

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



Southern

Africa

Record

Number 35

SOUTHERN AFRICA RECORD 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 also 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 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.

Compiler: Sonja Begg

Published by the South African Institute of International Affairs. Four issues per year. Subscription rate R10,00 per annum (surface mail). R14,00 per annum (airmail) Africa and Europe. R15,00 US and elsewhere.

Price per copy R2,50 (plus postage for overseas airmail).

Uitgegee deur die Suid-Afrikaanse Instituut van Internasionale Aangeleenthede. Vier uitgawes per jaar. Intekengeld R10,00 per jaar (landpos). R14,00 per jaar (buitelandse lugpos) Afrika en Europa. R15,00 VSA en elders.

Prys per eksemplaar R2,50 (plus posgeld vir buitelandse lugpos).

ISSN: 0377 5445

Southern Africa Record

Number Thirty-five, April 1984

Contents/Inhoud

Mozambique and South Africa

- A.** Bilateral discussions between Mozambique and South Africa following from the joint Ministerial Meeting in Swaziland on 20 December 1983 page 3
- B.** Joint statement by South Africa and Mozambique following discussions in Maputo on 20 February 1984 page 4
- C.** The Accord of Nkomati page 6
- (i) Agreement on non-aggression and good neighbourliness between the Government of the Republic of South Africa and the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique (16 March 1984) page 6
- (ii) Speech by the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique, Marshal the Hon Samora Moisés Machel, on the occasion of the signing of the Accord of Nkomati, 16 March 1984 page 11
- (iii) Speech by the Prime Minister of the Republic of South Africa, the Hon P.W. Botha, on the occasion of the signing of the Accord of Nkomati, 16 March 1984 page 15

Lesotho and South Africa

- A.** Telegram dated 9 December 1982 from the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon C.D. Molapo, to the President of the UN Security Council page 19
- B.** UN Security Council Resolution 527 adopted on 15 December 1982 page 20
- C.** Statement in the Security Council on 16 December 1982 by the South African Ambassador to the United Nations, H.E. Mr D. Steward page 21
- D.** Reply to the South African Ambassador's statement by the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon C.D. Molapo, on 16 December 1982 page 28
- E.** Letter dated 9 February 1983 from the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon R.F. Botha, to the UN Secretary-General page 30
- F.** Joint press statement on 3 June 1983 by the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon E.R. Sekhonyana, and the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon R.F. Botha page 31
- G.** Letter dated 17 August 1983 from the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon E.R. Sekhonyana, to the UN Secretary-General page 32
- H.** Letter dated 2 September 1983 from the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon E.R. Sekhonyana, to the UN Secretary-General page 33

- I. Letter dated 11 October 1983 from the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon R.F. Botha, to the UN Secretary-General page 35

South African Statements

- A. Uittreksel uit die 1984 Nuwejaarsboodskap van die Suid-Afrikaanse Eerste Minister, Sy Edele P.W. Botha page 37
- B. Extract from an address by the South African Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information, the Hon D.J. Louis Nel, to the Foreign Correspondents Association, Cape Town, 6 February 1984 page 39

Extract from an address entitled "The United States and Africa in the 1980s", by US Secretary of State, George Shultz, to the Boston World Affairs Council on 15 February 1984
page 43

Mozambique and South Africa

A. Bilateral discussions between Mozambique and South Africa following from the joint Ministerial Meeting in Swaziland on 20 December 1983*

As a result of the discussions which took place in Swaziland on 20 December 1983 between ministerial delegations of South Africa and Mozambique, four working groups comprising representatives of both countries are to be established to deal with bilateral security and economic relations.

The working groups will meet for the first time in the two capitals on Monday 16 January 1984.

These working groups will be made up as follows:

1. **Joint Security Working Group**

The objectives of this group will be:

- (a) To propose practical ways and means of eliminating all forms of subversion and violence,
- (b) To propose a mechanism by which this process can be effectively implemented and monitored.

The South African team will be chaired by Gen J. Coetzee, Commissioner of the South African Police, and will comprise representatives from the Departments of Foreign Affairs, Law and Order, Defence and National Intelligence. In addition, Dr J.P. Roux, Secretary General of the Office of the Prime Minister, and Gen A.J. van Deventer, Secretary of the State Security Council, will also be included.

2. **Joint Economic Working Group**

The South African negotiating team will be chaired by Mr J. van Dalen, Director-General of the Department of Foreign Affairs, and will comprise representatives of the following Government Departments:

*Text issued by the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information, Pretoria, 9.1.84

- (a) Transport Services
- (b) Manpower
- (c) Mineral and Energy Affairs
- (d) Agriculture
- (e) Environmental Affairs
- (f) Industries and Commerce.

3. **The Cahora Bassa Working Group**

The objective of this group will be to review the existing agreement in the light of current circumstances.

The South African negotiating team will be chaired by the Director-General of the Department of Mineral and Energy Affairs, Dr S.J. du Plessis, and will also comprise representatives of the Departments of Foreign Affairs, Finance, and Escom.

4. **Joint Tourism Working Group**

The objective of this group will be to propose joint ways and means by which tourism between both countries can be re-established.

The South African negotiating team will be led by the Chairman of the South African Tourism Board, Mr D.J. Hough and will comprise representatives of the Tourism Board and the Departments of Foreign Affairs and Industries and Commerce.

B. Joint Statement by South Africa and Mozambique following discussions in Maputo on 20 February 1984

Discussions were held in Maputo on 20 February 1984 between a South African delegation led by the Honourable R.F. Botha, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and a Mozambique delegation led by General Jacinto Veloso, Minister in the Presidency for Economic Affairs.

The South African delegation included the Honourable L. le Grange, Minister of Law and Order, and General the Honourable M. A. de M. Malan, Minister of Defence. The Mozambique delegation included Mr Oscar Monteiro, Minister of Justice, and Colonel Sergio Vieira, Deputy Minister of Defence and Major General Joaquim Munhepe, Secretary of State for Defence.

His Excellency President Samora Moisés Machel received the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Law and Order and Defence. During their conversation President Machel re-affirmed the principles of peace, stability, progress and good neighbourliness which underly the current discussions between South Africa and Mozambique.

The two delegations reviewed the activities of the working groups on security, economic affairs, Cahora Bassa and tourism and expressed their satisfaction with the progress which had been made.

They also agreed on the central principle concerning security arrangements between the two countries and expressed their intention of entering into a formal agreement in this regard.

Both sides re-affirmed their conviction that the problems of South Africa should be resolved by the leaders of the states of the region themselves. They agreed that conflict had plagued their region for too long and had retarded progress in the resolution of the common problems of the region.

The South African delegation raised the question of property owned by South Africans at the time of independence in Mozambique. Both delegations agreed to look into the matter and to put forward proposals for practical solutions.

The two delegations comprised the following members:

South African Delegation

1. Minister R.F. Botha
2. Minister L. le Grange
3. General M. Malan
4. Mr J. van Dalsen
5. Dr N. Barnard
6. Gen J. Coetzec
7. Dr J. Roux
8. General H. van Rensburg
9. General P.W. van der Westhuizen
10. Brigadier Erasmus
11. Mr M. Lous
12. Mr D.W. Steward
13. Mr J.C. Heunis
14. Mr A.L. Manley
15. Mr C.J.B. Wessels
16. Mr J.S. Aldrich
17. Major D. Crafford
18. Major Meyer

Mozambique Delegation

1. Jacinto Veloso, Minister of State in the President's Office for Economic Affairs
2. Jose Oscar Monteiro, Minister of Justice
3. Major-General Salesio Teodoro Nalyambijah, Deputy Minister of Security
4. Colonel Sergio Vieira, Deputy Minister of Defence

5. Major-General Joaquim Munhepe, Secretary of State for Defence
6. Major-General Raimund Pachipagra, Inspector of State
7. Major-General Oswald Tazama, Defence Force
8. Major-General Pecho Jume, Defence Force
9. Major-General Arneiro Mpfumo, Defence Force
10. Major-General Hame Tha, Defence Force
11. Lieutenant-Colonel F. Hohwate, Assistant to the President
12. Ambassador Francisco Madeira, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
13. Ambassador Mussagy Jerchad, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
14. Alberto Chissano, Director in the Presidency
15. Carlos Tajin, Director in the Presidency
16. Major Graco Chonjo, Defence Force
17. Ambassador Eduardo Coloma, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
18. Mfiacho Siteo, Ministry of Interior
19. Jose Castano Zumbine, Ministry of Interior
20. Pedro Comissario, Director in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
21. Sergio Caba, Ministry of Security

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

C. The Accord of Nkomati

(i)

AGREEMENT
 ON NON-AGGRESSION AND GOOD
 NEIGHBOURLINESS
 BETWEEN
 THE GOVERNMENT OF
 THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
 AND
 THE GOVERNMENT OF
 THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF
 MOZAMBIQUE
 (16 March 1984)

The Government of the Republic of South Africa and the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique, hereinafter referred to as the *High Contracting Parties*;

RECOGNISING the principles of strict respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, sovereign equality, political independence and the inviolability of the borders of all states;

REAFFIRMING the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states;

CONSIDERING the internationally recognised principle of the right of peoples to self-determination and independence and the principle of equal rights of all peoples;

CONSIDERING the obligation of all states to refrain, in their international relations, from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state;

CONSIDERING the obligation of states to settle conflicts by peaceful means, and thus safeguard international peace and security and justice;

RECOGNISING the responsibility of states not to allow their territory to be used for acts of war, aggression or violence against other states;

CONSCIOUS of the need to promote relations of good neighbourliness based on the principles of equality of rights and mutual advantage;

CONVINCED that relations of good neighbourliness between the High Contracting Parties will contribute to peace, security, stability and progress in Southern Africa, the Continent and the World;

Have solemnly agreed to the following:

Article One

The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect each other's sovereignty and independence and, in fulfilment of this fundamental obligation, to refrain from interfering in the internal affairs of the other.

Article Two

- (1) The High Contracting Parties shall resolve differences and disputes that may arise between them and that may or are likely to endanger mutual peace and security or peace and security in the region, by means of negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration or other peaceful means, and undertake not to resort, individually or collectively, to the threat or use of force against each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence.
- (2) For the purposes of this article, the use of force shall include *inter alia*—
 - (a) attacks by land, air, or sea forces;
 - (b) sabotage;
 - (c) unwarranted concentration of such forces at or near the international boundaries of the High Contracting Parties;
 - (d) violation of the international land, air or sea boundaries of either of the High Contracting Parties.
- (3) The High Contracting Parties shall not in any way assist the armed forces of any state or group of states deployed against the territorial sovereignty or political independence of the other.

Article Three

- (1) The High Contracting Parties shall not allow their respective territories, territorial waters or air space to be used as a base, thoroughfare, or in any other way by another state, government, foreign military forces, organisations or individuals which plan or prepare to commit acts of violence, terrorism or aggression against the territorial integrity or political independence of the other or may threaten the security of its inhabitants.
- (2) The High Contracting Parties, in order to prevent or eliminate the acts or the preparation of acts mentioned in paragraph (1) of this article, undertake in particular to —
 - (a) forbid and prevent in their respective territories the organisation of irregular forces or armed bands, including mercenaries, whose objective is to carry out the acts contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article;
 - (b) eliminate from their respective territories bases, training centres, places of shelter, accommodation and transit for elements who intend to carry out the acts contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article;
 - (c) eliminate from their respective territories centres or depots containing armaments of whatever nature, destined to be used by the elements contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article;
 - (d) eliminate from their respective territories command posts or other places for the command, direction and co-ordination of the elements contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article;
 - (e) eliminate from their respective territories communication and telecommunication facilities between the command and the elements contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article;
 - (f) eliminate and prohibit the installation in their respective territories of radio broadcasting stations, including unofficial or clandestine broadcasts, for the elements that carry out the acts contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article;
 - (g) exercise strict control, in their respective territories, over elements which intend to carry out or plan the acts contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article;
 - (h) prevent the transit of elements who intend or plan to commit the acts contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article, from a place in the territory of either to a place in the territory of the other or to a place in the territory of any third state which has a common boundary with the High Contracting Party against which such elements intend or plan to commit the said acts;
 - (i) take appropriate steps in their respective territories to prevent the recruitment of elements of whatever nationality for the

- purpose of carrying out the acts contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article;
- (j) prevent the elements contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article from carrying out from their respective territories by any means acts of abduction or other acts, aimed at taking citizens of any nationality hostage in the territory of the other High Contracting Party; and
 - (k) *prohibit the provision on their respective territories of any logistic facilities for carrying out the acts contemplated in paragraph (1) of this article.*
- (3) The High Contracting Parties will not use the territory of third states to carry out or support the acts contemplated in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this article.

Article Four

The High Contracting Parties shall take steps, individually and collectively, to ensure that the international boundary between their respective territories is *effectively patrolled and that the border posts are efficiently administered to prevent illegal crossings from the territory of a High Contracting Party to the territory of the other, and in particular, by elements contemplated in Article Three of this Agreement.*

Article Five

The High Contracting Parties shall prohibit within their territory acts of propaganda that incite a war of aggression against the other High Contracting Party and shall also prohibit acts of propaganda aimed at inciting acts of terrorism and civil war in the territory of the other High Contracting Party.

Article Six

The High Contracting Parties declare that there is no conflict between their commitments in treaties and international obligations and the commitments undertaken in this Agreement.

Article Seven

The High Contracting Parties are committed to interpreting this Agreement in good faith and will maintain periodic contact to ensure the effective application of what has been agreed.

Article Eight

Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as detracting from the High Contracting Parties' right of self-defence in the event of armed attacks, as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

Article Nine

- (1) Each of the High Contracting Parties shall appoint high-ranking representatives to serve on a Joint Security Commission with the aim of supervising and monitoring the application of this Agreement.
- (2) The Commission shall determine its own working procedure.
- (3) The Commission shall meet on a regular basis and may be specially convened whenever circumstances so require.
- (4) The Commission shall —
 - (a) consider all allegations of infringements of the provisions of this Agreement;
 - (b) advise the High Contracting Parties of its conclusions; and
 - (c) make recommendations to the High Contracting Parties concerning measures for the effective application of this Agreement and the settlement of disputes over infringements or alleged infringements.
- (5) The High Contracting Parties shall determine the mandate of their respective representatives in order to enable interim measures to be taken in cases of duly recognised emergency.
- (6) The High Contracting Parties shall make available all the facilities necessary for the effective functioning of the Commission and will jointly consider its conclusions and recommendations.

Article Ten

This Agreement will also be known as "The Accord of Nkomati".

Article Eleven

- (1) This Agreement shall enter into force on the date of the signature thereof.
- (2) Any amendment to this Agreement agreed to by the High Contracting Parties shall be effected by the Exchange of Notes between them.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the signatories, in the name of their respective governments, have signed and sealed this Agreement, in quadruplicate in the English and Portuguese languages, both texts being equally authentic.

THUS DONE AND SIGNED AT the common border on the banks of the Nkomati River, on this the sixteenth day of March 1984.

PIETER WILLEM BOTHA
PRIME MINISTER OF THE
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

SAMORA MOISÉS MACHEL
MARSHAL OF THE REPUBLIC
PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLE'S
REPUBLIC OF MOZAMBIQUE
PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL
OF MINISTERS

- (ii) Speech by the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique, Marshal the Hon Samora Moisés Machel, on the occasion of the signing of the Accord of Nkomati, 16 March 1984.

The signing of the Agreement of Non Aggression and Good Neighbourliness is a high point in the history of relations between our two states and a high point in the history of our region.

The principles we have enshrined in the Accord of Nkomati are universally valid ones that govern relations between sovereign states regardless of their political, economic and social systems. They are principles that open new perspectives for the relationship between our states, in so far as they guarantee a solid and lasting peace between the two neighbouring countries. They are principles that establish a new situation in our region, a situation of peace and good neighbourliness.

The Accord of Nkomati is a unique document among the states of our region. The need for it arose not so much from the differences between us, but above all from the process of confrontation that developed and created the awareness that this was not the road that would best serve the interests of our two countries.

We have undertaken here a solemn commitment not to launch aggressive actions of any sort against one another, and we have created conditions for the establishment, with honour and dignity, of a new phase of stability and security on our common borders.

We do not want Southern Africa, and our two countries in particular, to be the theatre for a generalised conflict. That is why we have enshrined in the Accord of Nkomati the principle that our states will not be used by any other state or group of states to jeopardise the sovereignty, territorial integrity or independence of our countries.

We are thus laying the foundation for a definitive break of the cycle of violence that had been established in this region of the continent. A violence that was above all the result of the burdensome legacies we carry with us. A violence that began some centuries ago, when the dignity and personality of African peoples were trampled on by the aggression, domination and exploitation of European colonialism. Africa was ravaged by the brutality of slave wars and colonial conquest, which brought division, humiliation, poverty and destruction to the peoples of the continent.

We are a continent of survivors. We survived slavery, we survived wars of conquest and we survived the brutality of repression when we wanted to become masters of our own destinies.

For that reason we are fully cognisant of the value of peace and of the need to reject the legacies that divide us.

We thus assume, before the world and before history, responsibility for guaranteeing the perpetuity of this Agreement and eliminating the root causes of violence, war and confrontation.

Mr Prime Minister, the differences between our political, economic and social concepts are great and even antagonistic.

We recognised these differences honourably on the hard and difficult road of frank and open talks that led us to this Agreement. We shall continue to be aware of the remaining contradictions but we recognise that we are indissolubly linked by geography and by proximity.

Peaceful coexistence, mutual respect, and relations of good neighbourliness are the only rational alternative for our future to be free from the spectre of violence and destruction.

The People's Republic of Mozambique cherishes peace as the most precious possession of mankind, the deepest aspiration of all peoples. Peace and coexistence are written into our Constitution. Based on our socialist policy of peace we have proposed, since the first meeting between our governments on 17 December 1982, that we should agree, formally or informally, to let peace and coexistence prevail between our states.

Peace is when there is respect between states for sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

Peace is when there is harmony, and physical, material, spiritual and social tranquility.

Peace is when the life, liberty, equality and dignity of man is respected without any discrimination.

Peace generates the conditions for progress, economic development and social wellbeing.

After a long period of armed conflicts, hopes of peace are emerging. They must be converted into reality. They must be fertilised and enriched so that they may blossom and grow.

The prospect of peace opens possibilities for developing the vast resources in which our region abounds. These resources must as a matter of priority be exploited for the benefit of the people, while always safeguarding the national interests of each state.

Economic relations between our states must develop in a healthy and correct manner.

We neither can nor should ignore the fact that our relations have a historic tradition, which enhanced the geographical contiguity of the two countries.

But we must also recognise that relations of economic dependence are not conducive to stability and harmonious progress. For this reason our state rejects any type of relationship that might in any way limit its independence or make it economically dependent on another country.

In the economic sphere let us find ways of developing resources, infrastructures and circumstances which, being part of the experience of our relations, are likely to bring reciprocal advantages and benefits on the basis of equality.

It is within this context that the Agreement of Non Aggression and Good Neighbourliness has an important role to play, as there can be no development without peace and tranquility.

We have established relations of co-operation with the states of Southern Africa in the framework of SADCC.

As we have already had occasion to state, SADCC was not created against South Africa. Its central objective is to eliminate hunger, wretchedness and illiteracy and to improve the standard of living of the peoples of the region. Its member states refuse economic dependence on South Africa as on any other country.

These objectives are solemnly proclaimed in the Lusaka Declaration which created the SADCC, and we would like to reaffirm once again our total fidelity to these principles.

Mr Prime Minister, our states have been able to map out the path of coexistence. They have been able to discuss between themselves. Between themselves they have been able to define their interests and objectives. Many have been surprised at the speed with which we have found the answers, and by our ability to do so without external interference.

We, the Mozambican people, want to develop friendly relations with the South African people. None of us, Mozambicans or South Africans, have another country. We are not foreigners to our continent or our countries.

We have to live together on a basis of mutual respect, freedom, equality and justice. These are fundamental principles of our state, principles that are the very essence of our concept of a free and democratic society. They are principles with which we remain consistent and to which we are intransigently loyal.

Our objective is that our region should assert itself as a model of peace. We do not want Southern Africa or our continent to be the base for any armed conflicts. In particular we do not want to be the ones to trigger of a confrontation on a worldwide scale.

The liberation struggle of the African peoples was a struggle to achieve peace.

The whole of Africa is continuing the struggle to become a zone of peace, and for her oceans to be thoroughfares of peace, unity, friendship and co-

operation between peoples. The whole of Africa is fighting to avert the horrors of a nuclear holocaust from the continent.

The peoples of Africa have always struggled to eliminate the motive causes of conflicts, tension and wars. They have always struggled to eradicate foreign domination and exploitation, and to build progress, prosperity and happiness in peace.

In this struggle to affirm the dignity and personality of African man, the Organisation of African Unity was and continues to be an important instrument for materialising the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of our continent.

We cannot lose this opportunity to pay our tribute to those who founded and inspired the OAU. More than twenty year ago a galaxy of illustrious African leaders had the lucidity, the historical vision and the courage to give form to the aspiration of unity so that the struggle of the African people for the liberation of our continent could continue.

In this great epic, the liberation of Africa, many were the heroes who sacrificed their lives for the noble cause. It is with deep emotion that at this moment we evoke their memories. They will remain immortalised with affection and respect in the history of Africa.

We would like to emphasise the decisive role of the leaders of the Front Line States, with which we have been united for a long time in the cause of the liberation of our continent and in the search for peace and progress, for justice and equality, in this region of Africa.

We salute Mwalimu Julius Kambarage Nyerere and Doctor Kenneth David Kaunda, those distinguished figures who transformed their peoples into firm and unwavering allies in the liberation of the Mozambican people. This respectful tribute to the peoples of Tanzania and Zambia is extensive to all peoples who made our struggle for peace and freedom their own.

The Agreement we have concluded is a significant contribution towards these noble objectives. Furthermore it enables the region to concentrate its efforts on the prime struggle of the continent and humanity — the struggle against hunger, disease, ignorance, poverty and underdevelopment.

Let Africa emerge as a region of progress where reason prevails over hate and prejudice and where the efforts of Man are concentrated on the struggle for development and wellbeing.

Peace, security, stability and progress have always been objectives of the Mozambican people's struggle.

In 1964 our people launched the armed struggle against Portuguese colonialism to win national independence and eliminate one of the factors that disturbed peace in our region. In 1974, ten years later, that objective was attained. Another ten years have elapsed, and we are here to establish the basis of a climate of good neighbourliness and peace to prevail between two states of the southern region of our continent.

Mr Prime Minister, the effort to achieve peace required determination, a correct historical perspective and steadfastness. The moment has come when for us, what counts for more than legal texts and formulations is the given word, the sense of commitment and good faith.

The Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique will keep its word both in letter and in spirit.

Mr Prime Minister, dear guests, we have always fought for peace, equality and progress proclaiming Frelimo's watchword, *the struggle continues!*

Today the struggle continues for equality, for democracy, for justice so that on our continent we should all be equal.

Today, for peace, stability, good neighbourliness and progress, *A luta continua*

Thank you very much.

(iii) Speech by the Prime Minister of the Republic of South Africa, the Hon P.W. Botha, on the occasion of the signing of the Accord of Nkomati, 16 March 1984.

Our action today in signing this treaty, the Accord of Nkomati, sets a new course in the history of Southern Africa. We have signalled to the world our belief that states with different socio-economic and political systems can live together in peace and harmony, and work together in the pursuit of common interests. Our meeting today on the border between our two countries indicates our willingness, and our ability, to reach peaceful accords which enshrine our commitment to the principles of good neighbourliness.

Another principle that underlies the agreement we have signed today is that each country has the right to order its affairs as it sees fit, and that interstate relations, particularly between neighbours, should not be disturbed by difference in internal policies. This is sensible and practical, as it recognises that each country has its own set of conditions for which it must seek its own solution in the interest of its citizens

South Africa was one of the first countries of Africa to confront colonial occupation and foreign exploitation. The people I belong to know the feeling of powerlessness in the face of an external force far greater than ours. Our independence did not come easily. Countless numbers of our women and children died in concentration camps while their husbands, fathers and brothers fought the might of a Great Empire. Their sacrifice has kept the flame of freedom burning in the hearts of South Africans ever since.

Neither South Africa nor Mozambique had a hand in drawing the political map as we know it today. Our borders were arbitrarily drawn by others, by people who served the interests of colonial powers and who spared little thought, if any, for the inhabitants of the region.

Having gained our political independence we have a duty to use it to free our peoples also from the chains of poverty, ignorance and disease. The means we have chosen may point in opposite directions: they often conflict, but we cannot allow our divergent outlooks on life to distract us from the urgent need to create better opportunities for our peoples, to enable them to break out of the debilitating cycle of poverty, and to work for a future which offers realistic prospects for peace and a better standard of living.

This is the logic and the purpose of the Accord of Nkomati. It is an act of faith on the part of our two governments — faith in the promise that given a climate of stability and mutual co-existence we will be able to focus our energies on the problems which really matter in our region, and get to work on the fundamental requirements of our peoples.

We face extremely complex social, political and economic problems in Southern Africa: so complex that they can result in conflict and it is often difficult to avoid being drawn into the resultant spiral of confrontation and conflict. In these circumstances the real issues are avoided — uncomfortable facts and harsh realities are dusted under the carpet while nations wage an ideological war of words and act with hostility towards each other. But facts and realities are remarkable resilient companions of mankind. They will not simply disappear because we banish them from our sight. Indeed, unless we attend to them honestly and frankly, the problems which they present will merely be compounded.

The Republic of South Africa, in voicing its concern several years ago at the increasing signs of confrontation and conflict in our region, came to the conclusion that the leaders of our sub-continent would have to face these realities and re-arrange their priorities accordingly. As governments we have a duty to view the welfare and prosperity of our peoples as our first priority. South Africa recognised that it had the stability, the economic strength and the productive capacity to assist its neighbours in achieving the regional goal of progress and development, provided the countries concerned were prepared to seek healthier mutual relations. My country offered to sign non-aggression pacts with all its neighbours in pursuit of that objective, and today with the People's Republic of Mozambique we are taking an important step in that direction.

In signing this agreement today we have opted for the road of peace. I know that it is a difficult road, not without risks for either of us: nor can we escape the fact that peace, too, has its price. We start off with a burden of mutual suspicion and bitter memories which, as we progress, must be shed by the wayside.

There can be no question of this agreement being a temporary expedient from which one side or the other might desire to derive unilateral advantage. This is so because the factors which have brought us together are themselves immutable. It is the economic and geographic realities of our region which

have brought us together and which will be the best guarantee of the success and permanence of this agreement.

We can explore numerous possibilities for expanding our relations for mutual benefit in the atmosphere of peace and trust that we are now creating. Such an atmosphere will lead to confidence and will encourage the private sectors of the South African economy and of other countries to play a constructive role if they can be assured that their investments will be secure and of mutual benefit to producers and consumers alike.

We are both African countries, inhabited by African peoples whose past and whose future are firmly entrenched in the southern part of the African Continent. We are of Africa. We share a common future in this part of the world, and a common responsibility to ensure that the generations which follow us will inherit a better world than we did. This agreement can contribute significantly towards such a better world. We have signed it before an assembled group of dignitaries and guests, civilians from many walks of life, as well as before representatives of our Armed Forces on whom we rely to defend our countries with their lives. By ensuring the successful implementation of this agreement we will create a situation in which, if our Armed Forces are called upon to do battle, it will not be between our respective countries.

By agreeing to the spirit and letter of this Accord my government looks forward to a new era of co-operation and peaceful co-existence between South Africa and Mozambique in the search for a better life for our peoples.

I see a sub-continent in which countries work together to rationalise and increase food production, develop regional trade, establish housing programmes, education and training schemes, health services, employment opportunities, and many other mutually beneficial activities. We can exchange information on programmes to overcome the consequences of droughts, floods and other natural disasters. Together we can form an economic alliance to negotiate better prices on world markets for our minerals and raw materials.

Given the necessary stability and good neighbourliness, I have a vision of the nations of Southern Africa co-operating with each other in every field of human endeavour: a veritable constellation of states working together for the benefit of all on the basis of mutual respect.

It is most appropriate that leaders and representatives of states in Southern Africa, as well as representatives of other states, are in attendance on this historic occasion.

I wish to thank them for their presence. Some I have met before: others I am meeting for the first time. All have, in one way or another, contributed to the process of communication and negotiation which has culminated in our proceedings today.

When, later this afternoon, we have to part, the structures which have been erected here, will be taken down and removed, and this beautiful valley

will again be the domain of the hippopotamus and many other creatures of the animal kingdom. I would like us, together, to build a memorial on this spot where the Accord of Nkomati was signed, so that long after we have gone, future generations will know that we met here today to charter a new and promising course in the history of our two countries.

Our task now is to return to work, to put our agreement into operation, and do all we can to ensure that historians of the future will mark today as a major turning point in the destiny of our sub-continent.

Once again something new has emerged from Africa. We believe that this agreement between our countries can serve as a model for relationships throughout our region, and, indeed throughout the world. We cannot allow Southern Africa to whither away and die. Our responsibility as Africans is to give our sub-continent a chance to live, to grow, to develop, and to show that we can succeed without the interference of outsiders. As Africans we take pride in our identity and in our traditions in this part of the world. Instead of dividing our energies and resources let us pool them, for it is in our combined economic strength that the promise of a more prosperous region will best be realised.

By our meeting here today we are sending a message to the world that Southern Africa will survive and her children will prosper. May God grant us the courage and the strength to fulfil our mission.

Lesotho and South Africa

- A. Telegram dated 9 December 1982 from the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon C.D. Molapo, to the President of the UN Security Council

This morning at about 0100 hours, the South African Defence Force mounted an aggressive attack on the capital of Lesotho, Maseru. In this commando-type attack, the South African Defence Force was led and guided by members of the so-called Lesotho Liberation Army who identified the targets to the SADF.

In their attack, the SADF used military aircraft and helicopters. The targets were Lesotho citizens, South African refugees, government apartments and flats leased to South African refugees. In this dastardly, cowardly and barbaric act, about thirty-one innocent lives were lost. These included women and children.

It is significant to note that in all these brutal killings, the victims were eliminated either through indiscriminate bombings of dwellings and in some cases victims were awakened and callously shot in a cold, criminal manner.

For all these dastardly acts we hold the Government of the Republic of South Africa fully responsible. Pretoria has arrogantly admitted responsibility and has threatened to repeat its barbarous action. This situation clearly constitutes a very serious threat to international peace and security. We therefore urge the convening of an urgent Security Council meeting to address this issue.

Charles Dube MOLAPO
Minister for Foreign Affairs
(of the Kingdom of Lesotho)

B. UN Security Council Resolution 527 adopted on 15 December 1982*

The Security Council,

Taking note of the letter dated 9 December 1982, from the Chargé d'Affaires of the Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Lesotho to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

Having heard the statement by his majesty King Moshoeshoe II of the Kingdom of Lesotho.

Bearing in mind that all member states must restrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations charter.

Gravely concerned at the recent premeditated aggressive act by South Africa, in violation of the sovereignty, air space and territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Lesotho, and its consequences for peace and security in southern Africa.

Gravely concerned that this wanton aggressive act by South Africa is aimed at weakening the humanitarian support given by Lesotho to South African refugees.

Deeply concerned about the gravity of the aggressive acts of South Africa against Lesotho.

Grieved at the tragic loss in human life and concerned about the damage and destruction of property resulting from the aggressive act by South Africa against the Kingdom of Lesotho.

1. Strongly condemns the apartheid regime of South Africa for its premeditated aggressive act against the Kingdom of Lesotho which constitutes a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country.
2. Demands the payment by South Africa of full and adequate compensation to the Kingdom of Lesotho for the damage to life and property resulting from this aggressive act.
3. Reaffirms Lesotho's right to receive and give sanctuary to the victims of apartheid in accordance with its traditional practice, humanitarian principles and its international obligations.
4. Requests the Secretary General to enter into immediate consultations with Lesotho Government and United Nations agencies to ensure the welfare of the refugees in Lesotho in a manner consistent with their security.
5. Requests member states to urgently extend all necessary economic assistance to Lesotho in order to strengthen its capacity to receive and maintain South African refugees.

* Adopted by a vote of 15-0-0

6. Declares that there are peaceful means to resolve international problems and that, in accordance with the United Nations charter, only these should be employed.
7. Calls upon South Africa to declare publicly that it will, in the future, comply with provisions of the United Nations charter, and that it will not commit aggressive acts against Lesotho either directly or through its proxies.
8. Requests the Secretary General to monitor the implementation of this resolution and to report regularly to the Security Council as the situation demands.
9. Decides to remain seized of the matter.

C. Statement in the Security Council on 16 December 1982 by the South African Ambassador to the United Nations, HE Mr D. Steward

I must at the outset protest against the manner in which the Council has conducted its consideration of this matter, despite the fact that South Africa is a party to this dispute and despite the fact that it requested to address the Council in terms of Article 32 of the Charter, it was not permitted to speak before the Security Council adopted Resolution 527. It is perhaps understandable that those members of the Council with an imperfect understanding of the rules of fair play and of the judicial principle of *audi alteram partem* should have gone along with this procedure. What is incomprehensible is that other states should have decided to condemn South Africa without even going through the form of allowing it to state its case. But then, perhaps it is not so surprising because this after all is the United Nations and there never was the slightest intention that the Council should consider both sides of the case, or that it should attempt to encourage a peaceful resolution of this matter instead of exacerbating it.

It is alarming that states, from which one would have expected better, have associated themselves with this kind of behaviour. Those countries represented in South Africa are well aware of what happens in Lesotho. However, in the Security Council, states are evidently not concerned so much with facts but with effect. It is to be hoped that they are ashamed when, in private, they endeavour to reconcile the truth with the positions which they assume at the United Nations. But be they ashamed or not, the South African Government will steadfastly maintain its position that it will not tolerate the granting of sanctuary to terrorists who plan and execute sabotage and violence against South Africa.

It is also somewhat ironic that the Security Council should have felt itself

qualified to pass judgement on South Africa's recent action against ANC terrorists in Maseru in the resolution which it adopted yesterday afternoon. Only last week nine members of the Council supported a General Assembly resolution which commended the ANC for intensifying its campaign against the institutions and people of South Africa. By a distorted brand of logic, clandestine marauders are applauded when committing acts of violence: when counter-action follows, they are transformed into refugees.

The action of the United Nations in endorsing this resort to violence against a member state is in direct contravention of the principle of the charter, that international disputes should be settled by peaceful means. How in these circumstances can the United Nations presume to pass judgement on South Africa when, in direct violation of its own charter, it has incited and encouraged the pattern of terrorist aggression which led directly to the limited action forming the subject of the complaint today before the Council; when the resolutions of the United Nations have urged war and forgotten peace?

How, under these circumstances can South Africa be expected to have any confidence in the Security Council's ability to carry out its functions with the meticulous impartiality required by the charter? How, indeed, can any state confidently put its case to the Council when its members have once again proved themselves to be so partial and its actions so irreconcilable with the charter?

Resolution 527 is grotesquely one-sided. No mention, whatsoever, is made of the terrorist activities of the ANC which gave rise to South Africa's action. No mention is made of the fact that Lesotho has allowed its territory to be used as a springboard for attacks against its neighbours. We must reluctantly conclude that the members of this Council are not concerned about attacks launched by terrorists against South Africa and against its citizens of all races. This comes as no surprise in respect of those members of the Council which in contravention of the charter, openly support the terrorist activities of the ANC. It is, however, disturbing that other members of the Council should have decided to go along with a formulation which so blatantly ignores the role played by ANC terrorism in this matter.

The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom, in particular, seemed to be quite content to turn a blind eye to terrorist attacks against South Africa. Evidently — and incredibly — his country expects the Republic to do likewise — as though South Africa were under some moral obligation to endure such attacks without defending itself. The distinguished representative of the United Kingdom also referred to the “statesmanship and restraint” of Lesotho. Does the United Kingdom really believe that Lesotho showed statesmanship and restraint when it accused the Republic of trying to overrun and rule its neighbours as its colonies? And while we are on the subject what may we ask did Britain do to prepare Lesotho for independence and

to ensure that it would be a viable state. What, indeed, is it doing now to assist Lesotho?

As for the calls for compensation, the present Government of Lesotho has to accept responsibility not only for this incident but also for the damage caused in South Africa as the result of sanctuary afforded terrorists by Lesotho.

For too many years have members of the United Nations turned a blind eye to the activities of organisations such as the ANC. For too many years have they equivocated, tolerated and condoned the blatant violation of the central principles of the charter by offering no more than token opposition to the General Assembly's promotion of violence by such organisations. Indeed, many of these states have lent the ANC overt or covert support in an attempt to ingratiate themselves with radical opinion.

South Africa is therefore the last country which should bear responsibility for creating the situation which led to the action of a small unit of the South African Defence Force against ANC targets in Lesotho on 9 December 1982.

These targets served as planning and control headquarters as well as bases for launching acts of violence against South Africa, Transkei and Ciskei. The South African action was aimed exclusively at ANC terrorists and their bases and can in no sense be construed as hostile to the people of Lesotho. Indeed the South African unit had firm instructions to avoid contact with civilians, in carrying out their task. The members of the unit made every effort to adhere to these instructions. It is a matter of considerable regret to the South African Government that civilians have died or suffered as a consequence of the ANC's tactic of siting their bases in residential areas with women and children in close proximity. This is a well-known terrorist device used by, among others, the PLO in Lebanon. The ANC headquarters were deliberately located in civilian houses spread throughout the residential suburbs of Maseru to render action against them more difficult.

The ANC command in Lesotho has been responsible for various acts of sabotage in South Africa, Transkei and Ciskei. The attention of the Security Council is drawn to the cold-blooded assassination in the streets of Umtata, Transkei, by a Lesotho-based ANC execution squad, of a former official of the ANC who had become disillusioned with the extent of communist influence and control over the organisation. The South African Government repeatedly objected to the presence of ANC terrorists in Lesotho in a number of discussions with the Lesotho Government. The Lesotho Government was informed of acts of violence and sabotage as well as plans for committing subversion in South Africa by persons who had fled to Lesotho and found a haven there, and details of ANC terrorists were provided to the Lesotho authorities. The Lesotho Government was on numerous occasions asked to remove the ANC terrorists from Lesotho.

The South African Government addressed representations to the Lesotho

Government concerning the presence of a leading ANC terrorist who engaged in subversive activities against South Africa. The Lesotho Government intimated that this person would be removed and this was done. However, soon afterwards he was replaced by an even more dangerous individual resulting in a worse situation. In addition to specific incidents, a number of ANC terrorists who have infiltrated into South Africa and independent neighbouring states from Lesotho have been arrested and large arm caches have been uncovered.

The Lesotho Government has repeatedly been warned by the South African Government that murder and sabotage planned and executed by the ANC or other terrorist groups from within their territory would not be tolerated; and that it would have to bear genuine refugees from South Africa. The facts, however, indicate otherwise: known ANC terrorists have been permitted free rein to plan and execute operations against South African targets.

The South African Government has also on a number of occasions proposed to the Government of Lesotho that joint border patrols should be instituted to control illegal border crossings in the interest of security in both South Africa and Lesotho. This elicited a negative response. A further proposal that officials be stationed on each side of the border to facilitate daily consultation on border problems proved similarly unacceptable.

In talks with Lesotho representatives on 19 August 1981, 28 November 1981, 19 March 1982 and 2 September 1982, South African representatives pointed to the serious stresses being placed on South African/Lesotho relations by the continued presence of ANC terrorists in Lesotho. At these meetings there appeared to be an understanding on the part of the Lesotho Government for the South African position, and for months the South African security authorities patiently restrained themselves in the hope that this understanding would be translated into positive action leading to the removal of this evil. However, this never materialised and the ANC terrorists have been allowed to remain in Lesotho and continue their role as a major destabilising element in the surrounding areas and in Lesotho as well. The destabilising effect of the presence of the ANC on Lesotho is known to cause concern to certain members of the Lesotho Government. In this connection a member of the Lesotho Government indicated that in his view South African security forces should simply take the required action against ANC terrorists in Lesotho without involving the Lesotho Government.

Lesotho is regarded by the ANC as geographically and strategically well-placed for the planning, co-ordination, and execution of acts of terrorism in large areas of southern Africa. According to information at the disposal of the South African Government, plans were well advanced for the perpetration of a number of deeds of terror by the ANC in South Africa, Transkei and Ciskei during the coming festive season. This evidence is indisputable and is sup-

ported by the fact that several well-trained terrorists have been deployed in Lesotho from elsewhere in southern Africa during the past month in order to unleash their programme of violence against the people of South Africa, Transkei and Ciskei.

The operation against ANC terrorists has brought to light, *inter alia*, the following plans of the ANC aimed against South Africa and neighbouring states:

- (a) Sabotage against an important railway complex and other South African transport service installations.
- (b) An assassination attempt on the life of the president of a neighbouring country.
- (c) A number of other targets in neighbouring states had been identified for attack.

The revised strategy of the ANC calls for more overt infiltration of terrorists into South Africa, Transkei and Ciskei and the establishment of arms caches. These terrorists are to be responsible for deeds of terror of increased intensity in areas bordering on Lesotho: and specific targets allocated to terrorists by the command structure in Lesotho include political leaders in independent states, infrastructural objectives in South Africa and independent neighbouring states, and community centres for Blacks in Port Elizabeth and Uitenhage.

The sole purpose of the pre-emptive action by the South African unit was *thus to prevent an escalation of terrorist activity embracing the perpetration of bombings, sabotage and bloodshed in South Africa, Transkei and Ciskei, after repeated warnings and appeals had gone unheeded.*

The South African Government wishes to emphasize that its policy with respect to the government and people of Lesotho has been geared towards peaceful co-existence. It remains ready to co-operate in ensuring harmonious relations with all its neighbouring states. It will be appreciated nevertheless that no government deserving the name can permit the fabric of its society to be mutilated or destroyed by the vicious and unrestrained deeds of conscienceless men bent on sowing death and destruction wherever they move. *No-one should therefore be left in any doubt concerning South Africa's determination to continue to take whatever steps may be necessary to defend its territory and its citizens from unprovoked and cowardly attacks.*

The accusation has been levelled against South Africa that it has been actively engaged in the destabilisation of its southern African neighbours. And it has even been claimed that deterioration in the economic situation of these countries is to a large extent the result of a deliberate South African strategy aimed at the disruption of their economies in order to keep them dependent on South Africa. The exact reverse is the truth. South Africa, better than anyone, realises that its own interests demand that there should be political, economic and social stability and development in southern Africa. The de-

stabilisation of the region is as inimical to the security and progress of South Africa as it is to the political and economic well-being of Lesotho and other contiguous states. Indeed, South Africa should be regarded as one of the most significant stabilising factors in an area which suffers from certain built-in and externally imposed destabilising factors such as a lack of natural resources, a high population growth rate, ethnic diversity, traditional land tenure systems and interference by certain outside powers for their own selfish purposes.

Illustrative of South Africa's role and intentions is the fact that it has always been ready to export large quantities of staple grains and many other foodstuffs to neighbouring states. Lesotho is one of the countries which enjoy the same reduced prices as consumers in South Africa on maize-related products, resulting in an annual saving of almost four million dollars. Ironically this figure coincides with the amount of damage recently caused to electrical installations in the province of Natal by ANC terrorists who fled to Lesotho and were then allowed to proceed abroad from there. South Africa has moreover initiated a ploughing and planting programme in Lesotho involving loan finance provided by the South African Government, and this has been lauded by the Lesotho Prime Minister as an important factor in Lesotho's drive to achieve food self-sufficiency.

South Africa has a highly developed transport infrastructure which is used extensively by its immediate neighbours including in particular Lesotho.

South Africa's economy also offers substantial employment opportunities to Basotho. Most recent figures reveal that 141 000 Basotho are employed in South Africa, of which 110 000 work in the mining industry. This figure *accounts for roughly half the adult male population of Lesotho. The remittance of their wages makes up more than 40 per cent of Lesotho's gross national product.*

Seventy-seven million dollars of the mineworkers' wages are paid annually to them through the Bank of Lesotho, while an additional approximate amount of 80 million dollars is transferred by the mineworkers themselves as cash remittances to Lesotho. In addition, goods to the value of about 144 million dollars annually accompany Lesotho miners returning from South Africa. More than 20 000 Basotho are employed in other sectors of the South African economy of which construction (6 181), government services (3 985), manufacturing (3 851) and agriculture (1 941) are the most important. Large sums are taken back by them to sustain and support their families in Lesotho. These remittances must, of necessity, constitute a substantial if not essential contribution to the economic stability of Lesotho.

The South African Government urgently appeals to the Lesotho Government to reconsider its attitude to the harbouring of terrorists whose avowed aim it is to plan and assist in the implementation of acts of subversion and violence in the Republic of South Africa and other neighbouring countries. The South African Government believes that the majority of Basotho do not

support the Government of Lesotho in the stand that it is taking in this matter and the Government of Lesotho will have to accept the responsibility if employment opportunities for its citizens are placed in jeopardy as a result of more stringent movement control measures which South Africa will have to introduce on the border unless the Lesotho Government changes its attitude. There is of course free movement of persons across the border between South Africa and Lesotho. There are approximately 1,5 million crossings annually through border posts, while 600 000 persons living along the border have been issued with special border traffic permits allowing them freely to cross the border. If the Lesotho Government remains intransigent as regards the activity of Lesotho-based ANC terrorists, it would be a matter of great regret to the South African Government were it to be compelled to consider instituting more restrictive measures to control movement across the border.

In health matters, South Africa's hospital facilities are utilised for specialist treatment by all its neighbouring states, including Lesotho; and the private sector in South Africa has sponsored free medical assistance by means of projects that send medical personnel over weekends to neighbouring states, including Lesotho, to examine patients and perform operations. As regards animal diseases, South Africa's Onderstepoort Veterinary Research Institute annually despatches millions of doses of 42 different vaccines to many African states, including Lesotho.

In the field of communications, South Africa supplies infrastructure and essential services to its neighbours: and all the international telecommunications traffic of certain adjoining states, including Lesotho, continues to be routed through South Africa without interference.

In the commercial sphere, Lesotho is a co-signatory with South Africa of the Customs Union Agreement dating back to 1910 and its import requirements are largely supplied from South Africa. Lesotho's share in the customs pool is the most important single component of its national revenue, ranging up to 65 per cent in 1981. Lesotho's share for 1983/84 is estimated at 99 million dollars.

In other words, co-operation, between South Africa and its immediate neighbours, including Lesotho, ranges virtually across the whole field of human endeavour and it is therefore clear that Lesotho enjoys considerable material benefit from its proximity to South Africa.

Why, then, are such manifestly fabricated allegations that South Africa is destabilising its neighbours so freely bandied about? The answer is obvious. South Africa remains the perennial scapegoat for governments unwilling and unable to face their own political and economic realities, to confront and find solutions to the overwhelming and intractable problems facing their countries and peoples in an era of socio-political and economic instability.

In the case of Lesotho it is no secret that the political life of Lesotho is characterised by internal instability—and in this potentially turbulent

environment, the ANC presence in Lesotho has become a useful tool to be exploited as a distraction from the unpalatable evidence of armed and violent political opposition which threatens the continued existence of the Leabua Jonathan Government. It will be recalled that the Lesotho constitution was suspended at the time of Lesotho's first post-independence election on 27 January 1970, and a state of emergency was declared after it had become apparent that Prime Minister Leabua Jonathan's Basotho National Party had lost the election. As a direct consequence of the Prime Minister's inability since then to implement his many promises to hold free elections, Lesotho has itself suffered a resurgence of terrorist activity aimed at subverting its present government.

At this point let me state categorically that the South African Government has consistently adopted a policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of all its neighbouring states, including Lesotho.

It is a basic and generally accepted rule of classical international law that the jurisdiction which a government exercises within its territory carries with it the obligation to prevent the commission in its territory of harmful actions against other states. This obligation is inherent in territorial sovereignty. And today this rule is reinforced by the common superior interest of all states not to permit within their jurisdiction the commission of acts which are injurious to the peace and security of another nation.

The choice for Lesotho, Mr President, is clear. It must decide whether it will continue to offer sanctuary to ANC and other terrorists or whether it wishes to contribute to peace and stability in the region. The South African Government has repeatedly offered to enter into non-aggression agreements with its neighbours and this offer remains open. Why is it that Lesotho is unwilling to accept this offer? If it were to accept, it could end the present confrontation and contribute substantially to peace in the region. Only Lesotho can furnish the reason for its failure to accept South Africa's offer. Violence, Mr President, can in the view of the South African Government be eliminated through an understanding of this nature. It is the profound hope of the South African Government that the Lesotho Government will respond in a positive manner.

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

- D.** Reply to the South African Ambassador's statement by the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon C.D. Molapo, on 16 December 1982

Mr President,

I do not intend giving any reply to what the Permanent Representative of

South Africa has said, but whilst I intend thanking the members of this august Council I thought it might be pertinent just to observe on one or two things that the Representative has said, and I shall be very brief. He criticised Britain for granting us independence. He fails to realise we asked for independence and it was granted to us without bloodshed.

South Africa is in trouble at the moment, because since 1912 the ANC has been calling for equality; a very noble struggle. It does not intend oppressing the white man in South Africa, it wants him to be equal. This the South Africans are not prepared to do. And then the Representative went to great length on the powerful economy of South Africa. Now this is the mistake that the South Africans are making — it is true they have a powerful economy, but they seem to think they can use it to manipulate and control neighbouring states. In the course of this debate, which we all appreciated, the countries in the neighbourhood of South Africa indicated that they will not be manipulated and Lesotho is one of them. South Africa has in its mind [that] the result of that economy is that they can tell us who our friends should be, which people we should accommodate, all that because of its powerful economy.

Mr President, the South African Representative made a number of very strange observations, some of them which are very true. One is the fact that Lesotho has refused to sign a non-aggression pact. Why have [we] refused? It is because we think the region has no enemies. It does not need pacts of common defence. The only problem facing that region is apartheid. If we are to enter into a non-aggression pact in the area where there are no enemies, then we would be saying that we enter into a non-aggression pact to fight the enemies of the black people of South Africa who are fighting for equality. That is the explanation of our refusal to enter into a non-aggression pact. But all the little homelands Bantustans, Ciskei, Transkei; insignificant creations of South Africa; all entered into non-aggression pacts with South Africa. The leader or the Chief Minister (I don't know how they call them) Sebe, of the Ciskei, was the first man who said that he was jubilant about what had been done in Maseru. He did not say that, it was dictated from certain quarters.

Mr President, my King has alleged and rightly so, that we will accept the ANC and any refugees in South Africa. In this regard we would like to indicate that we are supremely satisfied with the ANC refugees in Lesotho. They have not embarrassed us. They have complied strictly to the terms and conditions of asylum. And that is why we have on a number of occasions asked South Africa to indicate on the border with Lesotho any farm house, any railway, anything that has been destroyed by people who come from Lesotho. Examples which we have been given are Cape Town (a thousand miles away from Lesotho), Port Elizabeth, East London and Umtata. We have no communications whatsoever with those areas. They do not want to accept that South Africa is infiltrated with the opponents of apartheid, and now they imagine that they come from Lesotho.

Mr President, we thank you very much. We promise you that we shall not act in a rash and untoward manner, we will keep our heads cool and we want peace in the region, but we realise that this strong South African economy will be destroyed in the cause of the struggle against apartheid.

And he alleged that my people are working in South Africa, therefore that economy has been built on the sinews of my people. We are not so much willing or anxious to have it destroyed, but we see the tragedy in that country as long as apartheid persists. Those countries which think that they love South Africa, they must pressurise South Africa not to destroy this economy.

Finally, Mr President, South Africa has threatened that they might close our borders, that it might make movement across the border difficult and I regret that this threat was made in this House, but at the same time I am sure that you are aware of it.

In conclusion, while I thank you, I must say that our Prime Minister is not in fear that his government might fall. Thank you Mr President, and I thank you, the members of the Council, for this Resolution.

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

E. Letter dated 9 February 1983 from the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon R.F. Botha, to the UN Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to your letters* regarding Security Council Resolution 527 (1982) of 15 December 1982.

On 16 December 1982, South Africa's Permanent Representative at the United Nations expressed the South African Government's views on the resolution when he pertinently drew to the attention of members of the Security Council the fact of South Africa's exclusion from the deliberations leading to the adoption of the resolution. He also questioned the impartiality of the Council on this issue when he pointed out that only the week before, nine members of the Council had supported a General Assembly resolution which commended the ANC for intensifying its campaign against the institutions and people of South Africa. It was made clear that the Lesotho Government had been frequently warned by the South African Government that murder and sabotage planned by the ANC or other terrorist groups within Lesotho's territory and executed in South African territory would not be tolerated, and that Lesotho would have to bear the consequences of harbouring these elements in contravention of international law.

*Texts of these letters unavailable at time of printing

South Africa rejects Resolution 527 as it is fundamentally flawed and one-sided. Since it would be redundant to restate in detail the merits of South Africa's case, these comments address only those paragraphs of the resolution which are singled out in your communication under reply.

As regards paragraph 2 of resolution 527, the South African Government reaffirms its view that financial responsibility must be laid at the door of the Lesotho Government, not only for the incident debated in the Security Council, but also for the damage caused on a number of occasions in South Africa as a direct consequence of the Lesotho Government's policy of harbouring terrorists. As was stated by South Africa's Permanent Representative when he was given an opportunity to speak in the Security Council, after the adoption of the resolution, South Africa's sole motivation, after numerous appeals and warnings to the Lesotho Government, was to defend itself against terrorism involving the destruction of life and property in South Africa.

Concerning paragraph 6, the South African Government is in full accord that peaceful means should be employed to settle international disputes. But the pursuit of peace is not a unilateral task, other parties must also play their part. The United Nations must itself shoulder a large measure of responsibility for its moral and material encouragement of terrorist aggression against South Africa. South Africa exercises restraint and patient diplomacy in the pursuit of peace, but reserves the right in the last resort to take effective measures to defend the lives and property of its citizens.

With reference to paragraph 7 of resolution 527, I wish to point out that South Africa has repeatedly and publicly declared its desire to live in peace with its neighbours. It is willing to translate this wish into concrete action by concluding not only non-aggression pacts with its neighbours, but also treaties which would reciprocally prohibit the use of territories for attacks. Nothing is more indicative of South Africa's commitment to the ideals of the Charter of the United Nations than this offer which has been so often extended, but to which the response has been discouraging.

I trust that your Excellency will use your good offices to encourage others to follow the path of peace in southern Africa.

S/15598

F. Joint press statement on 3 June 1983 by the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon E.R. Sekhonyana, and the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon R.F. Botha

The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Lesotho and South Africa held discussions today in Johannesburg on the deteriorating relations between the two countries. Each Minister stated frankly and at length the point of view of

his government on the reasons for the deteriorating relations.

They agreed that it was of decisive importance that neither country should permit any elements to use their countries to plan, encourage or in any way be involved in subversion against the other.

It was agreed that the two governments would urgently give attention as to how this principle could be implemented in practice to mutual satisfaction.

As far as the accumulation of traffic at the border posts is concerned, the two Ministers stated the respective points of view of their governments. It is expected that the situation will return to normal today.

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

G. Letter dated 17 August 1983 from the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon E.R. Sekhonyana, to the UN Secretary-General

Lesotho has, for some time now, been going through a very grim period due mainly to the deterioration of relations between herself and her neighbour, South Africa.

South Africa has held on to weapons belonging to Lesotho at her ports. These arms are required by Lesotho for normal internal purposes of law and order. There have been cross border excursions from South Africa into Lesotho. Thirdly, South Africa has now imposed very heavy restrictions on the movement of persons across the common borders between Lesotho and herself.

On 10 August, and after repeated requests by Lesotho, South Africa finally agreed to a meeting with representatives of the Government of Lesotho. At the meeting, South Africa made a categorical demand as a condition for normalization of relations, as follows:

- (a) The return to it by Lesotho of certain members of the refugee community whom they claim pose a security threat to South Africa;
- (b) Alternatively, their expulsion out of Lesotho into a third country or countries.

On Saturday 13 August Lesotho made a public appeal to the international community to bring pressure to bear upon South Africa to exercise restraint and withdraw this demand on Lesotho. So far, there are no positive signs on the part of South Africa. Lesotho has always asserted that it has full control over the refugees in Lesotho and that South Africa has failed to convince Lesotho of the threat the refugees pose to South Africa.

In the circumstances, the Government of Lesotho would like to make an urgent appeal to yourself, as Secretary-General of the United Nations, to use your good offices and, through member states of the United Nations and

other related organizations, to make a final appeal to South Africa to exercise restraint on her demands and to lift the undue pressures she has imposed on Lesotho through arms embargo and restrictions on movement of people — measures which are very harsh, taking Lesotho's geographical position into account.

Your Excellency may wish to appreciate that the situation in question has already prevailed long enough and is, indeed, causing a security situation inside the country, as well as incalculable suffering of Lesotho's people and her economy. While Lesotho has full confidence in the success of Your Excellency's initiatives, should the anticipated success not be forthcoming Lesotho requests that you cause urgent consultations to take place between yourself and Lesotho after consulting member states of the United Nations, United Nations organizations and agencies as to how best the international community can help Lesotho to handle the refugee problem as smoothly and as humanely as possible.

Your Excellency, Lesotho wishes to reiterate that the presence of the refugees in Lesotho is caused by an external factor, within South Africa, over which Lesotho has no control. Since we can anticipate that, so long as these conditions prevail within South Africa, the tide of the refugees will increase and we are bound by an international convention as well as on grounds of morality not to return these refugees back to South Africa, we request that, in your consultations, the international community should advise you on how best Lesotho and the United Nations system and member states can best deal with a new wave into Lesotho of fresh refugees.

Finally, I have, today, through the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Maseru, provided you with the list of 512 politically affiliated South African refugees in Lesotho out of 3,000 registered with UNHCR to assist you in your consultations towards the final resolution of this problem.

You are requested to circulate this letter among all member states of the United Nations as well as international organizations and agencies as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) E.R. SEKHONYANA
Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Kingdom of Lesotho

S/15931

H. Letter dated 2 September 1983 from the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon E.R. Sekhonyana, to the UN Secretary-General

I wish, in further response to my letter of 17 August (S/15931), to thank you for the subsequent follow-up by the way of the visit to Lesotho of your

trusted Representative, Ambassador Abbie Farah, Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions.

My Government further notes with appreciation the initiatives which Your Excellency has already taken, in consultation with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and your direct informal consultations with South Africa.

I wish to state that, despite the appeals which Lesotho has made that South Africa exercise restraint on the issue of its demands that refugees be either returned to it or expelled from Lesotho to other countries, the selective economic sanctions, arms embargo, and selective non-approval of overflight requests on non-scheduled flights continue unabated, creating an unacceptable economic suffering for Lesotho's citizens and a deterioration of the security situation on the Lesotho/South African frontiers.

It is with regret, therefore, that Lesotho and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees have reluctantly agreed to start procedures calculated toward the resettlement in a third country/countries of some members of the refugee community in Lesotho, as a way of removing obstacles that seem to stand in the way of normalisation of relations with South Africa, if indeed that is the case; and from the High Commissioner's point of view, as a measure of discharging his humanitarian responsibilities for the welfare of the refugees. Once again, Lesotho hopes that this regrettable exercise shall be discharged in the most humane and dignified manner possible. Lesotho stands and shall always be ready to play her part in faithful adherence of her obligations under the Convention.

Almost on the same day as Ambassador Farah arrived in Lesotho, Lesotho experienced cross-frontier attacks on the south-west border with South Africa, at Morifi in the Mohale's Hoek district where an innocent civilian was abducted and subsequently killed by armed thugs from South Africa, while others gave mortar and bazooka cover from across the river boundary. On the eastern frontier, at Qacha's Nek, mortar and bazooka fire from across the frontier with South Africa destroyed the supply store of the Lesotho Paramilitary Unit, resulting in the sustainment of two casualties who are in hospital.

The above further attacks, Your Excellency, take place against the background of a unilateral, illegal arms embargo against Lesotho despite our appeals to South Africa, both direct and through your good offices. Lesotho, therefore, once again and with a great sense of urgency, calls upon you to use your good offices to impress upon South Africa to release Lesotho's essential security equipment that has gone through all the inspection procedures demanded by South Africa. Lesotho also requests South Africa not to interfere with subsequent security equipment that is an essential part of every country's right to keep law and order.

Lesotho further requests South Africa to respect the legal international norms, reinforced by recent bilateral understandings, not to allow her terri-

tory to be used as a launching pad for attacks against Lesotho.

As the latter issues are of a security nature, falling under the Security Council and your Office, I request that this letter be circulated to all Members of the United Nations as a document of the Security Council.

E. R. SEKHONYANA
Minister for Foreign Affairs

S/15970 Annex

- I. Letter dated 11 October 1983 from the South African Foreign Minister, the Hon R.F. Botha, to the UN Secretary-General

I wish to refer to the letter dated 2 September 1983 from the Lesotho Foreign Minister, the Hon. E.R. Sekhonyana to Your Excellency, which was subsequently circulated as *United Nations document S/15970*, and in which certain allegations were made against the South African Government.

It is regretted that at a time when South Africa and Lesotho have been holding talks at ministerial and official level to address certain problems in their bilateral relations, especially in the area of security the Lesotho Foreign Minister has deemed it necessary to include in the communication to you, statements that are not in accordance with the facts.

I would like in particular to state that South Africa has not applied selective economic sanctions or an arms embargo against Lesotho, nor has it applied selective non-approval of overflight requests for non-scheduled flights, as asserted in the Foreign Minister's letter. Because of well-founded fears about the activities of certain anti-South African subversive elements in Lesotho and because of its duty to protect life and property in South Africa, measures regarding the entry of persons into South Africa from Lesotho had to be tightened up. For the same security reasons a security consignment of arms destined for Lesotho was not immediately released from a South African port of entry.

The Government of Lesotho was informed that these border control measures would be relaxed and the arms released as South Africa's security concerns were met. It would appear that certain actions have been taken by the Government of Lesotho which have led to an improvement in the situation.

It is clear that border control measures on persons wishing to enter South Africa from Lesotho cannot be construed as economic sanctions, nor can delaying the release of a consignment of arms be said to be an arms embargo.

Regarding the allegations of armed attacks referred to in the Foreign Minister's letter, I wish to point out that South African territory would not be involved in the areas mentioned.

As the letter of the Foreign Minister of Lesotho has been circulated to all members of the United Nations as a document of the Security Council, I ask that this letter from me be similarly circulated.

(Signed) R.F. BOTHA
Minister of Foreign Affairs
and Information

S/16033 Annex

South African Statements

A. Uittreksel uit die 1984 Nuwejaarsboodskap van die Suid-Afrikaanse Eerste Minister, Sy Edele P.W. Botha

Geagte Landgenote,

Ons kyk met dankbaarheid terug na dit wat, ten spyte van struikelblokke, gedurende die afgelope jaar bereik is.

.....

We were able to establish the Development Bank of Southern Africa through which we hope to serve the ideal of a more balanced economy in Southern Africa. The regional development strategy as well as the Small Business Corporation proved to be making progress.

Consequently the South African economy will enter 1984 with improved prospects. Naturally we shall have to cope with certain problems, but we are looking forward to a positive growth rate as well as a determined effort to bring inflation further down. We can achieve these goals if we display the necessary motivation and teamwork as well as productivity.

I must also mention the overwhelming way in which the electorate supported the decision of Parliament to bring about a new constitutional dispensation.

What happened on Referendum day will go down in history as an event of the utmost importance. The white electorate expressed their determination to serve the cause of democracy, to uphold the principles of orderly government, to maintain *Christian civilized values and to apply justice to other population groups in our country.* On this foundation we shall endeavour to create greater stability. We shall continue to pursue the ideal of good neighbourliness and co-operation with other selfgoverning and independent states of Southern Africa. There exists no instant solution for our problems. Those

*As is customary, this speech was delivered in English and Afrikaans together

people who think they can solve problems by revolution and violence will only create misery, hunger and desperation.

Dis waar dat ons in 'n onstuimige en dikwels onsekere internasionale gemeenskap ons posisie moet handhaaf. 'n Deel van hierdie internasionale gemeenskap, soos by die VVO en Konferensies van die Statebond verteenwoordig, vind behae daarin om die Republiek van Suid-Afrika met venyn aan te val. Maar in weinig van daardie lande is die vordering op die gebied van onderwys, gesondheid en lewenspeil soos by ons.

Afrika sal nie sy probleme oplos deur Sowjet tweedehandse wapens of verwaarlosing van Regeringsadministrasie en misbruik van grond nie. Hoeveel armer wil baie Afrikastate word, voordat hulle dit besef?

Veral die lande in Suider-Afrika kan veel vir hulself vermag deur groter samewerking met die Republiek van Suid-Afrika oor sake van gemeenskaplike belang.

Geen selfrespekterende land soos die Republiek van Suid-Afrika kan aan hom deur internasionale politieke opportuniste of Sowjet-geïnspireerde terrorisme en rewolusionêre elemente laat dikteer hoe ons ons binnelandse sake moet hanteer nie. Die wyse van ons vreedsame naasbestaan kan slegs deur Suid-Afrikaners bepaal word.

Die integriteit van ons grense en ons verantwoordelikheid in Suider-Afrika sal ons met beslistheid handhaaf.

Die buurstate wat dink hulle kan terroriste teen ons huisves benadeel net hulself. Ons het nog nie naastenby die wapens gebruik waarvan ons onder groter druk teen ons wel gebruik kan maak nie. Ons Veiligheidsdienste, aan wie ons soveel dank verskuldig is, word steeds meer paraat.

Daarom is dit in ons bure se belang om liever die weg van samewerking te kies. Gelukkig is daar diegene wat dit aanvaar.

Die Republiek van Suid-Afrika en die oorgrote meerderheid van sy burgers is vasberade om ons gesonde ekonomie verder te verstewig, om ons strategiese belangrikheid te beweer.

Ons sal werk en veg vir ons duur verworwe vryheid. Dit wat ons in die vorm van materiële en geestelike besittinge het om te verdedig is waardevol. Deur dit reg aan te wend kan ons die mensheid dien.

Ons bid vir genade om te doen wat reg in God se oë is vir ons land en sy mense.

Mag ons almal daartoe die krag ontvang om in 1984 met blymoedigheid en diensbaarheid te leef.

Teks uitgereik deur die Kantoor van die Eerste Minister.

B. Extract from an address by the South African Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information, the Hon. D.J. Louis Nel, to the Foreign Correspondents Association, Cape Town, 6 February 1984

The time has come for the Western world and all reasonable observers to reconsider their perception of apartheid; to reconsider their perceptions and expectations of South and Southern Africa and, in fact, to seriously consider changing them.

Many important changes have taken place in our part of the world. The nature of these changes in our country and in Southern Africa compel, in my judgement, every responsible person — especially media representatives — to reassess his preconceived ideas on what is about to happen in this region.

I suggest this for the following three reasons:

Firstly

In December of last year, South Africa's Foreign Minister, the Honourable R.F. Botha, led a ministerial delegation to meet with several Cabinet Ministers of Mozambique in Swaziland. This meeting broke the ice and was followed by high-level discussions with representatives of the Mozambican Government in January this year, where matters of common concern were discussed. Four working groups, established by mutual agreement, resulted from these discussions.

It is abundantly clear that there are extensive areas of common interest between ourselves and the people of Mozambique. By concentrating on these areas, I believe that an atmosphere of mutual trust and understanding could develop, which will be conducive to resolve other matters of conflicting interests in the future.

Secondly

On 31 January this year, the South African Prime Minister, the Honourable P. W. Botha, made an important policy statement in Parliament.

Addressing himself to the question of SWA/Namibia and the conflict in Angola, the Prime Minister said that the Republic of South Africa has done everything in its power to bring about a peaceful settlement in the border area between SWA/Namibia and Angola. South Africa has never believed that there can be any long-term military solution to the problems of Southern Africa.

To demonstrate South Africa's sincerity in this regard, he announced the further disengagement of South African forces in Angola.

South Africa believes that there is a possibility for achieving a climate of increased security in that area and is prepared to negotiate practical arrangements to ensure that this possibility is given every chance of success. To achieve this object, Mr Botha said that trilateral discussions between the Re-

public of South Africa, the USA and Angola are not ruled out.

There are tentative signs in Southern Africa today that it is not only South Africa which is prepared to make the required contributions to achieve greater security and stability for all. There is a possibility that we are entering a new era of realism in Southern Africa. South Africa is prepared to do its share, provided that other countries in the region will do theirs. It is in this spirit, the Prime Minister said, that the Republic of South Africa has met and will continue to meet with its neighbours to develop mutual understanding. The people and Government of the Republic of South Africa stand prepared and are determined to offer a reasonable and preferable alternative to war and destruction.

Thirdly

I would like to refer you to the internal developments in the Republic of South Africa.

Changes are taking place in my country. Changes resulting from the orderly and peaceful transfer of power to our various black nations and the joint decision-making, in a new constitution, with our Coloured and Indian groups.

But changes in South Africa take place in an evolutionary fashion.

Revolutionary change is swift — but short-lived. Evolutionary change is slow — but longlasting. The South African Government therefore is committed to ensure that all future change will be evolutionary and not revolutionary.

South Africa is a society in transition, a society dynamically on the move. It is an expanding and developing democracy.

South Africa is purposefully moving from the *status quo* of the past to a different, peaceful future as she travels the path that leads from paternalism to friendship and co-operation, from domination to joint decision-making and consensus.

Against this background, I think you may find it of interest, if not rewarding, to consider — for the purpose of investigative reporting — some factual examples pointing to peace, stability, economic growth and co-operation in Southern Africa and to South Africa's role in the sub-continent. May I suggest a few:

Fact:

South Africa is a substantial food exporter to at least 13 African countries, the majority of which are in Southern Africa.

Fact:

South Africa provides essential transport services to a number of African countries, including Zambia, Malawi, Zaïre and Mozambique.

Fact:

Inter-territorial contract labour agreements have resulted in 282 272 foreign Blacks, in 1982, working legally in South Africa, earning R550 million which can be freely transferred to their countries of origin.

Fact:

Annually, millions of doses of vaccine against 42 different diseases are sent by Onderstepoort Veterinary Research Institute in South Africa to other Southern African countries.

Fact:

The South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) and the South African Bureau of Standards (SABS) provide advisory services to other Southern African states and reciprocal visits by missions from South Africa and these states take place regularly.

Fact:

Co-operation exists between South Africa and her neighbours concerning water and power supplies, of which the spectacular R500 million Cahora Bassa project on the Zambesi river in Mozambique is a prime example. This co-operation extends to various multilateral agreements on the subject, such as one signed between the Governments of the Republic of South Africa, the People's Republic of Mozambique and the Kingdom of Swaziland on 17 February 1983.

Fact:

One of the most important stabilising contributions South Africa makes to Southern Africa is trade. It is well known that at least 50 of the mainland and island independent African states trade with South Africa.

Fact:

The South African Customs Union, to which Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland also belong, is an example of the integral structure that is presently in operation, regardless of the political differences of its members.

Fact:

Except for Botswana, the states of the Customs Union also form the Rand Monetary Area, reflecting close economic integration. The South African Rand remains the central reserve currency of the participating countries.

Conclusion

The foregoing reflects the South African Government's acknowledgement of the importance of common interests and co-operation. This under-

lies her attitude towards neighbouring states. This attitude also extends to the various black nations and ethnic groups within her borders.

South Africa is a heterogeneous, pluralistic society, where First and Third World exist side by side. It is a society of ethnic minorities, with conflicting interests and aspirations, yet mutually dependent on one another for economic growth and survival.

It is inevitably true that heterogeneity and conflicting interests, which we cannot wish away, feed the expectations of conflict and even revolution. Similarly, common interests promote the expectations of peace, stability and development.

We accept the reality of the heterogeneity of our population. If we don't, the potential for conflict will be greater. We decentralize economic development and we devolve power. This process will continue until we have reached a situation in our country where every citizen, regardless of race, colour or creed, will enjoy freedom and equitable political rights in a stable and secure society.

South Africa sincerely wants her neighbours in the region to share in this stability, progress and peace, for our common good and to the benefit of the whole sub-continent.

Prime Minister Botha put it succinctly when he said in Parliament on 31 January 1984, "South Africa offers treaties, food, trade, know-how and energy. We offer peace and co-operation."

But in the words of the Prime Minister, "Peace, self respect and freedom is expensive. To achieve it, hard work and sacrifices are needed."

South Africa is enjoying peace. We expect further progress and development for all our peoples in the future.

I believe that I am justified in inviting the news media to change their pattern of expectations regarding South Africa and to align it with the optimism and positive expectations we in South Africa have regarding our future. And when events in South Africa point to peace, co-operation, harmony and progress, please take it seriously.

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

Extract from an address entitled "The United States and Africa in the 1980s", by US Secretary of State, George Shultz, to the Boston World Affairs Council on 15 February 1984.

Regional Security

Tonight, I have focussed on the role we have to play in confronting Africa's economic crisis. But I cannot ignore the other concerns. Africa needs stability and an end to conflict to get on with the important tasks of national development. Many African nations face real security threats. New and fragile political institutions are particularly vulnerable. Where economies falter and fail to provide the basics of existence and hopes for a better future, political instability can result. It is difficult for democracy to flourish — authoritarian solutions may appear more attractive, but often only serve to make problems worse while circumscribing human and political rights.

In this environment, outside powers are tempted to exploit instability. There is no excuse for some 35 000 Cuban troops in Africa — trained, equipped, financed, and transported by the Soviet Union — inserting themselves into local conflicts, thereby internationalizing local problems. This Soviet/Cuban meddling has no precedent; it distorts Africa's nonalignment; it injects an East-West dimension where none should be, making fair solutions harder to achieve.

We do not view Africa through the prism of East-West rivalry. On the other hand, Africa does not exist on some other planet. It is very much a part of today's world. Africa helps to shape the global structure — through its economic expansion or decline, by its weight in international forums, through its expanding web of bilateral and multilateral links with the major powers, and through its conflicts. At the same time, it is shaped by the global structure — by the shifts in the global balance of power, by the broader marketplace of ideas and technologies, and by the readiness of predators and partners to contribute to or detract from its development. We, and Africa, ignore these facts at our peril.

We are not the gendarmes of Africa. But to stand by and do nothing when friendly states are threatened by our own adversaries would only erode our credibility as a bulwark against aggression not only in Africa, but elsewhere. Therefore, we have been ready, together with others, to provide training and arms to help our friends defend themselves.

And we act rapidly when the situation demands. Last summer, when Chad was again invaded by Libyan troops, we rushed military supplies to the legitimate government there and helped halt the Libyan advance. Libya's destabilization efforts have come to be an unfortunate fact of African existence. It is an unacceptable fact. We will continue to work with others to help Afri-

can states resist Qadhafi's overt aggression and covert subversion.

In West and Central Africa as well as in the Horn — that critically important area which sits on Africa's right shoulder along the Red Sea — we help our friends, and we protect our own strategic interest. We encourage the regional parties to seek their own peaceful solutions to local conflict.

We continue to emphasize, as we should, economic and humanitarian assistance over military aid. This year the ratio will continue at five to one. The Soviets, of course, provide minimal economic assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa and rarely participate in humanitarian relief. They seek to buy their influence in Africa through the provision of arms. In the past decade, Moscow has contributed less than one per cent of Africa's foreign economic assistance, but has sold or provided 75 per cent of its weapons.

Southern Africa

Our policy of promoting peaceful solutions to regional conflicts applies, as a priority, to Southern Africa. Our strategy in Southern Africa is to work with the parties concerned to promote fundamental and far-reaching change in three areas:

- to build an overall framework for regional security;
- to bring about an independent Namibia; and
- to encourage positive change in the apartheid policy of South Africa itself.

Regional security is essential because our goals in the region are best served by a climate of coexistence in which the sovereignty and security of all states are respected. Economic reform and development, political pluralism, removal of outside forces, peaceful change in South Africa, and Namibian independence are more likely to be achieved in conditions of strengthened security and reduced violence.

The United States has no military bases or troops in Southern Africa — and never has. In stark contrast, Moscow and Havana have sent nearly 25 000 Cuban troops to Angola alone, compounding the problem of insecurity in Southern Africa.

Our diplomacy has not groped for quick fixes or instant remedies to complex and deeply-rooted problems. Our role is that of a catalyst, an honest broker. We have made clear we will exert ourselves where we are welcome. And welcome we are. Today, none of the region's leaders — whether in Lusaka or Pretoria, in Dar Es Salaam or Maputo — is asking that we disengage. They all seek more, not less, American participation in helping negotiate solutions.

It is too soon to predict breakthroughs. Southern Africa today is at an early, pioneering stage on the road to peaceful change. The countries of the area *must build that road; no one can do it for them.* There are many bridges to be built and deep gulfs of suspicion, fear, and hatred to be overcome. But

there are encouraging signs. We see a growing realism on all sides about the risks to everyone of open-ended conflict. Military solutions offer no hope. We detect a welcome glimmer of recognition that there are indeed common interests that bind the states of Southern Africa together. After several years of tension and threats, openings for peace are being explored and developed — with the active and energetic encouragement of the United States.

We have helped foster a dialogue, for example, between South Africa and Mozambique. Ours is a balanced role whose only tilt is towards the principles of peaceful settlement and respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty — principles enshrined in the charters of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity. We have made clear to both sides that our goal is to nurture mutual security. In such a climate we are prepared to do our part to assist in Mozambique's development and to bolster its chances for genuine nonalignment. And we have moved swiftly to respond to cyclones and droughts that have repeatedly brought Mozambique to the edge of disaster.

Our strengthened relationship with Mozambique has developed against a backdrop of concrete progress in its dialogue with South Africa. Today, leaders of the two countries are hammering out a basis of understanding and co-operation in the fields of security, transport, trade, energy and tourism.

Let me emphasize that these are fragile beginnings. But they symbolize what could become a broader pattern. We are helping to keep open existing channels of communications or to build new ones among other neighbours as well — South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Lesotho, Malawi, Botswana, and Swaziland. And we are uniquely placed to play this facilitating role: unique among outside powers, we are able to talk to all the diverse elements of the region. The broader pattern can take hold if it is based on the perception of enhanced security and mutual respect. South Africa recently announced its intent to reopen talks with the I.A.E.A. on safeguard arrangements for its commercial nuclear enrichment facilities and to adhere to the London supplier group guidelines for export of sensitive materials. These moves flow from and can contribute to an environment of strengthened security. They did not happen by accident. They are the direct result of our open and active policy of constructive engagement.

I have mentioned our efforts to bring about Namibian independence, respect for borders, and the removal of Cuban forces from Angola. There remain key objections. We and our four Western partners — Britain, France, Canada, and Germany — working closely with the U.N. Secretary-General and the parties in Southern Africa, have painstakingly resolved, one-by-one, the last issues remaining in the U.N. Security Council Resolution 435. That plan, when implemented, will lead Namibia to independence. In parallel, we are seeking to create conditions of greater confidence and security that could trigger the necessary discussions by Angola and South Africa that would set the process in motion.

Recent events suggest a clearly positive evolution. A disengagement of forces in Southern Angola is underway. Directly and indirectly, the key parties are communicating ideas and proposals to move the negotiations forward. Having defined the agenda and served as a catalyst, we are facilitating a step-by-step process that could — and I emphasize could — lead to further progress. We have not yet reached a settlement. Progress is fragile and the situation remains complex. Our task is to consolidate what has started and build upon it in the weeks and months ahead. This is the work of persistent, quiet diplomacy.

Our efforts for peaceful change have not neglected South Africa's internal policies. President Reagan has called apartheid "repugnant". It is also a source of *tension and instability in the whole region*. Thus, we have a moral and a practical interest in seeing the peaceful emergence of a more equitable system. To that end, this Administration has sought to work with peaceful elements across the political spectrum in South Africa in support of constructive change.

We have not pursued this goal in a vacuum. We have tailored our programmes, our diplomatic exchanges, and our rhetoric to the facts. Let us be candid with each other. Changes are occurring — in black education and housing, in labour law and trade unionism, in black urban residence rights, in the extension of certain political rights to the Coloured and Asian communities. South Africa's white electorate has given solid backing to a government that defines itself as committed to evolutionary change. These steps are not by themselves solutions; they reflect a series of unilateral moves, not a process of negotiations among South Africans. The majority of South Africans remain *without the fundamental human right of citizenship in their own country*. Blacks are denied national political rights and cannot yet compete on an equal footing in South Africa's dynamic economy. Arbitrary forced removals have uprooted long-settled communities. I could go on with the positive and negative sides of the balance sheet. But the fact of change is clear.

We have no blueprint of our own for what should replace apartheid; that is for the South Africans to work out for themselves. But we are right to underscore that change is imperative. We are right to insist that all South Africans — black, white and coloured — participate in this process, and it is our obligation to lend whatever support we can to recognize that a process of change has indeed begun, however imperfect it may be, and however arduous it sometimes appears.

The United States has sought to assist the process of change by: encouraging American labour unions to assist in the development of black labour unions, by programmes to assist black managers and entrepreneurs, and by promoting over 26 million dollars in scholarship assistance for young black South Africans. We have substantially expanded our support to civil and human rights organizations. With the encouragement of Congress, we are de-

signing new programmes to strengthen legal institutions and legal skills. And we have backed the impressive efforts of American businesses to provide equal treatment and expanded opportunities for all their workers regardless of race.

Economic development itself is a powerful engine for social and political evolution. Those who advocate disinvestment and economic sanctions would pull the rug out from under those South Africans who have taken the first concrete steps towards a more equal and equitable society.

In the West we value life, freedom, progress and peace; the only course consistent with these values is to engage ourselves as a force for constructive, peaceful change. It is not to egg on the forces of polarization heightening the tensions that could destabilize the entire region. It is not our business to cheer on, from the sidelines, a race war in Southern Africa — or to accelerate trends that will inexorably bring such a conflict about. We should recognize our limits: we can support and encourage change, but we cannot replace local initiatives, institutions, and vision.

Tomorrow's agenda

If I may leave you with one message, it would be that America takes Africa and its problems seriously. We see a direct relationship between Africa's political and economic stability and the health of the Western world. We are committed to working with our African friends, and with the international community, to help Africa overcome its problems.

It is in our self-interest that we do so. And it is morally right. It is in the best tradition of America.

Text issued by the United States Information Service, Johannesburg.

Publications of The South African Institute of International Affairs

Occasional Papers/Geleentheidspublikasies

Issued on an irregular basis, approximately ten a year, and containing the texts of addresses at Institute meetings or original articles. Subscription rate per annum R18 surface mail; R25 airmail Africa and Europe; R30 US and elsewhere. Price per issue R2 (plus postage for overseas airmail).

Latest titles are:

E. W. Anderson and G. H. Blake. *The Republic of South Africa as a Supplier of Strategic Minerals: an assessment.*

Richard Steyn. *Interview with Donald F. McHenry at Hilton on 19 January 1984.*

Golden Jubilee publication. A. L. Bostock. *A Short History of the South African Institute of International Affairs, 1934-1984.* R5.

International Affairs Bulletin

Three issues per year and supplied free of charge to members. Subscription rate for non-members R8 per annum surface mail; R12 airmail Africa and Europe; R13 US and elsewhere. Price per copy R3 (plus postage overseas airmail).

Latest issue, Vol. 7, No. 3, includes:

Geoffrey Wheatcroft. *The anguish of Africa.*

J. C. van Zyl. *South Africa in world trade.*

Robert d'A. Henderson. *The food weapon in Southern Africa and*

M. Tamarkin. South Africa's regional options: policy making.

Bibliographical Series/Bibliografiesereëks

No. 11. *Portuguese-Speaking Africa 1900-1979. A select bibliography. Vols 3 and 4 (in one issue).* Compiled by Susan Jean Gowan and Elna Schoeman. R25.

Published for the SAIIA by Macmillan South Africa (Pty) Ltd. Deon Geldenhuys. *The diplomacy of isolation: South African foreign policy making.* April 1984. 283 pp. hardcover. R19,95 (excl. G.S.T.) R22,50 (inclusive mail order price within South Africa). ISBN 0 86954 188 9.

(Publications lists and further details available from: The Publications Department, SAIIA, P.O. Box 31596, Braamfontein 2017, Transvaal, South Africa.)