

A Special Report: Southern Africa

SOUTHERN
AFRICA
PROJECT



The following series of articles has been prepared by the staff of the Committee's Southern Africa Project. We are including this special section in the **Committee Report** because events in South Africa are again approaching the crisis stage. At the same time, the United States government has adopted a posture which is much more supportive of the South African government and its *apartheid* policies than was true in the past. All of us have an obligation to be aware of these developments and to act accordingly.

We hope that the information contained in this section will give our readers a more complete understanding of the activities of the Southern Africa Project and its goals. In the

articles which follow, we describe some of the most pressing current problems faced by Blacks in South Africa—including the effect of United States policies toward that nation. In addition, we describe the framework of international law and United Nations actions within which the Project and other organizations are working.

The Southern Africa Project will be happy to provide additional information about the black struggle for freedom in South Africa, or to respond to inquiries from readers.

— Gay McDougall, Director
Southern Africa Project

The State v. Oscar Mpetha— The Elimination of a Troublesome Campaigner

Cape Town became the focal point of black unrest during 1980; out of this activity arose the trial in *The State v. Oscar Mpetha and 18 Others*. Brought under South Africa's Terrorism Act, the trial is important politically, as well as personally for those involved, who face possible death sentences.

The year began with a boycott of the inferior black educational system and ended with labor strikes. Behind these campaigns was a general rejection of *apartheid*. As practically all forms of political activity by black people in South Africa are officially prohibited, a number of unofficial, "non-political" organizations are now used to give expression to black political aspirations. Grassroots political expression is often undertaken by the residents' associations of the various black townships. The Nyanga Residents' Association, chaired by Oscar Mpetha, is one such organization.

At 71 years of age, Mpetha enjoys an international reputation for his more than 40 years of trade union work. In 1955 he helped found the South Africa Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU)—a federation that recognized and pressed the linkage between the struggles for political and labor rights—and he currently serves as national organizer of the African Food and Canning Workers Union. Mpetha also played an active role in the organizing and furnishing evidence to the Cillier Commission, which was established to report on the political riots of 1976.

On August 11, 1980, on a road that runs along the border of the Nyanga—a black township of Cape Town—and Crossroads—a squatter settlement on the outskirts of Cape Town (see **Committee Report No. 31**)—a disruption occurred that left two people dead. Oscar Mpetha, along with 18 others, was arrested and charged with inciting the violence and committing the murders.

The disruption was precipitated by a bus boycott that began in June, 1980, resulting from an announcement that bus fares would increase by 30 to 100 per cent. A Bus Action Committee, with which 40 community organizations were affiliated, decided to boycott the company providing bus services for the African and Coloured townships around Cape Town. As Chairman of the Nyanga Council, Mpetha was a leader of the boycott.

As is often the case with peaceful protest in South Africa, the boycott was considered sabotage against the State, justifying the intervention of armed security police. Blacks have charged that commuters were roughly handled, cars were stopped and often impounded, individuals were detained and questioned, and the independent "pirate" taxi drivers, shuttling boycotters to and from work, were brutalized and arrested.

During the morning of August 11, after police attempted to force commuters to board empty buses, a confrontation between "pirate" taxis and riot police occurred. It is believed that this confrontation sparked the later disruption, leading to the deaths—by stoning—of two white men and the subsequent arrest of Mpetha, and 18 others. The day before his arrest on August 13, Mpetha issued a statement, published in the local press, stating that it was "Police provocation" and confrontation with "pirate" taxi drivers which led to the unrest. It is widely believed that the authorities are using the charges to eliminate a troublesome campaigner.

Along with the others, who are—with two exceptions—aged 21 or under, Oscar Mpetha has been charged under South Africa's broadly-phased Terrorism Act and on two counts of murder. All of the defendants were held incommunicado

Continued page SA-6

May 31st—South African Republic Day Symbol of Repression—Day of Resistance

May 31 is perhaps the most important date in the history of South Africa. On May 31, 1902, at the end of the Anglo-Boer War, the treaty of Vereeniging was signed; it contained a crucial clause that barred all black people from political representation in the South African Parliament. Accepting this same racist clause, the British House of Commons on May 31, 1909, passed the South African Act of Union, which was ratified by the South African Parliament on May 31 of the following year. To white South Africans, the most important May 31 came in 1961, when the Afrikaner government declared the Republic of South Africa and in doing so broke away from the British Commonwealth. Therefore, May 31 has become the symbol of increasing repression for the black majority of South Africa.

Resistance to the official celebration of May 31, designated as Republic Day, dates back to the moment the Republic was declared in 1961, when a three-day period of mourning and strikes was observed by Blacks. This year's 20th Anniversary celebrations followed a general election in which only whites were permitted to vote, the results of which reaffirmed white rule and also indicated a swing to the far right among the white electorate. The black South African response was a nationwide boycott of the celebrations which included mass protests, school boycotts, labor strikes, all-night prayer vigils,

and acts of sabotage, all planned so as to avoid injury or loss of life. In Soweto, as in many other black townships, people in anger burned South African flags, raising instead the flag of the African National Congress (the banned liberation movement). Altogether more than 100 political, community, educational, trade union, and religious organizations spanning all of the major urban areas joined the boycott.

Manifestoes were issued, detailing the reasons for the boycott. Most common among those reasons were:

- Africans, who comprise 69.6% of the total population, possess 13.7% of the land, while whites, who comprise 16% of the population, possess 86.39%;
- In 1978 Africans engaged in non-agricultural work earned an average of R132 per month while whites earned R585 per month;
- In 1978 the infant mortality rate of Blacks was 13 times that of whites in the one-to-four age group;
- During 1977/1978 the government spent R54.08 on each black child's education and R551 on that of each white child;
- In 1970 an average of 1,685 Africans were prosecuted under pass laws every day;
- Over the past 30 years more than two million people,

Continued page SA-7

Sanctions Against Apartheid

The Southern Africa Project director and **Robert Kapp**, Secretary of the Lawyers' Committee, attended the United Nations-sponsored International Conference on Sanctions Against South Africa, held May 20-27 at UNESCO House in Paris, France. The Conference brought together representatives of over 124 governments (including several foreign ministers), 14 specialized agencies and other inter-governmental organizations, 37 international non-governmental organizations and 53 national anti-apartheid and other organizations, as well as a large number of individuals including statesmen, members of parliaments, experts and well-known personalities.

The Conference took place at a crucial time for the future course of events in southern Africa and for relations between the United States and Africa as a whole. It followed the apparent formulation of a U.S. policy of open and friendly relations with the government of South Africa; the January collapse of the pre-implementation talks for the planned United Nations supervised elections in Namibia; and the April Security Council debate on Namibia, during which the United States, France, and the United Kingdom cast a triple veto against a resolution calling for sanctions against South Africa. The Conference also met in the midst of political changes in France, coinciding with the installation of a new President who has a long record of support for the cause of African freedom.

The discussion in the Conference concentrated on (1) demonstrating the importance of enforcing sanctions against

South Africa as a vital element to bring about an end to the apartheid regime, (2) dispelling the myth that because of the front-line states' economic dependence on South Africa, they have no sincere wish that sanctions be imposed, (3) discussing the extent to which front-line states will have to be supported and assisted as a necessary component of the comprehensive scheme of sanctions against South Africa, and (4) technical aspects of monitoring full implementation of comprehensive sanctions by all members of the international community, particularly the major trading partners of South Africa.

While the Conference reaffirmed that comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa, under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, must remain the urgent objective, it also concluded that there exists more than sufficient authority in successive United Nations resolutions, and a compelling need for States which have not yet done so, to adopt immediate unilateral sanctions against the South African regime. The Conference judged that such sanctions are not only technically feasible but urgently necessary for the peace and security of Africa and the world, for ending South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia, and for assisting in the eradication of the entire apartheid system.

The following points were among the voluminous facts and analyses that were presented as background for the Conference deliberations:

- The mandatory arms embargo imposed by the Security Council on South Africa on November 4, 1977 is being

Continued page SA-7

United Nations Holds Seminar on Legal Issues Concerning Namibia

By resolution 2145 (XXI) of October 27, 1966, the General Assembly terminated the mandate of South Africa over Namibia and placed the Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Subsequently, by resolution 2248 (S-V) of May 19, 1967, the General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia to administer the Territory until independence.

United Nations resolutions and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of June 21, 1971 have established the illegality of South Africa's presence in the Territory and the invalidity of South Africa's acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia. In addition, they have established the obligation of member States of the U.N. to recognize the invalidity of South Africa's acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia and of refraining from any acts and dealings with the Government of South Africa implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to such presence and administration. The continued illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa, a decade after the historic advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, is a matter of grave concern to the United Nations.

In fulfillment of its mandate as the legal Administering Authority for Namibia, the U.N. Council for Namibia held a seminar June 22-24 on legal issues concerning Namibia, to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice at the Peace Palace in

The Hague. Legal experts and selected individuals who are members of judicial and legislative bodies were invited to participate in the seminar. The Lawyers' Committee was represented by the director of its Southern Africa Project.

The work of the seminar focused on two major legal issues relating to Namibia: implementation of Decree No. 1 of the Council for Namibia and the issue of unification of Walvis Bay (Namibia's only economically and militarily viable port) with Namibia. In the exercise of its authority as the trustee for the people of Namibia and the natural resources of the Territory, the Council for Namibia in 1974 promulgated Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. Pursuant to Decree No. 1, no person or entity may explore, extract, export, etc. any natural resource of Namibia without the consent and permission of the Council, on penalty of seizure, and forfeiture. The decree also authorizes seizure of the carrier in which any illegally exported resources are transported and provides that anyone contravening the Decree may be held liable in damages therefor by the future government of an independent Namibia. The Decree declares any concession or license for the exploitation of Namibian resources granted by the Government of South Africa purporting to be with the authority in the Territory to be null and void.

Since the early 1970's, contracts (largely between western-

Continued page SA-5

Congress Examines Reagan Request to Repeal Clark Amendment

The "Clark Amendment" was passed by Congress in 1976 in response to growing covert U.S. involvement in the Angolan conflict. After the collapse of the Portuguese colonial regime in 1975, the Ford Administration authorized CIA intervention in Angola. The CIA gave \$30 million in paramilitary assistance to the FNLA and UNITA factions, including aid for the recruitment of mercenaries and for propaganda. (See "Angola: the threat to repeal the Clark Amendment," June 25, 1981—Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy.) By the end of 1975, the CIA requested a second \$30 million for aid to UNITA. Congress voted against this appropriation and passed the Clark Amendment, putting a halt to further CIA covert action in Angola without the express approval of Congress.

The Reagan Administration has called for a repeal of the Clark Amendment in the Security Assistance Act of 1982, a request greeted with hostility and strong criticism from several African states, members of Congress and the business community with strong interests in Angola.

On May 12, 1981, the House Foreign Affairs Committee voted overwhelmingly to retain the Clark Amendment in the mark-up of the Foreign Aid Authorization Bill (H.R. 3175), based on the unanimous recommendation of the House Africa subcommittee which gave five major reasons why the Amendment should not be repealed: (1) it would seriously undermine the United Nations and Western Five (France, Britain, West Germany, Canada and the U.S.) effort to resolve the Namibian crisis; (2) it would not lead to a

withdrawal of or reduction in the number of Cuban troops in Angola. Instead it would play into the hands of the Soviets and the Cubans by increasing, not diminishing, the reliance the Angolans now have on the Cubans for security needs. According to senior Angolan officials, once the Namibian problem is resolved and the threat of South African raids has disappeared, the Cuban presence will decline.

Further, lifting the Clark Amendment could (3) have disastrous consequences for U.S. relations with black Africa. Repeal would be viewed by most African states as a U.S. tilt toward South Africa, which supports the cause of Mr. Jonas Savimbi and his UNITA forces. (4) The American business community has expressed substantial concern about the consequences such an action will have on their activities in Angola and the rest of Africa. Moreover, some Key African states such as Nigeria, our second largest oil supplier, might well take some type of retaliatory action against the U.S. or American companies. (5) Our closest allies in western Europe have all informed the U.S. of what is at stake should the Clark Amendment be lifted. They've stated that it would probably scuttle the Namibia negotiations and play into the hands of the Soviets and Cubans.

On May 13, 1981, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted 12-2 to repeal the Clark Amendment, but in a compromise reached between Senators Percy (R-Ill) and Tsongas (D-Ma), set conditions for sending military aid to any group in Angola. The compromise stipulates that prior to sending

Continued page SA-6

International Commission of Inquiry Issues Scathing Report on South Africa's Policy of *Apartheid* and Its Actions Toward Namibia and Angola

The International Commission of Inquiry into the Crimes of the Racist and *Apartheid* Regime of Southern Africa, at its second session held January 30-February 3 in Angola, issued a scathing report on South Africa's policy of *Apartheid*; its policy toward Angola and Namibia; its internal policy of repression of South Africa's majority population; as well as the policies of various NATO nations—including the United States—and other governments, supporting the illegal actions of South Africa. Attending the session, in addition to Commission members (among whom is **Ramsey Clark**, member of the Southern Africa Project's Advisory Subcommittee of the Lawyers' Committee Board of Trustees), were different personalities and representatives of various organizations from 28 countries in Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Americas.

Excerpts from the Commission's report are reprinted below; a complete copy can be obtained from the Southern Africa Project:

Legal Background

The Charter of the United Nations, the Principles set forth by the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights and International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*, as well as many resolutions and decisions adopted by the United Nations, . . . necessarily lead to the conclusion that *apartheid* is a crime under international law.

Namibia enjoys, in fact, the status of an international territory and was placed under the direct responsibility of the United Nations by General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) adopted on 27 October 1966. That the continuous presence of the South African authorities is illegal and all measures taken by these authorities are equally illegal and invalid was reaffirmed by the Security Council in its resolution 276 (1980) of 30 January 1980.

Therefore, the acts of violation and the contempt displayed by the South African regime for the body of international law established since 1950 by the International Court of Justice, the General Assembly, the Security Council and various other organs and bodies of the United Nations, and by many international conventions, have placed it in flagrant violation of all the principles and standards universally recognized by international society.

Findings

1. The reports submitted, . . . the testimony of many witnesses; the observation of the missions . . . ; the visit to the Central Military Hospital have enabled the Commission to draw the following conclusions. . . .

2. Armed attacks, raids and temporary military occupation of the territory [of the People's Republic of Angola] by the

South African army . . . and violation of Angolan air space perpetrated by these forces . . . are carried on systematically and almost daily.

3. These attacks are aimed in particular against the industrial and agricultural infrastructure and against all means of communication in order to paralyze the economic system and, consequently, to create a state of permanent insecurity with the aim of destabilizing the People's Republic of Angola.

4. This undeclared war is directly affecting large sections of the civilian population, who are victims of bombing, assassinations, abductions and torture.

5. Torture, in its most inhumane form, is systematically used by the South African regime against both the Angolan prisoners, the SWAPO and ANC combatants and sympathizers and even against the civilian population of these countries.

6. The arms and equipment used for war and repression by South Africa originate mainly from the United States of America, France, Belgium and other NATO member countries, as well as from Israel and certain Latin American countries (through importation, manufacture under license and fraud committed with export licenses). Mercenaries of the same origins are associated with or even integrated into South African army units.

7. The very difficult living conditions of the 50,000 Namibian refugees in Angola . . . are the direct consequences of the illegal measures taken in Namibia by the South African regime.

Legal Conclusions

1. South Africa by its acts of armed aggression systematically and on an immense scale violates the sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola and the integrity of its territory. . . . The People's Republic of Angola suffers from an undeclared war by virtue of the scale and the repeated and unprovoked nature of South African aggression. This is coupled with an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola by maintaining and using UNITA as a supplement to the South African army and to other mercenary forces to mask the aggression as a civil war. The same grave challenges to their sovereignty are suffered by the People's Republic of Mozambique and by the Republic of Zambia and they threaten Zimbabwe which has recently become independent.

2. The Government of South Africa has no right to justify its military actions by means of the rule of "hot pursuit" in search of SWAPO and ANC. Such a right does not exist in international law in relation to pursuit on land and is inconceivable from a territory occupied illegally. . . .

3. The recognized rights of the Namibian people are violated in outrageous fashion by the South African occupation. . . . Only the Namibian people have the right to exercise sovereignty over this territory's wealth and natural resources

Continued page SA-5

(Decree No. 1 of the United Nations Council for Namibia). South Africa's occupation of Namibia is a violation of the fundamental principle of a people's right to self-determination and it is a crime of aggression against the Namibian people. The systematic massacres and torture carried out by South Africa against the population and the liberation movement fighters (who are treated worse than common criminals) are a violation of humanitarian law (the Hague Convention, the Geneva Convention of 1949 and the Additional Protocol of 1977). They also constitute an open violation of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the 1966 International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights.

4. The repression of South Africa's majority population within the framework of *apartheid*, considered by international law to be a crime against humanity, expresses in the clearest form South Africa's colonialist nature and violates the rights of peoples to self-determination. . . . Members of the national liberation movements (ANC) have the well-founded right to benefit from combatant status as defined in international conventions and from prisoner-of-war status when they are captured in combat. Under all circumstances they have the right to benefit from declarations and conventions on Human Rights. . . .

5. The systematic and open violations of international law by the South African regime are only possible due to the direct and indirect complicity of a certain number of States which respect neither the spirit nor the letter of the United Nations resolutions and decisions, nor those of various international conventions, which are thus rendered ineffective. Certain NATO member states (notably the United States of America and France), Israel, China and certain Latin Americans and Caribbean States, together with transnational corporations supported by the big Western powers, effectively provide South Africa and its army with the means to carry out their policies of *apartheid* and oppression. This complicity has reached the point of allowing South Africa to acquire nuclear military capability. The States which are the *de facto* allies of the South African regime, as well as the transnational corporations which collaborate with it, thus contribute actively to turn South Africa into one of the main threats in the

maintenance of peace and security in the world. They jeopardize the fundamental precepts of the Charter.

Recommendations

1. Strict respect for the principles and rules of general international law, particularly those concerning the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and of the other front-line States and the protection of humanitarian law and human rights in southern Africa;

2. The carrying out of resolutions concerning the right of the Namibian people, whose authentic representative is SWAPO, to self-determination, a requirement established by the United Nations since 1973 and the recent Geneva Conference on Namibia (January 1981); the carrying out of resolutions in favour of the right to self-determination of the people of South Africa;

3. Effective application of sanctions already decided upon by the Security Council against South Africa, the application of sanctions provided for in Article 41 of the Charter (the breaking of economic relations and of all connexion by rail, sea, air, post, telegraph, radio and other means of communication as well as severance of diplomatic relations), the oil embargo and forbidding of all nuclear collaboration having priority;

4. Payment of indemnity by South Africa for all losses and damage caused by the acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and the front-line States;

5. Pursuant to decisions taken by the Security Council, effective aid to the front-line States and national liberation movements to be guaranteed and increased as an international right and duty for all.

Finally, taking into account the grave worsening of the situation, the International Commission of Inquiry appeals to Governments, to all those international organizations both governmental and non-governmental and particularly to the International Red Cross and other humanitarian organizations, to intensify in concrete terms their solidarity with the struggle against the crimes and acts of aggression of the *apartheid* regime.

U.N. Holds Seminar on Namibia, from page SA-3

based corporations extracting the natural resources of Namibia and corporations located in several western nations) have been executed by delivery of the resources under contract, in defiance of Decree No. 1. In discussing effective responses to these continuing violations of international law, the seminar participants analyzed the viability of enforcing Decree No. 1 through litigation in municipal courts of United Nations member states, the methods through which identification and seizure of goods could be implemented, the calculation of damages, and compensation procedures for the future independent government of Namibia. As background information for this discussion the Southern Africa Project director discussed the Project's experiences in 1975 in commencing a proceeding in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to block the importation of Namibian sealskins into the United States, *Diggs v. Richardson*, 555

F.2d 848 (1976). (See Committee Report No. 21.)

Additionally, the seminar discussed and reaffirmed the illegality under international law of South Africa's annexation in 1977 of Walvis Bay as an act of colonial expansion. Walvis Bay is recognized by the international community as an integral part of Namibia, with which it is inextricably linked by geographical, historical, economic, cultural and ethnic bonds. Its severance from an independent Namibia would cripple that country economically from the outset and would ensure South Africa's continued dominance over Namibia. Further, the importance of Walvis Bay as a strategic harbor and military installation for South Africa on the western Atlantic seaboard has been emphasized by recent negotiations between that country and certain Latin American military regimes to establish a South Atlantic alliance of non-communist powers based on the concept of NATO.

under Section 6 of the Act until they appeared in court four months following their arrest. The indictment, served seven days after that first court appearance, was vague. The State claimed that particularity was unnecessary in indictments under the Terrorism Act, a claim that was later rejected in an unprecedented ruling on a motion brought by defense counsel.

New precedent was also established by the court's ruling on the State's motion that under Section 153(4) of the Criminal Procedure Act, the trial should be held *in camera* since included among the accused were individuals under the age of 18. By the mere appendage of a juvenile to the list of defendants, this provision of the Act could be used as a convenient mechanism to closet political trials from public inspection. In ruling that in such situations, the proceedings will be open if the legal guardians and the accused youth so desire, the court closed an avenue of retreat for the State in political trials.

Over and above the precedents set by the rulings on these motions, this trial has political import for several reasons. First, all of the accused face the possibility of death sentences, particularly harsh given the youth of many of them. Second, the trial tests the South African Government's professed identity between political activity of any form and "terrorism" against the State. Finally, the conduct of the trial will provide

public exposure of alleged police malfeasance during the bus boycott. Hopefully, as in the case of the **Steve Biko Inquest** (see **Committee Report No. 28**), the result will be some degree of future restraint on official conduct in otherwise peaceful demonstrations.

The Southern Africa Project will be giving a wide range of support, both financial and technical, to this trial which is expected to continue for more than six months.

There has been a major crackdown on black trade union leaders and striking workers during 1981 in South Africa, as reflected by the following:

- well over one hundred trade union leaders have been arrested;
- 15,000 black workers have been fired in connection with over 63 strikes throughout the country;
- at least 2,060 striking workers have been deported to Bantustans, areas designated for African occupation;
- a computer system has been installed in one Bantustan that classifies black workers as 'trouble makers,' 'good boys,' 'trade unionists,' etc., and monitors the migration of workers into the urban areas.

Congress Examines Reagan Request to Repeal Clark Amendment, from page SA-3

aid, the President would have to determine and submit a confidential statement to both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that: substantial progress has been made in Namibia, including an effective ceasefire and preparations for internationally supervised elections; that provision of such assistance will not impair prospects for an internationally acceptable Namibia settlement; and that the national security interests of the U.S. are protected.

Both the House and Senate versions of the Clark Amendment are expected to be brought to the floor after the Congressional break in September.

In March, three members of the Southern Africa Project's Advisory Subcommittee joined with more than 100 other prestigious Americans in signing a letter which urged President Reagan "to assure Angola, by supporting retention of the Clark Amendment, that the U.S. will not intervene, overtly or covertly, in the internal affairs of that country. The U.S. should not alienate or threaten the Government of Angola, one of the most important African front-line states involved in the Namibian negotiations." In addition, the director of the Southern Africa Project is participating in a broad-based coalition of national organizations urging members of both

the Senate and the House to retain this important check on U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of Angola.

The Reagan administration formed a closer alliance with the *apartheid* regime of South Africa, as reflected by:

- the U.S. veto of four U.N. sanction resolutions against South Africa in April;
- South Africa Foreign Minister Pik Botha's visit to the United States to meet with Secretary of State Haig in May;
- the Office of Export Administration's decision to permit the export of medical supplies and "anti-terrorists" equipment for civil aviation use to the South Africa army;
- the U.S. agreement to train South Africa Coast Guard personnel and the U.S./South Africa agreement to reciprocally upgrade military attaches;
- the Reagan administration suggestion that U.N. Resolution 435 be reversed to require that a Namibian constitution be adopted prior to independence.

mostly women and children, have been removed from the "white areas" to the bantustans—70,000 in 1980;

- In 1980 alone 965 people were detained under the security laws—more than 17,619 persons have been detained since 1960;

- Since 1960 1,426 people have been banned and 162 banished to 'outlying areas'.—(*Cape Times*, May 25, 1981)

Black South Africans were not the only boycotters of the celebrations. Student representative councils of the white universities of Cape Town and Witwatersrand also endorsed the boycott, sponsoring several speakers and rallies on their campuses. At the University of Cape Town, the sports council voted to withdraw the use of the university sports facilities for the celebrations and their marathon track team was expelled from the annual national competition for issuing a call to all runners to wear black arm bands in solidarity with the boycott. At the University of Witwatersrand police and white right-wing supporters of the government clashed with the Republic Day boycotters resulting in the much-publicized arrest of the son of a well known member of Parliament.

In response, the government launched one of the most massive security operations in recent South African history. Demonstrations were broken up with tear gas, batons, dogs,

guns, and arrests. The arrests and police action promoted a *New York Times* headline: "Crackdown Under Way in South Africa" (June 23). The exact number of people arrested/detained during this crackdown has not yet been confirmed. In one Johannesburg township, it is said that police called in the army to assist in a house-to-house raid in search of 'ring leaders'. In this operation alone, scores of people, mostly students, were detained.

The period of unrest did not end with the Republic Day Celebrations. Police follow-up activities in the townships caused renewed protests and school boycotts against the police and army presence in their townships and schools; these demonstrations were broken up with tear gas and whips (sjamboks). Two weeks later marked an annual day of unrest when Blacks recall painfully the massacre of June 16, 1976, at which time 700 students engaged in peaceful protest were killed.

All of these events will likely be reflected in a sharply increased number of political trials, with charges carrying the possibility of severe sentences, based most probably on the Riotous Assemblies Act (for accused demonstrators) and the Terrorism Act (for alleged saboteurs). We anticipate that the Southern Africa Project will be called on to lend assistance to defendants in these trials.

Sanctions Against Apartheid, from page SA-2

violated, and corrective measures are not being taken by the Governments concerned. There is a need for an effective monitoring and enforcement machinery. Further, the South African "contingency plans," whereby in time of civil unrest and military necessity the entire South African economy, including transnational corporations, may be commandeered for military use, indicate that there cannot be any effective arms embargo without effective economic sanctions and vice versa.

- In the past two decades, foreign investments in South Africa have soared from three billion to 25 billion Rand, while the foreign trade of South Africa has increased four-fold.

- South Africa has returned recently to the foreign loan markets on a major scale. A substantial portion of the loans are being used, among other things, to finance the transfer of arms. The United States bank, Citibank, has been among those banks which recently made new loans to South Africa.

- Only Japan, among the major capital-investing States, has a statute totally prohibiting investments in South Africa. Sweden has a similar, but not as effective statute.

- Gold mining plays an unrivaled role in the South African economy, contributing approximately 20 per cent of the gross national product and paying for some 50 per cent of South African imports. Gold now provides much of the resources to finance the militarization of the South African economy. Some 20 per cent of South Africa's gold production is allocated for the production of coins (the Krugerrand), for which there has been a large international sales campaign.

- On the basis of available evidence it has been determined that South Africa has developed and tested a design for a nuclear weapon, and is capable of producing a small arsenal from its available weapons-grade material. This capability was acquired with the assistance in uranium extraction and processing, supply of nuclear equipment, transfer of technology, provision of training and exchange of scientists which the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France and the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as Belgium, Israel, Japan, The Netherlands and Switzerland extended to *apartheid* South Africa.

- Oil is South Africa's most vulnerable point of dependence on the outside world. That country's repressive and aggressive capacity would be diminished and its economy would rapidly grind to a halt if oil supplies were exhausted. Indeed South Africa would probably be able to survive for only a maximum of two-and-a-half years if all oil imports were halted.

- South Africa is increasingly using social, cultural, and sport exchanges to create a favorable international image for its *apartheid* policy, and is thereby attempting to break out of its international isolation.

- Investment of South African capital in neighboring States which are heavily dependent on the economy of South Africa is an attempt to increase their dependence upon the *apartheid* economy within the proposed racist constellation of States.

In his closing statement, the President of the Conference, Salim A. Salim, Foreign Minister of the United Republic of

Continued page SA-8

Tanzania, said:

This Conference has been an affirmation to those who may seek to link their policies to the *apartheid* regime of South Africa that we shall stand firm and counter any such measures. It is important to recall that it was more than 20 years ago that the South African liberation movement and the All African People's Conference appealed to the world for sanctions against South Africa because the racist regime had systematically closed all the doors to peaceful change. . . . For over two decades the racist regime of Pretoria has become more and more intransigent, it has refused to heed reason and persistently defied the world community; it constitutes today the world's Number One outlaw which relies entirely on the constant use of violence and terrorism in order to maintain an evil and out-dated doctrine of racial superiority.

The proceedings at this Conference showed that it is becoming increasingly untenable for certain countries and multi-national companies to have

the best of both worlds: friendship and good relations with Africa and collaboration with *apartheid* South Africa. They do not have much time to make the choice and should understand that there can be only one side, the side of justice and of the Charter of the United Nations. . . .

The people of South Africa and Namibia and their national liberation movements will bring about their own liberation. The duty and task of the international community is to support them in their righteous struggle, thereby reducing the suffering and the casualties in the irresistible march to freedom. It is towards that end that we appeal to the Governments and organizations and peoples of the world to mobilize for sanctions against South Africa in the light of the Declaration of this Conference.

The final documents and background papers of this Conference are available upon request from the Southern Africa Project.

THE LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW
733 - 15th Street, N.W.—Suite 520
Washington, D.C. 20005

Nonprofit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Washington, D.C. Permit 43113
--