

(2) We urge upon all countries and in particular those of the developed world the mobilization of public opinion in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia and we urge the mass media to enlist in the cause.

(3) We demand protection, through international regulation, against the plundering of the transnational corporations who balance profits against repression in a sordid equation of exploitation.

(4) We call upon the western Powers to outlaw the recruitment, within their territories, of mercenaries, those dogs of war who seek to feast for gain on the blood of patriots.

More specifically, with respect to Southern Rhodesia, we should urge all States not to:

(a) Engage in commercial contacts of any sort with Southern Rhodesia, in particular the supply of oil to the colony;

(b) Allow the promotion of emigration to Southern Rhodesia;

(c) Maintain communication by whatever means with Southern Rhodesia.

With respect to Namibia, we should urge all States to:

(a) Give the fullest support to the United Nations in the exercise of its role in Namibia, and be vigilant to ensure against any undermining or erosion of the United Nations' position as the legitimate authority in Namibia;

(b) Discourage and reduce the plundering of the resources of Namibia by confiscating all goods emanating from Namibia.

With respect to South Africa, we note that there has been a report which suggests that the United States administration may be prepared to take certain steps against Vorster. However, bearing in mind the moral and tactical requirements of the situation, we are powerfully of the view that only the most drastic action can be either correct or effective in the situation. Therefore, we urge all States to:

(a) Sever all military dealings with the Pretoria régime through the full implementation of the arms embargo;

(b) Sever all economic connexions with South Africa, particularly through an embargo on supplies of petroleum, petroleum products and other strategic materials; and through the prohibition of financial dealings with all organizations and individuals which support the Pretoria régime;

(c) Take punitive action against violations of the arms and economic embargoes by corporations, institutions and individuals within their jurisdiction;

(d) Sever all cultural links and in particular all sporting contacts;

(e) Mobilize public opinion at the national and international levels against the policies of apartheid and Bantustanization;

(f) Give full political, moral, financial and other material support to those movements which have been established by the indigenous people of South Africa, and which have been recognized by the OAU for the liberation of their homeland.

We have sought to suggest those principles that are non-negotiable in the present situation. We have sought to indicate the kind of action which the world community must summon up the will to take. I believe that I speak to the logic of the present situation and from all recent experience if I urge action now on all fronts simultaneously. It is our humble view that it would be fatal if the prospect of negotiations should dull the protagonists into a relaxation of effort. I urge absolute vigilance.

We must resist all efforts to divide the movement, whether by playing off one group against another, or by tempting individuals to desert in the expectation of present reward or future office. To succeed, we must be strong, and to be strong, we must be united. It is only by a strong united movement that we can be successful, and our success will be the appropriate monument to our brothers and sisters who have died.

Within recent months the recruitment of freedom fighters has greatly increased, and they are now controlling larger areas of territory and putting real pressure on the illegal Smith régime.

If there is to be a negotiated settlement, it is this military pressure which will ensure that power is finally transferred. Therefore, the armed struggle should proceed to a new crescendo even as talks proceed. Fascist régimes understand nothing but the application of force.

Similarly, I urge those States which are not themselves involved as protagonists, to immediate action. If the Nations which possess the capacity to apply decisive sanctions delay action on the grounds that talks are proceeding, they will, in all probability, condemn the talks to failure. Let the delegations present in Maputo urge their home Governments to apply sanctions now.

In the final analysis it is the world that is on trial in southern Africa.

We are witnessing the death throes of the colonial era even as we, all of us, serve as midwives to the birth of a new age. Man is too conscious now and that consciousness too widespread to turn back or even to wait for long. But we still have it in us to be good midwives or bad. Birth is never easy. But it can be unnecessarily protracted and full of agony. I hope that we who are here will venture to choose the path of wisdom through the courage to insist upon what is right.

If I have one final warning, one plea, one injunction now: it is to be alert.

I said before that the empires yield their territory slowly; and that they contest the ground with infinite cunning. If we speak of apartheid in sport some of the voices of the empires reply: do not mix politics and sport! If we speak of sovereignty the empires concede the political power and retain the

economic power. If we speak of sanctions South Africa is denounced but the transnational corporations remain free to build her economy and reap their profits. If we speak of armed struggle because all else has failed, the empires speak of communist threats. If we even speak of not broadcasting a London football match in South Africa the British Broadcasting Corporation speaks of a contract!

Let us dismiss these diversions and go to the heart of the matter which is majority rule now. Freedom now and justice now.

Let those who have sanctions to apply, apply them now so that the world can witness a sign that justice can prevail over economic self-interest. Let those who have arms to give, send them now so that the gangs in Salisbury and Pretoria come to realize that decent men will not be bluffed any longer.

And in our resolve let us not forget those front-line States on whom the struggle presses hardest, and who themselves need to be sustained if the victory to which they are so vital is not to be deferred. They too need not only our moral solidarity, but our material support. They must not be allowed by the accident of geography to bear alone what it is our duty as brothers to carry together.

And to those who will counsel patience, I ask why? Why should black children in Zimbabwe wait one more day to know that their fathers and their mothers have entered finally into their just inheritance in their own land?

I speak for all the Third World when I say to the developed world: act now. We know that you can bring down Smith and Vorster without firing a shot. And we will know why you do not bring them down, if you fail to act.

And if you fail, we will bring them down in time; though the labour for this birth may be long and hard and full of pain.

We do not threaten you for that is not our way. But we will remember that we had to struggle and that many of our brothers and sisters died, to gain what was always rightfully theirs. I urge you to think well now; for the generations will remember this time and history will be unkind to those who did not care.

I wish to end by thanking the President, Government and People of Mozambique for the kindness and warmth with which they have received me. Thanks to their great victory, I am today, in Maputo, further south on the continent of our forefathers than I have ever been before. Let us now move on west to Zimbabwe and Namibia - remembering that we may not rest until we have turned south and entered Cape Town finally.

Statement by Mr. Olof Palme, Secretary-General of the Swedish
Social-Democratic Party and Prime Minister of Sweden (1969-76)

This Conference has been convened in support of the peoples of Namibia and Zimbabwe. Let me at the outset convey to them greetings of support and solidarity from the Swedish Labour movement. We hail their struggle to achieve freedom and independence. Let me also thank you for the confidence you have shown me by inviting me to speak at this very important conference.

The Conference takes place in the capital of Mozambique. This is a country recently born out of the struggle for freedom, now a front line for the liberation of the entire southern Africa. We pay tribute to the courage and sacrifice of the people of Mozambique.

The Conference convenes at a time when the régime in Salisbury has launched open aggression against the neighbouring countries. Mozambique has been a constant target for these attacks. Now Botswana and Zambia are added to the list. We condemn the aggression and pledge our support to the struggle against the aggressors.

The problems of Namibia and Rhodesia/Zimbabwe stem directly from the policies of apartheid in South Africa. For Pretoria, indeed, the territories of Namibia and Rhodesia represent the outer defences for the protection of its racist régime. Thus, it persists in the illegal occupation of a territory enjoying international status, Namibia, and in defiance of Security Council decisions, it gives vital support to the illegal rebel régime in Rhodesia.

The accession to independence of Mozambique and Angola and the emergence of a revolutionary mass movement in South Africa, in Namibia and in Zimbabwe have brought the situation in southern Africa to the forefront in international affairs. It would seem proper for me, a representative, albeit in a personal capacity, of a Western world that has shown and shows so much ambivalence and hesitation, to give my views on where those countries course of action should lie.

The future of the black man in South Africa is a mixture of hope and frustration. After Sharpeville in 1960 we hoped for concerted international action against the oppressive régime in South Africa. Many of us took part in international conferences where we, in optimistic terms, said that the time for international intervention had finally come. But instead, South Africa rearmed with support from abroad and since then also Western economic interests in South Africa have boomed. Again, after Soweto we have reason to expect that those who can influence the racist régime towards a change will do so. But what we see is a dragging of feet, a hesitation to apply any concrete and forceful measures. What is this intricate relationship between the West and South Africa, why should we have this contradiction between a declared and, I am certain, often sincere condemnation of South African policy and the concrete relations that those same Powers, who condemn, still maintain with Pretoria.

The Prime Minister of South Africa, Mr. Vorster, talks about the need to protect Western civilization and Christian nationalism. At the same time he articulates values of unchristian racial chauvinism, contrary to the basis of Western humanism.

Mr. Ian Smith has said that Rhodesia and South Africa are agreed that they are both fighting to preserve the Western democracy that the white man brought to Africa. They are both hoping for external aid to fight for the interests of what they call the free world. For us in Europe, with our colonial past, it is necessary to be crystal clear. We will never accept Smith's and Vorster's perversion of Western democracy. Their oppression and racism will never be included in a world of freedom. They represent the very opposite of democracy. As a representative of a movement that for decades has fought for democracy against all forms of dictatorship, I cannot find words harsh enough to condemn their misuse of the words democracy and freedom. They are denying the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa the most fundamental human and political rights - the same rights that the European labour movement was denied and that formed the basis for the original programmes of our liberation movements. Therefore the workers of Europe are historically linked in solidarity with their oppressed brothers and sisters in Africa.

Indeed the issue in southern Africa has also become a test on the validity of Western civilization, that is whether it should be judged by its own enlightened modern values or whether it should be judged by its tolerance of a vicious doctrine of race supremacy. Contempt for human dignity elevated to the status of a system is an offence to our basic ideas. We take pride in our conception of the natural equality of man without which there can be no democratic system. We say that reason, not prejudice, should be the principle guiding our societies. There are, indeed, many deficiencies in our societies showing that we have not yet been able to live up to that principle. Nevertheless, the attitude to be taken in regard to South Africa poses a basic question of morality, of respect for the values and ideas which were created by those very countries in the West that now are seen to support the apartheid régime by their failure to join the great majority of nations in a programme to effect radical change. The peoples of Africa have very seldom met those high principles of Western civilization. They have met colonialism, advanced military technology and Western capitalism in its most brutal form. How long shall our professed ideals co-exist with apartheid, this weird dictatorship of the minority for social and economic exploitation?

It should also be a matter of enlightened self-interest for the Western world to oppose effectively the aggressive and racist régime in Pretoria. The security system of Europe of the nineteen-twenties and thirties failed miserably because aggression was too long tolerated. The aggressors were allowed to grow in military might and expansive self-confidence. The fate of the League of Nations was sealed by its inability to take action against the invasion of an independent African country, Ethiopia. The world was late in reacting to Nazi Germany pursuing its preparations to acquire world supremacy and conducting policies of racial extermination. The nations of Europe and North America had to pay dearly in human lives and material destruction to defend their freedom and the principles of modern society against this barbaric force.

The lessons are clear. The world community has to react against a régime which is in total defiance of its very basic tenets and principles. The Western nations should heed the lessons of history and take decisive action. The repeated acts of aggression by South Africa against neighbouring African states and permanently against Namibia must be punished.

If governments are moved neither by reasons of morality and principles, nor by reasons of their own enlightened and long-term interests, then, perhaps, fear of imminent losses might be more effective. The profits of foreign companies in South Africa cannot be guaranteed by the present power-holders in Pretoria. There should be no doubt now that the future of southern Africa belongs to the Africans themselves. Apartheid is a régime doomed to disappear and those who now exploit it for the sake of immediate profit are sacrificing much longer-lasting and much more secure advantages in the future.

Already today, the African nations are in a position to show that those who pursue with a single mind economic and material interests should beware of too close a link with the South African régime. It is a fact that the investments of Western firms in black Africa are far greater than the foreign investments in South Africa. The same goes for the trade flows. It would then be wise for the businessmen in the West to recall statements made by African statesmen in the United Nations and I quote from what was said there by the Commissioner for External Affairs of Nigeria:

"We cannot continue to have establishments in our midst which at the same time as they profess certain principles in their dealings with us, also cater to and sustain a régime that holds our brothers and sisters in bondage and slavery in complete disregard of those same principles."

South Africa is trying to build itself into one of the world's important military and economic powers with a supremacy over the whole region of southern Africa. So far, these efforts have been helped by foreign loans and external investments. In 1960, that is at the time of Sharpeville, foreign investment was 3 billion Rand. At the time of Soweto last year, it was over 10 billion Rand. In 1960, the military budget of South Africa was only 44 million Rand. Last year it had risen to 1,350 million Rand. Peaceful change becomes increasingly unlikely as the arsenals of the racist régime develop into a formidable machinery of both military and economic power for internal oppression and external aggression.

Those who continue to let foreign capital freely flow into South Africa and Namibia take on a great responsibility. It is a fact that South Africa's growing deficit in her balance of payments is to a very large extent due to the sharp increase of her military expenditure. The loans from abroad designed to cover this deficit are thus used for armaments which South Africa otherwise would not be able to afford.

History shows us that only when the oppressed themselves take action, change will come about. Support from outside can help but the essence is the will of the people to act, to resist exploitation. But history also shows us that the future is on the side of the oppressed. Our generation has witnessed an historic process of liberation that has swept the continents. Peoples that for centuries have lived under foreign domination have achieved their national independence. We have witnessed the gradual abolition of colonialism in southern Africa and see the last remnants of this epoch. And there is no reason whatever to believe that the process of liberation should stop at the Zambezi river.

The resistance of the racist régime raises the question of whether changes can be brought about only by violence, by armed struggle, or whether there is still a peaceful way of eradicating the affront to human dignity known as colonialism, racism and apartheid. We all obviously prefer peaceful solutions to violent ones. But those of us who are privileged and who have had the good fortune of peaceful change should never moralize about it, never try to appear virtuous in relation to those who have been forced to take up arms to liberate themselves. If we do, we have forgotten our own past. I come from a country where we make a virtue of patience, of persuasion rather than threats. But the movement I represent has, like all other radical movements, at one occasion or other in their history, been confronted with the choice between reform or violent revolution. It was not more than a generation or two ago that Sweden was an underdeveloped, poor and class-ridden society. The Swedish working class chose the peaceful transformation, but it was not alien to revolutionary violence in its struggle against the bureaucratic class society of that time.

At its congress in 1891 the Swedish Social Democratic Party strongly favoured peaceful change but at the same time said in a resolution: "The Social Democratic Labour Party, being a revolutionary party striving for a radical transformation of the existing bourgeois society, must take into consideration the possibility of using organized violence as the final means of liberating the suffering proletariat." By a combination of favourable circumstances we succeeded in transforming our society by peaceful change, by majority rule. It could have taken a quite different course.

It is easy to foresee that when people in search of peace and progress are met only by oppression and exploitation they will ultimately resort to violence. The armed struggle becomes the last possible resort. Now in Namibia and Zimbabwe continued armed struggle seems unavoidable. And history also tells us that once a people have taken up arms to liberate themselves, they will not give up until freedom has been achieved. How much armed pressure from the nationalists is necessary depends on how much unarmed pressure the Western powers apply in the form of sanctions and the like, as President Nyerere so well put it. There lies the possibility of an end to the armed struggle and a peaceful settlement on the basis of liberation and majority rule.

As the climax approaches and the struggle deepens in southern Africa, violence and economic disruption increase as well as the risk of the wrong kind of foreign involvement. The wrong kind of foreign intervention is the continued introduction of major-power rivalries in the region. The right kind of foreign involvement is that which will support the liberation struggle and reduce the resistance of the forces which still cling to the idea of maintaining white supremacy.

Extensive foreign investments in South Africa, Namibia and Rhodesia help to internationalize the conflict. These countries' natural resources and their strategic position may furnish a pretext for further involvement on behalf of the white régime. At the same time, however, such involvement would encourage other Powers to become more active in the area. We are facing the twofold risk

of a racial war and an escalated conflict between the foreign interests in that area. Thus the global consequences of the aggression against its neighbours and the situation in South Africa created by apartheid - those elements constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. Therefore chapter VII of the United Nations Charter should be applied.

The struggle of the oppressed should get the support of those outside, who are the friends of Africa. The Africans themselves will know how to master and control the influence of outside powers. African nations have shown a wise inclination to settle their problems within the Continent. Why should there be such concern in the West, I have often wondered, to categorize liberation movements in the third-world countries as friends or enemies of the West? The same, no doubt, applies to discussions among communist countries, where the same type of categorization takes place.

Those in the West who cry wolf about political and material aid to Africa from the East should consider their own contribution to this development. Did they themselves assist the liberation movements? From where did the Portuguese colonialists get their arms? From where have the South African racists got their arms and their licences?

At the same time non-aligned states as well as small nations should unite in solidarity in order to prevent a new scramble for Africa stemming from super power rivalry and from profit interests of multinational companies.

We should together oppose a trend of paternalism from those from the outside who seem to believe that only they can solve Africa's problems, that the Africans themselves are unable to find responses to their own national aspirations. The Africans of Zimbabwe, Namibia or South Africa have but one overriding goal: that of their own liberation, their own dignity, their own identity as peoples and nations. They will accept any assistance from whatever source because they wish to achieve their freedom.

The lesson is simple but fundamental: we should support the African peoples' struggle for liberation on their own terms, on African terms, because it represents the longing of the African peoples, the true and vital interests of the African nation.

Turning to the specific situation in Zimbabwe and Namibia we note that efforts to achieve a settlement of the Rhodesian problem have been intensified in the last year. Such efforts will have to be finally judged by their results. If they lead to solutions that satisfy the aspirations of the African majority, they would of course deserve support. The national liberation movement and the front-line States have a rich experience in dealing with the situation and with the rebel régime in Salisbury. Their attitude as to the form and content of further negotiations will decide the issue.

We are all aware that a negotiated settlement of the Rhodesian and Namibian problems cannot be achieved without the acquiescence of the government in Pretoria. The question has been put in some Western quarters, whether that régime should be

treated as an adversary or whether it would not be more fruitful to seek its co-operation by a more positive attitude. The question contains both a factual and a moral fallacy. The Government of South Africa will only do what is in its own interest and that interest is defined also in the context of what actions the outside world, particularly the Western Powers, will take. It will no doubt co-operate with the purpose of trying to install pliable régimes in Zimbabwe and Namibia, and it will only let go its hold over these territories when they become too costly liabilities to retain. It is possible to talk to the Pretoria Government if at the same time sanctions and increasing pressure are applied to give weight to the words. No solution of the problems of Zimbabwe and Namibia could ever contain any guarantee for the survival of apartheid in South Africa. What is finally at stake in Rhodesia as well as in Namibia is the future also of South Africa.

In Rhodesia, South Africa controls the survival of the rebel régime. In Namibia it is in itself in direct control by military force. South Africa has 50,000 troops in that territory which it rules in contravention of international law and countless United Nations resolutions. The South African plan for the territory is to divide the African population in a manner that would retain white economic and political control. It appears though that the Government in Pretoria is now prepared to abandon its Turnhalle puppets, though just how far it will go is still not clear. It is not for me to express myself on the points under negotiation. I can only recall certain basic principles. We are confronted with a colonial situation where discussions must be between the colonial authority and the representatives of the people. The United Nations have the legal responsibility over Namibia and should be a party to any negotiations as well as supervise and control any elections that may take place. The presence of South Africa, in the form of soldiers and political prisoners, symbolic of that régime, should come to an end.

The basic elements of the situation in southern Africa have by now been well analyzed. This conference makes a most valuable contribution. The need to act and to act decisively is clear to all. Action will have to be directed primarily against the apartheid régime because the survival of that system embraces the problems of Namibia and of Zimbabwe. The struggle is first and foremost the struggle of Africans, but it has long ceased to be exclusively an African struggle. It is a testing ground for all governments, a measure of their sincerity to commitments and principles.

The United Nations, with its Security Council, has a very particular and central responsibility.

However, the actions taken in the United Nations, or the lack of such actions, cannot serve as an alibi for passivity on the national level. Each country and government, each popular movement, has its own responsibility and its own role to play. That is why we have gathered here. The example is given by the front-line States in what they do for the liberation struggle notwithstanding heavy costs in human and material terms.

Allow me to recapitulate some of the areas where I believe action should be taken.

First, we must work for a halt to all arms exports to South Africa and all military co-operation with its Government. The apparatus of oppression is strengthened by each new weapons delivery or licence. Military co-operation gives that country the means to start its own manufacturing of arms in most important areas of weapon technology, maybe also in the ultimate of weapons. Can one really condemn the policy of apartheid in the United Nations, while one at the same time sends arms to those who are practising apartheid? A United Nations decision on a mandatory arms embargo is long overdue.

Secondly, we must seriously deal with the question of investment and export of capital to South Africa and Namibia. In this we should include the effects of transfer of technology as a strengthening of apartheid.

A ban on investment in South Africa can be really efficient only if it is part of an international action that has the support of industrialized countries with the largest economic interests in South African business and industry. The Security Council will shortly resume its discussions on this question, i.e. on the basis of a Swedish proposal adopted by the General Assembly last autumn, calling for action against foreign investment. A positive decision on this item would be the minimum expected from Western governments.

And to those who claim that such measures would upset basic principles of the Western economic system, we must explain that free men are more important than free movement of capital.

The question of limiting or ending foreign economic interests in South Africa is not merely a political question about what could conceivably be done to put effective pressure on the South African Government; it also becomes a moral question for each Government: should the companies - in our countries - be allowed to take part in the exploitation of the black labour force. According to South African laws, the foreign companies have to apply the rules of apartheid at their places of work. Thereby they are forced to place themselves on the side of the oppressors in the battle which is now about to enter a new and more serious stage. Therefore, in my opinion, the situation in South Africa has progressed to such a point that, in addition to international measures, each country has to consider unilateral prohibitive measures.

In Sweden, the Social Democratic Party has indicated one way to deal with this problem. We ask our Parliament for an immediate change in the currency legislation in order to prohibit the export of capital to South Africa and Namibia. As a second step to guarantee the deceleration of Swedish financial interests in the area, we urge the government to initiate discussions with the companies having subsidiaries in other countries investing in South Africa, for the purpose of reaching an agreement on how restrictions on Swedish companies in those countries should be applied. If such an agreement cannot be reached, we will propose further legislative measures.

Let me in this context add the following. It has been argued against a ban on investments in South Africa that this would hurt the parent companies in the Western world and lead to unemployment for the workers there. But in this case,

it is important to note that the workers themselves have made their choice, through their international confederations. They have told their governments that they support a ban on investments in South Africa and Namibia and are prepared to take the consequences of it. Now, the governments and the companies must take their responsibilities and show which forces they want to support.

Thirdly, we can give material and political support to the liberation movements and the already autonomous States in their struggle for national independence and economic emancipation. The repeated acts of aggression against Zambia, Angola, Mozambique and Botswana must be rebuffed. And if the opposition to foreign involvement in African affairs is to be credible, then also an end must be put to the recruitment, financing, training, transit and assembly of mercenaries on our own soil.

Governments could also easily increase their contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund, the International Aid and Defence Fund, the International University Exchange Fund and the like. Those bodies need funds and are doing extremely useful work in the field of humanitarian and legal aid to the victims of apartheid.

Fourthly, our refusal to recognize the so-called independent bantustans - Transkei being the first one - should be followed up by opposition to the efforts of international companies to give unofficial recognition by massive investments in those areas.

Fifthly, the illegal régime in Zimbabwe must be pressured to relinquish power. Sanctions must be strengthened.

Sixthly, we should increase our efforts to bring an end to the illegal occupation of Namibia, refute sham arrangements and refuse recognition to any puppets installed by South Africa. Support should be given to the South West African People's Organization (SWAPO), without whose participation no realistic policy can be shaped. Namibia should have immediate independence and majority rule. Free elections should be held under the supervision and control of the United Nations and should encompass the whole of Namibia as one political entity.

Mr. President, neutrality towards the existing and coming struggles in southern Africa is impossible. Between the exploiters and the exploited there is no middle ground. We cannot escape the question: whose allies do we want to be? Which side are we on?

This Conference is dealing with speeches, documents, resolutions, programmes of action. Behind these words and papers lies the reality of people. Human beings who suffer the indignities of apartheid, men and women who are imprisoned as political prisoners or mental detainees, children who are deprived of food, shelter, who see their parents constantly humiliated, who have known only resentment, rejection and violence.

The people here in Mozambique suffered their Wiriyamu and their Mucumbura. The people of South Africa suffered their Sharpeville and Soweto. The people of Zimbabwe suffered their Nyadzonya and Ndanga. The people of Namibia suffered

their Katutura and their Sialola. How many more names like this must be added to the list, before finally southern Africa has been liberated? This is a daily reality of people, but it is also the reality of this Conference. We must not fail in our support of human dignity, in our solidarity with the struggle for liberation. This Conference is important as an expression of this solidarity and hopefully as a basis for concerted action.

The longing for peace is common to all people. But as long as there is apartheid and racism, there can be no peace.

III. STATEMENTS BY THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE
NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS OF NAMIBIA AND ZIMBABWE

Speech by Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South-West
People's Organization (SWAPO)

Allow me, first of all, to express, on behalf of SWAPO and the embattled Namibian people, our profound gratitude to the General Assembly of the United Nations, for its praiseworthy resolution 31/145 of 17 December 1976, which authorized the Secretary-General of the United Nations to organize this meeting in co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, as well as in conjunction with the United Nations Council for Namibia, and also in consultation with the Organization of African Unity.

Permit me also, Mr. Chairman and distinguished delegates, to express our sincere thanks and appreciation to Comrade President Samora Machel, to FRELIMO, to the Government and to the people of Mozambique for making it possible for us to meet in this beautiful and revolutionary capital of the People's Republic of Mozambique.

To us in SWAPO who, for more than a decade, have shared with FRELIMO the daily agonies of the arduous and bitter struggle for national liberation, it is, indeed, a profound source of inspiration and encouragement to have this important meeting taking place in Maputo.

The fact that it is now possible for us to meet in Maputo is a concrete and cheering demonstration of the irreversible advance of the liberation struggle in southern Africa.

SWAPO has always considered the struggle to liberate all of southern Africa as indivisible. Accordingly, we regard the victories scored by the peoples of Mozambique, Angola, Guinea-Bissau, São Tomé and Príncipe as important battles won in a one, on-going and united struggle. Moreover, these victories of the peoples of Mozambique and other former Portuguese colonies, have re-affirmed SWAPO's conviction that no matter how difficult the struggle may be, we will certainly win against the forces of imperialism, colonialism and racism.

Mr. Chairman, it is now seventeen years since the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted its historic resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. This resolution placed a special responsibility upon the United Nations to support the struggle of all the oppressed and colonized peoples so as to enable them to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. This special responsibility is enshrined in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Since the adoption of that historic resolution, the United Nations has taken a number of commendable steps towards the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Over the last seventeen years, many countries in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and Pacific Islands have achieved their independence with the expressed support and, in some cases, assistance of the United Nations. Special tribute, in this respect, must be paid to the 24-nation Decolonization Committee whose members have kept both the spirit and the letter of the 1960 Declaration very much alive since 1961.

It is through this important Committee of the World Body that representatives of the oppressed and colonized peoples have been accorded the opportunity to expose the inhuman policies of imperialism, colonialism and racism. It was also through this Committee that spokesmen of the liberation movements have been afforded a platform to popularize the just struggle of their peoples against colonial domination, racist reaction and imperialist exploitation.

Those of us who are in the leadership of the liberation struggle are constantly faced with a host of problems. Besides those demanding tasks of organizing and planning a people's war of liberation, we have humanitarian, educational, health and many other social needs to cater for our peoples, who are forced to live a difficult exile life. Against this background I wish to seize this opportunity to express SWAPO's appreciation for the humanitarian assistance which the United Nations offers to the liberation movements through its specialized agencies.

I wish to note with thanks, furthermore, that during the last four years or so, the United Nations has been trying to do still better in assisting the colonized peoples of southern Africa to liberate themselves from the yoke of colonialism and racist oppression. A notable example of this new initiative to step up support for the struggling peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe, South Africa and the then Portuguese colonies was the convening of the 1973 Oslo International Conference of Experts for the Support of Victims of Colonialism and Apartheid in Southern Africa. The Conference, like this one, was aimed at mobilizing world-wide support for and assistance to the colonized peoples of southern Africa in their struggle for self-determination and independence. The results of the Oslo Conference have been quite constructive; for, many more people in the world and, particularly in the Nordic and Western European countries, have come to understand better and appreciate the justness and legitimacy of the liberation struggle which is being waged in southern Africa. It is, perhaps, not a mere coincidence that, besides the socialist countries, the governments of the Nordic countries are today on the forefront concerning concrete material assistance to the fighting liberation movements of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa.

I. The World Body's Special Responsibility

With particular reference to our country, I wish to express my movement's appreciation of the positive role which the United Nations has played towards the liberation of the oppressed people of Namibia. Through both the Committee of 24 and the Council for Namibia, and on the initiatives of the OAU and the non-aligned countries, the United Nations has correctly recognized SWAPO as the legitimate and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

It must be pointed out, however, that the United Nations has not bestowed this recognition on SWAPO as a matter of political favour. Rather, the recognition has been granted to our movement as an acknowledgement of its heroic political and military activities against the occupation régime in our country. It is also for this reason that the World Body has granted an observer status to SWAPO in the General Assembly.

The establishment of the United Nations Institute for Namibia in Lusaka is another concrete demonstration that the United Nations is aware of its special responsibility to assist the people of Namibia in their struggle for liberation.

The United Nations has also taken an unambiguous stand on the illegality of South Africa's oppressive and exploitative rule over Namibia, despite the fact that some United Nations Member States have refused to accept the economic and legal implications of the 1971 World Court ruling that South Africa's occupation of Namibia has been totally unlawful since 27 October 1966; and that any dealings with the occupying régime in Namibia, whether it be in terms of trade or investment, is a violation of the United Nations' correct position.

Notwithstanding the United Nations generous assistance and commendable acts of solidarity with the struggling people of Namibia, our people are still suffering under continued oppression and domination by the illegal racist minority régime of South Africa.

In defiance of the many decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly that South Africa must withdraw its repressive occupation from Namibia, Pretoria is now busier than ever before hatching out new colonial schemes with a view to entrenching its economic and military control over Namibia. Against this background, the United Nations must do more to help the Namibian people to put an immediate end to South Africa's illegal and brutal administration in Namibia.

II. The oppressed millions expect genuine support

The primary objective of this Conference, like that of the Oslo one four years ago, is to mobilize world-wide support for and assistance to the embattled peoples of southern Africa through political, diplomatic and concrete material support to their authentic national liberation movements.

What is of special importance regarding this Conference is the fact that it is being held under the enemy's very nose. This fact should bring home to the fanatic and racist oppressors of our people in Pretoria and Salisbury that representatives of an overwhelming majority of mankind are assembled here today to pass serious negative judgement against their repressive and fascist régimes.

More importantly, I am certain that the toiling masses of workers and peasants in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa are following the proceedings of this meeting with great interest and deep sense of hope. Millions of the oppressed peoples in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa are tuning on their radio receivers to the appropriate stations with a hope to receive encouraging and cheering news that this Conference is being held to truly define appropriate strategy and tactics in support of their liberation struggle.

May I appeal to the distinguished delegates through you, Mr. Chairman, that this Conference should not and must not disappoint them.

These toiling masses of workers and peasants in Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa will draw appropriate conclusions regarding this historic gathering. That is to say, if the Conference can come up with correct decisions, they will be highly inspired and encouraged to know that an extremely large portion of humanity is on the side of their just and noble struggle for national and social liberation.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, comrades and friends, while the oppressed people of southern Africa are hopeful of a new Maputo initiative in support of their liberation struggle, they are also mindful, at the same time, that in the past many progressive initiatives regarding United Nations support to the liberation struggle in southern Africa have been frustrated by the forces of imperialism within the United Nations system.

Things like triple vetos in support of the South African racists, sanction-bustings, military collaboration, exploitation of our people's labour and resources through investments in the racist-run economies of southern Africa are but constant and ugly reminders to the oppressed peoples of southern Africa that the world organization is not totally behind their struggle for liberation.

Against this background, I can re-assure you, Mr. Chairman, that no amount of pious declarations from this Conference, which does not contain convincing measures towards the total liquidation of imperialism, colonialism and racism in southern Africa, will impress these oppressed peoples. The world body must, therefore, do more to actually inspire and assist the peoples of Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa in their bitter fight for genuine independence and social liberation.

III. The situation in Namibia today

The most prominent feature of the political situation in Namibia today is the sharpening confrontation between the forces of national liberation, on one hand, and those of illegal occupation and Bantustanized new colonialism, on the other. Despite all the new manoeuvres designed to create a false impression that South Africa wants to give up its illegal and repressive occupation over Namibia, the objective fact remains that Pretoria has not abandoned its basic imperialist aim to keep Namibia under its political, economic and military domination.

A close examination of the evolution of the South African imperialist policy in respect to Namibia shows that while there has been a degree of strategic moves and tactical shifts over the last five years or so, there has been no clearly identifiable fundamental change in the essence of South Africa's policy objective to retain control and domination over Namibia.

Confronted, during the 1972-1974 period, with SWAPO's internal mobilization of workers, youths, churches, and having a large part of its armed forces tied down in Namibia by our liberation fighters, and also faced with intensified international pressure, the South African racist régime was forced to modify its strategy of overt Bantustan-building. This strategy came to be seen as inadequate to ensure South Africa's continued domination over Namibia.

Against this background, we saw by 1975 Vorster talking of special international status of "South West Africa" and the idea of a confederation of eleven Bantustans. The political essence of such a confederation would be a built-in protection for inequality on the basis of race, a dominant settler group with entrenched power to defend their own and South Africa's exploitative interests, and a façade of puppet Black "leaders" who have been brought together into the Turnhalle tribal talks.

As these tactical shifts were going on, many more South African troops and so-called security forces were being brought into Namibia to suppress the people. Moreover, harassments and intimidations remained the order of the day against all those who dared to oppose the illegal presence of South Africa in our country.

Over the last seventeen months, a more elaborate vision of a Bantustanized and puppet confederation began to emerge. By February this year Vorster had called upon the Turnhalle puppets to release to the world their so-called draft constitution for the establishment of an interim government in Windhoek. However, this draft constitution came as shocking embarrassment to those it was intended to satisfy, the major Western powers. The proposals contained in the so-called draft constitution have revealed much more clearly that what Pretoria is trying to impose on the Namibians is nothing more than a Transkei type of independence.

In line with the true motives of the real sponsors of Turnhalle tribal talks, this laughable draft constitution has, as the foundation of its ideological and economic policy, "the principle of free economic structure and inviolability of the possession of land and property". This pre-occupation with the protection of the existing structure of private property can, of course, never be confused with the genuine interest and aspirations of the Namibian people to assert their sovereign right over their land and all its resources. On the contrary, this constitutional provision about the "inviolability" of private possession of land and property is obviously intended to protect white property-owning classes and their privileged position, which is the cause of the liberation struggle the Namibian people are waging.

With this built-in protection for inequality on the basis of race, with the socio-economic power of the local settler group, and with the broader exploitative interest of the multi-national corporations firmly entrenched in the Turnhalle draft constitution, it has now been thought possible to call upon the white settlers in Namibia to approve the establishment of a puppet interim government in Namibia.

Under the terms of Turnhalle constitution, the South African government has arrogated to itself all the most essential aspects of government power, such as in those crucial areas of security, public media and finance. It is impossible to imagine how free conditions for independence can be created by the interim government if the following executive and legislative powers are retained by the South African government as proposed in Turnhalle document: defence, external affairs, transport, finance and foreign exchange, internal security, including the operation of the South African Defence Force and Police, telecommunications, including broadcasting, posts, customs and excise and sales policy.

Thus, the proposed constitutional basis for the interim government exposes the determination of the South African government to continue its illegal control and occupation of Namibia, under the pretext that this has been agreed to by the Namibian people themselves through the Turnhalle stooges.

Through the Turnhalle circus, South Africa is trying to cheat the whole world into believing that she is ready to grant independence to Namibia whereas in actual fact she is working hard to formalize the existing, imposed de facto Bantustan status of Namibia.

The Namibian people, led by SWAPO, will continue with the struggle until such a time when the South African government can understand that it cannot succeed in forcing our people to accept its scheme of a Bantustanized neo-colonialism controlled from Pretoria. To this end, I would like, Mr. Chairman, to renew our call to all members of the United Nations to reject and denounce the South African government attempts to set up the so-called interim puppet government in Namibia.

As we have said time and again, SWAPO is ready to talk to the representatives of the South African government about the modalities of transferring power to the Namibian people whenever Pretoria decides to face up to the objective reality that it cannot force the Namibian people to accept a puppet régime imposed on them through the Turnhalle stooges. It remains also our firm position that the United Nations is the legal custodian of Namibia; and that, as the only just conditions for talks, the occupying régime must accept the following:

1. South Africa must publicly accept the right of the Namibian people to independence and national sovereignty.
2. South Africa must publicly announce that Namibian territorial integrity is absolute and not negotiable in any quarter.
3. All political prisoners must be released.
4. All political exiles, of whatever political organization, must be allowed freely to return to their country without fear of arrest or victimization.
5. South Africa must commit herself to the removal of her police and army.
6. Any constitutional talks on Namibia must take place under United Nations supervision, and should aim at the holding of free elections in Namibia under United Nations supervision and control.

Moreover, SWAPO supports the Security Council resolution 385 of 30 January 1976 which, among other things, calls on South Africa to take immediate steps to withdraw its occupying forces from Namibia and allow for free national elections under the United Nations supervision and control.

SWAPO cannot, however, conceive free elections in Namibia which do not involve prior withdrawal of South African forces of repression and intimidation. For those who do not know Namibia well, it is necessary to point out that South Africa has ruled Namibia over the last 62 years by fear and force, trickery and treachery. As such, no election held with her army or police still present would be free from fear and intimidation. Without a clear international administrative presence and a free campaign, many potential voters would feel that the whole exercise is a trap set to identify supporters of the liberation movement. Therefore, a selected international administration for the purpose of conducting free elections, would be necessary. Many Namibians will not believe that they have been given a fair chance to express their true political position if the South African troops and police are not withdrawn.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, allow me to make one thing absolutely clear here. As a true liberation movement which has been fighting South African colonialism over the last sixteen years, a movement whose many cadres have sacrificed their lives or are imprisoned because of their effort to liberate Namibia, SWAPO cannot and will never accept any attempt, from any quarter, to bring it on the same level with the Turnhalle puppets.

We know that, when Vorster organized the Turnhalle circus in September 1975, some of the Western powers welcomed, if perhaps mutedly, the exercise. Some felt that the Turnhalle tribal talks held forth some prospects for a "moderate" and "anti-communist Black government in Namibia". Against this background, some kind of paternalist attempts were made to persuade SWAPO to accept the Turnhalle as "one of the interested major parties" regarding the question of finding a genuine solution to the problem of Namibia's independence. This is, in our view, an attempt to undermine the correct position of the United Nations, the OAU and the non-alignment movement, a position which says there are only three interested major parties to the problem - namely - SWAPO, the United Nations and South Africa.

The Turnhalle people are puppets of South Africa, plain and simple. They have no serious independent views which are different from those of their sponsor - the South African government. It is against this background that we are opposed to the current U.S., British, West German, French and Canadian attempts to want to place our glorious movement on par with those traitors to the Namibian people. Puppets are puppets. They cannot serve both the interests of their masters and of the Namibian people at the same time. SWAPO will never accept any kind of compromise with or accommodation of the Turnhalle puppets, except if they renounce quite categorically their present reactionary position.

Mr. Chairman, as I have pointed out earlier, the Namibian people will continue the political and armed struggle until genuine national independence is achieved. South Africa must be obliged to give up her imperialistic designs in respect to Namibia.

Until South Africa complies with the Security Council resolution 385, the United Nations must now intensify its opposition to continued South African occupation of Namibia on the following levels:

1. Isolate any puppet régime which South Africa may impose on the Namibian people.
2. The Security Council should impose a complete embargo on the sale of arms and military telecommunications equipment to the South African régime in Namibia.
3. No trade alliances with South Africa in respect to Namibia should be undertaken by the United Nations member states, or non-member states.
4. United Nations Member States should take steps to enforce the United Nations Decree for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia by prohibiting the importation of Namibian goods without the permission of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia.

5. The United Nations should re-affirm its correct position concerning SWAPO's role as the only authentic representative of the people of Namibia.

6. Maximum political and material support must be given to SWAPO to enable it to speed up the struggle for liberation.

7. Grant full membership to Namibia, through the United Nations Council for Namibia, in the Specialized Agencies and other United Nations bodies.

8. Member states should provide more financial contribution to the Institute for Namibia to enable the Institute to expand both its training and research programmes in preparation of Namibian nationhood.

In conclusion, allow me once again, Mr. Chairman, to express our deep and sincere thanks to all those who have contributed their time and energy in organizing this Conference, and to Comrade President Samora Machel, FRELIMO, the Government and to the people of Mozambique for agreeing to host this important meeting.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Speech by Mr. Robert Mugabe
Co-leader of the Zimbabwe Patriotic Front

The Patriotic Front of ZANU and ZAPU takes this opportunity to express its profound gratitude to the United Nations Decolonization Committee and the Council for Namibia for sponsoring this Conference in Maputo, capital city of Mozambique. We would like to pay special tribute to Dr. Kurt Waldheim, United Nations Secretary-General, Ambassadors Salim A. Salim, Chairman of the Decolonization Committee, Dustan Kamana, President of the UN Council for Namibia, Leslie O. Harriman of the UN Anti-Apartheid Committee and their respective teams for spearheading the sponsorship of this Conference in Maputo. Our thanks are also due to the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique, Comrade Samora Moises Machel, FRELIMO, the Mozambican Government and the People of Mozambique, for offering their country as host of this important Conference.

The choice of Maputo as the venue of this year's UN Conference on Zimbabwe and Namibia is significant because Mozambique constitutes one of the states affording a key frontline to the liberation struggles of these two countries, to Zimbabwe in particular and South Africa in general. Mozambique is one of the bridges between freedom and oppression, between justice and injustice, between racial equality and racial discrimination, between independence and colonial domination. Here, the people's might crushed imperialism and colonialism. The holding of this Conference in Maputo will thus be an educational experience for the oppressed Peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa.

For these people who have only heard reports about Mozambique facing enormous problems of refugees flocking from Zimbabwe and air raids from the fascist régime of Ian Smith, this Conference should provide them with an opportunity to study the situation at first hand and also to sense and feel the tense war atmosphere that prevails close to this country.

The Patriotic Front considers this Conference a major development towards the total isolation of the racist and fascist régimes of Ian Smith and John Vorster. This Conference must serve as the writing on the wall for the racist régimes in southern Africa and their imperialist sponsors. The efforts by the UN to isolate the rebel régime in Salisbury started in December 1966, when the UN Special Committee on Decolonization decided to impose selective mandatory sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. This was followed in May 1968 by the UN Security Council resolution which imposed comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia. The major break-through in the isolation of the racists occurred in March 1976, when the President of Mozambique, Comrade Samora Moises Machel closed the Mozambique - Rhodesia border. The closing of the Mozambique - Rhodesia border ended a ten-year sanctions busting carried out by the fascist Portuguese régimes of Salazar and Caetano, through Mozambique.

International efforts, in particular UN efforts to isolate and break the back of the régime of Smith have been heavily undercut by sanctions violators among whom are some countries represented here. The fascist régimes of John Vorster in South Africa and the Portuguese régimes of Salazar and Caetano in Mozambique were the main violators of the sanctions against the Smith régime.

In 1971, through the Byrd Amendment, the USA flagrantly violated UN sanctions by allowing the importation of chrome from Rhodesia on the flimsy ground that it was a strategic mineral that was important for USA defence build-up. We are, however, to note that through the efforts of the Carter Administration, this amendment has at last been repealed.

The Patriotic Front strongly denounces those countries that continue to violate UN sanctions, in particular South Africa; Britain, USA, and France by allowing their oil conglomerates to supply oil to Rhodesia. It is a shame that these same countries advocate a peaceful settlement in Zimbabwe yet they at the same time fail to employ effectively those peaceful methods that would bring down the illegal régime.

More serious has been the acquiescence of western countries Britain, USA, France, Canada, Australia, West Germany, Portugal, Belgium, etc. in the recruitment of mercenaries for the Smith régime. The Patriotic Front also unreservedly denounces these countries for facilitating the recruitment of mercenaries currently fighting in Zimbabwe. The international isolation of the racist régime of Ian Smith should not be considered a charitable contribution to the people of Zimbabwe. The people of Zimbabwe should not be viewed as objects of charity. By advocating the isolation of Smith, we are by no means invoking the international community's sense of charity but are reminding all Members of the UN of their international obligations in respect of the oppressed people of Zimbabwe so a just political and legal order can be created in the country.

It is for this reason that we call upon this Conference to look at itself as an international forum for the urgent promotion of the decolonization process in Zimbabwe. While the Patriotic Front attaches importance to the efforts of the international community to help bring down the Smith régime, we believe that the main task of liberating Zimbabwe belongs to us the oppressed people of Zimbabwe. It is we, Zimbabweans who have to carry the main burden of the liberation of our people and of our country for we are makers of our own history. Accordingly, we have constituted ourselves into a movement that is trying to save humanity from the scourge of imperialism, colonialism and racism which have dehumanized our people as indeed they dehumanized other peoples in the greater part of the world for centuries.

We are dedicated lovers of independence and peace, the sacred right of any people anywhere. At the same time, having come to the conclusion that Britain, the administering colonial Power, has not only shirked its responsibility in relation to the people of Zimbabwe, but has in fact by calculated acts of commission and omission, aided and abetted the Smith illegal régime, we have mobilised our freedom-loving people towards the achievement of our objective of peace and independence in Zimbabwe. Only through the instrument of war is any peace possible.

We hold this view in full cognisance of the role played by the UN through vigorous attempts to bring about peaceful change in Zimbabwe. The holding of this Conference in this vicinity is yet another laudable attempt by the UN to induce an acceleration in the process of change from racist settler rule to democratic rule. However, it must be admitted that all the endeavours by the UN's Security Council and the General Assembly have yielded no effective result.

Against the background of a raging guerilla war, the British and Americans began, what has been referred to as the Anglo-American initiative, last year. The Patriotic Front became one of the parties invited to the Geneva Conference held from October to December last year. We had hoped that the British Government would, in pursuit of its much publicized acceptance of the principle of the transference of effective power to the people of Zimbabwe, take definite steps to bring about the necessary transference. Geneva turned into a disgraceful farce. The British unashamedly confessed, as indeed they have always done, that they lacked the means whereby Smith might be caused to comply with the will of the seven million Zimbabweans. Indeed far from their desiring Smith to fall, they sought vigorously to give him yet another lease of political life to continue his wanton brutalities against our people and well-sponsored naked aggression against the front-line States. We rejected this Anglo-American conspiracy to legalise treason and sanction a perpetuation of colonial domination albeit under some guise of seeming power transfer.

The Anglo-Americans, as true partners in contriving deceptive schemes, are at it once again. On our part, and we are sure this is also the view of the UN, the responsibility for decolonizing our territory is an exclusively British one and so only Britain and ourselves, the Patriotic Front, as the authentic representatives of the people of Zimbabwe, must be directly engaged in any constitutional negotiations, whether in the form of a full-fledged Conference or of informal discussions or consultations. Strangers are barred entry into our home whether by the front or hind door.

The involvement by the USA in Zimbabwe will intensify the superpower rivalry in Zimbabwe and indeed in southern Africa. Such a development would internationalize the situation and make it internationally explosive, thus constituting a threat to international security. Equally serious is the fact that once the USA co-sponsors the Conference and participates fully at the Constitutional Conference table, she will insist that the situation in Zimbabwe move in its favour. Any deviation from the American position would not be tolerated. The point might at the moment appear far-fetched, but the Vietnamese experience is still fresh in our minds.

Vietnam was a French colony, but after World War II, the French asked for American help because the latter had no power to defeat the national liberation forces in the region. In 1955, the USA attended the Paris Talks on Vietnam. The next thing was that the USA had taken direct colonial control of Vietnam and in the 1960's engulfed the Vietnamese people in one of the most savage, barbarous, bitterest and most ruthless wars the world has ever seen. We therefore categorically say NADA to the internationalisation and Americanisation of our situation.

Our resistance to direct USA participation in any Zimbabwe Constitutional Conference does not in any way stem from our hatred of Americans. On the contrary,

Americans are not different from other people. There are some good as well as bad Americans, just as there are some good and bad people in any other society.

Our opposition to direct American involvement in our affairs is that by an accident of history we have been colonized by Britain. We did not like it, we still do not like it, and we will never like it, but we cannot change this reality that Britain is the colonial power in Zimbabwe. As the colonial power, Britain alone is, therefore, duty-bound to discharge its colonial responsibility and not shift responsibility to the American and other Western countries.

It is not by any means suggested that in discharging its colonial responsibility, Britain should not marshal support from or **co-ordinate its** activities with its allies. Britain is free to use American pressure or pressure from any of its circle of friends, but this must be done informally behind the scenes but never formally and never insisting that they appear at a conference table. If the current Anglo-American initiative on Zimbabwe is to see the light of day, the sponsors should seriously be guided by the views of the Patriotic Front. The Patriotic Front's position is very clear. First, Britain must recognize that the Geneva affair is dead. The death of Geneva means also that the ground rules and the participants at Geneva have disappeared with it. The new British initiative must have its own ground rules and new participants. Secondly, Britain must recognize that Zimbabwe is at present engulfed in a war situation. The two parties to the war raging in Zimbabwe are Britain as directly represented in Salisbury by the Smith régime and the African masses as represented by the Patriotic Front. To solve this war situation, only the warring parties must come to an agreement. In this connection, the British Government stands on the one side and the Patriotic Front on the other, for Britain must accept the reality that any Constitutional Conference is in reality a peace conference involving the warring parties.

Thirdly, there must be an unqualified transfer of power. There can be no half measures. The transfer of power must be complete and total. The people of Zimbabwe have not shed their precious blood for the last decade in order to achieve a false type of independence that leads itself to manipulation by those powers with vested interests. Finally, Britain must prove her capability, indeed her determination, that after a successful conclusion of a Constitutional Conference, she will implement the agreement that will have been reached.

It is not our intention to discourage those who pursue peaceful means to resolve the Zimbabwean problem. We recognize their right and freedom to exercise their minds and make the necessary attempts. On our part, however, the fact that there is a war raging in Zimbabwe means any talk of peace must necessarily be talk of the war and of removing the very causes that have given rise to the existing conflict.

We may be accused, as indeed we have already been, of being bloodthirsty extremists, radicals or war mongers. These accusations are as false as they are unwarranted. Zimbabweans have been very patient. Our patience has, in most cases been mistaken for weakness. Zimbabweans, like most people, love peace. We would have been the happiest people to achieve our independence without a single drop of blood, but alas! this has not been made possible. Peace is our main goal.

This Conference, in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia meets at a critical time in the development of the armed struggle in Zimbabwe. It meets at a time when ZIPA forces are inflicting heavy casualties on the enemy. A day hardly passes without reports by the enemy himself of casualties to him. Under the correct leadership of the Patriotic Front, ZIPA forces have mobilised and united with the masses of Zimbabwe to storm and shatter into pieces Smith's Rhodesian kingdom. ZIPA's military campaign has exposed the Smith régime's military weakness and has shown up his régime for a "Paper Tiger" that it has always been.

The area of our operations now covers more than two-thirds of the country. And most of the areas which are of great economic importance to the racist régime and which accounts for Smith's intransigence have come under the effective influence of our forces.

The intensification of the war, in particular the penetration of the guerrilla fighters into the enemy's strategic areas in the country has exposed the inhuman barbaric nature of the Smith régime. In a desperate bid to contain our forces, in the country, the régime has now resorted to some of the most despicable atrocities imaginable. The régime has rounded up thousands of African civilians and herded them like sheep in concentration camps ironically called "KEEPS". Recently the régime rounded up more than 250,000 peasants in the Honde Valley near the Mozambican border and put them in a new concentration camp. In these camps, the régime's hostages are denied proper shelter, adequate food, clothing and medical services. Sanitary conditions are atrocious in the extreme. At times Smith's Selous Scouts invade these "KEEPS" and eliminate people they suspect of having any links with guerrillas.

The Smith régime has also resorted to mass murder of innocent civilians both Africans and whites including missionaries who have become our sympathetic, often active supporters. On 8 August 1976, fascist troops invaded Mozambique and cold bloodedly massacred nearly 700 innocent Zimbabwean refugees at Nyadzonya who had escaped Smith's terror and nightmare a few months before.

On December 6, 1976, Smith's killer squad murdered a retired Roman Catholic Bishop (Schmidt), a Roman Catholic priest and a nun and injured another nun in the Lupani area.

On the 14th of December 1976, the Selous Scouts wantonly murdered Reverend Elisha Kuwana and his wife at Chitenderano near Umtali.

On February 2, this year, a well-planned and orchestrated murder of three Jesuit priests and four Dominican nuns was systematically carried out at Musami Mission, 30 miles away from Salisbury. Father Martin Thomas (45), Father Christopher Shepherd Smith (35), Brother John Conway (57), Sister Magdalene Christa Lavabosky (42), Sister Paulina Wilkinson (58), Sister Ceslous Anna Stiegler (59) and Sister Ephantany Bertha Shneider (73), were gunned down in a lightning attack by Smith's killer squad. On April 4, the Smith gangsters

murdered Rev. Basil Nyabadza of St. Francis Mission in Rusape. Rev. Nyabadza was a well-known staunch supporter of the nationalist cause whose children had earlier fled out of the country as refugees. On May 6, this year, the Rhodesian soldiers indiscriminately massacred over 35 innocent civilians and wounded over 34 others in the Ndanga district in the south-east of the country.

The régime's contention that the victims were caught in a cross-fire between freedom fighters and the rebel troops is utterly false. There is no grain of truth in the report and the world should dismiss it for the contempt it deserves.

The truth is that rebel troops dastardly murdered the masses at Dambwa Kraal after a number of the rebel soldiers had been gunned down in a separate battle a few hours earlier by the ZIPA forces of the Patriotic Front. Out of desperation because of their inability to face the guerrilla force in the area, the rebel soldiers went on a rampage, shooting indiscriminately at anything that moved.

The Dambwa Kraal massacre clearly demonstrated the cruelty, savagery and barbarism of the Smith régime - the supposed vanguard of Western civilization in the country. The silence of Britain on this incident and on many others stuns human conscience. Apart from the naked murder of political opponents, the Smith régime has started a witch-hunting campaign against Roman Catholic missionaries. Some of the Roman Catholic priests have disappeared without trace. Others, like Father Paul Egli, have been tried and sentenced to one year imprisonment. Yet others like the renowned Roman Catholic missionary, Bishop Donald Lamont, have been arrested, tried, sentenced and then deported out of the country.

The campaign against the Roman Catholic Church by the Smith régime is deliberate and calculated because of the stiff resistance which that Church has put up against the injustice, mass murder of people perpetrated by the fascist régime of Ian Smith.

Smith, in an attempt to cover up these atrocities, has accused us of committing them. Why should we, as freedom fighters dedicated to the amelioration of inhumanity and the enhancement of peace and calm, negate our very objective by eliminating defenceless people and causing unnecessary suffering? We remain firmly obedient to the rules of our war. The truth is that the white missionaries are being sacrificed by the Smith régime on the mistaken belief that the gullible Western world will believe his side and see justice in his cause and injustice in ours. Fortunately, the progressive world has long ceased to be susceptible to deceit and hypocrisy.

In any case, the struggle in Zimbabwe and indeed in southern Africa as a whole has never been against the white man per se. It is not a struggle for exclusive African rights. On the contrary our struggle is against an unjust system - a system of exploitation, oppression and racial discrimination. It is a struggle for human equality and dignity. The struggle, as we see it, is fundamentally between the exploiting class and the exploited class. The exploiters,

who control political, military and economic power, are of a wholly white class and the exploited and powerless are wholly Africans. Because of this racial division, our struggle tends to be confused and often misinterpreted as a racial one. We do not accept this thesis. We believe that white racism is only the result of the irrationality of imperialism - the highest stage of capitalism. Imperialism, to us, has been the major source of economic and social conflict. The concentration in a few hands of the ownership of the means of production and the unequal distribution of the products of human labour have resulted in a tragic situation where few countries in Western Europe, the USA and Japan have established political, economic, military and cultural hegemony over many parts of the developing world. The recent summit meeting in London of the so-called seven wealthiest countries on earth graphically illustrates the monopolization and concentration of wealth in a few selected countries and people.

Our situation is, therefore, comparable to other colonial situations. There has been in Zimbabwe, as indeed in Mozambique, Zambia, Kenya, Somalia, etc. a superimposition by the colonizers of a socio-economic system that created classes, evincing different and antagonistic class positions and class interests.

What this means for us in Zimbabwe is that our struggle must aim first at the defeat of imperialism and colonialism and secondly at the creation of a national democratic state offering us not only a ripe political context but also the vital instruments whereby we can achieve the process of social transformation in accordance with the interests of our broad masses. Our war should be viewed as an instrument for change and, we appeal, therefore, to this Conference for such material, political and moral assistance as can lend efficacy to our armed struggle and make victory certain. We equally appeal to this august Conference to attend fully to the question of naked and unprovoked aggression by Smith against the front-line States of Mozambique, Zambia and Botswana. The people of Mozambique, Zambia and Botswana under their dynamic leaderships have refused to be blackmailed into submission and have kept the flame of the revolution burning. We hail and salute the fortitude of the Mozambicans, the Zambians and the Tswana, in particular those in the Provinces or areas bordering with Zimbabwe who have been exposed to the régime's wanton acts. Only a day ago Smith arrogantly transmitted a message through the British Government, I repeat, the British Government, to be conveyed to the Zambian Government, to the effect that he would attack Zambia unless the latter ceased allegedly to aid guerrilla activities from her borders. There is the man, Ian Smith, in his true colours - an unmitigated aggressor, a wanton murderer and a completely lawless character who is running amock and gaining a longer lease of life by acts of terrorism aided and abetted by British, American and French weapons.

The Patriotic Front is determined to hunt him down and destroy him by destroying his citadel. His empire must go and the emperor with it. In this noble task of destroying imperialism, it is our realization that the unity of the people of Zimbabwe is vitally important. The Patriotic Front, consisting of ZANU and ZAPU, constitutes a firm basis for a solid and broad national united front of the whole nation of Zimbabwe. It is the necessary vanguard for the mobilization of the masses and rallying them behind the armed struggle. We are building a united front of people in all walks of life who hold our patriotism as the bond and these comprise workers, peasants, soldiers, intellectuals, students and African businessmen. It is only by maintaining the National United