

**CO-OPERATION IN INTERNATIONAL ACTION  
AGAINST APARTHEID**

**Nordic States, United Nations Special Committee against  
Apartheid and Nigeria**

by

E. S. Reddy  
Senior Fellow,  
United Nations Institute  
for Training and Research

With a preface by Major-General J.N. Garba,  
Chairman of the United Nations Special Committee  
against Apartheid

Published by the Nigerian Institute for International Affairs, 1985

## **PREFACE**

One of our main concerns in the struggle against apartheid on the international level, has been to persuade the Western countries to disengage from that inhuman system and support the oppressed people of South Africa in their difficult and heroic struggle to destroy apartheid and establish a non-racial society.

While we are far from success, some significant advances have been made over the years. The United Nations has imposed a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa in 1977 - the only such decision it has taken against any country - though vigilant efforts are required to prevent continuing violations and close the loopholes in the embargo. A majority of Western countries now support economic sanctions against South Africa and powerful grassroots movements have developed in the major Western countries which have continued to sustain the apartheid regime.

The Nordic governments, and many public organisations in Nordic countries, deserve recognition and appreciation for leading the way in the West in action against apartheid. They have demonstrated their sincerity by their generous assistance to the oppressed people and their liberation movements, as well as by a series of concrete measures to isolate the apartheid regime. Nordic co-operation with the United Nations Special Committee against apartheid and the OAU has grown steadily since 1963.

The Nordic countries were represented at a high level at the World Conference for Action against Apartheid held in Lagos in August 1977, and contributed greatly to its success. As President of that Conference, I had the opportunity to consult with them fully and welcomed the Nordic Programme of Action against South Africa which they adopted in implementation of the Lagos Declaration.

More recently, as Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid I have enjoyed the close co-operation of Nordic countries. I believe that the co-operation of the Nordic countries with African States provides a firm basis for promoting international action in support of the liberation struggle in South Africa in this crucial period.

Mr. E.S. Reddy, as head of the United Nations Centre against Apartheid until recently, has played a vital role in promoting this co-operation for over

two decades. He organised missions of the Chairmen of the Special Committee to Nordic countries and was Executive Secretary of the Lagos Conference.

I am glad that he has written this account of the development of co-operation between the Special Committee and the Nordic States, to which Nigeria was able to make a special contribution as a founding member of the Committee which has held its chairmanship since 1972. I am sure that it will be read with interest by all those committed to the liberation of South Africa.

Major-General J.N. Garba

Permanent Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations  
and Chairman of Special Committee against Apartheid

## INTRODUCTION

The growing co-operation of the Nordic countries with the United Nations and the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), as well as the African liberation movements, has been an important factor in the international campaign against apartheid.

The Nordic governments were the first Western governments to provide humanitarian and educational assistance to refugees from South Africa soon after the Sharpeville massacre of 1960. They were the first to assist the political prisoners and their families in South Africa. They were the first to make direct grants to African liberation movements recognised by the OAU. More recently, since the Soweto massacre of 1976 and the Lagos Conference of 1977, they have proceeded to take significant measures to isolate the racist regime in South Africa.

Nordic countries now account for half the contributions to the United Nations funds for assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and Namibia, and are the major contributors to non-governmental agencies engaged in such assistance. They provide the greater part of assistance from Western sources to African liberation movements and to organisations resisting apartheid inside South Africa.

The example set by the Nordic States has had a significant effect on public opinion in other Western countries and helped encourage a number of smaller Western countries to take concrete action in support of United Nations resolutions.

Nordic co-operation with the Special Committee, OAU and the African liberation movements has been an effective counter to the manoeuvres of the apartheid regime and some short-sighted "cold war" strategists to turn southern Africa into an arena of confrontation of external Powers. It has, moreover, helped reinforce the attachment of the oppressed people in South Africa to non-racialism.

The Special Committee against Apartheid has made a significant contribution to encouraging and facilitating the advances in the commitment and contribution of Nordic countries. The missions by its five Nigerian Chairmen to the Nordic countries have been landmarks in this development. They have also enhanced the image of Nigeria in Nordic countries and promoted friendship and co-operation between them. The Special Committee has benefited from the advice and assistance of Nordic governments

and organisations in promoting the campaign against apartheid in other Western countries.

This process of consultation led in 1984 to the Nordic-Nigerian initiative for a resolution in the United Nations General Assembly on concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid. Its essential purpose is to encourage Western countries to take meaningful action to exert pressure on the apartheid regime and assist the freedom struggle, so that the Western world will cease to provide comfort to the apartheid regime, and increasingly align itself with the forces of freedom. The success of this initiative requires closest co-operation between Nordic and African States.

The following account of the development of co-operation in the past, with particular reference to the missions of the Chairmen of the Special Committee to Nordic countries, will, it is hoped, be helpful in such efforts.

## **BEGINNINGS OF CONSULTATION AND CO-OPERATION**

The Nordic States, along with other Western States, opposed United Nations General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) of November 6, 1962, which called for sanctions against South Africa and established the Special Committee against Apartheid. None of the Western States agreed to serve on the Committee.

The Special Committee, however, refused to be disheartened and began active efforts to secure Western co-operation even in limited actions against apartheid. It devoted particular attention to Nordic countries.

Public opinion in Nordic countries had begun to be concerned with the situation in South Africa in the 1950s as a result of the efforts of some churchmen who had lived in South Africa and journalists who had visited that country. When the African National Congress appealed in the late 1950s for a boycott of South Africa, trade union, student and other groups in the Nordic countries launched an effective boycott movement. The Sharpeville massacre of 1960, and the visit of the late Chief Albert Luthuli to Oslo in December 1961 to receive the Nobel Peace Prize, had a great impact on public opinion. The governments of Norway and Sweden began to provide funds for humanitarian and educational assistance to the refugees from South Africa.

The Nordic countries were, therefore, responsive to approaches by the Special Committee and the liberation movements.

With the mass arrests, tortures and trials in South Africa in 1963-64, the Special Committee decided to promote international assistance for the legal defence of political prisoners and maintenance of their families. It secured a General

Assembly resolution endorsing such assistance and appealed to all governments to contribute to non-governmental agencies engaged in assistance, such as the Defence and Aid Fund in London led by the late Reverend Canon L. John Collins.

Nordic countries responded with substantial contributions. Sweden was the first and largest contributor with a grant of \$200,000.

In 1965, the Special Committee decided to establish a United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa in order to obtain increased contributions from a larger number of governments. The proposal for a Trust Fund was moved in the General Assembly by Sweden and seconded by Nigeria. The Committee of Trustees of the Fund has, since its inception, had Sweden as its Chairman and Nigeria as Vice-Chairman. The Nordic States have contributed about 60 per cent of the \$ 20 million received by the Trust Fund since 1966. They have made even larger contributions directly to the Defence and Aid Fund and other agencies.

Meanwhile, in 1964, a United Nations Group of Experts on South Africa, chaired by Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden, proposed a United Nations Educational and Training Programme for South Africans. The Nordic States have contributed about 40 per cent of the resources of this Programme which was extended in 1967 to cover colonial territories in Africa.

Discussions were held in Stockholm in 1968 by the Chairman of the Special Committee, the late Ambassador Achkar Marof of Guinea, and Ambassador Edwin Ogebe Ogbu, the Nigerian Vice-Chairman of the Committee of Trustees of the United Nations Trust Fund, with the Swedish Government on all aspects of assistance. Oliver Tambo, President of the African National Congress of South Africa, Canon Collins and I were invited to participate in the discussions. They led, in due course, to an increase in Nordic assistance and to the initiation of direct grants to the liberation movements in southern Africa for economic and social projects.

While the Nordic governments were most responsive to appeals for assistance to the oppressed people, and for action in the humanitarian field, they were cautious and hesitant on measures against the South African regime on legal and other grounds, except for the arms embargo which they had already implemented by denying licences for the export of arms to South Africa.

The conclusion of the United Nations Group of Experts in 1964 - that if the South African Government rejected recommendations for a just and peaceful solution, the Security Council would have no effective alternative but sanctions - led to discussion in Nordic countries. Several representatives from Nordic countries attended the International Conference on Sanctions against

South Africa, held in London in April 1964, and began to advocate sanctions.

As a result, in 1965-66, Nordic governments decided to support the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa by the United Nations Security Council and to undertake to implement any sanctions by the Security Council. There was little likelihood of sanctions by the Security Council, however, because of the opposition of the Western permanent members, and Nordic governments considered that any unilateral measures by them would be ineffective and legally difficult. This matter required extensive consultations for many years.

The Special Committee held a special session in Stockholm in 1968, with the participation of several public leaders from all Nordic countries, and that provided a forum for a useful exchange of views.

More important was the International Conference of Experts in Support of the Victims of Colonialism and Apartheid in Southern Africa, organised by the United Nations and the OAU in Oslo in April 1973. Ambassador Ogbu attended the Conference as Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid and took the opportunity to consult with a number of officials and public leaders on assistance as well as political action.

Subsequently, in 1975, he undertook a mission to Nordic capitals for full consultations with governments and organisations in the light of the new situation following the collapse of the Portuguese empire. Since that time, it has become a tradition for each new Chairman of the Special Committee to visit Nordic countries for consultations on all aspects of the international campaign against apartheid. The Chairmen have met not only leaders of governments and officials concerned, but also leaders of political parties, members of Parliament, non-governmental organisations and institutions. They have addressed public meetings and press conferences to acquaint Nordic public opinion with the concerns of the Special Committee and Africa.

Brief accounts of the missions are given below.

### **MISSION OF AMBASSADOR OGBU IN 1975**

Edwin Ogebe Ogbu visited Finland, Sweden, Norway and Denmark in May 1975. He was received by the Foreign Minister in Finland and by the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers in Sweden, Norway and Denmark.

As this was the first mission by the Chairman of the Special Committee to Nordic countries, the consultations were comprehensive, covering all aspects of the work of the Special Committee and the international campaign against apartheid.

After the collapse of Portuguese colonialism in 1974, it may be recalled, the South African regime tried to counteract growing isolation by promising reforms and advocating a "détente" with independent African States. The African States were, for some time divided on the response. An extraordinary session of the OAU Council of Ministers met in Dar es Salaam in April 1975 and, after full discussion, rejected any détente with apartheid and reaffirmed that the apartheid regime should negotiate with the national liberation movements.

Ambassador Ogbu had attended the OAU session and had contributed an analysis of the developments in South Africa. The Special Committee strongly supported the conclusions of the OAU and they were fully endorsed by an international seminar organised by the Special Committee in Paris.

Ambassador Ogbu took the occasion of the visit to Nordic countries to explain the attitude of the Special Committee and of African States. He emphasised that there can be no "détente" or compromise with apartheid. He urged that all opponents of apartheid should denounce moves to instigate "third forces" in southern Africa as a counter to the liberation movements.

He also stressed the urgent need for a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, in view of the rapid military expansion in that country under the cover of deceitful propaganda about "reforms."

While expressing appreciation for the co-operation of the Nordic countries and their generous assistance to the oppressed people in southern Africa, he discussed with them the differences of approach between the Special Committee and the Nordic States on some provisions in United Nations resolutions on apartheid - on the recognition of the right of the oppressed people to use all means of struggle including armed struggle, on the rejection of the credentials of the South African delegation to the UN General Assembly and on the calls by the General Assembly for sanctions against South Africa, a matter which the Nordic countries considered the sole prerogative of the Security Council.

The consultations confirmed that the differences were not fundamental and led to greater understanding between the Special Committee and Nordic States.

The Nordic States agreed that apartheid would inevitably lead to conflict and that the apartheid regime was responsible for any violence. They did not criticise the oppressed people for resorting to armed resistance when all other avenues were closed. Their only concern was that the United Nations should not endorse or encourage violence but should promote effective action for a peaceful solution.



They also recognised that the apartheid regime was in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. They explained that they were, however, opposed to the exclusion of South Africa from the United Nations because of fear of a precedent which might lead to other consequences.

While expressing strong support for a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, they argued that economic sanctions by individual countries, in response to recommendations by the General Assembly, would not be effective. They favoured action on sanctions by the Security Council, which alone could make binding decisions, and indicated that they would fully implement any sanctions by the Security Council.

Ambassador Ogbu pointed out that sanctions by the Security Council were being blocked by France, the United Kingdom and the United States which wielded the veto to protect South Africa. If action by Governments was conditional on a decision by the Security Council, there would be little action. He urged that committed governments should take national action to demonstrate their commitment and to exert influence on the attitudes of the three Great Powers.

The Nordic countries were not yet prepared to take economic measures, though co-operatives and non-governmental organisations had boycotted South African goods. The Swedish Government indicated that it was dissuading Swedish companies from investing in South Africa.

Ambassador Ogbu also stressed the value of direct assistance to national liberation movements, in addition to contributions to United Nations funds and voluntary agencies for assistance to the oppressed people. He suggested that assistance should not be limited to humanitarian and educational purposes but should cover other needs of the liberation movements. He also urged assistance to black trade unions and other organisations inside South Africa and to anti-apartheid movements in the West. He expressed the hope that in view of the independence of Portuguese territories, greater assistance could be channelled to South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia.

(Sweden was already giving direct assistance to African liberation movements. Norway and Finland had begun direct assistance to SWAPO).

The consultations showed that the Nordic countries attached great importance to the work of the Special Committee against Apartheid. They gave serious consideration to the matters raised by Ambassador Ogbu, and progress was made in several directions in subsequent years.

## **MISSION OF AMBASSADOR HARRIMAN IN 1977**

Leslie O. Harriman visited the four countries in April 1977 to renew contacts with the leaders of government, Parliament members and public organisations, and to consult on further action in the light of the developments since 1975. He was received by the President and Foreign Minister of Finland; the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister for International Development Co-operation, as well as the Leader of Opposition (Mr. Olof Palme), in Sweden; the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister in Norway; and the Foreign Minister in Denmark.

The Soweto massacre of June 6, 1976, and the resurgence of national resistance which followed in South Africa, required a new level of international action. Nigeria was prepared to play a more active role than ever before in support of the liberation struggles in southern Africa and was pressing the major Western Powers to exert their power and influence towards negotiated solutions.

The Nordic countries decided, soon after the Soweto massacre, to take an initiative in the United Nations General Assembly for action to persuade all governments to prohibit new investments in South Africa. Norway had stopped investments through currency controls and Sweden began consideration of a law for that purpose. Ambassador Harriman had encouraged several African and Non-aligned delegations to co-sponsor the Nordic proposal, though limited in scope, in the General Assembly. He felt that a two-pronged approach was desirable: continued pressure for total sanctions, combined with calls for partial measures in order to persuade Western countries to move ahead gradually.

The consultations in Nordic countries concerned the crisis in South Africa and the means to secure meaningful action by Western countries. Another major concern of Ambassador Harriman was to ensure effective support by Nordic countries to the World Conference for Action against Apartheid which the Special Committee had decided to organise in Lagos, in co-operation with the OAU and the Federal Government of Nigeria.

He saw the World Conference as a conference of commitment, where governments from all regions of the world would pledge concrete action and consult on further action. It would be a demonstration that the nations of the world, irrespective of "cold war" differences, were united in a commitment to spare southern Africa of a big Power confrontation and indeed to co-operate in a programme of action against apartheid under the auspices of the United Nations.

Ambassador Harriman stressed that there could be no deals with the Vorster regime to withhold action against apartheid in return for its co-operation in facilitating the independence of Namibia or Southern Rhodesia. He suggested that in addition to national action, the Nordic States could make a significant contribution by utilising their membership in international bodies to

persuade other Western nations to co-operate in action against apartheid. He expressed appreciation to the Norwegian Government for its categorical and public declarations that NATO should in no way be involved in southern Africa.

He suggested that the ban on new investments in South Africa should be extended to cover loans and transfer of technology.

He also stressed that contributions to voluntary organisations for assistance to the oppressed people should not be an alternative to direct assistance to national liberation movements.

The consultations were very useful in establishing contacts, especially in Sweden, where a non-Socialist Government had come to power, and in ensuring continued co-operation between the Special Committee and Nordic States.

The Nordic countries lent effective support to the Lagos Conference and sent high-level delegations to it, including Prime Minister Ordvar Nordli of Norway. They helped in facilitating the adoption by the Conference of the Lagos Declaration for Action against Apartheid by consensus.

Later in the year, the Nordic countries decided to propose a cessation of financial loans to South Africa and Sweden subsequently introduced national legislation to prohibit the transfer of technology to South Africa. Norway began direct assistance to South African liberation movements in 1977.

## **MISSION OF AMBASSADOR CLARK IN 1980**

B. Akporode Clark visited Finland, Sweden and Norway in May 1960. He was received by the head of the Foreign Ministry in Finland; by the Foreign Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in Sweden; and by the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister in Norway.

The mission was mainly in conjunction with the attendance of Ambassador Clark at two international conferences: a Seminar in Helsinki on Women and Apartheid and a conference and consultation in Sigtuna, Sweden, of student and youth leaders on action against Apartheid.

Zimbabwe had attained independence in April, and a public appeal had been launched in South Africa by Percy Qoboza, Bishop Desmond Tutu and others for the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners as an indispensable step towards a peaceful solution in South Africa. But for the Pretoria regime, the lesson of Zimbabwe was not the desirability of negotiated solutions in Namibia and South Africa, but the need to prevent free elections in Namibia and to escalate repression in order to crush the hopes aroused among the black people of

South Africa. Resistance by black students spread widely and the police indiscriminately killed or wounded hundreds of school children.

The consultations with the Nordic countries were, therefore, concerned with the campaign for the release of Nelson Mandela and action to stop the shootings of children in South Africa.

Special attention was given, especially in Norway, to means to secure an effective oil embargo against South Africa. With the Iranian revolution early that year, all major oil-producing countries had declared a commitment to the embargo.

Norway had decided on a policy of not selling its oil to South Africa and this policy was implemented by seeking undertakings from corporations producing oil in the Norwegian continental shelf. Norwegian tankers were, however, involved in transport of oil to South Africa from other sources, often under charter to foreign interests, and public opinion in Norway was concerned.

Ambassador Clark felt that co-operation between oil-exporting countries in the third world and Norway for an effective monitoring of their embargoes would have a great impact.

Another matter, which came up in the discussions, was a suggestion for a meeting of Nordic States, Nigeria and the frontline States in Africa, at the Foreign Minister level, for consultations on the situation in southern Africa.

The Nordic States expressed full support for the Free Mandela campaign and for the International Conference for Sanctions against South Africa. They were represented at the Conference – which was held in Paris in May 1981 – at a high level and contributed greatly to its success. Norway, as a member of the Steering Committee, helped facilitate a consensus declaration.

The first meeting of the Nordic and frontline States and Nigeria, at the Foreign Minister level, was held in New York in September 1980.

The Norwegian Government undertook a study of the oil embargo. It concluded that an agreement among oil-producing countries to tighten their regulations against supply of oil to South Africa and to co-operate in effective monitoring of the implementation of the regulations, would be the most effective and feasible means. The Norwegian delegation conveyed its views to Ambassador Clark at the Paris Conference and preliminary consultations were held by them with the participation of the leaders of the delegations of Algeria and Tanzania.

The mission of Ambassador Clark was thus quite fruitful. But East-West relations had begun to deteriorate and they cast a shadow on international efforts to promote freedom in southern Africa. There was, however, hope that an agreement could be achieved on the implementation of the 1978 United Nations Plan for the independence of Namibia in the light of the proposal of President Agostinho Neto of Angola for a demilitarised zone between Angola and Namibia. The independence of Namibia, it was felt, would focus international attention on apartheid in South Africa.

The hopes were soon frustrated by the aggravation of East-West tensions and the change of administration in the United States. The United States and the United Kingdom, together with some other Western countries, did not attend the International Conference in Paris. A Namibia settlement continued to elude the international community, and the situation in southern Africa deteriorated rapidly.

### **MISSION OF ALHAJI YUSUFF MAITAMA-SULE IN 1982**

H. E. Alhaji Yusuff Maitama-Sule visited Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland in May 1982. He was received by the Foreign Minister in Denmark; by the Foreign Minister and the Leader of the Opposition in Sweden; by the Foreign Minister and the President of the Parliament in Norway; and the Foreign Minister in Finland.

1982 had been proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly as the International Year of Mobilisation for Sanctions against South Africa. Before the visit to Nordic Countries, Alhaji Maitama-Sule had held extensive consultations with the new Government in France, and participated in a major national anti-apartheid conference in the United Kingdom, which called on Western countries to choose between the doomed system of apartheid and the independent States of Africa. He then visited several Arab countries to consult on an oil embargo against South Africa, and the Netherlands to consult with the Government and inaugurate the national committee for the International Year.

The situation in southern Africa had, however, deteriorated greatly. With the rise in international tension and the policy of “constructive engagement” pursued by the Reagan administration in the United States, United Nations efforts to mobilise governments and organisations for sanctions against the apartheid regime faced serious difficulties. The Pretoria regime escalated acts of aggression and threats against independent African States and even occupied large areas of Angola, so that there was an “undeclared war” in the region. It instigated large-scale subversion and sabotage against the frontline States and the destruction of their economic infrastructures. Instead of an

advance of international action for the total liberation of the African continent, there was an offensive by the apartheid regime.

Alhaji Maitama-Sule attached great importance to the support of the Nordic and other friendly Western States in efforts to assist the frontline States and the liberation movements and to persuade the United States and the United Kingdom to stop direct or indirect encouragement of the apartheid regime. He, therefore, held extensive consultations in the Nordic countries on all aspects of the situation.

He stressed the imperative need to avert a wider conflict and an East-West confrontation in southern Africa and expressed grave concern over the “cold war” approach of the United States to southern African problems. He pointed to the need for greater efforts to persuade public opinion in the West to exert its influence on the major Western governments, and to mobilise trade unions, religious bodies, intellectuals and others in support of freedom in southern Africa.

The consultations reflected a very wide measure of agreement between the Special Committee and the Nordic States. Alhaji Maitama-Sule was informed of progress in Nordic action against apartheid and the increase in Nordic assistance to southern Africa. The Swedish Government had appointed a commission to consider further measures against South Africa and Denmark began consideration of means to stop coal imports from South Africa.

The discussions with trade union leaders in the Nordic countries helped in the organisation of an international trade union conference against apartheid in 1983 and in developing closer co-operation between the Special Committee and the international trade union movement.

Consultations on the oil embargo, however, made little progress. The new government in Norway, while reaffirming support for joint action by oil-producing countries to monitor the implementation of their embargoes, against supply of oil to South Africa, insisted that action with respect to tankers transporting oil to South Africa was not feasible in the absence of a mandatory decision by the Security Council.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Later that year, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution formulated by oil-exporting States, including Norway, for a study of the means for an effective oil embargo.

While the mission led to closer co-operation between the Special Committee and Nordic States, no dramatic results ensued. Nigeria was confronted with economic and other difficulties, and the crisis in the OAU had weakened the ability of African States to unite in action in defence of the frontline States. The Pretoria regime was able to continue its blackmail against independent African States.

## **MISSION OF MAJOR-GENERAL J. N. GARBA IN 1984**

H. E. Major-General J. N. Garba visited Norway, Sweden and Denmark in October-November 1984. He was received by the State Secretary for Foreign Affairs and the President of the Parliament in Norway; the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister in Sweden; and the Foreign Minister in Denmark.

The visit was very brief, during the session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, and had been planned mainly to inaugurate a Conference of West European Parliamentarians for Action against Apartheid in Copenhagen. But it proved to be important because of the developments in South Africa.

General Garba had been elected Chairman of the Special Committee a few days after the Nkomati accord between the Pretoria regime and Mozambique. The Pretoria regime became confident that it could consolidate its position at home, dominate the entire region and break out of its international isolation. Its Prime Minister, P. W. Botha, visited several West European capitals in May-June.

But the tour of Botha provoked the largest anti-apartheid demonstration in London and widespread protests in all the countries he visited.

In South Africa itself, the black people and the white opponents of apartheid, instead of becoming despondent, joined together in a united movement of unprecedented scope against a new racist constitution approved by the white parliament and voters. The Pretoria regime hoped that by allowing the Coloured and Indian minorities to elect members to racially-segregated houses of Parliament, it could divide the black people and deceive world opinion. It was encouraged by the United States position that this constitution was a move forward. But the manoeuvre failed because of the massive boycott of the elections in August by the Coloured and Indian voters in solidarity with the African majority.

The regime, however, brought the constitution into force in September 1984, and that signalled a major crisis with demonstrations all over the country against all manifestations of apartheid. The regime could not suppress the

upsurge despite massive repression, including the deployment of military forces in African townships.

The Special Committee, under the leadership of General Garba, had actively promoted international action to frustrate the offensive of apartheid. Now, with a change in the situation caused by national resistance and international action, it had to give urgent attention to further action to meet the grave crisis caused by the new constitution and the massive repression.

General Garba felt that the Western States which endorse the three-pronged approach of the United Nations resolutions on apartheid – sanctions against South Africa, assistance to the oppressed people and their liberation movements, and mobilisation of world public opinion – should be encouraged, in co-operation with African and non-aligned States, to take the initiative. He consulted the Nordic States, as well as several other friendly Western States, on a resolution which would not only affirm the need for greater effort in the three directions, and call for mandatory sanctions by the Security Council against South Africa, but contain a pledge for concrete and meaningful measures by individual States pending action by the Security Council.

After preliminary consultations with delegations in New York, General Garba was able to meet leaders of Government and Parliament members in Norway, Sweden and Denmark to assess their attitudes. The three governments assured him of their full support to the resolution and of their willingness to promote effective implementation of its provisions. The visit also indicated that public opinion in the Nordic countries was in favour of further action in response to the grave crisis in South Africa and in support of the United Democratic Front and other organisations which were carrying on a peaceful struggle with great courage and determination.

Soon after the return of General Garba to New York, the resolution on concerted international action for the elimination of apartheid was agreed upon and moved in the General Assembly by Sweden. It was adopted by 146 votes in favour, with only two against and six abstentions. The United Kingdom and the United States voted against. Belgium, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and Malawi abstained.

The resolution called on all governments to consider measures such as:

- “(a) Cessation of further investments in, and financial loans to, South Africa;
- (b) An end to all promotion of trade with South Africa;



- (c) Cessation of all forms of military, police or intelligence co-operation with the authorities of South Africa;
- (d) An end to nuclear collaboration with South Africa.”

It also appealed to them to increase assistance to the victims of apartheid, to the liberation movements and all those struggling against apartheid, and to the frontline States and the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference. It also called for an end to all academic, cultural, scientific and sport relations that would support the apartheid regime.

Significant developments have taken place since the adoption of that resolution.

Sweden has enacted a law to strengthen its prohibition of new investments in South Africa and to extend the ban to the transfer of technology. Norway has taken steps to reduce trade with South Africa and to obtain information on use of Norwegian-owned tankers for supply of oil to South Africa. Denmark is enacting an investments law. The Nordic governments are considering proposals to strengthen their programme of action against apartheid. In other Western countries, public organisations are pressing for similar action. In the United States, in particular, a powerful public movement has developed for divestment from apartheid and a series of bills for that purpose were introduced in Congress by members of both the major political parties.

There will need to be further efforts, however, to see that all the provisions of the General Assembly resolution are seen as a minimum programme of immediate action for Western countries and fully implemented by all of them. Success of these efforts will not only have a significant effect on the situation in South Africa, and in restoring the credibility of the United Nations, but can set in motion a momentum for international action until apartheid is destroyed.

\*\*\*                      \*\*\*                      \*\*\*                      \*\*\*

(The annex to this paper contains extracts from some statements made by the Chairmen of the Special Committee against Apartheid during their missions to Nordic countries and the reports they presented to the Special Committee on their return. It is hoped that they provide an indication of the growing co-operation between the Special Committee, Nordic countries and Nigeria in the cause of freedom in South Africa).

## **ANNEX**

### **EXTRACTS FROM STATEMENTS AND ADDRESSES BY CHAIRMEN OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID DURING MISSIONS TO NORDIC COUNTRIES.**

#### **1975: H. E. MR. EDWIN OGEBE OGBU**

Statement at press conference, Helsinki, May 5, 1975

Statement at press conference, Stockholm, May 12, 1975

Statement at meeting with Non-governmental Organisations, Oslo, May 14, 1975

Statement at press conference, Copenhagen, May 16, 1975

Report to the Special Committee, New York, May 27, 1975

#### **1977: H. E. MR. LESLIE O. HARRIMAN**

Statement at press conference, Stockholm, April 14, 1977

#### **1982: H. E. MR. ALHAJI YUSUFF MAITAMA-SULE**

Message to Nordic countries, issued in Copenhagen, April 19, 1982.

Statement at meeting of Anti-Apartheid Advisory Committee, Copenhagen, April 21, 1982

Statement at meeting of the Association for Development Issues, Stockholm, April 23, 1982

Statement at press conference, Oslo, April 26, 1982

#### **1984: H. E. MAJOR-GENERAL J. N. GARBA**

Statement at press conference, Oslo, October 30, 1984

Statement at press conference, Stockholm, October 31, 1984

**1975: H. E. MR. EDWIN OGBE OGBU**

***STATEMENT AT PRESS CONFERENCE, HELSINKI, MAY 5, 1975***

The Republic of Finland is very far away from South Africa. But the freedom of the people in South Africa is as much a concern of Finland as of any other State. For, freedom, in the present-day world is indivisible.

Finland is one of the main contributors to the United Nations Funds for assistance to southern Africans. It has also contributed to other assistance funds and has always firmly declared its opposition to the criminal policy of apartheid.

I feel that the contribution of Finland to the struggle against apartheid is particularly valuable. It underlines the fact that the struggle in South Africa is not a struggle of the black people against the white people, but a struggle of all the people against racism. The solidarity expressed in action by the people of Finland, of the other Nordic countries and of other western countries is the best antidote to the development of racial bitterness in South Africa and other parts of the world. You have thereby demonstrated that you are your brother's keeper.

Secondly, we recognise that Finland is a neutral country. It is a country which values peace.

We, in Africa, have chosen peace. We have chosen non-alignment. We want our continent to be spared the ravages of war and even cold war so that we can devote all of our efforts to the economic and social development of our peoples. But we cannot have peace so long as racism exists in Africa.

The racist regime of South Africa has built an enormous military machine to threaten the liberation movements and the independent African States. Its military budget has increased almost 25 times since the Sharpeville massacre of 1960. It is fanning the cold war so that it can get the support of one of the sides. When the rest of the world is looking for peace, it is seeking tension.

Some Governments and some economic interests are taken in by the South African propaganda and are aiding and abetting the South African regime. We believe that all peace-loving countries and all non-aligned countries should join together in support of the African people in order to stop and frustrate the plans to perpetuate the hot-bed of racism and cold war in South Africa. We are, therefore, very grateful that Finland has taken a firm position on our side.

***STATEMENT AT PRESS CONFERENCE, STOCKHOLM, MAY 12, 1975***

Until two years ago, resolutions on apartheid\_ at the United Nations General Assembly were generally sponsored by Afro-Asian and non-aligned States. But in 1973 and 1974, as a result of our consultations, several proposals – especially on the release of political prisoners, on the arms embargo and on dissemination of information against apartheid\_ - were also sponsored by several Western States. The Nordic countries and some other Western countries were prepared to take the lead in proposing these resolutions. We feel that this was a very positive development which showed that apartheid was a matter of universal concern and that the South African regime was becoming increasingly isolated.

The Special Committee is continuing its efforts to develop a wider consensus and to promote further steps in international action to meet the needs of the present situation in southern Africa. We count on support by Governments and public opinion in Sweden and other Nordic countries in these efforts.

***Unite in action against apartheid***

We, in the Special Committee, value very highly the contributions of Sweden and other Nordic countries for assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa. The assistance has also had great significance, coming from the Nordic countries to the people of South Africa of whom the great majority are Black. At a time when we have been concerned over the collaboration of major Western countries with the racist regime, partly because of “cold war” considerations, the Nordic concern has helped to keep the issue outside the “cold war” framework. The Special Committee is very anxious that all Governments and organisations should unite in action against apartheid, irrespective of any ideological or other differences.

We would like to emphasise that the problem in South Africa is not a conflict between Black people and white people, but a confrontation between racism and all opponents of racism. The objective of the liberation movement, endorsed by the United Nations and the Organisation of African Unity, is to eradicate apartheid and to build a society based on the principle of equality of the people, irrespective of race, colour or creed.

The inhumanity shown by the Pretoria regime towards Bram Fischer, the great Afrikaner jurist who died last week demonstrates clearly that it is an enemy of the true interests of whites as well as of Blacks.

### *New situation*

A new situation has arisen in southern Africa after the collapse of Portuguese colonialism and, with it, the unholy racist-colonialist axis in southern Africa. The international community must now focus its attention on effective action against the Pretoria regime which is the main enemy of liberation in the remaining non-independent territories – Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa.

We hope that those Governments which have so far refused to implement United Nations resolutions on apartheid and colonialism, will draw the lessons from the developments in the former Portuguese colonies, and join with us in recognising that the situation in South Africa constitutes a threat to the peace, requiring decisive action.

Given effective international action to isolate the South African regime and to support the liberation movements, the people of these territories will no doubt be able in the future to rid themselves of racist and colonialist rule under which they have suffered for so long. With the emancipation of southern Africa, one of the most serious international problems will have been solved. A great step forward will have been taken towards completing the colonial revolution and laying the foundations for international co-operation on the basis of equality.

### *Arms embargo against South Africa*

We regard the full implementation of a total embargo on the supply of military equipment and all military co-operation with the South African regime as a first and minimum step which must be taken by all States.

I may recall that Sweden and other Nordic countries have always firmly supported an arms embargo against South Africa.

We call on the countries which still continue direct or indirect military collaboration with the South African regime to cease such collaboration immediately and facilitate action by the Security Council. Whatever their pretexts may be, any military collaboration with the South African regime is an act against freedom, against peace and against the United Nations. It is a hostile act against the South African people and against the whole of Africa.

The countries which provide weapons of war to the South African regime are the countries which provided them to the fascist colonial regime in Lisbon in the past. The only result of their support to Salazar and Caetano was to fan colonial conflicts at an enormous cost in human lives. They could not stop the liberation of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde and Sao Tome and Principe. In fact, the liberation struggles of the

people in these territories helped the Portuguese people to liberate themselves.

We hope that the collaborators with the South African regime are not so blind as to repeat the tragedy.

We call on all countries to proceed further and end all economic, political and other collaboration with the South African regime. That regime and its supporters must be made to realise that they can count on no international co-operation so long as they practise the crime of apartheid against the great majority of the people of South Africa and continue their oppression against the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe.

### *Manoeuvres of the South African regime*

Finally, I would like to say a few words about the recent manoeuvres of the South African regime.

Faced with growing isolation, it has resorted to propaganda for a so-called détente in Africa with a view to dividing African States and the international community. Its manoeuvres and its propaganda are encouraged by some foreign governments and by economic interests which profit from apartheid.

The Organisation of African Unity held an extraordinary session of the Council of Ministers in April in Dar es Salaam and declared categorically:

“Africans cannot and will never acquiesce in the perpetuation of colonial and/or racist oppression in their continent. That is why any talk of détente with the apartheid regime is such nonsense that it should be treated with the contempt it deserves.”

The Special Committee against Apartheid, at its recent seminar in Paris, endorsed the declaration of the OAU and commended it to the whole international community.

No one should be fooled by the deceptive phrases used by the racists in their propaganda.

The South African regime is anxious to divert attention from its crimes against the South African people. It is advertising some minor adjustments within the framework of apartheid in order to persuade some gullible people that international pressure should be relaxed in order to encourage it to find solutions.

I would like to make it clear that there can be no détente with racism. The struggle in South Africa is not for an amelioration of the conditions of the

African people but for the total eradication of racism. Neither the South African people, nor Africa, nor the United Nations can acquiesce in a mere reform of racism.

To allow the Vorster regime to find solutions to the problem of racism in South Africa is like appointing the wolf as the Ombudsman to protect the rights of sheep!

***Key to peaceful solution***

If those white people in South Africa, who have been blinded by racism, are now prepared to seek a peaceful solution, let them open the jail gates and release the leaders in prison. Let them negotiate with the liberation movements, who are the authentic representatives of the great majority of the people, on the basis of the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

So long as they are not prepared to take this course, the international community has a duty to cease all co-operations with the South African regime and lend all necessary support to the liberation movements in their struggle for freedom.

***STATEMENT AT MEETING WITH NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS, OSLO, MAY 14, 1975***

I am very happy to have this opportunity to meet with the representatives of non-governmental organisations in Norway. We greatly appreciate the valuable contribution by Norwegian organisations in the international action against apartheid.

I am told that trade unionists of Norway and other Nordic countries decided as early as 1960 – the year of the Sharpeville massacre – to join in a boycott of South African goods for six months. Norwegian dockworkers refused at that time to offload South African goods.

(That was even before Nigeria became independent. I might recall that the Nigerian Government also banned all imports from South Africa early in 1960, even before the independence of the country).

This act of solidarity, coming from Nordic countries in the far north, was, I believe, of great significance. It showed that the white people of Norway recognised the Black people of South Africa as their brothers and taught a lesson to the whites of South Africa.

Since then, many Norwegian organisations – such as the Norwegian Refugee Council and the Norwegian Defence and Aid Fund – have provided substantial material assistance to the victims of apartheid.

It was, therefore, quite appropriate that the UN-OAU Conference on southern Africa was held in Oslo in April 1973. At that Conference, we were able to make personal acquaintance with leaders of several Norwegian organisations, especially the Norwegian United Nations Association which made the practical arrangements for the Conference and the Southern Africa Committee.

In the Special Committee, we regard the work of non-governmental organisations as extremely important, both at the national and at the international level. In countries which have been collaborating with the South African regime, they have restrained the governments and educated public opinion against apartheid.

The Oslo Conference in 1973 was a historic event. It resulted in very important recommendations, especially concerning the status of the national liberation movements recognised by the Organisation of African Unity.

Happily, much of the Oslo Declaration has now become out of date, with the collapse of Portuguese colonialism. The liberation movements have obtained greater recognition in the United Nations and the specialised agencies, though there is still room for further progress in that direction.

The Oslo Conference was perhaps the first international conference to ask Britain to terminate the Simonstown agreement: The British Government has at last announced its intention to terminate that 20-year-old agreement, which is the only open military agreement between South Africa and another country.

As a result of the changes in Portuguese Territories, the liberation of South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe has now become the main issue. We will need to focus attention on these territories and intensify action. The Special Committee is trying to promote such action by increased consultations with governments and non-governmental organisations.

The OAU and a recent seminar of the Special Committee against Apartheid in Paris made a number of recommendations for co-ordinated action. I would like to refer to a few of them.

First, we expect to call for a Security Council meeting soon to discuss the situation in South Africa. I believe that we must ask for a clear determination that the situation in South Africa is a threat to the peace; for a



mandatory arms embargo; and for sanctions on diplomatic, economic and other relations with South Africa.

Whatever the outcome in the Security Council, we must confront the Big Powers – the veto-wielding trinity – which are blocking action.

Second, the OAU has decided on an oil embargo and asked for co-operation by Arab States. I understand that the Arab States have decided to co-operate and also to send a mission to Iran to persuade it to co-operate.

Third, the OAU decided to take steps to stop the movement of workers from neighbouring African territories to South Africa. The Seminar has supported the campaign of the European anti-apartheid movements against emigration from Europe to South Africa.

Fifth, we recognise that assistance to the liberation movements must be stepped up - especially for political and information activities and for activity inside South Africa.

Sixth, we have decided to do what we can to promote greater co-ordination among anti-apartheid movements and the organisations involved in the sports boycott.

I mention these as some of the matters on which campaigns and action by non-governmental organisations would be important and would also help governmental action.

***STATEMENT AT PRESS CONFERENCE, COPENHAGEN, MAY 16, 1975***

***Common commitment***

When we speak of apartheid, we are not referring to a local problem in a corner of Africa, far away from the Nordic countries. We are speaking of freedom, of human solidarity – of our common commitment during this Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

Solidarity is not a one-way affair. I need hardly remind you that the sacrifices of the African peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau helped bring about freedom in a European country, Portugal, a year ago.

After the collapse of Portuguese colonialism, it is certain that colonialist-racist rule in South Africa, Namibia and Southern Rhodesia is doomed.

The South African people, with the assistance of the international community, can look forward to the attainment of freedom and non-racialism after many decades of struggle in which their heroism and their loyalty to the principles of human solidarity has inspired many people beyond South Africa – a struggle whose nobility was recognised when Chief Albert Luthuli was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize and the United Nations Human Rights Award.

Over the course of the years, we have again and again appealed to the South African regime and its supporters to seek a peaceful solution, recognising the equality of all the people, irrespective of race, colour or creed. They have spurned our appeals and proceeded to intensify oppression, resorting to brutal measures against the leaders of the Black people, as well as those few whites who have courageously supported the principles of the United Nations Charter. They have tried to defy and reverse the inevitable course of history.

By their foolishness, they have precipitated conflict. They would have endangered the very security of the white minority, but for the fact that the sacrifices of a few courageous whites in South Africa, and the solidarity of the peoples and other continents, have helped the liberation movements to counteract racism.

### ***Intensify action against apartheid***

Even now, when the inevitability of the elimination of apartheid is near, the South African regime is continuing to try to consolidate and perpetuate racism. As the African proverb says: “There is medicine for madness but none for foolishness”.

It has tried to approach African States with talk of détente and with offers to end its aggression in Southern Rhodesia. It has made some minor administrative changes in South Africa.

But our study of its policies and actions shows that it is only trying to divert attention from its crimes, and to gain time to establish Bantustans and consolidate apartheid. Africa and the United Nations are not so naïve as to be fooled by these tricks.

It was the South African regime which aggravated the crisis in South Africa by resorting to massacres and torture, and by persecution of all those who opposed racism and called for co-operation among all the people, irrespective of race, colour or creed. If it wants peace, the very first step is to release the leaders of the people from prison and restrictions, and to negotiate with them. The key to peace is not in African capitals or in New

York but in the prison gates of South Africa itself. "The key that locks is also the key that opens," as we say in Africa.

### *Nordic contribution*

As you know, the United Nations has considered the problem of racism in South Africa almost since its inception 30 years ago. At every important stage of United Nations action, the consultations between the Afro-Asian States and Nordic countries and the initiatives of the Nordic countries have been most significant. I may recall that in 1952, when the problem of apartheid was brought to the United Nations by the Afro-Asian countries, the United Nations adopted a resolution on the initiative of Denmark and its Nordic colleagues, declaring clearly that the key to a solution in South Africa is equality before the law of all persons regardless of race, colour or creed. This has been the objective of the United Nations since that date.

In 1960, after the Sharpeville massacre, the Nordic organisations were among those who led the world in solidarity action by their boycott of South African goods. Shortly after, the Nordic Governments began providing assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa and to their liberation movements.

As early as 1965, the Nordic countries joined with the Afro-Asian States in recognising that the situation in South Africa is a threat to the peace, requiring mandatory action by the United Nations Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter.

In the ten years since that time, the situation in South Africa has deteriorated further, because of the criminal policies and actions of the racist regime. The United Nations Security Council has not been able to take effective action because of the resistance of some Western Powers which wield the veto. Even the arms embargo which was approved by the Security Council, has been violated by some of these States, which have thereby shown scant regard for the principles of the United Nations.

We, in the Special Committee, believe that the time has come for the international community to take all necessary measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to end the threat to the peace created by apartheid, and to assist the people of South Africa to attain their inalienable right to freedom.

We have, therefore, felt it necessary to hold detailed consultations with the Governments and peoples of the Nordic countries. We are most encouraged by these consultations because we share common convictions and a common commitment to international co-operation.

The consultations and the co-operation will no doubt continue until we achieve our common objectives.

***REPORT TO THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE, NEW YORK, MAY 27, 1975***

... All the Nordic countries assured us that they intend to continue and increase their political and material support to the oppressed people of South Africa. They recognised that after the end of Portuguese colonialism, there should be greater international action in support of freedom in South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe.

We were most heartened by the high regard shown by the Nordic countries for the work of the Special Committee and its efforts to secure concerted international action by a process of wide consultations.

The discussions included very frank and friendly consultations on our differences of approach on certain lines of action.

As you know, the Nordic countries have opposed proposals for the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations on grounds of principle. We explained to them that it gave us no pleasure to propose the expulsion of South Africa. But the South African regime had not only consistently violated the principles of the Charter but had repeatedly ignored the “strong warnings” administered by the United Nations since the Hambro ruling of 1970. We had no choice but to propose the necessary action under the Charter.

We also pointed out that true universality would be promoted, not by retaining representation of a minority racist regime, but by excluding it and associating the representatives of the great majority of the people with the work of the United Nations. All of us would warmly welcome the return of South Africa into the United Nations and other international organisations as soon as apartheid is eradicated.

The Nordic governments fully agreed that the South African regime had persistently violated the principles of the Charter. As one Foreign Minister put it, “if ever any country ought to be expelled from the United Nations, it is South Africa, both because of apartheid and because of its illegal occupation of Namibia.”

However, the Nordic countries are very apprehensive that the expulsion of South Africa might set in motion proposals for expulsion of other countries and undermine the effectiveness of the United Nations. They preferred to show their opposition to the South African regime in other ways – for instance, by material support to the liberation movements.

I expressed my appreciation of the position of principle of the Nordic States. I added that, in my view, the application of Article 6 of the Charter in relation to South Africa would, in fact, instil greater discipline in the United Nations and that the fears of setting a dangerous precedent were exaggerated.

This is a matter on which we will need to continue consultations so that there will be greater mutual understanding.

We also discussed the provisions of General Assembly resolutions concerning the right of the oppressed people of South Africa to struggle for their freedom by all available and necessary means. You may recall that the Nordic countries had expressed reservations on the grounds that the United Nations should not encourage violence.

We explained to them that the sponsors had no intention in any way to encourage violence. The choice of the means of the struggle is for the oppressed people and their liberation movements; they make their own decisions in the light of their specific conditions. It was the apartheid regime which had closed the avenues for peaceful change in South Africa and had obliged the liberation movements to abandon their strict adherence to non-violence.

What the sponsors had in mind was to make it clear that the South African people had as much right as any other people to choose their means of struggle. This had become essential because some friends and allies of the South African regime have tried to condone the violence of the regime and condemn any armed resistance by the oppressed people.

Neither the South African liberation movements nor the African States have called on the United Nations to intervene militarily. The proper role of the United Nations is to avert or mitigate violence by effective sanctions against the racist regime and assistance to the liberation movements.

The Nordic governments made it clear that they fully understood that the liberation movements resorted to violence only as a last resort. Though they could not, because of their traditions, provide any military assistance, they had given humanitarian assistance, in accordance with humanitarian law, to the victims of oppression. Their reservations with regard to the provisions in General Assembly resolutions were only because of their interpretation of the Charter and the role of the United Nations; they felt that the United Nations should promote peaceful change and should not encourage violence in any way.

It became clear in the discussions that there was no basic difference of views. We agreed that it would be desirable to hold consultations in order to attempt to arrive at a formulation which would have their wholehearted support.

As regards other aspects of the struggle against apartheid, I might stress that the Nordic countries agree with us that the situation in South Africa constitutes a threat to the peace in terms of Article 39 of the Charter. They strongly support an arms embargo and have implemented the decisions of the Security Council on this matter as if they were mandatory.

Denmark and Norway – which are members of the NATO - also assured us that the NATO has absolutely no business in South Africa and should not in any way get involved in that area.

As regards diplomatic and consular relations, the Nordic countries felt that the closing of the missions may not serve any purpose, and that the South African regime was fully aware that the existence of these missions did not imply any approval of its policies.

But we were assured that the policies were constantly under public debate and review – and any recommendations in the context of wider action would be given serious consideration.

As regards economic relations, we pointed out that trade with South Africa constituted much less than one per cent of the foreign trade of the Nordic countries. The termination of this trade would not cause serious problems but would have a symbolic effect.

The Nordic countries assured us that they did not provide any special incentives for trade with South Africa. If the United Nations adopted mandatory sanctions, they will faithfully carry out the decisions. In the absence of mandatory sanctions, they said, the Governments had no legal authority to prohibit the economic relations.

Meanwhile, the question of economic relations has been a matter of keen public debate in the Nordic countries, with the churches playing an important role.

The Swedish officials informed us that the Government had advised Swedish companies to refrain from any new investment in South Africa.

The Swedish church is intervening in meetings of stockholders of various companies to see that there is no new investment – direct or indirect – and that the employment practices of subsidiaries in South Africa were improved.

The churches and students in Denmark are also taking similar action.

We were informed in Stockholm that the Swedish Co-operatives had decided a few days earlier to boycott all South African foods.

In Norway, we heard that the Norwegian Government had repeatedly protested to the Inter-Governmental Committee on European Migration against its assistance for emigration to South Africa. The Norwegian Parliament called for withdrawal of Norway from ICEM unless it stopped such assistance.

As a result, the ICEM agreed to stop assistance for emigration to South Africa and decided to withdraw its representative from Pretoria.

The Nordic officials for their part expressed the wish that there would be consultations as early as possible on action to be taken at the next session of the General Assembly. I assured them that we would look forward to consultations with the Nordic representatives.

Before concluding, however, I must express our profound gratitude to the Governments, Members of Parliaments, leaders of non-governmental organisations and information media in all the Nordic countries for their goodwill and co-operation.

In Norway, the Prime Minister, Mr. Trygve Bratteli, told us that he would never forget his recent visit to Africa. We were deeply moved by his remarks to us which I will quote from my notes:

“If I should have a dream about Africa, it is that it might be possible some time for people of different colours to live peacefully together. I would be unhappy if future developments were to lead to having various parts of the world for one colour only.

“For many historical and political reasons, the most obvious responsibility lies with the white population of South Africa and Rhodesia.

“It has been my conviction, for most of my adult life, that if the white people want to stay in Africa, they should accept the removal of all kinds of discrimination. The white population has no choice except to accept equality, irrespective of colour or creed – or to leave.

“I hope that the white population will have wisdom to prepare themselves for change that it may be possible in future for people to live together.”



**1977: H. E. MR. LESLIE O. HARRIMAN**

***STATEMENT AT PRESS CONFERENCE, STOCKHOLM, APRIL 14, 1977***

The Special Committee against Apartheid has always emphasised that the struggle in South Africa is not a struggle of one racial group against another, but the effort of a whole nation to rid itself of racist domination, a struggle in which the oppressed black people, as well as those whites who detest racism, are fighting heroically against a racist clique. It is a struggle to overcome the centuries-old legacy of racism and against a fascist regime which has tried since 1948 to perpetuate and consolidate racist domination by resort to unlimited terror.

The struggle of the South African people has been particularly long and difficult because the racist rulers have been able to utilise the rich resources of the country for building up the machinery of oppression and for poisoning the minds of the white minority. It has also been difficult because of the activities of foreign vested interests, which profit from apartheid.

Because the struggle is for universal values and because powerful external interests have reinforced the racist regime, it is vital that all freedom-loving governments and peoples should assist the oppressed people of South Africa and their liberation movements.

***Role of the Nordic countries***

The Nordic countries have always been clear in their understanding of the issues involved in southern Africa. They have not been diverted by the insidious propaganda from South Africa or by the selfish and short-sighted considerations which have been dominant in the attitudes of the major Western Powers.

They have been generous in their assistance to the oppressed peoples and to their liberation movements. While espousing the cause of peaceful solutions, they have fully appreciated that repression by the racist regime may force the liberation movements to resort to armed struggles.

They have also favoured and pressed for international action to isolate the racist regime in South Africa. More than ten years ago, they agreed that the imposition of economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter is the only peaceful option available, and they pledged to abide by any decisions in this respect by the Security Council.

I would like to make special reference to the recent initiatives of the Nordic countries, with the encouragement of the Special Committee and Non-aligned States, to press for a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa and for a cessation of new investments in South Africa. These are two crucial and minimum measures on which international action is imperative and urgent.

I would also like to note with special appreciation that solidarity with the struggle for freedom in South Africa is not merely a policy of the Government in Nordic countries, but a commitment that is shared by all parties and the people as a whole.

### *The objectives*

I am happy to note that we have full understanding with the Nordic States on the objectives of international action.

As long ago as 1952, when the United Nations General Assembly took up the question of apartheid, Denmark sponsored the resolution declaring:

“... that in a multiracial society harmony and respect for human rights and freedoms and the peaceful development of a unified community are best assured when patterns of legislation and practice are directed towards ensuring equality before the law of all persons regardless of race, creed or colour, and when economic, social, cultural and political participation of all racial groups is on a basis of equality.”

In September 1963, the then Danish Foreign Minister explained what Denmark meant by the term “multi-racial.” He said :

“By that we simply mean a society in which men and women of two or several races live together. In using the word ‘multi-racial’ we are not implying the concept of special protection of racial minorities. In our view, it would be contrary to the very concept of multi-racialism to give such protection to minorities just on the basis of race.”

This is precisely what the South African liberation movements mean by calling for “non-racialism.”

In 1963, Norway, which was then a member of the Security Council, proposed a resolution to set up an Expert Group “to examine methods of resolving the present situation in South Africa through full, peaceful and orderly application of human rights and fundamental freedoms to all

inhabitants of the territory as a whole, regardless of race, colour or creed...”. An Expert Group was set up with Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden as Chairman, Lord Caradon as Rapporteur and members from Ghana and Morocco.

The Group declared in its report :

“The future of South Africa should be settled by the people of South Africa – in free discussion.

“... we consider that all efforts should be directed to the establishment of a National Convention fully representative of the whole population. Such a representative National Convention would consider the views and proposals of all those participating and set a new course for the future.”

It recommended that the South African Government be invited to send its representatives to take part in discussions under the auspices of the United Nations on the formation of a National Convention. The Group pointed out that if no satisfactory reply was received from the South African Government at an early date, the Security Council would be left with no effective peaceful means for assisting to resolve the situation except to apply economic sanctions. The Group emphasised that the course it advocated was the last chance to avoid a long ordeal of blood and hate in South Africa.

The South African Government rejected the invitation as it has rejected all approaches by the leaders of the African people for negotiations on a peaceful solution.

I would like to recall that the oppressed people of South Africa and the African States have agreed with the objectives as formulated by the Nordic States and by the United Nations. They are no more and no less than full equality for all the people of South Africa as a whole, without forcible division into bantustans and without unilateral decisions by a minority.

Indeed, the Group of Experts pointed out that the only factor which left open some possibility of a peaceful solution was the fact that the leaders of the African people had displayed outstanding political responsibility and had throughout emphasised that all South Africans of whatever race should enjoy equal rights.

### ***Need for firm action***

Thirteen years have passed since the report of the Expert Group. This has been a period of immense repression and suffering in South Africa. The

chances of a peaceful solution have perhaps disappeared because of the intransigence and the ruthlessness of the apartheid regime.

But the international community has the responsibility to see that the struggle in South Africa will end soon, with a minimum of human suffering. For this there will need to be firm action to curb the apartheid regime and to assist the oppressed people.

There should be an end to all supplies of military equipment to South Africa and all military co-operation with the apartheid regime.

The military budget of South Africa has increased from 55 million dollars in the year of the Sharpeville massacre (1959-60) to one and a half billion dollars in the year of the Soweto massacre (1976-77) and to nearly two billion dollars this year (1977-78). This military expansion of the apartheid regime not only reflects the gravity of the situation in South Africa but poses a grave threat to peace in the area.

Secondly, the apartheid regime is using the economic resources of the country and the inflows of foreign capital and technology to reinforce the machinery of oppression. The large increases of foreign investment and loans since the Sharpeville massacre parallel the growth of the military arsenal in South Africa.

So long as the apartheid regime continues its policy of racist domination, a policy which Vorster has again reiterated, economic collaboration with that regime is against all values cherished by the international community. Economic relations must, therefore, be broken.

Thirdly, the international community must greatly increase assistance to the oppressed people and their liberation movements at this crucial stage. Brutal repression since the Soweto massacre and the rise of resistance against apartheid have greatly increased needs in this respect.

Only by isolating the apartheid regime and helping the black people and all opponents of racism can the international community perform its duty to support the cause of freedom and international co-operation.

### ***Historic significance***

I would like to emphasise that the victory of the cause of freedom and non-racialism in South Africa will be of tremendous historical significance.

The liberation of South Africa will mean the emancipation of the whole continent of Africa which has suffered so much in recent centuries from the ravages of slave-traders and colonialists. It will mean a turning point in the

struggle to eradicate racism and racial discrimination all over the world. It will mean that the whole Africa will become non-aligned and will be able to make its contribution to international peace and co-operation.

We look forward to the co-operation of all governments and all peoples in this sacred cause.

**1982: H. E. ALHAJI YUSUFF MAITAMA-SULE**

***MESSAGE TO NORDIC COUNTRIES, ISSUED IN COPENHAGEN,  
APRIL 19, 1982***

By their deep understanding of the struggle for freedom and human dignity in South Africa, and their generous support to the oppressed people of that country for three decades, the Nordic countries have demonstrated their loyalty to the principles of the United Nations. They have thereby earned the gratitude of the oppressed people of South Africa, the respect of the Special Committee against Apartheid and the goodwill and friendship of African, Non-aligned and other States.

The Nordic countries have not only opposed apartheid but have provided generous humanitarian, educational and other assistance to the oppressed people of South Africa. They took the initiative for an international arms embargo against South Africa. They have supported economic sanctions against South Africa and pressed for a cessation of investments in, and loans to, South Africa. They have co-operated with the Special Committee and the Organisation of African Unity in action for the elimination of apartheid.

I believe that the contribution of Nordic countries to freedom in South Africa is of great significance. It has refuted the claims of the racist regime in South Africa to represent “Western” and “Christian” civilisation. It has shown that concern for freedom in South Africa is above the ideological and other conflicts of the present-day world. The Nordic States have, by their actions, been the pacesetters among the Western countries.

I would like to express my great appreciation to the trade unions, religious bodies, students and youth and others who have played a leading role in the Nordic countries in securing national consensus against apartheid.

We share a common objective in South Africa – the elimination of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic society in which all the people of South Africa – irrespective of race, colour or creed – will enjoy human rights and fundamental freedoms. We share a common desire for a peaceful transformation, through sanctions and other measures provided in the Charter of the United Nations, so that the people of South Africa can be spared the horror of a ghastly conflict during their inevitable advance to freedom. We also agree that the apartheid regime bears total responsibility for precipitating a violent conflict.

We look forward to closest co-operation with our Nordic friends in this last and crucial stage of the struggle in South Africa when the international community must take far more vigorous action.

With the march of freedom in Africa and the advance of the liberation struggles in South Africa and Namibia, the Pretoria regime has become desperate. It has committed numerous acts of aggression, terrorism and destabilisation in the whole region, and is greatly expanding its military and nuclear capability for a wider conflict. Regrettably, it finds encouragement from some short-sighted but powerful forces in the West.

We need to make new efforts towards concerted international action to isolate the racist regime and to avoid a wider conflict. We should provide greater assistance to the oppressed people and to the frontline States in this hour of their greatest need. We must resist all attempts to divide the nations and peoples committed to freedom in South Africa and indeed, secure ever-wider support.

I trust that the United Nations and Africa can count on the full support of the Nordic countries in these endeavours until South Africa is free and the entire continent of Africa is emancipated.

***STATEMENT AT MEETING OF ANTI-APARTHEID ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE, COPENHAGEN, APRIL 21, 1982***

It is almost thirty years since the United Nations was seized of apartheid.

It is almost twenty years since Nelson Mandela was captured and jailed.

Where are we?

We have had more and more massacres in South Africa – even of schoolchildren.

We have had the apartheid regime increasing its military budget by a hundred times and acquiring nuclear bombs to blackmail Africa and the world.

Is humanity so powerless and so lacking in determination to deal with a few racist tyrants in the south of Africa?

The United Nations has declared an International Year to appeal to the East and West, North and South, to mobilise for effective sanctions against South Africa.

That is why I am here – to get your support not only for sanctions by you, but to invite you to join us to get sanctions by your friends – so that we can rid Africa and this world of the shame of apartheid, and build the community of man that all our religions enjoin us to do.

The alternative to sanctions is a bloody conflict in southern Africa with enormous repercussions – which none of us can contemplate.

Let us save the lives of our brothers and sisters in South Africa – the blacks, the browns, the whites and whatever else – for they are all our brothers and sisters – yours and mine – as they strive to build a society in which they can live in peace.

I am so happy to meet with you – because you have acted even before our African countries were free, because you have shown genuine human solidarity.

All of us need to do more at this time and I am sure I can count on you.

I would like you to excuse me if I were emotional – for there is nothing more emotional than friendship, nothing is more repugnant than apartheid.

***STATEMENT AT MEETING OF ASSOCIATION FOR  
DEVELOPMENT ISSUES (FUF), STOCKHOLM, APRIL 23, 1982***

For us in Africa, for each of the fifty States which have acceded to independence, the first priority is reconstruction and development – to overcome the legacy of poverty, illiteracy, ignorance and ill-health so that at least the minimum basic needs of our people can be satisfied, so that the yawning gap between the developing and developed countries can at least be narrowed.

Development is the basic human right of our people.

I would say that no ideology is of relevance to us today in Africa – capitalism or communism, socialism or liberalism, conservatism or radicalism – unless it comes in the form of food, medicine and education.

Africa needs help for development, and is entitled to help.

We are, therefore, grateful to the Nordic countries and organisations, which have recognised the duty of the international community to assist Africa in economic and social development.



Africa has been compelled, during this generation, to devote equal attention, if not more, to another inescapable challenge, namely, the need to eliminate colonialism and racist domination so that the emancipation of the continent can be completed.

As Kwame Nkrumah said, soon after the independence of Ghana twenty-five years ago, the freedom and dignity of no African country or person is secure so long as any part of Africa is oppressed.

This was not merely a matter of sentiment and solidarity.

Angola has not seen a day of peace since its independence five and a half years ago. Zambia and Mozambique have seen their economic infrastructure destroyed by the racists time and again. Every country in southern Africa is a victim of destabilisation by the Pretoria regime.

We not only have armed conflict today in South Africa and Namibia, but an undeclared war by the Pretoria regime against all the frontline States, as well as a threat of much wider aggression by South Africa which has built up an enormous military machine and even acquired nuclear capability.

What is more, Africa faces the threat of cold war confrontation, with one superpower talking about the racists of South Africa as a traditional ally and exerting pressures, not on the racists but on the independent State of Angola.

Africa needs and appeals for understanding, support and solidarity during this critical period of its history.

Africa demands – not only the oppressed people of South Africa, but all the governments and peoples of Africa – that every nation make a clear and honest choice: between racist domination and freedom in southern Africa, between the fascists in South Africa and the peoples of South Africa, between the obnoxious regime in South Africa and the independent States of Africa, between the intolerable present of apartheid and the inevitable future of democracy, non-racialism and dignity.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Long ago you made the choice between the people of Africa and their enemies.

I have come to express my appreciation to you, and to consult with you on means to co-operate more closely in this critical period.

You can do more and you have groups in your own country pressing for stronger action. We in Africa can also do more. Equally important, you and

we can co-operate much more, with our friends, especially to ensure that those major western Powers which continue to collaborate with South Africa abandon their collusion with evil.

We seek peace and stability so that the people of southern Africa, the people of Africa, can devote all their energies to development.

There are only two ways to those goals: a violent struggle with all its gruesome consequences, or the peaceful path of comprehensive sanctions against the Pretoria regime.

We have appealed for sanctions for more than two decades. We received increasing support from the nations of the world. But a few powerful countries have frustrated our efforts and taken advantage of our sacrifices.

The trade of South Africa, the investments in South Africa, the military budget of South Africa have tremendously increased during this time because of their collusion with apartheid.

The people of South Africa have paid the price for the failure of the international community, in terms of enormous suffering, repression and massacres.

The profiteers from apartheid have not been ashamed to claim that sanctions will hurt the blacks, as if they collude with racist oppressors out of love for the oppressed people.

Let them tell that to the families of the innocent men, women and children killed in the massacres of Sharpeville, Soweto and Cassinga. Let them tell that to the family and friends of Dr. Neil Aggett, to the great leaders in prison in South Africa, to the millions of blacks deported from their homes, and to the people of Angola who have lost countless lives and suffered damage of nearly ten billion dollars from South African aggression.

It is not that these countries do not believe in sanctions. They believe in sanctions even more than we do. For they wield that weapon freely whenever they feel that their so-called national or economic interests, or their sense of values, are involved.

Because of the attitudes of these governments and economic interests, there is today a greater threat to peace in Africa than ever before.

Africa will not surrender to the onslaught of apartheid, and it cannot surrender. It will fight, with assistance from wherever it can get it, and making whatever sacrifice may be required for the redemption of the continent.

But we are deeply concerned about the global repercussions of such a conflict.

What will happen to the cherished ideal of the oppressed people of South Africa to build a truly multi-racial society? What will happen to the ardent wish of Africa for genuine and fruitful co-operation with all nations of the world, including those which were our erstwhile masters? What will happen to international peace and security?

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It was President Roosevelt who urged, during the Second World War, that the nations of the world “quarantine the aggressors.”

What we ask today is merely that the aggressors of Pretoria be quarantined.

We ask for an arms embargo, for an end to nuclear co-operation, for an oil embargo, for an economic, cultural and sport boycott.

That is the purpose of the International Year of Mobilisation for Sanctions against South Africa.

We thank the Nordic countries for their support and their initiatives.

We look forward to joining with them in the effort to see that there is a universal boycott of South Africa to prevent a wider conflict and to help all the people of South Africa and Namibia to rid themselves of the bitter legacy of the past and build free societies.

***STATEMENT AT PRESS CONFERENCE, OSLO, APRIL 26, 1982***

I feel compelled to say a few special words about Norway.

We in Africa will never forget that Chief Albert Luthuli of South Africa was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo in December 1961 – the first and only African to be awarded that honour. He not only walked with dignity in the streets of Oslo but found so much love, affection and honour that all of us in Africa felt honoured.

We in Africa will never forget that Norway was the first country to think of helping African refugees, and give scholarships to South African and Namibians.

When you found oil, you thought of Africa by increasing your contributions to the UN funds for South African students, and families of political prisoners.

Norway has been the largest contributor to the United Nations Trust Fund for Publicity against Apartheid since its inception in 1975.

We will also not forget that in 1973, in April, Norway hosted, in Oslo, the International Conference in Support of the Victims of Colonialism and Apartheid in Southern Africa, and invited as its guests the leaders of the liberation movements. That was the beginning of recognition by the United Nations of the liberation movements, and granting of observer status to them.

I must also recall that the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa was established, with the encouragement of the Special Committee, in Oslo under the direction of Abdul Samad Minty. I want to express our great appreciation to Norway for hosting the World Campaign and giving it the necessary support.

**1984: H. E. MAJOR GENERAL J. N. GARBA**

***STATEMENT AT PRESS CONFERENCE, OSLO, OCTOBER 30, 1984***

... we felt that we must visit Oslo even for a few hours, because of a very important event – namely, the decision of the Nobel Committee two weeks ago to award the Nobel Peace Prize to our good friend, Bishop Desmond Tutu - a great South African, an eminent religious leader and a courageous fighter against apartheid and racism.

Rarely has the Nobel Peace Prize been such a boost to the morale of people striving, struggling and sacrificing for justice as this award has been to millions of oppressed people in South Africa. It has been equally a source of great encouragement to millions of people all over the world, including the members of the Special Committee who have been acutely concerned with the moral challenge of apartheid in South Africa.

It has come at a crucial time when the people in South Africa are struggling with more unity and determination than ever - refusing to be disheartened by the apparent success of the apartheid regime in blackmailing some neighbouring states; when their friends abroad, in the anti-apartheid movements and other organisations and in the United Nations are making every effort to counteract the moves of some major Powers to bestow respectability on the despicable apartheid regime.

I must confess that in a way, the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Bishop Tutu makes me a little sad.

As you know, the Prize for 1960 was awarded in 1961 to the late Chief Albert Luthuli, President-General of the African National Congress, in recognition of the great non-violent struggle for freedom in South Africa.

How much longer must the black people of South Africa struggle and suffer before there is in their country a society in which all the people – black and white – enjoy human rights on the basis of equality?

Nearly a quarter century has passed since Chief Luthuli came here to receive his award – and can anyone claim that the international community has been able to ensure the slightest progress in human rights in South Africa?

Indeed, the apartheid regime is now proceeding to deprive the African majority – no less than 73 per cent of the population – even of its citizenship.

It would be most incongruous and unfortunate if black people receive prizes for their sacrifice while the racists receive weapons of murder.

The award of Nobel Peace Prize to Bishop Tutu must become the signal for action by governments and peoples all over the world in support of justice and a peaceful future in South Africa.

We count on the support of Nordic Governments and peoples.

***STATEMENT AT PRESS CONFERENCE, STOCKHOLM, OCTOBER 31, 1984***

I must, first of all, pay tribute to the Government, political parties and organisations in Sweden – and, if you will permit me, to Mr. Olof Palme personally – for the very valuable support they have given, and continue to give, to the struggle for freedom in South Africa.

The role of Sweden is an encouragement – and, indeed, an inspiration – to us.

In January 1965, Sweden became the first Western country to provide funds for assistance to political prisoners and their families in South Africa.

Later in 1965, Sweden became the first Western country to support sanctions against South Africa.

A few years later, Sweden became the first Western country to give direct assistance to liberation movements in southern Africa.

I will not try to recount all the contributions of Sweden, but I must express great appreciation for the crucial support given by Sweden most recently to all those who have been resisting the new racist constitution and other racist measures in South Africa.

I know that you do not seek appreciation – but then, as they say, the African elephant never forgets.

Let me now say a few words about the situation in southern Africa, which is critical and complex, but which should urge us to greater action rather than despondency.

As you know, the apartheid regime has been built into a powerful monster since the Sharpeville massacre of 1960.

It has been able to cause enormous damage to the newly-independent States in southern Africa and blackmail them.

But all the arms of the apartheid regime and all its repression and violence have failed to suppress the resistance of the people against apartheid. In fact, the resistance is more widespread and more determined than ever.

Those of us who are further away from South Africa have a duty now to compensate for the weakness of the frontline States and give greater moral, political, financial and all other assistance to all those struggling against apartheid.

No one should use the plight of the frontline States, and any agreements they may be obliged to sign with South Africa, as an excuse to relax action against apartheid.

Internationally, over the past decades, the South African liberation struggle was able to obtain increasing understanding and support.

But in recent years – I must be very frank – there has been a serious reverse because of the misguided policy of “constructive engagement” pursued by the United States administration, and to some extent supported by the United Kingdom. This policy is perhaps based on the assumption that if the apartheid regime falls, the Soviet Union will gain an advantage. Appeasement of the apartheid regime has been replaced by virtual alignment with that regime. Past experience in Africa proves that such assumptions lead to disastrous results.

We are obliged to rely on our friends among Western governments – and even more the public opinion in the West – to exert influence on the major Western Powers to abandon policies and actions which are hostile to African interests and to the cause of freedom and human rights.

My consultations in Stockholm are, therefore, focussed on three aspects: (a) increasing pressure on the apartheid regime; (b) greater support to those struggling against apartheid; and (c) means to promote public opinion and public action against apartheid, especially in the West.

Sweden has, of course, already made its contribution along these lines – so that I am not suggesting any change of policy, but consulting on co-operation to promote further action.

You may recall that early this year, many self-styled experts predicted a collapse of resistance in South Africa and the return of the apartheid regime to respectability.

But the black people in South Africa have disproved these experts by stepping up resistance. And the demonstrations and public protests against Botha's visit to Europe have aborted his hopes to end isolation.

But we face a new situation – the killings in South Africa and the massive use of military force by the regime against the black people.

We need to think of a new level of international action to respond to the gravity of the crisis with a sense of urgency.