

THE SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

OCCASIONAL PAPER

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Extracts from addresses given at SAIIA by:

- * Deputy President Thabo Mbeki
- * OAU Secretary-General Salim Ahmed Salim
- * Portuguese Foreign Minister José Duráo Barroso
- * The Right Honourable Lord Carrington

Deputy President **Mr. Thabo Mvuyelwa Mbeki** gave this address as the keynote speaker at the Wits Branch AGM of the Institute on 25 November 1993, in his then capacity as Chairman of the ANC, although still at that time also Secretary of the ANC Department of International Affairs.

Dr. Salim Ahmed Salim, Secretary-General of the OAU addressed the Wits Branch of the Institute on 25 February 1994, a rare distinction for the Institute in that this was the first visit to South Africa by an OAU Secretary-General and the only public address made during his visit.

His Excellency José Duráo Barroso, Foreign Minister of Portugal, gave the keynote address on 3 March 1994 at the opening dinner of the Conference on Transition to Democracy - South Africa, Angola and Mozambique (co-sponsored by the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung), jointly organised by the Institute and the Portuguese Institute for Strategic and International Studies of Lisbon.

The Right Honourable, the Lord Carrington, a former Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom and erstwhile Secretary-General of NATO amongst other distinguished appointments, gave this lecture on 10 March 1994, to inaugurate a regular series of lectures on international issues jointly sponsored by the British Council and the Institute.

The Institute published these extracts from various recent addresses in a consolidated issue of the Occasional Paper series, anticipating that those members unable to attend the actual meetings will find the highlights presented therein of some interest.

It should be noted that any opinions expressed in this publication are the responsibility of the authors and not of the Institute.

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Extracts from addresses

by

**Deputy-President Thabo Mbeki
His Excellency Salim Ahmed Salim
His Excellency Foreign Minister J.D. Barroso
The Right Honourable Lord Carrington**

ISBN: 1-874890-27-7

May 1994

**The South African Institute
of International Affairs
Jan Smuts House
P.O. Box 31596, Braamfontein
Johannesburg, 2017
South Africa**

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Foreign Policy in a New Democratic South Africa <i>Thabo Mbeki</i> | 1 |
| Towards a New South Africa: The Challenges of Transition to Democracy <i>Salim Ahmed Salim</i> | 4 |
| Transition to Democracy in South Africa, Angola and Mozambique - Implications for Regional Co-operation and Integration <i>José Duráo Barroso</i> | 12 |
| Challenges of Global Change: The World After the Collapse of the Soviet Union <i>Lord Carrington</i> | 17 |

FOREIGN POLICY IN A NEW DEMOCRATIC SOUTH AFRICA

Thabo Mbeki

There is a part of the Freedom Charter which says that South Africa shall be a fully independent state which respects the rights and sovereignty of all nations; South Africa shall strive to maintain world peace and settlement of all international disputes by negotiation and not war; a democratic South Africa will be non-aligned and will not affiliate to any international military blocs; peace and friendship among all our people shall be secured by upholding equal rights, opportunities and status for all. As far as the ANC is concerned this constitutes a basis for the reconstruction of the country's international relations. Among the principles which we believe ought to be underlined as this country's foreign relations, is a pre-occupation with democracy and human rights which ought to extend beyond the political, embracing the economic, social and environmental. A second principle is that relations among nations should be governed by a system based on justice and international law - that international peace is an objective for which we shall strive and when such peace breaks down, internationally agreed peace mechanisms to solve conflict should be resorted to. We further believe that our foreign policy should reflect the interests of the continent of Africa, that international *economic* relations must be an important part of our international relations and therefore that South Africa's own economic development in part depends on growing regional and international economic co-operation in an inter-dependent world, and lastly that the foreign policy objectives that we must pursue should mirror our own deep commitment to the consolidation of a democratic South Africa.

It is our belief that we ought to aim at a system of agreed relations between South Africa and the rest of the region. However, a *laissez faire* situation - a kind of free market - to determine the relationship between South Africa and the region, will produce a result that will not only be detrimental to the other countries in the region but will produce a result that will be detrimental to South Africa itself. We believe that in our own self-interest we ought to aim for a system of relations in the region which is governed by agreements arrived at by the countries in the region meeting together as equals. Therefore, we are opposed to notions and concepts of South Africa as a regional power.

As far as the economy is concerned, we think that there ought to be an agreement - negotiated perhaps within the context of the Southern African Development Community - to see what it is that can be agreed in terms of producing a regional economy; of producing an outlook for balanced regional economic development. SADC has already begun this discussion. Similar discussions have been taking place for some time outside of the context of

SADC, dealing with such matters as railways and electricity. Hopefully those discussions would also be instructed by the basic assumption that we are looking for co-operation in the region to be mutually advantageous.

We have mentioned the question of peace. In that context we also believe that it is going to be important that the countries of the region negotiate a common regional security system. There is somewhat of an impatience among the military people in the country, whether Umkhonto we Sizwe or the South African Defence Force, to re-equip. We believe that the questions of re-equipment cannot be resolved merely on the basis that a particular aircraft is old and needs to be disposed of and new aircraft bought. I would rather that we address the matter of regional security - to see what regions can agree on a common regional security system, and within that context, what should we do about re-equipping the new national defence force. Because clearly there is a way in which South Africa can move to re-equip itself which could be translated by other countries in the region as South Africa equipping itself in order to ensure that it is the dominant military power. These are all matters which need to be addressed in the context of agreement on a common regional security system. We believe that this is an important part of the foreign relations of a democratic South Africa.

With regard to international political relations, we must clearly be very interested in what happens to the United Nations. As you know there is a vigorous debate about how to structure that organisation - whether it is just to have five permanent members in the Security Council with the right of veto; whether it is just to have Great Britain sitting among those, rather than Germany; whether it is just to have Great Britain and France and the old Soviet Union, all European, sitting on the Security Council as permanent members but not Japan; and whether it is just that a continent such as Africa is completely excluded from exercising influence. There are many issues of this kind in which we must be interested - particularly in the context of the New World Order. I don't think that anybody quite knows what the New World Order is. But certainly, it ought to have as one of its elements the democratisation of international relations. If there were to be a world policeman it ought to be the United Nations. We should avoid a situation where we discredit that institution by assuming it to be just an instrument for the most powerful countries in the world. In the context of defining a New World Order, clearly the role of the United Nations is important.

Finally, we have the great advantage that as a country, we are probably better known than many others. There is an extraordinary fund of goodwill across the globe towards South Africa. Millions of people wish us success in the processes in which we are involved. And because they feel that they were involved in bringing about this change they want to see it succeed and to see themselves

making a contribution to its success. It would seem to us that it is a fund of goodwill which we should tap in the next two years - because it will in time disappear. We should tap it to ensure that the new South Africa is properly integrated into the rest of the world, and that it enters into the best possible economic arrangements with the rest of the world - and that also in its international relations it relates to the rest of the world - not only from government to government, but also from people to people. The universities that gave Nelson Mandela scholarships are interested in giving Nelson Mandela scholarships here and to help us with our education. The municipal councils that declared themselves apartheid-free zones are willing to help us develop local government. We will build a system of international relations which is not just confined to professionals and government, but also on a people to people basis, and that ought to be one of the objectives of our foreign policy. To that end what we do with regard to the rest of the world helps us to reinforce democracy here, to create a prosperous, stable and a peaceful country surrounded by a world that is itself peaceful and stable.

TOWARDS A NEW SOUTH AFRICA: THE CHALLENGES OF TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY

Salim Ahmed Salim

I am happy to be in South Africa and to visit this distinguished institution which has been such an integral part of the tormented history of this country and the suffering which its people were forced to endure under apartheid. That the Secretary-General of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) stands before you here, is itself the sign of the times we now live in.

The OAU, founded in the aftermath of the Sharpeville Massacre, was faced with the challenge of not only eradicating colonialism from the continent but equally fighting against racism and its institutionalised form of apartheid.

But right from the outset the OAU understood that Africa is, and will always be, a multi-racial and multi-cultural continent, in which all the people who inhabit it have equal claim to it. It was thus the denial by apartheid of this tenet of equality, which the OAU set out to fight. The struggle against apartheid was never against a people or a race. It was rather a struggle against a system conceived and deployed with the express objective of denying the human worth of other races, dispossessing them and brutally suppressing their claim to their rights. True to the universality of the struggle, African states formed alliances with all races all over the world, including this country where many whites also joined in opposing apartheid and suffered as a result. The fight against apartheid was a struggle transcending race, geography, religion and colour. It was the struggle for humanity to redeem itself by defeating an evil system.

Africa, especially the neighbouring and frontline countries, paid a heavy price for its opposition to apartheid. Armed attacks, wholesale invasions and acts of destabilisation launched by apartheid South Africa, exacted a very heavy price on these countries in terms of loss of human lives and extensive destruction of infrastructure. Even today those countries continue to suffer from the effects of this misadventure of apartheid.

What has happened in South Africa in the past four years is very heartening indeed. To imagine that we stand today on the threshold of a new South Africa was something unimaginable only a few years back. Four years ago, this country stood poised precariously on the edge of a precipice with little or no hope of salvation. The world around you was changing very fast, a change brought about by the sudden collapse of the old order of super-power ideological confrontation of the Cold War.

Fortunately, the leaders of the white minority government in this country were quick to recognise the folly of the continuation of the apartheid system. The OAU, and indeed the whole of Africa, naturally welcomed this new realism on the part of the government in this country.

Today, you have a new interim constitution in which reposes the collective wisdom of the leadership of South Africa in its cultural and racial diversity. It is the Kempton Park process that has brought you to this critical but hopeful juncture in your history. We, in the OAU, have the right to celebrate your achievements so far and to urge you to carry on with the epic you started at Kempton Park.

Your transition to democracy is progressing notwithstanding some nagging complications along the way. Who ever thought a transition from the kind of past this country has, would be smooth and happy? What is important, is the ineluctable reality that the last mile you have to walk to reach your destination will soon be over.

Our vision of the new South Africa is therefore of a country at peace with itself, a country at long last reconciled to its cultural and racial diversity. White, Asian and coloured South Africans without exception, must be allowed to feel that all of South Africa is their home. How can or should it be otherwise? South Africa is your common heritage. You have pooled your energies - all of you - to build it. You have shed your precious blood and poured out your sweat and tears - all of you - to transform this vast land into what it is today. And in opposing its folly of apartheid, you struggled together.

Collectively, South Africa and the rest of Africa have a shared challenge in fostering closer co-operation and building structures that will accelerate the movement toward greater economic integration, thus extricating the continent from grinding poverty and ultimately restore the continent to the mainstream of the international system.

This is a broad agenda which will involve the twin processes of political and economic transformation. But in order for that transformation to take place, I see a set of imperatives which must be met and a number of issues to be addressed. This is necessary because, in my view, the establishment of the new South Africa that we want is directly linked to the kind of challenges which the future leadership of this country will have to contend with. The ability of that leadership to address these challenges will, in turn, determine whether the new South Africa can effectively achieve that essential cohesion.

The pillars on which the new South Africa will be anchored, must embrace democracy as their foundation. A country such as this, emerging from decades

of extreme political polarisation and conflict, can find long term peace and enduring stability only in true democracy. To South Africa, this task of erecting of structures of democracy will not be easy. Neither the erstwhile advocates of apartheid nor the victims of it, have the requisite experience of genuine democracy. For the irony of oppression is that in order to keep someone down in the gutter, you have to be there with him or her to ensure that he or she does not escape. In a real sense, therefore, both the perpetrators of apartheid and those against whom it was directed, were all victims even if on vastly different scales. To build democracy requires tolerance, patience and forbearance on the part of those who are involved. But what is important is to begin.

Right now there is great polarisation in the country. Expectations are great; fears and contempt are equally deep. In this highly charged atmosphere, the government of tomorrow faces few choices except to contain both exuberance and extremism, and to attempt to bring into this country a sense of accommodation which will permit order to be maintained and to set out on the road to social harmony.

This country will not reconcile with itself unless its people are prepared to put the past behind them and look to the future. Of course, you will need to look back to draw the necessary lessons from your tragic history. It will, however, serve no useful purpose to linger in the past simply because it is politically expedient to do so. In this objective of evolving a new perspective to the country, the political parties, organizations and the government have a crucial role to play.

Likewise, in the new South Africa academic institutions have a pivotal role to perform. In this task, it will of course be necessary to begin with introspection, to change the attitudes and thinking of the institutions themselves. In addition, and most importantly, that reorientation will have to be discernible and clearly demonstrable to those who look to academia for intellectual guidance but who, for reasons of history, have grounds to harbour doubts as to its objectivity.

I accent the need for a new outlook because we all are painfully aware of the role played by some universities and academic institutions in defending racism in this country. Apartheid was justified, rationalised and defended by some academicians and institutions on grounds of fundamentally flawed and self-serving racist theories. It was these academicians and institutions who wrote the apartheid constitutions and who devised all the elaborate means for their enforcement. It was the same people and institutions who saw it fit to give the overwhelming part of the population of this country sub-standard education. In the new South Africa, therefore, I see need for these institutions to free themselves from the shackles of their prejudice and join the mainstream of academic thinking. And for the people to begin having faith in them, these

institutions and indeed the individuals in them, they will have to be seen explicitly to have broken with the past and embraced change. Without it they cannot play a meaningful and constructive role in helping determine the right course for the future of this country.

A central element to the strategy of promoting reconciliation in this country is to deepen the process of dialogue and build a culture of tolerance in diversity. Like the rest of the continent, South Africa is a quilt held together by a diversity of races, religions, ethnic groups, cultures, traditions and languages. All these are forces which contain great potential either for the strength or weakness of this country. If creatively managed, this diversity can be a factor of unity and strength. If however your differences are abused or exploited for political ends, they will unleash destructive forces which will have unfortunate consequences. The leadership of tomorrow will have the task of ensuring that tolerance and unity in diversity are promoted. Whether in ethnic, racial or religious terms, it will be necessary to put in place arrangements which assure equality, legitimacy and identity within the setting of a united South Africa. This country needs to find new basis for maintaining unity: apartheid held the country together by the use of force and physical separation. Now that apartheid is on its way out, it should not give way to the old-age rivalries and enmities of your forbears.

Long-term security and stability for South Africa will not come about in the absence of equality of opportunity and fairness in access to the national wealth. Democracy likewise will not endure in conditions of extreme inequality which apartheid created and which trapped the majority of this country in poverty. There is a need to restore the balance so that new opportunities are opened up and made accessible, on an equal basis to all the citizens of this country without regard to race, religion or gender. South Africa needs to maximise the potential of its human resource through the provision of the means required just as much as it needs to bring about social justice as an insurance against social instability. Either way, South Africa stands to gain from this duality.

Of course, expectations from the new South Africa and its future leadership are not confined to the borders of this country. The sub-region and the continent as a whole, is looking anxiously forward to a free, peaceful and a democratic South Africa. There is a fundamental belief that it will mark the restoration of justice for so long denied to the majority of this country. We see in it as well, the opening of immense opportunities for future co-operation. South Africa has a fairly sophisticated economy. It has the technological and scientific know-how as well as the resources which have combined to generate the critical mass for this country's impressive economic advancement.

Naturally, to achieve this, the whole question of co-operation will have to be approached creatively and dynamically so that the potential that exists is maximised on principles of equality and fairness to the advantage of all. The opportunities for trade and investment, for scientific and technological exchange, hold the potential to be the engine of development in the region. In this region, whether bilaterally or within the Southern African Development Community (SADC) or within the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), we expect South Africa to be a catalyst in promoting and spearheading economic co-operation. To be meaningful, it will be necessary for South Africa to be seen not as a dominant economic giant swallowing up the rest of the region, but as a partner in development. That is to say, the region, *must be allowed to offer more in its economic relations with the new South Africa than just cheap labour, accessible resources and ready markets.* We expect an open economy, not one insulated from meaningful and reciprocal international economic exchange by restrictive tariffs and other protectionist measures.

This is especially important as the new South Africa will be rejoining the region on an active and direct participation basis, when the pace of integration is quickening. All partners in this enterprise will therefore have to be assured that integration will offer mutual advantages and that it will not be allowed to erode and be used as a facility to perpetrate their dominance by those more economically able.

Beyond this region, we in the OAU look forward to the new South Africa as a powerful addition to our African family of nations. The experience you will have gained in resolving your own conflict, in building democracy and democratic institutions, of dialogue and reconciliation and of managing an efficient economy will be useful to other countries as they also grapple with the very same problems. Equally we expect South Africa, with its economic power, scientific and technological know-how, to spearhead economic development in the continent and to strengthen Africa's hand in the international system. The end of apartheid will liberate Africa from one of its most important commitments and allow it to redirect both attention and resources to meeting other pressing imperatives. Thereafter, the peace dividend which will accrue from resource savings previously diverted to the fight against apartheid, as well as those resulting from increased economic co-operation, will stand a real chance of propelling the continent to new heights of growth and development.

After the elections and the emergence of a democratic non-racial government, we hope to welcome the new South Africa to the OAU fold. South Africa will be joining an organisation that holds both hope and promise for the continent. It is an organisation which, after thirty years of existence, has had its ups and downs, its successes and failures but on the whole has stayed true to its mission

and which remains the repository of the collective will, hopes and aspirations of our countries.

Thirty years ago, when thirty-two of our countries founded the OAU, they were just emerging from colonial rule. They had no experience of modern government, much less of international organisations. They were, however, guided by their collective determination to found a joint framework within which their African identity could be projected, their views articulated and their common problems tackled. Today, that vision is part of the reality in the continent. The distinctively African identity, no longer appendages to some distant colonial power, is real. Through the OAU, the continent has been able to formulate and articulate its position in world affairs. Within the United Nations, Africa was able to be heard as a positive and active force in defence of peace, justice and economic development. We collectively opposed the Cold War and its attendant arms race and supported non-alignment.

Even with the completion of the tasks of decolonisation and the elimination of racism, Africa is still faced with the equally demanding challenge of economic development. Today, thirty years after political independence, the continent is still caught in the doldrums of poverty. The many social gains which were made in the first two decades of independence in education, health care, sanitation and rural development, are threatened with reversal in the face of a myriad of economic woes, some of international origin, others of our own making.

Politically, Africa also continues to be afflicted by many problems. Intolerance and exclusion as well as political rigidities and in some cases corruption, have bred conflicts in many of our countries. Those conflicts have had serious consequences for peace and stability as well as the cause of human rights. The millions of refugees and displaced persons drifting around the continent are a sad reminder of the results of bad politics in some of our countries.

In the economic field, we now see collective determination in the continent to right what has gone wrong. Economic reforms, unprecedented in the continent, are now in full gear, with and without international co-operation or assistance. Economic liberalisation is now the key word in Africa. We see the private sector playing an increasingly important role in the economies of our countries. Central to all this, is the determination of our countries that, ultimately, they have to resume the initiative of genuine self-reliance, if the slide of the people into greater poverty is to be halted and reversed. Our governments are more and more willing to take drastic measures, often at great social cost and political risk, aimed at bringing frugality and rationality to expenditure, as well as restoring efficiency, productivity and growth. I am sure you will have heard from the South African business community that more and more of our countries are opening to foreign investment on attractive terms.

Apart from the reforms which are being undertaken internally, our countries collectively realise that individual action will, in the long run, not suffice to conclusively address the continent's economic problems. This realisation has found concrete expression in the signature in Abuja, Nigeria, of the treaty establishing the African Economic Community. Africa, like the rest of the world, has awakened to the reality that in the days ahead, it is the more diversified and integrated economic groupings which will take advantage of economies of scale and of co-operation and be able to compete effectively in the market place. Africa, more than any other region, needs integration. We need to use our resources more rationally, to produce together and trade amongst ourselves.

At the OAU we have begun with the initial stages of the establishment of the future community. Work is in progress to finalise a number of protocols to the treaty, particularly those areas we consider most integrative: transport and communication, trade, money and finance, customs and, above all, the thorny issue of movement of persons, goods and services. We are also working with regional economic groupings such as SADC, COMESA, ECCAS (Economic Community of Central African States), ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States) and the Maghreb Union, to see how their programmes can be brought into alignment with those of the OAU in building a Pan-African Economic Community. Also, we are in the process of reviewing the future structure of the OAU General Secretariat to see the kind of adjustments and reforms which are necessary in order to enable it to discharge the function of helping member states in fostering greater integration in the continent.

Politically, the continent is in great movement as countries are converging on the acceptance of political pluralism. Greater political openness based on popular participation is in the ascendant, as people obtain more say on how they are governed, by whom and for how long. This new openness is having positive results in the political life of our continent. It has enabled a free and vibrant press to emerge. We see the growth in awareness and development of the civil society. New non-governmental organisations are springing up and advocacy for many causes, ranging from human rights, to the environment, health and development, is forcing governments to respond positively with increasing frequency. In all these, the OAU has been happily associated. We are called to observe and supervise elections in many countries. The OAU African Commission on Human and People's Rights is increasingly involved in monitoring the performance of governments in areas of human rights. And national Human Rights Commissions are being established in many countries.

Perhaps nowhere has the OAU involvement been more profound than in the search for solutions to the many conflicts which now afflict the continent. In a radical departure from past restrictive practices and their views, the member

states now not only concede a role to the OAU in helping them resolve conflicts, but they increasingly require active involvement of the Organisation. As a result of this new perspective on how member states view the role of the OAU, we are now actively engaged in a number of countries. The OAU is in Liberia, Rwanda, Burundi, to some extent in Mozambique, Somalia, Congo and in this country, lending its hand to the internal efforts aimed at resolving conflicts.

Within the context of bringing greater political and operational consistency in the way Africa wants to deal with these conflicts, OAU leaders, at their last Summit Meeting in Cairo, Egypt in July 1993, established within the Organisation, a mechanism for conflict prevention, management and resolution. This mechanism, which will operate with the Bureau of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government as its political organ, will have the Secretary-General and the Secretariat as the operational arm, as well as a peace fund to provide resources for its operations. This mechanism is already functioning and it has met several times at Ambassadorial level and once at both Ministerial and Summit level to consider the conflicts that now rage on in the continent.

We all have the obligation to ensure that we play our respective parts in the deliverance of that South Africa. The days ahead will be critical and I hope and pray that we shall bury our fears and overcome the impediments in the confident hope that we shall soon live to see that new South Africa taking its proud and rightful role in the comity of nations.

TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH AFRICA, ANGOLA AND MOZAMBIQUE

José Duráo Barroso

As you probably know, I came to South Africa not so much on a fact-finding mission, as with the intention of developing the close contacts which we have been maintaining here, in Lisbon, and elsewhere, at the highest level, with both the government and the different political forces of this country. Portugal has always considered it of the utmost importance to maintain dialogue with all the parties involved in the South African political process, since only an active engagement on their part can create the necessary conditions to the establishment of peace and full democracy. We feel that it is vital that the notorious consequences from previous tragic experiences which took place across this continent, will not happen here. We also hope that a new culture of tolerance will emerge, consigning to the past the dark ages of apartheid.

I would like to emphasize that the Portuguese government does believe that the political process in South Africa will have a positive outcome. It should be stressed the fact that this process has been developed, thanks to the will of the South African people, with neither outside intervention nor mediation from third parties.

Having said that, you could ask why Portugal is following so closely the current developments in this country. The answer is quite simple: because we have top priority political and economic interests in Southern Africa; because one of the largest communities of the Portuguese diaspora lives in this area; because we are linked to South Africa, Angola and Mozambique by historical and blood ties, as we have been reminded, so provocatively, by the author Andre Brink, in his recent book *Cape of Storms, The First Life of Adamastor*; because South Africa is for the average Portuguese a region with which he or she feels so closely identified, notwithstanding the physical distance that sets the two countries apart; and, last, but not least - why not admit it - because we shared with South Africa, in a not too distant past, neighbourly relations which conjure up memories.

This close relationship between Portugal and the peoples and regions of Southern Africa is not always correctly grasped by those who live beyond the borders of my country. This becomes increasingly evident when we try to bring the voice of several African countries to the fora and the governments which provide for economic and humanitarian aid. Indeed, Portugal has made a great effort to include African issues in the agendas of the European Union and other frameworks. I must point out that today South Africa is the object of the largest aid development programme designed by the EU's twelve for this continent. In

addition, we have supported, since day one, initiatives regarding the settlement of conflicts and assistance projects for the democratisation process in South Africa, Angola and Mozambique. We also have a sizable representation in the United Nations Peacekeeping Forces stationed in Mozambique (UNOMOZ). Furthermore, we are playing a very active role in the efforts to create a national army in Mozambique, having participated in a similar process in Angola. We are part of every single commission set up under the terms of the Peace Accords of Mozambique and we are actively engaged in the troika of observers of the peace process in Angola.

Summing up, not only for the Portuguese government but also for its public opinion, Southern Africa is not perceived as just another region of the globe. Instead, we feel that highly relevant national interests and objectives are at stake in this arena which deserve our close attention. Furthermore, we think, and we are very sincere, that our objectives are compatible - and not necessarily conflicting - with the interests of the regional powers. We want to co-operate with the government of South Africa.

Ladies and gentlemen, the recognition of the humane, economic, technological and financial potential of a South Africa internationally legitimised through a process of democratic transition, as peaceful as possible, could become a decisive factor in the economic revival of the entire sub-continent. The most important now is national reconstruction. The last World Bank report stresses that if the process is done in a peaceful way, South Africa will really have a very bright economic future. Positive dynamics generated here will be very important for the whole region.

But I would be deceiving you, if I didn't tell you that through the contacts that Portugal has been maintaining with the several governments of the region, we get the feeling that most neighbouring countries regard South Africa with great hope but also apprehension. Hope, because of the economic benefits that new opportunities could bring and hope in the deepening of the political dialogue, resulting from an often shared past, and from the demise of any changes for a resumption of disruptive actions. Apprehension because of the implications resulting from the heavy regional impact of the South African economy.

I think that these expectations and fears should not be taken lightly by the South African authorities. However, the countries of the region should also take into account the fact that the new South Africa is bound to set its priorities in a way which, obviously, may not always be in tune with those of the previous regime. There are, indeed, great expectations amid the underprivileged population - in sectors such as health, housing and education - which will call for large investments and will absorb a substantial part of the available resources. The correction of social and economic disparities is also a political imperative of

which its future leaders are all too aware.

It is, nevertheless, essential that legitimate social concerns do not overshadow the basic rules governing market economies, or otherwise, they could compromise the future improvement of living standards in this old and well-endowed country.

As far as economic matters are concerned, the word 'integration' is increasingly becoming the banner in international fora. The European Union, NAFTA, APEC and MERCOSUL are concrete examples which point to the new reality. I believe it would be useful if South Africa contributed actively to the creation of a regional system, which will allow for the opening of new export markets, and conversely, bring economic benefits for the whole region.

From an economic perspective, we think that this continent has experienced, over the past six years, a genuine cultural change. We are obviously in favour of sound economic policies and good governance for Africa. Mindful of the necessary flexibilisation, we support amendments to existing aid policies for development.

However, we do not think that the model 'trade is better than aid' is entirely suitable for Africa. In fact, this continent needs more trade *and* more aid, in a not necessarily exclusive process. In addition, it calls for a change in the aid programmes, including: assistance to central banks; not short term aid; not a short term co-operation aid; but support for business and improvement of management skills. In this mutually beneficial process, equity and balance will also be key ingredients to be taken into account. Let me add that when I was Secretary of State for Co-operation I felt somewhat frustrated by the relative failure of aid programmes. So trade is important, but we also need transfer of resources, know-how, management capabilities, etc...

Many see Africa as a lost continent. That is why we desperately need cases of success. I am sure South Africa will be one and that it will bring the attention of Europe to this part of the world. I personally think that the future relationship between the European Union and South Africa will have to be a very specific one, built on an *ad hoc* basis. It will not follow the Lomé model and probably not even integration in the SADC. A very original formula will have to be worked out to meet South Africa's specific needs.

Still in this context, I would like to emphasize what should be avoided - the easy temptation of assigning blame to the influx of immigration for the structural imbalances of the South African economy, largely due to the enforced self-sufficiency and isolation to which the country was condemned for years.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are also high stakes at play in Southern Africa, involving the attempt to prevent this continent being irreversibly marginalised. Such a slide into oblivion would be paradoxical, since it coincides with a time of political change. More and more, democracy, the rule of law and human rights are part of the political scenario in Africa.

The reasons underlying the trend I have just described, rest essentially on both the poor economic performance of most African countries, and the side-effects associated with the end of the Cold War and its obsolete geo-political imperatives. The recent experiences in Somalia and in Angola have combined to induce in the international community the perception that African countries need to find internal solutions to their problems; and further, that, there are limitations on the role the United Nations or other external forces can play.

I believe that one should resist the temptation of establishing simplistic analogies between the transition processes in Angola, South Africa and Mozambique. We must bear in mind that the conflicts in Angola and Mozambique had an essentially internal dimension, and would have never reached such well known tragic proportions, had it not been for their globalisation.

One of the lessons that we should draw from the Angolan case, is that it becomes crucial to establish clear undertakings with the antagonists, since these may work as deterrents to the use of force. I think the idea should be promoted that an armed solution is totally unacceptable as an alternative to a negotiated settlement.

In the Angolan case, one may criticise the fact that the parties involved in the peace process had themselves the main responsibility for implementation of the Bicesse Agreements. And we should not forget another fact - when the parties signed the agreement they did not want an increased international monitoring presence. However, it cannot be said that such 'shortcomings' were the reason for the civil war. I would like to recall that the parties called for the agreements they freely signed in Portugal, precisely under the terms to which they were subscribed; but, even more important, I would like to underscore that the conflict recommended because one of the parties lacked the political will to abide by the terms of the accords. Good faith and respect for an agreement is the main principle. *Pacta sunt servanda*. International law is the same for all civilisations.

Moreover, it is important to make it clear that, regardless of an international presence - which should be significant and effective in Angola and Mozambique - the success or failure of the negotiated settlement will depend, in the final analysis, on the will of the parties involved. There are no external magical

interventions, although we have always advocated that, especially in the cases of Angola and Mozambique, it is vitally important that the international community exercises an effective and not merely symbolic monitoring presence.

Finally, it would seem that if, on the one hand, the international community is to encourage the parties involved in the current transition process to reach pre-electoral power arrangements, to avoid the model 'the winner takes all'; on the other hand, we cannot accept that the basic democratic principles are not applicable to African countries. On the contrary: we cannot envisage any possibility that the process underway in Angola, Mozambique and South Africa will succeed without free elections and full compliance with their outcome, as long as the elections take place in a way that can be internationally considered to be free and just.

I would like to finish my remarks with a word of hope and faith in the future of Southern Africa. I am personally convinced that the Angolan peace process may be re-commenced, based upon the ongoing negotiations in Lusaka and very positive signs from Mozambique. However, we should not forget that everywhere, whether in Europe, Luanda, Maputo, Moscow, Lusaka or Washington, our attention is presently focused in the South African case. Whatever happens here will have a decisive impact on the attitude of the international community, not only towards Southern Africa, but also towards the whole continent. I am certain that South Africa will find its way to peace, democracy and respect for human rights and, as our navigators did, overcome its fears and weather the legendary Cape of Storms.

CHALLENGES OF GLOBAL CHANGE: THE WORLD AFTER THE COLLAPSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

Lord Carrington

May I say how greatly pleased I am to have been asked to give the inaugural lecture in the collaboration between the South African Institute of International Affairs and the British Council.

You will perhaps think that in what I have to say Europe, the North Atlantic, the US and Russia dominate my thinking. To some extent I must plead guilty - for over the past centuries, it is Europe which has been the source of all major wars, as well as a great many good things, and certainly in the last 50 years or so, Western Europe has been the tinderbox which could have lighted the fuse for the Third World War. This may change.

It is a fact that until about three years ago, nobody in this room had lived at a period when the world was not overshadowed by a possible conflict - first, the run-up to the Second World War, and then in its aftermath, the rivalry between East and West, the threat of nuclear war, and an ever present Cold War.

We all of us have our domestic problems and own anxieties and difficulties, but all these have been overshadowed by the threat of a Third World War, nuclear disaster, the amassing of armaments, the spending of far more money than anybody would like on weapons of destruction - and all have until recently been daily with us. Eastern Europe was under Soviet domination. Soviet expansion from Afghanistan - to parts of Africa - to Vietnam was a continuing danger, and there seemed no likelihood in the foreseeable future of any change for the better. The horns of the two super powers had been locked together for forty years.

Well, all of us, young or old, got used to it. We knew we had to do certain things, however unpalatable they were, and the great majority of those in North America and Western Europe were content to go along with it. Indeed, they believed, and I think they were right, that they had little option, if they wished to preserve their way of life and western values. There was a certainty about our affairs, a disagreeable certainty, but we all knew where we were and what we had to do.

Then, all of a sudden, we found ourselves in a situation which most of us never believed could or would happen and which opened up all sorts of possibilities which none of us had dreamed about. If you look back on what was said at the time of the collapse of the Soviet Union, you may find it understandable but rather curious that no one seemed to foresee the problems that were bound to arise.

After the initial phase of euphoria, when everyone seemed to think that the millennium had arrived, we were brought down to earth with a big bump - the invasion of Kuwait, the breakup of Yugoslavia, to name but two of the most serious international problems. It is ironic, to reflect that, if Mr. Brezhnev and the Cold War had still been alive and the Soviet Union still in being, neither the Gulf War nor the breakup of Yugoslavia would have happened.

Saddam Hussein would have been far too frightened of the Russians and the consequences of what the Russians and the Americans might do ever to have invaded Kuwait.

And, the six republics of Yugoslavia, in spite of the death of Tito, would have been far too nervous of Soviet ambitions in their country to contemplate a breakup of the federation. And, indeed, if the Soviet empire had still existed and the breakup had taken place, the Americans would very swiftly have moved in to ensure that vital strategic ports in the Adriatic did not fall into Soviet hands. Yugoslavia and Kuwait will not be the last of the international problems. Trouble looms in the countries of the former Soviet Union and elsewhere.

This brings to me to the first of our many disappointments and disillusionments. We had hoped that the inability of the Security Council to act firmly and swiftly because of the super powers' rivalry would disappear and that a more amenable Russia would join the United States and the other members of the Security Council in creating a Security Council capable of being the world's policeman and of taking action in all parts of the world to prevent or stop disputes which could lead to war or famine.

This has not happened. Not because of Russian intransigence but because the Security Council is not really capable of doing the job. It becomes clearer every day that, unless it gets a very firm lead from the United States, nothing much is going to happen. We saw that in the Gulf, in Somalia and elsewhere.

This is an unpleasant truth for the United States, but it is something they and we have to face. The United Nations has no troops of its own and is not very well organised to deal with them even if it had. Sir Brian Urquhart, for whom I have a great admiration and who was for many years a most distinguished Deputy Secretary-General, advocates a UN fire fighting force under its own command. I find it difficult to see how that would work in such a diffuse organisation - nor who would be the contributors. And, though the UN has struggled manfully in a number of places to assert its authority, no one can truthfully say it has been very successful. Its authority has been flouted, from Yugoslavia to Somalia to Haiti.

Much, therefore, depends upon the leadership given by the United States and

there are signs - and perhaps understandable signs - that the new Administration is not prepared to get involved in situations in which American interests are not closely involved. I was in the United States at the time when the twelve US servicemen were killed in Somalia. The question asked and asked trenchantly was 'What American interests did those twelve servicemen die for?'. And the resounding answer by public and press was 'None'. I don't think it is going to be easy to convince the United States, whether by itself or in conjunction with others, that it should intervene in areas in which it has little interest. Moreover, the new Administration's eyes are firmly set on US economic problems, domestic and international.

The second issue which has caused some controversy and discussion has been the future of NATO. Formed in 1949 as a result of the post-war actions of the Soviet Union, NATO was specifically devised to protect Western Europe and the North Atlantic area and deter the possibility of further Soviet aggression.

Recently discussion has centred around whether NATO should or could be turned into a rather wider organisation with a role outside the North Atlantic area. It is a perfectly reasonable question in the changed circumstances of the collapse of the Soviet Union to ask what NATO is now for. In the current circumstances - and I stress the word current - the scenario envisaged at NATO's birth is most unlikely to happen.

What then should we do about NATO when there is no very obvious potential aggressor? Some felt that NATO should be expanded - that the erstwhile countries of the Warsaw Pact, including some who were formerly part of the Soviet Union, should become members. Such a proposal would certainly alter the character of the organisation since it was to a very large extent against those countries or rather the Soviet Union which dominated them that NATO was formed. What would be the point of a defensive organisation without a potential threat? It is difficult to see how such an amorphous body could exist without a real purpose. In the event, as you know, it was decided to postpone such a decision by the compromise proposal of Partnership for Peace in which ex-members of the Warsaw Pact - though not as members of NATO - were asked to become increasingly involved in consultation and planning.

I think that the best solution at the present time is to hang on to what we have got. One of the lessons that I learned as Secretary of Defence was that the unexpected always happens. In the early 1970s I asked for the number of occasions on which British troops had been engaged in hostilities since the end of the Second World War and on how many occasions this had been foreseen. The answer, if I remember rightly, was something in the region of forty occasions and on only two of them had plans been made and the circumstances foreseen. I think, therefore, until the situation becomes much clearer, we would

be wise to stick to NATO which, in its 45 years of existence, has been a splendid success.

If we do not know what the future holds, and have no firm idea of how events will shape its much better to leave things alone. Recent events in Russia are not particularly encouraging. The amnesty for those who plotted against President Yeltsin and the emergence of Mr. Zhirinovskiy adds to the uncertainties. Anybody who has been to Russia recently will tell you that for most Russians the incorporation once again of what was the Soviet Union is still very much on the cards, with Russian troops still on the territory of the newly independent states and ethnic Russians forming sizeable minorities in many of them.

The third problem has been the European/North Atlantic relationship which has been the key factor in the prevention of global war.

There is no doubt that in the American mind, Europe is a great deal less important than it was four years ago. To the Americans, Europe was the place in which the war would start and its prevention was clearly and rightly a US priority. Its presence in Europe was therefore absolutely vital.

That is not so now. The Americans are increasingly pre-occupied with their relationships in the Pacific, with Japan and increasingly with China, whose economic growth is phenomenal.

We must also accept that a new generation of leaders and politicians has grown up in the US without any personal experience of the Second World War, the friendships, the shared dangers or the problems which confronted Western Europe and America in the aftermath of the war: the expansion of the Soviet empire, the Berlin Airlift, the invasion of Hungary and so on. Their priorities are rather different. They are basically a Vietnam generation.

Equally, in Europe, the removal of the immediate threat is, for some, evidence that America and the nuclear umbrella is to them no longer as important as it was, and the close ties of the last 45 years are no longer so necessary. It is also a deplorable but human characteristic that in times of danger, we all huddle together, forget our differences and seek safety in our common objective of self-preservation. When the immediate danger disappears, there is a natural tendency for national self-interest to take precedence over international co-operation.

I believe the worst thing that could happen is a serious erosion of the transatlantic relationship. The friendship that has existed between both sides of the Atlantic has led to great stability and order in the world. We must make every effort to retain that co-operation.

Fourth, the events of the last few years have greatly complicated the future of the European Community. It was to be hoped that a more united Europe would be able to play a greater and more positive role in world affairs, not in competition with the United States, but as a more equal partner capable of influencing events by its political cohesion and its economic prosperity. This has not happened.

Partly because German re-unification has upset the balance in the country, the French anxieties led directly to the Maastricht Treaty, whose main purpose was to advance the unity of Europe in such a way that the Germans were irrevocably committed. The Maastricht Treaty, in my judgement, though its intentions were understandable, went much too fast and much too quickly. I don't believe that the 12 disparate nations of the Community, with their different economic levels and the different ideologies of their governments, are ready to accept in full what was demanded of them in the Maastricht Treaty.

But the growth of the Community must be organic and not as a result of a series of artificial dates by which certain things have got to happen. Probably most of the things in the Maastricht Treaty will one day come about. But they will come about because everybody in the Community wants them to. They will all come about because people want it. I believe that this more pragmatic approach is gaining ground.

And secondly, because of the debate over its future we are faced with the problems of the East European countries, who badly want once again to become accepted members of a Europe to which they once belonged. This poses a dilemma. If we do not in some way accommodate the East European countries, there will be widespread disillusion. When the colonial master disappears, there is a natural tendency to believe that all problems will now be solved. They never are.

Indeed in some instances, they get much worse. The countries of Eastern Europe are in much the same position as were the erstwhile colonial countries. Disillusion can be very dangerous indeed. If we do not allow them to export their goods to us and if we manage trade between us to their disadvantage, there will be real trouble.

But, if we accept them as members of the Community, together with those members of EFTA, such as Sweden, Norway, Austria and Finland who may want to join, we shall create almost insuperable problems in the running of the Community. Foreign affairs and defence for one thing, difficult now, will be doubly difficult and we can all think of many other examples in a Community consisting of twenty countries as opposed to twelve.

I believe that the gradual approach is the best. Let us start the process of membership of the Community for the Eastern Europeans, particularly in the economic field. Let us accept, as indeed we should, the Swedes and Finns and Norwegians and Austrians, if they still wish to join. Let us sensibly pursue greater collaboration in defence and foreign affairs and, if we can achieve a common foreign policy, so much the better. Yugoslavia has shown that it will not be easy.

How then have these different organisations faced up to the problems created by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the uncertainties into which we have all plunged? How have the United Nations, NATO and the EC performed as effective peace-makers and peace-keepers? Though all of them may have started out with the best intentions, it would be only truthful to say 'not very well'.

And there are lessons to be learned, not only from Yugoslavia, but also Somalia and the Gulf War. Perhaps a dose of disagreeable realism is not too bad a medicine for us. There are no panaceas available to put the world to rights. There have always been enmities and wars and troubles in the world. We should not fool ourselves into thinking that human beings have changed all that much.

If Governments are prepared to lead and to collaborate with one another, we can do much better than we have. It's no use blaming international organisations, they are only the sum of their members.

Let us resolve to do better and learn from our mistakes.