

To: Those Concerned about Southern Africa  
From: Peter 'Molotsi & David Sogge  
Subject: Maputo Conference on Zimbabwe and Namibia

Date: June 10 1977

\* AN AFSC \*  
EXCLUSIVE \*

Little noticed in the Western media, the United Nations Conference in Support of the Peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique from May 16 to 21, 1977, may have marked a turning-point in the history of southern Africa. Attended by **representatives** of 93 nations plus nationalist leaders of Zimbabwe and Namibia, the event underscored the now formidable world support for liberation in southern Africa.

We of the AFSC Southern Africa Program are pleased to share with you some exclusive reports on the Conference, and the words of leading figures in it. Martha Honey, a former AFSC staff person, now a journalist resident in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, **went to Maputo** on our behalf. She interviewed a number of the key figures and recorded some of the major speeches and news conferences. She and her husband Tony Avirgan collaborated in writing a number of the dispatches attached here.

In a letter to us after the conference ended, Martha wrote the following:

I found the conference most exciting. There were some excellent speeches -- Machel, Ramphal, Manley, Mugabe, Palme. I feel I got to know the liberation movement people much better and am increasingly impressed with Mugabe. He is intelligent and thoughtful, seems to clearly understand U.S. policy and has a vision for building a socialist state after independence.

\* \* \*

In contrast with Mugabe, Sam Nujomo seems less clear ideologically -- a pure nationalist without much sense of the type of independent Namibia they will try to build. I also found the conference very educational for understanding better Andrew Young's outlook. He really tried to sell himself as a sort of comrade in the struggle, failing to recognize that in the eyes of the liberation people and the progressive Africans he is simply a representative of the greatest imperialist country. His remarks were both naive -- lacking an historical understanding of the southern Africa struggles -- and racist -- claiming expertise because he is black.

We think you will find the attached reports revealing of the aspirations and fears of some of the important leaders in the southern African struggle. Featured are:

- Summary Report, and article intended for the Washington Star
- Excerpts from Amb. Andrew Young's Address to the Maputo Conference
- Robert Mugabe Press Conference (comments on Andrew Young's address)
- Robert Mugabe Speech to the Maputo Conference
- Exclusive Interview with Robert Mugabe in Dar es Salaam before the Conference
- Exclusive Interview with Bishop Abel Muzorewa in Dar es Salaam
- Sam Nujoma Press Conference
- Exclusive Interview with Hidipo Hamutenya of SWAPO
- Excerpts from Pres. Samora Machel Speech to the Maputo Conference

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE  
1501 Cherry Street  
Philadelphia, Penna. 19102

SOUTHERN AFRICA PROGRAM

\*\*\*\*\*BULLETIN\*\*\*\*BULLETIN\*\*\*\*\*

The following dispatch was written by Martha Honey, AFSC special correspondent at the United Nations-sponsored International Conference in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique May 16 to 21, 1977.

---

Report on U.N. Conference in Support of the People  
of Zimbabwe and Namibia  
Maputo, 16 - 20 May 1977

Results of Conference: The final two documents which were adopted by consensus are a somewhat watered-down version of the original working paper. The agreed-upon program of action calls on the UN and member nations to take a series of measures against the white minority regimes in Rhodesia, Namibia and South Africa, including a blanket economic embargo against Rhodesia, the outlawing of mercenary recruitment and training; and prevention of multinational corporations, in particular oil companies, from trading with Rhodesia. The political declaration calls on the UN and member states to increase aid to the liberation movements in Rhodesia and Namibia. The only new mandatory sanctions are the arms embargo against South Africa. The 5 western Security Council members did not endorse the documents.

The drafting committee, called the Committee of the Whole, had worked hard all week, under the Chairmanship of Tanzanian Ambassador Salim Salim, to produce a final version which could be accepted unanimously. But Ambassador Andrew Young made it clear early in the week that he would not endorse "blanket sanctions" and would only consider endorsing very limited sanctions aimed at achieving specific limited ends. When a version emerged from Committee late in the week Young said the U. S. could not accept it and mentioned specifically that the call to apply Article 41 of the UN Charter was against US law. Article 41 calls for tele-communications sanctions.

Representatives of SWAPO and the Patriotic Front however have told me they are pleased with the outcome of the conference. It was attended by 93 nations and they feel now a majority of the nations are clearly committed to supporting the liberation movements either with military or humanitarian aid and to isolating the white-ruled states of Southern Africa. Both movements seem optimistic that independence and majority rule will come within a year or so.

Prospects for Peaceful Settlements: The nationalist forces contend that they have always been willing to have a peaceful settlement and that at some point independence and majority rule will be decided through negotiations. They say that their demands have always been consistent: in the case of SWAPO, that the UN assume its full responsibility and that Vorster withdraw his troops from Namibia and release all political prisoners prior to elections: in the case of Zimbabwe, that the British assume their colonial responsibility and guarantee the transfer of power to the majority. The one change in the Patriotic Front's position is that now they say they are the sole representative of the people of Zimbabwe since they represent the fighting force. They therefore are not willing to sit down at a Geneva-type conference where Muzorewa and Sithole are equally represented. They say these two are now "irrelevant characters" and can be invited to join the British team, along with Smith, if the British wish.

Both SWAPO and the Patriotic Front say that it is the armed struggle and not western pressure or initiatives which make the prospects for a peaceful settlement better each day.

Western Initiatives: Both SWAPO and the Patriotic Front continue to be skeptical of western initiatives. Sam Nujomo of SWAPO described the initiatives by the five western Security Council members as an "attempt to bail South Africa out of her predicament in Namibia." SWAPO was especially angered that representatives of the 5 countries visited Namibia, a clear violation of UN Resolutions calling for no dealings with Namibia. SWAPO says they are not opposed to western efforts as long as they are conducted in the framework of UN Resolutions. However they fear that the current initiatives are an attempt to usurp the power of the UN and establish a pro-western regime. The Patriotic Front is wary of US involvement in Zimbabwe negotiations. They are opposed to the US co-chairing or having any role in constitutional talks. As Joseph Musika, Secretary General of ZAPO, said to me, "Our memories of Vietnam are still very fresh. We know how the US moved into Vietnam as the French were withdrawing. We don't want to internationalize the situation in Zimbabwe." But again, as with SWAPO, they are willing to have the US apply pressure on Smith and Vorster such as sanctions. It therefore seems that the current moves by the Special Representatives of Britain and the US will have tough going. The Patriotic Front is talking with the British Social Representative, but has already made clear it will not accept any constitution drawn up by the Special Representatives. They say, a constitution must be worked out at a constitutional conference, the principals of which must be Britain and the Patriotic Front.

The Zimbabwe Development Fund: I talked with the British Ambassador to the UN James Murray and he emphasized the Fund is still in a preliminary stage and that it is simply a carry over of the Kissinger plan, the aim of which is to pay whites to stay and to "develop" an independent Zimbabwe economically. He conceded it would probably not be operative if a settlement came through armed struggle. Using information from Chris Root of Washington Office on Africa, I talked with Mugabe and other PF people. They seemed vaguely aware of the Fund, took the literature and said they would study it. Mugabe said it shows the US has long term designs on Zimbabwe and that it appears to be a sort of bribe to get them to accept the Anglo/American plan for a negotiated settlement.

Reactions to Andrew Young: See attached article which Tony and I wrote for the Washington Star. I think that pretty well covers it.

WASHINGTON STAR ARTICLE

MAPUTO - Ambassador Andrew Young, whose easy-going manner and "I'm here only to learn" approach had won him friends -and the Carter administration time- in an earlier visit to Africa, got into trouble here when he started speaking "as a fellow Black Man" and tried to lecture Africans on how to go about winning their freedom.

Before he left town, Mozambican President Samora Machel had to ask him to refrain from delivering any more "racist speeches" while in the country. Rhodesian and Namibian Nationalist Leaders, who are heavily engaged in Guerrilla Warfare, said that they resented having Young, an outsider, lecture them. "He just doesn't understand the history of our struggle" said Rhodesian nationalist leader Robert Mugabe.

During his speech to the "United Nations Conference in Support of the People of Zimbabwe and Namibia" Young urged nationalists in Rhodesia and Namibia to abandon the armed struggle, which has already claimed thousands of Black lives, and adopt the non-violent tactics of the American Civil Rights Movement. Young called for Blacks living under white minority rule in Southern Africa to engage in economic boycotts. He said "The combination of (economic) pressures and incentives are more effective than outright war."

Young dwelt heavily on the fact that he is Black and therefore understands the situation of Africans living under white rule. He declared, "If we do an analysis of the racism that we find pervading in southern Africa we find a phenomenon with which I am very familiar, it's been part of my whole life - come to me with my mother's milk." Throughout the speech Young referred to Machel, Mugabe and any other Black person as "Brother".

Such talk upset Machel, a staunch Marxist who sees all things in economic rather than racial terms. Since Machel's Frelimo party came to power in Mozambique two years ago a vigorous and uncompromising campaign against both Black and White racism has been waged.

At a reception given by Machel before Young's speech, the Mozambican President took the US Ambassador by the hand and patiently explained that progressive Africans did not see the current conflicts in Southern Africa as race wars, but instead as struggles against colonialism and economic exploitation and domination.

In his speech opening the conference, Machel drew a sharp distinction between settlers who feel no loyalty to the country (ie. the enemy) and whites who feel a part of the country along with the black and brown majority.

The Mozambican President was obviously distressed that none of this lesson on racism seemed to have sunk in. Many other African delegates who heard Young's speech immediately expressed surprise and called it "racist".

According to Mozambican sources, following the speech Machel told Young, in no uncertain terms, that such presentations are not welcome in Mozambique.

This reaction must have come as something of a surprise to Young, who had spent much of his speech recounting the tactics and successes of the American Civil Rights Movement in which he had played a key role. The message was that Blacks in America, using non-violent tactics, had indeed overcome and were now moving fully into the mainstream of American Life. "The hands that used to pick cotton have now picked a President." he said.

Young said that instead of engaging in guerrilla warfare, Blacks in southern Africa should take a lesson from their Afro-American Brothers. He said that if Blacks in Rhodesia "Kept their money in their pockets" they would bring about change.

In one section of the speech, which many African found particularly insulting, Young said that the American Civil Rights Movement had succeeded "in spite of massive violence" used against it. Several delegates said that they felt the Ambassador lacked a sense of perspective in comparing police clubs, tear gas and vigilante squads, brutal as they were, with the full scale military operations resulting in scores of deaths monthly, being used against Africans in Rhodesia and Namibia.

Immediately after Young finished speaking, Mugabe, a Lawyer, who heads the group doing most of the fighting in Rhodesia, said that a comparison between the southern United States and Rhodesia was "not applicable." "The US was an internal situation where rights were guaranteed in the Constitution. Ours is a colonial situation", said Mugabe.

Mugabe told journalists, "we've tried those methods. We've tried passive resistance. Our people have been locked up. Our people have been shot. We have now moved a stage up in the struggle." The guerrilla leader added, "no, we're not going to be a laboratory for experiments."

It was a reaction that could have been expected from the radical Mugabe. But even close and moderate friends of Young like Nigerian Ambassador to the UN, Leslie Harriman were put off by the speech. Harriman said he was "very disappointed". He said, "one could have hoped that Andy Young would contribute to the Conference and not lecture us on civil rights. I would have listened 10 years with some patience. But instead I listened today with considerable irritation."

Harriman's view appeared to be shared by the overwhelming majority of the delegates from 93 countries who attended the conference. The speech was met with only polite applause.

When Young visited Africa in February he promised that the Carter administration was different than past American governments and for time to allow it to prove itself. He promised quick repeal of Byrd Amendment under which the US was importing Rhodesian chrome in violation of the UN trade sanctions and this he delivered on in short order.

But in Africans' eyes repeal of the Byrd Amendment, while welcomed, only brought the US to the point it should have been ten years ago.- In legislative compliance with the UN Embargo. For many African delegates at Maputo the conference was to be a forum for Western Countries, particularly the US, to spell out the specifics of their "New" African Policies and lay out concrete programs of action to help speed the way to majority rule. They were disappointed.

Young's speech carried a strong theme that sounded as though it could have been lifted from the utopian essay "The Greening of America." He said that a "Revolution" has taken place in America The result of the Civil Rights Movement, The Peace Movement, Watergate, The Women's Liberation Movement and the Chicano Rights Movement. "While I respect your skepticism, there has been a Change in America", he said.

But Young refused to give the specifics that Africans were waiting for. In the "Trust me" style of the Carter Administration Presidential Campaign, he said that the major question is not about the specifics of the Carter Administration's African policies but "are our policies believable."

Mugabe said late, "if they (the Americans) have any pressure to exercise, let them exercise it from a distance."

The test for the Carter Administration's "New" African policy came as the conference tried to put together resolutions for dealing with the problems of white minority rule in southern Africa.

From the start Young, in his honest and forthright style, made it clear that the US would not support economic and communications boycotts against south Africa or a mandatory arms embargo.

To Africans there was nothing "New" in this US position. It has been the same stand taken by the US for more years than most African want to remember.

The Maputo conference marked a watershed for the Carter Administration's African Policy. Young found out that he can no longer get away with a "trust me" or "give us time" theme. From now on Africans will no longer be impressed by statements of intention. They are demanding concrete action.



AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE  
1501 Cherry Street  
Philadelphia, Penna. 19102

SOUTHERN AFRICA PROGRAM

\*\*\*\*\* BULLETIN \*\*\*\*\*

The following dispatch dated May 19, 1977, was written by Martha Honey, AFSC special correspondent at the United Nations-sponsored International Conference in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique May 16 to 21, 1977.

---

ANDREW YOUNG'S ADDRESS TO UN CONFERENCE: (excerpts)

I have a speech and you've been provided with copies of that speech. (see accompanying speech)

I think essentially its a good speech and it expresses the hopes as well as the policies of the USA. And yet the thing which I have heard here is not a desire for more statement of policy. For I think you have heard from the US in many ways, that there is a new interest in Africa and a new determination to work with you toward majority rule. You have heard also from "the gang of five" as we're called, of the work we're attempting to do together. And the question is not what are we doing, what are the policies that we discuss. The question we face is how believable are those policies. What right have you as Africans to believe that anything is any different now than during the period when the Portuguese used the arms that were sent as part of our NATO defense to oppress the people of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Buissau and Cap e Verde. And so I would like to ... discuss the credibility of our policies and why I think these policies represent something of a revolution in the consciousness of the American people. And are not in fact Andy Young policies, nor alone are they Jimmy Carter policies. But they are policies which have slowly and gradually evolved from a revolution which has taken place throughout the US.

...traces revolution from Gandhi's influence in 1950's, to civil rights movement to anti-war movement to Watergate to women's and Chicano's movement. Speaking of non-violent civil rights movement:) Even though we were a minority we were strong enough to make the difference between profit and loss, in a situation where the profit margin is usually not more than 10 or 12 percent. And so in fact the non-cooperation with the business community produced the concern for change because they realized that without our participation they would be without profit. And so it was in fact many of the multinational cooperations which we've maligned that we first gained our first impetus for freedom and support. Long before our Congress, even before our Supreme Court. And certainly before we had a President that cared anything about Black Americans... (re Carter's election) The hands that used to pick the cotton had now picked a President. And that is a substantial revolutionary change. When you realize that only 12 years ago most of them could not vote at all...

(Anti-war movement) radically reformed America's foreign policy and brought about a new approach to the problems we face everywhere in the world...

We are not immune to the struggles which Africa faces for we have known those struggles ourselves and somehow we have been able to come through them. And it is because of this that you see a determination on the part of this Administration to bring about changes around the world taht are consistent with the new spirit in America that was brought on in fact by a silent and non-violent revolution in our own country.

(Traces Carter's background: all his childhood associations were black)

(Traces record of Mondale on CIA and black related issues)

He is the man who at this very moment is meeting with John Vorster. And I can't think of another person that I would trust more in that confrontation, I can't think of another person who would be more uncompromising about freedom and justice. And yet I can't think of another person who would be more sensitive and humorous and understanding and capable of disarming and perhaps defanging the PM of S. Africa. And so I must confess that while I respect your skepticism and even your cynicism, there is a change in America that makes me extremely hopeful about the proceedings that are going on here and the continued role of the USA in them... (There is) a new and coordinated and welcome policy towards Africa that is now emerging in the Carter administration. And so I would say to you that while you must be true to your struggle, that you will respect us when we say that we must be true to our own experience. There have been different experiences, and in some senses they may not be applicable. But I think.. if we do an analysis of the racism that is pervasive in Southern Africa we find a phenomenon with which I am very familiar and which doesn't frighten me at all. For its been a part of my whole life - come to me with my mother's milk. And so the struggle that I sense here is a struggle that brings tears to my eyes.. History of freedom in Africa has not just been a history of freedom through armed struggle. The majority of the nations of Africa achieved their independence through negotiated settlement. And where there was a possibility of negotiated settlement, the nations moved much more rapidly in their development. And so for Africa's sake I think whenever there is the possibility of a negotiated settlement, whenever the pressures and forces can be brought to bear to bring about majority rule and justice without massive destruction of person and property, I think the history of Africa says that is to be preferred. And its then negotiated settlements have been totally refuted and rejected that armed struggle becomes inevitable... When one resorts to armed struggle ones' adversary becomes a force with which one seeks to reconcile ones' differences. Indeed it may be difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile the differences which exist in Zimbabwe and Namibia, but with the pressures at hand, with the economic force, with the moral force, and with the threat of economic isolation which occurred in the kind of remarks which came from the western members of the Security Council, I dare say we are faced with a power which is indeed superior to military power. For I dare say that even with a mandatory arms embargo it would be difficult to mount the kind of power to deal with the problems of this area strictly through military means.

(Calls for internal economic resistance) And yet in the whole struggle for economic change one finds that quite often blanket sanctions do not produce the desired result. But somehow a combination of pressures and incentives for change can prove more effective... And so I would say that those of us who are committed to negotiated settlement, should be respected for the tactics we attempt to utilize. The power that confronts southern Africa is not only western power, its also African economic development emerging in the states of Nigeria and Ivory Coast and Liberia and Gabon and Angola and Mozambique and many many others... And so I think in the challenge of development we will find a common ground which will inevitably engulf the entire continent and its based on some of those common economic assumptions that I hold such great hope for change in Southern Africa. For its very hard to segregate ones economy.. Even in Zimbabwe... there is enough wealth so that if every black citizen in Zimbabwe did not purchase anything but food and for another 3 or 6 months it would bring an impact on the Smith regime equal to that of the armed struggle. The very small merchants from which Smith derives his support would begin to feel the power of the people not doing anything but not doing something. We found that even with the most conservative blacks in America, those who we couldn't get to come to a meeting about freedom, even though we couldn't get them to do anything, we could get them to do nothing. And when we got them to agree to do the same nothing, namely keeping their money in their pockets they impacted on the economy in a way that could not be ignored. I would say to you, don't neglect the weapons of the economic arsenal that are at your disposal.

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE  
1501 Cherry Street  
Philadelphia, Penna. 19102

SOUTHERN AFRICA PROGRAM

\*\*\*\*\*BULLETIN\*\*\*\*\*

The following dispatch dated May 19, 1977, was written by Martha Honey, AFSC special correspondent at the United Nations-sponsored International Conference in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique May 16 to 21, 1977.

---

ROBERT MUGABE PRESS CONFERENCE  
(Following Address by Andrew Young to Conference)

What Mr. Young said was totally irrelevant to Zimbabwe. Theirs was an internal situation with rights guaranteed in the constitution. Ours is a colonial situation. There is no comparison. The two situations are completely different. Theirs was an internal struggle. Ours is an external struggle.

No I don't see any change in US policy. I don't see any at all. He's inviting us to accept the administration as a completely new one. One which has undergone a revolution. What revolution is there? They have to prove it. They haven't proved it. And they want to come, you see, with this pretense that in fact they have undergone a revolution. And so we must accept. No, we're not going to be a laboratory of experiments. If they have any pressures to exercise, let them exercise them, from a distance. We don't object to that. But interference in our internal affairs nada! (Portuguese for 'nothing doing')

We've got to be agreed on precedures. Who are the parties involved? Britain yes, as the colonial power. The Patriotic Front, yes, as the representatives of the people. Foreigners no, we don't want them.

Let Britain show us that there has been some change. Only last year at Geneva we found that Britain was still in her old position where she was not able, not willing, to cause change in our situation.

I don't see anything substantial in his (Young's) speech. He's talking of American civil rights; we're concerned here with a colonial situation where Britain, the colonial power, has refused for years to grant the people of Zimbabwe their rights. And he's saying we should use the same methods they used in the U.S. We have tried those methods. We've tried passive resistance. Our people got locked up; our people got shot while undertaking strikes and civil disobedience. We have moved a stage forward, a stage up in the struggle. The armed struggle is the final form of the struggle. We started with all that he was talking about. We have had our own Soweto's. We are not going to go back to Soweto. We are prepared to transfer power. We don't refuse to negotiate. As I'm speaking with you we've already agreed to consult with the British. We will listen to them. If they have a certain position which amounts to a determination to transfer power, fine, we will accept that position.



AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE  
1501 Cherry Street  
Philadelphia, Penna. 19102

SOUTHERN AFRICA PROGRAM

\*\*\*\*\*BULLETIN\*\*\*\*\*

The following dispatch dated May 16, 1977, was written by Martha Honey, AFSC special correspondent at the United Nations-sponsored International Conference in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique May 16 to 21, 1977.

---

ROBERT MUGABE'S SPEECH TO UN CONFERENCE

I don't have speech; these are notes from speech...

Britain, U.S. and France advocate peace in Zimbabwe but refuse to impose means which could bring down the regime. They could prevent recruitment of mercenaries and oil companies from selling to Smith. "We are dedicated lovers of independence and peace" and "only through the instrument of war is any peace possible in Zimbabwe" said Mugabe. At the Geneva Conference we had hoped British government would take definite steps to bring about transfer of power. Britain unashamedly confesses they lack the means to bring down Smith. This in effect gives him another lease on life. The responsibility is exclusively Britain's not America's. Involvement of the US in Zimbabwe would internationalize the situation. "We therefore categorically say, 'Nada' (Portuguese for 'nothing doing') to American involvement". Britain should not shift her colonial responsibility onto America. If the current Anglo-American initiative is to see the light of day, the following points must be accepted:

1. Geneva is dead and its ground rules are also dead, so we must have new ground rules and participants must recognize war has escalated.
2. The two bodies to talks must be Britain and Patriotic Front. Only the warring parties must come to agreement and any constitutional or peace conference must always only involve the warring parties.
3. There must be an unqualified transfer of power.
4. Britain must be willing to implement any agreement which is reached.

We view the liberation struggle as a dynamic process for transforming Zimbabwe.

Patriotic Front calls on the UN to:

- a. Intensify assistance to Zimbabwe refugees and Patriotic Front.
- b. Condemn massacres of missionaries and other civilians, and the herding of civilians into camps, mass arrests and detention.
- c. Condemn Vorster for assisting Smith.
- d. Condemn Britain for inability to bring about a settlement.
- e. Condemn western powers which continue to collaborate with Smith, in particular the French for training Mirage pilots; also to condemn western oil monopolies for grossly ignoring UN sanctions.

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE  
1501 Cherry Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19102

SOUTHERN AFRICA PROGRAM

\*\* BULLETIN \*\*

The following dispatch was written by Martha Honey, AFSC special correspondent at the United Nations-sponsored International Conference in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique May 16 to 21, 1977.

Interview with Robert Mugabe,  
Patriotic Front and ZANU:  
14/5/77

(Dar es Salaam on eve of Mugabe's departure for U.N. Conference)

1. What do you expect out of the U.N. Conference?
  - We hope that after the Conference, international attention will be more clearly focused on Zimbabwe and Namibia than has been the case to date. We also hope discussions will relate to matters directly relevant to us, namely, how assistance can be given to armed struggle and towards needs in our camps. Thirdly, we hope the Conference will generate greater interest on the part of those who have hitherto sided with the reactionary forces of Smith and Vorster and enable them to see the situation much more objectively so they can desist from lending assistance to Smith. I am referring to the fact that Smith is using just now American, British, and French arms. It is known that his pilots are being trained in the use of Mirages and this is taking place in South Africa. So France, we hope, will after this be a more enlightened country.
  
2. What role would you like to see the U.S. playing in the future in Zimbabwe?
  - We are not quite happy about the U.S. They resisted the making of sanctions comprehensive, they have been trading with the enemy, and in the U.N., I think in 1969, they cast their first veto ever in history against the making of sanctions comprehensive. At the present moment, it is their companies which are operating in the country. They exploit mines and most of the profits that are reaped there go to Washington. Now we have noted some slight change over the previous posture. The present administration has repealed the Byrd Amendment. But the repeal of the Byrd Amendment doesn't bring anything new to the political situation where the U.S. should have been much more astute. It only restores the U.S. to her original position which is the position occupied by other states which have not been trading with Rhodesia. We have a right to determine our own future. We don't want interference from the U.S. or from any other source. But this does not of course mean that we cannot be assisted by other countries. What we are objecting to in this case is the involvement of the U.S. to the extent that they become involved in our constitutional conference. Responsibility lies squarely on the British. It is a matter which involves the decolonization of the territory. The United States is not our colonizer. They are therefore not entitled to be as fully involved in the process of constitution making as the British and ourselves. But they should use whatever pressures they are capable of welding and pressurize Vorster and Smith to comply with the will of the people of Zimbabwe and Namibia. But we certainly object to the manipulation of our situation in such a way that the U.S. gets a foothold in our country. And we know that their intention is to use

whatever foothold is gained in our country to ward off Russia and the Eastern countries. In other words, the U.S. is fighting its own global war in our own territory. It is our fear, therefore, that the situation might be internationalized.

3. What is the reaction to Zimbabwe Development Fund?
  - If the condition for granting the Fund are that the settlement must come through negotiations at a constitutional conference and not through victory, then it is obvious what the U.S. is aiming at. Why have we been fighting? We've been fighting for independence and to get into position where we can transform the society in accordance with our own principles. Now if the aims of Britain and America are the same as ours, namely creating a situation in which the people of Zimbabwe are possessed with the means of developing their own society, then I don't see any reason why the U.S. should object to giving a grant or a loan to a government which is a product of the war. It makes their intentions very suspicious.
4. What is the reaction to current Anglo/American negotiating?
  - I was talking with the current U.S. Ambassador and British High Commissioner here. Apparently there has been set up a consultative committee which includes Americans and is going to start its visit in the following week. We've made our views clear with regard to the position being adopted by Dr. Owen. We cannot negotiate with the Americans and the British forming a joint team. We cannot even discuss the constitutional question with the Americans. But, we are prepared to talk with the British and we'll listen to any new plans they have. If they assure us that they are now prepared to transfer power in the full sense of the word, there is no reason why we should not talk with them. But we want to make it clear to Dr. Owen that full power must be transferred to us and by this we mean not just a predominance of Africans in a constitutional conference or in any Parliament which might be established, but the control of the army by the Africans. Smith's forces must be demobilized in accordance with our wishes, and our own guerrilla forces substituted. If this is the view, well, we're prepared to listen to them. But if the view is contrary to this principle, then we are not prepared to discuss anything with the British.
5. Is the Patriotic Front willing to participate in discussions with other nationalists, namely Muzorewa and Sithole?
  - No, we are not prepared to have irrelevant characters included. The people of Zimbabwe are adequately represented by the Patriotic Front. We are the only ones who are waging armed struggle. We represent the people of full force. Muzorewa and Sithole are characters running around pretending that they are doing something about the armed struggle but in fact they are doing absolutely nothing about the armed struggle and they are fore irrelevant. I don't see any reason why we must be forced to sit together with these characters. Apart from their being non-representative, they are reactionary. The holding of consultations is a different matter, but the question of a constitutional conference where Britain will want everyone to be represented, that raises a number of sensitive issues for us. We just cannot be made to recognize that Muzorewa and Sithole are in fact entitled to sit as delegates any any constitutional conference. They have not contributed to the armed struggle. ZANU and ZAPU are the only two forces which have contributed to the armed struggle. I will not sit at a constitutional conference in my capacity as Robert Mugabe; I'll sit there as a representative of ZANU which has been doing something about the armed struggle. And we hope all other participants will have this background.
6. What are the results of recent efforts to bring about military unity of ZANU and ZAPU? Reports have been that this has not been going smoothly.
  - You seem to be much more informed that I am. I haven't got any reports. But we've laid the basis for formulation of programs for joint military training and joint military operations. And we've left it entirely to a subcommittee

to conclude the actual framework that is required. I hope I'll be given a report in due course. Hitches there must be in a situation where people have operated from different contexts for such a long time. I wouldn't expect the process to be smooth, but we are determined that unity will be achieved. I would like to make it quite clear that what has been achieved so far is the mere visiting of camps and the intention has been to assess the attitude of the cadres in the camps. The camps in Mozambique have not yet been visited and I don't see how anyone at the juncture can suggest that the process has not succeeded.

7. But as of this time, the ZANU and ZAPU forces are separate, and there has been no integration of the military forces. Is that correct?
  - Yes, since the disorganization of ZIPA, when ZAPU withdrew, we've been operating from different camps. ZANU has been operating from Mozambique and ZAPU from Zambia. That is the position.
8. Reports of struggle within ZIPA and certain leadership, including Mwachinura have been detained. Could you comment on this.
  - When was this? Did this happen in my absence? I've been away for the last three weeks. Absolutely no dispute. It must be remembered that the military committee of ZIPA was merely held in reigns for those who were detained in Zambia, the more experienced commanders. Immediately they came and the process of integrating the two started. And naturally, some juniors have lost positions. And the more senior people have assumed the more senior roles. But several of the old command are still around. Others have naturally been given other duties. None are in detention. Why should we detain people?
9. You've recently said that operations are now taking place in two-thirds of the country. At this rate, when do you anticipate victory?
  - Sooner than later. I can't give a date. Certainly if we go at this rate, Smith will soon fall. I can't predict when. It's not a mathematical war; it's a war which has quite a number of imponderables. But over the last few months, we've had a number of gains and we want to consolidate these. Smith's forces are very much demoralized. Many farms are being deserted. To give you one example, in an area around Rusape, there used to be about thirty Afrikaner farms, twenty-three have deserted the place and only seven remain. And we are fully effective in two-thirds of the country. The emigration rate has also been running very high - fifteen hundred left the country by the end of March. This rate, I think, will continue. We hope, given the necessary reinforcements, we'll conclude the struggle within a short period.
10. Bishop Lamont recently said if there was a general strike, Smith could be brought down in one week. He said this has never been tried. Why hasn't this been tried? Are there plans to try such a thing?
  - This is where we ask our friends who sometimes support Muzorewa, what they think about a situation where a man claims thousands and thousands of followers and has never organized them into waging one single strike, into demonstrating effectively against the regime. Let him carry off some acts, even passive resistance if he's a prayerful man, and does not want people to be unnecessarily shot. But at least he can get them to sit down and pray, two days, three days, in the street. They could avoid going to work. But, no, in fact he hasn't got the necessary support. Well, as far as our own strategy, we felt that we should emphasize the armed struggle first and foremost. Other secondary forms of struggle - the strikes and demonstrations - they will take care of themselves. Already there is complete desertation in some areas and we have neutralized operations in some areas, on some farms. To us that's more effective than a strike which will expose people to injury and death.

11. Will there be civil war after independence?

- Of course this is not true. We're just now engaging in an exercise to weld our two forces together. We believe that this exercise is going to succeed. We are determined to avoid any clashes between us now and tomorrow. So, I cannot see us after coming together and working together for this long, engaging in a civil war. What would the purpose be? We have got to develop our country and raise the living standards of our people. This will be our main concern and not personal glory. We believe the question of who will lead the future Zimbabwe should be determined by the people. As independence comes, there should be elections, or elections should precede independence. Once a leader has been elected or a party given the rule, that decision must be respected by all organizations in the country. This is what we look forward to. I don't think there will be any civil strife.

12. Do you favor the plan to have elections before granting of independence?

- I have no objection provided we are all agreed an interim government is created. And this government will then lead the country to independence. This interim government will work out the constitution. And also provide an electoral law under which elections will be held just prior to independence. This is the sort of procedure I don't object to. But the type of suggestion which Muzorewa is trying to put across just now, that we should hold a referendum and choose a leader, that's ridiculous in the extreme. It's senseless. There are priorities. We must be correct here. The first priority is victory. We must first get the country. After we've got the country, then we can have elections. Muzorewa would like a leader even before we're certain that leader is going to rule.

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE  
1501 Cherry Street  
Philadelphia, Penna. 19102

SOUTHERN AFRICA PROGRAM

\*\*\*\*\*BULLETIN\*\*\*\*\*

The following interview dated May 17, 1977, was conducted by T. Avirgan and transmitted to us by Martha Honey, AFSC special correspondent at the United Nations-sponsored International Conference in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique May 16 to 21, 1977.

---

INTERVIEW WITH BISHOP ABEL MUZOREWA IN DAR ES SALAAM

(The Bishop didn't go to the conference)

1. Why are you not going to the Maputo Conference?
  - I'm being represented by Dr. Mutiti. He knows our case. I believe people by now know our case and its not really necessary for me to go.
2. What do you hope the conference will accomplish?
  - I hope it will come up with some revolutionary position to pressure the imperialists and also work on ways to strengthen our liberation struggle.
3. Are you working with Western countries or Ian Smith to assure independent government is moderate and pro-western?
  - This is the first time I've heard I'm favored by Western countries. All along I'd heard Nkomo was favored by the West. My stand is clear from Geneva. I demand a government which is established by popular vote, one person, one vote. So I don't see working with Western countries ANC's policy is that of non-alignment. We don't want to be slaves of anyone. You can also have puppets of the East as well as the West.
4. What kind of policy do you advocate for an independent Zimbabwe?
  - I don't know policies of my rivals. My policy is pro-Zimbabwe; not pro-west/ I want to take the best from the West, from the East and from Africa.
5. How should land issues be handled in independent Zimbabwe?
  - 5% live on  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the land and 95% live on the other half of the land. Obviously that has to be overhauled. That's all I can say for now without going into details. I don't think at this stage its my business to go into details about how it will be changed.
6. What about industry and commerce in independent Zimbabwe?
  - At this stage-don't want to discuss it.
7. But by not talking about these issues aren't you just heightening fears of whites in Zimbabwe?
  - Well, I don't know. It may be so but that's the way I want to go about it. I've got a platform for it and that's at a constitutional conference.
8. What are your feelings about increased US role in constitutional conference?
  - There are only two parties - people of Zimbabwe and the British government. These people must be involved. If British government wants to ask some friends, I have no business telling them. But if US comes up with proposal like Kissinger

its then my business to reject it. All we're interested in is that Britain decolonize Rhodesia and who helps them that's their business.

9. The US is moving ahead with the Zimbabwe Fund.. What is your feeling?
  - You mean there is a condition under which we can use Fund?  
Our position is that all funds will have to be administered by new administration of Zimbabwe. Only on that condition would I favor this Fund. Neither Britain nor the US has talked with me about a Fund.
10. Armed struggle: ZIPA is waging most of it. Are you waiting out the armed struggle and waiting to grab fruits of the struggle?
  - The majority of the people who have gone out to fight have come from ANC. From our grassroots organization which represents 95% of the people. All tribes of Zimbabwe are fighting and the majority of them have been recruited by ANC. Not ZANU, ZAPU or ZIPA. Therefore we have been participating in armed struggle. There is no such thing as the Patriotic Front. These ZANU and ZAPU, and now ZANU is going into pieces - one for Tongogara, one for Mugabe, one for Sithole.
11. You say you are recruiting people to go out of Zimbabwe to be trained as fighters. But how much control do you have over them after, as you say, they are 'grabbed' by ZANU or ZAPU? Do you have any control over the direction of the guerilla war?
  - Well, I may not have direct control but I have indirect control. But I can't announce the form of 'indirect control' to the world. Majority of the military cadres are loyal to me.
12. Bishop Lamont recently said one thing which hasn't been tried is a general strike which could bring down Smith in one week's time.
  - We have examined that possibility, many many times. Theoretically this is correct. But there are some problems which I can't go into at this time. It is impossible to do that. For instance, one of the reasons is that you do have lots of men and women in the street who are unemployed, and they've been hungry for a long time so they are bound to jump over to that office for employment. And there are other reasons which I'm not prepared to go into now.
13. Well, are there any alternatives to an intensified armed struggle?
  - Unfortunately, and I repeat unfortunately, it is either war or peaceful settlement. that's all, those two alternatives.
14. Well if those are the two alternatives, why not peaceful solution?
  - We hope we can take a peaceful settlement. All it takes is god, well first of all and common sense on the part of Mr. Smith to realize that to refuse to settle is not getting anywhere except to lead the country to more destruction. It takes only Mr. Smith to come to his senses. And then we'll have a conference to work on the transfer of power. That's all.
15. Do you see any signs that Mr. Smith is coming to his senses?

Well I don't want to exaggerate it but we'll wait and see what he'll do at the next conference, if we have one.
16. What is your attitude towards participation of current members of Mr. Smith's government in the government of independent Zimbabwe?
  - A lot depends on how whole thing is settled and what is said in Geneva. If its a peaceful settlement there may be some people who are taken because everything will be set up by elections. And if people elect some member of Smith's government or him, why not. The whole thing depends on the ballot.
17. There have been troubles between you and other nationalist leaders. What are the prospects of civil war after independence?

Well again, the whole thing depends on how we are going to settle the whole thing. If we have elections people will declare who are the leaders. Then it will be business of that government to defend itself and fight anyone who wants to dismantle it. So its possible we could solve this thing without any more fighting if its done democratically.

(Later interview)

18. Prospects for negotiated settlement?
  - Depends on goodwill of all people going to conference and on Smith. If he's intransigent it makes negotiation impossible.
19. How much of impasse is responsibility of West?
  - I want to believe most of it lies on Smith. But a lot depends on the British government. They don't want to use all the power which they have. They usually tell me they don't have power but whenever there is some drastic resolution against Smith in the UN they show up with this power and veto it. We want them to use that power to pressurize Smith. They should say to Smith 'Look we're ready to give independence to Zimbabwe' and if he doesn't want, throw him out.
20. Would you advocate using British military force?
  - Well I don't want to go into that because British have told us over 11 years, they aren't willing to use force. But there are other pressures - economic, for instance. If they go and agree with Vorster that Smith doesn't use any facilities in South Africa, Smith couldn't last but a few weeks.
21. Could Vorster be brought to a position of imposing embargo on Rhodesia?
  - He could and with time and pressure from Zimbabwe people themselves I believe that South Africa may be forced to do that. There will be a time when it will be very clear that whether Smith, Vorster and the British like it or not, the Africans are going to go all the way with armed struggle.
22. What is in South Africa's best interest is their being wise to hold on to Rhodesia? There have been recent reports of increased military assistance to Smith.
  - Well they may not realize it but they are tarnishing their image in Africa and especially with Zimbabwe. They will go on record as having prevented the people of Zimbabwe from being free.
23. Why are you so certain the guerrilla war succeed? Isn't it possible through proper military tactics to defeat a guerrilla war?
  - It's impossible. At this day and age in the world there is no one who can win an immoral war. It is those who are on the right side who are going to win.
24. What is the role of US in all this?
  - Well we believe the US should take a more serious role and work with the British in all this. To help transfer power to the majority. But I can't tell them how they should do it. Definitely until very recently they've been on the side of the minority. I don't know what is going to happen now. The fact that they continued to buy chrome and all that is an indication they are on the side of the minority.
25. Has there been a change under the Carter Administration?
  - There seems there is a ray of hope but we'll wait and see. They can demonstrate their sincerity by their willingness to accept what the Blacks are demanding.

26. Are people like Andrew Young being unrealistic when they talk about having a peaceful settlement now that the war is raging?
- I don't think so. From the very beginning the ANC has said we would have preferred a peaceful settlement. But we discovered it was not coming about. That's why the armed struggle was intensified. We've said that at point where Mr. Smith accepts the peaceful demands we're asking for, that stops everything. But in absense of his acceptance, the other alternative continues.
27. Smith said recently that Constitution for independent Zimbabwe should be drawn up primarily by his administration with the help of the British. What do you say to that?
- Well I think he is again starting his tricks. It should be the other way around. We are sick and tired of having proposals all the time from the British and other people and then we're asked to look at them. It's high time we said "This is what we want. Take it or leave it." We, being the nationalist.
28. You keep talking about a constitutional conference. Is there any possibility of a conference actually accuring now?
- Well why not? Since Geneva lots of things have been happening. Smith is being beaten terribly so this time a Constitutional conference will succeed with Smith changing his mind and accepting realities.
29. Is there any role for the US in a constitutional conference?
- Well I don't think so for the conference is mainly for the British and those who are seeking their freedom. Britain is colonial power. But any help or pressure from Americans will be welcome. But if they are not helpful they aren't welcome.
30. Is there a role for Ian Smith and his government in constitutional conference?
- Well, I believe there is. He's holding power now and that's an element we must face. So he'll have to be at constitutional conference. If he's driven out militarily then he'll just run out into the bush like a rabbit who is being chased by dogs.
31. There has been speculation that the British and Americans are thinking of putting elections before constitutional talks and thereby solving this problem of who represents the people. What do you feel about that?
- It sounds like they're coming to reality. That I believe is the most forward looking way on Zimbabwe. This is what I've been saying. This is what people in Zimbabwe have been telling me. There must be a national reverendum who will elect one person. If that person is Smith, he becomes our leader; if its Nkomo, Sithole, Mugabe, they become the leader. Then that person works out a transition government with the British and drafts the constitution. This is what we want and if that is what they are now coming to, then they are accepting the most forward looking way for Zimbabwe. There's one advantage -- people of Zimbabwe will tell us who are claiming the leadership who they want. Also it would be a transitional government, a representative government and a government of national unity. We say it shouldn't be winner take all. But all those who contest an election should have representation in new government according to percentage they get in the election. Is that not a most genuine and unifying proposal? I believe it is.
32. How would Bishop Muzorewa fair in such an election?
- Well I'm not running yet so I don't want to talk about it now. But we're putting principle first.
33. Many people have said you are the most popular figure in Rhodesia. But at the same time the war is going on and you are generally not the one who is thought of as directly involved in the war. Do you think that as long as the war goes on your popularity will deteriorate and the popularity of people like Mugabe will increase?

I didn't join politics in order to seek popularity. Although I may be castigated and rejected by external forces but majority of young men and women who go out to do the fighting are ANC people.

34. You and your organization have been rejected by the Front Line States who have been mandated by the OAU to oversee this struggle. Why did this happen?
- Not quite correct to say I've been rejected by Front Line States. More correct to say I've been rejected by Dr. Kaunda, not because he finds anything evil in me but because he has his own choice, of his own personal friend of years who he'd like to make the first President of Zimbabwe, and that's Mr. Nkomo. All other Front Line Presidents are trying to support their friend Dr. Kaunda. That's exactly what it is it's just an emotional reason and not an objective reason at all. That doesn't bother me - it would worry me to death if it were the people of Zimbabwe who had rejected me. But even if they rejected me because I'm a democrat at heart, I would say fine.
35. What about the rest of the OAU?
- Well you know how things work in Africa. A friend of so and so goes with his friend. But majority of the people who are trying to be objective - and there are many heads of state who are trying to be democratic and objective - and to say "time will come when people of Zimbabwe will select their own leadership. Our only business is to help them to defeat Smith." There are quite a few of them in the OAU. I'm pleased by that - we do have them that are supporting not me, but the cause of unity.
36. What is reason for increased US interest in Southern Africa?
- They have the same interest as all the other big powers in Zimbabwe. I believe that is what's going on.
37. In an independent Zimbabwe what role is there for whites, particularly whites in the current administration?
- All the whites who believe that blacks are human beings like them and want to stay in the country and contribute to the welfare of the country, they are welcome to stay. There are definitely some people, including some in Smith's government who will on their own, run away as soon as the flag is down. Not that we'd be chasing them but because their consciences will be bothering them. They will be running away from their own conscience.
38. But hasn't the situation gone beyond that emotionally? Are blacks in the country capable of accepting whites in the government? Hasn't the hatred gone so far both ways that it's a problem?
- It will be very difficult to have people who are butchering people - who are committing atrocities against missionaries, etc. - to turn around and say they are okay. People are able to distinguish their white friends and enemies. But for armed forces we must be thinking about what has to be done. Will be difficult for people to accept. So we'll have to think about it.
39. How much longer 'til we see an independent Zimbabwe?
- I believe that 1977 Christmas must be celebrated in a free Zimbabwe.



AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE  
1501 Cherry Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19102

SOUTHERN AFRICA PROGRAM

\*\* BULLETIN \*\*



The following dispatch was written by Martha Honey, AFSC special correspondent at the United Nations-sponsored International Conference in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique May 16 to 21, 1977.

---

Sam Nujoma Press Conference:  
17/5/77

We have no guarantee that the U.S. will support our demands. In order to achieve a negotiated settlement for Namibia, first South Africa must release all political prisoners, withdraw all its armed forces from Namibian soil, and that parties to the negotiated settlement will be SWAPO, U.N., and South Africa. So, if the U.S. can exert pressure on South Africa to get on with other members of the U.N., certainly we could be most grateful.

Elections would be after conditions for peaceful settlement have been created.

I had useful exploratory discussions with Ambassador Young and his people.

Initiative by five Western envoys: SWAPO has no objection to U.N. member states in their individual capacity or collectively to exert pressure on racist South Africa to accept implementation of the resolutions on Namibia. However, we object to any member states going to Namibia because this is in violation of the resolutions of the General Assembly. We feel also, this is contrary to the advice to the International Court of Justice.

In our judgment, the present moves by the five Western states are aimed at bailing South Africa out of her political predicament in Namibia. In the context of U.N. resolutions and International Court of Justice, the recent visit to Namibia by representatives of five countries is a naked violation of current resolutions on Namibia. The five are helping South Africa to consolidate her control over Namibia. We are now saying the interim government will be replaced by a central administrative authority. It is not clear who will constitute this central administrative authority - whether it is the U.N. Council on Namibia, which is the legal authority, or whether this is another maneuver by South Africa to keep its illegal occupation of Namibia - we don't know. Therefore, we can only say that while our movement is not opposed to initiatives by individual member states, certainly we object to the five Western powers visiting Namibia.

Elections: It is a state of war in Namibia. Before elections can take place, conditions for a negotiated settlement have to be created so the process for democratic elections can take place. And in our view, before elections can take place, first of all, all political prisoners must be released, all armed forces withdrawn (South African), and the U.N. should be convened. Talks must come before elections. If South African troops are withdrawn, we are certainly capable of taking over. We don't need foreign troops, U.N. or otherwise.

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

1501 Cherry Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19102

SOUTHERN AFRICA PROGRAM

\*\* BULLETIN \*\*

The following dispatch was written by Martha Honey, AFSC special correspondent at the United Nations-sponsored International Conference in support of the peoples of Zimbabwe and Namibia, held in Maputo, Mozambique May 16 to 21, 1977.

---

Interview with Hidipo Hamutenya,  
member of SWAPO Central Committee  
based in Lusaka, 20/5/77:

1. What has been SWAPO's reaction to the Conference and in particular Mr. Young's and Mr. Rowland's speeches?
  - SWAPO is satisfied with proceedings in general. Many delegates have spoken in favor of implementation of relevant resolutions of the U.N. We aren't impressed with speeches by Mr. Rowland and Mr. Young. We did not find anything particularly new or concrete in their speeches. All they've been able to emphasize is the need for a negotiated settlement, something we've all been advocating for quite a long time. But it's not enough. What's called for is concrete steps which the five powers now undertaking the initiative of bringing about a negotiated settlement, can outline; so far they haven't outlined anything that could convince anybody that they are about to take some steps which will make it possible to reach a breakthrough for a negotiated settlement.
2. What has been the outcome of negotiations by five Western envoys?
  - We were unable to find out what were the concessions made by Vorster. We were told that Vorster has agreed to suspend all the maneuvers concerning the Turnhalle tribal talks, but we're shocked again to find out that on the 17th of May, Vorster and his puppets in the Turnhalle went ahead and organized what they call a referendum among the white settlers in Namibia to vote in support of the interim government on the basis of the Turnhalle draft constitution.
3. So it seems to you that Mr. Vorster is just proceeding with Turnhalle?
  - That's the only conclusion one can draw from the referendum. And also we are told that yesterday the Turnhalle puppets are supposed to meet and to declare their intention to go ahead with the Turnhalle government as planned prior to the exercise by the five Western powers. So, we're unconvinced and unmoved that Vorster has made any concessions. We also heard from press reports that the five Western powers had backed down on their demand that Vorster must withdraw his so-called security forces from Namibia prior to any election. We don't see how our people can truly and freely exercise their rights in any election with South African troops and police present in Namibia. These are the instruments of repressions. They are the forces which have been intimidating and brutalizing the Namibian people for half a century.
4. What concessions must Vorster make before negotiations can get underway?
  - Abandoning Turnhalle and removing troops are the two most important. South Africa must also release all political prisoners whether on Robin's Island, or in jails or concentration camps in Namibia or South Africa.

5. What is SWAPO's estimate as to number of political prisoners?
  - It is difficult to tell. It could be in the hundreds. There were those who were arrested in the last few years during armed combat; we don't know where they are. They simply disappeared in the course of the battle or underground activities. We don't know how many have fallen the the battle and how many have been captured alive. South Africa does not report the capture of our combatants. So we don't have a concrete number, but we know it is several hundred.
  
6. What other moves would you like to see the U.S. and Britain take regarding Namibia?
  - In essence Mr. Young said in his speech there should be more economic pressure applied against South Africa and Rhodesia. He was more specific in urging the people to refuse to buy all but the most specific goods. Now I'd have been more impressed if Mr. Young had gone on to say that at a particular date, the U.S., Britain, France, and West Germany would definitely impose an economic embargo on Rhodesia and South Africa. One can become very cynical in finding Mr. Young urging the people of Zimbabwe, who after all have got no money, to sacrifice more, but he has nothing more to say about the multinational corporations which are actually butressing the power of Vorster and Smith.

Speech by the President of the People's Republic  
of Mozambique at the Formal opening of the  
International Conference in Support of the Peoples  
of Namibia and Zimbabwe.

Maputo, May 16, 1977

Comrades, leaders of the liberation movements,

Your Excellencies, distinguished delegates,

On behalf of the Mozambican People and the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique, we warmly welcome the distinguished delegates and observers. We welcome you to Maputo, a trench in the battle between freedom and colonial oppression, on the confrontation line between democracy, human dignity and the monstrosity of racism. We welcome you to Mozambique, a border between human rights and fascism.

After the defeat of Portuguese colonialism in Mozambique, Humanity was able to extend her liberated zone to the doors of South Africa, a colonial and oppressive stronghold. This is a victory of our people's just liberation war, this is a victory of the cause of the United Nations, a victory of the action of the Committee of 24, a victory of your political and diplomatic battle for the implementation of the historical resolution 1514 (XV).

Freedom and Peace are indivisible; the security of Nations and human rights are inseparable, they are in the same compartment. The existence of an atmosphere of war in Southern Africa, the growing tension in this region which threatens to involve the whole of humanity, is the direct result of colonialism and racism which still exist here. No country or man can remain indifferent to the Soweto massacres, to the death camps, to the beheadings and hangings in Zimbabwe and Namibia.

Confronted by the masses' continuous revolt, the colonialists and racists are striving to extend their internal conflicts to all neighbouring countries, in order to deflect attention from the essence of the conflict. We therefore witness a multiplication of subversive acts, border violations, provocations and aggression. The colonialists and racists intensify the arms race and lately, try to step up into the stage of the atomic arms race.

Wishing to maintain the broad masses in a sub-human condition, so that a handful can live in a situation of incomparable privilege, the colonialists and racists are trying to provoke a generalised conflict, to transform their internal conflicts into clashes between great powers.

Your presence here, the holding of this meeting is a concrete affirmation that we are all determined not to allow the extension of the conflict, to define it with precision. The situation in Zimbabwe, the situation in Namibia are colonial situations. Colonialism is condemned by the whole of Humanity, by all member countries of the United Nations Organisation, it constitutes the most serious form of violation of the People's right to choose their destiny, it represents the most violent form of aggression against the rights of man.

We are meeting so that together we may find the fastest and most efficient means of definitely liquidating colonialism in Zimbabwe and Namibia. We are meeting in order to find the fastest and most efficient means of totally transferring all powers of sovereignty and their exercise to the only legitimate owners of those powers: the people of Zimbabwe and Namibia. The United Nations Charter and the Resolutions which guide us are clear, our mission is to liquidate colonialism and racism. In order to find the just solutions we must clarify some fundamental points.

Over and above specific historical aspects, in Zimbabwe and Namibia we are faced with typical colonial situations. In Zimbabwe and Namibia colonial domination and oppression caused the people to take up arms for their liberation. This was the only alternative left to them. The people had to choose between dying as a consequence of colonial oppression and taking up arms in order to live in freedom and dignity.

We feel it is wrong to talk of peaceful solutions when there already is war. We must realistically seek the means to put an end to the war. To put an end to a war means to eliminate the causes of the war. Practical experience has demonstrated that a colonial war can only end in one of two ways: the military defeat of the colonial forces or the colonial forces' acceptance of the people's right to their total and complete independence.

The successes of the armed struggle in Zimbabwe and Namibia, combined with the political and diplomatic action of the international community and particularly the United Nations Organisation and the Organisation of African Unity have made the colonialists aware of the inevitability of their defeat in Zimbabwe and Namibia. This has created favourable conditions for a negotiated settlement of the existing wars. To be successful a negotiated settlement demands that the representations of the colonial forces fully accept the right to total and complete independence of Zimbabwe and Namibia in full territorial integrity.

Some positive steps have been taken in this direction. Nevertheless important obstacles still exist.

Of late, we see with apprehension, that certain forces, although declaring their acceptance of the principle of independence, are trying to annul it through guarantees to be conceded to minorities. Trying to understand the nature of these minorities, we find that we are not dealing with any national minorities. In fact what is happening is a subtle manoeuvre: to define minorities exclusively on the basis of skin colour. The minorities being presented at Whites.

In almost all United Nations member states there are citizens of the most varied ethnic origins. We find millions of citizens who belong to ethnic and racial groups different from the majority of the population. Nevertheless they are citizens like everyone else and they are not treated as a minority. The appearance in those countries of citizens of different races and colours results from the historical evolution and from the economic and social development of those countries.

In all African, Asian, Latin American countries, in all countries which have been subjected to colonial domination, settlers existed. Settlers are the direct result of colonial domination. They are foreigners, who for different reasons related to the colonial phenomenon, came to inhabit the colonized territory. They are settlers and not a national minority, they are foreigners who live in the territory. With the accession to independence of the dominated territory, some of these foreigners, some of these settlers, wishing to be integrated in the new country became national citizens. They are not a minority, they are citizens like the others, without any privileges or discrimination. This is the historical experience of all colonized countries.

We see no reason why the settlers of Rhodesia or Namibia should be treated otherwise. To do so is an attempt to preserve colonialism. To do so is to maintain in the country a category of citizens, very small in number but with sufficient power to block a decision of the vast majority of the population. To propose such a solution to a country which has just lived through the horrors and hatreds of a colonial war is to sow the seeds of a serious conflict in the first hours of independence. Our preoccupation is that all, regardless of race or colour, be citizens

community and strengthen national unity.

The experience of negotiations in all countries which were colonized is that negotiations take place between the representatives of the patriotic forces and the colonial power. The colonial power represents the interests of the settlers and the patriotic forces represent the interests of the masses.

We see in the negotiations which have been taking place both on Zimbabwe and on Namibia, a violation of this principle, a violation which has led the negotiations to failure.

In Zimbabwe the settlers refuse to be represented by the colonial power and wish to present themselves as a third force, since they cannot claim to represent the interests of the masses which they massacre and the patriotic forces which they fight. These are the settlers, whose number decreases daily, according to statistics, these are the settlers whose vast majority has a second nationality, who effectively behave as foreigners and, as in the experience of all colonial countries tend to leave the country after independence, these are the settlers who have repeatedly been responsible for the failure of all negotiations. The mistake is to regard them as the fundamental and decisive interlocutor, the mistake is to allow a tiny group of privileged foreigners the power to create obstacles to the implementations of the interests of the majority.

In Namibia we are surprised to see talks of settlers' parties and their puppets. Everybody knows who is fighting for Namibia's independence. Everybody knows who is imprisoned, deported, murdered in Namibia for demanding independence. Because the sacrifice of the Black people of Namibia, the struggle of the oppressed and humiliated of Namibia forced South African colonialists to accept the principle of independence, today, the privileged Whites of Namibia use their parties, which maintained colonial domination, to be represented as an interested party in the liberation of the country, when in fact they represent the force which hinders the liberation of the country. This state of affairs prevents a fruitful discussion between the patriotic forces represented by SWAPO and colonialism.

We are told that in Namibia the main stumbling block to a negotiated solution is the existence of only one nationalist movement - SWAPO - and we are told that one movement alone cannot claim to represent the interests of all the people. Simultaneously we are told that in Zimbabwe the lack of unity creates an obstacle to the discussions, the difficulty is the existence of many nationalist movements.

It would be convenient to use some logic to know the real obstacle to national independence. The only obstacle to national independence is colonialism.

The manoeuvres preventing the success of negotiated solutions to the colonial wars in Rhodesia and Namibia have been given decisive support by some Western circles and powers.

The United Nations have repeatedly denounced and condemned foreign investments in colonial territories. On Great Britain's request the United Nations' Security Council decreed sanctions against the British colony of Southern Rhodesia.

These sanctions have been fully implemented by the People's Republic of Mozambique, by the Republic of Zambia and by many other countries, with heavy sacrifices to their economy. We nevertheless see that they are openly and systematically broken by other United Nations member states including Western members of the Security Council. Many arguments are presented in defence of these violations.

We are told that the paralysation of economic activities would be detrimental mainly to the Black population. We are told that the pursuit of those economic activities in no way contributes towards the pursuit of the colonial wars. These same countries which violate sanctions, during the Second World War took drastic measures to isolate completely the fascist powers; they dealt heavy reprisals against companies which dared to trade with the fascist powers, they confiscated those companies' assets, arrested, tried and condemned those who were responsible. In the defence and in the name of freedom those countries rightly built up a legal arsenal

of repression against those who dared collaborate with the fascist oppressors. If today those same countries refuse to undertake severe measures against those who collaborate to strengthen the potential of the fascists, colonialists and racists of Southern Africa, it is surely because sordid interests have made them join sides with the inhuman camp against which they formerly fought.

It equally surprises us that citizens of Western countries members of the United Nations, citizens of Western countries members of the Security Council, are freely recruited as mercenaries for the rebel forces of Rhodesia. Once again the argument is in defence of liberty and the right to travel. However, we believe that in no country is the right to treason, the right to crime taken to be part of the democratic rights of citizens. The countries which allow the recruitment of mercenaries to Rhodesia, even today contain in their legislation extremely severe dispositions against citizens who commit crimes of treason and who collaborate with forces hostile to the country. The non-implementation of those principles can only mean that the fascist, racist and colonialist system has become an ally.

A special responsibility for prolonging the conflict falls upon those who supply the military means which enable the colonialists to continue with the policy of internal repression and colonial war and extend armed aggression to other countries. Although the United Nations clearly forbid the sale of weapons to Southern Africa's colonialists and racists, we see a continuous reinforcement of Pretoria's and Salisbury's arsenal. We are sure that any responsible state has ample means at its disposal to prevent transactions of weapons which are contrary to its interests. Therefore the supply of weapons, the supply of patents for manufacture, the establishment of arms industries, the establishment of industries which can lead to the nuclear armament of colonial and racist regimes can only be interpreted as active support for the systems condemned by the United Nations.