

International solidarity: Introduction



By Gregory Houston

The struggle against white minority rule in South Africa was one of the most significant liberation struggles of the post-World War II era. It drew effective international support from governments, organisations and peoples from all regions of the world, as did no other prior movement except the international campaign against slavery. This is the first in a series of volumes that will examine international solidarity against apartheid. The chapters that follow deal with the role of a select group of international organisations, cross-national non-governmental organisations, governments, and national and local movements in the struggle against apartheid. It must be emphasised from the outset that not all countries, organisations and movements could be covered in detail in this volume. Those chosen have a special significance. However, in this chapter mention will be made of some of those not dealt with elsewhere in the volume. In addition, the planned second volume in this series will focus on the role that African international organisations and countries played in supporting the struggle against apartheid.

The origins of international solidarity¹

The origins of international solidarity can perhaps be traced back to the 1890s – the protests by the Indian National Congress against discrimination against Indians in South Africa, and the Pan African Congress of 1900. Sylvester Williams, born in Trinidad in 1869, initiated the idea of the Pan African Congress. In 1898 he issued a statement calling for a conference ‘in order to take steps to influence public opinion on existing proceedings and conditions affecting the welfare of the natives in the various parts of the Empire, viz., South Africa, West Africa and the British West Indies’. After a meeting with Booker T. Washington, Williams decided to increase the scope of the conference by also looking at ‘the treatment of native

¹ This section was written by Bernard Magubane.

races under European and American rule'. The Pan-African Conference was held at Westminster Town Hall, London, in July 1900. There were 37 delegates from Europe, Africa and the United States.² A large number of delegates made speeches where they called for governments to introduce legislation that would ensure racial equality. Several years later, in 1906, Mahatma Gandhi promoted the idea of setting up a committee in Britain to help Indians in South Africa; and after 1913 the leaders of the African National Congress (ANC) made contacts in Britain and the United States, including Fenner Brockway, W.E.B. Du Bois and Marcus Garvey.³

The rise of the Nazi movement in Germany under Adolf Hitler and its slaughter of six million Jews shocked the whole world. In South Africa in the interwar years, the National Party was under the leadership of Dr D.F. Malan, a Dutch Reformed Church minister who was a great admirer of Hitler and Nazism. In 1945 the Declaration to the Nations of the World issued from South Africa by the Non-European United Committee for the first time linked racial practices in South Africa to the scourge of Nazism:

The non-European [in South Africa] is debarred from education. He is denied access to the professions and skilled trades; he is denied the right to buy land and property; he is denied the right to trade or to serve in the army – except as a stretcher-bearer or servant; he is prohibited from entering places of entertainment and culture. But still more, he is not allowed to live in the towns. And if it was a crime in Nazi Germany for an 'Aryan' to mix with or marry a non-Aryan, it is equally a criminal offence in South Africa for a member of the *Herrenvolk* to mix with or marry with the slave race. ... From the foregoing it is clear that the non-Europeans of South Africa live and suffer under a tyranny very little different from Nazism. And if we accept the premise – as we hope the Nations of the World do – that peace is indivisible, if we accept that there can be no peace as long as the scourge of Nazism exists in any corner of the globe, then it follows that the defeat of German Nazism is not the final chapter of the struggle against tyranny. There must be many more chapters before the peoples of the world will be able to make a new beginning. To us in South Africa it is indisputable that there can be no peace as long as this system of tyranny remains ... It is the grossest of insults not only to the eight million non-Europeans of South Africa, but to all those who are honestly striving to shape a world on new foundations, when the highest representative of the *Herrenvolk* of South Africa, Field-Marshal Smuts, who has devoted his whole life to the entrenchment of this Nazi-like domination, brazenly speaks to the Nations of the World of the 'sanctity and ultimate value of human personality' and 'equal rights of men and women.'⁴

2 E-mail communication with E.S. Reddy, 23 October 2007. Sources in his private possession.

3 Ibid.

4 Cited in W.E.B. DuBois, *The World and Africa: An Inquiry into the Part which Africa has Played in World History* (New York: International Publishers, 1965), 39-41.

It is one of the ironies of history that in 1945 General Smuts stood before the assembled peoples of the world and pleaded for an article on 'human rights' in the United Nations (UN) Charter. In 1946, the president-general of the ANC, Dr A.B. Xuma, took the South African case to the UN for the first time. Although there was no procedure under which he could make a direct petition, he lobbied effectively, helped by Senator Basner and a representative of the South African Indian Congress (SAIC). Benson says that:

It was hard work, both because little was known about South Africa and because they came up against a preconception that General Smuts could do no wrong. However they were helped by the lavish supply of ammunition provided by the South African Government: the mine strike, the regular imprisonment of passive resisters – more than a thousand had already gone to gaol and served terms of several months with hard labour, and the scandal of the African housing shortage. All these events, backed by facts and figures (available in any Blue Book) on the restrictions binding the non-white majority in South Africa and in South West Africa, made an unanswerable case for Xuma.⁵

India took a lead in the debates about the condition of black people in South Africa, Sir Maharaj Singh contributing valuable first-hand knowledge from his years as high commissioner from India in South Africa. Smuts argued persuasively for white 'civilisation', but in the long debates this was revealed as a euphemism for 'domination'. In 1946, the General Assembly voted 32 to 15 on a French-Mexican proposal advocating a settlement of the dispute over the treatment of the Indian community in South Africa; and by 36 votes to none rejected Smut's request to incorporate South-West Africa into South Africa. Thus, for the first time the issue of South Africa became a concern for the UN.

In the post-World War II era, Hancock observed that 'South Africa's racial policies were on the way to becoming the stuff and substance of her foreign policy'. And on 17 November 1946, J.C. Smuts wrote prophetically: 'Colour queers my poor pitch everywhere. But South Africans cannot understand. Colour bars are to them part of the divine order of things. But I sometimes wonder what our position in years to come will be when the whole world will be against us.'⁶ In 1948 the National Party was elected on the policy of apartheid. The first major attack on South Africa's apartheid policy in the UN was mounted in Resolution 616A of 5 December 1952. Two conspicuous landmarks along the road to this doctrinal confrontation were, on the UN side, the Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 (the year the National Party came to power on a white people-only vote); and on the South African side, the Group Areas Act of 1950.

The emergence of the Afro-Asian bloc of states from direct colonialism and their joining of international organisations offered new opportunities for those still under

5 Mary Benson, *The African Patriots: The Story of the African National Congress of South Africa* (London: Faber & Faber, 1963), 138.

6 Quoted in *Ibid.*, 473.

the yoke of colonialism to have a voice at the UN and its other institutions. In 1955, the Afro-Asian Summit was held in Bandung, Indonesia, from 18 to 25 April. This was arguably a signature moment. The collective expression of the countries recently emancipated from colonialism could speak with one voice. For Richard Wright, an Afro-American novelist: ‘The despised, the insulted, the hurt, the disposed – in short, the underdogs of the human race were meeting to address racialism and colonialism.’⁷

Moses Kotane and Molvi Cachalia represented the ANC and SAIC at the Bandung conference. In a 32-page memorandum to the conference, Kotane and Cachalia, on behalf of the oppressed in South Africa, appealed to the delegates

to use their good offices internationally to persuade other civilised and freedom-loving nations of the world to prevail on the Government of the Union of South Africa to abandon its unjust and disastrous policy of apartheid and racial discrimination. We are convinced and confident that the Government of South Africa could be forced to reconsider its reactionary and inhuman policy if all the nations who do not approve of policies and practices of racial oppression and discrimination, particularly the Governments of the United States and Britain, would boldly take a firm stand against such practices.⁸

This was the challenge to the international community. It is one which was consciously or unconsciously accepted by international organisations, governments and solidarity movements, and is the subject of this volume.

The Sharpeville massacre put the spotlight on the apartheid regime, exposing its brutality sharper than ever before. Already the target of liberal criticism and the condemnation of the Afro-Asian bloc, the apartheid regime now found itself even more unpopular as a result of worldwide solidarity activities.

Nature of solidarity activities

Activists involved in international support of the struggle against apartheid spoke of ‘solidarity’, and anti-apartheid movements were known collectively as solidarity movements.⁹ Solidarity also allows for the fact that these activists saw themselves not just as supporters, but as beneficiaries, both immediately in what they learnt from the interaction, but in the longer term too, in that the removal of the apartheid

7 Richard Wright, *The Color Curtain: A Report on the Bandung Conference* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1956), 12.

8 Cited in Brian Bunting, *Moses Kotane – South African Revolutionary: A Political Biography* (London: Inkululeko Publications, 1975), 209.

9 Thousands of groups and organisations were involved in the solidarity movement. They had different names and were international, regional, national and local. There were groups specially formed to support freedom in South or southern Africa, and other groups (trade unions, religious bodies, student and women’s organisations, etc.) with a much broader mandate, which were active in support of freedom in South Africa. The anti-apartheid movements were the lobbies which persuaded action by governments and by the more powerful organisations like trade unions. (E-mail communication with E.S. Reddy, 21 October 2007).

regime would deny to racist forces the world over a significant model and resource for ideas, ideology, inspiration and leadership.¹⁰ Solidarity activities are defined here as the various activities and campaigns of organisations, governments and peoples in solidarity with the people of South Africa's struggle for liberation and the support they gave directly to the liberation movements and other anti-apartheid organisations within South Africa for the conduct of the struggle. Thus defined, there is a wide range of activities that were conducted in solidarity with the struggle against apartheid. These can be divided into three broad categories. The first, which was aimed at isolating, boycotting and thereby weakening the apartheid regime, includes:

- initiating and supporting anti-apartheid resolutions in international organisations;
- excluding the South Africa government and South African bodies practising racial segregation from participation in their structures;
- imposing economic, political, and military sanctions against South Africa;
- imposing sporting, cultural and academic sanctions against South Africa;
- prohibiting South African aircraft from landing in their countries and closing their ports to South African ships;
- prohibiting their own airlines and shipping lines from providing services to and from South Africa; and
- prohibiting or discouraging emigration to South Africa.

The second category of solidarity activities, which focused on providing assistance to the liberation movement and the victims of apartheid, especially political prisoners, their families, and refugees, includes:

- funding the legal defence of the accused in political trials and the inquests of those who died in detention, and supporting and assisting their families;
- organising and participating in campaigns, public marches, rallies, demonstrations and pickets in support of the anti-apartheid struggle;
- providing military bases, military training and military hardware for the liberation movements;
- providing material assistance to the liberation movements;
- raising funds and collecting goods for use by the liberation movements; and
- providing humanitarian assistance to the victims of apartheid.

The final category, which focused on providing publicity to inform and mobilise world public opinion against apartheid and in support of the liberation struggle,¹¹ includes:

- convening and participating in hearings, special sessions, seminars and conferences devoted to the anti-apartheid struggle;
- undertaking research on apartheid and on collaboration with the apartheid system;

10 E-mail communication with Louise Asmal, 12 June 2007; and Al Cook, 14 September 2007.

11 E-mail communication with E.S. Reddy, 13 October 2007.

- promoting publicity against apartheid and raising public awareness of the realities of apartheid and of the legitimate struggle of the oppressed people in South Africa;
- organising and participating in exhibitions and other cultural activities against apartheid; and
- presenting awards and other honours to the leaders of the liberation movements.

This list is not exhaustive, but it demonstrates the wide range of activities carried out in solidarity with the South African liberation struggle. In addition, these activities occurred in many parts of the world, and were driven by many organisations and people, as will be demonstrated below.

The main forces involved in solidarity

The analysis of the role of the international community in the struggle against apartheid focuses on a wide range of organisations and people that can be loosely classified into a number of categories: (a) international governmental organisations; (b) international non-governmental organisations; (c) governments; (d) trans-national, national and regional non-governmental solidarity organisations; and, finally, (e) exceptional individuals active in international governmental and non-governmental organisations, governments and solidarity movements that supported the liberation struggle in South Africa, as well as millions of ordinary people who participated in solidarity activities on an individual basis and as members of solidarity movements.

- The most significant international governmental organisations that supported the anti-apartheid struggle were the United Nations and its agencies, in particular the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); the Organisation of African Unity (OAU); the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM); and the Commonwealth. By contrast, efforts to introduce co-ordinated action in the European Community (EC) were repeatedly blocked by Britain, West Germany and Portugal until the late 1980s.

In chapter 2 of this volume, E.S. Reddy¹² reviews the contribution of the United Nations and its agencies in promoting worldwide solidarity with the struggle for liberation in South Africa. He points out that while the effectiveness of international solidarity depended on actions by many governments and numerous anti-apartheid and solidarity groups and other public organisations, the UN acted as an invaluable instrument to promote concerted international action. In this chapter it is demonstrated how UN discussions internationalised the racial issue in South Africa and built a consensus against apartheid. It is shown how the UN responded to the campaign initiated by the newly independent African states, at the request of the liberation movements, for

12 The chapter summaries provided here have in general been written by the authors of each chapter.

sanctions against South Africa after the Sharpeville massacre of 1960; and how the UN Special Committee against Apartheid played a central role in promoting an oil embargo and other measures by governments, helped establish funds for assistance to South African political prisoners and their families, refugees and the liberation movement, and encouraged boycotts and other action by the public. One of the main conclusions reached in the chapter is that the crisis in South Africa in the mid 1980s, particularly after the declaration of the first state of emergency for the decade, and the pressure of public opinion persuaded the major Western powers to apply certain sanctions, while international financial institutions stopped loans to South Africa and hundreds of corporations withdrew investments in that country. It is held that the advance of the liberation struggle, together with actions by the governments and the public, obliged the South African government to end repression and begin negotiations with the genuine representatives of the people. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the role played by the UN in helping South Africans to overcome serious obstacles in the negotiating period and to ensure free and fair elections in April 1994.

- The Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation (AAPSO), the World Council of Churches (WCC),¹³ the World Peace Council (WPC)¹⁴ and the international trade union movement¹⁵ are among the most important international non-governmental organisations that were involved in international solidarity with the anti-apartheid struggle.¹⁶

None of the chapters in his volume deal with this category of actors.

- Many of the governments of countries in Africa, the Socialist Bloc, Asia, the Caribbean and South America took the lead in supporting the struggle against apartheid. Not only did these countries provide moral/political support by introducing and supporting resolutions calling for concerted action against the apartheid regime in international organisations, they also undertook such actions unilaterally, while providing material and other support for the conduct of the liberation struggle and the victims of apartheid. As the campaign against apartheid developed, governments of several smaller Western countries, especially Sweden and other Nordic countries, began to provide substantial political support, as well as non-military assistance, to the liberation movements.

13 For a brief discussion of the WCC's decision to support the liberation movements refer to M.B. Yengwa, 'World Church Support for Liberation Movements', *Sechaba*, vol. 5, no. 4, April 1971, 8-9.

14 For insight into the World Peace Council's solidarity activities see 'World Peace Council to Act against Racism', *Sechaba*, vol. 6, no. 8, August 1972, 10-11. The AAPSO and WPC were seen by many as front organisations for the eastern European countries.

15 Among the most important here are the International Confederation of Trade Unions; Organisation of African Trade Union Unity; World Confederation of Labour; World Federation of Trade Unions and their affiliates, as well independent unions.

16 Other organisations of note include the International Olympic Committee; International Peace Bureau; International Union of Socialist Youth; International Union of Students; Pan African Women's Organisation; Pan African Youth Movement; Socialist International; Supreme Council on Sport in Africa; Women's International Democratic Federation; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; World Assembly of Youth; World Federation of Democratic Lawyers; and the World Federation of Democratic Youth.

Chapter 12, written by Vladimir Shubin, focuses on the support that the Soviet Union/Russia gave to the liberation struggle during three decades that followed the banning of the liberation movements in 1960. In part, the background to this support is the relationship between the government and ruling party in the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), on the one hand, and the ANC and the South African Communist Party (SACP), on the other. An interesting part of this chapter is the discussion of the various meetings between representatives of the government and ruling party of the Soviet Union and the South African representatives and leaders of the liberation movement. This provides important new insight into the underlying nature of the relationship between these groups. The extent of the considerable material and other support the Soviet Union gave to the ANC for its armed struggle is outlined in detail. A study is also made of the impact of changes in the Soviet Union from the mid 1980s on Soviet support for the South African liberation struggle. In the same chapter, attention is given to the role played in South Africa's liberation struggle of another East European country, Bulgaria, in a section written by Marina Traikova.

Hans-Georg Schleicher argues in chapter 13 that the German Democratic Republic (GDR) proclaimed anti-imperialist solidarity a basic foreign policy principle and based its relationship with the South African liberation movement – the ANC – on common ideological and political values. Mutual interests between the GDR and the liberation movements were to some extent conditioned by the Cold War. In the GDR, the Solidarity Committee was the major instrument for mobilising, organising and implementing solidarity, co-ordinating the efforts of political parties, trade unions and other mass organisations. It was embedded in the political structures of the GDR under the ruling Socialist Unity Party (SED), while church-related anti-apartheid groups acted outside the official solidarity movement. There was a broad sense of solidarity among the wider population to draw upon but the centralised manner in which solidarity was organised in the GDR imposed constraints on initiatives from below, and was undoubtedly a weakness of GDR solidarity. At the same time, the efficiency of the support for, and close relations of the GDR with the liberation movements, was the result of the strong personal commitment of many East Germans. Early contacts existed between the SED and SACP, between the GDR trade unions and the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU), and, from 1960 onwards, between the GDR's Solidarity Committee and the ANC. The bulk of the chapter focuses on solidarity campaigns and practical support for the struggle during the period from the early 1960s through to 1989/1990.

From the very start, after the triumph of the January 1959 revolution, Cuba supported the anti-apartheid struggle, particularly at international events where its representatives consistently condemned South Africa's racist policies. At the same time, they urged support for the struggle for national liberation. That support increased steadily, and is the subject of chapter 14, written by Hedelberto Lopez Blanch. Cuban troops, sometimes numbering as many as 50 000, fought together with local Angolan forces against South Africa's invading army, an army that until the late 1980s

was described as 'invincible'. Intense military battles took place from 1975 to 1988, culminating in disaster for the South African forces at the battle of Cuito Cuanavale. The chapter deals with many events that have never before been covered in such detail, largely because the author was given access to recently declassified documents. The training of ANC guerrillas in Cuba and Africa; the battles with South African forces in Angola; tripartite talks between Cuba, the ANC and the Soviet Union; the Seventh Congress of the SACP in Cuba; and the discussions that opened the way to Namibia's independence and, subsequently, the first free elections in South Africa; as well as comments about Cuba's support of the liberation struggle by leaders of the ANC, are the main themes in this chapter.

In chapter 15, Zhong Weiyun and Xu Sujiang begin with a brief introduction of the Peoples Republic of China's policy towards Africa and its evolution and changes in the decades after the 1949 revolution. This is coupled with a study of the development and changes in the Communist Party of China's relationship with the ANC, Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) and SACP. A considerable part of the chapter focuses on the political, moral and material support that China rendered to these organisations. The concluding section deals with China's trade and economic sanctions against South Africa.

Vijay Gupta documents in detail the solidarity and support the Indian government, solidarity movements and the people gave to the struggle in South Africa in chapter 16. A year before achieving formal independence on 15 August 1947, India took a major step in the international arena when it drew attention to South Africa's racial policies at the UN. India's complaint internationalised the racial issue in South Africa. In addition, during the last 50 years of the liberation struggle in South Africa, a strong solidarity movement was built among non-governmental organisations within the country. No separate anti-apartheid movement was formed in India because the government, various political parties and the wider public supported the struggle of the South African people in a variety of ways. It is stated in this chapter that India's role in solidarity has a longer history than that of any other nation. Few countries equalled India in consistent diplomatic, political, economic and other support to the cause of liberation in South Africa for well over half a century. India and its people also played an important role in promoting solidarity by governments and the public in other countries. India took up the issue of apartheid not only in the UN and in the Commonwealth, but in many other forums such as the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and other international sports bodies.

During the Cold War, the southern African liberation movements were generally shunned by the Western world. Guided by the UN General Assembly, as early as in 1969, however, the Swedish parliament voted to assist them with official humanitarian assistance, breaking the mould which reduced the liberation struggles to a battlefield between the contending superpowers, as well as paving the way for a unique and expanding involvement by the Nordic countries in practically all fields – barring the supply of arms. In chapter 6, Tor Sellström paints a background to the Nordic position; he outlines the policies adopted by Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden;

discusses how the ANC was regarded as a South African ‘government-in-waiting’; and gives an account of the assistance provided. The issue of economic sanctions is also covered. While the Nordic anti-apartheid movements played a decisive advocacy role, Sellström discusses how a close partnership developed between the ANC and the Nordic governments, with particular focus on Sweden. Tables on official assistance are included, illustrating that Sweden was the prime financial supporter of the ANC – while it was in exile and during the transition period from 1990 to 1994. In recognition of his particular role, the chapter ends with a note on the Swedish prime minister, the late Olof Palme, outlining his contribution towards a principled, non-aligned stance in favour of liberation, non-racialism and majority-rule.

- The governments of most countries in the West initially resisted international efforts to promote the anti-apartheid struggle, while rejecting the option of unilateral action against apartheid South Africa. In particular, the governments of the United States, Britain and France – which were also permanent members of the UN Security Council – played a fundamental role in frustrating efforts to implement international action against apartheid South Africa, while shoring up the apartheid regime by maintaining trade and other links. Because of the resistance of their governments to international solidarity action against apartheid South Africa, a multitude of trans-national, national and local solidarity movements sprang up in the West from the 1950s onwards to provide moral/political and material support to the liberation struggle. These included the various Anti-Apartheid Movements (AAMs) that emerged in Britain, Ireland and other parts of Europe, as well as in other parts of the world, the various country formations of the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa (IDAF), and a number of regional solidarity committees. Complementing these movements was a wide range of trade union, youth and student, women, church and political organisations that participated in, and/or supported the activities of these movements or carried out solidarity actions independently. Solidarity movements in the West played a fundamental role in pressuring their governments to take up certain positions on the anti-apartheid struggle and to adopt unilateral action against the apartheid regime, creating public awareness of the issues around the anti-apartheid struggle; leading campaigns for the economic, political, military and social isolation of apartheid South Africa; and providing material support to the liberation movements and the victims of apartheid.

In chapter 9, William Minter and Sylvia Hill trace the long history of ties between opponents of racism in the United States and South Africa, and the stages by which anti-apartheid organisations and political sentiment became strong enough in the 1980s to shift public opinion and government policy even in the conservative Reagan era. They survey the contradictory contexts of American government and business complicity with the white minority regime and the evolution of the civil rights, Black Power, and anti-war movements, essential historical contexts within which African solidarity and anti-apartheid groups evolved. The story includes not only a range of national Africa-focused organisations, including the Council on African Affairs,

the American Committee on Africa/The Africa Fund, the American Friends Service Committee, TransAfrica, and the Washington Office on Africa, but also a host of local groups like the Southern Africa Support Project as well as sector-specific or shorter-lived groups that collectively reached almost every sector of American society with the anti-apartheid message. While this diverse movement, in a racially and socially divided and geographically vast country, at no stage ever featured an organisationally unified national coalition, it successfully mobilised around the twin themes of support for African liberation and opposition to the complicity of American business and government with apartheid. The movement involved not only African Americans but also white Americans, Africans from other countries, and those of other minority racial groups. Throughout this history, South African visitors and exiles played catalytic roles in the organisation of the movement in the United States, from early ANC leaders such as A.B. Xuma and Z.K. Matthews, to later activist exiles such as Miriam Makeba, Dennis Brutus, and Dumisani Khumalo.

In chapter 4, Christabel Gurney describes how the British Anti-Apartheid Movement grew from a group founded by South African exiles in 1959 into a British mass movement which united key constituencies in the trade unions, churches, universities, political parties and local authorities to take anti-apartheid action in the 1980s. The Boycott Movement was formed in Britain to internationalise the call by the South African Congress Alliance for a boycott within South Africa of goods produced by firms which supported the National Party. After the banning of the ANC and PAC in 1960, the British movement was transformed into the AAM, which took up the more radical call of the ANC's underground emergency committee for UN sanctions and the total isolation of South Africa. This was a key plank of the AAM's platform until the run-up to the 1994 freedom election. The chapter argues that in campaigning for sanctions and raising support for the liberation movements, the AAM challenged economic interests and racial assumptions which permeated British society. At the same time it campaigned against repression and for freedom for South African political prisoners. In this it worked closely with the other main anti-apartheid organisation in Britain, the IDAF. In the 1980s, the underlying situation was transformed by Britain's economic reorientation towards the European Community; a change in 'racial norms'; South Africa's isolation within the southern African region and above all by the explosion of opposition to apartheid within South Africa. The AAM won mass support within Britain for sanctions and economic disengagement from South Africa, and played a leading part in the world campaign for the release of Nelson Mandela and all other South African political prisoners. The chapter argues that in spite of Thatcher's intransigence, the British AAM played a seminal role in the world campaign for sanctions and helped to win international recognition for the role of the liberation movements.

The years 1956 to 1991 saw an attempt by the apartheid regime to crush the liberation movements through court action. This strategy had a dual aim: first, it was an attempt to criminalise the struggle and its leaders, and to enable the regime to present itself as a standard-bearer of 'Western civilisation' under attack by communism, saboteurs and terrorists; and second, to neutralise anti-apartheid activists by detaining and

imprisoning them. In chapter 3, Al Cook tells the story of IDAF, which helped ensure that neither of these objectives was realised. IDAF grew out of a fund that was formed to defend the accused in the Treason Trial of 1956–61, and to assist their dependants. It went on to provide legal defence for the members of all liberation organisations in the great majority of trials for this entire period. And it provided assistance to sustain the families of those detained, imprisoned, and in some cases hanged. It paid for inquests like those of Looksmart Ngudle, Steve Biko and Neil Aggett, and produced factual information that it distributed internationally to publicise what was happening under apartheid and prod the conscience of the world into action. Its activities were a great boost to the morale of political prisoners and their families. It was banned in South Africa in 1966, but continued its work clandestinely from London until it closed its doors at the end of 1991, transferring its work to South African organisations best placed to carry it out.

Chapter 5 is a study of the Anti-Apartheid Movement in Ireland, which had little trade with South Africa and was not in a position to exert a material influence when it came to sanctions. Louise Asmal, Kader Asmal and Thomas Alberts show that the determined stand of Irish people against apartheid in sport, manifested when all-white sports teams toured the country in the 1960s, made a considerable impact. The Irish AAM's greatest support came from the trade unions, and it was their refusal to provide the necessary services to South African sportspersons that brought about the cancellation of a number of sporting events and conferences where South Africa was represented. The Irish government, though agreeing early on to put South Africa on the UN agenda, was not overly keen to take concrete steps to end apartheid. It took ten young women shop-workers – who went on strike for three and a half years from 1984 because they refused to handle South African fruit – to finally persuade the Irish government to ban the import of fruit and vegetables from South Africa. For nearly 30 years the AAM in Ireland publicised events in South Africa, relying heavily on material from IDAF, with which it had a close relationship, as well as on the UN Centre against Apartheid. At the end of the day, the influence of Irish history, the inclusive spirit of the Freedom Charter of the ANC, and the example set by members of the liberation movement, who upheld their principles of non-racism in the face of appalling racist oppression, came powerfully together. It is argued that this combination brought a high level of awareness and support for the liberation struggle in Ireland.

In chapter 10, Joan Fairweather demonstrates how, as a predominantly 'white' middle power, Canada's contribution to South Africa's liberation struggle was somewhat ambiguous. While the Canadian government was openly critical of apartheid policies, it was often reluctant to transform its abhorrence into meaningful action. Throughout the period under review, Canadian foreign policy relating to southern Africa was heavily influenced by its relationships with Britain and the United States, its closest allies and trading partners. However, thanks to public pressure and the tireless efforts exerted by Canadian churches, trade unions, and development organisations, Canada gradually developed other allegiances – the most important being with newly independent African states and fellow-members of the Commonwealth. Although

these connections tended to be concentrated on trade and humanitarian aid, as opposed to direct assistance to the liberation movements, Canada's friendship was recognised by many African leaders and laid the groundwork for a more significant role in South Africa's liberation struggle. While no single, cohesive anti-apartheid organisation emerged in Canada, the public sector drew inspiration and direction from a wide range of partner organisations in South Africa and became the backbone of Canada's solidarity movement.

In chapter 11, Peter Limb presents the history of the anti-apartheid movement in Australia and New Zealand. The nature of this movement is explained, its history in both countries and their interactions detailed, and the movement's significance and lessons are discussed. The history of the anti-apartheid movement(s) in Aotearoa/New Zealand and Australia is the history of multi-faceted solidarity action with strong international but also regional and historical dimensions that gave it specific features, most notably the important role of sports sanctions and the relationship of indigenous peoples' struggles to the AAM. Not much has been written on the internal history of the AAM in these countries. What were its origins, divisions, and triumphs? To what extent were its politics influenced by ideas of solidarity, or were they more a reflection of South African political forces (including exiles), or perhaps of national politics? How united, how effective, was it? This chapter comprehensively outlines the history of the movement in all its components and phases. It traces the early history of ties between these countries and South Africa; the first protests against South African racially selected sporting teams; and the emergence of the AAM from the 1960s. The struggle over sanctions is another major theme; this, and the little-known history of the activities of the liberation movements in Aotearoa/New Zealand and Australia, form an interesting and important part of the chapter.

The early Dutch colonisation of South Africa, the traditional religious connections, the links with the Afrikaner language, and the relatively large number of Dutch emigrants in South Africa all contributed to the keen interest in South African affairs, including the anti-apartheid struggle, in Dutch society. They explain the extensive media coverage and the emergence of strong anti-apartheid movements in the Netherlands, which is the subject of chapter 7, written by Sietse Bosgra. Bosgra shows that the issue of apartheid led to frequent and heated confrontations between a majority in parliament and many sectors of civil society on the one hand, and the government on the other, about sanctions against South Africa. For instance, the Protestant churches supported sanctions and assistance to the ANC, while the trade unions and development NGOs played an important role in anti-apartheid campaigns. Local authorities often found themselves in conflict with the Dutch government as they introduced their own economic sanctions against South Africa. In the 1970s and 1980s these contradictions became increasingly evident. The motor of this development was the Dutch AAMs. In this chapter it is demonstrated how the AAMs were able to mobilise public opinion and, in large part, determine the agenda of political discussions in the press, in parliament and in the government. Among the most important issues that they raised were the oil embargo, loans by Dutch banks to the apartheid state and its organs, the import of coal, the sale of Krugerrands, and the

sale of South African products in major retail stores. In some respects they were able to influence government action, for instance, when they forced the government to introduce some non-economic sanctions, such as denouncing the cultural agreement with South Africa, the introduction of visa requirements, and blocking the entry into the Netherlands of officials of the South African government and the 'independent homelands'. The chapter also focuses on the material support the Dutch AAMs provided to the ANC.

In chapter 8, the role of nine other West European countries and the work of their anti-apartheid movements are discussed by a variety of authors. After the introduction of apartheid in South Africa, the West European countries maintained their close and friendly relations with white South Africa. This was based largely on economic interests and feelings of kinship. Moreover, during the Cold War era, South Africa was considered part of the 'free world' of anti-communist states. But as international opposition to apartheid grew, national anti-apartheid organisations emerged in the different European countries under study. In this chapter, it is demonstrated that although the development of anti-apartheid movements was to a large extent similar, each country had its own particularities. In the early 1960s, France played an important role as a supplier of arms to apartheid South Africa, while Italy was not only an important arms exporter to South Africa, but was also involved in the large scale importation of South African gold. West Germany was at the forefront of the anti-communist struggle, which was a significant impediment as far as anti-apartheid campaigns in that country were concerned. Belgium, increasingly split up into French and Flemish sections, had two distinct sets of relationships with apartheid South Africa and separate anti-apartheid movements. In the Flemish half of the country, feelings of kinship with the Afrikaners had an influence on anti-apartheid activities. The linkages Austria and Switzerland had with the apartheid state were less obvious – and therefore often overlooked – and were a persistent obstacle for anti-apartheid movements. Portugal, Spain and Greece had limited relations with South Africa, and here the anti-apartheid movements were less developed. During the apartheid period a growing number of West European countries became members of the EC, and more and more powers were transferred from national governments to the EC. The West European anti-apartheid movements agreed that they should co-ordinate their activities at the EC level. The chapter concludes with a study of two movements formed as a consequence of this decision: the Liaison Group of Anti-Apartheid Movements in the EC, and the Association of West European Parliamentarians for Action against Apartheid (AWEPAA).

- The international struggle against apartheid threw up a large number of exceptional women and men who, in their individual capacities and as members of broader collectives, were influential in the broad solidarity movement. These include personalities such as Oliver Tambo, E.S. Reddy of the UN Centre against Apartheid, Canon John Collins and Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, Julius Nyerere, Kenneth Kaunda, Fidel Castro, Olof Palme, Paul Robeson and a host of others. Two of these leaders, Olof Palme and Samora Machel, were killed because

of their support for the liberation struggle. The chapters which follow deal with some of these personalities, as well as the contribution of millions of 'ordinary' people to the liberation struggle.

Finally, it is necessary to mention the role of a number of countries and organisations that are not covered in this and the forthcoming volume on international solidarity. These include Iran, the Caribbean countries, and the Organisation of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC).

Arab countries have always denounced racism in South Africa and supported measures against apartheid. All the independent Arab states joined the Asian countries in 1952 in calling for a discussion of apartheid by the United Nations General Assembly. The OAPEC took the foremost step in the campaign for an oil embargo (see below) when it decided to end exports of oil to South Africa in 1975. This followed a decision by the Summit Conference of Arab States in Algiers in November 1973 to impose a complete oil embargo on South Africa.

Thereafter, Iran became South Africa's main supplier of oil during the remaining years of rule of the Shah; supplying 90 per cent of the country's oil needs. The Shah also had substantial interest in a South African oil refinery at Secunda. Following the Islamic Revolution in 1979, however, Iran's new leader, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, vowed to fight 'the tentacles of apartheid'.¹⁷ The Iranian Embassy in Pretoria was immediately closed, although an Iranian Interests office remained open in South Africa. Iran stopped all oil exports to South Africa and sold its shares in the Secunda refinery at throw-away prices. This move provided great momentum to the campaign for an oil embargo against South Africa. South Africa was then forced to purchase oil on the black market at great expense. At the same time relations with the ANC were greatly enhanced when a high-powered ANC delegation that included Alfred Nzo and Frene Ginwala attended a conference of liberation movements on the first anniversary of the Iranian revolution.¹⁸

Besides Cuba, the Caribbean countries of the Commonwealth had a strong feeling of solidarity with Africa, and these small countries took whatever action they could in solidarity with the people of South Africa. Jamaica, for instance, declared a trade embargo against South Africa as early as 1957 even though the island was still a colony of Britain and thus without responsibility for its external relations. Dockworkers in Trinidad boycotted South African ships after the Sharpeville massacre, well before the independence of their country. Cheddi Jagan, then Chief Minister of British Guiana was one of the first individuals to be arrested in an anti-apartheid demonstration: one that took place outside the British Houses of Parliament after the Sharpeville massacre. After independence, Jamaica supported all UN decisions aimed at the elimination of apartheid. It played a crucial role in

17 Iqbal Jhazbhay, 'South Africa-Middle East Relations during the Mandela and Mbeki Presidency: A Test of Sure-footed Maturity and Do-able Morality?', *Current Issues*, 22 July 2004, www.nuradeen.com/CurrentIssues/SAMiddleEastRelations.htm.

18 Javid Ghorbanoghli, 'Mr Mbeki, this is not way to treat a friend', <http://enbazztab.com/content/?cid+3852>.

pressing the international community to limit foreign trade and investment in South Africa, and contributed to the struggle to isolate South Africa in sport. It was among the countries that worked to bring the issue of apartheid in sports before the UN, and was appointed to the ad hoc committee set up to draft an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports. In December 1977, the General Assembly adopted the International Declaration against Apartheid in Sports, and finally, a decade later in 1987, the Convention. A Jamaican, Angela King, was appointed to head the UN observer team which monitored South Africa's first democratic elections in 1994.¹⁹

The role of the liberation movements

In March 1960, Peter Molotsi and Nana Mahomo of the PAC left the country to establish contacts and seek assistance for the PAC from abroad. 'Our mission was to canvass for material and financial support from the African countries', Molotsi recalls. Though initially the PAC construed Molotsi and Mahomo's mission to focus on soliciting material and military aid, the Sharpeville massacre later in the month forced them to remain in exile. Just prior to the banning of the ANC, and PAC in April 1960, the then deputy president-general of the ANC, Oliver Tambo, together with Yusuf Dadoo of the SAIC, left the country to organise an international solidarity campaign. The subsequent banning of organisations, mass arrests, state repression and departure from the country of many leading members of the ANC forced the liberation movement to establish a mission-in-exile. For the ANC in particular, the international isolation of South Africa was regarded as one of the key pillars of its revolutionary strategy.²⁰

When Oliver Tambo went abroad in 1960, the ANC already had some contacts. These included those established by the SAIC during the 1946 passive resistance campaign, and by the SACP in the Communist International. Christian Action, led by Canon Collins, started supporting the struggle in South Africa from 1952 when the Defiance Campaign was launched. Moreover, several exiles from South Africa had been active in publicising the situation and struggle in South Africa and seeking understanding and political support. These were young ANC and SACP supporters like Vella Pillay, Mac Maharaj, among others, who had been active in Britain.

The PAC, on the other hand, had legal existence for less than a year, and no such international contacts. However, it had a militant image as a result of incidents at Sharpeville, while the ANC was considered by some to be moderate. Peter Molotsi was effective in obtaining African support. The PAC's attack on the ANC's multi-racialism appealed to Africans who had opposed the fraudulent multi-racialism of the British colonialists in east Africa. Nana Mahomo, accusing the ANC of communism, obtained support from the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the American Federation of Labor, for example.²¹

19 H.S. Walker, 'Jamaica and the United Nations: 1962-1995', www.un.int/jamaica/memship.htm

20 The other three pillars were mass mobilisation and action, building the political underground, and the armed struggle.

21 E-mail communication with E.S. Reddy, 24 October 2007.

One of the first steps the two liberation movements took in their campaign for international solidarity was, together with the SAIC and the South West African National Union (SWANU), to establish the South African United Front (SAUF) in London in May 1960 in order to pool their resources and co-ordinate their activities in this area. The SAUF enabled the liberation movements to conduct their campaign to isolate South Africa economically, politically, militarily and socially with a single voice. Offices were established in London, Accra, Cairo and New York to disseminate information about conditions in South Africa and to mobilise international public opinion against the apartheid regime. The SAUF conducted campaigns to close off South Africa's access to oil and oil products; to secure the support of dockworkers to stop the shipment of these products at their source of supply; to persuade the independent African states to refuse permission for South African ships to dock in their harbours and deny landing rights and airspace to all South African aircraft; and to encourage the UN to take over trusteeship of South West Africa (Namibia) from South Africa. The various offices of the SAUF conducted their own campaigns, while Oliver Tambo of the ANC and Vusumuzi Make of the PAC addressed the UN Trusteeship Council. To draw attention to the oppressive conditions in South Africa, the SAUF issued position papers and memoranda on events such as the Sharpeville massacre and the Mpondoland revolt. However, the incompatibility of the two South African liberation movements led to the dissolution of this structure in March 1962.²²

Throughout the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s the ANC sent memoranda and position papers to the UN and other international organisations, governments and solidarity movements setting out its policies with regard to the campaign to isolate South Africa.²³ Immediately after the dissolution of the SAUF, the ANC began setting up offices in London, Cairo, Ghana, Algiers, and Dar es Salaam, each led by a chief representative to improve communication with international organisations, governments and solidarity movements. By the end of the 1960s, the ANC had nine offices in Africa, Asia, North America and Europe. This number increased to 20 by 1980, and to 41 by the end of the decade. ANC missions in various countries, and its representatives abroad, played a central role in international solidarity. They were responsible for briefing the media; producing and disseminating information; establishing and maintaining links with significant political figures, solidarity activists, trade unionists, etc., of the host country; facilitating and co-ordinating meetings between the leadership and leading figures in the host country; convening and participating in seminars and conferences on apartheid; participating and supporting campaigns of solidarity movements; raising public awareness about apartheid and the solidarity campaign; raising funds for the ANC; and a host of other tasks.

Delegations were sent to advance the ANC's cause at world forums such as the UN, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Federation of Democratic

22 Refer to Sifiso Ndlovu, 'The ANC in Exile, 1960-1970', in South African Democracy Education Trust (hereafter SADET) (eds), *The Road to Democracy in South Africa, Volume 1, 1960-1970* (Cape Town: Zebra Press, 2004), 429-32.

23 The ANC sent memoranda to the United Nations even in 1940s and 1950s. See www.anc.org.za/un for ANC letters to UN.

Youth, the Women's International Democratic Federation, the International Union of Students and the ILO.²⁴ This began in the 1950s, when representatives of the Congress Alliance attended international conferences such as the Bandung Conference in 1955 and the first All African People's Conference in 1958. The liberation movements made appeals for action in international forums that gave focus to the actions of international organisations, governments and solidarity movements. These include addresses made in the UN and other international governmental and non-governmental organisations such as AAPSO, and at international conferences and seminars focusing on apartheid. For instance, Oliver Tambo, president of the ANC, addressed the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa held in Paris from 20 to 27 May 1981, and called 'for the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against South Africa under the provisions of chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter'.²⁵ Tambo appealed to countries that had already imposed sanctions to widen their scope, make them all-embracing and strengthen the enforcement of these sanctions. He asked oil-producing states to join the oil embargo imposed by OAPEC and Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC); governments to stop the supply and transport of embargoed goods to South Africa; and those governments that had not yet imposed sanctions, to take action. This was one of the ways in which the liberation movements played a role in setting the agenda for international solidarity. On such occasions, delegates of the ANC were able to hold bilateral talks with those representing other organisations and countries. For instance, the deputy head of the National Youth Commission of the ANC, Manala Manzini, held talks with delegates from Nicaragua, the Federal Republic of Germany, India and Mozambique, among others, at the Assembly of the World Federation of Democratic Youth held in Hungary from 23 to 29 November 1987.

Delegates also contributed to the proceedings in these forums, spoke at solidarity meetings, and addressed the press, providing another opportunity for influence.²⁶ ANC delegates were able to inform people about developments inside South Africa and about the ANC's specific solidarity needs from that country; to build broad support for the international struggle against apartheid; to express the liberation movement's appreciation of support given by the solidarity movements; and to solidify relations with sympathetic political and other figures and with the solidarity movements.

Publications of the liberation movements played an important role in providing an agenda for solidarity actions. For instance, the ANC's official organ, *Sechaba*, which was first produced in 1967, was widely distributed abroad, providing readers with information about developments inside South Africa and in the broader southern African region. *Sechaba* was able to disseminate information about ANC strategies, tactics,²⁷ policies and activities; about ANC appeals to the world community; about solidarity actions and campaigns in various parts of the world; about economic,

24 Refer to Ndlovu, 'The ANC and the World', 541-71.

25 Tambo's address to the conference can be found in 'Sanctions – Weapon against Apartheid Aggression', *Sechaba*, July 1981, 3-10.

26 See 'ANC International', *Sechaba*, February 1987, 30.

27 See for instance the article by Neva Makgetla, 'Why we Call for Sanctions', *Sechaba*, September 1985, 9-15.

political, military and social collaboration between apartheid South Africa and other countries; about violations of unilateral and international sanctions; about liberation struggles in other parts of the world; and about a host of other issues of interest to people opposed to the apartheid system and to oppression in general.

The liberation movements also played a role in expanding public knowledge on the issue of apartheid and the struggle against discrimination in other countries when they, together with solidarity movements, promoted various activities to celebrate anniversaries of important events of the struggle, such as Sharpeville Day, Soweto Day, South African Freedom Day, Women's Day, etc., which were proclaimed by the UN and other organisations as international days. On such occasions, members of the liberation movements were able to address large numbers of people in rallies. Members were also active in organising international seminars and conferences on apartheid, for example the international conference on sanctions in April 1964.²⁸

Large numbers of black and white political exiles, many of whom were members of the liberation movements, provided valuable support to anti-apartheid movements in Western countries. For example, ANC members living in Britain formed a core of support for AAM activities, especially on demonstrations and pickets outside South Africa House. Many took up leading positions in solidarity movements, such as Kader Asmal in the Irish AAM, while others initiated international campaigns and in some cases led structures set up to direct international campaigns, such as the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa, in which Abdul Minty served as director. Oliver Tambo, for example, initiated the World Campaign for the Release of South African Political Prisoners in 1963 following the arrests of the leadership of the Congress Alliance at Rivonia in May 1963.

However, no individual member of either liberation movement deserves more credit for his role in initiating and cementing international solidarity than Oliver Tambo. Given the task of launching a worldwide solidarity campaign in early 1960, Tambo spent the next 30 years of his life in exile pursuing this task. Luli Callinicos acknowledges this with the following words:

... as one commentator remarked, 'No other post-World War Two struggle for decolonisation has been so fully globalised; no other has magnetised so many people across such national divides, or imbued them with such a resilient sense of common cause.' This outstanding phenomenon owed the major part of its success to Oliver Tambo's *indima* diplomacy, laid down step by step, acre by acre, in the long hard years of struggle.²⁹

The PAC, on the other hand, had alienated the Soviet Union and India, among others, with its attacks against communism and Indians. ANC policy, based on the Freedom Charter, appealed to people in the West. While the accused in the Rivonia Trial were afforded immense international support, PAC prisoners were not, largely because of violent attacks on white people carried out by PAC members in the early 1960s. What

28 Refer to Ndlovu, 'The ANC and the World', 554.

29 Luli Callinicos, *Oliver Tambo: Beyond the Engeli Mountains* (Claremont: David Philip, 2004), 520.

the PAC gained by its image of militancy was lost in subsequent years because of internal squabbles and its inability to recover from the repression of 1963–65 and build effective structures inside so that it could play an important role in the liberation struggle.

As a result, the PAC's international support was mainly due to the OAU, which recognised both organisations. The PAC received grants from the OAU Liberation Fund and was recognised by the Non-Aligned Movement and the United Nations, because of its recognition by the OAU. As a result it received some support from UN agencies and a few governments, especially as far as its humanitarian projects were concerned. Almost all solidarity movements favoured the ANC, even if they did not denounce the PAC. The PAC only had the backing of the Netherlands Azania committee and a few other inconsequential groups.³⁰

Campaigns in solidarity with the liberation movement

Various international organisations and their agencies, governments, and solidarity movements played a central role in campaigns for the economic, political, military and social isolation of apartheid South Africa. For the most part, many of the governments of countries in Africa, the Socialist Bloc, Asia, the Caribbean and South America took the lead in the various campaigns discussed below. By contrast, many Western governments resisted international efforts to isolate the apartheid regime, largely because of economic interests in, and/or historical links with South Africa. In these countries, it was up to solidarity movements to initiate and promote campaigns for the isolation of the apartheid state. In addition, the activities of the UN Special Committee against Apartheid were instrumental in persuading many countries to commit to these campaigns.

The purpose of such international action was to bring about an end to apartheid by using methods that would ensure the minimum of violence and suffering. Economic sanctions and boycotts; the campaigns to exclude South Africa from representation in international governmental organisations and to encourage governments to 'break off' diplomatic relations with the apartheid state; campaigns to end military co-operation and for an arms embargo; the campaign for an oil embargo; and for sports, consumer, cultural and academic boycotts were all helpful in this context. The international isolation of South Africa was crucial for a number of reasons:

- economic isolation was directed at weakening the economy of apartheid South Africa and thereby its capacity to maintain an aggressive posture and the means through which it could sustain and perpetuate itself;³¹
- political isolation was directed at eroding apartheid South Africa's representation in international governmental organisations and its bilateral political links, thereby restricting its international political influence;

30 E-mail communication with E.S. Reddy, 24 October 2007.

31 Refer to Oliver R. Tambo, 'Impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa', statement at the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, UNESCO House, Paris, 21 May, 1981. Available at www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/or/or81-5.html.

- military isolation was directed at eroding apartheid South Africa's capacity to suppress internal resistance against apartheid and engage in aggressive action against its independent neighbours; and
- social isolation was directed at eroding the South African white population's interaction with people from other parts of the world, thereby imposing a psychological cost that would lead to its rejection of the apartheid system.

In addition, a number of international campaigns focused on the victims of apartheid, such as the campaign for the release of political prisoners.

The isolation and weakening of the South African regime was also to make clear to the government and its supporters that the international community would not tolerate the continuation of apartheid. The government had to be persuaded to abandon apartheid, release political prisoners, end repression, and negotiate a peaceful solution in discussions with the genuine representatives of the people of the country.

The international campaigns had a number of common features. Firstly, they included international organisations and their agencies, governments, trans-national, national and local organisations. They also drew on the support of individuals already committed, or involved in measures to influence other governments and international organisations, as well as the public, to commit to the campaign and take the required action to implement the steps necessary for the isolation of South Africa. Secondly, these international campaigns involved widespread public mobilisation, expansion of public awareness of the issues involved, and public action in support of the campaigns. Thirdly, they involved some sacrifice on the part of countries, such as the economic benefits from continuing engagement with apartheid South Africa, as well as on the part of individuals; at the very least, the time and energy to participate in the campaigns and, for some, imprisonment.³² Fourthly, they faced resistance from a variety of quarters, including governments, organisations and individuals sympathetic to the apartheid state.

The process of building solidarity movements in the West was a lengthy and difficult one.³³ While the campaigns discussed below evolved from very small beginnings in a comparatively small number of countries, they grew to include international campaigns worldwide, involving a large number of solidarity movements, and thousands of trade union, youth, women and other organisations with memberships collectively amounting to several millions of people. This process of building the individual movements and the evolution of their campaigns is discussed in some of the chapters that follow. In their efforts they were to some extent assisted by certain catalytic events inside South Africa itself – events that drew international attention to South Africa and led to increasing international condemnation and popular mobilisation abroad.

32 For instance, 400 people were arrested in protests against the Springbok rugby tour of Britain in 1969, and 2 000 were arrested in protests against the Springbok Rugby tour of New Zealand in 1981. (E-mail communication with E.S. Reddy, 23 October 2007.)

33 E.S. Reddy points out that the international solidarity movement was built up mainly by the ANC. In later years, the ANC also helped build up movements in support of the liberation struggles of Namibia, Rhodesia, and the Portuguese territories. (E-mail communication, 23 October 2007.)

Some of these events deserve special mention here.

- In the Sharpeville massacre of 21 March 1960, 69 peaceful demonstrators who had gathered to protest against the pass laws were murdered in cold blood. Two others were killed at Langa in Cape Town. In the aftermath of the massacre, on 28 March the state responded to a nationwide stay-away, a national 'Day of Mourning' and protest for the atrocities at Sharpeville by declaring a state of emergency and detaining thousands of political activists. On 8 April it banned the ANC and PAC.
- The Rivonia Trial from 1963 to 1964 followed the arrests of several leaders of the Congress Alliance at Lilliesleaf Farm in Rivonia on 11 July 1963, which resulted in life sentences for Nelson Mandela and the seven other accused on 12 June 1964. The judgement was followed by another wave of mass arrests.
- The Soweto Uprising began on 16 June 1976, following the shooting of Soweto students demonstrating against the imposition of Afrikaans as a language of tuition and various other aspects of apartheid. Several hundred protesting students were killed in centres throughout the country after this fateful day, while thousands of students and political activists were arrested. These events were captured by television and newspaper crews from many Western countries.
- The death of Steve Biko at the hands of the police while in detention on 12 September 1977, and the banning of 18 anti-apartheid organisations and the Christian Institute in October precipitated another major crisis for the apartheid state.
- On 21 July 1985 there was a declaration of a partial state of emergency by the government in response to a wave of resistance that began in the Vaal Triangle on 3 September 1984. Thousands of troops of the South African Defence Force (SADF) were deployed in the townships during the emergency, setting the stage for the widespread deployment of troops during the various states of emergency that followed. This resulted in an unprecedented wave of repression that was captured by photographers and television crews from abroad.

Most African, Asian, Caribbean and Latin American countries, and virtually all countries in the Socialist Bloc, isolated South Africa by imposing unilateral economic sanctions, breaking diplomatic ties, ending all military co-operation, and terminating all social interaction. India was the first country to recall its diplomatic representative and impose economic sanctions against South Africa in 1946. It was followed by Jamaica in 1959, by Malaya and Sudan, and by independent African countries who called for a total boycott at their conference in 1960.

The economic sanctions campaign

In 1959, Chief Albert Luthuli, the president-general of the ANC at the time, made an appeal on behalf of the people of South Africa. He stated:

I appeal to all governments throughout the world, to people everywhere, to all organisations and institutions in every land and at every level to act now to impose such sanctions on South Africa that will bring about the vital

necessary change and avert what can become the greatest African tragedy of our time.³⁴

One of the first organisations to campaign for a boycott was the Boycott Movement in Britain, formed in 1959 in response to the chief's appeal, and which in time became the British Anti-Apartheid Movement.

The international campaign for economic sanctions took a variety of forms. One of the foremost was the campaign conducted by governments and the UN Special Committee against Apartheid in the UN, other international organisations and solidarity movements for comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa. International and national issue-specific campaigns were also conducted by international organisations, governments, and solidarity movements for ending trade with South Africa; disinvestment and banning of future investment in South Africa; banning of financial loans to South Africa, etc.

The campaign for international economic sanctions

African, Socialist Bloc and Asian countries pressed for comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa after the Sharpeville massacre in 1960. Although they succeeded in getting many resolutions on sanctions passed by the UN General Assembly over the years, efforts to impose mandatory economic sanctions were repeatedly blocked by the Western powers – the United States, Britain and France – in the Security Council. In time, however, a number of smaller Western nations began calling for mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. In addition, some Western governments imposed unilateral measures against the apartheid regime, such as the decision by Norway and Sweden to prohibit new investments in South Africa after the 1976 Soweto uprising. Meanwhile, the campaign to extend economic sanctions was conducted in international governmental organisations such as the Commonwealth and EC. Despite the failure to get the UN to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, by the second half of the 1980s, certain economic sanctions had indeed been imposed by the United States, Britain and the EC because of the pressure of public opinion. Local authorities, trade unions, pension funds and universities joined the divestment campaigns, and these had a significant effect. The decision of major international financial institutions in 1985 to stop loans to South Africa because of world public opinion and the deterioration of the South African economic situation had a great impact. Finally, as will be seen in chapter 2, the UN Special Committee against Apartheid played a particularly significant role in the campaign for international economic sanctions against South Africa.

Issue-specific campaigns

After the Sharpeville massacre in 1960, solidarity movements in the West engaged in a number of activities to pressurise their governments to impose sanctions against

34 Cited in '25 Years of Campaigning – The Anti-apartheid Movement', *Sechaba*, August Issue, 1984, 13.

apartheid South Africa. In addition, there were the international and national campaigns focusing on specific areas targeted for boycott.

- *The trade boycott*: The campaign to end all trade with South Africa, which in its comprehensive form included a ban on all exports to, and imports from South Africa, was conducted at a number of levels. Included here are the campaign for an oil embargo; the campaign against other exports to South Africa; the arms embargo campaign (discussed separately below); and the consumer boycotts (or so-called people's sanctions) conducted by solidarity movements in the West.
- *The consumer boycott* was intended to end imports of South African goods. Solidarity movements involved in the consumer boycott campaign targeted consumers, pressuring them not to purchase South African products. They requested shops and supermarket chains not to stock South African products; encouraged shipping companies not to transport South African goods; and asked trade union members not to handle any imports from South Africa. At the same time, solidarity movements engaged with governments to encourage them to impose bans on importing South African products. Some of the major campaigns were conducted against South African wines and fruit, gold, coal and other minerals, Krugerrands, cigarettes, and dairy products. Some of the national campaigns were of short duration, targeting the whole range of imports to a particular country, while others were extended for long periods and targeted one or more South African products. The effect of an embargo on imports from South Africa was a sharp reduction of the profits of South African businesses, while reducing the amount of foreign exchange available to the country to pay for its own imports, in particular for oil and armaments.
- The international *oil embargo campaign* was two-pronged. It was conducted by various countries to encourage oil-producing and exporting countries to discontinue exports of petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa; and by solidarity movements in countries involved in the oil trade to discourage all companies involved in the trade from selling and shipping oil to South Africa, as well as from refining oil inside the country. With regard to the first issue, the highlight was the success in getting many of the oil-exporting countries, particularly the members of OPEC, to impose an embargo. The campaign received a great fillip when the OPEC decided in 1975 to impose an oil embargo against South Africa, and when the government of the Shah was overthrown in Iran in 1979 and the new government cut off relations with South Africa. The highlights of the campaigns by solidarity movements were the public campaigns in most Western countries against oil companies operating in South Africa. The campaign against the Dutch multinational, Shell, for example, drew support from solidarity movements in the Netherlands, United States, Britain, Australia, and elsewhere, as well as from the WCC and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). The British AAM also embarked on a campaign against British Petroleum, while the AAM in France called for the withdrawal of Total from South Africa. In addition, measures were put in place by the UN, the ILO and trade unions, as well as by

various solidarity movements, to monitor and publicise the activities of shipping companies and tankers that were evading the oil embargo. The Shipping Research Bureau (SHIREBU), established by anti-apartheid groups in the Netherlands, made a valuable contribution in this respect.

- Among the various features of the *campaign against exports to South Africa* were the efforts of solidarity movements to pressure their governments to impose comprehensive bans on exports; stop granting export credit guarantees and currency licences for trade with South Africa; restrict subsidised export credit terms; and the development of stricter export controls once export bans had been imposed. Because the UN General Assembly's call in November 1962 on all states to end exports to South Africa was voluntary, some governments in the West had to be pressured into adopting some of these measures. In the last years of the 1980s, however, many governments had unilaterally adopted some or all of these measures in response to the crisis in South Africa and the pressure of public opinion in their countries, while others, members of the Commonwealth and EC, conformed to the sanctions packages developed in these organisations.
- *Disinvestment and loans*: The international campaign for disinvestment from South Africa – aimed at the withdrawal of all foreign companies from South Africa – drew attention to the complicity of such companies in perpetuating the apartheid system through, for instance, taxes paid to the apartheid regime, while enjoying substantial profits precisely because of the exploitative nature of the system. Pressure was brought to bear on all multinational corporations with plants in South Africa to end their involvement in South Africa by targeting investors in these corporations – banks, pension funds, universities, churches, municipalities, and so on – to withdraw their funds from these corporations. Solidarity movements also pressured their government to introduce disinvestment laws. Coupled with the campaign for disinvestment was the call for a ban on all new investments in South Africa and capital transfers to South Africa in the form of loans to the South African government, parastatals and private corporations. In both cases, solidarity movements pressurised their governments to impose bans on new investments in, and loans to South Africa, while conducting campaigns against those corporations and banks with investments in South Africa and making loans to that country. The main feature of the latter initiative was the campaign to get people to withdraw their funds from banks providing loans to South Africa and trade unions, municipalities, political parties, churches and other organisations to cancel their accounts with such banks. Campaigns for stopping new investments in South Africa and loans to South Africa were strengthened by the decision of Norway and Sweden after the Soweto massacre to ban new investments in South Africa. In the middle of the 1980s, scores of multinational corporations with headquarters in the United States, Britain and elsewhere began selling off their assets in South Africa, resulting in a flow of capital from the country and a limitation of prospects for future growth of the economy. In addition, the majority of Western governments had imposed bans on new investments in South Africa, while most banks had been discouraged from making further loans to South Africa and to corporations operating in that country, thus sharply limiting the growth of the economy.

The campaign to politically isolate South Africa

The campaign to isolate South Africa in the political sphere was conducted at two levels: by governments and solidarity movements to exclude South Africa from all relevant international governmental organisations; and by governments that unilaterally broke off diplomatic relations with apartheid South Africa. On the flip side was the campaign for the recognition of the liberation movements as the official and legitimate representatives of the people of South Africa in international governmental organisations, and to extend diplomatic status to offices of the liberation movements.

The first significant step in this regard was the campaign to expel South Africa from the Commonwealth. African states (as well as other members of the NAM) took up this cause, and at the Second Conference of Independent African States meeting in Addis Ababa in June 1960 they adopted a resolution calling upon African members of the Commonwealth to take all possible steps to secure the exclusion of South Africa from the Commonwealth. South Africa was eventually forced to leave the Commonwealth in May 1961 because of opposition to its racial policies.

In November 1962, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution that called on the Security Council 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. The matter was considered for the first time by the Security Council in October 1974. However, although ten members of the Security Council supported a proposal to recommend the immediate expulsion of South Africa from the UN, it failed to pass because three of the five permanent members of the Security Council rejected it. Soon thereafter, the General Assembly rejected the credentials of the South African delegation, and approved the ruling of its president that South Africa could not participate in the work of the General Assembly. South Africa was soon excluded from all other UN bodies.

By the end of the 1960s, South Africa had been expelled or excluded from the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa South of the Sahara; the Economic Commission for Africa; the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO); the International Civil Aviation Organisation; and UNESCO. By the second half of the 1980s, South Africa had been excluded from virtually all international governmental organisations.

The first step in the campaign to deny South Africa diplomatic representation abroad was the resolution taken at the Second Conference of Independent African States meeting in 1960, which called on all African states to break diplomatic ties with South Africa. This was followed by the 1962 UN General Assembly resolution, which included a call on member states to boycott diplomatic relations with South Africa. Many African, Asian and Socialist countries which had not yet broken relations with South Africa did so soon after the adoption of the UN resolution. In those, largely Western, countries that maintained diplomatic relations with South Africa, solidarity movements were instrumental (for the most part without success) in pressuring their governments to conform to the General Assembly resolution calling for diplomatic

sanctions. A few Western countries took unilateral action in this regard, and by the time of the un-banning of the liberation movements on 2 February 1990 South Africa had diplomatic links with only 28 countries. By contrast, the UN General Assembly recognised the ANC and PAC as the representatives of the overwhelming majority of South Africans in 1973. By the end of the 1980s, the ANC had missions in 41 countries.

Campaign against military collaboration with South Africa

The campaign to end military co-operation with South Africa was directed towards the following objectives: an embargo on the trade in arms with South Africa; ending all multi-lateral military activities; and an embargo on nuclear collaboration. The campaign for an arms embargo was intended to apply to the supply of all *materiel* which could be used for the suppression of resistance to apartheid or for military purposes against neighbouring states, as well as all assistance, direct or indirect, for the manufacture of such *materiel* in South Africa. The campaign for ending all multi-lateral military activities with South Africa was aimed at military agreements, joint military exercises, training of members of South African defence forces, and the withdrawal of military attaches.³⁵ Finally, the campaign for an embargo on nuclear collaboration was aimed at ending any and all forms of co-operation with South Africa in the manufacture and development of nuclear weapons.

Arms embargo campaign

In the early 1960s, the major concern was the use of military and arms related *materiel* for the repression of the black majority. This soon turned to a concern for the expansion of the arms industry inside the country, as well as the military build-up, as an increasing proportion of the budget was directed towards the military. By the mid 1970s the concern for a military build-up to be used for internal repression was followed by a concern for its use in aggression against South Africa's neighbours, particularly after the SADF invaded Angola in 1975 for the first time. As we will see in some of the chapters that follow, the campaign for an arms embargo was conducted at three levels: firstly, by various countries and agencies in the UN where the objective was to introduce a mandatory arms embargo obliging all member states to end trade in arms with South Africa; secondly, by solidarity movements in countries that continued to trade in arms with South Africa between 1963 and 1977; and, thirdly, by solidarity movements to enforce compliance with a UN mandatory arms embargo imposed in 1977.

Between 1963 and 1977, African and non-aligned countries introduced resolutions in the UN with the objective of achieving agreement on a mandatory arms embargo.

35 The British AAM embarked on a major campaign in 1974 to end the Simon's Town Agreement after joint South African-British sea and air exercises in October. The Labour Government of James Callaghan was embarrassed by the situation and terminated the agreement soon thereafter. (E-mail communication with E.S. Reddy, 23 October 2007.)

In addition, the UN Special Committee against Apartheid presented reports on military co-operation and recommended the steps to be taken, organised international conferences on military co-operation with apartheid South Africa, and supported international campaigns against military co-operation in an attempt to draw international attention to military co-operation and the need for a mandatory arms embargo. However, the Western powers were instrumental in blocking these efforts in the Security Council until the end of this period.

The arms embargo campaign was also conducted by solidarity movements in those countries that engaged in military co-operation with South Africa. Campaigns were initiated to oppose arms exports to South Africa; against multinational corporations operating in South Africa that produced items for use by the SADF; breaches of unilaterally declared embargoes on the sale of arms; and to impose bans on arms sales to South Africa. Finally, pressure was brought to bear on governments to support a mandatory arms embargo in the UN.

Following the adoption of a resolution by the UN Security Council to implement a mandatory arms embargo under chapter VII of the UN Charter in 1977, many governments in the West continued to ignore violations of the embargo and failed to introduce legislation to block loopholes that enabled such violations. The solidarity movements in these countries, together with the UN Special Committee against Apartheid, played a significant role thereafter in bringing information on loopholes and breaches of the embargo, as well as weaknesses in its monitoring, to the attention of the international community. Special reference must also be made to the significant contribution of the World Campaign for an End to Military Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa, led by Abdul S. Minty, which had several leaders of government as its patrons.

Campaigns to end social interaction: sports, cultural and academic boycotts

The sports boycott

The campaign for a sports boycott was conducted by country representatives in international sports bodies to end participation by South African sportsmen and women in international sports competitions such as the Olympics. Solidarity movements also brought pressure to bear on their national sports bodies to oppose participation by South Africans in international sports events and to end bilateral sporting links with South Africa. In addition, governments began to call for a sports boycott of South Africa in the UN from 1968, while other international governmental organisations began to take action against South Africa in this area.

Anti-apartheid movements in Western countries and sports bodies in African, non-aligned and Socialist countries took the lead in pressing for a boycott of sports teams from South Africa from the early 1960s. The key actors that deserve special mention here are the Supreme Council on Sport in Africa and the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SAN-ROC), formed in South Africa in 1963. Among

the highlights of this campaign were the exclusion of South Africa from the 1962 Commonwealth Games in Perth after it withdrew from the Commonwealth in 1961, and the exclusion of South Africa from the 1964 Tokyo Olympics and the Mexico City Olympics in 1968. South Africa was expelled from the Olympic movement in 1970.

The UN General Assembly first called for a sports boycott of South Africa in 1968. By 1970, South Africa was excluded from most of the major world championships. Apartheid South Africa's international contacts in amateur sport were reduced to tennis, golf and various minor sports, and bilateral exchanges with a few countries in cricket and rugby. In the early 1960s, the first major campaigns were conducted by the British, Irish, Australian, New Zealand, French and American anti-apartheid movements against bilateral sport exchanges. These campaigns continued throughout the decade and into the 1970s and 1980s, and brought an end to bilateral sports exchanges by the mid 1980s.

Meanwhile, from 1970 national sports bodies began to pressure other national sports bodies to end bilateral links by threatening to withdraw from international competitions. In 1971, the General Assembly called upon sports organisations to discourage and deny support to sporting events organised in violation of the principle of non-discrimination in sport, and on individual sportsmen to refuse to participate in any sports activity in a country in which there was an official policy of racial discrimination or apartheid in sport. At the 1977 meeting of Commonwealth Heads of Government in Gleneagles in Scotland, consensus was reached on the Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid and Sport (the Gleneagles Declaration), calling on all Commonwealth members to discourage sporting contacts with South Africa. The Gleneagles Declaration was approved by the OAU in June 1978. Sports ministers of the members of the Council of Europe adopted a declaration similar to that of the Gleneagles Declaration in 1978. From then on, many countries began to impose bans on bilateral sports links with South Africa.

In 1981 the UN Special Committee against Apartheid began to publish periodic registers of sports contacts with South Africa, with lists of sportspeople, administrators and promoters involved in such exchanges. The OAU Council of Ministers called upon governments to ban the persons named in the register from entering into their countries. Hundreds of city councils and local authorities in Britain and other Western countries decided to deny use of their sports facilities to persons on the UN register. The UN Convention against Apartheid in Sport came into force on 3 April 1988, and laid down that states should prohibit entry into their countries by sportspeople who participated in sports competitions in South Africa, as well as sportspeople or administrators who issued invitations to apartheid sports bodies or teams officially representing South Africa.

The cultural boycott

The cultural boycott campaign was initially taken up by solidarity movements and cultural bodies in Western countries in the 1960s, followed by a General Assembly resolution on a cultural boycott in 1980 and subsequent publication of a register of cultural workers who violated the cultural boycott. The campaign was directed

at individual artists and performers, associations of artists and performers, and governments to:

- persuade individual performers not to work in South Africa;
- ensure that trade unions representing performers and artists imposed a ban on their members working in South Africa;
- get playwrights to prohibit the performance of their works in apartheid South Africa;
- impose a ban on all technical co-operation with South Africa in the fields of film and television;
- prohibit the sale of television programmes and films to South Africa;
- cancel all cultural agreements with South Africa;
- encourage all states to take steps to prevent all cultural, academic, sports and other exchanges with South Africa; and
- discourage artists and performers from violating the cultural boycott by publishing a register of cultural contacts with South Africa listing those who performed in South Africa.

Examples of the actions taken in this campaign were the decision taken by the British Musicians Union in 1958 that its members should not perform in South Africa as long as apartheid was in place; and the signing of a declaration by prominent British playwrights in 1963 announcing that their plays could not be performed in South Africa. A similar declaration was accepted by 28 Irish playwrights in 1964 and signed by some of the most prominent members of the British Actors' Union, Equity, not to work in South Africa. Another was signed by more than 60 American cultural personalities who pledged to refuse any professional association with South Africa in 1965. Equity also prohibited the sale of programmes featuring its members, and the British television technicians union placed a ban on all co-operation with South Africa in the mid 1970s. Other actions included the suspension of a cultural agreement with South Africa by the Flemish Cultural Council in 1977; the adoption of a resolution by the UN General Assembly on a cultural boycott in 1980; the cessation of the Dutch cultural agreement with South Africa in 1981; the publication of a register of cultural contacts with South Africa, listing those who performed in South Africa, from 1983; and an international workshop on the cultural boycott organised by the Irish AAM in 1986.

The academic boycott

The leading forces behind the academic boycott campaign were the solidarity movements in Western countries. Solidarity movements targeted professional associations and universities in an effort to obtain pledges from academics that they would not accept posts at South African universities; ban all contacts with South African universities and academics; and exclude South Africans from participating in the activities of international academic and scientific associations.

Among the highlights of this campaign were the declaration signed by 600 British academics in 1966 not to accept posts in South African universities following an initiative of the British AAM; the decision in the mid 1970s taken by all Dutch universities to refrain from contacts with their South African counterparts following

an extensive campaign by solidarity movements; the decision to call for a total boycott of any form of contact with South African universities and South African academics taken by the British Association of University Teachers in 1980; the decision of the Irish Federation of University Teachers to withdraw from the international body to which it was affiliated in protest at the membership of a South African body in the early 1980s; the exclusion of South African archaeologists from the World Archaeological Congress held in Southampton in 1985; the exclusion of South Africans from the World Computer Congress held in Dublin in 1986; and the exclusion of South Africans later from the World Congress on Diseases in Cattle, largely due to the intervention of the Irish Veterinary Union.

Campaign for the release of political prisoners

The campaign for the release of political prisoners was initiated during the course of the Rivonia Trial of Nelson Mandela and other leaders of the Congress Alliance, which began in October 1963. The UN General Assembly adopted a resolution which, among other things, called for the unconditional release of all political prisoners and all persons imprisoned, interned or subjected to other restrictions for their opposition to apartheid. The London-based World Campaign for the Release of South African Political Prisoners appealed to people the world over to sign petitions in support of the release of political prisoners. Solidarity movements took up the campaign, and close to 200 000 signatures were collected. Pressure was also brought to bear on governments to support the international campaign by registering their support for the campaign in the UN and directly to the South African government. The initiative was soon extended to include a campaign against the death penalty, and international activities were taken up to demand clemency for political activists sentenced to death.

In 1980, the Release Mandela Campaign was launched simultaneously inside South Africa and abroad and it became clear that there was increasing evidence of support for this endeavour abroad. The campaign followed the strategy of the 1960s campaign: it called on governments to express their demands for the release of political prisoners directly to the South African government and through the UN; it called on solidarity movements to distribute petitions for signature by their members and other people in their countries, resulting in the collection of millions of signatures; and it called on solidarity organisations to organise demonstrations in support of the campaign. In London, 26 Labour Party parliamentarians tabled a motion in parliament calling on the Tory government to pressure the apartheid regime to release Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners immediately and unconditionally. A mass day of action was organised by the British AAM for the release of political prisoners in South Africa and Namibia. In the United States, 19 congressmen sent a note to the South African ambassador to the US, Donald Sole, urging the apartheid regime to release Mandela because 'he personifies the black man's struggle against apartheid'.³⁶ The high point

³⁶ 'Mandela Campaign Continues', in *Sechaba*, August Issue, 1980, 11.

of the campaign was the 1988 concert held at Wembley, which was broadcast to a potential world audience of a billion people.³⁷

Assistance to the liberation movements

After the banning of the ANC and PAC in April 1960, it became necessary for both liberation movements to establish missions-in-exile. Following the unbanning of the liberation movements in 1990, both organisations required assistance to meet a variety of needs. Moreover, after the two organisations turned to armed struggle in 1961 a wide variety of forms of support was needed for this mode of struggle. These two liberation movements thus had two distinct sets of needs: (1) assistance to maintain a mission-in-exile, including humanitarian assistance for their members, and to meet their requirements during the transition period after their unbanning; and (2) assistance for the armed struggle.

Material assistance to the liberation movements (including humanitarian assistance)

Funds were needed by both exiled South African liberation movements to set up and maintain offices; accommodation and subsistence for officials and their families; travel expenses for members; education of members and their families; humanitarian goods such as food, clothing, tents, medicines and recreational goods for the guerrilla camps; publicity and broadcasting facilities; and projects in frontline states for education, food production and self-support. In addition, funds were required to establish themselves inside the country, and to participate effectively in the negotiation process and the first democratic elections in 1994 after they were unbanned in 1990.

Examples of direct material aid given to the liberation movements by international governmental organisations prior to the unbanning include UN funding of fares and subsistence to representatives of liberation movements invited to UN meetings and conferences, and financial support to enable the ANC and the PAC to maintain offices in New York; UN Development Programme (UNDP) funding of health projects in Tanzania and Zambia for education and training projects, as well as self-reliance projects through training in agriculture, food production, settlement planning, health care and vocational trades; the OAU Liberation Committee's direct material assistance to both liberation movements; the OAU Assistance Fund for the Struggle against Colonialism and Apartheid's funding of economic and social projects of the liberation movements from 1971; and the NAM Africa Fund's assistance to the frontline states and liberation movements from 1986.

The OAU Liberation Committee, established in May 1963 to speed up the liberation of African people still under foreign or white rule, administered a special fund to provide assistance to the liberation movement, provide military aid in the form of arms and ammunition, training facilities for cadres of the liberation movements,

³⁷ E-mail communication with Christabel Gurney, 28 September 2007.

support for training and other camps, and direct material support to both the ANC and PAC.³⁸

Examples of direct material aid given by international non-governmental organisations include the WCC Programme to Combat Racism (PCR), which provided direct funding to the liberation movements as well as indirectly through solidarity movements active in Western countries; and the financial aid given by national formations of AAPSO, including the All-India Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation and the Chinese Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, among others.

A report of the PAC treasurer-general in 1967 revealed that the movement received financial grants from the United Arab Republic and China, among other sources, in the early 1960s.³⁹ The ANC, on the other hand, received most of its direct financial support from the Soviet Union in the early 1960s, accepting its first direct financial grant from that country in 1963. The Soviet Union also funded training of ANC members at universities and vocational schools in the Soviet Union. A significant feature of Soviet assistance was the provision of medical treatment to ANC leaders and cadres of the ANC's military wing, Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK), at Soviet hospitals, as well as providing for periods of rest for ANC leaders at Soviet resorts.

From the mid 1960s, the ANC began to receive more assistance and from more sources. The PAC received assistance from the UN and OAU, because of its status as one of the two liberation movements recognised by the OAU, but from very few other governments.

From the early to mid 1970s onwards, the ANC in particular received increasing proportions of its material needs for maintenance of the external mission and for humanitarian purposes from the Nordic countries, and Sweden in particular, allowing the ANC to set aside aid from the Soviet Bloc for military purposes. The first direct official aid to the ANC by Sweden was in 1973, with a modest allocation for food supplies. Thereafter this support continued throughout the period of exile, and after the Soweto uprising in 1976, Swedish direct assistance to the ANC amounted to millions of rands, covering support in three broad areas: 'daily necessities'; 'administration' (including both core and project support to various ANC departments, notably of information, education, agriculture and transport); and a 'home front component' for activities inside South Africa.

The Soviet Union continued to make a significant contribution in this area throughout the period of exile. Additional requests the ANC made to the Soviet Union in the post 16 June uprising period, for instance, included materials from food to stationery for SOMAFSCO, as well as a substantial increase in the provision of daily necessities to maintain a large number of MK camps in Angola. Various other governments, including the Indian, Dutch and East German governments, contributed to the OAU Assistance Fund for the Struggle against Colonialism and Apartheid and to various UN programmes that provided direct assistance to the liberation movements. They also provided financial

38 For an introduction on the role the Liberation Committee see Ndlovu, 'The ANC and the World', 559ff.

39 M. Nkoane, *Crisis in the Revolution: A Special Report on the Pan-Africanist Congress of South Africa* (London: Mafube, 1969), 58-9.

support to the ANC for its offices in their countries, transport, medicine, clothes and relief supplies, as well as financial assistance. Non-governmental organisations in the Socialist Bloc, such as the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, the Soviet Women's Committee, the Soviet youth and trade union organisations, also provided significant assistance to the ANC over the years.

Various solidarity movements in the West also played an important role in this regard. In the Netherlands, both the Anti-Apartheid Beweging Nederland (Netherlands Anti-Apartheid Movement, or AABN) and KZA were involved in fundraising for the liberation movements of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe. The fundraising foundation 'Steun het volk van Azania' (Support the people of Azania), was founded by the Dutch anti-apartheid organisation supporting the PAC, the Azania Komitee, in order to support a PAC transit camp in Bagamoyo (Tanzania). The Irish AAM Southern African Relief Committee raised funds and provided material assistance in the form of dried milk, food, educational materials and medical kits to the ANC. From 1978, local British anti-apartheid groups and specialist committees collected material aid for the ANC and funds for the Solomon Mahlangu Freedom College (SOMAFCO) in Tanzania. In 1978, the Canadian University Services Overseas (CUSO) developed a package of projects to support the work of the ANC and raised funds from their own sources as well as Canadian and European churches and NGOs. From 1981, left-wing forces such as the Socialist Party, the Communist Party, left-wing trade unions and various other organisations contributed to the material support for the offices of the ANC and SWAPO in Paris. In Australia, the Mandela Foundation was formed in August 1987 to raise funds for the ANC, focusing on fund-raising dinners and concerts. Swedish solidarity movements, in particular the African Groups, carried out significant fund-raising campaigns for the ANC, and also recruited professionals to work at SOMAFCO. It is clear that most of the funding from the solidarity movements went to the ANC.

During the transition period from 1990 to 1994, international organisations, governments and solidarity movements provided the liberation movements with funds for infrastructural support after the transfer of their headquarters to South Africa; for strengthening of their organisation inside the country and administration; for their negotiation efforts; for education and training of their members; for their information and publicity needs; for their voter education programmes; and for their election campaigns.

Assistance to the armed struggle

The liberation movements sought the following forms of direct assistance for the conduct of the armed struggle: training of their cadres; military bases; and military hardware.

The key features of direct assistance to the liberation movements as far as military training is concerned were the training of six members of the SACP in China in 1961; military training provided by Ethiopia to members of the PAC in 1961, followed by another group who underwent training in Egypt in 1962; the training of the first

group of MK cadres abroad in Ethiopia and Morocco in 1962; the despatch of a large contingent of MK cadres to the Soviet Union to undergo specialised training in 1963; the despatch of another group of MK cadres to Egypt for military training in 1964; the sending of the latter group on their return from Egypt to the Soviet Union for specialised training in the same year; training of PAC members in Ghana, Egypt, and Libya from 1965; the despatch of the first group of PAC members to receive military training outside Africa to China in 1965; the training of a large contingent of members of the PAC's military wing, the Azanian Peoples Liberation Army (APLA), in Libya and Syria in 1976 and another group in China a year later; the deployment of more than 200 Soviet specialists and interpreters to provide military training to MK cadres in Angola between 1979 to 91; and the provision of specialised training for MK members in the Soviet Union, the GDR and Czechoslovakia from 1977 and throughout the 1980s.

The first MK camp outside South Africa was established in 1964 at Kongwa, Tanzania. Initial training for PAC cadres occurred mainly inside South Africa and in Lesotho, where the leadership had established its headquarters in exile. However, after the failed revolt in 1963, in which hundreds of PAC members were arrested just prior to a planned countrywide uprising,⁴⁰ the first small group of cadres underwent training at the Kinkuzu camp of the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA) in the Congo. By the late 1960s PAC military camps had been established near Morogoro, Tanzania, and Zenkobo, Zambia. In 1969, the ANC had to relocate many of its cadres from Tanzania to the Soviet Union, where they remained until mid 1971, when they were taken to camps in Zambia. The independence of Mozambique and Angola in 1975, and the mass exodus from South Africa following the Soweto Uprising, provided the ANC with a chance to revive large-scale military training, which began in earnest in 1977. Numerous military camps were established in Angola and housed thousands of MK cadres until 1988. Although the Nordic countries had decided not to provide direct assistance to the armed struggle, Swedish aid to the ANC immediately after the 1976 Soweto uprising and the years thereafter included funds for food supplies for the military camps.

In the 1960s the Soviet Union began to supply the ANC with military hardware, including weapons used in the Wankie and Sipolilo campaigns in the latter half of the 1960s.⁴¹ In the aftermath of the Soweto uprising, the Soviet Union, as well as the GDR and Czechoslovakia, continued to supply the ANC's military wing with the military hardware it needed, as well as with requirements to maintain a considerable number of military camps. The latter included uniforms, foodstuff, clothing, tents, blankets, recreational material, etc. The PAC received its first weapons from Egypt in 1963. Libya also provided some arms to the PAC after training its cadres in the mid 1960s.

40 Refer to Brown Maaba, 'The PAC's War against the State, 1960-1963', in SADET (eds), *The Road to Democracy in South Africa, Volume 1*, 257ff.

41 For more on these campaigns see Moses Ralinala et al., 'The Wankie and Sipolilo Campaigns', in SADET (eds), *The Road to Democracy in South Africa, Volume 1*, 479ff.

Besides the assistance the two liberation movements received from various countries to carry out their armed struggle, they received similar assistance from the OAU's Liberation Committee, set up in 1963 by the OAU to provide material assistance to the liberation movements.⁴² For instance, voluntary contributions made to the Liberation Committee included donations of various necessities from the GDR that were passed on to the liberation movements.

Although support for the armed struggle came mainly from African countries, the OAU Liberation Committee and countries of the Eastern Bloc (there was no such support forthcoming from Western governments and from most solidarity movements in the West) there were some instances where solidarity movements and individuals in the West did indeed contribute to the armed struggle.

Humanitarian assistance

Besides the humanitarian support provided to the ANC discussed above, various international organisations, governments and solidarity movements provided extensive humanitarian aid to the victims of apartheid. The essential features of this type of international solidarity were:

- relief and assistance to political prisoners, their dependants and South African political refugees;
- assistance to anti-apartheid organisations inside the country; and
- assistance during the transition period for the repatriation of exiles and refugees and their re-integration into South African society.

A number of organisations were involved in providing relief and assistance to political prisoners, their dependants and political refugees from the early 1960s. These included IDAF, which provided funds for the legal defence of persons accused of committing political 'crimes' and aid to the families and dependants of political prisoners; Amnesty International, which 'adopted' prisoners and detainees who did not advocate violence and also assisted refugees from South Africa; the Joint Committee on the High Commission Territories, representative of a number of voluntary organisations, which provided relief and assistance to South African refugees in the High Commission Territories and in Northern Rhodesia; and the WCC, which provided funds for legal aid for political prisoners in South Africa and for assistance to their dependants. From 1965, the UN Trust Fund for South Africa used voluntary contributions from governments for legal assistance to political prisoners; relief for the dependants of political prisoners; education of prisoners, their children and other dependants; and relief for refugees from South Africa. In 1968, the Fund included legal assistance to banned persons and for rehabilitation of released prisoners as additional forms of humanitarian aid. Most of the money received from governments by the Fund was allocated to IDAF. In many countries in the West, the solidarity movements played an

42 The Liberation Committee's assistance to the South African liberation movements is the subject of a chapter in the next volume on *International Solidarity*.

important role in lobbying their governments to provide funds to the UN Trust Fund for South Africa.

The grants from the Trust Fund, and direct contributions by governments to IDAF, helped to secure the release of many persons charged under apartheid laws, or the reduction of their sentences, and assisted numerous families of political prisoners and banned persons. Moreover, they helped to publicise repression and resistance, as well as the aspirations of the accused, and the gross violations of the rule of law in South Africa.

Many governments, as well as solidarity organisations, participated directly in these activities, or indirectly by pressuring international organisations and governments to contribute to them, or raising and providing funds for organisations involved in humanitarian support.

In addition, international solidarity was extended to legal and semi-legal anti-apartheid organisations based inside South Africa by the various forces involved in solidarity activity. This includes support for organisations of the Black Consciousness Movement (BCM) during the 1970s, and the United Democratic Front (UDF) and Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and their affiliates during the 1980s. Assistance was given to meet the cost of administration and operational needs such as transport and propaganda; development projects such as adult literacy programmes, arts projects and training schemes; and bursaries for South African students.

Finally, the UN took the lead in providing humanitarian assistance for the return of refugees and political exiles. Governments, regional bodies and other organisations voluntarily provided funds to UN agencies such as the UNHCR, the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the UNDP. In addition, various grants from governments were used to provide returnees with funds for small income-generating projects as well as for training and rehabilitation. Solidarity movements played a role here too, for instance raising funds for repatriation and assisting refugees in their countries by informing them about the terms and conditions of their return to South Africa, and providing them with funds to return.

Humanitarian support to the victims of apartheid and persons fighting against the apartheid system and their families was a form of moral support that is incalculable in its effect. For many participants in the liberation struggle, the knowledge that they would be given legal assistance when needed, and that their families would be provided for in the event of their death, imprisonment or departure into exile was crucial to their participation in the struggle. Assistance to anti-apartheid organisations inside the country reinforced resistance to apartheid particularly during a period of heightened oppression inside South Africa in the 1980s.

Conclusion: Impact of international solidarity

There can be no doubt that international solidarity contributed substantially to the ending of apartheid. Some of its effects can be summarised as follows:

- The oil embargo resulted in South Africa paying billions more for oil between 1973 and 1991 than it would otherwise have spent, thereby imposing a sizeable burden on the South African economy.
- The various campaigns aimed at trade sanctions with South Africa, together with other economic measures, were important in heightening the pressure the South African business community began to exert on the apartheid regime to negotiate with the liberation movements.
- By the mid 1980s, the campaign for disinvestment led to a shrinking of investment in South Africa, while the campaign against loans to South Africa forced many banks to call on loans made in the past and reject applications for new loans. The lack of capital placed a limit on the growth of the economy. These were prime factors behind the collapse of the South African economy later in the decade, all of which added to the increasing pressure the apartheid regime faced to negotiate with the liberation movements.
- By the end of the 1980s, South Africa was one of the few 'pariah' states, with virtually no friends as a result of progressive political sanctions. This isolation limited the platforms available to the apartheid state to defend itself, while the correlating increase in international representation and prestige accorded to the liberation movements enhanced their influence.
- The arms embargo made it difficult for apartheid South Africa to obtain arms and ammunition, thereby rendering much of its equipment outdated by the late 1980s. Some argue that this was a crucial factor in weakening its armed forces, which became quite clear at the battle of Cuito Cuanavale where South African forces lost their advantage in the air to the Cubans. In addition, the enormous expenditure involved in the build-up of the domestic armaments industry and the purchase of military hardware on the black market imposed huge costs and added to the country's economic difficulties.
- Social isolation had a tremendous psychological impact on the white population, which had been the main beneficiary of international sport, cultural and academic exchanges during the apartheid era. As more and more white South Africans began to feel unwelcome the world over, it became increasingly difficult to support the apartheid regime.
- Assistance to the armed struggle of the liberation movements, particularly the support given to the ANC/MK by the Soviet Union and its East European allies, enabled them to engage in a sustained military campaign throughout the 1980s. This served a dual purpose in that it placed added pressure on the South African security forces and the white population, while simultaneously fuelling resistance inside the country.

Finally, perhaps the most significant impact of international solidarity is the way in which it shaped public opinion, particularly in the West, leading to a broad international consensus by the second half of the 1980s on the need, and the steps to be taken, to bring an end to apartheid. By the mid 1980s, there was broad consensus among international organisations and governments that the apartheid government

had to dismantle the system of apartheid, unconditionally release all political prisoners, unban the liberation movements, and negotiate with them. Taken together, the solidarity actions discussed above played a significant role in forcing the apartheid regime to the negotiation table.