

SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA: The Movement Broadens

In recent months, the internal situation in South Africa has sharpened considerably, with opposition among South African blacks reaching an unprecedented high. The South African authorities reacted violently, causing hundreds of dead. The state of emergency was imposed in 38 districts, covering 7 million people. Opponents to the government's policies, including the white business community, the opposition PFP, church and student leaders called for establishing contacts with the ANC and, if allowed by the government, visited the ANC Headquarters in Lusaka themselves. The government refused the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and detainees. On October 19, ANC activist Benjamin Moloise was hanged, which caused further protests internally and internationally. The trials against leaders of the United Democratic Front, aimed at immobilising the organisation without formally banning it, continue. President Botha repeatedly announced measures, aimed at giving the impression of improving the political, social and economic position of blacks, while at the same time fundamentally denying them equal rights.

The international business community reacted sharply on these developments. South Africa was forced to postpone repayment of loans and the Rand fell to its lowest level ever.

It is in this context, that the world-wide movement towards economic sanctions has broadened and now includes, however reluctantly in some cases, the United States, the European Communities and various other Western countries.

Blacks support sanctions

According to an opinion poll by Gallup's South African affiliate, more than *three quarter of South African urban blacks* think that "other countries are *right to impose economic sanctions* on South Africa unless South Africa agrees to get rid of the Apartheid system." Previous polls, which specifically focused on disinvestment, had shown less support for sanctions. The most recent poll, the first detailed one after the introduction of the new constitution, showed that respondents who expected to suffer personally from sanctions (48%) were no less in favour of sanctions than those who did not expect any personal sufferings (46%). Employed blacks were as much in favour of sanctions as the unemployed respondents.

The views expressed in this poll are a confirmation of earlier positions taken by the main South African trade unions CUSA, FOSATU and others, by the *United Democratic Front* and by the *South African Council of Churches*, which in 1984 and 1985 repeatedly spoke out in favour of international pressure on South Africa, including economic sanctions.

Another example of the opinions of urban blacks are the results of an investigation into the support for KwaZulu homeland leader *Gatsha Buthelezi* who opposes economic sanctions, against the popularity of bishop Tutu, the United Democratic Front and the ANC and its lea-

der Nelson Mandela. Even in his 'home base' Natal/KwaZulu, the latter three are supported by more respondents than Buthelezi himself. In the Transvaal industrial area, including Soweto, over half of the respondents support the ANC, the UDF and Bishop Tutu, against only 11% supporting Buthelezi. In both areas, he is supported by only a negligible proportion of non-Zulu's. Even among his own supporters, almost half are in favour of foreign economic pressure, which are supported by 70-80% of the Tutu/UDF/ANC supporters.

Southern Africa, third world call for sanctions

At their meeting on August 9, the member states of SADCC (Southern African Development Co-ordination Committee) strongly backed the sanctions measures adopted by various western states and simultaneously urged that these sanctions were accompanied by increased support to South Africa's neighbours, to offset possible negative consequences of the sanctions or South African reprisals to their economies.

A similar position was taken on September 15 by the heads of state of six *Front Line States* (Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe), who met in Maputo.

Later that month, *Mozambican president Machel* visited Washington and disappointed US officials and some Congressmen, who had hoped that he would oppose sanctions privately and remain silent publicly. On the contrary, Machel congratulated the US administration for their initial sanctions, calling them an important first step and adding that the Administration should quickly consolidate them by deciding what further steps ought to be taken.

On the counter-argument that Mozambique would suffer from such sanctions more than South Africa, Machel recalled that Mozambique had earlier participated in sanctions against Rhodesia, despite the cost.

At their conference in Luanda, Angola, the 101 *non-aligned countries* on September 16 stressed the need for immediate sanctions, as the South African economy is at the point of collapse.

The *EEC-ACP Joint Assembly*, with representatives from the European Parliament and from countries, affiliated to the EEC, has on September 27 adopted a resolution — with only one abstention — in which the EC measures announced on September 10 were called “very inadequate as a response either to the aggravation of the situation in South Africa or to the legitimate demands of the black South African people and organisations, representing them.”

At the bi-annual meeting of the *Commonwealth* heads of government in Nassau, Bahama's, in October, strong pressure was exerted on UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to agree to joint economic sanctions against South Africa. These were favoured both by Third World leaders and countries like Australia and Canada. The result was a compromise decision on some measures, which were already taken or announced by most governments. The main new element, from the British perspective, is the prohibition of the importation of Krugerrands. Mrs. Thatcher stressed the limited nature of the measures, considering the small volume of Krugerrand sales in the UK, whereas ANC president Oliver Tambo spoke of a victory, considering the staunch opposition of the British Prime Minister to any sanctions.

After six months, the Commonwealth will discuss developments in South Africa again and take further measures, if no beginning has been made with the abolishment of Apartheid. This is expected to increase pressure on the UK.

United Nations

Repeated calls for sanctions by Security Council

In June and July 1985, the Security Council has adopted two resolutions, which a.o. called upon member states, to implement various economic sanctions against South Africa.

Resolution 566 of 19 June a.o. condemns South Africa for not implementing resolution 435, embodying the UN plan for the independence of Namibia and for installing a so-called interim government in Namibia's capital Windhoek. It urges member states of the United Nations that have not done so to consider in the meantime taking appropriate voluntary measures against South Africa, which could include

- (a) Stopping of new investments and application of disincentives to this end;
- (b) Re-examination of maritime and aerial relations with South Africa;
- (c) The prohibition of the sale of Krugerrands and all other coins minted in South Africa;
- (d) Restrictions in the field of sports and cultural relations;

Most members of the Council, including the western countries France and Denmark voted in favour, only the United States and the United Kingdom abstained.

In July, the Council met again after the imposition of the State of Emergency in South Africa and adopted a *resolution (nr 569)*, introduced by France and Denmark. The Council a.o.

6. Urges States Members of the Organization to adopt measures against the Republic of South Africa, such as the following:
 - (a) Suspension of all new investment in the Republic of South Africa;
 - (b) Prohibition of the sale of Krugerrands and all other coins in South Africa;
 - (c) Restrictions in the field of sports and cultural relations;
 - (d) Suspension of guaranteed export loans;
 - (e) Prohibition of all new contracts in the nuclear field;
 - (f) Prohibition of all sales of computer equipment that may be used by the South African army and police.
7. Commends those States which have already adopted voluntary measures against the Pretoria Government and urges them to adopt new provisions, and invites those which have not yet done so to follow their example.

Hearings on the role of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia

After holding public hearings on September 16-20, 1985, organised by the Centre for Transnational Corporations of the United Nations, the panel chaired by former Australian Conservative Prime Minister Noel Fraser called for “delinking South Africa from the world economy to prompt the government to make the necessary changes”.

As immediate measures, the panel called on transnationals, operating in South Africa, to cut off new investments, new loans, export credits and licensing agreements, to desegregate their facilities and observe certain minimum standards in their employee relations or withdraw from that country immediately.

Immediate disinvestment is called for by corporations, contributing directly to the maintenance of the apartheid system and corporations benefiting from the illegal occupation of Namibia. This applies to all corporations, if they are forced under the “National Key Point Act” to deliver to the military, police and security sector.

Pension fund boycotts South Africa

The Pension Fund of the United Nations has recently sold its shares worth of almost 4 billion US \$ in companies with interests in South Africa. Its remaining shares, worth less than 100 million, will be further reduced.

Parliamentary meetings

West Europeans, Americans join forces

On May 22-23, 1985 AWEPA organised, in cooperation with US Senator Kennedy and with the Subcommittee on Africa of the US House of Representatives, the *Atlantic Seminar on Namibia and Apartheid*. Parliamentarians from the European Parliament and the West European and Canadian national parliaments met in Washington DC, USA, held consultations with their US counterparts and exchanged information on the positions of their governments and parliaments. To help coordinate parliamentary action for the liberation of Southern Africa, an *Atlantic Contact Group for Action against Apartheid* was formed.

Regarding *Namibia*, the participants welcomed the *legal action* in national courts by the UN Council for Namibia against persons and organisations, involved in the illegal exploitation of Namibia's natural resources. They call for recognition by all governments of the *Council as Namibia's legal authority*, for implementation of the Council's *Decree no. 1* on the protection of the natural resources of Namibia and they welcome initiatives in the US Congress towards such implementation. An end should be put to all imports, transport and processing of Namibian uranium.

As a reaction to the continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and the installation of a so-called interim government, the participants call for and will assist in bringing meaningful *economic pressure* to bear on South Africa. They will further assist in obtaining *aid and assistance* for the Namibian people and their liberation struggle, under the leadership of SWAPO.

Regarding *South Africa*, the participants note that it is caught in a double crisis: Apartheid is proving to be too expensive and the government failed to end black urban unrest. South Africa therefore is more vulnerable than ever to sanctions, both psychologically and economically.

They will therefore attempt to *enforce sanctions* as a contribution to the struggle against Apartheid, such as:

- strengthening the arms embargo and ending all nuclear collaboration
- tightening the existing oil embargo by national legislation and working for a UN imposed, mandatory oil embargo
- bans on investments in and loans to South Africa and on the import of Krugerrands and coal from South Africa
- ending of sports and cultural links, limiting visas to South Africans and granting asylum to those refusing to serve in the South African army.

The participants particularly appealed on the US Congress to get the US government to take concrete steps, to force South Africa to abandon Apartheid by implementing extensive economic sanctions.

Apartheid and Southern Africa, the West European Response

On September 12-14, 1985, AWEPA organised a parliamentary seminar on economic sanctions, in the context of the Conference 'Apartheid and Southern Africa, the West European Response', organised by the Holland Committee on Southern Africa and others in the Amsterdam City Hall. Among the over 100 partici-

pants were parliamentarians from the European Parliament, and most national parliaments in Western Europe, the United States and Canada, representatives of the liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, of the independent states in Southern Africa, of the UN Special Committee against Apartheid and the UN Council for Namibia and of the European Commission.

In the Statement of the Chair the *mission of the EC ministers* to South Africa and the *limited sanctions* adopted afterwards, were strongly *criticised*. Countries were called upon to *go ahead independently*, as a way to stimulate others, who now stay behind and block stronger common policy. Legal and other *measures in all military and economic spheres* should be taken and strictly enforced with severe penalties. South Africa responds to black resistance and international economic pressure, not to rhetoric, friendly contact and appeals of 'constructive engagement'.

The situation and needs of the *liberation movements* and *SADCC states* were reviewed extensively. Immediate development aid should be given to the ANC and SWAPO, and existing support to SADCC and its members should be substantially increased, to diminish their dependence on South Africa and to buffer the impact of sanctions against that country. There should be discussions with the Front Line States, at their request, concerning their *military needs*.

Through the institutions of the EEC and national parliaments, the participants will seek to achieve these goals.

A special message of support, signed by 876 members of parliament, was presented to the representative of the United Democratic Front.

Nordic countries

The Foreign Ministers of the 5 *Nordic countries* (Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland and Iceland) have on October 18, 1985 adopted a joint Program of Action, which is an extension of their earlier Program of 1978. The Nordic countries consider Apartheid as a serious threat to international peace and security and therefore support mandatory sanctions imposed by the UN Security Council as a means to abolish Apartheid by peaceful means.

- In the absence of such sanctions, the Nordic countries take *unilateral measures and call upon other countries* to do likewise and not wait for mandatory sanctions.
- The *Security Council* should take measures on *investments, trade, transport*. Oil is of particular importance. Other shipping nations will be consulted to reach an agreement on a common boycott of *oil transport* to South Africa.
- The countries will promote adoption by others of measures, mentioned in Gen. Ass. resolution 39/72 G of December 1984 on joint action, which regard investments, financial loans, trade promotion, military, police or intelligence co-operation and nuclear co-operation.

Common Nordic measures

- Prohibition or discouragement of new *investments*, including *leasing, patents, licenses*.
- *Encouragement of restriction of production* in South Africa and finding *other markets or suppliers*.
- Implementation by law of Sec. C. Res 558 (*import of arms, ammunition, military vehicles*).

- Prohibition of import of *Krugerrands*, new nuclear contracts, computer export usable by military and police, as requested by Sec. C. Res 569 (July 1985) (Other requests already implemented).
- No procurement by state authorities of South African goods.
- No state assistance for trade promotion with South Africa.
- Prohibition or discouragement of supply of loans (also participation in international loans), opposition to new IMF loans.
- Refraining from commercial air services.
- Further reduction of sports, cultural and scientific contacts.
- Sharper visa regulations for better enforcement of the above.
- More humanitarian assistance to refugees, liberation movements, victims and opponents to Apartheid, more support to Front Line States, SADCC and its members.

Air connections with South Africa by the Swedish-Norwegian-Danish company SAS have been suspended as from September 1985.

Before agreeing on the above joint measures, the Nordic countries had separately sharpened their South African policies.

Sweden

Sweden has in February 1985 extended its ban on new investments of 1978, which now includes loans, credits and debt securities, leasing agreements, transfer of technology and also applies to foreign subsidiaries of Swedish companies and to Swedish citizens abroad. On March 27, 1985 the government and coal importers reached an agreement to stop coal imports from South Africa. Further measures were announced on September 2:

- a ban on the importing of agricultural products from South Africa
- a recommendation to the business world to refrain from trade with South Africa
- the National Board of Trade be charged to inquire into the use of South African metals and minerals in Swedish industry with a view to ascertaining the possibility of alternative supplier countries
- a recommendation to Swedish shipping companies to avoid maritime traffic to South Africa
- a ban on the importing of *Krugerrands*
- municipalities and county councils to have the right to boycott South Africa
- a tightening of the scale of penalties for offences against the arms embargo against South Africa
- no exemptions will be granted in 1985 to companies, which want to invest in their existing South African subsidiaries.

Norway

Norway, which has already prohibited foreign exchange transfers for investment purposes in 1976 and gives no export credit guarantees, is working out prohibition by law of deliveries of Norwegian oil, after the existing gentlemen's agreement was repeatedly broken. All calls of Norwegian tankers to South Africa will be registered. Imports from South Africa will be subject to license. Companies, traditionally importing raw materials from South Africa for processing in Norway can request financial support from the government, if they have to overcome serious financial problems in finding other suppliers. Norwegian Parliament on June 7 demanded sharpening of these policies, which are now considered by the government: a license system also for exports to

South Africa, an immediate halt of imports of South African fruits and vegetables, establishment of a government fund for support to companies, switching to other suppliers and markets and compulsory, ship-by-ship and public registration of all calls to South African ports, both for oil transport and other cargoes.

Denmark

Denmark adopted a law, prohibiting new investments in South Africa on May 29, 1985, in business, plants, buildings, machines and equipment. The law applies to Danish citizens inside and outside the country, as well as to persons and companies, exerting decisive influence over companies in third countries. After the adoption in 1984 of parliamentary resolutions, no new long term contracts for coal imports from South Africa were entered into and the government informed oil companies, that no Danish North Sea oil should be delivered to South Africa. Oil and shipping companies were told that trade on and/or transport of oil to South Africa is in contravention of Danish trade and foreign policies.

Finland

In Finland the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee on June 18 appealed to the government, to work out proposals to put an end to all economic relations with South Africa.

The Finnish business community has reached an agreement with the government, not to import any South African fruit or base metals any more, once contracts run out.

Limited US sanctions

In what is generally considered as an effort to prevent the US Congress enforcing furthergoing measures, President Reagan has on September 9 announced a limited package of economic sanctions against South Africa:

- prohibition of the import of the South African gold coin *Krugerrand* after agreement has been obtained from the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade). The production of a US gold coin as an alternative for collectors is considered,
- prohibition of loans by American banks to the South African government and its agencies, unless these loans will be used in social projects for the black population,
- application of existing regulations, prohibiting export of nuclear equipment to countries, which did not sign the non-proliferation treatment,
- prohibition of sale of computers to the South African authorities, which can be used for the implementation of Apartheid policies,
- export subsidies will only be granted to firms, which implement the "Sullivan Code of Conduct" to their subsidiaries in South Africa.

The measures announced by the President also fall short of the provisions of a compromise bill, agreed upon between the House and the Senate. This bill includes all measures announced by the President, but adds provisions prohibiting new investments and coal and uranium imports, if after one year no significant progress in the abolishment of Apartheid has been achieved.

Finally, the US administration even implemented the ban on *Krugerrands* without waiting for the agreement of GATT.

European Communities: no substantial sanctions

On September 10, the Foreign Ministers of the 10 EC members and of future members Portugal and Spain met in Luxemburg and discussed the results of the mission of their 3 colleagues to South Africa. Unanimity was blocked by the United Kingdom, which objected to the withdrawal of their military attaché and any economic sanctions measure. The remaining countries then agreed on the following measures:

- a ban on domestic *oil sales*, on new *nuclear cooperation* agreements, of *transfer of arms* to paramilitary forces, the sale of *electronic equipment* for military use and the discouragement of *scientific and cultural* activities in South Africa.

Several foreign ministers pointed out, that this agreement hardly adds to what most countries had implemented anyway. They fall short of substantial measures like a ban on loans or on new investment, the latter already announced as national policy by EC members France and Denmark.

Later, the UK decided to join the other EC members after all in taking the above measures. Concrete proposals for the implementation of these measures are being worked out by the European Commission and have not yet been published.

In the *European Parliament*, no majority could be obtained either for a resolution, calling for immediate measures beyond those announced by the EC foreign ministers, nor for another one from the centre-right, which warned South Africa that stronger measures were to be expected if its reform policies were not pursued further. In April 1985, the European Parliament had adopted a resolution, calling for economic sanctions by the European Communities as such and by the member states independently.

Movements protest

On the occasion of the *EC visit* to South Africa, the *Anti-Apartheid Movements* in all EC member states jointly criticised the visit and called for strong economic sanctions against South Africa.

British, German oppositions request sanctions

In the *British House of Commons*, a bill has been introduced by a number of Labour mp's, which in general would enable the government to restrict economic relations with South Africa. More specifically, the bill contains paragraphs on export of oil and oil products, import of coal and uranium, export of military and strategic goods, import of Krugerrands and gold in general and payments and capital transfers.

The bill is considered as a possible blueprint for a future Labour Government. Labour leader Kinnoch has also declared, that a Labour government would support comprehensive, mandatory UN economic sanctions.

Also in the House of Commons, the opposition parties strongly condemned Prime Minister Thatcher's position, taken at the Commonwealth meeting. The House Foreign Affairs Committee, with the support of Conservative mp's, also decided to receive ANC President Tambo, which the government had refused.

In the *German Bundestag*, the opposition parties SPD and the Greens have equally criticised the government for not going far enough in taking economic sanctions. Beyond cancellation of the cultural agreement with South Africa, they spoke out in favour of economic sanctions in various fields: air connections, credits and investments, export guarantees, Krugerrands, nuclear and other technology, oil, etc. They also call for investigation into the possibilities, to obtain natural resources from other suppliers than South Africa.

Parliamentarians of the *Green Party* have on September 10 occupied the *West German Embassy* building in Pretoria for 2 days, as a protest against "the continuing support by the West German government to the Apartheid regime".

On September 15-17, 1985, the Green Party organised *public hearings* on the present relations between the FRG and Namibia and the perspectives for Namibian independence.

France first major Western power to introduce sanctions.

Concurrently to taking the initiative in the UN Security Council for economic sanctions (later adopted as Resolution 569, see over), France has on July 24 announced a *ban on new investments* in South Africa. Indirect forms of investments, loans etc. are not covered, nor are existing investments of a.o. Renault and licenses for the production of the Mirage military aircraft or the constructions by the French of South Africa's first nuclear energy plant at Koeberg.

Austria

The Austrian government has decided to take the following measures, as implementation of Resolutions 566 and 569 of the UN Security Council:

- no (para-) *statal investments* in South Africa
- prohibition of imports of *Krugerrands* and other South African gold coins
- limitation of *sports and cultural relations*, by withdrawal of financial support to organisations, involved in such contacts, by refusing visa and by denying Austrian sports people to enter competitions
- no guarantees for *export credits*
- no public participation in South African *nuclear projects*
- prohibition of export of *computer equipment*, that can be used by the South African army and police.

Australia

Australia, which earlier had prohibited its public authorities to grant construction contracts to South African firms, has in August announced further measures:

- its *trade representation* in Pretoria will be closed down
- exports of *petroleum and petroleum projects* to South Africa are prohibited
- *Computers and other equipment* for use by the South African army and police may not be exported
- Australian financial institutions are requested forthwith not to grant any more *loans* to South Africans
- no *new investments* by Australian authorities in South Africa
- Prohibition of imports of *Krugerrands*
- Prohibition of imports of all South African *arms, munition and military vehicles*
- no procurement by government agencies of *South African goods*.

Japan

Japan, which is South Africa's second trading partner after the US and has recently strengthened its political and diplomatic relations with South Africa, has on October 9 reversed this trend to a limited extent by prohibiting the exportation of *computers* with the South African army and police as destination. It further requested Japanese business, voluntarily to reduce its imports of *Krugerrands* and other South African gold coins, the sale of which rose sharply last year.

Canada

The Canadian government has in July announced initial sanctions against South Africa, which were subsequently sharpened in September 1985. They now include measures also taken by the United States on the sale of *computers* and the import of *Krugerrands*. Added to these, Canadian banks are asked voluntarily to ban loans to the South African government and its agencies. A voluntary ban on the sale of Canadian *oil and oil products* will be applied to prevent Canada to become an alternative fuel source for South Africa. Passenger and cargo *air connections* will be banned. Earlier measures had included a tightening of the arms embargo by prohibiting *computer sales*, the abrogation of *double taxation* agreements, termination of *support to export* to South Africa and of *export insurance*, and a ban on new contracts for the processing of *Namibian uranium*.

International liberals for sanctions

At their congress in Madrid in October, the *Liberal International* has taken a position in favour of sanctions against South Africa. Although the International is generally opposed to sanctions, it stated that in the case of South Africa the policy of dialogue has failed and sanctions have become inevitable to put pressure on the regime.

Later in the same month, the *International Federation of Liberal and Radical Youth* has at its Congress in The Netherlands adopted a resolution, calling for the total isolation of South Africa, as a contribution to the abolition of apartheid.

Nuclear and military

South Africa isolated in IAEA

The *International Atomic Energy Agency* has at its annual conference adopted a resolution, requesting its member states to terminate all cooperation in the nuclear field with South Africa. It further requests that South Africa allows IAEA inspection of its nuclear installations. Regarding Namibian uranium, the resolution requests that South Africa be barred from technical conferences, from which it might benefit for its exploitation of Namibian uranium. In its publications, nothing on Namibian uranium is to be mentioned, without first consulting the UN Council for Namibia.

It was the first time that such a resolution was adopted and that no Western government voted against it.

UK, FRG and French firms accused of breaking the arms embargo

In spite of assurances by governments that the mandatory arms embargo is strictly implemented, firms in the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and France were recently accused of supplying to the South African army and police.

British cut import Namibian uranium

The *British* state electricity company British Nuclear Fuel has decided, *not to enter into new contracts* for the supply of Namibian *uranium*. Thus far this uranium had been enriched by the Dutch-British-West German consortium Urenco, which has an enrichment plant in Almelo, Netherlands.

Urenco court case

The UN Council for Namibia intends to start a *court case* against *Urenco* for the illegal importation and enrichment of Namibian uranium, in defiance of its Decree no. 1.

The oil embargo

West European ports to join forces

The authorities of *Rotterdam* will contact other West European cities for developing a joint strategy to prevent the use of their ports for oil deliveries to South Africa. This was announced on October 11 after the publication of reports by the Shipping Research Bureau (SRB) and the University of Rotterdam into oil deliveries through Rotterdam to South Africa and the economic consequences of a total ban of such deliveries. These deliveries varied from 1,4 to 1,5 million tons of crude oil in 1979/1980 to zero in 1984. In the 'peak years', only 20-30 jobs were involved in these deliveries, spread over various sectors. The SRB added several suggestions for a policy of discouragement by the city authorities, to prevent repetition of oil deliveries to South Africa, such as: a public declaration discouraging such deliveries; an active policy towards national authorities, the UN, oil exporting countries, European ports, trade unions and (potentially involved) corporations; monitoring and publication of tanker movements from Rotterdam to South Africa; introduction of end users certificates; publication of lists of involved oil and transport companies; denying support to and contracts with such companies, research into cases of fraud; disinvestment from such companies.

The Rotterdam authorities were criticised for not taking further steps by the Bureau and anti-Apartheid organisations. Such unilateral measures, together with looking for allies elsewhere in Europe, were also recommended by the Chairman of the UN Special Committee against Apartheid, Nigerian ambassador Garba.

Three weeks later, Mayor Peper announced that a joint embargo against deliveries of crude oil is being worked out on EC level and that Rotterdam in this context will introduce permanent monitoring of possible oil deliveries via its port. Similar initiatives were taken by the West German cities of *Hamburg* and *Bremen*.

Norway contacts other shipping nations

In addition to current Norwegian policy on oil, the Norwegian Minister of Commerce and Shipping, Asbjörn Haugstvedt, has in October met his Greek colleague Mr. George Katsifaris in Athens. They discussed the possibility of a joint move by Norway, Greece, Liberia, Panama and others to ban their vessels from South African ports.

Maritime Unions against Apartheid

Trade unions of Seamen and Dockworkers from over 30 countries have on October 30 and 31 joined forces in *Maritime Unions against Apartheid* (MUAA). At their conference in London, unions from the UK, Denmark, Australia, Greece, the US, Japan, Norway, Kuwait and other countries as well as the ICFTU-affiliated International Transport Federation and the WFTU-affiliated Transport Union International have decided to conduct direct action against companies, involved in the supply of oil to South Africa, to press on governments to pass and enforce an oil embargo and to exchange information on ships, violating the UN oil embargo against South Africa.

Churches call for sanctions

Nobel Prize winner Bishop *Desmond Tutu* has on August 16 called for immediate economic sanctions, as a reaction against South African President Botha's speech at the congress of his party in Durban, in which no substantial changes in the Apartheid policy were announced. Bishop Tutu thus sharpened his earlier position, that he would call for such sanctions if no such changes would occur after 18 months.

Similar positions were taken by church leaders *Tutu, Boesak and Beyers Naude*, the Secretary-General of the South African Council of Churches, on the occasion of the visit by the three EC Foreign Ministers to South Africa, late August.

Calling for economic sanctions is prohibited by South African law and was one of the reasons for the arrest of Rev. Boesak and the strict conditions of his later release.

On June 28, the national conference of the *South African Council of Churches* had already declared, that disinvestment and similar economic pressures are now called for as a peaceful and effective means of putting pressure on the South African Government to bring about the fundamental changes that the country needs. It also asked its partner churches in other countries to continue with their efforts to identify and promote effective economic pressures.

The *European Ecumenical Commission for Church and Society*, which represents the non-Roman Catholic churches in the EEC, Switzerland and Portugal, has on September 26 expressed its support to the South African Council of Churches.

The member churches are requested to stimulate a broad public discussion on these issues, to cease investment in enterprises with significant involvement in South Africa, to promote grass roots education in their congregations with might include a call for a consumer boycott and to support South African conscientious objectors.

The Executive Committee of the *Lutheran World Federation* has at its annual meeting on August 26-30 unanimously adopted a resolution, calling for an oil embargo, disinvestment and similar economic measures as one of the remaining peaceful means towards change. Its member churches are urged to make representations to governments and to the European Economic Community to this end.

Trade union action

At the same time when governments announced more or less far going economic sanctions against South Africa, trade unions in various countries have conducted or announced further action to isolate South Africa.

The *International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)* has criticised the mission of the EC foreign ministers to South Africa and appealed to its affiliated unions, to bear pressure on their governments to implement economic sanctions. The ICFTU blames the EC ministers for ignoring black South African trade union leaders, who all have asked for sanctions.

The *British Trade Union Congress TUC* has, on its annual conference in September, unanimously called for governmental economic sanctions and supported actions by trade unions for boycotts of South African goods. The TUC will withdraw its investments in companies, which are active in South Africa and will campaign for a ban on British investments in and loans to South Africa and the mutual withdrawal of ambassadors.

The *Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, Finnish and Icelandic trade unions* have in October expressed their disappointment in the limited actions of their governments and started a total transport boycott of South African goods. The Swedish campaign will last one month and is also meant as a warning to the government, to impose a total trade boycott. Swedish dockers had already decided to boycott all cargo from South Africa until the end of December 1985. The campaign by Finnish transport workers will last indefinitely and also include postal connections, their Norwegian colleagues will not handle any cargo from South Africa until February 1, 1986.

Various boycott actions were conducted by trade unions in Italy, France, the UK and Australia.

Since July 1984, 11 employees at the *Dunnes Stores* in Dublin, *Ireland*, have been on strike, with the support of their trade union and daily picket lines, because the firm sells South African goods and dismissed an employee, who refused to handle them.

Mid-September 1985, labour minister Mr. Ruairi Quinn reached an agreement with the four main Irish supermarket chains to phase out South African products, in an attempt to settle the strike.

Business cuts down

Private banks refuse to renew credits, central banks extend no loans

As a reaction to increasing black resistance and repression by the South African authorities, and to the lack of any prospect of abolishing satisfactorily the Apartheid System, most western private banks have refused to renew their short term credits to South Africa. The collapse of the Rand forced South Africa to freeze repayment of current loans and credits, thus increasing the lack of confidence in any improvement of the political and economic situation. Western central banks then refused to extend intermediate facilities to the Governor of the South African Central Bank, De Kock. Various parastatal credit insurance companies froze the existing level of credits. It should be pointed out, that all the above restrictions were defended as purely economically motivated, in no way to be interpreted as politically motivated economic sanctions. Exceptions to the above policy of western private banks appear to be Swiss and German banks, which have in previous months increased their extended credits, whereas several US and to a much lesser degree British banks have started withdrawing from South Africa business, to a large extent because of public opinion pressure.

Empty threats of counter-boycott

On October 22, South African president Botha warned, that South Africa considers cutting off chromium supplies to the West, as a retaliation against Western sanctions. "If South Africa were to withhold its chrome exports, one million Americans would lose their jobs and the motor industry in Europe would be brought to a standstill." This threat was taken serious neither by business nor in political circles, including US officials, who pointed out that chrome is not as essential a metal

as suggested, that there are ample reserves and sufficient alternatives: other suppliers or other materials. South African business circles, both producers and exporters, reacted equally negatively to the possibility of further isolation of the South African economy from the outside world.

Krugerrand market dead

In 1984 and 1985, the share of the South African gold coin Krugerrand in the world-wide production of gold coins has dropped sharply, from around 3/4 to little over zero. The drop from 3.5 million ounces in 1983 cost South Africa more than 1 billion US \$ in foreign exchange. "The Krugerrand market is dead, it can hardly get any deader" a gold trader was quoted in the Financial Times last October.

Corporations

A growing number of West European corporations have in the last months reduced or terminated their business relations with South Africa for economic, political reasons or both.

In the *United States*, there is a growing tendency to cut links with South Africa, under public and economic pressure. Since 1980, 39 American firms out of 300 have withdrawn from South Africa, 9 of them in 1985 alone. Seven American states, twenty large cities and numerous churches and other private organisations have withdrawn their funds from companies, which have relations with South Africa.

Rotterdam Fair

South Africa has been banned from the *Agricultural Fair in Rotterdam*, which mainly focuses on potatoes, vegetables and fruit. No promotion and exhibition of South African produce was allowed in the September Fair.

AWEPAAs organises members of all national West European Parliaments and of the European Parliament, from various political backgrounds. Its aim is the promotion of freedom and justice in South Africa by

- encouraging economic sanctions against South Africa
- promotion of support to the oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia and their national liberation movements
- promotion of support to the Front Line States
- practical support to activities of Members of Parliament against the Apartheid system.

In its News Bulletin, AWEPAAs will inform members, interested organisations and individuals about governmental and parliamentary action regarding Southern Africa and other relevant developments.

More information, such as full texts of documents, can be obtained from the AWEPAAs Office, address below. On specific topics, more information can also be obtained from specialised agencies with which AWEPAAs cooperates:

- The World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa, P.O. Box 2, Lindeberg Gaard, Oslo-10, Norway, phone: (02)301.345, telex 72314
- The Shipping Research Bureau, P.O. Box 11898, 1001 GW Amsterdam, Netherlands, phone (020) 25.13.00, telex 17125
- The South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SAN-ROC), P.O. Box 235, London NW3 5TS, United Kingdom, phone (01) 435.8142