

APDUSA VIEWS

Issue No.62

July 2002

**SCOUNDRELS IN HIGH
PLACES.....**

**IN FAIRNESS TO JONAS
SAVIMBI**

**APDUSA VIEWS
P.O.BOX 8888
CUMBERWOOD
3235**

e-mail: Malentro@sai.co.za

INTRODUCTION

During February 2002, it was announced to the world that Jonas Savimbi was killed in battle. This was astounding news because this warrior had been fighting for so many years that one assumed that he would die in bed with one or other of the diseases associated with old age. Subsequent reports revealed that Savimbi was betrayed by a close associate who had been captured. The reports also revealed that Savimbi and his 30 bodyguards fought to the end. They were all killed. Savimbi took some 15 bullets. His killers claimed that they killed him in this manner because he held his gun until the very end.

Usually the death of a single individual, no matter how important, does not affect the course of social development. There are always others who will be able to replace that individual. But there are occasions when social forces are developing in a certain manner and that individual, because of force of character or intellect, is able to delay or temporarily obstruct that development, then his or her death acts as a catalyst for the maturation of that development.

We can assume that Savimbi's death will immediately place the peace process on fast track. In that sense, the death of Savimbi will put an end to the civil war and usher in a new phase in Angola's development. Savimbi's death is expected to close a bloodstained chapter in Angola's history.

OUR POSITION ON ANGOLA

Since we live in a climate of intolerance, philistinism¹ and ignorance, let us hasten to state our position on Jonas Savimbi and the other principal actor, Eduardo Dos Santos, together with their organisations, lest we be accused of being pro-Savimbi.²

1. All three liberatory movements in Angola, the FNLA (previously the UPA), the MPLA and UNITA, commenced their activities in fulfilment of historically progressive function, viz., the waging of a war of liberation against Portuguese imperialism.

¹ Philistinism is a term to describe aspiration for wealth and material acquisition with an aversion for anything intellectual, ethical or humanistic knowledge.

² Name-calling, labelling and superficial judgements have taken the place of healthy debate and discussion based on reasoned arguments and facts. Hence the need to make a statement of 16 points of clarification before being "allowed" to make the real point.

2. The leaders and leading personalities of all three movements were moved by a patriotic duty to remove the rule of foreigners.
3. Portugal, having to contend with three liberation wars – in Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Angola, was being bled to death. She, therefore, gave the “hands up” signal without suffering a decisive defeat.
4. In Angola, not one of the liberation movements could claim the lion’s share of success.
5. An attempt was made to unite the three movements for the purpose of governing Angola.
6. This attempt failed with the MPLA making a bid for power with the heavy backing of the Soviet Union. Luanda fell under its control.
7. This was the beginning of the civil war.
8. Soon the FNLA became a spent force and the contest was continued between the MPLA and UNITA.
9. By this time, **the original objectives, which included the welfare and advancement of the poor workers and peasants, were abandoned and overcome by the lust and craving for political power and all the consequences that follow.**
10. The MPLA and UNITA soon became sucked into the international conflict being waged between the East and the West, represented by the super powers – the USSR assisting MPLA and the US assisting UNITA.
11. There was the further complication of the Sino-Soviet Dispute. China supported UNITA. To make it worse, South Africa was drawn in as a regional power and as an anti-Soviet ally of the West. Cuba sent in its army to assist the MPLA.
12. This civil war was carried on for 26 years. Millions were driven from their homes and forced to become refugees in the land of their birth; hundreds of thousands were killed and many more wounded and maimed. The youth of that ill-fated nation were press ganged into the war and were trained to become killers.
13. The wealth of the country, especially oil and diamonds, were plundered to finance the war.
14. Neither faction has anything to be commended about. They are both guilty as hell for the protracted suffering they inflicted on the ordinary people of Angola. The conflict was not based on a dispute about social and economic programmes for a liberated Angola, but about power and profit.
15. Savimbi became a sophisticated and efficient smuggler of diamonds and arms. Dos Santos has become one of the richest men in the world – a kleptocrat and a war profiteer.

Human life and suffering counted for nothing to both these men and their organisations.

16. Our attitude towards these organisations is: **A PLAGUE ON BOTH THEIR HOUSES!**

SCOUNDRELS IN HIGH PLACES.

Having made our position clear on the contending forces in Angola, we now turn to combat a LIE AND A CALUMNY on somebody who is unable to defend himself. We do this in the name and pursuit of TRUTH, something we value above most things.

THE OUTCOME OF THE 1992 ELECTIONS IN ANGOLA.

In 1992, after decades of civil war, a settlement was reached in Angola, in terms of which UN supervised elections were to be held in September of that year.

At the conclusion of the elections, the UN special representative, Margaret Anstee announced the results in favour of the MPLA and that the elections were “free and fair”.

Jonas Savimbi, however, contested the findings on the grounds of fraud. The whole world rejected Savimbi’s allegations of fraud and damned him as a bad loser who was simply looking for an excuse to continue the civil war.³

Nothing more was heard about the matter in the local press until an article appeared in The Natal Daily News on the 24th December 1992.⁴

The article was written by Gerald L’ange from the Daily News Africa Service. The article is headlined: “**Angolan election riddle**” and states inter alia:

³ According to journalist, Gerald L’ange, in an article referred to below, Savimbi was prepared to accept the outcome of the elections notwithstanding the allegations of irregularities. The resumption of the civil war was due to other serious allegations made against the MPLA concerning the demobilisation of UNITA forces.

⁴ It is difficult to fathom the reasoning of the Editorial Committee of The Daily News to publish an article of such great importance on Christmas Eve when even devoted Daily News readers would have had their minds occupied with other matters than the state of the African continent.

1. A document (A Report) emanating from the Provincial Committees set up by the United Nations which investigated Unita's complaints of irregularities, concluded that: :

"It may generally be concluded that there were irregularities discovered in the electoral process which could have affected the overall outcome of the voting. In some cases the volume of votes lost or gained by each candidate could, taken nationally, be significant as to distort the final results."

2. This finding directly contradicts the announcement made by one Margaret Anstee, the United Nations special representative in Angola. Margaret Anstee announced on 17th October 1992 that the elections had been "free and fair" and declared the MPLA the winner of the contest. The report referred in paragraph 1 above is dated 16th October 1992 and is presumed to have been handed to Margaret Anstee on the same day.⁵
3. This means that the report of the Provincial Committees reached Ms Anstee **before** she made the announcement of the outcome of the elections and the declaration of freeness and fairness.
4. According to Gerald L'ange, Ms Anstee's eventual findings were "based on a sampling rather than a scrutiny of the polling." It is our view that the Provincial Committees were active in the field and not sitting in some air- conditioned office and therefore, their findings must be taken seriously.
5. What happened next is a matter of speculation. There were powerful reasons for not invalidating the elections:
 - a) The cost of fresh elections
 - b) The likelihood of renewal of warfare
 - c) The parlous state of the UN funds
 - d) The possibility of a repetition of what took place and with the same results
6. Gerald L'ange presents a scenario in which Boutros-Ghali, the Secretary General of the UN instructs Ms Anstee to **disregard** the report of the Provincial Committees and to rule that the elections were free and fair.
7. Mr L'ange is doubtful that the scenario will ever be confirmed even if it is true. Then, quite illogically, he states that the scenario "must be presumed to be untrue unless the contrary is proved."⁶

⁵ It has never been claimed that the Report was handed too late or after the official announcement by Ms Anstee was made.

8. Attempts were made by senior UN officials, including Ms Anstee and Kofi Anan (then assistant Secretary-General of the UN) to undermine the profound importance of the Report of the Provincial Committees by claiming that there was no evidence of **“a pattern of fraud.”** The exact phrase, **“a pattern of fraud”**, was used by Ms Anstee, Kofi Anan and a “senior” official at the UN headquarters in New York. Surely not a coincidence? But what of the very categorical conclusion of the Provincial Committees? No attempt was made by them to show why or how the conclusion of the Provincial Committees was incorrect.
9. While there were compelling reasons for the UN to get out of Angola and this was only possible if the elections were validated, there is no evidence, whatsoever, to suggest that the Provincial Committees had an ulterior motive to have the elections declared invalid.
10. The United Nations, in validating the elections, did so by rejecting the findings of the very committees it set up to investigate fraud or irregularities in those elections.
11. No explanation has been tendered as to why the Report of the Provincial Committees was NEVER made public.

CONCLUSION

We adopt the scenario constructed by Mr L’ange and which he was too quick to discard. It is not beyond the realm of credulity to accept that persons in high places like the UN officials can behave and act dishonestly and immorally and cold-bloodedly. The conduct of the UN and its Secretary-General, Kofi Anan in Rwanda was such that they are correctly held responsible for allowing the genocide to take place.

Holden Roberto, Dos Santos and Savimbi must take the main responsibility for the rape and plunder of their motherland. For the pursuit of ends which had nothing to do with the interests of the people they dragged Angola into almost thirty years of a very destructive and devastating civil war.

Savimbi was quite wrongly portrayed as the only villain by the powerful propaganda machine of those countries, which supported the MPLA. Yet

⁶ Why does Mr L’ange construct a scenario, which he states must be presumed untrue until the contrary is proved? Yet he, himself, does not believe that the scenario will be confirmed. It looks as if Mr L’ange has stumbled on to a terrible truth and recoiled at the implications of a public denunciation of the “angels” among the politicians.

Savimbi was only one, albeit an important one, of the villains. He was often blamed for all the bad that came out from Angola.

He was denounced for not accepting the results of the 1992 elections.

We now know that his complaint of irregularities was not without foundation.

11th July 2002