Working for non-racial democracy in South Africa january to A Report of the Liaison Group September ofNational Anti-Aparthcid Movements 1991 in the Countries ofthe EuropeanCommunity

Contents Introduction Background Developments in European Community policy Representations to EC Presidency and Council of Ministers European Parliament European Commission Co-orchnated anti-apartheid activity - February 1st 1991 - Hunger Strikes ' Krugcrrands ' Danish Parliament Relations with African National Congress Relations with other organisations Work ofLiaison Group Secretariat Conclusion Annex: List of Liaison Group Memoranda and Press Releases 1991 Appendix 1 European Council, Rome, 14-15 December 1990 Declaration on South Afiica Appendix II EPC IVIinisterial Meeting, Brussels, 4th February 1991 Declaration on South Africa Appendix III EPC Ministerial Meeting, Luxembourg, 17-18June 1991 Declaration on South Afxica Appendix IV European Council, Luxembourg 28-29 June 1991 Declaration on South Aflica Appendix V EPC Ministerial Meeting 16 September 1991 Statement on South Africa 000000 10 10 11 12 13 13 14

14 14

## Introduction

HIS year has already proved to be critical for the peace process in South AfricaThjs Report covers a period (Jan - Sept 1991) which began with the entire process at risk due to the lack ofprogress 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 united, non-racial and democratic South Africa.

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 Minsters 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.

The Liaison Group ofthe EC AAMs has been especially active 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 A&ica. Background

i T HE Liaison Group of AAMs in the European Community consists of  $14\,\,\mathrm{i}$ 

national AAMs in eleven out ofthe twelve member states of the Community and was founded in September 1988 in Athens during the Greek Presidency ofthe Community. The Group meets at least once every six months usually in the country of the Presidency. Although it has neither an office or staff, it was decided at its Paris meeting in September 1989, to set up a small secretariat consisting of a small number of AAMs who would be responsible for co-ordinating work between Irieetings.

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

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. It met again in Amsterdam, Netherlands, on 28-29 September 1991 when this Report was approved and adopted.

Developments in European Community Policy towards Southern Africa

HE 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 willproceed to an easing ofthe set ofmeasures adopted in 1986. '1

A further Declaration on South Africa was adopted by the EC Foreign Minsters in Brussels on 4th February 1991 following President de Klerkk address of 1st February in which he announced Pretorials 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. As a result, following the tabling oflegislation 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 Nlinisters 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 IVIinisters took a political decision to lift these measures a move, which was strongly criticised in the European Parliament. 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, which 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, i.e. both the 1985 and 1986 packages lifted immediately, with the exception of the arms embargo and related military sanctions. In the latter period of the Luxembourg Presidency the focus of the Communityk

National Peace Accord on 14th September 1991. The President of the Council of Ministers, M. Poos, advised the Liaison Group on 10thjune 1991 that whilst Pretoria had honored its promises in relation to the

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

repeal of apartheid legislation, it had failed to do so over the release ofpnsonexs and the return of exiles. This concern was reflected in the Declaration (Appendix III) adopted at the EPC Ministexial 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 substantiuc negotiations aimed at drawing up a new constitution" and continued by specifying uthe detention of political prisoners and the problems impeding the return of exiles." They expressed the hope that these obstacles "can be removed swyftly ".

The Comrnunityls 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 IV). This stated that "the European Council would wish to see a speeding up of the process of rzegotiation on the new constitution leading to the establi shment

ofa new, united, democratic and non-raa'al South Afn'ta". Following the position taken by the Foreign Nlinisters, the Heads ofGovernment noted "that obstacles remain on this path. It (the European Council) expresses the hope that a rapid solution can beform to

the problem ofpolittcal prisoners and that of the return of exx'les". The Luxembourg Presidency was characterised by a changing perception within the Community as to the reality of the situation in South Afiica, which reflected in particular the setbacks which the peace process was facing in South A&ica. The 1 European Communityls 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. A further statement (Appendix V) 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". During the period covered by this Report the European Community has continued to pursue its (positive measures" in particular the llSpecial Programme for the Victims opraithcid" for which there has been a further increase in finding. This Programme has been re-evaluated, in the light Ofthe developments in South Africa, and its scope widened to includejob creation, primary health care, education and low cost housing. In addition funds are no longer to be channeled through the four South African partners alone (Kagiso Trust, SACC, SACBC, and the non-raCIal trade unions). In order to facilitate its operation a European Community technical ()HTCC was opened in Pretoria.

Representations to the Presidency and Council of Ministers
HE Liaison Group made a major effort to intluence the approach of the
Presidency and the Council ofMinisters towards developments in South
Africa during this period. The absence of anational Anti-Apartheid Movement in
Luxembourg created certain obstacles; however these were successfully overcome.
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 ofprogress over the removal ofobstacles 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 ofMinisters, on behalf of the Liaison Group. The letter consisted of an appeal to the Council of Minsters to intervene immediately with the South A&ican regime to secure the removal ofall 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.

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 oer 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 Nlinisters. 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.

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 on 15th April. This decision was immediately condemned by the United Nations. Ambassador Gainbari, the Chairman ofthe UN Special Committee against Apartheid issued a statement on 22nd April 1991 describing the EC action as "totally prematurell. The Liaison Group, on 24th April 1991, addressed a letter together with a memorandum to the President of the Council OflVIinisters urging the Foreign Minsters 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 be fulfilled.

On 12th March 1991 hve 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.

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. P005 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 'lrewarding" De Klerk; and for an urgent dcmarche to Pretoria insisting on the removal of all obstacles to negotiations together with action to stop the violence. Later the same month of 29th May European Community policy was challenged in a Statement uSouth Africa: Myth and Reality'ljointly issued by the South African partners to the ECls 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 monitoting and security mechanisxm, 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.

The President of the Council ()fMinisters, M. P005, responded positively to the Liaison Groupk request for a meeting and this took place on lOthJune in Luxembourg. The Liaison Group delegation was led by Archbishop Huddleston who was accompanied by Fons Geerlings of the Netherlands AAM and Michael Terry ofthe British AAM. The delegation presented a 10 page memorandum which included a live point programme ofaction to the President of the Council ofMinistexs during the hour long meeting.

M. P005 briefed the Liaison Group delegation on the initiatives taken by the Community in support Ofthe peace process including six separate diplomatic demarches. He responded positively to the delegation, undertook to circulate the Memorandum including the Five Point Plan ofAction to his Ministerial colleagues on the Council otiMinisters and undertook to try and secure agreement that the question ofSouth Africa would be on the agenda Ofthe Luxembourg Summit and for action on the basis Ofthe Liaison Groupys proposals. The delegation issued a release following the meeting and held a number ofbriefmgs with press accredited to the Community. Following the meeting with M. P005, Archbishop Huddleston wrote to all the Heads ()fGovernment ofthe Community urging their support for the proposals set out in the Liaison Group memorandum. The Declarations adopted by the Foreign Ministers On 17\_18june and by the Luxembourg Summit on 28/29 june (Appendies III 81 IV) substantially took into account key elements of the Liaison Groupys proposals. The Liaison Group welcomed both Declarations.

In relation to the Declaration adopted by the European Council clan'ty was sought over the status of the French and English translations. The official French text stated (lilotrzmrrwnr I'abrqgmtion dv troix piliers restanrs dc I'apanhcid"; whilst the English transla-

tion included a llthel' before lthree pillars, so that it read: "notably the repeal ofthe time mmzz'riing pillar: vfaparrlzrid". This significantly Changed its meaning by implying that & the pillars ()lizipartheid had been repealed.

The European Parliament

HE Liaison Group has focussed especially on the European Parliament which the Commission itselfacknowledged in correspondence with the Liaison Group is "generally closer to public opinion in the member states. " 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 Presidean O&ice, GeoEl-Iarn's; 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 Parliamentls Political Committee on Southern Aflica known as the Capucho Report since Mr Capucho had served as Rapporteur; and the second issue the Rome Summitls decision to lift the ban on new investment and to ease the remaining 1986 sanctions measures.

Immediately following the Rome Summit the Liaison Group had encouraged representations to the President of the Parliament expressing opposition to the decision to relax sanctions. 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 Parliaments 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. 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 reeafhrmed 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. The European Parliament was scheduled to discuss the Capucho Report at its january Session however because there were over 70 amendments to the draft motion 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 ofMEPs at a national level. On 215t 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.

The issue of sanctions again caused controversy in the Parliament at its April sessmn. 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)

By early May the situation in South Africa was deteriorating rapidly. The 30th April deadline for the removal ofobstacles to negotiations had passed and in response political prisoners had gone on hunger strike, the ANCls 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 Iiieasures. Following consultations amongst the members of the Liaison Group, the Secretariat made a co-ordinated effort to promote 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 ajoint 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 Nlichael 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.

The Liaison Group was able to make a significant impact on the Session by hosting the visit ofl)avid Moisi, (for details see below). The Resolution was debated on the evening ofThursday 16th May and was adopted by 93 to 48 votes thus demonstrating that the Council Ministers were out oftouch with European public opinion. The Resolution 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 otiMinisters 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 Coziimission to inform Parliament that it had made legislative proposals to lift sanctions The Liaison Group issued a Press Release welcoming the Parliamentys vote for a "tough polity on South Afrim".

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 Presidents Office.

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 ofthe decision to ease the 1986 sanctions measures which was also sent to the President of the Council of Nlinisters. The Commission replied stating that the Commission had "done no more thanfulfill its institutional role ofinitiative in accordant e to

a timetable and politicalguidelines set out by the Heads of State and Government (in Decem

ber 1990) and by the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Co-opemtion (last February)? However the reply stated that the Commission had recommended that the European Parliament be consulted "on such a sensitive issue"; nevertheless the Council of Nlinisters ignored this advice, see above).

In an important development on 10th june, coinciding with the Liaison Groupls 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 lack ofprogress in the negotiating process. 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 Afiica 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 santtions Qold coins, iron and steelproducts) is still held up, as oftoday, by

the opposition of the Danish Parliament. "The letter, dated, 31\$tJuly 1991, added "since the US announcement of withdrawal of sandions under the CAAA, however, we can expect the pressure to mount in the direction of a further easing of sanctions worldwide". 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:

Feb lst: 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 PW. de Klerkls opening address to the triecameral 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 ofthe Liaison Group was asked to co-ordinate the action on behalfof all the AAMs and details were compiled and released to the press of all the activities which took place on 1st February. 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 interna-

tional 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 an ANC member, 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 ofpolitical 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 ofCommunity countries. Over a two week period he visited Brussels, London, Amsterdam, Paris, Copenhagem Rome and Athens. The tour by David Moisi alerted public opinion to the continued plight of political prisoners and effectively countered Pretorials 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 ofMinisters which led to the june 17/18 Declaration which specifically called for action in this area. Krugerrands: Following the political decision to lift the 1986 sanctions measures on 15th April 1991, the. Chamber ()fMines announced on 18thjune 1991 that it was to re-issue Krugerrands. Since any such imports into the Community would be in breach ofCommunity legislation, the Liaison Group agreed to monitor any potential sales ()fKrugerrands and to initiate appropriate action if evidence was obtained that EC legislation was being breached.

Danish Parliament: The Liaison Group has worked closely with the Landskomiteen Sydafrika-Aktion to encourage the majority in the Danish Parliament to maintain their opposition to the premature lifting of the 1986 EC package of sanctions. The Liaison Group sought to promote support within the EC and beyond for the majority parties in the Danish Parliament and AAMs and other organisations were asked to send messages ()fsupport to the three parties in the Danish Parliament.

Relations with the African National Congress

Hli Liaison (lroup has worked in close eo-operation with the African National (?ongress during the period covered by this Report. Mr Mendi Msimang, (ANC Chieflh'presentative in the UK and Ireland) and Mr Teddy Pekane (ANC Chieflhtpresentatives iii the Benelux countries) participated in the Brussels Liaison (iroup meetingr injanuary 1991 when they were able to provide a detailed briefing olithe outcome otithe ANC Consultative Conlbrenee injohaimesburg in Decenk ber 1991 and (m the policy proposals put forward by the ANC in itsjanuary 8th '91 scitement.

The Liaison Group convened a Secretariat Iiieeting on 9th February 1991 in Amsterdam to coincide with a visit by Mr YusufSalojee, the Administrative Secretary of the ANC International Department in order to have. a further in depth exchange otiviews on developments in EC policy towards South Afiiea. Members of the

Secretariat were also able to meet with the then Secretary General of the ANC, Mr Alfred Nzo, in Brussels on 12th April 1991 who was returning to Africa following the ANC delegationys meeting with M. P005 in Luxembourg. The Liaison Group also worked closely with the ANC over the arrangements for David Moisi's tour of Europe. In Strasbourg he wasjoined by Ms Helen Pastoors of the ANC and ANC representatives in the capital cities he visited assisted in facilitating his programme. The Liaison Group is especially appreciative of the assistance and support which the ANC Chief Representatives in London and Brussels have provided to it in its work. Day to day co-operation was maintained throughout this period between the ANC mission in the UK and the British AAM on behalf of the Liaison Group.

HE 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 ECs Special Programme for the Victims of Apartheid; the EC NGO Liaison Committee; and AWEPAAi It has also sought to maintain an exchange ofinformation with the United Nations Special Committee against Apartheid and the UN Centre against Apartheid, the OAU representation in Brussels, and the ACP Secretariat.

Members of the Secretariat of the Liaison Group attended to the ACP - EEC Joint Assembly in Amsterdam in September 1991 where they addressed an NGO sponsored lifn'ngell meeting. A move for a representative of KZA to address the full Assembly however was unsuccessful.

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

Work of the Liaison Group Secretariat

HE meeting of the Liaison Group on 13thjanuary 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 YusufSalojee, the Administrative Secretary of the ANC)s Intemadonal Depaitment. The meeting, having been extensively briefed by the ANC, worked out a further programme ofwork especially in respect to representations to the European Parliament and the Council ofMinisters. The Secretariat has otherwise liaised regularly by means oftclephone and fax.

At the request of the Nordic Group ofAAMs, 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 Finlandls position would be worse than

that of the ECA Despite this and other appeals Finish trade sanctions were lifted with effect from 1stjuly 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 adminstration with that agreed by the EC at the Lux-embourg Summit. A Press Release was issued announcing that this last minute appeal was being made by the AAMs of the EC. Conclusions

HE Liaison Group has carried out an extensive programme ofactivity 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 ofpressure by the Community.

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. 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 regimes participation in the Peace Facilitating Committee. 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 0111990 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 otithese pressures.

The Liaison Group continues to have an important role to perfonn 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, noneracial, non-sexist and democratic South Africa. It will continue to work for the maximum pressure by the Community to achieve this goal and for the maintenance ot-sanctions against South Africa until the ANC, other democratic forces in South Africa and the OAU should judge otherwise.

12

Annex:

Liaison Group Memoranda and Press Releases, 1991

13th January

22nd February

24th April

25th April

6th May

10th May

15th May

16th May

9th June

10thJune

10thJune

19th June

Council of A/Iinisters.

Press Release : AAMS Programme ofIntemationally Co-ordinated Action issued by the Special Meeting of AAM1s held on 11-13 january 1991, Brussels.

Press Release: Anti-Apartheid Movements welcome decision of the European Parliament to maintain pressure on Pretoria Memorandum: Recent Developments in South Africa and their impli cationsfor the easing ofEC sanctions measures adopted in September 1986 to the President and the Council of Niim'sters, and the President and Members of the European Community Commis sion.

Press Statement on Appeal to the President and the Council of Ministers urging the suspension of moves to relax EC sanctions. Statement warning of the need for a fundamental change in EC policy towards South Afxica.

Briefmg on the Hunger Stn'ke by South African Political Prisoners.

Press Release: Robben Island hunger striker meets European Parlia merit.

Press Release: European Parliament votes to adopt tough policy on South Afn'ta.

Press Release: Archbishop Trevor Huddleston leads Liaison Group delegation to meet President quuropean Countil of Ministers. Memorandum: European Community Polity towards South Africa: junc 1991 to the President of the Council ohonisters. Press Statement: EC Liaison Group meet with President Ofthe

Statement in response to Declaration adopted by EPC NLiniste dal Meeting on 17-18 june.

Appendix I

European Council, Rome 14/15 December 1990

Declaration on South Africa

The Community and its member States have consistently followed developments in South A&ic a with the

greatest attention and have given favourable reception to the initiatives which have been taken to bring

about the abolition ofapanheid and the establishment ofa united, non-racial, and democrat ic South A&ica.

They have already expressed approval of the results of the talks between the government a nd the ANC,

in particular those of the Pretoria meeting in August, which opened the way to the negotia tion of a new

constitution

They deplore the phase of senous violence through which South Africa is passing which may endangerthcse

developments. They welcome, however, fuxther indications serving to coniinn that the process of change

already begun is going ahead in the direction advocated by the Strasbourg European Counci 1 They have

decxded to encourage this process.

Against this background, the European Council has decided that as soon as legislative act ion 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 easmg of the set ofmeasures adopted in 1986.

As ofinow, 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 ofsending a cle ar signal of

political suppon to the victims of apartheid, and intending to contribute to a new econom ic and social

balance in South Africa, have agreed to strengthen the programme ofpositive 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 spee ding up of the

process under way through sending to all the parties involved in negotiation a concrete s ign of support for

the establishment of anew South Africa, united, non-racial, and democratic, and capable o fresuming the

place which it deserves in the international community

Appendix II

EPC Ministerial Meeting, Brussels, 4 February 1991

Declaration on South Africa

The Community and its member States warmly welcome the announcement made on 1 February 19

by Presulent de Klerk offurther important changes to come in South Africa. These will include the repeal

olithe 11Group Areas Actll, ofthe two uLand Acts", and ofthe "Population Registration Act ", which will

thus open the path towards the complete and irreversible abolition ofapartheid 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 deczded that 25 soon as legislative action is taken by the South Afn' can Governme nt to repeal the

u(lmup Areas Act" and the llLand Acts", the Community and its member States will proceed to an easing

ofthc set ol'measures adopted in 1986. In the\$e Circumstances, the Community will prepare the necessary

steps.

The Community and its member States also welcome the outcome of the meeting 01.29January b etween

 $\mbox{Mr}$  Mintiela and  $\mbox{Mr}$  Buthcleu. On behalf, rexpecuvely, 01. the ANC and the lnkatha Freedom Party. The

(tgcemcnt between the two parties must now be implemented so as to enable discussion on the future of

South Africa tO take plate in a peaceful atmosphere

Appendix III

EPC Ministerial Meeting, Luxembourg, 17-18june 1991

Declaration on South Africa

The Community and its member States welcome the repeal of the Population Registration Act two weeks

after the repeal of the Land Acts and the Group Areas Act.

These measures mark the beginning of a new era in South Africa. The way is now open for n ational

reconciliation and the establishment of aunited, democratic and nomracial South Afxica. The Community

and its member States pay tribute to all those who have devoted themselves, inside and ou tside the country,

to the abolition of the apartheid systemi

The Community and its member States note, that a number of obstacles still delay the opening of substantive

negotiations aimed at drawing up a new constitution. They have repeatedly expressed the h ope that all

obstacles to negotiation, including the detention of political prisoners and the problems impeding the  ${\sf retum}$ 

ofexiles, can be removed swiftly i They regret the continuing cost of violence in South AEr ica and call on

all parties to work for tolerance.

Appendix IV

European Council, Luxembourg, 28/29june 1991

Declaration on South Africa

The European Council welcomes the important progress made towards the complete and irreversible

abolition ofapanheid, notably the repeal of the three remaining pillars ofapartheid: the L and Acts, Group

Areas Act and Population Registration Act.

It hopes that these imponant measures will be followed by the elimination in practice of all racial

discrimination and by an improvement of the position of the most disinherited elements of the South

African population.

The European Council would wish to see a speeding up of the process of negotiation on the new

constitution leading to the establishment of anew, united, democratic and non-racial Sout h Afn'ca and calls

on all parties to make common efforts to resolve all outstanding questions so as to enable negotiations

between all political forces to begin as soon as possible.

The European Council notes nevertheless that obstacles remain on this path. It expresses the hope that a

rapid solution can he found to the problem of political prisoners and to that of the return of exiles. It

reiterates its concern abut the Violence in South Aliica and calls on the South African G overnment to spare

no eflbrt to uphold the law and public order. It notes with hope the consultations on thi s grave problem

and calls on all parties to display moderation.

The European Council, conscmus of the significant inlluence of the role which sport might be called on

to play in the emergence of a South Afiican Nation, notes with satisfaction the progress achieved in

desegregation in the sporting field. It hopes that all the conditions set by the Internat ional Olympic

Conunittee for the readmission of South Africa will be fulfilled as soon as possible. It proposes, while

respectlng the independence of sporting organisations, to support the principle of renewin  ${\tt g}$  sporting

contacts at the international level on a case by case hams, where unified and non-racial sporting bodies have

been set up.

Appendix V

liPC Ministerial Meeting, 16 September 1991

Statement On South Africa

The Community and its member States welcome the signing of the National Peace Accord on 1

September 1991 and express their hope that this agreement will finally open the path towa

rds a detinite end

ut'senseless bloodshed. which has delayed substantive negotiations on a new Constitution. Continued (onnnitment to peace is essential for further progress in the process of change in South Africa.

Therefore the Community and HS member States urge all parties to subscribe to the princip les laid down

in the National Peace Accord and assure its enforcement on all levelsl

```
BELGIUM
Akue Komjucc Zuidelijk Africa
Koning Albert Laan 2
3010 Kcsscllo
Tel: 32 16 350565
Fax: 32 16 350566
Comm: Contra 1c Coloniahsmc ct 11Aparthcid
199 Avenue M011ch
1060 Brussels
Tel: 32 2 6404082
Fax: 32 2 5142365
BRITAIN
Anu-Aparthcid Movement
13 Mandela Street
London, NW1 0DW
Tel: 44 71 387 7966
Fax: 44 71388 0173
DENMARK
Landskmmtecn Sydafrika-Aktion
anfcnikldtsgadc 35
2200 Kobcnhavcn N
Tel: 45 31 359 232
Fax: 45 31 354 332
FRANCE
Mouvement Anti-Apartheid
Box 109
75463 Paris, CEDEX 10
Tel: 33 1 4077 0922
Fax: 33 1 4201 4734
Recontre National Contrc YAPQIIhCld
Centre M. Sidobrc
26 rue E. Raspajl
94110 Arcuul
Tel: 33 1 447 403070
Faxz331466 41810
GERMANY
AntkApathCld Bewcgung
Blucchcrstr. 14
5300 Bonn
Tel: 49 228 211355
Fax: 49 228 219329
?REECE
Committee for International Democratic Solidarity
Spirou Trikoupi 25
10683 Athens
Tel: 301 36 13052
Fax: 301 36 22547
IRELAND
Irish Anti-Aparthcid Movement
PO Box 38
Dun Laoghairc, Co. Dublin
Tel: 353 1 284 4070
Fax: 353 1 284 4081
ITALY
Co-ordinamemo Nazionale Anti-Apartheid
c/o MOLISV
V12 di S. Prisca
15/A 00153 Roma
Tel: 39 6 574 1463/575 8926
Fax: 39 6 5741463
NETHERLANDS
Anti-Apartheid Bewegung Nederland
PO Box 10500
1001 EM Amsterdam
Tel: 31 20 626 7525
Fax: 31 20 623 7335
Komitee Zuidelijk A&ica
Oudczijds Achtcrburgwal 173
Amsterdam DJ 1012
Tel: 31 20 627 0801
Fax: 31 20 627 0441
```

PORTUGAL

Movcmcmo Ponugucs Contra o Apartheid

R. Roden'go da Fonscca 56 - 2

1200 Llsboa

T61: 35 11 356 3375 Fax13511 356 3211

SPAIN

Movilmcmo AnLrApatheid Espanol

Apto. 139 Las Rozas Madrid 28230

Tel: 34 1 6375569 Fax: 34 1 6372422

Prinlcd 17y Blurkruw Press (TU), London E(Tl Tel 071-251-3043

```
..

ll, _ w Ill 1;.....

-'--'l I.I.J--I-l'_#-IL I.

_:. l-I _ I _n)' II

.' %

_ -_ I

_ .. _ I

_ .. _ I

I " - - -

n 1
n 1
._ I
II _
1I
III . I
.
1 J_I l' r
. In H
.-;I I.'
I'l
I II
x- H-i' 4 -
I1. I.
-I.
i
r 4 I
I
I
Η
._-′ 7
```