



# **Anti Apartheid Movement**

Annual Report  
September '69/August '70

**THE ANTI-APARTHEID MOVEMENT**  
**89 Charlotte Street London W1P 2DQ. Tel 580 5311**

Annual Report  
September 1969 – August 1970

*Hon President*  
The Rt Revd Ambrose Reeves

*Vice Presidents*  
Basil Davidson  
Sir Dingle Foot QC  
The Rt Revd Trevor Huddleston CR  
The Rt Hon Jeremy Thorpe MP

*Sponsors*  
Lord Brockway  
Lord Collison  
Thomas Hodgkin  
Frank Hooley  
Jack Jones, MBE  
David Steel MP  
Angus Wilson

*Chairman*  
John Ennals

*Vice Chairman*  
Peter Jackson

Price 10p

## **FOREWORD**

What exactly does the Anti-Apartheid Movement do? How often have I heard this question. The following pages give an adequate answer to such questions about our work as far as 1969-70 is concerned.

It is an impressive record. Considering the smallness of our budget and the fewness in numbers of our paid staff, it is a remarkable achievement. It reflects great credit both on the devotion of those who are on our staff and on the numerous individuals who from time to time assist voluntarily in ways too many to mention in helping to cope with the volume of work that is dealt with in our office. Sometimes, indeed, a visitor to our office might be forgiven if he imagined that he had walked into Piccadilly Circus.

But impressive as this Annual Report is of the volume of work undertaken in the last year, and the not inconsiderable achievements of the Movement during this time, our attention must be given primarily to the present and the future. This is a critical moment in the life of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. Those who support racism are as active as ever. In the coming months we need to intensify our efforts, increase our membership and our income, if we are to do the work before us. For this reason I would urge the reader who is convinced after reading this Report of the importance of our work to take whatever steps he can to support us. Those who are already members of the Movement ought to ask what more they can do actively to help. I am sure that as far as others are concerned they will at least want to become members. In the future we shall need the active help of every single person who is opposed to racism in any form.

**The Rt Revd Ambrose Reeves**  
President

## CONTENTS

### *Introduction*

A Year of Activity	1
Apartheid South Africa and African Resistance	1
The Challenge in Britain and the West	2
International Developments	3
1 <i>Southern Africa</i>	
Rhodesia (Zimbabwe)	4
Namibia (South West Africa)	5
The Portuguese Colonies	6
Lesotho	7
Botswana	7
2 <i>Campaigns</i>	
Arms Embargo	8
Political Prisoners	13
Cabora Bassa	16
Sport	17
Sharpeville Tenth Anniversary	23
3 <i>Organisation</i>	
Anti-Apartheid News	24
Work in the Trade Union Movement	25
Regional and Branch Activities	26
Youth and Students	27
Membership	29
Publicity	29
Finance	31
National Committee	31
4 <i>International</i>	
General	32
Rome Conference	33
5 <i>Conclusion</i>	33

## INTRODUCTION

### *A Year of Activity*

The Anti-Apartheid Movement has completed a year of sustained and intensive public activity against racism and apartheid in South Africa and in support of the freedom struggles of the African peoples in Southern Africa. It has undoubtedly been a year of some success for the Movement and the anti-apartheid struggle. The liberation movements in Southern Africa have achieved important advances in winning support from the African masses, in consolidating their forces and in refining their policies and programmes. They are now challenging the armed forces of the Southern African colonialists with greater experience and confidence. In Britain, the cancellation of the cricket tour, the delaying of the government's decision to resume arms deliveries to the Vorster regime and, above all, the considerably increased public awareness of the fundamental issues at stake in Southern Africa and their place in British politics – all these have increased South Africa's isolation and stiffened the public's opposition to increased British collaboration with the Vorster regime. The militant support received by the Movement from youth and students and from other sections of the British public has been crucial in the recent achievements of the anti-apartheid struggle in this country.

The past year has also been one of increased challenge. The return of a Conservative government has encouraged the pro-apartheid lobbies to intensify their pressures for closer British relations with the Vorster regime, for a quick 'settlement' with the Rhodesian Smith regime and for rendering increased support to the hard-pressed Portuguese colonialists in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea Bissau. These pressures are certain to mount in the coming year. In meeting them, the Movement's resources will be taxed to the full, demanding policies and public campaigns which will meet these challenges fully.

### *Apartheid and African Resistance*

In South Africa, for the fifth time since 1948, the Nationalist Party sought and won from the white electorate a mandate for apartheid. The April 1970 election showed not only the intransigence of the white voters on basic racial questions, but also their readiness to back new domestic and foreign policies designed to consolidate the apartheid system. Cut-backs in the economic growth rate and informal adjustments of the industrial colour bar have been made to accommodate the growing tension between the labour demands of an expanding economy and traditional forms of segregation. However, these changes have only intensified the process whereby urban Africans are ruthlessly uprooted and forced into migratory labour, so that increased labour productivity is achieved without according to blacks either their demands for urban security or the economic advances which could be expected to accompany industrial expansion in other circumstances. The ease with which white voters and labour organisations have accepted these changes shows that they are

recognised as necessary for the survival of white supremacy and privilege. Such calculatedly inhuman and exploitative policies, imposing a mounting burden of insecurity and suffering on the black majority, require total suppression for their efficacy, and the South African government has in the past year further elaborated and extended the police state apparatus which has been developed in the preceding decade. More than ever before, Africans are being divided from Indians and Coloureds, and each from the other, by imposing segregation in respect of jobs, living conditions, social services and in transport and communications. Dummy instruments of self-government in the 'Bantustans' are being promoted in the hope of winning to the side of the white community a small black elite with a vested interest in the survival of apartheid. Over all hangs a heavy pall of terror.

African resistance to this tyranny continues despite all odds. Underground propaganda, organisation and agitation are some of the means adopted, and spontaneous work-stoppages and outbursts of popular anger at railway stations and other flash-points demonstrate that apartheid has failed to cow its victims. There can be little doubt that the arrival in South Africa of the guerrilla struggle being waged throughout the northern part of the sub-continent will meet with a ready response from a people so steeled by hardship and goaded by ill-use.

Similar processes of polarisation and the escalation of State violence and exploitation occurring in Zimbabwe, Namibia, Angola and Mozambique have been fully documented in both the regular and occasional publications of the Movement. But it is important to stress once again that the struggle against racism and colonialism in Southern Africa is developing a sub-continental character embracing over 30 million people of diverse experience and condition united in common cause against a racial minority enjoying the open-ended support of major Western powers.

A principal task of the Movement has been and remains to expose the interlocking political, economic and strategic aspects of this unholy alliance, the dangers it represents to the stability of independent Africa and the real threat to world peace posed by the prospect of widespread racial conflict involving 'white' nations defending vested interests against African liberation movements pursuing their legitimate fight for freedom by the only course left to them - guerrilla struggle.

#### *The Challenge in Britain and the West*

Campaigning tirelessly for policies of disengagement by the Western powers, the Movement has sought to persuade governments, parliaments, political parties and the public at large that support for apartheid and continued relations with white South Africa on racist lines harms not only the oppressed majority in Southern Africa but also the true interests of the nations with whom South Africa enjoys 'normal' relations. This reality was effectively and massively demonstrated in Britain when, in the course of a sustained and successful campaign against the proposed apartheid cricket tour, it became apparent to millions of people, and ultimately to the government, that 'normal' relations with white South Africa could

only be maintained at incalculable cost. Race relations, civil order, Commonwealth sport and international non-racial cricket were jeopardised by the stubbornness of the Cricket Council. To overcome it, unprecedented efforts of organisation and publicity were mounted during the winter by the Movement and other anti-apartheid organisations against the Springbok rugby tour. In succeeding months, spurred by and inspiring the international effort to isolate all aspects of apartheid sport, the cricket campaign brought home the true nature of apartheid to many in Britain for the first time, mobilised thousands in active protest, drew in new and youthful support for the Anti-Apartheid Movement, and generated a wider and deeper commitment to the cause of African freedom.

Hard on the heels of this significant achievement, the Conservative Party regained power. The partial arms embargo operated by the Labour government, standing as a crucial though inadequate and vulnerable symbol of the Movement's success in advocating British disengagement, was immediately threatened as a result. Worse, a renewed effort to 'settle' with the Smith regime can be expected, and the virtual abandonment of sanctions, whatever the outcome of that attempt. Finally, attempts to increase British trade and investment in Southern Africa, strengthen links with the white minority regimes, and give greater support for Portugal's colonial wars – all will form part of the Conservative approach to the area. Herein lies the challenge to the Movement in the coming year.

### *International Developments*

The past year and especially more recent months have seen renewed international efforts to confront the apartheid question and the problems of Southern Africa.

The factors explaining this change are broadly: (a) the intensification of the liberation movement struggle, particularly in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea Bissau; (b) the attempts of South Africa and its colonialist partners in Rhodesia and Portugal to consolidate their grip on the region, expand their armed forces (seeking Western arms and capital for this purpose), and to weaken the resolve of the neighbouring African States to support the forces of liberation in Southern Africa; (c) the actions of the AAM and similar movements which have helped to create an international climate favourable for the anti-apartheid struggle; and (d) the announced intention of Britain to rescind the arms embargo and thus join with France, West Germany and other Western countries in extending strategic and economic relations with the Southern African regimes, which includes reaching a settlement with the Rhodesian regime.

The initiatives of President Kaunda of Zambia have been critically important: Zambian pressure on the United States during the visit of US Secretary of State Rogers to Africa was followed by special appeals to the Commonwealth to oppose the British plan to renew arms supplies to South Africa and to make a deal with the Smith regime; Zambia, with the support of other African States, exerted considerable pressure on West Germany, France and Italy to withdraw from the Cabora Bassa hydro-

electric project. The dangers to the African States, arising from South Africa's military expansion, were raised in the OAU and led to the convening of a special session of African Heads of State on this question. The African countries raised the matter of British intentions at the UN Security Council and sought greater UN authority in enforcing a comprehensive arms embargo. The Conference of Non-Aligned Heads of State, meeting in Lusaka, gave primary place in its deliberations to the Southern African question, and agreed to give full support to the African and OAU position on the arms question. It has condemned by name all the Western countries which are supporting racism in Southern Africa.

The evolution of an effective programme of action against apartheid has up to now been weakened by the inability of the UN to implement the numerous decisions it has taken on this question. This inability was a reflection of the power of the major Western countries to ignore the UN and to protect apartheid South Africa. The new determination shown by the African States and the other non-aligned nations could contribute decisively to bringing an end to this obstruction and lead to the early and effective implementation of the sanctions measures that have been taken and are now being proposed.

## 1 SOUTHERN AFRICA

### *Rhodesia (Zimbabwe)*

November 11, 1969 marked the fourth anniversary of UDI. According to Ian Smith, sanctions had had little effect, but on November 17 Mr Foley, then Under Secretary at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, told the Commons that Rhodesia's per capita income had fallen by 4.5 per cent. Nonetheless, sanctions continued to be eroded, notably by the regime's major supporters, South Africa and Portugal. Clifford Dupont, officer administering the Smith regime, signed the republican constitution on November 29, 1969, and Rhodesia was proclaimed a republic on March 2, 1970.

By the end of March all countries, with the exception of South Africa and Portugal (which withdrew its Consul but the position of the Consulate is unclear), had withdrawn their Consulates and missions from Rhodesia. In the April election the Rhodesian Front was returned to power by an almost entirely white electorate and Clifford Dupont was sworn in as President. South Africa's Prime Minister stated that South Africa would continue to back Rhodesia and in May Vorster undertook an official visit to Rhodesia, where he spent two days and was welcomed by Smith supporters.

The republican constitution expressly rejects for all time the idea of majority rule. Together with the constitution, the Smith regime has introduced even further retrogressive measures, such as the Land Tenure Act which ends long-standing African settlement in areas now designated for 'whites', and a down-grading of African secondary schools by shifting the

emphasis to non-academic vocational training reminiscent of South Africa's Bantu Education Act. The churches in Rhodesia have strongly opposed the Land Tenure Act, which would restrict freedom of worship and the multi-racial character of mission schools.

Chief Rekayi of the Tangwena tribe has been leading resistance to the regime's order that the tribe vacate their ancestral land designated for 'whites' under the Land Apportionment Act. He was twice convicted for contravening this Act, but won his case against the order in the Salisbury High Court. However, in February 1969 this was overruled and a proclamation ordered him and his tribe to leave by August 31. They were forcibly removed but returned again. Eviction notices have been served and the Chief informed that if these are not obeyed by September 1970, prosecution under the Land Tenure Act will be instituted.

In May Dupont announced that the Rhodesian armed forces would be strengthened in the face of the increased activity of African guerrilla fighters. A month earlier six African guerrillas had been sentenced to death, bringing to 43 the number of Africans waiting in the condemned cells of Salisbury prison. Some have been there for four years.

In June police were called into Rhodesia's 'multi-racial' university where a crowd of students were protesting against the absence of black representation on the Council. A disciplinary committee appointed to inquire into this demonstration expelled two students and suspended five. All seven were members of the Committee of 10, a student group formed to co-ordinate protests against proposed statutes for the new University Council.

More demonstrations followed as the Smith regime exerted increasing control over the university. During March 1970 the Universities of London and Birmingham announced that they had agreed to phase out existing links with UCR (see *Youth and Students*).

Leopold Takawira, Vice President of ZANU, died on June 15. A long sufferer from diabetes, he had been detained in Salisbury prison since 1964 under brutal conditions. The cause of death was given as 'long-standing illness'.

In accordance with its election pledge, the Conservative government plans further attempts to reach a settlement with the Smith regime on the basis of the 'five principles', which include 'unimpeded progress to majority rule'. Smith has said on numerous occasions that there is no going back from the position of a republic and a constitution which rules out majority rule forever, and the hard fact is that the Rhodesian constitution conflicts with all the 'five principles'.

#### *Namibia (South West Africa)*

South Africa continues to occupy Namibia in defiance of UN General Assembly and Security Council resolutions which, following on the termination of South Africa's mandate in 1966, have called for her withdrawal from the territory. Laws passed in 1968 and 1969 extended South Africa's control by emasculating the legislative assembly at Windhoek.

the capital, and setting up local government for 'native nations', the first of the South West African 'bantustans'.

Resistance is growing and South Africa is responding with an increasing number of arrests, detentions and trials. At least 43 Namibians are now serving sentences in South African prisons, and a trial of another 10 members of SWAPO (South West African Peoples Organisation) took place early in 1970.

Chief Hosea Kutako, father figure of the liberation movement in Namibia, died in late July. The newly-formed Friends of Namibia Committee arranged a memorial service at St Martin-in-the-Fields on July 31, at which Moses Garoeb, Administrative Secretary of SWAPO, spoke on behalf of the people of Namibia.

On July 30 the Security Council decided once again to refer the question of Namibia to the International Court of Justice. This decision was seen by many as a means of restoring the prestige of the World Court damaged by its decision on Namibia in 1966, when after six years the Court ruled that Liberia and Ethiopia, who had brought the case against South Africa, had no direct interest or legal right to do so. However, the Movement considers that priority should be given to securing the implementation of UN resolutions on Namibia and to support for the struggle of the Namibian people. Any action likely to delay the achievement of these objectives would not be in the interests of the majority of people in the territory.

President Nixon decided officially to discourage US investment in Namibia. The reason given for this action was that the United Nations mandate had been terminated and South Africa no longer had sovereignty over the territories of South West Africa. However, this decision will not affect companies that already have investments there. If, as the Americans report, their investments have recently been drying up into a 'mere trickle', other countries have rushed to fill the gap. Namibia is a classic case of a country being rapidly exploited while under total foreign rule.

In July *The Sunday Times* exposed a 'secret agreement' between Britain and South Africa whereby Britain is to buy large quantities of uranium from a new mine in Namibia. This agreement between Rio Finex, a subsidiary of Rio Tinto Zinc, and the UK Atomic Energy Authority was signed during the Labour administration. It indicates further support for apartheid South Africa and implies recognition of its rule in Namibia in opposition to the UN and majority African opinion.

### *The Portuguese Colonies*

Portugal spends half her annual budget on defence in a desperate attempt to maintain her hold on the African 'colonies' of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau. In all three, wars of liberation are being fought against the Portuguese colonialists and the African liberation movements are steadily gaining ground. Despite the assistance Portugal receives from South Africa in military equipment and manpower, and the weapons obtained from the major Western powers via NATO, vast areas of each

territory have been liberated. Reconstruction work is being carried out by the liberation movements in agriculture, public health, education and commerce.

Guerrilla activity has been on the increase in all three territories. Guerrillas are infiltrating the Cabora Bassa dam site and have successfully executed acts of sabotage (see *Cabora Bassa*). It is estimated that in Guinea Bissau, which has been fighting for freedom from the Portuguese racists since 1963, almost 80 per cent of the country is now liberated; and in Angola, where the struggle was launched in 1961, almost a third of the country is now freed from the stranglehold of the Portuguese colonialists.

South Africa co-operates with the Portuguese in Angola and Mozambique as she regards these territories as her first line of defence against the freedom fighters. Britain meanwhile maintains her centuries-old alliance with Portugal and continues to give consistent support to Portuguese policies in Africa whenever they come under attack in the United Nations.

### *Lesotho*

Early returns during the Lesotho election held on January 27, 1970 indicated that the Basutoland Congress Party led by Nitu Mokhehle was taking the lead from Chief Jonathan and the Basutoland National Party. Chief Jonathan, hitherto Prime Minister of this landlocked State, surrounded by apartheid South Africa, declared a state of emergency on January 30, suspended the constitution and imposed a dusk to dawn curfew. He arrested Mokhehle, and King Moshoeshoe was placed under house arrest and subsequently forced into exile. Uprisings took place in a number of areas and many people were killed, others arrested and detained. The British government refused to recognise the Jonathan regime and on February 19 Judith Hart, then Minister of Overseas Development in the Labour government, announced that all British aid to Lesotho was to be suspended until the situation was clarified.

South Africa continued to support Jonathan, who has throughout maintained close connection with the Vorster government in Pretoria. White South Africans continue to hold key positions in the Lesotho police force and in the administration of the country.

In June, while the leaders of the principal opposition parties were still being held, the British government reversed its earlier decision, recognised the government of Chief Jonathan and restored aid.

Sporadic outbreaks of resistance to Chief Jonathan's rule continue but, with South African support and restored British aid, Chief Jonathan is unlikely to hold free elections or release those held in prisons as he had promised.

### *Botswana*

In April South Africa delivered a stern note to Sir Seretse Khama, President of Botswana, challenging his country's right to proceed with the building of an international highway, financed by America, which with the ferry across the Zambesi would link Botswana and Zambia. South

Africa maintained that Botswana and Zambia did not share a common frontier despite the fact that the ferry across the Zambesi has been in use for the past 80 years. The area involved lies along the Zambesi river where Botswana, Rhodesia, Zambia and Namibia (South West Africa) meet, and the issue is complicated by the fact that South Africa has no standing in the matter since the UN ruling in 1966 withdrew South Africa's mandate over South West Africa. Hence with the UN as the authority in Namibia and Britain as the only legitimate authority in Rhodesia, Zambia contended that neither Pretoria nor Salisbury has the right to interfere.

Though there has been a sand track and the ferry which has linked Botswana and Zambia, a new road would be of incalculable economic and political advantage to Botswana. The road will expand Botswana's cattle trade to the north and generally step up exports to Zambia and black Africa thus reducing Botswana's dependence on the South African market. It will further open up the Chobe region at present virtually isolated by poor communications. But its political importance lies in the fact that it provides Botswana, otherwise completely surrounded by white-dominated territories, with an access to black Africa which will assist in buttressing an independent Botswana.

The AAM wrote to the Foreign Secretary pointing out that Britain was still the ruling power in Rhodesia and calling upon him to clarify Botswana's right to proceed with this project. In the Johannesburg *Sunday Times* of 14.6.70 it was reported that the British Government had privately informed Botswana that 'South African objections to the proposed Botswana-Zambian highway are not tenable'.

At the time of writing the plans for the building of the road are proceeding.

## 2 CAMPAIGNS

### *Arms Embargo*

The Conservative government's declared intention to resume the sale of arms to South Africa is in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions and majority Commonwealth opinion. It has also met considerable opposition within the United Kingdom and cannot but be seen as a move towards closer political and military ties with apartheid South Africa and with the minority racist regimes throughout Southern Africa. As long ago as January 1969, Mr Anthony Barber, Conservative Party Chairman, stated that a Tory victory in the election would lead to a reversal of the arms embargo, implemented by a Labour Government in 1964 – albeit only partially. Similar statements had been made by the present Foreign Secretary, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, and Mr Seiwyn Lloyd, and the minority racist governments in Southern Africa had long looked forward to the Tory victory.

Sir Alec Douglas-Home added that Britain would make full use of the 1955 Simonstown agreement, ostensibly to ensure the safety of the Cape

sea route, and that arms supplied to South Africa would be only for 'external defence'. However, no such dividing line can be drawn between the external and internal role of the weapons named on South Africa's shopping list. And the 'threat' against apartheid South Africa comes from the majority of South Africans, victims of the exploitation and oppression imposed under that system.

Of the Nimrod maritime reconnaissance aircraft repeatedly mentioned as a likely purchase, *The Sunday Times* (19.7.70) quotes an expert as saying, 'If I wanted to put together a highly mobile and very powerful counter-insurgency force, I'd have a couple of Nimrods and a handful of Buccaneers'. In fact, as Lord Carrington, the present Secretary of State for Defence, said in 1963: 'The Government cannot guarantee that no weapon could ever, in any circumstances, be used for this purpose [enforcing apartheid] . . . even naval weapons could, at a pinch, be used to bombard a land target.' Thus the Conservative government plans are a danger to the freedom struggle throughout Southern Africa since all arms for apartheid will be used to strengthen the system; freedom fighters, it will be argued, represent a form of external attack and Britain therefore will be seen as the ally of the defenders of white supremacy. The evolving Anglo-South African alliance will be even more clearly defined if the Conservative government succeeds in its plans for developing a naval alliance with South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and Portugal. South Africa's 'external defence' also means support for the Smith regime in Rhodesia, for the Portuguese colonialists in their wars in Angola and Mozambique, and for South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia (South West Africa).

The reversal of the arms embargo cannot be divorced from the fact of Britain's economic stake in South Africa, both in trade and investment (the latter estimated to be in the region of £1,500 millions, almost two-thirds of the total foreign investment in South Africa). Other Western countries, notably France and Italy, have been supplying arms to South Africa and also have sizeable investments there.

Using Western concern for the safety of this massive economic investment as a lever, white South Africa plans increased British and Western involvement in her 'defence', claiming an alleged threat from the build-up of Soviet naval forces in the Indian and South Atlantic Oceans. This strategy aimed at a more open political and military alliance with the West and ultimate incorporation within the Western defence system now coincides with that of the Conservative government. Since there are four million whites in Southern Africa facing growing resistance from 30 million Africans, reliance on external support to maintain apartheid and white privilege inevitably increases.

Resuming arms supplies to South Africa will not only assist in the maintenance of apartheid and set back the forces of change for a non-racial and free South Africa but will also reinforce South Africa's aggressive role in the rest of Africa. Mr Vorster, South Africa's Prime Minister,

has threatened neighbouring Zambia; Dr P. van der Merwe, Chairman of the Nationalist Party's Foreign Affairs Committee, said during the recent South African election campaign that 'South Africa in future may have to cross her borders to destroy her enemies'. South Africa has already crossed her borders in defence of white supremacy: in Rhodesia South African forces have been fighting together with those of the illegal Smith regime against the African liberation movement, as well as with the Portuguese armies in Angola and Mozambique.

Further British involvement in Southern Africa is self-defeating both to its interests in Southern Africa and in Africa as a whole. It will mean a Britain allied with the minority racist governments against the forces of African liberation and, as President Kaunda has warned, 'fighting with the fascists against black independent Africa'.

The AAM, which campaigned for Britain's implementation of the UN arms embargo in 1964 and for its maintenance in 1967 when there was evidence that members of the Labour Cabinet were planning to rescind the embargo, is now again working against any renewed arms supplies to apartheid South Africa. Realising the need to draw attention to South Africa's military expansion and the growing Western support for an enlarged military role for South Africa, the Movement towards the end of last year published a pamphlet: *South Africa's Defence Strategy*. This booklet, which was mentioned in last year's report, has been sent to governments, to international bodies and to organisations, and the information thus conveyed became a subject for discussion. Before the June election, the Movement issued a memorandum listing issues important to Britain. The arms embargo came first on the list, and while the disastrous effects of stated Tory policy to resume arms sales were emphasised, it was also pointed out that under a Labour government there were loopholes in the embargo which had greatly assisted the growth of the South African armaments industry. A background document on the arms embargo and on British involvement in apartheid was sent to Constituency Labour Parties; it included suggestions for resolutions to the Labour Party Conference in September. These called for a total arms embargo and a curb on further investment in South Africa.

On June 1 cables were sent to African states, to the Organisation of African Unity and to the United Nations suggesting that immediate initiatives be taken to call a special Security Council meeting demanding a comprehensive arms embargo against South Africa. On the following day, the movement called a press conference to publicise its campaign for British disengagement in Southern Africa, during which the Hon Secretary reported on his recent appearances before the UN Committee on Apartheid, the Security Council Committee on Namibia, and the Africa Subcommittee of the US House of Representatives, at which the arms issue was the major point of discussion (see **INTERNATIONAL**). The June members' newsletter called for immediate protest by letter and telegram

to the Prime Minister, to the Foreign Office, to MP's and to the Press. Further cables were sent urging a Security Council meeting and a series of visits to Commonwealth High Commissions was undertaken. Many organisations, trade unions and church groups were contacted and urged to make a public declaration against any relaxation of the embargo, and briefings were sent to the Press and television. Thousands of duplicated postcards to be sent to the Prime Minister were distributed to members and to prominent trade unionists, MPs, artists, etc who, at the same time, were asked to declare their willingness to take part in demonstrations on this issue.

**South Africa Freedom Day, June 26.** To mark the anniversary of the AAM and the day on which the Freedom Charter was signed in South Africa in 1955, a Conference on the British Stake in Apartheid was planned. This took place in Birmingham and was organised jointly by the Birmingham AA Committee and the London Office. The Conference was geared to mapping out a campaign on the arms embargo. Background documents were prepared and the Conference was attended by over 300 people including a number of representatives from regional and national organisations and the trade union movement. Speakers were M. B. Yengwa of the Luthuli Foundation, Sean Gervasi, Abdul Minty and John Sprack, and the chairman was W. W. Hamilton MP. Subjects dealt with included the Development of the Freedom Struggle in Southern Africa, the Political Economy of Anglo-South African Relations, the Tory Government and the Arms Embargo, South Africa's Militarisation and Threat to World Peace, and Action against Apartheid. The Conference passed a resolution calling upon HMG to honour international obligations and institute a complete arms embargo, and resolving that AAM members and supporters would mount a campaign to stop the sale of arms to South Africa and its allies by any means necessary. Publicity material in the form of posters, leaflets, stickers and background documents was published and distributed.

A series of public demonstrations was then planned. During the first, which took place on June 29, MP's Joan Lester and Frank Judd delivered a letter to the Prime Minister calling for the maintenance of the embargo. This was followed on July 1 when protestors encountered the South African Foreign Minister who visited Sir Alec Douglas-Home to discuss arms sales.

Meanwhile, at its first meeting after the election, the Labour Party's National Executive passed a resolution which declared that supplying arms to South Africa would place Britain 'in the camp of the White racist regimes' and endanger the existence of the Commonwealth. Strongly worded protests came from the majority of Commonwealth countries, and Uganda's President Obote, in a statement in *The Observer* of July 5, said: 'The arms to be supplied to the Government of South Africa will not be used against any foreign invasion of that country. They will be used against Africans in that country and against African countries

neighbouring on South Africa.' The General Council of the TUC also passed a resolution urging the government to maintain the arms embargo. This was followed by a similar resolution by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

The Movement sent a briefing on the arms issue to Members of Parliament including the 38 members of the Conservative Party Bow Group. Parliament reassembled at the beginning of July. An early day motion sponsored by Frank Judd MP, 'That this House is totally opposed to the resumption of arms sales to South Africa', was signed by more than 100 Labour MPs and tabled on July 10.

The British Council of Churches, the United Nations Association, the Movement for Colonial Freedom, Africa Bureau, the Liberal and Communist Parties, and a host of other organisations and trade unions made statements denouncing any reversal of the embargo. On Saturday, July 17 the Movement arranged a demonstration in Whitehall: six people stationed at the entrance to Downing Street started a 24-hour fast which was followed on the Sunday by a demonstration, march and meeting. Demonstrations and vigils took place in centres throughout the country and the AAM drew attention to these in the July newsletter. On July 20, Sir Alec Douglas-Home announced in the House of Commons that the government 'will consider the export to South Africa of limited categories of arms for maritime defence'. This decision provoked renewed hostility from the Commonwealth. The Tanzanian government had earlier informed the British government that it would leave the Commonwealth if Britain sold arms to South Africa. A meeting between the Presidents of Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia took place at which, it was reported, a common initiative was decided upon to mark their disapproval if the arms embargo were lifted.

The day after the announcement in the Commons, another AAM demonstration took place in Downing Street followed by a lobby of Conservative MPs. A list of British firms likely to benefit from the lifting of the embargo was produced and campaign plans worked out to encompass all the areas where these firms are situated.

The UN Security Council met on July 23 and a resolution was passed calling on all States to implement the embargo 'unconditionally and without reservation'. It went further than previous resolutions by recommending an embargo on all arms, vehicles and spare parts, a ban on military training and technical assistance for weapon manufacture, and on granting licences for local manufacture of the banned items. Of the 15 Council members, 12 voted for the resolution, Britain, France and the United States abstaining.

At a meeting of the Organisation of African Unity in Addis Ababa, it was resolved that African Heads of State exert maximum pressure to halt Western arms supplies to South Africa. A deputation of Foreign Ministers from four African countries, under the leadership of President Kaunda, is now expected in Western capitals to discuss this issue.

Within Britain there has been an apparent lull in the public debate on

the arms question. This should not deceive anyone. Our campaign has to be developed widely and systematically at all levels, through political parties and sympathetic organisations. Strong local and regional bases are required. The AAM intends to promote conferences in key areas to co-ordinate and intensify pressure on the government and potential arms suppliers, and a massive demonstration rally is planned for October 25.

### *Political Prisoners*

The exact number of political prisoners and detainees in South Africa is unknown. Under the Terrorism Act passed in 1967, 'a person may simply vanish and no one be accorded any information as to his fate or whereabouts' (A. Suzman, *South African Law Journal*, 11.8.68). He may be detained indefinitely, held in solitary confinement and given no access to anyone except his interrogators. No court can question the validity of the action taken. The Terrorism Act and the General Law Amendment Act (1962) have in addition shifted the burden of proof to make the accused guilty until he is proved innocent. Prior to the passing of the Terrorism Act, other laws – such as the 180-day 'no trial' detention clause passed in 1965, the General Law Amendment Act, the Suppression of Communism Act, the Criminal Law Amendment Act (No 8, 1953) – the list is a long one – all provide the most severe penalties (some the death sentence) for furthering or encouraging 'the achievement of any political aim, including the bringing about of any social or economic change in the Republic'.

Given such power, the authorities have arrested and detained thousands, at least 15 people have died under interrogation, many are serving long prison sentences, many have been executed. In May and June 1969, at least 40 people were detained under the Terrorism Act, including Mrs Winnie Mandela, wife of Nelson Mandela now serving a life sentence on Robben Island, and Philip Golding, a British citizen. Among the others were teenage students, a 73-year-old man, three or four African news reporters, a mother and son, and a husband and wife who left four young children. Of the detainees, at least three died – Michael Shivute on the night of his detention, Caleb Mayekiso 19 days after being detained, and the Imam Abdullah Haroun at the end of September after four months in detention. A demonstration outside South Africa House was organised on September 30 in protest at these deaths, all officially described as due to 'natural causes' though evidence of brutal beatings was brought before the courts.

The Movement wrote to the Foreign Office and to the Prime Minister urging intervention on behalf of these detainees, with particular reference to Philip Golding who had a direct claim to HMG's protection. Through newsletters and other mailings, members and organisations were urged to write to the Foreign Office, and on October 9 an AAM deputation led by Jeremy Thorpe MP saw the Foreign Secretary. The deputation urged that representations be made to the South African government on behalf of Philip Golding, all detainees and other political prisoners. A petition signed by delegates to the Labour Party Conference pledging support for

this campaign was presented to the Foreign Secretary. Jack Jones, General Secretary of the T&GWU, Hugh Scanlon, President of the AEF, Ian Mikardo MP, Lawrence Daly, General Secretary of the NUM, Clive Jenkins, Joint General Secretary of ASTMS, and Frank Judd MP were among the signatories.

Over 50 men and women formerly imprisoned by the South African government for opposition to apartheid demonstrated outside South Africa House on October 25. The demonstration was followed by a meeting at the Africa Centre on 'The Prison that is Apartheid'. Speakers included Canon Collins, representing the International Defence and Aid Fund, and Diane Cilento and Cosmo Pieterse read extracts from speeches made by political prisoners in South Africa.

A letter from the Movement, emphasising the plight of the 40 detainees, the illegality of the trial of eight Namibians and the recent establishment of the Bureau of State Security (BOSS)\*, appeared in *The Times*. Among the signatories were the Bishop of Southwark, Lord Constantine, Bishop Sansbury, Bishop Huddleston, Bishop Reeves and Professor Ayer.

The names and available background of the detainees were circulated to sympathetic organisations. It was suggested that their members and supporters write to the South African Prime Minister calling for the release of the detainees and of the eight Namibians now serving long sentences; that letters be sent to the Foreign Office asking HMG to intervene and, if the detainees were brought to trial, that HMG have an observer present.

Questions about Philip Golding were asked in the House of Commons and his continued detention received wide publicity. On October 28, 22 detainees including Mrs Winnie Mandela were charged with furthering the aims of the African National Congress. On December 10 Philip Golding was released after giving evidence for the State against the accused. Two detainees, Shanti Naidoo and Nombwe Mamkhala, refused to do so and were sentenced to two months' imprisonment. The trial was adjourned until February 16, 1970. In court, all three had described the torture they had endured under interrogation and these allegations of brutality were not challenged by the State. In recognition of the courage of these and other political prisoners throughout Southern Africa, the AAM arranged a well-attended torchlight demonstration on December 23 outside South Africa House.

On the resumption of the trial, the judge found the accused not guilty. They were acquitted and promptly redetained under the Terrorism Act and again held in solitary confinement. Relatives filed an urgent application alleging that assaults and torture had been used and asking for ade-

\* Clause 10 of this Act gives the security police the right to detain and interrogate people who allegedly have communicated information about matters with which BOSS is dealing. Even if this detention is wholly unjustified, the victim will have no redress in the courts. He cannot prove the justice or otherwise of the police action - he is not entitled to know what matter was being dealt with by BOSS. Under Clause 29, the Minister can issue a certificate preventing the victim or anyone else giving evidence in court about his detention and interrogation.

quate steps to be taken for the protection of the detainees. This was refused. The Movement cabled the Prime Minister and the Secretary General of the United Nations asking that every effort be made to obtain the release of the detainees.

In May, which marked the first anniversary of the detention of the 22, thousands of South African students, lecturers and churchmen demonstrated against their continued incarceration and against the erosion of the rule of law in South Africa. Opposition grew and soon after the Attorney General announced that those of the 22 who were not to be charged would be released.

Early in June, leading Barristers-at-Law signed and delivered a letter to the South African Ambassador while AAM demonstrators mounted a vigil outside; at the same time, other demonstrators picketed the South African Tourist Office with placards urging would-be travellers to South Africa not to go. Later in that month, 19 of the 22 were charged, three were released, and Benjamin Ramotse, a new accused detained since 1968, joined the 19. The trial, which recommenced on August 24, has been adjourned until September 14. Counsel for Benjamin Ramotse, a Zambian citizen, revealed that he was arrested in Botswana, taken to Rhodesia and then to South Africa. The British government has received an appeal urging intervention on behalf of Mr Ramotse since under international law Britain is still responsible for Rhodesia.\*

South Africa's prisons continue to hold the 39 Namibians mentioned in last year's Report, despite UN resolutions condemning their illegal arrest and trial. How many more Namibians and South Africans endure this 'soul-corrosive' experience (to quote Winnie Mandela's evidence in court) we do not know. Only international opinion stands between the Vorster regime's police and further deaths in detention. Widespread public protest must be maintained.

In Rhodesia the Smith regime claims to have captured numbers of guerrilla fighters, though few trials have been publicised and it is surmised that these are held in secret. In addition, hundreds continue to be held in detention camps such as Gonakudzingwa under appalling conditions. Though no official figures for the number of political prisoners and detainees have been given, the Smith regime has at its disposal the machinery to oppress its political opponents under laws which parallel South Africa's repressive legislation.

The number of political prisoners held by the Portuguese in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea Bissau is also unknown. Unfortunately there is little information available to us and further efforts must be made to obtain the necessary details so that more intensive campaigning can be undertaken on behalf of political prisoners in Rhodesia and in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea Bissau.

\* Since the first printing of the Annual Report, all of the accused have been released except Mr Ramotse, who was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. The rest have been served with banning orders, and Mrs Mandela has been placed under house arrest.

This year, as in previous years, the AAM will be circulating lists of the families of political prisoners in Rhodesia, South Africa and Namibia to whom Christmas greetings can be sent. Thousands of cards are sent each year and close personal relationships have grown between the sender and recipient, for whom this message is an encouraging indication of concern and interest.

### *Cabora Bassa*

The Cabora Bassa project, mentioned in the 1968-69 Annual Report and now taking shape amidst mounting international controversy, is a critical example of the collaboration of international capital with apartheid South Africa and Portuguese colonialism in their efforts to insulate Southern Africa from the advance of African liberation. Aimed at exploiting Mozambique's natural resources for the benefit of international capital, it is to be built by a consortium of European and South African enterprises and involves a capital outlay of over £150 millions. The scale of the project signifies its grave consequences for the cause of African freedom. If it is finished, it will be the biggest source of hydro-electric power in Africa. It provides for the creation of a comprehensive infra-structure of transport, communication, mineral mining and processing, steel production, plantation farming and for the settlement of one million Europeans in the area by the end of this century. Thousands of African peasants have already been compulsorily resettled to make way for this dam.

Originally the consortium building the dam was made up of German, French, Italian, Swedish, Portuguese and South African companies, and the project was to receive financial backing from the German, French, Italian, Portuguese and South African governments. Last September, ASEA, the Swedish company, withdrew from the scheme because it feared prosecution under the Swedish law on Rhodesian sanctions. In May the Italian government withdrew its offer of financial backing, after pressure from the Zambian government. This represented a significant victory for the international campaign against the project.

At the initial request of the African National Congress of South Africa, the Movement participated in the setting up of the Dambusters Mobilising Committee to campaign against Cabora Bassa and, in particular, against the participation of British firms and banks. The Committee is a broadly based group comprising youth and student, church and political organisations.

Barclays Bank DCO, in addition to its enormous and unparalleled interests in Southern Africa, has provided a financial guarantee of £1.2 millions to one of its customers involved in the project. Accordingly, Barclays has been the object of a campaign in this country taking the form of numerous pickets, the urging of individuals and organisations to withdraw their accounts, action on university campuses against Barclays branches and against Barclays attempts to recruit employees among students, and protests at Barclays Bank's annual general meeting. This campaign, highlighting British economic involvement in Southern Africa in a new and specific way, has met with a ready response from a variety of supporters.

Press reports indicate that it has caused concern not only to those financial interests directly concerned, but to others for whom it has had salutary effects (Johannesburg *Star* 5.9.70, *The Times* 24.4.70).

In April, Guest Keen & Nettlefold were reported in the South African press to have set up a subsidiary in Mozambique with the object of supplying construction machinery to Cabora Bassa. In July it emerged that another British firm, United Transport Overseas, holds three of the major transport contracts for the project and has tendered for a fourth. Alcan, a Canadian firm with extensive UK interests, is supplying aluminium for the scheme. The British Babcock & Wilcox, an engineering firm, has recently set up a subsidiary in Lourenco Marques, which will probably be involved in Cabora Bassa. In response to these developments, plans are being made to escalate the campaign against Barclays and to extend it to these firms.

Apart from the role it plays in the Dambusters Mobilising Committee, the Movement has briefed MPs who are delegates to the Council of Europe urging them to act within the Council to encourage other countries to prevent their nationals participating in the scheme. This met with a favourable response from several MPs and the matter was subsequently raised in the Council. The Movement has sent information about the project to U Thant and suggested that it be circulated to UN member countries. It wrote to the then Prime Minister Harold Wilson urging that the British government implement the UK sanctions legislation in relation to Cabora Bassa. It also requested interviews at the French and German embassies in London. The request was turned down by the French embassy but representatives of the Movement met the First Commercial Secretary at the German embassy and, at his request, prepared a document setting out the ways that firms participating in Cabora Bassa would infringe the UN resolution on Rhodesian sanctions.

Cabora Bassa was also featured in the February issue of *AA News* and current news on the project carried in other issues. Information about the dam and the campaign has been exchanged with French, German and other continental contacts, and international co-operation in the campaign can be expected to increase.

### *Sport*

The campaign against continuing exchanges with racially selected South African teams, representing less than one-fifth of South Africa's population yet purporting to represent the entire country, has fired a widespread interest in the full meaning of apartheid. Over the past year, as a direct result of the rugby and cricket campaigns, more people have asked for information about apartheid in Southern Africa and about British support for the racist minority regimes, and more people have joined the Movement and participated in increasingly militant demonstrations. The tremendous coverage by the press, television and radio of local and national campaign activities has put the Movement's work into an international perspective by stimulating reactions throughout Africa, in Europe, and, most important, in South Africa itself.

Since August 1969 (when last year's annual report ended), South Africa has been expelled from the Olympic Games, excluded from Davis Cup Tennis and from international weightlifting, squash, wrestling, gymnastics, canoeing and athletics. Together with SANROC the Movement worked for these results by writing to the relevant bodies and in some cases to the other participants, and by organising pressure and demonstrations. The scheduled tour of this country by an all-white South African cricket team was stopped and the Springbok rugby tour suffered a hazardous passage. All this has been achieved through sustained effort by the Anti-Apartheid Movement, SANROC, and more recently by the Stop the Seventy Tour Committee (STST), of which the founder members were AAM, International Socialists, MCF, NUS, Reading Joint Anti-Apartheid Committee, SCM, UNA Youth, UNSA, Young Communists and Young Liberals. Throughout September and October attempts were made to get the Springbok rugby tour cancelled. The AAM made representations to the Secretary of the Rugby Home Unions and its constituent bodies. Publicity, material and details of the venue of each match were sent to AA Committees throughout the country which greatly enlarged their membership in preparation for public protests should the tour go ahead. Where no AA Committees existed, these were formed, based on AA membership, students, trades councils, trade unions, churches, the Liberal, Labour, Communist and Co-operative Parties. The Committees petitioned local Councils (and, in the case of the Ebbw Vale match, the Steel Corporation) to refuse the use of their premises for the entertainment of the team; urged prominent citizens to refuse invitations to such social occasions and publicly to boycott the match; wrote to those likely to play against the Springboks urging them not to do so – this proved encouragingly successful in some cases. Demonstrations and meetings were arranged, leaflets and stickers distributed, resolutions passed.

Despite these extensive attempts to stop the tour, the team arrived on October 30. They were met by demonstrators at the airport, by an AAM counter-reception at South Africa House the following day, and by demonstrations at every fixture and on most social occasions. They were left in no doubt as the tour went on that steadily increasing numbers of the British public rejected any exchange with teams chosen on the basis of colour.

The traditional kick-off at Oxford, scheduled for November 5, was the object of an intensive campaign by the Oxford Fireworks Committee, formed for the occasion and publicly announced at the AAM meeting at the Liberal Assembly. Protests from the heads of five Oxford colleges led to the Vice-Chancellor's officially dissociating the University from the match; the Oxford and District Trades Council announced their opposition; demonstrations took place at the rugby ground; and the gathering momentum forced the authorities to transfer the match, ultimately, to Twickenham. With only a few hours' notice, over 1,000 people, including many from outside London, turned out in protest. A few weeks and many demonstrations later, the government of Northern Ireland, aware of the great number of people prepared to involve themselves actively in demon-

strations against racism in sport, and after representations from the Northern Ireland AAM, cancelled the match scheduled for Belfast. In December it was decided that the Southern Counties match, arranged for Bournemouth on January 28, would not be played there as the police were concerned about security; no other ground was found and that match never took place.

In London, the North, the Midlands, in Wales, Scotland and Ireland (where the Irish AAM organised a demonstration, numbering some 8,000 people), the demonstrators included people from the churches, trade unions (the ICTU called on its members to deny support and services for any match played in Ireland), immigrant organisations, student bodies, political parties and Members of Parliament, young people and housewives.

Demonstrations at the matches were two-pronged: massed placard-bearing crowds and public speakers gathered outside the grounds; and disruptive demonstrations, largely organised by STST, took place inside. The size of the campaign is indicated by the fact that the AAM London office alone distributed over 200,000 leaflets, thousands of posters, stickers and background sheets. STST produced their own, as did many local groups. Although the rugby tour was not stopped, it was severely damaged, public opinion was aroused, and the way set for the successful cricket campaign.

Meanwhile, in New Zealand, a campaign to stop the All Blacks tour of South Africa was underway. In support of this campaign, spearheaded by the Citizens Association for Racial Equality (CARE), a deputation from the Movement saw the New Zealand High Commissioner in early November to urge the active discouragement of the tour, and suggested that the New Zealand government specifically oppose the two matches scheduled in Rhodesia. This was followed a month later by a support demonstration outside New Zealand House. As the campaign in New Zealand intensified, the Movement organised another such demonstration in June 1970. Despite the impressive campaign conducted by the New Zealanders, the All Blacks left on June 20 to tour South Africa, where a number of their matches have occasioned brutal assaults by white spectators on Coloured spectators who cheered the New Zealand side.

The AAM Annual General Meeting in October 1969 called on the MCC to cancel its invitation to the all-white South African cricket team to tour this country in 1970. A nation-wide petition was launched, various organisations, political parties, trade unions, student groups and MPs were contacted, and a campaign strategy formulated. Peter Jackson MP, Vice Chairman of the Movement, circulated a letter in the House of Commons addressed to Mr Griffiths, MCC Secretary, which was signed by 103 MPs who said they would join anti-apartheid demonstrations if the cricket tour took place. Representations were made to the Test and County Cricket Board, which met in December, but it decided to proceed with the tour. In a press statement the Movement condemned this decision and warned of its serious repercussions throughout the Commonwealth. In South

Africa the all-white South African Cricket Association again offered the South African Cricket Board of Control – the non-racial and therefore non-white group – a trust fund of £30,000, which the SACBC turned down, calling instead for mixed sport. Further initiatives were taken in January when a deputation from the AAM, including MPs Andrew Faulds, Peter Jackson and Frank Hooley, and Abdul Minty, Hon Secretary of the Movement, delivered a letter to the meeting of the Cricket Council at Lords urging the abandonment of the tour 'even at this late stage'. Protests snowballed. In Wales the Archbishop refused to renew his membership of the Glamorgan County Cricket Club and Bryan Davis, Trinidad batsman, stated publicly that he would not play against the South Africans. At the end of January the South African Government refused admission to Arthur Ashe, American Negro tennis champion and to the International Cricket Cavaliers. The MCC found this 'irrelevant'. *The Sunday Times* editorial of January 2 stated, 'the MCC's preparations for next summer's tour by South African cricketers are beginning to look like a para-military campaign. Barbed wire girds Lords and the high command holds strategic briefings with the police. . . . Essentially they are constructing fortresses which will have the effect of preserving them as one of the last refuges for all-white sport'.

The AAM wrote to the Board of Control for Cricket in each Commonwealth country urging them to call on their nationals playing in the UK to refuse participation in any fixtures against the South Africans, and suggesting that should the Cricket Council persist in its invitation, they refuse any future fixtures with British teams. Letters were sent to Commonwealth Heads of State asking them to consider their countries' withdrawal from the Commonwealth Games if the tour took place; Commonwealth High Commissioners were visited by delegations from the Movement. Commonwealth action started in February, when Kenya, Uganda and Zambia refused to play an MCC side because they disapproved of the Springbok's tour. In April, the Pakistan Board of Control for Cricket called on its members not to play against the South Africans, and it was followed by the Indian Cricket Board of Control. At the end of April, the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa threatened the withdrawal of 13 African countries from the Commonwealth Games in Edinburgh if the tour took place, and called on the British government to intervene. India, Pakistan, Guyana, Trinidad, Malaysia and Jamaica made similar statements.

Tension in the country was mounting. Many individuals and organisations concerned with local race relations considered that the tour would cause a sharp deterioration. Frank Cousins, Chairman of the Community Relations Commission, warned that the tour could do 'untold damage to community relations' and the National Union of Public Employees (NUPE) asked the government to cancel it. Lancashire's bowler Peter Lever asked his club to release him from his contract during the Springbok fixture, and Mushtaq Mohammed, Northants all-rounder, did the same. At the meeting of the Cricket Council on February 12, representatives of the Movement handed in a petition signed by more than 12,000 people calling for

the cancellation of the tour. This meeting announced the drastic curtailment of the tour from 28 matches to 12.

Extensive publicity had been given in South Africa to the demonstrations and protests during the rugby tour, and the press were daily reporting the build-up of opposition to the cricket tour. For the first time, leading white South African sportsmen and sports administrators began to come out against segregated sport. Gary Player, hitherto silent on apartheid in sport, stated publicly that Papwa Sewgolum, South African Indian golfer, should be allowed to compete in the South African Open championship. And non-white sports bodies, encouraged by the growing support for their cause in this country, were increasingly vehement in their opposition to apartheid sport.

The West Indian Campaign Against Apartheid Sport was launched in February and announced plans to call on all West Indian county cricketers not to play in this country again if the tour went ahead. The Greater London Labour Party, the NEC of the Labour Party, the Co-operative Party, the Liberal Party Council, the Communist Party, the National Union of Students and, by the middle of March, 23 trade unions, all declared opposition to the tour and support for the campaign. In April, the British Council of Churches, the UNA, the Indian Workers' Association, the Pakistani Workers' Union and the AEF joined them. On April 21 the TUC urged its nine million members to boycott the tour, and on April 26 the NCCL condemned it. Film and television technicians were told they would have ACTT support if they blacked the Springbok matches. Branches of the National Union of Journalists (NUJ) came out strongly against the tour and called on members 'not to report cricket matches in which a South African touring team takes part'. Though this resolution was defeated at the NUJ Conference, the Middlesborough Gazette members of the NUJ decided to black scores and not to report the tour at all. On April 17, John Arlott, who had broadcast on every Test match since the war, decided not to do so for the South African tour.

With support growing at a spectacular rate, the Movement finalised plans for what promised to be its biggest-ever demonstration at the first fixture at Lords on June 6. On May 2, a letter signed by the President, Vice Presidents and Sponsors of the Movement was delivered to Lords. It pointed out that statements issued by the Cricket Council opposing apartheid were irreconcilable with their intention to play against a team chosen under apartheid laws. It also emphasised the insult to the black citizens of this country and the serious jeopardy in which the Commonwealth Games had been placed. On May 3 the Fair Cricket Campaign was launched, with the Bishop of Woolwich as chairman and Sir Edward Boyle MP and Reg Prentice MP as vice-chairmen. Several organisations, including the AAM, were represented on it, and its function as defined by the Bishop was to 'try to minimise the disastrous effects on sport throughout the Commonwealth' and 'to fight the unnecessary strains the tour is imposing on race relations in this country'.

Meanwhile, the Cricket Council had set up an appeal for £250,000 to

pay for policing the grounds at each fixture. Speculation on the date of the General Election occupied the political pundits, and it was generally considered that the police would be over-extended if it took place in June.

Then the staff and general sub-committee of the Inner London Education Authority decided that no facilities or premises controlled by the ILEA would be made available during matches at Lords and the Oval, and three more cricketers announced that they did not wish to play the South Africans.

On May 15 the International Olympic Committee announced its decision to expel South Africa (which had been excluded from the Olympic Games in 1964 and 1968) from the Olympic Movement; it is the only country to have been expelled. The IOC thus acknowledged that no concrete steps had been taken by SANOC to bring about non-racial sport in South Africa.

The efforts of the AAM intensified. In an atmosphere of mounting crisis, on May 19 the Cricket Council announced that they would proceed with the tour but that 'no further tours between South Africa and this country will take place until South African cricket is played and teams selected on a multi-racial basis in South Africa'. The Movement announced its intention to proceed with demonstrations: an all-night vigil outside Lords from Friday, June 5 was organised, and all indications were that the main demonstration at Lords early on Saturday, June 6 would be massive. Letters urging increased pressure on the Cricket Council were sent out to various organisations and leading trade unionists.

Finally, on May 22, in response to government pressure, the Cricket Council cancelled the tour. The Movement applauded the decision and in a press statement said, 'it will be welcomed by the majority of South Africans . . . and will prove an inspiration in their continuing resistance to apartheid'.

In scale and effectiveness, this was a remarkable campaign. The successful outcome was the result of excellent work by many organisations, concern at deteriorating race relations in this country, Commonwealth pressure and the threat to the Commonwealth Games and, above all, the revulsion against all aspects of racism and apartheid which was becoming the overriding concern of vast numbers of people in this country. STST and its chairman, Peter Hain, who handled publicity in the Press and on television outstandingly well; the Fair Cricket Campaign; the Anti-Apartheid Movement and local groups who worked very hard – all contributed to the outcome. Adding, as it did, to the momentum which must ultimately result in South Africa's complete isolation, the campaign proved a vital educational force in this country, and produced heartening reactions throughout Africa. In South Africa, although it did little to change government attitudes, it provoked a number of sports bodies and individual sportsmen, fearing total isolation, to press for change. It cheered the majority of South Africans, and their response spurred and encouraged the campaigners in this country. The campaign provided a new dynamic and extended the response to anti-apartheid work on other issues.

### *Sharpeville Tenth Anniversary*

'Sharpeville marked a watershed in South African affairs. Until then, violence had been used almost entirely by the white minority against the non-white majority. . . . After a serious reappraisal of the situation following Sharpeville, the African leadership decided that violence was the only alternative left if they were ever to secure the freedom and dignity of their people.' (Bishop Ambrose Reeves, Bishop of Johannesburg at the time of Sharpeville.)

Sharpeville survives as a symbol of the viciousness of apartheid and the system which made it possible. In marking the tenth anniversary of this massacre and the day designated by the United Nations for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the Movement was mindful of the thousands in South Africa's prisons and of the resistance to apartheid which continues to grow. A Sharpeville commemoration weekend was planned in London, together with simultaneous events throughout the country.

A letter signed by Lord MacLeod, the Revd Lord Soper, Bishop Ambrose Reeves, Bishop Trevor Huddleston and Archbishop Roberts, drawing attention to this Sharpeville anniversary and to the continued detention of the 22 Africans, was sent to 12 Church newspapers. Its publication was timed to coincide with the weekend events.

On Saturday, March 21, the AAM together with the United Nations Student Association, staged a re-enactment of the Sharpeville tragedy, directed by Paul Tomlinson, in Trafalgar Square. The crowds that gathered in the Square and those that watched it on television saw the Africans meet, the 'police' take aim and the Africans, many of them South Africans in exile, fall to the ground as did the real victims at Sharpeville 10 years before. Bishop Ambrose Reeves then addressed the crowd and spoke of the South African government's action over the past 10 years which showed that it was irrevocably set on a course of violence and repression. He went on to call for effective opposition to the cricket tour and demanded that Britain break trade and investment links with South Africa.

Large pictures of the re-enactment made the front pages of three Sunday newspapers and it received extensive publicity on radio and television. The re-enactment was also shown on television throughout America, and newspapers in Africa and South Africa featured it.

'Freedom Theatre' was the title given to the presentation at the Lyceum, on the following Sunday night, of entertainment designed to portray the situation in South Africa. Playwrights were approached to contribute short plays based on aspects of racism in Southern Africa. Original material was contributed by David Mercer, Edward Bond, Lewis Nkosi, George Melly, John McGrath, Guy Slater and Mark Lushington, and those taking part included Roy Dotrice, Carmen Munroe, Cosmo Pieterse, Diane Cilento, Robert Lang, Edward Woodward, Kenneth Haigh, Johnny Sekka, John Cleese and Stefan Kalipha. Midge Mackenzie directed and was, to a large extent, responsible for the success of the evening, both in its planning and execution. Additional directors included David Jones and Frank Cvitanovich. Music was provided by Peter Straker, the African National

Congress Youth Choir, Alexis Korner, Jon Hendricks and Dudu Pukwana. Other actors, producers, designers and backstage staff took part and all participants gave their services freely. Over 1500 people were present.

Both events were widely publicised in advance, largely through diary and news columns items in the press and through mailings which included posters, leaflets and stickers. The evening, a unique effort for the Movement, made an impact on many of those present; it brought in new people with valuable skills in many fields, particularly those of design and copy-writing, who have since made their services available to the Movement.

Activities around the country included vigils, pickets, meetings and exhibitions, and were held in Edinburgh, Manchester, Newcastle, Gloucester, Coventry, Nottingham, Birmingham, Exeter, Mansfield, Glasgow, Cardiff and Brighton. Sharpeville was also recalled in special articles in a number of national and provincial newspapers.

Sharpeville was commemorated in various other centres throughout the world, including a week of meetings and other activity in Paris, a public meeting in New York and by demonstrations in Toronto and Montreal.

### 3 ORGANISATION

#### *Anti-Apartheid News*

Over the past year the circulation of the Movement's monthly newspaper has increased substantially. During the year 1968-69, the circulation had remained steady at 5,000 per month. In the past year it has risen to 8,000 during the university term. Plans have been made to increase this figure further, and a circulation of 10,000 in October 1970 was projected at the time of writing. The underlying cause of this rise, after the circulation had remained steady for so long, was the greater level of anti-apartheid activity, and the resulting increase in the campaigning force of the Movement.

*Anti-Apartheid News* is a campaigning newspaper. It has continued to preserve a balance between chronicling the activities of those involved in action against apartheid in Britain and elsewhere on the one hand, and reporting events in Southern Africa on the other. Despite the continual pressure on space, greater coverage has been given to the struggle against colonialism in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea Bissau.

The practice has become established of running a centre-spread in each issue, dealing in rather more depth with a particular field of interest. Some have dealt with a particular aspect of Southern Africa, eg Namibia, Cabora Bassa, workers under apartheid, and the progress of the armed struggle; and others with specific campaigns, eg against arms sales and apartheid sport.

In the body of the newspaper, information has consistently been presented about political trials and the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa, Rhodesia and Namibia. This has included articles by ex-prisoners, such as Desmond Francis, David Evans and John Schlapobersky; and regular coverage of the detention and trial of Winnie Mandela and

her co-accused. Several interviews with leaders of the African liberation movements, including Amilcar Cabral, Moses Garoeb, Daniel Chipenda and Sam Nujoma, have been carried during the year.

Activities of the liberation movements, such as the ANC leaflet explosions, have been described more fully and accurately than in the national press. And the crisis in Lesotho has been covered by articles from Jack Halpern and Laurence Pitkethly. In addition, careful reading of the South African newspapers has meant that many events have been publicised in *AA News* which would otherwise go unnoticed in Britain. Books relevant to the Southern African situation have regularly been reviewed in the pages of the newspaper.

Printing costs have increased substantially, while the cost of the newspaper has remained constant for five years. The Movement is subsidising the newspaper, and this situation may not be able to continue. One way to avoid a rise in price would be a further increase in sales. It is clear that the more people read the newspaper, the more effective the Movement will be. To this end it is essential that the number of bulk sales should increase. Selling the newspaper is an effective way of winning recruits for the Movement, and it fills a valuable educational role in itself. So the willingness of people to sell *Anti-Apartheid News* is an essential factor in the growth of the Movement as an effective campaigning organisation.

#### *Work in the Trade Union Movement*

The Movement's efforts in this field have produced growing if unspectacular results. Many active trade unionists are sympathetic to the aims of the Movement, but they are, of course, a small minority in the trade union movement as a whole, and they are often too preoccupied to lend more than token support to particular activities. The Movement will have to give more attention in future to the linked problems of showing trade unionists how Britain's relations with Southern Africa affect their interests as workers, and transforming latent support into actual activity.

In the latter stages of the campaign against the cricket tour, many trade unions including the T&GWU, ACTT, POEU, USDAW, NUPE and DATA condemned the tour, and some of their members proposed the blacking of services to the whites-only team. The NUJ also opposed the tour but did not adopt the proposal of some journalists to refuse coverage of the matches. The General Council of the TUC, while not going so far as to support demonstrations against the tour, did urge trade unionists to boycott the games. Many Trades Councils, local branches and areas also actively supported the campaign against the tour.

The campaign against the emigration of white workers to South Africa initiated by the Movement last year has gained pace. Its endorsement by the ICFTU will undoubtedly contribute towards a climate of opinion in Western Europe in which emigration will increasingly be seen as collaborating with apartheid. The British TUC, though not implementing its 1969 resolution on this question as vigorously as might have been hoped, has nevertheless encouraged affiliated unions to express their opposition to

apartheid in a practical way by discouraging emigration. Some unions, including DATA, the Tobacco Workers, the Musicians' Union and the NUM, have maintained or intensified their opposition to emigration, and the result has been mounting concern, and resentment, in pro-apartheid labour circles in South Africa which are determined to maintain the industrial colour bar and therefore welcome skilled white immigrants. Articles and reviews in the trade union Press, many of them supplied by or placed on the initiative of the AAM, have helped to carry the issue to a wider audience. A memorandum on the question was sent to all members of the TUC General Council, and the office helped the TUC with additional background information. However, South African Embassy figures suggest that the rate of recruitment is still rising in Britain, and much more vigorous action is needed if the outflow is to be reduced.

Both the General Council and the Annual Congress of the TUC opposed the sale of arms to South Africa, and a declaration of principle, launched by the Movement, is at the time of writing beginning to collect hundreds of signatures and to circulate more widely. It is hoped that through regional conferences and a trade union lobby of Parliament the trade union movement will be drawn more deeply into active opposition to the Conservative government's proposals. Wide educational efforts will have to accompany the campaign and, if the government abandons the embargo, the unions will need to press employers not to take South African arms contracts.

The Trade Union Action Group continues to prepare leaflets, memoranda and articles for the trade union Press, and has in the past year researched thoroughly the extent to which trade union funds are invested in firms with South African interests. The information collected is being made available to sympathetic trade unionists with a view to rectifying what is probably an unwitting form of collaboration with apartheid. For the first time in many years the Movement held a meeting at the TUC which, although poorly attended by delegates, was nevertheless a useful precedent which would be consolidated in future. Contacts with Trades Councils have been extended, and educational work generally in this field will be facilitated by the presence in the UK of a representative of the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU). The recognition of this body by the TUC would obviate any impression that the latter prefers to maintain relations only with the TUC of South Africa (which excludes African workers from membership).

### *Regional and Branch Activities*

The branch structure of the Movement, responding well to the challenge first of the rugby tour, then of the cricket campaign, has grown stronger and more extensive in the past year. We now have 40 branches of whom 31 can be said to be active in varying degrees.

Some long-established branches have been particularly active – Edinburgh, Birmingham, Manchester, Bristol and several of the Surrey group. Others have done little – Merseyside, Hampstead, North Staffs and

Hornsey, while some which had been inactive for a long time have become revitalised and show good growth prospects – Nottingham, Derby. A modest but steady level of activity is maintained by Finchley & Friern Barnet, Exeter, Bournemouth, Kensington & Chelsea, Southend and Glasgow, and several new branches have made promising starts – Mid-Sussex, Portsmouth, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, West Wales, Gloucester, Peterborough, Middlesbrough, Coventry, and Kingston & Richmond. A few new branches are composed entirely of young people (eg Walsall and Preston) and need support from experienced activists. The Movement still lacks any sort of organised structure in Yorkshire and this is an area with big industrial communities covering a broad belt across the northern part of England, to which special attention should be paid in future.

Partly because of the prior demands of the campaign against apartheid sport, and partly because of lack of members and/or groups in several key areas, opposition to South African trade missions and to the recruitment of emigrants has not been as effective or sustained as might be desired. Efforts and plans made repeatedly in recent years for regional conferences outside London have now materialised successfully (see above on the Birmingham conference in June 1970), and must be pursued in the course of the arms campaign if the latter is to take root widely. With the Labour Party in opposition, the Movement's local work will in some respects become easier, while the range of activities and issues demanding action is growing. Material support for the liberation movements is still largely untried ground for most branches.

Over several years the AAM has expanded greatly without losing the dynamic which gives the Movement its campaigning character. Bureaucracy, formality and slowness are the dangers of increased size and consolidated organisation, but the AAM has avoided them fairly successfully so far. Alert and vital branches, with an ever-widening range of members and contacts, remain essential for the realisation of our policies and aims.

### *Youth and Students*

Awareness of racial discrimination in general, and in Southern Africa in particular, has never been greater amongst young people, and especially among students. This welcome development is accompanied often by a readiness to take action on issues of principle, short-circuiting orthodox channels and eschewing slow or half-hearted methods of protest. The resulting militance and commitment of the young has added a new and important dimension to the broad anti-apartheid struggle. The demonstrations against the rugby tour, involving thousands of people in different parts of the country every week through much of the winter, signified the breadth and depth of popular feeling on the matter, and ensured that the cricket campaign began at a much higher level than previous such campaigns. In limited space, full description of the enormous student contribution to these efforts is impossible, but it is true to say that student participation together with that of school children and other young persons, was a vital factor in the intensive public activity against apartheid in sport.

In addition to the local and regional activity of students, the National Union of Students has become more actively involved in Southern African issues than hitherto. At its Margate conference in November 1969, attention was focused on apartheid sport; but at the Bradford conference in April 1970, more comprehensive consideration was given to Southern Africa, and a lengthy resolution adopted dealing with moral and material support to the liberation movements, the sports and academic boycotts, Cabora Bassa and the campaign against Barclays Bank, the University College of Rhodesia and the boycott of South African goods.

The President of the NUS attended the Rome Conference (see below), and the Vice President visited South Africa where he recognised both the growing ineffectualness of NUSAS in the context of the need for radical change, and the impossibility of legal non-violent solutions to the problem of apartheid. The Bradford resolution also established a sub-committee to investigate the links between British colleges and universities and South Africa. In addition to the NUS, student organisations such as SCM and UNSA have developed a deeper and more active commitment to the anti-apartheid struggle.

Activity on Southern African issues has been maintained. There is hardly a major university or college without an anti-apartheid group or groups of some sort, but in view of the numbers involved it would be invidious to single out any for special mention. Students are increasingly seeking out the connections between the structure, character and personnel of higher education in this country and exploitative processes in the Third World, especially in regard to racism in Southern Africa. The past year has seen several local campaigns or protests against such connections, but experience shows that they are as yet too seldom pursued with sufficient single-mindedness to achieve even part of the desired change.

Particular concern has been expressed by students at the Universities of London and Birmingham about the continuation of links with the University College of Rhodesia, and considerable pressure put upon the authorities to cease acquiescing in the growing regimentation of UCR by pro-apartheid elements in Salisbury. New light was thrown on this acquiescence by revelations in *The Guardian* (3.3.70) following the disclosure of confidential files from Warwick University. The drift towards apartheid in higher education in Rhodesia took a further step on September 11, 1970 when new statutes for the University College were adopted increasing the number of government appointees on the Council and making no provision for African representation. African student discontent at the College has thereby been deepened, and the need will increase for British Government aid to African students trying to pursue their studies outside Rhodesia. The Movement supported the efforts of students in London and Birmingham, in line with its decision at the October 1969 AGM to promote the academic boycott of universities in both South Africa and Rhodesia, and to make the boycott more effective by pressure on the channels through which staff are recruited in Britain and other parts of the Commonwealth. The Movement's policy has again been put to the

Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU), both in correspondence and in person by the Hon Secretary, and steps are being taken to persuade Commonwealth Universities to terminate the anomalous situation whereby whites-only institutions in South Africa still enjoy some of the facilities of the ACU.

Led by the Ruskin Kitson Committee, students at Ruskin College again organised a march from Oxford to London, and a Trafalgar Square rally in May, to show solidarity with South African political prisoners, and also this year to support the cricket campaign and to highlight British economic support for apartheid. While not as successful as the previous year's, this event showed that the efforts of small numbers of determined people can have a useful educative effect. The AAM assisted the students, and with clearer goals and greater involvement in other similar activities in Oxford, Ruskin students can be expected to make a valuable contribution to the Movement's work, not least because of their trade union connections and experience.

The award of honorary degrees to Sir Humphrey Gibbs last year, with unfortunate implications of approval for government policy regarding Rhodesia, in particular an indifference to the principle of majority rule, was strongly criticised by students at UEA (Norwich) and Birmingham University.

In general, the student world as a responsive and lively section of the community will continue to supply stimulating impetus to the broader work of the AAM. The allegedly widespread prejudice against students should not be allowed to inhibit the important educational and agitational work of the Movement in this quarter. On the contrary, the growing identification of numbers of young people with the freedom struggle in Southern Africa is one of the most crucial brakes upon the increasing support of business and racist lobbies for the status quo in this area.

### *Membership*

In a year of many and varied activities, much publicity and a stronger organisation, the Movement's membership has increased considerably, although the drop-out rate remains high. The rate of recruitment rose by 270 per cent over the corresponding period in 1968-69, with a monthly average of over 100 new members. Many supporters, some frequently active in the Movement, are still not yet members, and there is ample scope for expanding the base of the AAM. A single-issue organisation cannot satisfy all the political needs of its members in the same way as a political party; it must, however, attract and seek out all with a continuing concern in that issue, and in this sense our efforts to expand the membership must be sustained.

### *Publicity*

The Southern African situation and the work of the AAM has received extensive publicity over the past year. Reports not obtained via normal channels have appeared as a result of campaigns, eg arms embargo, sport, political prisoners, etc, and through AAM initiatives. Contacts have been

established and maintained with the Press, television and radio, and the Movement is regularly called upon to supply factual material and other information when articles or programmes on Southern Africa are undertaken. Suggestions for suitable people to interview are also frequently requested. Articles and programmes are suggested, and publicity sought for the views and presence in this country of leaders of the Southern African liberation movements. Two television films were shown on the work of the Movement (*24 Hours* and *World in Action*) and AAM representatives have appeared on *24 Hours* (on the issue of HMG's intention to resume the sale of arms to South Africa and on a number of occasions during the sports campaign), on *Today*, *News at Ten* and other discussion programmes.

In addition, advance publicity for events such as the weekend activity commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre appeared in the diary and news columns of the *Sunday Telegraph*, *The Times*, the *Daily Telegraph*, in the features page of *The Guardian*, and in the *Morning Star* (which has consistently supported the work of the Movement). This is an example of an effort that is constantly being made.

*Anti-Apartheid News*, now with a greatly increased circulation, is a valuable source of information and publicity for AAM work (see *AA News* report). A long list of source material published by the International Defence and Aid Fund, the Anti-Apartheid Movement, the Africa Bureau and the United Nations Committee on Apartheid is sent out and this material widely distributed. Another important aspect of our publicity and educational work is providing speakers for meetings throughout the UK. During the past year the number of speakers provided for such meetings – usually in response to requests from other organisations – has increased by 40 per cent, and the number of speakers meetings now arranged between three and four per week.

Numerous leaflets, posters and stickers have been printed for use in AAM campaigns, many designed and written by skilled professionals who have contributed their services free. The excellent work they have done has thrown a fresh light on the issues and literally hundreds of thousands have been distributed throughout the UK. An outstanding example was the cricket poster with the slogan, 'If you could see their national sport you might be less keen to see their cricket', a picture of which appeared in *The Sunday Times*. It created great interest and aroused considerable demand.

Despite AAM efforts in the publicity field, ignorance of the nature and practice of apartheid is widespread. In addition, the South African propaganda machine, with its unlimited financial resources and glossy publications, cannot yet be fully countered by the resources available to the Movement. It is therefore important that efforts in this vital field be extended so that greater use may be made of the mass media to expose the true meaning of apartheid and racism in Southern Africa.

### *Finance*

The annual accounts to September 30, 1970 are in the course of preparation and will be presented to the Annual General Meeting. They will show a substantial increase in both our revenue and expenditure. This reflects the high level of activity during the year, particularly during the period of the cricket campaign. The increase of expenditure is largely attributable to our increased output of propaganda material, newsletters, etc. The increase of revenue reflects the widespread public support which our campaign evoked. We have, however, still not solved the problem of putting our revenue on a regular and reliable basis. Donations come flooding in at times of high political tension, but the flood dries up rapidly as soon as a quieter period follows. We are then compelled to rely to an extensive degree on a few large, effort-consuming fund-raising functions.

One of these functions deserves special mention for the extent to which it combined successful fund-raising with a high political content. This was the event held to commemorate Sharpeville on March 22 at the Lyceum Theatre. The thanks of the Movement are due to all those who contributed to that memorable evening.

Two additional fund-raising functions were held at the Round House. The first, in November 1969, a pop show featuring Manfred Mann Chapter 3 and other well-known groups, turned out to be an enjoyable and financially successful evening. The second, held in August 1970, was arranged by Independent Entertainments, a group of people based on the Round House, who mounted a concert of African music to raise funds for the Movement. This initiative and the funds thereby accruing to the AAM were deeply appreciated.

### *National Committee*

At the National Committee meeting on February 28, the Rt Revd Ambrose Reeves was unanimously elected Hon President of the AAM. He succeeds David Steel MP who relinquished the post after more than three years of sustained effort on behalf of the Movement. Members of the National Committee had the opportunity of welcoming the Bishop when he chaired the meeting which took place on May 30.

The National Committee, which is the policy-making body of the Movement, also provides an opportunity for an exchange of ideas amongst those attending and for the establishment of personal contact between the representatives of different local groups. At the meeting held on February 28, representatives of local committees reported on their work and announced their plans for activities during the Sharpeville weekend and for the cricket tour.

Four meetings of the Committee have taken place and average attendance has been in the region of 30 people with constant absenteeism from the majority of organisations represented. This is a regrettable absence which we have attempted to remedy without, as yet, any notable success.

Discussion has ranged over the activities of the Movement, and plans for campaigns against the Cabora Bassa dam, the all-white South African

rugby and cricket tours, British economic involvement in Southern Africa, on the issue of political prisoners and the arms embargo have emerged from these discussions.

#### 4 INTERNATIONAL

##### *General*

During the year the Hon Secretary used the occasion of visits to Addis Ababa and North America to make representations on behalf of the Movement.

In February, together with the AAM Chairman, he attended the African Regional Conference of the UN Office for Public Information, in which African newspaper editors and representatives of non-governmental organisations participated. This provided an opportunity for establishing valuable contacts and for influencing the discussions and decisions of the OAU and more regular contact has since been maintained. The Executive Committee took the decision to extend the work of the Movement: to establish wider contacts in independent African countries and secure an enlarged distribution of AAM material. Due to the absence of sufficient resources, this decision has not as yet been fully implemented.

While on a visit to Canada and the US in May 1970, the Hon Secretary met representatives of a number of organisations including the Canadian AAM and the American Committee on Africa. In Canada he met with government officials to discuss Canadian economic involvement in Southern Africa and particularly the supply of Canadian military equipment to South Africa as spare parts for weapons previously sold. In Washington representations on similar lines were made to the State Department and evidence given before the House of Representatives Sub-committee on Africa. At the UN the Hon Secretary had meetings with Secretariat officials and with several delegations. Two formal hearings took place – one before the Special Committee on Apartheid, the other before the Security Council Sub-committee on Namibia.

In addition to Prime Minister Vorster's visits to Malawi and Rhodesia, which took place in May this year, he visited several European countries in the following month. These visits were a departure from the usual pattern of activity of recent South African Prime Ministers and, taken together with the visit of Dr Muller, South African Foreign Minister, to Britain and Europe, indicated a determined effort to forge links with the outside world in the face of growing condemnation of apartheid.

The AAM alerted groups and contacts in Paris and Geneva. A delegation from the French Committee Against Apartheid, with representatives from the trade unions and other organisations, delivered a letter to the French Foreign Minister which stated: 'France sustains a particularly serious role in the light of its arms deliveries to the government in Pretoria. French public opinion profoundly rejects this role. Considerations of economic interest should not outweigh those which concern not only the situation

of peoples submitted to barbarous and absurd racial discrimination, but the future of all Africa, and the role of France with regard to the Africa of tomorrow.'

Press reports state that in his visits to Portugal, Switzerland, France and Spain, Vorster discussed not only the gold situation, arms sales to South Africa and the financing of the Cabora Bassa dam, but also the possibility of Associate Membership of the Common Market.

Though the Movement has maintained contact with groups and individuals throughout the world and in some cases (eg New Zealand, West Germany, Canada) extended these, there is a clear need for more intensive work in the international field. As a first step towards making its material more widely available, the booklet *South Africa's Defence Strategy* has now been translated into French for distribution throughout the French-speaking world.

#### *Rome Conference*

From June 27-29, 1970 a conference of solidarity with the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau in their struggle against Portuguese colonialism was held in Rome. Organised by the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), the African Independence Party of Guinea and Cape Verde (PAIGC), and the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO), the conference was supported by numerous national and international organisations and attended by several hundred delegates from over 60 countries and 177 organisations. The conference, the first of its kind, marked a significant advance in international recognition of the liberation movements and increased support for the struggle of their peoples. The AAM and several other British organisations participated in the work of the conference.

## CONCLUSION

Areas of work which it has not been possible to cover in this report include assistance given to individual councillors in their efforts to implement a council boycott of South African goods; a campaign against the 1820 Settlers' Association which 'promotes the settlement of white people in South Africa'; and attempts to prevent South African jobs from being advertised in the British Press since acceptable applicants are defined in terms of skin colour. These are only a few examples but, as the report indicates, a new momentum has been gained for anti-apartheid work over the past year which has yet to be extended and maintained.

The advent of a Tory government demands a new style of work. The dichotomy that existed between Labour's policies and practices, giving rise to occasional reservations on the part of some supporters of the anti-apartheid cause, has been replaced by an open alliance between Britain and the racist Southern African regimes. Unless we are able to engage larger numbers of people committed to the cause of liberation in Southern

Africa, the direction of government policy will remain unchanged. We hope that the campaign for a total arms embargo against South Africa will enable us to do this, as well as assist in placing a greater emphasis on the concrete needs of the liberation movements for clothes, medical equipment, books and other items.

Campaigns against British economic involvement in Southern Africa now need to be intensified, both in lobby activity and in direct demonstration, and we shall continue to pursue our efforts on behalf of political prisoners throughout Southern Africa. The development of closer international contacts and the planning of concerted action on particular issues will be another priority of the Movement.

For this work we have a larger body of support in this country and closer links have been forged with many organisations, including immigrant groups. The regional base has been strengthened and further efforts will be made to win the participation of all sections of the Labour movement for the campaign against racism and apartheid and in support of the armed struggle in Southern Africa.

**Join the Anti-Apartheid Movement**  
**89 Charlotte Street London W1P 2DQ. Tel 580 5311**

*Receive*

**ANTI-APARTHEID NEWS**  
 Information Bulletins  
 Special AAM Reports

*Annual Membership subscriptions*

Students/Apprentices/Pensioners		<b>10/-</b>
Other individuals		<b>£1</b>
Local organisations		<b>£2</b>
National organisations	from	<b>£5</b>
University students unions		<b>£20</b>

*Overseas rates*

as above for surface mail/double for airmail

I/We \* wish to join the AAM and subscribe to ANTI-APARTHEID NEWS and enclose £.....†

Name .....

Organisation (if applicable) .....

Address .....

.....

Term address (if applicable) .....

.....

† *It would be a great help to us if you could use the Banker's Order below.*

To The Manager

..... Bank  
 ..... Branch

On the ..... next, and on each subsequent month/quarter/year \* please pay to the account of the Anti-Apartheid Movement (No 1 Account), Lloyds Bank, 88 Tottenham Court Road, London W1.

Subscription £..... Donation £..... Total £.....  
 Date ..... Signature .....

Address .....

\* *Delete as necessary.*

Printed by SW (Litho) Ltd London E2 01-739 1870