



Southern

Africa

Record

Number 32

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).

Southern Africa Record

Number Thirty-two, June, 1983

Contents/Inhoud

South African Statements

- A.** Extracts from the motion of no confidence, by the Leader of the Opposition, Dr the Hon. F. van Zyl Slabbert, in Parliament on 31 January 1983. page 3
- B.** Extracts from the reply by the Prime Minister, the Hon. P.W. Botha, during the no confidence debate on 1 February 1983. page 9
- (I)** Concerning Soviet involvement in Southern Africa; South Africa and Africa; and the development of South Africa's black states. page 9
- (II)** Concerning South Africa's relations with Southern African states. page 14
- (III)** Concerning the proposed border adjustments between South Africa and Swaziland. page 16

Namibia

- A.** Extracts, concerning South West Africa/Namibia, from a statement in Parliament by the South African Prime Minister, the Hon. P.W. Botha, on 1 February 1983. page 19
- B.** Statement by the Zimbabwean Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Hon. Witness Mangwende, issued in Harare on 24 February 1983. page 21
- C.** *Interview with Mr Sam Nujoma, President of SWAPO, in Zimbabwe during Mr Nujoma's discussions with Prime Minister Mugabe, reported on 16 May 1983.* page 23

Zimbabwe

- A.** Extracts from an address by the Zimbabwean Prime Minister, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, at the Seventh Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in New Delhi from 7-11 March 1983. page 26
- B.** Extracts from an address, concerning Britain's role in Zimbabwe; and internal stability; by the Zimbabwean Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Hon. Witness Mangwende, at a farewell for the outgoing British High Commissioner, Mr Robin Byatt, in Harare on 24 March 1983. page 29
- C.** Extracts from an address warning ZAPU on subversion, by the Zimbabwean Prime Minister, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, at an independence anniversary reception in Bulawayo on 18 April 1983. page 32

- D.** Address, concerning national achievement, but also the effects of lawlessness, by the Zimbabwean President, Rev. the Hon. Canaan Banana, on the third anniversary of independence, in Harare on 18 April 1983. **page 34**

- E.** Extracts from a speech by the Zimbabwean Prime Minister, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, on the occasion of the installation of H.E. Rev. the Hon. Canaan Banana, as Chancellor of the University of Zimbabwe, on 9 May 1983. **page 41**

South African Statements

- A. Extracts from the motion of no confidence, by the Leader of the Opposition, Dr the Hon. F. van Zyl Slabbert, in Parliament on 31 January 1983.

The first point I should like to make — this is common knowledge to hon. members of the House — is that there is a close interaction between external and internal factors as far as South Africa's relationship to other countries is concerned and other countries' relationship to South Africa. Whether one talks about sport or trade or cultural affairs or diplomatic relations, this happens to be the case, I am not saying it is good or bad; I am simply stating a fact.

Before I turn my attention to the domestic situation, I wish to raise a few issues concerning the South African Government's attitude towards its neighbouring territories, and these are issues not simply related to foreign policy, but also to considerations of defence and internal national security. I believe that one of the most dangerous external situations in which South Africa could find itself is one of being surrounded by a group of chronically unstable and impoverished neighbouring territories, desperately casting their eyes to the super-powers for help. It makes obvious common sense that economic interdependence, flourishing trade and the regular exchange of goods, services and expertise must lead to greater stability in the region, to the long-term benefit of all the countries involved.

The hon. the Prime Minister has repeatedly declared himself and the South African Government as more than willing to fill this role and has said that this country has no aggressive intentions and is prepared to contribute to stability in this region. South Africa, however, is perceived, by her neighbouring territories as well as by her potential allies, as playing exactly the opposite role. South Africa is accused of deliberately pursuing a policy of destabilization towards neighbouring territories through the use of military, economic, transport and trade means.

If South Africa is perceived to be doing this, we must be sure of the fact that these perceptions are increasingly going to shape foreign policy as far as we are concerned. How is such a consistent discrepancy possible, on the one hand the South African Government declaring itself willing to assist in increasing stability, with an increasing awareness, on the other hand, on the part of our neighbouring territories and our potential allies that we are in fact playing a destabilizing role? By destabilization I do not mean combating terrorism, hot-pursuit or pre-emptive strikes. By destabilization, as they see it, I mean deliberate intervention in the internal affairs of another country in order to promote conditions of social, economic and political instability.

The hon. the Minister of Defence is on record as having said, over the weekend and just before the weekend, that this perception of South Africa, this accusation, is largely due to communists and communist countries. I am afraid, however, that either the hon. the Minister is not aware of the extent to which this perception exists in the West, or he is misinformed.

Let us consider some of the relevant reports, the first from the United States State Department itself. Last week, on the 24th, the following statement appeared in *The Argus*:

The United States has not gone that far, but came unexpectedly close in a written statement by the US State Department to the American magazine *Africa Report*. It said:

The MNR in Mozambique appears to be basically a military organization with none but the most general of political programmes, apart from trying to replace the Government of Mozambique. It received the bulk of its support from South Africa.

The State Department was then approached and said that this was its considered opinion. It is interesting that this report appeared in *Africa Report* after an article written by a gentleman called Mr Michael Clough. He is the Africa Area Co-ordinator and adjunct Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval Post-graduate School in the United States. I am in no position to state whether what he says is true or not, but I am simply saying that this man is making an important input into foreign policy considerations in that country, and what does he say about this accusation? Let me quote:

In the near future the Reagan administration may be forced to make a major decision on relations with Mozambique that could have far-reaching effects on American policy towards the entire South African region. The need for such a decision may be created by the continued escalation of attacks on Mozambiquan President Samora Machel's Government by the South African-backed Mozambique National Resistance Movement and actions taken by that Government in its efforts to counter the growing threat to its survival.

Let us also look, for example, at the *New York Times*, which is a reputable newspaper. In that newspaper there is an article by a certain *Flora Lewis* which states, in regard to Angola:

But far from threatening South Africa, he . . . (That is Nujoma) . . . has to worry about his bases in Angola, where South African forces move as they please through the two southern provinces. The Cubans stay well to the north and do not protect him. He professes not to care whether there is a political settlement, proclaiming: "We will fight to victory!" That makes it easier for South Africa to dig in. There is even speculation that its military really wants the Cubans to remain in Angola, as a justification for Pretoria's destabilizing incursions throughout the region.

Another example, a conservative one and almost right-wing from Britain, comes from the Institute for Strategic Studies. It appeared in their regular journal called *The Strategic Survey*. I quote again:

The front-line States accused South Africa of conducting a conscious policy of destabilization in the region. Indeed, her armed attacks into Angola and Mozambique, threats of such attacks against Zimbabwe and other States and support of armed dissidents and mercenaries in the region all suggested an increasingly belligerent and provocative military posture. This policy was attributable in large part to the growing security threat to South Africa and her leadership's perception of it. But the belligerency of the response, which seemed to go far beyond what was required on strictly security grounds, seemed to be due more to South African internal politics than to the objective assessment itself.

So I can go on giving other quotes. The point I am trying to make is that this is becoming the kind of conventional wisdom of our allies. I believe it is very dangerous. I believe we cannot simply dismiss all this as newspaper speculation and distorted reporting.

When I was in Washington in September, I spoke to people in the State Department concerned with South Africa and also to other people who are knowledgeable about South Africa and who have regular contact with top Officials in the South African Government, and I was personally more than alarmed when they quite blandly told me that there was a policy of destabilization. I refuted that in no uncertain terms. I am quite willing to give the names and the instances to the hon. the Minister of Defence or the hon. the Prime Minister if he wants me to do so. I told those people it simply did not make sense for South Africa to engage in a policy of deliberate destabilization.

I mentioned the following reasons: firstly, I said it threatened to undermine the US policy of constructive engagement in South Africa. This was the first obvious threat one could think of if there was this attempt at de-

stabilization. In fact, if one listened to the debates in Harare at the American-African Institute Conference, one already heard the argument there that the policy of constructive engagement was simply a facade behind which the South African Government could destabilize. I said this was not part of the policy in South Africa.

Secondly, I said it increased Soviet influence in southern Africa — it did not decrease it, it increased it. In fact, the same gentleman, Mr Clough, argues in *Africa Report* that South Africa if it pursues a policy of destabilization, is in fact becoming the ally of Soviet Russia by forcing other countries to invite them to come into this area. I read again from his report:

The major impediment to the development of a positive long-term relationship between the United States and Mozambique as well as other southern African States is the widely-held conservative assumption that the United States and the current South African Government share similar regional interests. This view is dangerously mistaken. As is becoming increasingly clear, the apparent belief of South African leaders that their country benefits from the continued existence of weak and unstable governments on its borders is creating an ironic situation whereby the supposedly pro-Western White regime in South Africa is becoming the Soviet Union's most valuable and, some might say, natural ally in the region.

This article appeared in *Africa Report* in the edition that appeared just before the State Department's interview took place. I cannot by any stretch of the imagination see how one can divorce this kind of policy advice — the title of the paper is "American Policy Options" — from the subsequent statement by the State Department itself. Therefore, as I said, the second reason is that a policy of destabilization would increase the Soviet influence.

A third consequence of such a policy is that it destroys market and trade opportunities and the potential for economic development. In other words, it makes the period of reconstruction when one wants to get regional economic development off the ground so much more difficult. Fourthly, it nudges the whole southern African region into a state of semi-permanent war and conflict, and that, too, is not in the interests of South Africa.

However, a far more important and a dangerous consequence is one the hon. the Prime Minister himself has mentioned a number of times, *viz.* if there is such a thing as a policy of destabilization from South Africa's point of view — I said this to the gentlemen in America — it would mean that we would be defenceless in the face of accusations with reference to non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. This has always been a cornerstone of South Africa's foreign policy. I cannot for one moment, I said, think that it was possible that South Africa would engage in a policy of deliberate destabilization because then morally and otherwise we would

be unable to insist that they have no right to intervene in our internal affairs.

I regard these as compelling reasons. The more I put them to the people in Washington the more they smiled knowingly or the more they looked at me in blank amazement as if they did not believe it. I spoke to the Council on Foreign Relations on exactly this point, as well as to the Foreign Policy Association, and made the selfsame point which I have just made. I must say I came away distinctly uneasy because I remembered in 1975 when I was made a complete fool as a Member of Parliament when I had been deceived on the Angolan debacle.

.....
That is why I was comforted — I mean this — when I listened to the hon. the Minister of Defence as well as to the Chief of the Defence Force on television recently when they stated that it was not South Africa's policy to destabilize. I want to appeal to the hon. the Prime Minister to reiterate that policy in the House and give us the assurance that we are not interfering in the internal affairs or in internal movements of any other neighbouring territory and that we are not interested in the MNR, Unita or movements in Zimbabwe, but that we are only interested in protecting the safety and security of the South African State and that that is our only interest.

.....
It is well to remember, also, that the period of constructive engagement may very well be coming to a close. This is possible because the indications are that President Reagan is in some difficulty. If there is a new American Administration there may be new policies towards South Africa. If those policies are shaped by people who have this perception of South Africa we are going to find ourselves in a very difficult position. I believe it is in South Africa's interest to see to it that the legacy of this era must not be seen to be increased destabilization in southern Africa with South Africa being presented as the main culprit.

South West Africa/Namibia

I should like to make a few brief remarks about South West Africa/Namibia. At the moment the picture is one of increasing confusion. For South Africa, I believe, it remains a problem of diminishing options. The longer we remain involved there, the fewer will be the options available to us to come to an acceptable agreement with regard to the situation. With the collapse of the DTA Government, an era has come to an end in which a particular strategy for achieving a peaceful internal transition has obviously failed. I believe that Mr Mudge really did his best. However, I do not believe that the same can be said of the Government and its relationship with the DTA. If there had really been a desire to help Mr Mudge, it could have

been done. I believe that desire has been lacking, and it is important to find out why. All I still want to add — and I am not going to say any more about this; one of my hon. colleagues will deal with it in greater detail at a later stage — is that South Africa's greater involvement in the administration of that territory should not give rise to a greater polarization, nor should it totally destroy the middle ground or harden people's attitudes with regard to a peaceful international settlement.

.....

Ingwavuma/KaNgwane

Nothing better illustrated the arrogance and callousness of this Government during a growing conflict situation than its handling of the Ingwavuma/Kangwane incident. Behind the scenes, repeated pleas were made for this matter to be handled with great circumspection. We discussed it at length. Then the announcement was made quite baldly: The Government, the Cabinet, has decided. That is all. The Cabinet has decided. What did this decision mean? This decision taken by the Government in respect of Kangwane and Ingwavuma had three consequences. Firstly, it was a flagrant contradiction of the Government's own declared policy in respect of homeland development. Mr Mabuza asked for self-governing status and his request was turned down. That decision amounted to a motion of no confidence by the government itself in its own policy as far as Kangwane was concerned. Secondly, it was a confirmation of the Government's standpoint that whatever their policy, Blacks would not become South African citizens. That was another consequence. Thirdly, it was an indication that the Government would seize upon any opportunity to get rid of as many Blacks as possible as quickly as possible. This reminds me of the following jingle:

As I was going up the stair
I met a man who wasn't there
He wasn't there again today
I wish, I wish he'd go away!

That is more or less the attitude of the Government towards the Blacks in this Ingwavuma/Kangwane debacle. Fortunately, however, this decision could not be implemented, although I believe that irreparable harm has been done to inter-group relations as a result of the way in which this decision was handled. It is actions such as these which give rise to resentment and polarization in our country. This kind of behaviour cannot be separated from the increasing frustration and discontent which cause people to resort to violence and terror. Mabuza told me himself that if this decision was implemented, he would be faced with bloodshed in his own territory, and that we should do everything in our power to prevent it.

We are told about the increase in subversive activities. We are told that

more and more young people are crossing the borders of our country to be trained as terrorists.

.....
One might ask oneself: why? On the one hand it is as a result of exploitation and agitation. No one can deny that. Then there is a fertile breeding-ground for such exploitation and agitation. There is no doubt about the fact that the internal situation in respect of black people is definitely deteriorating.

Against this background the Maseru raid contains a message for us politicians, for us in this House, which we dare not disregard. Apart from military considerations, this raid was an important escalation in the conflict situation in South Africa, and from now on we shall increasingly have to take account of the political and diplomatic consequences of such actions. The crucial question which we politicians must ask ourselves before sitting back complacently and watching the Defence Force and our young men having to do the dirty work, is this:

What are we doing to prevent more and more young Blacks from falling a prey to agitators, out of sheer frustration, and from turning to violence as the only solution to the problems in South Africa? If we ignore or evade this question, we are betraying the future of our children.

South Africa. *Republic*. House of Assembly Debates, no. 1, 28 January–4 February 1983, cols. 18–23, 26–27, 29–31.

- B. Extracts from the reply by the Prime Minister, the Hon. P.W. Botha, during the no confidence debate, on 1 February 1983.
- (i) Concerning Soviet involvement in Southern Africa; South Africa and Africa; and the development of South Africa's black states.

The Republic of South Africa is important. In the first place it is important . . . because of its strategic position, its modern harbours, its modern transport system and its ability to be of great value militarily. In its time in office the National Party Government has made a tremendous contribution towards making these characteristics or circumstances possible. In the second place — and this is recognized throughout the world — this country is of the utmost importance to the West owing to its strategic minerals. However, South Africa is also important from the point of view of food production. It is one of the few countries in the world that still exports food, in spite of the inconsistency of its natural conditions. From an invest-

ment point of view South Africa also remains an important country. People are not going to invest their money in a country if they do not know that there is a stable government that can offer security to their investments.

However the Republic of South Africa is also important in the African context. It is important as an African State. I want to refer to two facets of this importance. Soviet Russia and its satellites are not only interfering in Africa, but are also, in particular, involved in a brutal attempt to conquer southern Africa.

.....

Soviet involvement in Southern Africa

Russia is waging a psychological war and a propaganda campaign against southern Africa and the Republic of South Africa which is unprecedented in history. It is also carrying on a campaign of subversion. I have been told on good authority that the KGB has at least a half million agents working for it throughout the world, and recently the KGB has been more active in South Africa than ever before. In the third place Russia is waging a terrorist war through the ANC and SWAPO. The training of both these organisations is being co-ordinated by the PLO and the Communist Party. Russia is also gradually building up conventional forces in countries to the north of us which it already has in its power. Surely it is no use our denying these facts. That is why we must stop levelling accusations at each other here while there is a destabilisation from that quarter. I shall return to this matter later.

Soviet Russia's task is being facilitated by its infiltration — and that of its satellites — of the World Council of Churches and the United Nations. However, its task is also being facilitated by a number of sickly left-wing politicians and toadies in certain Western media who pave the way for communism in many countries. We also have some of them in South Africa.

.....

The facts are as they were recently put in *US News and World Report*, and I quote merely one sentence:

For the 1,5 billion inhabitants of the communist world the Marxist promise of a workers' paradise has turned into a nightmare of permanent scarcity, economic stagnation and discontent.

In other words, communism, as far as true liberty and economic progress are concerned, is a swindle. What is more, it is a hollow cry which is made to the world and which conceals purely military control for power purposes. We should act purposefully and in unity in an attempt to avoid a fate of this nature for the Republic of South Africa. I repeat, we must act purposefully and in unity in an attempt to avoid a fate of this nature for the Republic of South Africa. Soviet Russia and those paving its way in the

Republic of South Africa often go about dressed in flowing garb with Bibles in their hands in order to prepare their way to chaos with devilish cunning, and they cry blue murder if they are touched.

South Africa and Africa

There is a second facet to our relationship with Africa. The second facet to our importance as African State is our multinationalism, but also our positive interest relations (sic) to the rest of Africa, particularly Africa south of the Sahara. Let me present hon. members with a few alarming facts concerning Africa, not because it might be news, but by way of illustration of what I want to say.

The United Nations Conference on Trade came to the conclusion that out of 30 of the world's poorest countries 20 are African States. African countries have a foreign loan burden of 77 000 million dollars. Or is the West perhaps carrying this burden instead of Africa? These countries have a *per capita* income of 316 American dollars per annum. A while ago it was authoritatively stated that the United States pumped in 5 000 million dollars into the agricultural development of Africa without any impressive results. A member of the European Parliament, Richard Cottrell, wrote the following in the *Daily Telegraph* of 17 September last year:

The White man will just have to pick up his burden again. Could we re-invent colonialism? It is a reasonable assumption that many of the former people of the Empire must now be looking back with fondness to the calm, ordered and often relatively prosperous days of colonialism compared with the present miseries and dictatorships.

We might not agree with him, and I for one do not agree with him. However, Mr Cottrell made an important point to consider. The dreadful plight of Africa. That is the point, and let me add this to this gloomy picture: I believe that a large part of Africa's present bad state of affairs can be attributed to a lack of management capability, lack of good administration, lack of proper agricultural know-how, land utilization and lack of action against corruption. Africa needs less weapons and more food. Furthermore, Africa is illogically hanging on to colonial drawn borders as well as out-dated socialist ideas destroying their national resources and initiative by private enterprise.

Development of South Africa's black states

In contrast, Sir, the Republic of South Africa holds great promise, although it is only during the past 50 years and particularly since 1948, (that it) wrested itself from colonialism.

.....
One of the mistakes we have made since 1948 — I want to admit to it frankly here today — was our failure to see to it that the necessary devel-

opment occurred within the black states. I admit this frankly. But was the State to blame for everything? Or should the private sector, too, accept a major share of the blame? What a reluctant attitude was not adopted by the private sector in this regard! And white South Africa is not to blame for everything either. The independent and self-governing black states of southern Africa have 23 per cent of the agricultural potential of the region at their disposal. Even so they produce only six per cent of the output.

It is calculated that between 30 per cent and 50 per cent of the arable land is not being utilized correctly. Nevertheless, there are signs of improvement in some of their countries: in this regard I have in mind particularly a country such as Bophuthatswana, which is seeing to its agricultural development in a beneficial and positive manner.

.....
I have taken the trouble to have ascertained what the NP Government has spent since 1948 to date on the development of the national states — those national states which are independent and self-governing. I find that the amount spent on them by the Republic of South Africa for development and otherwise comes to R8 489 million. . . . The amount spent since 1977 comes to R4 952 million. It is a tremendous amount for a country such as South Africa, calculated in comparison with what the so-called vociferous world is doing to black Africa. Whether it has achieved the desired results, is another matter. But I have just dealt with those reasons. After all, we have the same problems here as those Africa has. Surely we have exactly the same problems.

However, what have we achieved in addition? We have assisted four peoples along the road to full constitutional liberation. The other peoples, at least four or five in number, have proper self-government. There are four independent states, each with a sovereign parliament of its own, and four or five self-governing states, and this in comparison to what happened in the colonial politics of southern Africa, in which no rights were granted to those people. And yet people allege that there has been no constitutional development. In this process, there has been no bloodshed.

However, let us now view it from a different angle. The independence of Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland is recognized by Britain, by the UN and by other states in the West, but the peaceful liberation of Transkei, Venda, Ciskei and Bophuthatswana is not recognized. So what kind of standards are applicable in this regard? What difference is there between the liberation of Lesotho and that of Transkei? Both were granted their liberty by means of sovereign parliamentary resolutions. The one has a greater potential than the other. So what gives rise to these double standards being applied if such action is not born from dishonesty — from international dishonesty? What international hypocrisy is not involved in this regard! Of course, these dishonest international political practices, are being aggra-

vated by certain elements in this country, and it is these we must battle against to complete the process of emancipation in South Africa. Therefore the constitutional as well as the economic development of black people is a matter to which the Government gives high priority, and our actions have proved this, as I have just quoted. It forms part of the twelve-point plan for which the government obtained a mandate in the elections less than two years ago and with which it intends to proceed. It forms an important part of the greater ideal of promoting order and stability in southern Africa. However, multinationalism and the facts with regard to population numbers cannot be disregarded. These are realities which we must bear in mind. . . . This is no reason for us to throw up our hands and say to one another: just look what is going to hit us in the year 2000. It does not work that way. Numbers alone are not decisive in life.

We respect the cultural and national aspirations of black people and we recognize their right to territory. They already possess some of southern Africa's best land with the highest rainfall. We do not begrudge them that land and we do not intend to deprive them of it. At the same time, we subscribe to the principle that for the citizens of states that have opted for independence, and have taken the necessary steps to attain it, that independence has to be meaningful in respect of efficient administration, good government, developing economies and international recognition. We help them wherever we can to try to obtain that international recognition. The government tries to help promote it by means of meaningful consolidation and socio-economic and administrative aid on a large scale, and the latest successful summit and other deliberations are the best proof of this. It was a successful summit, in spite of all the predictions that it would not succeed.

.....

As for the summit, we also gave attention to another matter, which we believe to be closely connected with this, namely the Development Bank for Southern Africa. This bank is not going to compete with the private sector, but is in fact going to increase their share in development and to eliminate fragmented aid as far as possible. Therefore we are grateful to be able to announce, with the approval of all the governments concerned, that this bank must start operating on 1 September. The government is giving serious attention to this, along with other governments.

.....

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition referred to remarks concerning the idea of a federation. I want to say at once that if independent black states wish to form a federation to serve their common interest, I have no fault to find with that. They are free and independent and they can enter into a federation with one another and do just as they please. It is for them to decide, and it does not affect our proposals in respect of regional and

confederal co-operation, as we have repeatedly explained them. Therefore I am not going to discourage the idea. If they can succeed in doing that, good luck to them. . . .

We have no more objection to that than we have to the SADCC. I have told black leaders in southern Africa that if they want to proceed with the SADCC, they are welcome to do so, and they must make a success of it, because, I said: "We do not want poor neighbours; we prefer rich neighbours". I told them, however, that they should not establish that organisation and then start railing at us. They should get their projects off the ground. . . . Nor does the promotion of this matter have any effect in principle on the proposed co-operation in the development bank that is being envisaged. Therefore the proposed Development Bank does not stand in its way.

In stating this positive standpoint towards neighbouring countries, I want to add at once that I have never seen the struggle in southern Africa as a struggle between white South Africa and the other population groups. The struggle in southern Africa is an ideological one. In this I am supported not only by my party, but by the electorate of South Africa, which has given us a two-thirds majority. The year before last we issued an election manifesto in which stated the following:

The National Party commits itself to the vigorous implementation of national strategy to enable the RSA to repulse decisively the total onslaught of Soviet expansionism which is directed at all South African inhabitants.

We also stated:

Consequently the Government does not view this struggle as one between white and non-white, but as a struggle between the forces of chaos, violence and suppression on the one hand, and a Christian civilisation, law, order and justice on the other.

South Africa *Republic*. House of Assembly Debates, no. 1, 28 January–4 February 1983, cols. 114–128

(ii) Concerning South Africa's relations with Southern African states

As a result of the general struggle we are waging against the Soviet onslaught in southern Africa, a new cry has now been raised. Every year we have a new cry. This year again a new cry has been raised in the country. It is the cry of destabilization. And once again, South Africa is the scapegoat. That cry was raised by certain radical clergymen who wrote me

a letter about South West. I sent them a proper reply to that. Thereupon, however, they proceeded to publish a document full of distortions, in which they tried to gull the world into believing that I had not replied to them properly. Secondly, the cry is being raised in certain media which have been known for 80 years for the unsavoury role they have played in South Africa's history. . . . Thirdly, this cry is being raised by certain communist elements outside the Republic of South Africa, because it suits Russia, with its enormous propaganda campaign, to accuse South Africa of destabilization, while Russia, with its Cuban and East German lackeys, is the main destabilizer in South Africa. Fourthly, the cry is being raised by certain African leaders whose only contribution to history has been the impoverishment of their own countries.

Let us examine the facts. Firstly, there are co-operation agreements between us and several southern African states concerning posts and telecommunications, trade and railway transport, the only reliable railway transport in southern Africa. Similar agreements exist in connection with water and electricity. It is not our fault that Ruacana is not working at full capacity. It is not our fault that Cabora Bassa is not working at full capacity. Furthermore, there are co-operation agreements in respect of the Rand monetary area. There are co-operation agreements in respect of health services for humans and animals. In this connection it is interesting to note the following, and I quote:

Compensation payments to the various countries representing a return on the rand currency circulating in the respective areas now total more than R20 million per annum.

This is the destabilizer! We are supposed to be the destabilizer, but we are paying R20 million a year! . . . Take it away, then we shall see what is left. In 1969, a comprehensive customs union agreement was entered into between South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland. During the 1982-83 financial year, R314 million was paid over to the BLS countries and R341 million to the TBVC countries in terms of this agreement. The total customs pool will amount to roughly R2 418 million, but we are a destabilizing influence. What nonsense!

Just imagine, destabilization in South Africa as a result of our actions! Who went to talk to Dr Kaunda about peace in southern Africa? I did. Who went to have talks with the Prime Minister of Lesotho at the Peka Bridge? The Minister of Foreign Affairs and I. Who discussed peace in southern Africa with the Swaziland authorities? Who travelled a long distance recently to have talks with Angolan authorities? Who had talks with Mozambique in spite of deep-seated differences? The Minister of Foreign Affairs of South Africa. But no *we* are destabilizing! If we had really wanted to destabilize, we could bring the whole works to a standstill overnight.

What more did I do? I made an offer to defence agreement — that is to say, non-aggression pacts — to neighbouring countries, and I did not only do so in public. I said I was prepared to conclude a defence agreement with each one of these neighbouring countries. However, I went even further and said that I was prepared to conclude agreements with them in which we stated that we would not utilize our territories for any across-the-border operations against one another. There are independent states who concluded defence agreements with us and with whom we are living in peace.

I repeat this offer today: I am prepared to conclude defence agreements with every state in South Africa that shares a common interest with us, and I am prepared to conclude agreements with them in which we state that we will not allow our territories to be used against one another.

Evidently these offers are falling on deaf ears. They are being rejected with a cynical gesture. If those gentlemen want to do that and want their territories to become the gathering places of ANC and SWAPO terrorists, I say here today: "We shall remove those nests for you". I said this not only to them, but also to the Western leaders: "We shall remove the nests for you". There is sufficient opportunity to discuss matters with one another in a peaceful and constitutional way in South Africa. There is sufficient opportunity here. There is sufficient opportunity here for people who wish to work in order to make progress.

.....

I say again that every country which offers shelter to anti-South African terrorists, will have to deal with the security forces of South Africa as far as those terrorists are concerned.

South Africa. *Republic*. House of Assembly Debates, no. 1, 28 January–4 February 1983, cols. 134–137

(iii) Concerning the proposed border adjustments between South Africa and Swaziland*

I also wish to make a short statement on the Ingwavuma and the Kangwane issue now. In this case, too, I must speak with great responsibility today because an inquiry is at present in progress, an inquiry which was agreed to. Otherwise I would have been able to say far more than I am in fact going to say today.

The decision to investigate the possibility of incorporating the territory of Kangwane and the district of Ingwavuma into Swaziland was the out-

*For earlier statements on this issue see *Southern Africa Record*, nos. 28 and 29.

come of prolonged talks on border adjustments between the Republic of South Africa and Swaziland. It is a step in the direction of the realization of a long-cherished ideal of the Swazis who a long time ago were deprived, through historical error, of their Swazi citizenship, of being united under one King in one country. In addition, these steps were taken after I had personally had talks on Ingwavuma with the Chief Minister of KwaZulu and after repeated discussions on Kangwane had taken place on ministerial level. . . .

It was deemed desirable for the finalisation of the border adjustments to remove the black areas in the Inwavuma district from the jurisdiction of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, to do away with the Kangwane Legislative Assembly and to transfer the authority in respect of the areas concerned, which was previously vested in the Governments of KwaZulu and Kangwane, to the Minister of Co-operation and Development.

By so doing it was by no means implied that the territories would finally be transferred to Swaziland. And the Swazi Government knew this. The reason for doing this was simply to try to create a climate in which the true feelings of the inhabitants of the two territories as to the desirability or otherwise of incorporation into Swaziland could be gauged in an impartial way. That was our motivation.

Two proclamations were promulgated to make provision for the removal of the Black areas in the Ingwavuma district from KwaZulu, i.e. R109 of 1982 and R121 of 1982.¹ As far as the first proclamation was concerned, it was disputed in court by the KwaZulu Government, and the local division of the Supreme Court there issued a decree *nisi* and the authority and control over the administration of Ingwavuma was re-allocated to the KwaZulu Government. Therefore the South African Government did not take these steps before it had engaged in effective consultation and it did so on the advice at its disposal. I am not referring here to the hon. the Minister of Co-operation and Development; I am referring to legal advice. In other words, the decision of the court was given in spite of the fact that other legal advice became available to us. . . .

The Government of the Republic then issued a further proclamation, viz. R21 of 1982, in terms of the provisions of another Act, in order to achieve the same object. The KwaZulu Government likewise disputed this second proclamation in court and the aforesaid Supreme Court declared this proclamation null and void as well. An appeal was lodged against this court decision by the Government, but the Appeal Court upheld the decision of the Durban and Coast Local Division of the Supreme Court. This gave rise to the decree *nisi* granted in the first court case still being valid. As a result of a settlement between the parties, Proclamation R109 of 1982

1. See Southern Africa Record, no. 28, October 1982, pp. 34-38.

was declared null and void by the court and KwaZulu is once again in effective control of Ingwavuma. The settlement between the parties makes provision, *inter alia*, for the appointment of a commission of inquiry into Ingwavuma. Let me just add here that I played a personal part in these talks. I should therefore like to express my thanks to the King of the Zulus, who also played his part in this connection, and who did so in an honourable and sensible way.

The terms of reference given to the commission were to institute an investigation into and bring out a report and make recommendations on the conflicting claims between the Kingdom of Swaziland and KwaZulu, concerning the Ingwavuma district, and, having regard to the interests of the inhabitants of Ingwavuma, to consider the desirability or otherwise of border adjustments between South Africa and Swaziland. The commission, under the chairmanship of Mr Justice Rumpff, was appointed by notice in the Gazette. Besides the chairman, the commission consists of five members nominated by the Government of the Republic of South Africa and three members nominated by the Government of KwaZulu. The Legislative Assembly of Kangwane had been abolished by proclamation since 18 June 1982, and as a result of the decision of the Appeal Court a settlement between the two parties has agreed to in the case of Ingwavuma. The settlement the applicants and the respondent provided, *inter alia*, that the question of border adjustments between the Republic of South Africa and the Kingdom of Swaziland, insofar as these affect Kangwane, should also be referred to the commission for investigation and report, and that the Government of Kangwane should also be allowed to nominate three representatives in this case as members of the commission.

What I must say here at this stage is that the Government was never in any way imbued with the spirit of acting in an arrogant and unilateral way here, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition alleged. We, and I personally, went out of our way — long before the time — to find a solution by way of discussions, but we were unable to succeed in doing so. However, the Government is not dealing only with Ingwavuma. Nor is the government dealing only with Chief Minister Buthelezi, like the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The Government is dealing with neighbouring states. The Government is dealing with a legacy left behind by previous regimes, regimes long before there was an NP Government. We have to cope with these problems. Earlier today I said that Africa was clinging in an unnatural way to colonial border arrangements which caused it far more grief than joy.

South Africa. *Republic*. House of Assembly Debates, no. 1, 28 January–4 February 1983, cols. 145–148.

Namibia

- A. Extracts, concerning South West Africa/Namibia, from a statement in Parliament by the South African Prime Minister, the Hon. P.W. Botha, on 1 February 1983.

I come now to another matter, that of South West Africa. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition raised the matter in this House, and I want to tell him that if he reads the statement I made about this matter in this House last year in conjunction with what I am going to add now, he will have the full picture. I still stand by that statement.

The Republic has consistently co-operated, with the five Western countries in particular, to help make a positive settlement possible in South West Africa. Not for a moment can we be accused of not having been available at all times and not having co-operated in seeking a solution. The five Western powers knew, and still know today, that South Africa is not prepared to hand over South West Africa at the point of a gun and to allow the Red flag to fly in Windhoek. I have said repeatedly and I say again here today: We will not do that; we would rather fight. At every stage of the negotiations there was proper consultation with the internal parties. I personally wore myself out, together with the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Defence, and we went out of our way to consult the internal parties, and we consulted all of them; not just one of them. We spent hours, days and nights consulting with these people in order to convey their standpoints to the five Western powers. Eventually we also succeeded in persuading representatives of the five Western powers to go to Windhoek themselves to consult with the internal parties there.

This is what our attitude has been and still is today. Meanwhile, we have borne a great financial burden in respect of South West Africa, a burden which no other member of the international community has helped to bear up to now. I have had the figures checked by an expert, information covering a number of years, and it is amazing to see what South Africa has

done to meet its obligations — in fact, more than its obligations — to South West Africa. Excluding military expenditure, expenditure affecting the security of SWA, and excluding customs arrangements, the Republic has assisted SWA, to the tune of R1 721 million since 1977 in the form of direct subsidies and loans. This is an enormous amount. As I have said, this excludes military expenditure, customs arrangements and our contribution in the case of Ruacana in the form of a loan.

I readily concede that the military security and stability of SWA is of strategic importance to the Republic as well. I do not deny that; I have never denied it. But the success which the security forces have achieved against SWAPO has also been to the direct benefit of the vast majority of the people of South West. Their security, their properties, their families, their education, their churches — all those things have been safeguarded by the success which the SADF has had against SWAPO.

Let us take off our hats today to a Defence Force which, under difficult circumstances, has been the second since the Second World War to deal effectively with terrorists across the border.

The Red flag in Windhoek can only bring untold misery to the people of South West Africa, because the Red flag is the symbol of decay, of hunger and of economic despair in Angola. It is also the symbol of decay, of starvation and of death in Mozambique and in Zimbabwe. Surely this is so. Why should we try to gloss over the facts? We do not wish that fate upon South West Africa, because of its ties with South Africa, but also because of our strategic interests, and for the sake of the people themselves, we do not wish that fate upon South West Africa. Therefore we hope that the multiplicity of political parties in South West Africa will be reduced. I must say it is a maze of political parties, an absolute maze. I think there are some of them that have more leaders than followers. . . .

I want to appeal to the inhabitants of South West Africa to lend their active co-operation in putting an end to this state of affairs. In fact, I believe that I do so with the support of this House today. . . . Of course there may be exceptions, people who cannot think for themselves. However, we shall leave them out of it. The great majority of members in this House will agree with me that one cannot have 40 political parties for a population of about 1 million people. . . .

I have no wish to choose the political leaders of the people of South West Africa. That is their own affair. However, they should take my advice, because I have to act with responsibility towards the taxpayers of South Africa, and my advice to them is that they cannot carry on in this irresponsible manner while at the same time expecting the taxpayers of South Africa to put up with these things. Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition says that we did not treat Mr Mudge as we should have, but I did not deprive Mr Mudge of his followers. I did not tell Peter Kalangula

to walk out. Nor did I tell Mr Josef Garoep to walk out. I did not create those difficulties. . . .

The internal relations politics of South West Africa cannot be practised without taking into account the realities of the existence and ideals of minority groups. If one refuses to recognize this — and I am afraid that the international community completely fails to see it, because, I believe, they are not familiar with the circumstances there — and if one does not recognize the realities of the existence of the minority groups in South West Africa, one is not facing up to the problems of that country. By denying that, one is bringing disaster upon that territory. The people of South West Africa must seek their own internal solutions, but we must help them, because we have a responsibility towards them. The South African Government does not interfere, but it does try to give advice where necessary.

South Africa. *Republic*. House of Assembly Debates, no. 1, 28 January–4 February 1983, cols. 131–134.

B. Statement by the Zimbabwean Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Hon. Witness Mangwende, issued in Harare on 24 February 1983.

In the light of the goings and comings in the Namibian independence saga, and also in the interest of clarity on this burning issue to us and indeed to the international community as a whole, it is incumbent on us to expose what, in fact, the main impediments to Namibia's independence are.

Firstly, the southern part of a sovereign state — Angola, a member of the United Nations, the Organisation of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement, is occupied by the troops of apartheid South Africa.

South Africa now wants to give conditions to its victim, Angola, which are supposed to determine the progress, or lack of it, of the Namibian people to independence. Surely, it is quite obvious to any sane human being that South African occupation of southern Angola is the problem and not the acceptance or non-acceptance of its conditions to Angola.

The military occupation of parts of a sovereign state is a clear violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and indeed of the UN Charter itself and international law and practice.

How can the international community be expected to accept racist South Africa's aggression on Angola as normal in international relations? South Africa must unconditionally withdraw from Angola forthwith: Its

occupation of Angola is now the main obstacle to the independence of Namibia.

Secondly, the other obstacle to Namibia independence is the irrelevant moribund US diplomacy on this issue. The Reagan Administration has ill-advisedly laboured to project the presence of Cuban internationalist forces in Angola as the main obstacle to Namibia's independence. So much effort is being spent to try and divert the international community's attention from the real issue — Namibia's independence — to a non-issue (the presence of Cuban internationalist forces in Angola).

What has the presence of Cuban internationalist forces in Angola to do with the independence of Namibia? Is it not the right of two independent sovereign states to establish mutually beneficial relations between themselves? Is the right of the Namibian people to self-determination to be perpetually mortgaged to US geopolitical considerations and ambitions?

Undoubtedly anyone who has keenly followed the painstaking and protracted negotiations of the Namibian independence issue ever since the Security Council Resolution 435¹ was adopted as the international consensus on this crisis, will know that South Africa never raised the presence of Cuban internationalist forces in Angola as an obstacle to Namibian independence.

What South Africa was worried about was what it wrongly thought to have been the UN Secretariat's partiality in favour of SWAPO and also its desire to ensure that modalities leading to Namibia's independence were worked out in its favour.

Apart from a few issues — South Africa's refusal to announce the electoral system it prefers (proportional or single member constituency system), the final composition of UNTAG, which in fact is almost agreed to now, and its refusal to name when the process to Namibian independence will start — all those modalities have finally been worked out and agreed upon by all parties to the conflict.

I dare say, even today, South Africa does not regard the presence of Cuban internationalist forces in Angola as a main obstacle to Namibian independence.

The US Administration has concocted what it styles constructive engagement policy with South Africa. Put simply this means that the US must embrace the apartheid regime in order to influence it.

Even if one were insane enough to give credence to this fallacious and in fact delusory idea, this bears no relationship of any consequence to the crude demand that Cuban internationalist forces must be withdrawn from Angola.

What the US should be telling South Africa and the whole world is that

1. See *Southern Africa Record* no. 14, December 1978, pp. 43-44.

racist troops should stop occupying parts of Angola and cease forthwith the delinquent policy of destabilising countries in the southern African region. Furthermore South Africa should start implementing United Nations Security Council Resolution 435 immediately.

This is what the international community wants and this is indeed the business at hand. Let us get on with the business. Let us stop prevaricating and blackmailing the people of Namibia.

Press statement 122/83/PR/MM issued by the Department of Information, Zimbabwe

C. *Interview with Mr Sam Nujoma, President of Swapo, in Zimbabwe during Mr Nujoma's discussions with Prime Minister Mugabe, reported on 16 May 1983**

"I can only say that SWAPO is ready to sign a ceasefire and is ready to talk directly to the Pretoria regime in order to put an end to the strife, war and bloodshed in our country," SWAPO president Sam Nujoma said in an interview in his hotel room.

"As far as SWAPO is concerned, the ceasefire would have come into effect in January 1981 during the Geneva pre-implementation conference.

"But the South African racist delegation there were reluctant to sign a ceasefire agreement and, up to now, South Africa refuses to accept the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 435," he said.

Mr Nujoma traces back the present deadlock in the protracted negotiations towards a Namibian solution to early 1981, when Mr Ronald Reagan became President of the United States.

"The Reagan Administration first tried to amend 435. When they failed they tried using muscle power to block the implementation of 435 by injecting elements, such as the Cuban troop withdrawal, as a precondition for Namibian independence," he said.

"Initially, the Western Five contact group was genuine in its efforts to assist the UN to help the Namibian people to achieve freedom and independence."

But, according to Mr Nujoma, the Reagan Administration has "hijacked" the contact group (with the exception of France, which, Mr Nu-

* Originally published in the *Rand Daily Mail* (Johannesburg), 16 May 1983, and reproduced here with the kind permission of the editor.

1. See *Southern Africa Record* no. 14, December 1978, pp. 43-44.

joma said, officially dissociated itself twice from demands for a Cuban troop withdrawal. SWAPO has condemned the Cuban issue as extraneous).

"The United States is leading the other three (members of the contact group: Britain, Canada and West Germany) in support of South Africa's campaign to sabotage the efforts of the international community to find a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem, leading to elections and independence."

He said the United States, motivated by economic and strategic interests, was assisting South Africa to delay a settlement "even to the extent of denying the Namibian people the knowledge of the type of electoral system they are to participate in".

SWAPO, however, had repeatedly stated it was prepared to fight "a free and fair election" . . . whether under a system of proportional representation or in single member constituencies, as long as the exercise was supervised by the United Nations.

Turning to racial conflict in southern Africa, Mr Nujoma accused Mr Reagan of "sympathising with the minority white settlers in South Africa because they happen to be fellow whites".

"We see the Reagan Administration promote racial hatred in southern Africa and that is certainly a disservice to the whites there . . . particularly to the future generations.

"If the whites of South Africa and Namibia have to live in this part of the African continent, they have to identify themselves with the interests of the indigenous people.

"Our future policy is to welcome the whites, because we feel they are part and parcel of Namibia.

"They will therefore be protected by the rules of the land, as well as their properties.

"There is no single African who will go and rob or even take a little from a white person. Namibia is a huge territory, and it has enough resources at least to provide each and every citizen with a better living."

But Mr Nujoma believes his party's military wing — the People's Liberation Army of Namibia (PLAN) — has much work ahead before any settlement is reached.

"PLAN's role is to speed up the emancipation of Namibia and, therefore, is part and parcel of the policy of SWAPO to fight and liberate Namibia and its people from colonialism, imperialism, racism and exploitation of man by man."

He dismissed recent claims by spokesmen for the South West Africa Territory Force that PLAN's latest thrust into "white" Namibia had been a failure.

"The Boers themselves have been announcing their fatalities," he said.

He said PLAN had the capability to force South Africa to negotiate with SWAPO.

"We have paralysed part of the economy of the country. The Ruacana hydro-electric supply to the Rossing uranium mine and to the rest of the country has been destroyed by determined cadres — men and women of PLAN — and more action will be taken against the racist economic infrastructure in order to ensure that the regime is forced to accept a genuine negotiated settlement under Security Council Resolution 435."

He said the failed South African sponsored DTA, National Assembly and Ministers Council had been an "evil attempt to deceive the Namibian people into supporting a homeland system".

"But the Namibian people, under the leadership of SWAPO, are too politically mature and never supported these puppets, until they collapsed.

"Any new attempt at an internal settlement will be fought with vigour and determination by PLAN and politically and diplomatically by SWAPO".

Mr Nujoma, who appeared relaxed and spontaneous throughout the interview, addressed me as a South African for the first time during my final question when I tried to press him on what assistance a SWAPO government would give the African National Congress of South Africa, with which it has close links.

"You are a South African. I think you are just aware you are in danger as a white person if you don't join ANC while there is time," he said when I asked him to clarify his reply to my question.

I did not finally get a categorical answer, but was left with the impression that a SWAPO government would give whatever diplomatic, moral and financial support it could to the ANC but not permission to establish bases in Namibia.

Mr Nujoma said talk by South Africa and the United States of ANC bases in a SWAPO-ruled Namibia was "cheap propaganda".

South Africa was "cunningly manoeuvring to maintain control" by implementing its "so-called constitutional dispensation," which included coloureds and Asians but committed millions of Africans to "concentration camps known as bantustans".

South Africa was "sitting on a volcano which will explode one day and smash everybody, including Botha, to pieces," he said.

As long as oppression remained (in South Africa) people will resist . . . even whites at a later stage will definitely join the struggle in order to eliminate neo-Nazism, fascism and racial oppression, he said.

"The people of South Africa are already struggling inside South Africa and the outcome will never depend on Namibian independence.

"Certainly, Namibia is not going to be a base of oppression against any other country . . . but the people of Namibia will support the rights of the people of South Africa to freedom and independence."

Zimbabwe

A Extracts from an address by the Zimbabwean Prime Minister, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, at the Seventh Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in New Delhi from 7–11 March 1983.

Relations with South Africa

The Seventh Summit of our movement is taking place against a background of a dangerously critical international scene and in this context the survival, viability and solidarity of the Non-Aligned Movement have become even more imperative than hitherto. Our contemporary international system is being buffeted by a number of grave problems solutions to which remain elusive but which, if allowed to persist, cannot but imperil the security, peace and prosperity of all our countries.

With your indulgence, I wish to start my brief review of the international scene from the southern African region. Almost every leader in that region has drawn the attention of the international community to the dangerous policies of the apartheid regime in Pretoria. Inside South Africa itself, the racist regime continues relentlessly on its course of inhumanity and the unrelieved oppression of the mass of the people under its ferocious domination. Every form of political expression or protest is denied them.

Even the mildest form of such protest is ruthlessly and brutally throttled. As a result, the oppressed masses of South Africa have taken the only step that is logical and justifiable: the armed struggle against the oppressive white minority regime. In this, they have every right to expect the moral, material and diplomatic assistance the Movement of Non-Aligned countries can give.

The Pretoria fascists are, however, not content merely to lord it over the millions under their jackboot. They labour daily to extend their savagery to all the free states in our region. Distinguished delegates will recall the reckless and contemptuous disregard of all norms of international law displayed by the Pretoria regime when, in the dead of night on December

9, 1982, it unleashed its murderous troops upon Maseru, the capital of the Kingdom of Lesotho. The unsuspecting victims of this absolutely savage act of unjustifiable aggression were both Basotho citizens and South African refugees, mainly young women and children.

These cold blooded massacres were by no means isolated, for in its dual strategy of terror and repression at home, and military aggression and economic brute-bullying abroad, the pariah regime has also slaughtered many innocent souls in Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe and even as far as the Seychelles on the Indian Ocean. These insane activities of the Pretoria regime are part of its policy of regional destabilization, which has three main objects: the negation of the liberation struggles in South Africa and in Namibia, which South Africa continues to occupy in arrogant defiance of the Namibian people and the entire international community. Secondly to intimidate and deter the governments and peoples of frontline states and other neighbouring countries from supporting the struggling South African and Namibian masses. Thirdly the foiling of our regional co-operation endeavour under the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference.

The lack of progress on the Namibian question is now an international scandal and a shame. It is now almost four years since a realistic and internationally acceptable formula to solve the problem was worked out. And yet, Security Council Resolution 435¹ remains unimplemented, and in serious danger of being undermined by the activities of some of its own authors, who encourage South African intransigence. These countries assist South Africa in manufacturing all types of pretexts for delaying the implementation of the United Nations Plan. We have been told that the regime will not co-operate with the United Nations in implementing the plan until Cuban troops have been withdrawn from Angola. What an absurdity! The people of Zimbabwe categorically reject this contrived, irrational and quite irrelevant condition.

South Africa and those who give her solace in her arrogant defiance of the just demands of the international community must be left in no doubt as to where we stand on this urgent question. We must give all-round assistance and support to SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative liberation movement of the struggling Namibian people. This conference, moreover, should now call upon the Security Council to meet as soon as possible and take appropriate measures to compel South Africa to comply forthwith with its resolutions and decisions on the Namibian question.

Equally unacceptable and outrageous, is the fact that a large part of South Africa's army has with impunity invaded and occupied southern Angola. What is shocking to us is that the world has by its silence ac-

1. See *Southern Africa Record* no. 14, December 1978, pp. 43-44.

quiesced in this continuing act of naked aggression against Angola, which seriously threatens that country's revolution, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Surely this movement must render Angola every form of support in her efforts to expel the aggressive enemy from her sovereign territory.

.....

North/South economic relations

In our view, the pervasive recession the world is experiencing is not just cyclical, nor are the high rates of unemployment in so many countries today just the product of a prolonged down-turn in the world economy nor simply the byproduct of deflationary or monetarist policies aimed at combating inflation. It has become abundantly clear that the underlying problem afflicting the international economy is structural; it is inherent in the inequitable and in large measure archaic system epitomised in the Bretton-Woods institutions and the simplistic, almost chimerical belief in free market forces in the grim face of market power.

Against this general background, the world economy needs restructuring in respect of the decision-making process, redirection of resources to change the pattern of production and trade and, more fundamentally, reformulation of the principles and the rules that govern our international trade, financial and monetary regimes and practices. For these reasons, the quest for a New International Economic Order must remain our absolute objective, whatever the obstacles and however forbidding the task.

Zimbabwe fully supports the prompt launching of the global round of negotiations, a challenge to which the whole world must react positively. But, this necessary and major exercise should not deflect us from taking immediate or short-term measures aimed at recovery in the world economy. In particular, attention should be directed at the pressing problems of huge debt burdens and balance of payments deficits which cripple so many of our developing countries, throw development plans into utter disarray and cause stagnation in growth and employment.

It is our hope that in the spheres of trade and development and the concomitant monetary and financial dimensions of development and payment arrangements the next real opportunity will be at Belgrade on the occasion of UNCTAD VI. There the fundamental issues must be addressed and immediate measures examined or pressed with. In Belgrade, the nations of the world must seize the opportunity to provide a new impetus, to come to grips with the central issues of trade, raw materials and commodities, money and finance, and make a decisive contribution to the global negotiations that are to follow, as well as pinpoint the pressing measures so urgently required to reactivate the world economy and which could bring relief to so many national economies now in such dire straits.

We, of the Third World do not, of course, sit on our laurels of political independence while awaiting the processes of global inter-dependence to unfold. In many decisive ways we are our own masters, throughout the gamut of national efforts, collective self-reliance and global co-operation. In this, the South-South dimension is critical, but it must go beyond words and pious resolutions. Collective self-reliance on the south-south basis can enhance our development efforts, give credibility to our solidarity as well as negotiating muscle in international fora.

In brief, south-south co-operation is not only an action-oriented strategy for economic development; it is also an international strategy to enhance the bargaining power of the South vis-à-vis the North.

Let me avail myself again of this opportunity to reiterate that Zimbabwe is proud and honoured to be a member of this great movement. My country puts great importance on the success of this conference and the further positive development of the Non-Aligned Movement. We are well aware of the difficulties ahead as our movement traverses into the third decade of its existence. The integrity and unity of the non-aligned countries will meet even greater challenges. Yet we have only one option: to succeed at all costs.

Text 195/83/ST/JM issued by the Department of Information, Zimbabwe

B. *Extracts from an address, concerning Britain's role in Zimbabwe; and internal stability; by the Zimbabwean Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Hon. Witness Mangwende, at a farewell for the outgoing British High Commissioner, Mr Robin Byatt, in Harare on 24 March 1983.*

I wish, on behalf of the Government and on my own behalf, to express warm and sincere thanks to you, High Commissioner Byatt, for the manner in which you have served your country in Zimbabwe. All of us recognise that you came at a very difficult and delicate period in the history of Zimbabwe and the United Kingdom relations; a time when even a slight mistake could have seriously soured relations between Whitehall and Harare. . . .

There were times, as you well know, when not everybody in Britain or indeed in Zimbabwe was always happy with decisions my Government and yours took.

.....
You will recall that prior to independence, the war was claiming 50 lives

and costing about one million dollars a day in public expenditure, in order to maintain an unjust system. That bloody period of shame in our history left the newly independent state of Zimbabwe a legacy of mistrust and bitterness as well as a number of armies and heavily armed white population. In fact, the stage was then ready for an uncontrollable racial and civil strife, which threatened to disrupt the process of peaceful development after the Lancaster House Agreement. It was in order to prevent such a disruption that the Prime Minister inaugurated a government of national unity and the magnanimous policy of national reconciliation. One of the goals of this policy was to dissolve all the different forces and create a united national army.

It is no secret to all of you that our success in integrating the rival forces was, in no small measure, due to the generous assistance we received from the British Government through the British Military Advisory Team (BMAT). We want you to carry back to your Government our gratitude as a nation for this timely assistance. We are proud of the achievements of BMAT. It is my hope that Her Majesty's Government, and indeed the British people as a whole, will be proud of their achievements here in Zimbabwe and will further intensify their support for the Zimbabwe Government to ensure that our collective success is not whittled away by certain elements in our society committed to lawlessness and disorder.

In other areas, the British Government has provided much needed assistance for our reconstruction, resettlement, manpower training, rural and urban development projects. . . .

I do not wish to go into the details of British assistance. What is of relevance to us is the spirit in which High Commissioner Byatt presided over the implementation of that aid. In this connection, I wish to note that Mr Byatt showed great sympathy, understanding and respect for Zimbabwe's sovereignty and principles. He understood and respected our desire that aid should not be used as an instrument to direct our policies. He sought to promote friendship between Britain and Zimbabwe and not to turn us into neo-colonial puppets of the United Kingdom.

We fought for justice and we are determined to continue to pursue the cause of justice. We fought for our sovereignty and national dignity and we are determined to preserve this dignity. Sovereignty is not negotiable and it is the principle on which all nations stand. We in Zimbabwe uphold this principle and it will guide both our internal and external policies.

There is at the moment an orchestrated anti-Zimbabwe campaign in some foreign press. I am told that this campaign of falsehoods and exaggerations is causing some of our friends to reconsider giving aid to Zimbabwe. I understand some countries are considering to use aid to lean on the Government of Zimbabwe so that it can go soft in fighting dissidents and banditry. I wish to state categorically, that, while we do not treat this

threat idly we will neither heed nor accept it. We do not accept aid with strings attached, especially strings that make a mockery of our independence and democratic principles. All the true friends of this country must surely be aware of the humane and conciliatory manner in which the Government of Cde Mugabe has tried to solve the inherited problems of this country. *It is also no secret that while the Zimbabwe Government has been trying to deal with those issues the racist Pretoria regime has been destabilising our economy and fostering internal dissidents in our midst.*

All of you here will recall that in 1982, the people of Zimbabwe witnessed cases of murders, rape, armed robberies and the destruction of expensive equipment badly needed for reconstruction and development projects in Matabeleland. These activities were posing a serious threat in the affected areas to peaceful development and causing a breakdown of law and order. Nobody can deny the fact that the Government was faced with a situation which required firm action. Yet a section of the international media has chosen to cover up all our problems and forget our achievements by portraying us in the most negative light.

As a Government committed to justice and the rule of law, a Government which was established by a popular mandate, we are solemnly charged with the responsibility to defend Zimbabwe's masses and their hard won independence. We will not shrink, therefore, from using the necessary force when faced with disorder created by unscrupulous armed elements. *After examining the deteriorating situation created by acts of banditry, the Government was left with no choice but to pursue a dual strategy of finding political and military solutions to the problem. No Government worth its name could condone the type of lawlessness that was facing us. We had no choice but to take a firm stand against murder, rape and robberies perpetrated against innocent citizens of this country. Only last week, two innocent old farmers and their families were butchered in cold blood. Who will such innocent lives turn to if we as a popularly elected Government, fail to stamp out the evil menace to society?*

Given the circumstances, we cannot, therefore, accept the uninformed criticism of armchair critics who, through their silence over the escalation of dissidence, not only condone but implicitly promote what dissidents seek to achieve and, thus sanctify their actions. We shall not be party to the betrayal of the hard won independence of the people of Zimbabwe and we shall use all the means necessary to preserve this independence.

Press statement 212/83/DC issued by the Department of Information, Zimbabwe

- C. Extracts from an address warning ZAPU on subversion, by the Zimbabwean Prime Minister, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, at an independence anniversary reception in Bulawayo, on 18 April 1983.

Our independence is a national phenomenon which, as it bestowed a new sovereignty over our nation also equated each and everyone of us. Through it, we are all now an equal people with equal political rights. Through it, we have all now acquired a sense of belonging, first to Zimbabwe, and secondly to one another, for we now have a common nationality and a common destiny within a common geographical entity, that is Zimbabwe.

There are no longer superior or inferior citizens by virtue of their race, colour, tribe, region or religion. We are all of us nothing more or less than equal before the Government, before our law and before our courts. Accordingly, within the eyes of the State our communities are equal and their demands must, where they are the same, be treated equally.

This phenomenon of equality was one of the objectives for which we waged our national struggle and for which so many of our heroic young men and women died. We are glad that their blood was not shed in vain, for the cause of freedom and equality for which they sacrificed their lives has been won and won soundly.

.....
In other words, my party, ZANU, prompted by the spirit of national reconciliation decided, entirely on its own, that a government of national unity was preferable to an exclusively ZANU government.

Surely this magnanimous gesture by my party and Government deserved positive reciprocity from those to whom the gesture was made in the national spirit to unite all our peoples. Alas, that hand of friendship was construed by some ZAPU leaders as weakness on our part. Arms were cached on strategically selected farmsteads with a view of their being used at a vantage moment.

Indeed, a spate of dissident activities followed in the wake of our discovery of most of those arms. Thus, robberies, callous murders, rapes, kidnappings of foreign tourists and our nationals, arson and malicious destruction to public property, have now become the pastimes of politically misguided criminal activists in this region. What these political misfits and malcontents hope to gain by this wave of violence no one knows. No Government worth its name can ever be intimidated into changing its course by crime and lawlessness.

I am glad, however, that the majority of the people in Matabeleland are for peace, progress and prosperity. My message to the dissidents and bandits is that they drop their guns and support fully Government policies and programmes aimed at their achieving these three vital p's (peace, progress

and prosperity). Government has designed a national mechanism for working towards the progress and prosperity of our nation.

That mechanism is the Three-Year Transitional National Development Plan which embraces a set of programmes to be spread over all our economic sectors and directed by each and every Minister of Government towards the attainment of defined set goals.

The plan covers land resettlement and rural development; the expansion of the educational system and provision of more educational facilities; the development of our health service and the provision of more health facilities; the further development of our railway system and the building of more roads; the development of our residential housing system and the provision of more houses in both urban and rural areas; the provision of more pipe-borne water facilities to rural areas; the organisation and training of the worker and his involvement in the management and decision-making process in the enterprise which employs him.

These and many other objectives encompassed in the Three-Year Plan, cannot be attained either in part or in full unless firstly, there is peace, and, secondly, we are all fully dedicated as participants alongside Government to their accomplishment.

To Government, and I am sure, to most people not only in this region but throughout the country, peace has become a matter of top priority. A community which, as several communities have in the past done, decides actively to sympathise and side with the dissidents and bandits, for whatever reason, must not get shocked when my Government or its armed forces view its action as that of an enemy of peace, law and order.

That community will have no one to blame if its members are as severely punished as dissidents and bandits for they will have chosen to be one with them and party to their illegitimate cause. Obviously, it cannot ever be a sane policy to mete our blanket punishment to innocent persons, although in areas where banditry and dissident activities are rampant and civilian sympathy is a common feature, it may not always be possible to distinguish the innocent from the guilty.

As we move into the fourth year of our independence, I ask all of you here and those in the provinces you represent that is in the Midlands, Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South, to commit yourselves to greater peace in your areas, harder work by the people and good leadership by those chosen to lead the people in the rural and urban councils.

Cases of ZAPU councillors and ZAPU branch, district and provincial officials who have been found to be working in complicity with dissidents and directly aiding and abetting their criminal activities have been far too many. Their numerous lawless acts clearly constitute a general indictment against ZAPU as a subversive organisation.

If this trend and its common feature of subversion continues, I can as-

sure you that my Government will not hesitate in prescribing ZAPU. For now, however, we are happy that against this wave of banditry and subversive acts by a misguided section of ZAPU there also exists a strong opposition to it by some of its members, mainly those in Government and others whose clear views we have come to know.

What we should all energetically strive to achieve is the unity of our nation in accordance with our enunciated policy of national reconciliation. My party and Government can never accept the philosophy of the dissidents and their misguided political mentors in ZAPU that whatever the results of our democratic elections in 1980, ZAPU, which was the clear loser, is entitled to rule and Joshua Nkomo to replace Robert Mugabe as Prime Minister.

Well, as they have been clearly shown, we cannot be replaced that easily and I refuse to yield to anyone but the people of Zimbabwe who elected my Party to power.

Surely, in the situation in which colonialism and imperialism have been vanquished and freedom and equality characterise our new democratic political order, the most urgent task which should concern all of us, whether we are ZANU or ZAPU, white or black, Kalanga, Karanga, Ndebele, Zezuru, Venda, Manyika, Tonga, Shangani, Korekore, Ndau, Nadzva, is the achievement of progress and prosperity among all our people.

To my party and Government none of these ethnic groups are more important than others and none whatsoever is receiving any deliberate preference solely by virtue of its ethnicity. We all are one and equal for, being Zimbabweans, we own our country and its resources together; we share in equal measure, our Zimbabwean nationality; and we owe, also in equal measure, allegiance to Zimbabwe and no other state.

This indeed is the view we should all have, and if we do, then united we shall achieve peace, progress and prosperity, but divided we are doomed to poverty and suffering. I am for peace, progress and prosperity. What is your own choice?

Well, let us see what it turns out to be in the fourth year of our National Independence.

Text 281/83/PR issued by the Department of Information, Zimbabwe

- D. Address, concerning national achievement, but also the effects of lawlessness, by the Zimbabwean President, Rev. the Hon. Canaan Banana, on the third anniversary of independence, in Harare on 18 April 1983.

It is my privilege and very great honour, Comrades, to address you today, as our nation prepares to cross over the threshold into its fourth year of sovereign statehood and freedom and as, together, we brace ourselves

for what threatens to be a most demanding and challenging year for us all.

It will probably be the most difficult period we Zimbabweans have yet had to face since the birth of our nation just three years ago.

It will certainly require, from each and every one of us, the same courage, tenacity, strength of character and determination, so magnificently developed during the long years of our liberation struggle, if we are to successfully defend our hard-won freedom and maintain our course towards prosperity and progress for all.

But, fellow Comrades, in addition to courage, tenacity and determination, our future, and that of our succeeding generations, depends on all of us channelling our energies, and resources into one common direction. Without this unity of purpose, and this togetherness, there can be no real progress, for we will remain weak and vulnerable — not only to external enemies, but also to those who would seek to destroy us from within.

As a unified nation, with an over-riding oneness of purpose to guide and protect us, there is no challenge, no obstacle and no enemy too big that we cannot face and overcome.

The past three years, when taken as a whole, have proved that Zimbabweans are more than adequately equipped to meet the challenges a new nation such as ours has to face. I have been filled with pride and overjoyed to watch over and witness the determination of Zimbabweans — so recently divided by a bitter and bloody conflict — to distance themselves from that past and to create a solid multiracial and non-racial base upon which future generations of Zimbabweans will be able to build a sound and viable nation.

It has been more than gratifying to all of us to experience the slow but definite reaching out by the majority of Zimbabweans to their fellow Zimbabweans — the grasping of hands in friendship and the squaring of shoulders as our people turn to face the future, standing side by side, linked by a genuine desire for peace, partnership and progress.

Sadly, Comrades, this wonderful healing spirit of friendship and reconciliation is not shared by all. Over the past year, we have seen the spread within our young nation of a cancerous virus. I am referring to the dissidence menace, the existence of which poses an intolerable threat to our continued peace and national security.

Comrades, your Government was faced with a situation in which it either had to surrender power in certain parts of the country to a band of criminal gangsters, or it had to act to re-assert the authority vested in it by the overwhelming majority of our people in the February 1980 elections.

Government chose to act and did so in a decisive manner. It was a clear warning to dissident elements and those who are behind them that they will not win and that further opposition of this cowardly, murderous nature cannot and will not be tolerated.

The dissidents are bent on causing misery and division, and in so doing, are playing right into the hands of our enemies — particularly the racist Pretoria regime, which is always prepared to exploit any internal unrest in any of the Frontline States in order to further its own policies of destabilisation and subversion.

There is no doubt that the young men involved in these despicable acts of banditry have been misled by self-seeking politicians into believing that they can change the situation and overthrow the popularly elected Government by force of arms — what an expensive illusion, the biggest joke in living memory.

Who in his proper senses would choose to fight against freedom and lead a life of misery and self-inflicted oppression? Who in his proper senses would choose to live an outlaw for the rest of his life?

It is my hope that all our people will continue to co-operate with the forces of law and order, until all forms of banditry and lawlessness are completely eliminated from every corner of Zimbabwe.

Notwithstanding the isolated incidents of banditry, Zimbabwe remains one of the most peaceful, stable and progressive countries among developing nations. This one particularly sad and troublesome area should not be allowed to mar or overshadow the very real and impressive progress your Government has made towards the achievement of its objectives, as a whole, over the past twelve months.

It is not too late for the dissidents to abandon their forlorn cause at the hands of unscrupulous politicians who are unashamedly willing agents of foreign powers.

It is most unfortunate, indeed a tragic irony, that these misguided people are now bent on destroying the very freedom and independence they and their colleagues fought to bring about. Those of their colleagues who fell on the battlefield for the noble cause of nationhood must turn with pain and anguish in their graves at this disgraceful somersault.

Government on the other hand, is equally determined to strive for unity and national prosperity. The only way forward is through such unity. The overwhelming majority of Zimbabweans want unity, the only sure guarantee for lasting peace and security. Those who stand in the way of unity are resisting the popular will of the masses.

Unity, however, will not be brought about by empty phrases; it can only be achieved through decisive action. National unity is greater than individuals — self-seeking individuals have no constructive role to play in the development of our country. Zimbabwe needs selfless men and women who are prepared to put the interest of their country before person glory and self-aggrandizement.

To those who will have us torn apart by petty and parochial issues, may I remind them that Zimbabwe demands of us all a high sense of calling that

requires us to rise above tribal and regional loyalties; our duty and responsibility to our nation should transcend all the venomous scourges of nepotism, tribalism, regionalism, ethnocentrism, and egocentrism.

It is incumbent on all Zimbabweans to respond to a higher and nobler call of national unity, with a single national identity. We are all one; we are all Zimbabweans, irrespective of where we may be born or where we might work or reside; or the language we might speak. There is room for all in Zimbabwe to live in harmony and peace.

In spite of an exceedingly hostile press campaign mounted by the western media, our international standing and reputation have continued to grow as a result of Zimbabwe's increasing participation in international fora and as witnessed by our election to the United Nations Security Council, and the election of the Prime Minister, Cde Robert Mugabe, as one of the Vice Chairmen of the recent New Delhi Non-Aligned Movement Summit.

Nearly 60 countries and international organisations are now accredited to Harare and we, in our turn, have established 21 diplomatic missions abroad over the past three years.

We continue to play our role, as a fully non-aligned nation, in the search for peaceful and just solutions whenever conflict between nations threaten the delicate peace and stability of our world, and we retain our position in the forefront of those developing nations earnestly seeking the establishment of a more just and equitable international economic order.

In our own region, we continue to play an active role within the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC), and are making slow, but sure progress in our march away from dependence on the racist Pretoria regime.

We are pledged to combat all forms of racism, colonialism and imperialism, wherever they may occur, and we are totally opposed to any and all forms of intervention and interference by one state in the internal affairs of another.

On the domestic front, enormous progress has been made in almost every field of Government's operations.

The acquisition of commercial land for redistribution to and resettlement of landless peasants continues to gain momentum. During the past twelve months, over one million hectares of land have been purchased and nearly 9 000 families have been successfully settled.

This brings the total area now reserved for resettlement to over two million hectares, and the total number of families settled since 1980, to over 21 000.

Over the past twelve months, 310 new co-operatives have been registered, marking yet further progress towards the socialist transformation of our economy through co-operative development.

As you will know, the harvesting of crops is now getting underway, but the prolonged drought has severely affected our agricultural production. In some areas, crops were completely wiped out and Government has had to act to provide emergency food aid to some of our people who would otherwise have certainly died from starvation.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend our farming community, both commercial and communal, for their untiring and courageous efforts to ensure adequate food production for our people, in spite of unfavourable climatic conditions and, in some parts of the country, in the face of a dangerous security situation.

The restoration of essential water supplies — particularly those supplies to irrigation schemes closed during the liberation war, has been a top priority for the Ministry of Water Resources and Development. Great emphasis has, of course, been placed on development within the rural areas, and in particular, on the provision of domestic water requirements to rural health centres, schools, army barracks and youth centres.

Local authorities throughout the nation are now beginning to adopt and implement Government's new national housing policy for both rural and urban areas. Building brigades are rapidly being formed and eight are already in effective operation. Another 15 are expected to become operational within the very near future.

Government's rural housing construction policy calls, of course, for the active co-operation and participation of the masses who will have to organise themselves and put up their houses on a self-help basis with the necessary technical and financial aid coming from Government in the form of loans.

In the field of health, Government has continued to make considerable progress in its thrust to improve rural health services. Emphasis has been placed on the improvement of preventive services and great strides have been taken in making health services available and accessible to as many Zimbabweans as possible.

My Government has also continued to make remarkable progress in the quantitative expansion of education so as to provide every Zimbabwean with the opportunity to be educated.

On the subject of Youth — I am delighted to learn that well over 350 000 young Zimbabweans have now been mobilised into youth brigades and have demonstrated their high level of responsibility to society by voluntarily engaging in numerous projects in support of Government programmes throughout the nation.

In industry and other work-places, I am pleased to note that the majority of employers have now fully realised the advantage of having workers' committees at their places of work and that genuine and voluntary co-operation is now evident in many industries.

The racial imbalance of the past in the Public Service has been corrected and black Zimbabweans now hold a majority of senior Government positions.

Emphasis within the Public Service will continue to be placed on the development of a sound infrastructure at all levels of Government, with constant in-service training taking place in a concerted effort to improve efficiency within our administration.

A strong administration infrastructure is absolutely crucial to our continued development and, in particular, to the efficient implementation of the projects and development called for under the three-year Transitional Development Plan.

In the field of communication, television transmissions are now in colour and there are plans to establish a second television channel to expand the transmission network to improve rural coverage.

One of the most crucial exercises being undertaken by the information and media services in the country is the drive to urge all those Zimbabweans eligible to vote, to register themselves as voters as soon as possible.

Government's efforts have resulted in the registration thus far of over 800 000 persons, but there is still an enormous amount of work to be reached by the end of this year. Your vote is your voice and it is your patriotic duty to make that voice heard.

A sharp drop in world metal prices placed enormous pressures on the mining industry in Zimbabwe as a whole.

A number of smaller mines were forced to close, and it was only through intensive Government activity and intervention that all our larger mines — with the exception of the Empress Nickel Mine — are still in operation.

The difficulties of the past year have provided a unique opportunity for Government and the mining companies to work closely together to come to fully appreciate each other's points of view.

Indeed, the future of the industry looks very bright as both Government and the mining companies are now working together towards the same goals.

During the year under review, Government moved towards the achievement of its stated goal of state participation in, and control of, the mining industry. To this end, the Mineral Marketing Corporation of Zimbabwe was established and now acts as the sole agent for the sale and export of all minerals produced from Zimbabwe.

Similarly, the Zimbabwe Mining Development Corporation — soon to be established — will be the vehicle through which the state will participate in the mining investment and operation. Government also acquired a 40 per cent controlling equity participation in the Wankie Colliery Company and has actively encouraged the setting up of mining co-operatives.

The world economic recession also had a marked negative effect on our industrial sector where productivity, generally, was low. The manufacturing sector, however, still offered good prospects for investment and over 100 new and expansion projects in various fields were approved.

Government's policy of participation in this sector was advanced by the acquisition of controlling interests in both CAPS Holdings and Olivine Industries.

As a nation, we experienced, in 1982, our worst fuel shortage since independence — a crisis arising from deliberate and calculated enemy action against our fuel storage and transport facilities.

I would like to commend you all for the mature and highly responsible manner in which you faced up to that particularly trying crisis.

In response to the severe pressures experienced as a result of the sharp appreciation of our dollar against the currencies of our major trading partners, Government decided to devalue the Zimbabwe dollar by 20 per cent. This bold move had the effect of restoring viability to our exporting sectors, preserving employment and generally assisting efforts to restore stability and balance to our external accounts.

Shortly before the devaluation, an export promotion scheme became operational and in conjunction with the devaluation, provided a stimulating incentive to manufacturers and producers to find export markets for their goods.

Preparations for the establishment of the Zimbabwe Development Bank are well advanced and work is also proceeding on a bill to establish the Zimbabwe Development Corporation in the not too distant future.

Zimbabwe's participation within multilateral financial institutions such as the African Development Bank, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), have facilitated the negotiation of a number of assistance packages from these institutions — the most notable being the recently announced IMF loan package of 375 million dollars to help Zimbabwe bear the effects of the world recession.

There are encouraging signs, however, that this terrible economic recession is slowly receding, and although it will take some time for the effects of any such recovery to make themselves felt in Zimbabwe, the measures your Government has taken to protect and strengthen the economy, will place Zimbabwe in an excellent position to take full advantage of an eventual upturn in the world economic situation.

If I have listed all these achievements and advances, and if I have dwelt at length with these very positive aspects of the past twelve months, it is simply to demonstrate that in spite of a very serious international economic recession, in spite of the brutal policy of insidious destabilisation being waged against our country by the racist Pretoria regime, and in spite of a determined attempt by certain misguided criminal elements within our

own society to cause division and to shatter our hard-won peace, through acts of savage banditry and subversion, the people's Government has nevertheless succeeded in making truly remarkable progress in the consolidation of our independence.

Comrades, for as long as there are those who continue to pull against the popular flow, our potential for development and progress will be adversely affected. We cannot allow these divisions to continue. We must strive for unity — and as we celebrate this, the third anniversary of our independence, let us all rededicate ourselves to this one, crucially important goal.

Let us make unity and peace our common theme throughout the year ahead, and let us strive to achieve them on all levels.

Let us work for peace in all our dealings as individuals. Let us strive for unity and peace within our family groups, and within our various communities.

Above all, let us strive for peace and unity as a nation, within the family of nations, and face up to the exciting and challenging year to come, in the sure knowledge that our togetherness, our over-riding oneness of purpose, will surely see us through. *Long live our hard-won independence.*

Press statement 259/83/MM issued by the Department of Information, Zimbabwe

- E. Extracts from a speech by the Zimbabwean Prime Minister, the Hon. Robert Mugabe, on the occasion of the installation of H.E. Rev. the Hon. Canaan Banana, as Chancellor of the University of Zimbabwe, on 9 May 1983.

It became imperative for our state to confer upon its highest institution of learning a new status consonant with our newly acquired status as an independent nation. The *University of Zimbabwe Act of 1982* is the legal instrument by which Government has sought to bestow this legal status on our University so it can, with authority, chart a new path in the sphere of learning, research and development.

Similarly, the act of installing the President of Zimbabwe as the Chancellor of the University of Zimbabwe symbolizes our disengagement from the colonial conditions of the Royal Charter subordinating the University to external direction.

Perhaps the University's new dispensation could be seen and appreciated in the light of what C.G. Weeramantry says about the failure of Western style Universities in many Third World countries:

These dispersed Western learning, often to the neglect of local cultures

and indigenous needs. They produced a class of Western-oriented intellectuals, looking to the West for guidance and support, and treating the values of the West as the values of relevance.

This historic occasion marks a new stage in the transformation of our University which should enable it to adapt to the new politico-socio-economic environment of our country and engender greater responsiveness to the needs and aspirations of the people of Zimbabwe as a whole.

More importantly, perhaps, the installation of our Head of State as the Chancellor of our University serves to demonstrate a commonness of purpose between the State and the University both in physical terms and in terms of policies designed to apply to the sphere of higher education.

Thus, one of the major features of the new relationship between the State and the University is the increase in the level of Government involvement in the affairs of the University. I would hasten to add that Government participation in the affairs of its institutions of higher learning is not a new thing either in Zimbabwe or elsewhere in the world. Universities are created by society to serve its needs.

This is why I stated in my address to the University audience of 1981, that "higher education was too important a business to be left entirely to deans, professors, lecturers and administrators," to the exclusion of the State. *It is both logical and imperative that Government, as the chief architect of national policy, including that on education, be involved in the affairs of the University through participation in its council in order to ensure that the university defines and pursues its policy objectives in full view of the parameters of the broad national objectives.*

Within these set parameters, the University should remain free to set its own goals and exercise its energies. Accordingly, a University or any institution for that matter, should create, define and pursue objectives which are in consonance with the broad national objectives as set out by a legitimate and democratic Government.

On this subject, listen to what one celebrated socialist leader, President Kim Il Sung, says on improving instruction and education at Universities, *in his concluding speech delivered at the meeting of the heads of departments of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea in 1963:*

University education is aimed at training revolutionary intellectuals of the working class needed for the completion of the Korean revolution and for the building of socialism in Korea. Our education should be in accord with the interests of the Korean revolution and the Korean people and should serve the successful fulfilment of our revolution and construction. This is precisely Juche (sic) in education.

We, in Zimbabwe, are not only of the same view but also of the same ideological persuasion. The principal object of my Government's political, social, cultural, technological, economic, and aesthetic innovations, is the

people, that is, their well-being in terms of their food, their health, their shelter, their education, their recreation and happiness. In pursuance of this objective, Government has adopted socialism as its ideological guide in the formulation of policies, programmes and legislation necessary to effect the desired socio-economic transformation.

In other words, we cannot hold our revolution as complete until we have built a socialist society. This clearly means that the political stage of freedom and independence which we have created in the country should now constitute the springboard for a socialist thrust to achieve democracy in the socio-economic sector.

We are, by virtue of our colonial history, still what Frantz Fanon describes in his famous work, *The Wretched of the Earth*, a "world cut in two," comprising the "haves" of our developed Zimbabwe and the "have-nots" of our under-developed Zimbabwe. Our ardent belief is that socialism alone offers us an unimpeachable basis of morality on whose strength we are committed to such modalities as can level up the social gaps responsible for the inequities characterising the lives of our people.

Although we are in the last group of African countries to get decolonised, our state of underdevelopment is by no means peculiar to us. As Peter Gutkind and Immanuel Wallerstein state at quite some length in their work, *Political Economy of Contemporary Africa*, with reference to the colonial era:

Indigenous economic structures largely lost their functions, legitimacy, and autonomy as they were incorporated into the colonial capitalist state with its primary objective of extraction of resources both physical and human. Subsistence economies were transformed into peasant or wage-labour structures. Africa's rural economy was transformed into a vast reservoir of labour to be shunted about according to the fortunes of the capitalist economies; and as a result, there was set in motion the process of proletarianisation dependency, and internal centre — periphery relations, that the dominance of towns over the rural areas, one region over another, or one African country over another.

This phenomenon, which is a peculiarity of most developing countries, is more acutely felt in countries, like our own, which have only recently attained their independence. Only a few days ago President Samora Machel, delivering the report of the Central Committee to the Fourth Congress of the Frelimo Party, had this to say on the subject:

In production and management of social and economic units, a monopoly of know-how and technology was kept in the hands of foreigners. At the time of independence, the number of skilled workers was insignificant; Mozambican owners of the means of production scarcely existed. For Mozambicans was reserved a place as cleaner, stevedore, unskilled labourer, domestic servant. Teachers in state primary edu-

cation, secondary, technical and higher education, engineers, lawyers, economists, agronomists, technicians, foremen, skilled workers, all those who held technical or management positions, even the least demanding, were foreigners. This factor is one that weighs most heavily today in the struggle against economic and cultural backwardness.

Hugh M. Arnold writing on "Africa and the New International Economic Order" in *Third World Quarterly Journal* Volume III, No. 3 (1980) states quite affirmatively that "the dominant trend in Africa is towards inequalities both among and within the nations. Most African states are characterised by marked internal inequalities in the distribution of wealth."

He adds that in the 1980's there has been a further intensification of these inequalities in Africa, and that with the exception of Tanzania the inequalities are being perpetuated. He goes on to quote Ann Siedmann who has suggested that since political independence in most African countries a newly emergent class variously referred to as the "bureaucratic bourgeoisie" or the "managerial bourgeoisie" has used the state political-economic machinery to enrich themselves.

This subject of socio-economic inequalities, either historically derived or currently created or perpetuated, is brought to your notice not because I regard the University as the primary instrument for the correction of our inequalities but because of its vital role, in the formation of intellectual and professional cadres and the development of needed advanced skills for our envisaged transformation to take effect.

Accordingly, state involvement in charting and regulating the role of the University is necessary. We want to facilitate the generation and fertilisation of ideas between the State and the University, with the State setting out the broad outlines of national policy and national goals and the University and other institutions of training, providing the necessary manpower training and development as well as undertaking diversified programmes of research.

In Volume I of our Three-Year Transitional National Development Plan we stress the need for "vigorous programmes of training and of ideological and political education in order to provide such qualitative dimensions to the transformed structure of property relations as will enhance and maximise their productivity."

The whole educational programme envisaged in broad terms under Chapter 18 of the first volume of the Plan aims at the rapid development of the University of Zimbabwe, both quantitatively, in terms of increased enrolment, and qualitatively, through its emphasis of "disciplines with practical as well as theoretical relevance to the needs of the economy," so that it can play its full supportive role in national development.

Our University must thus, find its role in the social milieu of Zimbabwe in which it must take full account of the political policies and ideo-

logical direction of the Government. Listen to what Mao Tse Tung said in this regard:

To sweep away foreign and feudal oppression and build a new democratic China, we need large numbers of educators and teachers for the people, and also people's scientists, engineers, technicians, doctors, journalists, writers, men of letters, artists and rank-and file cultural workers. They must be imbued with the spirit of serving the people and must work hard. Provided they serve the people creditably, all intellectuals should be esteemed and regarded as valuable national and social assets.

In other words, the University of Zimbabwe legitimates itself and becomes relevant to our times when it seeks to meet the needs and requirements of the people of Zimbabwe by ensuring that its products will be "valuable national and social assets" and not intellectual and cultural schizophrenics.

A socialist milieu demands socialist institutions and socialist intellectuals. We look forward to the University producing socialist doctors, engineers, lawyers, agronomists, teachers, philosophers and theologians. Yes, socialist theologians, for God, Himself, I contend, was a socialist creator.

When he created the earth and its resources, animate and inanimate, in accordance with the first book of the Genesis and finally made man giving him "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air."

.....
We find we have no alternative but to urge the University to apply itself fully to the developmental problems of our young nation. In adopting this attitude, my Government should not be understood as seeking to curb the freedom or autonomy of the University. If anything, our task is to promote its freedom by providing it a correct perspective. To us, however, the freedom of the student or lecturer is not synonymous with anarchy.

The concepts of academic freedom and free speech we shall certainly continue to foster in accordance with our own immutable democratic beliefs. But we hold that all criticism should be inspired by a genuine intention to be constructive.

Dr Kwame Nkrumah, expressing his view on this subject said that the objectives of the University could not be achieved without scrupulous respect of academic freedom since "scholars must be free to pursue the truth and to publish the results of their researches without fear". However, he would not accept the claim that is often asserted, "that a University is more or less an institution of learning having no respect or allegiance to the community of the country in which it exists and which it purports to serve".

Genuine academic freedom must thus, be seen to be compatible with patriotism and service to the community.

Press statement 320/83/JK/DB/JM issued by the Department of Information, Zimbabwe

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:

Sinclair, Michael. *Nigerian foreign policy: the evolution of political paranoia.*

Killick, Sir John. *The total onslaught: how does it look from Moscow?*

Vale, Peter. Australian-South African relations: kissing cousins or a quarrel in the family?

Leahy, Sir John; Pakendorf, Harald; Thula, Gibson. *Western attitudes to South Africa: three views.*

Special Studies/Spesiale Studies

Vale, Peter and Wally Kopp. A Layman's guide to nuclear arms and arms control. (Includes a bibliography and a glossary of terms). R8,00.

Symposium Proceedings

as available.

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).

Bibliographical Series/Bibliografiesereeks

No. 10. *Portuguese-Speaking Africa 1900-1979. A select bibliography. Vol. 2 Mozambique.* Compiled by Susan Jean Gowan. R25,00.

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

Bradlow Series

In 1982 a grant from the Estate of the late H. Bradlow made it possible for the Institute to establish a Fellowship to bring scholars each year to Jan Smuts House to conduct specific research projects. The Bradlow series will comprise the published results of this research work:

No. 1: Grundy, Kenneth W.: *The rise of the South African Security Establishment: An essay in the changing locus of state power.* R10,00.