

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

THE S.A. INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
NOT TO BE REPROD



*Southern*

*Africa* **Record**

Number 49

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 necessarily 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: Alan Begg*

---

Published by the South African Institute of International Affairs. Four issues per year. Subscription rate R23,00 per annum (South Africa). R33,00 overseas (surface), R50,00 overseas (airmail).

Price per copy R6,00 (plus postage for overseas airmail).

Uitgegee deur die Suid-Afrikaanse Instituut van Internasionale Aangeleenthede. Vier uitgawes per jaar. Intekengeld R23,00 per jaar (Suid-Afrika). R33,00 buiteland (land pos), R50,00 buiteland (lug pos).

Prys per eksemplaar R6,00 (plus posgeld vir buitelandse lugpos).

ISSN: 0377 5445

---

# SOUTHERN AFRICA RECORD

Number Forty-nine. 1987

---

## Contents/Inhoud

### **USSR — Foreign Policy and Southern Africa**

Extracts from M.S. Gorbachev's 25 February 1986 landmark address to the  
27th Congress of the CPSU page 3

Extracts from M.S. Gorbachev's 2 November 1987 address  
on the 70th Anniversary of the October Revolution page 8

### **Commonwealth and South Africa**

*Concluding statements by the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers  
on Southern Africa: Lusaka 1-2 February 1988* page 23

### **South Africa and Switzerland**

Extracts from speech by Defence Minister Magnus Malan delivered to the Swiss  
South Africa Association: Zurich, 6 December 1987 page 26

### **Zimbabwe**

President Robert Magabe's inaugural speech in Harare, 31 December 1987 page 36

**SOUTH AFRICA BY TREATY**  
**1806-1986**

*A Chronological and  
Subject Index*

**JACQUELINE A KALLEY**

Price: R 40.00 + postage



**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SERIES**  
No. 16

## USSR — Foreign Policy and Southern Africa

The following extracts from General Secretary Gorbachev's major addresses of 1986 and 1987 should be read in the light of the extracts from speeches by Messrs Starushenko and Gontcharov which appeared in Numbers 46 and 47/48 of the "Record" and which appear to confirm a certain shift in Soviet-Southern African policy

Extracts from General Secretary Gorbachev's opening address at the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 25 February 1986

### **Khrushchev moves in new directions**

... The old stereotypes in domestic and foreign policy began to crumble. Attempts were made to break down the command-bureaucratic methods of administration established in the 30s and the 40s, to make socialism more dynamic, to emphasize humanitarian ideals and values, and to revive the creative spirit of Leninism in theory and practice.

The desire to change the priorities of economic development, to bring into play incentives related to a personal interest in work results, keyed the decisions of the September 1953 and July 1955 plenary meetings of the party Central Committee.

More attention began to be devoted to the development of agriculture, housing, light industry, the sphere of consumption, and to everything related to satisfying human needs.

In short, there were changes for the better — in Soviet society and in international relations. However, no small number of subjectivist errors were committed, and they handicapped socialism's advance to a new stage, more-over doing much to discredit progressive initiatives.

The fact is that fundamentally new problems of domestic and foreign policies, and of party development, were often being solved by voluntaristic methods, with the aid of the old political and economic mechanism.

But the failures of the reforms undertaken in that period were mainly due to the fact that they were not backed up by a broad development of democratization processes.

At the October 1964 plenary meeting of the party Central Committee there was a change of the leadership of the party and the country, and decisions were taken to overcome voluntaristic tendencies and distortions in domestic and foreign policies. The party sought to achieve a certain stabilization in the policy, and to give it realistic features and thoroughness.

The March and September 1965 plenary meetings of the party Central Committee formulated new approaches to economic management. An economic reform, and big programmes for developing new areas and promoting the productive forces, were worked out and began to be put into effect.

In the first few years this changed the situation in the country for the better. The economic and scientific potential was increasing, the defence capacity was being strengthened, the standard of living was rising. Many foreign-policy moves enhanced the international prestige of our state. Strategic parity with the USA was achieved.

The country had at its disposal extensive resources for further accelerating its development. But to utilize these resources and put them to work, cardinal new changes were needed in society and, of course, the corresponding political will. There was a shortage of the one and the other. And even much of what has been decided remained on paper, was left suspended in mid-air. The pace of our development was substantially retarded.

At the April 1985 plenary meeting of its Central Committee and its 27th Congress the party frankly identified the causes of the situation that had arisen, laid bare the mechanism retarding our development and gave it a fundamental assessment.

### **Old formulas hamper development**

... It was stated that in the latter years of the life and activities of Leonid Brezhnev the search for ways of further advancement had been largely hampered by an addiction to habitual formulas and schemes, which did not reflect the new realities. The gap between word and deed had widened.

Negative processes in the economy were gathering momentum and had, in effect, created a pre-crisis situation. Many aberrations had arisen in the social, spiritual and moral spheres, and they were distorting and deforming the principles of socialist justice, undermining the people's faith in it, and giving rise to social alienation and immorality in various forms. The growing discrepancy between the lofty principles of socialism and the everyday realities of life was becoming intolerable.

The healthy forces in the party and in society as a whole were becoming more and more acutely aware of the pressing need to overcome negative phenomena, to reverse the course of events, to secure an acceleration of the country's socio-economic development, and to bring about a moral purification and renewal of socialism.

It was in response to this extremely acute social need that the April 1985 plenary meeting of the Central Committee put forward the concept and strategy of accelerating the country's socio-economic development, and the course aimed at a renewal of socialism.

There were given more elaborate theoretical and political formulation in the decisions of the 27th Party Congress and subsequent plenary meetings of

the Central Committee, and assumed final shape in the general policy of a revolutionary reorganization of all aspects of socialist society's life.

The *perestroika* idea rests upon our 70-year history, on the sound foundation of the basically new social edifice erected in the Soviet Union; it combines continuity and innovation, the historical experience of Bolshevism and the contemporaneity of socialism.

### **Socialism in development and *perestroika***

The changes taking place in the country today probably constitute the biggest step in developing socialist democracy since the October Revolution.

In reorganizing our economic and political system, it is our duty to create, first of all, a dependable and flexible mechanism for the genuine involvement of all the people in deciding state and social matters.

Secondly, people must be taught in practice to live in the conditions of deepening democracy, to extend and consolidate human rights, to nurture a contemporary political culture of the masses; in other words, to teach and to learn democracy.

The purpose of the radical economic reform begun in the country is to assure, during the next two or three years, a transition from an overly centralized command system of management to a democratic system based mainly on economic methods and on an optimal combination of centralism and self-management.

This presupposes a sharp expansion of the autonomy of enterprises and associations, their transition to the principle of profitability and self-financing, and the investment of work collectives with all the powers necessary for this.

The economic reform is no longer just plans and intentions, still less abstract theoretical discourses. It is becoming a part of life.

Today a considerable number of enterprises and associations in industry, construction, transport and agriculture are working on the principles of self-maintenance and self-finance.

From the beginning of next year, enterprises producing 60 per cent of our industrial output will be operating on this basis. The law on the state enterprise (association) will have become effective.

In restoring material incentives to their rightful place and in paying more attention to their collective forms, we should not allow sociocultural, moral or psychological incentives to be underrated.

They are of exceptional importance for enabling relations of collectivism and comradeship and the socialist way of life to develop normally and our Soviet values to take firm root in the thoughts and actions of our people.

### **Conservatives fear threat to interests**

... It would be a mistake to take no notice of a certain increase in the resist-

ance of the conservative forces that see *perestroika* simply as a threat to their selfish interests and objectives. This resistance can be felt not only at management level but also in work collectives.

Nor can one really doubt that the conservative forces will seize upon any difficulty in a bid to discredit *perestroika* and provoke dissatisfaction among the people.

Even now there are those who prefer to keep ticking off the slip-ups instead of getting down to combating shortcomings and looking for new solutions.

Naturally, these people never say that they oppose *perestroika*. Rather, they would have us believe that they are fighting against its negative side . . . ideological principles that might be eroded by the increasing activity of the masses.

But comrades, isn't it time to stop trying to scare us with all sorts of slip-ups?

Of course negative side effects are inevitable in any undertaking, particularly if it is novel. But the consequences of marking time, of stagnation and indifference have a much greater impact and cost a lot more than the side effects that arise temporarily in the course of a creative effort to reshape the social fabric.

We should learn to spot, expose and neutralize the manoeuvres of the opponents of *perestroika* — those who act to impede our advance and trip us up, who gloat over our difficulties and setbacks, who try to drag us back into the past.

Nor should we succumb to the pressure of the overly zealous and impatient — those who refuse to accept the objective logic of *perestroika*, who voice their disappointment with what they regard as a slow rate of change, who claim that this change does not yield the necessary results fast enough. It should be clear that one cannot leap over essential stages and try to accomplish everything at one go.

### **The October Revolution and today's world**

The April 1985 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee was a landmark in the development of Leninist thought along this line too. The new concept of foreign policy was presented in detail at the 27th Congress.

As you know, this concept proceeds from the idea that for all the profound contradictions of the contemporary world, for all the radical differences among the countries that comprise it, it is interrelated, interdependent and integral.

The reasons for this include the internationalization of world economic ties, the comprehensive scope of the scientific and technological revolution, the essentially novel role played by the mass media, the state of the earth's resources, the common environmental danger and the crying social problems of the developing world which affect us all.



The main reason, however, is the problem of human survival. This problem is now with us because the development of nuclear weapons and the threatening prospect of their use have called into question the very survival of the human race.



Acting jointly with the other countries of the Socialist community, we have submitted several important initiatives to the United Nations, including a project for devising a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

The Warsaw Treaty states have addressed NATO and all European countries with a proposal on reducing armed forces and armaments to a level of reasonable sufficiency.

We have suggested comparing the two alliances' military doctrines in order to make them exclusively defensive.

We have put forward a concrete plan for the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons and are working vigorously in this direction.

We have advanced proposals on devising effective methods for the verification of arms reductions including on-site inspection.

We have come out resolutely for strengthening the prestige of the United Nations, for the full and effective use of the powers conferred upon it and its agencies by the international community.



The October 1986 meeting in Reykjavik ranks among the events which have occurred since the new stage in international affairs began, which deserve to be mentioned on this occasion and which will go down in history.

The Reykjavik meeting gave a practical boost to the new political thinking, enabled it to gain ground in diverse social and political quarters and made international political contacts more fruitful.

The new thinking, with its regard for universal human values and emphasis on common sense and openness, is forging ahead on the international scene, destroying the stereotypes of anti-Sovietism and dispelling distrust of our initiatives and actions.

It is true that, gauged against the scope of the tasks mankind will have to tackle to ensure its survival, very, very little has so far been accomplished. But a beginning has been made, and the first signs of change are in evidence.

This is borne out, among other things, by the understanding we have reached with the United States on concluding in the near future an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles.

The conclusion of this agreement is very important in itself: It will, for the first time, eliminate a whole class of nuclear weapons, be the first tangible step along the path of scrapping nuclear arsenals, and will show that it is in fact possible to advance in this direction without prejudice to anyone's interests.

That is obviously a major success of the new way of thinking, a result of our readiness to search for mutually acceptable solutions while strictly safeguarding the principle of equal security.

However, the question concerning this agreement was largely settled back in Reykjavik, at my second meeting with the US President.

*In this critical period the world expects the third and fourth Soviet US summits to produce more than merely an official acknowledgement of the decisions agreed upon a year ago, and more than merely a continuation of the discussion. The growing danger that weapons may be perfected to a point where they will become uncontrollable is urging us to waste no time.*

That is why we will work unremittingly at these meetings for a palpable breakthrough, for concrete results in reducing strategic offensive armaments and barring weapons from outer space — the key to removing the nuclear threat.



What is the world going to be like when it reaches our revolution's centenary? What is socialism going to be like? What degree of maturity will have been attained by the world community of states and peoples? Let us not indulge in guessing. But let us remember that the foundations for the future are being laid today.

It is our duty to preserve our inimitable civilization and life on earth, to help reason win over nuclear insanity and to create all the necessary conditions for the free and all-round development of the individual and the whole of humanity.

We are aware that there is a possibility for continuous progress. We realize that it is not easy to insure it. But this does not frighten us. On the contrary, this inspires us, giving a lofty and humane purpose to our life and injecting it with a profound meaning.

In October 1917 we parted with the Old World, rejecting it once and for all. We are moving toward a new world, the world of Communism. We shall never turn off that road.

Translation into English by the Soviet News Agency *Tass*

Short extracts from General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev's address delivered 2 November 1987 on the 70th Anniversary of the October Revolution of 1917

**The basic goals and directions of the party's foreign-policy strategy**  
Comrades! The basic tasks of the country's economic and social development also determine the CPSU's international strategy. Its main goal is crystal clear — to provide the Soviet people with the possibility of working in

conditions of lasting peace and freedom. This, in essence, is the Party's primary programmatic requirement for our foreign policy. In the present situation, fulfilling this requirement means, above all, halting the material preparations for a nuclear war.

After weighing all aspects of the current situation, the CPSU has advanced an integral programme for the complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century — a programme that is historic in its scope and its significance. Its implementation would open up to mankind a fundamentally different period of development and the opportunity to concentrate solely on creative activity.

As you know, we have presented our proposals not only through traditional diplomatic channels but also directly to world public opinion, to the peoples. The time has come to thoroughly understand the harsh realities of our day: Nuclear weapons bear the threat of a hurricane capable of wiping humankind from the face of the earth. Our appeal once again underscores the open, honest and Leninist nature of the CPSU's foreign policy strategy.

Socialism unconditionally rejects war as a means of resolving political and economic contradictions and ideological disputes between states. Our ideal is a world without weapons and violence, a world in which each people freely chooses its own path of development, its own way of life. This is an expression of the humanism of communist ideology and of its moral values. Therefore, the main direction of the Party's activity in the world arena will continue to be *the struggle against the nuclear danger and the arms race and for the preservation and strengthening of world peace.*

There is no alternative to this policy. That is especially true during periods of aggravation in international affairs. Perhaps never in the postwar decades has the world situation been so explosive, and hence so complex and unfavourable, as it was in the first half of the 1980s. The right-wing grouping that came to power in the US and its principal fellow travellers in NATO turned sharply away from detente, toward a policy of military force. They armed themselves with doctrines that reject good-neighbourliness and cooperation as principles of world development and as the political philosophy of international relations. The Washington administration has remained deaf to our appeals to halt the arms race and improve the situation.

Is it really worth while to reopen the wounds of the past? Especially now, when signs of a change for the better seem to be appearing in Soviet-American relations and realistic tendencies are beginning to be perceptible in the actions and attitudes of the leaders of some NATO countries? We believe it is worth while, inasmuch as the sharp chilling of the international climate in the first half of the 1980s reminded us once again that nothing gets done of its own accord: One has to fight for peace, and fight persistently and purposefully. We must seek, find and use even the smallest chance in order — while it is still possible — to conquer the tendency toward a mounting danger of war.

Understanding this, the CPSU Central Committee at its April plenary session once again analyzed the nature and scope of the nuclear threat and outlined practical steps that might lead to an improvement in the situation. We proceeded from the following basic considerations.

*First.* The nature of current weaponry leaves no state with any hope of defending itself using solely military-technical means — through the creation of a defence, let's say, even the strongest. Ensuring security is becoming more and more a political task, and it can be accomplished only by political means. What is needed above all is the will to take the path of disarmament. Security cannot be built *ad infinitum* on the fear of retribution — that is, on the doctrines of 'containment' or 'deterrence.' To say nothing of the absurdity and immorality of a situation in which the entire world becomes a nuclear hostage, these doctrines encourage an arms race that, sooner or later, may get out of control.

*Second.* Security, if we are talking about relations between the USSR and the US, can only be mutual, and, if we take international relations as a whole, it can only be universal. The highest wisdom is not to be concerned exclusively for oneself, especially when this is to the detriment of the other side. It is necessary that everyone feels equally secure, since the fears and anxieties of the nuclear age give rise to unpredictability in policies and concrete actions. Consideration for the critical significance of the time factor is becoming very important. The appearance of new systems of weapons of mass destruction is steadily shortening the time and narrowing the possibilities for making political decisions on the question of war or peace in the event of a crisis.

*Third.* The US and its military-industrial machine, which to date shows no intention of slowing down, remains the locomotive of militarism. This must be taken into account, of course. But we understand very well that the interests and goals of the military-industrial complex are not at all the same as the interests and goals of the American people, as the true national interests of that great country.

Naturally, the world is much more extensive than the US and its occupation bases abroad. In world politics, one cannot confine oneself solely to relations with any one country, even if it is a very important one. This, as experience shows, only encourages the arrogance of power. But, needless to say, we attach great importance to the state and nature of relations between the Soviet Union and the US. Our countries have a good many points of contact, and there is an objective need to live in peace with one another and to co-operate on an equal and mutually advantageous basis — but only on an equal and mutually advantageous basis.

*Fourth.* The world is in a process of rapid changes, and it is beyond anyone's power to maintain an eternal *status quo* in it. It consists of dozens of states, each of which has its own completely legitimate interests. All of them without exception face a fundamental task: Without closing their eyes to so-

cial, political and ideological contradictions, they must master the science and the art of behaving in the international arena in a restrained and circumspect way and of living in a civilized manner, that is, in conditions of polite international intercourse and co-operation. But if this co-operation is to assume broad scope, what is needed is a comprehensive system of international economic security that would in equal measure protect every state from discrimination, sanctions and other attributes of imperialist, neocolonialist policy. Such a system is capable, along with disarmament, of becoming a reliable pillar of international security in general.

In short, the world today has become too small and fragile for wars and a policy of force. It cannot be saved and preserved unless there is a break — a decisive and irrevocable break — with the way of thinking and acting that for centuries has been built on the acceptability, the permissibility, of wars and armed conflicts.

But this means recognizing that winning the arms race, like winning a nuclear war itself, is no longer possible. The continuation of this race on the earth, and especially its extension into space, will accelerate the already critically high rate of the stockpiling and improvement of nuclear weapons. The situation in the world could take on a nature in which it would no longer depend on the intelligence or will of politicians. It could become a captive of technology and military-technocratic logic. Consequently, not just nuclear war itself but also the preparations for it — i.e., the arms race, *the striving for military superiority — objectively cannot bring anyone a political gain.*

This means, furthermore, recognizing that the present level of the balance of the opposing sides' nuclear potentials is inordinately high. For the time being, it ensures *equal danger* for each of them. But only for the time being. The continuation of the nuclear arms race will inevitably increase this equal danger and may bring it to proportions in which even parity would cease to be a factor of military-political deterrence. Hence, it is necessary above all to greatly lower the level of military confrontation. True equal security in our age is guaranteed not by the highest possible but by the lowest possible level of strategic balance, from which it is necessary to completely exclude nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

This means, finally, recognizing that in the present situation there is no alternative to co-operation and interaction among all states. Thus, objective — I emphasize, objective — conditions have evolved in which the struggle between capitalism and socialism can proceed *solely and exclusively in forms of peaceful competition and peaceful rivalry.*

For us, peaceful coexistence is the political course to which the USSR intends to continue to maintain unswerving adherence. While ensuring the continuity of foreign policy strategy, the CPSU will pursue an active international policy stemming from the realities of today's world. The problem of international security cannot, of course, be solved by just one or two peace

offensives, even very intensive ones. Only consistent, systematic and persistent work can bring success.

Continuity in foreign policy has nothing in common with the simple repetition of what has been done in the past, especially in approaches to accumulated problems. What is needed is special precision in evaluating one's own possibilities, restraint and the loftiest responsibility in making decisions. What is necessary is firmness in upholding principles and positions, tactical flexibility, readiness for mutually acceptable compromises, and an orientation toward dialogue and mutual understanding, not confrontation.

As you know, we have undertaken a series of unilateral steps — we have instituted a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, reduced their number, and halted all nuclear explosions. We have held conversations in Moscow and abroad with the leaders or members of the governments of many of the world's states. The Soviet-Indian, Soviet-French and Soviet-American summit meetings were necessary and useful steps.

The Soviet Union has made vigorous efforts to give a fresh impetus to the talks in Geneva, Stockholm and Vienna, the purpose of which is to scale down the arms race and strengthen confidence among states. Talks are always a delicate, complex matter. The main thing here is to work for a mutually acceptable balance of interests. Turning weapons of mass destruction into an object of political machinations is immoral, to say the least, and it is politically irresponsible.

Finally, there is our Statement of 15 January 1986. On the whole, our programme is essentially an alloy of the philosophy of shaping a safe world in the nuclear-space era and a platform of concrete actions. The Soviet Union is proposing that disarmament problems be approached in their totality, since, as far as security is concerned, in one thing is connected with another. We are not talking about rigid linkages or attempts to 'give way' in one area in order to erect a barricade in another. We are talking about a plan of concrete actions that has a strict time schedule. The USSR intends to work persistently for its realization, regarding this as *the central guideline of our foreign policy for the coming years*.

*Soviet military doctrine* is also constructed in full accordance with the letter and the spirit of the initiatives we have advanced. Its thrust is unequivocally defensive. In the military sphere, we intend to continue to act in such a way that no one will have any reason for fear — even imaginary — for his security. But we and our allies, to an equal extent, want to be rid of the feeling that a threat is hanging over us. The USSR has made a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and it will adhere to that commitment as strictly as possible. But it is no secret that scenarios exist for a nuclear attack against us. We have no right to disregard them. The Soviet Union is a very staunch opponent of nuclear war in any form. Our country is in favour of withdraw-

ing weapons of mass destruction from circulation and confining military potential to the bounds of reasonable sufficiency. But the nature and level of these bounds continue to be limited by the positions and actions of the US and its bloc partners. In these conditions, we repeat again and again: *The Soviet Union does not lay claim to greater security, but it will not settle for less.*

I would like to call attention to the problem of verification, to which we attach special importance. We have declared more than once that the USSR is open to verification, that we have as much interest in it as anyone else. Comprehensive, very rigorous verification is perhaps the most important element in the disarmament process. The essence of the matter, as we see it, is as follows: *Disarmament without verification is impossible, but verification without disarmament makes no sense either.*

Here is another basic point. We have voiced our attitude toward 'star wars' in quite some detail. The US has already dragged many of its allies into this programme. The problem is threatening to become irreversible. It is extremely necessary, before it is too late, to find a realistic solution that *will guarantee that the arms race is not carried into space.* The 'star wars' programme cannot be allowed to be used both as a stimulus to a continued arms race and as an obstacle on the path to radical disarmament. Tangible progress in matters relating to a sharp reduction of nuclear potentials can be of important assistance in surmounting this obstacle. Therefore, the Soviet Union is prepared to take a real step in this direction, to resolve the question of medium-range missiles in the European zone separately — with no direct connection to the problems of strategic arms and space.

The Soviet programme has struck a responsive chord in millions of people, and interest in it on the part of politicians and public figures continues to grow. The times are now such that it is difficult to brush it aside. Attempts to cast doubts on the Soviet Union's businesslike interest in accelerating, in putting onto a practical level, the solution of an urgent problem of our times — the destruction of nuclear weapons — are becoming less and less convincing. Nuclear disarmament cannot remain the monopoly of politicians. The whole world is reflecting on this today, since it is a question of life itself.

But one must also take into account the reaction of the centres of power, which hold the keys to success or failure in the disarmament talks. Of course, the US ruling class — or, more exactly, its most selfish groups, those linked to the military-industrial complex — have other goals that are clearly antithetical to ours. For them disarmament means a loss of profits and a political risk, whereas for us it is a boon in all respects — economically, politically, morally.

We know our principal opponents, and we have amassed complex and lengthy experience in relations and talks with them. The day before yesterday, we received a reply from President Reagan to our 15 January Statement. The American side has begun to set forth its views in greater detail at the

Geneva talks. We will, of course, carefully study everything that the Americans have to offer on these questions. But, since the reply was received literally on the eve of the opening of the Congress, the US administration is apparently *hoping* — at least we assume so — that the world will learn about our attitude toward the American position from this rostrum.

I can say right now that the President's letter gives no reason for any adjustments in the evaluations of the international situation as set forth in this report before the message was received. It says that the elimination of nuclear weapons is a goal toward which all nuclear powers should strive. In the letter, the President agrees in general with various Soviet propositions and intentions on questions of disarmament and security. In other words, his reply seems to express some encouraging opinions and propositions.

But these positive expressions are lost in various sorts of reservations, 'linkages' and 'conditions' that, to all intents and purposes, block the resolution of the fundamental questions of disarmament. The reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals is made contingent on our consent to the 'star wars' programmes and to reductions — unilateral reductions, by the way — in Soviet conventional weapons. And the problems of regional conflicts and bilateral relations are linked to this. The elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe is blocked by references to the position of Britain and France and the demand that we weaken our defences in the eastern part of the country while American military forces remain in that region. A refusal to stop nuclear testing is justified by arguments to the effect that nuclear weapons serve as a 'deterrent' factor. This is in direct contradiction with the goal affirmed in the letter — the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. It is on the question of nuclear explosions, the termination of which the whole world demands, that the unwillingness of the US and its ruling forces to embark on the path of nuclear disarmament is manifest in its most naked form.

In short, without going into detail, it is hard to detect in the document we have just received any serious willingness on the part of the American leadership to get down to the business of solving the cardinal problems of eliminating the nuclear threat. It appears that officials in Washington, and elsewhere, too, have gotten used to nuclear weapons, tying them to their plans in the international arena. All the same, politicians in the West, like it or not, will have to answer the question: Are they prepared to part with nuclear weapons altogether?

Under the accord reached in Geneva, there is to be a new meeting with the American President. We see its significance in the bringing of practical results in highly important areas of arms limitation and reduction. There are at least two questions on which an accord might be reached: ending nuclear tests, and eliminating American and Soviet medium-range missiles in the European zone. And then, incidentally, if there is a willingness to seek agreement, the question of the date for the meeting will resolve itself: We will accept any



proposal on this score. But there is no point to conducting futile discussions. We will not remain indifferent if the Soviet-American dialogue that has gotten under way and that has raised definite and not unfounded hopes that changes for the better are possible is used to prolong the arms race and material preparations for war. The Soviet Union is firmly bent on justifying the hopes of the peoples of our two countries and of the whole world, who expect from the leaders of the USSR and the US concrete steps, practical actions and real accords on how to check the arms race. We are ready for this.

Like any other country, we naturally attach great importance to the security of our borders — both land and sea. We have many neighbours, and they are different. We have no territorial claims against any of them. We do not threaten any of them. But, as life has confirmed more than once, there are quite a few people who, disregarding the national interests both of our country and of neighboring states, are fond of trying to aggravate the situation on the Soviet Union's borders.

For example, counter-revolutionaries and imperialism have turned Afghanistan into a bleeding wound. The USSR supports that country's efforts aimed at defending its sovereignty. We would like in the very near future to return to their homeland the Soviet troops who are in Afghanistan at its government's request. An agreement has been reached with the Afghan side on a schedule for their staged withdrawal, as soon as a political settlement is reached that will ensure a real cessation of armed intervention from outside in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and will reliably guarantee its nonresumption. It is in our vital, national interest that the USSR invariably have good and peaceful relations with all contiguous states. This is a vitally important goal of our foreign policy.

The CPSU considers the *European* area to be one of the principal areas of its international activity. Europe's historical opportunity, its future, lies in peaceful co-operation among the continent's states. It is important, while preserving the capital already accumulated, to move on: from the initial phase of detente to a more stable phase, to mature detente, and then to the creation of reliable security based on the Helsinki process and the radical reduction of nuclear and conventional arms.

The importance of the *Asian and Pacific* area is growing. There are a good many tangled knots of contradictions in this vast region, and the political situation is unstable in certain places. This region must, and without delay, find solutions and paths to them. This process should begin, apparently, with the co-ordination, and then the pooling, of efforts in the interests of a political settlement of painful problems, so that on this basis, and at the same time, at least the edge will be taken off the military confrontation in various parts of Asia and the situation there will be stabilized.

This task is all the more urgent since the *hotbeds of the danger of war* are not dying down, either in Asia or on other continents. We are in favour of step-

ping up collective searches for ways of defusing conflict situations in the Middle East, in Central America, in *Southern Africa*, in all the planet's hot spots. The interests of universal security insistently demand this.

Crises and conflicts are also fertile soil for *international terrorism*. Undeclared wars, the exporting of counterrevolution in all its forms, political assassinations, the taking of hostages, airplane hijacking, explosions in the streets, at airports and railway stations — this is the disgusting face of terrorism, which its sponsors try to cover with various sorts of cynical fabrications. The USSR rejects terrorism in principle and is willing to co-operate actively with other states to eradicate it. The Soviet Union will resolutely safeguard its citizens from acts of violence and will do everything it can to protect their lives, honor and dignity.

Looking back at the past year, one cannot help seeing that, from all indications, preconditions for an improvement in the international situation are beginning to take shape. But the preconditions for a drastic change still are not that change itself. The arms race is continuing, and the threat of nuclear war remains. However, the *international reactionary forces* are by no means omnipotent. The development of the world revolutionary process and the upsurge of the mass democratic and antiwar movements have significantly broadened and strengthened *the enormous potential of peace, reason and goodwill*. This is a powerful counterbalance to the aggressive policy of imperialism.

Today the fate of peace and social progress is tied, more closely than ever before, to the dynamism of *the economic and political development of the world socialist system*. The need for this dynamism is dictated by concern for the peoples' well-being. But it is also necessary to the socialist world from the standpoint of counteracting the danger of war. Finally, it is a demonstration of the possibilities of the socialist way of life. We are being watched by both friends and foes. We are being watched by the fast, heterogeneous world of the developing countries. It is seeking its choice, its path, and what this choice will be depends in large part on the successes of socialism and the persuasiveness of its answers to the challenges of the times.

We are convinced of socialism's ability to accomplish the most difficult tasks facing it. Vitally important to this end is increasingly vigorous interaction, which produces the effect not simply of the addition but of the multiplication of our potentials and serves as a stimulus for the acceleration of our common progress. This is reflected in the joint documents of the countries of the socialist commonwealth.

The interaction among ruling Communist Parties remains *the heart and soul of these countries' political co-operation*. Last year, there was virtually no fraternal country with whose leadership we did not hold meetings and detailed conversations. The very forms of this co-operation are being updated. A new, perhaps a key, element in this co-operation is taking shape — the institution of multilateral working meetings among the fraternal countries' lead-

ers. These meetings make it possible to hold efficient, comradely consultations on the whole range of problems of socialist construction in its internal and external aspects.

In the complicated international situation, the extension — by unanimous decision of its members — of the *Warsaw Treaty* was of great importance. This treaty has received a second birth, as it were; without it, it would be difficult today to imagine world politics as a whole. Take the Sofia conference of the treaty's Political Consultative Committee. It was a sort of prelude to the Geneva dialogue.

In *economics*, the Comprehensive Programme of Scientific and Technical Progress was adopted. Its import is the transition of the CMEA countries to a co-ordinated scientific and technical policy. In our view, changes are also required in the activity of the headquarters of socialist integration itself — the Council for Mutual Economic Aid. The main thing is that in the implementation of the programme there should be less administrative fiat, fewer committees and commissions of all kinds, and more attention to economic levers, initiative and socialist enterprise, and that labour collectives should be involved in this process. This would be a thoroughly Party approach, which is necessary for such an extraordinary undertaking.

Energy, businesslike efficiency, initiative — all these qualities meet the requirements of the times, and we will strive to see to it that they are disseminated throughout the system of relations among the fraternal parties. The CPSU attaches increasing importance to lively and extensive intercourse among citizens of the socialist countries, among people of various occupations and various generations. This is a source of mutual spiritual enrichment and a channel for the exchange of thoughts, ideas and *the experience of socialist construction*. Today it is especially important, on the basis of the development not just of one country but of several, to analyze the nature of the socialist way of life and to comprehend the processes of the improvement of democracy, management methods and personnel policy. A solicitous, respectful attitude toward each other's experience and its employment in practice constitute an enormous reserve for the socialist world.

In general, one of the advantages of socialism is its ability to learn. To learn to solve the problems that life poses. To learn to avert the crisis situations that our class adversary tries to create and take advantage of. To learn to counteract attempts to divide the socialist world, to set some countries against others. To learn to prevent collisions of interests among different socialist states, to mutually harmonize those interests, and to find mutually acceptable solutions to even the most difficult problems.

It seems to us that it is worth while to take a close look at relations in the socialist world as a whole, too. We do not believe that the commonwealth is separated by any barriers from the other socialist countries. The CPSU favors honest, open relations with all Communist Parties and all states of the

world socialist system and comradely exchanges of opinion with them. We strive to see first of all what unites the socialist world. Therefore, Soviet Communists are gladdened by every step along the path of the drawing together of all socialist states and by every positive move in relations among them.

One can speak with satisfaction about a certain amount of improvement in the Soviet Union's relations with its great neighbour — *socialist China*. Differences in approach, particularly in approaches to a number of international problems, remain. But we also note something else — the possibility in many cases of working jointly and of co-operating on an equal and principled basis, without detriment to third countries.

There is no need to explain the importance of this. The Chinese Communists have called the victories of the USSR and the forces of progress in World War II a prologue to the victory of the people's revolution in China. In turn, the formation of people's China helped to strengthen socialism's world positions and to thwart many schemes and actions of imperialism in the very difficult postwar years. Thinking of the future, one can say that the reserves for co-operation between the USSR and China are enormous. They are great because such co-operation is in the interests of both countries; because what is dearest to both peoples — socialism and peace — is indivisible.

*The CPSU is an indestructible part of the international Communist movement.* We the Soviet Communists understand very well that each of our victories in socialist construction is also a victory for the entire movement. Therefore, the CPSU sees its main internationalist duty in the successful progress of our country along the path opened and paved by October.

The Communist movement in the nonsocialist part of the world remains the principal target of political pressure and persecution by reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie. All the fraternal parties are under continual fire from anti-communist propaganda, which is not averse to employing the most shameful means and tactics. Many parties operate in the underground, in an atmosphere of real persecution and repression. The Communists do not take a single step without a struggle that requires personal courage. Allow me, comrades, on behalf of the 27th Congress and on behalf of all Soviet Communists, to express feelings of sincere admiration for our comrades' selfless struggle and of deep fraternal solidarity with them!

In recent years, the Communist movement has run into many new realities, tasks and problems. Everything indicates that it has entered a qualitatively new stage of development. The international conditions of the Communists' work are changing rapidly and profoundly. A substantial reorganization is taking place in the social structure of bourgeois society, including the composition of the working class. Complex problems are confronting our friends in the young independent states. The scientific and technological revolution is having a contradictory effect on the financial pos-

ition and consciousness of working people in the nonsocialist world. All this requires an ability to rethink many things; it requires a bold, creative approach to new realities on the basis of the immortal teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin. The CPSU knows this well from its own experience.

The enormous diversity of the Communist movement and of the tasks confronting it is also a reality. Sometimes this leads to differences of opinion. The CPSU does not dramatize the fact that there is not always total unanimity among the Communist Parties. In general, apparently, there cannot be an identity of views on all questions without exception. The Communist movement was formed when the working class entered the international arena as an independent and powerful political force. The parties that make up this movement, while growing on national soil, pursue common final goals — peace and socialism. This is the main, the decisive thing that unites them.

We believe that the diversity of our movement is not synonymous with disunity. Just as unity has nothing in common with uniformity, with hierarchy, with interference by some parties in the affairs of others, with the desire of any one party to have a monopoly on truth. The Communist movement can and must be strong through its class solidarity and the equal co-operation of all the fraternal parties in the struggle for common goals. This is how the CPSU understands unity, and it intends to promote it in every way.

The tendency toward strengthening the potential of peace, reason and goodwill is steady and, in principle, irreversible. Behind it is the desire of people, of all peoples, to live in concord and co-operation. However, one must look at things soberly: The alignment of forces in the struggle against war is taking shape in the course of acute and dynamic confrontation between progress and reaction. The CPSU's solidarity with the forces of national and social liberation and our line aimed at close interaction with the socialist-oriented countries, with revolutionary-democratic parties and with the Non-Aligned Movement remain unchanged. The Soviet public is prepared to continue to develop relations with noncommunist trends and organizations, including religious ones, that speak out against war.

The CPSU regards its relations with *Social Democrats* from the same viewpoint. It goes without saying that the ideological differences between Communists and Social Democrats are deep and that their experience and achievements are dissimilar and not of equal value. However, an unbiased familiarization with each other's positions and views is certainly useful for both Communists and Social Democrats. It is useful above all for stepping up the struggle for peace and international security.

We live in the real world, and we build our international policy with consideration for the specific features of the present phase of international development. A creative analysis of this phase and our vision of the future have led

us to a conclusion, a very significant one. Today as never before, it is important to find a path of closer and more productive co-operation with governments, parties, public organizations and movements that are truly concerned for the fate of peace on earth, and with all peoples, for the sake of *creating a comprehensive system of international security*.

We see the Basic Principles of such a system as follows:

*1. In the military field*

- the renunciation by the nuclear powers of war — both nuclear and conventional — against one another or against third states;
- the prevention of an arms race in space, the termination of all tests of nuclear weapons and their total elimination, the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, and the renunciation of the development of other means of mass annihilation;
- the strictly verifiable reduction of the levels of the military potentials of states to the bounds of reasonable sufficiency;
- the dissolution of military groupings and, as a step toward this, the renunciation of the expansion of such groupings and of the formation of new ones;
- the proportional and balanced reduction of military budgets.

*2. In the political field*

- unconditional respect in international practice for the right of each people to make a sovereign choice of the paths and forms of its development;
- the just political settlement of international crises and regional conflicts;
- the elaboration of a set of measures aimed at strengthening trust between states, at creating effective guarantees against attacks on them from outside and guarantees of the inviolability of their borders;
- the development of effective methods of preventing international terrorism, including security in the use of means of international land, air and sea transportation.

*3. In the economic field*

- the exclusion from international practice of all forms of discrimination; renunciation of the policy of economic blockades and sanctions, if this is not directly stipulated by recommendations of the world community;
- a joint search for ways for a just settlement of the problem of indebtedness;
- the establishment of a new world economic order guaranteeing equal economic security for all states;
- the elaboration of principles for the use for the welfare of the world community, above all of the developing countries, of part of the funds that

will be released as a result of the reduction in military budgets;

— the pooling of efforts in the study and peaceful use of space and in the solution of global problems on which the fate of civilization depends.

#### 4. *In the humanitarian field*

— co-operation in the dissemination of the ideas of peace, disarmament and international security; a rise in the level of the availability of general objective information, and the mutual familiarization of peoples with one another's lives; the strengthening of the spirit of mutual understanding and concord in relations between peoples;

— the eradication of genocide, apartheid, the preaching of fascism and every other type of racial, national or religious exclusiveness, as well as of discrimination against people on this basis;

— the expansion — while respecting the laws of each country — of international co-operation in the implementation of the political, social and personal rights of human beings;

— the resolution, in a humane and positive spirit, of questions of reuniting families, concluding marriages, and developing contacts between people and organizations;

— the strengthening of, and a search for new, forms of co-operation in the sphere of culture, the arts, science, education and medicine.

These Principles stem logically from the provisions of the CPSU Programme. They are in complete conformity with our concrete foreign policy initiatives. Guided by them, it would be possible to achieve a situation in which peaceful coexistence would become the highest universal principle of interstate relations. In our view, the Principles could even become a point of departure and a kind of framework for a direct, systematic dialogue between leaders of countries in the world community — both bilateral and multilateral.

And since the matter at hand is the fate of peace, such a dialogue is especially important between the permanent members of the Security Council — the five nuclear powers. They bear the main burden of responsibility for the fate of mankind. I emphasize — not a privilege, not grounds for claims to 'leadership' in world affairs, but a responsibility that no one has a right to forget. Why, then, don't their leaders gather around a *round table* and discuss what can and must be done to strengthen peace?

In our view, the entire existing mechanism of talks on arms limitation should begin to operate at peak efficiency. Can one really 'get used to' the fact that these talks have continued on parallel courses, as it were, for years, while at the same time an arms buildup has proceeded?

The USSR devotes great attention to the joint examination at international forums, including those within the framework of the Helsinki process, of the

problems and prospects of the world economy, the interrelation between disarmament and development, and the expansion of trade and scientific and technical co-operation. We believe that in the future it would be important to convene a *World Congress on Problems of Economic Security*, at which it would be possible to discuss, as a single whole, everything that encumbers world economic ties.

We are prepared to seriously consider any other proposals aimed in this direction as well.

Success in the battle against war must be achieved without fail. This success will be a historic victory for all mankind, for every person on earth. The CPSU sees the very essence of its foreign policy strategy as active participation in this battle . . .

Text from Current Digest of the Soviet Press. Vol. XXXVIII No. 8.



# Commonwealth and South Africa

Statement of the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers on Southern Africa:  
Lusaka, 1-2 February 1988

Members of the committee: the Rt Hon. Joe Clark (Canada) — Chairman; The Hon. Bill Hayden (Australia); The Hon. Rashleigh E. Jackson (Guyana); The Hon. K. Natwar Singh (India); The Hon. Major-General Ike Nwachukwu (Nigeria); The Hon. Benjamin Mkapa (Tanzania); The Hon. Luke J. Mwananshiku (Zambia); The Hon. Dr Nathan Shamuyarira (Zimbabwe).

## **Concluding Statement**

*The committee's first meeting was devoted to an initial consideration of the main areas of its mandate from Commonwealth heads of government under the Okanagan statement and programme of action.*

The committee recognized at the outset that its task was of an ongoing nature and that some aspects of its work would be of a non-public character.

Its conclusions in Lusaka included the following:

### *(i) Sanctions*

To widen, tighten and intensify economic and other sanctions against South Africa, the committee has set in train an examination of the application of sanctions, involving their evaluation on a continuing basis, an assessment of their impact and an identification of efforts to frustrate them. It will take account of economic, political and other relevant considerations.

The committee also agreed on the terms of reference of the expert study identified by heads of government in Vancouver on South Africa's relationship with the international financial system with a view to exploring the possibilities of effective action against South Africa in this area. Australia will continue to play a leading role in the preparation of this study. In this context, the committee issued an urgent call on the international banks concerned not to participate in rescheduling exercises but to maintain maximum pressure on South Africa for early repayment of all due amounts.

The committee took note of recent indications of significant changes in

South Africa's terms of trade and trading patterns. It will undertake a thorough examination of these trade questions. It will also separately develop ways of promoting trade and investment in the Front-line and neighbouring states as a means to increase their economic independence of South Africa.

While the programme of agreed studies is proceeding the committee will pursue all appropriate action for mobilising international support for sanctions with a view to securing a more concerted application of a global sanctions programme.

The committee paid special attention to the existing mandatory arms embargo and recognized the need for specific action at both the national and international levels to secure their more effective enforcement of the embargo. The committee will devote particular attention to this matter and pursue it as an issue of urgency.

*(ii) South Africa and its neighbours*

The committee gave particular attention to the enlarging needs of the Front-line States deriving from South Africa's policies of destabilization in the region. They paid particular attention to the effect of these policies on Mozambique and to current South African aggression in Angola. They welcomed the increased assistance to the region's development by the Africa Fund as agreed at the recent SADCC ministerial meeting in Arusha but recognized, as heads of government had done at Vancouver, that if the region's development is to be effective the international community must also address the security needs of the Front-line States. They examined ways in which this might be achieved on an urgent and effective basis and set in hand a process of consultation with the governments concerned towards this end.

The committee welcomed the progress that had been made for the establishment of the commonwealth special fund for technical assistance to Mozambique.

*(iii) Reaching into South Africa*

The committee held preliminary discussions with representatives of the South African Council of Churches, the African National Congress (ANC), the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC), the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO) and the Anti-apartheid Movement.

In the context of the intensification of repression in South Africa under the State of Emergency the committee recognized the importance of maximum exposure of the realities in the country and the need for effective responses to the draconian censorship that has been imposed. It began the exploration of ways in which the truth of what is happening in South Africa can be conveyed to the international community. Within the next few months Canada will propose to the committee a detailed strategy to combat South Africa's censorship and propaganda.

As part of the world-wide efforts to promote action against apartheid, the committee welcomed the decision to convene a conference of world parliamentarians later this year, as conveyed by the chairman of the UN special committee against apartheid.

On 1 February the committee conveyed to the South African Foreign Minister its deep concern at the recent confirmation of death sentences on the "Sharpeville Six". The committee expressed the hope that even at this late hour the government of South Africa would heed their humanitarian appeal.

*(iv) Namibia*

The committee reaffirmed its strong support for Namibian independence as called for in Security Council Resolution 435. It rejected once again linkage between Namibia and the developments in Angola. The committee agreed to increase its efforts to bring the plight of the Namibian people and South African aggression to the attention of the international community.

*(v) Further action*

The committee considered a possible programme of meeting up to the next meeting of heads of government in Kuala Lumpur in 1989. It recognized however that its work may be pursued in a variety of ways including contacts with other governments and facilitating opportunities for focusing world attention on apartheid.

In between meetings, continuity in the work of the committee will be maintained through liaison in London by a committee of eight high commissioners under the chairmanship of Canada's High Commissioner, Mr Roy McMurtry, in close consultation with the secretariat.

The committee agree that its next formal meeting will be held in Canada in July 1988.

Text supplied by the British Embassy.

# South Africa and Switzerland

Extracts from speech by South African Defence Minister Magnus Malan to the Swiss South African Association, Zurich, Switzerland, 6 December 1987

... I am essentially a realist, and a practical man; one who looks at how the world functions, and at how its peoples interact. It is the why and wherefore, and most of all the how, that interests me.

For my duty is to ensure the security of people, and therefore ultimately the stability of the society on which its well-being depends. After all, the political objective of a true democracy can only be achieved if one provides stability to people and improves their quality of life. And that is one of the prime objectives of my Government.

Allow me at the outset to give you the basic national goals of my Government. These are embodied in the Preamble to our constitution. They are:

- To uphold Christian values and civilized norms, with recognition and protection of freedom of faith and worship,
- To safeguard the integrity and freedom of our country,
- To uphold the independence of the judiciary and the equality of all under the law,
- To secure the maintenance of law and order,
- To further the contentment and the spiritual and material welfare of all,
- To respect and to protect the human dignity, life, liberty and property of all in our midst,
- To respect, to further and to protect the self-determination of population groups and peoples,
- To further private initiative and effective competition.

These goals are the guidelines for our national life.

... Like you in western Europe, we believe, for example, in the maintenance of the sovereignty and integrity of our country; we believe in the sovereignty of the law as a basis for the protection of the fundamental rights of individuals as well as groups; and we believe that the human dignity, life, liberty and property of all must be protected, regardless of colour, race, creed or religion.

... You Europeans, among yourselves, clearly have much in common. Nevertheless, Europeans have waged destructive wars upon one another, in fact since time immemorial — with you Swiss, it must be admitted, an honourable exception for many a long year. Historically it has thus been shown that common bonds are not enough.

One must therefore recognize the fact that, for any friendship to be binding, nations also need common interests, even a common threat.

It is in the light of such common interests that I wish tonight to set out the most important basis for our friendship, as I see it.

Let us first look at the global situation. On the one hand, we have a grouping of highly developed western nations, the Free World, which includes Japan. To this grouping adhere and belong the up-coming nations of the Far East, perhaps one or two Latin American countries, and clearly the Republic of South Africa as well. They are all nations that have either arrived, or are going places.

These nations also have a need for order. For them, for their national self-interest, and indeed for their whole value system, order is vital. They can neither exist as they wish to, nor advance, without peaceful and civilized order.

On the other hand, we have the Soviet Bloc, a grouping of countries that promote the notion of regional conflict, and moreover practise it. These countries are manifestly the enemies of our values. They export their revolutionary creed, and thereby openly as well as covertly seek to destroy our kind of international order.

And between the two competing blocs — of order on the one hand, and of conflict on the other — lies the Third World: there for the taking if it is not protected and developed.

The rise of these three Worlds means that the West must look anew at its security — to the strategic considerations that ensure its safety, and also how it is to maintain the widest spread of the civilized order for which it obviously does and must stand.

It is in respect of these concerns that I submit that you people of western Europe, and we South Africans now more than ever share a common interest.

As it is, the world has shrunk in this age of air and missile power. Moreover, even short of open war, the strategically important outer regions of the world have gained a new significance in this shrinking world. For in an economically interdependent world there are vital oil routes and shipping lanes that must be protected.

Geography has not been as kind to you Europeans as to the Americans on their island continent. Strategically, Europe is wide open to the East, where for four decades the Soviet threat has loomed.

And to the South there is what Churchill called 'Europe's soft underbelly'.

By that he meant the weaker nations of southern Europe, far less industrialized and hence ill-equipped in military terms when he gave this description at the time of the Second World War.

But now, in this shrinking world, western Europe has a new 'soft underbelly'. This is obviously Africa.

Africa is to a great extent the continent that divides East and West. For that reason western Europe can hardly afford to have an unstable Africa as its underbelly. Instability leads, among other things, to unemployment.

An unstable Africa has already off-loaded large numbers of guest workers onto the economies of western Europe. Continuing instability could aggravate, could worsen, this situation further. The social and political upheaval of such a development is well known to you.

Furthermore, an Africa lost to western Europe would deny it access to vast and much needed raw materials and minerals. Some African countries are, unfortunately, ripe for revolutionary takeovers of the kind that could swing them firmly into the Soviet camp. I submit that for western Europe this is an uneasy prospect.

Besides that, Russian and Cuban military forces are to a lesser or greater degree already installed in three of Africa's strategic regions — in the south-east in Mozambique, in the south-west in Angola, and in Ethiopia, close to the Horn of Africa.

Europe's new 'soft underbelly' is not only vulnerable, but already under threat.

May I now just say that South Africa is playing its part in helping Africa avert this threat. We are doing so by supporting Africa economically and otherwise. Our contribution to the stabilization of, in particular, our region of Southern Africa, is greater than that of any other country.

We are a sturdy anchor of stability in Africa.

More than 90 per cent of the states of Africa trade with South Africa, in spite of a boycott adopted as far back as 1963 by the Organization of African Unity. In Southern Africa, all countries have economic relationships with South Africa to a greater or lesser degree on an 'open' basis with the exception of Angola, whose government formally forbids any form of trade with South Africa.

South Africa's trade with Africa is now approaching US \$1,5 billion a year. Last year 80 000 businessmen from Africa visited South Africa.

The Economist Intelligence Unit estimates that total trade between South Africa and the nine member states of the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (Angola, Zambia, Malawi, Tanzania, Mozambique, Swaziland, Zimbabwe, Botswana and Lesotho) is seven times higher than trade among these countries themselves.

But, as for Europe, one needs again to look at the tides of history. The West in general appears not to be too concerned about its world-wide strategic interests.

The perception is that the great European tide that once reached out across the globe is now receding and declining — a perception underlined by continuing evidence of post-colonial and racist guilt.

The hard fact is that Europe simply cannot afford such perceptions of itself taking hold. This would simply increase its vulnerability. There is, too, the thought that if you do not move ahead, you may think you're holding your position but in actual fact you're moving backwards.

Europe therefore urgently needs to maintain its outward movement, to be seen to have an outgoing thrust. It needs, simply, to look to its vital interests. Africa represents such interests.

In this talk, as a friend, I have tried to put myself in your shoes, without being pedantic or prescriptive. And I put forward no special pleading on behalf of South Africa. It is for you to decide on the value of our common interests, and of South Africa as a source of First World capabilities, as a trading partner, as an investment prospect and, looking to my field, as a strategic imperative.

I say this because South Africa is really a do-it-ourselves country. The world's first heart transplant was done in South Africa. Our self-sufficiency is clearly demonstrated by our armaments industry. Our weapons systems are designed for *guerrilla warfare conditions and have been tested under actual combat conditions on the battlefield* — and have passed the test with flying colours.

In the process, we became one of the top dozen arms exporters in the world. Ten years ago the United Nations asked its members not to sell weapons to South Africa. Today, the United Nations is asking its members not to buy weapons from us.

We learn and gain much from our ties with and from the business we do with the outside world; and we feel we offer as much in return. We wish to continue doing so, as an integral part of the Free World with an open mind in terms of international trade and communication.

But beyond that, we know it is we who have to perform a pioneering task in Africa. We know we must take the initiative in improving the quality of life of the developing component of our population as well as the developing nations of the Third World who are our neighbours.

After all, it is in our mutual interest to do so. We know how dependent they are on our industrial base and our technology, dependent on our commitment to our continent and our dedication to peace and stability.

Obviously our destinies are linked together. And it is the knowledge of this fact on both sides that gives me great confidence for our long-term future. Together we can achieve a great deal; together we can build a new Africa.

As for the short-term outlook, there are some salient facts that need to be considered. The so-called revolutionary take-over of the RSA which the mass media in the West so wishfully predicted for the end of 1986 simply did

not come off. Nor was, or is, there any such prospect whatsoever of a take-over of power in South Africa. Let me assure you of this fact tonight.

Allow me at this point to digress briefly. South Africa is one of the few countries in the world in which the First and Third World elements interact permanently, and where it is the objective to accommodate the First and the Third Worlds in a political sense.

That is one of the innovations and initiatives of South African politics, seldom recognized by the world at large.

First World South Africa rapidly moves towards the computerized 21st Century, while Third World South Africa is, unfortunately, still in a pre-industrial phase. This is also the reality of Africa, which has not yet moved into the 20th century.

The reality of two co-existing Worlds is seldom appreciated by the West.

Our political vision, based on this reality, is to create a form of government that will accommodate both components at all levels. This is why our accent is on political participation and not on political power seizure

Our vision has far-reaching implications for political co-operation, economic growth, investment, education, housing and employment. We labour at these objectives but our labours are hampered by sanctions or punitive economic actions, spearheaded by the United States Congress.

Political rights are also being expanded in South Africa. Proof of this is the launching of a Joint Executive Authority for KwaZulu and Natal. Dr Buthelezi's willingness to participate in this regional venture proves that President Botha's policy of broadening democracy is gaining momentum.

I speak of a country, the RSA, in its post-apartheid era, where day to day life proceeds normally. Our business continues as usual, our infrastructure is intact, development proceeds and we support Southern Africa. Despite the enormous and vast outside pressures upon us, our confidence is resurgent and reviving — particularly as we, with our steadfastness, take an optimistic and confident view of our long-term prospects.

Furthermore, we ourselves remain a spirited people. You must by no means think that we will simply cave in and run away. We South Africans have a proud and documented history of dedication, endurance and readiness to meet challenges.

But we also know that we must keep our powder dry. Yet, as the ancient Romans tell us — and you Swiss have amply demonstrated — if you wish for peace, prepare for war.

Our intentions, towards all our neighbours, are indeed peaceful. We wish to live in a spirit of mutual respect and to give to all the exciting opportunity and challenge of building a better Africa.

Our ideal for our sub-continent, and indeed our continent, is stability and a steady improvement in the quality of life. Europe can make a big contribution towards fulfilling this ideal.



Clearly, however, we cannot live at peace with ourselves and our neighbours if there is outside interference which is ill-motivated and politically destructive. Nor can we accept the advice of outsiders when it is tainted with their own self-interest. Outsiders don't have to live with the consequences and outcome of their frequently ill-informed advice. We have to.

Most of all we need to ward off *military meddling in Africa's affairs*. History shows that this has been the real curse and problem of our vulnerable continent.

Too often military intervention and take-over of governments has been the result of one man, one vote, a political system that is simply not suitable for Africa. One man, one vote, one-party states and people's democracies have all caused both political and economic ruin in one African state after another. We reject them all.

The tragedy of Africa today, as explained by the noted African political scientist, Ali Mazrui, is that the continent is in the process of decay and social decomposition. Instead of African economies growing, most are stagnating or even shrinking. Instead of Africa's *per capita* production expanding, it shows a tendency to diminish.

Whereas everywhere else in the world, including other Third World regions, *per capita* food output is increasing, in Africa it has been decreasing for year after year.

Here we find common ground and a basis for friendship with you. Here is our challenge, namely to build bridges of understanding and support, especially to Southern Africa, our immediate surroundings. It is in our interest to have stable, prosperous and developing neighbours. We have always been ready to use our First World capabilities to assist Southern Africa.

We already have a proud record of assistance — in this we are a stabilizing regional power; and contrary to what you in Europe are being told, not a destabilizing force. It is not only unfair, but also malicious and one-sided to blame South Africa for the many ills of Southern Africa and even of Africa. What is needed is a realistic look by the West at the inability of Africa to handle its own problems.

I wish to turn to our security. Our national security is our most important priority, as it is for all self-respecting nations. Should our security be threatened, we cannot and will not stand idly by. We cannot be the power playground of the outside world.

For that reason we have our ground rules for stability, co-operation, progress and inter-state relations in our sub-continent.

Apart from the basic desire to help stabilize our neighbours and to improve the quality of their people's lives, the ground rules or Leitmotive of our relations are:

- Acknowledgement of the sovereignty of neighbouring states, which means that we have no expansionist ambitions.

- Acceptance of the differences in ideology in respect of some of our neighbours; we can live with our Marxist neighbours, and co-operate in many areas, such as development of resources and economic interaction.
- Rejection of the export of revolution by certain of our neighbours, which, despite repeated appeals, continue to provide sanctuary to terrorists, who are trained and plan their terror against South Africa in those countries. This takes place under the umbrella of the alliance between the South African Communist Party and the African National Congress.
- Reservation of the right to counter revolutionary violence with all the means at our disposal, even if this implies crossing our borders to do so.

I state these ground rules because they relate to the reality of our situation in Southern Africa.

This reality is simply that the SA Communist Party, in alliance with the African National Congress, uses facilities in certain African countries as bases, transit camps and for training and planning purposes.

Terrorists are then sent on terror missions to South Africa. When we act against these terrorists, wherever they are, we do so in accordance with international law. The security of all our people demands that we take pre-emptive action. We have to cut terrorists off before they can commit or spread their terror and violence. We have to keep them away from our doorsteps, our cities and our towns.

I wish briefly to refer to two countries in our sub-continent. Firstly Mozambique.

South Africa acknowledges the Nkomati Accord between Mozambique and ourselves. We consider it a model for relations with other countries in the sub-continent.

In terms of the Accord we have rendered large-scale support to Mozambique. Since the signing of the Accord in March 1984 South Africa has invested some US \$24 million in various projects in Mozambique, such as repair to the rail network, repair to ships, the upgrading of factories and assisting them in improving their food production.

Despite our economic and other aid, Mozambique does not honour the ground rules for sound relations. Terrorists are allowed freedom of movement. Unfortunately, disinformation, agitation and propaganda against South Africa has become a way of life for some countries, such as Mozambique, Angola and Zimbabwe. In the case of Mozambique this is so even though Article 5 of the Nkomati Accord forbids and prohibits propaganda.

Mozambique today is a country torn apart by war — a country of human suffering on a massive and tragic scale. I believe the only solution there lies in the field of negotiation and reconciliation. It is in that country's interests that the two warring factions, namely Frelimo and Renamo, should be brought together at the conference table.

In accordance with the spirit of the Nkomati Accord we are prepared to go out of our way to bring the two parties together.

In order to achieve that objective, we reserve in a responsible manner the right to a certain degree of freedom of movement — all directed at the interests of that country and the stability and prosperity of our region. Our choice is not between Frelimo and Renamo — we have a commitment to order and stability.

The Nkomati Accord remains a practical basis for co-operation, and we intend exploring its possibilities, as in the past.

The reason for failures in the past can be ascribed to the fact that South African foreign policy is conducted on a completely different level to that of some of the states in our region.

While South Africa recognizes the sovereignty of neighbouring states, these states perceive the destruction of the so-called 'racist Pretoria regime' as a long-term policy objective.

Thus there exists an inherent clash between the interests of South Africa and those of some of our neighbours. For the latter, the SACP/ANC alliance stands as the symbol and standard bearer of the 'revolution' against South Africa.

What some states regard as support for so-called freedom fighters, the South African government views as support for the export of revolution and violence.

This fundamental clash of views and objectives inevitably leads to cross-border initiatives by South Africa in order to arrest and stop terrorist infiltration. As I have said, we take these initiatives beforehand and timeously because our national security is of overriding importance.

Secondly, I wish to refer briefly to Angola.

We believe Angola's problems should also be solved through negotiations leading to national reconciliation. In that country, contrary to an agreement reached in 1975 between the various groups, namely the MPLA, Unita and FNLA, an MPLA government came to power with Russian and Cuban backing. Its popular support has never been tested.

The Cubans are alien or foreign to Africa; they are the tool for Russian expansionism in our sub-continent.

Their withdrawal is of prime importance to any peace initiative with regard to Angola as well as South West Africa/Namibia. My Government deems the Cuban presence a major stumbling-block to peace in Angola and SWA/Namibia, as well as in the region as a whole.

You are aware that recently we had to counter a two-pronged attack on stability and peace in areas adjacent to SWA/Namibia.

On the one hand, we acted against Swapo terrorists who are given sanctuary and protection by Angola. Our stated policy is that we cannot allow terrorists freedom of movement in order to commit and perpetrate terror, atro-

cities and intimidation against the Namibian people. We therefore strike at them before they can infiltrate the territory. We do so to preserve security and stability.

To the east of Swapo's major area of activity, Dr Jonas Savimbi, President of Unita, puts up a gallant and motivated stand against the Cuban and Russian backed Angolan forces. His successes this year are common knowledge. South Africa supports him because we see embodied in him and his movement the same values which we subscribe to.

We went to his support because Unita forms a buffer in south-east Angola between countries such as Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana — as well as, of course, SWA/Namibia — and Russian/Cuban expansionism.

Such expansionism has obvious implications for further destabilization and disruption of our region. Furthermore, it will result in more suffering and misery for its people. And it must also be remembered that the ultimate objective of this expansionism is to seize control of South Africa itself.

Russia's expansionist ambitions, with Angola as the starting point or the springboard, are beyond doubt. The build-up of weapons and manpower — the biggest in Africa south of the equator — far exceeds legitimate defence and security requirements. Since 1985 the Russians have sent \$3,5 billion-worth of military supplies to Angola. There are approximately 45 000 Cubans, 4 000 North Koreans, 500 East Germans and more than 1 000 Russians in that country.

The weapons captured by Unita are, ironically, used against the Soviet and Cuban-backed Angolan troops. It is estimated that at least \$1 billion-worth of East bloc war equipment was destroyed or captured during the recent offensive against Unita.

It is also important to note that Unita, with widespread popular support, controls a third of Angola. It actively and effectively operates in the rest of the country as well.

The struggle in Angola will deeply affect the stability and progress of Southern Africa. When there is a call for help to promote peace and civilized order, we cannot turn our backs and we cannot ignore the realities of the struggle. It is our future, too, that is affected and it is our interests that are threatened as well.

The price of freedom and stability is high. It is a price we are prepared to pay, because our future depends on it.

I know that I am talking to an audience that is aware of the fact that South Africa is broadening its democratic base. My country is in a state of transition and of far-reaching developments.

I can assure you that we will not run away from our responsibilities. On the other hand we will not allow a dictatorship in South Africa that will plunge our people into the misery and suffering that we see elsewhere in Africa.

We want a secure and stable South Africa. It is only from a base of security and stability that you can build a prosperous future.

That future belongs to all South Africans. And we want to share it with our neighbours in a stable and secure Southern Africa.

Unfortunately at the most challenging and exciting time of South Africa's history, there are so many in Europe who want to turn their backs on South Africans, including (through punitive action) black South Africans.

They are doing so at the wrong time and for all the wrong reasons.

We need Europe. We need capital and investment. We need cooperation and understanding to enable South Africa to develop its Third World component and to support Southern Africa. This is the essence of the friendship which I referred to earlier on . . .

Text supplied by the South African Ministry of Defence.

# Zimbabwe

Text of the President, Cde Robert Mugabe's inaugural speech in Harare, 31 December 1987

May I begin by thanking you for coming in such large numbers to this historic event of the inauguration of our first Executive President. On your behalf and on behalf of the many millions of Zimbabweans who would have desired to be here, may I welcome our guests of honour from the Frontline States, Ethiopia and Uganda. Their presence here indeed lends magnificence to our historic occasion, but more than that affirms the close relations of friendship, brotherhood, and solidarity between them and ourselves. We all wish them an enjoyable stay in Zimbabwe.

Today our nation celebrates an historic event, a landmark in the unfolding historical process of the development of its people. It was exactly in the year 1890 that our country was colonially occupied, as a group of settlers, sponsored by Cecil John Rhodes under the Chartered British South Africa Company settled here in Harare setting the British flag on the city's Kopje as Fort Salisbury was created.

It was around this citadel that settler colonial power progressively grew and from it that the rest of the country, for nine decades known as Rhodesia, was kept under control. Fort Salisbury became the anchor of imperial and settler colonial power in the country, consolidated first in 1923 as the right of self-government was granted to the settler community, then in 1953 with the imposition of the Central African Federation and in 1965 with the treasonous act of UDI, the unilateral declaration of independence.

In any situation of great deprivation, immorality and injustice, especially one confounded (*sic*) by illegality, the human pugnacious forces of antagonism, rebellion and resistance, readily unleash themselves as the oppressed people's quest for political, social and economic justice grows. The Second Chimurenga which ZANU and ZAFU fought side by side was a modality for achieving such justice, with clearly stated objectives.

Firstly, we fought that war to overthrow settler political power which for

ninety years had negated our people's right to self-determination so we could become masters of our own destiny.

Secondly, we were cognisant that political power once acquired would become an instrument for restoring our lost property rights through people-oriented socio-economic policies based on socialism, aiming at transforming the neo-colonial economic system in such a way that the people would once again become sovereign owners of their economic resources and productive means.

When, at the 1979 Lancaster House Conference, our protracted negotiations yielded the present Constitution, which created the Republic of Zimbabwe, some people might have felt that the battle for our political sovereignty as a nation had been fully won. I am afraid, political victory at that stage was not that total, for what emerged was a Constitution which seriously compromised and variously derogated from our sovereignty as a nation. We, for example, accepted clauses, insisted upon by Britain and the internal settlement coalition, that prescribed the principle of racial representation held as repugnant by the Patriotic Front. As if this was not enough vitiation of the democratic process, the racial representation prescription in question was so outrageously weighted in favour of the white community that it lacked any basis of morality. Surely, we could not, as human beings, have been expected to continue to bear the indignity of this immorality and injustice for too long.

Other limitations on the free exercise of our sovereign power by the Lancaster House Constitution included the entrenched clauses contained in the Bill of Rights which had to do with the acquisition of property and which prescribed an impossible amendment procedure, requiring an affirmative vote of 100 per cent.

In effecting the series of amendments which have culminated in our abolition of racial representation and the creation of the Executive Presidency, we have done nothing more than act in accordance with the true wishes of our people. I happen to be the individual you have chosen to lay your full trust in and confer upon the historic and singular honour of being the first Executive President of our young and blossoming Republic. May I, in the same warm and full-hearted spirit in which you have, through the Party and your representatives in Parliament, chosen me as your pioneer, thank you for your great confidence in me. I am your wish who shall always endeavour to fulfil your wishes past, wishes present and wishes future.

I am glad to say that this occasion has been made more historic and auspicious by the unity accord recently signed between ZANU (PF) and PF-ZAPU which by bringing our people together has created a new hope for the future. I wish to appeal to all Zimbabweans, whatever their tribe, race, colour, region or religion, to stand behind this unity accord and promote it in

word and deed wherever you are and whatever you are doing. The unity is, indeed, a second phase in the development of our policy of national reconciliation begun in 1980.

Earlier on I made reference to the second objective of our national liberation war as the restoration of our lost property rights through an economic reconstruction, rehabilitation and land resettlement programme, to be followed thereafter by a socio-economic programme of socialist transformation. Our eight years of independence have certainly witnessed positive attempts by the Party and Government aimed at achieving this objective.

I can assure you that the Party and Government will remain cognisant of the fact that political power without economic means is hollow and deceptive. This is why, throughout the period of the past eight years, Government has embarked first, on the Three-Year Transitional National Development Plan and secondly on the current First Five-Year National Development Plan (1986-1990). The first of these plans concentrated on efforts to effect those socio-economic adjustments which became necessary because of the protracted national liberation struggle and the damage it wrought both to our people as communities and to their infrastructure.

The main thrust in those early years thus lay in the resettlement of displaced people, a task which was achieved practically within the first year of our independence as homes and agricultural fields, seed and implements were found for most of them. At the same time a land resettlement programme for the redistribution of the land was begun, while, infrastructurally, damaged roads and bridges, clinics, schools and other communal facilities were reconstructed and rehabilitated.

In our belief that a meaningful and systematic development of our economy depended on the education and training of our population, a vigorous educational thrust was begun during the first year of our independence and has since been successfully maintained under the First Five-Year National Development Plan. In general, however, the Three-Year National Development Plan encompassed all sectors and thus made a comprehensive transitional impact upon which it became possible later to found the current plan.

During the operational period of the transitional plan, our Gross Domestic Product in 1980 grew by 11 per cent in real terms, followed by 13 per cent in 1981. The following two years, however, witnessed adverse conditions caused by world recession and drought, and hence our GDP was a negative two per cent in 1982, and a negative three per cent in 1983. In 1984, however, the economy began showing signs of recovery continuing up to 1985, by which year the average growth rate since independence in 1980 now stood at 2,4 per cent. Our export trade which, in 1980 and 1981, had reached the level of nearly \$1,5 billion respectively also started declining in the difficult years, dropping to about \$1,2 billion in 1983 and 1984 respectively, but picking up again in 1985 and rising to over \$1,2 billion as the economy began performing better.



It is against this background that we must judge our national economic performance. If we realize that in 1980 our GDP at Factor Cost was only \$3,2 billion, then its rise to \$7,3 billion in 1985 and to \$8,5 billion in 1986 was no doubt phenomenal in terms of the value of the goods and services we produced between 1980 and 1986 respectively. However, unless the growth in the production of such goods and services creates within it a progressive increase of our country's export quota, then whatever GDP we register is merely one which enhances our consumption, a situation which is bound to aggravate our balance of payments position if, at the same time, our imports continue to grow.

The 1986-1990 plan stipulates as the principal socio-economic goal of Government 'the establishment and development of a democratic, egalitarian and socialist society'. For this goal to be attained it is as necessary to develop our human resources by enhancing their mental and cultural faculties as it is to aim at the efficient production of goods and services, so the living standards of all Zimbabweans could be raised. Determined efforts under the plan are, therefore, being made to transform, control and expand the economy, to effect land reforms and efficient utilization of the land, to raise the standard of living of our entire population, with particular emphasis on that of the peasantry, to create more employment opportunities and increase manpower development, to develop science and technology and, finally, to maintain the correct balance between the environment and development.

Programmes and projects within the sectoral and provincial plans which were merged under the overall First Five-Year National Development Plan, were all aimed at these broad objectives. A total investment of \$7,1 billion, in form of gross fixed capital formation, was planned for the whole of the plan period, with \$1,8 billion being the expected contribution from the private sector.

The material productive sectors (that is, agriculture, mining, manufacturing, electricity and water, construction, the distributive sector, transport and communication) were to receive \$5,3 billion or 74,3 per cent of this investment, while the social service sectors like housing, education, health, and so on were to get \$1,8 billion or 25,7 per cent. These levels of investment are yet to be attained, and the difficult economic conditions we have been experiencing might cause a revision of the plan targets.

All in all, our hope was that we would finance 60 per cent of our investment programme by using our own domestic resources and 40 per cent by way of foreign resources. This hope has not yet been readily forthcoming. On the contrary, our country has been growing into a net capital exporter through the payment of external debt service repayments, dividends and profits.

The year 1987, just ended, has been the second year of the development plan scheduled to last for five years. On the whole, the year has experienced mixed economic performances. During the first half of the year, the perform-

ance was very depressed due to low investment levels, depressed commodity export prices, high debt service repayments, higher inflation stemming mainly from a large budget deficit, supply constraints due to the drought, and reduced import allocations. But during the second half, positive measures implemented by Government aimed at promoting exports, stimulating investment and generating employment, together with a slight recovery in commodity export prices, have assisted a positive growth rate. The Government measures have thus succeeded in reversing the earlier negative trend, even though they have created no more than a standstill position.

The report I have received is to the effect that there has been a very positive response by the private sector to our initiatives and a considerable number of new major investment projects have been initiated over the year, some of which are in the mining sector, the tobacco industry and other manufacturing areas. The viability of a country's economy, despite adequate resources and favourable domestic, regional and world markets, always depends on the determination of its people to achieve their highest possible performance. Whatever resources we might have, therefore, need our full energies to exploit so they can yield for us the requisite volumes of those goods and services we need for both the domestic and external markets. Hard work is what I call upon our entire nation to offer.

Your Party and Government fully realize that our socio-economic environment exists, not in vacuum, but in a given wider geographical and political environment with its own objective and concrete realities. Over the last eight years of our independence, these realities, in some cases economic and in other political, have impelled us to recognize the need for us to enter into and become members of a number of organizations such as the OAU, SADCC and the PTA, in all of which we have maintained an active membership.

In all of them, the question of apartheid in South Africa, the illegal occupation of Namibia and the destabilization of Frontline States by South Africa, have always received full attention. In the regional economic organizations, SADCC and the PTA, we have, alongside other members, helped to promote our trade and economic co-operation in the region so we can reduce our external economic dependence, in particular that on South Africa. We pledge ourselves to continuing vigorous efforts for the success of our co-operation under these organizations and the establishment, therefore, of meaningful economic relations between us and our well-intentioned neighbours and other partners.

Our attitude to South Africa over these years has been guided by our rejection and condemnation of the inhuman and revulsive system of apartheid in that country. We are glad that practically the whole world has condemned the evil system and given its support to the just struggle for its dismantlement and the creation, in its place, of a true democratic order.

Accordingly, alongside other Frontline States and under the OAU, we shall continue to give moral and political support to the liberation struggle being waged for freedom and democracy in South Africa. Similarly, in Namibia we have over all these years of our independence, given unstinting support to SWAPO's legitimate struggle for the liberation of Namibia from the illegal occupation it has been under for so long. We reject now, as we have done before, the linkage extraneously contrived between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of the Cubans from Angola.

In solidarity with our Frontline brothers, most of whom have suffered from South Africa's acts of aggression and destabilization, we continue to condemn South Africa's lawlessness in the region and demand the immediate withdrawal of its troops from Angola. In a much more practical way, we have pledged our own armed forces to the defence of Mozambique, partly to ensure the security of our own routes to the sea through that country and partly to help defend Mozambique's sovereignty against South Africa's evil strategy to overthrow its legitimate government.

On the international forum, not only have we been active members of the United Nations (UN), and its agencies, the Commonwealth and the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), we have also had the honour and privilege of being made Chairman of NAM. Our economic and political horizon has been greatly broadened and transformed from that of an insular and inward-looking little Rhodesia we found in being at the time of our independence, to that of a country whose dimensions of association are as wide as the world. Our moral perspectives which enables us to have friends both in the socialist and capitalist worlds also impels us to be rational and objectively critical of the international policies of the super powers whenever we judge them wrong.

We remain strictly non-aligned and refuse to put to auction our national sovereignty for a bag of foreign currency, no matter the economic problems and difficulties confronting us. Our sovereignty has never been and can never in future be for sale. It just is not a negotiable commodity. We cannot export it! It is a supreme phenomenon of our national being which gives us the absolute right to determine the direction of our policies and infuses us with courage to stand firm on matters of principle.

On regional issues, we have thus always clearly expressed our policies. We condemn Israel for its genocidal policies against the Palestinians, and strongly advocate their right under the PLO to a home in Palestine. We have supported the Contadora peace process recently enhanced by practical peace modalities concluded in Guatemala. Accordingly, we wish to applaud the ready response which Nicaragua has given to the agreed measures setting the internal and regional peace process in motion. We condemn any interference in the internal affairs of that country.

We also take note of the negotiations currently taking place on the disturb-

ing situation in Afghanistan and trust that the foreign forces in that country will soon be withdrawn so its people can be left free to solve their internal political differences without interference from any quarter. Similarly, we urge the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Kampuchea and appeal for the respect by all its neighbours of its sovereign status and territorial integrity.

The situation in the Gulf continues to give us concern as nothing appears to ameliorate it. We wish to appeal once again to both our brothers of Iran and Iraq to look for a peaceful solution to the bloody conflict between them. We express the hope that the UN initiative will lead to peace in the Gulf.

I wish now to pay tribute to all you Zimbabweans in whatever walks of life you find yourselves, for the outstanding achievements of the last eight years that stand aloft across all our sectors. We have toiled hard, very hard indeed, in adverse circumstances to produce not only enough food for our population and region but several other cash crops. Thanks to the farmers, big and small! We have manufactured volumes and volumes of secondary goods for the home and external markets. Thanks to our manufacturers, big and small! We have extensively and strenuously dug our earth for a wide variety of minerals, in part for our own use, but mainly for the export market. Once again, we thank our miners, big and small! The commercial sector with its big and small entrepreneurs performed a wonderful job of distributing our products. We thank them all. But distribution would have come to a halt without the infrastructural services offered by our road, rail and air networks, and the energy sector. Many thanks to all those involved.

But what of the arms of the State, the ministerial areas which gave us so many schools and educational facilities, hospitals and clinics, and housing projects and improved the status of the worker, fed the starving masses, developed and improved roads and bridges, cared for and protected our game, especially the rhino, ran our pre-school, literacy, women and youth programmes, and made financial provision for them all? We thank them all, from ministers down to the messenger and cleaner.

Other equally important arms of State are our security forces, all told, which ensured our peace and security, law and order, and the safe custody and punishment of all criminal offenders. Thanks to them all, and for the sterling service in keeping our routes through Mozambique open.

Our State institutions, Parliament and the Judiciary, have performed excellently. Many many bills have been enacted into law since 1980 including recent Constitutional amendments. So have many judgments been passed in our courts in interpretation of the law, the condemning of criminals and exonerating the innocent. We thank all those involved. To our local authorities, for their various community services, to the chiefs and headmen for their social and cultural role, we say thank you. To the toiling worker, we say well done, keep up the discipline of hard work.

The direction of the policies followed by Government derive from the

Party, your Party, ZANU (PF). Twice in the last eight years you expressed your full confidence in it by giving it a majority verdict to rule. Government policies have, therefore, been Party policies translated into operational reality.

I am sure you would like to join me in thanking the Party, its full leadership (viz the Central Committee), its Women's League and Youth League as well as all its provincial, district, branch and cell organs, for successfully acting as the people's political vanguard and paving the way for the successful development of our nation. Thank you ZANU (PF)! Keep it up!

Last but not least, I wish to pay lasting tribute to the one man who, though small in body, is yet great in mind, soul and spirit, who as our Head of State for the last eight years, performed many an important function. All of us who have been ministers, appointed by him though of course on the advice of the Prime Minister. Without him, our task as Government would have been well-nigh impossible. Never did I on any single occasion differ with him on any fundamental issues. It was always his lot, supported naturally by me, to receive other heads of state and entertain them.

Every year, as you will recall, he was called upon to open a new session of Parliament, this in addition to numerous ceremonies which he was expected to conduct. He visited many homes of the disabled and handicapped, many homes of orphaned or destitute children, and of the aged. He joined many young couples in holy matrimony. Who does not know about his pioneering educational work as he strove hard to establish Kushinga/Phikelela at Marondera? Let us not forget State House Tornados, the football club he founded and whose team is now in the Super League. Over and above these time-consuming pursuits, he still found time to write a number of books on extremely relevant subjects. His last great act was to ensure the unity of ZANU (PF) and PF-ZAPU.

Today, Banana has retired from the Presidency, we all admit, with magnanimity. On behalf of the Party, the Government and the whole nation I say to you, Banana, well done! You have served the nation truly, honestly, loyally and faithfully. You have seen us emerge as a nation, single, united and consolidated. We shall always admire you for the outstanding national role you have played. No doubt, we shall constantly be calling upon your talents in future so you can use them in spheres where your service will still be required.

And to Mai Banana, may I say how grateful we are for your own role as the First Lady which demanded that you go about fulfilling several State and allied functions, ranging from playing host to our VIP guests, visiting children and the handicapped, and working together with women in various spheres. Well done! The support you gave to Cde Banana as our first President enabled him to accomplish his functional role to the great satisfaction of all of us. We say to both of you, thank you, thank you and thank you again!

Tinotenda, tinotenda, tinotenda narinhi wose! Siyabonga, siyabonga, siyabonga lakusasa!

Finally, may I assure our whole nation and the Party, that I shall continue as before, to be guided by the principles of the Party and to regard the interests of the nation as paramount. Executive power can never rightly be a one man's show. Ours is and must always remain a people-oriented revolutionary path guided by socialist principles. It is the people as a whole who are our concern and to whose collective interest individual interest must subject itself. If I am to succeed in leading you along our defined socialist path towards common and national developmental goals, may I ask for your support, your support as individuals, as families, as the Party, as Government, as the Church, nay, as the nation. I remain forever, one of you; one of you as much by birth as by a common struggle and a common destiny.

It is our country together and together let us develop it.

It is our nation together and together let us build it.

It is our freedom together and together let us defend it.

It is our unity together and together let us consolidate it.

Text supplied by Zimbabwe Department of Information, Harare.

#### **Note**

Readers are invited to apply to the Compiler for copies of full texts when only extracts have been printed.

# Publications of The South African Institute of International Affairs

## Occasional Papers/Geleentheidspublikasies

Issued on an irregular basis, and containing the text of addresses at Institute meetings or original articles. Price per copy: R5 (plus postage).

Latest titles are:

John Barratt: *South Africa and its neighbours: Cooperation or Conflict?*

André du Pisani: *Beyond the Barracks: Reflections of the Role of the SADF in the Region*

Gavin Maasdorp: *Current Political and Economic Factors in Transportation in Southern Africa.*

## International Affairs Bulletin

Three issues per year and supplied free of charge to members. Subscription rate R18 per annum South Africa; R28 overseas (surface), R42 overseas (airmail). Price per copy R7 (plus postage overseas airmail).

### Vol. 11, No. 3, 1987 includes articles by

Blumenfeld on *Western Economic Policy towards South Africa.*

Van Meurs on *Law of the Sea and South Africa*

Van Wyk on *Elite Perception of South Africa's Options.*

Van Schaik & Feldman on *The Persian Gulf War*

Du Plessis on *The New World Information Order.*

## Bibliographical Series/Bibliografiesereëks

No. 13. *South Africa's Chrome, Manganese, Platinum and Vanadium: Foreign Views on the Minerals Dependency Issue.* An Annotated Bibliography by Eve Andor. R30,00 plus postage.

No. 14. *The Southern African Development Coordination Conference (SADCC).* A select and annotated bibliography by Elna Schoeman. R30,00 plus postage.

No. 15. *The USSR and the Soviet Bloc: Policies and Influences in Southern Africa.* A Select and Annotated Bibliography by L.E. Andor. R30,00 plus postage.

No. 16. *South Africa by Treaty 1806-1986.* Achronological and subject index by J. A. Kalley. 513 pp. R40,00 plus postage.

## Special Study:

*The Economic Implications of Disinvestment for South Africa.* pp. 100. Carolyn M. Jenkins. R20,00 plus postage.

## Jan Smuts Memorial Lecture

Prof. James Barber's excellent and provocative paper *Is there a South African Nation?* has been reprinted and copies are available. R5,00 plus postage.

## A First Directory of South African Political Scientists

Ed. A du Pisani, R12 plus postage.