

381 1933/198

BMR/011/0095/17

draft

REPORT OF THE LIAISON GROUP
OF NATIONAL ANTI-APARTHEID MOVEMENTS
IN THE COUNTRIES OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY
January - September 1991

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Background
- 3.0 Developments in European Community policy
- 4.0 Representations to EC Presidency and Council of Ministers
- 5.0 European Parliament
- 6.0 European Commission
- 7.0 Co-ordinated anti-apartheid activity
 - February 1st 1991
 - Hunger Strikes
 - Krugerrands
 - Danish Parliament
- 8.0 Relations with other organisations
- 9.0 Work of Liaison Group Secretariat
- 10.0 Conclusion

Annex: List of Liaison Group Memoranda and Press Releases

Appendices:

I: European Council, Rome, 14-15 December 1990: Declaration on South Africa

II: EPC Ministerial Meeting, Brussels, 4th February 1991: Declaration on South Africa

III: Extracts from Resolution on Southern Africa adopted on 21st February 1991 by the European Parliament

IV: Extracts from record of European Parliament 15-19 April 1991

V: Resolution adopted by European Parliament on South Africa, 16th May 1991

VI: EPC Ministerial Meeting, Luxembourg, 17-18 June 1991: Declaration on South Africa

VII: European Council, Luxembourg 28-29 June 1991: Declaration on South Africa

VIII: EPC Statement on South Africa, adopted 16 September

1.0 Introduction

1991 has already proved to be a critical year for the peace process in South Africa. This Report covers a period (Jan - Sept 1991) which began with the entire process at risk due to the lack of progress towards removing the obstacles to negotiations. It deteriorated rapidly as escalating violence further threatened the prospect of negotiations. However by September 1991 significant breakthroughs had been achieved which again opened up the possibility of more rapid progress towards a genuine end to apartheid and the creation of a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa.

1.1. The policy of the European Community and its member states has had a significant influence on developments in South Africa. The premature lifting of the investment ban by the Rome European Council and the moves by the EC Foreign Ministers in April 1991 to lift the other sanctions measures imposed in 1986 significantly relaxed the international pressure on Pretoria. However during the latter period of the Luxembourg Presidency there appeared to be growing frustration within the Community over the lack of progress towards negotiations. At the Luxembourg European Council at the end of June 1991 a Declaration on South Africa was adopted which was significant since it included the first explicit criticism of Pretoria by the Community since the unbanning of the ANC and release of Nelson Mandela in February 1990.

1.2. The Liaison Group of the EC AAMs has been especially active during this period in seeking to influence the institutions of the Community and to try and ensure that EC policy makes a positive contribution in support of the peace process in South Africa.

2.0 Background

The Liaison Group of AAMs in the European Community consists of 14 national AAMs in eleven out of the twelve member states of the Community and was founded in September 1988 in Athens during the Greek Presidency of the Community. The Liaison Group meets at least once every six months usually in the country of the Presidency. The Liaison Group has neither an office nor staff, however at its Paris meeting in September 1989 it was decided to set up a small secretariat consisting of a small number of AAMs who would be responsible for co-ordinating work between meetings.

2.1 The Liaison Group since 1988 has built up extensive contacts with Community institutions. It has met with Presidents of the Council of Ministers and senior officials of respective Presidencies; with Vice-President Mr Andriessen, Mr Burghardt the Director-General for Political Co-operation and other Commission officials; and with the leadership of the European Parliament and the majority of its political groups.

2.2 The Liaison Group met in Brussels on Sunday 13th January 1991 when it considered action arising from the Rome Summit decisions on South Africa including representations to the Luxembourg Presidency, the European Parliament, and the Commission.

3.0 Developments in European Community Policy towards Southern Africa

The framework for European Community policy during the period covered by this Report was set in Rome in December 1990 at the European Council at which a Declaration on South Africa was adopted (see Appendix I). At Rome the Community ban on new investment was lifted immediately and the Council decided "that as soon as legislative action is taken by the South Africa Government to repeal the Group Areas Act and the Land Acts, the Community and its member states will proceed to an easing of the set of measures adopted in 1986."

3.1 A further Declaration on South Africa was adopted by the EC Foreign Ministers in Brussels on 4th February 1991 following President de Klerk's address of 1st February in which he announced Pretoria's intention to repeal the Group Areas and Land Acts. This Declaration, Appendix II, stated that the "Community will prepare the necessary steps" to ease the set of measures adopted by the Community in 1986.

3.2 As a result, following the tabling of legislation to repeal the Group Areas and Land Acts in the tri-cameral parliament, the Commission brought forward proposals to lift the sanctions measures adopted in September 1986 to the Council of Ministers with the recommendation that the European Parliament should also be consulted on the matter. However, without prior consultation with the European Parliament, on 15th April the EC Foreign Ministers took a political decision to lift these measures - a move which was strongly criticised in the European Parliament (see Appendix IV). The Presidency was then responsible for translating this decision into Community legislation. The Danish government was required to secure Parliamentary approval for such a move, but the majority in the Danish Parliament were opposed to the premature relaxation of sanctions. Approval was not forthcoming, this is still the case, and therefore a stalemate situation continues. The EC sanctions measures of 1986, with the exception of the ban on new investment, therefore remain in force. Meanwhile the UK government indicated at the 15th April meeting that it wished to see all the EC sanctions measures, ie both the 1985 and 1986 packages lifted immediately, with the exception of the arms embargo and related military sanctions.

3.3 In the latter period of the Luxembourg Presidency the focus of the Community's concern over South Africa shifted from the issue of sanctions to the need to remove the obstacles to negotiations. During the Luxembourg Presidency six different diplomatic demarche were delivered by the Community to Pretoria of which the most significant appears to be that on violence that was delivered towards the end of May 1991. It would appear that this demarche was influential in convincing Pretoria to participate in the Peace Facilitating Committee which led to the adoption of the National Peace Accord.

3.4 The Presidency advised the Liaison Group on 10th June 1991 that whilst Pretoria had honored its promises in relation to the repeal of apartheid legislation, it had failed to do so over the release of prisoners and the return of exiles. This concern was

reflected in the Declaration (Appendix VI) adopted at the EPC Ministerial Meeting on 17-18 June 1991 in which the Community and its member States acknowledged "that a number of obstacles still delay the opening of substantive negotiations aimed at drawing up a new constitution" and continued by specifying "the detention of political prisoners and the problems impeding the return of exiles." They expressed the hope that these obstacles "can be removed swiftly".

3.5 The Community's frustration with Pretoria was expressed even more forcibly in the Declaration on South Africa adopted at the Luxembourg European Council on 28/29 June 1991 (Appendix VII). This stated that "the European Council would wish to see a speeding up of the process of negotiation on the new constitution leading to the establishment of a new, united, democratic and non-racial South Africa". Following the position taken by the Foreign Ministers, the Heads of Government noted "that obstacles remain on this path. It (the European Council) expresses the hope that a rapid solution can be found to the problem of political prisoners and that of the return of exiles".

3.6 The Luxembourg Presidency was characterised by a changing perception within the Community as to the reality of the situation in South Africa, which reflected in particular the setbacks which the peace process was facing in South Africa. The European Community's policy shifted from that of uncritical approval of Pretoria to a more even handed approach thus opening up the prospect for the Community to make a constructive contribution to the peace process in South Africa.

3.7 A further statement (Appendix VIII) was issued by the Community in September 1991 following the adoption of the national Peace Accord in which the Community and its member states urged "all parties to subscribe to the principles laid down in the National Peace Accord and to assure its enforcement on all levels".

3.8 During the period covered by this Report the European Community has continued to pursue its "positive measures" in particular the "Special Programme for the Victims of Apartheid". This Programme is being re-evaluated in the light of the developments in South Africa and in order to facilitate its operation a European Community technical office was opened in Pretoria.

4.0 Representations to the Presidency and Council of Ministers

The Liaison Group made a major effort to influence the approach of the Presidency and the Council of Ministers towards developments in South Africa during this period. The absence of a national Anti-Apartheid Movement in Luxembourg created certain obstacles, however these were successfully overcome.

4.1 On 9th April 1991, following speculation in the press and media that the 1986 sanctions measures were to be lifted shortly, and against the background of the peace process being increasingly threatened by the lack of progress over the removal of obstacles to negotiations and by the failure of Pretoria to

take effective action to halt the violence, Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, the President of the British AAM, wrote to M. Poos the President of the Council of Ministers, on behalf of the Liaison Group. The letter consisted of an appeal to the Council of Ministers to intervene immediately with the South African regime to secure the removal of all obstacles to negotiations and for it to take effective action to curb the violence; it called upon the Community to support the proposals put forward by the ANC on 5th April designed to end the violence; it urged the Community to refrain from easing the 1986 sanctions measures; and it requested a meeting at which the Liaison Group could present proposals for a new initiative by the Community to promote the peace process.

4.2 In addition to the representations made by the EC Anti-Apartheid Movements, the African National Congress sent a high-level delegation to Luxembourg on 11th April consisting of Mr Alfred Nzo, the then Secretary-General of the ANC and Mr Thabo Mbeki, the Head of the ANC International Department where they met with M. Poos, the President of the Council of Ministers. The ANC delegation briefed M. Poos over developments in South Africa including the decision of the ANC to suspend its participation in talks over negotiations on 9th May unless Pretoria had responded positively by that date to the proposals the ANC had made on 5th April for action to end the violence. The ANC opposed any moves to lift sanctions in these circumstances.

4.3 These and other representations failed to persuade the EC Foreign Ministers who took the political decision to lift the 1986 sanctions measures as outlined above in paragraph 3.2 on 15th April. In response to this move on 24th April the Liaison Group addressed a further letter together with a memorandum to the President of the Council of Ministers urging the Foreign Ministers to suspend the 15th April political decision. The memorandum sought to persuade the Ministers on the grounds that Pretoria did not intend merely to repeal the Group Areas and Land Acts but to replace them with new legislation and that therefore there was no certainty that the intention of the Rome Summit decision would therefore be fulfilled. On 12th March 1991 five bills had been tabled to replace the Group Areas and Land Acts but it had been reported that four of these bills were to be withdrawn until the next parliamentary session and there was no certainty that they would be replaced by bills which would be consistent with the Rome Summit decision. Since the principle material factor behind the decision to lift the 1986 measures was the tabling of this legislation, the memorandum argued that the basis for the decision was no longer valid.

4.4 The Liaison Group made a further move to influence the Presidency on 6th May 1991 when it issued a statement warning of the need for a fundamental change in EC policy towards South Africa. The statement was issued following the expiry of the 30th April deadline by which the obstacles to negotiations would be removed and with three days to go before the May 9th deadline set by the ANC for Pretoria to take action to curb the violence. The Statement announced that an urgent meeting was being sought by the Liaison Group with M. Poos in order to present the case for the suspension of moves to lift the 1986 sanctions measures; the

rejection of any moves to lift the 1985 sanctions package; the abandonment of the policy of "rewarding" De Klerk; and for an urgent demarche to Pretoria insisting on the removal of all obstacles to negotiations together with action to stop the violence.

4.5 Later the same month of 29th May European Community policy was challenged in a Statement "South Africa: Myth and Reality" jointly issued by the South African partners to the EC's Special Programme - the Southern Africa Catholic Bishops Conference, the South African Council of Churches and the Kagiso Trust - and the Standing Committee of European NGOs which appealed for action to secure the removal of the obstacles to negotiations, independent monitoring and security mechanisms, and the establishment of an interim government. The fact that South African and EC NGOs came together to issue such a statement added to the pressures on the Community to re-evaluate its policies.

4.6 The President of the Council of Ministers, M. Poos, responded positively to the Liaison Group's request for a meeting and this took place on 10th June in Luxembourg. The Liaison Group delegation was led by Archbishop Huddleston who was accompanied by Fons Geerlings of the Netherlands AAM and Michael Terry of the British AAM. The delegation presented a 10 page memorandum which included a five point programme of action to the President of the Council of Ministers during the hour long meeting. M. Poos briefed the Liaison Group delegation on the initiatives taken by the Community in support of the peace process including six separate diplomatic demarches. He responded positively to the delegation, undertook to circulate the Memorandum including the Five Point Plan of Action to his Ministerial colleagues on the Council of Ministers and undertook to try and secure agreement that the question of South Africa would be on the agenda of the Luxembourg Summit and for action on the basis of the Liaison Group's proposals. The delegation issued a release following the meeting and held a number of briefings with press accredited to the Community.

4.7 Following the meeting with M. Poos, Archbishop Huddleston wrote to all the Heads of Government of the Community urging their support for the proposals set out in the Liaison Group memorandum. The Declarations adopted by the Foreign Ministers on 17-18 June and by the Luxembourg Summit on 28/29 June (Appendices VI & VII) substantially took into account key elements of the Liaison Group's proposals. The Liaison Group welcomed both Declarations. In relation to the Declaration adopted by the European Council clarity was sought over the status of the French and English translations. The official French text states "notamment l'abrogation de trois piliers restants de l'apartheid"; whilst the English translation includes a "the" which significantly changes its meaning as follows: "notably the repeal of the three remaining pillars of apartheid".

5.0 The European Parliament

The Liaison Group has focussed especially on the European Parliament which the Commission itself acknowledged in correspondence with the Liaison Group is "generally closer to

public opinion in the member states."

5.1 On the occasion of the Liaison Group meeting on 13th January 1991 representatives of the Group held a series of meetings with MEPs and Officials of the Parliament and its Political Groups. These included the Principle Counsellor in the President's Office, Geoff Harris; Vice-President of the Parliament, Antonio Capucho, the Secretary-General of the Socialist Group, Julian Priestly; the Secretary-General of Left Unity, Kratis Kyriazis; members of the Secretariats of the Group for the European Unitarian Left and the Green Group as well as a large number of individual MEPs. The discussions focused on two issues; the Report from the Parliament's Political Committee on Southern Africa known as the Capucho Report since Mr Capucho had served as Rapporteur; and the second issue the Rome Summit's decision to lift the ban on new investment and to ease the remaining 1986 sanctions measures.

5.2 Immediately following the Rome Summit the Liaison Group had encouraged representations to the President of the Parliament expressing opposition to the decision. A model declaration was drawn up and at a national level organisations and individuals were encouraged to endorse such a declaration and send it to the Parliament's President. In addition a number of MEPs and national political groups had been approached to establish whether they would be willing to submit a motion for urgency to the January session of the Parliament.

5.3 The Liaison Group meeting in Brussels on 13th January 1991 considered this matter and the related issue of the Capucho Report which was due to be debated at the January session. Members of the Group expressed their concern over the text of the Resolution which would be debated with the Report and identified areas where amendments would strengthen the Resolution in relation to South Africa, Namibia and the Frontline States. The Liaison Group agreed upon the need to mobilise public opinion in Europe to ensure that either through a motion of urgency or the Capucho Report that the Parliament re-affirmed its support for sanctions and for the peace process. As a result of consultations it was decided not to pursue the proposal for a motion for urgency and to focus on the Capucho Report.

5.4 The European Parliament was scheduled to discuss the Capucho Report at its January Session however because there were over 70 amendments and due to other pressures in particular the Gulf War the voting was held over to the February session. This provided an opportunity for concerted lobbying of MEPs at a national level. On 21st February the Parliament voted by a large majority (96 - 44) in support of a key paragraph which called for the maintenance of sanctions. The vote on the Resolution as a whole (see Appendix III for key extracts) was 97 in favour 38 against. It went further by expressing concern at the delays in implementing the Pretoria Minute, and supporting the convening of an elected Constituent Assembly to draw up a new constitution and an interim government to rule South Africa during the transition process. The Liaison Group issued a statement welcoming the decision.

5.5 The issue of sanctions again caused controversy in the Parliament at its April session. The session opened on 15th April, the day that the Foreign Ministers took the political decision to lift the remaining 1986 sanctions measures. Strong protests were registered during the session that there had been no consultation with the Parliament. The matter was raised by M. Cot, the leader of the Socialist Group and by Mr Price (European Democrats); Barbara Simons (Socialist Group); and Mrs Dury (Socialist Group). M. Poos addressing the Parliament stated that the decision was a mere formality and therefore did not require consultation with the Parliament. M. Delors also replied to the Parliament stating that the Commission had merely acted in accordance with the political line indicated by the Rome European Council. (see Appendix IV for details of the debate)

5.6 By early May the situation in South Africa was deteriorating rapidly. The 30th April deadline for the removal of obstacles to negotiations had passed and in response political prisoners had gone on hunger strike, the ANC's deadline for action to end the violence was approaching without any positive response by Pretoria and there appeared to be a determined effort to override the Danish veto on the lifting of the 1986 measures. Following consultations amongst the members of the Liaison Group, the Secretariat made a co-ordinated effort to ensure that there was a full debate on South Africa at the May session of the Parliament. Approaches were made at a national and local level to MEPs and national political groups to persuade them to submit motions for urgent debate and to try and ensure that there would be sufficient support for the matter to be debated. There was a very positive response from the Socialist Group, the Green Group, the Group for European Unitarian Left, Left Unity and the Rainbow Group and agreement was reached on a Joint Motion which was tabled on behalf of the above Groups and by Mr Price of the European Democratic Group. The Secretariat was able to be represented in Parliament by Michael Terry of the British AAM and in addition a hunger striker, David Moisi, who had been released the previous week flew from South Africa to Strasbourg to publicise the hunger strikes.

5.7 The Liaison Group was able to make a significant impact on the Session by hosting the visit of David Moisi, for details see paragraph 7.2. The Resolution was debated on the evening of Thursday 16th May and was adopted by 93 to 48 votes thus demonstrating that the Council Ministers were out of touch with European public opinion. The Resolution (Appendix V) recognised that the prospect of a political settlement was now seriously threatened, expressed its support for the political prisoners on hunger strike and urged the Council of Ministers to maintain all existing pressure until all obstacles to negotiations had been removed and opposed any moves to lift the oil embargo, and the arms, military and nuclear sanctions. It also regretted the failure of the Commission to inform Parliament that it had made legislative proposals to lift sanctions. The Liaison Group issued a Press Release welcoming the Parliament's vote for a "tough policy on South Africa".

5.8 The Liaison Group is deeply appreciative of the positive response and assistance it has received from numerous Members of

the European Parliament, from Officials of the Socialist, Green, European Unitarian Left, and Left Unity Groups and from the President's Office.

6.0 European Commission

The Liaison Group has continued to make representations to the Commission and to provide it with information on developments in South Africa. On 24th April it wrote to President Delors forwarding the Memorandum urging a suspension of the decision to ease the 1986 sanctions measures which was also sent to the President of the Council of Ministers, see para 4.3. The Commission replied stating that the Commission had "done no more than fulfill its institutional role of initiative in accordance to a timetable and political guidelines set out by the Heads of State and Government (in December 1990) and by the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Co-operation (last February)". However the reply stated that the Commission had recommended that the European Parliament be consulted "on such a sensitive issue" however the Council of Ministers ignored this advice, see para 5.5 and Appendix V).

6.1 In an important development on 10th June, coinciding with the Liaison Group's meeting with the President of the Council of Ministers in Luxembourg, the then Deputy President of the African National Congress, Mr Nelson Mandela, was received at the Commission by President Delors. The meeting was reportedly very successful and M. Delors undertook to support the question of South Africa being on the agenda of the Luxembourg Summit, a move which reflected the growing understanding within the Community over the lack of progress in the negotiating process.

6.2 Following the EPC Foreign Ministers meeting on 17-18 June, M. Delors was sent the text of the statement released by the Liaison Group welcoming the Declaration adopted on South Africa and seeking clarification on the status of the 1986 sanctions measures. The Commission replied stating that "the implementation of the repeal of the 1986 EC trade sanctions (gold coins, iron and steel products) is still held up, as of today, by the opposition of the Danish Parliament. The letter, dated, 31st July 1991, added "since the US announcement of withdrawal of sanctions under the CAAA, however, we can expect the pressure to mount in the direction of a further easing of sanctions worldwide".

7.0 Co-ordinated anti-apartheid activity

The Liaison Group has also sought to promote and co-ordinate anti-apartheid activity within the Community. The following are the most important activities which it has sought to co-ordinate:

7.1 Feb 1st: A special meeting of Anti-Apartheid Movements was held in Brussels from 11-13 January from Europe and North America at which it was agreed to co-ordinate action in capital cities to coincide with F.W. de Klerk's opening address to the tri-cameral parliament. The activities were designed to generate international pressure for the removal of the obstacles to negotiations and to mobilise support for an interim government and for an elected constituent assembly to draw up a new

democratic constitution. The Secretariat of the Liaison Group was asked to co-ordinate the action on behalf of all the AAMs and details were compiled and released to the press of all the activities which took place on 1st February.

7.2 The Hunger Strikes: In response to the hunger strikes organised by South African political prisoners in early May 1991, the Liaison Group sought to mobilise international solidarity with their struggle and to secure their release and all political prisoners. The Liaison Group therefore hosted a visit to Strasbourg, Brussels and EC capitals by David Moisi, a hunger striker released on 8th May. He spent three days in Strasbourg during the May session of the European Parliament from 14-16 May during which he was able to have meetings with leaders from the majority of political groups in the European Parliament. On 16th May the Parliament adopted a motion for urgency which expressed its support for the hunger strikers. From Strasbourg David Moisi embarked on an intensive tour of Community countries. Over a two week period he visited Brussels, London, Amsterdam, Paris, Copenhagen, Rome and Athens. The tour by David Moisi alerted public opinion to the continued plight of political prisoners and effectively countered Pretoria's propaganda that all genuine political prisoners had been released. In a series of meetings with Community member states he was able to present the case for renewed EC pressure for the release of all political prisoners. The tour therefore helped contribute to the pressures on the Council of Ministers which led to the June 17/18 Declaration which specifically called for action in this area.

7.3 Krugerrands: Following the political decision to lift the 1986 sanctions measures on 15th April 1991, the Chamber of Mines announced that it was to re-issue Krugerrands. since any such imports into the Community would be in breach of Community legislation, the Liaison Group agreed to monitor any potential sales of Krugerrands and to initiate appropriate action if evidence was obtained that EC legislation was being breached.

7.4 Danish Parliament: The Liaison Group has sought to promote support within the EC and beyond for the majority parties in the Danish Parliament which refused to agree to the lifting of the 1986 sanctions measures. AAMs and other organisations were asked to send messages of support to the three parties in the Danish Parliament.

8.0 Relations with other organisations

The Liaison Group has continued to have regular contact with similar organisations working at an EC level, in particular SANAM/Standing Committee representing the NGOs involved with the EC's Special Programme for the Victims of Apartheid; the EC NGO Liaison Committee; and AWEPA. It has also sought to maintain an exchange of information with the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid and the UN Centre against Apartheid, the OAU representation in Brussels, and the ACP Secretariat.

8.1 At a national level the members of the Liaison Group have extensive contact with a range of ngos, trade union, religious and other organisations concerned with the anti-apartheid

struggle with whom they seek to involve in activities relating to the EC and South Africa.

9.0 Work of the Liaison Group Secretariat

The meeting of the Liaison Group on 13th January 1991 laid down the broad framework for the work of the Group during the Luxembourg Presidency and also agreed on the composition of the Secretariat until the next meeting of the Group as follows: CCCA, Belgium; AAM, Britain; AAB and KZA, Netherlands. The Secretariat held one full meeting in Amsterdam on 9 February which was also attended by Yusuf Salojee, the Administrative Secretary of the ANC's International Department. The meeting, having been extensively briefed by the ANC, worked out a further programme of work especially in respect to representations to the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers. Members of the Secretariat also met with the ANC Secretary-General, Alfred Nzo, in Brussels on 12th April who was returning to South Africa following the ANC delegation to Luxembourg. The Secretariat has otherwise liaised regularly by means of telephone and fax.

9.1 At the request of the Nordic Group of AAMs, the Liaison Group issued an appeal to the Finish government on 26th June to urge it not to lift its trade sanctions against South Africa and pointing out that Finland's position would be worse than that of the EC. Despite this and other appeals Finish trade sanctions were lifted with effect from 1st July 1991. Likewise a last minute appeal was addressed by the Liaison Group to President Bush early on 10th June 1991, at the request of the America Committee on Africa, just prior to the announcement of his decision to lift the sanctions imposed under the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act contrasting the reported position of the US administration with that agreed by the EC at the Luxembourg Summit. A Press Release was issued announcing that this last minute appeal was being made by the AAMs of the EC.

10.0 Conclusions

The Liaison Group has carried out an extensive programme of activity during the period covered by this Report in order to try and secure maximum support from the European Community for the peace process in South Africa and to prevent any premature relaxation of pressure by the Community.

10.1 The Group has been encouraged by the more realistic approach adopted by the Community's institutions especially during the latter period of the Luxembourg Presidency. The European Parliament, in particular, has played a most constructive role in bringing about a change of attitude within the Council of Ministers.

10.2 There is considerable evidence that indicates that it was pressures exerted by the Community which played an important role in securing the release of political prisoners, the agreement between Pretoria and the UNHCR for the return of exiles, and the regime's participation in the Peace Facilitating Committee.

10.3 However in all probability Pretoria only felt able to delay and procrastinate over the removal of obstacles to negotiations because of the significant relaxation of international pressure during the latter part of 1990 and early 1991. And there can be no doubt that it was member states of the Community, the UK in particular, which led to way in securing the relaxation of these pressures.

10.4 The Liaison Group continues to have an important role to perform in encouraging the EC to promote the peace process in South Africa and to ensure that it results in a genuine end to apartheid and the creation of a united, non-racial, non-sexist and democratic South Africa. It will continue to work for the maximum pressure by the Community and for the maintenance of sanctions against South Africa until the ANC, other democratic forces in South Africa and the OAU should judge otherwise.

Annex: Liaison Group Memoranda and Press Releases

Date	Title
13th Jan	Press Release issued by the Special Meeting of AAM's held on 11-13 January 1991, Brussels entitled AAMs Programme of Internationally Co-ordinated Action
22nd February	Press Release "Anti-Apartheid Movements Welcome Decision of the European Parliament to Maintain Pressure on Pretoria"
24th April	A memorandum to the President and the Council of Ministers and the President and Members of the European Community Commission entitled "Recent Developments in South Africa and their implications for the easing of EC sanctions measures adopted in September 1986".
25th April	Press Statement on Appeal to the President and the Council of Ministers urging the suspension of moves to relax EC sanctions
6th May	Statement warning of the need for a fundamental change in EC policy towards South Africa
10th May	Briefing on the Hunger Strike by South African Political Prisoners
15th May	Press Release "Robben Island Hunger Striker Meets European Parliament"
16th May	Press Release "European Parliament Votes To Adopt Tough Policy On South Africa"
9th June	Press Release "Archbishop Trevor Huddleston leads Liaison Group delegation to meet President of European Council of Ministers"
10th June	"European Community Policy Towards South Africa: June 1991" - A memorandum to the President of the Council of Ministers
10th June	Press Statement "EC Liaison Group Meet with President of the Council of Ministers"
19th June	Statement in response to Declaration adopted by EPC Ministerial Meeting on 17-18 June

EUROPEAN COUNCIL
ROME, 14/15 DECEMBER 1990

DECLARATION ON SOUTH AFRICA

The Community and its member States have consistently followed developments in South Africa with the greatest attention and have given a favourable reception to the initiatives which have been taken to bring about the abolition of apartheid and the establishment of a united, non-racial, and democratic South Africa. They have already expressed approval of the results of the talks between the Government and the ANC, in particular those of the Pretoria meeting in August, which opened the way to the negotiation of a new Constitution.

They deplore the phase of serious violence through which South Africa is passing which may endanger these developments. They welcome, however, further indications serving to confirm that the process of change already begun is going ahead in the direction advocated by the Strasbourg European Council. They have decided to continue to encourage this process.

Against this background, the European Council has decided that as soon as legislative action is taken by the South African Government to repeal the Group Areas Act and the Land Acts, the Community and its member States will proceed to an easing of the set of measures adopted in 1986.

As of now, so as to contribute to combatting unemployment and improving the economic and social situation in South Africa, and to encourage the movement under way aimed at the complete abolition of apartheid, the European Council has decided to lift the ban on new investments.

At the same time, the Community and its member States, with the objective of sending a clear signal of political support to the victims of apartheid, and intending to contribute to a new economic and social balance in South Africa, have agreed to strengthen the programme of positive measures and to adapt it to the requirements of the new situation, including requirements related to the return and resettlement of the exiles.

The Community and its member States hope in this way to be able to contribute to the speeding up of the process under way through sending to all the parties involved in negotiation a concrete sign of support for the establishment of a new South Africa, united, non-racial, and democratic, and capable of resuming the place which it deserves in the international community.

P. 20/91

Brussels, 4 February 1991

DECLARATION ON SOUTH AFRICA

The Community and its member States warmly welcome the announcement made on 1 February 1991 by President de Klerk of further important changes to come in South Africa. These will include the repeal of the "Group Areas Act", of the two "Land Acts", and of the "Population Registration Act", which will thus open the path towards the complete and irreversible abolition of apartheid and the establishment of a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa.

The Community and its member States recall that at its meeting of 14/15 December 1990, the European Council decided that as soon as legislative action is taken by the South African Government to repeal the "Group Areas Act" and the "Land Acts", the Community and its member States will proceed to an easing of the set of measures adopted in 1986. In these circumstances, the Community will prepare the necessary steps.

The Community and its member States also welcome the outcome of the meeting of 29 January between Mr Mandela and Mr Buthelezi, on behalf, respectively, of the ANC and the Inkatha Party. The agreement between the two parties must now be implemented so as to enable discussion on the future of South Africa to take place in a peaceful atmosphere.

Regarding Namibia:

1. Congratulates the people and the State of Namibia on their national independence, proclaimed in March 1990, and welcomes them warmly back to the international community;
2. Draws attention to the exceptional example of the process of independence in Namibia, achieved following settlement of the conflict through negotiation and subsequently characterized by a spirit of openness, dialogue on the part of all involved, which led to the adoption of a constitution based on pluralist democracy and human rights;
3. Urges all the parties concerned to resolve the status of Walvis Bay in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 432 which states that territorial integrity and unity of Namibia must be assured through reintegration of Walvis Bay into its territory;
4. Urges the Council and Commission, as well as the Member States, to increase aid for the development of Namibia, particularly within the framework of the new Lomé Convention;

Regarding Angola:

5. Welcomes the re-establishment of direct talks between the parties to the dispute, under Portuguese mediation and in the presence of observers from the USA and the Soviet Union;
6. Urges both the RPA Government and UNITA to adopt more flexible positions so that a properly monitored ceasefire may be brought about without thus enabling social and political life to return to normality, democracy to be established in the country, and full expression to be granted to all political forces involved in reconstruction of the country;
7. Welcomes the prospects for political democratization, as seen in the constitutional reforms approved by the Central Committee and Extraordinary Congress of the MPLA, which provide for a multiparty system;
8. Calls on the MPLA and UNITA to reach an agreement on:
 - a rapid cease-fire monitored by international observers,
 - a deadline for free elections open to all parties,
 - a single Angolan national army;
9. Calls on the Council, Commission and Member States immediately to provide urgent humanitarian aid to alleviate the desperate problems of famine in this country, in addition to the promised substantial and effective aid for the reconstruction and economic and social development of the country; highlights by way of example, the agreement between the disputing parties which has enabled 'peace corridors' to be opened up, thus facilitating international aid to reach the stricken zones;

Regarding Mozambique:

10. Congratulates the Mozambican Government and RENAMO on the successful conclusion of the preliminary agreement whereby the Zimbabwean army will be concentrated in the Beira and Limpopo corridors and RENAMO has undertaken to cease all offensive military action in these areas;
11. Condemns the campaign of terror which RENAMO is continuing to wage against defenceless civilian communities, leading to suffering and to the destruction of economic and social infrastructures;
12. Encourages the parties to continue the negotiations in the same spirit of dialogue, with the aim of achieving a complete ceasefire and peace in Mozambique;
13. Welcomes the adoption by the Mozambican Parliament on 2 November 1990 of the constitution, in force since 30 November, which makes provision for elections by universal suffrage and secret ballot, the creation of a multi-party system, equal rights for all religious faiths and the legitimization of private property alongside state property;
14. Calls on the Council, the Commission and the Member States immediately to increase urgent humanitarian aid to the thousands of refugees dispersed in the neighbouring countries and the victims of famine in Mozambique, in addition to the vital and substantial aid for the reconstruction and economic and social development of this country;
15. Calls on the governments of the Member States of the Community to play an active role in aid to Mozambique and the reconstruction of the country which has been severely hit by continued Renamo attacks and the policy of destabilization pursued by South Africa;

Regarding the Republic of South Africa:

16. Reaffirms its total opposition to apartheid in all its forms and its support for the creation of a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa, based on the fundamental principles set out in the UN Declaration on South Africa, which provides for electoral lists on non-racial lines, and therefore welcomes the Pretoria agreements of 7 August 1990 which open the way for negotiations on a new constitutional order;
17. Expresses its concern at the delays in implementing the steps agreed in the Pretoria Minute, especially over the release of political prisoners, granting immunity for political exiles and the repeal of repressive legislation, and calls for immediate action to speed up the process to ensure implementation by the 30 April deadline set out in the agreement;
18. Urges the South African Government to cooperate fully with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees in order to facilitate the return of all refugees and political exiles to South Africa;
19. Reaffirms its support for the willingness to negotiate expressed in the Pretoria agreement and calls for all democratic political forces representing the people of South Africa to be involved in such negotiations;

20. Supports in this connection the proposals made by the ANC on 8 January 1991, including an all-party congress, an elected constituent assembly to draw up a new constitution and an interim government to rule South Africa during the transition process;
21. Reaffirms its solidarity with the people of South Africa and supports the position they have adopted through their organizations and leaders whereby the aim of negotiations should not be the reform of apartheid but its abolition, as called for in the UN General Assembly resolution of 12 December 1990;
22. Recognizes the crucial roles played throughout this process by President de Klerk and the ANC leader Nelson Mandela, who with determination, political courage and a clear sense of the higher interests of the country and its people, have tried to ensure that the conditions are created for the peaceful transition of South Africa to a united, democratic and non-racial State;
23. Expresses its profound concern at the violent clashes between supporters of INKATHA and of the ANC and other groups perhaps exacerbated by sinister forces opposed to the ending of apartheid; takes the view that the violence may jeopardize the positive results of the negotiating process but at the same time hopes for the success of the dialogue between representatives of the government, the ANC and all progressive forces;
24. Considers that if the violence in the townships is to be resolved, it is essential to deal with the main underlying causes, namely the laws of segregation that are still in force, mass unemployment, which affects a large proportion of the black population of the townships, and the continuing repression and police violence;
25. Welcomes the UN resolution unanimously adopted at the recent forty-fourth session and, in accordance with that resolution, stresses the need to maintain 'the existing measures aimed at encouraging the South African regime to eradicate apartheid until there is clear evidence of profound and irreversible changes';
26. Calls on the Council to reaffirm its support for the UN Declaration on South Africa;
27. Calls on the Council, the Member State governments, the ACP governments and the Executive Secretary of SADC to implement and monitor strictly officially declared sanctions against the apartheid regime until a change has occurred;
28. Calls on the Council of Ministers to give urgent consideration to the failure of the South African Government to remove the obstacles to negotiations and to exert maximum pressure to secure their immediate removal;

29. Supports the Commission's initiative with a view to opening a 'technical office' in South Africa, to be responsible for administering the Community funds allocated to the anti-apartheid struggle;
30. Calls on the Commission and the Council to take the demands of the opposition in South Africa, particularly the ANC, into account in their decisions;

regarding the Southern African region:

31. Welcomes the resolve expressed by the SADC States to enhance the effectiveness of their organization by means of an increasingly concerted regional policy;

o
o o

32. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the governments of Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and the Republic of South Africa.