is shortsighted and against the fundamental interests of the British and American people. For the continuance of such policies can only reap a harvest of boycotts against these countries in the future which will prove more harmful to the long-term prosperity and economic progress of the people of these countries, especially of Britain. On the other hand, a total boycott of South Africa will quickly—indeed, in a matter of months, according to the experts—bring an end to apartheid and racial oppression in South Africa, and so create the conditions for a major and substantial leap in mutually advantageous trade and other economic relations between themselves and the South African people. And by winning such a change of policy, the people of these imperialist countries will earn the lasting goodwill and respect of the people of Africa as a whole. It will represent a resounding repudiation of the

claims of Verwoerd and his ilk that their hated regime and policies represent 'Western Civilization' in Africa and serve, in some way, the interests of the people of the 'West' and of 'Christendom'.

The struggle for sanctions is essentially a political struggle—a struggle to change the political policies of the capitalist and imperialist states towards South Africa and to secure the implementation and enforcement by the African, Asian and Latin American countries, of decisions they have already taken. Some, including sincere opponents of apartheid, conceive the movement for and the enforcement of sanctions as an exercise in the adjustment of international trade patterns, or of solving certain related legal and policing problems. They raise, as if it was a brand-new idea, the desirability or enforceability of sanctions as an international policy against the Verwoerd regime. Such questions have long been settled, both inside and outside the United Nations. Rather, what is now called for is a sustained spurt in the international struggle to secure the enforcement of the already agreed and settled programme of international sanctions against the South African apartheid republic.

The fruits of such a struggle will amount to more than the ending of apartheid in South Africa and of Verwoerd's colonial rule in the territory of South-West Africa. Such a struggle will enhance the prospects for peace and will blaze the trail for the complete liberation of the African continent. Rather than weaken, sanctions against apartheid will strengthen the United Nations: it will for once establish the United Nations' role as a true and independent force for world peace and progress.

'SANCTIONS AGAINST APARTHEID'

Reprints of the above article are available in pamphlet form for readers and others who feel, as we do, that the maximum circulation should be obtained for this valuable and informative analysis. Copies are available in bulk for the nominal price of 3s. 6d. (British postal order or equivalent) per dozen, post free. Single copies 4d. post free.

**ELLIS BOWLES, 52 Palmerston Road, London, SW14
England**