

**LIBERATION OF SOUTHERN AFRICA - OUR
RESPONSIBILITY**

SELECTED SPEECHES OF OLOF PALME

Edited

by

E. S. Reddy

**VIKAS PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD
NEW DELHI
1990**

CONTENTS

Foreword

Introduction

I. CRYSTALLISE INTERNATIONAL OPINION FOR ACTION ON NAMIBIA

Presidential address to the International Conference on South West Africa, Oxford, March 23, 1966

II. SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND THE LIBERATION STRUGGLES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Statement at the Congress of the Socialist International, Geneva, November 26-28, 1976

III. SO LONG AS THERE IS APARTHEID AND RACISM, THERE CAN BE NO PEACE

Statement in the United Nations Security Council, March 25, 1977

IV. THERE IS NO MIDDLE GROUND IN SOUTHERN AFRICA BETWEEN THE OPPRESSORS AND THE OPPRESSED

Speech at the United Nations Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, Maputo, May 20, 1977

V. STRUGGLE AGAINST APARTHEID IS A UNIVERSAL CAUSE

Speech at the World Conference for Action against Apartheid, Lagos, August 22, 1977

VI. REPORT OF THE SOUTHERN AFRICA MISSION OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL, 1977

VII. DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS MUST BE ON THE SIDE OF AFRICAN LIBERATION

Speech at the Congress of the Socialist International, Vancouver, November 4, 1978

VIII. PROGRESS OF LIBERATION IN AFRICA CANNOT BE STOPPED

Speech at the Conference on Southern Africa of the Socialist International and Socialist Group of the European Parliament with the Frontline States, ANC and SWAPO, Arusha, September 4, 1984

IX. IF WORLD DECIDES TO ABOLISH APARTHEID, APARTHEID WILL DISAPPEAR

Address to the Swedish People's Parliament against Apartheid, Stockholm, February 21, 1986

FOREWORD

To those of us engaged in the struggle to end apartheid the name of Olof Palme will always be held in highest honour. The country, Sweden, of which he was Prime Minister at the time of his death by an assassin's bullet in 1986, was the first Western power to commit itself to direct aid to the liberation movement in southern Africa and has been the most generous. It has also been the most persistent advocate in the West of an effective, mandatory policy of sanctions against the Pretoria regime and has set an example by its own actions. Moreover it has, at the United Nations and in every international forum open to its participation, urged the world powers to recognise apartheid itself as the threat to peace and has taken whatever action it could to compel them to listen.

I had the privilege of hearing Olof Palme deliver what was in fact his last major speech, just a week before he died, on this very subject. Its message is encapsulated in one paragraph. He said: "This system (apartheid) cannot, would not, be able to survive if it were not, in various ways, supported or accepted or tolerated by the rest of the world. And so the rest of the world is directly implicated in the continuance of this system." He understood and stated and again that apartheid is *irreformable*. That persuasion, dialogue and diplomatic pressure are themselves incapable of destroying what is basically evil in itself. That there can be no such thing as "constructive engagement" with a tyranny. The only way is to destroy the doctrine of racism upon which it rests - and so to destroy the tyranny itself and replace it with democratic rule.

Mr. E.S. Reddy has performed a great service in gathering together the speeches of Olof Palme on the issue of the liberation of southern Africa over the twenty years from 1966-1986 during which they were delivered.

These speeches do indeed speak for themselves. In fact they carry, in an extraordinary degree the tone of voice, the passion, the commitment of the speaker himself. It is supremely important, at this moment in the history of the liberation struggle, for the world to listen to Olof Palme. His words are a massive assault on the complacency of the Western powers in their attitude to the monstrous evil of apartheid. Not least on those countries in Europe who have for so long sustained the Pretoria regime in its tyranny by trade, investment and collaboration. It is essential that this book should be read not just by those who are, for whatever reason, sympathetic to the idea of ending apartheid, but by those who are confused and bewildered by the conflicting arguments over how to end it speedily.

It is dangerous to be an enthusiastic supporter of *any* cause (particularly a noble cause) without really knowing what you are enthusiastic about. There are

too few people who have the experience the expertise and the literary ability to convey the truth of these major issues effectively. Mr. Reddy, with his vast experience at the United Nations over many years, is exactly the right person to edit Olof Palme's speeches and so to give to all of us their blessing. It is because he himself is so deeply committed to the cause of liberation that he is such an ideal mediator of the ideas expressed in this book. I hope and pray that it will reach the widest possible readership. Its time has come.

The Rt. Revd. Trevor Huddleston, CR.

INTRODUCTION

"We had come to know him (Olof Palme) not only as a leader of the Swedish people and an international statesman, but also as one of us, a fellow combatant who has made an inestimable contribution to the struggle for the liberation of South Africa...

"From Vietnam to Nicaragua, from El Salvador to Palestine, from Sahara to South Africa, across the face of the globe, the flags hang limp and half mast in loving memory of this giant of justice who had become a citizen of the world, a brother and a comrade to all who are downtrodden."

*- Message of condolence by Mr. Oliver Tambo,
President of the African National Congress of South Africa, on the
assassination of Olof Palme*

In a generation when the response of Western governments to the revolution against colonial and racist domination in southern Africa had been characterized by equivocation and hypocrisy, Olof Palme was one Western leader who had consistently and effectively demonstrated his solidarity with the oppressed people, in words and in action.

Under his leadership, Sweden provided generous assistance to the victims of repression and their liberation movements, and to the newly independent States which suffered enormously because of their geographic location and their refusal to betray Africa. It led the way in the West in sanctions against the oppressive regimes. It thereby reinforced the faith of the African people in non-racialism and countered moves to complicate their just struggle by making the region a theatre of East-West confrontation.

Olof Palme was tireless in his efforts to promote international action against apartheid - especially in the aftermath of the Soweto massacre of 1976, and in the critical period from 1984. He was instrumental in obtaining a firm commitment from the Socialist International in support of the African liberation struggle, and he constantly challenged the major Western Powers which continued to obstruct international action.

I had occasion, as head of the United Nations Centre against Apartheid, to consult with Mr. Palme on several occasions since the mid-1960s on international action against apartheid. He was always abreast of the

developments in southern Africa and paid great attention to the views of the leaders of liberation movements whom he met frequently. He was never paternalistic and constantly emphasised that African people must be helped in the context of their choices. He always pointed to the simple and basic moral issues, to the human aspects - the suffering of the people, their aspirations and their legitimate rights.

His commitment was total. If his Government or his party did not take action sooner than they did, or stronger than they did, it was never for lack of will on his part but because he was anxious to educate the people first so as to obtain full support of the nation, and because he wished, as much as possible, to act in a way that other Western countries could follow the example.

I decided to edit this collection of speeches of Olof Palme not only as a tribute to him for his role as the Western leader who has contributed most to the struggle for liberation in southern Africa, but also because of the continuing relevance of his views on the responsibilities of people in the Western world, of democrats and socialists, to act in support of that struggle.

For while apartheid continues to cause enormous suffering, and take a heavy toll in human lives, international action is still frustrated by the obstruction of a few powerful governments. Though the Pretoria regime has committed an unending series of acts of aggression, and has been repeatedly condemned by the United Nations, they continue to prevent even a determination that the situation constitutes a threat to international peace and security, and thereby to prevent mandatory sanctions against that regime. The leaders of some of the major Powers persist in plans to bestow respectability and international acceptance on that regime in return for seeming concessions, instead of seeking the elimination of racist domination.

The declarations of Olof Palme who represented the best traditions of the people in the West and underscored the imperatives of international solidarity and cooperation, therefore, deserve continuing attention. The speeches in this collection, except for one in 1966, are from two crucial periods: 1976 to 1978 when he was in opposition, and 1984-86 when he was Prime Minister. They are inevitably rather repetitive as he was trying in different conferences and fora to stress the central issues in southern Africa and the most essential measures to discharge the responsibilities of Western countries. I hope they adequately reflect the commitment and contribution of Mr. Palme.

Commitment and Contribution to Liberation

The contribution of Olof Palme was the result of an abiding commitment since his early youth to human solidarity, especially by the people of the rich countries with those of poor countries and with peoples who are oppressed. When he was only 19 years old, he joined other Swedish students in donating

blood to raise funds for scholarships to South African students.

His feeling of solidarity was strengthened by his year's study in 1948 in the United States where he saw the evil of racism, and by his travel to India and other Asian nations in 1953 as leader of the Swedish student movement.

Soon after the Sharpeville massacre of 1960, when the Nordic student movements set up a scholarship programme for South African refugees, he helped, as a member of the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA), to facilitate a grant by the Swedish Government.

As a member of the Cabinet from 1963, he participated in decisions which placed Sweden in the forefront of Western countries in action against apartheid and in support of the African freedom movements. Whatever his portfolio, he spoke out against apartheid and for international action against colonialism and racism.

In 1965, Sweden became the first Western country to advocate binding sanctions by the United Nations against South Africa. In the same year, it made its first contribution to the Defence and Aid Fund and other agencies for humanitarian assistance to political prisoners in South Africa and their families. Next year, when the Defence and Aid Fund was banned in South Africa, it took the unusual step of giving it confidential grants. Sweden has also been a principal contributor to the United Nations and other funds for humanitarian assistance to victims of apartheid and for scholarships for young South Africans - contributing many times its share under any criteria.

In March 1966, Mr. Palme chaired the International Conference on South West Africa, organised by the British Anti-Apartheid Movement in Oxford. This Conference not only drew attention to the brutal oppression in the territory but helped crystallise opinion in favour of ending South Africa's mandate to administer the territory. After the International Court of Justice disappointed hopes of a judicial remedy by its abortive verdict of July 1966, the United Nations General Assembly terminated the mandate on October 27, 1966, by an overwhelming vote.

In April 1966, Oliver Tambo, leader of the African National Congress of South Africa, visited Stockholm at the invitation of the Social Democratic Party. Olof Palme invited him home to celebrate the coming of spring with his family on April 30, 1966 - in a gesture of recognition of the liberation movement - and marched with him in the May Day parade the next day. Thus began the close friendship of Olof Palme and Oliver Tambo. In subsequent years, Mr. Palme established close personal relations with leaders of other southern African liberation movements.

When Olof Palme became Prime Minister in 1969, the situation in southern

Africa was cause for serious concern. The white minority in Southern Rhodesia had declared unilateral independence and South African forces had moved into that country in open defiance of the colonial Power, the United Kingdom. Wars between colonial and racist authorities and liberation movements were taking place in Angola, Mozambique, Rhodesia and Namibia. The repression of the African people had increased. The "unholy alliance" of the minority regimes in South Africa and Rhodesia, and the Portuguese fascist regime, posed a challenge to the world.

Yet there was little international action. The liberation movements and their friends had to make persistent diplomatic and political efforts, including especially the mobilisation of the public in the Western countries, to obtain even slight progress in international action.

Again Sweden, together with other Nordic States, was the most responsive to appeals from Africa and the United Nations, and Olof Palme played an important role.

The liberation movements required greater international assistance, as their needs had greatly increased with the launching of armed struggles and the establishment of liberated areas in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. They had so far been able to obtain assistance, however, only from the Communist countries, mainly in kind, and modest amounts from poor non-aligned countries and public organisations in the West.

The Swedish Government decided in 1969 to give direct assistance to African liberation movements, and was the only Western country to do so for several years. It increased the assistance year by year and by 1986, it had contributed well over 700 million kroner to the liberation movements in southern Africa, the popular movements struggling against apartheid in South Africa and Namibia, and the victims of oppression.

Progress on sanctions against South Africa proved more difficult. While several smaller Western countries had followed the Swedish example by supporting proposals for sanctions in the United Nations, it was not possible to obtain a binding resolution from the Security Council because of the vetoes or threats of vetoes by Britain, France and the United States. Sweden and the other smaller States felt that sanctions must be binding and universal to be effective and action by them alone would serve little purpose. That meant no action at all, even by Sweden except for discouraging Swedish businessmen from new investments in South Africa.

After the Soweto massacre in 1976, however, Sweden and Norway led the Western States, by taking national action to stop investments in South Africa, while pressing for binding measures in the United Nations. Olof Palme and the Swedish Social Democratic Party, then in Opposition, proposed in Parliament the

prohibition of new investments in South Africa and initiatives in the United Nations to promote such action by all countries. Administrative action was taken forthwith and legislation prohibiting new investments was adopted in 1979.

This was the beginning of a series of actions by Sweden such as the ending of air links with South Africa, stopping of visa-free entry to South Africans, support of sports, cultural and other boycotts of South Africa, extension of the investment ban to include transfer of technology, and most recently the virtual ban on trade with South Africa.

Campaigner for International Action

Palme was outraged by the continuing violence against schoolchildren in South Africa after the Soweto massacre, the attacks by the racist regimes against neighbouring countries, and the hypocrisy of the major Western Powers in condemning apartheid while continuing even military Co-operation with the Pretoria regime. He was also gravely concerned over the danger of superpower conflict in southern Africa.

He played an important role by devoting considerable effort from 1976 to promoting action by the Western world, especially by the Socialist movement, in support of the oppressed people of southern Africa.

Addressing many conferences on southern Africa, he constantly emphasised that there can be no neutrality in southern Africa, that there was no middle ground between the oppressors and the oppressed, and that there can be no reform of apartheid or compromise with apartheid.

Rejecting criticism of liberation movements for resorting to armed struggle, he warned that people in the West should not moralise against those who were forced, by the intransigence and escalating brutality of the oppressors, to resort to violent resistance. He pointed out that the cooperation of Western governments with the racist regimes in southern Africa helped cause the situation.

He denounced moves by the major Western Powers to give assurances to the apartheid regime in return for its co-operation in facilitating negotiated settlements in Rhodesia and Namibia. He pointed out that the Pretoria regime would cooperate only if there were sanctions and pressure, and that the issue ultimately was apartheid itself.

He stressed that lack of action by the United Nations should not serve as an alibi for passivity as regards action at the national level. He proposed a programme of action - including an end to all military co-operation with racist regimes; pressure on the major Western Powers for binding sanctions by the United Nations; unilateral national measures, pending such binding sanctions,

especially on ending investments in South Africa and stopping loans to South Africa; support to liberation movements and the oppressed people; assistance to the independent States in southern Africa; and encouragement of action by churches, trade unions and other organisations in support of liberation.

He became a sponsor of the World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Cooperation with South Africa, initiated by Abdul S. Minty, to ensure the full implementation and the strengthening of the United Nations arms embargo against South Africa.

He stressed constantly that democratic socialists should identify themselves with the struggles against oppression. The Social Democratic movement, he pointed out, had arisen as a liberation movement of people denied political and human rights. It must be a movement of workers and other people oppressed through history, and the parties in Europe must be linked in solidarity with the oppressed people of Africa.

As he said at the Socialist International Congress in Geneva in 1976:

"Democratic socialism should never stand on the side of colonialism and racialism. In each individual instance we must stand on the side of the poor and oppressed peoples and give our support to the continued struggle for liberation in southern Africa.

"It is not only a question of contacts and dialogue but of identifying ourselves with the liberation struggle of the oppressed majority of this planet."

He was instrumental in obtaining a resolution at that Congress declaring full solidarity of the Socialist International with the struggles in southern Africa, and led a mission to southern Africa in 1977. The commitment of the Socialist International was valuable since Social Democratic parties were in power in several European countries and were influential in several others.

The crusading efforts of Palme in support of African liberation were greatly appreciated not only by the liberation movements but also by the Organisation of African Unity and United Nations bodies. The United Nations awarded him a gold medal in 1978 in recognition of his great contribution to the international campaign against apartheid.

Response to Revolutionary Upsurge in South Africa

When Olof Palme returned to power in 1982, Zimbabwe had become independent. But the Pretoria regime had increased attacks against neighbouring States and repression against the rising resistance in South Africa and Namibia. It

was encouraged by the policy of "constructive engagement" pursued by the Reagan administration in the United States and the stubborn opposition by the conservative governments in Britain and West Germany to any sanctions against it.

A critical situation arose in 1984 when Mozambique was obliged, because of devastation from South African aggression and destabilisation, to sign the Nkomati accord with South Africa. It appeared that the frontline States were weakening while resistance in South Africa was rising. The Pretoria regime hoped, with the encouragement of some Western Powers, to break through its isolation and assert suzerainty over the whole of southern Africa.

Olof Palme recognised the need to lend greater political and material assistance to the frontline States and to find ways to support the resistance movements inside South Africa, especially the United Democratic Front and the independent trade unions. Assistance from Sweden to the frontline States increased rapidly, amounting to more than 300 million dollars in 1986. Sweden became the principal source of support to the movements struggling against apartheid inside South Africa in the face of brutal repression.

The meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Nordic and frontline States which Sweden organised in June 1984, and the meeting in September of the Socialist International with the frontline States and liberation movements, of which Palme was the moving force, contributed significantly to protecting and advancing the resistance to the South African aggression and repression.

At the same time, the Swedish Government increased national sanctions against South Africa and took initiatives to strengthen the Nordic programme of action against apartheid. It worked closely with Non-aligned States to secure stronger United Nations action in response to the upsurge of resistance in South Africa from 1984 and the imposition of a State of Emergency.

Olof Palme continued till the end of his life to promote action for the emancipation of Africa. His last major address was to the Swedish People's Parliament against Apartheid, a week before he was assassinated: he concluded it with a call that "we must live up to our responsibility for bringing this repulsive system (of apartheid) to an end."

I would like to express my gratitude to the Palme family for permission to publish these speeches, especially to Mrs. Lisbet Palme who is actively continuing efforts in support of the children in southern Africa struggling against oppression. I must also express my great appreciation to Anders Ferm, Hans

Dahlgren and Anders Bjurner in Sweden, Nikhil Chakravartty in India, and many others, for their encouragement and help.

And to Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, who has played a historic role in rousing the conscience of the world to the moral issues posed by apartheid and continues to identify himself totally with the struggle of the people of southern Africa, for agreeing to write a foreword.

E.S. Reddy

New York
June 1989

CRYSTALLIZE INTERNATIONAL OPINION FOR ACTION ON NAMIBIA

*Presidential Address to the International Conference on South West Africa,
Oxford, March 23, 1966*

Apartheid has no Future

The last twenty years have been characterised by a rapid process of decolonisation. Colonial empires have crumbled and disappeared. Nations have won national independence - sometimes after peaceful negotiations, sometimes after long strife and gallant struggle. It is a complete illusion to believe that this process of decolonisation should stop in front of the last remnants of colonial rule in the Africa of today.

The efforts to retain white supremacy and white power under the pretext of the obnoxious theories of apartheid stand in total contradiction to the ideals of human rights, equality and common decency which must form the basis of any civilised community. Apartheid can only lead to continued conflict and strife - with disastrous consequences to the international scene as a whole - to continued intolerable conditions for millions of people and to continued human suffering. This system of apartheid has no future, it is a disgrace to the present and it must soon become an evil of the past. That is our common responsibility. That is what this conference is about.

A few days ago the South African Government banned the Defence and Aid Fund in South Africa.¹ It is an act of force that signifies weakness. People are sentenced in accordance with laws that are in themselves a mockery of the ideals of justice. Now their possibilities of defence before courts that are bound by these laws are apparently taken away. But those who are afraid to allow humanitarian aid to the victims of a perverted justice are not strong. They only show that they strongly feel the wall behind their backs.

Perhaps the action against the Fund was meant to show that aid from outside has no meaning and that support will always fail. The Fund has contributors in many countries. The government to which I belong is, I believe, the largest single

¹ The Defence and Aid Fund for South Africa was founded in the early 1950s by the Reverend Canon L. John Collins in London to provide legal and other assistance to the victims of unjust laws in South Africa, to support their families and to keep the conscience of the world alive to the issues at stake.

In 1966, the South African Government banned the Defence and Aid Committee formed in South Africa to disburse the funds sent from London, thus making the provision of assistance to political prisoners and their families difficult.

contributor. The happenings of the last few days have rather convinced us of the necessity of continued and determined support for the activities the Fund has carried out. It has proved its effectiveness.

Sanctions against Rhodesia

In these days the question of Rhodesia stands in the forefront of public attention. The sanctions against Rhodesia must not fail. I am naturally thinking of the consequences for the people of Rhodesia of such a failure. But a failure would also be disastrous for the whole idea of a world community with will and power to enforce the rule of law.

In December 1965 the Swedish Government requested the Security Council of the United Nations to decide on mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia. Today in a policy declaration in Parliament our Foreign Minister repeated that request. It has become fearfully late. But it is hardly ever too late if you really want to act.

Sanctions - to be effective - require decisive action from the governments of the Member States of the United Nations and appropriate legal means to enforce them. The experience of the last few months have shown that a number of technical difficulties may arise. Governments have had to rely on temporary legislation and voluntary agreements with different interests. As an example, I can mention that in a recent bill I had to revive two old laws from the last war in order legally to prohibit shipping to a country subjected to sanctions decided or recommended by the Security Council.²

This experience is the reason why the four Scandinavian countries have decided to prepare a special United Nations law, covering all aspects of economic life, that shall be put immediately into effect when the Security Council decides or recommends sanctions. This will, in the future, improve our preparedness for swift action if and when such a situation arises.

Time for Action on South West Africa (Namibia)

I now come to the issue of South West Africa.

Everybody in this hall is fully aware that very soon the question of South West Africa will be in the focus of attention. This does not mean that the problems and the plight of the people in South West Africa are something new and sudden. For over twenty years, there has been an endless row of pleas and petitions, of resolutions and recommendations, of opinions from the International Court of Justice and of reports from distinguished international commissions. I need not on this occasion go into this recent history. It is fully covered in the admirable papers presented to this conference and we were reminded of it in the message from the

² Olof Palme was then Minister for Transport and Communications

Reverend Michael Scott.

This long chain of failures and disappointments may easily have caused despair. It is not a very promising background for feelings of optimism and hope. But nevertheless there is some hope and much determination in the air. People have a feeling that at long last we are coming to the point where the international community will have to go forward from resolution to decision, from intention to intervention. It has been a very long and painful road. But many hope that we are now approaching the end.

This is vital and decisive for the people of South West Africa. It is important because we are thus coming near the whole kernel of apartheid. Therefore this conference is tremendously important. We are all waiting for the verdict of the International Court. And we know that the decision of the Court is legally binding. We are all looking forward to the subsequent handling of the issue of South West Africa in the United Nations. We know that the execution of the Court's decision - if need be - falls upon the Security Council and that the Council in that case has wide legal powers for action. We are thus aware that soon very important decisions will have to be taken in the cabinet rooms of individual governments and in the council halls of the United Nations.³

This conference cannot take mandatory decisions binding upon governments and upon international organisations. But at this crucial stage it can fulfil the decisive function of providing the facts, the material and the documentation about the situation in South West Africa. And it can crystallise the attention of international opinion on the dreadful consequences of inaction, and the urgent necessity of action in the case of South West Africa. But effective action calls for preparation and planning.

It has all too often happened in the history of individual countries, of the world powers, of the international community, that they have for years seen a situation arise, and then inevitable developments take their course. In this respect they have unwittingly acted as bystanders. And when the issue has burst wide open it has seemingly come as a shock and surprise. Action has then become blunt, haphazard, sometimes panicky and with disastrous consequences. It is an

³ After South Africa ignored a number of United Nations resolutions, as well as advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice, on the administration of South West Africa, Ethiopia and Liberia, as Allied Powers in the First World War, brought contentious proceedings before the International Court at the request of the United Nations General Assembly. They held that South Africa had violated its obligations under the Mandate and asked the Court to order it to abolish apartheid in the Territory and submit its administration to supervision by the United Nations. It was hoped that a binding judgement by the Court on this dispute would facilitate effective international action.

However, after prolonged proceedings, the International Court ruled on July 18, 1966, that Ethiopia and Liberia had not established their legal right in the matter. Accordingly it declined to pass judgement on the merits of the dispute.

important purpose of this conference to remind and impress upon the world community the responsibility it soon will be facing.

If we believe that reason and facts can appeal to the minds of men, this conference will have strength and power. And if we believe that the emotional impact of the ideals of justice and equality can stir the imagination and the will to act among people everywhere, then this conference will indeed have influence and significance for world opinion.

Common Responsibility

We want the people of South West Africa to form their own future. This is a question of political decision and political organisation. But it is also a question of social and economic development. That is also a common responsibility.

The Swedish Government has just decided to launch a programme of assistance to Swaziland, Bechuanaland and Basutoland.⁴ The programme will be carried out in cooperation with the United Nations, and it is mainly directed towards education. The declared aim of the programme is to strengthen the independent standing of these small and surrounded countries.

The people of South West Africa have for many years been exploited. The international community has been unable to defend their rights and their interests. It is our common responsibility that South West Africa should have the chance of a better future. Would this not really be an opportunity to show that international solidarity and common effort is a practical reality? If this shall be the case, we have no time to wait. The time for planning, preparations and constructive thinking for this international effort has already come.

I fully agree with President Kaunda that external solutions for the problems of reconstruction and consolidation often fail. But those who are responsible for internal solutions should in crucial times not feel that they stand alone.

The success of this conference will be measured by its impact on international opinion. You will consider the facts and the material. You will probe into their implications and discuss possible roads of action. What we need above all is unity of purpose and clarity in aims. That this conference can provide.

The conference is of great importance. Therefore your responsibility is great. I wish the conference the best of success.

⁴ After independence in 1966, the name of Bechuanaland was changed to Botswana and that of Basutoland to Lesotho.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Statement at the Congress of the Socialist International, Geneva, November 26-28, 1976

In southern Africa the world's last colonial empire has crumbled. The peoples of Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Angola have been freed from Portuguese rule after centuries of exploitation and decades of struggle. But in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia white minority rule still prevails. I could name many other areas of human conflict, too many. And to this open violence is added a more anonymous but no less serious menace - deepening poverty and starvation, the unwillingness of the affluent countries to lend the support that is needed, and rising military expenditure.

So long as injustices remain, there can be no question of a lasting peace, for the demands which people are making for a transformation of their conditions and for a way out of oppression and misery are more powerfully felt than admonitions to austerity and peaceableness. The liberation struggle can be restrained for a time by superior force, but sooner or later people's longing for freedom will break out. Efforts to stem the tide of this development serve only to intensify conflicts and attitudes and to impede future cooperation between peoples and countries. Instead, we should assist the nations and peoples in their efforts to gain independence, social justice and human dignity.

Growing Threat to Peace in Southern Africa

Southern Africa is rapidly moving towards an uncertain climax. International attention and diplomatic efforts are focussed on the remaining parts of colonialism and apartheid. Here, in Geneva, important talks are being held, talks that will probably condition the future of Zimbabwe. In the United Nations pressure is rising against the white minorities. In southern Africa itself the liberation struggle is intensified and taking new forms.

As the climax approaches and the struggle deepens, the risks increase of unnecessary violence and economic disruption, as well as of the wrong kind of foreign intervention. The wrong kind of intervention is the continued introduction of the rivalries of major Powers in the region. The right kind of foreign intervention is that which will support the liberation struggle and reduce the stubborn resistance of the forces which still cling to the ideas of maintaining white supremacy.

Some months ago, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) published exhaustive documentation on the risks of a steep escalation of the conflict in southern Africa which may grow into the next major international

battlefield.

The continuing oppression by the apartheid regime of the people of South Africa and its illegal occupation of Namibia are already a potential threat to world peace. True, the white supremacy is threatened by the pressure from the success of the nationalist movements in the former Portuguese colonies and by the stepping up of the struggle in Zimbabwe and Namibia. But at the same time the regime is reinforcing the machinery of oppression, strengthening its defences and endeavouring to gain assurance of wider international support.

The Soweto massacre this summer and the events which followed - with hundreds of people killed, thousands injured and arrested - served to show that the white minority will not hesitate to resort to brutal violence. Last week a number of trade unionists and journalists were arrested or banned.

Recently Mr. Smith⁵ said that Rhodesia and South Africa have agreed that they should keep fighting to preserve the Western democracy that the white man brought to Africa. Vorster⁶ demands external aid to fight for the interests of the "Free World." Haven't these people learnt anything? Let us make it very clear. Democratic socialists will never accept Smith's perversion of Western democracy. We will never include Vorster's oppression and racism in a free world...

Apartheid is by nature a system of violence which can only be maintained by force and by the oppression of the black majority. It is also a system of social and economic exploitation which separates workers from workers on the basis of the colour of their skin, at the same time as almost two million black people are unemployed. A society which responds to demands for human dignity and decency with brutal police action and indiscriminate killing must not only be condemned; it is also doomed to permanent division and conflict.

The stubborn resistance of the racist regimes raises the question whether changes can only be brought about by violence and revolution, or whether there is a peaceful way of eradicating the affront to human dignity known as colonialism, racialism or apartheid. But it is easy to foresee that when people in search of peace and progress are only met by oppression and exploitation, they will ultimately resort to violence.

The SIPRI study also points to the risk of the extensive international investments in South Africa helping to internationalise the conflict. The country's raw material resources and its strategic position may furnish a pretext for further involvement on behalf of the white regime. At the same time, however, such

⁵ Ian David Smith, then Prime Minister of the illegal regime in Rhodesia

⁶ B.J. Vorster, Prime Minister of South Africa

involvement would encourage other Powers to become more active in the area.

Thus there is a serious risk of Africa becoming a new battlefield between black and white and between East and West. This is something which is least of all desired by the Africans themselves.

Role of International Community

The African nationalists have always had national independence as their prime goal. They are all intensely opposed to the South African racism. The struggle for national independence and their resistance to apartheid unite them.

Moreover, they have all been quite determined that after independence they would not be drawn into the global power struggle between the great Powers. Another factor that unites them is their determination to remain non-aligned.

In this situation Social Democrats should have the important task of working for peace, liberty and social justice... In Africa, Western Europe has a special responsibility as rich States and former colonial Powers. The European heritage is a heavy burden. We should listen to the warning from Botswana's President:⁷

"Continued friendship between independent Africa and the Western world in the future will depend upon the Western attitude towards the liberation of southern Africa."

The liberation of the Africans will be their own work. And that liberation will inevitably come one day. But the international community can contribute to shorten that struggle, make it easier and less violent.

The Task before Social Democrats

What, then, should be the ingredients of our policy? Allow me to mention some of the sectors it should cover:

1. The Social Democrats should work for a binding United Nations resolution prohibiting all exports of arms to South Africa and all military collaboration with South Africa.

2. We should give material and political support to the liberation movements and the already autonomous States in their struggle for national independence and economic emancipation. There is particular cause for alarm in the persistent foreign attempts to sabotage Angola's independence. If we are to be credible in our opposition to foreign intervention we must also try to stop the recruitment, financing, training,

⁷ Seretse Khama

transit and assembly of mercenaries from our own soil. We must also take an unequivocal stand against the repeated acts of aggression against the Republic of Zambia and the People's Republic of Angola by South Africa and against Mozambique by the Rhodesian minority regime.

3. We should co-ordinate better our efforts to conduct an effective policy of isolation and sanctions in the United Nations against South Africa. Our refusal to recognise the so-called independent bantustans, of which Transkei is the first,⁸ should be followed by opposition to the efforts of international capitalism to give unofficial recognition by massive investments in these areas.

4. We should encourage efforts aiming at majority rule in Zimbabwe while still fully implementing sanctions against the Smith regime...

5. We should work with determination to bring about an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia, and we should give our support to SWAPO.

6. We must seriously consider the question of new investments in South Africa and the attitude we should adopt in these matters. On this point we (in Sweden) have very clear views, but I choose to phrase it more generally here. We cooperate closely with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) which has proposed a series of interesting recommendations for action. Following these recommendations, the Swedish trade unions have already achieved results in their negotiations with Swedish firms with subsidiaries in South Africa.

7. We should together with the ICFTU give support to black unions and student movements in South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe.

The alternative to peaceful development in southern Africa is a devastating racial war which for a long time to come would poison relations between groups of people, races and nations and jeopardise world peace. Therefore democratic socialists must take their part of the responsibility.

Democratic socialism should never stand on the side of colonialism and racialism. In each individual instance we must stand on the side of the poor and the oppressed peoples and give our support to the continued struggle for liberation in southern Africa.

It is not only a question of contacts and dialogue but of identifying ourselves

⁸ The "independence" of Transkei, proclaimed by the South African regime in October 1976, was not recognised by any other country.

with the liberation struggle of the oppressed majority of this planet.

SO LONG AS THERE IS APARTHEID AND RACISM, THERE CAN BE NO PEACE

Statement in the United Nations Security Council, March 25, 1977

Let me first express my deep gratitude to the Council for the honour you have shown me and the movement I represent by giving me this opportunity to make a contribution to your important debate. I would like to express a special word of thanks to the African group in the United Nations - a group of States which plays an increasingly important role in the work of the world Organisation.⁹

When the United Nations was founded thirty-two years ago, only four of its 51 original members were African. One of those was South Africa. Today the African group make up 48 out of the 147 members. Thus, the cause of Africa is also the cause of the United Nations.

On this occasion, I would also like to pay a tribute to the African States for having so persistently sought to work through this Organisation in finding a solution to the problems of southern Africa. The United Nations was created as an instrument for peaceful settlement of conflicts. This is also the way you have chosen to work in order to seek a change in South Africa - through negotiations and by demanding support from the rest of the world.

South Africa is still a bastion of racism. But an increasing number of people are beginning to see the end of apartheid and colonialism and the beginning of freedom and human dignity for the oppressed majority.

At the last Congress of the Socialist International in Geneva in November of last year, the problems of southern Africa were at the centre of interest. The democratic socialists of the world made it clear, through a resolution, that "neutrality towards the existing and coming struggles in southern Africa is impossible. Between the exploiters and the exploited there is no middle ground. Action must be taken designed to end a system which is both evil in itself and a threat to peace."

This week, the people of South Africa have painfully been reminded of a tragic day - the massacre in Sharpeville. Sixteen years later came the events in Soweto. Both these atrocities against a defenceless population were logical consequences of the apartheid system. But there are important differences. During these sixteen years, we have witnessed an escalation of the violence of the ruling minority. But at the same time, the will and the ability of the majority to resist the oppression and to unite against the rulers have increased. A people's longing for freedom can never be extinguished. The time of submission is over.

⁹ Mr. Palme was invited to make a statement during the discussion in the Security Council on the situation in South Africa, on the proposal of the African members of the Council.

What Apartheid Really Means

Yet the system prevails, maintained by force. Is it that those who are not directly affected simply cannot conceive what apartheid really is like, what it really means? Let me give a few examples of what apartheid means to the people, in human terms.

Take Soweto: We now know what really happened in June last year. The official documents and police reports give this picture. It all started in Soweto, but the protests spread to more than one hundred townships in the entire country. The immediate cause was the children's protest against the compulsory study of Afrikaans in the schools. But behind there was the dissatisfaction of the black majority with social and economic conditions in towns like Soweto. The brutality of the police led to new demonstrations. According to police inspector Gerber in Soweto, more than 16,000 bullets were fired in Soweto alone from June 16 - when the protests started - to September 16. These bullets killed and wounded 1,611 persons, while another 1,229 were killed and wounded by "other causes."

According to Professor S.J. Taljaard, who examined 229 of the people killed in Soweto, two-thirds of these had died from bullet wounds. Eighty percent of those killed were shot in the back. A doctor at the Peninsula Maternity Hospital in Cape Town states that in his hospital alone seventy infants died from teargas poisoning.

Take the system of "mental prisoners": This very day, the World Health Organisation is publishing a report on a chain of privately-owned institutions accommodating many thousands of mentally ill black Africans, detained against their will. They are being forced to work without any pay. These institutions, labelled "human warehouses" by a retired official, get the bulk of their "patients" - in reality "mental" or political prisoners - from South Africa's Ministry of Health. The private firm, Smith Mitchell of Johannesburg, which operates this slave labour system on a profit-making basis and has done so for more than a decade, calls it "therapy". It earned 13.7 million dollars in 1973. Between 8,000 and 9,000 black mental patients are involved.

Testimonies, among others in the Swedish daily *Dagens Nyheter*, claim that many Africans are arrested in the slums for having "stirred up trouble" and after a hasty examination, sentenced to be "imbalanced" and sent away to these institutions.

Take the torture and deaths in South Africa's prisons: Many people have died due to "suicide" in the South African prisons. They have been held under the so-called security laws, which allow for *incommunicado* detention without charges for an indefinite period. The most absurd explanations have been given for these deaths. The police talk of hangings, slipping on a piece of soap or in a staircase, jumping out of a window, etc. The responsible Minister for the Police, Mr.

Kruger, has given his explanation the prisoners committed suicide on instructions from the Communist Party. The Catholic bishops have protested against the widespread torture in the prisons, which is used against children as well as old age people. The authorities answer by preparing new laws against so-called terrorism - laws which in other countries would only be applied in times of war.

Such is apartheid: a weird dictatorship of the minority for social and economic exploitation. But it has also a unique feature. Apartheid is the only tyranny branding a person right from birth according to the colour of the skin. From the very moment of conception the child's destiny is determined. A Swedish author has called this system "spiritual genocide".

Apartheid systematically dissolves family ties. It legalises a cruel removal of populations. The whole black labour force is turned into migrant workers in their own country. A growing majority of both sexes is forbidden by law to live with their families outside the workless bantustans. Normal family life is increasingly a rarity. The children are, in the words of Colin Legum, becoming a neglected and starved generation, with no models of concern or caring, no loyalties, no self-esteem, no dependable relationships, no possible aspiration to responsible citizenship. They see their parents constantly humiliated. They have only known resentment, rejection and violence.

Outside South Africa we may feel that there is time to go step by step in the struggle against apartheid. But time is running out for the children of South Africa. The white minority should consider that those children are the people with whom they will have to negotiate one day. And those are the children whom we look forward to welcome in our midst as representatives of their people.

Perversion of Western Democracy

Mr. Ian Smith has said that Rhodesia and South Africa are agreed that they are both fighting to preserve the Western democracy that the white man brought to Africa. They are both hoping for external aid to fight for the interests of the so-called "free world". For us in Europe, with our colonial past, it is necessary to be crystal clear. We will never accept Smith's and Vorster's perversion of Western democracy. Their oppression and racism will never be included in a free world. They represent the very opposite of democracy. They are denying the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa the most fundamental human and political rights - the same rights that the European labour movement was denied and that formed the basis of the original programmes of our liberation movements. Therefore, the workers of Europe historically are linked in solidarity with their oppressed brothers and sisters in Africa.

The Question of Violence

The resistance of the racist regimes raises the question of whether changes can be brought about only by violence or revolution, or whether there still is a peaceful way of eradicating the affront to human dignity known as colonialism, racism and apartheid. But it is easy to foresee that when people in search of peace and progress are met only by oppression and exploitation, they will ultimately resort to violence. The armed struggle becomes the last possible resort. Now, in Namibia and Zimbabwe, continued armed struggle seems to be unavoidable. How much armed pressure from the nationalists is necessary depends on how much unarmed pressure the Western Powers apply in the form of sanctions and the like, as President Julius Nyerere so well put it.

Threat to International Peace and Security

It is quite possible that white South Africa could have believed earlier that the policy of apartheid would succeed, if only they could buy a little more time and show a little more flexibility in some areas. But the architects of apartheid indeed built their plans on quicksand. Minority rule is coming to an end, and southern Africa is rapidly moving towards an uncertain climax. As the climax approaches and the struggle deepens, the risks of unnecessary violence and economic disruption increase, as well as the risk of the wrong kind of foreign intervention. As I have said before, the wrong kind of foreign intervention is the continued introduction of the rivalries of major Powers in the region. The right kind of foreign intervention is that which will support the liberation struggle and reduce the resistance of the forces which still cling to the ideas of maintaining white supremacy.

Last year, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute - SIPRI - published extensive documentation of the risks of a steep escalation of the conflict in southern Africa, which may grow into the next major international battlefield.

The SIPRI study points to the risk of extensive foreign investments in South Africa helping to internationalise the conflict. The country's raw material resources and its strategic position may furnish a pretext for further involvement on behalf of the white regime. At the same time, however, such involvement would encourage other Powers to become more active in the area. The same is true for Namibia. We are facing the twofold risk of a racial war and an escalated conflict between the foreign interests in this area. Thus the global consequences of the developments in southern Africa, South Africa's threats and aggressions against her neighbours, the situation in South Africa created by apartheid - these three elements constitute a threat to international peace and security.

The liberation of the Africans will be their own work. And that liberation will inevitably come one day. But the international community can contribute to shorten the struggle and make it more peaceful, with less human suffering.

It goes without saying that the United Nations and its Security Council have a

very particular and central responsibility. I sincerely hope that the United Nations, and your deliberations in this Council, will make a decisive contribution towards a just development in South Africa and towards the liberation of the entire southern Africa.

Areas of Action

However, the actions taken in the United Nations, or the lack of such actions, cannot serve as an alibi for passivity on the national level. Each country and government, each popular movement, has its own responsibility and its own role to play.

Allow me then, in reply to your kind invitation, to mention some of the areas where such action could be taken.

First, we must work for a halt to all arms export to South Africa and all military cooperation with its government. The apparatus of oppression is strengthened by each new weapons delivery. The military cooperation gives the country the means to start its own manufacturing of arms in most important areas of weapon technology, may be also in the ultimate of weapons. Can you really condemn the policy of apartheid in the United Nations, while you at the same time send arms to those who are practising apartheid?

Let me also point out that the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid, Ambassador Leslie O. Harriman, has recently referred to a substantial foreign involvement - direct or indirect - when it comes to supplying South Africa with rifles, helicopters, teargas and ammunition, which were used in the Soweto massacres. No African country or combination of African countries could be a military threat to South Africa. Yet South Africa is continued to be armed from abroad. What is the logic behind such a policy? South Africa's continued refusal to heed the demands of the international community gives no alternative to a mandatory arms embargo.

Second, we must seriously deal with the question of investment and export of capital to South Africa and Namibia. I will elaborate on this vital point in a moment.

Third, we can give material and political support to the liberation movements and the already autonomous States in their struggle for national independence and economic emancipation. Governments could also easily increase their contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa. These bodies need funds and are doing extremely useful work in the field of humanitarian and legal aid to the victims of apartheid.

The repeated acts of aggression against Zambia, Angola, Mozambique and

Botswana must be condemned. If we are to be credible in our opposition to foreign involvement into African affairs, we must also put an end to the recruitment, training, transit and assembly of mercenaries on our own soil.

Fourth, our refusal to recognise the so-called independent bantustans - Transkei being the first one - should be followed up by opposition to the efforts of international companies to give unofficial recognition by massive investments in those areas.

Fifth, we should increase our efforts to bring an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia, refute sham arrangements, and support SWAPO without whose participation no realistic policy could be shaped. Namibia should have immediate independence and majority rule.

Sixth, parliaments could set up parliamentary committees to investigate the activities of those companies, which have subsidiaries in South Africa, for the purposes of ensuring that such companies are run along the lines of internationally acknowledged working practices. Where these are not adhered to, the company shall cease its activities entirely.

Role of Foreign Investments in South Africa

For a long period of time the South African government has been encouraging foreign investments in the country. Behind this policy there lies not just a desire to increase the economic resources of the country. Of no less importance is the fact that foreign investments create ties to a number of rich industrial nations which acquire an economic and political interest in the preservation of the apartheid system. The foreign companies benefit both from the country's high technical standards and from the extremely low wages of the black labour force. The return on invested capital is high. In addition, the investments help the country's flow of trade along, which in turn make South Africa's trading partners more sensitive to disturbances in the South African economy. Riots in South Africa have repercussions on employment in other countries.

Since Angola and Mozambique have become independent States, South Africa's isolation has increased. The country has no friends on the African continent other than the Smith regime in Salisbury.

In this position, South Africa has intensified her efforts to attract West European, American and Japanese capital. According to information from various sources, the Vorster Government is carrying on a broad international campaign to induce foreign capital to participate on favourable terms in the exploitation of natural resources, preferably in the Transkei and in Namibia.

There is a theory that economic development and foreign investments in the long run would help to loosen up the apartheid system. The idea is that the lack of

trained manpower would force the government to let black labour into jobs which had previously been reserved for whites only. The foreign companies would also be able to set a good example in their relations to Coloured and black labourers. Reality has effectively contradicted this theory. The disparity of wages between black and white workers has for instance continued to widen. Leading black South Africans, supported by many years of experience, have categorically denied the claim that it is possible to achieve gradual development toward greater economic and social justice within the framework of the apartheid system. Both the ANC of South Africa and SWAPO of Namibia have urgently appealed to the international community to try to stop investments in South Africa and Namibia. There is a growing understanding for their demands. Their appeals are more and more being met by proposals for practical action.

In November 1976, at the Scandinavian Labour Congress - an association of all the Social Democratic parties and trade union organisations in Scandinavia - a resolution was adopted calling for a ban on new investments in South Africa and the adoption of a national plan of action in accordance with the recommendations of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). And at a conference on apartheid, the ICFTU has adopted recommendations which - among other things - call for a ban on all new investments in South Africa, including the replacement of machinery, repairs and maintenance. These proposals reflect a growing awareness among the trade unions of the treatment of black workers in South Africa - arrests, dismissals, job reservations, bans on trade union activities etc. They want to show their solidarity with their harassed and persecuted friends. And they realise that unjust and unfair labour policies in South Africa will in the long run harm also labour relations in the investors' home countries.

The Social Democratic Government in Sweden had for several years discouraged Swedish businesses from investing in South Africa. Last August, we proposed a sharpening of the attitude to Swedish investments in South Africa. At the same time, on a Scandinavian basis, the government took the initiative for a common action at the international level.

This policy has been continued.

Next week, the Swedish Parliament will debate a motion presented by the Social Democratic Party which asks for an immediate change in Sweden's currency legislation in order to prohibit the export of capital to South Africa and Namibia. As a second step to guarantee the deceleration of Swedish financial interests in South Africa we urge the government to initiate discussions with the companies having subsidiaries in other countries investing in South Africa for the purpose of reaching an agreement on how restrictions on Swedish companies operating in those countries should be applied. If such an agreement cannot be reached, we will propose further legislative measures.

New Situation since Soweto Massacre

The reason for this increased pressure for unilateral action is not difficult to discern. We all feel that a dramatic change has taken place in the political situation in South Africa since the riots in Soweto last summer. The risk of racial war has drawn closer. The question of limiting or ending foreign economic interests in South Africa thus becomes not merely a political question about what could conceivably be done to put effective pressure on the South African Government. It also becomes a moral question for each government whether our companies - in our countries - should be allowed to take part in the exploitation of the black labour force. According to South African laws, the foreign companies have to apply the rules of apartheid at their places of work. They are thereby forced to place themselves on the side of the oppressors in the battle which is now about to enter a new and more serious stage. Therefore, in my opinion, the situation in South Africa has progressed to such a point that each country has to consider unilateral prohibitive measures.

It has been argued against a ban on investments in South Africa that this would hurt the mother companies in the Western world and lead to unemployment for the workers there. But in this case, it is important to note that the workers themselves have made their choice, through their international confederation. They have told their governments that they support a ban on investments in South Africa and are prepared to take the consequences. Now, the governments and the companies must take their responsibility. It is time to decide on which side we stand, what forces we want to support.

A ban on investments in South Africa can be really efficient only if it is part of an international action that has the support of those industrialised countries which have the largest economic interests in South African business and industry. It can be really efficient only if it has the wholehearted support of the world community. Therefore the Security Council must take the lead in such actions. This underlines the great importance of your deliberations and your decisions. It is of primary importance now to get a process started in common action.

People Look to the Security Council for Action

Permit to conclude with one last reflection. The international debate has taken on a new dimension of moral commitment and involvement in the human and political rights of people. This reflects a concern for basic values - a concern for the fate of people, their plight and their suffering but also their hopes and dreams of a better future. It represents an element of vitality and humanity that is badly needed today.

There can hardly be a place where moral commitment is more eminently justified than in the case of South Africa. First, because apartheid is a unique and, in many ways, extreme form of human evil. Second, because we all know that the

system cannot prevail for any long period of time without direct or indirect support from abroad. Third, the liberation of South Africa will primarily be the task of the Africans themselves. But we all know that the international community could make a decisive contribution if only the necessary political will is mobilised.

The Security Council of the United Nations should be the expression of a united political will. Therefore, the oppressed peoples look towards this Council with hope and expectation.

It is sometimes said that there is no higher moral than to preserve peace. Rightly so. But as long as there is apartheid and racism, there can be no peace.

**THERE IS NO MIDDLE GROUND IN SOUTHERN AFRICA
BETWEEN OPPRESSORS AND THE OPPRESSED**

*Speech at the United Nations Conference in Support of the Peoples of
Zimbabwe and Namibia, Maputo, May 20, 1977*

This conference has been convened in support of the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe. Let me at the outset convey to them greetings of support and solidarity from the Swedish labour movement. We hail their struggle to achieve freedom and independence. Let me also thank you for the confidence you have shown me by inviting me to speak at this very important conference.

The conference takes place in the capital of Mozambique. This is a country recently born out of the struggle for freedom, now a frontline for the liberation of the entire southern Africa. We pay tribute to the courage and sacrifice of the people of Mozambique.

The conference convenes at a time when the regime in Salisbury has launched open aggression against the neighbouring countries. Mozambique has been a constant target for these attacks. Now Botswana and Zambia are added to the list. We condemn the aggression and pledge our support to the struggle against the aggressors.

The problems of Namibia and Rhodesia/Zimbabwe stem directly from the policies of apartheid in South Africa. For Pretoria, indeed, the territories of Namibia and Rhodesia represent the outer defences for the protection of its racist regime. Thus, it persists in the illegal occupation of a territory enjoying international status, Namibia, and in defiance of Security Council decisions, it gives vital support to the illegal rebel regime in Rhodesia.

The accession to independence of Mozambique and Angola and the emergence of a revolutionary mass movement in South Africa, in Namibia and in Zimbabwe have brought the situation in southern Africa to the forefront of international affairs. It would seem proper for me, a representative, albeit in a personal capacity, of a Western world that has shown so much ambivalence and hesitation, to give my views on where the course of action of those countries should lie.

The future of the black man in South Africa is a mixture of hope and frustration. After Sharpeville in 1960 we hoped for concerted international action against the oppressive regime in South Africa. Many of us took part in international conferences where we said, in optimistic terms, that the time for international intervention had finally come. I remember saying at the Namibia Conference in Oxford in 1966 that the time had come to go from "intention to intervention." But instead, South Africa rearmed with support from abroad and since then Western interests in South Africa have also boomed. Again, after

Soweto we had reason to expect that those who can influence the racist regime towards change will do so. But what we can see is a dragging of feet, a hesitation to apply any concrete and forceful measures.

What is this intricate relationship between the West and South Africa, why should we have this contradiction between a declared, and I am certain, often sincere condemnation of South African policy and the concrete relations that those same Powers which condemn still maintain with Pretoria?

Test for Western Civilisation

The Prime Minister of South Africa, Mr. Vorster, talks about the need to protect Western civilisation and Christian nationalism. At the same time he articulates values of unchristian racial chauvinism, contrary to the basis of Western humanism.

Mr. Ian Smith has said that Rhodesia and South Africa are agreed that they are both fighting to preserve the Western democracy that the white man brought to Africa. They are both hoping for external aid to fight for the interests of what they call the "free world". For us in Europe, with our colonial past, it is necessary to be crystal clear. We will never accept Smith's and Vorster's perversion of Western democracy. Their oppression and racism will never be included in a world of freedom. They represent the very opposite of democracy.

As a representative of a movement that for decades has fought for democracy against all forms of dictatorship, I cannot find words harsh enough to condemn their misuse of the words "democracy" and "freedom". They are denying the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa the most fundamental human and political rights - the same rights that the European labour movement was denied and that formed the basis of the original programmes of our liberation movements. Therefore the workers of Europe are historically linked in solidarity with their oppressed brothers and sisters in Africa.

Indeed the issue in southern Africa has also become a test on the validity of Western civilisation, that is, whether it should be judged by its own enlightened modern values or whether it should be judged by its tolerance of a vicious doctrine of race supremacy. Contempt for human dignity elevated to the status of a system is an offence to our basic ideas. We take pride in our conception of the natural equality of man without which there can be no democratic system. We say that reason, not prejudice, should be the principle guiding our societies. There are, indeed, many deficiencies in our societies showing that we have not yet been able to live up to that principle. Nevertheless, the attitude to be taken in regard to South Africa poses a basic question of morality, of respect for the values and ideas which were created by those very countries in the West that now are seen to support the apartheid regime by their failure to join the great majority of nations in a programme to effect radical change. The peoples of Africa have very seldom

met those high principles of Western civilisation I just mentioned. They have met colonialism, advanced military technology and Western capitalism in its most brutal form. How long shall our professed ideals coexist with apartheid, this weird dictatorship of the minority for social and economic exploitation?

Enlightened Self-interest

It should also be a matter of enlightened self-interest for the Western world to oppose effectively the aggressive and racist regime in Pretoria. The security system of Europe of the 1920s and 1930s failed miserably because aggression was too long tolerated. The aggressors were allowed to grow in military might and expansive self-confidence. The fate of the League of Nations was sealed by its inability to take action against the invasion of an independent African country, Ethiopia. The world was late in reacting to Nazi Germany pursuing its preparations to acquire world supremacy and conducting policies of racial extermination. The nations of Europe and North America had to pay dearly in human lives and material destruction to defend their freedom and the principles of modern society against this barbaric force.

The lessons are clear. The world community has to react against a regime which is in total defiance of its very basic tenets and principles. The Western nations should heed the lessons of history and take decisive action. The repeated acts of aggression by South Africa against neighbouring African States and permanently against Namibia must be punished.

If governments are not moved, neither by reasons of morality and principles nor by reasons of their own enlightened and long-term interests, then, perhaps, fear of imminent losses might be more effective. The profits of foreign companies in South Africa cannot be guaranteed by the present power-holders in Pretoria. There should be no doubt now that the future of southern Africa belongs to the Africans themselves. Apartheid is a regime doomed to disappear and those who now exploit it for the sake of immediate profit are sacrificing much longer-lasting and much more secure advantages in the future.

Already today, the African nations are in a position to show that those who pursue with a single mind economic and material interests should beware of too close a link with the South African regime. The investments of Western firms in black Africa are far greater than the foreign investments in South Africa. The same goes for the trade flows. It should then be wise for the businessmen in the West to recall statements made by African statesmen in the United Nations and I quote from what was said there by the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria:¹⁰

"We cannot continue to have establishments in our midst which at the

¹⁰ Major-General Joseph N. Garba

same time as they profess certain principles in their dealings with us, also cater to and sustain a regime that holds our brothers and sisters in bondage and slavery in complete disregard of those same principles."

Armed Struggle or Peaceful Transformation

South Africa is trying to build itself into one of the world's important military and economic Powers with a supremacy over the whole region of southern Africa. So far, these efforts have been helped by foreign loans and external investments. In 1960, that is, at the time of Sharpeville, foreign investment was three billion rand. At the time of Soweto last year, it was over 10 billion rand. In 1960, the military budget of South Africa was only 44 million rand. Last year it had risen to 1,350 million rand. Peaceful change becomes increasingly unlikely as the arsenals of the racist regime develop into a formidable machinery of both military and economic power for internal oppression and external aggression.

Those who continue to let foreign capital freely flow into South Africa and Namibia take on a great responsibility. South Africa's growing deficit in her balance of payments is to a very large extent due to the sharp increase of her military expenditure. The loans from abroad designed to cover this deficit are thus used for armaments which South Africa otherwise would not be able to afford.

History shows us that change will come about only when the oppressed themselves take action. Support from outside can help but the essence is the will of the people to act, to resist exploitation. But history also shows us that the future is on the side of the oppressed. Our generation has witnessed an historic process of liberation that has swept the continents. Peoples that for centuries have lived under foreign domination have achieved their national independence. We have witnessed the gradual abolition of colonialism. In southern Africa we see the last remnants of this epoch. And there is no reason whatever to believe that the process of liberation should stop at the Zambezi river.

The resistance of the racist regimes raises the question of whether changes can be brought about only by violence, by armed struggle, or whether there is still a peaceful way of eradicating the affront to human dignity known as colonialism, racism and apartheid. We all obviously prefer peaceful solutions to violent ones. But those of us who are privileged and who have had the good fortune of peaceful change should never moralise about it, never try to appear virtuous in relation to those who have been forced to take up arms to liberate themselves. If we do, we have forgotten our own past.

Swedish Experience

I come from a country where we make a virtue of patience, of persuasion rather than threats. But the movement I represent has, like all other radical movements,

at one occasion or other in its history, been confronted with the problem of reform or violent revolution. It was not more than a generation or two ago that Sweden was an underdeveloped, poor and class-ridden society. The Swedish working class chose the peaceful transformation, but it was not alien to revolutionary violence in its struggle against the bureaucratic class society of that time.

At its Congress in 1891 the Swedish Social Democratic Party strongly favoured peaceful change but at the same time said in a resolution:

"The Social Democratic Labour Party, being a revolutionary party striving for a radical transformation of the existing bourgeois society, must take into consideration the possibility of using organised violence as the final means of liberating the suffering proletariat."

By a combination of favourable circumstances we succeeded in transforming our society by peaceful change, by compromise, by majority rule. It could have taken a quite different course.

Let me, Mr. President, outside of the prepared text, make a comment about the native tribes of Scandinavia that may seem exotic to some of you.

By coincidence I come to Maputo directly from the little town of Haugesund, on the west coast of our good neighbour Norway, where the Norwegian National Day was celebrated. For the first time they had invited a speaker from Sweden. On their National Day the Norwegians celebrate their liberation from Sweden in 1905, from Swedish domination and involvement in Norwegian affairs.

It was a tense moment some seventy years ago. Many feared that armed struggle was imminent. The Norwegians would have fought until they had liberated their country. Conservative forces in Sweden wanted to maintain colonial rule, apply law and order.

In a famous resolution written by my predecessor as Chairman of the Social Democratic Party and later Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr. Hjalmar Branting, the Swedish Labour Party said on June 13, 1905:

"The working people of Sweden have united under the banner: Justice for Norway, peace with Norway. Norway has by its own will, by majority rule, decided to renounce the union with Sweden. To persist with a forced union would be foolish and unjust. Our demand 'Justice for Norway` simply means: we recognise unconditionally the right of self-determination of the Norwegian people. No involvement, no paternalism, only a calm and honest disengagement.

"Not until we have recognised without conditions the full independence

of our Norwegian brothers do we have security in our second demand, 'Peace with Norway.'

Thus: first independence, then peace. And I told the fine people of Haugesund that it should not be difficult for them to identify with the African struggle for liberation.

People who take up Arms for Liberation will not give up

It is easy to foresee that when people in search of peace and progress are met only by oppression and exploitation they will ultimately resort to violence. The armed struggle becomes the last possible resort. Now in Namibia and Zimbabwe continued armed struggle seems unavoidable.

And history also tells us that once a people has taken up arms to liberate themselves, they will not give up until freedom has been achieved. How much armed pressure from the nationalists is necessary depends on how much unarmed pressure the Western Powers apply in the form of sanctions and the like, as President Nyerere so well put it. There lies the possibility of an end to the armed struggle and a peaceful settlement on the basis of liberation and majority rule.

Risk of Foreign Intervention

As the climax approaches and the struggle deepens in southern Africa, violence and economic disruption increase, as well as the risk of the wrong kind of foreign involvement. The wrong kind of foreign intervention is the continued introduction of major Power rivalries in the region. The right kind of foreign involvement is that which will support the liberation struggle and reduce the resistance of the forces which still cling to the idea of maintaining white supremacy.

Extensive foreign investments in South Africa, Namibia and Rhodesia help to internationalise the conflict. The natural resources of these countries and their strategic position may furnish a pretext for further involvement on behalf of the white regimes. At the same time, however, such involvement would encourage other Powers to become more active in the area. We are facing the two-fold risk of a racial war and an escalated conflict between the foreign interests in the area. Thus the global consequences of South Africa's aggression against its neighbours and the situation in South Africa created by apartheid - those elements constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. Therefore Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter should be applied.

The struggle of the oppressed should get the support of those outside who are the friends of Africa. In my country, Sweden, there is broad support for such a line of action...

The Africans themselves will know how to master and control the influence of outside Powers. African nations have shown a wise inclination to settle their problems within the continent. Why should there be such concern in the West, I have often wondered, to categorise liberation movements in the Third World countries as friends or enemies of the West? The same, no doubt, applies to discussions among communist countries where the same type of categorisation takes place.

Those in the West who cry wolf about political and material aid to Africa from the East should consider their own contribution to this development. Did they themselves assist the liberation movements? From where did the Portuguese colonialists get their arms? From where did the South African racists get their arms and their licences?

At the same time non-aligned States as well as small nations should unite in solidarity in order to prevent a new scramble for Africa stemming from superpower rivalry and from the profit interests of multinational companies.

We should together oppose a trend of paternalism from those on the outside who seem to believe that only they can solve Africa's problems, that the Africans themselves are unable to find responses to their own aspirations.

The Africans of Zimbabwe, Namibia or South Africa have but one overriding goal: that of their own liberation, their own dignity, their own identity as peoples and nations. They will accept any assistance from whatever source because they wish to achieve their freedom.

The lesson is simple but fundamental: we should support the African peoples' struggle for liberation on their own terms, on African terms, because it represents the longing of the African peoples, the true and vital interests of the African nations.

Need for Action against the Apartheid Regime

Turning to the specific situation in Zimbabwe and Namibia we note that efforts to achieve a settlement of the Rhodesian problem have been intensified in the last year. Such efforts will have to be finally judged by their results. If they lead to solutions that satisfy the aspirations of the African majority, they would of course deserve support. The national liberation movement and the frontline States have a rich experience in dealing with the situation and with the rebel regime in Salisbury. Their attitude as to the form and content of further negotiations will decide the issue.

We are all aware that a negotiated settlement of the Rhodesian and Namibian problems cannot be achieved without the acquiescence of the government in Pretoria. The question has been put in some Western quarters whether that

regime should be treated as an adversary or whether it would not be more fruitful to seek its cooperation by a more positive attitude. The question contains both a factual and a moral fallacy. The government of South Africa will only do what is in its own interest and that interest is defined also in the context of what actions the outside world, particularly the Western Powers, will take. It will no doubt cooperate with the purpose of trying to install pliable regimes in Zimbabwe and Namibia, and it will only let go its hold over these territories when they become liabilities too costly to retain. It is possible to talk to the Pretoria government if at the same time sanctions and increasing pressure are applied to give weight to the words.

No solution of the problems of Zimbabwe and Namibia could ever contain any guarantee for the survival of apartheid in South Africa. What is finally at stake in Rhodesia as well as in Namibia is the future also of South Africa.

In Rhodesia, South Africa controls the survival of the rebel regime. In Namibia it is itself in direct control by military force. South Africa has 50,000 troops in that territory which it rules in contravention of international law and countless United Nations resolutions. The South African plan for the territory is to divide the African population in a manner that would retain white economic and political control. It appears though that the government in Pretoria is now prepared to abandon its Turnhalle puppets,¹¹ though just how far it will go is still not clear.

It is not for me to express myself on the points under negotiation. I can only recall certain basic principles. We are confronted with a colonial authority and the representatives of the people. The United Nations have the legal responsibility over Namibia and should be a party to any negotiations as well as supervise and control any elections that may take place. The presence of South Africa, in the form of soldiers and political prisoners, symbolic of that regime, should come to an end.

The basic elements of the situation in southern Africa have by now been well analysed. This conference makes a most valuable contribution. The need to act and to act decisively is clear to all. Action will have to be directed primarily against the apartheid regime because the survival of that system embraces the problems of Namibia and Zimbabwe. The struggle is first and foremost the struggle of Africans, but it has long ceased to be exclusively an African struggle. It is a testing ground for all governments, a measure of their sincerity to commitments and principles.

Action on National Level

¹¹ In 1975, the South African regime organised a "constitutional conference of so-called representatives of ethnic groups at Turnhalle in Windhoek. They produced a constitution in March 1977. The United Nations denounced this conference and its participants were repudiated by the Namibian people.

The United Nations, with its Security Council, have a very particular and central responsibility.

However, the actions taken in the United Nations, or the lack of such actions, cannot serve as an alibi for passivity on the national level. Each country and government, each popular movement, has its own responsibility and its own role to play. That is why we have gathered here. The example is given by the frontline States in what they do for the liberation struggle notwithstanding heavy costs in human and material terms.

Allow me then to recapitulate some of the areas where I believe action should be taken.

First, we must work for a halt to all exports to South Africa and all military cooperation with its government. The apparatus of oppression is strengthened by each new weapons delivery or licence. The military cooperation gives the country the means to start its own manufacturing of arms in most important areas of weapon technology, may be also in the ultimate of weapons. Can one really condemn the policy of apartheid in the United Nations, while one at the same time sends arms to those who are practising apartheid? A United Nations decision on a mandatory arms embargo is long overdue.

Second, we must seriously deal with the question of investment and export of capital to South Africa and Namibia. In this we should include the effects of transfer of technology as a strengthening of apartheid.

A ban on investment in South Africa can be really efficient only if it is part of an international action that has the support of industrialised countries with the largest economic interests in South African business and industry. The Security Council will shortly resume its discussions on this question, *inter alia* on the basis of a Swedish proposal adopted by the General Assembly last autumn, calling for action against foreign investment. A positive decision on this item would be the minimum expected from Western governments.

And to those who claim that such measures would upset basic principles of the Western economic system, we must explain that free men are more important than free movement of capital.

The question of limiting or ending foreign economic interests in South Africa is not merely a political question about what could conceivably be done to put effective pressure on the South African Government; it also becomes a moral question for each government. Should the companies in our countries be allowed to take part in the exploitation of the black labour force? According to South African laws, the foreign companies have to apply the rules of apartheid at their places of work. Thereby they are forced to place themselves on the side of the oppressors in the battle which is now about to enter a new and more serious stage.

Therefore, in my opinion, the situation in South Africa has progressed to such a point that, in addition to international measures, each country has to consider unilateral prohibitive measures.

In Sweden, the Social Democratic Party has indicated one way to deal with this problem. We ask our Parliament for an immediate change in the currency legislation in order to prohibit the export of capital to South Africa and Namibia. As a second step to guarantee the deceleration of Swedish financial interests in the area, we urge the government to initiate discussions with the companies having subsidiaries in other countries investing in South Africa, for the purpose of reaching an agreement on how restrictions on Swedish companies in those countries should be applied. If such an agreement cannot be reached, we will propose further legislative measures.

Let me in this context add the following. It has been argued against a ban on investments in South Africa that this would hurt the parent companies in the Western world and lead to unemployment for the workers there. But in this case, it is important to note that the workers themselves have made their choice, through their international confederations. They have told their governments that they support a ban on investments in South Africa and Namibia and are prepared to take its consequences. Now, the governments and the companies must take their responsibilities and show which forces they want to support.

Third, we can give material and political support to the liberation movements and the already autonomous States in their struggle for national independence and economic emancipation. The repeated acts of aggression against Zambia, Angola, Mozambique and Botswana must be rebuffed. And if the opposition to foreign involvement in African affairs is to be credible, then an end must also be put to the recruitment, financing, training, transit and assembly of mercenaries on our own soil.

Governments could also easily increase their contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa, the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, the International University Exchange Fund and the like. Those bodies need funds and are doing extremely useful work in the field of humanitarian and legal aid to the victims of apartheid.

Fourth, our refusal to recognise the so-called independent bantustans - Transkei being the first one - should be followed up by opposition to the efforts of international companies to give unofficial recognition by massive investments in those areas.

Fifth, the illegal regime in Zimbabwe must be pressured to relinquish power. Sanctions must be strengthened.

Sixth, we should increase our efforts to bring an end to the illegal occupation of

Namibia, refute sham arrangements and refuse recognition to any puppets installed by South Africa. Support should be given to the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), without whose participation no realistic policy can be shaped. Namibia should have immediate independence and majority rule. Free elections should be held under the supervision and control of the United Nations and should encompass the whole of Namibia as one political entity.

Neutrality is Impossible

Neutrality toward the existing and coming struggles in southern Africa is impossible. Between the exploiters and the exploited there is no middle ground. We cannot escape the question: Whose allies do we want to be? Which side are we?

This conference is dealing with speeches, documents, resolutions, programmes of action. Behind these words and papers lies the reality of people. Human beings who suffer the indignities of apartheid, men and women who are imprisoned as political prisoners or mental detainees, children who are deprived of food and shelter, who see their parents constantly humiliated, who have known only resentment, rejection and violence.

The people here in Mozambique suffered their Wiriyama and their Mucumbura. The people of South Africa suffered their Sharpeville and Soweto. The people of Zimbabwe suffered their Nyadzonya and Dawn Krael and Ndanga. The people of Namibia suffered their Katatura and their Sialola.¹² How many more names like this must be added to the list, before southern Africa has finally been liberated?

This is a daily reality of people, but it is also the reality of this conference. We must not fail in our support of human dignity, in our solidarity with the struggle for liberation. This conference is important as an expression of this solidarity and, hopefully, as a basis for concerted action.

The longing for peace is common to all people. But so long as there is apartheid and racism, there can be no peace.

¹² Wiriyamu, Mucumbura, Sharpeville, Soweto, Nyadzonya, Dawn Krael, Ndanga, Katatura and Sialola refer to places where unarmed Africans were massacred by the forces of the white minority regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia in their efforts to suppress resistance.

STRUGGLE AGAINST APARTHEID IS A UNIVERSAL CAUSE

Speech at the World Conference for Action against Apartheid, Lagos, August 22, 1977

We have assembled here in Lagos united by a common goal: the total elimination of apartheid. There can be no reform of apartheid, no compromise on apartheid, this weird dictatorship of the minority for social and economic exploitation.

This year we have had the debate on South Africa in the United Nations Security Council and in the United Nations Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia in Maputo, and now we meet here in Lagos at this World Conference for Action against Apartheid. May I add, Mr. President, that I find the capital of Nigeria a most appropriate site for this conference. Nigeria is playing a prominent role in the conduct of African affairs, especially in the struggle against apartheid. Her record in the United Nations is particularly laudable. And we all know the key role Ambassador Leslie Harriman is playing as Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid.

And today in the remarkable speech by the Head of State of Nigeria,¹³ his country has shown the world - and the apartheid regime - that Nigeria's commitment against racism is total and exemplary. We salute your determination and commitment.

Critical Stage in Liberation Struggle in Southern Africa

These meetings have attracted an ever wider attendance from all parts of the world. They assemble with a growing feeling of urgency and determination. Programmes of action with the backing of the world community are formulated, above all in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Thus the problems of southern Africa are in the forefront of international affairs. We are all aware that we are witnessing the final stage, the inevitable disappearance of the apartheid system. We can rejoice at the success of the liberation movements, the increased isolation of the racist regimes, the strong public opinion in the whole world.

But at the same time we also know that the situation is very grave. We are faced with a serious challenge, a common responsibility for the entire world

¹³ Lt. General Olusegun Obasanjo

community. How could we in common ensure that this inevitable process of liberation is not delayed, that it is not accompanied by massive violence, unnecessary bloodshed and human suffering, that it will not ultimately lead to a superpower conflict and a world conflagration? In view of the huge arsenals for external aggression and internal oppression at the disposal of the racist regimes and the extremist attitudes expressed in those countries, these are pertinent questions and a vital responsibility.

The answer to these questions and this responsibility is common and determined action against apartheid.

In Southern Rhodesia there is armed struggle. At the same time there are serious efforts through the Anglo-American initiative to find a peaceful settlement on the basis of majority rule. The white regime in Southern Rhodesia has reacted in an extremist way. It has committed repeated aggression towards the neighbouring countries; it has in fact increased internal oppression. This regime is thereby taking on a great responsibility. The longer it postpones the inevitable change to majority rule, the lesser room there will be for compromise and tolerance, the harder the terms will be for the losers. It should certainly be in the interest of the majority of the white minority in Southern Rhodesia to abandon its present policies. You cannot expect 95 percent of Southern Rhodesia's population to compromise on majority rule, or to agree to the retention, even for a transition period, of the armed power on which minority rule is based. There may still be time for a negotiated settlement in Zimbabwe. But the prerequisite is an end to white extremism.

In Namibia we can now see a possible way to a peaceful termination of South Africa's illegal occupation. This requires the full implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976).¹⁴ Let us hope that this opportunity will not be lost.

We all know that a peaceful settlement of the problems of Southern Rhodesia and Namibia requires the acquiescence of the Government in Pretoria. Some have talked about a price to be paid or guarantee to be given to South Africa in return for this. Let me repeat what I have said before: the government of South Africa will only do what is in its own interest and that interest is defined also in the context of what actions the outside world, particularly the Western Powers, will take. It will no doubt cooperate with the purpose of trying to install pliable regimes in Zimbabwe and Namibia, and it will only let go its hold over these territories when they become liabilities too costly to retain. It is possible to talk to the Pretoria Government if at the same time sanctions and increasing pressure are applied to give weight to the words. No solution of the problems of Zimbabwe

¹⁴ In resolution 385 adopted on January 30, 1976, the Security Council decided on free elections in Namibia "under the supervision and control of the United Nations" - after the release of political prisoners and the abrogation of repressive and discriminatory measures - to enable the people of Namibia to determine their own future.

and Namibia could ever contain any guarantee for the survival of apartheid in South Africa.

What is finally at stake in Southern Rhodesia as well as in Namibia is the future also of South Africa. It is of fundamental importance to be unequivocal, not to resort to wishful thinking on this point, especially in view of the developments in South Africa itself during the last two years.

The Final Failure of Apartheid

During these last two years we have witnessed the final failure of the system of apartheid, even if viewed from the perspective of the architects of the system. Their promise was racial coexistence, peace and stability. But the people of Soweto and other urban townships in South Africa showed by their revolt that they regard the system as impossible to endure. They do not demand reforms. They demand total and immediate change. And the reply of the authorities has been to increase violence. The children of Soweto have shown that they do not want to grow up as victims of an obnoxious system. Their revolt will continue, flare up again and again so long as apartheid remains. Soweto was a signal, a watershed in the development towards the ultimate downfall of the system.

Last year, the first of the black homelands, the Transkei, was given its so-called independence. But the entire world community has refused to recognise that independence. And some of the homeland leaders have become angry critics of the racist regime.

Thus the policies of racial separation, instead of leading to greater harmony, increased the contradictions and the conflicts within the country.

The architects of apartheid know that the system has no future. It is a question of time before it will collapse entirely. But every day it continues means suffering for the children in Soweto and for millions of human beings in southern Africa. For them time is precious.

What it all amounts to, when the ideological trappings are removed, is that the white authorities do not want to give up their relative prosperity and their privileged position. In order to retain these privileges they profess a vicious and anachronistic doctrine of race supremacy; they have created a legal and social structure in total contradiction to fundamental human and political rights; and they use massive violence against those who oppose or try to change the system. But the privileges of the white minorities rest on two pillars: first, the continued use of cheap labour and the economic exploitation of the African population; second, the continued support from abroad, from what the leaders of the racist regimes usually refer to as the "free world". Without these two pillars apartheid would crumble.

People in West Should Consider their own Contribution

The liberation from exploitation will come from within Africa; it will be pursued and led to victory by the Africans themselves. The African people prefer, as before, to achieve their liberation by peaceful means. But if they are met only by oppression and violence, they will not hesitate to resort to armed struggle, as they once did in Algeria, Angola, Mozambique and Guinea- Bissau and as they have been forced to do in Namibia and Zimbabwe. And history tells us that when a people have taken up arms to liberate themselves, they will not give up until freedom is achieved. Under these circumstances I see little reason for people from abroad to moralise about the resort to arms, especially as they have for so long condoned institutional violence to uphold the privileges of the minority.

The victims of apartheid have but one overriding goal: that of their own liberation, their own dignity, their own identity as peoples and nations. They will accept any assistance - in economic terms, in arms, in equipment - from whatever source, because they wish to achieve their freedom, to be free at last. Those in the West who are upset about political and material aid to Africa's liberation should consider their own contribution. Did they themselves assist the liberation movements? From where did the Portuguese colonialists get their arms? From where have South African racists get their arms and their licences?

Support African Peoples' Struggle on their own Terms

At the same time it is of utmost importance that we oppose paternalism, oppose efforts to use African countries as pawns in a power game, prevent a new scramble for Africa stemming from superpower rivalry and from the profit interests of multinational companies. Small nations and non-aligned States have a special interest in this context.

We should repeat and repeat again, in words and deeds, the simple but fundamental lesson: we must support the African peoples' struggle for liberation on their own terms, on African terms, because it represents the longing of the African peoples, the need and vital interests of the African nations. The liberation from apartheid will be the work, and the victory of the African peoples themselves. But they should feel the wholehearted support from the world community.

Withdraw Economic Support to Apartheid

This brings me to the second pillar of the apartheid system: the factual support from abroad. It is not often that the ideas and practices of apartheid are openly defended in other countries. But in concrete terms the South African regime has received massive support in the form of arms and military cooperation, transfer of technology, large loans and capital investments. There has thus been and is a contradiction between a declared condemnation of apartheid and the concrete

relations that Western countries have maintained and do maintain with Pretoria.

The representatives of the regime have concluded that they have an ideological affinity to Western democracies, that they, furthermore, are part of a world-wide struggle against the communist menace. In truth, Smith and Vorster represent a perversion of Western democracy. Their oppression and racism will never be included in a world of freedom.

It is an important development - if I can read the news correctly - that the Pretoria regime is finally beginning to realise not only that the apartheid policy has failed in practice, but also that it has become increasingly isolated and really has no friends in the world. Of even greater importance is the fact that after Soweto, international capital is beginning to look upon South Africa as a "risk" country. South Africa depends on a continued inflow of capital from abroad. Her growing deficit in the balance of payments is to a very large extent due to the sharp increase in military expenditure. The loans from abroad, designated to cover their deficit, are thus used for armaments which South Africa otherwise could not afford.

It is often said that the Western Powers must apply strong external pressure on the regime in Pretoria. That is certainly so. But it is perhaps more correct to say that it is a question of withdrawing economic support without which the apartheid system could not exist for very long.

The West can learn from Africa, especially from Nigeria's stand. Concerted action from the international community through the United Nations will of course be the most efficient action. But the action taken, or the lack of such action, can no longer serve as an alibi for passivity on the national level. Each country has its own responsibility and role to play. An immediate ban on investments and export of capital to the racist regime should be a minimum target.

Allow me, Mr. President, in this context to report that, in my country, the Swedish Parliament has recently adopted a Social Democratic Party motion which instructs the Government to appoint a commission in order to work out - without delay - legislation to prohibit new investments and export of capital from Sweden to Namibia and South Africa. To those who claim that such measures upset basic principles of the Western economic system, we repeat: free men are more important than free movement of capital.

Elimination of Apartheid will Contribute to Peace

It is my sincere hope that this conference will formulate and stimulate action, be an important step on the road from intention to intervention in the struggle against apartheid.

In Maputo we said: the longing for peace is common to all peoples. But so long

as there is apartheid, there will be no peace. Therefore the struggle against apartheid is a legitimate and universal cause.

The elimination of apartheid will be a contribution to peace.

REPORT OF THE SOUTHERN AFRICA MISSION OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL¹⁵

At the last Congress of the Socialist International, in Geneva in November last year, the problems of southern Africa were in the forefront of our discussions. We stated, among other things in our resolution, that "neutrality towards the existing and coming struggles in southern Africa is impossible. Between the exploiters and the exploited there is no middle ground. Action must be taken to end a system which is both evil in itself and a threat to peace."

Later on, in March 1977 in London, the Socialist International decided at a Bureau meeting, to send a delegation to the frontline States. The aim of the mission was to express the solidarity of the Socialist International with the liberation movements in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, to further the Socialist International's contacts with the governments and parties of the frontline States and to study the reality in southern Africa on the spot.

Events in southern Africa have also made 1977 a year of mounting pressure against apartheid all over the world, with a focal point in the United Nations. In March this year the Security Council debated the South African question; in May the United Nations Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia convened in Maputo; and in August the United Nations World Conference for Action against Apartheid met in Lagos.

On the one hand, these efforts are reflecting a growing awareness that the world is witnessing what seems to be the final stage, the inevitable disappearance of the apartheid system. The liberation movements are gaining strength, the racist regimes are being increasingly isolated and world opinion against apartheid is getting stronger.

But on the other hand, the situation is very grave. The military and economic power, the huge arsenals for external aggression and internal oppression at the disposal of the racist regimes and the extremist attitudes expressed in these countries are indications of this. We are facing the two-fold task of a racial war and an escalated conflict between the foreign interests in this area. Africa has traditionally been an area of colonialist ambitions from the West. It is now a theatre for superpower rivalries and involvement from many countries, and the

¹⁵ In September 1977, a mission of the Socialist International, led by Mr. Olof Palme, visited Angola, Zambia, Botswana, Mozambique and Tanzania to convey the solidarity of the Socialist International to the frontline States and the liberation movements. The mission consisted of twelve members from ten countries. Mr. Palme presented this report to the meeting of the Bureau of the Socialist International (Madrid, October 15-16, 1977) which adopted it unanimously. The report is essentially an endorsement of what Mr. Palme had been advocating in several speeches in 1977.

Cuban presence in Angola is a further important factor.

The global consequences of the developments in southern Africa, South Africa's threats and aggressions against her neighbours, the situation in South Africa created by apartheid and the white regime's ambition to develop nuclear energy - these four elements constitute a threat to international peace and security.

This was the background to our mission in September to Angola, Zambia, Botswana, Mozambique and Angola.

Situation in Southern Africa

Tanzania and Zambia have by now consolidated their independence. They play an important role in world affairs as sovereign nations. But they are still striving to reach economic emancipation. Botswana has staunchly defended her independence, but has a difficult geographical location. Angola and Mozambique have recently gained their national independence, but in many respects they are in a difficult situation. They still have to defend their borders, to fight against systematic aggression which takes a heavy toll in material and human terms. Their economic problems have been aggravated by the massive exodus of trained people from the former colonial Power. In the north of Angola, as a result of the Shaba war, there are more than 200,000 refugees from Zaire, who are in great need of assistance. Mozambique is particularly hurt by white Rhodesia's aggression: 2,800 people have been killed during the last fifteen months. The border closure is estimated to cost the country two hundred million dollars per year. Six thousand people lost their jobs. There are 37,000 refugees from Rhodesia.

But all five States are in the frontline in the struggle against apartheid. Their courageous and costly solidarity with the liberation struggle is an example to the world.

In Rhodesia there is armed struggle. At the same time there are serious efforts through the Anglo-American initiative to find a peaceful settlement on the basis of majority rule. We prefer a negotiated settlement, and the Anglo-American proposals could to our mind serve as a basis for such negotiations. Apparently the African side has also accepted this. The white regime in Rhodesia has, however, reacted in an extremist way. It has committed repeated aggression towards the neighbouring countries and increased internal oppression. This minority regime is thereby taking on a great responsibility. The longer it postpones the inevitable change to majority rule, the harder the terms will be for the losers. One cannot expect 95 percent of Rhodesia's population to compromise on majority rule, or to accept to retain the armed power on which minority rule is based. There may still be time for a negotiated settlement in Zimbabwe. But the prerequisite is an end to white extremism and maximalist positions on all sides. And if the war goes on, there can be no doubt of the ultimate victory of the liberation struggle.

In Namibia a possible way to a peaceful termination of South Africa's illegal occupation is at hand. This requires the full implementation of Security Council resolution 385 (1976). Till then we must continue our support to SWAPO (the South West Africa People's Organisation), refute sham arrangements and refuse recognition of South African puppets. Namibia should have immediate independence and majority rule based on democratic principles. Free elections should be held under the supervision and control of the United Nations and should encompass the whole of Namibia as one political entity.

A peaceful settlement of the Rhodesian and Namibian problems requires the acquiescence of the Government in Pretoria. But there can be no price to be paid to South Africa in return for this. The Government of South Africa will certainly only do what is in its own interest. It will no doubt cooperate with the purpose of trying to install pliable regimes in Zimbabwe and Namibia, and it will only let go its hold over these territories when they have become liabilities too costly to retain. It is possible to talk to the Pretoria Government if at the same time sanctions and increasing pressure are applied to give weight to the words. No solution of the problems of Zimbabwe and Namibia could ever contain any guarantee for the survival of apartheid in South Africa. What is finally at stake in Rhodesia as well as in Namibia is the future also of South Africa.

It is of fundamental importance to be unequivocal, not to resort to wishful thinking on this point, especially in view of the developments in South Africa itself during the last two years. During these last two years the final failure of the system of apartheid has become evident, even if viewed from the perspective of the architects of the system. Their promise was racial coexistence, peace and stability. But the people of Soweto and other urban townships in South Africa showed by their revolt that they regard the system as impossible to endure. They do not demand reforms. They demand total and immediate change. And the reply of the authorities has been to increase violence. The young generation of South Africa has shown that it does not want to grow up as victim of an obnoxious system. Their motives were explained to us by Alfred Nzo, Secretary-General of the African National Congress of South Africa:

"You in Europe may find it strange that the school children of Soweto revolted because they had to learn Afrikaans. But to the children the message was clear. They would be forced to learn the language of their oppressors, not their own. They would be educated to be good slaves to the racists and never be allowed to enjoy the green pastures of equality. For them, this was a declaration of war. They had to revolt."

And their revolt will continue, flare up again and again so long as apartheid remains. Soweto was a signal, a watershed in the development towards the ultimate downfall of apartheid.

Last year, the first of the black homelands, the Transkei, was given its so-called independence. But the entire world community has refused to recognise this independence. And some of the homeland leaders have become angry critics of the racist regime. Thus the policies of racial separation, instead of leading to greater harmony, have increased the contradictions and the conflicts within the country. Apartheid is a unique kind of evil. It is the only tyranny branding a person right from birth according to the colour of the skin. From the very moment of conception the child's destiny is determined.

What it all amounts to, when the ideological trappings are removed, is that the white minorities do not want to give up their relative prosperity and their privileged position. In order to retain these privileges they profess a vicious and anachronistic doctrine of race supremacy; they have created a legal, institutional and social structure in total contradiction to fundamental human and political rights, and they use massive violence against those who oppose or try to change the system.

But the privileges of the white minorities rest on two pillars: first, the continued use of cheap labour and the economic and social exploitation of the African populations; second, the continued support from abroad, from what the leaders of the racist regime usually refer to as the free world. Without these two pillars apartheid would crumble.

General conclusions

The Independence of Africa

The degree of openness and friendliness with which we were met everywhere reflected a sincere and deep-rooted wish for non-alignment and diversified relations in all fields, for cultural, political and economic exchange to mutual benefit. African countries do not want to be used as pawns in a power game. We must work to prevent a modern scramble for Africa stemming from superpower rivalry and from the profit interests of multinational companies.

We must support the African people's struggle for liberation on their own terms, on African terms, because it represents the longing of the African peoples, the need and vital interests of the African nations. Liberation movements are not monolithic organisations. They represent a broad spectrum of opinion.

Armed Struggle

The African peoples prefer, as before, to achieve their liberation by peaceful means. But if they are met only by oppression and violence, they will continue to resort to armed struggle, as they once did in Algeria, in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau and as they now have been forced to do in Namibia and Zimbabwe. And history tells us that when a people has taken up arms to liberate

itself, it will not give up until freedom is achieved. Under these circumstances there is no reason for people from abroad to moralise about the resort to arms, especially as so many have for so long condoned institutional violence to uphold the privileges of the minority.

The victims of apartheid have but one over-riding goal: that of their own liberation, their own dignity, their own identity as peoples and nations. They will accept any assistance - in economic terms, in arms, in equipment - from whatever source because they wish to achieve their freedom, to be free at last. President Kaunda made this very clear to us:

"In Africa we do not produce arms. We asked the West for arms. They did not give us any. Instead Vorster and Smith, like the Portuguese colonialists before, received arms from the West. Then we turned to the East. They did not come to us, we came to them, as a last resort. They furnished us with arms and we are grateful for that. But this does not mean that we are communists. Nor that we want to be or become dependent on them. But we find the moralising attitude in the West concerning this political necessity rather hard to bear."

The Factual Support from Abroad

It is not often that the ideas and practices of apartheid are openly defended in other countries. But in concrete terms the South African regime has received massive support in the form of arms and military cooperation, transfer of technology, large loans and capital investments. There has thus been and is a contradiction between a declared condemnation of apartheid and the concrete relations that Western countries have maintained with Pretoria.

South Africa depends on a continued inflow of capital from abroad. Her growing deficit in the balance of payments is to a very large extent due to the sharp increase in military expenditure which has quadrupled over the last four years. The loans from abroad, designated to cover their deficit, are thus used for armaments which South Africa otherwise could not afford. It is not possible to condemn the policy of apartheid and at the same time send arms to those who are practising apartheid.

It has been argued against a ban on investments in South Africa that this would hurt the parent companies in the Western world and lead to unemployment for the workers. But in this case, it is important to note that the workers themselves have made their choice, through their international confederations. Such is the case of the ICFTU (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions). They have told their governments that they support a ban on investments in South Africa and Namibia and are prepared to take its consequences. Now the governments and the companies must take their responsibilities and show which forces they want to

support.

The question of limiting or ending foreign economic interests in South Africa is also a moral question for each government, whether the companies should be allowed to take part in the exploitation of the black labour force. According to South African laws, the foreign companies have to apply the rules of apartheid at their places of work. Thereby they are forced to place themselves on the side of the oppressors in the battle which is now about to enter a new and more serious stage. At the same time it is a fact that the disparity of wages between black and white workers continues to widen.

Therefore, we feel the situation in South Africa has progressed to such a point that, in addition to international measures, each country has to consider unilateral measures. In Norway this is already a fact and in Sweden Parliament has recently adopted a Social Democratic Party motion and instructed the Government to appoint a commission in order to work out - without delay - legislation to prohibit by law new investments and export of capital from Sweden to Namibia and South Africa. And to those who claim that such measures would upset basic principles of the Western economic system, we must explain that free men are more important than the free movement of capital.

Democracy and Apartheid

The representatives of the white regimes have concluded that they have an ideological affinity to Western democracies; that they, furthermore, are part of a world-wide struggle against the communist menace. In truth, Smith and Vorster represent a perversion of Western democracy.

Their oppression and racism will never be included in a free world. They represent the very opposite of democracy. They are denying the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa the most fundamental human and political rights - the same rights that the European labour movement was denied and that formed the basis of the original programme of their liberation movements. Therefore, the workers of Europe historically are linked in solidarity with the oppressed in Africa.

It is often said that the Western Powers must apply strong external pressure on the regime in Pretoria. This is certainly so. But it is perhaps more correct to say that it is a question of withdrawing economic support without which the apartheid system could not exist for very long. Concerted action from the international community through the United Nations will of course be the most efficient action. But the action taken, or the lack of such action in the United Nations, can no longer serve as an alibi for passivity on the national level. Each country and government, each political party and popular movement, has its own responsibility and its own role to play.

The Responsibility of the Socialist International

The friendliness and openness which we met indicate also that expectations on our International are high. Decades of negative experiences or passivity from the West cannot be eradicated by words only. This situation is a serious challenge, but also a joint responsibility for the entire world community to make a contribution so that the process of liberation is not delayed - that it is not accompanied by massive violence, unnecessary bloodshed and human suffering, which could ultimately lead to a superpower conflict and a world conflagration.

The action of the Socialist International should be directed against the two pillars of apartheid mentioned above. The liberation from exploitation will be the work and the victory of the African peoples themselves. But they should feel the wholehearted support from the world community. A consistent support to this African struggle for freedom and social justice should be a natural act of solidarity for democratic socialists. It is, however, also an obligation for the Socialist International and its member parties to take actions against the second pillar of apartheid - the support from abroad.

Programme of Action

We can see the following areas where action could and should be taken.

1. *We must halt all arms exports to South Africa and all military cooperation with its Government.* The apparatus of oppression is strengthened by each new weapons delivery or licence. The military cooperation gives the country the means to start its own manufacturing of arms in most important areas of weapons technology, may be in the ultimate of weapons.. We must oppose the transfer of strategic technology to South Africa, including nuclear. No African country or combination of African countries could be a military threat to South Africa. Yet South Africa continues to be armed from abroad. A United Nations decision on a mandatory arms embargo is long overdue.

2. *We must work for a prohibition of new investments and export of capital to South Africa and Namibia.* A ban on investment in South Africa can be really efficient only if it is part of an international action that has the support of industrialised countries with the largest economic interests in South African business and industry. The United Nations Security Council will resume its discussions on this question *inter alia* on the basis of a Swedish proposal adopted by the General Assembly last autumn, calling for action against foreign investment. A positive decision on this item would be the minimum expected from Western governments.

Given the explosive situation in South Africa, each country, however, has to consider, in addition to international measures, unilateral action as, for example, has been done in Norway and Sweden.

3. *We must work for increased support to the frontline States. They show exemplary solidarity with the liberation struggle, experience great sacrifices and are objects of aggression. They all have a large number of refugees.*

More countries should follow the United Nations recommendation to contribute to alleviate Mozambique's economic difficulties as a consequence of the border closure.

4. *We should give political support to the liberation movements, humanitarian aid and material support for peaceful purposes to the ANC of South Africa, to the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe and to SWAPO of Namibia. Support could be given in many ways. All movements have many refugees to feed and clothe. These have found a refuge mainly in the frontline States. Aid to them can be channelled through the host governments. SWAPO is probably facing an election campaign in a near future and is in great need of financial and technical assistance.*

5. *Governments should contribute or increase contributions to help the victims of apartheid. This includes help for legal assistance, help to the families of political prisoners, refugee aid and scholarships. Among the channels to use are the International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, the International University Exchange Fund and the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.*

In Lusaka, the United Nations Namibia Institute, which prepares administrators for a free Namibia, needs more funds. It is estimated that practically all white civil servants, who constitute two-thirds of the administration in Namibia, will leave the country after independence.

6. *We should encourage governments to contribute to efforts in southern Africa towards regional cooperation, aiming at reducing dependence on South Africa,.*

7. *We must stop the flow of mercenaries to the racist regimes. This implies legislation to end the recruitment, financing, training, transit and assembly of mercenaries from our own territories. Mercenaries play and can pay a fatal role in the prolongation of the war in Rhodesia and Namibia.*

8. *We should all intensify our solidarity work for the liberation of southern Africa. Each party should start a national solidarity campaign in order to mobilise public opinion, raise funds and counter-balance racist propaganda in our mass media.*

9. *Governments should assist popular movements working in support of the liberation struggle in southern Africa. These include political parties, trade unions, churches and other socio-political groups.*

Indeed, the issue in southern Africa has also become a test of the validity of our

civilisation, that is whether it should be judged by its own enlightened modern values or whether it should be judged by its tolerance of a vicious doctrine of race supremacy. Contempt for human dignity elevated to the status of a system is an offence to our basic ideas.

Democratic socialists take pride in their conception of the natural equality of man without which there can be no democratic system. We say that reason, social justice and solidarity, not prejudice and oppression should be the principles guiding our societies.

There are, indeed, many deficiencies in our societies showing that we have not yet been able to live up to that principle. Nevertheless, the attitude to be taken in regard to South Africa poses a basic question of morality, of respect for the values and ideas which were created by those very countries in the West that now are seen to support the apartheid regime by their failure to join the great majority of nations in a programme to effect radical change. The peoples of Africa have very seldom encountered those high principles of our civilisation just mentioned. They have met colonialism, advanced military technology and Western capitalism in its most brutal form. Our professed ideals can no longer coexist with apartheid.

Our journey has reinforced our conviction that the Socialist International and its member parties can make an important contribution to the liberation of Africa.

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM MUST BE ON THE SIDE OF AFRICAN LIBERATION

*Speech at the Congress of the Socialist International, Vancouver, November 4,
1978*

Two years ago at the Geneva Congress, the Socialist International committed itself to intensify its struggle against apartheid and exploitation in southern Africa. We said in our resolution that "neutrality towards the existing and coming struggles in southern Africa is impossible. Between the exploiters and the exploited there is no middle ground. Action must be taken to end a system which is both evil and a threat to peace.

In March 1977, the Bureau decided to send a mission to Angola, Zambia, Botswana, Mozambique and Tanzania, the so-called frontline States. The aim of the mission was to express the solidarity of the Socialist International with the liberation movements in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, to further our contacts with the governments and parties of the frontline States and to study the reality in southern Africa on the spot.

Events in southern Africa over the last years have also mobilised a mounting pressure against apartheid all over the world, with a focal point in the United Nations. We can in all modesty state that the Socialist International and democratic socialists have played a role, directly and indirectly, in these deliberations.

The Socialist International mission with representatives of ten member parties took place in September 1977. The mission presented a report, including a nine-point programme of action, to the Madrid Bureau meeting in October 1977. The Bureau unanimously adopted the recommendations for action.

We had in our report pointed out the extreme gravity of the situation in southern Africa. The military and economic power, the huge arsenals for external aggression and internal suppression at the disposal of the racist regimes and the extremist attitudes expressed in these countries were indications of this. The report further underlined the two-fold risk of a racial war and an escalated conflict between the foreign, non-African interests in the area. Having been traditionally an area of colonialist ambitions, Africa was now also a theatre for superpower rivalries.

The global consequences of the developments in southern Africa, the racist regime's threats and aggressions against their neighbouring countries, the explosive internal situation created by apartheid and South Africa's ambition to develop nuclear energy - those four elements constituted in our view a threat to international peace and security.

What could our contribution then be to avoid further escalation and to bring an end to that unique evil which is apartheid? We came to the following conclusion:

Apartheid rests on two pillars.

First - the continued use of cheap labour and economic and social exploitation of the African population.

Second - the continued support from abroad, from what the leaders of the racist regimes usually refer to as the "free world."

Without these two pillars apartheid would crumble.

Liberation from exploitation is basically a matter for the Africans themselves. But they should feel the wholehearted support from the world community in their difficult struggle. To take action against the second pillar, the factual support from abroad is mainly an obligation for those who live in the richer, industrialised countries in the West. It is very clearly an obligation for the Socialist International and her member parties.

Programme of Action of Socialist International

Therefore, in solidarity with the African liberation struggles, we suggested the following programme of action which was approved by the Bureau...¹⁶

This is the platform for our action, the goals to which democratic socialists have committed themselves. It was an important step forward that we could agree on this programme. It is being implemented in many countries, in different ways. The degree to which our parties and governments live up to the programme will decide how public opinion in our own countries and the African peoples will judge our political will to contribute to the struggle for peace and against apartheid.

Danger of Great Power Confrontation in Africa

We must remind ourselves that in southern Africa we are witnessing an inevitable process towards racial and national emancipation of the black people of this area. This process is accompanied by great dangers for world peace and of racial conflict. The liberation process continues slowly and at the cost of great human suffering.

The fears we expressed some years ago regarding Great Power intervention and

¹⁶ Please see the previous section, report of the southern Africa mission of the Socialist International, for text of the programme of action.

confrontation in Africa have unfortunately proved well-founded. In some areas, it has been a rather sickening spectacle. On the African Horn, they have changed partners. Ethiopia, traditionally equipped by American arms, turned to the Soviet Union in its conflict with Somalia, a country previously supplied from the Soviet arsenal but which now receives backing from some Western Powers. The incidents in Zaire and the Shaba province were not very complimentary to the actors on the stage. We are fully justified in criticising the communist Great Powers for their activities in Africa and the Cuban presence in some countries. But we should refrain from grotesque exaggeration of the importance of Cuba in Africa. There can be no excuse whatsoever for the countries of the West to relapse into old-fashioned patterns of colonial behaviour.

The African nations do not wish to be regarded as pawns in a game between Great Powers. They want, and should be given support, on their own terms since what they are striving for is their own liberty, what they are defending is their own human dignity. Africa's central ideology has been and will remain nationalism.

Prospects for Negotiated Settlements in Zimbabwe and Namibia

In Zimbabwe, under pressure of the growing success of the nationalist forces, the Smith regime was finally brought to accept the principle of majority rule. But it came in a form designed to guarantee continued white dominance of the country. Today we know that the so-called internal solution, which excluded the Patriotic Front, is a complete fiasco. The war has not ended but escalated. In September, 800 people died in Zimbabwe, the highest figure ever. Emigration is increasing again and approaching two thousand persons a month. Travel in the countryside must be undertaken by convoy. In Rhodesia's second city, Bulawayo, the guerrilla forces are said to control the suburbs. The Salisbury regime has given a desperate answer to this situation by barbarous raids into Mozambique and Zambia.

Smith and his allies, given a temporary moral boost after their visit to the United States, are fighting a losing battle. The longer they postpone the inevitable change to majority rule, the harder the terms will be for the losers.

We still believe that there is room for a negotiated settlement. We understand that the Patriotic Front and the African States accept a transitional council of representatives, the presence of a United Nations force, and the control of the forces of law and order being invested in the hands of a neutral resident commissioner; and that they accept the integration of the existing forces into a new Zimbabwean national army. But this presupposes an end to white extremism. In the meantime international sanctions must continue to be strictly applied in full solidarity with the people of Zimbabwe.

Not so many weeks ago prospects of reaching a negotiated settlement in

Namibia seemed rather bright. After a year of hard negotiations, under the auspices of the Western Five, both SWAPO and South Africa agreed to a United Nations supervised plan and time-table for Namibia's independence.¹⁷ The General Assembly of the United Nations noted in its declaration on Namibia in May of this year that SWAPO had made far-reaching and substantive concessions to facilitate a negotiated settlement.

In September the Vorster regime arrogantly dealt the peace efforts a major blow by rejecting the United Nations settlement for Namibia. The outcome of the subsequent talks in Pretoria, between the foreign ministers of the Western Five and the new South African Government, was not exactly a step forward. Let us hope they were not a step backwards either. It is easy to understand the bitterness and disillusion of SWAPO. If anything positive could be said about this new situation, it is that for the first time we seem to have a united and determined front of those nations in the West who can really bring about a change.

The lesson from Pretoria is this: the Government of South Africa will only do what is in its own interest and that interest is defined also in the context of what actions the outside world, particularly the Western Powers, will take. It will no doubt cooperate with the purpose of trying to install pliable regimes in Zimbabwe and Namibia, and it will only let go its hold over these territories when they become liabilities too costly to retain. It is possible to talk to the Pretoria Government if at the same time sanctions and increasing pressure are applied to give weight to the words. No solution of the problems of Zimbabwe and Namibia could ever contain any guarantee for the survival of apartheid in South Africa. What is finally at stake in Rhodesia as well as in Namibia is also the future of South Africa.

It is important to underline that in the case of both Namibia and Zimbabwe, the way to a negotiated settlement had been paved by concessions and goodwill on the part of the liberation movements and the frontline States. In both cases the hopes for a settlement were crushed by the intransigence and arrogance of the white minorities. They have something to learn when it comes to reconciliation and compromise from the recent accords between Zaire and Angola.

We all favour peaceful evolution and negotiated settlements as an alternative to violence and bloodshed. But naturally there is a point when the credibility of this approach will be undermined, when Africans reach the conclusion that much more desperate means are needed. This point has not been reached yet in the case of Namibia, I hope, although South Africa's behaviour in recent months should not give any illusions about her intentions. There is still room for negotiations. But I think they will only succeed if it is made abundantly clear and credible that the Western Powers are prepared to apply pressure and effective sanctions if the

¹⁷ The plan, negotiated by five Western Powers, was approved by the United Nations Security Council in resolution 435 (1978) of September 29, 1978.

negotiations should fail again.

Final Failure of Apartheid

In South Africa, we see how repression and human misery continue to increase. Prisoners continue to die mysterious deaths. A great number of so-called terrorist trials are being held. In one of them Solomon Mahlangu is facing the gallows for a crime he did not commit. Recent shock figures reveal that in the South African "paradise", the death rate of black children under five in the Ciskei and the Transkei is up to 240 of every thousand births registered. The policy of the homelands is being expanded. Another two so-called independent "nations" are expected to be created. The final solution in the mind of the regime is that there shall not be any black South Africans. South Africa could in that case find itself in the unique situation that the majority of its inhabitants will be foreigners.

All this amounts to the final failure of apartheid, even if it is viewed from the perspective of the architects of the system. Their promise was social coexistence, peace and stability. But the people of Soweto and other urban townships showed by their revolts that they regard apartheid as impossible to endure. They want to be free at last.

Promising Trends in the West

There has always been great hypocrisy in the rich industrialised countries between our declared condemnation of apartheid and the concrete relations that we still maintain with Pretoria, relations like military cooperation, transfer of technology, loans, capital investments on which white South Africa depends.

But there are also other promising trends which are growing stronger and stronger. Time doesn't allow me to enumerate them here. Let me mention just two examples. At the recent British Labour Party conference at Blackpool, delegates unanimously called on the Government to work at the United Nations "towards a mandatory ban on all trade with apartheid South Africa, and in the first instance to support the proposal at the United Nations for mandatory oil sanctions against South Africa."

And last week the Food Workers` International carried out a solidarity campaign in some fifteen countries in favour of trade union rights at the plant of Unilever in South Africa. In Sweden the workers at Unilever went on strike, the first of its kind ever.

Other points discussed where governments could easily exercise pressure in South Africa:

They could consider seriously cutting down air links to and from South Africa.

They could introduce entry visas for South Africans. South Africa requires visas for many of our countries without being subjected to the same demand itself. The Nordic countries took that measure on November 1st.

Commitment of Democratic Socialists

Let me end by this:

We made a serious start at our Geneva Congress regarding our attitude to the liberation struggle in southern Africa. We have followed up that policy and we are today committed to work for a concrete programme of action. Let the message of this Congress be:

-Democratic socialists must in every case be on the side of the exploited and oppressed against the oppressors. We want to be on the side of African liberation.

-We consider free men to be more important than the free movement of capital. Therefore we must stop the economic support from our countries to apartheid. Our professed ideals can no longer coexist with apartheid.

-We want peace, but we realise that so long as there is apartheid and racism, there can be no peace. Therefore our commitment to the eradication of apartheid is a contribution to peace.

PROGRESS OF LIBERATION OF AFRICA CANNOT BE STOPPED

Speech at the Conference on Southern Africa of the Socialist International and the Socialist Group of the European Parliament with the Frontline States, ANC and SWAPO, Arusha, September 4, 1984

Four months ago, the city of Arusha hosted the summit meeting of the frontline States. It was a historic event characterised by courage and determination. The highest leadership of the frontline States, together with that of the liberation movements, reasserted their commitment to the struggle for freedom in Namibia and South Africa. From Arusha they also launched an urgent appeal to all other nations and peoples for concrete support and active participation in that struggle. Now they are here again, to our great pleasure and honour.

The Arusha Declaration again underlines the fact that the liberation of Africa from exploitation will be pursued and led to victory by the Africans themselves. We who come from other parts of the world should support the African peoples' struggle for liberation on their own terms because it represents the longing of the African peoples, the true and vital interests of the African nations. This is self-evident but needs to be repeated. We should firmly and together oppose all trends of paternalism from the outside.

But naturally, we in Europe also have a role to play.

Involvement of Socialist International

This conference is the first one where frontline States and liberation movements from southern Africa meet jointly with Socialist International parties from Western Europe. The Socialist International has long been involved in the struggle for independence and freedom in southern Africa.

The reasons for our involvement are obvious:

1. The system of apartheid is and remains a moral outrage. It is the only system branding a person right from birth according to the colour of the skin. From the very moment of conception the child's destiny is determined. This makes apartheid a tyranny of a particularly evil kind. Every civilised person and civilised people must view it with contempt. It is our duty to eradicate this weird aberration in human history from the face of the earth.
2. The peoples of Namibia and South Africa are denied the most fundamental human and political rights. Equally our European labour

movement once was denied their rights and that formed the basis for the original programmes of our liberation movement. The workers of Europe are historically linked in solidarity with their brothers and sisters in Africa.

When the South African regime proclaims that it fights for the so-called "free world" and represents democracy, it must be crystal clear that this bastion of racism in fact represents the very opposite of freedom, and that the apartheid regime is a perversion of democracy.

3. We are all bound by the rules of international law and we have all accepted the Charter of the United Nations. The illegal occupation of Namibia continues in defiance of the whole international community. The destabilisation policy of South Africa, with the use of military aggression and economic blackmail against the neighbouring States, is likewise in contradiction of international law.

4. The continued oppression in South Africa is a threat to international peace and security. This has been confirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The longer the apartheid system is allowed to persist the more violent its downfall will be. In a world of superpower rivalry and intervention, this can have the most disastrous effects on all of us, wherever we live.

March of Folly

The racist policies of South Africa are at the root of the problem. I am not the one who is best placed to tell this audience what the situation is really like in South Africa. Our African friends here have learnt about it in bitter ways. But I would like today to share with you some thoughts I have about how history will deal with the developments in and our relations with South Africa.

A Swedish statesman in the seventeenth century, Axel Oxenstierna, Chancellor of Sweden under King Gustavus Adolphus, said on his deathbed: "Know, my son, with how little wisdom the world is governed."

This quotation is used in the introduction of a recent book by the American historian Barbara Tuchman, *The March of Folly*.

In this book, using examples from old and recent history, she traces and explores one of the most compelling paradoxes of history: the recurring pursuit by governments of policies contrary to their own interests.

By folly she means a self-destructive act, taken despite the availability of a recognised and feasible alternative. Going through history, she describes the fall

of Troy, the papal misrule in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, leading to the split in the Christian church; she recounts how England created rebels in America in the eighteenth century. And finally she explains how the United States, by insisting on victory, was defeated in Vietnam.

Is the racist regime in Pretoria conducting a policy against the long-term interests also of the white minority, marching the road of folly, in Barbara Tuchman's sense of the word?

I recently had a visit from a prominent South African industrialist. He started the conversation by saying that the black man will naturally take over in South Africa. This takeover must be prepared and for that reason South Africa must have a strong economy. He probably wanted to say that we should not weaken that economy by imposing sanctions.

Are there any signs that the ruling white minority believes in such a transfer of power to the black man? If this was so, we should be able to witness a number of reforms in that direction, recognising the legitimacy of the demands of the majority: the start of a gradual process towards the ultimate goal, majority rule.

This is obviously not happening.

The so-called reforms of the Pretoria regime have only been of a cosmetic nature - a way of trying to give the system a more respectable facade.

The recent parliamentary elections for Coloured and Asian people is a good example. The new parliamentary chambers are only allowed to deal with matters within their own race groups. The all-white parliament retains a firm grip on all important matters for the country as a whole. It is no wonder that these elections were boycotted by a vast majority of those entitled to vote. The whole election procedure has proved to be a mockery. The forces against apartheid have in fact won a resounding victory.

Brutalisation of Apartheid

What actually seems to happen in South Africa is a strengthening and brutalisation of apartheid.

The bantustan policy is a dramatic expression of this process.

In one of the richest countries of the world, which could feed and house everyone, some nine million people have already been robbed of their citizenship and some four million people moved by force to these areas. And many more are threatened.

In these "homelands", the per capita income is only 5 percent of what it is in

the rest of the country. And in the largest of them, Transkei, four out of ten children die before they reach the age of ten.

Apartheid South Africa is in fact a society in permanent violence.

Every three days a black man is hanged.

Every year hundreds of thousands are arrested as a result of the pass laws.

And every year close to one million Africans are brought to trial for violation of laws that apply to black people only.

The truth about South Africa's so-called reforms is this: when all the trappings are removed, it is obvious that the leaders of the white minority do not want to change the system. They do not want to give up their prosperity and privileges. And they use massive violence against those who oppose and try to change the system.

The racist minority government in South Africa projects a picture of might and arrogance. Partly it is the face of most oppressors in human history. Partly it is to conceal that they must know that their system in the long run is doomed. Sooner or later the explosion will come. The collapse of the system will be enhanced by its own contradictions.

In less than twenty years, the total population will have increased by about 15 million - almost all of them black people. The white minority will be even more of a minority, trapped in their "laager". The regime seems to have realised the meaning of these demographic figures. It tries to further split the people into groups based on skin and origin. Therefore, so-called reforms and further repression are two sides of the same coin.

Like few other regimes Pretoria spreads death and destruction beyond its borders.

Instead of seeking a modus vivendi with its regional partners, the apartheid State blackmails its neighbours.

It is also a contradiction that not even the architects of apartheid are true to their extremist ideas: without access to cheap black labour the wealth of the white minority would erode. In other words - without the blacks there would be no white wealth.

The more the white minority tries to strengthen itself internally by repressive means, the more they are subject to international contempt and isolation. The names of Sharpeville and Soweto are names of shame in the modern history of South Africa. There will be many more names to add to this abominable list if

they continue to enforce apartheid. International opinion will not fail to react.

Rising Resistance

But above all and in spite of all the military might, there is rising resistance within South Africa itself.

The African National Congress is gaining strength.

Independent trade unions are developing rapidly, despite severe constraints.

And the United Democratic Front has in only one year attracted more than 600 different organisations, with more than two million people. Never before in the history of South Africa has the organised resistance been of such magnitude.

In spite of all this the white minority government in South Africa steers towards an inevitable catastrophe. In the long run their system inevitably will fall. The longer the white rulers persist in maintaining the white dictatorship, the harder and more violent the conflict will be. Long-term security and stability are being sacrificed in a policy that is clearly contrary to the long-term self-interest of the white minority. This is truly a march of folly.

Gradually more and more white South Africans realise this predicament. When asked what his country would be like in 1995, the South African author Andre Brink said: "By that time we should have the civil war behind us. I can't see how the present circumstances shall be able to prevail for more than one more decade."

If the other white South Africans heeded his warning and recognised their true self-interest, there would be hope for peaceful change.

There is another course of action to choose, a reasonable alternative. They could recognise the legitimacy of the majority, embark on a road of gradual reforms, safeguard the legitimate interests of the white minority, start a process towards peace and equality. It is very late in the day. But it is still possible to choose a policy of wisdom and conciliation.

What should we do?

The European colonial governments were once faced with a similar option. Some had the wisdom to accept self-determination and national independence. Others chose confrontation and fought bloody racial wars.

Today we Europeans have a self-interest in a change of the system in South Africa. It is not only a question of principle. It is also a question of war and peace, because so long as there is apartheid, there will be no peace.

The question today is: why are we then not doing more to help the process of real change in South Africa?

In the colonial times, most of our parties were young and weak, and had no say in government affairs. We are a movement representing workers and other people oppressed through history.

For us, it should be a challenge to meet the forces of liberation in southern Africa, in a struggle against the remnants of old colonialism and minority rule.

What then should we do? Let me answer briefly, in a few points.

1. *We should give full support to the frontline States.* I have spoken today mostly about South Africa, the root of the present problems in the region. This is by no means to neglect the neighbouring countries, the frontline States. Their desire, after achieving independence, to concentrate their efforts on peaceful development has been seriously hampered by destabilisation - military, economic and political. The reason is that these countries have stood up in solidarity with their oppressed brothers and sisters in South Africa. Undoubtedly, the South African Government would like to make the neighbouring States into some kind of bantustans, without possibility to oppose South Africa.

There is every reason to increase the economic support to and cooperation with these countries from us in Europe. This need is further underlined by the fact that the whole region of southern Africa has also been struck by drought and famine. Further pledges to support those affected by this disaster are therefore necessary.

In Sweden we allot something like twenty percent of our total development assistance, or nearly 0.2 percent of our gross national product, to the frontline States and the liberation movements. This at least shows our priorities.

2. *We should press for government support to the liberation movements, the ANC of South Africa and SWAPO of Namibia.* It is fully in line with resolutions in the United Nations to give humanitarian assistance to the freedom fighters in South Africa and Namibia. We have done so in Sweden for a long time and it has proved very efficient. It also has strong public support in my country. Popular organisations, churches and trade unions have continuously conducted campaigns and solidarity work with the liberation movements in southern Africa, as part of international actions. As parties and governments, we should give these actions our full support.
3. *We should be more persistent in demanding South Africa's withdrawal from Namibia.* The United Nations Security Council has repeatedly and unanimously told South Africa to withdraw from Namibia. There were new signs earlier this year that a solution might finally be under way. These efforts should be

supported, as long as they stick to United Nations Security Council resolution 435. But we should reject the so-called Cuban link, which has no part in the process for Namibian independence, and all other links or new conditions for the implementation of resolution 435. It is an international scandal that the independence of Namibia has not yet been achieved. And we should be prepared to continue and increase our support to the Namibian people, when the day of freedom finally comes.

3. *We should be more active in the work for United Nations sanctions against South Africa.* For many years the international community has been asked by the ANC, by the frontline States and by other forces of liberation to put pressure on South Africa through international sanctions. A large majority of the countries of the world are in favour of such sanctions. But so far binding international sanctions through decisions by the United Nations Security Council have not been achieved, except in the limited military sphere.

Big Powers use sanctions against each other, and against others. Evidently they believe in the method.

5. *We should build up pressure on South Africa also by direct selective action.* In the light of history, it will be no excuse to just sit back and say that some big Powers blocked a decision that the rest of us wanted, and let it rest at that. We have to go the other way. Party by party, government by government, we could introduce various means of direct selective action. Such sanctions will not be hundred percent efficient. But that is not the major point. We want to find peaceful means to put pressure on South Africa to change their system. We know that the South African Government is vulnerable to international pressure. And we know that when Ian Smith finally sat down at Lancaster House, this was because of both the liberation struggle and the international sanctions.

Since 1979 Sweden has had a law banning new investments by Swedish companies in South Africa. That is one example of direct selective action that I believe can be used also by others. My Government is now considering ways and means of making these sanctions more effective. But it is also my hope that more parties and governments will follow suit. Actions by one government will be more effective with more to come: we are now seeing some hopeful signs in other countries. Our resolution gives several examples of other kinds of direct selective action which also must be considered.

6. *We should pursue a policy of isolation against the regime in South Africa.* Contacts between South Africa and the neighbouring States are necessary for geographical reasons or because of their economic dependence on South Africa. I have not criticised such contacts. We have to understand them.. But such contacts cannot be used to justify attempts to break the international isolation of the apartheid State.

There is absolutely no reason for independent countries in Europe to accord the Pretoria regime credibility and acceptability and thereby alleviate the ban on South Africa by the international community. On the contrary we should make further attempts to isolate apartheid. The Nordic governments on their part pursue a policy of discontinuing contacts with South Africa in the fields of sports, culture and science.

Process of Liberation Cannot be Stopped

For those who look at southern Africa today, without reference to history, the situation may look grim indeed. But seeing the shape of events in a longer perspective, we can be more optimistic.

When I came to Tanzania and Zambia in 1971, we were confronted not only with an apartheid regime in South Africa and an illegal occupation of Namibia. We also had a racist State across the river, in Southern Rhodesia. Meeting with President Kaunda in Livingstone, I remember saying that we now stood at the frontier of human decency. And Mozambique and Angola were at that time ruled by a European dictatorship. Many people said it would be unrealistic to believe in the liberation of those countries. The world would have to live with Portuguese fascists and the regime of Ian Smith.

I came back in 1977, with the Socialist International mission to southern Africa. Portugal had changed, and Mozambique and Angola were free and independent nations. But Ian Smith was still in Salisbury, and he said that things would not change in a thousand years.

Now it is seven years later. Zimbabwe is free. The process of liberation continues. It cannot be stopped. The basic human ideas that motivate this struggle are shared by the people in southern Africa as well as by peoples in the rest of the world. They will prevail.

It is my sincere hope that through this conference, we, as movements and parties from two neighbouring continents, shall be able to understand each other better, and that we can strengthen our ties of friendship and cooperation. We must find constructive ways to continue and follow up this dialogue of solidarity.

In sharing goals, wishes and dreams, we have a joint responsibility before mankind of today and tomorrow.

The voice of reason must be heard. Our actions must prove that we tried another path than the march of folly. We must follow the road of compassion and solidarity.

**IF WORLD DECIDES TO ABOLISH APARTHEID,
APARTHEID WILL DISAPPEAR**

*Address to the Swedish People's Parliament against
Apartheid, Stockholm, February 21, 1986¹⁸*

It is a great pleasure for me to speak to this People's Parliament against Apartheid. We are very pleased to see leaders of ANC and SWAPO here, as also representatives of the active opinion against apartheid from the United Nations and from all over our country.

I should especially like to address myself to Oliver Tambo, the indefatigable champion of freedom in South Africa for many decades. Because of his convictions, he was forced to leave his country twenty-five years ago. I met Oliver Tambo for the first time more than twenty years ago and since then we have had very many opportunities to converse. His work, his optimism and his belief in the possibility of change, that it will be possible finally to send apartheid to the lumber-room of history, has been a great inspiration to us all.

The other day I read a big advertisement published in the South African press by the white minority regime in Pretoria. The advertisement read:

"Revolutionaries may stamp their feet. The communists may scream their lies. Our enemies may try to undermine us. But here is *the reality*."

Further down in the advertisement we are told what "the reality" is: "Our government is committed to power sharing, equal opportunities for all, equal treatment and equal justice."

As an example it is mentioned, amongst other things, that the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act and provisions of the Immorality Act have been repealed.

The Reality of South Africa

What then is the reality of South Africa today?

When the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act was repealed slightly more than a year ago, it was after considerable pressure had been put on the Government. The Minister responsible said in an explanation of the revision of the law that "the

¹⁸ The last major speech of Olof Palme before his tragic assassination was his keynote address to the Swedish People's Parliament against Apartheid, held in Stockholm on February 21-22, 1986. Organised by the Swedish United Nations Association and the Isolate South Africa Committee, it was attended by almost one thousand representatives of political parties and public organisations. Mr. Oliver Tambo, President of the African National Congress of South Africa, also addressed the conference.

responsibility now rests with parents, teachers, religious and other leaders." The responsibility for what? one may well ask. Of course, the responsibility for seeing to it that no mixed marriages take place. In Parliament, where the black majority is not represented, the following questions, amongst others, were posed about the proposal:

- Where may a couple consisting of a white and a black live?
- Where may their children go to school?

The Government's answer revealed that the intention was not to change anything except the formal prohibition. Thus, a "mixed" couple may not live in a white area. If they are accepted in an area for blacks, they can live there. They can also apply for permission to live in an area for a minority that neither of them belongs to.

The children of the couple are classified, as has been the case up to now, according to three criteria: heredity, appearance and acceptance. A child of a mixed marriage may be completely white or completely black, or "coloured", i.e. of mixed blood.

May a white child of a mixed marriage go to a school for whites? asked one member of parliament. Schools for whites receive far more resources and can therefore maintain a higher standard than schools for other races. For this reason it is natural to try to get the child into one. It is possible that the white child may go to a school for white children, was the reply. But if the couple have another child that is "coloured", may this child go to the same school as its sibling? Out of the question, was the answer.

The reaction to the abolition of the prohibition of mixed marriages among black apartheid opponents in South Africa was, to put it mildly, lukewarm: "We are not struggling in the first instance for the right to marry white women," as one of them said.

But let me go back to the apartheid regime's advertisement. There, as I said earlier, they talk about equal opportunities for all.

Another Language

The reality speaks another language. We know that South Africa is a country where black people do not have the franchise, where destitution in the so-called black "homelands" is in glaring contrast to the affluent white areas. We know that the richest and most fertile 87 percent of the land has been reserved for the white minority of scarcely 15 percent of the population, while the majority of the population has been relegated to the poorest 13 percent of the land. This deeply unjust distribution is the result of a conscious policy and one of the cruellest cases

of the removal of people in modern history.

And these forced removals of black people continue: we have examples from as late as a few weeks ago. The removal began of thousands of people from Moutse in Eastern Transvaal, ninety kilometres to a newly established homeland. The removal was carried out when the men were at work. Women and children were loaded onto buses and driven off. We must not forget this reality when we hear the regime talk expansively of their reforms.

200,000 Black People Imprisoned Yearly

In the advertisement we are told that the passes, which all black people have to carry, are to be abolished as also influx control in the towns. We are also told that the passes will be replaced by a new identity document which will be issued to everybody. For the black majority, this only means that they will get a new document. Many believe that this document will be connected to a computer system to make the control of black people's movements stricter than ever. More than 200,000 black people are imprisoned yearly for breaking the pass laws. Black people will still not be allowed to live where they like. The Group Areas Act, which regulates where different ethnic groups may settle, is not to be amended: this information was given recently by Pretoria.

In the advertisement, it says that the South African Government is committed to a single education policy. At the same time the regime has declared that "the multi-cultural character of the South African community" must be recognised. They mean that the system with separate schools for different racial groups will be preserved.

Cannot be Reformed, can only be Abolished

Thus the truth is that apartheid in South Africa is not being reformed as the regime is trying to assert in its advertising campaigns. A system like apartheid cannot be reformed, it can only be abolished.

To the majority of South Africans all this is nothing new. By this stage they have a fundamental scepticism of everything the Government says. They have already heard that "South Africa must adapt or die," as was said a few years ago. What is new now is that even the white people are beginning to doubt their Government.

The Leader of the Opposition, the liberal Van Zyl Slabbert, resigned from Parliament on 7 February in protest against the regime's inability to set about the country's problems. And those white people that can are leaving the country. Emigration, mainly of well-educated, English-speaking people, is increasing and now amounts to more than a thousand a month. Industry is demanding rapid reforms and has entered into contacts of its own with the African National

Congress, which is banned since the time of the Sharpeville massacre in 1960.

The Regime Doubts Itself

Many of the keenest supporters of the regime interpret all talk of reforms as a sign of weakness. The result is that the regime has begun to doubt itself.

At the same time the opponents of apartheid have begun to rely on their ability to force the regime to abolish the system. Young blacks have boycotted the schools for nearly two years and defied both the police and the military forces. Quislings have been chased out of black residential areas. Black consumers have boycotted the shops of white people until the businessmen have moved over to their side and demanded reforms. Trade unions have organised strikes and built up new organisations. The United Democratic Front has grown up as a nationwide, non-racial popular movement against apartheid. In 1984, UDF organised a successful boycott of the elections to the new parliament chambers for Asians and Coloured people (i.e. people of mixed blood), mainly because the black majority was still excluded.

Unequalled Violence

All this has happened - and continues to happen - despite the fact that the Government has unleashed a violence that is unequalled even in South Africa's history. More than one thousand people have been killed in disturbances since the autumn of 1984, most of them victims of police bullets. Military forces have been stationed in the black suburbs where there is a new state of emergency. More than seven thousand have been arrested under the emergency laws. Reports reach us of torture and deaths in the jails. Last year a member of the ANC, Benjamin Moloise, was executed despite protests from the outside world. Six more have been sentenced to death, against their denials, for the murder of a representative of the Government. UDF leaders have been accused of high treason, but some of them have been released and the indictment withdrawn because the court was unable to accept the grounds for prosecution put forward by the prosecution side. At present, the UDF leader Murphy Morobe is in prison in Johannesburg. In 1984 Morobe had accepted, on behalf of the UDF, the "Let Live Prize" of Arbetet (Work), the Swedish newspaper. Cheryl Carolus, a Coloured UDF leader from Cape Town, who visited Sweden just a few weeks ago, was released from prison a few days ago with strict bail conditions which, amongst other things, forbid her to work for UDF.

Threats and Attacks on Neighbours

In its defence of the apartheid system, the regime has not only intensified the oppression internally. Violence has also been escalated against neighbouring countries, which have been subjected to both threats and direct military attacks. South Africa regularly invades southern Angola and supports the UNITA

guerrillas. During 1985, it was revealed that South Africa had continued to give support to the opposition MNR guerrillas in Mozambique, in contravention of the security treaty that South Africa and Mozambique entered into in 1984. South Africa's commando troops carry out sabotage in the neighbouring countries and kill refugees from South Africa.

Threat to International Peace and Security

The destabilisation policy in relation to the neighbouring countries reveals ever more clearly that apartheid and the regime's defence of the system constitute a threat to international peace and security. Nor are there any indications that South Africa is prepared to withdraw its army of occupation from Namibia and accept a peaceful solution in accordance with the United Nations plan of 1978. Quite the contrary: according to several reports, South Africa is increasing its presence, especially in northern Namibia. According to reports that reach us through SWAPO and the churches, the oppression there has been increased still more.

During 1985, South Africa installed a new "government" in Windhoek. The South Africans have expressly removed security and foreign policy issues from the new government's area of responsibility. The government in Windhoek has not succeeded in any other areas in showing that it is capable of pursuing an independent policy in relation to South Africa. No one, apart from South Africa, has recognised this internal government.

Independence for Namibia

In the discussions that have been held between South Africa, the United States of America and Angola on the Namibian issue, no progress has been made despite the fact that, in the autumn of 1984, Angola declared itself prepared to discuss a withdrawal of the Cuban forces from southern Angola. South Africa obviously continues to protract and delay a solution according to the United Nations plan. A great responsibility rests therefore with the United Nations and its Security Council to put power behind its plan and force South Africa to agree to independence and free elections in Namibia. The plans for foreign military and other assistance to the oppositional UNITA guerrillas is an example of a measure which can logically only obstruct a negotiated settlement and would be perceived as support of South Africa.

What we are now witnessing in South Africa is a vicious circle of increased violence in defence of a system that is already doomed. It is only short-sightedness, a disinclination to see reality as it is, that makes the white minority cling firmly to power through continued oppression of its own population and terror against neighbouring countries. The white people must be aware of their own interests in a peaceful solution, while such a solution is still possible.

Pressure Must Continue

In this situation, the reaction of the outside world is of great importance. Pressure on the regime must increase. It must be made clear to the minority regime that it has no support in the world around.

The United Nations has a very important role to play as regards mirroring world opinion. It is a positive step that the Security Council, as a result of the increased pressure of opinion, recommended economic sanctions against South Africa for the first time last summer.

The United Nations also has the possibility of applying means of compulsion provided that consensus can be achieved in the Security Council. A decision in the Security Council for mandatory sanctions would in itself be an important signal to the apartheid regime that the patience of the rest of the world is at an end, and it would perhaps constitute the most important means of pressure on the white minority to abolish apartheid.

The main aim of our efforts is, as earlier, to bring about such a decision. I would like to repeat our appeal to the members of the United Nations Security Council, who have special possibilities of influencing South Africa, to take their responsibility.

If sanctions were applied, they would hit the whites' privileges very hard. The white people know this. The idea of economic sanctions has the wide support of the black majority's leaders. The liberation movements and the rest of Africa are also in favour of economic sanctions.

Swedish Sanctions in the 1970s

When, in the 1970s, we in Sweden began to pursue the issue of unilateral Swedish sanctions against South Africa, many people shook their heads and said it would have no effect and that no one would follow suit. But what spurred us on was the knowledge that, if we wanted to try to contribute to a peaceful settlement of apartheid, we must start in good time.

The Swedish initiative has now been followed by many countries. Criticism has died down. More and more people who were earlier doubtful are now beginning to understand that this type of action is necessary. Sanctions are not a guarantee that a bloody settlement can be avoided. But the rest of the world must take its responsibility and seek every opportunity to contribute actively. The United Nations and its Security Council can also play an important role.

We are naturally prepared to contribute towards alleviating any destruction caused to South Africa's neighbouring countries and to work towards persuading other United Nations Member States also to do so.

New Nordic Action Programme

Pending the achievement of consensus in the Security Council for mandatory sanctions, we must all make our contribution towards maintaining and increasing pressure on the apartheid regime. On the Nordic side we have long sought to co-ordinate our measures to give them extra weight. Last October we adopted a new joint Nordic programme of action against South Africa as a follow-up and extension of the 1978 programme.

Included in the programme are intensified joint efforts in the United Nations to increase the pressure on the apartheid regime.

The earlier ban on investments has been extended with a ban also with regard to loans, financial leasing and transfer of control of patent and manufacturing rights.

Within the framework of our international commitments we have included a number of measures in the trade policy area.

In the Nordic programme there is also a recommendation to importers and exporters to look for new markets. It includes measures to prevent public procurement of South African products and the discontinuance of government support to trade promotion activities. We undertake to prohibit the import of Krugerrands and the export of computer equipment to South Africa. Furthermore, we pledge to ban new contracts in the nuclear field and to end commercial airlinks with South Africa.

Together with the other Nordic countries, we have also undertaken to further limit our contacts with South Africa in sports, cultural and scientific fields. Visa rules for South African citizens are to be tightened up.

Last but not least we have agreed to increase, on a Nordic basis, our humanitarian assistance to the victims and opponents of apartheid, as also our development assistance to States neighbouring South Africa.

However, we will not rest there. We see the Nordic programme of action as a platform for continued joint and unilateral measures against apartheid.

Ban on Consumer Goods Import

On a national basis, Sweden has introduced a ban on imports of agricultural products from South Africa. It means in practice a ban on the import of all consumer goods from South Africa. We have recommended that Swedish companies voluntarily limit their trade with South Africa. Trade has already dropped, and there are examples of companies that are actively looking for

suppliers in countries other than South Africa.

The Government is now carefully following developments. If companies do not follow the recommendations of the Government and Parliament, new measures must be considered.

To speed up the reorientation of companies from South Africa to other countries in the region, the Nordic countries and the so-called SADCC¹⁹ States have recently agreed on widened cooperation. It is a question of promoting trade, investments, technology transfer, cultural exchange and communications between the Nordic countries and these countries in southern Africa.

Support to Frontline States

At the same time as we put greater pressure on South Africa, we must be prepared to support the frontline States.

The Government is substantially increasing assistance to the countries and people in southern Africa that are hit by South Africa's destabilisation and apartheid policy. Under the proposal the Government recently put forward, more than forty percent of the bilateral assistance will be appropriated for southern Africa. This is equivalent to an amount of slightly more than two billion Swedish kroner for this fiscal year. To this is added our contributions to the various United Nations agencies.

Sweden gives development assistance to the individual countries so that, despite the destabilisation policy, these countries can develop and reduce their economic dependence on South Africa. Our support to the development co-ordination conference, SADCC, also aims to contribute towards enabling the countries jointly to increase their own trade and thus get away from South Africa. ANC and SWAPO will directly receive increased assistance for their humanitarian activities for, amongst others, their refugees in the neighbouring countries. Through extensive and increasing assistance, other organisations and people, who are victims and opponents of the apartheid policy, will obtain both economic and political support from Sweden. Many popular movements are involved and are making a valuable contribution to this assistance.

We all have a role to play in opposing apartheid. I have described the Government's work in the United Nations and other international forums. We are also actively working to induce other countries to take similar measures of their own. One of the reasons why we very carefully make sure our measures are within the framework of international treaties is that it is then far more probable that other countries will follow our example. This was the case as regards the ban on investments. Likewise, the interest in the Swedish ban on imports of

¹⁹ Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference

agricultural products from South Africa has been very substantial.

Speeding up the Fall

Municipalities and county councils in Sweden have been given the opportunity of participating in the boycott of South Africa. Several members of Parliament, from all parties in the Parliament, are participating in a European action group against apartheid.²⁰ The organisers of today's meeting are a further example of how widespread is the interest today in southern African issues. This is exceedingly gratifying, especially since we know that our work here has its counterpart in many other countries. It is gratifying also because with increased international pressure on the minority regime, we can contribute towards speeding up the fall of the apartheid system.

It is by taking joint responsibility that we can contribute towards abolishing the apartheid system. This system can live on because it gets support from outside. If the support is pulled away and turned into resistance, apartheid cannot endure. If the world decides to abolish apartheid, apartheid will disappear.

Insanity of the System

I have chosen to speak in very practical terms about what apartheid really is and also about what we are doing.

Fundamentally this is a profoundly emotional question and one which goes to the depths of our feeling because it is such an uncommonly repugnant system. Simply because, on account of people's colour, it abandons them to poverty. This system will be to the discredit of the world for as long as it persists.

But when expressing these feelings it is important for us to remember the very simple, basic facts which I have presented. And we know that we have a duty, knowing as we do that this system is sustained by the internal apparatus of oppression, the entire police force, the military and this wretched complex of legislation making up the apartheid system. This is why they are still able to put the leaders of opposition in prison. It goes without saying that Nelson Mandela must be released.

We have such an incredible example of the insanity of the system in their refusal to talk to the leaders, and to us. Because if you refuse to talk to the leaders who have people's confidence, this will inexorably result in the whole thing ending in a fearfully violent and bloody conflict. It is a legacy of history that the black people of Namibia and South Africa have a wide popular movement, a really eminent leadership which would be a possible interlocutor in a dialogue to dismantle this despicable, doomed system. But the regime responds by

²⁰ Association of West European Parliamentarians for Action against Apartheid

intensifying oppression and putting the leaders of this people in prison. This, then, is a classical example of madness of which nothing can come but evil - until the day it disappears, and one day it has to come to an end.

That was one point. The other is that this system cannot, would not, be able to survive if it were not, in various ways, supported or accepted or tolerated by the rest of the world.

We are all Implicated

And so the rest of the world is directly implicated in the continuance of this system. If the rest of the world decides, if people all over the world decide that apartheid is to be abolished, the system will disappear. This is a simple way of expressing this responsibility. It also shows the classical truth that, among those with vested economic interests in the survival of this system, there is resistance. There is also hesitation and resistance on the part of the establishments. From those who regard people's longing for liberty in a country as a potential cause of global contest between different superpowers, there is resistance. And all this, in my opinion, is another example of madness, because the apartheid system is also a classical example of a threat to peace which people must jointly abolish.

Mobilising Public Opinion

But given this economic and superpower interest, there is also the classical way, namely that of mobilising popular opinion in support of human dignity. And that is the essential importance of a popular assembly like this one.

On the one hand we have the apparatus of oppression, which is undermining itself and is being undermined by the courageous struggle waged by the black popular movements in South Africa. On the other is outside support, and so by declaring our support for the black struggle, and by helping to isolate the apartheid regime, we must live up to our responsibility for bringing this repulsive system to an end.

(Original in Swedish)