



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THIRTY-FIRST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MUBAREZ (Yemen)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 28: POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/35/PV.31
14 November 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 28

POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA (A/SPC/35/6 and Add.1)

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at its 58th plenary meeting on 12 November, the Special Political Committee is meeting this afternoon to permit the organizations named in the letters dated 12 and 13 November 1980 from the President of the General Assembly, addressed to me in documents A/SPC/35/6 and Add.1, to be heard on this item.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to permit the representatives of those organizations to address it.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe it would be very useful on this occasion to make use of the authorization given again by the General Assembly this year whereby this Committee may request transcription of debates. Accordingly, with the concurrence of the Committee, I shall take it that it is agreed that I should request that the texts of these statements be transcribed and issued, so that they can be transmitted to the General Assembly in accordance with the request contained in the letter of transmittal from the President of the General Assembly that the Committee submit its report as soon as possible.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: The first speaker on my list is Miss Jennifer Davis, Director of Research, American Committee on Africa, on whom I now call.

Miss DAVIS (American Committee on Africa): On behalf of the American Committee on Africa. I should like to thank the members of the Special Political Committee for this opportunity to share with them some of our concerns about current developments relating to South Africa.

The Committee was founded in the 1950s to mobilize support in the United States for the growing struggle for freedom and independence then sweeping across the whole of Africa. Even in those early days it was clear that some of the toughest struggles would come at the southern end of the continent, where intransigent settlers and colonial régimes had entrenched themselves in positions of great privilege, power and wealth. Indeed, the history of the past 20 years has confirmed that no such group has voluntarily or willingly given up its monopoly of political power and its ability to use such power for the generation of enormous wealth. Again and again, in Angola, in Mozambique and in Zimbabwe, we saw that, to achieve their rights as men and women shaping their own destinies, the people were forced to engage in intense and extended conflict, taking up arms to win their freedom.

We do not believe that it can be different in South Africa. The system of racial domination and exploitation now called apartheid has produced the most extraordinary privilege and wealth for sections of the white population. No realistic examination of the evidence can conclude that these interests are now preparing to abandon their power. On the contrary, they are in fact mobilizing on all fronts to preserve and protect their positions in the face of a growing challenge from the black population.

It is now popular in some circles - in corporate and Western political circles in particular - to see "hopeful change" in South Africa and to interpret those changes as signs that the State is moving to incorporate all South Africans, black and white, into a unified society where access to resources, wealth and political power will no longer be determined on a racial basis.

On the contrary, we believe that the changes now occurring are designed to preserve and protect the present racist system by improving its flexibility and efficiency. For example, the South African economy has both expanded and diversified tremendously in the past 30 years. In the old days mines and farms dominated the economy with a need for lots of cheap unskilled black labour and the system of reservations or Bantustans, of pass laws and migratory labour was

(Miss Davis)

designed to fill those needs. Then one pair of black hands was completely interchangeable with another. Today complex manufacturing plants require different labour qualities - men and women with considerable skills.

Thus we see legislative shifts to allow some skilled black job-training to allow some workers permanent urban status, so that they will keep coming to the same job, and even to allow some carefully controlled union organization to act as a stabilizing safety valve. But all these changes are responses to new needs within the power elite's economy. Their pace and direction are controlled by that elite. They have nothing to do with responses to the overwhelming black need and demand for a full share in the running of South Africa. Black South Africans are simply being manipulated in new ways to meet new needs. Nothing has changed in the basic relation of power.

At the same time as the State is streamlining aspects of the economy, it is also, most menacingly, streamlining and expanding its capacity to deal with any challenge to the whole system.

Under the banner of "total strategy" we are seeing the increasing militarization of the whole society, the concentration of political power within a smaller and smaller circle even inside the white sector and the careful preparation of the economy for increasing self-sufficiency. None of these is a sign that South Africa's rulers are planning to concede power to black South Africans. They are the warning signals of its ruthless determination to destroy any such challenge.

In this context accommodationist arguments such as that presented by President-elect Reagan's chief Africa adviser, Chester Crocker, are particularly dangerous. Crocker, Director of African Studies at the Georgetown University Centre for Strategic and International Studies, advocates what he calls a "serious and sustainable United States policy" favouring "evolutionary change towards a non-racial society". The theory is that, given enough time and prosperity, the South African State will reform itself and that policies of sanctions, corporate divestment and isolation are counter-productive. This is the same type of thinking that underlies the United States corporate defence of its continuing presence in South Africa.

The theory has no basis in fact. My Committee has long argued that a continuing United States corporate presence in South Africa gives support to the

(Miss Davis)

apartheid system in an infinite number of ways, direct and indirect.

At the crudest level, this is shown by the continuing sales to the South African Government by United States businesses, such as Ford, General Motors and Mobil. Much of the material sold inevitably has repressive police and military applications, even if it was not specifically sold for that purpose. As long as corporations continue producing in South Africa, their products will be subject to such use.

But recently the Government has introduced legislation which strips naked the inevitable security collaboration between it and any United States or other foreign corporation which produces anything more significant than toothpicks or paper flowers. Under the new National Key Points legislation, introduced after the African National Congress attacks on the SASOL oil-from-coal manufacturing plants, the Minister of Defence can declare any place or area a national key point "whenever he considers it necessary or expedient for the safety of the Republic". Since the large majority of direct United States investment in South Africa is in key industries such as the oil, auto and electronics industries, most are likely to be declared key points in the event of any serious threat to the apartheid régime.

The legislation provides that owners of places declared national key points will have to satisfy the Minister of Defence that they have taken steps to provide adequate security for their plants. Owners who do not take such steps will be subject to gaol and large fines. The Government can also choose to provide the security and bill the company.

The Key Points Industries legislation also provides for strict control of the press. The Government can prevent publication of any news about incidents involving security at classified national key points. All such news will have to be passed by military censors before publication.

Under the bill, the Government can grant police powers of arrest, search, the use of firearms and what they term "reasonable" force to company employees, who will thus become essentially an extension of the military.

So even were there a company with the best intentions it would find itself directly and militarily confronting the liberation movement. In fact, evidence

(Miss Davis)

already suggests that many foreign corporations will collaborate as a matter of course with the South African Government in protecting their investments against people they regard as dangerous radicals. Members of this Committee may recall the 1978 exposure by the American Committee on Africa and the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility of a secret General Motors (South Africa) contingency plan which made provision for the fullest co-operation with the police and the military in times of what they called "civil unrest". More recently the South West Africa People's Organization of Namibia has released secret documents relating to a similar plan being implemented by the British multinational, Rio Tinto Zinc, at its uranium mine in Namibia.

In our view, giving South Africa time simply enables it to strengthen itself for a coming confrontation with the liberation forces.

I should like to quote briefly two further examples. Because the international arms embargo and restrictions on the transfer of military application technology have been at the very best intermittently applied by Western countries since the first Security Council resolution on the issue in 1963, South Africa has been able to build itself vast military power and production capacity, although it must still depend on imports for very sophisticated equipment.

Similarly, delays in the imposition of an effective oil embargo and continued Western corporate collaboration with Pretoria's plan to build an oil-from-coal capacity domestically are allowing South Africa to move towards considerable energy self-sufficiency. But that process still has a long way to go, despite South African boasts, and the country must still import some 300,000 or more barrels of oil every day and will not achieve even 50 per cent self-sufficiency when it has completed all present alternative energy plans.

(Miss Davis)

Arms and oil sanctions, tightly and swiftly imposed on South Africa, could have a tremendous effect, but the longer the delays, the greater South Africa's capacity to construct for itself survival mechanisms.

International recognition that the South African régime is not an impregnable giant has been greatly heightened by the growing waves of black resistance now battering the walls of apartheid. In the United States we are working with more and more Americans who are coming to realize that they can play a role in supporting this struggle for liberation by cutting the many economic links which continue to sustain the apartheid régime.

Widespread student activism has already been reported in this Committee and in other committees within the United Nations for several years. It has focussed on working to achieve the withdrawal of United States corporations from South Africa and the ending of all bank loans to borrowers connected with that country. This work continues, and Dumisani Kumalo of our staff has just returned from an extended campus tour during which he was enthusiastically received at 14 colleges.

The campaign to end all bank lending has already produced significant withdrawals, about which I believe the Committee will hear more this afternoon.

Perhaps the most striking new initiative is the one being taken by state and local legislators to prohibit the investment of public money in banks and corporations involved in South Africa. Already legislation has succeeded or is being negotiated in at least 12 cities and 10 states in the United States. Bills which discourage or forbid financial links to companies doing business in South Africa have already passed the legislatures of Connecticut, Massachusetts and Nebraska. In 1980 Massachusetts required the divestment of state pension funds from banks which make loans to the racist Government and from corporations which employ more than 500 workers in South Africa or have investments of \$10 million or more there. Already no new pension fund money is being invested in such companies.

Cities involved in the same campaign have included Gary, Indiana; Berkeley, Cotati and Davis, all in California; Madison, Wisconsin; Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Hartford, Connecticut.

The interest in legislative action on South Africa has brought together vital new coalitions which include trade unions, churches, black organizations, students and other progressive groups and individuals, as well as the commitment of one or more legislators.

(Miss Davis)

The American Committee on Africa has been one of the initiators of the newly formed Co-ordinating Committee for the Campaign for State and Local Legislative Action, which hopes to help build this campaign nationwide in the coming months. Many billions of dollars of state funds are currently invested in corporations active in South Africa. The fear that such money may be withdrawn should exert a powerful influence on corporate managers as they weigh future deals in South Africa.

In this way we hope to add new muscle to the vital international campaign to cut all ties with apartheid. In conclusion, we would add our voice to the many calling for the immediate imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa as the most effective way of supporting the people of South Africa in their struggle for freedom.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon Mr. Dwain C. Epps, Executive Secretary of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches.

Mr. EPPS (Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, World Council of Churches): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to address your committee on behalf of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches.

I should like to begin by quoting from the most recent statement on South Africa adopted last August in Geneva by the Central Committee of our organization: It said that:

"The South African Government, which has a fundamental policy of retaining power in the hands of the white minority group, claims that it acts in the name of Christian civilization".

This is a claim which

"demands unequivocal rejection, particularly on the part of churches and Christians everywhere in terms of their faith and loyalty to Christ".

Apartheid is "a sin" and "a perversion of the Christian Gospel", the Central Committee stated, and it appealed to the nearly 300 member churches in 100 countries to declare their rejection of apartheid "as a fundamental matter of faith".

(Mr. Epps)

This is but the most recent condemnation of apartheid issued by the World Council of Churches, but it may be one of the most important, coming as it did after a year-long process of consultation with the churches at national and regional levels all over the world. As members of the Committee know, the Council has become a prime object of attack by the apartheid régime, which has stated that it and the United Nations are together its chief external enemies. Large sums of money have been pumped into international campaigns waged primarily through the Western news media to discredit the World Council of Churches in the eyes of the churches as a result of our opposition to apartheid. Other millions have been invested in so-called research institutes and other bodies located in Western countries for the publication of pamphlets and books maligning the Council with innuendo and half-truths.

It is therefore of some considerable significance that in the face of such concerted attacks, the churches have strongly reaffirmed the World Council of Churches' Programme to Combat Racism and have restated their intention to give the highest priority to the struggle to eliminate the cancer of apartheid from the world.

This is a question, for us, of faith and faithfulness, one for which we have demanded concrete actions and not just pious declarations. Thus, nearly a decade ago the World Council drew up a list of corporations directly involved in investment or trade with South Africa or other white-dominated countries in Africa and decided to withdraw its investments from them. Later the same thing was done with regard to banks and financial institutions. Member churches have been urged to follow suit and a large number of them by now have done so.

While remaining committed to the principle of non-violent change for justice, the Council also decided that it could not stand aloof from the peoples' struggles for independence, and in 1969 created a Special Fund to Combat Racism out of which grants have been given to African liberation movements for their humanitarian needs. It is again noteworthy that designated giving to this fund has steadily increased despite attempts from some quarters to eliminate it. This year, more than \$750,000 was disbursed to liberation movements and to groups and organizations throughout the world which are working to inform public opinion about apartheid and to mobilize opposition to the South African régime and to those who collaborate with it.

(Mr. Tpps)

These and other activities of the churches in the struggle against apartheid are by now well known to this Committee through the publications of the United Nations Centre against Apartheid. This is, as we ourselves have recognized, only a small beginning. We do not suggest that these activities alone are sufficient to overcome the evil of apartheid. We do, however, consider that they are of more importance than is indicated in the four lines dedicated to the contribution of church and religious bodies by the Special Committee against Apartheid in its report to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

As is apparent, the World Council of Churches places a high priority on informing and mobilizing international public opinion. Indeed, it was out of our conviction that opinion is affected more as a result of action than of declaration that the steps that I have described were taken. It was when we moved to disinvest and to provide concrete support for liberation movements that the most effective debate and education on these issues began in our constituency and in the broader public debate, particularly in a number of Western countries.

(Mr. Epps)

We are grateful for the support of these endeavours and for the all encompassing work on apartheid which has been provided by the Special Committee and the Centre Against Apartheid. We hope that the General Assembly will strengthen its support of the Centre for its impressive contribution in the field of information, and we would urge Governments to make much fuller use of the broad range of printed material, radio and television programmes, and audio-visual resources available from the Centre in their efforts to inform public opinion in their own countries.

It has become eminently clear that the South African apartheid régime will not respond simply to an increased flow of dramatic resolutions of condemnation or renewed appeals. It is only through the effective application of comprehensive sanctions by the Security Council that international concern can have any effect. The first special report of the Special Committee against Apartheid on the implementation of United Nations resolutions on apartheid by Governments and intergovernmental organizations contained in document A/35/22/Add.1 provides incontrovertible proof of this assertion.

It is for this reason that the most recent World Council of Churches' resolution has reiterated its call for the adoption and enforcement by the Security Council of effective comprehensive sanctions against South Africa. Nothing less can be considered an adequate response to those in South Africa who continue to struggle for justice, no matter the cost. We have reiterated our appeal for pressures to be brought on Governments for the withdrawal from South Africa of investments, private or public, which originate in their countries; for an end to bank loans; for an arms embargo and oil sanctions; and, in general, for the isolation of the South African apartheid régime.

Some argue that the brunt of these measures would be borne by the victims of apartheid. The answer to such arguments is being given daily by those very people who continue to press for the application of such measures, despite the fact that to do so is considered today by the white minority Government to be a most serious crime. Today the lead is being

(Mr. Epps)

taken by the children of South Africa, those who, it might be argued, would have the most to lose from the isolation of South Africa. But their hope is invested in the future, and the fact that hundreds of South African youths arrested earlier this year remain in prison has not dimmed that hope.

It is our sincere hope that the States Members of the United Nations, both collectively and individually, will give evidence this year that they have heard the cry of our brothers and sisters in South Africa, and that they will respond to the political will appropriate to the human sacrifice which our fellow human beings are offering daily and without relent under the yoke of the apartheid régime.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is the Reverend Carl H. Mau, Jr., General Secretary of the Lutheran World Federation, Geneva, Switzerland, and speaker for the Lutheran World Ministries, on whom I now call.

Reverend MAU (Lutheran World Federation): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity and privilege of addressing this Committee on behalf of the Lutheran World Federation, which has a membership of 100 church bodies in 52 countries on six continents. These church bodies have 53 million baptized members. Several of our member churches are in South Africa and Namibia; they have over a million black members, all of whom suffer from the repression associated with apartheid.

I could trace the long history of anti-apartheid activities in the Lutheran World Federation, but let me begin with June 1977 when delegates from all over the world met in Dar es Salaam for our sixth assembly. It was there that several black theologians from southern Africa called upon the Federation to respond in the strongest possible terms to the divisions and oppression which accompany apartheid. The participants in the seminars where those people spoke brought their report to the Assembly in a manner which could not be misunderstood. They recommended that

(Reverend Iiau)

"The Lutheran World Federation (LWF) call upon its member churches to recognize that the present Government of South Africa has consistently violated the Lutheran understanding of the role of government and of law and of basic human rights; that the Lutheran World Federation and its member churches, especially those in southern Africa and their partner churches overseas, publicly support those calling for change which will ensure universal suffrage; and that the member churches avoid anything that could give the impression that the churches support racism and injustice."

When the Assembly received that report it felt called to action. The Lutheran Church is a confessional church. That means that it believes and teaches certain basic truths which are contained in historic writings known as confessions. Members of churches which have agreed to these teachings commit themselves to live according to them and expect the same of their brothers and sisters who have also accepted those confessional writings. When faced with apartheid, we were aware that there is not uniform practice in South Africa, but that black and white people divided by apartheid carry this division over into their churches. The Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation therefore made the following statement:

"Under normal circumstances Christians may have different opinions on political questions. However, political and social systems may become so perverted and oppressive that it is consistent with the confession to reject them and to work for changes. We especially appeal to our white member churches in southern Africa to recognize that the situation in South Africa constitutes a status confessionis. This means that, on the basis of faith and in order to manifest the unity of the church, churches would publicly and unequivocally reject the existing apartheid system."

This strong action taken by our churches has become the basis for further and continuing action on the part of our churches with respect to the apartheid policy.

(Reverend Mau)

The Executive Committee of the Lutheran World Federation is actively pursuing this matter through visits and correspondence in an effort to eliminate apartheid from its community and to work for the elimination of that policy from the world community.

This resolution has had considerable effect. It places a responsibility not only on the white churches of southern Africa but also on our member churches everywhere. It has caused Western churches to evaluate afresh their racial attitudes, their economic life, their banking affiliations and their government relations.

Our Swedish member church has been active for a number of years bringing its influence to bear on its own Government. Leaders of the church were in the forefront of efforts culminating in legislation making it illegal for Swedish firms to invest further in South Africa.

A few weeks ago, on 24 October, the Swedish National Committee of the Lutheran World Federation and its development arm, Lutherhjälpen, made a sharp attack on apartheid. Let me read to you its statement:

(Reverend Mau)

"The Lutheran World Federation (LWF) Swedish National Committee with Lutherhjälpen expresses its deep concern over the latest developments in South Africa and Namibia. A consensus of information shows that apartheid politics leads to a rise in injustice, violence and a greater risk of a bloodbath occurring.

We maintain - in accordance with the statement by Lutheran World Federation's General Assembly in Dar es Salaam, 1977 - that apartheid is a sin which opposes the Christian gospel, and it is consequently gospel itself which must constitute the basis for apartheid rejection. We therefore declare our support for the churches in South Africa and Namibia, who are working towards a radical change in the present political system. We express solidarity with all who are fighting for freedom, justice and equal civil rights in these countries.

"Together with many people in South Africa and Namibia, we are of the opinion that investment in these countries by foreign companies is investment in apartheid and, despite the economic improvements brought about for some, such investment is helping to maintain and strengthen the prevailing oppression. We thus consider that the Swedish Government should observe greater abstinence when dealing with applications for permission for substitute investment from Swedish companies. If companies evade the 1979 law concerning prohibition of new investments, the law should be revised.

"Swedish citizens should keep a close observation on the activities of Swedish companies in South Africa and Namibia. The statement of accounts which these companies should hand in in accordance with the 1979 law and the Government's instructions should thus, in our opinion, be publically available.

(Reverend Mau)

"With reference to the 1977 United Nations Security Council decision on a weapons embargo against South Africa, we consider that the Government should urgently examine information and indications in the mass media about Swedish companies directly or indirectly contributing toward South Africa's rearmament."

At the beginning of October, the American Lutheran Church, with 2.5 million members, resolved inter alia:

"...that the ALC again express its unequivocal rejection of apartheid and all other forms of racial discrimination in our own society as well as in other nations, and declare apartheid to be a matter of 'status confessionis'; and be it further

"Resolved that the ALC again declare its strong commitment to work for the elimination of these abhorrent evils and to support those who suffer under such oppression through unremitting prayer and deliberate action; and be it further

"Resolved that the ALC declare its judgement that at this moment in history in South Africa, divestiture is the most legitimate strategy in opposing apartheid and the most effective consequence of a declaration of 'status confessionis'; and be it further

"Resolved that the ALC reaffirm its past positions calling for an end to future bank loans to the Republic of South Africa; an end to any sales to the South African police and military; and a moratorium on any significant expansion efforts by United States corporations in South Africa; and be it further

"Resolved that the ALC call upon all divisions, units, districts, institutions, congregations and members of the church to utilize all possible resources for the elimination of apartheid and other expressions of racial discrimination; and be it further

"Resolved that the ALC urge the Government of the United States to implement economic sanctions against the Republic of South Africa".

(Reverend Mau)

In May of this year this same church body sold \$2 million worth of certificates of deposit from Citibank in protest against the bank's South African investment policies.

These are examples of the seriousness with which our member churches view apartheid. While not all of them carry out identical actions, it is fair to say that there is great unanimity in the world-wide Lutheran community to work for change as the resolution calls upon it to do. They implement this both as individual churches and by making common cause through Lutheran World Federation activities or World Council of Churches activities in which many of our churches also participate. The Lutheran World Federation's service arm, called the Lutheran World Service, responds to the humanitarian needs of those victimized by apartheid who are now in exile in camps or settlements in Botswana, Swaziland, Zambia and Angola. These programmes serve thousands of people at a current annual cost to our Federation of nearly \$1.5 million, and are carried on in co-operation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the various liberation movements concerned.

Finally, the members and staff of the Lutheran World Federation are given full support by the Federation's president, Bishop Josiah Kibira of Bukoba, Tanzania. In every official report since his election, he has been critical of those churches which either by silence or implication have given support to apartheid policies. Last year in Brazil in his report to the Executive Committee, he said:

"Our concern is not politics as such. It is rather when politics enter, rule and make the church dumb instead of outspoken against injustice and sin".

In his report this year he tied the historical teachings of the church directly to opposing apartheid. He said in Augsburg, Federal Republic of Germany:

"All that the church is, its nature, function and structure, ought to reflect its statement of confession. Thus our Lutheran churches everywhere need to re-examine the integrity of their practice vis-à-vis their confession. Each of them has the obligation to look at the way and manner in which it lives its Christian faith honestly in a given society".

It was in this context that President Kibira made special mention of the situation of the churches in southern Africa, calling apartheid a great problem for the Christian faith. "Racial segregation," he said, "is contrary to the concepts of human rights and justice" and he called on the member churches in southern Africa to make a clear statement as to their confessional integrity in their situation. At the same time, he challenged churches outside Africa to examine their attitude towards world-wide endeavours to combat white racism in South Africa and to secure independence for Namibia, which he called "the last colony on African soil".

Thus, Mr. Chairman, the Lutheran World Federation is among the non-governmental organizations which contribute to exercising the mandate of your Committee. As we inform our constituency of this crime against humanity, serve its victims and advocate change in the political and economic orders, we are allied with all people of conscience and goodwill in a quest for a just and humane society in southern Africa.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker on my list is Ms. Beatrice von Roemer, representative at the United Nations of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, on whom I now call.

Ms. VON ROEMER (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions): The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) has asked to speak before this body because we feel that perhaps more than ever before it is imperative to alert the international community to the real situation of the African trade union movement in South Africa. As free trade unionists we cannot allow the world to be deceived by South Africa's claims of labour reforms or lulled into complacency by the illusion that voluntary codes of conduct will effect significant change in the behaviour of companies operating in South Africa.

As to labour legislation, the South African Government itself left no doubt about the true intent behind such legislation when it issued a pamphlet defending it in the following words:

"Twenty-seven black trade unions exist already and have a membership of some 70,000. They will now be effectively brought under the discipline and control of the law, and this will include a ban on political activities, a control over their membership, access to their financial statements and balance sheets, and control over their overseas funding."

Thus, it is not really surprising that during the last year we have witnessed a clampdown on the independent black trade union movement which has proved even more severe and damaging than the 1976 banning. Union organizers are subject to constant harassment, and we continuously receive reports of new arrests. Two recent examples of the official handling of industrial disputes must surely have destroyed any lingering illusions about the so-called reforms. In May and June, following a strike in the meat industry in Capetown for recognition of democratically-elected workers committees, virtually the whole leadership of the Western Province General Workers Union was arrested. Five of those arrested were held in detention until the strike was broken in August. Forty-two

(Ms. von Roemer)

of the workers were endorsed out of Capetown under police escort. In July, the strike of the Black Municipality Workers' Union was broken by calling in armed police in camouflage uniforms and busing strikers away to rural dumping grounds. The strike leaders and union officials were charged with sabotage under the General Law Amendment Act of 1962 which provides a minimum gaol sentence of five years. and a maximum penalty of death. They are now facing trial.

Just the other day, the ICFTU was informed of a new crackdown over the weekend in East London in which 16 trade unionists were arrested. The General Secretary of the ICFTU yesterday cabled to Prime Minister Botha requesting their immediate release and warning that the free trade union movement will spare no effort to ensure that internationally recognized labour standards are finally recognized in South Africa.

A particularly damaging blow against the independent African trade union movement was the prohibition of collection of contributions by, for, or on behalf of, the Federation of South African Trade Unions (FOSATU) under section 29 of the Fund Raising Act. Labour lawyers insist that the notice also prohibits FOSATU from receiving funds from its affiliates. An editorial in the Rand Daily Mail stated that the ban was tantamount to declaring FOSATU an affected organization and was clearly designed to cripple it financially.

But there is yet another offensive under way against the existing independent black trade unions. This consists of exerting tremendous pressure on workers to establish in-company unions under the tutelage of white unions. According to reports received by the ICFTU, many companies are granting to new unions facilities, such as access for recruiting, which they have always denied to existing unions. They are even helping those new unions to organize: personnel officers are involved in recruitment procedures and in many cases management just called the workers together and simply told them to join a certain union. Those so-called parallel unions are mere paper organizations and have no power to negotiate wages. They merely promise workers to help them if they should lose their job or get ill and to give their families some unspecified amount of money if they die. Their

(Ms. von Roemer)

role was aptly characterized by an African worker who said:

"This union helps us when we are dead. When we are still alive it doesn't help us."

From the point of view of the employers, however, they perform an extremely useful function, for not only are they blessed with a docile union but can proudly claim that they are abiding by codes of conduct such as the one elaborated by the European Economic Community (EEC).

In the meantime, none of the existing independent trade unions has been registered to date. Conditions for registration remain stringent: the Registrar may, if he wishes, grant only provisional registration and impose any condition he wishes before full registration is given. A union may lose its registration if it meets with the Registrar's disapproval at any stage, and those decisions cannot be challenged. While the South African Government made some concessions to internal and international criticism by issuing a decree extending the right to join unions to so-called migrant workers who are actually South African citizens or have come from the bantustans workers from neighbouring countries are still excluded. It must also be kept in mind that concessions conferred by ministerial decree rather than amendment of the law can be withdrawn in the same way.

In the face of all those tremendous obstacles, African trade unionists continue to show unbelievable courage and perseverance. At this time, there is a strike by the Media Workers' Association against the paper The Capetown Herald for recognition and for wage increases. The ICFTU is watching developments closely.

Because the African trade unionists are more than ever in need of international support, the ICFTU decided to convene a free trade union conference on South Africa. It took place just last week in London and brought together top-level labour leaders from industrialized countries as well as from the African and Asian regions. A programme of action was elaborated which is to be adopted by

(Ms. von Roemer)

the Executive Board of the ICFTU at the end of this month. It conforms closely to the recommendations for trade union action adopted at the last International Labour Organisation (ILO) conference, which, in turn, were based on principles advocated by the ICFTU. Thus we shall continue to support the African trade union movement; we shall continue to put maximum pressure on companies investing in South Africa to recognize African trade unions and comply with internationally recognized labour standards; we shall continue and intensify our campaigns against white immigration. Furthermore, the General Secretary of the ICFTU and the General Secretary of the European Trade Union Confederation are asking for an urgent meeting with the President of the EEC Council of Ministers in order to request modification of the EEC Code of Conduct.

It has always been our contention that codes of conduct, in order to have any significant effect, must include enforcement clauses. Governments must be prepared to penalize those companies which do not abide by the code by withdrawal of export licences and credit guarantees. We also demand the establishment of tripartite machinery composed of Governments, employers and trade unions to monitor compliance with the code by companies.

Governments which persist in the belief that the codes of conduct as currently formulated are already having a beneficial effect on the situation of African workers might do well to ponder the fact that out of the 2,005 Western-based companies operating in South Africa, only 0.6 per cent have recognized African trade unions. In our opinion, that is a shameful record.

Finally, I should like to recall that the ICFTU has persistently called on the United Nations to impose mandatory sanctions on South Africa. In a resolution adopted at our 1979 Congress, which has also been incorporated in the new programme of action, we called on Governments and parliaments concerned to introduce legislation aimed at stopping new investments in South Africa by legal

(Ms. von Roemer)

entities originating from the respective country and reiterated our position that mandatory sanctions, including a full oil embargo, be imposed against South Africa under United Nations auspices.

The free trade union movement will not rest until the day when the item on apartheid can be stricken from our agenda and from that of this body.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mr. Wilfrid Grenville-Grey, representative of the International Defence and Aid Fund, on whom I now call.

Mr. GRENVILLE-GREY (International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa): I am privileged to address this Committee on behalf of Canon John Collins, President of the International Defence and Aid Fund for southern Africa. Our humanitarian concern is to report to you about the current plight of prisoners, detainees, the banned and the banished - who together with their families suffer the most of all the victims of apartheid.

A dramatic illustration of the constantly deteriorating system of justice in South Africa came in August, when Mr. A. R. Klein, chief prosecutor in the criminal section of Pretoria Commissioner's Court, told the magistrate in the middle of a trial that he was resigning forthwith. Mr. Klein said:

"I am not prepared to apply apartheid under the guise of justice. I decided that I, as an individual, was not important when it came to the 12,000 or more people who are still prosecuted under the system in Pretoria alone each year, despite Dr. Koornhof's announcement that apartheid is dead."

Four other prosecutors have also resigned during the past year. So now it is not only those outside the system but also those inside it who see that the rot is spreading. Two Supreme Court judges, Mr. Justice Didcott and Mr. Justice Milne, have recently issued public warnings that the independence of the judiciary is being undermined. Such a statement by judges is unprecedented, and it has met with wide support from fellow judges and lawyers.

When Canon Collins addressed the Special Committee Against Apartheid in 1977 he said:

"I would beg that whenever and wherever we speak of political prisoners we speak of political detainees."

(Mr. Grenville-Grey)

Canon Collins aptly called detainees 'South Africa's hidden hostages.' During 1980 the South African Government has been relentlessly active in detaining people - teachers, businessmen and especially students and trade unionists - under the Terrorism, Internal Security, and General Laws Amendment Acts. By the end of June over 400 people had been arrested and in August a further 57 were detained under Section 10 of the Internal Security Act. Many have been released, but there are still 155 people on the banned list, and they include Helen Joseph, now 75, who was first banned in 1957 and who is serving her fourth banning order.

Our great and increasing concern in Defence and Aid is that it is becoming more and more difficult to get information about political prisoners and detainees. Yet, in order to mobilize public opinion, as our General Secretary, Phyllis Altman, stressed here at the United Nations in March, we need to

"endeavour to get as much biographical detail as possible so that teachers could be asked to campaign on behalf of imprisoned teachers, trade unionists on behalf of trade unionists, and so on."

But now, according to the Second Police Amendment Act of 1980, people arrested under the Terrorism Act will, as far as the outside world is concerned, be robbed of that precious and unique possession - their name. Now not even their names, let alone their biographical details, can be published without police permission. Newspapermen who defy this new rule could receive up to eight years imprisonment and/or a fine up to 1,500 rand. Under this law people can simply "disappear". Professor John Dugard of Witwatersrand University has said that this law makes it "difficult to avoid the conclusion that the country has stepped into the realm of the police state". As the courts are unable to intervene in cases of detention the new law removes "the sole remaining protection for the detainee - publicity". The latest laws bring up to more than 100 the number of laws restricting freedom of the press.

(Mr. Grenville-Grey)

The Government claims it as an improvement that since Steve Biko was arrested no detainees have suffered the ultimate deprivation - death. But there is all too much evidence that the detainees of 1980 all too often suffer, under interrogation, something just as fearful - living death. Last month at the Rand Supreme Court Mrs. Mataung told the court under oath that her husband had smuggled out a desperate note on toilet paper to his cousin, Mrs. Sithole, which read:

"They don't have enough evidence to take me to court. I have been tortured for the last 48 days, sometimes at night. They say they will torture me until I become insane or dead rather than release me and they want me to kill myself. They are boasting that no lawyer can force them to release me or take me to court."

The policing of employment, and of unemployment, is one of the most repugnant features of injustice in South Africa today. As recently as last August the Sunday Times reported that, in 1979, 1,000 Africans from Pretoria were sentenced to two years in work colonies for being jobless for more than 122 days. The fact that they had done part-time or piece work in that time was not a valid defence. And so, officially designated as "idle and unwilling to work", they labour on farms to disguise the inefficiency and swell the profits of the white farmers. A South African, J. F. Coaker, has expressed his shame at all kinds of forced labour on farms when he wrote in the famous Spro-Cas report on Law, Justice and Society:

"Although the new laws which protect and embody apartheid in our society have no overt content amounting to slavery, they diverge widely from the ordinary forms of free Western democracies, and they create a vast population of prisoners whose situation is not very far off that of slaves of antiquity, while they remain in prison."

The campaign to release Nelson Mandela, which produced petitions signed by more than 75,000 people inside South Africa is now being wound up. But the campaign has in recent months developed a powerful international dimension and the International Defence and Aid Fund will do its best, especially through its publications, to carry it further and wider on behalf of Mandela

(Mr. Grenville-Grey)

and all political prisoners in South Africa. We cannot rest until the situation recently described by John Jackson in his book Justice in South Africa has been irrevocably reversed. Jackson says at the conclusion of his chapter on "The Children of Robben Island":

"Most attorneys believe in the nobility of law and harbour that illusion of justice depicted by the blindfolded figure with the sword in one hand and the scales of justice in the other. Unfortunately in South Africa, the blindfold has been removed, the scales are unbalanced and the sword is in constant use."

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Father Daniel Driscoll, of the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, on whom I now call.

Father DRISCOLL (Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility):

It is a pleasure and a privilege for me to be here this afternoon. I am a Maryknoll priest, active in justice and peace work for my society, the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers, and I also serve on the Board of the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, a working coalition of 180 Roman Catholic orders and dioceses and 17 Protestant denominations here in the United States.

I have a full written statement which I am submitting for the record, and in this presentation I will highlight the key points of that presentation. I have copies of the written text available for those delegations which are interested.

(Father Driscoll)

The United States churches that are part of a campaign against South African apartheid and United States support for that campaign have focused their attention on a number of programmes. One of the most important, we believe, has been a programme of challenging the support of United States banks and corporations for the system of white minority rule in South Africa.

One of the most important forms of support for the apartheid status quo has been the lending by private banks to the apartheid Government and its agencies. The major lending banks have been from the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, West Germany and France. United States banks have an exposure of approximately \$2 billion. The Committee is probably aware that many banks, under pressure from churches, unions, universities, concerned citizens and others, have adopted policies limiting or prohibiting loans to the South African Government and its agencies. These include ABN and AMRO in Holland, Toronto Dominion Bank in Canada, Chase Manhattan, Chemical Bank, First National Boston, Irving Trust, American Express and Bankers Trust in the United States. While we are pleased with that, we unfortunately must point out this afternoon that a new wave of loans to South Africa has begun.

Just last month, in October 1980, a \$250 million seven-year syndicated loan was made to the South African Government. This Eurocredit was led by the Dresdner Bank and was co-managed by Barclay's United Kingdom, Union Banque de Suisse and Citicorp.

In June 1980, the South African Government raised a Deutsche Mark 120 million bond issue which was its first public bond since before the Soweto riots of 1976. Fortunately five United States banks indicated publicly their refusal to take part in that new loan. That new loan resulted in a wave of protests to Citibank and I am happy to report that our organization, the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, played a key role in that, and the renewal of a campaign to withdraw bank accounts from Citibank has been established. Last March the National Council of Churches, the United Methodist Board of Global Ministries and Union Theological Seminary announced the withdrawal of over \$60 million worth of accounts from Citibank. These withdrawals will increase.

Citibank tries to tell the public that this new loan will be used to improve housing, medical facilities and schools for blacks. The reasons for opposition to that new loan were well stated on 2 October of this year in a letter from William P. Thompson, Stated Clerk of the United Presbyterian Church, when he wrote to Citibank. His remarks echo the sentiments of many of the Roman Catholic orders and Protestant denominations. He stated:

"The bank's claim that this loan will be used for black housing projects, hospitals and schools is misleading. Certainly there is a desperate need for more of such facilities for the four-fifths of South Africa's population which is not white, but it should be understood that funds provided from overseas for these purposes allow that Government's own funds to be used to strengthen its military and police forces. Such monies are clearly fungible and add to the aggregate strength of the present Government of South Africa. Citicorp's ostensibly laudable projects mock the aspirations of the black population for a fair and equitable political and economic process and cast Citicorp in the role of social worker in the apartheid prison.

"Despite claims by Citicorp representatives and others, this loan serves an essentially political purpose, providing a litmus test for South Africa's international credibility, rather than additional support for its gold-fuelled economy. South Africa's Finance Minister, Owen Horwood, conceded as much in New York City on 25 September, when he noted that, 'strictly speaking, we didn't have to raise a loan of this kind', a statement appearing in the Wall Street Journal on 26 September 1980. In its answer to shareholder resolutions from the United Presbyterian Church and other churches in 1977 and 1979, Citicorp maintained that it 'refrained from participation in political activities in any country'. In Mr. Horwood's words, however, this loan is a 'test of its creditworthiness' for South Africa, which has apparently been given a passing grade by Citibank. In our view this loan is not only unnecessary, but an immoral gesture of support for the world's most clearly racist régime."

(Father Driscoll)

In response to those loans, the United Kingdom bank loan campaign has also expanded. According to reports sent to us by British groups, the recent campaigning activities in Britain fall into several areas. First, British banks and the South African military; in the words of Prime Minister Botha, the Defence Advisory Board in South Africa would advise the defence force on the "best business methods and other matters", including armaments manufacture. Further research shows that British banks are involved in a number of ways with the South African military apparatus as a result of the total strategy at present being advocated by the régime. Secondly, financing of the Electricity Supply Commission's (ESCOM) nuclear programme; several British banks have been involved in loans to ESCOM, and the End Loans To South Africa (ELTSA) group is at present investigating the extent to which those loans are used for the financing of the Koeberg nuclear project. The importance of exposing Western collaboration with South Africa's nuclear programme was highlighted by the recent screening of the World in Action television documentary entitled "South Africa's Bomb Shell", which made reference to the fact that Western banks were partially responsible for financing South Africa's nuclear bomb. Many British banks have been involved in financing ESCOM, including Barclay's, Standard Chartered, Hill Samuel, Midland and National Westminster. Other projects that have been financed by banks from the United Kingdom include SASOL. This movement on the part of British banks has led to protest movements, including the Withdrawal from Barclay's Campaign, which continues within the student movement and church bodies, and within the trade union movement, which has been trying to drum up support to oppose those loans.

Returning to the case of the Citibank loan, which affects us directly as members of the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility here in the United States, the analysis we have given of the vital role of Citibank is illustrative of the important role of international banks. As I mentioned before, one of the cases that Citibank made for this most recent loan was that the loan was going to black housing projects, hospitals and schools, in short, for socially useful purposes. However, a look at black housing indicates just how shallow Citibank's justification is. The vast majority of South Africa's black population lives in appalling housing conditions. Even a cursory glance at the figures will show that far more money is to be spent on houses for whites than for any other racial group.

(Father Driscoll)

Therefore, this loan goes towards segregated housing, a component part of the apartheid system. We consider that Citibank's participation in this loan is an implicit acceptance of an intolerable system. Furthermore, the loan is an important public-relations effort by the South African Government in order to prove its international acceptability on the international markets. Despite Citicorp's claims, this loan serves an essentially political purpose in improving South Africa's credibility.

We should like to close by making four recommendations. We believe this issue deserves the Committee's most serious attention. International banks are responding positively to South Africa's newest attempt to borrow on the international capital markets. Particularly banks from the United Kingdom, the United States, West Germany, Switzerland and France are involved, as we mentioned before.

We would urge consideration of the following: first, publicity and interpretation of these new loans and their true implications; secondly, strong recommendations to the States Members of the United Nations to intervene and stop the flow of capital to South Africa; thirdly, continued hearings on bank loans within the United Nations by appropriate bodies, such as the Special Committee against Apartheid; and, fourthly that, in conformity with earlier General Assembly resolutions, the United Nations use its financial leverage as a client of many banks - the same type of leverage that we in the Church community attempt to use - and the power of the massive United Nations pension fund be used to demand an end of South African loans.

The CHAIRMAN: The next speaker is Mrs. Karen Talbot, United Nations representative for the World Peace Council, on whom I now call.

Mrs. TALBOT (World Peace Council): The World Peace Council would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the other members of the Committee, for the opportunity to be heard today before the Special Political Committee on the question of apartheid.

The World Peace Council is convinced that now is the time to go beyond the resolutions and verbal condemnations of apartheid -- however important they have been -- to resolute action that can effectively bring an end to the criminal apartheid system, which has created so much human suffering and misery and which gravely threatens international peace and security. The time is long overdue for the imposition of total mandatory sanctions against South Africa.

The vast majority of the Governments of the world and the bulk of humanity stand with the valiant liberation movement of South Africa and yearn for the final and complete eradication of apartheid and the total victory of the oppressed South African people and their liberation movement.

Despite the universal condemnation, the rulers in Pretoria are with increasing brazenness and audacity flouting United Nations resolutions and world public opinion. The reasons are clear. The criminal apartheid régime continues to flourish due to the continuing and growing support it receives from a few Western nations -- nations which consistently vote against, abstain on or veto virtually every United Nations resolution aimed at ending apartheid.

The transnational corporations which provide the fundamental pillars of support for apartheid and the illegal South African régime are headquartered in those very nations. Those nations are specifically named in resolutions on apartheid of the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly as guilty of violations of the arms embargo and of despicable collaboration with South Africa in every sphere.

The transnational corporations are also well known to all of us. They have been exposed most recently at the International Seminar on the Role of Transnational Corporations in South Africa, held in London last November, which was co-sponsored by the Special Committee against Apartheid -- and we have heard many of those transnational corporations and banks mentioned here today.

Despite the arms embargo, South Africa continues to obtain military equipment, ammunition and technology and has acquired nuclear-weapons capability through the collaboration of various of those transnational corporations and the few Western Powers which make up the core of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

(Mrs. Talbot)

Given this enormous support and the escalating military might accruing to South Africa, is it any wonder that South Africa has intensified its aggression against front-line States, such as Angola and Zambia, or that it displays continuing intransigence regarding Namibia?

Not only does this growing militarization and nuclearization of South Africa gravely threaten neighbouring African States, but it also poses serious dangers to world peace.

The military build-up of South Africa cannot be separated from the unprecedented new build-up by NATO, an exceedingly dangerous build-up which threatens to catapult the world to the very brink of nuclear disaster.

The very transnational corporations which fill their coffers with enormous profits from this arms build-up are often the same transnational corporations which profit from plunder of the natural resources of South Africa, from the hunger and deprivation and the super-exploitation integral to the apartheid system and from the military and nuclear collaboration with the illegal Pretoria régime.

The continued far-reaching collaboration between Israel and racist South Africa is especially notorious and detestable.

Those are the factors that embolden the racist rulers of South Africa to step up their repression, persecution, imprisonment, torture and brutal killing of workers, schoolchildren and other foes of apartheid. Those are the factors which encourage bantustanization, which proceeds unabated. Those are the factors which give rise to intensifying racist oppression and inhuman exploitation perpetrated against the black majority of South Africa.

The World Peace Council and its national committees in 140 countries reiterate the demand for the immediate institution by the Security Council of total mandatory sanctions, including an oil embargo. We support the call for urgent steps to ensure the full implementation of the arms embargo through mandatory action by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

In this regard we welcome and will co-operate fully in the preparations for an international conference on sanctions against South Africa, hoping, however, that there will be no further delay in imposing mandatory sanctions.

(Mrs. Talbot)

World public opinion can and must be brought to bear to assure that once we have achieved comprehensive mandatory sanctions, those sanctions will indeed be enforced and implemented. The World Peace Council is committed to mobilizing public opinion to that end. We call for the implementation of decisions taken at the International Non-Governmental Organizations Action Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Geneva in June and July 1980, which was sponsored by the Non-Governmental Organizations Sub-Committee on Racism, Apartheid and Colonialism, which is chaired by Mr. Romesh Chandra, President of the World Peace Council.

The World Peace Council recently concluded a World Parliament of Peoples for Peace in Sofia, Bulgaria, from 23 to 27 September this year, which was attended by 2,500 elected deputies from 135 countries and 200 political parties, innumerable trade unions, churches, women's and youth organizations and international organizations, including scores of members of Parliament and elected officials - an immense gathering truly reflecting a vast scope of philosophical, religious and political beliefs. A special hearing on violations of human rights in South Africa and Namibia was held at that Parliament. That World Parliament, literally representing hundreds of millions of people, reiterated its condemnation of the criminal apartheid régime, its unremitting and unqualified all-out support and solidarity with the liberation movement of South Africa and its determination to augment even further its campaigns for international mobilization against apartheid, for the freedom of Nelson Mandela and all other South African political prisoners and for the immediate cessation of all political trials, including the trial of the Silverton Nine.

(Mrs. Talbot)

In carrying out this renewed commitment, the World Peace Council is organizing many international, regional and national events and actions in the next months.

The World Peace Council can be counted on actively to stand behind United Nations endeavours. We stand with the Special Committee against Apartheid and all other United Nations bodies, the Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement, which have given consistent support to the cause of liberation for South Africa and the eradication of apartheid.

The World Peace Council draws strength and guidance from the participation of the top leaders of the African National Congress (ANC) and the South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) in its leading body, the Presidential Committee. The cause of the World Peace Council is one and the same with the cause of liberation for South Africa.

The people of South Africa and Namibia, under the unstinting and courageous leadership of the ANC and SWAPO, are inexorably advancing, despite the renewed viciousness of the Pretoria racist rulers. They are on the final assault towards the elimination of the apartheid régime and towards the seizure of power. Victory will most assuredly be theirs. World-wide solidarity and the imposition and implementation of total mandatory sanctions against South Africa - the complete isolation of that hated racist régime - are essential in helping to hasten that day.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the Reverend Herbert Daughtry, National Chairman of the National Black United Front.

Reverend DAUGHTRY (National Black United Front): The National Black United Front is honoured to address this Committee today regarding the current volatile condition existing in southern Africa. Apartheid is matched in its infamy only by the hideous master-race philosophy of the Nazi party. Although remnants of this master-race concept can be found in the world today, nowhere is it an official form of government other than in southern Africa. The racist régime of Israel is ironically employing Nazi-like tactics to remove the Palestinian people from their homeland.

This planet which we occupy will become a place of peace and moral integrity when those forces which espouse a belief in human rights remove the blight of apartheid from the face of the earth by any means necessary.

(Reverend Daughtry)

While various forces may employ different means to remove this blight, we should never be confused by cosmetic changes which are meant merely to forestall the inevitable downfall of apartheid. In recent times, various surface concessions have been granted to the African masses of southern Africa. No one is more familiar with the fallacy and emptiness of such measures than the black masses of the United States. Our history as an oppressed people in the United States is replete with examples of the worthlessness of those cosmetic changes. Oppressed people do not face loss of limbs, forced removal from territorial homelands and death merely to eat or drink from an integrated lunch counter or to have a select few become the buffers for an evil régime. The changes that are essential must go to the very root of the problem, which is the absence of self-determination and majority rule for the African masses in southern Africa.

In order for this herculean task to be accomplished greater commitment and action on the part of local, national and international groups dedicated to the task will be required.

The imposition of monetary sanctions against South Africa and the freezing of assets are all actions which have precedents when employed against non-white, anti-colonial and anti-imperialist forces. However, a nation which holds captive millions of people under the most inhumane form of government the world has ever seen is still not attacked aggressively by this or other bodies in like manner. Surely, if words were matched by actions, apartheid would have been buried a long time ago. If nations and organizations are under constraint to act forcefully, then they have a moral and political obligation to support fully the armed struggle of the liberation forces fighting in southern Africa.

The heroic victory of the people of Zimbabwe, led by the Patriotic Front, and the victories of the peoples of Guinea-Bissau, Angola and Mozambique should now allow for increased material support for the liberation forces in southern Africa.

The National Black United Front whole-heartedly supports the call for an all-out arms embargo against the racist apartheid régime of South Africa. Although it may at present be well stocked, and wallowing in the belief of its invincibility, the arms embargo would be a clear statement to it of the serious commitment to human rights and majority rule that nations now supplying them with sophisticated weapons have. It would have a demoralizing effect as well as serving to inspire the liberation forces.

(Reverend Daughtry)

In conclusion, let me outline what we, a progressive, pan-Africanist, mass - based organization, have done and intend to do. We have engaged in continuous educational programmes and the co-ordination of activities to express support for the liberation movements. We have provided forums, access to radio and print media, and have established an annual Soweto Day observance on 16 June to commemorate the heroic struggles of the people of Soweto to rid their nation of this dreaded scourge of the earth, apartheid. We have initiated divestment campaigns and are continuously soliciting funds, medical supplies and clothing for the people of southern Africa.

These things we will do and more besides, for the liberation of South Africa is more than a moral commitment with us, but is grounded in blood ties. We are one people, and our destinies are inextricably woven together. Victory in South Africa will mean victory for us here in the United States of America. It is a great moment in history. Imperialism, racism and other enemies of humanity are retreating before the moral progressive forces of the world. We are confident of victory. We echo the words of the People's Revolutionary Government in Grenada, whose people but yesterday suffered under the heel of tyranny: "Forward ever, and backward never".

Mr. Chairman, with your permission I should like my remarks to be supplemented by those of Mr. Dave Lampel.

The CHAIRMAN: As there seems to be no objection, I call upon Mr. David Lampel.

Mr. LAMPEL: My name is David Lampel. I am National News Director, a member of the Board of Directors and a part-owner of the Inner City Broadcasting Corporation, a chain of seven stations in the United States. I am a member of the Board of Directors and Vice-President of the Pacifica Foundation, a chain of five radio stations in this country. For identification purposes as well, I am also a member of the National Board of the Radio-Television News Directors Association International and a member of the Broadcast Advisory Board of United Press International.

(Mr. Lampel)

However, my comments this afternoon will deal specifically with the press, some research that has been done, and some comments made recently. I think that these remarks might be taken into consideration as well as some proposals that I shall make at the conclusion of my remarks.

First of all, everybody knows and it is part of the rhetoric of the Government of South Africa that it is proud to claim, as it always does in international forums such as this, in order to dismiss the indictments that have been levelled against it - that it is, among other things of which it claims to be, the leader in Africa, having the freest press on the continent, although the fact of the matter is that whether it be for economic matters or even something like the press, it counts for only the white minority population. However, even that claim is now coming under dispute, that is, its having for its white minority the freest press in Africa or in the world, or that somehow the press of that country is telling the truth to the people there.

James McClerc, the ombudsman for The Rand Daily Mail, wrote a few months ago: "Death by a thousand cuts, all excruciatingly painful but none fatal until the last, was the punishment traditionally inflicted by tyrants on their most dangerous enemies. Is the Government of South Africa doing the same sort of thing to oppress freedom in South Africa? This gloomy thought", he says, "comes as a result of a new series of laws" - representatives heard alluded to in part this afternoon. "They provide that without the permission of the Minister of Defence it will not be legal for the media to report incidents at installations that have been declared national key points."

In practice, this means, according to The Rand Daily Mail, that in the event of another incident like the recent attack on SASOL the press and the South African Broadcasting Corporation will have to remain silent, unless and until the Minister gives the go ahead.

The National Key Points Act follows closely on the heels of the Police Amendment Act, which provides for disclosure of the names of

(Mr. Lampel)

people arrested by the police in the course of anti-terrorist activity. This Act also controls the publication of information about police activities in fighting or preventing terrorism. Its penalty clauses are even more drastic: a fine of 15,000 rand or eight years in gaol.

Further, there are some other special problems posed within the press of South Africa today by the relationship, dominance and total ownership of all press, including the so-called black-oriented press. That special problem in journalistic ethics provided by the system also creates conflicts. Reporters sometimes seek to convince officials to drop minor prosecution against blacks by offering to kill the story. The police rarely release information on arrested people. Reporters are sent to question terrified families who beg them not to publish if the police blame them for co-operating with the press. They fear that they may lose their jobs or be deported from their homes. There are also some of the press serving the role of part and parcel of the Government itself.

In 1979 The Johannesburg Star noted the ineffectiveness of residential apartheid by publicizing the fact that many non-whites were living in areas of Johannesburg designated as "white only" in the Areas Group Act. Subsequently, several hundred people were evicted by the police after the story had appeared. On the other hand, the city was forced to increase its expenditure for coloured and Asian housing in their own areas. Whether The Star was right to do the story is still a matter of discussion in local press circles in South Africa.

But the most insidious aspect of all that is something which will no doubt cause a lot of us to have concern and pause for thought, especially those of us who are plying the trade of journalism in the Western world. It relates to a case in point of a man name John McGough, the head of the PANEX Corporation. That is only one of some of the examples that have begun to come out.

In an investigative story done, funded and researched by the Center for Investigative Reporting in this country, unknown throughout most of the country, regarded as something of a crank in his home town, the

(Mr. Lampel)

stocky, cocky, silvery-haired publisher was treated as a big shot, they say, by the South Africans in the early 1970s. The story of McGough's South African connexion which preceded his many attempts to acquire media properties and the sudden growth of newspaper holdings under his control suggest how easily some of the elements of the American media - and for that matter the Western media - might be converted into propaganda vehicles for foreign Governments. It also suggests that a canny publisher can make use of a foreign Government eager to buy United States public opinion and come out ahead in the deal - at least for the time being.

Of course, at the moment Mr. McGough is the subject of several investigations by the judiciary of this country. Those investigations still have yet to surface in terms of some of the details. But let us look at what the South Africans have uncovered at least in their Erasmus Commission report about some of the things that have come out.

Mr. Eschel Rudy, a former official of the Ministry of Information, it was learned, met McGough when he came to South Africa on a Government-paid visit. Apparently, Cornelius Moulder who was then the head of the Information Department had ideas for improving the country's image abroad. In the paper Curtain published in 1969 Rudy had argued that the Department should conduct an aggressive campaign overseas, it should sidestep racial questions and instead emphasize the Republic's economic potential and strategic importance for the Western world. In the first year of the Rudy plan the Department's budget for foreign operations increased from \$6 million to more than \$8 million. The United States was a prime target for this new campaign: information offices were opened across the country and 56 United States citizens, reporters and others, were sent to South Africa at the expense of that Government at about \$3,000 a piece.

However, such programmes were only a small part of the Information Department's activities. Rudy met with then Prime Minister Vorster and a group of other officials. According to an account that Rudy gave earlier this year to a South African journalist while in the United States,

(Mr. Lampel)

he had discussions with people connected with the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) regarding that Agency's overseas propaganda operations. "Now", he told Vorster and his aides, "I want you to approve not an information asset but a propaganda war in which no rules or regulations would count". The plan was approved, a secret fund was established, and that war was to cost by the time it was over - or at least in terms of what we noted to be over - \$70 million, which is interesting considering that the South African Government needs to borrow so much money to stay afloat.

Part of the activities - and I shall not go into all the details, but briefly -- included an attempt by Mr. McGough, a man who was making \$67,000 a year, who had nothing more than 4 per cent of the PANEX Corporation under his belt and about \$50,000 in equity, to approach the Washington Star in the nation's capital to purchase The Star for about \$25 million. Asked by the individuals there where he would get such a sum of money, he said that he could put up about \$15 million and that the Republic of South Africa, according to some of his close sources, would contribute another \$10 million.

What indeed happened, however, was a number of financial dealings that still remain foggy but have begun to come out in the Erasmus Commission report. The Erasmus Commission, as representatives know, was set up by the South African Government to look into Mr. Rudy's and Mr. Moulder's activities. However, they focused solely on things that had come to light and did not deal at all with what had happened to a lot of the funds involved, even though Mr. Rudy himself is now under indictment in South Africa, but free on bail.

The Sacramento Union, a big paper on the West Coast, was also a target of this activity. An attempt was made by McGough to buy the paper and, apparently, according to investigations that have been carried out a sum of \$10 million advanced to him by the South African Government from their fund was used to buy The Sacramento Union.

According to the Erasmus Commission report, UPI Television Network (UPITN), a network bought from Paramount Pictures and makes up independent television news (ITN) and some of the other sources of news that is sent to the world, is an organization with clients in 100 countries. After VISI News, UPITN is the second largest news film producer and distributor in the world; in many third-world countries it may be the only source of foreign news.

(Mr. Lampel)

In the United States it relied for foreign spot coverage in remote areas on its major American client, the American Broadcasting Corporation, which sold its foreign news customers list to UPITN in 1976. According to the Erasmus Commission Report there was no question but that McGough was acting on South Africa's behalf when he bought 50 per cent of UPITN. The Commission quoted McGough as having said: "My understanding is that I represent you, South Africa, in that company". Last June, McGough sold his shares in UPITN when the matter came to light. Independent Television News also bought up his shares for an undisclosed sum estimated to be about \$2 million. The chairman of the board of ITN commented at the time: "The board was unhappy at suggestions that McGough's money could have come from South Africa's Government, as was claimed by the Erasmus Commission".

However, despite the assurances that McGough could not control editorial content, that he lacked the power to influence coverage, McGough himself became co-chairman of the board and Clarence Rhodes, a PANEX director, and reportedly a member of the pro-South African group known as the Club of Ten, was installed as UPITN's president in London; McGough nominees still constitute one half of the board's members.

And the list goes on to include the Oakland Tribune, a number of other papers, a string of weeklies and dailies throughout Texas and the Mid-West and ZANAP, a corporation set up as a South African printing company. A subsidiary of PANEX was set up and among its great contributions to African literature was a comic book about a "black Superman", who apparently works with the South African status quo and is very much involved in seeing that things stay the way they are. "The Trib", a New York newspaper that folded - as members of the Committee may recall - was also an attempted target of this activity. The Washington Journalism Review reports that McGough attempted to buy it.

(Mr. Lampel)

The point of all this is to give an example of some of the things we know about what South Africa is willing to do and has tried to do to sell its story in the West. A lot of this may be amusing; but the question is - and McGough's career poses this serious question for us - what is there to prevent a foreign country from picking up important United States media properties and, through them, shaping public opinion to suit its own national interests? The answer, judging by the South African evidence, would seem to be not much.

Finally, I have some recommendations. These are activities on the part of a Government that not only has decided to mislead its own public and to use the press in varying fashions and to repress its own media - being made up of people who have a vested interest in supporting that status quo - but has moved into the Western world and that has accounted for much of the ignorance and much of the misleading knowledge that people have in the Western world about the situation over which this Committee is so concerned. And when this Committee wonders why it cannot get press coverage for its activities and why, indeed, its statements and pronouncements fall on deaf ears, it has to ask itself why sometimes the world, or at least the world's press, seems not to care about what is done here. I recommend that some appropriate organization within the United Nations, perhaps the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), set up a panel to review and monitor attempts by the South African Government to influence public opinion overseas. This could, of course, take the form of receiving reports and disseminating them, as was done by the Centre for Investigative Reporting, or it could take the form of going through the United States Justice Department's files to find all the individuals and film-makers involved. These include the son of a former Mayor of the city of New York who was on the South African Government's payroll and as a result had to register as a foreign agent.

(Mr. Lampel)

A lot of this information is public, but if there were a co-ordinated way to make the world understand, and make the Western press aware of some of the activities that go on across borders around this world on behalf of South Africa, perhaps those concerned might take a different view of the possibility that they are being used by that country to mislead public opinion.

Another recommendation, the final recommendation, has to do with a proposal that an organization known as the National Association of Television and Radio Announcers made some years ago and which apparently remains an active proposal, and could still be implemented if this Committee or another duly constituted body of the United Nations were interested in hearing details about it, and that is to turn the tables. Quite frankly, one of the problems, I suspect, in South Africa itself is that people do not recognize or fully appreciate the views that the world holds about them and the repugnance with which the world views the activities of apartheid. Would it be possible under circumstances that could be determined - in terms of finding neutral territory in the Southern Pacific on some of the islands, or perhaps on the African continent itself, but definitely under the supervision of international agencies - to create a radio station? Unlike many of the broadcasting stations of the world, which are designed to give out information in ponderous ways, to deal with national and international developments affecting their own countries and peoples and to express their own local cultures, this radio station would be much like Radio South Africa, which is heard throughout Africa, which presents contemporary Western music, disco, and all kinds of other programming and which has a voice in Africa because of its unique Western style of approach to programming. Let us take that concept and turn it against South Africa itself.

(Mr. Lampel)

Such a station could tell that country about and let it hear the music of artistes of the world who talk about the oneness of man and the brotherhood of man. Let that country hear the opinions that are being expressed about it in this chamber as well as about so many other activities around the world and throughout Western Europe. Even the most conservative régime has had something negative to say about South Africa and its apartheid system at some point. Could this radio station outlet not be turned on South Africa, organized in a Western fashion and format to interest the listeners in the white minority as well as the rest of the southern African people so that they could hear the facts about how the world sees them - how boxers in this country are making statements about wanting to refuse to fight South African boxers; how artists in this country have turned down offers to go to South Africa, why several sporting groups around the world have refused to go and play in South Africa. The people need to hear this. Indeed, one South African friend of mine said recently to me, in explaining the mentality of that country, that they look at the world as do two monkeys in a cage in a zoo who are looking out at the people who are looking in at them. One monkey says to the other: "Who are all those people?", and the other says: "Those people are behind bars".

This, indeed is the mentality that governs and perpetuates a system repugnant to everybody on the face of this earth, and perhaps if, through the peaceful use of radio and communications, we could show those people in cogent, peaceful terms just what we think of them, how the rest of the world feels about them, and what changes should be made perhaps that might be a beginning.

I submit that our corporation and other broadcasting outlets in this country and around the world would be willing to provide expertise, as well as some of the finance, to put this operation together, but it has to be something that is a commitment on the part of an international body.

(Mr. Lampel)

And whatever the Committee would suggest, I would be willing to help in organizing it, and I am sure I speak for a lot of my colleagues. This concludes my remarks, the point being, however, that all the words we say today may have been said many times before and will be said many times in the future, and the exasperation that many of those present no doubt feel at hearing those words all over again has to do with the fact that they have now to be heard by the world and by South Africa itself. That is where it is going to do some good.

Let truth ring throughout that country, and no man and no system can stand up to that.

The CHAIRMAN: The next and last speaker on my list is Mr. Akumu, Organization of African Trade Union Unity, on whom I now call.

Mr. AKUMU (Organization of African Trade Union Unity): I should like to thank the Chairman for allowing me to make a short statement. As I see, a number of our colleagues and particularly the National Chairman of the Black United Front and his colleagues, have covered most of the points.

But there is one point that I should like to bring out - that every year, and not only every year but periodically, we have had this type of hearing and made this type of statement. The question is, what are we making all these statements about? Is it that there has been a small step in improving the conditions under apartheid? Is it that things have become worse, or what is the position?

There is also an important point that I think has been overlooked by everybody who has made a statement here and which I think is crucial. It was mentioned by two of the previous speakers that apartheid actually believes in the master race, that like nazism and fascism it believes in racial superiority and that where it is challenged, like nazism and fascism, it believes not only in suppression but in elimination.

(Mr. Akumu)

There is one aspect that has been omitted, which is how did we eliminate nazism and fascism? Do we have a position in Africa? What about the position of the liberation movements? The churches and others have spoken very well and I pray they will continue to support the cause and what they stand for. But they also took a position during the war against nazism and fascism. They went, and in fact prayed with a sword in their hand for the defeat of fascism and nazism.

I think we have reached a stage where we must go beyond the resolution beyond the boycott, beyond the recommendation, because South Africa is not listening to this.

I have just come from Africa, where we finished our Congress of 15-20 October in Mogadishu. We have just finished a trade union conference in London, on 6 and 7 November. We have a delegation that visited the front-line States, where very important economic installations - whether in Angola, Mozambique or Zambia - have been destroyed by the racist régime. We know that South Africa reads the papers, we know that South Africa is informed; we know their representatives are here with us, if not taking tapes or listening, then taking notes. They know this, and the question is, are we still hoping, are the United Nations, the United Nations Secretariat and the United Nations agencies still feeling that there are hopes of changing the South African leadership by peaceful means?

I would submit very strongly that there is a war going on today, that the decision has been made by 50 Members of the United Nations in the Organization of African Unity (OAU). They have sat, decided, set up a war council and an OAU liberation committee to support the OAU action and the liberation committee. Is the United Nations going to conform to this, going to assist. going to do much more practical things, or is the United Nations going to be as the old League of Nations - to wait until we have other things.

(Mr. Akumu)

Now this is our question. Since we appeared before the Committee a lot of changes have taken place, if anything for the worse. The South African régime has become much more repressive and the transnational corporations and the companies that had already talked about other things that they were going to do including codes of conduct have never implemented them, and worse still, one of the most powerful nations - in fact, a leader of the West - today has a Government that has already said very clearly that it is going to support the South African Government, that it is going to embrace one of the advisers of the incoming President of the United States. It said so very clearly, so that things have become worse.

I think the United Nations must come out very clearly in support of the armed struggle and denounce South Africa - I do not think we ought to mince our words, I think what can be done by economic sanctions, what could be done by pressures, what could be done by such measures, has to be done. But even the half-hearted support we used to get from the United States is now gone. We are going to expect a Government that is going actively to support South Africa.

We have come to that sad conclusion in Africa, and we all know that the transnational corporations have assisted South Africa not only to obtain technology, to obtain finance, to recruit the skilled workers they want, but we also know that their Western allies - and I think on this we have to be very blunt - have assisted them in all of this, and have in fact covered them.

To date, even some of the progressive Western papers wanted to publish facts about some transnational corporations that are paying starvation wages. No, the Western Governments would not accept that. We already know that whether you call it the Canadian code of conduct, the Sullivan code of conduct, or the EEC code of conduct, it will never work.

And, at a discussion with trade union leaders in London last week, they said: if we implement a total boycott we would be prosecuted by our Government. That is what the German trade union said - we would be prosecuted by our Government if we were to implement the boycott.

(Mr. Akumu)

So it is quite obvious that Western Governments are supporting apartheid. The transnational corporations operating in South Africa, we have been told, number slightly over 2,000; only 20 of those are negotiating with African trade unions - only 20 are negotiating under the dubious conditions. They do not even formally recognize the trade unions. Many of them, with the approval of the metropolitan Governments, have joined South Africa in this paramilitary contingency arrangement, of which we have already been told.

We all know that the Standard Charter Bank head in South Africa is on the Prime Minister's national military advisory board. The question we have been asking ourselves in Africa is what has gone wrong in the Western democracies? I think the answer is simple, that the question is between the African and the white, and that the West has double standards.

Because we are black we are Africans, we are lesser human beings, and therefore they are not prepared to go the whole hog.

(Mr. Akumu)

We are saying this because many of us lost relatives when we joined in the fight against nazism and fascism. We lost relatives, we lost people. We all know that in the war in Spain a number of Western trade unionists, a number of Western people, volunteered to fight against fascism. Will they do it today? No, because eventually it is going to be black against white, and the Western Governments have a double standard.

If this is not true, why then did the Western Governments hurriedly pass a sanctions bill against Iran over the 50 hostages - in Africa we are very sympathetic about the 50 American hostages, and we hope they come back home to spend Christmas with their families - and yet will never consider a sanctions bill to aid 22 million blacks who have been in bondage for all these years? Why, if it is not racism?

It is quite obvious: we are black, and therefore lesser human beings. I think it has to be said as bluntly as that. If that is not the question, really, why did the British Government, for example, hurriedly dispatch troops to quell a rebellion in Anguilla, a little place, but wait for 15 years, at a cost of many millions of lives, for a settlement in Zimbabwe? Why, if it is not racism?

We are aware of this, we have to say it a little bluntly. I think it needs an African, who comes from Africa, who can afford to say that this is so.

It is racism that the European workers, the white workers, live like barons all over Africa. They live very well, very comfortably, whether in Kenya, Tanzania, the Ivory Coast or Nigeria. But the African workers, the black workers, whether in Paris, in London or in the United States, are subjected to intimidation and demonstrations every day. Why? It is racism.

So I think the United Nations must say quite clearly that it is against racism. It must say so boldly.

(Mr. Akumu)

I think that is the question. I think if we are talking about apartheid, mincing our words, saying nice things, hoping things will change, that the Riekert Commission or the Wiehahn Commission is going to help the trade union workers, then we are cheating ourselves. They are just nice words, spoken because we are here. I think the facts are that there is definitely a racial approach, that the whites in the developed nations think that they are better off with the whites in South Africa, and the confrontation must then be. Those who are progressive can think beyond colour and support the liberation movement.

The United Nations must go beyond this talk of sanctions and of press liberalism; it must go beyond that and join in training. We have tried to call strikes, we have tried to organize trade unions. In 18 months we have had 10 strikes - the municipal strike, the motor strike. We have talked with Fords, we have tried everything with Volkswagen, we have talked with Unilever of Britain. All of it has failed.

South Africa has been condemned, and it knows it. Nothing new can change it. The International Labour Organisation has expelled it; it knows about everything. All this has failed.

Now, what we feel could be done and in practice should be done is that we should ask the United Nations today - and we think it is important - that it support the armed struggle, that it begin to support the volunteers, that it begin to seek facilities from its Member States and to make them available to the people who want them. If that cannot be done, why then did we condemn apartheid in 1973 as a crime against humanity? Why did we say in 1976, "this is now operative"? If this is so, we must begin to train the people, to assist the liberation movement. I am saying so because Africa will never develop otherwise. The front-line States are being destroyed, everything is being done to destroy their economic installations. Africa is living under constant threat, and all efforts towards development have been diverted.

(Mr. Akumu)

All the talk is very good: boycotts are important, mandatory sanctions are important, but I think the most important thing for the United Nations to do now - and at this session - is to accept that it should seek Member States to put facilities at the disposal of the liberation movements, seek volunteers, train them and give them facilities to be able to assist in the fight against apartheid, and eliminate apartheid from the earth. If this is not done, we feel that South Africa will not mind all the resolutions; in fact, it assists in drafting them, at the International Student Exchange. We know that. It assists in drafting them because it knows they are useless and will not change anything.

But when the United Nations begins to provide facilities, to provide means, to call for volunteers, to provide the arms and facilities necessary for the fight to eliminate apartheid, then South Africa will be in a different position. If it is needed to talk with the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) on Namibia, it will talk. If it is needed to talk with the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC), it will talk. But if that is not done, I am afraid it will be otherwise. It is very nice to come here to make and to hear statements, withdrawing money from one bank and putting it into another bank. The United States Government, the British Government, the West German Government, through their transnational corporations and the like, are assisting South Africa. They will still provide the money, because the same money is moved from one bank to another. It will still be the same.

I am afraid that the United Nations must go now for action, the action that will eliminate apartheid, the action that ended the Smith régime in Zimbabwe - support for the armed struggle, calling for volunteers, training the people and providing them with weapons. All the talk about trade union strikes and about boycotts is very good. Those are good political pressures, but they will never change apartheid. What will change apartheid is practical action, and the United Nations has reached a stage now where, if it is to be practical, it must join in the armed struggle.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its hearing of the organizations interested in the question of apartheid, and I request the Rapporteur to prepare a report for the General Assembly on this phase of the Committee's work.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.