

SOUTH AFRICAN RECORD

SAIIA



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

THE S.A. INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

NOT TO BE REMOVED

NUMBER 5

SOUTHERN AFRICA RECORD, which is issued by the Institute on an irregular basis (the first number having appeared in March, 1975) contains the original texts of, or extracts from, important statements by political leaders, government representatives and international organisations, concerning international relations in the southern region of Africa. In addition to statements on issues of current concern, some significant statements made in the past are included in the RECORD from time to time. The reproduction of these policy statements of the past and present, is intended for information and reference purposes, not only for students, but for all those who are concerned with the relations between the countries of Southern Africa.

Statements are reproduced if and when texts become available (not in chronological order), and it must be emphasised that the selection of statements included in SOUTHERN AFRICA RECORD should not be regarded as exhaustive or even representative. Nor should the selection be regarded in any sense as indicating a viewpoint as to the relative importance of one or other statement over another not reproduced or reproduced in a later number of the RECORD. In any case, as the Institute itself cannot, in terms of its Constitution, hold a viewpoint on any aspect of international affairs, no views expressed in any statement reproduced in the RECORD should be identified with the Institute.

This issue of SOUTHERN AFRICA RECORD (No. 5) is appearing in a new format, and the price per issue is now R1,50 (previously R1). As the RECORD is issued on an irregular basis (about four times a year), there is no annual subscription rate, but subscribers are charged annually for the issues of the RECORD received by them during the previous year.

Orders for the RECORD should be addressed to the Administrative Secretary, S.A.I.I.A., P.O. Box 31596, Braamfontein, 2017, South Africa.

SOUTHERN AFRICA RECORD

NUMBER FIVE

JULY/JULIE 1976

CONTENTS/INHOUD

Address by the U.S. Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, in Lusaka, Zambia, on 27 April, 1976	1
Extract from a statement in Parliament, concerning Southern Africa, by the South African Prime Minister, the Hon. B. J. Vorster, on 22 April, 1976	11
Interview with President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia by the Editor of the Sunday Express, Mr. Allister Sparks, in August 1975	14
Speech by H. E. General Murtala Muhammed, Head of the Federal Military Government of Nigeria, at the Extraordinary Summit Conference of the OAU concerning Angola, held in Addis Ababa on 11 January, 1976	18
Statement in Parliament by the South African Prime Minister, the Hon. B. J. Vorster, on 4 March, 1976, concerning the closing of the border between Rhodesia and Mozambique	26
Interview with the Prime Minister of South Africa, the Hon. B. J. Vorster, by Mr. George Evans, of the Sunday Telegraph, London, on March 14, 1976	27



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

**Uittreksels uit 'n toespraak deur die Suid-Afrikaanse
Eerste Minister, Sy Edele B. J. Vorster, tydens die
Feesvieringe van Somerset-Oos se 150-jarige bestaan.
3 Mei 1975**

31

**Toespraak gelewer deur Sy Edele Eric H. Louw, Minister
van Buitelandse Sake, by geleentheid van die gradedag
van die Universiteit van Pretoria, op 30 Maart 1957**

34

**ADDRESS BY THE U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE, DR. HENRY
KISSINGER, IN LUSAKA, ZAMBIA, ON 27 APRIL, 1976.**

INTRODUCTION

President Ford has sent me here with a message of commitment and co-operation.

I have come to Africa because in so many ways, the challenges of Africa are the challenges of the modern era. Morally and politically, the drama of national independence in Africa over the last generation has transformed international affairs. More than any other region of the world, Africa symbolizes that the previous era of world affairs – the colonial era – is a thing of the past. The great tasks you face – in nation-building, in keeping the peace and integrity of this continent, in economic development, in gaining an equitable role in world councils, in achieving racial justice – these reflect the challenges of building a humane and progressive world order.

I have come to Africa with an open mind and an open heart to demonstrate my country's desire to work with you on these great tasks. My journey is intended to give fresh impetus to our co-operation and to usher in a new era in American policy.

The United States was one of the prime movers of the process of decolonization. The American people welcomed the new nations into the world community and for two decades have given aid and encouragement to economic and social progress in Africa. And America's responsibilities as a global power give us a strong interest today in the independence, peace and well-being of this vast continent comprising a fifth of the world's land surface. For without peace, racial justice and growing prosperity in Africa, we cannot speak of a just international order.

There is nothing to be gained in a debate about whether in the past America has neglected Africa or been insufficiently committed to African goals. The United States has many responsibilities in the world. Given the burden it has carried in the postwar period, it could not do everything simultaneously. African nations too have their own priorities and concerns, which have not always accorded with our own. No good can come of mutual recrimination. Our differing perspectives converge in a common purpose to build a secure and just future for Africa. In active collaboration there is much we can do; in contention or apart we will miss great opportunities. President Ford, the American Government and people are prepared to work with you with energy and goodwill if met in the same spirit.

So it is time to put aside slogans and to seek practical solutions. It is time to find our common ground and act boldly for common ends.

Africa is a continent of hope – a modern frontier. The United States from the beginning has been a country of the frontier, built by men

and women of hope. The American people know from their history the meaning of the struggle for independence, for racial equality, for economic progress, for human dignity.

I am not here to give American prescriptions for Africa's problems. Your program must be African. The basic decisions and goals must be African. But we are prepared to help.

Nor am I here to set African against African, either among your governments or among factions of liberation movements. African problems cannot be solved and your destiny cannot be fulfilled except by a united Africa. America supports African unity. We urge all other countries to do the same.

Here in Africa the range of mankind's challenges and potential can be seen in all its complexity and enormous promise. The massive power and grandeur of nature is before us in all its aspects – as the harsh master and as a bountiful servant of mankind. Here we can feel the rich and living cultures which have changed and invigorated art, music and thought around the world. And here, on this continent, we are tested, all of us, to see whether our future will be determined for us or by us, whether humanity will be the victim or the architect of its destiny.

THE PROBLEM OF SOUTHERN AFRICA

Of all the challenges before us, of all the purposes we have in common, racial justice is one of the most basic. This is a dominant issue of our age, within nations and among nations. We know from our own experience that the goal of racial justice is both compelling and achievable. Our support for this principle in Southern Africa is not simply a matter of foreign policy, but an imperative of our own moral heritage.

The people of Zambia do not need to be reminded of the importance of realizing this goal. By geography and economic necessity, Zambia is affected directly and grievously by strife in Southern Africa. Political stability in this region means more to Zambia than to many others. Yet Zambia has chosen to stand by her principles by closing her border with Rhodesia and enduring the economic consequences. This is a testimony to the determination of the people of this country and to the statesmanship of its great leader, President Kaunda.

And it was in this city seven years ago that leaders of East and Central African states proclaimed their Manifesto on Southern Africa.

One is struck by the similarity of philosophy in the American Declaration of Independence and in the Lusaka Manifesto. Two hundred years ago, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed

by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

And seven years ago, the leaders of East and Central Africa declared here in Lusaka that:

"By this Manifesto we wish to make clear, beyond all shadow of doubt, our acceptance of the belief that all men are equal, and have equal rights to human dignity and respect, regardless of color, race, religion, or sex. We believe that all men have the right and duty to participate, as equal members of society, in their own government".

There can be no doubt that the United States remains committed to the principles of its own Declaration of Independence. It follows that we also adhere to the convictions of the Lusaka Manifesto.

Therefore, here in Lusaka, I reaffirm the unequivocal commitment of the United States to human rights, as expressed in the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We support self-determination, majority rule, equal rights and human dignity for all the peoples of Southern Africa—in the name of moral principle, international law and world peace.

On this occasion I would like to set forth more fully American policy on some of the immediate issues we face—in Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa—and then to sketch our vision of Southern Africa's hopeful future.

THE UNITED STATES POSITION ON RHODESIA

The United States position on Rhodesia is clear and unmistakable. As President Ford has said, "The United States is totally dedicated to seeing to it that the majority becomes the ruling power in Rhodesia." We do not recognize the Rhodesian minority regime. The United States voted for, and is committed to the U.N. Security Council resolutions of 1966 and 1968 that imposed mandatory economic sanctions against the illegal Rhodesian regime. Earlier this year we co-sponsored a Security Council resolution, which was passed unanimously, expanding mandatory sanctions. And in March of this year, we joined with others to commend Mozambique for its decision to enforce these sanctions even at great economic cost to itself.

It is the responsibility of all who seek a negotiated solution to make clear to the Rhodesian minority that the world community is united in its insistence on rapid change. It is the responsibility of those in Rhodesia who believe in peace to take the steps necessary to avert a great tragedy.

United States policy for a just and durable Rhodesian solution will therefore rest on ten elements:

First, the United States declares its support in the strongest terms

for the proposals made by British Prime Minister Callaghan on March 22 of this year: that independence must be preceded by majority rule which, in turn, must be achieved no later than two years following the expeditious conclusion of negotiations. We consider these proposals a basis for a settlement fair to all the people of Rhodesia. We urge that they be accepted.

Secondly, the Salisbury regime must understand that it cannot expect United States support either in diplomacy or in material help at any stage in its conflict with African states or Africa liberation movements. On the contrary, it will face our unrelenting opposition until a negotiated settlement is achieved.

Third, the United States will take steps to fulfill completely its obligation under international law to mandatory economic sanctions against Rhodesia. We will urge the Congress this year to repeal the Byrd Amendment, which authorizes Rhodesian chrome imports to the United States, an act inconsistent with United Nations sanctions. In parallel with this effort, we will approach other industrial nations to ensure the strictest and broadest international compliance with sanctions.

Fourth, to ensure that there are no misperceptions on the part of the leaders of the minority in Rhodesia, The United States, on the conclusion of my consultations in Black Africa, will communicate clearly and directly to the Salisbury regime our view of the urgency of a rapid negotiated settlement leading to majority rule.

Fifth, the United States Government will carry out its responsibility to inform American citizens that we have no official representation in Rhodesia nor any means of providing them with assistance or protection. American travellers will be advised against entering Rhodesia; Americans resident there will be urged to leave.

Sixth, as in the case of Zambia a few years ago, steps should be taken – in accordance with the recent U.N. Security Council resolution – to assist Mozambique, whose closing of its borders with Rhodesia to enforce sanctions has imposed upon it a great additional economic hardship. In accordance with this U.N. resolution, the United States is willing to provide \$12.5 million of assistance.

Seventh, the United States – together with other members of the United Nations – is ready to help alleviate economic hardship for any countries neighboring Rhodesia which decide to enforce sanctions by closing their frontiers.

Eighth, humanitarian provision must be made for the thousands of refugees who have fled in distress from Rhodesia into neighboring countries. The United States will consider sympathetically requests for assistance for these refugees by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees or other appropriate international organizations.

Ninth, the world community should give its support to the people of Rhodesia as they make the peaceful transition to majority

rule and independence, and should aid a newly independent Zimbabwe. To this end, we are ready to join with other interested nations in a program of economic, technical, and educational assistance, to enable an independent Zimbabwe to achieve the progress and the place in the community of nations to which its resources and the talents of all its people entitle it.

Finally, we state our conviction that Whites as well as Blacks should have a secure future and civil rights in a Zimbabwe that has achieved racial justice. A constitutional structure should protect minority rights together with establishing majority rule. We are prepared to devote some of our assistance programs to this objective.

In carrying out this program we shall consult with the Presidents of Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia.

We believe these are important measures. We are open minded with respect to additional actions that can help speed a resolution. The United States will consult closely with African leaders, especially the four Presidents, and with other friends on the Rhodesian problem. For the central fact that I have come here to stress is this: The United States is wholly committed to help bring about a rapid, just and African solution to the issue of Rhodesia.

NAMIBIA

Rhodesia is the most urgent but by no means the only critical problem in Southern Africa. The status of Namibia has been a source of contention between the world community and South Africa for over three decades.

The territory of South-West Africa turned into a source of serious international discord following World War II. When the United Nations refused to accede to South Africa's proposal for annexation of the territory, South Africa declined to enter into a trusteeship agreement, and since then has refused to recognize the United Nations as the legal sovereign. In 1966, the General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate over the territory. In 1971, the International Court of Justice concluded that South Africa's occupation of Namibia was illegal and that it should withdraw.

The United States voted for the 1966 General Assembly resolution. We were the only major power to argue before the International Court that South African occupation was illegal. And in January 1976 the United States voted in favour of the U.N. resolution condemning the occupation of Namibia and calling for South Africa to take specific steps toward Namibia's self-determination and independence.

We are encouraged by the South African Government's evident decision to move Namibia toward independence. We are convinced that a solution can be found which will embody equal rights for the entire population and at the same time protect the interests of all who

live and work there. But we are concerned that South Africa has failed to announce a definite timetable for the achievement of self-determination; that all the people and all political groupings of Namibia have not been allowed to take part in determining the form of government they shall one day have, and that South Africa continues to deny the United Nations its proper role in establishing a free and independent Namibia.

Therefore the United States position is as follows:

- We reiterate our call upon the South African Government to permit all the people and groups of Namibia to express their views freely, under U.N. supervision, on the political future and constitutional structure of their country.
- We urge the South African Government to announce a definite timetable acceptable to the world community for the achievement of self-determination.
- The United States is prepared to work with the international community, and especially with African leaders, to determine what further steps would improve prospects for a rapid and acceptable transition to Namibian independence. We are convinced that the need for progress is urgent.
- Once concrete movement toward self-determination is underway, the United States will ease its restrictions on trade and investment in Namibia. We stand ready to provide economic and technical assistance to help Namibia take its rightful place among the independent nations of the world.

SOUTH AFRICA

Apartheid in South Africa remains an issue of great concern to those committed to racial justice and human dignity.

No country, no people can claim perfection in the realm of human rights. We in America are aware of our own imperfections. But because we are a free society, our problems and our shortcomings are fully aired and made known to the world. And we have reason to take pride in our progress in the quest for justice for all in our country.

The world community's concern with South Africa is not merely that racial discrimination exists there. What is unique is the extent to which racial discrimination has been institutionalized, enshrined in law and made all-pervasive.

No one—including the leaders of Black Africa—challenges the right of White South Africans to live in their country. They are not colonialists; historically, they are an African people, but White South Africans must recognize as well that the world will continue to insist that the institutionalized separation of the races must end. The United States appeals to South Africa to heed the warning signals of the past two years. There is still time to bring about a reconciliation of

South Africa's peoples for the benefit of all. But there is a limit to that time – a limit of far shorter duration than was generally perceived even a few years ago.

A peaceful end to institutionalized inequality is in the interest of all South Africans. The United States will continue to encourage and work for peaceful change. Our policy toward South Africa is based upon the premise that within a reasonable time we shall see a clear evolution toward equality of opportunity and basic human rights for all South Africans. The United States will exercise all its efforts in that direction. We urge the Government of South Africa to make that premise a reality.

In the immediate future, the Republic of South Africa can show its dedication to Africa – and its potential contribution to Africa – by using its influence in Salisbury to promote a rapid negotiated settlement for majority rule in Rhodesia. This, we are sure, would be viewed positively by the community of nations as well as by the rest of Africa.

A VISION OF THE FUTURE

Southern Africa has all the prerequisites for an exciting future. Richly endowed with minerals, agricultural and hydroelectric potential, a favorable climate, and, most important, great human resources, it needs only to overcome the human failure of racial strife to achieve bright prospects for all its peoples.

Let us all strive to speed the day when this vision becomes a reality.

The United States stands ready to work with the nations of Southern Africa to help them achieve the economic progress which will give meaning to their political independence and dignity to their struggle for equality.

As you know, Deputy Secretary Robinson, an expert in economic development, is accompanying me on this visit. This is the first time that an American Secretary of State and Deputy Secretary together have come on such a mission reflecting the importance we attach to the economic development of Southern Africa. Mr Robinson and I are discussing development needs with African officials in the various capitals and we shall continue these consultations at the UNCTAD meeting in Nairobi next week. After my return to Washington, based on what we have learned, we will urgently study a new aid program for this continent.

Africa and its friends face a dual challenge – immediate and long-term growth. In the short term, economic emergencies can arise from natural disasters or sharp swings in global economic conditions over which developing nations have little control. These economic shocks must be dealt with if the nations of the region are to maintain their hard-won progress toward development.

For example, the sharp drop in world copper prices has had a devastating impact on the economies of Zambia and Zaïre. The United States will deal with this problem in its bilateral assistance programs for these countries, and in our programs for multilateral action – to be proposed at UNCTAD next week – for resource development, buffer stocks, and earnings stabilization.

But our basic concern must go beyond responding to emergencies. We need to develop urgently, programs to lay the foundations for sustained growth to enable the developing nations of Southern Africa to deal effectively with global economic shocks and trends.

Let me mention four that are especially relevant to Southern Africa: Trained local manpower, rural development, advanced technology, and modern transportation.

- For Namibia and Zimbabwe, training programs should be intensified now so that needed manpower will be ready when majority rule is attained. Existing programs to train Namibian and Zimbabwean refugees as administrators and technicians should be expanded as rapidly as possible. We have requested additional funds from Congress for this purpose. We urge other donors and international organizations to do more.
- Development for all of Southern Africa involves a process of transforming rural life. We are prepared to assist in agricultural development, in health programs, in manpower training, in improving rural transportation – through both bilateral and multilateral programs.
- A revolution in development planning could be achieved by the use of satellites to collect vital information on crops, weather, water resources, land use, and mineral exploration. The United States has already shared with developing nations information from our earliest Earth Resources Survey satellites. We are now prepared to undertake much larger programs to apply this technology to Africa – including training programs and the development of training facilities and satellite receiving stations in Africa itself.
- Perhaps the most critical long-term economic need of Southern Africa is a modern system of regional transportation. The magnitude of the effort extends beyond the capacity of any one nation or group or nations. For this reason the United States proposes that the world bank undertake as a priority matter the organization of a multilateral consultative group of donors to develop a modern regional transportation system for Southern Africa. For our part we promise our full co-operation in working out a long-term program and in financing appropriate portions of it.
- And finally, I can announce today that we expect to triple our support for development programs in Southern and Central Africa over the next three years.

In addition, the United States has offered leadership in many in-

ternational forums to promote development through multilateral co-operation. The industrial nations, the newly-wealthy oil-producers and the developing countries themselves, must collaborate for the goal of development.

Africa is a principal beneficiary of the many United States initiatives in multilateral institutions and programs – to enhance economic security through supporting export earnings in the face of sharp economic swings; to promote growth through better access to capital markets and technology transfers; to accelerate agricultural production; to improve the conditions of trade and investment in key commodities; and to address the special needs of the poorest nations.

Many of the proposals we have made are already being implemented. Next week in Nairobi I will put forward new proposals to further advance progress in relations between developed and developing nations.

CONCLUSION

Today I have outlined the principles of American policy on the compelling challenges of Southern Africa.

Our proposals are not a program made in America to be passively accepted by Africans. They are an expression of common aspirations and an agenda of co-operation. Underlying it is our fundamental conviction that Africa's destiny must remain in African hands.

No one who wishes this continent well can want to see Africans divided either between nations or between liberation movements. Africans cannot want outsiders seeking to impose solutions; or choosing among countries or movements. The United States, for its part, does not seek any pro-American African bloc confronting a bloc supporting any other power. Nor do we wish to support one faction of a liberation movement against another. But neither should any other country pursue hegemonial aspirations or bloc policies. An attempt by one will inevitably be countered by the other. The United States therefore supports African unity and integrity categorically as basic principles of our policy.

There is no better guarantee against outside pressure from any quarter than the determination of African nations in defence of their own independence and unity. You did not build African institutions to see outside forces fragment them into competing blocs. The United States supports Africa's genuine nonalignment and unity. We are ready for collaboration on the basis of mutual respect. We do so guided by our convictions and our values. Your cause is too compatible with our principles for you to need to pursue it by tactics of confrontation with the United States; our self-respect is too strong to let ourselves be pressured either directly or by outside powers.

What Africa needs now from the United States is not exuberant

promises or emotional expressions of good will. What it needs is a concrete program which I have sought to offer today. So let us get down to business. Let us direct our eyes towards our great goals – national independence, economic development, racial justice – goals that can be achieved by common action.

Africa in this decade is a testing ground of the world's conscience and vision. That Blacks and Whites live together in harmony and equality is a moral imperative of our time. Let us prove that these goals can be realized by human choice, that justice can command by the force of its rightness instead of by force of arms.

These are ideals that bind all the races of mankind. They are the mandate of decency and progress and peace.

This drama will be played out in our own lifetime. Our children will inherit either our success or our failure. The world watches with hope and we approach it with confidence.

So let it be said that black people and white people working together achieved on this continent – which has suffered so much and seen so much injustice – a new era of peace, well-being and human dignity.

Appendix:

Mr. President, if I am correct, Dr. Kissinger, in Africa, stated that the Americans favor the position of the Black nationalists in Rhodesia for getting control of the government.

What would you do if the 15 000 Cuban troops stationed in Angola intervened for the Black nationalists in Rhodesia?

First, let me say that the orders are – and Dr. Kissinger stated them publicly while he was in Africa – that we would not use any military force; we would not provide any weapons for any of the nations that might try to put pressure on Rhodesia. That is a matter of firm, hard statement.

Now the question as to if 15 000 Cubans went into Rhodesia; in the first place, they have been warned that any adventurism by them will be met by appropriate action by this country. We have diplomatic, we have economic and we have military options, and whatever they do we will exercise the necessary option to make sure that they are not successful.

Now let me add one final point: the policy of this country is a policy that led to the establishment of the United States. We, as Americans, became American because of self-determination. That is how we became the United States of America. That is what we have traditionally believed in.

We have also believed in the absolute guarantee of minority rights in any country, and, furthermore, we, under no circumstances, believe that Cuba or the Soviet Union or any outside country should have the authority, the power or the capability to interfere with internal affairs in Africa.

Comments by U.S. President Gerald Ford on Southern Africa, during interview in Fort Wayne, Texas, on 2 May, 1976, from an official text as released by the U.S. Information Service.

**EXTRACT FROM A STATEMENT IN PARLIAMENT,
CONCERNING SOUTHERN AFRICA, BY THE
SOUTH AFRICAN PRIME MINISTER, THE HON. B. J.
VORSTER, ON 22 APRIL, 1976.**

I also feel myself called upon to say a few words in regard to the position of Southern Africa. Hon. members will recall that I spoke in the Other Place in October 1974. The theme of my speech was peace in Southern Africa. On that occasion I issued a warning against the escalation of violence and its significance for Southern Africa as such. If it was necessary to issue that warning in October 1974, it is doubly necessary to issue it a second time now, in April 1976. At the time I committed myself to seeking peace in Southern Africa. Because hon. members know that it is true, I can say without fear of contradiction that this Government, and I who am responsible for it, went out of our way to seek peace. Wherever it was possible, I went out of my way to try to normalize relations and to seek peace, and we made progress along that road.

There are people who say – some of them are in this House – that the latest developments have led to that road becoming a dead end. That is not true. What is true is that there have been setbacks. As a realist I always expected those setbacks. Those setbacks occurred, sometimes minor ones, sometimes major ones. In spite of that the attempt, the initiative, is not dead at all, but definitely alive still. In spite of the fact that the graph was forced downwards in places, the tendency is still an upward one. When the dust of certain events has settled, the upward tendency of that graph will continue even further. As far as I am concerned, it was worth while to seek peace, and I shall continue to seek that peace, in spite of what is happening at the moment and what might still happen in future.

I am not saying this because I am a pacifist. I say again that when I speak on behalf of South Africa, I am not speaking out of weakness or out of fear. I believe that every responsible leader has a duty in this respect. I believe it is the duty of every responsible leader to seek peace as long as possible. In my case – because I realize what consequences escalation could have for Southern Africa – I have made a promise to the young people of South Africa. I have done so on more than one occasion. My promise to them was that I would leave no stone unturned in my efforts to seek peace. However, if this is not possible – and may God forbid that this should happen – and if it becomes clearly apparent that this is not possible, I shall, in accordance with my promise, be able to say to them with a clear conscience: "I failed in my attempt. May God have mercy on you." This Government, its Ministers and I, are not seeking war, but unfortunately there are leaders in Africa, therefore in Southern Africa as well, who talk very easily of war, in many cases knowing full well that they

cannot afford it economically and otherwise. There is nothing which is as expensive today – not only expensive in the financial sense, but expensive, too, in every other sense of the word – as war. I want to make an appeal to those leaders who talk so easily of war to reconsider. I note that, in recent times, South Africa has also come under fire in the process. I do not intend to react to that now. I simply want to issue a warning and say that it can go too far and that I therefore feel myself called upon – because I have achieved a good understanding with him, and he will know in what spirit I am saying this in this Parliament today, a spirit of goodwill, a spirit of appreciation for what he has done – to say to the President of Zambia that he should in his statements please refrain, as I have said before, from drawing the bow too taut. I must issue a serious warning, and I want to trust that leaders, in Southern Africa and elsewhere, will take cognizance of this. The killing of innocent men, women and children is not only barbaric and detestable; it can ultimately be dangerous for the perpetrators as well as for their inciters. Whether they are tourists from South Africa or other tourists, or whether they are inhabitants, Black or White, of Rhodesia or of any other country, such deeds can only unleash forces which could have far-reaching consequences. They could arouse unbridled emotions. They could have far-reaching consequences for Southern Africa. I want to trust that people who have control over this kind of thing will consider very earnestly, what the effect of this could be on the southernmost point of the continent of Africa.

South Africa is not, and has never been, involved in Rhodesia's internal dispute, nor have we ever been asked to become involved in that internal dispute. It is a matter for Rhodesians, White and Black, to settle and that is also how they see it. Consequently I want to trust that other States will adopt the same standpoint as South Africa in this regard, for the good of this subcontinent in which we are living. South Africa's policy in this regard has always been clear. During the past ten years South Africa has not participated in boycotts or the closing of borders, nor does South Africa intend doing so in future. Recently I have seen several reports. I have seen several demands and appeals that were made to me as head of the Government in South Africa. Now, I want to say with the utmost goodwill that South Africa's foreign policy towards a neighbouring State – any neighbouring State, including Rhodesia – will not be determined by the UN, nor by any Government in Europe or elsewhere, and least of all by any Government in Africa. South Africa will at all times take its own decisions on its own foreign policy. I also note that an appeal is being made to me by leading British newspapers to do something about the Rhodesian dispute. What South Africa has done in this regard in the past is well known. Therefore it is not necessary for me to repeat it now, except to say once more, for the purposes of the record, that we

have never prescribed to anyone, that we have never tried to twist anyone's arm, and that we have never given orders. Our standpoint has always been that decisions have to be taken by the Rhodesians themselves, and we have no intention of deviating from that policy. We have issued warnings where it was necessary, and we have given advice where it was necessary. We pointed out alternatives, but it was always in a good spirit of neighbourliness, and in that spirit we shall continue in spite of the fact that there is a world of difference between politics in Rhodesia and the policy we follow here in South Africa. I said that I note, now, that British newspapers are making an appeal to me. It is well and proper that they should do so. I think, however, that they should rather make an appeal to their own Government. The British Government has always adopted the attitude that it has certain rights in Rhodesia. Without arguing the question of whether or not this is true, I just want to say that if its premise is that Rhodesia is its territory and the Rhodesians living there its subjects, then I believe that the British Government is under a special obligation in that regard. Then it is not only the neighbouring States that are under obligations; the British Government is also under a special obligation as far as that matter is concerned.

**INTERVIEW WITH PRESIDENT KENNETH KAUNDA OF
ZAMBIA BY THE EDITOR OF THE SUNDAY EXPRESS, MR.
ALLISTER SPARKS, IN AUGUST 1975**

How do you feel about the Southern African situation now?

In a speech last year I mentioned three major obstacles to creating an atmosphere of understanding between Mr. Vorster and African leaders: South Africa's involvement in Rhodesia, in Namibia (South West Africa) and the question of apartheid.

Fortunately, Mr. Vorster has kept his word on the question of withdrawing his armed forces from Rhodesia; hopefully he will disengage politically and economically as well. So there we can see some hope. If we can settle this problem of Rhodesia, then we shall be in a far better position to face together the other problems of Southern Africa.

On Namibia, we are once again all leaning on Mr. Vorster and hoping he can save us from the prospect of armed conflict which none of us wants but into which we are all being increasingly drawn.

South Africa itself is different. The OAU has recognised that it is a sovereign, independent country. Our only difference there is over the question of apartheid.

Don't you regard the statements by Mr. Vorster and other members of his Government, to the effect that they intend moving away from race discrimination, as constituting a commitment in terms of the Lusaka Manifesto?

This is a very difficult question. I must say that I have now had some dealings with Mr. Vorster and he has kept his word on all the things he has undertaken to do.

We asked him not to interfere in the internal affairs of Mozambique when it became independent, and he hasn't. We asked him not to allow refugees to use South Africa as a base to operate against Mozambique, and he has not allowed this.

Then we asked him to withdraw his forces from Rhodesia – and, well, he has withdrawn those forces.

So at least on these points he has shown himself to be a man of his word. This gives us hope that he will do the same as far as the internal situation in South Africa is concerned – although let me say that African leaders are aware that it is a very difficult situation.

Do you believe that race discrimination can be ended by way of separate development, to which the South African Government remains committed?

Really, we can't see how separate development can ever bring equal opportunity to all the various racial groups in your otherwise great country. The American experiment (separate-but-equal policy

of the Deep South, declared unconstitutional by the US Supreme Court in 1954) showed that it is not the same thing as equal opportunity for all.

It's impossible – and I can only hope Mr. Vorster will come to see how impossible it is.

But I can't accuse him of ill-will or deceit because, as I've tried to indicate, he has kept his word on all these things on which he undertook to do something about. I can only hope he is looking for a more realistic way to solve the problem.

The Lusaka Manifesto says you recognise that group fears and self-consciousness may have to be taken into account in the initial stages of any policy of change. Are you prepared to view the South African Government's continued commitment to separate development in that context, accepting that it is politically impossible for Mr. Vorster to do otherwise at this stage?

Certainly. That is why I keep coming back to the question of Namibia. Mr. Vorster must buy himself time, buy us all time, by moving on the question of Namibia.

Once over that I believe the question of apartheid would be understood as a passing phase, because we accept that you can't change things overnight. We accept that in Mr. Vorster's own set-up he has got to try to carry certain people with him – otherwise they will throw him out and then we shall be back where we started. We understand all this.

But Namibia is the critical issue that would convince Africans of Mr. Vorster's bona fides and give him time to move with his internal situation. It is the test, more so than Rhodesia, because it is within his sphere of power. So really it is in Namibia that Mr. Vorster's good intentions are being tested.

And if he were to disengage from South West Africa, would you then regard his good intentions as having been proved – and would you then be prepared to regard his statements about moving away from race discrimination as constituting a pledge in terms of the Lusaka Manifesto?

Yes, I would go so far as to say that: I would be quite happy to. Then we would say, we give you some time so that you can go ahead.

In view of the tremendous importance you have now placed on the question of South West Africa, can you tell me how you view the constitutional conference that Mr. Vorster is arranging for the territory?

It is really antagonising people who would otherwise be his friends. Firstly, because it leaves out the UN. And secondly, because it leaves out SWAPO, which is the main political force in the country.

If Mr. Vorster were to invite the UN to come in and supervise the

setting up of a new state in Namibia, he would be disarming all of his opponents.

He says he is holding this conference because the people – all of the people – must decide on the constitutional future of the territory, and he doesn't regard SWAPO as being representative of all the people.

I would advise very strongly that Mr. Vorster should look at the question of the Portuguese and Frelimo. The Portuguese refused to recognise Frelimo, even though it was the only political force with the ability to hold the country together.

And in Namibia I am quite sure that SWAPO is the leading political force. There may be some other tribal divisions, but Mr. Vorster should not encourage tribal divisions. He should encourage national organisations so that there are no splinter groups after independence to cause trouble.

Where you have a strong party, allow it to take over. If you allow a multiplicity of parties to spring up, you can very easily reap an Angola. It was the same thing that caused such a disturbance in the Congo, but now you have a strong government there and Zaïre is stable.

And would you not regard it as sufficient if Mr. Vorster were simply to include SWAPO in his present constitutional conference? Do you see it as vital that the UN should supervise the handover?

Yes, it is vital – because the UN is the responsible body.

In order to have these changes, isn't it important that White fears of Black rule should be allayed – and isn't what is happening now in Angola doing a lot to heighten these fears?

It would be great folly on our part to ignore these genuine fears of minority groups – not only White but others as well. And the Angolan situation is certainly not helping matters.

On the other hand, where you have an Angola you also have a Mozambique. You have Zaïre, Tanzania, Zambia. There are many African countries where there is stability. Your own Prime Minister has met the President of Liberia. There is the Ivory Coast, Mauritania.

So what is important to remember is that where you have a multiplicity of parties where the colonial power tries to be too clever and tries to divide and rule, it often leaves behind it the conditions for chaos.

That is the basis of my objection to the Bantustan policy.

Our task is to try to bring about inevitable change as peacefully as possible. But we must certainly never underrate the genuine fears of minority groups.

The Afrikaner community feels a special sense of nationhood that is important to them, and I think this makes it particularly difficult for them to contemplate Black majority rule.

The thing about this approach to life is that if any community regard themselves as a special group, for any reason at all, then they become a closed group. And then other people treat them as such.

Now we, in Humanism, believe that Man belongs to God, and you can be in China or America or Germany or India, and you will still come under one umbrella.

We believe that slowly but inevitably we are moving towards one human race – and that it is in the interests of the entire human race to avoid rigidity in trying to stop the inevitable.

But in all this I plead most sincerely with the White people of South Africa to accept that they have nothing to fear from their Black brothers. For we are brothers – and we must treat each other as brothers.

SPEECH BY H.E. GENERAL MURTALA MUHAMMED, HEAD OF THE FEDERAL MILITARY GOVERNMENT OF NIGERIA, AT THE EXTRAORDINARY SUMMIT CONFERENCE OF THE OAU, CONCERNING ANGOLA, HELD IN ADDIS ABABA ON 11 JANUARY, 1976.

It is of great historical significance that the first Extraordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government to be held since the founding of the Organisation of African Unity twelve years ago, is being held on the liberation of Africa. Angola is merely the excuse being used by those who cannot reconcile themselves to the momentous victories of the forces of African nationalism, to assert their neo-colonialist ambitions on the continent. Angola merely provides the occasion to recreate the nineteenth century partition of Africa into spheres of influence where the predominant consideration will be the interests of the big powers without any consideration for the inalienable rights of the African. Let us therefore make no mistake about the problem which confronts us at this Session: it is not the question of a simple disagreement between Angolans requiring a simple solution in the African tradition. Rather it is a much deeper danger of extra-African powers in collusion with the inhuman and obnoxious Apartheid regime in Pretoria trying to frustrate the will of people who having sustained a heroic struggle against a most brutal colonialist repression, are on the threshold of a glorious dawn of national self determination. If the neo-colonialists succeed in Angola, then our hopes for Southern Africa will have been dashed.

The history of modern Africa is replete with shameless exploitation, brutalisation, repression and downright denial of the humanity of Africans. Side by side with colonialism which sought to deny self determination for the African, there has developed that unique doctrine of Apartheid. As the forces of African nationalism began their assault on the bastions of colonialism in Northern, Western and Eastern Africa, the forces of exploitation turned more and more on Southern Africa to make a last ditch stand. An imaginary line beyond which Harold MacMillan's "wind of change" would not be permitted to blow, was drawn, to be sustained by the unholy alliance which came to be known as the Pretoria-Lisbon-Salisbury axis.

For years the OAU called the attention of the international community to the role of this axis in provoking a potential racial war in Southern Africa which would affect the peace and security of the entire continent. We analysed the diabolical role of the various points in the axis and implored those whom we knew had influence to put the necessary pressure so as to minimise the unsettling effect of armed confrontation.

First we called attention to the diabolical role of Apartheid. The main elements of that criminal doctrine are too well known to this

Assembly to necessitate my detailed analysis. Suffice it to say that the whole rationale behind this doctrine which the United Nations Organisation has aptly condemned as a crime against humanity is the perpetual subjugation of the African in order to create a paradise on earth for the Whites. Thus the four million Whites do not only control all the instruments of government, to the total exclusion of the fifteen million Africans, they also inflict on the Africans a repression unparalleled in human history. The Africans are condemned to a life of misery, hunger, disease, in a land literally flowing with milk and honey. They are no more than tools utilised by the white man in the interest of maintaining his high standard of living; as tools they are made to work in the white man's mines and farms to increase the white man's profit; as tools they are discarded and sent to pine away and die in the so-called homeland when they are no longer able to serve as beasts of burden.

When I contemplate the evils of Apartheid, my heart bleeds and I am sure the heart of every true blooded African bleeds. When we talk of these evils we are assured of the "sympathy" of the Western countries, but when we call for sanctions to end this shame of Western civilisation, suddenly the glitter of gold in the form of high dividends becomes more convincing a consideration than the lives, the liberty and the well-being of Africans.

The Western powers have bluntly refused to take any positive action either in the form of military or economic sanctions which will dissuade the regime in Pretoria from pursuing its criminal policy. Rather they are encouraged to persist through increased investment, military collaboration and other forms of co-operation.

Little wonder, therefore, that the Apartheid regime became so emboldened as to embark on foreign adventures outside the immediate confines of its territory. In order to create a number of client states around itself, the Pretoria clique encouraged and sustained rebellion of the white minority in Rhodesia against Great Britain. The Unilateral Declaration of Independence by Ian Smith and his fellow conspirators marked the formal extension of Apartheid northwards and pushed further South Africa's line of defence against African nationalists. Not only was Southern Rhodesia showered with economic assistance by Apartheid South Africa, she was defended by South African forces working in close collaboration with the Portuguese colonialists. The international community looked helpless as the implementation of United Nations sanctions against the Rhodesian rebels was frustrated by South Africa and Portugal. Moreover, some Western powers again under the pressure of powerful economic interests in their countries joined in breaking the sanctions, not caring for the effect of their action on African sensitivities. The most notorious example of this open collaboration for the rape of Africa was the Byrd Amendment which permitted the importation of Rhodesian

chrome into the United States. Once again African weakness was exploited by a super-power which claims world wide responsibility, but whose actions as far as the African continent is concerned are motivated by no more than economic and ideological self interest.

Having succeeded in installing a puppet regime in Salisbury, the South African regime had no qualms in exporting Apartheid into Namibia, an international territory whose Trust Territory status was terminated by the United Nations in 1966. Seen as another buffer zone to stem the nationalist tide from the North, Namibia became a pawn in the game of South African racists, whose grand design is a sphere of influence in Southern Africa that will embrace not only the dependent territories under the Lisbon-Pretoria-Salisbury axis, but also the independent territories in the area. Were they not daring enough to raid Zambia and Tanzania under the guise of pursuing nationalist guerilla forces?

So long as the fascist regime in Portugal was able to withstand the onslaught of nationalist forces in Mozambique and Angola, so long did the Apartheid regime and their economic backers feel secure. Thus South Africa saw its fate intricately bound with that of the maintenance of Portuguese oppressive colonialism in these territories. However, to their glory, the people of Guinea Bissau under the P.A.I.G.C., the people of Mozambique under FRELIMO, and the people of Angola under the most active of the fighting forces, the MPLA, waged a most determined struggle which ended in the collapse of the regime in Lisbon. Thus not only the African in the Portuguese territories was liberated, but through the sacrifice of the African freedom fighter, the metropolitan Portuguese who had endured a most brutal and repressive regime in Lisbon, was also liberated. The new Portuguese regime, faced with the realities of the situation took the most sensible course and one by one, formally handed power to the peoples of the former territories.

Confusion and panic were naturally thrown into the ranks of the racists of Southern Africa. With the collapse of a pivotal point of the Lisbon-Pretoria-Salisbury axis, Apartheid was doomed to come face to face with revolutionary Africa. Part of the buffer zone having collapsed, the forces of freedom are at the very doorstep of the racists and the apostles of Apartheid. This is the crisis situation that has led South Africa to embark on the most daring adventure of all by blatantly sending an invading force into Angola. The intention is clear. It is to crush the most powerful and the most nationalistic of the Liberation Movements - the MPLA. Thereafter, the South African regime hopes to install a puppet government in Angola, and then turn their attention towards fermenting trouble in Mozambique. The recent attempt at rebellion in Mozambique is instructive in this connection.

We cannot pretend that we are unaware of the machinations and conspiracy against our continent by not just the racists of South

Africa but even by those who pretend to be the friends of this continent but whose sole interest is in what they can get out of us. The present session of our Assembly provides a unique opportunity of reassessing who the true friends of Africa are.

Naturally, because of its strategic importance in the South Atlantic, because of its natural resources and because of the strength and dynamism of the MPLA, Angola has become an area of great interest. Strategically there are those countries, including South Africa and obviously the United States who are frightened at the emergence of a truly nationalist Government, who will insist on the sovereign rights of Angola to control both its territory and the sea appertaining thereto. The hope of a foreign base to police this part of the ocean is inconceivable unless puppets are installed in power. Then there are the vast natural resources with which the territory is endowed, and which had hitherto been exploited by foreigners. Under a nationalist government that insists on the sovereignty of Angola over its natural resources, there can be no guarantee of cheap Angolan raw materials and energy to fuel and sustain the factories of neo-colonialists. The alternative, therefore, is to create confusion which in turn will result in a weak regime which will be teleguided from abroad as a reward for the assistance of helping that regime to come to power. Nigeria cannot accept such a degrading and humiliating condition for a people who have not been offered independence on a platter of gold, but who have had to fight hard against a regime indirectly supported by those same countries that now seek to reap where they have not sown.

Let us not forget, that in the era of the repressive colonial regime in Angola and other Portuguese territories, the same super-power that now sees red in Angola had the opportunity of building a store of goodwill for itself by espousing the cause on which its own history rested. The anti-imperialist anti-exploitation slogan which led to the American war of independence had a relevance in the Angolan liberation struggle which should have endeared it to successive administrations in the United States. This was not to be. On the contrary, the United States Government as well as the governments of many Western countries saw the African struggle against imperialism as directed against Western interests. As long as Africa remains dependent, it is within the orbit of NATO countries and is available for exploitation to sustain Western prosperity, while the Africans sink deeper into poverty. Rather than join hands with the forces fighting for self determination and against racism and Apartheid, the United States policy makers clearly decided that it was in the best interest of their country to maintain white supremacy and minority regimes in Africa. As far as we know, this is still the extant policy of the United States, in Africa, an area I may add, considered of the least priority as far as the United States, with a population of twenty three million black people, is concerned. If Africa does in fact rank so low in United States

concern, it becomes even more irritating that an American Administration should suddenly take upon itself to dictate to this august assembly how to settle an African problem. In the days before the opening of this Session, we witnessed a flurry of diplomatic activities on the part of the United States. Not content with its clandestine support and outpouring of arms into Angola, to create confusion and bloodshed, the United States President took upon himself to instruct African Heads of State and Government, by a circular letter, to insist on the withdrawal of Soviet and Cuban advisers from Angola as a precondition for the withdrawal of South Africa and other military adventurers. This constitutes a most intolerable presumption, and a flagrant insult to the intelligence of African rulers.

We are all aware of the heroic role which the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries have played in the struggle of the African peoples for liberation. The Soviet Union and other Socialist countries have been our traditional suppliers of arms to resist oppression, and to fight for national liberation and human dignity. On the other hand, the United States which now sheds crocodile tears over Angola, has not only completely ignored the freedom fighters, whom successive United States Administrations branded as terrorists, she even openly supported morally and materially the fascist Portuguese Government. Further, we have no cause to doubt that the same successive American Administrations continue to support the Apartheid regime of South Africa, whom they see as the defender of Western interest on the African continent. How can we now be asked to believe that a government with a record such as the United States has in Africa, can suddenly become the defender of our interests?

It is in consideration of the unedifying role which the United States has played in the African liberation struggle that the Nigerian Federal Military Government took very strong objection to the patronising interest which President Ford suddenly developed in the Angolan situation. It should be made clear that African memory is not as short as the American Government thinks; we are intelligent enough to draw a distinction between foreign advisers from friendly countries, invited by patriotic forces to assist in maintaining national sovereignty and defend territorial integrity, and those racist adventurers who take upon themselves to invade African countries in order to undermine their independence and exercise neo-colonialist influence.

This is the crux of the Angolan question. On the one hand is the MPLA whose record in the struggle against Portuguese imperialism is impeccable and whose Government in Luanda has been recognised by twenty three African countries. The Nigerian Federal Military Government being deeply convinced that the MPLA is the most dynamic, most nationalistic of all the movements representing the interests of the Angolan people, and convinced that it possesses the

attributes of an effective government, joined other African countries in according it recognition. It is the duty of this Summit Session to complete the process undertaken so far by individual governments by unanimously according the recognition of our Organisation to the government of the MPLA.

On the other hand are the FNLA and UNITA, two movements which no doubt played their part in the liberation struggle but which have forfeited their right to the leadership of the Angolan people by joining hands with neo-colonialists, adventurers and racist soldiers of fortune, including the apostles of Apartheid, in a determined effort to destroy the sovereignty of Angola. After the moral and material support which Nigeria gave to the Angolan liberation struggle, the Federal Military Government cannot support any movement that seeks to hand the fruit of Angolan, indeed African, labour to the enemies of Angola and Africa. It is a mark of the disrepute in which the FNLA/UNITA front have thrown themselves by their unpatriotic association with the notorious subverters of African independence and the band of racists in Pretoria, that no African country has accorded them recognition.

The Angola situation is not unique in the stormy history of our continent – a history which is mostly the making of outsiders. There are hardly any of our countries which, having emerged from colonialism to independence, have not been subjected to subversion and other covert activities to promote instability. Such a situation of political chaos helps to keep our countries weak and under-developed, to the delight of the neo-colonialist who can always point to the inability of the Africans to rule themselves, much less rule the white minorities in Southern Africa. Yet we know that peace is the most vital prerequisite for orderly development. As long as the neo-colonialists who pretend to be friends succeed in setting one section of our people against another, they ensure thereby our continued dependence on them. We spend our meagre resources in maintaining law and order, often to the advantage of the military industrial complexes in the so-called developed world. The gap between them and us thereby grows even wider, we become ever weaker and create greater conditions for the interference of the developed countries in our domestic affairs.

Another recent development has further heightened the danger of conscious sabotage of our independence by foreign powers. The monetary crisis has highlighted the vulnerability of the economics of the developed countries and the extent to which their prosperity had been built on our poverty. The lower the prices we were paid for our natural resources, the higher the prices we have had to pay for the manufactures made out of the same natural resources purchased from us. The result of the world economic crisis has forced the developed countries to face the realities of the inter-dependence of the world

economy, rather than the erstwhile presumption by them that they sustained world economy by themselves. The collapse of many supposedly buoyant economies has led to reactions which even found expression in threats to physically attack some developing countries to force down the price of their raw materials. Neither Europe nor America can endure a drop in their standard of living. But rather than make the necessary adjustments, it appears some developed countries cast around neo-colonialist eyes and once again long for the recolonisation of that continent which is still endowed with much of the world's untapped resources. The new weapon is no longer the bible and the flag, but de-stabilisation and armaments. Africa should show its awareness of this new danger and see the Angolan situation not as an isolated affair but as part of the greater danger.

In the circumstances this Assembly has before it a clear choice. It should endorse the MPLA as the only government of Angola and invite its President, Dr. Augustino Neto, to take his place of honour among us. The Assembly should call upon the FNLA and UNITA to dissociate themselves from South Africa and lay down their arms and the OAU should use its good offices in consultation with the Angolan government to effect national reconciliation of all the people of the country. This step is not without precedent. Nigeria recalls with tremendous pride and satisfaction the noble role which this Organisation played during our crisis. The effectiveness of the role of the OAU rested on three key factors.

- First, the insistence on non-interference by foreign powers.
- Secondly, the firm recognition of the Nigerian Federal Government as the only government in the country.
- Thirdly, the close collaboration between the OAU Commission and the Nigerian Federal Government.

The easy and unprecedented reconciliation which has marked developments in Nigeria since 1970 is as much a tribute to the enlightened policy of the Nigerian Federal Military Government, as it is a justification of the sensible approach of the OAU to the crisis. It is worth recalling that those who are now seeking to dictate a solution on Angola to the OAU were the same do-gooders and self-appointed keepers of the moral conscience of the world who condemned the OAU resolutions of 1967 and 1968 on Nigeria. They were proved wrong in Nigeria, they will be equally proved wrong in Angola.

Africa has come of age. It is no longer under the orbit of any extra-continental power. It should no longer take orders from any country, however powerful. The fortunes of Africa are in our hands to make or mar. For too long have we been kicked around; for too long have we been treated like adolescents who cannot discern their interests and act accordingly. For too long has it been presumed that the African needs outside "experts" to tell him who are his friends and who are his enemies. The time has come when we should make it clear

that we can decide for ourselves; that we know our own interests and how to protect those interests; that we are capable of resolving African problems without presumptuous lessons in ideological dangers, which more often than not have no relevance for us, nor for the problem at hand. Nigeria has come to this Assembly determined to co-operate with you, Mr. Chairman, and with all member-States to put a stop to foreign interference in our continental matters. As an African nationalist of distinction, I trust that your wise guidance will direct our deliberations to fruitful conclusions of which our peoples will be proud.

**STATEMENT IN PARLIAMENT BY THE SOUTH AFRICAN
PRIME MINISTER, THE HON. B.J. VORSTER, ON 4 MARCH,
1976, CONCERNING THE CLOSING OF THE BORDER
BETWEEN RHODESIA AND MOZAMBIQUE.**

I want to make the following statement: The closing of the border and the stopping of commercial traffic between Rhodesia and Mozambique cause certain immediate problems for both countries and will in due course leave gaps and require adaptations not only for these two countries, but also for quite a number of other countries in Southern Africa, including Zaïre and South Africa.

South Africa adheres to its standpoint that boycotts and the closing of borders do not provide any solution to political disputes and far from solving problems rather have the potential of accentuating points of difference, with the danger of causing an escalation to something much more serious and of being the spark which will cause the smouldering fires of friction to flare up, to the detriment of all those involved or nearby. It is even more so in the case of countries which are economically inter-dependent and in which the economy is at once mutually affected and harmed. I believe that it is irresponsible for countries, especially those far away, to stir up such action.

Unfortunately these conditions are aggravated by sensational reporting, sometimes based on misunderstanding, which foments further discord and gives rise to panic.

The greatest immediate need of developing countries, especially those most seriously affected in recent times by war, violence, economic depression and declining export prices, in contrast with rising import prices, is to provide employment, to obtain and produce food and to combat poverty.

So far South Africa has not been directly affected by the events, and it is still too early to determine the precise effect of the action taken, but the situation is and remains one which can have distressing consequences, and every further development will have to be carefully evaluated and every step to protect the interests of South Africa and its peoples will have to be taken with calm deliberation.

Apart from the danger inherent in the situation itself, the Russian and Cuban presence in Southern Africa is an aggravating factor, especially in view of the Russian policy and tactics to exploit such situations to their own advantage and to achieve their well-known aim of world domination.

The Government is constantly giving attention to the matter and I shall keep the House informed as often as may be necessary.

**INTERVIEW WITH THE PRIME MINISTER OF SOUTH AFRICA,
THE HON. B.J. VORSTER, BY MR. GEORGE EVANS, OF THE
SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, LONDON, ON MARCH 14, 1976.**

Prime Minister, how serious is the threat posed by Russian and Cuban aggression against South Africa?

It is extremely serious. The current intervention is not likely to be confined to Angola. Nearby countries are deeply concerned about the next Soviet move, and about who is going to be the next target. It is not generally realised that in Africa the Soviet Union has spent more than R2 000-million in the past five years on military equipment alone, twice as much as it has provided in economic aid.

The Soviet force will have to be stopped by strong and co-ordinated action, and it is essential that other African states should join with South Africa in making a co-ordinated effort against Russian imperialism. Many African countries have only recently gained their independence from their colonial masters. It is hard to believe that having thrown off the yoke of centuries of colonial domination they would now allow themselves to fall victims to worse imperialism. These matters are serious, and so far as we are concerned are probably the most important in the history of South Africa since the original settlers landed more than three centuries ago.

The deduction now widely drawn is that Russian and Cuban forces are in Africa to stay and that their eventual aim is to "liberate" not only South West Africa but also Rhodesia. Is this a serious threat? Would South Africa oppose such aggression by force of arms?

If South Africa is attacked South Africa will naturally defend the borders for which it is responsible with all the means at its disposal. South Africa is not prepared to accept Russian domination in this area, and it is a pity the Russians apparently take it for granted that the West will not take a stand in this matter. At the moment I have no indication of Cuban attacks on Rhodesia, but of course it is a matter which would be cause for great concern should it happen. South Africa is giving its closest attention to all such Russian and Cuban movements in Southern Africa.

The withdrawal of South African forces from Rhodesia was interpreted as pressure on Mr. Smith to come to terms with Black nationalism and accept the principle of majority Black rule. Do you see this as inevitable in the near future, or would you accept a compromise solution?

As far as South Africa is concerned, over the years we have talked to the Rhodesians, we have advised, we have pointed out alternatives, we have made suggestions, but never have we prescribed or twisted

Mr. Smith's arm. This attitude stands. The decision that will be taken in Rhodesia must be taken by Rhodesians, Black and White. We have gone out of our way to promote peace in Southern Africa and to create a climate in which it is possible for Rhodesians to meet and try to solve their domestic problems. We cannot be blamed in this respect.

You have gone out of your way to establish personal contact with a number of Black African leaders. Is it part of your policy to encourage another wind of change, specifically in Rhodesia and South West Africa, or have recent events in Angola and Mozambique wrecked your policy of détente with Black Africa?

My policy continues, and I will continue to go out of my way to normalise relations between South Africa and the African countries. My attempts were successful to a certain extent. Recent events, however, have put a spanner in the works, but I have no doubt that when the dust settles a better perspective will emerge and that my attempts will ultimately succeed.

I have never subscribed to the phrase "the wind of change" in the context in which it was made at the time, but it is certainly true that nothing is static. Things keep changing and one has realistically to take cognisance of the changes. Had it not been for the Russian and Cuban intervention the climate would have been very much better.

How were the Russians and Cubans able to mount this major military offensive and gain such a strategic advantage in complete secrecy? Was your military intelligence defective? When were you first aware of their presence in Angola in such numbers?

There is no question of defective intelligence. The Cubans started to come by the end of September last year, and by the beginning of October were arriving in large numbers.

It is safe to say that awareness of Russian and Cuban intervention grew from September 25. I want to state very clearly that South Africa's involvement was not the cause of Russian and Cuban intervention but the effect of it.

It is accepted that the MPLA would not have won without Cuban help. Have you been able to form any estimate of the Cuban Army's worth as a fighting force? What has the cost to South Africa been in casualties and money?

It is not a question of the Cuban Army's worth as a fighting force. They were simply able to operate sophisticated weapons for and on behalf of the MPLA. South African casualties have been fewer than 30 dead. In terms of money, the cost has been substantial.

Has the efficiency of the South African forces been seriously impaired by the arms ban? How great is your need for more arms?

It has been impaired in that we are limited in our choice of weapons as a result of the attitude of Western countries, but it would not be correct to describe it as seriously impaired.

We have been forced to become self-sufficient, but, of course, there is certain heavy equipment which we do not manufacture as yet.

We certainly do not require this type of equipment for use against the Black peoples in South Africa or elsewhere but for the sole purpose of defending ourselves against Russian and now Cuban intervention.

The West, or rather some Western countries, have decided that we must do without such equipment as aircraft and tanks. But, thank God, there are some Western countries who do not take this view.

Does Dr. Kissinger's warning to Castro to keep out of Africa not impress you?

Talk will not stop the Russians. It never has stopped them. The whole situation has acquired a totally new dimension in the past few weeks, and the sooner the West takes cognisance of this the better it will be for them.

If the Russians and Cubans are in Africa to stay, I repeat it should be a matter of the utmost concern to the whole free world.

What in your view is the basic cause of the long-standing strain that apparently exists in Anglo-South African relations? Do you draw any distinction between the attitude of the Labour or Conservative parties towards South Africa? What do you think of the British handling of the Rhodesian problem?

If Anglo-South African relations have become strained then it's none of our making. I can unreservedly say that South Africa's attitude and her utterances as far as Britain is concerned have always been correct.

I cannot think of a single instance where this was not so. We have, to the best of my knowledge and belief, never said anything to embarrass the British Government, be it a Labour or a Tory Government.

But I have only to point to Mr. Ennals's speech of a few days ago to show that unfortunately the same cannot be said about certain British politicians.

Mr. Ennals, Minister of State, was widely reported as having said in an Oxford lecture that militarily the rulers of South Africa and Rhodesia were on their own and could not look to Britain or America to intervene if war engulfed Southern Africa.

This speech was not in the least helpful. Such speeches can only fan the flames in Southern Africa at this moment. I think it is every responsible man's duty not to do it at this stage for whatever reason.

I am not quoting any Conservative leaders in this respect because I do not know of any such speeches they have made and I cannot therefore blame them.

I have certain definite views on the British handling of the

Rhodesia problem, but it would not be helpful to express them at this time.

Has South Africa's departure from the Commonwealth had any lasting effect or do you now regret it?

There is no political party in South Africa whose policy is to return to the old order.

Turning to internal issues, world opinion is still strongly hostile to South Africa on aspects of apartheid such as lack of equal educational opportunity for Blacks and segregation in sport, among other issues. Why have you failed to counter these impressions if the facts are otherwise?

They quarrel with us on a number of issues but how they can quarrel with us on ground of lack of educational opportunities for Black I would not know. I do not know of a single African country which can boast of better or more extensive educational opportunities than those open to South Africa's Black peoples.

As far as sports are concerned, before this Government came to power South Africa's Blacks had no opportunity whatever of taking part in international sport and did not do so.

It was this Government which made it possible for Blacks, Coloureds and Indians to participate in international sport. Black rugby players have played against France and Britain for the first time under this Government.

Black athletes have taken part in meetings at home, in Europe, in Britain and in America with White athletes. This kind of allegation hurts.

Despite what you say, the image of a rigid police state projected by authoritarian organisations such as BOSS still persists. It is widely suspected, for example, that this organisation engages in espionage against your political opponents even in Britain.

The Bureau for State Security has no powers of detention or arrest. In fact, I think it has less power than your own MI5. These are completely stupid and malicious allegations.

If South African agents were able to do this as some of your Labour back-benchers allege, then I can only say we must have the best secret service in the world.

This is all part of the organised campaign against South Africa. Any stick is good enough to beat us with. In some quarters so far as we are concerned the only good news is bad news.

**UITTREKSELS UIT 'N TOESPRAAK DEUR DIE
SUID-AFRIKAANSE EERSTE MINISTER, SY EDELE
B.J. VORSTER, TYDENS DIE FEESVIERINGE VAN
SOMERSET-OOS SE 150-JARIGE BESTAAN, 3 MEI, 1975**

Ons moet nie net stabiel wees nie; hierdie wêreld waarin ons woon vereis ook dat ons paraat moet wees, paraat moet wees in die ekonomiese sin van die woord, paraat moet wees in die militêre sin van die woord, paraat moet wees sover as wat ons beplanning betref, paraat op morele en ander gebiede om die storms te trotseer wat oor ons hoofde sal kom. En daarom is ek baie dankbaar, want ek is aan u verantwoording verskuldig en ek besef ek verkeer gedurig onder die besef dat in hierdie moeilike tyd moet sake so deur my gestuur en beheer word dat u toekoms daardeur nie in gevaar gebring word nie maar dat die toekoms van ons kinders en kleinkinders daardeur verseker kan word. En terwyl daar aan die een kant, danksy andermaal die kommunistiese oorwinning in Viëtnam 'n groter en groter bedreiging van die kommunistiese wêreld teenoor die vrye wêreld ontstaan, daar moet u en ek vir onself afvra hoe ons op die beste manier daardie toets gaan weerstaan waarvoor nie net Suid-Afrika geplaas gaan word nie maar waarvoor die hele vrye wêreld geplaas gaan word. En kyk 'n mens objektief na die prentjie voor jou dan stem dit jou tot onrus en moet dit jou noodwendig tot onrus stem dat die kommuniste die grootste deel van Europa en Asië reeds beheer, dan moet jy uit die aard van die saak met sorg kennis dra dat sy vloot pas 'n oefening gedoen het in al die oseane van die wêreld waaraan tweehonderd en twintig van sy skepe deelgeneem het net met een doel voor oë en dit naamlik om die toevoer-roetes, die noodsaaklike toevoer-roetes vir Europa en die vrye wêreld af te sny in die geval van 'n konvensionele oorlog. En as jy dit alles kalm bekyk dan bly die basiese feit oor wat 'n ontsettende verantwoordelikheid op die skouers van Suid-Afrika en sy mense plaas naamlik dat Suid-Afrika die bewaker is en die bewaker sal moet bly van die Suidpunt van Afrika, die beskermheer van die seeroete wat die slagaar van Europa en die vrye wêreld geword het oor die jare heen. Dan besef jy dat hierdie klein Suid-Afrika geroepe is om 'n magtige rol te speel, dat hierdie Suid-Afrika, so klein as wat hy is, nie alleen geroepe is om 'n magtige rol te speel nie, maar dan moet jy tot jou spyt kennis neem dat terwyl die vrye wêreld daarvan bewus moet wees, die vrye wêreld dit nie makliker maak vir Suid-Afrika om daardie rol te speel nie. Maar nou is ek tog dankbaar om vanmiddag wanneer ek aan u verslag moet doen op hierdie heuglike geleentheid om vir u te sê dat daar in die afgelope tyd wel 'n kentering gekom het, dat daar wel beter begrip aan die ontwikkel is vir Suid-Afrika en sy omstandighede, dat goedgesindheid besig is om teenoor Suid-Afrika te groei. En dit het gebeur, danksy soos ek

Hierdie is 'n ongeredigeerde transkripsie van die Eerste Minister se amptelike toespraak.

gesê het die stabiliteit wat Suid-Afrika en sy mense tot stand gebring het, maar ook, en daarvoor wil ek vir u dankie sê, danksy die gehalte van die mense van Suid-Afrika.

Dit sal vir ons nodig wees na vore om bymekaar te staan, want ons het 'n roeping om in die wêreld te vervul, ons het 'n roeping teenoor die vrye wêreld om die Suidpunt van Afrika te beman en te verdedig, ons het 'n roeping teenoor Afrika. Projektee 'n mens Suid-Afrika teenoor Afrika dan is dit 'n feit dat jy bevolkingsgewyse en grondgewyse meer of min tussen vyf en ses persent van Afrika uitmaak. Maar dit is ook 'n feit dat daardie klein kolletjie van vyf of ses persent is verantwoordelik vir byna vyftig persent van die produksie wat daar in Afrika tot stand kom. Dan besef 'n mens, nie alleen die rol wat Suid-Afrika te speel het nie, maar jy besef ook die roeping wat Suid-Afrika te vervul het. 'n Moeilike wêreld is dit waarin ons ons bevind en makliker gaan hy seer seker nie na vorentoe word nie. En dan is 'n mens dankbaar, ook as u gemeenskap waar u u honderd en vyftigste verjaardag vier, as u voorraad moet opneem hoe staan dit met ons in hierdie moeilike wêreld, dan besef jy al meer en meer as jy die verslae daaroor lees dat met die geweldige toename van bevolking is daardie volk gelukkig wat sy mense uit sy eie bodem kan voed. En dan kom jy onder die indruk dat voedsel al meer en meer van 'n strategiese materiaal word, dan is jy baie dankbaar teenoor die mense wat veral op wie se skouers die verantwoordelikheid rus om voedsel te produseer, dat hulle dit op so 'n wyse doen dat Suid-Afrika nie net vandag nie, maar dat hy vir sover as wat jy in die toekoms kan sien genoeg voedsel uit sy eie bodem sal kan produseer om sy eie mense te voed en nog oor te hê om na ander lande uit te voer. Gelukkig is die land wat dit van sy landbouers kan sê. Gelukkig is die land wat net vir twintig persent vir die opwekking van sy energie van olie afhanklik is as gevolg van die rol wat die olie-producente vandag in die wêreld-politiek speel. Gelukkig is die land wat oor genoeg ander konvensionele brandstof beskik soos wat Suid-Afrika wel oor beskik en gelukkig is die land, waar ons nou die kern-eeu betree het, wat ook oor daardie kern-materiaal beskik waaroor Suid-Afrika beskik. Maar meer nog gelukkig is die klein landjie soos Suid-Afrika wat oor die kern-wetenskaplikes beskik wat uraan kan verryk sonder dat hulle enige hulp van buite gehad het om dit wel te kan doen. Gelukkig is die land wat beskik oor die mense van gehalte wat dit kon vermag en wat op ander wetenskaplike gebiede soveel bydraes gemaak het tot wetenskaplike ontwikkeling in Suid-Afrika en ook daardeur 'n bydrae gemaak het tot wetenskaplike ontwikkelinge in die wêreld. Gelukkig is die land wat oor grondstowwe beskik wat hy uit sy bodem kan haal om te verwerk en nog oor kan hê om aan die ou wêreld te verkoop wat dit nodig het vir sy bestaan. Dan is 'n mens dankbaar teenoor die Voorsienigheid wat dit wel in ons bodem gelê het. Maar ook in hierdie

tyd van wisselvalligheid, gelukkig is die land wat oor 'n metaal beskik wat, alhoewel die hele wêreld hom wil wegmaak as 'n betaalmiddel hulle dit nie kan regkry nie omdat hy steeds meer vertroue inboesem as enige ander geldmiddel wat ooit bedink kan word. Gelukkig is die land Suid-Afrika wat oor die goud beskik waaroor hy wel beskik. Maar baie belangriker as dit alles, gelukkig is die land wat oor roepingsbewuste mense beskik. Gelukkig is die land wie se mense nog glo, glo in die dinge wat mooi is, glo in die roeping waarmee hulle geroep is, glo in die sterkte en die almag van God wat hulle weë gelei het deur die jare heen. Weliswaar langs opdraendes en steiltes uit dat hulle nie gedink het hulle sal ooit bo kom nie. Weliswaar was daar terugslae wat hulle tot in die grond geslaan het, maar altyd weer kon hulle opstaan omdat selfs in die bitterste uur van hulle vernedering die geloof nooit versaak is nie. 'n Klein volkie is ons in die jaar 1975, 'n volkie wat aangeveg word deur baie ander volkere van die wêreld vir verskillende redes maar 'n klein volkie wat 'n taak en 'n roeping het om te vervul en wat dit sal doen soos wat Somerset-Oos se mense dit hier aan die voet van die Bosberg vir honderd en vyftig jaar gedoen het.

**'N TOESPRAAK GELEWER DEUR SY EDELE ERIC H. LOUW,
MINISTER VAN BUITELANDSE SAKE, BY GELEENTHEID VAN
DIE GRADEDAG VAN DIE UNIVERSITEIT PRETORIA OP 30
MAART 1957**

Daar is etlike aspekte van my werk – en dié van my Departement – wat ek as onderwerp sou kan kies, soos bv., die algemene internasionale toestand; die Verenigde Volke; kommunistiese imperialisme; die rol van die Verenigde State van Amerika in die internasionale politiek; die betekenis van Bandoeng – e.d.m. Ek kon u vertel van die ontstaan, die groei, en ook die jongste ontwikkelings in verband met die Unie se Departement van Buitelandse Sake, en van ons Diplomatieke Diens. Ek het egter besluit om 'n onderwerp te kies wat van besondere belang vir Suid-Afrika, en veral vir die jongere geslag van Suid-Afrikaners is, nl. die toenemende belangrikheid van Afrika op die internasionale terrein, en samhangend daarmee, die Unie se belange in Afrika, meer bepaald in Afrika suid van die Sahara.

Vergun my om terloops te verduidelik waarom, in verband met die Unie se belange in Afrika, daar gewoonlik gepraat word van “Afrika suid van die Sahara”.

In die eerste plek spruit dit uit die gevoel dat die noordelike lande van die vasteland, wat geleë is aan die kus van die Middellandse See, in werklikheid binne die sfeer van Europese invloed val. Daar was nog altyd, ook in die vroeë geskiedenis, noue betrekkinge tussen Europa en die lande van Afrika wat aan die kus van die Middellandse See geleë is.

En dan is daar die faktor dat die feitlik onbewoonde Saharawoestyn 'n natuurlike skeiding is tussen die lande van Noord-Afrika, en die wat suid van die Sahara geleë is. Daar is ook die faktor van die verskil in die rassamestelling in die totstandkoming van die Sahara, onderskeidelik. Die inheemse bewoners van die noordelike lande is hoofsaaklik Arabiere, of daar vloei 'n groot persentasie Arabiese bloed in hul are. Daarby is hulle, met min uitsonderings, Mohammedane. Eindelik is daar die feit dat die tegniese probleme van die onderskeie streke heeltemal verskillend is.

Afgesien van die Unie se politieke, asook ekonomiese belange in Afrika, veral suid van die Sahara, is daar gedurende die afgelope paar jaar, bewyse van besondere groot internasionale belangstelling in Afrika – en dit groei nog steeds. Die jongste voorbeeld daarvan was die groot belangstelling in die totstandkoming van die onafhanklike staat van Ghana op die Weskus van Afrika. Tien jaar gelede sou die gebeurtenis betreklik min opspraak verwek het. Ek is daarvan oortuig dat die Vise-President van die Verenigde State toe nie spesiaal as afgesant van sy land sou gestuur gewees het nie. Mnr. Nixon se sending, en sy openbare vetonings van welwillenheid en vriendelikheid, na sy aankoms in Accra, is nie sonder betekenis nie. Die

spesiale sending van die Vise-President van die Verenigde State, gepaard met sy optrede daar, is bewys van die nuwe en besondere groot belangstelling wat Amerika in Afrika toon.

In die New York Times is verklaar:

"Mr. Nixon's assignment is regarded as of first importance in its international and domestic political implications. During much of the trip the Vice-President will be south of the Sahara . . . where twentieth century nationalism is beginning to stir. The trip constitutes a dramatic gesture of United States realization of this new mood in Africa."

Maar dit is nie slegs die Verenigde State van Amerika nie. Ook Indië en Sowjet-Rusland het buitengewone belangstelling in die feestelikhede betoon- en om dieselfde redes.

'n Ander bewys van die nuwe internasionale belangstelling in Afrika, is die totstandkoming van 'n Afro-Asiatiese "bloc" of groep, in die verenigde volke en die daaropvolgende Bandoeng-konferensie van 1955.

Toe ek in 1955 die konferensie ter herdenking van die tienjarige bestaan van die Verenigde Volke te San Francisco bygewoon het, was dit vir my opvallend hoedat die Indiese en ander Oosterse afgevaardigdes, in hul toesprake altyd die klem laat val het op die *Afro*-deel van die koppelwoord Afro-Asiatiese.

Ook die Sekretaris-generaal van die Verenigde Volke het in twee agtereenvolgende jaarrapporte, na ontwikkelinge in Afrika verwys, en veral die klem laat val op die beginsel van die selfbeskikkingsreg as 'n basis vir vriendskaplike verhoudings tussen Afrika en die Westerse lande. In hierdie verband herinner hy daaraan dat hierdie beginsel spesifiek in die V.V.O. se handves genoem word. In sy 1955-verslag verklaar die Sekretaris-generaal van die Verenigde Volke dat studie en beplanning nodig is -

. . . to meet the emerging problems of the continent of Africa in a spirit consonant with the aims of the U.N. Charter . . . The great changes that are under way in Africa, present a challenge to the rest of the world . . . It is apparent that in the next ten years, the peace and the stability of the world will be strongly affected by the evolution in Africa, by the national awakening of its people, by the course of race relations, and by the manner in which the economic and social advancement of the African peoples is assisted by the rest of the world . . . I believe that this is a area of concern to the United Nations".

In sy volgende jaarverslag (1956) het die Sekretaris-generaal teruggekeer na die onderwerp van Afrika. Hy het geskryf:

"It becomes steadily more significant that the continent of Africa with some 200 million inhabitants is in a crucial state of

transition . . . There is a growing restiveness, born of impatient nationalism, racial handicaps and frustrated aspirations . . . It is quite clearly in prospect that the voices of Africa which will henceforth be heard in the United Nations, will increasingly be those of Africans themselves . . .”

Hy gaan dan voort om aan die hand te doen dat die V.V.O. alle moontlike hulp moet aanbied in die genoemde oorgangsproses – sowel aan onafhanklike, as aan afhanklike gebiede, en in hierdie verband verwys hy na “the broad assurances of the United Nations Charter” – vermoedelik die bepalings van Artikel 73 wat bepaal dat die V.V.O. die nie-selfregerende volke moet help om hul politieke aspirasies te verwesenlik.

Samhangend met die menings wat deur die Sekretarisgeneraal van die Verenigde Volke uitgespreek is, is daar die neiging van die “Gespesialiseerde Agentskappe” van die V.V.O. om te probeer inmeng, en selfs in te gryp, in die werk van die organisasies wat reeds geskep is om samewerking tussen die lande van Afrika suid van die Sahara te verkry. Hierdie organisasies, die C.C.T.A. (Commission pour la Cooperation Technique en Afrique, au Sud du Sahara – Kommissie vir Tegniese Samewerking in Afrika suid van die Sahara) en die C.S.A. (Conseil Scientifique pour l’Afrique au Sud du Sahara – Wetenskaplike Raad vir Afrika suid van die Sahara) het reeds aansienlike sukses gehad in hul strewe om oplossings te vind vir gemeenskaplike probleme wat binne die bestek van hul werk val. Ek sal later weer na hierdie twee organisasies verwys.

Ek wil nou net meld dat ek dit jammer vind dat die Sekretarisgeneraal van die Verenigde Volke in sy twee voormelde jaarrapporte nie melding gemaak het nie van die belangrike werk wat deur die C.C.T.A. gedoen word om die ekonomiese vooruitgang van die Afrikaanse gebiede te bevorder, veral deur die verskaffing van tegniese hulp en voorligting. Ek kry die indruk dat hy meer besorg is oor wat hy genoem het “the impatient nationalism, racial handicaps and frustrated aspirations” van die inheemse volke van Afrika, as oor hul materiële belange!

Ek het melding gemaak van die belangstelling wat in die vasteland van Afrika getoon word deur die sg. Bandoenglande. Later sal ek aantoon dat afgesien van rasse-oorwegings, die besondere belangstelling ook voortspruit uit die geografiese ligging van Afrika.

Dit is egter nodig om ook te verwys na die belangstelling wat in Afrika getoon word deur die twee groot wêreldmoondhede wat vandag teenoor mekaar staan op die internasionale terrein, nl. Rusland en die Verenigde State van Amerika.

Die belangstelling van Sowjet-Rusland is op ideologiese oorwegings gegrond – die bereiking van die Lenin-Stalin-planne vir “wêreld-revolusie”. Afrika met sy bevolking van meer as tweehonderd miljoen

naturelle, is vrugbare grond vir die saad van kommunisme. En dan is daar die waarde van Afrika se strategiese ligging tussen die Ooste en die weste. Dit is al vir jare duidelik dat die Kremlin sy oog op Afrika het, en in die afgelope jare het die belangstelling praktiese vorm aangeneem deur 'n beleid van ekonomiese penetrasie wat gepaard gaan met kommunistiese propaganda en insypeling. Een van die middels wat deur Kremlin gebruik word, is gebare van besondere vriendelikheid en welwillendheid, as ook aanbiedinge van ekonomiese en finansiële hulp. Wanneer 'n nuwe onafhanklike staat in Afrika tot stand kom, is Rusland gewoonlik die eerste om diplomatieke verhoudings aan te knoop, gewoonlik deur die aanstelling van 'n Ambassadeur – wat vir die nuwe staat natuurlik baie vleënd is.

Ek kom nou by die Verenigde State van Amerika. Met die oog op die baie belangrike rol wat die V.S.A. vandag in die internasionale politiek speel, en gesien sy groot invloed in die raadsale van die Verenigde Volke, is dit nodig om spesiale aandag te wy aan die besondere belangstelling wat nou deur die Verenigde State getoon word, ook in daardie deel van Afrika wat suid van die Sahara geleë is.

In die dae van die “ou (geheime) diplomاسie”, en van die magsewewig, was dit in werklikheid die Groot Vyf wat besluit het oor vrede en oorlog. In daardie dae het die Verenigde State hom buite die “internasionale kookpot” van Europa gehou, en 'n beleid van isolasie gehandhaaf.

Die eerste wêreldoorlog het die uitwerking gehad dat die mense van Europa en Amerika 'n afsku gekry het vir die ou stelsel van geheime diplomاسie en die magsewewig, en veral onder leiding van President Wilson, is die Volkebond in die lewe geroep. Ek wil daaraan herinner dat met sy toetreding tot die Volkebond het die Unie van Suid-Afrika vir die eerste keer 'n gelykwaardige lid van 'n internasionale organisasie geword het. En dit was ook toe dat daar in die Verenigde State van Amerika 'n gevoel begin ontstaan het teen sy tradisionele beleid van isolasie. Maar die voorstanders van die ou isolasiebeleid was te sterk, en die V.S.A. het nie lid van die Volkebond geword nie. Dit het 'n tweede en meer verwoestende wêreldoorlog gekos om die V.S.A. afstand te laat doen van sy isolasiebeleid. President Franklin Roosevelt het die voortou geneem met die stigting van die Verenigde Volke te San Francisco. Vandag is die organisasie in New York gesetel, en die V.S.A. is sy vurigste voorstander. Daar is diegene (ook in Amerika) wat beweer dat die V.V.O. 'n instrument van die V.S.A. se buitelandse beleid geword het.

Waar die V.S.A. in die verlede afsydig gestaan het van die doen en late van die res van die wêreld, is hy nou binne in die internasionale politiek, waar hy dan ook 'n baie belangrike rol speel. Daarom dat die Verenigde State nou ook besondere belang stel, nie alleen in Noord-Afrika nie, maar ook in Afrika suid van die Sahara. Bewys van die nuwe belangstelling is te vind in die feit dat die belangrike

Senaatskomitee oor Buitelandse Verhoudings aan 'n subkomitee opdrag gegee het om ondersoek in te stel, en verslag te doen omtrent ekonomiese en ander ontwikkeling in Afrika suid van die Sahara.

In die "Voorwoord" van die verslag wat in November 1956 verskyn het, skryf die voorsitter van die subkomitee, Senator Mansfield, o.m.:

"Certainly, Africa is worthy of increased attention from the United States. It has some of the world's greatest reserves of natural resources, and some of the world's most primitive societies. Africa is also the target for increasing communist efforts at economic penetration . . . All the signs indicate that Africa will offer an increasing challenge to the wisdom and statemanship of the United States and of the Western European democracies, which are responsible for colonial dependencies in that continent. It is non too soon to begin preparing to meet that challenge".

Alhoewel die Eisenhower-beleid ten opsigte van die Midde-Ooste omtrent drie maande ná die verskyning van die Mansfield-rapport aangekondig is, kry 'n mens tog die indruk dat die twee nie heeltemal los van mekaar staan nie. Dit is dus van belang om te let op die "Inleiding" van die rapport wat handel oor "Sub-Saharan Africa in the contemporary world". Uit die inleidende, sowel as uit die slotparagrafe van die verslag, is dit duidelik dat die Senaat se subkomitee in gedagte gehad het die politieke sowel as die ekonomiese belange, nie alleen van die sg. "koloniale moondhede" nie – maar ook van die Verenigde State.

Die "Inleiding" begin deur daarop te wys dat die vasteland van Afrika gekom het, "well within the sphere of contemporary international relations, and into the forefront of Great Power strategic calculations."

Maar hy gaan verder, en wys daarop dat "... the awakening political consciousness of more than 150 millions occupying the vast area between the Sahara and the Union of South Africa, render that area of great and increasing importance to the nations of the free world . . . The African continent has come to figure prominently in the security plans and strategic calculations of the Great Powers arrayed on either side in the world ideological contest".

Die nuwe Amerikaanse belangstelling in Afrika word nie alleen in amptelike kringe aangetref nie. Dit blyk ook uit artikels in koerante en tydskrifte. 'n Onlangse bewys daarvan is die opspraak wat in Amerika verwek is deur 'n boek getitel: "Africa's Challenge to America", deur 'n welbekende Amerikaner geskrywe, en wat gekenmerk is deur 'n aanval op sg. "kolonialisme". Die skrywer gaan so ver as om te vra dat die Amerikaanse Regering eenvoudig oor die hoofde van "koloniale" owerhede en Regerings in Afrika moet gaan, en hom direk moet wend tot die bevolkings van die betrokke gebied!

Dit is duidelik 'n poging om publieke gevoel in Amerika op te sweep, nie alleen teen die "koloniale" moondhede nie, maar ook teen die Unie van Suid-Afrika, wat spesiaal in die boek genoem word.

Ek het spesiaal stilgestaan by die Amerikaanse belangstelling in Afrika, en wel omdat die Verenigde State vandag die rykste, die sterkste, en ook die mees invloedryke land in die wêreld is, en daarby ook die toonaangewende rol in die Verenigde Volke-vergaderings speel. Met Amerika se sienswyse en beleid ten opsigte van wêreldsake moet ongetwyfeld vandag rekening gehou word.

Die verslag van die Senaat se subkomitee het gegaan oor Afrika suid van die Sahara en noord van die Limpoporivier. En tog is daar in die verslag harhaaldelik verwys na die vasteland van Afrika as geheel..

Oor die Senaatskomitee se verslag hand daar twee vraagtekens: Eerstens hoe staan die V.S.A. teenoor die "koloniale" gebiede? As ek moet oordeel na uitlatings deur vooraanstaande Amerikaners, en 'n soms kritiese houding van die Amerikaanse afvaardiging in die V.V.O. se Voogdyskapkomitee, dan is dit duidelik dat die Verenigde State nie goedgesind is teenoor "kolonialisme" nie. Dit straal ook uit die rapport van die Mansfield-komitee waarna ek so pas verwys het, en waar gepraat word van "the awakening political consciousness" van die eenhonderd en vyftig miljoen naturelle in Afrika, en hoedat daarvoor gesorg moet word dat "the dependent peoples are raised to the level of participation in the affairs of an ideologically divided world".

Die tweede vraag is: Hoe staan die Verenigde State teenoor die Unie van Suid-Afrika? Hierdie vraag is nie in die Senaatskomitee se verslag aangeroer nie.

Ek sal nie probeer om op die vraag te antwoord nie, behalwe om daarop te wys dat Amerikaanse beleid gekant is teen kleurdiskriminasie. Ook weet ons dat in die afgelope jare die Unie nie die steun van die Amerikaanse afvaardiging geniet het nie, toe die Unie in die V.V.O. protes aangeteken het teen die skending van Artikel 2 (7) van die Handves wat inmenging in die huishoudelike sake van 'n lid van die Organisasie belet. Sodanige inmenging was nog altyd ten opsigte van die Unie se kleurbeleid.

Ek is egter bly om daarop te let dat die Amerikaanse afgevaardigde buite stemming gebly het toe die kwessie van die Unie se apartheid-wetgewing onlangs in die Politieke Komitee van die V.V.O. bespreek is, en dat hy ook in die bespreking te kenne gegee het dat die V.V.O. versigtig moet wees om hom nie met die huishoudelike sake van ledestate in te meng nie. In vorige jare het die V.S.A. - afvaardiging meer onsimpatiek teenoor die Unie gestaan.

Uit besprekings wat ek tydens my onlangse besoek aan Amerika gehad het, het ek die indruk gekry dat daar in sekere kringe 'n toenemende besef is van die rol wat die Unie van Suid-Afrika as blanke staat, in Afrika suid van die Sahara kan speel, en dat dit in die

belang van die Westerse lande is, dat die suidhoek van Afrika, met sy belangrike strategiese ligging, onder die beheer van 'n blanke demokrasie, en anti-kommunistiese Regering moet staan.

Aan die ander kant, is daar aanduidings dat die Verenigde State begerig is om die steun en die goeie gesindheid van Indië en die Arabiese lande te verwerf, met die oog op 'n moontlike komende botsing met die Sowjet en sy satelliete. Ook het die V.S.A. nou op hom die taak geneem om vrede in die Midde-Ooste te bewaar. En daarby, het hy aansienlike belange in die Verre Ooste en in die Stille Oseaan. Die vraag ontstaan of Nehru en die Arabiere die verlangde ondersteuning sal verleen, sonder om 'n prys daarvoor te vra - en sal die prys nie dalk Afrika wees nie?

Ons in Suid-Afrika sal steeds die posisie goed moet dophou, indagtig synde aan ons verantwoordelikheid aan die pioniers en die grondleggers van die Suid-Afrikaanse Staat om die blanke beskawing aan die suidhoek van Afrika in stand te hou.

Die toenemende belangstelling in die vaste land van Afrika is dus iets waarmee ons in die Unie rekening moet hou. Weliswaar, bereidwilligheid om te help met die reusetaak om Afrika te ontwikkel, moet verwelkom word. Maar dan moet die belangstelling en hulp nie deur politieke, of selfsugtige ekonomiese belange gemotiveer word nie. Ordelyke en vreedsame ontwikkeling moet beoog en bevorder word, wat aan die vasteland van Afrika sy regmatige plek in wêreldsake sal besorg. Belangstelling en hulp - hoe goed dit soms ook bedoel mag wees - wat inmenging in die huishoudelike sake van die betrokke gebiede mag meebring, en wat tot ontwigting kan lei, kan baie gevaarlik wees, ook vir ons wat in ander dele van Afrika woon, en wat noodwendig die effekte daarvan sal voel.

Ek wil dus verder stilstaan by die redes vir hierdie nuwe belangstelling in Afrika.

Een van die belangrikste redes is die plek wat aan Afrika toegesê is, in die sg. "Koue Oorlog". In Afrika suid van die Sahara en noord van die Limpopo, woon daar meer as eenhonderd en vyftig miljoen natuerlike, die oorweldigende meerderheid waarvan nog maar 'n lae peil van beskawing bereik het. Trouens, baie van hulle is nog in 'n primitiewe stadium van ontwikkeling. Die ondervinding het geleer, (ook hier in Suid-Afrika) dat hulle besonder vatbaar is vir politieke en ideologiese invloede.

Die stryd tussen die kommunisme en die Westerse nasies "for the minds of men", soos iemand dit gestel het, sal waarskynlik in Afrika gevoer word - en so ook 'n moontlike toekomstige stryd tussen die Weste en die Ooste. Die Westerse lande - en veral die Verenigde State van Amerika - probeer om die belange van Westerse en Oosterse nasies met mekaar te versoen, o.m. deur middel van vleierende gebare van welwillendheid, asook deur ekonomiese en finansiële bystand.

Aan die ander kant, word die natuerlike van Afrika deur die sg.

Bandoeng-lande bearbei en aangemoedig om onafhanklikheid te eis – of hulle nou daarvoor ryp is, of nie. Deur sowel kommuniste, as deur die Bandoeng-lande onder leiding van Indië, word hulle aangespoor om hul teen die “blanke oorheersers” te verset. Die doel word nages-treef, nie alleen deur middel van propaganda in Afrika nie, maar ook deur opruiende toesprake in die Raadsale van die V.V.O. waar die “koloniale” moondhede (en ook Suid-Afrika) as onderdrukkers bes-tempel word. Geen woord word egter gerep van die opbouende werk wat deur die “koloniale” moondhede in die Afrikaanse gebiede ge-doen is nie, en nog gedoen word, om order en vrede te handhaaf, en om sosiale en ekonomiese vooruitgang te bevorder.

Die doel van die kommuniste is om hul eie ideologie en kommunistiese imperialisme te bevorder. Die doel van Indië is om afsetgebiede te kry vir sy oortollige miljoene inwoners, en om uiteindelik die plek van die tans versmadelike “koloniale moondhede” in te neem.

Daar is ook ander redes vir die nuwe en toenemende belangstelling in Afrika, en wat bewys lewer van die vasteland se toenemende belangrikheid op die internasionale terrein. Hulle is die volgende:

GEOGRAFIES

Afrika lê tussen die Weste en die Ooste, en hy kan óf as ’n verskansing, óf as ’n brug tussen die twee wêrelddele dien. Afrika speel ’n steeds belangriker rol in kommunikasie tussen die Ooste en die Weste. Die belangrikheid van die Kaap die Goeie Hoop het veral nou geblyk as gevolg van die sluiting van die Suezkanaal.

EKONOMIES

Afrika is ’n bron van belangrike grondstowwe en ook ’n belangrike potensieële afsetgebied vir lande wat ekonomies afhanklik is van hul uitvoerhandel.

MILITÊR

Die geografiese ligging van Afrika is van besonder belang met die oog op ’n moontlike toekomstige botsing óf tussen die Ooste en die Weste, óf tussen die kommunistiese en die nie-kommunistiese lande. In geval van ’n botsing tussen die Ooste en die Weste, loop Afrika die gevaar om as slagveld te dien, soos gebeur het met België in die oorloë tussen Frankryk en Duitsland. In geval van ’n botsing tussen die kommunistiese en die nie-kommunistiese state word Afrika nie alleen regstreeks bedreig nie, maar die Kaapse seeroete is dan die enigste veilige verbinding tussen die Weste en die Ooste. Die Suez- en Panama-kanaale kan maklik elk deur ’n enkele atoombom vernietig word.

As ’n bron van strategiese materiale soos uraan, mangaan, kroom en ander minerale ertse, sal Afrika se belangrikheid steeds toeneem.

Ek kom nou by die posisie van die Unie van Suid-Afrika, as deel van die Afrikaanse vasteland.

Die uitgangspunt is natuurlik die geografiese feit dat die Unie 'n onafskeidbare deel van die Afrikaanse vasteland is, en derhalwe gemeenskaplike probleme, en ook belange het, veral met die gebiede wat suid van die Sahara is. Die Unie kan hom nie van die res van die vasteland isoleer nie.

Verder moet in ag geneem word dat die Unie op ekonomiese gebied, veral op nywerheidsgebied, verreweg die mees ontwikkelde staat van Afrika is, en dat die gebiede in die Noorde waardevolle markte vir ons nywerheidsprodukte aanbied-markte wat met groot voordeel verder ontwikkel kan word. Andersom, die Unie is vir die Noordelike gebiede 'n waardevolle bron van noodsaaklike nywerheidsprodukte.

Soos reeds gemeld, is die Unie 'n groot produsent van belangrike grondstowwe, en in hierdie verband moet daar veral gelet word op die feit dat a toomkrag sy rol ook in die ontwikkeling van Afrika, soos in die res van die wêreld, sal moet speel. Die Unie is een van die belangrikste produsente van uraan. Ons sal dus 'n waardevolle bydrae ook in hierdie opsig kan lewer.

Wat betref wetenskaplike en tegniese ondernemings – en navorsing – vergelyk Suid-Afrika gunstig met die meeste Europese lande. Ook in hierdie opsig is die Unie toegerus om 'n belangrike, selfs noodsaaklike, bydrae te lewer tot die oplossing van gemeenskaplike gesondheids-, tegniese, wetenskaplike en dergelike probleme.

Ek wil kortliks wys op 'n ander aspek van die Unie se belang in die vasteland van Afrika.

Omdat die Unie van Suid-Afrika 'n hoogs ontwikkelde staat op die vasteland is, met 'n natuurlike aanvoeling vir, en 'n kennis van die belange en behoeftes van die gebiede suid van die Sahara, is ons in staat en ook bevoeg om oor sodanige belange en behoeftes te kan oordeel – om daardie gebiede by te staan en van raad te bedien, veral wanneer optrede oor sake van gemeenskaplike belang nodig mag wees. Uit voege van sy kennis, en gemeenskaplike belang, is die Unie van Suid-Afrika meer bevoeg, en ook beter toegerus om dit te kan doen, as dié lande wat, uit die aard van die saak, nie dieselfde kennis van Afrika, suid van die Sahara, dra nie.

Ek kom nou by die vraag: Wat staan die Unie te doen – wat is ons Afrika-beleid?

Beleid kan nie op 'n dogmatiese wyse oornag geformuleer word nie. Dit moet stelselmatig ontwikkel, en na gelang van omstandighede uitgebou word. Daar moet met groot versigtigheid opgetree word, want die gevolge van oorhaastige en onrealistiese optrede kan noodlottig wees. Dit is egter noodsaaklik dat daar 'n begin gemaak word – aangesien die gevolge van 'n *laissez-faire* houding ewe noodlottig vir ons kan wees.

Die eerste stappe is egter reeds gedoen. Ek het reeds na organisasies soos die C.C.T.A. en die C.S.A. (die Kommissie vir Tegniese

Samewerking en die Wetenskaplike Raad) verwys. Hierdie twee organisasies het reeds uitstekende werk gedoen. Sedert ek Minister van Buitelandse Sake geword het, het ek daarvoor gesorg dat die Unie sy volle "gewig ingooi" in die werk van beide die C.C.T.A. en die C.S.A. Die Unie word nou doeltreffend verteenwoordig by die betrokke konferensies, en die samewerking wat bewerkstellig is tussen ons en die ander ledestate van Afrika suid van die Sahara is belowend vir die toekoms. Ons leer mekaar ken, en, wat meer belangrik is, ons leer mekaar vertrou. Ons sien uit na meer intensiewe samewerking t.o.v. probleme van gemeenskaplike aard, en verwag dat die organisasies verder uitgebou sal kan word. Al wat ons vra, is dat die state en gebiede van Afrika sal toegelaat word om die werk op hul eie manier te doen.

Ten einde die Unie in staat te stel om sy plek in hierdie groter omvang te kan volstaan, is dit nodig dat ons deeglike kennis moet dra van Afrika en sy probleme. Inligting moet ingesamel, en ook beskikbaar gestel word, omtrent al die betrokke aangeleenthede en probleme.

In hierdie verband wil ek graag meld dat ek onlangs 'n reorganisasie van die Departement van Buitelandse Sake gelas het – 'n reorganisasie wat reeds ver gevorder is. O.m. sal toestande en vraagstukke in Afrika behoorlik en op wetenskaplike wyse bestudeer en benader kan word ten einde die Minister van Buitelandse Sake in staat te stel om die Unie-regering in te lig en ook te adviseer in verband met sy Afrika-beleid.

Soos ek die posisie sien, moet Suid-Afrika die rol wat hy in die toekoms in Afrika sal speel, as 'n roeping aanvaar, en sy plek as 'n Afrikaanse moondheid in alle opsigte volstaan. Ten einde dit te kan doen, sal ons nie alleen met die ander Europese state met belange en verantwoordelikhede in Afrika, moet saamwerk nie – soos reeds gebeur deur middel van die C.C.T.A. – maar ons sal ook bereid moet wees om met alle andere state, wat reeds in Afrika veral suid van die Sahara tot stand gekom het, en in die toekoms sal ontstaan, saam te werk in verband met sake van gemeenskaplike belang. Ons vermoë om dit met sukses te kan doen, sal egter van drie belangrike faktore afhang:

- Die verwydering in Afrika van suspisie oor die Unie se kleurbeleid. Dit sal 'n geleidelike proses moet wees;
- Die aanvaarding deur ander Afrikaanse state van die Unie van Suid-Afrika as 'n Afrikaanse staat; en
- Die bereidwilligheid van Suid-Afrika as 'n leidende en hoogs ontwikkelde land in Afrika, om 'n belangrike bydrae te lewer in die behandeling van gemeenskaplike probleme.

Die standpunt van die Unie-regering i.s. samewerking met die ander state en gebiede in Afrika, is duidelik deur ons Eerste Minister, mnr. J.G. Strijdom, soos volg gestel:

“Een na die ander kom onafhanklike nie-blanke state in Afrika tot stand . . . – Ons erken daardie state as deel van Afrika. Ons moet hulle nie as vyande beskou nie . . . tesame met ons, moet hulle besef dat daar plek in Afrika is vir nie-blanke state, en ook vir blanke state”.

Die Eerste Minister het verder die wenslikheid beklemtoon van samewerking tussen die Unie en alle ander state en gebiede in Afrika. In sy onlangse boodskap van gelukwensing aan dr. Nkruma, Eerste Minister van Ghana, by geleentheid van die onafhanklikheidsviering, het mnr. Strijdom weereens verwys na die wenslikheid van samewerking in verband met sake van gemeenskaplike belang.

Dit is veral belangrik dat die werklike motivering van die Unie se kleurbeleid buite ons grense reg begryp word, nl. dat dit geen bedreiging vir die ander volkere van Afrika inhou nie. Die feit dat die Suid-Afrikaner vas besluit is om sy voortbestaan as ’n blanke volk met ’n eie identiteit te verseker, beteken nie dat dieselfde reg nie aan andere gegun sal word nie – of dat andere se nasietrots nie erken en eerbiedig sal word nie.

In hierdie verband moet ons in gedagte hou, soos reeds deur my aangedui, dat die groot vraagteken wat in verband met die toekoms van Afrika bestaan, die volgende is: Gaan Afrika by die Weste ingeskakel wees, of gaan Afrika onder die heerskappy van die Ooste gebring word? Die Unie is m.i. die mees belowende potensiele permanente skakel tussen die Westerse nasies enersyds, en die bevolkings van Afrika suid van die Sahara andersyds. Weliswaar, daar is ander lande wat vandag as belangrike skakels beskou moet word – Wes-Europese state met kolonies – en derhalwe met groot invloed – in Afrika. Sommige van hulle is egter besig om hulle stelselmatig te onttrek – ’n proses wat nie in die geval van die Unie met sy permanente blanke bevolking kan, of sal gebeur nie. Ons toekoms lê hier in die Staat wat deur ons voorouers geskep is. As permanente bevolking van die vasteland van Afrika, moet ons as Afrikaanse moondheid ons bydrae tot die toekoms van Afrika lewer.

Ek het die mening uitgespreek dat die Unie in sy hoedanigheid as permanente blanke moondheid in Afrika as skakel kan dien tussen die Westerse nasies en die inheemse bevolking van Afrika, suid van die Sahara.

Ons beleid en optrede moet egter sodanig wees dat die Unie deur die ander state en gebiede van Afrika as *hul* skakel met die Westerse lande aanvaar word. Indien egter die Unie deur sowel die Westerse as die Afrikaanse state en gebiede as skakel erken wil word, sal dit nodig wees dat Suid-Afrika as Afrikaanse moondheid sy blanke en Westerse identiteit sal moet handhaaf, en in die toekoms bewaar.

Dit sal die taak wees van die jongmense en vroue van vandag – studente van hierdie en ander universiteite – om so ’n beleid tot

uitvoering te bring. Ons wat nou Regerings-verantwoordelikheid dra, sal daarop moet kan staatmaak dat die regeerders van die toekoms daarvoor sal sorg dat die Unie van Suid-Afrika – alleen, of tesame met die blanke gemeenskappe noord van die Limpopo – sal bly voortbestaan as 'n permanente blanke staat aan die suidhoek van Afrika, en daarby 'n staat wat op die vasteland van Afrika die rol sal speel wat hom toekom.

Uit u geslag sal die leiers van more te voorskyn tree. Hulle sal ten volle toegerus moet wees om die groot verantwoordelikheid te kan aanvaar – om te kan voortbou op die werk wat reeds gedoen is, en om aan Suid-Afrika sy regmatige plek in Afrika, en op die internasionale terrein te besorg. Suid-Afrika behoort aan u; wees getrou aan Suid-Afrika en aan sy belange. Wees getrou aan uself en aan die komende geslagte van blanke Suid-Afrikaners.