

SANIA

# SOUTH AFRICAN RECORD



DIE SUID-AFRIKAANSE INSTITUUT VAN INTERNASIONALE AANGELEENTHED  
THE SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

NUMBER 21

**SOUTHERN AFRICA  
RECORD  
NUMBER 21  
OKTOBER/OCTOBER 1980**

---

**CONTENTS/INHOUD**

**Negotiations on SWA/Nambia:**

- |           |                                                                                                                                                                                            |           |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>A.</b> | <b>Letter dated 20 June 1980, from the UN Secretary-General to the South African Foreign Minister, in reply to his letter of 12 May 1980</b>                                               | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>B.</b> | <b>Press release issued on 11 July 1980 by the United States Mission to the UN, containing a statement by the five Governments concerning Namibia</b>                                      | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>C.</b> | <b>Letter dated 29 August 1980, from the South African Foreign Minister to the UN Secretary-General, in reply to his letter of 20 June 1980</b>                                            | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>D.</b> | <b>Statement by the United States Ambassador to the UN, Mr Don McHenry, on 9 September 1980</b>                                                                                            | <b>12</b> |
| <b>E.</b> | <b>Statement by the South African Foreign Minister on 9 September 1980, concerning Ambassador McHenry's remarks on the same date, about South Africa's role in the SWA/Namibia dispute</b> | <b>19</b> |
| <b>F.</b> | <b>Interview with Mr Sam Nujoma, Swapo President, during a conference on SWA/Namibia in Paris, from 11 — 13 September 1980</b>                                                             | <b>20</b> |
| <b>G.</b> | <b>Letter dated 15 September 1980, from the Council of Ministers in Windhoek, to the UN Secretary-General</b>                                                                              | <b>22</b> |
| <b>H.</b> | <b>Letter dated 17 September 1980, from the South African Foreign Minister to the UN Secretary-General</b>                                                                                 | <b>22</b> |
| <b>I.</b> | <b>Letter dated 19 September 1980, from the UN Secretary-General to the South African Foreign Minister, in reply to his letter of 29 August</b>                                            | <b>23</b> |
| <b>J.</b> | <b>Letter dated 22 September 1980, from the South African Foreign Minister to the UN Secretary-General, in reply to his letter of 19 September</b>                                         | <b>23</b> |
| <b>K.</b> | <b>SABC Radio interview on 20 April 1980, with the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon. R.F. Botha, on the question of Walvis Bay</b>                                                  | <b>24</b> |

**South Africa and Angola:**

- |            |                                                                                                                                             |           |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>(I)</b> | <b>Letter dated 27 June 1980, from the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon. R.F. Botha, to the President of the UN Security Council</b> | <b>26</b> |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|

- (ii) Resolution 475 (1980) adopted by the UN Security Council on 27 June 1980 27

**South Africa and Lesotho:**

- (i) Extract from a statement by the Foreign Minister of Lesotho, the Hon. C.D. Molapo, to the UN General Assembly on 25 September 1980 29
- (ii) Reaction by the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon. R.F. Botha, to the Lesotho Foreign Minister's statement 32

**Zimbabwe:**

- (i) Extract from an address by the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, to the OAU 17th Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, in Freetown, Sierra Leone, on 2 July 1980 33
- (ii) Extract from a speech by the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, to the Zimbabwe Economic Society at the University of Zimbabwe, on 8 September 1980 37
- (iii) Extract from a speech by the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, to the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference in Salisbury on 11 September 1980 44

**South Africa and Zimbabwe:**

- (i) Joint statement issued by the Governments of South Africa and Zimbabwe on 3 September 1980 47
- (ii) Comment on 6 October 1980 by the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon. R.F. Botha, in response to press enquiries about accusations by the Zimbabwean Prime Minister that South Africa supports subversion against Zimbabwe 48

**Extract concerning Southern Africa from a statement in Parliament by the South African Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, the Hon. P.W. Botha, on 1 May 1980 50**

**Uittreksels oor Suidelike Afrika uit 'n toespraak deur die Suid-Afrikaanse Eerste Minister, Sy Edele P.W. Botha, tydens die Republiekfeesvierings van die Randse Afrikaanse Universiteit op 30 Mei 1980 54**

**Extracts concerning Southern Africa from a speech by the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary, Lord Carrington, to the UN General Assembly on 23 September 1980 61**

ISSN : 0377 5445

Midas Printers (Pty) Ltd

## NEGOTIATIONS ON SWA/NAMIBIA

### A. Letter dated 20 June 1980, from the UN Secretary-General to the South African Foreign Minister, in reply to his letter of 12 May 1980

Your Excellency

I have the honour to refer to your letter of 12 May (S/13985).<sup>1</sup> I welcome Your Excellency's reassurance that South Africa seeks an international settlement of the Namibian question within the framework of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).<sup>2</sup>

You will recall that the concept of the demilitarized zone was advanced by the late President Neto with a view to facilitating the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). I have now held further consultations in the context of South Africa's acceptance of the concept and its desire to make it feasible. Your Excellency, in paragraph 4 of your letter, referred to the four remaining matters on which further information was sought.

As regards the matter of selected locations, the Governments of Angola and Zambia have confirmed to me their desire to retain a total of seven such locations in their portion of the proposed zone. The Front-Line States and SWAPO have stated that, in their view, the South African claim to retain twenty bases in the Namibian sector of the demilitarized zone during the first twelve weeks after the ceasefire is unnecessarily large. However, in the interest of obtaining a final settlement to the Namibian question, the Front-Line States and SWAPO would agree to this total, within the framework of the provisions of the Settlement Proposal (S/12636).

Your letter also refers to that part of the Settlement Proposal dealing with the closure of SWAPO bases in Angola and Zambia one week after the certification of the result of the election. The Governments of Angola and Zambia have reassured me that no infiltration of armed SWAPO personnel will take place from their territory into Namibia after the ceasefire. By their acceptance of the Settlement Proposal they had undertaken to ensure that the provisions of the transitional arrangements, and the outcome of the election for a Constituent Assembly, would be respected. In the interest of establishing a climate of confidence, the Front-Line States informed me of their desire for a reciprocal undertaking by the Government of South Africa that it also would accept and abide by the outcome of free and fair elections held under

1. See *Southern Africa Record*, no. 20, August 1980, p. 24-26  
2. *Op. Cit.* no. 14, December 1978, p. 43

United Nations supervision and control. As sovereign states they would diligently exercise their responsibilities in compliance with the letter and spirit of the proposal. It follows, therefore, that the closure of the bases and the disposition of arms and equipment would be the responsibility of the host governments. Their final disposition would be undertaken by them in consultation with the Government of the independent state of Namibia. The personnel previously resident in such bases would, of course, have the opportunity of peaceful repatriation to Namibia. As regards the question of Swapo bases in Namibia, I would recall that, as your Government has been informed, the Front-Line States and Swapo decided, in August 1979, that upon South Africa's acceptance of the demilitarized zone, and upon implementation of resolution 435 (1978), this question would no longer arise.

As to the question of the deployment of UNTAG's military component, I wish to assure Your Excellency that we have a common interest in ensuring that UNTAG is fully capable of fulfilling its responsibilities. You are certainly aware of the wide range of tasks assigned to the military component of UNTAG under the Settlement Proposal. As previously explained to your military advisers, the military component is required to perform approximately ten different categories of tasks, apart from patrolling in the demilitarized zone. These duties must be carried out throughout the vast area of Namibia within a total troop strength of 7 500, including headquarters and logistic elements. Nevertheless, according to the provisional deployment proposals outlined by the United Nations mission in February and March 1980, five of UNTAG's seven battalions would be deployed in the demilitarized zone together with substantial elements of its monitoring, air, communications, transport and other units. I should like to reiterate that United Nations peace-keeping operating procedures are of a different nature to those pertaining to a national defence force. In particular, UNTAG's provisional deployment proposals assume the existence of a ceasefire and the co-operation of all parties concerned. In setting them out, General Prem Chand emphasized not only this point, but also that final decisions concerning deployment could be taken only in the light of the circumstances prevalent at the time of implementation.

In view of the information thus provided upon these questions, which were those remaining to be dealt with after the recent United Nations mission to Southern Africa, I hope that Your Excellency will now be in a position to co-operate in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

In your letter of 12 May, Your Excellency went on to mention

several additional matters in regard to which I should like to make the following observations:

As regards paragraph 5 of your letter, I am sure you will understand that in implementing Security Council resolution 435 (1978) the United Nations will continue to deal only with the parties envisaged in the Settlement Proposal (S/12636) and in the demilitarized zone proposal.

Your Excellency states that the South African Government deems it imperative that all participants in the political process in Namibia must now be placed on an equal footing at least by those directly responsible for implementation. In this connection, I, for my part, would reiterate that the principle of impartiality has been, and will be, consistently followed in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). You will recall that in paragraph 11 of my report of 29 August 1978<sup>3</sup> (S/12827) I stated that "in performing its functions, UNTAG will act with complete impartiality. In order that the proposal may be effectively implemented, it is expected that the Administrator-General and all other officials from within the Territory will exhibit the same impartiality". This report was approved by the Council in resolution 435, has been accepted by all the parties, and will govern them in the exercise of their various functions under the proposal. Thus, not only the Secretariat of the United Nations, but the South African Government and its officials will be expected, in the implementation of the Security Council resolution, to carry out their duties with complete impartiality and without any discrimination. I trust that Your Excellency shares these views.

In my opinion, the holding of free and fair elections has, as its prerequisite, that all parties be granted fair and equal treatment by all the responsible authorities. This requirement is central to the Settlement Proposal which makes provision in regard to all measures affecting the political process at all levels of administration. It states that every adult Namibian, without discrimination or fear of intimidation from any source, will be eligible to vote, campaign and stand for election to the Constituent Assembly. It makes provision for secret ballot, and for full freedom of speech, assembly, movement and press. It requires that the electoral machinery ensure that all political parties and interested persons, without regard to their political views, shall have a full and fair opportunity to organize and participate in the electoral process. It requires the repeal of all remaining discriminatory or restrictive measures which might abridge the objective of free and fair elections, and the release of all political prisoners or detainees so that they can fully and freely participate in the electoral process,

3. . See *Southern Africa Record*, no. 14, December 1978, p. 9-19

without fear of arrest, detention, intimidation or imprisonment. The proposal also provides for the peaceful return of all Namibians in exile so that they, too, may fully and freely participate in the electoral process without risk of arrest, detention, intimidation, or imprisonment. It stipulates that all Namibians be given a full and voluntary choice whether to return. It requires that my Special Representative take steps to guarantee against the possibility of intimidation or interference with the electoral process from whatever quarter. Compliance with all the criteria indicated in the Settlement Proposal is a guiding principle for me and will be scrupulously ensured by my Special Representative and his staff.

Your Excellency also alludes, in paragraph 8 of your letter, to various resolutions of the General Assembly. The implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is undertaken specifically under the authority of the Council in the context of the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

I wish, finally, to reiterate my belief in the urgency of arriving at a peaceful solution to a question which has preoccupied the international community for many years, and whose unresolved condition has led to tragic loss of life and destruction in Namibia and throughout the whole region. I believe that this letter should resolve the issues which have stood in the way of the implementation of resolution 435. I would therefore like to suggest to Your Excellency that we now establish the earliest possible date for a ceasefire and the implementation of the Security Council resolution.

#### **B. Press release issued on 11 July 1980 by the United States Mission to the UN, containing a statement by the five Governments concerning Namibia**

The Governments of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States continue to believe that implementation of the United Nations Settlement Plan and of Security Council resolution 435 is the best available means of achieving an internationally acceptable settlement in Namibia. The five Governments remain resolute in their efforts to achieve that goal.

The Governments of the Five are therefore concerned by the South African Government's establishment of a "Council of Ministers"<sup>1</sup> in Namibia. Such action raises legitimate questions as to South Africa's intentions and complicates an already difficult

1. The Council of Ministers, with executive powers, was sworn in on 1 July 1980; prior to this, the National Assembly had been handed executive powers on 19 September 1979

settlement process.

The Governments of the Five do not recognize the "Council of Ministers", just as they do not recognize the "National Assembly" in Namibia, which was based on the internal elections of December 1978 which the Governments of the Five regard as null and void. These developments do not alter the responsibility of the South African Government for the implementation of the UN Settlement Plan under the terms of resolution 435. The Five Governments call on the South African Government to refrain from any action which could jeopardize the successful resolution of the negotiations.

Transcript text supplied by the South African Department of Foreign Affairs and Information

**C: Letter dated 29 August 1980, from the South African Foreign Minister to the UN Secretary-General, in reply to his letter of 20 June 1980**

Your Excellency

1. The people of South West Africa/Namibia and the South African Government are determined to *conclude successfully the negotiations* of the past three and a half years to bring the Territory to independence. During this time, much has been achieved and it is in the interests of all concerned that these achievements should not be forfeited. It is essential that we do not lose sight of the issues of substance on which South West African and South African agreement has been forthcoming, such as a unitary state, universal adult suffrage, the removal of discrimination based on colour, the holding of free and fair elections to the satisfaction of the United Nations, the right of all South West Africans to return to participate peacefully in the political process and the reciprocal release of detainees wherever held.

2. Your Excellency's letter of 20 June 1980 (S/14011) dealt with a number of issues which required the closest consideration by the leadership in South West Africa and by the South African Government. The approach of these authorities was constructive and positive with the objective of preserving and facilitating the implementation of what has been achieved.

3. The South African Government has taken note of the fact that South Africa will be entitled to retain a total of twenty bases in the demilitarized zone during the first twelve weeks after the cease-fire comes into effect. It has also noted that Angola and Zambia



together will have seven bases in the demilitarized zone on their sides of the border. It is assumed that the conditions laid down for bases in the DMZ will apply equally to all. The South African Government expects UNTAG, in the execution of its functions in the DMZ, to ensure compliance with the provision in paragraph 2 of Your Excellency's report (S/13862) of 31 March 1980, namely that Swapo would be excluded from these seven bases. Furthermore, the South African Government has noted that Swapo's claims to bases inside South West Africa/Namibia have been abandoned.

4. The South African Government welcomes the assurances now provided to Your Excellency by the Governments of Angola and Zambia in respect of the closure of Swapo bases in Angola and Zambia. It is assumed that the Governments of the two states accept full responsibility for ensuring that Swapo personnel when returning to South West Africa/Namibia after closure of their bases, will do so peacefully, *i.e.* without arms, and only through designated entry points, as stipulated in the Settlement Proposal. It is further assumed that Your Excellency is satisfied that the countries concerned can and will honour their commitments. The importance which the inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia and the South African Government attach to this aspect should not be underestimated. The early and successful conclusion of the Settlement Proposal would be jeopardized and other serious consequences could follow if any of the governments involved are unable to carry out their commitments fully and consistently.

5. In your letter you call on all to respect the outcome of the settlement plan. South Africa by its acceptance of the Settlement Proposal on 25 April 1978<sup>1</sup>, indicated its willingness to abide by this outcome, provided it would be achieved by free and fair elections.

6. The South African Government has noted Your Excellency's reply on the matter of the deployment of UNTAG. Given UNTAG's task to ensure that the DMZ retains its demilitarized character, it is assumed that practical arrangements will be made at the outset for UNTAG's military component to be deployed throughout the entire DMZ. It is also assumed that the final decisions on deployment by the military commander of UNTAG, to which you allude, will be taken before implementation and after due consultation.

1. See *Southern Africa Record*, no. 12, May 1978, p.32

7. Your Excellency states that the principle of impartiality will be consistently followed in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)<sup>2</sup>. For the South African Government and the people of South West Africa/Namibia *impartiality is a crucial issue in implementing that resolution successfully*. It is assumed, therefore, that all parties involved in the implementation of the Settlement Proposal will henceforth maintain a strictly impartial approach. Consequently, preferential treatment of Swapo should now cease.

8. With regard to Your Excellency's reference to the impartiality of the South African Government and its officials, the requirement of impartiality is not to be construed as being inconsistent with measures which may be necessary for the maintenance of law and order, the protection of life and property, the continuation of orderly administration, etc., since the Settlement Proposal envisages conditions of peace.

9. Your Excellency contends that impartiality on the part of the United Nations, and in particular on the part of the Secretariat, will be manifested after the commencement of the implementation of the Settlement Proposal. That would be too late. That, in effect, amounts to an admission which is borne out by the record that up to now the United Nations family has not been impartial. It is this lack of impartiality that is the cause of the doubts in the minds of a large section of the people of the Territory about entrusting a role to the United Nations in the implementation of the plan. Scrupulous impartiality is required forthwith. It is a prerequisite to securing the support of all parties in the Territory for commencement of implementation. Your Excellency's actions and statements, as well as those emanating from other organs of and bodies in the United Nations to date, have not suggested that the importance of this fact is comprehended. Some of Your Excellency's comments, together with recent arbitrary actions by the United Nations, have not been helpful in positively influencing the attitude of South West Africans to the most recent proposals and implementation suggestions. On the contrary, they have further reduced the faith of South West Africans in those designated by the UN to play a role in the implementation of the settlement proposal. The South African Government does not believe that political expediency should be allowed to stand in the way of a clear, impartial and uncompromising approach on the part of all those involved in and responsible for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

2. See *Southern Africa Record*, no. 14, December 1978, p.43

10. The proposal incorporated in that resolution and all efforts to secure an internationally acceptable solution of the South West Africa/Namibian issue should be based on the assumption that all the parties would act in good faith. Mutual trust flowing from this good faith is essential. A review of developments since South Africa accepted the proposal on 25 April 1978 reveals that lack of these basic ingredients, good faith and mutual trust, has proved to be the greatest obstacle to implementation and is directly attributable to Swapo's actions and attitudes, together with UN bias in favour of Swapo.

11. At the root of the threatening impasse is the fact that the UN is required to play a neutral role in respect of implementation, but at the same time it is the most ardent protagonist of Swapo which is one of several parties contending for power in the Territory. Despite the fact that Swapo has consistently engaged in violence and terror to gain its ends in the Territory, in violation of the provisions of the UN Charter and of the spirit of the Settlement Proposal, the United Nations, at the instance of its General Assembly, is continuing to treat Swapo as the sole and authentic representative of the people of the Territory using the vehicle of the Secretariat for this purpose. The United Nations has thus undermined its own credibility. The General Assembly and the Secretariat did not attempt to modify their attitudes and actions supportive of Swapo when the Security Council adopted the Settlement Proposal. This continues to call into question the good faith of the United Nations.

12. The pronouncement by the General Assembly of Swapo as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, and the reiteration of this proposition at a time when the Security Council was endeavouring to find an agreed procedure for implementing the proposal, could not fail to raise alarm among the major political parties and movements in the Territory (none of whom espouse violence), who will be contending with Swapo for the support of the electorate. South Africa will not be a contestant in any election in South West Africa/Namibia. It will be the political parties of the Territory that will contest the election and for this contest they must, if the election is to be regarded as fair, all be on a par, including Swapo. The future of South West Africa/Namibia is in the hands of these parties. The basis of South Africa's policy in regard to the Territory has always been that the people themselves must decide their future. In negotiations with the five Western Powers who evolved the Settlement Proposal and with the United Nations, the South African Government has

mainly acted as a channel to convey the opinions of the democratic parties in the Territory, which have consistently been consulted. South Africa has, however, had the reciprocal duty of conveying to the parties in the Territory the views of the Five and of yourself and your representatives and on occasion, at your request, seeking to persuade the leadership in the Territory to heed the calls of the Security Council.

13. The ambiguity of the UN position has become *the central issue in the thinking of a large section of the people*. Something must be done, for example, to correct the assumption that UNTAG will be a stalking-horse for Swapo.

14. Your Excellency's public statements are another crucial factor in establishing an image of the impartiality of the United Nations in the minds of Namibians opposed to Swapo. While your commitment in your letter of 20 June 1980 to impartial UN implementation of the Settlement Proposal is welcome, it is your recent statements which substantially influence the attitude of Namibians to the current Settlement Proposal and implementation suggestions and their assessment of the bona fides of the United Nations. Statements such as made recently by Your Excellency in Sierra Leone do not help to persuade the leadership in the Territory to commit themselves to the implementation formulae envisaged.

15. In your remarks you chose to express deep appreciation to Swapo for their co-operation. I would like to remind Your Excellency that Swapo has, since the tabling of the Settlement Proposal, done everything in its power to obstruct its implementation. South Africa agreed to the proposal in ample time for the target date for independence set by the plan, 31 December 1978, to be achieved. Swapo prevented that implementation by withholding its "agreement", which was most ambiguous, until independence in 1978 became impossible, precipitating a crisis in the settlement process.

16. It was Swapo also that precipitated the next crisis by insisting on the establishment of Swapo armed camps within South West Africa/Namibia after the commencement of implementation and by rejecting the monitoring of Swapo bases, both in violation of the Settlement Proposal. Swapo sympathisers then engineered endorsement by the Secretariat of these unauthorised demands. You will recall that the relative paragraphs 11 and 12 of your report S/13120 of 26 February 1979<sup>3</sup>, stymied implementation,

3. See *Southern Africa Record*, no. 15, April 1979, p.22-27

the commencement of which the South African Government had been strongly and repeatedly urging.

17. Moreover, Swapo has throughout never desisted from its policy of violence. The statements of its leader have made it clear that Swapo would not allow democratic processes to abort its quest for power in South West Africa/Namibia. As part of that strategy, a UN supervised election is regarded merely as a device which might possibly be exploited to assist its overall objective, while retaining an unmonitored force at full strength across the border to intervene should it lose such an election. Swapo has never once during the attempted settlement, ceased or offered to cease, its campaign of infiltration, subversion, terrorism and assassination, as an earnest of its good faith. For it is Swapo that is the initiator of aggressive violence in the Territory, provoking responsive protective reaction on the part of South Africa, in accordance with her commitments. Without Swapo's harassment, the need for South African retaliation would fall away.

18. Your Sierra Leone statement, I regret, also erred seriously on a question of fact and was totally one-sided. The "attack by South African armed forces" was not launched against an Angolan target but against Swapo bases.

19. Associating yourself with the condemnation of South Africa is not only uncalled for and inappropriate, but dangerous. Your failure to make any mention whatsoever of Swapo's continuous campaign of terrorism, and wanton destruction of life and property in the Territory is inexplicable. These actions of Swapo and the construction and staffing with Soviet and East German aid, of an extensive underground headquarters complex, together with the stockpiling of considerable quantities of Soviet war material, intended for use in South West Africa, are solely responsible for precipitating the South African retaliation. There is no question of your being in ignorance about Swapo activities as I have kept you informed officially on a regular basis and in detail of Swapo's heinous activities, for example as recently as my letter of 24 June 1980. You are well aware that Swapo assassinates community leaders, murders farmers and others in remote areas, plants bombs designed to blow up civilians, abducts school children, destroys property, including installations providing water, power and services to the civilian population, places landmines in public roads, and at all times attempts to infiltrate, subvert, kill and destroy in its campaign against the civilian population. It is difficult to comprehend how you can fail to condemn Swapo's ac-

tivities when you display no reticence in condemning actions forced on South Africa by those activities. The facts set out in my letter to the President of the Security Council dated 27 June 1980, have moreover been simply ignored. There is, I regret, no trace of impartiality in this approach.

20. The South African Government wholeheartedly concurs with Your Excellency that a cessation of violence by all parties is a prerequisite for initiating the process of settlement. However, such a cessation of violence will not take place until Swapo ceases its terrorist attacks. Swapo, for its part, is unlikely to cease these attacks while such actions continue to be condoned and supported by certain elements in the international community, including the United Nations, which in spite of these acts of terror continues to support Swapo to the exclusion of the other parties of the Territory.

21. A great responsibility rests on Your Excellency at this critical stage of South West Africa/Namibia's road to independence. It lies in your power to make a substantial contribution by condemning Swapo's campaign of intimidation and violence against the civilian inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia. By so doing, you could contribute to reassuring the people of the Territory who insist that up to now they have been denied equal treatment by the United Nations.

22. The South African Government welcomes Your Excellency's statement that the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) is undertaken specifically under the authority of the Security Council in the context of the provisions of the United Nations Charter. It is therefore assumed that no action contrary to these provisions will be initiated by the General Assembly or officials of the United Nations. Any such action would jeopardize further implementation.

23. On the basis of all the above assumptions and Your Excellency's confirmation, the South African Government stands ready to discuss with Your Excellency the composition of UNTAG, the status of forces agreement and the setting in motion of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). In doing so I wish to recall that in my letter of 12 May 1980 (S/13935)<sup>4</sup> I expressed the view that the successful implementation of the Settlement Proposal or of any proposal designed to achieve a peaceful solution will continue to be seriously jeopardized *if all the*

4. See *Southern Africa Record*, no. 20, August 1980, p. 24-26

*parties are not treated on an equal basis.* The people of South West Africa/Namibia, with the support of the South African Government, have consistently demanded fair and equal treatment impartially applied. The South African Government accordingly deems it essential that Your Excellency henceforth include the leadership in the Territory in all future consultations on the setting in motion of the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) or on any other matter which would facilitate the achievement of an internationally acceptable solution.

S/14139

**D. Statement by the United States Ambassador to the UN, Mr Don McHenry, on 9 September 1980\***

Mr Chairman, distinguished members of the Subcommittee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak with you today on the subject of Namibia — a matter of importance to the Administration and one which I know has been a concern of the Subcommittee for some time.

I last addressed the Subcommittee on the question of Namibia, also known as South West Africa, on May 7, 1979.<sup>1</sup> At that time I described in some detail the history of the Namibia dispute:

- The League of Nation's mandate given to South Africa to administer the Territory following World War I;
- South Africa's steady imposition of its own system of apartheid on the Territory and the subsequent 1966 decision of the United Nations General Assembly, with the support of the United States, to terminate South Africa's mandate;
- The ruling by the International Court of Justice that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal and that South Africa was obliged to withdraw;
- South Africa's refusal to withdraw, and the development of the armed struggle, led by the South West Africa People's Organization, Swapo.

I also described the decision in April 1977, by the then five Western members of the United Nations Security Council — Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States — to jointly launch an unprecedented effort to find an internationally-acceptable solution to the Namibian problem, based on the set of principles unanimously adopted by the United Nations Security Council in resolu-

\*Made before the US House of Representatives Subcommittee on Africa  
1. See *Southern Africa Record*, no. 18, December 1979, p.46-56

tion 385 in January 1976.<sup>2</sup> I outlined some of the problems with which the Five's settlement effort has been faced, and I explained the proposal for a settlement which the Five placed before the United Nations Security Council on April 10, 1978.<sup>3</sup> That proposal includes among its key elements:

- The holding of free and fair elections for a Constituent Assembly leading to independence;
- The cessation of all hostile acts by all parties;
- The restriction of South African and Swapo armed forces to base and the subsequent phased withdrawal from Namibia of all South African troops — that withdrawal to be completed one week after certification of the elections;
- The administration of the Territory during the transitional period leading to the elections by a South African-appointed Administrator General, with all acts affecting the political process under the supervision and control of a UN Special Representative appointed by the Secretary General of the UN;
- The introduction of a United Nations civilian and military presence to ensure the observance of the terms of the settlement;
- The release of all Namibian political prisoners and detainees;
- The return of exiles; and
- The establishment of conditions for free and fair elections, including freedom of speech, movement, press, assembly, and the repeal of discriminatory or restrictive legislation.

When I last addressed the Subcommittee on this subject, I indicated that both South Africa and Swapo had agreed to the Five's Settlement Proposal but that South Africa had not agreed to the United Nations Secretary General's plans for implementation of the proposal — plans which the Five regarded as consistent with the original proposal which South Africa had accepted. Swapo, on the other hand, had indicated its acceptance of the Secretary General's implementation plans and its readiness to move ahead with that implementation.

I would recommend my earlier testimony to the members of the Subcommittee for a fuller discussion of the events which I have just recalled. Today, however, I would like to provide you with an update on the developments which have taken place since, and with an assessment of the current state of our continuing settlement effort.

In May of 1979, South Africa raised two principal objections to the Secretary General's plans for implementation. The one which

2. See *Southern Africa Record*, no. 4, February 1976, p.40-42

3. *Op. Cit.* no. 12, May 1978, p.25-30



then seemed to be South Africa's primary objection concerned the Secretary General's proposal that any Swapo armed personnel inside Namibia at the start of the cease-fire would be restricted and monitored by the UN at designated locations inside Namibia. South Africa objected to this proposal on the grounds that it would provide Swapo with bases inside Namibia. The Five supported the Secretary General's proposal as a sensible way of dealing with the practical problem of monitoring those Swapo armed personnel inside Namibia at the time of the cease-fire. The question became moot when the Frontline States, in the interest of advancing the settlement effort, prevailed upon Swapo to agree that upon South Africa's acceptance of implementation of the settlement plan, Swapo would no longer insist on such designated locations. Those Swapo armed personnel inside the Territory at the start of the cease-fire would therefore be given the choice of either turning over their arms to the United Nations and participating peacefully in the electoral process, or of being granted safe passage out of the Territory.

The second South African objection concerned South Africa's insistence on the monitoring by the United Nations of Swapo bases outside Namibia. South Africa maintained this insistence despite the fact that the Five's proposal, which South Africa had previously accepted, made no such provision.

In the view of the Five, this factor had been adequately taken into account in determining the size and composition of the proposed United Nations presence during the transitional period. Moreover, the Frontline States had committed themselves to ensuring the scrupulous observance of the cease-fire, an assurance which the Five had every reason to regard as genuine.

Nevertheless, in an effort to overcome this South African objection, the late President Neto of Angola proposed a compromise: the establishment of a demilitarized zone fifty kilometres on either side of Namibia's northern border with Angola and Zambia. Under this compromise, the United Nations forces would not only monitor the border from the Namibia side, as envisioned in the Five's original proposal, but also would be permitted to operate on the Angolan and Zambian sides of the border within the demilitarized zone. Both the South African Government and the Governments of Angola and Zambia would be permitted to retain certain forces within the 100-kilometre-wide zone at designated locations. No Swapo forces would be permitted in the demilitarized zone. The South African forces would still be withdrawn from their side of the demilitarized zone twelve weeks after the cease-fire, in accordance with the provi-

sions of the Five's proposal.

In a letter to Secretary General Waldheim dated May 12, 1980,<sup>4</sup> the South African Government stated that it had studied and evaluated the feasibility of the demilitarized zone. Among other things, South Africa in its letter asked that it be allowed to retain its forces at twenty designated locations within the demilitarized zone, about three times the number envisioned in President Neto's original proposal. Despite the fact that such a large number of locations was never envisioned, the Frontline States, meeting in Lusaka, Zambia on June 2, once again prevailed upon Swapo to accept the South African insistence on twenty locations in the hope that this would lead to a final settlement. Angola and Zambia further agreed that their forces would have only seven such locations on their territories within the demilitarized zone.

These agreements were conveyed by Frontline and Swapo representatives to Secretary General Waldheim, who in turn conveyed them to the South African Government in a letter dated June 20, 1980. In his letter, the Secretary General expressed his hope that the forthcoming positions taken by the Frontline and Swapo in order to meet South Africa's remaining reservations about the demilitarized zone concept would now permit South Africa's early agreement to implementation of the settlement plan.

On August 29, South Africa sent a further letter to Secretary General Waldheim, replying to the Secretary General's letter of June 20. In its letter, South Africa sets forth a number of interpretations and assumptions about aspects of the Settlement Proposal and the demilitarized zone concept. It goes on to state that if these interpretations and assumptions are accepted, South Africa would be prepared to proceed with discussions on the implementation of the settlement plan.

I regret to say that this qualified willingness to discuss implementation of the settlement plan, while not unwelcome, nevertheless falls short of the clear-cut response that had been hoped for. Secretary General Waldheim and the Five are currently giving the South African letter detailed study and analysis. For that reason, I am not in a position to comment further at this time on its substance.

Apart from the substance, however, I feel obligated to address at least briefly some of the other aspects of the South African letter that are certain to receive attention. The letter contains a number of allegations and interpretations of fact that only can be described as distorted. In particular, we regard the direct attacks on the Secretary General personally as both unhelpful and un-

4. See *Southern Africa Record*, no. 20, August 1980, p. 24-26

justified. I do not care to speculate on South Africa's motives in this regard, but I do wish to commend the Secretary General and other parties involved for their restraint thus far in withholding comment.

If there is a genuine issue buried within the rhetoric of the South African letter, it is the issue of the impartial implementation of the UN settlement plan. In this connection, South Africa has charged that the United Nations General Assembly's designation of Swapo as "the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people" raises questions as to the ability of the United Nations to supervise impartially the elections in Namibia, and South Africa has called on the United Nations to exhibit complete impartiality henceforth.

There are several comments which should be made here. First, as South Africa is aware, the settlement plan for Namibia would be carried out by the Secretary General under the authority of the Security Council, not the General Assembly. The Security Council has never adopted or endorsed the disposition of the General Assembly to regard Swapo as the sole representative of the Namibian people. On the contrary, Security Council resolutions 385 and 435,<sup>5</sup> on which the UN settlement plan is based, fully endorse the principle that the leadership of the Territory must be determined through free and fair elections in which all political parties, including Swapo, will be placed on an equal footing.

Finally, it should be noted that significant elements of the Namibian people, including political parties and the Namibian Council of Churches — whose member churches comprise among their congregations more than half of the Territory's adult population — support prompt implementation of the settlement plan.

Second, the United Nations has over the years established an excellent record for impartial peacekeeping operations in even the most difficult and demanding circumstances. We need only look at the examples of Cyprus and the Middle East. With regard to the Namibian settlement plan, the Secretary General of the United Nations has repeatedly and publicly given South Africa assurances of his complete impartiality and that of his United Nations staff in the implementation of the plan, most recently in his letter of June 20. In that letter, as on previous occasions, the Secretary General stated that the requirement of impartiality is one that applies to all parties to the settlement, and he has called upon South Africa to give a reciprocal assurance of its own impartiality in the implementation of the settlement plan.

5. See *Southern Africa Record*, no. 14, December 1978, p.43

Thirdly, as in any negotiation, each side in the Namibia dispute has taken positions with a view to maximizing their bargaining leverage with the other. These positions will inevitably be altered once a final agreement is reached and implementation of the settlement plan begins. In insisting that Swapo now be denied that stature it presently derives from its recognition by some in the international community, South Africa is in effect seeking to extract a major concession without committing itself to an agreement. There is considerable wariness on the part of Swapo and its supporters in the international community about abandoning the remaining positions and leverage they now enjoy, just as there is wariness on the part of South Africa about surrendering its advantages in the negotiations. The task that confronts the Five and the Secretary General is to bring both sides to final agreement and to begin the implementation of the settlement plan, in which case most of the reservations currently voiced by both sides will become moot.

For their part, the Five had made clear that their efforts to ensure a fair settlement in Namibia will not cease once implementation begins. We will remain ready to do all in our power to ensure that the provisions of the plan will be scrupulously adhered to, not least those which provide for the fair and equal treatment of all parties in the electoral process. However let me say, Mr Chairman, that we fully intend to pursue the major task before us, which is to complete the work and fulfill the promise of three and a half years of arduous negotiation in order to bring about an internationally accepted settlement in Namibia. We will therefore focus our attention in the days ahead on those substantive aspects of South Africa's position which must be addressed if a settlement is to be achieved. We are confident that the other parties involved, including the Secretary General, are prepared to proceed with the same determination and seriousness of purpose.

In this regard, let me say that, despite the three and a half years which have been spent already on this settlement effort, there is urgency to it. The situation inside Namibia is constantly changing, and those changes threaten to unravel the agreements which have already been reached. The most significant action inside Namibia has been South Africa's creation of a so-called "Council of Ministers", composed entirely of members of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, the party which won the South African-supervised elections of December 1978. These elections were boycotted by major internal political parties as well as by Swapo and not recognized by the Five or by the international community. This "Council of Ministers" has been given conside-

rable authority by South Africa and the Government seems to be scalling down the visibility and scope of the Administrator General.

*In response to this action, the Governments of the Five released a statement on July 11, making clear their refusal to recognize the "Council of Ministers" and their insistence that the South African Government must continue to be held fully accountable for implementation of the UN settlement plan.*

The fighting along Namibia's northern border also increases, with losses to both Swapo and South Africa ever growing and with South African raids into neighbouring states becoming more frequent. The Frontline States have given the Five their co-operation and support, but their willingness to participate in this settlement effort cannot be taken for granted. Likewise, Swapo's willingness to implement the settlement plan cannot be taken for granted. Swapo has been brought to this point with considerable persuasion from the Frontline States. If the settlement cannot soon be implemented, the Frontline States and Swapo may have second thoughts.

As I stated in my previous testimony, most African members of the United Nations are convinced that South Africa has never had any intention of proceeding with an internationally-acceptable settlement in Namibia. The Frontline States believe that since they have brought Swapo to accept the settlement, it is now up to the Five to obtain South Africa's agreement. If South Africa does not agree, there will be increasingly strong calls at the United Nations for us to support our own negotiations by exerting real pressure, including economic sanctions if necessary, on South Africa to comply.

The South African Government meanwhile appears to be continuing its two-track strategy of participating in the Five's settlement effort, while at the same time taking actions inside Namibia which move toward an ill-conceived and doomed internal settlement. Concerning implementation of the settlement plan, South Africa has not made a decision to proceed with implementation. No one can say with certainty what South Africa ultimately intends, but a variety of reasons have been advanced as to why South Africa may hope to postpone a decision.

We have continually told the Frontline States and other African nations that negotiation is a real alternative to the armed struggle in Southern Africa. The settlement in Zimbabwe is certainly proof of that premise. But the settlement in Zimbabwe only came when the war was so advanced that the destruction of all of then Rhodesia was near. The challenge in Namibia is to achieve an internationally-acceptable settlement before the armed struggle reaches that stage, as it otherwise eventually will: to avoid the

bloodshed and devastation which the settlement in Zimbabwe has so vividly shown to be unnecessary.

At present, the key to an internationally-accepted settlement in Namibia lies with the South African Government, and the Five must continue their efforts to convince South Africa that such a settlement is their best alternative. We have come a long distance in this settlement effort — much farther than many sceptics originally thought possible — and I believe that a peaceful settlement is possible in the near future. Those who allow further delay must bear the burden of responsibility for the resulting deterioration. I believe that South Africa has in its government the leadership which is necessary to bring about a settlement. I hope that the South African Government will display the political wisdom and the political will, which is now all that is required for the attainment of peace and independence for Namibia.

*Washington Viewpoint* no. 24, 16 September 1980

**E. Statement by the South African Foreign Minister on 9 September 1980, concerning Ambassador McHenry's remarks on the same date, about South Africa's role in the SWA/Namibia dispute\***

The latest remarks, concerning South Africa's role in South West Africa, made by the American Representative at the UN, Mr McHenry, will not contribute towards a peaceful settlement. The time has come that he should rather devote his attention to the miseries of Africa. Mr McHenry's remarks were uncalled for, but it would certainly have astonished me had Mr McHenry been impressed by the South African reply. South Africa is not attempting to meet Mr McHenry's demands, but is trying to meet her obligations towards the people of SWA. I do not need to cite instances concerning the UN's record with regard to impartiality, the facts speak for themselves.

One would, however, have expected that, particularly in view of the American dilemma over the hostages in Teheran, the Russian invasion of Afghanistan and the general increase in terrorism and lawlessness in the world, Mr McHenry would have taken care not to side so openly with the terrorists of South West Africa.

I hope the American people take note of this standpoint of their Administration's Representative at the UN.

This is not the first time that Mr McHenry has sided with the terrorists. Previously he played a part which led to the wrecking of the negotiations when he supported Swapo's stand concerning the non-monitoring of bases outside SWA. It seems to me he is about to do this again.

\*Translation of statement made in Afrikaans

Text supplied by the South African Department of Foreign Affairs and Information

**F. Interview with Mr Sam Nujoma, Swapo President, during a conference on SWA/Namibia in Paris, from 11 — 13 September 1980\***

*Question: In view of the fact that Mozambique and Zimbabwe have recently adopted more pragmatic economic policies, what are your plans for Namibia after independence?*

**Mr Nujoma:** There has to be a completely new approach to the economic development of our country which will be geared to benefit all the people of Namibia, irrespective of their colour or race or places of origin or status in society.

*What will your attitude be to multinationals?*

Multinationals, which are now exploiting Namibian mineral wealth, are bound by the South African laws to pay taxes and royalties to the regime. According to the information we have, they also pay South African white employees who are in military service for up to a year, which means that they have become part and parcel of the South African war machine.

*Swapo has recently stated that the big mining companies, like RTZ, which operate against UN decrees, will be made to pay indemnity after independence. Does this mean they will be nationalised?*

Nationalisation would depend on the decision of the Namibian parliament. It is not something I can say now. We will adopt a new approach towards foreign investment. It is possible we will guarantee whatever is required for them to continue their operations in our country, but we would not allow them to continue the present system which is geared to benefit the minority white settlers. Of course, new agreements and treaties will have to be entered into.

*What will your attitude be to economic links with SA? For instance, to the shared rail and communications systems?*

I don't think we need SA. As long as SA's attitude towards Namibia is aggressive, we don't need any links with them. As long as SA sends its troops to attack us, would you expect us to have any relationship with them?

*Assume that the attacks will not happen, what would your attitude be?*

We will see then. Our attitude will depend on the attitude of SA.

*Would you maintain diplomatic links with SA?*

Again, this would depend on the SA attitude towards Namibia and its people.

*What would your attitude be if Swapo lost democratic elections?*

We don't entertain the idea of losing elections.

*But would you accept the verdict, whatever it is?*

\*Interview conducted by the *Financial Mail* (Johannesburg), and reprinted with their permission.

Of course we will, but I know very well we won't be defeated. There is no doubt about that.

*Do you think that the present diplomatic initiatives will soon lead to free elections?*

To be frank, there are no signals on the part of SA that it is willing to co-operate in the implementation of the Security Council resolution for a negotiated settlement. The latest communication of SA to the UN Secretary General is rather discouraging. In the view of Swapo, if there is no willingness on the part of Pretoria (to implement the UN plan) the armed struggle is the only effective way which will lead our people to freedom. However, Swapo will continue to press for the full implementation of Security Council resolution 435. In this respect, Swapo is ready to talk even directly to the Pretoria administration about the modalities of implementation. We are also ready to sign a ceasefire with SA, and we are prepared to co-operate fully with the UN to facilitate implementation of its decolonisation plan.

*Are you prepared to negotiate with the "internal" parties?*

The so-called internal parties are puppets of SA's racist regime, and they have no power whatsoever. They don't even have an organisation. They are individuals who are hand-picked by the South Africans, so what do we talk to them about?

*If their presence is a condition for talks, would you attend?*

They can attend as part of the South African delegation, although they don't have the support of the Namibian people. Let them come with the ambassadors. It's OK, we have no objection.

*Is it possible that there will be a conference at which the front-line states will take part?*

The front-line states support the struggle for the liberation of Namibia, but I think the Namibian people are capable of negotiating for their own independence.

*What would be the future of Whites in Namibia when it is independent?*

Our fight for independence is not a fight against individual whites but against a system of oppression, a system of racial discrimination which denies our people fundamental human rights. Therefore, after liberation every citizen of Namibia, irrespective of colour, will be protected by the laws of the country.

*Will they be welcome to stay on?*

Certainly, yes. It would be a crime for an independent Namibia under an African government to commit the same crime of discriminating against other people on a racial basis.

*If you had a message for South Africans, particularly white South Africans, what would it be?*

I would urge them, the Whites in particular, to press upon the Botha regime (the need) to co-operate with the UN in order to



find a negotiated settlement, to avoid further bloodshed and the loss of life and property of Blacks and Whites alike.

**G. Letter dated 15 September 1980, from the Council of Ministers in Windhoek to the UN Secretary-General**

Your Excellency,

The Council of Ministers of South West Africa/Namibia has noted from press reports that a two day United Nations-sponsored conference on the Territory was held last week in Paris, France, and was apparently attended by representatives of various governments and organizations, including the United Nations organizations.

Since none of the political parties of the Territory except Swapo was invited to attend the conference, the Council of Ministers would appreciate your reply to the following questions:

- (a) On whose initiative was the conference arranged?
- (b) Was the conference in fact held under the auspices of the United Nations?
- (c) What representatives of the United Nations Organization attended the conference?
- (d) What was the role of UNESCO at the conference?
- (e) At whose cost was the conference held and what was the approximate amount of the costs involved?
- (f) What organizations and parties from the Territory, if any, were invited to attend the conference?

A copy of this cable is being sent to the Honourable the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information of the Republic of South Africa for his information.

**H. Letter dated 17 September 1980, from the South African Foreign Minister to the UN Secretary-General**

I am in receipt of a copy of the letter which was addressed to you by the Council of Ministers in Windhoek on 15 September 1980, regarding the "Conference in Solidarity with the People of Namibia" which was recently held in Paris.

For ease of reference I attach a copy of the letter in question: from it, it is clear that the Paris Conference has strengthened the serious reservations held in South West Africa regarding the "impartiality" of the United Nations.

I have on several occasions, and recently in my letter to you of 29 August 1980, warned how vital it is that the democratic parties inside the Territory should be convinced of United Nations im-

partiality. The Council of Ministers seeks assurances, also from me, that the Paris Conference is not inconsistent with UN impartiality.

I would, therefore, appreciate receiving your reaction to the pertinent and valid questions raised by the Council of Ministers.

**I. Letter dated 19 September 1980, from the UN Secretary-General to the South African Foreign Minister, in reply to his letter of 29 August**

Excellency,

I should like to refer to your letter of 29 August 1980 (S/14139) in reply to the various clarifications I have communicated to you on 20 June 1980 (S/14011).

After careful consideration, taking all factors of the situation into account as well as the great need to move forward without further delay, I believe that we should now proceed with the implementation of the United Nations plan. To this end, I propose to send a team of senior officials to South Africa to discuss with your Government the setting of a time-frame and other modalities for such implementation. I would suggest that these discussions take place during the week from 29 September to 4 October 1980.

As Your Excellency is aware, I have, on many occasions, expressed my deep concern at the cycle of violence resulting from the unresolved nature of the Namibian question. I wish, therefore, to reiterate my view that the best way to stop such violence is by establishing, as soon as possible, the ceasefire which is the first step in the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Meanwhile, I shall continue to urge all concerned to exercise the maximum degree of restraint with a view to ending the bloodshed and facilitating the process of implementation.

**J. Letter dated 22 September 1980, from the South African Foreign Minister to the UN Secretary-General, in reply to his letter of 19 September**

Thank you for Your Excellency's letter of 19 September 1980.

The South African Government has noted Your Excellency's proposal that a team of senior United Nations officials visit South Africa during the week from 29 September to 4 October 1980. I have to inform Your Excellency that the South African Prime Minister and I will be attending a congress during that time. Thereafter a special session of Parliament will be held. The

swearing-in and constitution of the new Cabinet will take place on 7 October 1980. The new Administrator-General of South West Africa/Namibia will assume his post also on that date. In addition, due to another long-standing commitment, the Prime Minister and I will not be available between the 8th and 20th October 1980.

In the circumstances, I suggest that Your Excellency's officials visit South Africa for discussions during the period 20 to 27 October 1980. It is assumed that at the outset the matters raised in my letter of 29 August 1980 will be discussed.

Text for items G-J supplied by the South African Department of Foreign Affairs and Information

### **K. S.A.B.C. Radio Interview on 20 April 1980, with the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon. R.F. Botha, on the question of Walvis Bay**

*Question: Why is Walvis Bay important to South Africa?*

Minister Botha: Every part of the Republic of South Africa is important to the Government of South Africa and Walvis Bay is an integral part of the Republic of South Africa. This is the most important facet of it. A Government or a country simply does not give away part of that which belongs to it. And secondly, Walvis Bay is a port. A lot of capital has been invested in the Port and Settlement of Walvis Bay by Government agencies and by the private sector. The South African Government has a quantifiable interest besides the political interest from a sovereign point of view.

*Under what circumstances will South Africa be prepared to discuss the incorporation of Walvis Bay into South West Africa in future?*

No, I must make it very clear the the South African Government has at no stage indicated a willingness to discuss the incorporation of Walvis Bay into another entity. What we have stated in the past, and that is still the present position, is that we will be prepared to discuss the use of the port, the making available of the port, to a democratically elected government of South West Africa/Namibia and that position has not yet been reached. Such a government on its way to independence has not yet come into existence but this is what the South African Government had in mind, namely that we would not wish to deny South West Africa the full use of that port. That is the subject which I think we are ready to discuss.

*So Walvis Bay is part and parcel of South Africa and this will not change?*

Oh, yes! This is history. It was annexed in the previous century by Britain and subsequently after annexation in 1878, became

part of the colony of the Cape of Good Hope, part of the Union of South Africa, part of the Republic of South Africa, and that is the international legal situation although this is not generally recognised today. The world and the United Nations, I suppose, could simply decide that it is part and parcel now of the territory of South West Africa and they intend to do so. They have passed resolutions to that effect, but those resolutions do not have legally binding effect. We have stated — I have stated so myself in the Security Council and in documentation submitted to the United Nations — that Walvis Bay is part of the Republic of South Africa.

Should the world come along with what I would call a general plan to reconsider the position of enclaves like that all over the world — the position of Hong Kong, as far as I am concerned, say the position of Hawaii, of Gibraltar, of Northern Ireland — should that sort of situation become an issue which the world would wish to look at again, to see whether they would wish to discuss a new arrangement, I stated then South Africa might also be prepared to do so. But naturally these other powers would never be prepared to deal with their enclaves the way they now say we have to deal with Walvis Bay. So as far as we are concerned Walvis Bay is part of the Cape of Good Hope, part of the Republic of South Africa. And naturally I know that there may be uncertainty in the minds of some of the inhabitants in Walvis Bay. We are aware of that. That is why the Government is now seriously considering a special dispensation, a special position for Walvis Bay, from an administrative point of view and I believe we must go out of our way to assist Walvis Bay, to assist its development and to look at its position, so that the inhabitants of Walvis Bay do not feel neglected.

*Are there any privileges that may come along for the people of Walvis Bay?*

I do not want to go further today but to state that the South African Government, claiming Walvis Bay as part of its territory, will certainly not neglect the inhabitants of Walvis Bay.

Transcript text supplied by the South African Department of Foreign Affairs and Information

## **SOUTH AFRICA AND ANGOLA:**

✓ (i) **Letter dated 27 June 1980, from the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon. R.F. Botha, to the President of the UN Security Council**

Your Excellency

South Africa has always been and remains in favour of dialogue as a means of resolving differences. In the case of Angola this aim has been severely hampered by the continuing acts of violence perpetrated from Angolan territory by Swapo.

The border area between South West Africa/Namibia and Angola has been and still is the centre of recurring incidents of terrorist activity by Swapo. The Secretary-General has, over a period of two years, been kept informed of these incidents which include the wilful murder of civilians, abductions of school children, the laying of landmines and other wanton acts of sabotage and destruction. As recently as yesterday the South African Government once again had cause to draw the Secretary-General's attention to Swapo's terrorist activities involving the death of 46 civilians, the abduction of 71 school children and the wounding of a further 35 civilians during the period March to May 1980.

Furthermore, in the southern part of Angola, conditions of civil war and instability have prevailed for a period of some five years. This is evident from the large number of refugees which periodically flock to South West Africa/Namibia from this ravaged area. South Africa has, at great cost to itself, always received these refugees, without international assistance of any sort.

South Africa is responsible for the security and protection of the people of South West Africa/Namibia and their property. In the exercise of this responsibility, South Africa cannot stand idly by while Swapo seeks to impose its will on the people of the Territory by force of arms, murder and abductions.

South Africa's commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes and to the creation of peace and stability in Southern Africa is further demonstrated by its acceptance, more than two years ago, of a plan for the constitutional settlement of the South West African situation.

The Security Council is at present engaged in a debate on allegations of "aggression" by South Africa against Angola. South Africa emphatically rejects this accusation. South Africa harbours no aggressive intentions against Angola and its people.

Text supplied by the South African Department of Foreign Affairs and Information.

The problems on the border are, as in the past, the direct result of Swapo activity. The Angolan authorities are also aware that any action on the part of the South African security forces is aimed solely at Swapo and not at Angola and its people.

The allegations that South Africa employed force-levels of several brigades are ludicrous. In fact, a small combat team with some air support was involved in action against Swapo. Furthermore, the allegations of civilian casualties and destruction of property and livestock by South African forces are unfounded. Such casualties as resulted, involved only Swapo personnel or persons involved with Swapo activities. At no time has South Africa directed operations against civilians. If there were any civilian casualties they presumably resulted from the civil war which is continuously raging in the area.

At no time did South Africa act against the MPLA, except on 23 June, when in the course of action against Swapo, a South African helicopter was fired upon and damaged by MPLA forces who were in the vicinity. After the helicopter had force-landed, the MPLA forces attacked the two-man crew, killing the flight engineer. The pilot, in defending himself and fighting his way out, killed several MPLA soldiers. The combat team engaged in the operation against Swapo commenced their return to base some days ago and advance elements crossed the border of South West Africa/Namibia in the early afternoon of 26 June 1980. The withdrawal will be completed within the next day or two.

South Africa wishes to live in peace with all its neighbours and to contribute to the development of the region as a whole. However, this cannot be achieved as long as Swapo is allowed to continue its armed violence against the people of South West Africa/Namibia. South Africa has no choice but to continue to eradicate threats from countries which openly harbour terrorists and make their territories available for attacks against South West Africa/Namibia.

It is Swapo who should be condemned. I also urge you, Mr President, and the Security Council, to prevail on Swapo to cease its campaign of violence against the people of South West Africa/Namibia.

**(ii) Resolution 475 (1980) adopted by the UN Security Council on 27 June 1980**

The Security Council,

Having considered the request by the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations contained in document S/14022,

in which he requested the convening of an urgent meeting of the Security Council,

Having heard the statement of the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of Angola to the United Nations,

Recalling its resolutions 387 (1976) of 31 March 1976, 428 (1978) of 6 May 1978, 447 (1979) of 28 March 1979 and 454 (1979) of 2 November 1979, which, *inter alia*, condemned South Africa's aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and demanded that South Africa scrupulously respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola,

Gravely concerned at the escalation of hostile, unprovoked and persistent acts of aggression and sustained armed invasions committed by the racist regime of South Africa, in violation of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola,

Convinced that the intensity and timing of these acts of armed invasion are intended to frustrate efforts at negotiated settlements in Southern Africa, particularly in regard to the implementation of Security Council Resolution 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) of 29 September 1978,

Grieved at the tragic loss of human life, mainly that of civilians, and concerned about the damage and destruction of property, including bridges and livestock, resulting from the escalated acts and armed incursions by the racist regime of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola,

Gravely concerned that these wanton acts of aggression by South Africa form a consistent and sustained pattern of violations aimed at weakening the unrelenting support of the Front-Line States for the movements for freedom and national liberation of the peoples of Namibia and South Africa,

Conscious of the need to take effective measures to maintain international peace and security,

1. Strongly condemns the racist regime of South Africa for its premeditated, persistent and sustained armed invasions of the People's Republic of Angola, which constitute a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of this country, as well as a serious threat to international peace and security,
2. Strongly condemns also South Africa's utilization of the international territory of Namibia as a springboard for armed invasions and destabilisation of the People's Republic of Angola,
3. Demands that South Africa withdraw forthwith all its military forces from the territory of the People's Republic of Angola, cease all violations of Angola's air space and, henceforth, scrupulously respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the

People's Republic of Angola,

4. Calls upon all states to implement fully the arms embargo imposed against South Africa in resolution 418 (1977) of 4 November 1977,

5. Requests member states urgently to extend all necessary assistance to the People's Republic of Angola and the other Front-Line States, in order to strengthen their defence capacities in the face of South Africa's acts of aggression against these countries,

6. Calls for the payment of full and adequate compensation to the People's Republic of Angola by South Africa for the damage to life and property resulting from these acts of aggression,

7. Decides to meet again in the event of further acts of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola by the South African racist regime in order to consider the adoption of more effective measures, in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the charter of the United Nations, including chapter VII thereof,

8. Decides to remain seized of the matter.

✓ **SOUTH AFRICA AND LESOTHO**

Handwritten notes: "South Africa and Lesotho", "October 1980", "C.D. Molapo", "25 September 1980"

**(i) Extracts from a statement by the Foreign Minister of Lesotho, the Hon. C.D. Molapo, to the UN General Assembly on 25 September 1980**

Southern Africa continues to constitute another major area of tension in the world today. Not long ago the Security Council and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) had to consider atrocious bombings and ferocious attacks by South Africa on the People's Republic of Angola. A few weeks earlier, South African troops had committed acts of aggression in Zambia, thus displaying unrestrained contempt for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of its neighbours. The attacks on Angola are a ploy to disguise South Africa's intention to deny the people of Namibia their right to self-determination and independence despite the numerous resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

In its resolution 2248 (S.V.) of 19 May 1967, this Assembly established the Council for Namibia as the legal administering Authority of Namibia until that international Territory's independence. It is a matter of common knowledge that South Africa has frustrated the Council in the fulfilment of its mandate. What is even more unacceptable is that Namibian patriots continue to languish in South African gaols. *Apartheid* and Bantustans have been introduced into Namibia and an internal settlement built on



the Turnhalle groups is being pursued relentlessly if not insidiously. Namibian resources continue to be illegally exploited. South Africa has thus far flouted all Security Council decisions on Namibia. One might mention Security Council resolutions 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) and clearly discern a constant pattern of refusal to comply with the Security Council's decisions and of the promotion of bogus arrangements aimed at creating a neo-colonial puppet régime.

We should like to register our support for the struggle of the Namibian people for freedom. By now, South Africa should have learned that no amount of distortion, intimidation or oppression can stifle a people's desire to achieve freedom, independence and human dignity. The South-West Africa People's Organization (Swapo) is a force with which the South African Government has to reckon. Nobody can afford to brush it aside in any negotiations on Namibia and act as if it did not exist.

The continent of Africa is plagued by three more critical spots: the Horn of Africa, Western Sahara in the north and Chad in the west. The OAU is seized at the moment of these serious issues and my delegation wishes to register its support for its endeavours. We urge great vigilance and honest counsel in approaching these issues. My delegation notes with appreciation the humanitarian assistance being extended to the displaced persons and refugees in these sub-regions. We appreciate the efforts of the Secretary-General of the OAU, as documented under item 23 of this Assembly's agenda. May goodwill prevail on the part of all concerned in efforts to normalize the situation in these areas.

We should also like to express concern for the speedy resolution of the Cyprus problem and the situation in South-East Asia. The world has seen enough human suffering. Our collective efforts should thus be directed at the final solution of such problems. How otherwise can we talk of progress and development in the midst of so much human suffering?

Under the agenda item entitled "Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of South Africa", sufficient time will be devoted to consideration of the very lucid report of the Special Committee against *apartheid*, and I do not intend to take any more of the Assembly's limited time by going into that item.

The simmering crisis inside South Africa itself is a matter of great concern to us. Because of our geographical and political situation, we cannot watch the escalation of disruption and violence in South Africa with equanimity. To the extent that we cannot escape unscathed from a conflagration in South Africa, we are an interested party. We should be caught in the crossfire if anything were to happen. Hence our concern over South Africa's *apartheid* policies, which are the root cause of the economic and

political instability in southern Africa.

Economic co-operation among states of any region is always a good thing. In Africa, both the OAU and the United Nations regional commissions have encouraged such co-operation. The independent African States of the southern sub-region recently concluded a conference in Salisbury aimed at such co-operation and at reducing their economic dependence on South Africa. It is against this background that a distinction should be made between their efforts and South Africa's brand of co-operation, styled "Constellation of Southern African States".

South Africa's so-called constellation of states, consisting of itself and its bantustans, which it wants to sell to the independent African States is nothing but a political mirage. In our view, it is yet another attempt by South Africa to bring about the recognition of her bantustan creations, which have so far been rejected by the international community. Through this stratagem South Africa hopes to win support and respectability for her grand *apartheid*, which fragments southern Africa into weak black satellites dominated by a strong white state. We reject this constellation while it is operated within the framework of *apartheid*.

I cannot leave this rostrum without conveying to the Assembly the Lesotho Government's gratitude for the support our people have received since 1976 following the Soweto upheavals and the closure of some of the border posts between Lesotho and South Africa. The assistance was aimed at expanding educational facilities in the country to create room for displaced South African students who had fled to Lesotho and to improve Lesotho's economic viability, to enable it to withstand external coercion and lessen its dependence on South Africa. The latest review report by the Secretary-General is before the Assembly. It will be noted that we have been the recipient of massive aid from a variety of sources, but mainly from some Governments represented here. We are indeed greatly indebted and we are glad to acknowledge such gracious assistance.

Notwithstanding this, the pledges, grants, loans and technical assistance extended still fall short of targets set four year ago. South African and Namibian students are still with us and continue to arrive in Lesotho. The need to remedy our geographical isolation still exists. We thus earnestly reaffirm our commitment to the international airport project to which Lesotho attaches great importance. In this connexion, I should like to express my delegation's gratitude to those countries which have made modest contributions to our current efforts towards the construction of our one and only international air bridge. This was one of the leading projects recommended to and subsequently approved by

the Security Council in 1977. It is our wish that Governments will reconsider their position on this expensive but vital project and become involved in it. So far only a few Governments of the European Economic Community and the Arab world are involved in it, with the Lesotho Government shouldering the biggest share of the funding.

I should like to observe, in conclusion, that we have reached a critical point in the struggle for the liberation of the rest of Africa. Heavy sacrifices have already been made and will continue to be made. To assist any of the Front-Line States or any of the independent African States neighbouring Namibia and South Africa is also to contribute to the final elimination of *apartheid* and alien occupation in southern Africa. This is a task to which we must direct our united force and energy. The lesson of Zimbabwe has proved, more than any other lesson in recent history, that racial bigotry and colonialism are myths which have no place in the community of free nations.

A/35/PV.11

**(ii) Reaction by the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon. R.F. Botha, to the Lesotho Foreign Minister's statement**

The remarks of Mr Molapo at the UN stand in stark contrast to the spirit and content of the "Bridge-talks" held recently between the Prime Ministers of South Africa and Lesotho.

His comments also contrast strangely with the messages of appreciation sent to the South African Prime Minister by Premier Jonathan in regard to the steps initiated by South Africa to establish constructive co-operation between the two countries in various areas.

Mr Molapo's remarks at the UN are in the first instance not an attack on South Africa but on his own credibility. It is regrettable that he is creating an image of his country of fickleness and hypocrisy. By so doing he is impeding further co-operation and also deterring private investors.

He is thus not harming South Africa but his own country. He is destroying the foundations of the structure that the Prime Ministers of the two countries painstakingly began to build in the interest of both countries.

The South African Prime Minister will be in touch with Premier Jonathan in connection with this matter today.

## ZIMBABWE

### **(i) Extract from an address by the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, to the OAU 17th Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, in Freetown, Sierra Leone, on 2 July 1980**

I further wish to take this opportunity of expressing to the OAU collectively, and to all its members severally, the most profound gratitude from my Government and my people for the honour given my country by its being admitted as the 50th member of the OAU.

As a new member, Mr Chairman, we are cognisant of the duties and responsibilities which our membership of the Organization imposes on us. It is, however, our pledge that we shall endeavour to the best of our ability to abide by the Charter of the OAU and to shoulder our responsibilities in a manner truly befitting our new status.

This also is the opportune occasion for me to express the indebtedness to my people for all the assistance we received over the years in our efforts to liberate our country. Times there were when we felt frustrated by the size of assistance made available to us, and yet the history of the liberation struggle of Zimbabwe could never be completed without reference to the very significant promotive role played by the OAU.

Naturally, in recognizing this role we cannot fail to express our appreciation for the part so magnificently and untiringly played by the Liberation Committee in trying to secure us as much assistance as possible, and in listening to, and accommodating, our numerous, indeed innumerable, complaints and problems, at times taking the form of actual insults.

The struggle was hard, long and bitter for the people of Zimbabwe. We lost lives not only in hundreds, but in their thousands. Many hundreds more stand maimed and disabled. A third of the population became displaced persons as their homes and properties suffered disruption.

The struggle was similarly hard and bitter for the Frontline States, whose communities in the bordering areas were decimated and whose economic infrastructures have suffered immense damage. To them I say, "Thank you for your wonderful assistance and heroic stand in support of us. We asked for transit bases and you gave them to us. We asked for food and you gave it to us. We asked for shelter and you gave it to us. We asked for arms and you gave them to us. We asked for your sacrifices, and you gave us your people to die for us. We asked for your solidarity

and you gave us the unity of Presidents Nyerere, Seretse, Kaunda, Samora and Neto. To you, I say Zimbabwe will never forget your contribution. We are now free together, and Africa's independent zone has increased by 151,000 square miles or 395,000 square kilometres.

Africa's free population has also grown by an additional seven million. The membership of the OAU has increased to 50. Thanks exceedingly for all you have done in the name of humanity, in the name of democracy and in defence of the dignity of Africa. Blessed are those who sacrifice, suffer and die in the name of the freedom of Africa, for theirs is the Kingdom of Africa.

Mr Chairman, it would be unfair on my part if I did not make particular mention of those other states who deserve mention because of their singularly substantial contribution. I would certainly sound an ingrate if I did not refer to the very substantial material military aid that came to us from Nigeria, Socialist Ethiopia, Algeria and Libya, especially during the last two years of our struggle, which aid brought about a qualitative transformation in our armed national struggle. On behalf of my people, I express to them all my deepest gratitude.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I also wish to take advantage of this forum to re-echo my people's thanks for all the material aid received from Socialist countries the world over, from the progressive Western countries; progressive, solidarity and humanitarian organizations and the United Nations agencies. The sum total of their assistance, whether it took the form of military or humanitarian aid, was decisive in ensuring progress towards victory.

I have made reference to the assistance accorded us during our liberation struggle in order to underline the ability which it gave us in creating a viable political base among our people. Armed struggle, once facilitated, became to us an instrument for creating political power among the people.

When, therefore, the Lancaster House Conference reached agreement on the present independence constitution for Zimbabwe, and elections became the modality of attaining independence, our political machinery, built over a long period, only needed little reshaping and reorientation. When put to the test, its effectiveness baffled all our enemies and opponents but delighted our friends and allies, as we scored a landslide victory in the elections.

Mr Chairman, Sir, after my party, ZANU, had won the elections resoundingly, we felt the moment demanded of us a spirit of magnanimity rather than that of arrogance, a spirit of national unity rather than that of division, a spirit of reconciliation and forgiveness rather than of vindictiveness and retribution, a spirit

to achieve total peace rather than that of continued war. To me and my party, the election victory became a positive instrument for turning the minds of all our people, black and white, of all those who had fought for the unjust cause of racial domination and lost it; and of all those who had fought for the just cause of freedom, independence and democracy and won it; from the antagonisms, anger and bitterness of the past, now repaired by our victory, and inspire them to look to the future.

We felt the past and its wounds and grievances had to be buried and forgotten, but that the past and the lesson it had taught us all about the evils of racial oppression, undemocratic rule and economic exploitation, had always to be remembered.

To us, time had now come for those who had fought each other as enemies to accept the reality of a new situation by accepting each other now as allies who, in spite of their ideological, racial, ethnic or religious differences were now being called upon to express one loyalty to Zimbabwe, embrace one nationhood, and collectively and positively respond to the call for true peace and the consolidation of our independence.

This was why, Mr Chairman, I invited our friends of ZAPU, in the Patriotic Front, to join us in a coalition. This also is why I invited two members of the white community to become part of that coalition of forces determined to make a success of our independence.

I feel the experiment has, to date, been successful. It has enabled us to make a beginning in respect of the programmes of integrating our three disparate military forces, resettling our displaced population and reconstructing our economy. We have every confidence that our independence will be consolidated as both the security situation and the economic position show some improvement.

South Africa *Robinson*

Mr Chairman, Sir, the attainment of independence by Zimbabwe has broadened the Southern African freedom frontier and increased influence and pressures upon the South African racist régime to effect the necessary democratic changes in South Africa, as well as resolve the Namibian question in a manner acceptable to the Namibian people, as led by Swapo, and in conformity with the United Nations resolution 435 of 1978. The broad masses of South Africa, who have warmly welcomed our election victory and our achievement of independence are now resorting to mass action of a non-collaborative nature against the civil authorities.

This is more than a writing on the wall for South Africa. And

yet, Mr Chairman, the régime in Pretoria will not heed the warning, nor does it seem to be in a mood to accept the bitter experience the Rhodesian Whites have gone through and derive a salutary lesson therefrom. South Africa seems intent on a process marked with blood for, as Mr Botha says, the régime is prepared to go on shooting for another 100 years!

Far from admitting the wrongness of her evil policies, South Africa is, on the contrary, challenging its neighbours and organizing subversion, sabotage and armed activities, in order to destabilize their economies and political systems. We have the internationally and morally untenable situation here where apartheid is challenging democracy and the concept of non-racial societies beyond its borders by its continuous acts of naked aggression.

Apartheid is on the rampage in immoral defence of itself. In Mozambique, it is actively sponsoring the Andrea gangsters in their banditry and acts of sabotage. In Zambia, it is not only deploying its own troops in open attacks upon that country, but it is also promoting the Mshala gang. In Angola, it has recently been committing mass murders of civilians, financing UNITA, and directing numerous acts of sabotage. In Swaziland and Lesotho, it has conducted recent incursions.

In Zimbabwe, according to our evidence of the highly sophisticated explosive material and missiles captured before the independence celebrations, it attempted the disruption of those celebrations. Also, from recent undeniable evidence, a systematic, clandestine recruitment campaign has been taking place in our country for fighters to defend apartheid in Namibia and Angola. As I speak, there are some five thousand persons in South Africa recruited in our country, especially soon after the elections, many of whom are undergoing military training.

Should Africa stand by, Mr Chairman, when these offensives are being mounted against her sovereign independence and territorial integrity? Must this organization continue to be a forum for paying nothing more than lip-service to the aspirations of the people of South Africa?

Now that the question of the independence of Zimbabwe has been settled, must not concerted meaningful action be taken to buttress our frontier, and must the OAU not come to the aid of the Frontline States with substantial military support so these states are enabled both to defend their territorial integrity and to effectively give support to the national struggle in South Africa?

Is this not the time, Mr Chairman, for all member states to stand up and be counted on the vital question of the total freedom of Africa? Pious resolutions cannot secure the people of South Africa and Namibia their freedom.

Now that we have only South Africa and Namibia to rid of colonialism, Zimbabwe wishes to propose that a definite concrete programme of supportive action be worked out at this conference.

I am aware, Mr Chairman, of the current move to involve South Africa and Swapo, in a conference under the auspices of the United Nations. My country indeed welcomes this move. But what if South Africa remains adamant and resists progressive change? Have we any contingency measures more supportive of Swapo than the few dollars it gets from the Liberation Committee?

The ANC and PAC, which are operating in extremely difficult circumstances and which we have always supported and shall continue to support, surely now deserve our better attention by way of increased material assistance. The national struggle for democracy in South Africa is gathering momentum, but the acceleration of the pace towards the final goal of freedom and independence will depend not merely on the initiative and spirit of sacrifice the people of South Africa are capable of, but also on the degree of practical support Africa and the international community are prepared to give them.

*For the Record no. 2. Zimbabwe Ministry of Information, Immigration and Tourism*

**(ii) Extract from a speech by the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, to the Zimbabwe Economic Society at the University of Zimbabwe, on 8 September 1980**

The political history of this country, beginning with European settlement in 1890, going up to 1979, has been one of continual conflict between two forces diametrically opposed to each other. The conflict situation arising as it did from the phenomenon of imperialism and colonialism, was built around a matrix of contradictions so highly antagonistic that they exploded into one of the bloodiest protracted wars Africa has experienced. What was this matrix of contradictions and how did it operate?

True to Karl Marx's postulation, imperialism and colonialism in this country, were certainly the political instrument or modality of extending capitalism to our region. Accordingly, in 1890, Southern Rhodesia became the territorial property of a company — the chartered British South Africa Company — the sovereignty of Britain being more theoretical and nominal than practical and effective. The newcomers, all of European extraction, except their wagon drivers and house-servants, from the very onset sought to maintain a separate racial and social identity progressively perpetuated and entrenched by a protective politi-



cal, economic, legal and social system which, as it yielded maximum advantages for the white minority settler group, created maximum disadvantages for the black majority community.

The seizure of political power institutions, and physical instruments of power, reinforced the configuration of separate relationships of white black, ruler and subject, commercial farmer and peasant farmer, master and servant, the bourgeois class and the working class, and generally the rich and poor, with a line clearly drawn between them.

By 1979, when the Lancaster House Agreement, which produced our Independence Constitution, was worked out, the national liberation war had been raging for nearly 15 years as a deliberate means of solving these contradictions and bringing political power into the hands of the people. If the minority white community were to be transformed into non-racialists and cease to be master and to enjoy the exclusive monopoly of wealth and control over the country's natural resources, and if the blacks were to cease to be racial inferiors, emerge from the status of impoverished peasants and workers and begin to enjoy an equitable distribution of wealth and ownership of the country's resources and means of production, we reasoned as revolutionary nationalist leaders that only a national armed struggle could do it.

But we also reasoned that there would have to be stages in the continuous process of liberation until economic liberation was achieved.

The first stage in the process of searching for a permanent solution to the contradictions that had combined in creating national grievances was that of reformist nationalism of the 1950s, which was characterized by predominantly non-violent means.

The second stage was that of revolutionary nationalism, beginning in the 1960s and characterized by armed struggle and which in turn produced the third stage of national independence.

The third stage is thus one of political power or the national democratic stage, placing the physical instruments of power democratically in the hands of the people through their properly elected government. It is my belief that all national forces committed to our national independence and democratic system be united regardless of their political and ideological differences.

This third stage, which has yielded the instrument of national independence, must now lead us to the fourth economic stage, when economic power should rest in the hands of the Zimbabwean people. I am sure it is this stage, which is as much the concern of this symposium as indeed it is the concern of my government. My government has already stated that its ideologi-

cal direction, as it sets in motion the socio-economic process of the current stage, is decidedly socialist.

The rationale of our socialist-thought and our motivation are simple to understand. Nature has placed at the disposal of man, that is, the whole of mankind, the natural resources of the entire world within his reach. Indeed, even the Bible informs us (Genesis 1) that after God had created heaven and earth, the grass, trees, the birds, the great whales, cattle and other beasts and creatures, He finally made man and gave him dominion "over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle and over all the earth, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth".

It is men together who have dominion over natural resources. Our concept of socialism thus recognizes this phenomenon of collective ownership of the country's resources. Indeed, our own African tradition of communal ownership of the land, forests, rivers, game, birds, fish and other natural things, does no less and is similar to the Biblical view. In fact our collective tradition precedes by centuries the socialist or communist theory of Karl Marx.

The matrix of our historical contradictions did not vanish into thin air as of midnight, April 17, this year, we pulled down the Union Jack and hoisted our multi-coloured national flag to signal the advent of Independence. What the reality of independence has so far done to us is to affect the relations of political power and transform them in favour of the broad masses of Zimbabwe.

What the reality of independence has not done, and is yet to do, is affect socio-economic relations so they too can transform in favour of the majority of our people.

For, if that does not happen, our society shall remain stuck with the socio-economic injustices and imbalances of our colonial past, together with their ugly contradictions and antagonisms, colonialism, in those circumstances, will only have let go its political reign while still holding fast to its economic reins.

President Julius Nyerere has, in his usual humorous manner put the position dramatically as he writes on "Third World Negotiating Strategy" in the *Third World Quarterly* of April, 1979:

"The Imperialists may have said, when they colonized us that they wanted to Christianize us; some said they wanted to civilize us. But the real reasons were different. Those reasons became apparent when they discovered that it was cheaper to have the colonies govern themselves. You did not have to pay the governors and the civil servants. They could pay their own presidents, their ministers and civil servants, while you controlled the economy. It was much cheaper than having an army and governors stationed in the colonies. Once the Imperialists

discovered this, it was not very difficult for them to concede independence". (Vol. 1, No. 2.)

In circumstances in which political independence becomes an end in itself and loses its socio-economic goals, then the successors to the colonial governments become the unwitting (sometimes certainly witting) watchdogs of insidious colonial interests. Such successor governments, although constitutionally sovereign, are indeed neo-colonialists because they are either oblivious to the socio-economic needs of their people, or consciously or unconsciously allow the constraints of the colonial past to affect the direction of their policies.

My government is obviously not prepared to be a colonialist watchdog, witting or unwitting. We are not prepared that the final objective of our political struggle be the mere attainment of independence and the hoisting of a new national flag.

Rather, our total commitment is to the attainment of social and economic goals through the instrumentality of our independence and the ideological modality of socialism, which alone we believe can yield the greatest social good to the greatest number of Zimbabweans. Independence thus offers the physical political-power instrument, while socialism gives us the intellectual and theoretical framework for the direction or orientation of our policies and programme.

Our socialism, we have already acknowledged, derives its basic thought and principles from Marxist-Leninist philosophy and the principles and social practice of our traditional society not at variance with them. Further, the application of our socialism, we admit, cannot develop deep roots if it were to take the form of an imposition, nor would it acquire any meaningful perspective if it were to ignore the historical and environmental factors.

Here I am in perfect agreement with that illustrious hero of the Yugoslav revolution and anti-Fascist and anti-Nazi resistance, the late President Josip Broz Tito, a great socialist leader of all time who espoused the basic principles of Marxist-Leninism in the context of historical and prevailing Yugoslav circumstances. Tito who before he died, had become a personal friend, was a realist. He wrote as follows on the subject of self-management in the process of transforming the Yugoslav socio-political system:

"A truly new socio-political system does not emerge as a new and complete one, nor does it stem merely from a scientific theory, no matter how close to the truth it may be. The new society grows from the old one and gradually transforms it in terms of its basic social and legal relations, but cannot immediately change in it certain material conditions and relationships resulting from historical development of the material

and spiritual forces of a country". (*Socialist Thought and Practice, Belgrade, Issue No. 6, June, 1980.*)

It is this same realistic persuasion which has led my party and government to take cognizance of the historical development of our society and boldly to recognize the reality of free enterprise, contradictory though this may seem to our basic principles of socialism, as an unavoidable current economic phenomenon in the initial development stages of the process of social transformation we envisage.

But this should not be taken as authority or licence for private enterprise to romp unbridled and proceed on an exploitative course, as happened over the last 90 years of settler, racist rule.

Definite governmental controls to reduce inequity and orientate private enterprise in the direction of state objectives, without inhibiting expansion and development, are obviously a necessary instrument of ensuring that individual interest is reconciled with public interest. Some aspects of these policy regulatory measures will soon be enunciated in an economic policy statement.

At a time when our main concern is the resettlement of our peasantry, the rehabilitation of our economy and social services, we have determined that any measures disruptive of the economic infrastructure must at all costs be avoided. Our socialist thrust will thus restrict itself for now to the area of land resettlement and organization of peasant agriculture. Here we intend to correct with speed the historical injustices and imbalances in the distribution of land between the white commercial farmers and the peasantry by reapportioning to the latter a large percentage of the land now in the hands of the former, most of which is underutilized.

Work on the restoration of social services — education and health — and of re-invigorating them has already begun in earnest. The role of education in the formation of skills cannot be over-emphasized. Government will accordingly give this social service special attention for many years to come.

While private enterprise in commerce and industry, mining and agriculture, has been recognized, it in turn must accept certain responsibilities as part of its contribution to the common good. One of these responsibilities is that of raising the standard of living of the worker, as well as his skills, through organized training facilities. The role of the worker in private enterprise must be accepted on a mutually beneficial basis with all the dimensions enunciated by government, covering:

(a) Wages and conditions of service;

- (b) Organization of worker committees;
- (c) Training facilities;
- (d) Participation in decision-making;
- (e) Participation in ownership through share-holding;
- (f) Insurance and pension systems.

The resettlement and rehabilitation programmes are mainly corrective in their thrust, so they can provide us with a sound socio-economic springboard for a global developmental plan, which should aim at short-term, medium-term and long-term targets. The formulation of this plan is now under way and should be ready for adoption by government before the next fiscal year. That development plan must take careful cognizance of the unfortunate duality of our socio-economic system comprising, in the words of the recently published United Nations economic and social survey, *Zimbabwe — Towards a New Order*, "two economic sub-systems, two societies, two consumption patterns and life styles . . ." (page 25). It must then proceed, sector by sector, to establish the popular needs and ride roughshod over the racial phenomenon so as to emerge with a plan capable of liberating the economy from a one-sided racial control.

The problem of economic dualism is a characteristic not only of our national economy but also of the present international system. The Third World countries are up in arms because the 'haves' of the world community are paradoxically also the Oliver Twists, who insist on having more, on being more highly developed than developed, at the expense of the developing countries which are showing no sign of ever reaching Rostow's take-off stage.

The Commonwealth heads of government who met in Lusaka in August last year and passed a communique which led to the Lancaster House Conference, also agreed to set up a group of 8 to 10 experts from Commonwealth Countries, "to investigate and report on the factors inhibiting structural change and sustained improvement in economic growth in both developed and developing countries". The experts were also to "assess the importance of and the relationship between possible constraints, such as protection and adjustment policies, inflation, subsidies both on production and exports, fluctuations in commodity prices, availability and cost of energy resources, including oil, and factors inhibiting investment, transfer of technology and international flows of official and private resources". (*The World Economic Crisis*, Commonwealth Secretariat, *preface*).

This assessment and evaluation of the problem — or is it problems — was to be followed by recommendation of specific measures which developed and developing countries might

adopt in reduction or elimination of the constraints. The exercise was embarked upon as a preparation for the Special Session of the UN General Assembly, from which we have just come.

Now that our country is independent and has become a member of the Commonwealth and the United Nations and is about to become an associated member of the EEC under the Lomé Convention, it is necessary that we know and appreciate the world context into which we have gained entry. We are going into economic and trade relations with developed and developing countries. We are currently searching for the accommodation of our beef, sugar and other products in the Common Market, as we, at the same time, are making appeals for grants, soft loans, and investments. As a Third World country the constraints analysed and evaluated by the Commonwealth experts in terms of their sum total effect upon economies will no doubt soon catch up with us.

Michael Manley, the Prime Minister of Jamaica, I am sure speaks for all the Third World countries when in his article, "Third World Challenge: The Politics of Affirmation", he says in his usual frank and aggressive mood:

"Today, faced with 400 million people on the verge of starvation and more than a billion deeply trapped in poverty, every one a potential producer and consumer, there is not one developed country in the world that is contributing as much as 1,0 per cent of its gross national product to overseas assistance. The US itself has seen its contribution fall from more than 2 per cent to 0,2 per cent". (*Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Jan.) 1980, page 40).

Earlier in the same article, Manley refers to the need to close the gap between the rich and poor nations, a problem we have here on a national level and might now be compounded by the international problem we are inheriting as a developing, and so a poor (though not poorest) country. On the question of closing this gap between developed and developing nations, Manley says, "we are casualties of a war between giants". We are caught, he says, between the ever-rising price of oil and the prices of imports from developed nations, "which continue to dance their inflationary jig". He holds that it is unrealistic to speak of closing the gap between rich and poor nations without discussing the need for substantial transfers of resources from developed to developing countries to enable them to develop structures designed to produce reasonable economic opportunities and balanced rewards.

I agree with Manley, in toto. I would, however, add that between themselves, developing countries are yet to do their best in creating regional systems of co-operation, reciprocal trade and assistance.

This is why our new Republic of Zimbabwe is keen to play its part in making the proposed regional economic grouping of the nine, possibly ten, southern African countries work as an effective, economic, regional entity.

Whatever the problems with which we are bound to be faced in our international economic relations, our determination to make maximum use of our own resources remains. In the end, this is bound to be our salvation. However, all development must follow a definite, well-plotted and well-envisioned direction towards the satisfaction of the vast needs and aspirations of our people. As a government, we need all available economic binoculars as we survey the national road. Will this symposium provide us with any pair? I look forward to receiving them.

Text supplied by the Zimbabwe Ministry of Information and Tourism

✓ (iii) **Extract from a speech by the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, to the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference in Salisbury on 11 September 1980**

This conference is taking place some five months after the Declaration on Development Co-operation was signed in Lusaka by the Heads of States present and initialled by me on behalf of the Republic of Zimbabwe that was to be, just some seventeen days before our independence. Between the Lusaka Summit Conference and this Conference of Ministers both our officials and Ministers have been concerned with the formulation of inter-regional projects and proposals for establishing a viable system of co-operation, ramifying itself in the diverse dimensions of transport and communications, food security planning, control of foot and mouth disease, agricultural research in semi-arid areas, manpower development, industrial development, regional energy conservation and security plan, institutional mechanisms, and the Southern African Development Fund.

It is to assess and evaluate the proposals or projects formulated and now being recommended by the countries that were charged at the Lusaka Conference with these crucial area tasks, that the current Ministerial Conference is meeting. This conference is, therefore, a further stage in the progressive course towards the establishment of a regional system of economic co-operation aimed at achieving our economic liberation. I trust that the tasks that we set each other have been honourably and studiously accomplished and that, therefore, the stage of implementation of the principles and objectives of our co-operation is now much closer than it was in March — April when we met in Lusaka.

The demands of our people daily impel us to move in the direction of economic viability, to attain which we must recognise the warning contained in our Lusaka Declaration entitled "Southern Africa: Toward Economic Liberation". We recognised in that declaration that our over-dependence in respect of transport and communications, and a variety of goods and services, on South Africa was neither a natural phenomenon nor the result of a free market economy. We further recognised that our countries were in spite of their political independence, "fragmented, grossly exploited and subject to economic manipulation by outsiders". We determined that the future development of our economic systems must aim at reducing economic dependence not only on the Republic of South Africa but also on any single external state or group of states.

There was clear recognition, therefore, of our individual responsibilities as nation states and of our collective responsibility as a group of friendly neighbouring majority-ruled African countries, to work in co-operation and in continuance of our national struggle until complete economic liberation was achieved.

I recognise a two-dimensional struggle towards the attainment by any one of our nine states of the objective of economic liberation. There is the vertical and national dimension which takes into account the set socio-economic objectives of the state and undertakes the full mobilisation of the national resources — human and natural — in a vigorous endeavour to fulfil those objectives. There is also the horizontal and international dimension which develops because of our recognition of the insufficiency and inadequacy of our resources to provide us with the required volumes of consumer goods, the necessary capital goods and skills.

In both these dimensions, it is a historical and current economic reality that we have been forced to compromise our economic sovereignty over our resources. At home our primary, secondary and infrastructural sectors have become dominated, in many cases owned, by foreign investors, the principal operators being variously known as multinationals or transnationals. They produce, unless properly controlled by a system of regulatory measures, a mouse's share for us and a lion's share for themselves.

Our resources cease to be our own. We remain dominated economically by economic lords as we were politically dominated by political lords yesterday. Economic domination is indeed a worse phenomenon than political domination, for in the latter case no political resources are depleted by being shipped abroad, whereas in a situation of economic domination our resources are



wasting away day by day as they get freighted to Paris, London and New York, both as lowly purchased raw materials like chrome and copper and as huge dividends and profits. The irony of it is our helplessness in the situation.

Away from home, as we attempt to trade in our numerous raw commodities, the terms of trade are harshly unfavourable. Away from home, as we try to import both consumer goods for our population and capital goods for the industries which our buyers and also our sellers own and control, the prices we pay are deliberately made exorbitant. Thus, we meet foul play in both cases; and whether we play "at home" or "away" ours is perpetual defeat, theirs perpetual victory. I am sure you will agree that we are yet to field our own national teams and train our own referees, but most of all let us ensure that the home ground is really our own.

Is there any wonder that we have been turned into either economic puppets or perpetual beggars? Our voices in Africa have grown hoarse from endless soliciting tunes that invoke no response but derision. Our feet have become blistered as we gallivant from one metropolitan capital to another, telling the familiar story of our poverty to those who have authored it and continue to make us poorer. Our hands forever imploringly open are only occasionally graced (or is it disgraced?) by miserable pittances. We have certainly compromised our dignity and African personality by allowing ourselves to become perpetual objects of pity. Surely we must act quickly to redeem ourselves and reinforce our hard-won political sovereignty by adopting and implementing effective programmes for the achievement of economic independence for our broad masses.

The central guiding principles of our regional development efforts are our enunciated intentions now transformed into definite proposals which are aimed at achieving our regional economic self-sufficiency and self-reliance, so we can collectively disengage from economic dependence on others. The enunciated salutary principles call upon us to realign the totality of our entire regional economic machinery, using the key sectoral linkage we have earmarked, so we can generate growth and development on both a national and regional basis.

Our common goal must remain the liberation of our economies for the common good of our peoples. We have a successful record of co-operation to go by, even if that record is political. For, just as we profited by common political action in achieving the political liberation and independence of several countries of this region, let us also intensify our endeavours towards the economic liberation of the region.

Economic independence would mean, in material terms, reduction of our external dependence for food, fuel, soft goods, capital goods, skills, and finance. Surely we can develop the ability of our people to feed and clothe themselves? Surely we can work out an efficient system of transportation for our goods? Surely we can establish a regional common market for our goods? Surely, we can develop relevant skills in our region through the establishment of programmes of training on a co-operative basis? What really is there we cannot do, given the will to achieve it?

The ideals which we have formulated for ourselves must translate themselves into viable concrete programmes of co-operation. Our people are waiting, not for principles and objectives, but for food, clothes, medicaments, good homes, education for their children, and other benefits. Let us learn to practise our theory. We as heads of government have given you the task to work out the practical models and modalities. You certainly have to succeed, for your success will be the success of our governments, and your failure their failure.

Text supplied by the Zimbabwe Ministry of Information and Tourism

## ✓ SOUTH AFRICA AND ZIMBABWE

### **(i) Joint statement issued by the Governments of South Africa and Zimbabwe on 3 September 1980**

After an exchange of views over the past few weeks between the Governments of South Africa and Zimbabwe, it has been agreed that trade representatives will be appointed in Salisbury and Johannesburg to look after trade interests and to provide consular assistance.

The Exchange of Notes provides that:

1. The Government of South Africa will appoint to the Republic of Zimbabwe a Trade Representative with the function of looking after South African interests in the Republic of Zimbabwe and providing Consular assistance to the citizens of both countries.
2. Likewise the Republic of Zimbabwe will appoint to South Africa a Trade Representative with the function of looking after Zimbabwe trade interests in South Africa and providing Consular assistance to the citizens of both countries.
3. The appointment of Trade Representatives will occur on a basis of reciprocity.
4. The respective Trade Representatives and their suites shall be entitled on a reciprocal basis to immunity from criminal and civil jurisdiction of all courts of the country to which they

- are appointed.
5. The respective Trade Representatives and, where applicable, their suites, shall be entitled on a reciprocal basis to all immunities in respect of persons and property in accordance with international custom and practise governing the position of trade missions.
  6. For the purpose of this understanding "suite" shall mean in relation to the Trade Representative, his family, the members of his staff and their families. "Families" shall mean the wife or husband, as the case may be, dependent children and any relative approved by the Department of Foreign Affairs on a reciprocal basis. "Staff" shall mean all those persons who take part in the official work of the Trade Representative provided these persons are employed exclusively for that purpose and provided further that these persons are not citizens or permanent residents of the country to which the Trade Representative is appointed. The "staff" complement in each trade mission shall not exceed twelve (12) people.
  7. Both Governments shall undertake to see to it that this understanding will be of full force and effect within their respective countries.

Those staff members who are not covered by this arrangement will return home as soon as possible.

Text supplied by the South African Department of Foreign Affairs and Information

**(ii) Comment on 6 October 1980 by the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon. R.F. Botha, in response to press enquiries about accusations by the Zimbabwean Prime Minister that South Africa supports subversion against Zimbabwe**

Mr Mugabe alleges that a secret army of 5 000 men<sup>1</sup>, consisting of dissidents from Zimbabwe, is receiving training in South Africa and he warns Zimbabweans to be prepared to fight in the event that the dissidents should be sent to overthrow the Government of Zimbabwe. He also says that he enquired from South Africa about this anti-Zimbabwe force but has received no reply.

On a previous occasion<sup>2</sup> I replied fully to similar allegations and said:

The South African mission in Zimbabwe has not recruited a single member of the armed forces of Zimbabwe for attacks or subversion against Zimbabwe. The South African Defence Force has merely considered applications for appointment in the Defence Force and some of the applicants have been

1. Reported in *The Star* (Johannesburg) 19 September 1980

2. On 6 July 1980 in response to a statement by Mr Mugabe to the OAU on 2 July 1980. See p.

appointed.

Factors such as citizenship and age are taken into consideration in terms of current policy. The private sector in South Africa and the defence forces of other countries have also appointed former members of the Zimbabwe armed forces.

The South African Government does not interfere in the affairs of its neighbouring states. The Government has consistently behaved correctly towards Zimbabwe in accordance with international practice and norms, despite unfriendly statements by members of the Government of Zimbabwe.

South Africa will not allow its territory to be used for attacks and subversion against its neighbouring states. South Africa insists that the territory of its neighbouring states should not be used as springboards for attacks and subversion against it

Our representative in Salisbury at the time, moreover, informed the Government of Zimbabwe that the South African Government denied the allegations and requested that evidence in support of the allegations should be submitted to us. To this day we have not received such evidence. Nevertheless Mr Mugabe continues with his accusations of a South African threat to him. Is this because he is under pressure to permit ANC terrorists to make use of Zimbabwean territory to undertake subversion against South Africa? The Government of Zimbabwe will sooner or later have to devote its full attention to the country's internal situation in order to ensure stability, which is a prerequisite for economic growth and development.

Allegations against South Africa may distract attention from the unstable domestic situation, but will not contribute anything to its solution. Indeed it makes cooperation all the more difficult and frightens off the private sector.

**EXTRACT CONCERNING SOUTHERN AFRICA FROM A STATEMENT IN PARLIAMENT BY THE SOUTH AFRICAN PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF DEFENCE, THE HON. P.W. BOTHA, ON 1 MAY 1980\***

There is a power struggle between the East and West. The Republic of South Africa is caught up in this power struggle and is therefore exploited as and exposed political target in the international arena. I think we are agreed about this. There is unnecessary involvement of South Africa in the international arena, through no fault of our own, as a result of interference and opportunism on the part of certain international powers.

Further more, there is the terrorist threat. I am not speaking only of the international terrorist threat. There is also the Southern African terrorist threat. I believe that the terrorist organizations will try, in the short and medium term, to intensify their terrorist onslaught on soft targets, and they are being encouraged and incited to do so by forces from outside, in response to, and in support of, a possible internal political problem. They are trying to raise its threshold.

Furthermore, there is the conventional military onslaught we have to bear in mind. There is a gradual build-up of more sophisticated arms in neighbouring States, especially in Mozambique, Angola and Zambia. Such equipment can be converted almost overnight into a credible instrument of Russian aggression. I personally do not believe that the Russians will interfere directly in Africa, or in Southern Africa for that matter. I have debated this matter with people of stature who have visited our country and who are experts in this field. They agree with me. They do not think either that the Russians will interfere directly in Southern Africa. However, Russia will try to create conditions which will cause it to be invited in, and when it is invited in, it will interfere by proxy as it has already interfered by proxy elsewhere in Africa. Only this afternoon there were reports in the news again about the number of Cubans in Ethiopia, for example. Of course, we know how many Cubans there are in Angola.

There is the external threat as far as Zimbabwe is concerned. I believe that the new Zimbabwe will probably be pressurized to play an active role in the onslaught on the Republic of South Africa in the future. However, only time will show whether it will yield to that pressure. Then there is the OAU, which plays its role at the UN and in its own right as an instigator and director of international action against the Republic of South Africa, and it is

\*Statement made during discussion of the Minister's defence budget vote

playing this role while a large number of its members are trading with us and are dependent on us for many matters. Then, too, there is the Soviet block, which also forms part of the external threat. Developments around Zimbabwe and South West Africa are creating opportunities that can be exploited by the Soviet block, which is prepared to act in a purposeful and aggressive manner in order to achieve its objectives and promote its interests.

The hon. member for Yeoville has asked me whether I shall confirm what he said, but he was only repeating what we have often said, *i.e.* that the Republic of South Africa has no aggressive intentions towards any neighbouring State or any other country on earth. On the contrary, we are prepared — this was stated by my predecessor and I repeat it — to conclude non-aggression pacts with any neighbouring State, while on our borders of further afield. In fact I have non-aggression pacts with some independent States in Southern Africa who concluded those pacts with us when they became independent. We wish to extend these to any other neighbouring State, non-aggression pacts which will mean that we will not invade them and that they will not commit any act of aggression on our territory or violate it from their territory either. Because there must be no doubt about the Government's standpoint, I want to make quite clear that if our territory is threatened, if South African territory, or a territory which is under our protection, is violated, we shall strike back. This is not just a promise; we are already doing so. We have no quarrel with the forces of peaceful neighbouring States, but we do have a quarrel with terrorists who use the neighbouring States as springboards to launch attacks against South Africa, and if a neighbouring State allows itself to be drawn into the aggressive behaviour of terrorists, it will have to pay that price, of course. We prefer to be left in peace to settle our own affairs and we think our neighbouring States could very fruitfully devote their attention to their own internal problems without picking a quarrel with us. I hope the hon. member is satisfied with the standpoint.

As regards the attitude of the Western countries towards these threats, I must admit that there are some of them that exercise a moderating influence on the international affairs we are involved in — some to a greater and others to a lesser extent. I want to thank those in the Western world who exercise a moderating influence. In particular, I should like publicly to convey my thanks to the British Prime Minister for the sensible and moderating influence she is exercising in connection with South Africa as well. However, I want to add that if the Republic of South Africa is weakened, or if those who pose the most serious threat to us

succeed in overthrowing the Republic of South Africa, we shall not be the only ones who will pay the price, but the West will pay a bigger price in spite of the hope which exists in some Western countries that they may be able to make a different arrangement with regard to the raw materials supplied by South Africa as well as our strategic position. They will pay a price from which they will not recover. They can disparage our strategic position and our strategic minerals as much as they like for opportunistic reasons, but they will pay the price if anything goes wrong with South Africa. As regards the time factor in the total threat with which the Republic is faced, the time factor is important — I have said so in the past and I say it again — for the solution of our domestic problems as well as the resolution of our relationships in Southern Africa. The present internal and external tendencies show a systematic escalation in the total onslaught on the Republic of South Africa. For this reason, through the application of its total national strength, not only in respect of the reactive combating of threats, but wherever possible also for the elimination of the fundamental causes which give rise to the threat, the Republic of South Africa can in fact drastically influence the nature, the magnitude and the intensity of the onslaught, as well as the time scale, if only we would learn to get along with one another.

I wish to join the hon. member for Durban Point in the hope he expressed that there would be a rethink about the importance to the West of the Cape sea route. I have stated my views on this matter on many occasions in this House and elsewhere. When I opened Simonstown's tidal basin on 22 March this year, I once again stressed the point that Simonstown and the strategic position of South Africa were of the utmost importance. But I am afraid that we are not heard in the international councils on this point. In military councils, yes. I know for a fact that military leaders in the West, in the Free World, are well aware, most of them, of the important situation and strategic position which we hold. But the politicians right throughout the Free World are quiet. They are silent on this matter.

*South West Africa/Namibia.* The hon. member for Durban Point also said that a solution must be found for the SWA situation. I do not want to deal with that situation today in detail. Militarily speaking, we have the situation under control, and I think we have done well in combating terrorism in South West Africa.

\*Looking at recent history, one sees that since the Second World War, there have been few terrorist wars in which the defence forces have succeeded in repelling the terrorist onslaughts. In South West Africa we have succeeded, with a few exceptions, in pinning down the terrorist forces at the border and

often driving them back to where they operate from. We have the position under control and it is to the credit of our security forces that are jointly operating there. However, I want to add that a political solution for South West Africa is imperative. South Africa is not the one that is delaying a political solution. However, South Africa has obligations towards the people of South West Africa. The Republic of South Africa cannot throw the people of South West Africa to the wolves. But then the people of South West Africa must themselves display a better spirit towards one another. I am reproached for saying this, but I repeat that they must evince a better spirit towards one another if they want a political solution to be found. They chose to become independent; therefore they must accept the consequences of this.

However, I want to say something else about this. The Free World, in particular — the West and here I am thinking more specifically of the five Western powers with which we have negotiated — has not yet done what the UN Secretariat and the General Assembly does, namely to single out Swapo and to replace it in a privileged position in respect of the representation of South West Africa. We all know that the General Assembly has said: "We accept that Swapo is the sole representative of the peoples of South West Africa". This is the most ludicrous resolution that a responsible assembly such as that one could ever adopt. Unless the West dissociates itself from that concept and accepts that there are other political organizations representing the majority of the population, there can be no political solution. In my opinion, much more attention should be given to the will of those political organizations within South West Africa that wish to act constitutionally. There should also be much more consultation with them, and I hope that the international community which is sincere in its attempts to find a solution will seek such a solution in consultation with the leaders of the political organizations, inside South West Africa. We shall help them in that connection. A body will also have to be established in South West Africa which will be able to govern the territory, even though it is not yet independent, because military security must be backed up by effective government. Military action alone cannot create the necessary security. Where we have proceeded to train certain security forces for South West Africa, security forces consisting of inhabitants of South West Africa itself, with regard to the Police as well as the Defence Force, I am therefore prepared, i.e. the Government is prepared, to transfer those powers to the control of a body in South West Africa which is able to govern effectively. Then, however, the inhabitants of South West Africa must be reconciled with one another and must discuss with one another



what they can do to help ensure political stability in South West Africa. I do not want to say any more about this matter. We are willing to do this, and in doing so, we should be transferring a large part of the administration of South West Africa to the inhabitants of South West Africa themselves.

In the Steyn report the term "peoples' defence force" is used, and we often hear it in conversation as well, and in speeches made by hon. members in this House. Therefore it is important that I should say a few words about this matter as well. In my opinion, the S.A. Defence Force should be organized, as far as the economy allows, in such a way as to constitute a representative Defence Force. However, a defence force cannot be built on numbers only. A defence force is a finely tuned instrument and as such it must be based on expertise, leadership and the ability to handle arms. The manpower problem cannot be solved overnight, as people think, simply by adding elements from the people to the defence force. It is the task of the Government, but also of other parties, of all South Africans, to help elevate the South African Defence Force above party political disputes and to keep it there. For these two principles, *i.e.* that a Defence Force must be representative and that it must be an organization that is above party political disputes, I have worked successfully for 14 years, and I am not prepared to apologize to anyone as far as this is concerned, for I have succeeded.

South Africa (Republic). *House of Assembly Debates*, no. 11, 1980. Cols. 5295-5300

### **UITTREKSELS OOR SUIDELIKE AFRIKA UIT 'N TOESPRAAK DEUR DIE SUID-AFRIKAANSE EERSTE MINISTER, SY EDELE P.W. BOTHA, TYDENS DIE REPUBLIEKFEESVIERINGS VAN DIE RANDSE AFRIKAANSE UNIVERSITEIT OP 30 MEI 1980\***

Suid-Afrika is myns insiens op die drumpel van 'n dekade waarin al sy mense, sowel as dié van sy naburige lande, onherroeplik tussen vrede en vooruitgang aan die een kant, en konflik en menslike lyding aan die ander kant, moet kies. Suid-Afrika het 'n sleutel tot die hoof strategiese plan van die supermoondhede geword saam met ander lande op die aardbol. Toe Leonid Brezhnev in 1975, tydens die 25ste herdenking van die stigting van die Sowjet-beheerde Duitse Demokratiese Republiek gepraat het, het hy die volgende gesê:

"We are convinced that the time will soon arrive when the whole of Africa — from the Cape of Good Hope to the Western Sahara — will be free".

That is, dominated by Moscow's Red Uncle Toms. Die Sowjet-

\*This speech was delivered in Afrikaans and English together, as is customary

strategie, betreffende Afrika, het maksimale en minimale doelwitte. Die maksimale doelwit is die verowering en die beheer van Afrika.

Ek herinner my aan 'n gesprek wat ek gevoer het toe ek 'n jong Minister van Verdediging was en toe dit my voorreg was om Salazar persoonlik te ontmoet in 1967 in Lissabon. Hy het aan die einde van die gesprek opgestaan en na 'n kaart gestap en vir my gesê:

“U is 'n jong man, u sal nog sien wat ek vanaand aan u voorspel. U sal die dag beleef as die Weste nie wakker word nie dat Afrika vanaf Dar Es Salaam tot aan die Kongomond deur 'n Rooi Gordel verdeel is en dan sal die finale aanslag op Afrika en op Europa kom”.

In 1967 het dit onbereikbaar gelyk, in 1980 het Salazar se woorde groot waarheid bewys.

Kom ons kyk verder noordwaarts. Die Sowjet-unie se huidige inmenging in Afghanistan het verreikende gevolge. Die Sowjet-unie het homself daar die reg toegeeën om in te meng wanneer hy besluit dat 'n linkse Marxistiese bewind wat deur middel van verdrae van samewerking en vriendskap aan Moskou verbind is, aktiewe militêre bystand vereis, of wanneer die sekerheidsgebied van die USSR bedreig word. Dit voorspel niks goeds vir state soos die Yemen, Ethiopië, Angola, Mosambiek, of waar ook al kommunisties-geïnspireerde minderheidsgroepe, mag deur middel van geweld oorneem nie.

Die Sowjet-unie se oogmerk is ook om die bestaande regerings in Suidelike Afrika te ondermyn. Dit geskied deur die aantelling van rewolusionêre bewegings om die gevestigde, gematigde regerings omver te werp. Konflik en polarisasie is die basiese vereiste vir kommunistiese uitbreiding. Die Sowjet-unie en sy satellietstate hang die Marxistiese doktrine aan en het gedurende die afgelope dekade uitmuntend daarin geslaag om veral Suider-Afrika se gevestigde regerings omver te gooi. Die uiteindelijke doelwitte is om so op te tree dat hulle inmenging aangevra word met 'n duidelike doel. Want Rusland opereer óf self óf deur sy satelliete altyd op uitnodiging. Eerstens die totale beheer van Suid-Afrika met sy belangrike see-roete, minerale reserwes en strategiese infrastruktuur. Tweedens die stigting en ondersteuning van terroriste-organisasies ten einde onstabiliteit te skep, deur ondermyning van die jeug se gesindhede, verwoesting van die ekonomiese stelsel en tradisionele lewenswyses, vyandige propagande met die oog daarop om die regering van die bevolking en van die internasionale gemeenskap te isoleer; en die voorsiening van massiewe militêre hulp in die vorm van wapens en ander uitrusting en die ontplooiing van plaasvervangende magte.

Ek het onlangs 'n verslag ontvang van Dallas Security Investments Corporation oor Suid-Afrika. Na deeglike studie van ons situasie en die omstandighede wat hier heers skryf hulle in daardie verslag hierdie belangwekkende paragraaf:

“Probably the most difficult realization for free world investors is that the Soviet Union and its Cuban pawn have been mobilized into a state of real war. A communist global strategy to control the natural resources of the world is acutely visible. For several reasons it is felt that South Africa must be the focal point of the Soviet threat”.

Indien hierdie tendens voortduur, sal Suider-Afrika hom in 'n eskalerende oorlogsituasie onder toenemende internasionale en nasionale druk bevind.

Moenie daaraan twyfel nie: Suid-Afrika is die uiteindelijke mikpunt! Die beheer en omverwerping van die ander Suider-Afrika state is maar net tussendoelwitte tot die uiteindelijke doel. Ek het al by verskeie geleenthede gesê dat ons ons in 'n totale oorlogsituasie bevind. Die fisieke of militêre aanslag is maar net een aspek daarvan.

Ons word gekonfronteer deur 'n totale aanslag wat nie slegs 'n militêre bedreiging teen militêre teikens inhou nie, maar ook 'n ideologiese, psigologiese en ekonomiese oorlog sowel as 'n aanslag op die diplomatieke en politieke terreine. Hierdie is 'n gesamentlike en gekoördineerde aksie wat teen Suid-Afrika en sy mense beplan word — die uiteindelijke doel is om die Suid-Afrikaanse burgers te demoraliseer en om ons wil om weerstand te bied, te vernietig. Elke denkbare metode is al aangewend om dit te bereik, vanaf militêre optrede en die internasionale forums van die wêreld en die ekonomiese druk waarvan ons almal bewus is, tot 'n gedwonge wapenverbod, tot die koelbloedige moord op politieke leiers en onskuldige burgerlikes in die operasionele gebied. Al die aanduidings is dat die aanslag nie aan die afneem is nie — ons as Suid-Afrikaneers moet daarvan kennis neem.

Die Weste word deur 'n gebrekkige strategie en innerlike verdeeldheid op die verkeerde pad gelei. Ons het nou weer beleef hoedat, onder leiding van Amerika, daar na aanleiding van Iran en Afghanistan 'n sekere strategie ontplooi is en hoedat daardie strategie nie die volmondige steun ontvang het van Europese lande nie, en staatshoofde van die Europese lande nuwe strategieë ontplooi het wat die innerlike verdeeldheid van die Weste net beklemtoon het. Die onbeslisheid en gebrek aan begrip by sommige van die supermoondhede in die magstryd dui daarop dat ons nie op hulp moet reken nie, nie op valse hoop ons toekoms moet bou nie, maar die probleme as verenigde nasie met 'n gemeenskaplike doel vierkantig in die oë moet kyk. Ons as 'n

nasie het voorheen voor menige probleme te staan gekom. Ons is aanpasbaar en ons is vindingryk. Daar het ons 300 jaar in hierdie land oorleef. Ons verskeidenheid is nie 'n ondraaglike las nie en is nie 'n straf deur die Skepper op ons gelê nie maar ons verskeidenheid samestelling maak ons 'n brug tussen Europa en Afrika.

Met die agtergrond en vermoë het ons die suidelike deel van Afrika die potensiele reus gemaak wat dit is en ons het 'n duidelik-omlynde taak om hier te verrig.

Vyandige kritici het al gesê ons praat van patriotisme en nasionale eenheid en Vaderlandsliefde net as 'n slagyster, sodat die Blankes en veral die Afrikaner ander bevolkingsgroepe kan verkneg. Maar ons geskiedenis getuig daarteen. Ons nasionale doel dra 'n ander boodskap. Dis nodig dat ons daaroor ook vir onself helderheid moet kry. Want tereg is daar gesê deur 'n skrywer: "Hy wat weet waarvoor hy leef, sal ook weet hóé om te leef". Dit geld vir die individu, die gesin en die volk sowel as die nasie.

Nêrens anders as in die Aanhef tot die Grondwet word hierdie doel duideliker gestel, vir almal van ons in Suid-Afrika nie:

"In nederige erkentlikheid teenoor die almagtige God wat ons voorgeslagte uit baie lande byeengebring het — verklaar ons dat ons bereid is — om die onskendbaarheid en vryheid van ons land te beveilig; om die wet en die orde daarin te handhaaf; om die geluk en die geestelike en stoflike welvaart van almal te bevorder; bereid is om ons plig te aanvaar om gesamentlik met alle vredeliewende volkere wêreldvrede te soek".

Dit is die verhewe ideaal waarna ons strewe. Dit is die verhewe ideaal wat on bely in die inleidende paragraaf tot die Grondwet van hierdie Republiek. Ek beskou dit as die innerlike visioen wat as die inspirasie van ons Suid-Afrikaanse volke met hulle verskillende kulture en tale as gemeenskaplike doel moet dien. Dit is die saamsnoerende idee waaromheen ons nasionale eenheid gewef kan word — ook deur die reeds geïnisieerde stappe tot 'n nuwe Konstitusionele bestel vir die Republiek van Suid-Afrika.

"In nederige erkentlikheid teenoor die Almagtige God, Besikker oor die lotgevalle van Nasies en die geskiedenis van volkere" aanvaar ons dat God ook die Vader van ander mense — van al die mense van hierdie, asook die ander lande, is. Ons eie selfrespek en trots verhoed ons nie om ook vir andere met 'n ander kultuur, respek te hê nie! Liefde vir my eie beteken nie dat ek andere moet haat nie. Die bedreiging wat Suid-Afrika ondervind, is een van oorlewing en dit raak ons almal, van watter kleur of politieke oortuiging ookal. Om hierdie bedreiging die hoof te bied sal lojaliteit en toegewydheid van die totale bevolking

verg — van elke man, vrou en kind, van elke kleur.

.....  
The continent of Africa has been no less complex during the last decade. Of the 53 independent African states in 1979 a total of 36 had civilian governments. 18 of these states were one-party states and another 17 were multiparty states. 15 had military governments and 13 were one-party states and 2 had no parties. Between 1970 and 1979 there were 20 successful coups d'etats. Civil wars, international hostilities and genocide have claimed the lives of millions.

The Continent is still characterised by economic instability political disorder and a population explosion. Africa, also the southern sub-continent is faced with upheavals in the social order, political instability, illiteracy, poverty and disease.

50% van die wêreld se vlugtlinge leef in Afrika. 30 van Afrika state het 'n per capita inkomste van minder as R173 per jaar. Slegs 10 Afrika state se geletterdheid — uitgedruk as 'n persentasie van die bevolking, is bokant 30%. Suid-Afrika is die hoogste met 89%. Kan 'n mens dit verstaan dat die Afrika Eenheid Organisasie onder sulke omstandighede nog vir ander wil voorskryf? En tog word die AEO gebruik om ons binnelandse probleme te internasionaliseer en om die Westerse moondhede teen mekaar af te speel.

Daarteenoor is hier onder leiding en aanmoedigende hulp van die Republiek van Suid-Afrika drie state, Transkei, Venda en Bophuthatswana, in staat gestel om langs konstitusionele weg hulle vryheid te verwerf. Nie een enkele vyandige gewerskoot was daarvoor nodig nie. Maar die internasionale gemeenskap, die erken hulle nie, hy erken net dit wat met bloed en rewolusie tot stand kom.

En minstens 'n halfdosyn ander volkere het reeds langs vreedsame weg die stadium van selfregering deur ons bereik. Hulle word nie aan hulself oorgelaat nie. Voortdurende gesprekke vind met hulle plaas en hulp van die Republiek van Suid-Afrika se kant is tot hulle beskikking op hulle pad van opbou en ontwikkeling.

Sedert die laat sestiger jare was dit my voorreg om heelwat state in Afrika te besoek. Trouens ek dink ek was nie die eerste Nasionale Minister wat sommige van hierdie Afrika state besoek het. Ek het nooit na buite daarvoor gepraat nie, maar ek het heelwat uit daardie besoeke geleer. Die een belangrike waarheid wat ek geleer het is dat die Republiek van Suid-Afrika die land is, wat met sy verskeidenheid en staat van ontwikkeling, 'n groot bydrae kan lewer om geweldige groot dele van Afrika op die pad van stabiliteit te help. Dit word ook bevestig in hierdie jongste verslag van "Dallas Security Investments":

"The future of the South African economy will have a profound effect on the economies of other black African states. Trade between the Republic of South Africa and 18 African countries amounts to 900 million dollars per year".

Op die gebied van waterbewaring, gesondheid, landbou, toerisme, vervoerwese, is daar groot braaklande wat samewerking en beraadslaging vereis tussen ons en ons bure. Die Republiek van Suid-Afrika se kundigheid kan vir sy onmiddellike bure van deurslaggewende betekenis word in 'n kontinent wat worstel.

'n Marxistiese, sosialistiese politieke bestel vir lande noord van ons het geen heil vir hulle bewerkstellig nie. Dit kan ook nie vir ons nie. Die Afrikaner, Engelstalige Suid-Afrikaner en ander bevolkingsgemeenskappe sal deur so 'n stelsel van hulle ekonomiese hulpmiddels gedreineer word. Wat in Angola en Mosambiek mense se lot geword het sal, as dit hier by ons toegepas moet word, nog groter rampspoedige gevolge hê. Uit Angola en Mosambiek kon tienduizende mense vlug. Uit die Republiek van Suid-Afrika kan ons nie vlug nie. Ons het nie 'n alternatief nie. Ons moet hier bly lewe vir onself en vir ons bure. Ons pensioene, ons spaargeld, ons geluk, ons eiendomme, ons beleggings, ons gesinslewens, ons kultuurgoedere, ons kuns, ons roep, dit alles is op die spel.

En daarom, Republiekdag, 31 Mei — moet vir ons 'n toekomsvisioen van nasionale eenheid en opbou wakker roep. Ons moet onthou dat ons nasionale eenheid gevorm moet word om met toewyding 'n nasionale doel en doelstellings te bereik en te handhaaf. En wat behels daardie doel? In teenstelling met Marxisme het ons 'n vryemark stelsel waarin die beginsel van effektiewe mededinging onderskryf word. Daarin bestaan toegang tot die verskillende markte in die ekonomie ten eiende doeltreffende benutting van die produksiefaktore moontlik te maak. 'n Belangrike komponent van hierdie strategie is om, in ooreenstemming met die beroepsvereistes wat ons ontwikkelende ekonomiese struktuur sal stel, ons mannekrag beter te benut.

Tereg sê 'n bekende Amerikaanse gewese minister, mnr William Simon in sy boek — *A Time for Truth* — die volgende:

"Productivity and the growth of productivity must be the first economic consideration at all times, not the last. The concept that 'wealth is theft' must be repudiated".

Op die ekonomiese gebied, het ons land reeds lank ervaring van verbintenisse oor die grense van bevolkings- en kultuurgroepe heen en moet ons die hoogste prioriteite verleen aan samevoeging van ons vermoëns waar moontlik. Daarvoor moet die Staat en die privaatsektor mekaar vind, daarvoor is ons

besig om mekaar te vind. Die klem val nie op die uitwissing van natuurlike verskille tussen mense nie. Dit val juis op die beklemtoning van die rykdom van verskeidenheid wat daar binne Suid-Afrika bestaan en op die vereniging van die handelinge van ons mense rondom gemeenskaplike belange en doelstellings.

Daarom byvoorbeeld geniet die skepping van 'n ontwikkelingsbank vir Suider-Afrika nou die besondere aandag van die Staat. Daar is behoefte aan deurlopende aandag aan die ontwikkelingsvraagstukke van Suider-Afrika, die mobilisering van hulpbronne en kundigheid en die bepaling van prioriteite. Dit is in die nasionale belang dat vir sover ons vermoë en prioriteite dit toelaat, ons ontwikkelingskapitaal, bestuursvernuif en tegniese kundigheid aangewend moet word om ons ekonomies agtergeblewe gebiede te ontwikkel. So 'n poging sal egter verydel word as radikaliste in hierdie land hulle sin kry — radikalisme wat dikwels van die buite aangestook word.

.....  
Die Christelike bewys moet kan lewer dat dit verkiesliker is bo die materiële gelykmakingsleer van die Kommunisme. Hierdie benadering lê ten grondslag van ons beoogde skepping van 'n nuwe konstitusionele bedeling waarin ook minderheidsgroepe in Suid-Afrika tot hulle reg sal kom. Ek glo nie dat 'n politieke Utopia binne ons bereik is op hierdie deur-die-mens-bedreigde aardbol nie. Volmaaktheid is nie duskant die graf moontlik nie. Maar ek glo dat ons in ons strewe ideale kan uitleef wat die magte van vernietiging, ontbinding en chaos kan neutraliseer en dat ons die orde kan verkies.

Tereg het 'n groot staatsman wat saam met sy volk ook in die doodsvalei gegaan het toe hy moes vlug, gesê:

“Geloof beteken nie dat daar nie twyfel is nie. Geloof beteken dat twyfel geignoreer word terwyl daar met moed voortbeweeg word”.

Mag 31 Mei 1980 die begin wees van 'n nuwe trek, 'n moedige trek na 'n beter, stabiele konstellasie van Suider-Afrika state, waaroor die Suiderkruis die wag hou.

Text supplied by the South African Department of Foreign Affairs and Information

**EXTRACTS CONCERNING SOUTHERN AFRICA FROM A  
SPEECH BY THE UNITED KINGDOM FOREIGN SECRETARY,  
LORD CARRINGTON, TO THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON  
23 SEPTEMBER 1980**

Since I last addressed this Assembly 12 months ago, many terrible things have happened in the world. There has been much cruel and cynical defiance of the principles on which our Charter is based. It would be difficult to say that the world is a safer, more prosperous or happier place today than it was a year ago. Indeed, within the last few days the emergence of a fresh conflict in the Middle Eastern region has given us further cause for anxiety. The tasks confronting all of us remain formidable.

But what has happened during the last 12 months has not all been bad. The great majority of the members of this organisation have observed the Charter. And things have happened to inspire us and to persuade us, if persuasion were needed, that conflicts can be resolved: that peaceful negotiations can uncover compromises on which warring parties can settle their differences: that perseverance, goodwill and realism, here at the United Nations and elsewhere, can end wars and save human lives.

When I last addressed this Assembly, war was still raging in that country which is now called Zimbabwe and which last month was welcomed as the 153rd member of our organisation. That conflict had been going on for 14 years, some would say longer. But long, complex and at times painful negotiations succeeded in finding a basis on which it could be ended, on which the people of Zimbabwe could be given the opportunity to decide for themselves how and by whom they should be governed. I would like to suggest, Mr President, that as we enter this 35th session of the General Assembly, the example of Zimbabwe should inspire us to search all the harder for peaceful, practical and realistic (and I cannot emphasize too much the importance of this last adjective) solutions to the major problems that confront the world today.

.....  
Namibia

(After references to Third World aid; the Middle East; Afghanistan; Iran; refugees; Cambodia).

Another area of tragic armed conflict is Namibia. Here too a political solution must be found by negotiation. But here there already exists a plan, approved by the Security Council, and negotiations are already well advanced. The British Government remains firm in the belief that the United Nations plan provides the only sure route to a peaceful and democratic settlement with general international recognition. We shall continue to work with



the Secretary-General and the African states most closely involved to achieve the long overdue agreement on implementation of this plan.

### Zimbabwe

I have already referred to Zimbabwe's advance to independence and to membership of the United Nations. That has given my Government great satisfaction, a satisfaction shared, I know, by every member of this organisation. But this new member of our organisation needs more from us than congratulations. It needs substantial aid to rebuild its economy from the ravages of civil war. My own Government pledged \$180 million of aid to Zimbabwe over the next three years. We have also cancelled \$53 million of official debt, and rescheduled the remainder on favourable terms.

Although a number of other offers of assistance have been made, the international community as a whole has not yet done enough to put Zimbabwe back on to its feet. The damage resulting from years of isolation and of war is enormous. The expectations raised by the peace settlement are high. An international effort to underpin the political and economic stability of Zimbabwe during its first few years as an independent state can secure its future prosperity, and enable it to play an influential part in Central Africa. I believe it to be of the highest importance that such an effort should be forthcoming in the months ahead.

### South Africa

As regards South Africa, my Government's view is clear. We consider apartheid to be morally indefensible and politically unworkable. But if change is to come peacefully in South Africa, it will have to be a step-by-step process. We will not achieve peaceful change by increasing South Africa's isolation, nor by ostracism, nor by threats. We cannot know how fast changes will come in South Africa, but there are voices inside the country calling for change and we should not ignore them. What the United Nations can and must do is to continue to remind South Africa that apartheid is a system repugnant to all the members of the United Nations and incompatible with the ideals of this organisation and of the international community as a whole.

*For the Record*, Ref. no. 3, 25 Sept. 1980, issued by the British Information Services, Johannesburg