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About the Anti-Apartheid Movement

The British Anti-Apartheid Movement, formed initially as the "Boycott Movement" in 1959, works in political parties, trade unions, religious groups, universities, colleges, schools, and with the general public for an end to all forms of collaboration with the apartheid regime and for support for the liberation struggle in South Africa and Namibia.

We seek to -

(a) inform the British people about apartheid, publicise the situation in Southern Africa and expose collaboration with the apartheid regime;

(b) provide support for all those struggling against apartheid in South Africa and Namibia and in particular for the liberation movements;

(c) campaign for the release of political prisoners and detainees in South Africa and Namibia and other victims of apartheid repression;

(d) mobilise support for the isolation of the apartheid regime and for the ending of all forms of collaboration, especially through the imposition of United Nations economic sanctions against South Africa.

Some 400 organisations are affiliated to the Movement, including 35 national trade unions. The AAM has some 55 affiliated local committees throughout Britain, from Aberdeen to Brighton, and regional committees in London, Wales and Scotland.

The Movement publishes a newspaper, Anti-Apartheid News, ten times a year. This can be obtained at the address on the cover. UK and Europe subscriptions are £4.50 per year, those for outside Europe £7.50 (surface mail) and £8.50 (airmail).

Membership of the AAM costs £7.50 per year. Membership subscriptions and subscriptions can be paid directly into the AAM's Giro Account No 52 513 0004.
Introduction

On the facing page we have given a brief description of the objectives and campaigning work of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. In the body of this paper we attempt to outline the scope and character of the campaigning undertaken by the Anti-Apartheid Movement, in co-operation with organisations such as the Namibia Support Committee, against British economic links with the illegal occupation of Namibia and especially the activities of British based transnational corporations in sustaining the illegal occupation.

However, first, we should outline the context within which these campaigns are organised and some of the complementary activities of the Anti-Apartheid Movement's work on Namibia.

British Policy

The central objective of the AAM's work is to effect a dramatic change in the policy of the British Government regarding Southern Africa as a whole. We believe that Government action is crucial if we are to succeed in breaking the decades long support which Britain has given to the South African apartheid regime in its occupation of Namibia and in the development of the apartheid policy within South Africa itself. It may not appear likely that the present British Government will under any circumstances agree to the change of attitude that is required, even if, under pressure of circumstance, they may adjust or even reverse some aspects of their policy. However, we hope that a future Government will adopt not only the measures we propose, but also the spirit which makes them truly meaningful. In short, we hope that a future British Government will turn away from the traditional policy of protecting and collaborating with the apartheid regime to one of confronting the regime and providing effective support to the liberation struggle. We believe that our hopes are not totally unjustified.

British policy on Namibia over recent years has been based on a three-pronged approach. First, to attempt to defuse the growing international pressure for sanctions against South Africa, second to alter the terms of the UN Plan, as embodied in the Security Council Resolution 435 of 1978 in both their and South Africa's favour, and third to ensure that any eventual Namibian independence agreement is so brought about that it may actually strengthen South Africa in its attempts to sustain apartheid within its borders.

Britain's motives for staving off sanctions - namely the protection of what it perceives to be its economic and other interests in the region - were graphically illustrated in October 1981 by the behaviour of Sir Leonard Allinson, British Assistant Under Secretary of State. On the eve of the publication of new Contact Group proposals for a Namibian settlement he headed the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office delegation to a conference in London to promote trade with South Africa, organised jointly by the Confederation of British Industry and the United Kingdom-South Africa Trade Association (UK-SATA). Sir Leonard flew off to Africa immediately afterwards at the head of the British component of a Contact Group delegation to launch a new phase of negotiations.

The protracted process of manouevre and diplomatic deals that has been in train since the Contact Group negotiations began in 1977 has seen Britain well to the fore in offering the apartheid regime various present and future concessions in return for its co-operation. But it has also seen Britain being quite prepared to give overt and direct support to the regime.
when the latter judges that "the time is not right". Britain has willingly allowed South Africa time to build up the DTA for it to be able to stand a better chance in the polls and for South Africa to make a determined attempt to destroy SWAPO. All the indications are that Britain, no less than President Reagan, is not at all ill-disposed to either of these objectives, and the present Thatcher Government has, through making it quite clear that it will not support sanctions or any other effective measures to make South Africa comply with the UN resolutions, through dropping references to the resolutions themselves and through its attitude on the question of "linkage", given a clear and far from discouraging signal to South Africa. Indeed, they have gone further, with repeated attempts to change the independence plan in a series of ways.

Throughout all this Britain's guiding policy has been to protect South Africa itself. Britain is still today South Africa's second or third biggest trading partner, the biggest investor in South Africa and perhaps South Africa's most reliable ally. US support for South Africa may have seized the world's attention, but South Africa knows that over the years Britain has been at least as consistent a friend and that it may well be as close a friend long after President Reagan has gone. Within the EEC British influence is being used to extend support for South Africa from Western Europe still further.

It is in this context that the campaigning work of the Anti-Apartheid Movement to end British economic links with South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia needs to be seen. As we stated above we hope for a change in Government policy, and we are working to create the climate for such a change under a new Government. At the moment, however, the clear message from Whitehall and Downing Street to British business is certainly not one which disposes the corporations' decision makers to diminish their level of involvement in the occupied territory.

It should be added, however, before passing on that it is precisely the strong British commitment to protect South Africa, taken with the logic of the white supremacy system in Southern Africa, which means that the AAM's campaigning work to end British economic links with the illegal occupation is located firmly in the context of the need for sanctions against South Africa as such and as will be clear later we see the campaigns against economic collaboration with South Africa and economic collaboration with South Africa over Namibia as inextricably interlinked.

The Campaigning Framework

In March, 1981 the AAM launched a campaign in Britain on the theme "Isolate Apartheid South Africa - Sanctions Now". This culminated in a major demonstration and conference in March 1982. The current theme for campaigning is taken from the title of the March conference "Southern Africa - The Time to Choose". We are saying to British people that they face and urgent and inescapable choice between collaboration with apartheid South Africa and support for the cause of freedom. We hope they will choose for support for the liberation movements of Southern Africa and the isolation of the regime; and significant progress has been made.

The principal themes in campaigning on Namibia remain as they have done since the independence of Zimbabwe:

* support for SWAPO and the Namibian liberation struggle
* the campaign to release Namibian political prisoners
* action to end Britain's contract for uranium from Namibia
* British Government action to end South Africa's occupation
* action to isolate apartheid South Africa

The AAM has made a priority of pointing out that Namibia is militarily occupied by South Africa, that Namibia is an international territory and the responsibility of the United Nations, that South Africa's occupation of Namibia is illegal, that South Africa has exported to Namibia its racist apartheid policies and its brutal methods of repression, that South Africa uses Namibia as a base for attacking and invading neighbouring African states, in particular Angola and Zambia, and that South African, British and other foreign companies are actively plundering Namibia's natural resources.

On political repression AAM works closely with SATIS (Southern Africa - The Imprisoned Society) for the release of all political prisoners and detainees. There is no space in this paper to go into detail, but this has been a major theme in campaigning, especially with the recent increase in repression. Campaigns have sought to highlight the fact that many of the leaders of the Namibian people, like Herman ja Toivo, are incarcerated on Robben Island, while many others are imprisoned, banned, tortured and detained, including the over 100 who were captured during the massacre of Namibians at Kassinga in Angola in 1978. Campaigning like this played an important part, we are convinced, in ensuring that Marcus Kateka, Aaron Mushimba and Hendrik Shikongo were not executed.

The AAM also works closely with the Namibia Support Committee to provide material assistance, including medical and educational aid. The NSC organises a number of material aid projects and has recently re-launched its drive for SWAPO Medical Kits. The AAM publicises these campaigns and encourages local activists to raise the necessary funds.

Both the NSC and AAM, and of course SWAPO itself, provide speakers, for meetings and have a vast range of material - slides, films, leaflets, posters, booklets, which AAM attempts to distribute as widely as possible so that the British people can be better informed about Namibia. The AAM has organised two speaker tours for SWAPO activists in the last few years and local groups of the AAM have assisted with others organised by NSC, while both organisations co-operate on holding weeks and days of action and longer campaigns such as that which lasted for three months following the major Paris international conference in 1980.

All this should be viewed, of course, in the context of the AAM's continual concern to promote greater support for and understanding of the policies of SWAPO, with whose Western European Office the Movement works closely.

Increasingly, however, the one element which we have not concerned ourselves with in this account - action against economic collaboration - has been to the fore. It is with this that the body of this paper, now that we have set the background in place, is concerned with.

Action to Break Economic Links

There are two ways in which British companies and the Government provide important economic and financial support for the South African illegal occupation of Namibia. First, by strengthening South Africa itself, and second by operating directly in and through various types of economic relationship with Namibia itself.

The Movement has since its inception been concerned to avoid the trap of believing that it is possible to see the occupation of Namibia in isolation from the continued existence of the apartheid regime in South Africa itself.
It makes no sense to speak of sanctions against the illegal occupation regime in isolation from sanctions against the Pretoria regime. Conversely, the greatest assistance that we can in many ways render to the people of Namibia is to secure the strongest possible international and domestic action against South Africa. The United Nations arms embargo campaign is a good case in point, as are all the subsequent campaigns to make the arms embargo more effective and more extensive. These were not "Namibia" campaigns, in their narrow context. Namibia was always one of the principal concerns in the minds of those who prosecuted the campaigns, but their scope was wider and often the focus was not directly on Namibia. Nevertheless, the one international decision which has probably helped the people of Namibia most was the arms embargo decision.

Equally, the AAM is concerned to see sanctions imposed against South Africa not only because of Namibia. We do not see sanctions, as some in the West do, as an incentive to better behaviour or a reformative device which, applied over Namibia, can be withdrawn when an acceptable settlement is achieved. At the same time, one of the three principal points we make when proposing the sanctions policy is that they are required to make South Africa comply with the UN Plan (the other two are that they are required to force South Africa to halt its attacks against neighbouring states and to assist in the liberation struggle within South Africa itself).

So it would be relevant to consider in the context of this discussion the AAM's work to ensure that collaboration with apartheid South Africa is ended. The AAM campaigns for an end to military and nuclear collaboration, for an oil boycott, for the severing of all economic ties with South Africa and above all for the imposition of UN mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa that would end all forms of Western support for the regime contribute in a very important way to the campaign in solidarity with the people of Namibia no less than they do to the campaign in solidarity with the people of South Africa. This is because British collaboration with South Africa provides important support for it in its illegal occupation. Support for the apartheid regime makes possible its continued occupation.

In fact, the campaign to "Isolate Apartheid" has been central to the AAM's campaigning work, never more so than in the last year in which we have organised many activities around that theme and succeeded in making the "idea of isolation" central once again to the perceptions of the broad anti-apartheid community in Britain.

At the same time we recognise the need to campaign to end certain specific forms of collaboration directly with the illegal occupation of Namibia and which make a particular contribution to the occupation. Britain is up to its neck in the illegal occupation - and the RTZ uranium contract (see below) is only the best known example, albeit probably the most important one. An estimated 25% of Namibia's exports come to Britain. Two British banks dominate the financial sector (Barclays and Standard Chartered) and outside; mining a number of major British companies have substantial interests (see list later). Altogether there are at least 25 British based transnational corporations with interests in Namibia, the second highest figure after South African companies (many of which are themselves British controlled). In mining RTZ dominates uranium production and the other mining houses almost all have substantial British involvements.

To point this out is to provide some explanation in itself for the policies Britain has pursued in regard to Namibia. To end this involvement has been one of the priorities for action in AAM work on Namibia especially recently.
The most recent major activity of the AAM in this area was during the United Nations International Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia, October 27th to November 3rd, 1982. During this Week the AAM, in co-operation with the Namibia Support Committee, sought to focus in particular on the role of British companies in sustaining South Africa's illegal occupation. Apart from exposing the role of Britain in the context group, focussing attention, especially in the trade union and labour movement, on the situation in Namibia and mobilising solidarity with SWAPO in the most general sense, the week aimed to:

* expose the role of British companies
* stimulate protest at the activities of British companies
* underline the need for the total isolation of South Africa
* the imposition of UN mandatory sanctions

The responsibility for drawing up detailed programmes rested with the local Anti-Apartheid groups, student Anti-Apartheid groups and other local organisations participating in the Week of Action. However, the AAM stated in advance that it wanted to see the following forms of action in as many towns and cities as possible:

* public meetings/film shows with SWAPO, NUNW speakers, etc
* activities, especially involving trade unionists, focusing on local companies' links with Namibia (either companies based in Namibia or companies which help to sustain South Africa's military occupation). Such activities might include pickets of companies, leaflettings, delegations of trade union unionists to their companies, action against direct links with Namibia
* delegations to MPs urging them to support the termination of British companies' activities in Namibia, the strict enforcement of the arms embargo and the application of sanctions against South Africa.

The AAM asked its supporters and local groups to contact local trade union and labour movement organisations in particular, pointing out that the TUC (Trades Union Congress) policy was to support SWAPO, but also other organisations such as local Black organisations, women's organisations, anti-racist committees, political parties, churches, and so on. (Both the British Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, although not explicitly supporting SWAPO, have pursued policies generally sympathetic to SWAPO).

Groups were encouraged to undertake their own company research but the AAM and NSC also provided information. They were also asked to make a priority of approaching the local media and also seeing whether local authorities could support the campaign.

Centrally, the AAM produced a Briefing Document on the current situation in Namibia, a leaflet in preparation for the week, a poster, a list of British companies with subsidiaries, associates and other interests in Namibia and some of this is attached at the end of this document.

To provide a focus for the Week of Action the AAM and supporting organisations organised a series of events in London. The Anti-Apartheid Movement's London Committee organised demonstrations outside the Headquarters of Trafalgar House, whose South African subsidiary Cementation Engineering manufactures shells for the G5 and G6 artillery weapons, to underline the involvement of this company with the military occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The AAM also urged the Foreign Secretary to launch an immediate investigation into whether the company and/or its employees are in breach of British law...
in their clear defiance of the UN arms embargo. The London Committee also organised a protest at the City of London offices of Blue Star Port Lines. This shipping company, in co-operation with Rennies Consolidated (SWA)(Pty) has begun regular (35 day) services from Tilbury dock, London, to Walvis Bay using certainly two and possibly four vessels. Two of these are known to be 28,000 ton Swedish ships with ro-ro facilities. End Loans to Southern Africa held a demonstration outside one of the main Barclays Offices. Barclays is the biggest bank in both Namibia and South Africa. The Namibia Support Committee demonstrated outside one of the Head Offices of BP, which supplies oil to the apartheid military in Namibia and is a shareholder in Tsumeb mining. The Week culminated with a demonstration at RTZ Head Office.

Outside London there were many activities, although it is fair to say that nowhere was the trade union involvement as great as we had wanted in the planning stage. Meetings, street leaflettings, demonstrations, film shows, and other activities took place in Southampton, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Liverpool, Bristol, Keele, Guildford and a number of other centres.

Campaign against the Namibian Uranium Contract

The Week of Action was designed to point up the involvement of British companies in sustaining the illegal occupation of Namibia. Part of the idea was that British people should understand more clearly how many different companies are involved and in how many different ways.

However, for many years the AAM and NSC have been working together in a campaign which has focussed on just one British based transnational - the Rio Tinto Zinc Corporation. This is the CANUC campaign, the Campaign against the Namibian Uranium Contract. Formed in 1979 and now convened by the Namibia Support Committee, CANUC was set up to stop the import into Britain of uranium from Namibia, especially the imports covered by the contract now held between Rossing Uranium and the Central Electricity Generating Board.

Much if the background and detail concerning the contract can be found in The Rossing File, produced by CANUC. The main facts are these:

* Since 1966 the British Government has allowed there to be imports of uranium to Britain under a contract held first by the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority (UKAEA), then through British Nuclear Fuels (BNF) and now through the Central Electricity Generating Board (CEGB).

* Initially the contract was for 7,500 tons or £120 million worth of uranium and it was to run until 1982. But the contract has now been extended to 1984 and by June 1981 £100 million worth of uranium had still to be delivered. (At today's prices the original value of the contract was around £200 million).

* The British Government revealed in 1981 that over half the uranium imported into Britain for British use then came from Namibia, most of it presumably under this contract. (Other uranium comes in for processing and re-export to "third parties").

The contract is in clear defiance of the repeated requests of SWAPO that it should be terminated. SWAPO have condemned the contract as a "criminal exploitation of irreplaceable resources which rightfully belong to the people of Namibia" and have clearly stated that "those who have relations with the South African regime in Namibia and are actively contributing by trade
revenues to the regime are helping to perpetuate the illegal exploitation of our people". The contract is also in defiance of international law since the revocation of the United Nations mandate for the administration of the territory in 1966 the United Nations, besides urging governments to refrain from dealing in and with South Africa concerning Namibia has specifically called on companies not to operate there. Under Decree Number One for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia the UN Council for Namibia has specifically banned the prospecting, mining and removal of any Namibian natural resources without its authority. Neither the British Government nor the bodies directly involved in the contract have applied for such authorisation, indeed the UN Council have repeatedly asked that the contract be terminated.

The Rossing mine which provides the uranium for the contract is itself the single biggest foreign investment in Namibia and the uranium exports account for much British trade with Namibia.

The principal objective of the campaign, its cancellation, has proved difficult to achieve. But the campaign is growing. The Labour Party is opposed to the contract and significant support has been received from the trade unions in Britain, especially after details of the importation of the uranium were received and publicised by Granada Television and others. This trade union support has also enabled the campaign to spread internationally and the campaign now has links with transport unions in France, the Netherlands, the FRG and other Western European countries. In Britain the National Union of Seamen, ASLEF, the train drivers union, and the Transport and General Workers' Union have all provided important support for the campaign.

The AAM has sought to ensure the widest possible support for the campaign and in addition to lobbying and similar work this has involved the organisation of street activity - the AAM believes above all the campaigns must be public and not just concentrated in London.

The last major Day of Action was held in December 1981, when demonstrations were held throughout Britain outside electricity showrooms and electricity board offices. Passers by were handed a leaflet asking "Do you know how much of Britain's electricity is produced by nuclear reactors fuelled by uranium stolen from the people of Namibia?" In London CANUC and the London Committee of the AAM supported by Students Against Nuclear Energy, CND, the London Students Organisation and others demonstrated outside the CEGB headquarters. In the North West of England CANUC supporters picketed Edmundsons in Morecambe, the firm which transports the yellow-cake uranium. Other protests took place in 40 towns and cities including Newcastle, Glasgow, Southampton, Norwich, Leeds, Bath, Canterbury, Birmingham, Leicester, Nottingham, Cardiff, Peterborough, Bristol, York, Huddersfield, Bradford, Cambridge, Hull and Plymouth.

A few days earlier Alan Sapper, the then Chairman of the Trades Union Congress, handed in 10,000 petitions to 10 Downing Street in a bid to get the government to cancel the contract. CANUC followed up these initiatives with a postcard campaign (samples attached). The cards are being sent to MPs, the Foreign Secretary, the CEGB and CANUC itself by supporters of the campaign. Other initiatives have been discussed at two campaign meetings in Birmingham and Leeds attended by AAM, student, anti-nuclear and other supporters of the campaign. One of these is a drive to get local authorities to withdraw shares from RTZ in protest at the contract and general involvement in Namibia. A number of local authorities have, as a result, decided to review their holdings; and Avon County Council have already decided to withdraw all but one of their RTZ shares.
Meanwhile, campaigning has continued among trade unionists to secure their support for action to stop the imports of Namibian uranium. On April 2nd, 1982, the Transcrt and General Workers' Union South-West of England Region held a seminar in Bristol attended by virtually all the unions involved in uranium transport in Britain, as well as a number of others. Representatives of the workers at the British Nuclear Fuels plant at Springfields, where the uranium is processed, were also present. It was reported during the seminar that BNFL had been circulating material to its employees rejecting CANUC's campaign points. The seminar adopted a resolution stating that "blockading actions" (i.e. action to prevent imports of uranium through trade union decisions not to co-operate) are both "feasible and necessary to do what the UK government has failed to do, give effect to Decree Number One". Among other decisions taken were to invite SWAPO speakers to sites through which the uranium is thought to pass, to isolate the transport firm which moves the uranium (Edmundsons of Morecombe) and campaign more widely on the issue in the labour movement. A similar seminar is being held in Bristol on November 27th, 1982.

Campaigning for the Isolation of South Africa

As mentioned above all this campaigning takes place in the context of the AAM's overall campaign to secure support for sanctions and break all forms of economic collaboration with South Africa. To this end the AAM has organised many activities which feature campaigning on Namibia, including on November 27th a national trade union delegate conference attended by 250 representatives of trade unions throughout Britain including Len Murray the General Secretary of the Trades Union Congress, whose affiliates have 11 million members. The AAM works broadly - but places special importance on unions.

That conference and the general campaign gives major prominence to the need to secure sanctions, a move now supported by the Trades Union Congress in a historic resolution which also included support (for the first time for SWAPO). In 1981 the TUC adopted policy affirming "support for SWAPO in its struggle for genuine independence", condemning the use by Britain of its veto to block United Nations sanctions and pledging its support "for the total isolation of the racist regime, including the imposition of mandatory United Nations economic sanctions against South Africa". The policy is shared by most major national trade unions. Now the AAM is trying to make this mean what it should through action on the ground both in the form of direct action against collaboration with apartheid South Africa and through building up a climate of opinion favourable to Government action including support for sanctions.

SWAPO has stated many times that it wants sanctions, and has been supported by the the Front Line States. President Nujoma has also made clear the implications of the West continuing to block sanctions against South Africa. As he put it in his press statement after South Africa had torpedoed the Geneva Pre-Implementation Talks in 1981, "we are confident that Namibia will be free. No people have ever been kept in permanent oppression." He went on:

"The question is at what cost? The responsibility for the continued loss of life and suffering lies with the Pretoria regime".

And we might add that until Britain and other Western countries give effective support to SWAPO's liberation struggle by ending collaboration with the apartheid regime they too share fully in this responsibility. It is the AAM's wish and determination that we will do all possible to ensure that collaboration is ended soon.
Namibia is under illegal occupation by apartheid South Africa. The United Nations and Namibia's liberation movement, SWAPO, have demanded the cancellation of the contract.

We demand the cancellation of the contract.

Can we please support the campaign against the Namibian uranium contract and encourage others to do the same?

[Contact information for the campaign]

Electricity we use is generated by nuclear reactors fuelled by illegally imported Namibian uranium.
Dear Lord Carrington,
I am totally opposed to the import of uranium from Namibia in defiance of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice and would like an assurance that the Government will stop these illegal imports. I look forward to your early reply.
Yours sincerely,

Name __________________________
Organisation ____________________
Address _________________________

To
The Rt Hon Lord Carrington
Secretary of State
Foreign and Commonwealth Office
Downing Street
London SW1

Dear *
I understand that Britain is importing uranium from Namibia in defiance of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice. Since this uranium is used to fuel nuclear reactors which in turn generate electricity which I have to use, I am writing to ask whether you will support the campaign to cancel the contract and pursue the matter with the government ministers responsible. I look forward to your reply.
Yours sincerely,

Name __________________________
Address _________________________
_______________________________

To
House of Commons
Westminster
London SW1

Dear Mr Anderson,
I understand that a significant quantity of electricity is generated by nuclear reactors which are fuelled by uranium stolen from Namibia. I would like an explanation as to why I should pay for this electricity since the uranium is imported illegally, as well as in defiance of the wishes of the people of Namibia.
Yours sincerely,

Name __________________________
Address _________________________
_______________________________

To
Mr John Anderson
Secretary to the Board
Central Electricity Generating Board
Sudbury House
15 Newgate Street
London EC1

Dear CANUC,
I am interested in the Campaign Against the Namibian Uranium Contract and would like further information.

Name __________________________
Organisation ____________________
Address _________________________
_______________________________
Tel _____________________________

To
Campaign Against the Namibian Uranium Contract
c/o Namibia Support Committee
53 Leveton Street
London NW5
what you can do

**Action during the Week 27 October to 3 November**

There are many ways you can support the campaign this week and afterwards. Special priorities are:

- Publicise the collaboration of British companies with South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia — especially the illegal plunder of Namibia's mineral wealth — and campaign to end their involvement.
- Write to your local paper, or phone-in to your local radio.
- Press the government, and your MP, to take action to end the presence of British companies in Namibia and to support sanctions against South Africa.
- Urge your local authority, church, trade union and any other organisation you know to support the campaign and to sell any shares they have in companies in Namibia.

If you know of any link with the illegal occupation of Namibia — and it's likely that a company near you will have interests there — make this the week to start the campaign against their involvement, and let us know about the action you have taken.

**After the Week...**

- Publicise the situation in Namibia, especially if there is a particular link with your area. Invite SWAPO to send a speaker, or show a film.
- Raise funds for the Namibia Support Committee's Material Aid programme to assist SWAPO in caring for Namibian refugees.
- Buy a Medical Kit (£100). (Contact NSC, address below.)
- Press for the release of Namibian political prisoners and detainees — SATIS (address below) has details of how you can help.
- Mobilise support for the AAM Week of Action ‘Southern Africa — The Time to Choose’ in March 1983.
- Make a donation so we can continue this campaigning work — the Week of Action, and this leaflet, cost money.
- Affiliate to the Anti-Apartheid Movement and get more details from these organisations:
  - Anti-Apartheid Movement, 89 Charlotte Street, London W1P 2DQ. Tel 01-580 5311.
  - Namibia Support Committee, 53 Leverton Street, London NW5. Tel 01-267 1941/2.
  - SATIS, c/o AAM, 89 Charlotte Street, London W1P 2DQ. Tel 01-580 5311.
  - SWAPO, 96 Gillespie Road, London N5. Tel 01-359 9116/7.
  - CANUC, c/o NSC, 53 Leverton Street, London NW5. Tel 01-267 1941/2.
  - Write direct to the AAM using this tear-off form.

Please send me a list of material on Namibia and the Week of Action briefing document, and tell me more about how I can support the struggle of the Namibian people. Also send me details about how to join the AAM.

**NAME**

**ADDRESS**

**Telephone**
SOLIDARITY WITH SWAPO!

This week has been declared by the United Nations as a special week of solidarity with the struggle of the people of Namibia who have been fighting for years for freedom from the illegal military occupation of their country by South Africa. There will be events and activities throughout the world. In Britain, the Anti-Apartheid Movement, in cooperation with the Namibia Support Committee, are organising a Week of Action to:

- focus attention, especially in the trade union and labour movement, on the situation in Namibia and to mobilise solidarity with SWAPO
- expose the role of British companies operating in Namibia in defiance of the will of the Namibian people, the UN and the International Court of Justice, and protest against these companies' activities in sustaining South Africa's occupation and its aggression against African front line states
- expose the role of Britain as a member of the Contact Group and its collusion with South Africa
- campaign for the total isolation of South Africa, and in particular for the imposition of UN sanctions against South Africa, which would compel it to quit Namibia, halt South Africa's aggression and isolate the apartheid economy and its war machine

YOU CAN HELP

- Find out if there are any British companies in your area with operations in Namibia – or any other local link with Namibia.
- Order the AAM briefing document on the Week and other material on Namibia (see form on back).
- Ensure that there is action during the Week in your area.

REMEMBER

- South Africa occupies Namibia with 100,000 troops, the equivalent per head of population of five million troops occupying Britain.
- British collaboration plays a crucial role in sustaining this military occupation. Britain is the major foreign investor in Namibia and is deeply involved, in particular, in plundering Namibia's mineral wealth. British companies have greatly enhanced South Africa's military capability in Namibia.
- As a member of the Contact Group (US, UK, France, Canada and West Germany), Britain has been involved in 'negotiations' over Namibia and is actively supporting the US in its efforts to prevent genuine independence for the people of Namibia.

THESE ARE THE COMPANIES

These are a few of the British-based companies with Namibian operations – a full list is available from AAM (address overleaf):

- Mining:
  - Rio Tinto-Zinc Ltd, Charter Consolidated, Consolidated Goldfields, Alpine Holdings.

- Karakul Fur:
  - Hudson's Bay & Annings, Eastwood & Holt

- Trade:
  - Harrap Bros, A C Young & Co, Grand Metropolitan, Lonrho, Wood Hall Trust

- Shipping, Freightage, Transport & Storage:
  - Clan Lines, Union Castle, Crosby House Group, Ellerman Lines, Reed International

- Finance, Banking & Insurance:

- Fuel:
  - British Petroleum Ltd, Shell Transport and Trading

- Construction:

- Engineering & Equipment:

- Consumer & Office Products:
  - Distillers Corporation, Fisons, Gestetner Holdings, Glaxo Holdings, Rank Organisation, Rowntree-Mackintosh, Thorn-EMI, Willis Faber, Wittington Investments, Unilever Ltd
what you can do

Action during the Week 27 October to 3 November

There are many ways you can support the campaign this week and afterwards. Special priorities are:

- publicise the collaboration of British companies with South Africa’s illegal occupation of Namibia—especially the illegal plunder of Namibia’s mineral wealth and campaign to end their involvement
- write to your local paper, or phone-in to your local radio
- press the government, and your MP, to take action to end the presence of British companies in Namibia and to support sanctions against South Africa
- urge your local authority, church, trade union and any other organisation you know to support the campaign and to sell any shares they have in companies in Namibia

If you know of any link with the illegal occupation of Namibia—and it’s likely that a company near you will have interests there—make this the week to start the campaign against their involvement, and let us know about the action you have taken.

After the Week...

- publicise the situation in Namibia, especially if there is a particular link with your area. Invite SWAPO to send a speaker, or show a film
- raise funds for the Namibia Support Committee’s Material Aid programme to assist SWAPO in caring for Namibian refugees. Buy a Medical Kit (£100). (Contact NSC, address below.)
- press for the release of Namibian political prisoners and detainees—SATIS (address below) has details of how you can help
- mobilise support for the AAM Week of Action ‘Southern Africa—The Time to Choose’ in March 1983
- make a donation so we can continue this campaigning work—The Week of Action, and this leaflet, cost money
- affiliate to the Anti-Apartheid Movement and get more details from these organisations:
  - Anti-Apartheid Movement, 89 Charlotte Street, London W1P 2DQ. Tel 01-580 5311
  - Namibia Support Committee, 53 Leverton Street, London NW5. Tel 01-267 1941/2
  - SATIS, c/o AAM, 89 Charlotte Street, London W1P 2DQ. Tel 01-580 5311
  - SWAPO, 96 Gillespie Road, London NS, Tel 01-359 9116/7
  - CANUC, c/o NSC, 53 Leverton Street, London NW5. Tel 01-267 1941/2
  - or write direct to the AAM using this tear-off form

Please send me a list of material on Namibia and the Week of Action briefing document, and tell me more about how I can support the struggle of the Namibian people. Also send me details about how to join the AAM.

NAME
ADDRESS

........................................
Telephone
Note on British Companies and Namibia

The following list of British companies which are involved in Namibia was reproduced for the Anti-Apartheid Movement activities organised for the United Nations International Week of Solidarity with the People of Namibia, October 27th to November 3rd, 1982, and was drawn up by the Namibia Support Committee.

(a) Finance, Banking and Insurance

British financial groups dominate the clearing institutions in Namibia. Barclays Bank Ltd operates 22 branches, 90 agencies, and is expanding - it recently opened a branch at the South African army base of Ondongwa.

Standard Chartered Banking Group also has many branches via its South African affiliate. The two banks hold 70% of all bank deposits in Namibia (R220 m). Hill Samuel helped finance the Kunene River project.


(b) Fuel and Construction

BP and Shell own refineries and many distribution depots and have joint prospecting ventures (BP Developent Cp and Shell Exploration SVA).

Construction companies that have an involvement include Acrow, Lead Industries Group, George Wimpey and Sons Ltd, Davy International, 600 Group, Taylor Woodrow, Palfour Beatty, and SDG.

(c) Engineering and Equipment

APV, Associated Engineering, Airwork (British and Commonwealth Shipping), Chloride, GKN, Lucas Industries, Smiths Industries, William Dalna (Trafalgar House), Delta Metal/McKernie Brothers, Babcock and Wilcox Ltd all have interests with the latter owning Tripeljay Equipment of Windhoek. Blackwood Hodge have a branch dealing in earthmoving equipment in Windhoek. BOC subsidiary Atco has an operation in Namibia. Mitchell Cotts Group Ltd owns 80% of the Reinforcing Steel Co in Windhoek.

(d) Mining and Related

Alpine Holdings, DICC, Lead Industries Group all have interests, but RTZ is the most important. Charter Consolidated, the UK registered arm of Anglo-American and Consolidated Goldfields have holdings in Kiln Products which is involved in zinc mining and processing through ZINCOR.

(e) Shipping, Freightage and Transport/Storage

Clan Lines, Union Castle and now Blue Star Port Lines all sail from Walvis Bay. Others in this field with interests include Reed International, Ellerman Lines, Crosby House, and Rennie Consolidated. Blue Funnel is reported to have begun a liner service to Namibia.

General

The latest figures indicate that there are 88 multi-nationals in Namibia,
25 of them British. All Namibia's gem diamonds are sold through the London based Central Selling Organisation, a De Beers controlled monopoly. Lead products are also sold to international customers through the London office of Tsumeb Sales Ltd. Canned fish, mainly pilchards, are imported to Britain under Glenryck and Puffin labels mainly - registered brands of Federale Marine Ltd, the South African marketing agency for fish products. Karakul pelts are sold under the Swakara label by two companies at auctions in London - Hudson's Bay and Annings and Eastwood and Holt. Harrop Brothers, a subsidiary of Sirdar Wools Pvt Ltd and SW Yarns purchase unprocessed Namibian wool. Other companies involved in trade are A.C. Young and Co, Grand Metropolitan, Lonrho and Wood Hall Trust.