CHAPTER-IV
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AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS
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The United Nations has passed so many resolutions urging the member states to adopt economic sanctions against South Africa. However, they could not be implemented for a long time. The limitations on the competence of the United Nations and its ability to take actions stem from the structure of the United Nations as Security Council's decisions are not self-enforcing. It has to depend on national governments for the implementation of its decisions. This dependence constitutes a major lacunae in its capacity to deal with recalcitrant states.

The main problem in the application of economic sanctions is that the sanction policy is aimed at re-bounding the economy of the sanctioneering state and the sanctioneering state has to make sacrifices. This explains as to why the countries having great economic interest in South Africa, do not want to get the sanctions implemented. Thus, the non-cooperative attitude of the trading partners particularly of Britain and the United States has led to the ineffectiveness of the imposition of economic sanctions by the U.N. In such a situations the various organizations (NAM, OAU and ANC) of Asian and African countries have been playing an important role to get the sanctions implemented against South Africa. In
fact, the efforts of these organisations have been in keeping their general aim in the United Nations, that is, to assign a new role to the organization as an instrument of change. As Margaret Doxey Writes:

"The governments of the developing countries have their own causes and perspectives and they are seeking legitimization of new norms of policy. They are concerned with decolonization, with the end of white minority rule... and a better deal from the developed world"1.

For them the South African regime is unaccepted because of its racist nature. It is inconsistent to the United Nations charter and a crime against humanity. Thus they want the regime to be punished. According to them the United Nations sanctions should not only be retributive but also reformative. They should bring about a situation in South Africa, consistent with the principle of racial equality majority rule and democratic system. The issue of sanctions has been emphasized, not only in the forum of the United Nations but also in other forums such as Non Aligned Movement (NAM), organization of African Unity (OAU) and African National Congress (ANC). At the outset a discussion about the role of NAM will be in order.

The most essential objective of the policy of Non-Aligned Movement is the struggle against colonialism, neocolonialism and racism. From its very inception, the

Non-Aligned movement has been trying for the promotion of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. For this purpose it has been making efforts in the United Nations and in its various summits as well. In the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement has made every effort to isolate South Africa and to expose its notorious policy of Apartheid.

**ROLE OF NAM**

The first Summit of NAM was held in 1961 in Belgrade. By that time, the international community had become well aware of the repressive policy practised by the South Africa. The Sharpeville Massacre in 1960 drew the attention of the world towards this inhuman policy of South Africa. At the same time, the security council called on the racist government to abandon this policy. Thus, the question of discrimination and apartheid had been on the agenda of the first NAM Summit. It resolutely condemned the policy of apartheid practised by the South African government. It demanded the immediate abandonment of that policy. It further, declared that the policy of racial discrimination anywhere in the world constituted a grave violation of the charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.²

---

With the passage of time, the NAM grew from strength to strength both in terms of its numerical strength and effectiveness. The issue of apartheid in South Africa acquired prominence at the succeeding summits of NAM. Apart from condemning apartheid, it stressed upon the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. At its second summit held in Cairo, it warned South Africa that if it continued with its racial policies, the non-aligned nations would not tolerate much longer its presence in the community of nations. The Cairo declaration read:

"The racial discriminations, particularly its most odious manifestation, apartheid-constitutes a violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the principle of equality of peoples. Accordingly, all governments still persisting in the practice of racial discrimination should be completely ostracized until they have abandoned their unjust and inhuman policies.... The inhuman racial policies of South Africa constitute a threat to international peace and security. All countries interested in peace must, therefore, do every thing in their power to ensure that liberty and fundamental freedoms are secured to the people of South Africa." 3

On the issue of sanctions against South Africa, the Cairo Declaration stated that:

"The conference regrets to note that the Pretoria government's obstinancy in defying the conscious of mankind has been strengthened by the refusal of its friends and allies particularly, some major powers to implement United Nation's resolutions concerning sanctions against South Africa."

(a) The Conference therefore called upon all states to boycott all South African goods especially arms ammunition, oil and minerals to South Africa.

(b) called upon all states which have not yet done to break off diplomatic, consular and other relations with South Africa;

(c) requested the Governments represented at this conference to deny airport and overflying facilities to ships proceeding to and from South Africa and to discontinue all road or railway traffic with that country;

(d) demanded the release of all persons imprisoned, or subjected to other restrictions on account of their opposition to the policy of apartheid. The conference also expressed its deep regret that the security council had again been prevented from
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imposing comprehensive and mandatory sanctions under chapter VII of the charter. It also made it clear that the continued collaboration of certain Western countries with South African regime in this field as well as the investments and economic assistance being given by them to South Africa had only encouraged that regime in its intransigence. So it called upon all states for a cessation of all assistance by the IMF and other specialized agencies of the United Nations.\(^6\)

It also condemned the South African Regime for creating, arming and utilizing counter revolutionary groups, bandits and mercenaries as an extension of South African army of cause instability in the region.\(^7\)

Thus in the second summit of the NAM the participants condemned vehemently the inhuman policy of apartheid practised by the South African Government. They disclosed it again the principles of the U.N. charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They criticised the Western Countries particularly the trading partners of South Africa for supporting the racist regime by creating hurdles in the way of the implementation of security council resolutions. So, it urged its members to do their utmost efforts in the eradication of the racist policy.
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In its third summit held in Lusaka, the non-aligned countries assembled their sharpened their attack on South African racial policies. They reaffirmed the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa against the policy of Apartheid and racial discrimination. They condemned the practice of torture, inhuman and degrading treatment of the so-called prisoners. They condemned those countries, in particular the United States, France, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Japan which by their political economic and military collaboration with the Government of South Africa, encouraged and incited that Government to persist in its racist policy. Those countries which continued to sell military equipment to South Africa or helped it to produce arms and ammunitions in violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the security council in this regard were the special target of attack.

The NAM denounced South Africa's so-called 'outwardlooking' policy. It recommended to all non-aligned countries to refrain from entering into diplomatic, economic or relations of any other nature with South Africa. It suggested to all such non-aligned countries as may be maintaining such relations with South Africa to break them forthwith;
It solemnly affirmed the need for effective international action to bring an end to apartheid; it also expressed its full support for and solidarity with the oppressed people.\(^8\)

Thus, it is clear that in its third Summit, the NAM sharpened its attack on the racist regime. It declared the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa as legitimate. At the same time, it criticised the minority regime for the inhuman treatment being given to the so-called prisoners. Apart from condemning the countries supporting the African Government, it urged its member states to sever their links with the racist regime forthwith. It went a step further from its earlier demand of the release of political prisoners. It showed its anxiety for detaining Nelson Mandela and other leaders of liberation movement for such a long time.

In its fourth summit held in Algiers in 1973, NAM declared that "apartheid in South Africa is more than a system of racial discrimination: it is primarily a form of colonialism."\(^9\) Going a step further than the Declaration of the Cairo and Lusaka Summits, which had called for the release of political prisoners in South Africa, the Algiers Summit viewed "with profound anxiety" the uninterrupted imprisonment for over ten years of the
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leaders of the liberation movement such as Nelson Mandela, Walter Sisulu and others. It expressed serious concern at the large scale expansion of military means of South Africa throughout that region which represents danger to peace and security in Africa and in the world. Alarm was also expressed at the increasingly frequent interventions by South Africa in support of other racist and colonial regimes in its neighbourhood.

It also noted with grave concern that instead of granting economic and political freedoms and rights to the Africans, the racist regime had been applying Bantustan policy. It condemned and rejected the Bantustan policy which "seeks to Balkanize that territory and divide people into ethnics which is contrary to the idea of true Africanism.

It reaffirmed its full-support for the people of South Africa in their lawful struggle against apartheid. Further, it pledged itself to extend constant economic, diplomatic and moral support to independent states in regions exposed to the economic threats and subversive acts of racist and white minority regimes in the South Africa.
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Thus, the fourth Summit of the NAM countries considered the policy of apartheid as an offshoot of colonialism. It criticised the Bantustan policy of African government as it was designed to divide the population on ethnic lines. It considered the increasing military power of South African minority government as a threat to peace in the region as well to the world at large. So, it pledged its support both to the peoples of South Africa in their lawful struggle as well as to the independent states exposed to the economic threats and disruptive acts of the racial regime.

The fifth Summit of the NAM was held in Colombo in 1976. It expressed its deep concern over the explosive situation in South Africa which had resulted from the white minority regime of racist oppression over the vast majority of people under the policy of apartheid. Thus it condemned the racist regime of South Africa for its oppression of the majority of the people of South Africa and for its acts of aggression against neighbouring independent African states. It reaffirmed its full support to the liberation movement in the South Africa.13

It strongly condemned the continued political, economic, military collaboration by western countries and
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some other states particularly Israel with the racist regime. It also condemned all collaboration in the nuclear field by the West.\textsuperscript{14} It made it clear that activities of the transnational corporations assisted the regime to sustain apartheid and get profit from racism in South Africa.

Thus it called upon the non-aligned countries, separately and jointly to take diplomatic, economic and other measures to secure the cessation of all collaboration with the South African regime by states and Transnational Corporations.\textsuperscript{15}

It also called upon the United Nations' Security Council to impose a mandatory embargo under Chapter VII of the charter and urged all countries concerned to take steps to prevent the supply of petroleum and petroleum products to South Africa and to deny facilities to airlines and ships proceeding to or returning from South Africa.\textsuperscript{16}

It denounced the Bantustan policy of the white-led minority government and called on the states to refrain from any form of recognition and co-operation with any authority set up under the policy.\textsuperscript{17}
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Considering sanctions to be the effective solution to the problem, it urged all the member states of the United Nations, particularly the Western Industrial States which maintain economic, diplomatic, consular, cultural and military relations with the racist regime in South Africa to sever their links in compliance with the United Nations resolutions calling for such severance. 18

The Colombo Summit also recognised the important role played by the United Nations in regard to the elimination of the evil of apartheid. Noteworthy had been the special role played by the United Nations special committee against apartheid.

But the declaration also noted that the effectiveness of the United Nations has been limited because of the attitudes of a few Western powers which continued collaborate with Pretoria. Evidently the Colombo summit condemned the minority regime of South Africa for its oppressions over the vast majority of black Africans. It criticised those countries which were collaborating with the racist regime in the nuclear sphere. It also highlighted the activities of transnational corporations in sustaining apartheid. It also urged all its members to do their utmost efforts in securing the cessation of all such collaborations with the South Africa. At the same time, it urged the Security Council to apply mandatory sanctions
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under chapter VII of the UN charter. It also appreciated the role of the UN in general special committee on Apartheid in particular in the elimination of the apartheid policy.

The sixth summit of the NAM held at Havana in 1979 stressed the need:

(a) to provide political, economic, financial and military assistance to the South African liberation movement;

(b) to support training programmes of the South African liberation movement;

(c) to contribute generously with aid programmes for South African refugees;

(d) to strongly condemn in the United Nations the apartheid regime's criminal policy and its programme of tribal fragmentation;

(e) to implement the OAU, Non-Aligned and United Nations' resolution stipulating that there be no diplomatic or other relations with Bantustans;

(f) to denounce the economic, material, financial and military collaboration and the political, diplomatic and moral support that the imperialist powers provide to South African;

(g) to urge all states to strictly enforce and effectively control the arms embargo against South Africa in accordance with Security Council Resolution No.418;
(h) to demand strict implementation of all United Nations resolutions on South Africa;
(i) to demand a halt to all oil and fuel shipments to South Africa;
(j) to exert maximum pressure on the South African authorities to ensure that full political status is granted to all political prisoners in South Africa and those imprisoned, banned or restricted for their opposition to apartheid;
(k) to demand the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners.

It denounced the racist regime for intensifying the repression, Massacre and Systematic aggression against the frontline states and reaffirmed its solidarity with liberation movement. Recognizing the need of the liberation movements and the oppressed people for increased financial and material assistance in their struggle against racism, it called to provide political, economic, financial and military assistance to the South African national liberation movements (b) to support training programmes of the South African liberation movements (c) to contribute generously to the aid programmes of South African refugees.19

The conference also declared that the imperialist powers particularly the United States, Great Britain, France, Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, Italy,

Israel cannot escape blame for the existence and maintenance of racial oppression and the criminal policy of apartheid because of their political, diplomatic, economic, military, nuclear and other forms of collaboration with the Pretoria regime and thus to deny the South African people their legitimate aspirations. It stressed that this collaboration had not only facilitated the establishment and consolidation of the apartheid regime's repressive and oppressive apparatus but also increased Pretoria's war potential which constitute not only a threat to the South African people and independent neighbouring states but also to international peace and security.\textsuperscript{20}

It held that the United States, Great Britain, France and the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel were responsible for the continued existence and maintenance of the criminal policy of apartheid.\textsuperscript{21} The Summit categorically states that the complicity of Western powers with the apartheid regime enabled her to defy world public opinion with impunity, contributed to her increasing intransigence and strengthened her pretensions of being the defender of 'White, Christian Western Civilization and gendarme of the 'free world' in the area with the right to intervene militarily in any African country South of equator.\textsuperscript{22} It appealed to the Western and other countries to actively mobilize their resources and efforts so as to confront the apartheid system as a matter of priority.\textsuperscript{23}
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To sum up, the Havana Summit enlisted a number of steps to be taken for the abolition of the discriminatory policy of apartheid in South Africa. It recognized the fact that the liberation struggle had reached at the decisive stage. As a consequence of this, the extreme repressive measures were being adopted by the racist regime to suppress the movement. It held the imperialist power's complicity responsible for the persistence of apartheid in South Africa.

The Seventh NAM Summit was held in New Delhi in 1983. Like other NAM Summits, it again condemned the racist regime for its repressive and discriminatory acts against the overwhelming majority of African people. It drew the attention of the world to the sinister schemes at the perpetuation of colonialism under the guise of bantustanization and thus depriving the South Africans of their political, economic and social rights to keep them under their subjugation.

The summit held that the continued collaboration of certain Western Countries and Israel with the South African Regime as well as the investments and economic assistance being given by them to South Africa had only encouraged the regime in its intransigence. So, it expressed deep regret that the Security Council had again and again been prevented from imposing comprehensive and
mandatory sanctions under chapter VII of the charter.\textsuperscript{24} It urged all governments and international organizations to sever contacts with the racist regime of South Africa. The Heads of State or Government called for a cessation of all assistance to South Africa by the International Monetary Fund as the granting of such assistance and credit had been used by the Pretoria regime to meet its increasing expenditure for military and repressive purposes directed against the majority population.\textsuperscript{25}

The Summit again called for the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and all other political prisoners. It rejected the so-called constitutional reforms considering them as yet another device to divide the oppressed people of South Africa and not to eliminate apartheid.\textsuperscript{26} It again condemned the United States policy of 'constructive engagement'. It expressed its solidarity with and strong support for the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa.\textsuperscript{27}

The conference noted with great concern the increased acts of aggression against the neighbouring states. It condemned the South African Regime using revolutionary groups and mercenaries as an extension of South African army. It felt that it caused instability in the region. It reiterated that such acts of the regime
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constituted a serious threat not only to regional stability but also to international peace and security.

Thus, it is quite clear that most of the resolutions passed by the summit were in the form of reaffirming of its earlier stand. However, it rejected the constitutional reforms introduced by the Pretoria Regime finding them a new device to divide the people and thus to perpetuate the apartheid.

At the eighth NAM Summit held at Harare in 1986, it again condemned Bantustan Policy and acts of repression, oppression and discrimination being perpetrated against the vast majority of its people. It was convinced that apartheid can not be reformed but must be totally eliminated. Delivering the Keynot address, Mr. Mugabe described the three chief ingredients of his action programme for immediate implementation as (i) sending a team of NAM Foreign Ministers to visit capitals of important Western Countries and Japan to press for adoption and implementation of mandatory sanctions against South Africa (ii) another team of NAM Foreign Minister to represent the movement at the UN General Assembly Session on Namibia (iii) helping the liberation movement of South Africa. 28

It viewed that the struggle in South Africa has entered a phase where it was stated that comprehensive mandatory sanctions should be adopted to compel the racist regime to abolish its obnoxious system of apartheid

It urged all states to support and render effective assistance to the liberation movements in South Africa. It called for a provision of necessary resources for frontline states to enhance their defence capability and mobilise assistance to increase their capacity to withstand the effects of aggression and retaliatory sanctions by the racist regime. 29

It condemned some of the Western States for violating arms embargo imposed by the United Nations Security Council against the racist regime. It asserted that the growing militarization of the racist regime of South Africa would not have occurred without the connivance and tacit support of certain Western Countries. It decided to send a team of NAM foreign ministers to Western Capitals to persuade the Government of U.S., Britain, West Germany and Japan to impose sanctions against South Africa. 30

The notable development at Harare Summit was a programme to set-up a Fund called Action for resisting Invasion Colonization and Apartheid Fund. 31 The Summit called on the principal trading partners of South Africa to stop all collaboration with the repugnant regime of South Africa. It considered the comprehensive and mandatory sanctions as the most appropriate and effective peaceful means available to the international community. So it proposed a detailed programme of action in which mandatory sanctions against

South Africa, under Chapter VII of the Charter must be central element and which should also include additional actions by governments to isolate the racist regime and to send all appropriate assistance to those striving for freedom in South Africa. Simultaneously, it urged the United Nations for prohibition of technology to South Africa, cessation of the Export, sale or transport of oil, snapping of air links with and termination of any visa free entry privileges and promotion of tourism to South Africa.³²

Thus the Summit emphasised the need of comprehensive sanctions as a peaceful and effective mean of the abolition of apartheid.

The above description of various summits of NAM reveals that the question of apartheid has been on agenda since its first Summit. Considering it a grave violation of the charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it recommended the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. It considered it to be the most effective and peaceful solution to the problem. Through its programme for peace and International Corporation adopted at its second Summit, it supported the imposition of sanctions. However, it could not succeed in getting the sanctions implemented. It held the West responsible for this. So, it condemned the West at its

various Summits for its continued collaboration with the racist regime of South Africa.

It is well known that the Western Countries had very close economic ties with South Africa for which they reaped enormous profits. The profit earned by the Western countries was possible because of the system of apartheid. Hence the Western countries were not sincerely interested in the elimination of the system though they were with the world in condemning it. The measures provided for in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, could not be taken by the International community so far, because the Western powers that enjoyed veto power did not want to sacrifice their own interests.

Thus, from its very inception, the NAM, had identified western powers as the main obstacle in the way of complete success in getting the sanctions implemented which were considered to be helpful to the dismantling of apartheid regime. The NAM also alleged that the West's collaboration with the Pretoria regime had been helpful for the regime to continue with its racist policy. It was because of these trading partners, the racist regime had constantly been defying the world public opinion. Thus,
the West had proved itself a hindrance in the way of liberating of the African people. Hence, the NAM exposed and condemned the Western powers for their non-co-operative attitude.

The NAM had realised the fact that without the co-operation of western powers, it was impossible to get the sanctions implemented against the regime. Thus, it deemed that the world should be made to realise that apartheid was an inhuman and undemocratic practice. Keeping this in view it condemned the racist regime for its apartheid policy and Bantustan as the 'cornerstone' of apartheid designed to ensure the Bantustanization, tribal fragmentation and reaffirming its sacred commitment to the 'Principles of territorial and national sovereignty' of all territories under foreign domination, it strongly condemned and rejected the concept of 'bantustans' on several occasions.

As the Non-Aligned Movement has been committed to wipe out colonization and racialism from every corner of the world, so it has been extending its full moral, material and political support to the liberation movements of South Africa. It realised that the oppressed people of South Africa were not enjoying fundamental rights and they had to face brutality of the racist regime and were in need of financial and material help. So it called upon all states to contribute generously to strengthen the effectiveness of the liberation movement. In this way it
reaffirmed its solidarity with the struggle of the oppressed people. In fact it was important to stand with the struggle of oppressed people to make the racist government realise that the world was with the Africans and it would not be possible for the racist regime to defy the world public opinion or to crush the movement for a long time. It was also necessary to encourage the morale of the 'Africans' to get themselves free from the Yoke of apartheid system.

The NAM had also been making efforts to put a total stop to the sale of Western military equipments and transfer of technology in the nuclear fields to the South Africa because its growing military strength would lead to dangerous consequences. It had been using military strength against the opponents of apartheid in South Africa and against its neighbouring states.

Moreover, the check on the increasing military strength of South Africa was necessary as the growing military gave the racist regime self-confidence that she would be able to deal effectively with the opponents of apartheid. Thus South Africa became more intransigent and defiant to international community. We find that it remained so inspite of the several resolutions passed by the General Assembly an the security council.

All of us are aware that there are only two ways of the abolition of apartheid the way of the armed struggle
that led to bloodshed and of sanctions that led to a peaceful solution. So the International Community and the black leaders preferred the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. NAM had also supported this alternative.

Further, the NAM strongly rejected the outward looking policy of the racist regime as this policy was to keep the African away from struggle and stressed upon forging economic ties with the racist regime. NAM condemned the policy because it created divisions in the liberation movement. Rather it demanded total economic sanctions against South Africa.

However, it could not succeed in its efforts. It was not because of the lack of sincerity on the part of the NAM but because of the fact that it did not possess the enforcing power.

NAM had also been making efforts at isolating South Africa in International organization. Further, it sought to strengthen the hands of the United Nations as an instrument for the attainment of its goals. The Non-aligned countries took an active part in the meetings of the 'Special Committee against Apartheid' and in International conferences on sanctions. These conferences provided an opportunity for all the freedom-lovers to express their solidarity with the liberation movement and to mobilize public opinion in favour of imposing sanctions. The NAM having taken the advantage of such
opportunities supported the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. If refuted the West's claim that sanctions would not work and they would hurt the blacks. It held that in fact, the west was not willing to impose economic sanctions against South Africa because sanctions would hurt the whites more.

In addition in various agencies of the U.N. the NAM has been making every effort to isolate South Africa and to expose its obnoxious policy of apartheid. It also have been making efforts for the expulsion of South Africa from the various agencies of the United Nations. However, its every effort had been thwarted by the Western powers by using their veto power. Even then it can not be said that NAM has totally failed in its efforts. In fact there are leopholes in the structure of the United Nations which makes it ineffective. However, the NAM has played a prominent role in the UN in drawing the attention of the world to the apartheid policy. When its efforts were frustrated by the Western powers in the security council, it raised its voice in the General Assembly. Being in majority, the NAM countries pressurized the General Assembly to reject the so-called constitutional reforms as they were contrary to the principles of the UN charter. Moreover, in the General Assembly the racist Government's
credentials of her representatives were not accepted with the result that she was not able to take part in its deliberations.

To conclude it can be said that despite its limitations, NAM has played a comendable role to get the sanctions implemented and to draw the attention of the world community to the racial and nefarious policy of apartheid. As it does not possess the power to enforce its resolution, NAM has failed to achieve desired results. It has not been a deciding factor in the United Nations inspite of its having made tireless efforts at its own and in the United Nations to mobilize public opinion for pressurizing the West to apply sanctions against the racist regime, it has failed to play the decisive role in the U.N. Since the fact remains the NAM has been making efforts since its inception.

Here it would be pertinent to examine the role of organization of African Unity in mobilising the African states and world community for exposing the worst type of racial oppression being practised by the South Africa's white minority government.

The Role of Organization of African Unity: - The organization of African Unity* was founded in 1963. Like the United

* It is an Organization of Sovereign States which have engaged to co-operate for certain purposes.
Nations, OAU is also dedicated to the principle of full equality for all the people irrespective of race or colour. So, it is impossible for it to acquiesce in the denial of human equality. Since its very inception, it has been making tireless efforts to secure the principle of equality in South Africa where people have been discriminated against under apartheid policy. The OAU has realised its responsibility that it must work for the full eradication of apartheid. To achieve its goal, it focuses on the following lines:

Application of Sanctions: In view of the stubborn refusal of the South African government to comply with the United Nations Resolutions calling upon her to dismantle the system of apartheid, the OAU has been making a sustained efforts to have the mandatory economic sanctions, provided for in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. In its first meeting, the OAU supported the efforts of the United Nations. In line with the United Nations Resolutions, it called upon the African States to boycott South African goods and to end the supply of minerals and raw materials
to South Africa. It also requested the cooperation of the major trading partners of South Africa in successfully giving effect to the proposed boycott. It also tried to draw the attention of the United Nations that the apartheid system aggravated the situation in South Africa and it was a matter of grave concern for the international community as it was a clear threat to international peace and security. In 1963, the Security Council had declared that 'the situation in South Africa was seriously disturbing international peace and security'. Thus, it recommended to impose arms embargo against South Africa. The OAU had supported the arms embargo and made it clear that any form of military and other co-operation with the minority regime constituted a hostile act against the African people. So it requested the African group at the United Nations to draw the attention of the Security Council to the continued violations of its decisions on the arms embargo and call for effective measures to end these violations.

But certain countries continued violating arms embargo. Thus, OAU strongly condemned all the powers, particularly France and the United Kingdom, for continuing to supply the Pretoria regime with arms in violation of


the resolutions of the Security Council. It also called for a world-wide campaign for cessation of all military co-operation with South Africa and for the boycott of South Africa in economic, cultural and other fields. It also called for appropriate action against companies investing in South Africa.  

Further, it appealed to members of international community and requested the African group at the United Nations to obtain from the Security Council the implementation of the measures provided for under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter in respect of South Africa which continued to violate systematically the United Nations Resolutions. It also invited its members to exert all pressure on the allied and partners of South Africa with a view to severing economic and other relations with apartheid regime. It also urged the United Nations Security Council to take the necessary steps to make the arms embargo imposed on South Africa mandatory. It expressed its view that sanctions would be proved important and effective as a weapon if they are strictly and vigorously applied.

The Soweto uprising and brutal activities or repressive measures by the racist regime made the
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organization to realise that such actions of the apartheid regime in South Africa constituted a grave threat to international peace and security in the whole region. So it emphasised the need for the total isolation of the apartheid regime. It gave utmost priority for the cessation of all military and nuclear co-operation with that regime, as well as making bank loans to and investments in South Africa. It requested the African group at the United Nations to press for the adoption of mandatory decisions by the Security Council to the end. 40 It reiterated its demand for imposition of sanctions in its subsequent meetings.

As a result of continuous pressure of the ONU, the Security Council imposed a mandatory arms embargo under Chapter VII of the Charter. 41 But the OAU could not succeed so far in getting the Security Council imposed mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa because of the non-cooperative attitude of the western powers. Despite the so many resolutions and world communities' demand, the west continued to oppose sanctions, and continued collaborating with the racist regime. So OAU focussed at exposing and condemning western powers.

Condemning the Western Powers:

The racist regime of South Africa has been able to survive with its apartheid policy and to defy the United Nations' resolutions because of the full support that she enjoyed from her western friends.* The countries have been maintaining trade, economic, financial and military contacts with South Africa and thereby strengthening the racist regime. Because of this Western support, South Africa has been feeling quite safe and paying no heed to what the rest of the world said or did. The west has been thwarting every effort of the organization of isolating the apartheid regime. This would be helpful to bring the apartheid regime to her knees. At its Cairo Summit held in 1964, the OAU asked the major trading partners of South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of United Nations resolutions but to no effect. At its summit held in 1968, it condemned Great Britain, the United States, France, West Germany and Japan by name for their continued political, military and economic collaborations with South African Regime. 42

The OAU has been emphasising repeatedly that the racist regime could persist in her policies because of the support of the West. In its Summit 1971 it condemned the

---

* When the OAU first took up for consideration the issue of apartheid in South Africa, the UN had already been considering the issue of apartheid for the last seventeen years. Thus, the OAU was aware of the west's attitude since its inception.

main investors as well as trading partners of South Africa for encouraging and assisting the South African authorities in their oppression of the African people. It condemned all the powers, particularly France and the United Kingdom for continuing to supply the Pretoria regime with arms in violation of the Security Council Resolution. This theme has been repeated in its subsequent meetings. Thus, the OAU is convinced that the racist minority regimes in Southern Africa owe their survival to the decisive political, economic and military support of certain powers and multinational companies. Thus, in 1975 it urged the western powers, particularly the United States of America, the United Kingdom, France, Federal Republic of Germany and Japan to end immediately all co-operation with the Pretoria Regime. Since then the OAU, in every one of its meetings have criticized and condemned the western powers for their continuous collaborations. It has appealed to them to refrain from all relations with the racist Pretoria Regime. But all its resolutions have fallen on deaf ears of the west because the OAU could not force these big powers to behave in accordance with its orientations. But as on Africa watcher puts it OAU could do nothing more than condemning their action. Thus, it could not change
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the attitude and policies of the west.

**Condemning and Rejection of Bantustan Scheme**

Having noted the negative attitude of the west right in the beginning, the OAU realised that the world should be made acquainted with the evil of apartheid system. So apart from condemning apartheid system at its various meetings, it also rejected the Bantustan Scheme which has been the cornerstone of the apartheid policy. It made it clear that this scheme was most unfair because under this scheme 87 percent of the population of South Africa could claim only 13 percent of the territory as their own. In the rest of the country they were treated only as foreigners or as migrant labourers coming to work in white areas. Thus, the OAU had taken a firm stand on the question of Bantustans as this scheme was to render the Africans as foreigners in their own land. Rejecting the Bantustan Scheme, it called on the states not to accord recognition to the so called independent Homelands. It declared that recognition of any Bantustan by any state would be seen as a betrayal of not only the fighting people of South Africa but the entire continent.\(^{47}\)

In fact, these Bantustans are designed to divide the Africans and to keep the black Africans away. The

---

racist government argued that the policy would enable the blacks to develop according to their own culture and they (bantustans) will be granted independence. But the OAU opposed such independence as deceptive. These bantustans appeared to possess all the outward symbols and trappings of an independent state such as a President, a Prime-Minister, a flag and diplomatic services but the minority government would continue to interfere in their internal matters because the important posts in the administrative set up were occupied by the whites. The blacks also occupied some important posts but they were used as puppets and motivated to help the racist government to pursue their policy more effectively. Further, these homelands were non-viable units economically. Thus, in the absence of adequate economic resources, they were to totally dependent upon South Africa for their survival. In fact, the so-called bantustans could be observed as colonial pockets of South Africa. The OAU made it clear that the bantustans had been created in defiance of all common sense. "We all know that the secret dream the pipe dream of their creators in this way to surround the Pretoria nucleus with puppet states sans, foundation, sans consistency and sans future". It is worth noting that the United Nations had recommended not to accord recognition to these so-called

independent Homelands and no country, including South Africans Western allies, had accorded recognition to these bantustans.

Apartheid regime's military build up is a threat to International peace and security:

As we know that the racist government of South Africa continued to adopt more and more repressive measures against the South Africans struggling against apartheid and adopted aggressive attitude against its neighbouring states which provided help to these struggling people. For this, the racist government had concentrated on its military build up. With the help of the Western Countries, South Africa had been able to accumulate a lot of arms, weapons, aircrafts, missiles etc. It had been able to build up its indigenous capacity to manufacture a considerable variety of military hardware. Consequently South Africa had in her possession a huge war machine, with it she used to crush the liberation movement and to intimidate the neighbouring states and to compel them to abandon their support for the nationalists' movement. Hence the OAU expressed its grave concern over the massive military build-up in South Africa in its various meetings. Due to its military build up, its aggressive acts against neighbouring states and ruthless repression of the opponents of apartheid, the OAU declared that apartheid regime was illegitimate and
represented a grave threat to world peace and security. It also made it clear that the nuclear co-operation developing between South Africa, the United States of America, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Isreal constituted a clear manifestation of the hostility of these countries to the cause of African liberation. They deliberately aimed at helping the Pretoria regime to manufacture atomic weapons to intimidate Africa and international community. It also repeated this at the 'International Conference on sanctions' against South Africa' held in Paris in 1981. It appealed again and again to the Western powers to end their military collaboration. It was their help that enabled the racist regime not only to defeat the struggle against apartheid but also let South Africa maintain, strengthen and expand her apartheid policy and thus to defy the will of the international community.

Support to the Liberation Movement:

Considering the prevailing situation of South Africa as threat to international peace and security, it stressed on the supporting liberation movements. It noted the non-cooperative attitude of the west. It emphasized the need to support the liberation movement of the black Africans. Since its very inception, it called on the
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States to provide moral, financial and material help to freedom fighters. For this purpose, first of all, the OAU set up a liberation committee which was particularly intended to establish a liberation budget to finance the struggle for African freedom and co-ordinate all assistance provided by African countries for liberation movements and to manage a special fund for the purpose. Although the liberation committee could not achieve much success because of lack of co-operation of member states, yet since its formation it had been receiving a lot of contributions from all over the world and it allocated the funds to the liberation movement in South Africa.

Further, the OAU reaffirmed its full and unconditional support, to the oppressed people of South Africa in their legitimate struggle to eliminate apartheid and achieve majority rule. It appealed all friendly governments and organizations to provide greater moral, political, humanitarian and material support to the liberation struggle of the peoples of South Africa. This was repeated in 1977 when it called on all peace, justice and freedom loving nations to increase their moral support and financial and material aid to the national liberation movement of South Africa. It was important to make the racist regime realize that the world stands with the struggling people and wanted apartheid to be eradicated.

52. Ibid.
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The OAU committed as it is to the eradication of apartheid, wants to achieve its goal through peaceful means. Its manifesto on south Africa which is known as Lusaka Manifesto adopted in 1969 makes this amply clear.

In the Manifesto it was stated that,

"on the objective of liberation we would prefer to achieve it without physical violence. We would prefer to negotiate rather than destroy, to talk rather than kill. We do not advocate violence, we advocate an end to the violence against human dignity which is new being perpetrated by the oppressers of Africa. If peaceful progress to emancipation were possible or if changed circumstances were to make it possible in the future, we would urge our brothers in the resistance movement to use peaceful methods of struggle even at the cost of some compromise on the timing of change." 55

This paragraph of Lusaka Manifesto, can be interpreted as an 'abandonment of the armed struggle' and as resolution to compromise. Some African countries* proposed for 'dialogue' with South Africa for solving the problem. But it seems that the Lusaka Manifesto was misinterpreted, because while the OAU used 'negotiate' or 'compromise', at the same time, it also declared that "we can neither surrender nor compromise." 56 This clearly

55. 'Lusaka Manifesto' Cited in 'Seminar on South Africa' Unit on Apartheid No.28/75 Aug.1975, p.15.
* These African Countries were Lesotho, Madagascar, Togo, Mal and Swaziland.
reveals that the OAU would never compromise on the question of full eradication of apartheid, though it would prefer to achieve this through peaceful means.

Thus, the OAU rejected the proposal of 'dialogue' making if it meant dilution of its stand on apartheid. If there was to be any 'dialogue' at all with South Africa, it should be between the minority regime of South Africa and the people they were oppressing and exploiting.\(^57\) Like NAM, the OAU had rejected the 'outward looking' policy which was only to divide and deceive the African states. Thus dialogue was strongly rejected by the OAU and had become a thing of the past.

Because of increasing intransigence and repeated massacre, it went on to say that 'there is no ay left to the liberation of Southern Africa except armed struggle'.\(^58\) At the same time, it was realized by the international community that the armed struggle would cause bloodshed and economic, financial sanctions would shorten it or could stop this bloodshed and be helpful in the eradication of apartheid. The OAU also made efforts for their implementation. But it had not succeeded to get these sanctions implemented. It was because of its limitations that it failed to be the deciding factor in the United Nations. It did not possess enforcing power as Methews remark, "It is only an instrument for conflict

---
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management among its members. It has no disciplinary powers over any offending members. 59

But this does not mean that the OAU has failed completely. It has played an effective role in exposing the evil of apartheid and West's non-cooperative attitude. Admittedly it is not the deciding factor in the United Nations, but being in majority in the General Assembly, it has played an active role in drawing the attention of the world to the apartheid issue and its solution which lies in the implementation of sanctions. It also tried to pressurise the member states in the United Nations. By participating actively in the international conferences on sanctions, it has laid emphasis on the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. It has recommended to launch a campaign to teach the people that apartheid is a crime against humanity. It has sent missions in different countries to persuade the west to impose sanctions throughout Africa and the rest of the world to make them aware of the apartheid issue and come forward to pressurize the trading partners particularly the west to impose sanctions against South Africa.

If brief, it can be said that like the United Nations, the OAU, is also committed to the full eradication

of apartheid. To achieve its goal, it has been focussing at the application of chapter VII of the charter and condemning the west for impeding the implementation of sanctions. It has been strongly critical of its bantustan policy so that people might be acquainted with the evils of apartheid. It has been condemning its military build up which poses a clear threat to international peace and security. It has also made its strategy clear that it would prefer peaceful means and sanctions would be a peaceful solution to the problem. For the imposition of sanctions it made efforts in its meetings and in the United Nations. It had succeeded in making the Security Council to declare that situation in South Africa constituted a threat to international peace and Security and made a fervent plea to impose arms embargo. It was because of the OAU’s efforts that the Security Council made the arms embargo mandatory and the UN rejected 'outward looking' policy. But the OAU had not succeeded in getting the mandatory economic sanctions implemented because it lacked enforcing power and thus failed to play a decisive role in the UN. However, it did succeed to a great extent in mobilizing public opinion in favour of sanctions.

The Role of the African National Congress

The ANC is perhaps the oldest liberation movement in South Africa and has an inspiring history of sacrifice
and heroism. It has carried on armed struggle against apartheid. It has also been seeking for the imposition of sanctions and has been ready to pay any price for it. Since 1959, it has been stressing upon the necessity of sanctions against South Africa. The ANC views that South African regime is illegitimate in relation to the majority of the people in South Africa, it being white minority rule imposed on the majority of the people. So, it goes back to the question of the removal, the abolishing, the destruction of the apartheid regime. Hence it pleads for the isolation of the regime and such measures as include sanctions on the regime to put necessary pressure. The ANC also alleges that the white regime imposes itself as a kind of colonial power. It is criminal to perpetuate a crime against humanity. Thus, it much be abolished.

The ANC is also conscious that sanctions are not the cure in itself. They will not bring about the restructuring of South African Society in accordance with the ideals of justice, equality, peace and majority rule envisaged in the freedom charter. The call of the ANC for imposing sanctions was responded by the General Assembly

61. 'The Freedom Charter' Forward to Freedom: Documents on the National Policies of the African National Congress of South Africa (Published by ANC P.O.Box 680) p.29-31
in 1963 when it adopted a resolution calling upon all member states to impose separate and collective sanctions against South Africa.

But this was not the result of the call of the ANC alone but a tragic event like the Sharpeville Massacre of 1960 gave a dramatic impetus to the need for mandatory sanctions. Furthermore, the international community had come to argue that apartheid and the racist regime in South Africa could not be considered a "local" affair. Rather it was seen to have international ramifications. Thus, it must be eradicated peacefully.

Since its inception, the ANC launched a peaceful resistance movement and adopted constitutional methods. In 1952, it carried on a defiance campaign against pass laws. But soon it noticed that the racist government's repressive measures were escalating. When it opened fire on peaceful demonstrators in Sharpeville in 1960, it became clear that sooner or later, it would have to give up the path of non-violence. It was only after the Sharpeville Massacre, the ANC had concentrated its efforts on the armed struggle and imposition of sanctions as well. It carried its armed struggle having realised that there was no other alternative. Dr. Nelson Mandela also observed "it would be unrealistic and wrong for African leaders to continue preaching peace and non-violence at a time..."
when the government met out peaceful demands with force." However, it did not mean that the ANC became violent. The fact is that it had never been in favour of violence. Rather advocated the path of non-violence. But at the same time it never wanted its movement to be crushed. The ANC wanted to carry on its liberation movement until its victory i.e. full eradication of apartheid and establishment of a society based on equality in which all Africans would have equal share as envisaged in their freedom charter. Though it wished to attain this goal peacefully, the circumstances compelled them to resort to violence. Dr. Mandela made it clear in his statement.

"We first broke the law in a way which avoided violence. When this form was legislated against and then the government resorted to a show of force to crush opposition to its policies, only then did we decide to answer violence with violence." 63

This reveals that the ANC wanted to carry on its movement peacefully, it became violent it only when all else had failed or so to speak all channels of peaceful protest had been barred. Moreover, when the ANC noticed that the racist government remained unaffected and rather adopted more and more repressive measures, it was left with two
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choices submit or fight. The ANC did not want to submit as Dr. Mandela stated, "we shall not submit and we have no choice but to hit back by all means in our power in defence of our people, our future and our freedom." 64

Thus to achieve its goal, it continued with armed struggle through Umkhonto we Sizwe. Also it continued efforts to get the sanctions implemented which were needed for peaceful eradication of apartheid. Explaining the significance of the sanctions, argued that "sanctions will weaken the apartheid regime thereby making our struggle lighter; that means we shall be fighting against a weaker enemy their will be less bloodshed ---- lifespan of apartheid will be shortened." 65

Like NAM and OAU, the ANC is also aware that the racist regime can not be brought to its knees, owing to the support of the west through military, economic and other collaborations. So, the only way is that sanctions must be imposed against the racist regime. For the racist regime alone is not responsible for the miserable conditions of Africans but also the countries which collaborate with the regime are also responsible for it. So it called on the international community to reaffirm its adherence to total diplomatic, political, economic,
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military isolation of the Pretoria regime calling on all member states to refrain from establishing any such contact. 66 "But the West have paid to no heed to it.

However, in 1963, the United Nations called upon member states to impose arms embargo but it was not applied by the member states. The West continued the economic and military support to the racist regime. As Olive Tambo has stated.

"The big imperialist powers and their junior partners--have consistently defied the call by the peoples of the world to isolate and destroy the criminal apartheid regime. It is they who have supplied arms for the butchery of Africans--and who have given Vorster the moral strength to defend the racist regime of South Africa." 67

Thus the attitude of the certain western powers has been frustrating the efforts of the international community. Through supply of sophisticated war equipments, the west has strengthened the racist regime. The regime has been using these weapons to repress the blacks and enhancing its aggressive power towards neighbouring states. Thus the west has always joined the world in condemning the system while in practice never favouring imposition of sanctions. The sharpeville and
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Soweto Massacres also reveal that the racist regime has been using its military strength to enhance its repressive and aggressive potentiality.

So the ANC realised that the world community must be acquainted with the real situation prevailing in the country, only then the peoples throughout the world would join them. It mobilized all its resources to publicise these massacres so that peoples outside the country might came to know the brutality of the racist-government. On the part of the West, it wanted that if the West imposed arms embargo, the racist regime would realize that its friends stand no longer with it. But its efforts did not prove fruitful. The west continued to supply arms and technology in the nuclear field. Then the ANC called on the United States, France and the United Kingdom to support the invocation of Chapter VII of the Charter. It implored the General Assembly to propose for consideration by the security council this year.\(^\text{68}\)

The Security Council adopted a resolution 418 (1977) which involved chapter VII asking the states to impose mandatory arms embargo. But the embargo was circumvented by the west and its junior partners. However, the ANC continued to make its efforts to get the sanctions implemented.

\(^{68}\) Ibid. p.8.
In this way the collaboration of the West had been strengthening the inhuman racist regime. It had thus been responsible for the destruction of the forces within South Africa that sought to bring about a peaceful change. But the West did not want to solve the racist problem because of its economic and strategic interests. So it prevented the regime from being isolated. The United States Government wanted a non-radical solution for the South African question in the long term---that it was prepared to accept only such a solution as would leave its interests intact. 69

It was because of these interests, the mandatory and comprehensive economic sanctions could not be applied so far even though the General Assembly had recommended these measures as far back as in 1975. Now only the arms and economic sanctions are considered to be the most effective solution to the problem. However, the world body recommended to impose cultural sanctions and also in the field of sports. The arms embargo as stated earlier, was circumvented by the certain powers. Only the economic sanctions are left to be the effective weapon and considered to be an important contribution to the liberation movement. Emphasising on the necessity of imposing sanctions, the acting President Oliver Tombo
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stated that "sanction will not and can not be expected in themselves to bring down the apartheid system—but if properly implemented, the effect of sanctions will be to limit the scope, scale and duration of the war that is now raging in South Africa. Unless the international community can do this the repercussions of the conflict will also engulf us all.\textsuperscript{70}

At the conference, held in 1981, the ANC appealed to the governments which have hitherto refused to imposed sanctions. It also appealed the countries which have already imposed sanctions to take action to widen their scope, to make them all embracing and strengthening the enforcement machinery.\textsuperscript{71}

But it is the sovereign right of every country to choose to impose sanctions. It is within their domestic jurisdiction to adopt such measures. It was realized that only pressure can force the West to apply sanctions against South Africa and such pressure can be exerted through the mobilisation of public opinion in favour of sanctions because no one can dare to disregard public opinion. The ANC sent its missions to abroad and thereby mobilized public opinion by imparting informations about the real situation of South Africa. It tried to make them to understand the importance of sanctions as a peaceful
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way of helping to bring about democratic change in South Africa. The ANC wanted to gain solidarity of the peoples from abroad with the people of South Africa. It also also it clear that they wanted solidarity not pity and that if the world community wanted to avoid bloodshed in South Africa, it must apply sanctions against South Africa.

The ANC succeeded in its efforts to some extent. The campaign to isolate South Africa gained a new momentum in the West particularly in the United States and in Britain. The representatives of the ANC had made efforts in these countries which dominated vital sectors of South African economy with a view to build support for national liberation movement. It was realised that the economic deprivation can bring the racist regime to its knees. These efforts of the ANC bore fruit. Disinvestment bills on a local and state level were passed throughout the United states. Similarly in the Great Britain, British-based multi-nationals which paid black South African workers starvation wages were exposed. Even the British Government's policies towards South Africa were challenged.

In 1985 local authorities implemented a boycott of South African products. Besides forty two local councils stated in a letter sent to the Ex.Prime Minister Mrs. Thatcher,

"We hope that your government will abandon its opposition to measures designed to increase South Africa's international isolation, and in particular to support United Nations mandatory economic sanctions."\textsuperscript{73}

In the United States, the ANC continued to make efforts to direct the attention of the masses to their struggle against apartheid and to the non-cooperative policy of the Reagan administration. They also stressed upon the other forms of struggle targeting states legislatures, city councils, congress or the Reagan Government.

The ANC succeeded in its efforts to an extent. Under the pressure of international community and their own peoples, these opponents imposed limited sanctions against South Africa in 1986. But the ANC has not been able to get comprehensive economic sanctions so far. Its efforts have been thwarted by the trading partners of South Africa. Yet it never gave up the hope. As the racist government adopted more and repressive measures against it, it has intensified its struggle to the same extent and encouraged the morale of the Africans by saying that 'Victory is Curs'.
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It had to face many problems such as it was banned (Now the ban has been lifted) and its leader had to go underground. It had to depend upon abroad for material, financial and arms assistance. But it continued to fight in all forums but it has not yet achieved its goal.

In 1987 it appealed to the international community that the hour had come when the world, especially the United States, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and France must finally say that no longer would they associate themselves with the racist regime and encourage the pursuit of such relations. The ANC called a Conference at Arusha in February 1988 for the purpose of intensifying its campaign for the isolation of the racist regime. The conference demonstrated that the racist regime was isolated and the ANC led mass democratic movement enjoyed the support of the overwhelming majority of humanity. It re-affirmed that apartheid is a crime against humanity.

The Conference observed that the people of South Africa have the right to pursue their struggle for democracy, self determination and genuine independence against this brutal and illegitimate regime and to use all methods of struggle including armed resistance to

achieve this end. The Conference also called on the international community to impose comprehensive and mandatory sanctions on South Africa.\textsuperscript{75} It urged all governments and international organizations and solidarity movements to act in support of those who are risking their liberty and lives in the struggle for a non-racial united democratic South Africa.\textsuperscript{76}

In fact, this was a historical move of the ANC because never before such a Conference was called by the organisation. The motive to call such a Conference in which the representatives from capitalist countries, from socialist countries and non-aligned movement and leaders and activists of the anti-apartheid movements were present, was to urge the progressive people throughout the world to come and devise new forms of struggle under the new conditions.

A brief survey of the role of the ANC to eradicate apartheid and to isolate South Africa reveals that the ANC since its inception has been playing role which continued to grow in strength and popularity. It would not be wrong to consider it as a vanguard of the African movement. As a result of its efforts at national as well as international level the Pretoria regime began to realise itself under pressure and raised the issue of negotiations. Though the ANC never opposed to a
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negotiated settlement of the apartheid question it has not been ready to call off armed struggle. It declared that its armed struggle will continue until the transformation of Racist Africa into United and democratic non-racial society does not take place. ANC has a clear understanding of South Africans racist leader's intentions behind the issue of negotiations in that he intended to defuse the struggle inside the country by raising false hopes of a just political settlement. The Pretoria Regime has every intention to block and to defeat the continuing campaign for comprehensive and mandatory sanctions by sending out bogus signals, so the ANC is ready to engage itself in negotiations with some preconditions mentioned below; (a) Unbanning of the ANC and all other organizations; (b) Repeal of all the political proscriptive laws; (c) Return of Exiles and to allow consultation within the wider democratic movements and (d) unconditional release of all political prisoners.

The ANC very rightly realised that to make the Apartheid Regime un governable it must engage itself with the trade unions and make efforts for the withdrawal of the African labour. This step would hit the regime at its weakest point. This strategy of the ANC has been
successful and South African Trade Unions have become closer to the spirit of the ANC. It can be regarded a remarkable victory of the ANC that now the Apartheid Regime seems under its greatest ever threat. It has become virtually ungovernable, as the ANC successfully persuaded the council boards to resign and thus destroy the apartheid-supporting local administration in numerous townships. It also goes to the credit of the ANC that the Western Countries, the major supporters of South African Regime have imposed sanctions on it. Consequently the Apartheid Regime has faced a dramatic reduction in investment. Though it did not pay heed to this international and national voice with the view that it would not commit suicide. But the newly elected President Mr.P.W.De Klark realised the real situation and lifted ban from the ANC and released Dr. Nelson Mandela and many other prisoners. Some Laws have been repealed and it came to the negotiating table. This is also a great victory of the ANC but the ANC's ultimate goal is to seize power from the whites and establish a truly democratic state meant for all living beings in South Africa and based on one man one vote. It has to achieve its real goal as yet.

Though, South African government has made some reforms and paved the way for a negotiations, apartheid has not been dismantled. All the political prisoners and detainees have not been released; pillars of apartheid have not been dismantled; the question of the political representation of the black people of South Africa is yet to
be resolved. Thus, much have to be done.

The ANC has changed its policy, it decided to intensify the peoples war so as to make South Africa ungovernable. It pledge itself to avoid all contact with the South African government until the State President was prepared to discuss the total elimination of apartheid. Though, it has not renounced the armed struggle, it armed attacks have declined and it decided to emphasis on non-violent protest. 77

But this does not mean that the ANC has weakened or it has lost its position. It is still an important movement in South Africa. There can be no resolution of South Africa's crisis without it. It has changed its strategy due to the changing circumstances.

First of all the situation has changed in Soviet Union. So, the Soviet Union has tried to persuade ANC to rely more on the strategy of negotiations rather than on armed struggle. Further the frontline states have begun to scale-down the presence of the ANC in their territories. This makes it difficult for the ANC to continue an effective guerilla war. Moreover, the ANC has realised that intensified people's war would underpin more effective resistance and thus force the state into further negotiations. It would also be helpful for the

normalization of political situation so that all political parties could operate. In this way it would make easy for the South African government and the west to deal with the problem.

'To sum up, the NAM, the OAU and the ANC have played a significant role in the eradication of apartheid in South Africa. However, these organizations could not succeed in their mission fully. It is mainly due to the fact that they do not have binding force to get their decisions implemented. So, they have to depend upon the help of the United Nations, particularly, the Security Council. However they have done their best to raise the issue of apartheid in the world body. They have tried to impress upon the Security Council to impose mandatory sanctions against South Africa as prescribed in Chapter VII of the UN Charter. However, these organizations could not get these sanctions implemented because of the very composition and procedure of the Security Council whose permanent members enjoyed veto power. Some of them were against the implementation of the sanctions because of their vested economic and other interests as they had trade collaboration with the racist regime of South Africa. They tried to foil every attempt of these organizations in the Security Council by using their veto power. These organizations realised this fact and tried to create world public opinion against these western powers. They succeeded in pressurizing them through public opinion to a great extent. That is why sanctions were
imposed on South Africa. This had a desired effect in that the South African Government had to come to the negotiating table, to bring certain reforms they released some of the political prisoners including Dr. Nelson Mandela. They paved the way for establishment of non-racial democratic society.

However, the ANC in its attempt to solve the problem of apartheid had to resort to armed struggle. It was felt that armed struggle was the only alternative available to them after the failure of all peaceful means. But at the same time, the ANC pursued the path of creating public opinion and pressurizing South African government by the instrumentality of sanctions against South Africa. They have shown solidarity with the liberation movements of South Africa. At the same time they have also co-operated fully with the UNO. As a result of efforts of these organizations, the United Nations succeeded in helping the people of South Africa in abolition of apartheid.