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Abstract:
The apartheid policy pursued by the government of the Republic of South Africa was born out of the expansion of violence committed by blacks in June 1985, which prompted the government of the Republic of South Africa to declare martial law in July 1985. Although the British government condemned the declaration of martial law, it refused to reject the demands of the European Council and the United Nations to impose sanctions against the Republic of South Africa.
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THE INTRODUCTION
South Africa received great attention on the part of British politics, as Britain was associated with South Africa with strong historical relations dating back to the beginning of the eighteenth century, with the arrival of the first English settlers to the shores of South Africa. Despite the expansion of the South African government in the policy of apartheid, the British government continued to support it for a government of South Africa continuously. And defending it, especially during the era of Margaret Thatcher, who called for preventing the imposition of sanctions on South Africa and ending apartheid through peaceful means.

This study consisted of an introduction, two chapters, and a conclusion in which the researcher has provided an overview of the spread of violence in South Africa and the actions that took place, reducing the government's efforts as well as the reasons that prompted the government to announce these provisions and how the British government used to prevent the imposition of sanctions in the European Council and in the United Nations, as the British government did not hesitate to use its diplomatic efforts to prevent and encourage the countries of the world to prevent the imposition of sanctions against the Republic of South Africa.

THE FIRST AXIS: THE REASONS THAT LED TO THE IMPOSITION OF MARTIAL LAW
The violence continued in South Africa, culminating in March 1985, which is today which coincided with the 25th Anniversary of the Sharpeville Massacre. Security forces shot twenty people who were on their way to attend a funeral in Oytenhagen (Uitenhague) in the Eastern Cape (Eastern Cape). And it was the government that time Funerals were forbidden in those areas; Because it became a focus for meetings and protests, which in turn led to a confrontation between the mourners and the police, As he met many people killed in political violence.

Accordingly, the black demonstrators attacked several targets. It symbolized the Botha system, as a burnwaa Police stations and other government buildings. In addition to the homes of policemen and...
town councilors. Sometimes they killed the occupants of these buildings, and this was followed by
protests in the regions, and boycotts of schools. With the spread of resistance in Transvaal, Orange
Free, Natal and Cape Town. By mid-1985 the apartheid regime had collapsed regions, street and
defense committees proliferated, and people's courts, across the country and became as "people
power organs" to replace the apartheid local authorities (3). The situation was exacerbated by the fact
that in June 1985 the African National Congress held its second consultative conference in Kabwe in
Zambia in which he called for making the country "ungovernable" (4).

To deal with the widening strikes, and acts of violence that saw by African patriots, protest against
the policy of apartheid in various parts of the world, Republic South Africa (5). Botha declared a state of
emergency, and customary provisions (State Of Siege in Witwatersrand, And Eastern Cape, and
Western Cape regions in 21 July 1985, the first case imposed since the Sharpeville massacre before twenty
five years (6). By this declaration, the police were given the power to arrest demonstrators without warrants, L. Lain definitely, without bringing charges against them, or allowing them to be informed by lawyers or their relatives, and gave the government greater power than it already exercised to monitor radio coverage and spoilage Zia and journalistic disturbances. Police and security forces were deployed throughout Republic South Africa, thousands were arrested, including members organized Democratic Front United (7).

SECONDLY / BRITAIN'S POSITION ON THE IMPOSITION OF MARTIAL LAW IN THE REPUBLIC OF

Government announcement led Republic South Africa state of emergency, and its practice of violence
against blacks moved international opinion against it, as the foreign ministers of the ten countries
issued a decree members of the European Community common (EEC), including Britain a statement
in 22 July 1985 about the situation in Republic South Africa. The text of the statement: that the
continuations survival the Western companies in South Africa, was for him beneficial effect of change,
and that Code of conduct for European companies with branches in Republic South Africa good to do
that. Although France was among them the ten European governments members in European
group that supported the statement, except if Halt announced that it would recall its ambassador
from South Africa and ban new investment there, and later that day called for a meeting of the
Security Council of the United Nations. It submitted a draft resolution calling for ending the state
of emergency, releasing patriots who were subjected to a campaign of mass arrests, condemning the
racist regime, and calling for imposing "Optional penalties" stop any new investment, and ban the
purchase the krugrand, stopping loans guaranteeing imports, banning the conclusion of any new
contracts in the nuclear field, banning the sale of any electronic equipment used in repression
operations, and asking the Secretary-General of the United Nations to submit a report on the
implementation of the resolution, after approval (8).

And the next day he was condemned Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, head of the anti-apartheid in
Britain, at the opening session for the peace conference held in a church city Wesley in London in the
presence of representatives of the Methodists (Methodism) Around the World Botha's Recent
Proceedings, as he declared "Apartheid is basically a form of "rowing", and that churches insouth Africa
is witnessing severe suffering to resist it for him. He called on Western governments to replace words with deeds in their opposition to apartheid. In the same context, a contract council of Ministers British in 25 July 1985—meeting attended by Margaret Thatcher, and the Speaker of the House of Lords and some British officials. The meeting included discussing many things. Of which mode in Republic South Africa, a statement issued by the Foreign ministers, ten member states of the European Community at 22 July 1985. France’s proposal submitted to the Security Council towards Republic South Africa. Accordingly, Howe suggested that the British government seek a way to avoid the penalties against the Republic of South Africa, because from what the government of South Africa, while avoiding isolation. The British government towards this issue, as it will appear to make limited criticism of the policy of apartheid compared to other Western countries. To achieve this, Howe pointed out the necessity of close contact with the United States of America. The reason for this being that the British government, although pressure increased dramatically in the US Congress to impose sanctions on South Africa. And at the conclusion of the meeting, the British government thought it was six willing to work in the Security Council, if necessary, whether alone or jointly with the United States of America.

The British government continued to pursue issues related to apartheid through its visible presence in the Security Council. On July 26, 1985, Security Council held its emergency session. Based on the previous invitation from the French government, sanctions against the Republic of South Africa, so during the session, they discussed the deteriorating situation in the Republic of South Africa, and discussed the French project that calls for imposing “optional sanctions” on it, but the African members of the Security Council opposed this idea, and sought to make the sanctions mandatory. In response, British delegates and the American veto “veto” (veto); to prevent the rise of Burkina Faso (Burkina Faso) of submitting a request on behalf of the non-aligned countries, to make modifications to the project make penalties on South Africa is mandatory. Despite the differences that prevailed among the participating countries, the Security Council called for the imposition of “optional sanctions” on the Republic of South Africa, and its demand to end the state of emergency declared in 36 towns and cities, and to stop the widespread arrests of nationals. After discussions, the Security Council held its emergency session. It imposed sanctions on the Republic of South Africa, which included freezing any new investments in South Africa, banning the sale of all currencies in which it is minted, imposing restrictions in the field of exchanging sports activities and cultural relations, stopping export guarantee loans, banning any new contract in the nuclear field, and banning Sale of computer equipment that could be used by the South African army and police against Africans, and the release of all political prisoners in South Africa. Meanwhile, a minister from South Africa, to force it to cancel the imposed state of emergency, held a minister.
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The meeting discussed the policies to be followed to end apartheid. During the meeting, the Netherlands, Denmark, France and Ireland pressed to agree to the imposition of “voluntary” sanctions, along the lines of the Security Council resolution of July 26\(^{(19)}\). They also expressed their desire to summon their ambassadors to South Africa to consult with them, with the aim of participating in preparing joint measures against South Africa, while Italy, Belgium and Germany suggested sending a mission to South Africa, for the purpose of fact-finding and urging Botha to start a dialogue with black leaders and express their views on the serious developments in South Africa.

The foreign ministers of the aforementioned countries considered that the tripartite ministerial mission is an attempt to contribute to ending apartheid, and they noted that in the event that tangible progress is not achieved within a reasonable period, these countries will reserve the right to reconsider their position. The best way to put pressure on South Africa is to withdraw the ambassadors\(^{(20)}\).

The foreign ministers of countries supported a call to apply the resolutions of the Security Council on South Africa on July 26th. In addition, they agreed that the South African government should take concrete and immediate measures to represent the opening of a real dialogue with the true representatives of the black population. The ministers also decided to send a tripartite ministerial mission to South Africa, consisting of the foreign ministers of Luxembourg, Italy, and the Netherlands\(^{(21)}\). Although the states in Helsinki supported these proposals, the British delegate refused to accept them, under the pretext that sanctions will not lead to the changes that everyone would like to see, and that a statement can be issued reaffirming the previous position of European countries, and criticizing the lack of dialogue. After a long and serious argument, the British delegate agreed just on the condition that forwarding the ambassadors for a meeting at the political committee to the European Commission. And donel was also agreed that the presidency of the European Commission would communicate with the South African government regarding the proposal to send the Tripartite Commission\(^{(22)}\).

As a result of the increasing intensity of strikes in the Republic of South Africa, and fearing the increase in international pressure to impose sanctions on his country, the South African Council of Ministers held a special planning meeting, in which it considered the latest proposals of the recent Special Ministerial Committee (Special Cabinet Committee). The Council of Ministers assessed the escalating internal unrest and the growing international pressure the country is facing, as well as the government’s position on the constitutional reform plans. After discussions among ministers it was agreed that President Botha would use his inaugural address at the National Party Conference in Natal to be held on 15 August 1985 as an opportunity to announce some “important new constitutional guidelines”, namely the government’s acceptance of blacks remaining in white areas, also accepting that the six non-independent black homelands would not necessarily move toward independence; And that the blacks in these areas (homelands or bantustans) and the so-called white...
areas of the Republic of South Africa will become equal citizens in their constitutional conditions, including having their voice heard in decision-making at all levels of government, and negotiations will have to be held with the blacks in South Africa to reach an agreement on How will they be accommodated in a new constitutional order?\(^{(23)}\).

Accordingly, President Botha sent a message in 5 August 1985 to Thatcher. He referred to the decision of the foreign ministers European Commission around Issue. He sent a tripartite mission to his country and confirmed that it would be "In the place of greeting" from his government, provided that the visit does not include any right on the part of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of A to the European Commission in interfering in the internal affairs of his country, and she really wanted to investigate the facts. He also indicated in his letter that two years ago he had formed a ministerial committee to make some constitutional amendments in the future that can satisfy—From the point of view of the aspirations of the people of South Africa as a whole, as the Committee made a number of proposals which Botha felt would have an influence on the political future of dullness , And it will be "In the place of greeting" from the British government\(^{(24)}\). In his letter, Botha also indicated that he had seriously studied these proposals, and that he intended to issue an announcement about his government’s decision, which would be taken on the basis of what he considered to be in the interest of the Republic of South Africa and the South African region, and that he would send his foreign minister to it to explain these developments. To turn it into reality, Botha asked his secretary of state to write letters to the German chancellor, Helmut Josef Kohl (Helmut Josef Michael Kohl), And Thatcher, And US President Reagan, Botha explained in the message that He will carry out some reforms that "serve the people of South Africa". Not only did Botha write these letters to the British, American and German leaders, but he also instructed his foreign minister, Baek BoTTo send a number of letters to the foreign ministers of Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Italy, proposing that the three ministers meet his foreign minister in Western Europe in mid-August 1985\(^{(25)}\). The South African government was not satisfied with that, but the South African Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs stated, on August 8, in an interview with iStation, that his government is ready to make changes in the applicable laws - after conducting negotiations with the "moderate" national leaders - noting at the same time that the explosive unrest was caused by "extremists' attempt" to obstruct such negotiations\(^{(26)}\).

The British government welcomed this, and it was agreed that Thatcher would not meet Botha, but instead he would awhere Ferguson as her personal envoy in Vienna\(^{(27)}\).

According to schedule, The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, Bek Botha, traveled to Vienna, ashold a meeting between and between Deputy Undersecretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Foreign and Commonwealth Office Britisha Wayne FjRegson, F.; J 8 August 1985. And everlasting Beck Botha His welcome to the meeting, and outlined the main proposals to be pursued by his government no further constitutional change to be announced by the President in his speech at 15 August 1985, who shot it (crossing the Rubicon) (crossing the Rubicon) describing it as "historic". It will emphasize three goals, Which: Firstly There will be shared responsibility (ie, including blacks) in decisions affecting the country as a whole, which is means "sharing power at the highest level", secondly shared citizenship, Third Undivided South...
Africa. Beck Botha confirmed that the policy will be abolished from homelands, and that contact has been made with some black leaders. He added that he would put forward proposals on August 15, 1985 - from his point of view, on a group of "black radicals," including Bishop Tutu, and representatives of black organizations. Baek Botha appealed for support from the British government, noting that outside understanding, particularly from the British government, "Very helpful. He has gratitude for the policy that was pursued by the British government." (28).

In response, Ver pointed out that Sun to the difficulties facing the British government, to maintain her relationship with Republic South Africa confirmed the support of the governments. Teto President Botha's proposals depend on "seriousness" that Bad takes out the blacks. Proposals to be put forward by the speech which Botha will deliver, their willingness to join in real discussions; Because the British government saw the participation of blacks as indispensable, to achieve its aspirations in stability and prosperity in the region. Ver pointed out that Sun to the Foreign Minister's proposals, represented in the release of Nelson Mandela, and the statements of the ten countries were discussed at the meeting. The concern of the South African government about the activities of the tripartite commission, which will visit the country at the end of August, which may lead to the addition of new sanctions against his country, And to request Pick Botha of the British government took the lead, only to veerc Sun confirmed that countries may take Ta collective decision, and that European Commission insist on doing BV visit, Bek Botha tried to justify raiding Gaborone previous, except that virc Sun condemned South Africa's action, he asserted on Not accepted the government of British H No excuse can be given South African government in this regard, since the government of British H cannot accept a military incursion", "killing innocent civilians", This is confirmed by a vote in the Security Council, Moreover, this procedure made the task of the British government in resisting the stress Against South Africa more difficult, And More than you expect (29).

In light of this he sent Peter ricketts (Peter Ricketts) Assistant Special Secretary to the Secretary of State, On August 9, 1985 message to Thatcher's private secretary. He explained the opinion of the ministers in the meeting held between Owen Ferguson and Beck Botha, He asserted that the British government would need to think carefully about how it would respond for a speech to be delivered by Botha, when it is issued On August 15, 1985, stressing that it was in the interest of the British government to give South Africa's statement a fair chance, so it should urge— From his point of view— Partners in particular and others, who are not automatically inclined to judge South Africans for thinking clearly before they dismiss the "Manifesto" as inappropriate, or worse, also suggest that the British government coordinate its general response with the American and German reaction (30).

Based on these developments, correspondence began between the British Foreign Office and the Prime Ministry. In August 1985— send rif Head of the South Africa Department at the British Foreign Office, and Under-Secretary for African Affairs, telegram to Patrick Moberly (Patrick Moberly) British Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa, among which the increasing pressures on the British government to take economic measures against Republic South Africa, represented by the legislation put forward by the US Congress (31), and change in the position of some countries that previously opposed sanctions, notably France and Australia (32). In addition to the pressures she was subjected to the British government. Within the European Commission, to adopt a societal position that supports sanctions As for The American position The congressional action had a strong impact as a
result of the new and favorable developments in Republic South Africa. Despite the fact that the US government has consistently vetoed mandatory sanctions at the United Nations, however, the government of British confirms that it is unable to rely on such assurance; because of the suspicions of senior officials Britons within the administration about that Especially after Congress approved imposing sanctions on South Africa. (33).

But regarding to within the European Commission, Reef has made it clear that the position of the British government has become very difficult; because of the French decision to announce specific economic measures against South Africa. Accordingly, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Howemessaged to Thatcher, between Where the increasing pressure to get attention to the government To the potential dangers of isolating Britain. In light of this, Thatcher noted in her response that the government strongly opposed the sanctions, because of their impact in Britain, it demanded that the Foreign Office analyze its set of the Means of mobilizing support against such measures, because they run counter to the interests of the British government that its Sanctions are unlikely to achieve their goals. She wanted to see recommendations on how to deter a government in Republic South Africa for its action against South African states on the continent Africa that lead to increased pressure on the government of British to imposing sanctions, while encouraging it to move forward with a number of measures to improve the prospects for dialogue with black leaders at the domestic level. (34).

As a result, it was decided to hold a meeting at the level of the British government, in which the risks to the interests of the British government involved in its policy during that period, and alternative policies, would be assessed. confirmed Thatcher that the intention of the British Government to continue to promote, as far as possible, its policy, and the goal of the British government is to avoid putting it in a position where it has to choose between harming its interests in South Africa and harming its interests elsewhere, explaining to the Foreign Office that the ability of the British government to influence the events taking place in Republic South Africa, on the limited international public opinion, must therefore continue to maneuver as skillfully as possible between international pressure on the one hand, and understandable reluctance on the other. the government On the other hand, by coordinating action with its Western partners through which it can pre-empt some of the criticisms directed at it, and call to take more far-reaching measures, this a on the one hand, on the other hand, Thatcher felt that she should be kept fully informed of the direction of the Rain both major western countries, and in Africa and the Commonwealth (35).

And in 1985 the ruling National Party of the Republic of South Africa held its conference in Durban found in it Peter Botha, President of South Africa, a letter announced to undertake a new series of political reforms, including black participation in the political process, education reform, and it was described as “for the benefit of Africans”, with the aim of calming world public opinion (36).

This discourse caused discontent in British political circles. The British government expressed its "disappointment" with Botha's speech, particularly for his refusal to release Nelson Mandela without conditions, and Denis Healy, spokesman for Britain's opposition Labor Party, stating that "Botha missed an opportunity to save South Africa from a bloody, tragic conflict", and that it was not a positive speech, and did not achieve From his point of view Significantly the expectations of
progress aroused by Pick Botha in his meeting with Owen Ferguson in Vienna, in which he explained that the focus of the speech will be on a Participation of all races, including blacks, for decisions affecting the country as a whole, common citizenship, and an undivided South Africa, but Botha in his speech did not make something regarding shared responsibility. Botha made it clear that he believed in the participation of all societies in matters of common interest, but he did not specify how to achieve this. As for shared citizenship, it wasn’t clear also. Therefore, the British government saw that the speech was a public confirmation of the government’s commitment to the path it had charted in South Africa, and that it had not made concessions to the demands of others, which in turn would lead to an international reaction that would be affected.

The matter did not stand on the official position of the British government, it was lost. Press attacked British Prime Minister of South Africa Botha. In an article published by The Times, “When Breaths Exhaust Hope in South Africa,” she indicated that Peter Botha’s speech gave only the least amount of hope for the possibility of bringing about a change in the “racist” government policy, but rather that this speech had thrown the Republic of South Africa with greater difficulties than it had been. Botha, in his speech, robbed the opportunity that “moderate” black leaders were waiting for to open a “fruitful” dialogue, or to enter into serious negotiations, and foreign governments trying to avoid imposing an economic embargo on South Africa would be forced to impose it, prompted by the prevailing idea that it unable to adopt a firm stance.

And based on this, a meeting took place between Thatcher and the British Foreign Secretary, Howe in September 1985. During the meeting, the latter indicated that discussions that decide to take place after week. So with the ten ministers about the imposition of sanctions on South Africa, and it is necessary to approve the measures taken by the ten ministers, without commitment what he called “possible measures.” v. South Africa, taking into account the different interests of member states. Thatcher supported the opinion of the Foreign Minister, as she considered it wrong to acknowledge the phrase “study.” an procedures; Because that may indicate that the government of British She was ready to take action, and also emphasized that it would be better to look for “more ambiguous” formulation such as looking at ways in which Member States could respond to the situation in South Africa, taking into account their separate national positions. the meeting.

European Commission held in September 10, 1985 (For political cooperation in the European Community Political Cooperation) A meeting was held in Luxembourg, during which the issue of imposing sanctions on the Republic of South Africa was discussed, and these sanctions included banning the export and import of weapons and semi-military equipment, stopping oil shipments, freezing cooperation in the nuclear field, and what amounted to ending cultural and sports relations.

And Discussions took place during the meeting. Ben Rifkind, British Government Representative, and my representative Member States who were determined, Especially the Germans and the French, based on the adoption of a group of a for a course. The most important of these decisions is the summoning of military attachés, and freeze agreements in the cultural and scientific fields, stop the export of oil to the Republic of South Africa, and Refuse to sell sensitive equipment to the
South African Police and Armed Forces, he refused to cooperate in the development of the South African nuclear program, not to import and export weapons and paramilitary equipment to and from South Africa, and to freeze contacts and official agreements in the sports and security fields. \(^{43}\) Ms. Sugg suggested. Boss is the Prime Minister of the European Commission, also Add banon Krogrand, and on Export credit guarantees, and the new investment \(^{44}\). After strong opposition by Rifkind, he showed his acceptance of these penalties; because she is same to a large extent the measures that the British government was willing to take against South Africa, except for some severe penalties, which is to call the military attaches, and the introduction of the visa regime, and freezing agreements in the cultural and scientific fields. After discussions that lasted for several hours, the members concluded that no action was taken "coercive measures" new against South Africa, except for withdraw military attaches, the reason for this is due to the British adherence in this matter. Despite Rifkind's best efforts around military attaches, however, member states warned against this, which prompted him to submit a request to postpone the meeting for several hours, and he agreed to member states on demand, so Reevknid made contact with Thatcher which showed his own concern about the implications of imposing sanctions, and other potential ambiguities \(^{45}\). Accordingly, and at what asixth that P meeting, Rifkind did not agree to withdraw the British military attaché, although that, except that the members decided to go on heading in carrying out these measures without Britain's consent \(^{46}\), which forced Reevknid to accept the statement, except "restrictive measures" pretext that his government needed further time to study it in detail. While the negotiations were going on, protests occurred in Bremeng Important \(^{47}\), Britain took it as an excuse to withdraw its delegate from the meeting \(^{48}\). Accordingly, the British government saw the need to study its implications, in the event of sanctions against South Africa, so it requested from the group the Weza Yeh \(^{Misc 118}\) in September 1985, a review of the strategy of the British government long term towards its investments, financial and economic British in South Africa, in light of the increasing international pressure on it, and work to present proposals, to mobilize support against the economic measures on South Africa. Accordingly, the group reported in it, I explained how the political and economic situation in South Africa over the next five or twenty years could affect British commercial, financial and economic interests, and the policy options available to the British \(^{49}\). The committee explained in its report that the developments, the depreciation of the rand, the loss of confidence in South Africa, and the attitude taken by its industrialists, you click on Government South Africa internally and externally, for a change, the committee stressed that the pressure on the government Republic of South Africa for change has become sharp during that period, which makes it imperative for the government to go along with this new situation, and the committee believed that the international community's resort to sanctions at this stage will only lead to making the South African government more challenging and resistant to reform, and making the global economy more dangerous than it is. It really is, because South Africa is unable to pay its debts, if the economy collapses. There may be side effects Countries them money lender, the otherz \(^{50}\). In its report, the committee also emphasized the impact of sanctions on the interests of the British government's Western partners, so I explained that the depreciation of the rand, and decline in the
value of their interests in South Africa, it will get sharper with penalties, as well as the great impact that South Africa’s economic collapse will have on neighboring countries. On top of this advanced position, the committee felt that a reserve position could be considered (substitute) that can be used by the British government to bear the effects of sanctions at the lowest possible cost, the Office of the Chief felt that Ministers Thatcher the problem must be approached from the perspective of the interests of the British government, and not from the perspective of a principled position against sanctions.\(^{(51)}\).

As a result, the British government agreed on endorsement Raise a group “restrictive measures” against Republic South Africa agreed upon by the nine nations in October 1985.\(^{(52)}\).

As for the foreign minister Howe, he recommended that a step be taken states On pulling out the attachments Military from Republic South Africa; Because he sees that if you do not support Britain, the attitude of the entire international community will affect this in Britain position, and you will find Britain itself increasingly isolated in both the UN and when Commonwealth heads of government. Powell was endorsed by the Secretary of State in his opinion, so saw that anyhand Britain in a full statement of the European Community will strengthen the position of the British government there in resisting the worst measures that it takes. Dr. Ha advisor Politics external to head Ministers Percy Craddock (Percy Craddock) Good point, and it’s worth making the sacrifice for it. The reason for that to that government Britain, you will get in trouble at the UN, the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, And he made it clear that the withdrawal of the military attaches had nothing to do with the situation inside South Africa, it will not have any beneficial effect there. And it is in fact a measure to further isolate South Africa, And it is unlikely that the lack of value will result The British government to subscribe to each point in society statement The European to others simply abandoning it.\(^{(53)}\), And on according to That showed the British government its approval of the economic measures of the nine countries.\(^{(54)}\). The countries of the European Community welcomed the decision of the British government to withdraw its military attaches from South Africa as part of the pressure campaign appreciated by the countries of the Group to force the South African government to abandon its apartheid policy.\(^{(55)}\).

**CONCLUSION:**

It becomes clear to the researcher through the study that there is a contradiction in the official and popular position in Britain regarding the apartheid policy in the Republic of South Africa. Despite the opposition of the British government to impose sanctions against South Africa; Because of its racist policy, however, the organizations condemned that policy, and were calling for sanctions to be imposed against it. It also appears that there is a clear divergence in the views of some party leaders and British officials Regarding the issue of imposing sanctions on the Republic of South Africa, some of them supported the imposition of sanctions on the Republic of South Africa, and some of them opposed them, so it was not specified how to deal with the government of the Republic of South Africa. Perhaps this is due to the desire of some of them to take into account the higher interests of the British government, especially the economic ones. It also becomes clear that the British government's opposition to imposing sanctions against the South African government was not because it harmed black Africans, but rather it feared for its economic interests in South Africa.
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