SPEECH BY MR. JOHN DE COURCY LING, MEMBER OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AT A LUNCHEON OF THE SOCIETY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN WASHINGTON AT 12 NOON ON MONDAY 16 SEPTEMBER 1985

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY POLICY TOWARDS AFRICA - ESPECIALLY SOUTHERN AFRICA

When I first joined the Foreign Office in 1959 Harold Macmillan was Prime Minister and Selwyn Lloyd was Foreign Secretary soon succeeded by Alec Douglas-Home. Their colleague who was given all the most difficult tasks was the best Prime Minister Britain never had - Rab Butler. In addition to the very large department of the Home Office he was made Minister for Central Africa including Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland (Malawi). Harold Macmillan imagined that if he could package these three Central African countries into a single federation the problem of their emancipation would somehow become more manageable. He was utterly wrong. Northern Rhodesia became Zambia under Kenneth Kaunda and Southern Rhodesia malingered under white rule thanks to the stone walling politics of a former RAF war time pilot, Mr. Ian Smith, and many other white Rhodesians like him. From 1964 when Alec Douglas-Home was defeated by Harold Wilson in the October election until Lord Carrington's successful midwifery which brought Southern Rhodesia to independence under Robert Mugabe in 1981, Southern Rhodesia was a sad reminder to the world of Britain's post
IMPERIAL IMPOTENCE, OF THE DISUNITY OF THE EUROPEAN ALLIES AND THE FACT THAT SOUTHERN AFRICA CONTAINED IMPERIAL SETTLEMENTS WHICH HAD NOT BENEFITED FROM THE MAXIM ISSUED BY THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE IN KENYA IN 1926 THAT WHERE THE INTERESTS OF SETTLERS AND NATIVES I.E. WHITES AND BLACKS, WERE IN CONFLICT THEN THE INTERESTS OF THE BLACK NATIVES WOULD BE PARAMOUNT. THIS WAS A DRAMATIC AND HISTORIC STATEMENT OF THAT LIBERAL POLICY WHICH SHAPED THE BRITISH APPROACH TO HER COLONIES IN AFRICA AND THE CONTINENT GENERALLY FOR THE ENSUING 40 YEARS BY WHICH TIME THEY WERE ALL INDEPENDENT. IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA BEFORE MUGABE, IN SOUTH AFRICA STILL TODAY AND IN NAMIBIA IT IS MORE TRUE TO SAY THAT WHEN WHITE AND BLACK INTERESTS ARE IN CONFLICT THEN WHITE INTERESTS ARE PARAMOUNT. CRUDELY SPEAKING THAT IS THE SITUATION WE FACE TODAY.

WHAT IS THE EUROPEAN POSITION ON THIS? IT IS CLOSER TO THE WORDS OF THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE IN 1926 THAN THOSE OF MR. P.N. BOTHA IN SEPTEMBER 1985. MR. BOTHA'S IMMOBILISM AND HIS MUELISH DEFENCE OF THE STATUS QUO IS CHARACTERISTIC OF A WELL DUG IN AFRIKANER. APARTHEID AFTER ALL IS A PRODUCT OF AN EXPORTED CONVICTION OF THE DUTCH REFORM CHURCH. IT IS A KIND OF CONVICTION WHICH BREEDS SELF RIGHTEOUSNESS THAN THE LOVE OF HUMANITY AND CHARITY TOWARDS THEM WHICH DERIVES FROM THE MAIN STREAM OF CHRISTIANITY IN EUROPE.

IT IS HOWEVER FUTILE TO IMAGINE THAT EUROPEAN ATTITUDES TO THE REST OF THE WORLD ARE GOVERNED BY RELIGION OR MORAL ISSUES. IN PRACTICE, ALL INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ARE GOVERNED BY POLITICAL,
ECONOMICAL AND STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS. WHAT ARE THE
CONSIDERATIONS THAT SHAPE EEC POLICY TOWARDS SOUTH AFRICA IN
PARTICULAR?

1. **Trade**: British trade in black Africa e.g. Nigeria and
Zambia are greater than our trade in the Republic of South Africa.
This disequilibrium is reflected in the aggregate trade of the
12 member states of the EEC together.

2. **The political tradition** of the 12 member states of the
European Community is a liberal one which finds the reactionary
nature of apartheid abhorrent.

3. **Strategic**: As a British Conservative member of the
European Parliament I believe that NATO and the EEC are
complementary organisations. 10 of the 12 member states of
the EEC are members of the NATO military command structure i.e.
all except Ireland and France; and 11 members of the EEC are
members of the political consultation apparatus of NATO i.e. all
except Ireland. It is worth noting moreover that in the current
inter governmental discussions about European Union the Irish
Government would not rule out military participation in the
defence of "European Union". European union without NATO is
inconceivable.

4. **NATO and the EEC** have a military and maritime interest in
the stability of South Africa so that her ports, Durban, East London, Port Elizabeth, Simonstown and Cape Town should be open and well disposed towards NATO and EEC civilian and Naval vessels.

5. The churches in Europe particularly the Christian churches are rallying public opinion strongly in the hope of exciting governments to become more hostile to the government of South Africa.

6. Economic sanctions have had a poor history in European terms. Some governments in the EEC are inclined to pay lip service to them. They were not effective against Mr. Smith's illegal regime in Southern Rhodesia. On the contrary, commercial isolation proved to be the catalyst of Rhodesian industry for import substitution. Moreover, the collapse of the Rand and the difficulty of the South African central bank in servicing the considerable problem of overseas, private and public debt means that the self imposed restriction on overseas credit which South Africa has adopted is in itself a rigorous form of economic sanction.

7. The EEC's treaty (the Lome Convention) with the 66 associated countries of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific - mostly former colonies of the United Kingdom and France - means that Europe has a special relationship with the developing countries of black (and brown*) Africa. When the chips are down, this is

* Association agreements
THE SIDE ON WHICH WE SHALL BE THROWING OUR MORAL, POLITICAL
AND ECONOMIC WEIGHT IN THE QUEST FOR PEACEFUL CHANGE IN SOUTH
AFRICA.

IT WOULD BE A GREAT MISTAKE TO EXAGGERATE AT THIS STAGE THE
ABILITY OF OUTSIDE POWERS (EUROPE, UNITED STATES OR EVEN THE
SOVIET UNION) TO ACCELERATE THE TURN OF EVENTS IN SOUTH AFRICA.
NO DOUBT THE RUSSIANS WILL BE WATCHING THE SITUATION CAREFULLY
AND CUBAN TROOPS IN ANGOLA MAY FIND AN OPPORTUNITY IF LAW AND
ORDER BREAKS DOWN IN SOUTH AFRICA TO MAKE AN UNHAPPY SITUATION
50 TIME WORSE.

IF YOU BELIEVE AS I DO THAT IT IS ECONOMIC PROGRESS AND COMMERCIAL
EMANCIPATION OF BLACK PEOPLE WHICH HAS ABOVE ALL CREATED PRESSURE
TO REMOVE APARTHEID THEN IT FOLLOWS LOGICALLY THAT ECONOMIC
SANCTIONS ARE LIKELY TO BE COUNTER PRODUCTIVE. CERTAINLY WE
IN THE UNITED KINGDOM TRIED ECONOMIC SANCTIONS IN RHODESIA AFTER
UDI AND THEY WERE A HOPELESS FAILURE. I BELIEVE THAT OUR
GREATEST POWER IS THE POWER OF PERSUASION.

LET US SAY EVERY DAY AT EVERY LEVEL TO THE SOUTH AFRICAN
AUTHORITIES THAT IT IS IN THEIR INTEREST AS WELL AS THAT OF THE
FREE WORLD GENERALLY TO ANNOUNCE NOW A TIME TABLE FOR THE GRANTING
OF EQUAL POLITICAL RIGHTS TO ALL THEIR CITIZENS AND A PROGRAMME
FOR THE DISMANTLEMENT OF APARTHEID WITHIN, SAY, THREE YEARS.
THIS WOULD BE A GIGANTIC STEP FOR THE SOUTH AFRICANS BUT IT IS
THE ONLY WAY IN WHICH WE CAN ENSURE THE RETURN OF STABILITY IN
Southern Africa. The Soviet interest is to maintain instability in that area as in other strategic areas and apartheid suits their purposes.

In addition, we in the EEC require:

(a) That all South African citizens should feel safe, secure and at ease within their own country with freedom of political activity and expression and freedom to marry between the races. Brazil should be a model.

(b) It is essential that the government should encourage legitimate activity by opposition political parties where appropriate by releasing political prisoners from jail. They should enter negotiations with them about equal rights for all citizens.

(c) The release of Nelson Mandela has now become a matter of acute symbolic importance.

(d) The state of emergency should be ended.

(e) Following the suspension of the pass laws the group areas acts should be repealed.

It has sometimes been said that we British with our substantial investment in South Africa have maintained apartheid. Nothing
can be further from the truth. Many British firms such as Barclays set the pace in giving black employees equal opportunities. Never forget that it was we and not the Afrikaners who won the Boer War. Now we are re-fighting it not with guns but with diplomatic means.