

“Acting as spokesman of the social conscience of mankind”

**The International Labour Organisation and actions against apartheid, 1964-
1994.**

Åmund Bækken Blakar



Master's thesis in Modern International and Transnational History

Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo

Spring 2020

“Acting as spokesman of the social conscience of mankind”¹

The International Labour Organisation and actions against apartheid, 1964-1994.

¹ ILO, *Declaration Concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva (1964) p. 3.

© Åmund Bækken Blakar

2020

“Acting as spokesman of the social conscience of mankind”

The International Labour Organisation and actions against apartheid, 1964-1994.

Åmund Bækken Blakar

<http://www.duo.uio.no>

Acknowledgements

I have fortunately been able to finish my master thesis despite the lockdown of the University. The lockdown affected me most by denying me access to secondary literature I imagine I could have employed in the analysis. There is no guarantee that the literature would have been useful, but it would have been reassuring to have crossed the titles off the list. Luckily, my primary sources were digital and collected well before March 12th. The home office has been functioning, but it has not been as efficient, I dare say, as the reading room would have been. Simultaneously, and significantly, the other students and I were unable to share our experiences, ideas and challenges at the break room. I will be the first to admit that I have missed that. However, when the University gradually reopened in May, efficiency fortunately rose.

I have met a lot of people during my six years at the University, and now can express my gratitude towards them. First, Daniel Maul, my supervisor, for introducing me and the other students to the International Labour Organisation and writing international history from new perspectives. Thank you for your feedback, your book suggestions, encouraging words and discussions in your office, classrooms and Zoom meetings. They have always left me more motivated and with new ideas on how to produce a thesis. Our shared affection for Italian cuisine and culture have also been happy moments of discussion. I would also like to thank the other staff at MITRA for two years of learning and challenging my ways of thinking about history.

I would also like to thank Sunniva Engh, my bachelor thesis supervisor. I learned much from you and your feedback. I also learned about the MITRA programme through you, and you encouraged me to write histories of humanitarian aid, which I still enjoy reading and writing. You are a well of knowledge and you show that you care for the projects and your students.

At the teacher programme, I made many friends. A special thanks go to Herman, Bork and Harald for letting me form a band and play with you. Sjarlatan lives on. Thank you Eli Morken Farstad, “gamle ørn”. I would also like to thank Ingrid Persson Raner for all the fun we have had together at and outside Blindern. Our meetings have been highlights at the University. I wonder how many coffee-breaks we have had, Raner.

I also extend my gratitude to all my co-students at MITRA and the history MA programme. A thank you to Anja Torheim for your solid deliveries of humour and support at the PC room. The people who I have met and worked with at *Fortid* magazine also deserve praise. I would also like

to thank the staff at the Norwegian Institute in Rome, where I spent four months in 2019. My stay was filled with joy, amazing people and a highly rewarding academic milieu. A special thanks to Samuel Andrew Hardy for the fun in Rome and for reading my thesis and correcting my language. A special thanks to Einar and Madeleine for the fun we also had together.

A special thanks go to Ole-Jørgen, Marius and Nils Andreas for your humour, wits and your friendship and for making me forget the master thesis when needed.

My family deserves the biggest thanks of all. My mother has always supported me through the ups and downs at the University. My father, mother, sister, my brother-in-law and my two favourites; Marte and Olav, have always shown me what matters in life. Thank you for being who you are and for your encouraging words through the MITRA programme and the master thesis writing. Thank you for reminding me to look up from books at time to time.

I am lucky enough to live with my girlfriend. Thank you for support and love, Guro. Thank you for your witty humour and your motivation throughout this and preceding semesters. Thank you for dragging me out of the house when I have needed it and thank you for enduring me occupying the kitchen both for work and cooking. Thank you for structuring my days when I have been unable to and for asking me questions that have left me pondering. Thank you for laughing at my silly jokes and thanks for your insightful mind. Kvigstadvegen and new adventures await.

Finally, I would like to thank my father. Sadly, he died as I began the MITRA programme in August 2018. We all miss you sorely every day. Thank you for your inspirational character and for still being my role model. You ignited my interest in history and motivated me to pursue it. Thank you for sharing your endless knowledge of all things, your patience and humour with us. You were the best. This one is for you.

Blindern, June 12, 2020.

Abstract

“Let us hope that this report will be the last in the long series that began in 1964, to monitor the progress of apartheid and to promote action to defeat it.”²

This thesis presents an empirical study of the International Labour Organisation’s anti-apartheid efforts in the period 1964 to 1994. The analysis that follows is based on a set of Special Reports published by the ILO’s Director-Generals, detailing the ILO’s attempts at eradicating apartheid in labour matters. At the same time, the thesis explains what motivations and driving forces were behind the Organisation’s actions. These two parts constitute the thesis’ research question.

In the analysis, chapters are subdivided according to periods in which the Organisation’s efforts were similar, and it is separated from each other by years or events where an identifiable new effort can be discerned. These events or years are called watershed years or events. There are four chapters, thus four periods. Overall, the analysis finds the ILO’s action to both intensify and to diversify over the years and that during the final years of action, when the Pretoria government and opposition were negotiating on the structure of post-apartheid South Africa the ILO used its position to influence this structure.

The thesis also discusses the history and policy of racial discrimination during the 20th century, racial discrimination as a human rights issue, the Cold War and the agency of international organisations. These themes and concepts are employed to contextualize the development of the ILO’s efforts and to describe their background and motivation. The analysis will show that several of the initiatives that led to an escalation of the ILO’s efforts against apartheid came from outside the organisation. The themes and concepts are also used to describe the international terrain the ILO and other actors had to navigate during the period.

The thesis finds numerous activities and initiatives by the ILO meant to assist in the eradication of apartheid in labour matters. As South Africa was not a member, the Organisation needed to align itself with organisations that faced apartheid. The ILO also used its apparatus to encourage increasing action from its tripartite constituency. Concluding, many of the ILO’s activities came as responses to events in South Africa or as initiatives from the UN system.

² ILO, *Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 2. This quote is from the final Special Report, published in 1994.

Table of contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
THEMES, SCOPE AND RESEARCH QUESTION	1
CONCEPTUALISING RESEARCH QUESTION AND TERMS	4
PERIODIZATION AND THESIS DEMARCATIONS	7
HISTORIOGRAPHICAL STATE OF RESEARCH	9
THE EMERGENCE OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AS A HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUE	12
PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIAL, METHODOLOGY AND THEORY	14
THE HISTORY OF APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA AND THEIR EXIT FROM THE ILO	18
THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	21
CHAPTER 2: THE ILO AND ANTI-APARTHEID ACTION 1964-1971	23
1964: THE DECLARATION CONCERNING THE POLICY OF <i>APARTHEID</i> OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA AND THE I.L.O. PROGRAMME FOR THE ELIMINATION OF <i>APARTHEID</i> IN LABOUR MATTERS IN THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA	24
THE SPECIAL REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL ON THE APPLICATION ON THE DECLARATION CONCERNING THE POLICY OF “APARTHEID” OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, 1964-1971	25
EARLY ILO ACTION, 1964-1971: WITHIN THE UN LEAGUE	28
CHAPTER 3: THE ILO AND ANTI-APARTHEID ACTION, 1971-1981	32
THE SPECIAL REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL, 1971-1981	33
ILO ACTION AGAINST APARTHEID, 1971-1981: ACTION DEFINED. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, AN UPDATED <i>DECLARATION</i> AND NEW HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVITIES	37
CHAPTER 4: THE ILO AND ANTI-APARTHEID ACTION, 1981-1990	43
THE SPECIAL REPORTS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL, 1981-1990	46
THE ILO’S ANTI-APARTHEID ACTIONS, 1981-1990: NEW HUMAN RIGHTS EFFORTS AND MOBILIZING CONSTITUENTS	50

MONITORING THE ACTIONS OF CONSTITUENTS	52
RESEARCH INTO AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON APARTHEID IN LABOUR AND SOCIAL MATTERS	53
ACTION TO DEFEND HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR STANDARDS	55
IMPLEMENTATION OF TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION PROGRAMMES FOR SOUTH AFRICA	58
THE GROUP OF INDEPENDENT EXPERTS AND SANCTIONS TOWARDS SOUTH AFRICA	59
<u>CHAPTER 5: THE ILO AND ANTI-APARTHEID ACTION, 1991-1994</u>	<u>62</u>
PRELUDE TO CHANGE: THE FINAL SPECIAL REPORTS AND THE FACT-FINDING AND CONCILIATION COMMISSION	64
<u>CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION – “ACTING AS SPOKESMAN OF THE SOCIAL CONSCIENCE OF MANKIND”</u>	<u>69</u>
<u>SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	<u>75</u>

Chapter 1: Introduction

Themes, scope and research question

In January 1964 the South African delegation to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) informed the Director-General, David Morse, that they intended to leave the Organisation, officially doing so two years later. Their presence in the Organisation had since the 1950s been a troubled one, as apartheid, the discriminatory official policy of “apartness” or separate development and racial discrimination of the majority of black South Africans, became official government policy in 1948.³ At the 1963 International Labour Conference (ILC), an annual conference gathering the ILO’s tripartite constituents, apartheid and South Africa’s membership caused so much division and hostility that it outright endangered the Organisation’s existence.⁴ Twenty-six years later, months after he had been released from Robben Island, Nelson Mandela spoke at that year’s ILC, thanking the Organisation for its efforts and commitment in eradicating apartheid: “We must, however, in the first instance express our deepest appreciation to you all for the struggle you have waged over the years for the release of all South African political prisoners.”⁵ Come 1994, when South Africa’s new African National Congress (ANC) government, led by Mandela, re-joined ILO and ended apartheid formally, the ILO completed its anti-apartheid campaign, which had begun as South Africa left the Organisation. Fuelled by the members’ anger at apartheid, who had led the campaign against South Africa when it still was a member, the ILO first adopted a *Declaration* concerning apartheid, on how it was incompatible with the ILO’s main principles, conventions and the 1944 Philadelphia Declaration, and urged also South Africa to renounce apartheid. The ILO also unanimously approved a *Programme* for the elimination of apartheid in labour matters, defining what parts the government in Pretoria would have to remove of its legislation for it to be compatible to the standards of the ILO.⁶ The 1964 Declaration also requested that the ILO’s Director-General annually publish a Special Report on the development of apartheid in labour matters and on the application of the *Declaration*. These Reports were given the task to include recommendations and measures that should be adopted to bring about the end

³ Rodgers et.al., *The ILO and the Quest for Social Justice*, p. 54.

⁴ See Alcock, *The History of the International Labour Organisation*, pp. 321-334.

⁵ Address by Mr. Nelson Mandela at the 77th International Labour Conference (1990)
[https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/statements-and-speeches/WCMS_215611/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/statements-and-speeches/WCMS_215611/lang-en/index.htm) (accessed June 8, 2020).

⁶ Alcock, *History of the International Labour Organisation*, p. 336.

of apartheid in South Africa.⁷ It did not specify if it was the ILO that should adopt such measures, but during the campaign the ILO did adopt several measures and developed many strategies that were intended to end apartheid, and assist those combating it. When the ILO adopted the 1964 Declaration, the Director-General defined the ILO's role when condemning apartheid: "Acting as spokesman of the social conscience of mankind".⁸ With this, the ILO's Office and Governing Body clearly expressed its condemnation of apartheid and embarked on its anti-apartheid campaign, which would develop in the coming thirty years.⁹ By the 1980s, the ILO had for example established committees solely tasked with reviewing and recommending further action by the Governing Body and the ILO actively encouraged its constituents to act against apartheid, through sanctions etc.¹⁰

This master thesis will focus on the campaign by the ILO, and by doing so, answering the thesis' research question: *what did the International Labour Organisation do to eradicate apartheid in labour matters in South Africa between 1964 and 1994 and what were the motivations and driving forces behind its actions?* To answer this question, I employ the thirty Special Reports mentioned above, to distinguish the ILO's actions and to identify points in time, or watershed years, where the actions of the Organisation changed and took new directions, and what lay behind these changes. I also employ the 1964 Declaration on Apartheid and the Programme for the Elimination of Apartheid in Labour Matters in the Republic of South Africa are also discussed within the thesis as they would contain the edited choices of action by the Organisation.

The dedication to act against violations of labour rights and human rights was not born in the ILO in 1964, but by the 1960s the Office and Governing Body argued that apartheid was no longer a national concern.¹¹ The ILO had since its inception in 1919 established a firm resolution to secure equal rights for workers everywhere, such as a standard working week, protection of trade union rights etc., albeit "everywhere" grew considerably after the Second World War.¹² From 1944 and the ILO's second foundation, the Organisation turned further towards the protection of

⁷ ILO, *Declaration Concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva (1964), p. 4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁹ The International Labour Organisation's secretariat and executive organ, respectively.

¹⁰ ILO, *30th Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in the of South Africa*, pp. 10.

¹¹ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 210; Rodgers et.al., *The ILO and the Quest for Social Justice*, pp. 54-55.

¹² Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, pp. 55; 73-79.

workers' rights, as new fundamental principles were chiselled into the 1944 Declaration of Philadelphia. These principles alluded to *human* rights, which was central to the newly founded United Nations (UN), of which the ILO became a specialised agency. The new ILO conventions of the 1950s and 60s that dealt with fundamental rights of workers were discussed in human rights terms – and the conventions on trade unions and collective bargaining, freedom from forced labour, freedom from discrimination and equal remuneration created the fundamental goals the ILO encouraged its members to uphold.¹³

Even if the ILO has a long history of upholding labour rights, the case of apartheid is unique in the Organisation's history. Firstly, South Africa was not a member of the ILO from 1964 to 1994. It was not unique for member states to leave or threaten to leave the ILO, however, the ILO's pressure and actions aimed at apartheid, as we shall see, were still retained, and intensified during the period.¹⁴ Secondly, both allies and firm opponents of South Africa and apartheid met in the Organisation and in its different constellations, where at times their voices on apartheid collided.

Writing a history of the ILO comes with many opportunities and some challenges. The ILO as an international organisation is unique because of its tripart membership base; representatives from government are represented alongside states' biggest employers' and workers' organisations. Non-government organisations (NGO) are thus included in the organisation's structure as all three delegations share full voting rights. Another challenge is the fact that during the Organisation's 100-year long history, the definition of worker and work has undergone massive changes. Therefore, the definition of who the Organisation is meant to represent and work for has adjusted. Nevertheless, the Organisation is known best for its role as a standard setter within international labour, its technical assistance operations and as a forum where its expertise within labour is shared.¹⁵ The ILO's role in this final regard can also be viewed as an arena where international coalitions on behalf of workers are forged and as a protector of workers' rights everywhere against repressive governments.¹⁶

¹³ See ILO, *Declaration of Philadelphia*, Philadelphia (1944); Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, pp. 128-131; 188-213.

¹⁴ After 1945, seven states have left the ILO. The United States delegation did so in the late 1970s e.g. Godderis, "The Limits of Lobbying: ILO and Solidarnosc", pp. 440-441; 437; Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 years of global social policy*, pp. 219-223.

¹⁵ Van Daele, "Writing ILO Histories", p. 13.

¹⁶ García, "Conclusion", p. 475.

The ILO's rich history of creating and upholding conventions and its role as a forum for international cooperation makes it a worthwhile object of study. In the 1970s and 1980s, the ILO was involved in among other countries Spain, Poland, Argentina and Chile on behalf of trade unions, as a result of complaints submitted about their governments. In these cases, the ILO established committees that visited the countries and reported on freedom of association and labour relations, resulting in the ILO putting pressure on the governments.¹⁷ Another reason to choose this research question is that even though the ILO's anti-apartheid campaign has been treated in publications on the Organisation's history, it has never been the subject of a historical study – at least outside of the ILO's halls. The story has been touched upon in wider contexts in works on the ILO's history, but other than this, the ILO's anti-apartheid campaign will for the first time here be the subject of inquiry.

Conceptualising research question and terms

Key primary sources for this thesis are the Special Reports produced by the Director-General of the ILO, and the period they cover structures this thesis – 1964 to 1994. The Special Reports not only explained the ILO and other actors' actions, but they also presented how apartheid developed from year to year, within labour relations primarily:

6. Invites the Governing Body to request the Director-General to follow the situation in South Africa in respect of labour matters and to submit every year for consideration by the Conference a special report concerning the application of the present Declaration including any necessary recommendations concerning any measures which should be adopted with a view to bringing to an end the policy of *apartheid* in the Republic of South Africa.¹⁸

I will present and group the ILO's actions against apartheid, and further, categorise them based on traceable trends or developments of action. These developments then come together in separate chapters and periods. When a particularly noticeable change is in place this constitutes what I term a *watershed year*, in which ILO action changed direction or intensified in a way, which set a trend for the following period of ILO action. Overall, these periods translate into thesis chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5, with a running presentation and analysis of ILO action within the periods. The final chapter,

¹⁷ Rodgers et.al., *The ILO and the Quest for Social Justice*, pp. 50-51.

¹⁸ ILO, *Declaration Concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva (1964), p. 4.

6, summarises and draws conclusions from the previous chapters' findings and answers the research question.

An overarching term and issue in this thesis is *racial discrimination* and the international struggle against it. Racial discrimination became an issue in the UN and a human rights issue after the Second World War and the Holocaust. In its wake, South Africa and apartheid were one of the most heavily criticized exponents of racial discrimination in the latter half of the previous century.¹⁹ Paul Gordon Lauren places racial discrimination in the forefront in the telling of the 20th century, as it has been at the root and centre of several issues affecting the century's history, such as the rise and fall of European colonial empires, the World Wars and other conflicts, the "Westernization of the world", the "Final Solution" and other attempts at extermination, and the Cold War e.g. Racial factors have, according to Lauren, also influenced the division between North and South and subsequent shifts in global power structures, unequal distribution of resources and non-white movements in the Global South. Further:

Race also has been at the heart of determined challenges to state sovereignty by the United Nations, intensified global concern for human rights, and passionate attention focused upon apartheid and persistent issues of immigration and indigenous peoples.²⁰

As the ILO faced apartheid, the Organisation emphasized freedom from discrimination, freedom from forced or coerced labour and the right to form trade unions and to engage in collective bargaining as the central tenets of labour rights that South Africa needed to implement to uphold the Organisation's defined main principles.²¹ The ILO also campaigned for the overall removal of apartheid:

to renounce without any further delay its policy of apartheid and, in like manner to repeal all legislative, administrative and other measures which are a violation of the principle of the equality and dignity of man and a direct negation of the rights and freedoms of the peoples of South Africa.²²

The other reasons as to why the ILO aligned themselves so clearly with anti-apartheid campaigners stemmed from its transforming constituency in the 1960s; the decolonized states of

¹⁹ Grawitzky, *The role of the ILO during and ending apartheid*, p. 3; Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 205;

²⁰ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 1-4.

²¹ ILO, *Declaration Concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 3; ILO, *Programme for the elimination of "Apartheid" in labour matters in the Republic of South Africa*, p. 1.

²² ILO, *Declaration Concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 3.

Africa and Asia. Initially, the Governing Body and Director-General, David Morse, wished to remain neutral and apolitical, but apartheid could no longer remain a case only of South Africa's conscience.²³

Overall, apartheid was a case that united states against it, especially states that had achieved independence from European colonial empires in Africa and Asia. These states wished to keep their independence and to stay outside of the Cold War, which accompanied the timeline of apartheid. However, the transition into independence was also marked by the relationship between "developed" and "underdeveloped" states, a relationship defined by those Western countries who defined the steps towards "developed" or development and placed their own standards as the models for the "underdeveloped" or non-industrialised world to follow. International organisations (IO) that were active at the time were also brought into this discussion, as they inherently reflected Western or "developed" states at their time of inception.²⁴ This forced many states that had recently reached independence to take sides during the Cold War. Old colonies that wished to experience economic and technological progress – modernization – but the means to achieve this were possessed by Western states and further popularised by IOs' expression of an inherently Western modernity.²⁵ The ILO and the Governing Body was one such institution as it ventured into development discourse and operations in the 1950s. David Morse, Director-General of the Organisation in 1948 to 1970, even promised the United States that the ILO was fully prepared to be a tool of US modernity and development of the world – a Cold War instrument.²⁶

As decolonisation, development and the Cold War influenced the ILO and other IOs at the time, resistance against apartheid united across ideologies and positions regarding development and Cold War debate. The debate was one in which the old African and Asian colonies used their

²³ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 156.

²⁴ Historians have argued that IOs have served as agents on behalf of Western society and civilization. See Dykmann, Klaas. "Only with the Best Intentions: International Organizations as Global Civilizers," *Comparativ* 23, no. 4/5 (2013): 21–46. See also Mazower, Mark. *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations*. Lawrence Stone Lectures. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2009; Mazower, Mark. *Governing the World: The History of an Idea, 1815 to Present*. New York: Penguin Press, 2012.

²⁵ Dykmann, "Only With the Best Intentions: International Organizations as Global Civilizers", p. 32

²⁶ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 147. See also Maul, Daniel. "'Help Them Move the ILO Way': The International Labor Organization and the Modernization Discourse in the Era of Decolonization and the Cold War." *Diplomatic History* (printed ed.) 33: 2009: 3:S.387-404.

new majority in the International Labour Organisation to secure a victory.²⁷ A brief recapitulation of South Africa's membership in the ILO and its exit is provided below.

The Office and the Governing Body supported their calls and in the 1950s the ILO's composition and focus became truly universal unlike earlier, as the Organisation also turned towards development aid for countries in the Global South.²⁸ Moreover, decolonisation and the dismantlement of colonial empires was in the forefront of African and Asian states' attention and memory as the 1950s and 1960s progressed. International organisations' involvement in this process and in "global governance" is a debated topic among historians. Historians argue that international organisations inherited and continued the defined mission of "civilizing" established by European colonial empires. The ability to define civilization and therefore to compare levels of it rested upon the powers of Europe, who then again transferred this to international organisations. IOs then continued the line, establishing a standard of civilization to be attained and defining which states needed to follow a recipe of "development" in order to reach that level of civilization.²⁹ Nevertheless, as the thesis will show, for long periods, the ILO's attention towards battling apartheid was minimal, and only limited to acting within the larger UN framework.

Periodization and thesis demarcations

The Special Reports of the Director-General were an annual publication at each year's ILC and discussed there between 1965 and 1994. The Special Reports' primary mission was to report on developments within labour and labour relations in South Africa from year to year. This was later expanded as the Declaration was updated in 1981 and 1988 before it was rescinded in 1994. Further, the Reports were to offer new measures and actions to be taken in order to remove apartheid. The 1964 Declaration did not specify if these measures or actions were supposed to be further recommendations to the South African government, or if the measures were to be adopted by the ILO.

²⁷ For a detailed description of the process during which South Africa left the ILO, see Alcock, Antony. *History of the International Labour Organisation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1971, pp. 318-337.

²⁸ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 156. See also Frey, Marc, Sönke Kunkel, and Corinna R. Unger (eds.). *International Organizations and Development, 1945-1990*. Palgrave Macmillan Transnational History Series. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

²⁹ Dykmann, "Only With the Best Intentions: International Organizations as Global Civilizers", pp. 28-30.

The scope of the thesis is 1964 to 1994, when South Africa was not a member of the ILO. How the ILO acted against apartheid when South Africa was a member state is explained below.³⁰ However, within the thesis, the structure follows the distinguishable trends in ILO action in separate periods. The first period and chapter is from 1964 to 1971, the initial period of the ILO's anti-apartheid campaign. Here, the ILO spent time and resources on establishing the bureaucracy and framework needed to monitor apartheid's development. The Organisation also kept an active position within the UN family, and offered its assistance in potential anti-apartheid activities initiated by the UN.³¹ This first period ended in 1971, when, still within the framework of the UN and the International Year for Action against Apartheid, the ILO for the first time reported on individual actions by the ILO in an anti-apartheid context.³² Simultaneously, the Organisation began encouraging action from its constituents and gave concrete examples of methods for action.³³ This trend was accentuated and established as a part of the ILO's work in 1981, when the Declaration concerning Apartheid was updated, which is where chapter 4 begins. By now, the ILO offered technical assistance, primarily to liberation movements in neighbouring countries, but also to South African organisations such as the ANC. The ILO also established the norm of creating a programme of action for the constituents to follow and also to report on whether or not they had acted in line with ILO regulations against apartheid.³⁴ In the period between 1981 and 1990 the ILO also intensified the required actions of constituents, by encouraging them to ratify sanctions against South Africa for example.³⁵ The Declaration was updated again in 1988 and the ILO

³⁰ For other descriptions of ILO and anti-apartheid relations pre-1964 see e.g. Alcock, Anthony. *History of the International Labour Organisation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1971, chapter 15 (pp. 318-337); Maul, Daniel. *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019, pp. 209-210; Maul, Daniel. *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization: The International Labour Organization 1940-70*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2012, pp. 236-245; Rodgers, Gerry & Eddy Lee, Lee Swepston & Jasmin Van Daele. *The ILO and the Quest for Social Justice, 1919-2009*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 2009, pp. 45-53; Rubin, Neville. "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy – The ILO in the campaign against apartheid". Unpublished article: International Institute for Labour Studies. 2009.

³¹ See e.g. ILO, 5th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 21-22.

³² ILO, 8th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 26-27.

³³ ILO, 7th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 26-33.

³⁴ ILO, 17th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 83-96.

³⁵ ILO, 25th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*, p. 145.

increased the support and assistance to both the ANC but also to national trade unions in South Africa.

By 1990 the situation in South Africa had changed considerably, and this is when the final analysis chapter begins. South Africa was at war with several of its neighbouring states, and internal anti-apartheid forces had been consolidated against the government. The government responded to this with force and violence, resulting in a chaotic and violent period. In 1990, Nelson Mandela was released, and the world understood that apartheid would indeed end one day. With the end of the Cold War, the arguments from the Western camp that South Africa fought against communism in the region became irrelevant. In 1992 a Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission (FFCC) on freedom of association published a report on the terms for trade unions in South Africa. This became a yardstick for future South African labour relations and was by then the ILO's overall focus.³⁶ The penultimate chapter and analysis ends with South Africa re-joining the ILO in 1994 after a new constitution had been made and apartheid was revoked.

Historiographical state of research

The ILO as a subject of study, in turn, has resulted in several studies and monographs detailing the ILO's history and its standing, relations and efforts with several topics. Examples on the ILO's concern and efforts within certain subjects and attempts at protecting workers' rights suffering under repressive governments have also been written and its consequences debated. On the ILO and apartheid, however, there is a lack of focused accounts on the ILO's activities. An unpublished article by Neville Rubin is the closest thing to a detailed analysis of the ILO's anti-apartheid campaign from a historical perspective.³⁷ Rubin presents a subdivided periodization of ILO effort based on the ILO's actions and activities. The Special Reports are also mentioned, but they are not treated as the main sources for the narrative. Rubin does, however, present the ILO's action comprehensibly, albeit somewhat short and descriptively.

³⁶ ILO, *30th Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 11.

³⁷ Rubin, Neville. "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy – The ILO in the campaign against apartheid". Unpublished article: International Institute for Labour Studies. 2009.

Two summaries have been published of the ILO and apartheid by the Organisation itself, after a roundtable as part of the ILO Century Project in 2013.³⁸ These summaries discuss the ILO and apartheid, at times unevenly, focusing on internal South African developments as much as ILO effort. In short, they also attach much weight to the late 1980s up until 1994 as the most important and influential period of ILO action. These do however not base as much of their discussions on the Special Reports, but they serve as sound summaries of the activities.

Apartheid and the ILO's campaign against it have been touched upon in other volumes detailing either the ILO's entire history or focused parts of it. The oldest example, and long the only example of a complete history of the ILO, is Antony Alcock's 1971 account.³⁹ Alcock devotes an entire chapter to the ILO and apartheid, focusing on the details from 1960, leading up to South Africa's decision to leave the ILO in 1964. As little to none had transpired in the ILO's anti-apartheid activities by 1971, Alcock leaves the story in 1964.

Rodgers et.al. explore the ILO's social justice operations are investigated and its methods in the cases it was involved.⁴⁰ The book discusses the broader themes within the ILO's social justice conscience individually – human rights, the quality of work, social protection, employment and poverty reduction, decent work and “fair globalization”. On apartheid, the volume offers what is regarded as the most in-depth study of the Organisation's anti-apartheid work⁴¹. The discussion of it is somewhat brief but important in that it compares similar ventures by the ILO. As does Jasmin van Daele et.al. in their collection.⁴² It is also structured thematically and offers in-depth analysis of topics and events with significant ILO involvement, but it only mentions apartheid as

³⁸ ILO History Project: *The role of the ILO during and ending apartheid*. Compiled by: Renee Grawitzky, May 2013. Accessible from: https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS_214906/lang--en/index.htm (accessed 11.05.2020); International Labour Organization Century Project: *From Workplace Rights to Constitutional Rights in South Africa. The role and actions of the tripartite ILO constituency in the challenge to apartheid and the transition to democracy*. Working paper compiled by: Renee Grawitzky, for the ILO Century Project Roundtable: “From Workplace Rights to Constitutional Rights in South Africa”. November 2013. Accessible from: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/--africa/documents/publication/wcms_229509.pdf (accessed 11.05.2020).

³⁹ Alcock, Antony. *History of the International Labour Organisation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1971.

⁴⁰ Rodgers, Gerry, Eddy Lee, Lee Swepston and Jasmin Van Daele. *The ILO and the quest for social justice, 1919-2009*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 2009.

⁴¹ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 210.

⁴² Van Daele, Jasmin, Magaly Rodríguez García, Geert Van Goethem and Marcel van der Linden (eds.) *ILO Histories: Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World During the Twentieth Century*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2010.

one of several examples. Nonetheless, it is an important contribution to understanding how the ILO works and how it has worked.

Daniel Maul's several accounts on the ILO stretches far and wide, both in scope and themes, and includes an overall historical account on the Organisation as well as contributions on the ILO in different topics; decolonisation, development, human rights, technical assistance, and resistance against forced labour. Thereby, Maul's works exemplify the varied missions of the ILO and its rich history.⁴³ On apartheid, the focus is on both 1964 and South Africa's decision to leave, the uniqueness of ILO action against affairs in a state outside its ranks and the concurrence of the ILO's ventures into other repressive states' treatment of trade unions. Maul also makes a point of mentioning South Africa as an example of various events and commitments in ILO history; decolonisation, which altered the composition of the ILO and where apartheid was attacked by decolonizes states; the ILO's commitment and altered approach to end forced labour in the 1930s and 1950s, and; as one of many examples of the ILO's branching out in protecting human rights from the late 1970s.⁴⁴ On the other hand, the discussion on the ILO's campaign against apartheid is limited to the split in 1964 and the end of apartheid in the 1990s in Maul's two monographs. Apartheid is only a side aspect in all of these accounts.

On South Africa's and apartheid's history, many titles offer an overview of the history of it, its antecedents, how institutional apartheid was and the long process that was required to end it.⁴⁵ Historians have also pointed to the connection between apartheid and the Cold War, making the argument that South Africa's anti-communist stance which accompanied and complemented apartheid resulted in the West's protection of apartheid and the Pretoria government, and therefore,

⁴³ Maul, Daniel. "The International Labour Organization and the Struggle against Forced Labour from 1919 to the Present." *Labor History* 48, no. 4 (2007): 477-500; Maul, Daniel. "'Help Them Move the ILO Way': The International Labor Organization and the Modernization Discourse in the Era of Decolonization and the Cold War." *Diplomatic History* (printed ed.) 33: 2009: 3:S.387-404; Maul, Daniel Roger. "The 'Morse Years': The ILO 1948-1970". In *ILO Histories. Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World During the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jasmien Van Daele, Magaly Rodríguez García, Geert Van Goethem and Marcel van der Linden, pp. 365-400. Berlin: Peter Lang 2010; Maul, Daniel Roger. "The International Labour Organization and the Globalization of Human Rights, 1944-1970". In *Human Rights in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann, pp. 301-320. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011; Maul, Daniel. *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization: The International Labour Organization 1940-70*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2012; Maul, Daniel. *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*. Berlin: DeGruyter, 2019.

⁴⁴ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, pp. 225-236.

⁴⁵ Eriksen, Tore Linné. *Sør-Afrikas historie*. Kristiansand: Portal, 2016; Dubow, Saul. *Apartheid, 1948-1994*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014; Welsh, David and J.E. Spence, *Ending Apartheid*. Harlow: Person Education Limited, 2011.

gave apartheid such a long life.⁴⁶ Further, the argument and connection between the Cold War and apartheid is that the Cold War fuelled, prolonged and turned decolonisation processes into proxy wars of the Cold War; conflicts between South Africa and national liberation movements (NLM) and e.g. the ANC in the neighbouring states, as the Soviet Union supported these organisations materially and militarily, causing wars of independence to be shaped by Cold War actors and trends.

Paul Gordon Lauren's presentation of the diplomacy and politics of racial discrimination and racism is a valuable account of the 20th century's history and a central tenet in this thesis and narrative.⁴⁷ Lauren explains the history of racial discrimination during imperialism, decolonisation, the Cold War and internationalism and the transformation of racial discrimination to an international issue led by African and Asian states in particular, and focuses much of his attention on apartheid and its position in the last half of the century.

This thesis uses the relevant arguments collected from the catalogue of ILO history, while at the same time offering a new in-depth perspective on a matter that has evaded discussion by historians. I also include the relevant and necessary context that complements the narrative, to present the most comprehensible understanding of the ILO's changes in anti-apartheid action. At the same time, I will discuss the politics and diplomacy of racial discrimination and apartheid and the international efforts to combat it, as well as the ILO as an international organisation. I first discuss these terms below in terms of the long lines of research on them. Further below, I discuss the primary sources for this thesis and the methodology I employ to craft the narrative from them.

The emergence of racial discrimination as a human rights issue

Historians of human rights debate what the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) meant, what its roots were and when it became a defined political guideline and tool. Arguments have been made that the human rights only became a factor in international politics in the 1970s,

⁴⁶ See Westad, Odd Arne. *The Global Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005; Westad, Odd Arne. *The Cold War. A World History*. New York: Penguin Books, 2017.

⁴⁷ Lauren, Paul Gordon. *Power and Prejudice. The Politics and Diplomacy of Racism and Racial Discrimination*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1996.

as other visions of ideals succumbed and US President Jimmy Carter (1977-1981) made human rights a part of his administration's official foreign policy.⁴⁸

Racial discrimination grew to become a concern of international organisations and emerged as a human rights issue during the 1960s, brought into the light by decolonized states in Africa and Asia.⁴⁹ Racial discrimination, or just discrimination, is the subject of several UN and ILO conventions. In fact, more UN resolutions deal with race than any other topic.⁵⁰ Apartheid and the UDHR were both introduced in 1948, but it took states and actors years to get racial discrimination considered by the Security Council e.g. As a consequence of the dissolution of European empires, new states, determined to use their independence and collected voice in international arenas, gained majorities in these forums and sought to establish an understanding of racial discrimination as both a threat to international peace but also to rid the world of its remnants. One of the very first tries at this came during the 1960s, with the 1965 International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.⁵¹ The Convention was the first product of this determination and it provided a binding treaty for states to promise to end racial discrimination and segregation. Racial discrimination was defined as “(...) any distinction, exclusion, restriction, or preference based on race, color, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition (...) of human rights and fundamental freedom.”⁵² Thereby, the Convention consciously referred to human rights, and by making it binding the hope was to add clout to the UDHR. All signatories pledged to uphold these standards and to use their abilities to remove and combat racial discrimination and apartheid within their borders and support the international struggle against it. The 1965 Convention was one of the initial steps to address the threat of the politics and diplomacy of racial discrimination internationally and was viewed as a culmination of the work that originated with the UDHR. Still, further steps needed to be taken, as the proponents of the 1965 Convention were deeply angered with the continuing existence of examples rejecting the Convention and its ideals, e.g. South Africa and other southern African states led by a white minority government.⁵³

⁴⁸ See Moyn, *The Last Utopia*, p. 4. See also Lauren, Paul Gordon. *The Evolution of International Human Rights: Visions Seen*. 3rd ed. Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights. Philadelphia, Pa: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

⁴⁹ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 248.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 248-250.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 248.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 250.

Simultaneously, the same states had formed a majority of the members of the ILO and circled out South Africa and apartheid a few years before as highly incompatible with the ILO's principles. Apartheid was, again and again, circled out as a threat to international peace and opponents against within both the UN and the ILO gathered at conferences, ratified conventions against it and declared decades and years to combat racial discrimination and apartheid.⁵⁴ These states and delegations quickly became acutely aware of the support, implicit and direct, South Africa received from the US, Israel and its neighbours. The role of the US in both the anti-apartheid struggles and the overall human rights discussion has been one of where the US has talked the talk but refused to walk the walk.⁵⁵

Racial discrimination as a violation of human rights was established by the voices of those suffering under it during European colonial empires and after its dismantlement. Whereas anti-colonialism in itself was not a human rights movement, racial discrimination was still upheld by either colonial states or states with colonial pasts in southern Africa, and South Africa became the clearest example of it.⁵⁶ Their existence and especially South Africa's apartheid system was the source of almost half a century worth of criticism and condemnation. As its neighbours struggled for independence, South Africa either challenged the new states militarily or outright occupied it, as in the case of Namibia.⁵⁷ Thus, racial discrimination and apartheid became synonyms.

Primary source material, methodology and theory

As aforementioned, the thirty Special Reports of the ILO's Director-General on the application of the Declaration on Apartheid, later action against apartheid, and finally the review of the Declaration, serve as the thesis' primary source material. They are all collected from the ILO's digital libraries.⁵⁸ The 1964 Declaration concerning apartheid requested the annual Reports by the Director-General and the Special Reports were presented at each year's ILO. The information they

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 273.

⁵⁵ On numerous occasions the US chose not to condemn South Africa in the Security Council or to participate at World Conferences to Combat Racism. As will be shown, the refusal to condemn apartheid worked as a confidence boost to the Pretoria government. However, US diplomats to the UN did at times point out the double standards of criticising racial discrimination in one country yet refusing to acknowledge its existence in others. For more see Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 295-301.

⁵⁶ Moyn, *The Last Utopia*, pp. 84-119.

⁵⁷ Namibia was occupied until 1990 and figured quite heavily in the ILO's support of anti-apartheid forces. This will be analysed below.

⁵⁸ See <https://www.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/P/09832/> (accessed 11.05.2020).

presented was gathered from e.g. the UN and its agencies, the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), anti-apartheid movements and the World Health Organisation (WHO).⁵⁹ The Reports display a progressively more engaged attitude of the ILO's Governing Body and Office, as especially the chapter detailing the 1980s (chapter 4) will show.

The methodology used in the analysis of the efforts and actions presented by the Reports is *qualitative* in that it seeks to create a narrative from a set of written documents.⁶⁰ These Reports serve as the base for the *empirical* study of ILO action as it is presented in the Reports. They are close read to; a) establish ILO actions to eradicate apartheid; b) find distinguishable traits in ILO action; and c) establish when the ILO's actions changed and what caused it to. As mentioned above, the actions that stand out are defined as watershed years, which result in a tangible change in the ILO's anti-apartheid action.

As this is a qualitative study based on written sources, a second issue arises: *language*. Discourse analysis is the method of isolating and discussing language in source and is a central method to history. Being critical towards a source's content, creator and context is a defining trait of historianship.⁶¹ The language employed by the ILO when reporting on member states' success in implementing its conventions and standards, is highly diplomatic and understated, as Virginia A. Leary provides examples of.⁶²

The Committee of Experts [ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, made up of twenty members, which examines reports on member states' compliance with ILO Conventions] does not 'condemn' States for 'violations' of human rights. (...) The Committee may state in its report that it 'hopes' or 'trusts' that 'measures will be taken to ensure application of the Convention'.⁶³

Furthermore, the Committee would express that it would be "glad" or "grateful" if the State in question could offer more information on the matter and continued deficient implementation of Conventions are noted "with regret" or "concern", which would mean severe criticism. Were the situation to improve, the Committee would acknowledge this "with interest" or "with

⁵⁹ See e.g. ILO, 24th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 1-2.

⁶⁰ Kjeldstadli, *Fortiden er ikke hva den en gang var*, p. 183.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

⁶² Leary, Virginia A. "Lessons from the Experience of the International Labour Organisation". In *The United Nations and Human Rights. A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Philip Alston, pp. 580-619. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 598.

satisfaction”.⁶⁴ Immediately, the case of apartheid is however different and allowed for much more direct and confrontational terms from the ILO. Seeing as South Africa left the Organisation in 1964, 1966 officially, the ILO could step away from the tone of diplomacy:

Whereas the International Labour Conference, by a resolution 29 June 1961, condemned the racial policies of the Government of the South Africa and called upon the Republic of South Africa to withdraw International Labour Organisation until such time as the Government Republic abandons apartheid (...)⁶⁵

This is one example of many. The point is, however, to emphasize that language carries meaning and that how the Special Reports uses language to convey and carry meaning, is relevant in such a material-driven study. I will therefore use examples from the source material to shed light on how the ILO’s attitudes towards apartheid progressed. In the analysis chapters below, I will employ discourse analysis pragmatically. By this I mean that I will be employing discourse analysis in the analysis parts below, but it will not occupy the main part of the analysis, it will serve more to highlight and amplify the ILO’s overall understanding of its position to act against apartheid.

International organisations as actors and their relative influence is a subject of debate among both political scientists and historians is how IOs gain and apply power.⁶⁶ Leary points to the ILO’s capability to supervise its constituents’ ability of upholding the conventions they ratify as members as both highly effective and a successful aspect of the ILO’s work in implementing human rights.⁶⁷ Annually, the constituency reports on its ratification of international labour standards, as the ILO system also encourage cross-examination of the same efforts by the rest of the tripartite membership. The ILO also has a well-established tradition of complaint procedures

⁶⁴ Leary, “Lessons”, p. 598.

⁶⁵ ILO, *Declaration Concerning the Policy of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 2.

⁶⁶ Archer, *International Organizations*, pp. 135-159; Hovi and Underdal, *Internasjonalt Samarbeid og Internasjonal Organisasjon*, pp. 38-40. See also Frey, Marc, Sönke Kunkel, and Corinna R. Unger (eds.). *International Organizations and Development, 1945-1990*. Palgrave Macmillan Transnational History Series. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

⁶⁷ Leary, “Lessons”, pp. 595-612. This system of implementing and monitoring human rights will be further discussed in the thesis and is in Leary’s view a factor the distinguishes the ILO from e.g. the UN, in that has proven to be more efficient and non-politicized. Furthermore, the ILO labour standards are defined by the ILO online, see: <https://www.ilo.org/global/standards/introduction-to-international-labour-standards/lang--en/index.htm> and <https://www.ilo.org/global/standards/introduction-to-international-labour-standards/conventions-and-recommendations/lang--en/index.htm> (both accessed 26.2.2020).

and direct contact between officials from the Office and Governing Body and tripartite representatives.⁶⁸

A second method to wield potential influence for IOs is to sway international public opinion. The most effective way to achieve such goals is to share information, to wield “soft power”, according to Magaly Rodríguez García.⁶⁹ “Soft power” is a term coined by Joseph Nye Jr.⁷⁰ “In this sense, it is also important to set the agenda and attract others in world politics, and not only to force them to change by threatening military force or economic sanctions. This soft power – getting others to want the outcomes you want – co-opts people rather than coerces them.” He continues: “Soft power rests on the ability to shape the preferences of others.”⁷¹ The thesis will show how the ILO grew from this traditional method into a more direct line of action when assisting e.g. trade unions operating within South Africa. However, “soft power” retained its place in the ILO’s toolbox and was expanded on as the ILO during the 1980s began to encourage constituents to ratify sanctions against South Africa. García explains soft power concerning the ILO:

When frontal opposition at home seems unfeasible, workers’ organizations try to build coalitions with labour and human rights transnational networks in order to denounce the labour situation in their countries. The ILO is thus viewed as an important arena where two objectives can be achieved: the protection of workers’ rights against infringement on the part of governments; and the formation of international coalitions to put pressure on authoritarian regimes.⁷²

García’s words on the ILO, assessing the Organisation’s impact on the previous century, exemplify too the attitude and dedication of the ILO when it engaged its resources and those of its constituents against apartheid.

This master thesis is an attempt at writing international history. International history has traditionally been focused on the history of cooperation or interaction between states. Therefore, it focuses on history where states have been established as *actors* on an international scene.⁷³ The central actor is an international organisation, whose constituency is largely made up of state

⁶⁸ Leary, “Lessons”, p. 581.

⁶⁹ García, “Conclusion”, p. 475.

⁷⁰ See Nye, Joseph S. *Bound to Lead. The Changing Nature of American Power*. New York: BasicBooks, 1990; Nye, Joseph S. *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.

⁷¹ Nye, *Soft Power*, p. 5.

⁷² García, “Conclusion”, p. 475.

⁷³ Iriye, *Global Community*, pp. 9-10; Finney, *Palgrave Advances in International History*, pp. 1-4.

members, and therefore it is intergovernmental.⁷⁴ Simultaneously, and a second argument for the thesis' nature as international, is that apartheid was the affair of the Republic of South Africa, and that the Cold War, an influential context in the rest of the thesis was also defined by international actors. The ILO is not transnational, nor is the thesis transnational, nor are transnational actors or movements the area of focus. However, the ILO's support to organisations in states bordering South Africa identified a group of transnational actors operating and co-operating across borders (of which some came to represent states, e.g. the Zimbabwe African National Union – Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) in Zimbabwe, ANC in South Africa and the South West Africa's People's Organisation (SWAPO) in Namibia).

The description and discussion of events below illuminates how the history of apartheid is a central part in other narratives of the past century. Ways to describe or group stretches of history under one central heading is a post-modernist term in history writing called “master narratives” or “grand narratives”. This heading is based on historians' evaluations of what central connections and events in history shaped historical processes and what guided them. At the same time, master narratives can be countered, as historians argue whether or not, in this case, the 20th century was defined by globalisation, the Cold War or decolonisation *inter alia*. Apartheid was surely affected by the Cold War, but apartheid is also a central part of the history of racial discrimination and the history of colonialism. This thesis thus touches upon several of these contradicting narratives, as it also embodies other contradicting narratives of internationalism, globalization and the history of international organisations.⁷⁵

The history of apartheid South Africa and their exit from the ILO

Apartheid means “separateness” or “apartness” in Afrikaans. Apartheid as a political institution was imposed between 1948 and 1994, beginning when the National Party got a majority at the

⁷⁴ Iriye, *Global Community*, pp. 1-2.

⁷⁵ For further definition and critical discussion of master narratives, see e.g. Klein, Kerwin Lee. "In Search of Narrative Mastery: Postmodernism and the People without History." *History and Theory* 34, no. 4 (1995): 275-98. Accessed June 9, 2020. doi:10.2307/2505403. For other examples of master narratives see e.g. Iriye, Akira. *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002; Lauren, Paul Gordon. *Power and Prejudice. The Politics and Diplomacy of Racism and Racial Discrimination*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1996; Mazower, Mark. *Governing the World. The History of an Idea, 1815 to the Present*. New York: Penguin Books, 2012; Westad, Odd Arne. *The Cold War. A World History*. New York: Penguin Books, 2017.

national elections. The National Party held power and maintained power until 1994 when the ANC and Nelson Mandela won the presidency by a landslide.⁷⁶ Introduced as white Afrikaner nationalist policies, the apartheid regime saw the white minority politically and economically dominant, categorizing other population groups. Black, coloured and Indian South Africans were required to carry with them identification papers, and forced to live in designated parts of the country – “homelands”.⁷⁷ The apartheid regime dictated working spaces and jobs for the different population groups, as well as hindering organisations aimed at improving living conditions, e.g. trade unions and liberation movements. At the forefront of the organized anti-apartheid effort was the ANC, where Nelson Mandela long championed the cause, directly and indirectly, after his imprisonment in 1963. The Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) was to be the labour equal from 1985, gathering workers from a number of trade unions, co-operating closely with the ANC when it was unbanned in 1990.⁷⁸

Labour was in many ways at the core of apartheid. Labour and the accessibility to a cheap workforce made the economic progress of South Africa possible. Segregation and relocation of peoples were partially enforced to ensure that workers lived close to the industrial centres. The official policy of the Pretoria government on black workers was that they were only in “White areas” to sell their labour.⁷⁹

Apartheid resulted in conflicts, protests, arrests and deaths of civilians through the years the regime existed. The 1960 Sharpeville Massacre resulted in the deaths of 69 black South African civilians protesting against pass laws, many of whom were shot while fleeing.⁸⁰ Sharpeville would resonate internationally, attracting fierce criticism from several international forums; the UN, e.g., brought South Africa before the Security Council, where the Security Council concluded that apartheid and South Africa was to blame for the massacre and the root of the problem. Sharpeville would inspire revolts in other parts of South Africa, also aimed at the pass laws. These, and Sharpeville in particular, would become a symbol of anti-apartheid struggle but these events would

⁷⁶ Welsh and Spence, *Ending Apartheid*, p. 139.

⁷⁷ Maul, *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization*, p. 236.

⁷⁸ Southhall, *Imperialism or Solidarity?*, p. 21.

⁷⁹ Dubow, *Apartheid, 1948-1994*, p. 62; ILO, *1st Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 9.

⁸⁰ Dubow, *Apartheid, 1948-1994*, pp. 74-75. The pass laws prevented black Africans from living in “White towns”, unless there to assist the “white man”. This in reality meant that black Africans could only enter into these towns to work in allocated sectors of the economy, defined by labour bureaux. Black Africans also needed to procure a valid approval in their identification papers to leave the “homelands” and upon entering White areas.

not gain enough momentum to challenge the Pretoria government.⁸¹ The South African government strengthened apartheid policies after 1960, Sharpeville turned the ANC increasingly militant and the government reacted by imprisoning ANC leaders, such as Nelson Mandela.⁸² Today, Sharpeville is a milestone in South Africa's history. It is also an episode still debated by historians, survivors and politicians alike, thus representing how troubled national narratives and understandings of peoples' own history can be. It was also the breaking point for South Africa's membership in the ILO.⁸³

South Africa announced it would withdraw from the ILO in 1964, effectively leaving in 1966. In 1963 South Africa was barred from all but one forum in the ILO.⁸⁴ Decolonized states from Asia and Africa had altered the composition of the ILO, making it diverse not only in language, but in different economic and political levels too, effectively altering the ILO's working goals and understanding of "development".⁸⁵ Underdeveloped and industrialized states now became definitions and a dichotomy. These states were not alone in voicing the criticism, nor were they the first, but they voiced the criticism stemming from colonial pasts, not solely from human rights. On numerous occasions and in several international arenas, these countries used every opportunity to condemn Pretoria, and the ILO was one of them. At the 1961 ILC, Joseph Johnson, Federal Minister of Labour from the Nigerian government, proposed a resolution urging South Africa to leave the ILO, on the basis that apartheid was incompatible with the principles of the 1944 Declaration of Philadelphia.⁸⁶ The claims were unopposed, but the United Kingdom e.g. and the Office thought it damaging to isolate South Africa, which could potentially harm those the Organisation and Philadelphia Declaration was intended to defend. Cold War considerations also mattered, mostly for Western countries, who saw the South African government as a line of defence against communism in southern Africa. Tensions would continue to rise until the 1963 ILC, where the abovementioned Johnson was set to lead the Conference. Here, apartheid dominated.⁸⁷ The new ILO members wished to use their numbers to achieve a moral victory over

⁸¹ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 307; Welsh and Spence, *Ending Apartheid*, pp. 168-169; 173; Westad, *The Cold War. A World History*, pp. 566-569.

⁸² Best et.al., *International History of the Twentieth Century and Beyond*, pp. 448-449.

⁸³ Dubow, *Apartheid, 1948-1994*, pp. 76-78; Maul, *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization*, pp. 236-245.

⁸⁴ Maul, *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization*, pp. 236-245.

⁸⁵ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p.

⁸⁶ Alcock, *The History of the ILO*, pp. 318-319.

⁸⁷ Alcock, *The History of the ILO*, pp. 318-319; Maul, *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization*, pp. 238-245.

racial discrimination. However, the disagreements regarding South Africa at the Conference did not stem from different attitudes towards apartheid, but whether morality or legislation should define the Organisation's reaction towards South Africa. The African and Asian states wished to expel South Africa, thereby showing that they were relentless in their confrontation against colonialism and racial discrimination. David Morse, Director-General, and the Governing Body wished to exert force against South Africa as a member state, believing this method to be more efficient in the end, as well as in line with the Constitution and ILO legislation.⁸⁸ Apartheid could have been the ILO's undoing, as attitudes on how to deal with South Africa split the ILO down the middle but Morse offered the solution; he moved to bar South Africa from as many ILO forums as possible, intending to expel South Africa on constitutional terms, with assistance from the UN. The expulsion was not possible, but South Africa's limited position within the Organisation caused it to leave.⁸⁹ African and Asian states were satisfied with the results and the ILO stepped out of the 1963 ILC stronger, confident that South Africa's exit was the correct result. Morse argued that the ILO remain apolitical, with apartheid as a distinctive example of the opposite.

The International Labour Organisation and technical assistance

The ILO's technical assistance programme and projects in South and southern Africa became one of the pillars of the Organisation's anti-apartheid activities. Technical assistance, or the technical assistance program (TAP), was birthed after WWII and built upon the experience the ILO had gained during the interwar years. In a systematic approach to development, the ILO, alongside the UN and its agencies, turned towards "underdeveloped nations" to bring their path towards development. The ILO's goal of development was industrialisation, new labour protection, organisation, and vocational training e.g. TAP grew quickly, as did the perspective of the ILO on who was in dire need of technical assistance, as mentioned above – the "underdeveloped nations". Simultaneously, the TAP's international scope was a result of the ILO's change of scope when concerning main tasks after the war, initially hoped to be migration politics in Europe. This was however deemed too political, so, alongside other international agencies, the ILO turned its focus outside of Europe, mainly to Latin-America and Asia, as defined by David Morse, Director

⁸⁸Alcock, *The History of the ILO*, pp.; Maul, *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization*, pp. 238-245.

⁸⁹ Maul, *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization*, p.

General 1948-1970.⁹⁰ During his leadership, the Organisation underwent a tremendous change, becoming universal in its membership, and both witnessing and being a field through which Cold War tensions were played out. According to the ILO, technical assistance is aimed at assisting states in aligning existing legislation and practice with “the obligations under ratified instruments”, i.e. the ILO’s fundamental principles from the Philadelphia Declaration and human rights standards, e.g. conventions on forced labour and freedom of association.⁹¹ Technical assistance is meant to impress the ratified ILO standards onto states, through which the ILO can arrange meetings and seminars led by professionals on labour legislation, to educate and to establish as many standards as possible. The technical assistance given to trade unions and NLMs was largely aimed at educating and training people who were discriminated against and what could be done to realize labour rights in South Africa.⁹²

⁹⁰ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 years of global social policy*, pp. 144-153. For a second explanation of the ILO’s TAP, see Maul, Daniel, *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization: The International Labour Organization, 1940-1970*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, particularly chapter 5: “Principled Development: The beginnings of the technical assistance program”.

⁹¹ <https://www.ilo.org/topics/international-labour-standards> (accessed 31.03.2020); Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, pp. 127-131; 184. Conventions no. 29, 87, 98, and 105, respectively.

⁹² ILO, *30th Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in the of South Africa*, p. 10; Rubin, “From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy”, p. 74.

Chapter 2: The ILO and anti-apartheid action 1964-1971

As decolonisation changed the African continent in the 1950s and 1960s, the Cold War likewise entered the African continent and affected it. States that had achieved independence could not still operate separately from the force of previous empires or contemporary superpowers. Southern Africa, however, would remain the hard-core colonial remnants for decades to come and became the main site for Cold War conflicts on the continent.⁹³ In South Africa, apartheid had become a recognisable political system and ideology during the 1950s but would during the 1960s increasingly strengthen its influence on all parts of life in the Republic.⁹⁴

In this chapter, I begin the thesis' presentation and discussion of the International Labour Organisation's anti-apartheid actions after South Africa left the ILO. The "watershed moments" are points in time where the efforts and actions from the ILO against apartheid changed – e.g., an amendment made to the 1964 Declaration concerning apartheid would show itself in the relevant Reports, or when the ILO's efforts and actions grew, e.g. offering technical assistance to the trade unions or liberation movements of South Africa, or an event in South Africa sparked a response from the ILO. The first seven reports (1965-1971) form the first discussion of ILO action in this chapter. I end the chapter's discussion in 1971 since the 1972 Report is the first to include a description of ILO action against apartheid. 1971 was the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and sparked international and ILO action and the ILO recommended further action from constituents.⁹⁵ These factors indicate a turn in both ILO consciousness on its agency against apartheid, as well as a new phase of actions against apartheid. This phase originated in the UN with the 1971 International Year for Action to Racial Discrimination but eventually expanded. The ILO, by the early 1970s, marked its intentions to participate individually.

⁹³ Westad, *The Global Cold War*, p. 567.

⁹⁴ See *Ibid.*, pp. 3; 207-287.

⁹⁵ ILO, *8th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 26.; ILO, *7th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 26. All Special Reports presented the events and developments of the past year.

1964: The Declaration Concerning the Policy of *Apartheid* of the Republic of South Africa and the I.L.O. Programme for the Elimination of *Apartheid* in Labour Matters in the Republic of South Africa

As South Africa decided to leave the Organisation in 1964, the ILO's attitudes and diplomatic tone towards the Republic drastically changed. The ILO's 1964 *Declaration Concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" in the Republic of South Africa* described in which ways apartheid contradicted the ILO's labour standards and condemned apartheid. The ILO further cemented their anti-apartheid stance within the tradition originating with the 1944 Declaration of Philadelphia and with UN human rights protection.⁹⁶ The 1964 Declaration requested the Director-General to hand in the mentioned annual special reports, and the ILO used the opportunity to implore member states "... to combine their efforts and put into application all appropriate measures to lead the Republic of South Africa to heed the call of humanity and renounce its shameful policy of *apartheid*."⁹⁷ The Declaration was later updated in 1981, 1988, and 1991.⁹⁸

The 1964 Declaration presented three focus areas and what measures Pretoria would be asked to implement to remove apartheid and to achieve equality in South Africa.⁹⁹ The three aspects of apartheid the ILO focused on were "(...) equality of opportunity in respect to admission to employment and training; freedom from forced labour (including practices which involve or may involve an element of coercion to labour); freedom of association and the right to organise".¹⁰⁰ These areas were of fundamental importance to the ILO, who referenced their importance as "(...) fundamentals of freedom of dignity", and central to ILO standards stretching back to the 1944 Philadelphia Declaration. They were the subject to executive examination by ILO bodies and relevant as neighbouring states to South Africa had implemented the same standards.¹⁰¹

Accompanying the Declaration was the *Programme for the Elimination of "Apartheid" in Labour Matters in the Republic of South Africa*. Apartheid was therefore from the beginning of ILO action defined as a fundamental breach of labour rights, and labour rights were further defined

⁹⁶ ILO, *Declaration Concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, Geneva (1964).

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, article 7.

⁹⁸ ILO, *30th Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 9.

⁹⁹ ILO, *Declaration Concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, Geneva (1964).

¹⁰⁰ ILO, *Programme for the elimination of "apartheid" in labour matters in the Republic of South Africa*, Geneva (1964).

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

as human rights. Additionally, apartheid had labour control as a central component, which made the ILO's role particularly relevant. The Programme defined which areas the ILO deemed important for SA to amend and it exemplified parts of the apartheid legislation that dealt with labour matters that should be amended or removed, as well as pointing out the discriminatory aspects of the policy. In other words, the ILO published a comprehensive understanding of apartheid's labour legislation, but the Programme did not offer a set of tools or operations for the ILO, ILC, the Office or Governing Body to affect apartheid. The ILO's Office and Governing Body were first and foremost relying on international public opinion and the efforts of members to achieve change in this matter.

The Special Reports of the Director-General on the application on the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa, 1964-1971¹⁰²

The initial period of this thesis is from 1964 to 1970, based on the Special Reports from 1965 to 1971. The following is discernible in the period: a) the ILO continues its recommendations from the 1964 Declaration to South Africa and monitors developments and; b) the ILO cooperates within the UN system to take action against apartheid.

Other studies of the ILO's anti-apartheid actions also characterize the initial period in similar terms and identify a second period of ILO action as beginning in the early 1970s.¹⁰³ The initial reports requested the government of Pretoria to inform the ILO and its Office about its policy developments within the fields emphasized by the ILO in 1964. Not surprisingly, the South African government did not deliver such information, leaving the ILO to undertake its monitoring of South Africa's apartheid situation. Up until 1994, this would remain the task which the ILO did not alter; if anything, it only grew in size, through different ILO bodies and committees.

The early Reports explained the implementation of new apartheid policies, such as the updated Bantu laws from 1964, which went to further lengths to separate the population;

¹⁰² The complete collection of ILO Special Reports of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa is available at <https://www.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/P/09832/> (last accessed 11/02/2020).

¹⁰³ Rodgers et.al., *The ILO and the Quest for Social Justice*, p. 55; Rubin, “From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy”, pp. 4-6.

The first Special Report showed how, with the adoption of the Bantu Laws Amendment Act and the Bantu Labour Act in 1964, the machinery for controlling and directing the life and labour of Africans in the White economy had been reinforced and streamlined so as to give more complete expression to the basic principle of apartheid that ‘a Black man in a White area is there only to sell his labour’.¹⁰⁴

As mentioned above, the ILO attacked apartheid in its labour component, which the above quote demonstrates was at the policy’s core and lay at the heart of the segregationist policies pursued by the government. On its own, apartheid directly opposed the ILO’s main standards which it sought to introduce to its constituents and workers everywhere.¹⁰⁵ More importantly, the case of South Africa and apartheid quickly became unique in separate ways; apartheid became, during the 1950s, an anachronism internationally (at least on the surface) as old colonial empires disbanded, and the newly formed states in Africa and Asia attacked South Africa for its blatantly racist policies.¹⁰⁶ Its politics and diplomacy of racial discrimination were faced with concrete and challenging recommendations from the ILO’s Office, and the Director-General emphasized how South Africa not only needed to remove apartheid for “human rights” reasons but also for economic reasons, to ensure maximal economic profit involved realizing a much more proficient and effective labour system, not only aimed to benefit white South Africans but to maximize financial outcome.¹⁰⁷ But as long as South Africa remained allied to Western powers, a supplier of raw materials and a bulwark against “African socialism” and communism in southern Africa, apartheid remained a fact and led to further measures to enforce more segregationist policies in South Africa throughout the 1960s.¹⁰⁸

Through its contents and limits, the first Special Reports can be thought of as additions to the 1964 *Declaration*, in that they further explored apartheid’s consequences for labour and workers. By reporting on the growing strength of apartheid, the ILO did not establish any methods

¹⁰⁴ ILO, *2nd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 5.

¹⁰⁵ See e.g. convention no. 87 (on Freedom of association and protection of the right to organise) no. 98 (on Right to organise and collective bargaining), no. 105 (on Abolition of forced labour) and no. 111 (on Discrimination, Employment and Occupation). See all ILO fundamental conventions in: <https://www.ilo.org/global/standards/introduction-to-international-labour-standards/conventions-and-recommendations/lang--en/index.htm> (accessed 15.03.2020).

¹⁰⁶ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p, 183.

¹⁰⁷ ILO, *5th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 27.

¹⁰⁸ Eriksen, *Sør-Afrikas historie*, p. 123; Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 285; 307.

to actively act against it. The initial Special Reports display the role apartheid played within the UN, reflecting the development of racial discrimination as an international issue. They also display the continuing role decolonisation had to play internationally, as the UN, and thereby the ILO, attached much weight to the admittance of new member states to the UN.¹⁰⁹

In 1968 published a report titled “The ILO and Human Rights”, highlighting the 20th anniversary of the UDHR and the ILO’s cooperation with the UN and its role as a human rights agency. The ILO was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize the following year when it also celebrated its 50th anniversary and its 25th since the Declaration of Philadelphia. The Nobel Committee emphasised the achievements of the ILO as a reason for the Peace Prize.¹¹⁰ However, as will be shown below, the 1960s and 1970s were not decades of new victories for the Organisation, as Cold War considerations were, directly and indirectly, figuring in disagreements within in the Organisation and within its constituency, blocking further progress.¹¹¹ In the case of apartheid, attention was limited in the Office and Governing Body, and the Special Reports were adopted without any discussion at ILCs.

The Reports that indicated new policies from the ILO and referenced examples of workers’ and employers’ organisations that had either influenced governments or companies to end trade with South Africa was the 1971 Report.¹¹² However, rather than encouraging similar actions by ILO constituents, based on the example above and the example of other international labour bodies actions’ against apartheid, the ILO included recommendations on what the South African trade and employers’ unions could do to end apartheid. The International Trade Union Conference of 1973 did, however, encourage this, which was one of the first international coalitions that shaped future ILO actions against apartheid. The Trade Union Conference came as a response to strikes in Durban, South Africa, the year before, but also because of the growing realisation that trade union bodies could play a bigger role against apartheid.¹¹³ Other international trade unions bodies, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), the World Confederation of

¹⁰⁹ ILO, *3rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 23.

¹¹⁰ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, pp. 210-211.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² ILO, *7th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 29-31.

¹¹³ ILO, *10th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 47-19.

Labour (WCL) and the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), also had similar practices on informing members on developments.¹¹⁴

The second innovative Report, which conveyed a new era of ILO action against apartheid, came in the 1972 edition. The chapter “The Question of Apartheid in the United Nations” and its subchapter “Action taken by the International Labour Organisation” carried a new tone and realization of potential ILO impacts on apartheid, even though it was coordinated by the UN.¹¹⁵ The chapter represents a watershed moment as it marks the ILO’s changing realization of its role, and Reports from 1981 and onwards would include a chapter on ILO action, which would become more than what the 1972 Report reported. Direct action, however, from the ILO will be further discussed below.

Early ILO Action, 1964-1971: within the UN league

As with previous eras in the ILO’s history, the time immediately after South Africa’s resignation and the ILO’s nascent anti-apartheid campaign required just that; time. Establishing the bureaucratic framework needed to perform the established duties of the 1964 *Declaration* required an initial stage of development.¹¹⁶ Even though South Africa had faced criticism from multiple angles, the 1960s was a period where apartheid could expand unhindered, and larger labour groups opposing apartheid whose membership was made up from black South Africans, i.e. the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU), were exiled. The Trade Union Council of South Africa (TUCSA), which became the largest trade union-representing organisation, had initially opposed apartheid’s job reservation and opened for black unions’ membership, but TUCSA turned to appease white members instead and therefore away from the international trade organisations siding with anti-apartheid unions.¹¹⁷ Therefore, few relevant actors from the trade union circles in South Africa were available for ILO interaction.¹¹⁸

It would, therefore, be the UN that first attempted creating channels for ILO assistance to South Africa. The UN through its Secretary-General, U Thant, initiated an educational and training

¹¹⁴ Southall, *Imperialism or Solidarity?*, pp. 99-109.

¹¹⁵ ILO, *8th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 26-28.

¹¹⁶ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 33.

¹¹⁷ Southall, *Imperialism or Solidarity?*, pp. 107-108.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

programme aimed at assisting victims of apartheid through a range of different practical training, for example, in which the ILO was given a central role, and the ILO expressed great interest in contributing in the programme. The 1964 Report presents the programme like this:

The I.L.O., the support of which the Director-General pledged, would, of course, have to play a major role in the programme, especially as regards the training of a large number of semi-skilled technical personnel and highly skilled workers and foremen, for which the facilities of the Turin centre would provide one of the main means.¹¹⁹

The subsequent reports up until 1971 all dedicated space to the educational and training programme, yet the ILO's involvement only remains potential and similar to the above quote. Later reports also explained how financial challenges affected the efficiency of the programme, as it was dependent on donations from UN member states. The 1969 report explained how the UN asked for information on potential training institutions in Africa from the ILO, i.e. where the UN could place the programme's candidates, which the ILO provided.¹²⁰

The UN also led the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in 1971, after which the ILO for the first time reported on its actions. The ILO, alongside other international organs, used the International Year to consolidate and cooperate on anti-apartheid initiatives. The ILO published and disseminated the Special Reports and other booklets aimed at South Africans and other relevant recipients containing information on apartheid's consequences for labour. The Organisation also emphasized a resolution adopted by the 1971 ILC which called upon constituents to increase actions and to encourage further action to end apartheid. The resolution also warned constituents not to partake in policies resulting in emigration to South Africa as this only consolidated apartheid further.¹²¹ Direct encouragement like this would also become a staple of the ILO's efforts with the updating of the *Declaration* in 1981.

The International Year for Action was the result of the changing composition of the UN's member mass, which had also affected the ILO's composition, and these states' resolution to bring decolonisation, development and racial policies to the international arenas. The trends at play here

¹¹⁹ ILO, *1st Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 20.

¹²⁰ ILO, *5th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 17.

¹²¹ ILO, *8th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 26-28.

had achieved resolutions, treaties and institutional mechanisms in the UN to put their cases on the agenda, as had the African and Asian states that moved to bar South Africa from the ILO in 1964. South Africa did not leave the UN, but represented, as it had in the ILO, the “hard core” states of racial discrimination in Southern Africa, alongside Portugal’s colonies Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau and the government of Southern Rhodesia.¹²² The International Year was for Action was one of the first international campaigns to eradicate racism and racial discrimination everywhere, but voices inside the anti-racist movements in the UN argued that the tools at hand were insufficient in the battle against racial discrimination. The Sub-Commission of Prevention of Discrimination in the UN, therefore, suggested that what was an international year against racial discrimination should become a Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination from 1973.¹²³ Here too, the ILO would be heavily involved as a UN agency, but would later expand its capacities and methods against apartheid.

The 1971 International Year was preceded by UN Conventions aimed at eliminating racial discrimination that came into ratification as binding legal treaties, which at that time, seemed to be a climax of newly decolonized states working together to combat racism and racial discrimination. The victory led to further measures, in which the ILO played a prominent part. However, the ILO’s “climax” in decolonisation matters, so to say, may have been the 1963 ILC and South Africa’s exit. After this, the ILO’s members became convinced of the Governing Body and Director-General’s dislike of racial discrimination, even at the cost of interfering in national policies. In the period after the ILO needed to calibrate its non-relationship with South Africa and, largely, the UN took responsibility in doing so, as South Africa was still a UN member and represented racial discrimination internationally.

Even still, the ILO’s actions were limited and remained rhetorical. At the 1970 ILC, Cameroon’s workers’ delegate and Conference Vice-President, Fogam, reflected on the ILO’s lacking actions against apartheid. Fogam requested more discussion and debate concerning the ILO’s Programme of Action against Apartheid and urged actions from members:

¹²² Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 260-261.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 252.

I therefore, on behalf of all the workers of Africa, renew the urgent and solemn appeal to all governments of ILO member States to respond by deeds and not by words in order to cure this cancer, the apartheid régime [sic.] of South Africa.¹²⁴

As the UN led the anti-apartheid struggle during the 1960s, the ILO had to rely on its relation to it for any possible way to act against apartheid. The discussion below will highlight similar features, where ILO action is either made possible or came about as a result of UN initiatives. However, there is also the fact that the situation did not permit ILO action and effectively meant that the ILO's attention towards apartheid faded somewhat during the 1960s and 70s. The coming decade would eventually cement further actions by the ILO and lead to an update of the 1964 *Declaration*, with updated anti-apartheid methods, and with the establishment of co-operation between the Governing Body and the states that bordered South Africa against apartheid. This would only come, however, after a second Sharpeville.

¹²⁴ ILO, 7th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 27.

Chapter 3: The ILO and anti-apartheid action, 1971-1981

I frame this period based on the points mentioned above which signalled a change in ILO action, ending the chapter in 1981 with the updated *Declaration* of 1981- which took into account new anti-apartheid methods for the ILO. I would argue that the 1981 *Declaration* made the ILO's anti-apartheid action operative, or operational, as both technical assistance to NLMs and trade unions in the southern African regions and actively calling upon the tripartite members to act against apartheid became established ILO methods against apartheid. This also meant that the ILO took on a more active role than the Organisation had previously had in the UN system. This is also reflected in the Special Reports, which in the late 1970s contained chapters detailing the multiplying actions by the ILO to end apartheid, signalling a new standard for the Reports which was founded with the 1981 *Declaration*.

The earthquake that shook South Africa and the rest of the world was the Soweto uprising in 1976, where schoolchildren and parents in Johannesburg protested against segregated and unequal education. When police attempted to disperse the protesters, violence ensued and quickly spread to other parts of the city, resulting in nearly 150 deaths and more than one thousand wounded.¹²⁵ After Soweto, international protests against apartheid reached a new climax and led to several black African states boycotting the 1976 Olympics in Montreal.¹²⁶ Racial violence continued in South Africa however and fuelled both international action and NLMs in the region opposing the Pretoria government. 1978 was declared the International Anti-Apartheid Year, halfway into the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. South Africa became the most criticised state for its policies of racial discrimination which spread to its closest neighbours in the region. In 1974 Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau, Portugal's colonies in Africa and the oldest colonial empire on the continent, all achieved independence as Portugal transitioned from dictatorship to democracy. Southern Rhodesia became Zimbabwe after a long guerrilla war, where South Africa supported the Rhodesian minority government with military forces.¹²⁷ South Africa did, however, retain control over one neighbour – Namibia. Namibia was occupied and ruled by the same apartheid system as in South Africa, and South Africa would retain control of Namibia until 1990 after a series of lengthy conflicts. Namibia would also become part

¹²⁵ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 280-281.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 260-268.

of the focus for the ILO and given space in the Special Reports. Representatives from SWAPO, the Namibian liberation movement and other NLMs, e.g. the ANC and Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) met with ILO officials to coordinate the ILO's technical assistance projects.¹²⁸

The Special Reports of the Director-General, 1971-1981

The first Special Report of the period contained, as mentioned, a subchapter called "Action taken by the International Labour Organisation", the first mention of this so far in the series of Reports. Alongside the Special Reports the ILO also published a general survey completed by the ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, i.e. convention 111, from 1958.¹²⁹ The ILO's contributions in the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination attracted attention to apartheid and racial discrimination as an international issue, focusing on its threat to international peace and how constituents could seek to change the situation.

In 1973 this was brought up by the UN Security Council, as members of the General Assembly adopted the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid made apartheid a crime under international law and called for South Africa's immediate disengagement in Namibia. The only real consequence from this convention for South Africa was that its delegates were barred from General Assembly deliberations, which was unsatisfactory for some member states. These states approached the Security Council, hoping to force South Africa out of the UN because of its government's continuing defiance of human rights and the occupation of Namibia.¹³⁰ South Africa was not expelled however, as France, Britain and the United States vetoed against Pretoria's expulsion. The possibility and discussion of expulsion were unprecedented, as it had been in the ILO a decade earlier. Even though apartheid split the UN too down the middle, the organisation's existence was not at risk and the Western powers demonstrated that they relied on South Africa for its geopolitical position, strategic natural

¹²⁸ ILO, *17th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 82.; Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 7.

¹²⁹ ILO, *8th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 26; Convention 111, Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention.

¹³⁰ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 279.

resources and anti-communist position, acquiescing to its racial discrimination policies.¹³¹ The climax of the 1963 ILC did not repeat itself.

In the 1972 Report, the ILO appealed to end emigration, mainly from their member states to South Africa, “in so far as it tends to consolidate the policy of apartheid”.¹³² This was a second example of the ILO presenting apartheid as a case of international consequences. In 1973, the Report continued on the tone set in 1971, with a chapter titled “Freedom of Association and civil liberties in South Africa”, maintaining focus on the potential impact South Africa’s trade unions could have in South Africa’s situation. Research, presented in the chapter, emphasised the positive impact of trade unions everywhere in securing workers’ rights and on the quality of work.¹³³ 1974 Report’s chapter of this sort was titled “Apartheid – Ten years of ILO concern”, which explained the ILO’s pledge to eradicate apartheid based on its history of commitment to social justice. Once again, the Report emphasised the ILO’s commitment and hoped that the following Reports would receive more attention from delegates than before.¹³⁴ Rubin notes, however, that up until 1976, the year of the Soweto uprising, the Reports were not discussed at all during the ILCs. On the ILO’s side, the inclusion of government delegates from African countries and representatives from African Organisations (OAU, ANC) at the 1975 ILC was the only symbol of the ILO’s changing behaviour before 1977.¹³⁵ If anything, the pressure to establish the ILO’s assistance and arose alongside the aftermath of Soweto, conflicts in the region and a coming request from the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).¹³⁶ This will be further discussed below.

The following reports’ concluding chapters followed the same tone; “A Time for Change” (1975); “The Continuing Challenge to the World Community” (1976); “Towards Increased Practical Action to Eradicate Apartheid” (1977); “The International Anti-Apartheid Year and the ILO” (1978) and “The ILO and Further Action to Eliminate Apartheid in Labour Matters” (1979). The description of the situation in South Africa ran similar in these chapters, as did their urging conclusions; that what the ILO described, and their beginning realisation of direct assistance to

¹³¹ Ibid., p. 279.

¹³² ILO, *8th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 27.

¹³³ ILO, *9th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 39-41.

¹³⁴ Ibid., p. 41.

¹³⁵ Ibid., p. 7.

¹³⁶ Rubin, “From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy”, p. 7.

southern and South African organisation opposing the apartheid regime, would both assist and complement international developments in eradicating apartheid. The beginning of ILO action in the 1960s was to isolate segments of apartheid that blatantly collided with the main principles of ILO conventions and the 1944 Declaration. This turned into a mission to isolate apartheid and South Africa, as the neighbouring states (FLS) achieved independence, increasingly hostile to apartheid and involved in hostilities with South Africa. However, as far as isolation went, South African PM from 1978, P.W. Botha *wanted* isolation from the neighbouring states, both because they opposed apartheid but also because South Africa's internal affairs mattered the most to him.¹³⁷ Botha adhered strictly to apartheid's racial ideology, and *vistung Suid-Afrika's* (fortress South Africa) safety was of utmost importance to him.¹³⁸ An example of wanting isolation and to increase safety was South Africa's involvement in Rhodesia's transformation into Zimbabwe in 1979-1980. By convincing the white minority government to sign the Lancaster House Agreement, Ian Smith effectively stepped down from power, allowing free elections and majority rule. South Africa hoped, however, and, rightfully so, that the would-be prime minister, Robert Mugabe, was more interested in maintaining his power base than cooperating with the Soviet Union, who had supported the struggle for independence.¹³⁹

In effect, all the conflict in Zimbabwe, and especially the ones that ensued in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau, were Cold War proxy wars as the Soviet Union and the US, and therefore South Africa supported and participated on both sides of the conflicts. They were also largely intertwined as PM Botha sought to further destabilise his neighbours' liberation movements and hunted ANC leaders in exile during his premiership.¹⁴⁰

The Reports of the Director-General generally display a growing realization and concern of apartheid's victims, e.g. how female workers in South Africa risked discrimination because of both gender and skin colour.¹⁴¹ The chapters mentioned above also display an increasing dedication to assist *practically* and *directly* the region's national liberation movements (NLM) firstly. The 1977 Report was the second Report to include a separate chapter on ILO action taken: "During the year the Governing Body of the ILO also accepted a recommendation by the Director-

¹³⁷ Westad, *The Cold War. A World History*, p. 566.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 566-567.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 566-567.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 566-567.

¹⁴¹ ILO, *11th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 29-37.

General that measures be taken (...) to develop programmes of direct assistance to the peoples of southern Africa.”¹⁴² This followed ECOSOC’s request that UN agencies establish patterns of assistance to colonial peoples of southern Africa and to organisations recognised by the Organisation of African Unity as fighting for freedom.¹⁴³ The initial were Namibians, and similar arrangements were being planned for Rhodesia. Namibia was included in the Reports, as was the *Declaration* expanded to cover Namibia’s apartheid-like system as well from 1988 formally, but Namibia had been covered regularly since the 1960s. Namibia became ILO member in 1978 but was at the time occupied by South Africa, and the Pretoria government sought to establish a regime similar to apartheid in Namibia.¹⁴⁴ Because of this, SWAPO, Namibia’ NLM, received technical assistance from the ILO. One project was titled “Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled the Liberation War in Namibia”.¹⁴⁵

The mention of assistance in the Special Reports was not entirely new as the ILO had previously been very keen on assisting southern Africans through the UN’s training and education program in the 1960s. This, however, had not happened, and as the 1970s progressed, the ILO began to take on a more individual role. The UN had however requested this initial process of assistance. In the ILO’s anti-apartheid campaign what was new was the realisation of assistance.¹⁴⁶ Technical assistance began in 1977 and was established as ILO practice in 1981, alongside the practice of requesting information in ILO constituents on action or inaction taken against apartheid, based on an updated Programme of action against apartheid.

The 1970s Reports displayed how unstable the region was becoming.¹⁴⁷ The trends visible in the Reports and the innovations that would be established by 1981 came largely as a response to events in the region or from calls from delegates to the ILO from various African countries, as did the first request for direct ILO assistance. The Reports also displayed the ILO’s transition into direct assistance, as well as were the need and notion for it originated. That the ILO established a

¹⁴² ILO, *14th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 45.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 45

¹⁴⁴ ILO, *25th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*, p. 1.; Rubin, “From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy”, pp. 54-55; Westad, *The Cold War. A World History*, pp. 566-569.

¹⁴⁵ Rubin, “From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy”, p. 74.

¹⁴⁶ ILO, *13th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 45.

¹⁴⁷ Westad, *The Cold War. A World History*, p. 567.

system where constituents reported on actions or lack of actions was however an ILO innovation yet in line with ILO procedures overall, and a change from urging states to take action to encourage and requesting them to take certain actions. The ILO possesses and possessed the framework to survey and verify constituents' ratification of conventions which among international organisations is more unique to the ILO than to the UN. This supervisory system allows for an effective response to violations of conventions, which involves states obliging to share annual reports on measures taken to fulfil the demands of conventions.¹⁴⁸ The efficiency of this system has earned the ILO praise and it is by the extension of this that the ILO could request and review annual information on action against apartheid by constituents.¹⁴⁹ Accompanying the *Declaration* were several published criteria, yardsticks so to say, for constituents' actions, which will be further discussed in the next chapter. This became a central part of ILO action against apartheid during the 1980s, as ILO action was continuously stepped up and moved in new directions.

ILO action against apartheid, 1971-1981: action defined. Technical assistance, an updated *Declaration* and new human rights activities

The updated *Declaration's* major innovations were technical assistance and the formalisation of information flow on constituents' actions against apartheid. Up until 1981, the major task of the Special Reports had been to inform the constituents and, increasingly, throughout the 1970s to inform readers outside of the ILO and inside South Africa of apartheid's effects on labour. The Special Reports and other publications were annually emphasised as major contributions to that end.¹⁵⁰ Furthermore, these publications were distributed in as many languages as possible, in turn settling the ILO as a provider and reminder of apartheid's continuing effects on South Africa's (and Namibia's) populations, but also its effects on labour.¹⁵¹ Hoping to arouse action from constituents, this constant reminder and encouragement from the ILO's members was the Organisation's oldest task in fighting apartheid. Each publication came with promises to impress

¹⁴⁸ Leary, "Lessons", pp. 595-596.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 581-582.

¹⁵⁰ ILO, *14th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 26-27.

¹⁵¹ Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 6.

upon the world and the constituents the need to act in every possible way – the special chapters discussed above are examples of this.

The process that led up to the *Declaration* being updated began with a series of conferences and committees established in the wake of the Soweto uprisings and the technical assistance introduced by the Organisation in the late 1970s. In 1980 the ILO hosted both a Tripartite meeting of Members of the Governing Body on Apartheid and a Tripartite Conference Committee on Apartheid. The second event later turned into an International Tripartite Meeting on Apartheid, held in Lusaka, Zambia, May 1981, convened by the ILO Governing Body, which produced the recommendations that were taken into the 1981 *Declaration* later that year.¹⁵² Through updating the *Declaration*, the ILO's attitude became firmly entrenched in one of unequivocal condemnation: “[The Conference] Emphatically reaffirms its condemnation of the degrading, criminal and inhuman racial policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, which policies are a violation of fundamental human rights and thus incompatible with the aims and purposes of the ILO.”¹⁵³

Technical assistance was also established in the *Declaration* and given increasingly larger portions of the Special Reports of the 1980s: “increase the ILO's educational activities and technical assistance to the liberation movements, the Black workers and their independent trade unions in South Africa”¹⁵⁴. The same Report specifies an example of assistance provided to South and southern African victims of apartheid, by a seminar held by the ILO on equality of treatment on women workers the year before, at which the ANC was represented, alongside SWAPO, Namibia's liberation movement.¹⁵⁵

Simultaneously, the ILO participated in several international forums, gathered to both attract attention to apartheid's opposition and to streamline and coordinate organised action against apartheid. International Trade Union Conferences were held in both 1973 and 1976, both convened at each year's ILC. They were led by the workers' group from each year's preceding ILC, who, based on affairs in South Africa initiated both Conferences. At the 1973 Trade Union Conferences, the concluding resolution urged workers everywhere to unite against apartheid and produced a set

¹⁵² Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁵³ ILO, *17th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 35.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 36.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 82.

of methods and declarations to be followed by trade unions. The ILO's long-term programme, ratified in 1971, was also adopted by the Conference.¹⁵⁶ The 1977 International Trade Union Conference concluded with similar remarks and conclusions, while the year's Special Report was discussed and was adopted at the 1978 ILC.¹⁵⁷ In its resolution, the International Trade Union Conference e.g. requested the Governing Body to establish a Conference Committee with the mandate to "examine the Special Report of the Director-General against apartheid and violation by member States of the United Nations and ILO resolutions aimed at total abolition of the system of apartheid".¹⁵⁸ The Conference Committee would become one of the main organs within the ILO tasked with the Organisation's anti-apartheid activities, as it reviewed ongoing actions and recommended new to the Director-General. It was always chaired by a government delegate at the ILC, representing one of the front-line states and remained in function until 1994. One of its initial recommendations was to convene the tripartite conference committee which then again convened an international tripartite meeting on apartheid, which as described above, resulted in the recommendations implemented in the 1981 updated *Declaration*.¹⁵⁹

The NLMs of the region were the initial recipients of technical assistance, as a response to South Africa's policies. They included ANC, SWAPO, the PAC, the Patriotic Front/Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) and the Patriotic Front/Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU-PF).¹⁶⁰ The technical assistance included seminars on labour rights, vocational and technical training and vocational training at the ILO's Turin centre.¹⁶¹ As Namibia was admitted as a member state in 1978 the ILO once again marked their opposition against South Africa's policies and apartheid, and Namibia's tripartite delegation, partially from SWAPO, was secured by assistance from the UN Council for Namibia.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁶ ILO, *8th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 26-28; ILO, *10th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 66.

¹⁵⁷ Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 7.

¹⁵⁸ ILO, *14th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 53.

¹⁵⁹ Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 8. The Conference Committee became a standing Committee tasked with overlooking ILO action against apartheid during the 1980s.

¹⁶⁰ ILO, *15th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 23.

¹⁶¹ ILO, *17th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 81-82.

¹⁶² Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 7.

The ILO also continued to mark its efforts within the Decade for Action and during the International Anti-Apartheid Year in 1978. The publication of material distributed to ILO members and the peoples in and outside southern Africa was continued, and often revised. Each publication included a description of relevant developments in South Africa and urged each reader to contribute to the actions against apartheid.

Technical assistance was not the cure for apartheid, and as far as ILO action against apartheid, it attempted to remedy the symptoms of South Africa's aggressive activities in its neighbouring countries' affair, especially Namibia. As discussed above, whatever potential scope of actor capacity the ILO possessed was limited towards members and non-existent over non-members. The solution was to provide a set of norms for the Organisation's members – requesting updates on the action by the constituents from year to year. Responses were fluctuating each year but became and remained a large part of the ILO's set of actions after 1981.

Overall, the late 1970s and early 1980s represent an eventful period for the Organisation concerning its member states and the work performed within human rights protection. The US left the ILO in 1977-81, and the ILO launched investigations into violations of trade unions' rights under Argentina, Chile, Portugal and Spain's repressive governments. During the 1970s, international politics were influenced by human rights as they became stated parts of countries' foreign policies, most importantly during the Presidentship of Jimmy Carter (1977-1981) as Samuel Moyn explains.¹⁶³ It was during the 1970s, argues Moyn, that human rights surpassed morality and became means as well as an end, and the “last utopia” as other “visions imploded”.¹⁶⁴

In turn, the ILO's experiences with the repressive governments in Southern Europe and America were shaped by the new human rights activism which grew out of the ongoing expansion in global human rights activities. Both in Argentina and Chile, the ILO launched investigations on blatant violations of trade unions' rights and condemned each government in turn for it. The two countries responded differently; Chile and the Pinochet dictatorship, which toppled Salvador Allende in 1973, responded by lifting some of the bans placed on e.g. collective bargaining, but with very limited effects. Argentina's military junta from 1976, chose to claim openness and denied the allegations brought forth by the ILO's representatives visiting Argentina, all the while

¹⁶³ Moyn, *The Last Utopia*, p. 213.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

participating at ILCs with full delegations and continuing the repressive measures against trade unionists without any real repercussions.¹⁶⁵

Even though the ILO has presented its activities in both Chile and Argentina as successful later on, any real effects on the affairs in both countries are difficult to determine.¹⁶⁶ However, they represent a change in human rights thinking and politics during the 1970s, initiated by the Carter administration's tenure, which in turn influenced the ILO. As the ILO possessed a system for monitoring the ratifications of conventions and sought to uphold their international labour standards, the concern for trade unions and freedom of association became guiding in its work in human rights defence. In Argentina and Chile and later on, Poland, the ILO's presence and role as an international forum was perhaps as significant as its visits to both countries and subsequent condemnation of conditions on the ground. Compared to ILO action against apartheid at the time, it seems that the ILO would need to attach more weight to the strategies aimed at apartheid in South Africa, as the discussion between delegates representing different sides was taken outside of the ILO.¹⁶⁷ However, the dedication which brought the ILO face to face with the repressive governments, be it South Africa or Chile, originated in the same work – the 1944 Philadelphia Declaration the fundamental conventions ratified by the ILO in the wake of the UDHR.¹⁶⁸ A difference was the longevity of activities. Argentina returned to democracy already in 1983, where the ILO advised on democratic labour legislation. The ILO did the same for Chile, but not before 2001, and South Africa did not return to the ILO before 1994. As Maul points out, the ILO also relied on attention on human rights cases from the other international voices, but when the ILO retained its criticism and other voices had moved on, the overall international pressure to change receded.¹⁶⁹ The question was if the rest of the world had the attention span comparable to the one the Office and Governing Body acquired on apartheid during the late 1970s. Nonetheless, the next chapter will display that South Africa did quite enough to gain and hold the world's attention.

Another thing that separated the case of South Africa from other ILO ventures is the focus on racial discrimination, which had been an established ILO area of focus since the 1964

¹⁶⁵ Basualdo, "The ILO and the Argentine Dictatorship", p. 411; Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, pp. 225-236.

¹⁶⁶ ILO, *The ILO at a glance*, p. 2; Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 232.

¹⁶⁷ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 289-295.

¹⁶⁸ Maul, "The International Labour Organization and the Globalization of Human Rights, 1944-1970" pp. 309-314

¹⁶⁹ Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 232.

Declaration. In Argentina and Chile, the initial task was human rights protection but the knowledge of labour standards and monitoring rendered ILO action largely within trade unions and freedom of association protection. Even though this turned out to have limited effect, the ILO was unable to provide similar support inside South Africa and opted to support the organisations attacked by South Africa in the front-line states. During the 1980s, the ILO further expanded on actions against apartheid, and the protection of human rights and implementation of international labour standards became stated principles and goals of the ILO's work in the next decade.¹⁷⁰ As decolonised states in the UN pushed for recognition of racial discrimination as human rights violations, hoping to add power to human rights policies in the 1960s, apartheid became, more so than ever, the manifestation of racial discrimination as well as the last remnant of colonialism in Africa during the 1980s.¹⁷¹

¹⁷⁰ ILO, *20th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 81-82

¹⁷¹ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 239-250.

Chapter 4: The ILO and anti-apartheid action, 1981-1990

Apartheid was heavily attacked during the 1980s, from both within and outside South Africa. Everyday apartheid remained a fact was a failure in the eyes of the states and organisations bent on eradicating it. The same forces that had tried to remove South Africa from the ILO, successfully, and the UN, utilised their numbers to convene, under the UN's umbrella, international conferences aimed at cementing international efforts against apartheid, racial discrimination and colonialist remnants.¹⁷² However, these efforts displayed the differences in attitudes among countries, as Western countries had preferred a cautious approach compared to African and Asian countries at the first World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in 1978. At the conference, the US did not participate, to everyone's surprise, in protest at how the same states juxtaposed racial discrimination to Israel's engagements hostilities towards Palestine.¹⁷³ The ILO's Director-General addressed the Conference and expressed the Organisation's concern about racial discrimination and its efforts at combating it and apartheid in particular. The Conference ended with a joint program to combat racial discrimination and several of its principles were aimed at apartheid. The program called for cooperation among states to put pressure on the regime, to deny all economic, military, political and diplomatic assistance that could benefit apartheid, as well as called for sanctions, the prohibition of sending e.g. weapons, loans, oil or anything that would benefit South Africa.¹⁷⁴ Several of these principles made their way into the ILO's anti-apartheid campaign and methods during the 1980s, and the ILO would repeat several of these claims at ILCs, conferences, Tripartite meetings and other meetings related to apartheid.¹⁷⁵ Eventually, the established Conference Committee on Apartheid was remade into a permanent standing committee, tasked with assessing and providing recommendations for further ILO action continuously. Also tasked with similar work was the Group of Independent Experts, established in 1989, to monitor the ILO's actions against apartheid, and to specifically work for the implementation of sanctions against the Pretoria regime by the ILO's constituents. The suggestion to establish the Group of Independent Experts came from the Committee on Apartheid's

¹⁷² Ibid., pp. 268-273.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 269-270.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 273

¹⁷⁵ ILO, *20th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 160-164.

recommendations in preparation for the updating of the *Declaration Concerning Action against Apartheid* in 1988.¹⁷⁶

As the Decade for action came to an end in 1983, a second Decade for action was initiated immediately afterwards, and a second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination convened in Geneva. Once again, the ILO participated heavily but the US, once again, did not.¹⁷⁷ In 1981, Ronald Reagan had become US President and led a much more friendly policy towards Pretoria than his predecessor, Jimmy Carter, had. Prime Minister Botha and the rest of the South African government joyously received the news of Reagan's victory and the new administration's stance on apartheid: "racial dictatorship is not as onerous as Marxist dictatorship".¹⁷⁸ South Africa now was confident in the legitimacy of its policies, feeling US support more strongly than ever, launching raids into Mozambique and Angola, and rejected any discussion of a ceasefire with SWAPO. Both the US and South Africa were subjected to fierce criticism in international forums and whenever the Security Council was e.g. asked to impose sanctions against South Africa, the US vetoed the decision.¹⁷⁹ Ultimately, the US claimed that South Africa could not end its occupation of Namibia as long as Cuban soldiers were stationed in Angola, once again igniting intense Cold War rivalries in the region.¹⁸⁰

On the other hand, the US returned to the ILO in 1981. Around then, the ILO also began actively supporting the trade union Solidarnosc against repressive measures by the Polish government. This support would remain unchanged into the 1990s. The ILO's anti-apartheid action remained within the effort that resulted in the 1978 and 1983 World Conferences to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, but during the 1980s the ILO too initiated own conferences specifically on apartheid, held in one of the front-line states, and maintained the support of NLMs from these states. Inside South Africa, the formation of the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) in 1985 was one of the biggest steps in black trade unions' struggle against apartheid. In 1979, the South African government had allowed trade union formation with some

¹⁷⁶ ILO, *30th Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in the of South Africa*, p. 10; Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", pp. 8-9.

¹⁷⁷ ILO, *20th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 162.

¹⁷⁸ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 284.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 285.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

notable exceptions with the Industrial Reconciliation Amendment Act.¹⁸¹ By then, allowing trade union formation was not enough for black South Africans. Nevertheless, with COSATU came also the realisation that trade unions could pose a major threat against apartheid from within South Africa's borders, and the ILO acknowledged this by giving technical assistance to COSATU's activities and by repeatedly requesting the release of COSATU leaders from imprisonment.¹⁸²

This chapter ends in with the release of Nelson Mandela in 1990, his subsequent visit to the ILC and Namibia's independence the same year. Mandela's release was one of the factors that proved that apartheid could be removed, as was the unbanning of organisations such as the ANC. The ILO acknowledged and welcomed this change and as a consequence adjusted its efforts to assist South Africa into the post-apartheid reality, at the same time retaining pressure in its established strategies against apartheid.¹⁸³ Prime Minister and State President Botha, whose premiership had resulted in massive racial violence and a state of emergency from 1986, was succeeded by Fredrik W. de Klerk in 1989.¹⁸⁴ Botha had attempted to address the violence by claiming reforms to the political system, e.g. offering those of mixed race and Indians in South Africa a tricameral parliament.¹⁸⁵

In 1986 a selection of Commonwealth leaders of e.g. Australia and India, the so-called Eminent Persons Group, visited South Africa and later on published a report to be distributed internationally on the situation in South Africa. The report was published the very same day Botha issued a nation-wide state of emergency and expressed that the situation was dire and that the reforms were far too little, and all too late. They concluded that if no attempts at reforms or conciliation were made, the result would be mayhem.¹⁸⁶ However, with Mandela's release and the rescinding of several apartheid measures by the Pretoria government, 1990 proved that apartheid

¹⁸¹ Eriksen, *Sør-Afrikas historie*, p. 123; Grawitzky, *From Workplace to Constitutional Rights in South Africa*, p. 12.

¹⁸² ILO, *23rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 159; ILO, *27th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 103.

¹⁸³ ILO, *27th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 99.

¹⁸⁴ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 294.

¹⁸⁵ Eriksen, *Sør-Afrikas historie*, pp. 126-128; Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 289-295. Other attempts at reforms were revoking the pass laws and removing the ban on mixed marriages.

¹⁸⁶ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 295

would be removed. 1990 is, therefore, a watershed year not only in the ILO's anti-apartheid campaign but in the history of apartheid.¹⁸⁷

The Special Reports of the Director-General, 1981-1990

The nine Reports in question share the same structure as the previous Reports, but the Reports' description of labour developments grew considerably in length through the years. In the 1982 Report, the relevant chapter was 34 pages, whereas in 1990 it was 75 pages long, demonstrating the accelerating pace of events. A second noticeable change is a chapter on the action by ILO constituents from 1983 onwards. These factors resulted in the Reports becoming substantially longer by the turn of the decade. Not only did the ILO request annual updates on its constituents' recent actions against apartheid, but also the Organisation provided updated questionnaires for responses, and they regularly updated the programme that the constituents were asked to act upon. These programmes with their updates were in line with other international efforts against apartheid and racial discrimination, e.g. calling for states' extensive sanctioning of South Africa.¹⁸⁸

Otherwise, the Reports' parts on ILO action presented the action through what was the four established areas of focus in the period: (a) monitoring action taken, or failure to take action against apartheid, by ILO constituent members; (b) research into and dissemination of information on apartheid in labour and social matters; (c) action to defend human rights and the implementation of international labour standards; and (d) implementation of its technical co-operation programme for the southern African region.¹⁸⁹ This was not explicitly made clear in the chapter describing ILO action for the 1982/1983 Reports, even though they present ILO action largely through the same lenses, but it was a staple of the 1984-1988 Reports. The 1989 Report also evaluates ILO action through the same lens, but much space is dedicated to explaining the process leading up to updating the *Declaration* once more in 1988, and its innovations.¹⁹⁰ Among these were:

¹⁸⁷ ILO, 27th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 3.

¹⁸⁸ ILO, 23rd *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 81; Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 287.

¹⁸⁹ ILO, 20th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 160.

¹⁹⁰ ILO, 25th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*, p. 142-145.

It placed emphasis on the situation in South Africa and Namibia and urged greater action by governments, employers' and workers' organisations and the ILO against the apartheid regime and on behalf of the victims of this evil system. It renamed the Conference Committee on Apartheid as the Conference Committee on Action against Apartheid and the annex to the Declaration as the Programme of Action against Apartheid.¹⁹¹

The first mentioned “innovation” is a continuation as well as an innovation, in that the ILO, once again, emphasized their established yet growing concern regarding apartheid in South Africa, and in that it included Namibia in the *Declaration*'s content. This equated the two countries in the title; *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*. Namibia had been thoroughly covered in previous Reports however not as equal as South Africa, and the partition dedicated to Namibia was always much shorter than South Africa's, even though it also grew somewhat. The 1989 Report anticipated Namibia's independence, and that Namibia could be removed from the *Declaration*; Namibia achieved independence 21 March 1990 and was during the 78th Session of the ILC deleted from the title and from the contents of the *Declaration*.¹⁹²

More telling is the change in title; from *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid* to *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning **Action** against Apartheid in South Africa* in 1989.¹⁹³ The title of the Committee on Apartheid was also changed to the Committee on Action Against Apartheid. The *Declaration* and the ILO's strategies and methods were now, more than ever, occupied with direct action – support and assistance to the victims of apartheid and action to have apartheid removed from South Africa and the region overall.

Compared to the 1981 *Declaration*, the ILO expanded to reach more victims of apartheid through technical assistance, and once again, appealed to the actions of constituents, and the recommendations from the ILO showcase new methods, such as sanctioning South Africa:

In recommendation 4, governments were urged to pay special attention to paragraph II (2) of the new Programme of Action against Apartheid regarding

¹⁹¹ ILO, 25th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*, p. 142.

¹⁹² Dubow, *Apartheid, 1948-1994*, p. 264; ILO, 27th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 1.

¹⁹³ ILO, 25th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*. Geneva (1989). Candidate has marked bold.

the refusal to roll over South African loans and the denial of new loans and credit guarantees.¹⁹⁴

and;

In recommendation 7, governments were called upon to enforce a strict coal embargo and to tighten up the oil embargo. Concerted efforts were also called for in recommendation 8 to thwart the South African Government's attempts to attain self-sufficiency in energy.¹⁹⁵

These efforts were in line with other international processes for sanctioning of the apartheid regime and represent a third period in the Organisation's action against apartheid, in line with Rodgers et al., and Rubin presentations.¹⁹⁶ Another innovation was that the ILO had previously required a period to establish the framework through which to execute the principles and methods established in the previous *Declaration* editions. This was visible in the period which passed when South Africa left the Organisation in 1964/1966 and the early 1970s, when the ILO began exploring more direct ways to, encourage action from not only workers' unions, but also the other constituents. A somewhat comparable, yet shorter, period is visible in the first Reports after the *Declaration* was updated in 1981. After the 1988 *Declaration*, the anti-apartheid activities were already so well-established that the implementation of new operations did not require a preparation period. More importantly, dedicated personnel were spearheading these activities, as the Committee on Action Against Apartheid and the Group of Independent Experts shouldered the Organisation's efforts from the late 1980s onwards.

A second distinguishable factor in the Reports' operative descriptions, is the progressively growing ILO effort to influence and shape ILO constituents' actions against apartheid, as illustrated by the first quote above. Equally, the ILO encouraged multi-national corporations that had dealings with the Pretoria government to end this. However, this affected the Organisation as well, as it was revealed that the Union Bank of Switzerland's (UBS), the ILO's provider of banking services for a long time had extensive dealings with South Africa, e.g. offering loans and selling Krugerrands, South African gold coins. The Special Reports from 1985 and 1986 express the Organisation's concern regarding UBS' relation with South Africa, resulting in the Office

¹⁹⁴ ILO, 25th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*, p. 144.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

¹⁹⁶ Rodgers et al., *The ILO and the Quest for Social Justice*, p. 55; Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 9.

requesting preparations to transfer banking providers.¹⁹⁷ Whether or not the ILO actually changed banks is not described in the Reports, but UBS' relation with South Africa is commented on by the Office and Director-General during the 1990s. By then, the UBS still offered banking services to delegates at ILCs in Geneva:

The ILO Director-General was requested in recommendation 5 (1) to convey once again to the Union Bank of Switzerland (UBS) its concern over the latter's continued support for the South African regime and to find alternative banking facilities in the Palais des Nations for delegates attending the International Labour Conference.¹⁹⁸

The 1990 Special Report's most noticeable aspect on the ILO's action is the establishment of the Group of Independent Experts, which consisted of three labour standard experts, chosen by the Governing Body and Office. They were tasked with monitoring the implementation of sanctions and other actions against apartheid, as a further operationalisation of ILO actions. The Group's initial priorities were "an embargo on the importation of coal from South Africa; effective financial sanctions; and the interruption of airline links with South Africa."¹⁹⁹ The Report also suggested methods of assisting Namibia restructuring into independence. These suggestions were in line with previous assistance provided to Namibia; e.g. workers' education, labour administration and human resource development.²⁰⁰

The 1991 Report explained how "... the year under review was a watershed as regards apartheid."²⁰¹ The Report justified this claim by pointing to Nelson Mandela's release, his appearance at the 1990 ILC, as well as the South African government removing some of the apartheid regime's legal framework.²⁰² Also, the Report presents the ILO overall efforts, and shows that with the 1988 updated *Declaration*, the ILO's methods grew:

Its activities included: monitoring action taken or not taken against apartheid by ILO constituent Members, *after the setting up in 1989 of the Group of*

¹⁹⁷ ILO, 21st *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 185-188.

¹⁹⁸ ILO, 27th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 102.

¹⁹⁹ ILO, 26th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*, p. 145; Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 69.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 127-128,

²⁰¹ ILO, 27th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 3

²⁰² *Ibid.*

*Independent Experts to follow up and monitor the implementation of sanctions and other action against apartheid, with special attention to steps taken to circumvent such measures; technical co-operation projects in the southern African region; research and dissemination of information on current developments in the labour and social fields; and action to protect human rights and the implementation of international labour standards.*²⁰³

The ILO's anti-apartheid actions, 1981-1990: new human rights efforts and mobilizing constituents

As mentioned, the actions of the ILO in this period consisted of four defined principles; a) monitoring constituents' action or inaction against apartheid; b) researching and publishing information on apartheid in labour and social matters; c) action to defend human rights and the implementation of international labour standards, and; d) providing technical assistance to regions and peoples of southern and South Africa. This was the defined four ways which the ILO during the 1980s sought to end apartheid. A later amendment to the ILO's campaign was to encourage the tripartite members to ratify sanctions against South Africa. The states that fought to retain international pressure against apartheid in different forums had suggested extensive sanctions against South Africa since the 1970s.²⁰⁴ Sanctioning became a part of the international pressure against apartheid as the situation in South Africa steadily intensified and more and more protestors died at the hands of the Pretoria government. Prime Minister and State President Botha declared a state of emergency in 1986, after increasing numbers of incidents and casualties of black Africans causing protests outside South African embassies everywhere. However, the South African government responded sternly to domestic protestors and even stepped up their attacks on ANC in bordering countries and tried to establish a new apartheid-friendly administration in Namibia.²⁰⁵ The results were hostilities on several fronts. Even though South Africa cooperated with the US under President Reagan, South Africa was no unchallenged militarily or politically. In 1987, South Africa proved no longer able to dominate the front-line states, as a result of a weapons embargo and the support the Soviet Union had provided the socialist and communist NLMs in the countries.

²⁰³ Ibid., p. 99. Italics added by candidate.

²⁰⁴ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 271.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 294.

The warring resulted in weariness in South Africa, realising the difficulties of continued warfare.²⁰⁶ By then, the Soviet Union, through its leader Mikhail Gorbachev, announced that it would withdraw its support from Angola and that South Africa should end its occupation of Namibia.²⁰⁷ These factors added together resulted in the situation in which the ILO needed to adjust its anti-apartheid efforts during the 1980s. The *Declaration* was updated once again in 1988, and the introduction of a standing Committee on action against apartheid and a Group of Independent Experts, both tasked with the constant review of anti-apartheid efforts and recommendations of new efforts to the ILO's Governing Body and Conference display the existence of a dynamic and dedicated portion of the Organisation's resources aimed against apartheid.²⁰⁸

Also occurring during the late 1980s was the ILO's campaign in support of Solidarnosc in Poland, a trade union counting 10 million members, that was banned by the communist government in 1982. The ILO had declared its support for Solidarnosc in the late 1970s after complaints of trade unions' rights violations – and even visited Poland in 1980. As the situation deteriorated in 1981-82, the ILO received a complaint by the ICFTU, requesting an inquiry by the ILO in Poland. The ILO's report urged that the Polish government release Solidarnosc leaders and to accept an official ILO Fact-Finding and Conciliation Committee, a measure similar to others taken by the ILO with regards to Argentina and Chile previously. This decision did not affect the Polish government, so a second complaint was issued in 1982 by workers delegates to the ILO from Norway and France, which argued that Poland violated Conventions 87 and 98 on the right to organise and collective bargaining.²⁰⁹ In 1984, the Commission of Inquiry established by the ILO for this purpose presented its evidence, contradicting any arguments of Solidarnosc's plans for grabbing power used by the Polish government to ban the union and explained the juridical justification for Solidarnosc's existence.²¹⁰ The report was not accepted by the Polish government.

The international and South African political climate was wrought with instability, as protesters and the Pretoria government were clashing with increasingly violent fashion. In this situation, it seems that the defined methods of the ILO in eradicating apartheid in the 1980s and how they developed were operative and responsive as never before.

²⁰⁶ Eriksen, *Sør-Afrikas historie*, p. 134

²⁰⁷ Eriksen, *Sør-Afrikas historie*, p. 134; Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 307.

²⁰⁸ Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", pp. 8-11.

²⁰⁹ Goddeeris, "The Limits of Lobbying", p. 431-434.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 435-436.

Monitoring the actions of constituents

Paragraph 5 (a) of the updated *Declaration* from 1981 that established the Director-General of the ILO was to request information from governments, workers and employers on their actions against apartheid, based on the *Declaration's* Appendix.²¹¹ Each Report included a summary of the previous years' responders, separated into governments', employers' and workers' actions, and a total number of how many had responded. This number grew and fell somewhat during the years, but the total number of responders never grew above one-third of all constituents asked.²¹² What they did not say is perhaps just as interesting. Those who failed to take such action, i.e. those who did not act against apartheid, or did not respond with any action in line with the ILO Programme, were not included in the Report, nor were those that responded with a copied response from the previous year. Thus, the ILO either a) urged the states to inform of their action, or b) urged them to take action in line with the ILO's plans.

Three different sets of evaluation forms were used to evaluate governments' actions against apartheid in the decade in question: firstly, from 1983 to 1985, the government members were asked to explain their lines of action within the UN; relations with South Africa; investment, trade and economic relations; emigration and tourism; support for neighbouring states; Bantustans, NLM and solidarity actions by trade unions.²¹³ In the 1986-1990 Reports, the Committee on Apartheid presented 16 points which the government were to answer to explain their actions.²¹⁴ The criteria were changed through the years but were from 1988 defined in a Programme of Action against Apartheid. From 1991 an annual questionnaire was distributed, which would last until 1994. Many similar yardsticks were used to measure actions by employers' and worker's organisations, which were asked to put pressure on national governments to implement further

²¹¹ ILO, 19th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 48.

²¹² ILO, 26th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*, p. 143.

²¹³ ILO, 21st *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 66-182

²¹⁴ ILO, 20th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 160; ILO, 22nd *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 156; ILO, 27th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 99.

actions, and put pressure on large companies, to halt any relations with South Africa.²¹⁵ The shifting focus in the surveys displayed the rapidly changing situation in the region and that by allocating resources to monitor these developments more closely, the ILO could transform its efforts accordingly as well as the efforts it asked of its constituents.

Research into and dissemination of information on apartheid in labour and social matters

This mostly took the appearance of the ILO, the Office, the Governing Body, the ILC, the various committees and groups tasked with working with the apartheid cause, analysing the written material produced and disseminated by the ILO on “apartheid in labour and social matters” – i.e. the Special Reports, bulletins on apartheid’s effects on the inhabitants of South Africa.²¹⁶ One example of this was the publication *Apartheid and Labour*, published in 1983, and spread widely to constituents, NGOs and to trade unions within South Africa. The publication was an updated version of the 1977 booklet *The ILO and Apartheid* and included explanations of what apartheid meant to workers in South Africa, and what the ILO proposed needed to be done to remove it.²¹⁷ In 1988 the ILO also completed a documentary titled “Changing this country: the testimony of four South African workers”, which was produced and disseminated with financial support from trade union organisations in Norway and the Netherlands. The documentary explained the situation for trade unionists and unions, and alongside it, the ILO published material similar to that above, intending to spread knowledge of rights, international labour standards and ILO suggestions for a free South Africa.²¹⁸

After the *Declaration* was updated in 1988, the ILO also planned to produce a short documentary which would explain the process leading up the updating of it. The documentary was intended as an add-on to exemplify ILO action both within the UN and in the overall anti-apartheid

²¹⁵ ILO, *20th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 124-127.

²¹⁶ ILO, *22nd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 163.

²¹⁷ ILO, *20th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 162; ILO, *The ILO and Apartheid*. ILO, Geneva, 1977.

²¹⁸ ILO, *25th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*, p. 147.

struggle. However, the documentary was never made.²¹⁹ Through these publications, the ILO hoped to raise awareness both around apartheid and on their efforts as one actor and as a part of the UN system. Besides, the Special Reports were also considered relevant for dissemination, as a second example of both the ILO's actions and their lengthy campaign against apartheid.

In relation with this research, the ILO Committee on Discrimination and the Committee on Action Against Apartheid suggested further measures to be implemented by the ILO's operative anti-apartheid movements, and the convening of international tripartite conferences on apartheid, which were held on multiple occasions in the 1980s, often/always in one of the neighbouring "frontline" states of South Africa.²²⁰ At these conferences the technical assistance given by the ILO to NLMs and trade unions in southern Africa was discussed, to understand where most efficiently to place further technical assistance. This was the case at the International Tripartite Conference on Apartheid in Zambia in 1984.²²¹ What had been a Conference Committee lasted until 1994 and grew out of just Conference meetings. Its discussions and talks with representatives and members of the ILO and the organisations representing victims of apartheid in the region were the bases for their conclusions:

The conclusions, which were then forwarded to the Conference as part of the Committee's report, emphasised that a more explicit formula should be adopted by governments and by employers' and workers' organisations for reporting on the implementation of the Programme of Action annexed to the Declaration.²²²

Moreover, representatives from the liberation movements and trade unions in question also addressed the ILCs during the 1980s – Oliver Tambo, President of the ANC in exile visited in 1986, as did Sam Nujoma, the leader of SWAPO, in 1988, and COSATU representatives visited the Committee on Apartheid.²²³

²¹⁹ ILO, *26th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*, p. 132.

²²⁰ ILO, *25th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa and Namibia*, p. 147.

²²¹ ILO, *21st Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 184.

²²² ILO, *22nd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 157.

²²³ Grawitzky, *From Workplace to Constitutional Rights in South Africa*, p. 12; Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", pp. 9-10.

Action to defend human rights and the implementation of international labour standards

The South African backdrop at the time might have been what led the ILO to acknowledge human rights protection as a vital course in combating apartheid. During the 1980s, military and state crackdowns against apartheid protestors within South Africa grew more intense than ever, and South Africa was in fact at war in Angola and Namibia at the time, prompting the ILO's recognition and cooperation with the various NLMs.²²⁴

When the ILO adopted the *Declaration Concerning Apartheid*, Nelson Mandela was already imprisoned. On his behalf, and that of others, the ILC or the Governing Body requested on numerous occasions that the Director-General contact the South African government and request the freedom of political prisoners, of which many were trade unionists from COSATU and the Council of Unions of South Africa (CUSA).²²⁵ Similarly, the ILO would forward complaints from black trade unionists in South Africa to the UN, as was custom seeing as South Africa was not a member of the ILO. This applied to the complaint on trade unions violations COSATU sent to the ILO in 1988, which was referred to the UN. Finally, in 1991 the ILO's Governing Body was able to act on this complaint and a Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission (FFCC) on freedom of association was sent to South Africa to investigate the reasons for the complaint, and the current situation.²²⁶ The FFCC presented its findings to the Governing Body in May 1992, which will be further discussed in the next chapter.

Even though South Africa was no longer a member of the ILO, the ILO constitution still required the Pretoria government to report on seven Conventions it had ratified as a member state. The government of South Africa did provide information on the implantation of these Conventions, but referred to the "Bantustans", or "homelands", dedicated living areas for the non-white population, as separate than the rest of South Africa, seeing as the South African government

²²⁴ Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", pp. 9-10.

²²⁵ ILO, *19th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 114; ILO, *23rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 159.

²²⁶ Grawitzky, *From Workplace to Constitutional Rights in South Africa*, p. 15; ILO, *Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in the of South Africa*, p. 11. Geneva (1994).

sought to present them as autonomous.²²⁷ The reports from South Africa, therefore, carried little relevance, seeing as the non-white population still needed to leave these areas to work. The ILO therefore further requested more information on the Conventions' application in South Africa, including the Bantustans.²²⁸

The interest in implementing the ILO's international labour standards in South Africa had, since 1964, remained one of the original calls for change in South Africa by the ILO. Through their efforts of technical assistance, the ILO had since the late 1970s, sought to educate e.g. trade unions in their rights as workers, labour standards and legislation, as well as vocational education at their training centres, in hopes of achieving this.²²⁹

The ILO's realisation of human rights protection as a stated goal *and* method for ending apartheid reflects the argument of Moyn in that human rights first came into action as a factor to account in international politics during the late 1970s as the "last utopia". Moyn presents the overall decolonisation struggle as uninspired by human rights after its inception and that self-determination was the argument that drove decolonisation.²³⁰ However, the same forces behind decolonisation and its successors first evoked racial discrimination as a human rights violation during the 1960s, with the adoption of the legally binding International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in 1965.²³¹ Here, for the first time, a definition of racial discrimination was provided and was intended to supplement the UDHR, providing it with some long-wanted clout by the Afro-Asian UN delegates. Racial discrimination was defined as "(...) any distinction, exclusion, restriction, or preference based on race, color, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect on nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, or any other field of public life".²³²

²²⁷ Dubow, *Apartheid, 1948-1994*, pp. 159-169; 295; ILO, *23rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 163; Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 291.

²²⁸ ILO, *27th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 110. The conventions were no. 2, 19, 26, 42, 45, 63 and 89.

²²⁹ ILO, *25th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*, p. 146.

²³⁰ Moyn, *The Last Utopia*, pp. 84-119.

²³¹ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 248.

²³² *Ibid.*

This definition of racial discrimination had been acknowledged as apartheid's relationship with black Africans by the ILO with e.g. the 1964 *Declaration*. As the examples of Argentina, Chile and Poland illustrate, the ILO's protection of human rights in member states turned into a vocalised defence of the respective trade unions and was limited to that. The government in Argentina kept relations with the ILO during the periods of its criticism, and the Organisation allowed delegates to attend the International Labour Conferences despite the numerous claims and critique from the Organisation concerning trade unions' rights and the imprisonment and treatment of labour leaders. Poland, on the other hand, turned away from the ILO and sought to leave the Organisation in 1986, which was extended one year, and by then, Mikhail Gorbachev's *perestroika* and *glasnost* policies, restructuring and openness respectively, had altered the political landscape. When Solidarnosc and Lech Walesa – just as Nelson Mandela did – in 1990 thanked the ILO for its support during the early parts of the 1980s, it did not pay any attention to the relationship between the ILO and Poland in the mid-80s, as the ILO did not want Poland to leave.²³³ The ILO had provided vocal support for the trade unions and their safety in numerous countries, but the concrete influence the Organisation's efforts in South Africa had are not easily visible. However, and once again, the point that South Africa was not a member of the ILO complicated any attempts at direct action or support *within* South Africa. On the other hand, the ILO's efforts were thus all the more unique and in turn exemplify the importance of the Organisation as an institution where attitudes and images of nations or organisations can be presented favourably or negatively and shared internationally and transnationally. This discussion is one that has concerned international organisations for a long time, and it raises the question of what the ILO is intended to be and how it can best work to achieve social justice for example.

The increasing violence, as mentioned above, might have triggered the ILO's dedication to protecting human rights, but the examples of Argentina, Chile and Poland also point to a change in attitude largely correlating with the mentioned examples of Moyn's arguments *and* as a reaction to the Soweto insurgence in 1976.²³⁴ By then, South Africa was soon to be at last state defined by racial discrimination in the region.

²³³ Goddeeris, "The Limits of Lobbying", pp. 438-439.

²³⁴ Moyn, *The Last Utopia*, p. 213.

Implementation of technical co-operation programmes for South Africa

Technical co-operation became one of the main pillars of ILO action against apartheid and was given much space to be presented in the Special Reports in the decade in question. During the period new projects were continually being implemented, and so technical assistance grew. The recipients of assistance were always in the region of southern Africa. Rubin, as mentioned above, explains this as part of the pressure South Africa's neighbouring states were able to put on it, and because it was at war with several of the countries the NLMs represented.²³⁵

Even though the ILO recognised the importance of COSATU and similar organisations in South Africa, the challenge was to find ways to provide them with technical assistance. ILO technical assistance could not be sent into South Africa, but the ILO did support COSATU's efforts, requested that union leaders who were imprisoned be released and supported the strengthening of COSATU through workers' education, trade union training and promotion of non-discrimination in South Africa.²³⁶

Technical assistance also involved in the fields of vocational training and rehabilitation, labour administration, employment planning, rural development, small enterprises development, workers' education and migrant workers.²³⁷ COSATU became one of the primary recipients of assistance, mostly in a similar fashion to the list above, as was the ANC. A list of anti-apartheid related assistance projects, annexed in Rubin's article, demonstrates the breadth of recipients, as well as the dedication to supporting NLMs and to pressuring South Africa from several angles. Some of the projects were Fellowship Programme in Social Security for ANC, PAC & SWAPO; Fellowship Programme for NLMs, Black Workers and their Independent Trade Unions in Southern Africa and Namibia; Assistance to Establish the ANC Vocational Training Centre at Dakawa, Tanzania, and Training and Upgrading of ANC Clerical and Secretarial Staff.²³⁸ The effect of these projects were never discussed, but the 1994 Report does contain a review of ILO action.

The majority of these technical assistance projects were based within the borders of the front-line states, who bonded closer during the 1980s to form the Southern African Development

²³⁵ Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", pp. 9-10.

²³⁶ ILO, *23rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 162.

²³⁷ ILO, *22nd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 163.

²³⁸ Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 74.

Coordination Committee (SADCC). The SADCC worked for closer economic co-operation, another step for the front-line states to try and act against apartheid. The ILO's Office and Governing Body provided trade union leaders from the SADCC with seminars and trade union rights and implemented a technical assistance project titled "Southern African Team for Employment Promotion (SATEP) Activities in relation to Migrant Workers and Reducing Economic Dependence on South Africa in the context of SADCC and SALC [Southern African Labour Commission]".²³⁹ Simultaneously, the ILO retained its co-operation with the SADCC, as government delegates from a front-line state always led the Committee on Apartheid and on two occasions, the ILO and the front-line states and the SADCC convened in an International Tripartite Conference on Apartheid, in 1980 and 1984. Both Tripartite Conferences resulted in recommendations for updated efforts by the ILO's Office and Governing Body against apartheid and was taken up in subsequent updates of the *Declaration Concerning Apartheid*. The secretariat of these Conferences and the Committee on Apartheid were all made up of delegates who were committed to placing available resources at disposal to eradicate apartheid.²⁴⁰

The Group of Independent Experts and sanctions towards South Africa

Sanctions against South Africa became one of the ILO's preferred strategies in the late 1980s. The Committee on Apartheid stated, "that the objective of the tripartite membership of the ILO, and of the ILO itself, was to promote comprehensive sanctions against the South African regime."²⁴¹ The ILO recommended far-reaching sanctions such as boycotts, stopping loans to Pretoria and strikes by workers.²⁴² The ILO reported on sanctions adopted by member states, how they developed from year to year, and how they impacted South Africa's economy etc. In this, the ILO was one of several international instigators.

The Group of Independent Experts was founded in 1989 as a result of the updated *Declaration* in 1988, and sought to monitor and review sanctions aimed at South Africa: "The

²³⁹ ILO, *23rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 157-163; Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 74.

²⁴⁰ Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", pp. 8-10.

²⁴¹ ILO, *23rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 158.

²⁴² ILO, *23rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 158.

Group's mandate was to investigate and evaluate the effects of present sanctions measures; to conduct research and case studies; and to publish its findings three times a year."²⁴³ The Governing Body elected the three members of the Group. In February 1993 the Group was disbanded after the Group had had ten meetings, revised the questionnaire of constituents and published studies of the sanctions and embargoes aimed at South Africa.²⁴⁴ At the meetings held by the Group, they decided recommendations for further economic sanctions, disinvestment campaigns and strikes by each ILO constituent. In its work, the Group combined the monitoring of constituency and South Africa and worked to streamline the actions and sanctioning of all ILO constituents.

Trade embargoes and were adopted by the US in 1986, as Congress overrode President Reagan's veto. Reagan once again argued that gradual change in South Africa was key, but the combined domestic pressure from trade unions, churches, the congressional Black Caucus and figures in both the Republican and Democratic parties advocated that the US adopted the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act.²⁴⁵ The implicit and direct support of Reagan had been consequential in South Africa's activities in the 1980s but the Act, the changing nature in USSR's engagements in southern Africa and the economic stress South Africa experienced in the period all influenced the course of apartheid and its coming demise.

Not everyone agreed with sanctioning South Africa, and there were also ongoing debates regarding the efficacy of sanctions. Others voiced a more cautious approach, and long refused to acknowledge sanctions against Pretoria.²⁴⁶ Black South Africans argued that economic sanctions only worsened the economic situation. The effect sanctions had was also debated, but the response from the Pretoria government reaffirmed its stance that it would not share its power. On sanctions, the Group of Independent Experts expressed that:

(...) financial sanctions had proved most effective in curbing the buoyancy and growth of the South African economy. It considered that the effectiveness of financial sanctions had been reduced because of the failure of all members of the international community to implement them and that such actions would be more readily detected if a comprehensive database on inward and outward financial flows in South Africa were developed.²⁴⁷

²⁴³ ILO, *30th Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in the of South Africa*, pp. 10-11.

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

²⁴⁵ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 304-305.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 296-297.

²⁴⁷ ILO, *30th Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in the of South Africa*, pp. 10-11.

1990 was as mentioned a watershed year in apartheid, as the world and South Africa understood that change was coming. In the context discussed in this chapter, the ILO was one of several actors and attempted to fine-tune its campaign against apartheid as much as possible. The major ways the ILO attempted to exert influence was to encourage direct action from its constituents and to retain and expand its technical assistance to NLMs and the ANC. The ILO also functioned as an important forum or stage for representatives of the different organisations, SWAPO, COSATU and ANC, to voice their hopes and identify issues in South Africa and how the world could change. When Nelson Mandela appeared at the 1990 ILC, just months after his release, he thanked the ILO for its years of support. He also emphasised that there was still work to be done.²⁴⁸ During the 1990s the ILO needed to navigate a new situation in South Africa, as new opportunities for influence opened up and as the Cold War reached an end.

²⁴⁸ Garcia, "Conclusion", p. 477; Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 307-310; Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 11.

Chapter 5: The ILO and anti-apartheid action, 1991-1994

“The last mile”, as Nelson Mandela put it, of ILO anti-apartheid action climaxed with South Africa re-joining the Organisation in 1994. From 1991 to 1994, the government in Pretoria relaxed several policies and dismantled apartheid, as negotiations were ongoing for a new constitution for South Africa. The economic and social effects were felt in the coming decades and apartheid’s consequences and deep running framework affected and still affects South Africa’s population.²⁴⁹

The 1990s was a new world – the Soviet Union dissolved in 1991, the Eastern bloc countries removed communist governments and the US became the sole superpower in the world. As a consequence of this, South Africa’s arguments of acting as a defence against communism in the region no longer carried any weight. Since the beginning of apartheid, Western powers had acquiesced to the existence of South Africa’s racial discrimination policies, and even supported the regime, albeit somewhat under disguise.²⁵⁰ As other states in the region gradually achieved independence, South Africa’s policies became an advocate for status quo in a region where the Western powers feared communism would blossom, and where the Soviet Union sought to attack the last representative of Western colonialism.²⁵¹

What finally ended apartheid was not the end of the Cold War alone – that was one of several factors. These factors were both domestic and international, and the growing strength of anti-apartheid protesters and their demands, combined with economic recession and the failed attempts at reforms also mattered greatly. In 1990, major organisations such as the ANC, the South African Communist Party (SACP) and the PAC were unbanned, and alongside the release of Nelson Mandela, this established who would lead the negotiations from the black Africans’ side.²⁵² COSATU allied itself with the ANC during the negotiations, as its previous association had been with the United Democratic Front (UDF) inside South Africa from the late 1980s. The UDF was an organisation similar to the ANC in that it united members on the basis of opposition to apartheid – which is what the ANC quickly became after 1990. By then, UDF and COSATU were both strong organisations because they initiated mass mobilisation within South Africa during the 1980s

²⁴⁹ Eriksen, *Sør-Afrikas historie*, p. 169.

²⁵⁰ Dubow, *Apartheid, 1948-1994*, p. 222-223.

²⁵¹ Welsh and Spence, *Ending Apartheid*, p. 161.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 117-119.

and used their strength and numbers against the apartheid government and united people across skin colour.²⁵³

The ILO had by 1990 acknowledged the apparent ongoing changes in South Africa but remained true to its *Declaration* and still encouraged continued action of its constituents until the negotiations in South Africa between the ANC on one side and the National Party on the other resulted in free elections and the dismantling of apartheid.²⁵⁴ Technical assistance was a part of this, as was the ILO's striving to have South Africa ratify international labour standards in the post-apartheid state.²⁵⁵ The FFCC's report on trade union violations was presented to the Governing Body in 1992 and concluded that South African law did not satisfy international labour standards, e.g. rights to strike and collective bargaining.²⁵⁶ The Report was sent to the ECOSOC, which was customary, seeing as South Africa had remained a member of the UN in the period. ECOSOC requested South Africa to take measures to meet the FFCC report's demands, and it became a yardstick concerning labour rights and legislation for the post-apartheid South African state as well.²⁵⁷ In November 1993, the Governing Body of the ILO voted to suspend the *Declaration Concerning Action against Apartheid*, allowing the FFCC report to guide the future of relations between South Africa and the ILO.²⁵⁸

The Committee on Action against Apartheid received representatives from COSATU, ANC, the Pan-Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC) and the National Council of Trade Unions (NACTU), COSATU's sibling. These representatives gave testimonies on ILO activities' effects and discussed the Organisation's further actions. These representatives found attentive voices and a collective wish to see the rapid dismantling of apartheid. Furthermore, the organisations also lobbied to assure themselves and their members that they could rely on future support from institutions such as the ILO to guide future legislation and practice in the right direction.

In *Ending Apartheid*, David Walsh and J.E. Spence argue that the international actors, states and IOs, all had valuable parts to play during the negotiations between 1990 and 1994, most

²⁵³ Ibid., pp. 103-105.

²⁵⁴ ILO, 28th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. III; ILO, 30th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in the of South Africa*, pp. 1-2.

²⁵⁵ Grawitzky, *From Workplace to Constitutional Rights in South Africa*, p. 15.

²⁵⁶ Grawitzky, *From Workplace to Constitutional Rights in South Africa*, p. 15.

²⁵⁷ Welsh and Spence, *Ending Apartheid*, p. 191.

²⁵⁸ ILO, 30th *Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in the of South Africa*, p. 3.

importantly in keeping negotiations running without breakdowns between the ANC and the National Party.²⁵⁹ The ILO's place in this equation was largely due to the FFCC's visit and subsequent report, which provided the ILO's role in the transition to post-apartheid South Africa and. It also represented an area where the ILO had the most experience and where it could draw on these experiences efficiently: protection of trade unions' rights. However, the report became a recommendation and guide for the total remodelling of industrial relations in South Africa. After South Africa re-joined the ILO, the Office and Governing Body continued to request evidence on its progress in achieving the FFCC's goals.²⁶⁰

Prelude to change: the final Special Reports and the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission

The ILO listened to Mandela's appeal and did not relax any of the strategies or methods implemented to end apartheid after his 1990 release and visit. This was reflected in the contents of the Special Reports, as the ILO also described the recent steps in the ongoing negotiations in South Africa. On the need for continued ILO effort, the 1992 Report detailed the conclusions of the Conference Committee on Action against Apartheid at the 1991 ILC and echoed its findings:

(...) the need to sustain efforts to implement the recommendations contained in the updated Declaration of June 1988 and the Programme of Action appended to it since the changes taking place in South Africa, although welcome, had not affected most of the fundamental bases of apartheid. The Conference called, *inter alia*, for pressure to be placed on the Government of South Africa for the release of all political prisoners and the unconditional return of exiles, and for the creation of an appropriate climate for negotiations.²⁶¹

The previous Reports described the ongoing change but also the realisation in the ILO that progress was made day by day and that the ILO would need to evaluate and reinvent its own relations with South Africa. The 1992 Report expressed this change:

²⁵⁹ Welsh and Spence, *Ending Apartheid*, p. 191.

²⁶⁰ Rubin, "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy", p. 11.

²⁶¹ ILO, *28th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 95.

All of this shows the need for consideration of a new strategy which will be able to deal seriously with the realities of the present changed situation and to face up to the challenges of the future as they emerge.²⁶²

The Report also discussed how other organisations were directly involved inside South Africa and the Report expressed the Organisation's disappointment that it had been unable to assist in the same way previously. Opportunely, the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission's mandate to investigate COSATU's 1988 complaint on freedom of association was accepted by South Africa in 1991, resulting in a visit from the FFCC the following year. As the original mandate for the visit, COSATU's complaint, had been acknowledged sufficiently repaired by new labour relations ratified by South Africa in 1991, the Pretoria government not only accepted the FFCC's mission but also allowed an extension of the Commission's original mandate, which became a review of the total system of trade unions, labour and industrial relations against the ILO's established standards and principles.²⁶³ The Commission's findings were published in a report in May 1992. The FFCC report's conclusions presented recommendations for change in labour relations under the then-valid Labour Regulations Act in South Africa and for future terms for trade unions. These dealt with the right to form and join trade unions, the right of trade unions to function freely, the right to strike, protection of the right to organise, collective bargaining and protection of workers excluded from the Labour Relations Act.²⁶⁴ In its conclusions, the report also presented the parts of existing labour legislation which did not comply with existing trade union rights, e.g. collective bargaining and right to strike, as well as a recommendation to execute a complete review of the Labour Relations Act.²⁶⁵ These recommendations were implemented after the first free elections of 1994.²⁶⁶ The same report would also be the basis for further training and technical assistance programmes to be continued by the ILO in the coming years.²⁶⁷

²⁶² Ibid., p. V.

²⁶³ ILO, *29th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 84; Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 236.

²⁶⁴ ILO/FFCC, *Report of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association concerning the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 49-167.

²⁶⁵ ILO/FFCC, *Report of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association concerning the Republic of South Africa*, pp. 162-167; Grawitzky, *From Workplace to Constitutional Rights in South Africa*, p. 15; Rubin, "From pressure principle to measured militancy", p. 11.

²⁶⁶ Rubin, "From pressure principle to measured militancy", p. 11.

²⁶⁷ ILO, *29th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 85; Maul, *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*, p. 236.

1992 also saw the last International Tripartite Conference on southern Africa, convened by the Governing Body. A series of these Conferences had led to closer relations with the “frontline states”, proposals for ILO action, and meetings with leaders of the anti-apartheid struggles in the region.²⁶⁸ The final Tripartite Conference was held in Harare, Zimbabwe, and was tasked with reviewing developments with regards to the ongoing transitional period in South Africa and recommendations in regards to what role the ILO should play at the time and post-apartheid. The ILO, in cooperation with the UN and agencies, decided to expand trade unions’ membership base during the transition to democracy and to prepare a series of technical assistance projects to be implemented after apartheid’s fall.²⁶⁹ The final Tripartite Conference marked, together with the FFCC’s work, a second peak of the history of ILO action to eradicate apartheid, as the decade-long cooperation with the SADCC could finally prepare for the removal of apartheid’s grasp on the region. Apartheid had brought the SADCC states into combat with apartheid, and it had prolonged and complicated their transitions into independent states. The fact that many of these states had remained closely allied with the Soviet Union and had cooperated as closely with the ILO’s officials as it had marks yet a unique standpoint for in the ILO’s history. It is another display of how much the removal of apartheid mattered, as the Organisation took such a political stance.

Otherwise, the Special Reports from 1992 and 1993 detailed ILO action in a framework similar to those preceding it – the actions of the Organisation were still in the same nature that was established with the 1988 updated *Declaration*. Actions taken from constituents were covered in a separate chapter, and in the subchapter on the ILO’s actions, attention was also focused on the work of the Group of Independent Experts, who had updated the questionnaire, where said actions were to be filled in, in line with the updated Programme of Action.²⁷⁰

The 1994, and final, Special Report stands out in the series, both in form and content. It was titled *Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, indicating the shift in focus both in South Africa and in the ILO.²⁷¹ In the Report the ILO presented a historical overview of events both in South Africa

²⁶⁸ ILO, *29th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 85.

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ ILO, *28th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*, p. 94. The Programme of Action had been ratified in 1991.

²⁷¹ ILO, *30th Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in the of South Africa*. ILO: Geneva, 1994.

and the ILO that ushered in change and what action the ILO had taken against apartheid over the past 30 years. The ILO also discussed which events had led to change in its own activities against apartheid. Examples were the 1973 strikes, after which the ILO began to argue that South African trade unions could play an important role against apartheid, the 1976 Soweto uprising which put the apartheid regime in the forefront of international criticism and resulted in two International Trade Union Conferences on apartheid. This, in turn, created the preparations for the updating of the 1964 *Declaration*. A final emphasis was put on Nelson Mandela's release in 1990.²⁷² Simultaneously, the Report echoed hopes and recommendations for South Africa's post-apartheid state and development in industrial relations, human resources and the stated main goals of the 1964 *Declaration*.²⁷³

As pointed to above, the ILO was unable to act against apartheid by offering direct assistance to organisations and their activities in South Africa which led to its close co-operation with NLMs in the front-line states. Examples of technical assistance to COSATU e.g. were provided in exile and the ILO was also unable to fulfil requests from COSATU and other trade union coalitions. The comparable examples from the history the Organisation, the experiences from Poland, Argentina and Chile were similar, in that the ILO's assistance and support were relatively inconsequential and showed that the Organisation still relied heavily on cooperation with the states in question. However, the role the ILO could play during 1992-1994 was one in which it also had much experience in – it could provide an international forum through which voices could be heard. This had also been a part of the ILO's role previously, as representatives for both ANC and COSATU had participated in the meetings of the Conference Committee and at ILCs, during the 1980s and onwards. Furthermore, the ILO's expertise within international labour standards enabled it to quickly provide a recommendation for which parts of South Africa's industrial relations would need to be updated. The strength of the Special Reports was knowledge they presented also added to the ILO's ability to influence in the transition period and negotiation period. As Welch and Spence present it, this was one of the major ways of exerting influence by international actors at the time.²⁷⁴ The ILO, on the other hand, remained influential during the

²⁷² Ibid., pp. 7-9.

²⁷³ Ibid., pp. 20-31.

²⁷⁴ Welch and Spence, *Ending Apartheid*, p. 119. Another example is the Soviet Union's request that the ANC accept negotiations as the right option to gain power in 1990, which the ANC followed. The ANC became a "broad church" where several denominations and ideologies were represented during the negotiations. ANC had been allied with the SACP and remained allied it and COSATU. It had also cooperated with NLMs in the region allied with the USSR.

transitional period to the post-apartheid 1994. Seeing as de Klerk, Mandela and the international actors involved in the dismantling of apartheid were painfully aware of the chances of violence, South Africa relied on a peaceful resolution of apartheid. Armed groups on both sides were ready to attack each other if they were dissatisfied with the outcome of the ongoing negotiations. Mandela and de Klerk, the main figures during the conciliation process, worked tirelessly to dismantle apartheid peacefully. They achieved this by 1994, with great support from e.g. the UN, and in April 1994 the first non-racial democratic election was held. Nelson Mandela and the ANC won by a landslide. Apartheid was history.²⁷⁵ At the 1994 ILC, where the final Special Report was presented, South Africa was welcomed once more as a member state of the ILO.

²⁷⁵ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 307-310.

Chapter 6: Conclusion – “Acting as spokesman of the social conscience of mankind”

What made the anti-apartheid actions and campaign by the International Labour Organisation unique was the fact that the Organisation’s Office and Governing Body, the executive organ of the Organisation, were as involved as they were in the international struggle against apartheid, technically the affair of a state that was not a member of the ILO. I have discussed this unique history in an attempt to answer the research question of this thesis. What did the International Labour Organisation do to eradicate apartheid in labour matters in South Africa between 1964 and 1994 and what were the motivations and driving forces behind its actions?

As was visible in the Organisation’s Conferences and other international forums, apartheid both allied and divided actors. The US, for example, only ratified sanctions as Congress overruled President Reagan’s veto against the sanctions in 1986. By then, African states had called for sanctions since 1978.²⁷⁶ 1986 was the same year as the ILO began requesting its member states to do the same.²⁷⁷ There is no evidence to suggest that the Governing Body of the ILO decided to adopt this strategy because the US had done so, but it is a curious coincidence, nonetheless. In the earlier history of the ILO’s anti-apartheid campaign, there are other examples of the Organisation adopting or implementing a strategy to its arsenal as a result of requests or initiatives from other IOs, and especially from the UN. The first example is the UN’s potential education and training programme in the last half of the 1960s, where the ILO’s resources were promised to the Secretary-General. An even better example is the implementation of technical assistance to NLMs in southern Africa after 1976 and Soweto, which was ratified as a defined action of the Organisation to eradicate apartheid in 1981. The initial request to provide technical assistance came from the Director-General after a resolution had been adopted by ECOSOC, which, arguably, came as a response to the 1976 Soweto uprisings.²⁷⁸ As highlighted above, any tangible sense of change in

²⁷⁶ Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, p. 273. They had also tried to expel South Africa from the UN in 1973-1974. This debate took place during the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, 1973-1983, a continuation of the International Year to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in 1971. At the 1978 World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which was also the International Anti-Apartheid Year, the represented states called for the sanctioning of South Africa by states.

²⁷⁷ ILO, *23rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 157.

²⁷⁸ ILO, *13th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of “Apartheid” of the Republic of South Africa*, p. 45. The resolution adopted by ECOSOC was the *Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples*.

the ILO pre-1976 was only the inclusion of representatives of the OAU and ANC at the ILC a year before. Similarly, the workers' delegates in the ILO initiated both International Trade Union Conferences in 1973 and 1976, respectively, as a response to South African events, and Soweto in particular. The second Trade Union Conference even proposed the Conference Committee on Apartheid to the ILO, which became a standing committee during the 1980s, tasked with reviewing and recommending further ILO action, spearheading the ILO's actions during the 1980s.

Arguably, when the *Declaration Concerning Apartheid* was updated in 1981, and for a second time in 1988, the ILO's operative anti-apartheid action assumed a more individual role than earlier.²⁷⁹ The combined strength of the ILO's experiences in protecting trade unions' rights in Spain, Poland, Argentina and Chile and monitoring constituents' upholding of international labour standards, enabled the Organisation to keep thorough track of what the constituents did to eradicate apartheid. The Governing Body and the Committee on Apartheid also encouraged and urged for further actions by all the Organisation's members. Over the decade, the ILO constructed its anti-apartheid arsenal around four defined methods – encouraging members to act and report on actions against apartheid, investigate and disseminate information on apartheid in labour matters, protect human rights and implement international labour standards, and provide and expand on its technical assistance to organisations in the region that worked against apartheid and the Pretoria government.

The final and perhaps most influential aspect of ILO action against apartheid was the FFCC's visit to South Africa and its subsequential report in 1992, which affected both the ongoing negotiation process and guided the ILO's relation to the post-apartheid South Africa that re-joined the Organisation in 1994. I argue that it was more influential than other previous action because it was direct assistance from the Organisation and an effort within South Africa's borders. Sanctions no doubt affected South Africa, but that was not something the ILO could adopt on its own. The original reason behind the FFCC's visit to South Africa was the complaint posted by COSATU in 1988 but as the Pretoria government accepted the Commission in 1991 and dealt appropriately with the legislation that had caused the initial complaint, the FFCC's mandate and mission became much bigger than it had originally been. Upon South Africa's reinstatement as ILO member, the

²⁷⁹ The Declaration's title likewise reflected this. In 1988 the title was altered from *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid* to *Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*.

FFCC's report becomes more guiding for the Governing Body's continued technical assistance than other aspects of its anti-apartheid campaign.²⁸⁰

The dedication and initiation of ILO's anti-apartheid campaign did not only stem from outside interference. E.g. South Africa did not leave the ILO in 1964 solely because of other states' arguing it should, and the ILO's history is filled with examples where the ILO on its own volition offered technical assistance to trade unions.²⁸¹ The 1944 Philadelphia Declaration and the several Conventions on workers' fundamental rights adopted in the 1950s, all manifested the key role human rights played in guiding the ILO's international activities. However, as has been highlighted in the chapters above, as South Africa was not a member of the ILO, the Organisation could not interfere within state borders. The initiation to do so, or the opportunity to do so, had to come from an angle which allowed some ILO action. This is what caused the strong support from the ILO to regional NLMs, and in particular, SWAPO, as South Africa's occupation of Namibia violated international law.²⁸² Had South Africa remained a member, the evidence from other similar ILO ventures could suggest that the ILO could have established more direct ways at eradicating apartheid.

This is not to say that the ILO and other international organisations possess the powers to affect or influence the politics of its member states.²⁸³ Rather, the ILO serves as an arena where new policies and politics can be forged and set new standards for states to follow. Therefore, the ILO and other IOs rely heavily on its members' will to cooperate. It was not before 1991 and the FFCC's mission that the ILO could affect within South Africa and help steer the new labour and social legislation towards its international labour standards, and only then with the government's accept. By that time, the ILO's establishment of the Group of Independent Experts, established in 1989, was tasked with exclusively reviewing the effects of sanctions and whether or not member

²⁸⁰ South Africa is the last example of a Fact-Finding mission on freedom of association sent out by the ILO. There are five other examples of Fact-Finding commissions sent to other states, all members at the time: Japan (1966), Greece (1966), Chile (1975), Lesotho (1975) and USA/Puerto Rico (1981, the year the US re-joined the ILO). See Reports of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Committee: https://www.ilo.org/global/standards/information-resources-and-publications/WCMS_160778/lang--en/index.htm (Accessed 05.06.2020).

²⁸¹ *Inter alia* Solidarnosc in Poland. See chapter 4 above.

²⁸² Lauren, *Power and Prejudice*, pp. 274-288.

²⁸³ This has been of the recurrent criticisms of the ILO and similar organisations See García, "Conclusion", p. 479; Hovi & Underdal, *Internasjonalt samarbeid og internasjonal organisasjon*, pp. 38-40.

states had adopted them.²⁸⁴ Whether or not sanctions affected or improved the situation in South Africa was debated at the time, but it did at least put pressure on South Africa's economy at the time, which for long had been built on the exploitation of black South Africans, and states and the ILO were sure the final acceptance to remove apartheid had to come from within South Africa.²⁸⁵ The Special Reports from 1983 did include chapters dedicated to the actions of the tripartite members. Actions were to be taken based on a programme devised by the Committee on Apartheid, later on, the Group of Independent Experts. The Special Reports did not castigate its members for lack of action, it did, however, use every opportunity to encourage action to be taken.²⁸⁶

One of the most important aspects of the ILO's efforts against apartheid was its constant monitoring and dissemination of information on apartheid. This derived not from any outside suggestion, it was established ILO practice before apartheid.²⁸⁷ As opposed to other ILO action against apartheid, this was directed straight at apartheid as the information was spread to black South African workers, but also people all over the world. The intention here was to spark responses from as many angles as possible and can be defined as a "soft power" move by the Organisation, hoping to sway and retain international public opinion. Another equally significant effort by the ILO and the Committee on Apartheid was that it invited representatives from e.g. COSATU, ANC and SWAPO to give speeches on apartheid and what they perceived the ILO's Office, Governing Body and constituents could further do to eradicate apartheid.²⁸⁸ In the period, the Governing Body and Office, alongside the Committee on Apartheid also held conferences and meetings dedicated to apartheid within one of the front-line states and co-ordinated with the SADCC to discuss their experiences and needs to end apartheid. Seminars on workers' rights were also offered here. In some views, this has been one of the most important roles of the International

²⁸⁴ Even though states had ratified sanctions against apartheid South Africa and placed embargoes on trade on certain goods, did not mean that they did not uphold the sanctions or embargoes. See Lauren, *Pride and Prejudice*, pp, 295-301. South Africa and other states were quick to point out these two sets of rules.

²⁸⁵ Lauren, *Pride and Prejudice*, pp. 304-305.

²⁸⁶ See Leary, "Lessons", p. 598. Opposed to the tone of language used to condemn apartheid, the Office and Governing Body delivered their hopes for increased action against apartheid in a traditional diplomatic tone.

²⁸⁷ García, "Conclusion", p. 475.

²⁸⁸ Rubin, "From pressure principle to measured militancy", pp. 7-10.

Labour Organisation, as it has enabled the construction of international alliances to put pressure on authoritarian regimes on behalf of the protection of workers' rights.²⁸⁹

This master thesis has answered the question of what the International Labour Organisation did to eradicate apartheid in labour matters in South Africa between 1964 and 1994 and what were the motivations and driving forces behind its actions. When apartheid ended in 1994 and South Africa re-joined the International Labour Organisation, the ILO had acted as the spokesperson of the social conscience of mankind since 1964. In 1964, this meant that apartheid was a matter that gathered so much criticism and was so out of line with ILO standards and the new states in its ranks that it could no longer be considered a national issue. It meant that South Africa's policies were incompatible to those of the ILO and therefore South Africa could no longer be a part of the Organisation. When South Africa left the ILO, they did so totally.²⁹⁰

Even if the ILO's relationship with South Africa seemed to be non-existent, it would inevitably need to follow up on the apartheid situation as it became evident that apartheid would not be removed during the 1960s. The official ILO line was to retain focus on the development of apartheid and to compare this annually to the 1964 *Declaration and Programme*, accompanying South Africa's exit. These two documents did not, however, establish a defined programme of action on the behalf of the ILO against apartheid. It seems apartheid and the Special Reports became standardised quickly and that they were relatively undiscussed at ILCs.

The emergence of racial discrimination as a violation of human rights surely brought apartheid to the world's centre of attention, as the most condemned example of it at the time. As it was unequivocally denounced, it became the primary target for international criticism, since its once colonial neighbours were freed during the 1970s as South Africa represented the very last remnants of colonialism's legacy on the African continent. It was therefore also a case that easily united action and attention against it, and this unity was a show of force by the states that had been

²⁸⁹ García, "Conclusion", p. 475. Garcia point to other examples: Basualdo, Victoria. "The ILO and the Argentine Dictatorship (1976-1983)". In *ILO Histories. Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World During the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jasmien Van Daele, Magaly Rodríguez García, Geert Van Goethem and Marcel van der Linden, pp. 401-421. Bern: Peter Lang 2010; Goddeeris, Idesbald. "The Limits of Lobbying: ILO and Solidarnosc". In *ILO Histories. Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World During the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jasmien Van Daele, Magaly Rodríguez García, Geert Van Goethem and Marcel van der Linden, pp. 423-441. Bern: Peter Lang 2010.

²⁹⁰ Since the end of World War II, seven countries in total have left the ILO, and two of them – South Africa and Albania – both left in the 1960 and did not re-join until the 1990s. The other countries were: Yugoslavia (1959-1951, Venezuela (1955-1958), Lesotho (1971-1980) and the US (1975-1980/1977-1981). Goddeeris, "The Limits of Lobbying", p. 437.

former colonies. The support of Western states of South Africa angered and brought the debate of racial discrimination into a debate of the post-colonialism and the Cold War. However, the history of apartheid does embody these opposing master narratives of the 20th century – racial discrimination, decolonisation, internationalism and the Cold War, where presumably the Cold War has overshadowed the others in historiographical accounts.²⁹¹ The International Labour Organisation had to navigate what has become these narratives at the time to complete its anti-apartheid campaign but was in turn affected by the actors also starring in these competing narratives.

1964 to 1994's set of Special Report display an intensifying and diversifying set of actions by the International Labour Organisation to eradicate apartheid in labour matters. The motivations and driving force behind it came from within the Organisation – the Office and Governing Body, its officials, the dedication to fight for social justice and human rights which was defined in the Philadelphia Declaration, fundamental Conventions and examples of the Organisation's history. They also came from outside the Organisation – some of the ILO's procedures adopted were UN initiatives, Trade Union Conferences and Tripartite Conferences on Apartheid recommended further action. Finally, the ILO was allowed to act inside South Africa's borders to eradicate apartheid in labour matters based on the Organisation's international labour standards, an opportunity that completed the 30-year long mission.

²⁹¹ Westad, *The Global Cold War*, p. 3.

Sources and Bibliography

Primary sources

International Labour Organisation

Declarations

International Labour Organisation. *The Declaration of Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: International Labour Office, 1944.

———. *The Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1964.

———. *I.L.O. Programme for the Elimination of "Apartheid" in Labour Matters in the Republic of South Africa*". Geneva: International Labour Office, 1964.

Reports

ILO. *1st Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1965.

———. *2nd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1966.

———. *3rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1967.

———. *4th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1968.

- . *5th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1969.
- . *6th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1970.
- . *7th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1971.
- . *8th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1972.
- . *9th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1973.
- . *10th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1974.
- . *11th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1975.
- . *12th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1976.
- . *13th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1977.

- . *14th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1978.
- . *15th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1979.
- . *16th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of Apartheid of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1980.
- . *17th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1981.
- . *18th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1982.
- . *19th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1983.
- . *20th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1984.
- . *21st Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1985.
- . *22nd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1986.

- . *23rd Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1987.
- . *24th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning the Policy of "Apartheid" of the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1988.
- . *25th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1989.
- . *26th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa and Namibia*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1990.
- . *27th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1991.
- . *28th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1992.
- . *29th Special Report of the Director-General on the Application of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1993.
- . *30th Special Report of the Director-General on the Review of the Declaration concerning Action against Apartheid in South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1994.
- . Governing Body: Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission. *Prelude to change: Industrial Relations Reform in South Africa. Report of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association Concerning the Republic of South Africa*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1992.

———. *The ILO at a glance*. Brochure, 2008. https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/WCMS_082367/lang--en/index.htm (Accessed 11.06.2020).

Speeches

Mandela, Nelson. “Address by Mr. Nelson Mandela at the 77th International Labour Conference (1990).” 77th Session of the International Labour Conference (ILC): Address by Mr. Nelson Mandela at the 77th International Labour Conference (1990), June 8, 1990. https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/statements-and-speeches/WCMS_215611/lang--en/index.htm (Accessed 11.06.2020).

Secondary literature:

Alcock, Antony. *History of the International Labour Organization*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1979

Archer, Clive. *International Organizations*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Basualdo, Victoria. “The ILO and the Argentine Dictatorship (1976-1983)”. In *ILO Histories. Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World During the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jasmien Van Daele, Magaly Rodríguez García, Geert Van Goethem and Marcel van der Linden, pp. 401-421. Bern: Peter Lang 2010.

Best, Antony, Jussi Hanhimäki, Joseph A. Maiolo and Kirsten E. Schulze. *International History of the Twentieth Century and Beyond*. Routledge: London, 2015.

Dubow, Saul. *Apartheid, 1948-1994*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Dykman, Klaas. “Only with the Best Intentions: International Organizations as Global Civilizers,” *Comparativ* 23, no. 4/5 (2013): 21–46.

Eriksen, Tore Linné. *Sør-Afrikas historie*. Kristiansand: Portal forlag, 2016.

- Finney, Patrick. *Palgrave Advances in International History*. Palgrave Advances. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- García, Magaly Rodríguez. "Conclusion: The ILO's Impact on the World". In *ILO Histories. Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World During the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jasmien Van Daele, Magaly Rodríguez García, Geert Van Goethem and Marcel van der Linden, pp. 461-478. Bern: Peter Lang 2010.
- Goddeeris, Idesbald. "The Limits of Lobbying: ILO and Solidarnosc". In *ILO Histories. Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World During the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jasmien Van Daele, Magaly Rodríguez García, Geert Van Goethem and Marcel van der Linden, pp. 423-441. Bern: Peter Lang 2010.
- Hovi, Jon & Arild Underdal. *Internasjonalt samarbeid og internasjonal organisasjon*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2017.
- Iriye, Akira. *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Kjelstadli, Knut. *Fortida er ikke hva den en gang var. En innføring i historiefaget*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1999.
- Klein, Kerwin Lee. "In Search of Narrative Mastery: Postmodernism and the People without History." *History and Theory* 34, no. 4 (1995): 275-98. Accessed June 9, 2020. doi:10.2307/2505403.
- Lauren, Paul Gordon. *Power and Prejudice. The Politics and Diplomacy of Racism and Racial Discrimination*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1996.
- Leary, Virginia A. "Lessons from the Experience of the International Labour Organisation". In *The United Nations and Human Rights. A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Philip Alston, pp. 580-619. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Maul, Daniel. "The International Labour Organization and the Struggle against Forced Labour from 1919 to the Present." *Labor History* 48, no. 4 (2007): 477-500.

- Maul, Daniel. "'Help Them Move the ILO Way": The International Labor Organization and the Modernization Discourse in the Era of Decolonization and the Cold War." *Diplomatic History* (printed ed.) 33: 2009: 3:S.387-404.
- Maul, Daniel Roger. "The "Morse Years": The ILO 1948-1970". In *ILO Histories. Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World During the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jasmien Van Daele, Magaly Rodríguez García, Geert Van Goethem and Marcel van der Linden, pp. 365-400. Berlin: Peter Lang 2010.
- Maul, Daniel Roger. "The International Labour Organization and the Globalization of Human Rights, 1944-1970". In *Human Rights in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann, pp. 301-320. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Maul, Daniel. *Human Rights, Development and Decolonization: The International Labour Organization 1940-70*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2012.
- Maul, Daniel. *The International Labour Organization: 100 Years of Global Social Policy*. Berlin: DeGruyter, 2019.
- Moyn, Samuel. *The Last Utopia*. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Nye, Joseph S. *Bound to Lead. The Changing Nature of American Power*. New York: BasicBooks, 1990.
- Nye, Joseph S. *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.
- Rodgers, Gerry, Eddy Lee, Lee Sweepston & Jasmin Van Daele. *The ILO and the Quest for Social Justice, 1919-2009*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 2009.
- Rubin, Neville. "From Pressure Principle to Measured Militancy – The ILO in the campaign against apartheid". Unpublished article: International Institute for Labour Studies. 2009.
- Southall, Roger. *Imperialism or Solidarity? International Labour and South African Trade Unions*. Rondebosch: UCT Press, 1995.

Van Daele, Jasmien, Magaly Rodríguez García, Geert Van Goethem & Marcel van der Linden (eds.). *ILO Histories. Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World During the Twentieth Century*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2010.

Van Daele, Jasmien. "Writing ILO Histories: A State of the Art". In *ILO Histories. Essays on the International Labour Organization and Its Impact on the World During the Twentieth Century*, edited by Jasmien Van Daele, Magaly Rodríguez García, Geert Van Goethem and Marcel van der Linden, pp. 13-39. Berlin: Peter Lang 2010.

Welsh, David & J.E. Spence. *Ending Apartheid*. Harlow: Longman, 2011.

Westad, Odd Arne. *The Global Cold War. Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Westad, Odd Arne. *The Cold War. A World History*. New York: Penguin Books, 2017.