

ARCMAG-Inkth-10-3-2

VOL. 1 No. 4
JULY 1978

INKATHA

'MYTHS, FICTION AND POLITICS'

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

June 19, 1978

I would like to thank my friend, and the friend of many of my people, Professor Jacques Freymond, the Director of this Institute, for inviting me to this great Institute. It has a very special place in our hearts, having produced for us such an outstanding leader in the person of Dr Sibusiso Bengu, who today is the Secretary-General of Inkatha. There have been many other black scholars who have been to this Institute through the efforts of Professor Freymond, and we have one studying here even now, in the person of Musa Myeni. Musa Myeni, although young in years, knows, from practical experience, what it means to have the South African jackboot on one's neck. We are grateful that after his traumatic experience it has been possible for him to come and do his studies here. I would like to thank all our friends in this country who have assisted Professor Freymond to ensure that this assistance, which we need so desperately, was rendered to the black people of South Africa. I thank all other citizens of Switzerland whose only commitment to our cause is not just being concerned about it, but who have rendered assistance to the oppressed and the afflicted in South Africa. I think it is a privilege for me to come to this Institute on the year of Professor Freymond's retirement to pay him and his fellow countrymen the tribute due to them for all they have done for us, and for all they continue to do for us.

Inkatha Yenkululeko YeSizwe is a national, cultural liberation movement and I talk to you today as its President. I want to convey to you what Inkatha is and what Inkatha is doing in the South African context. Inkatha has emerged as the largest and most disciplined black organisation in South Africa. It is represented in branches scattered far and wide in the Orange Free State, in the Transvaal and Natal. Membership represents the urban, the rural, the peasant, the worker and the professional. It represents youth, and it represents the women of South Africa. Its commitment is in the field of national politics and within the context of the black man's struggle for liberation in South Africa. With other black organisations, Inkatha is taking its place in laying the foundation for a new South Africa. Its current membership is over 150 000 and the comprehensiveness of its representation in all walks of life makes it not only the largest black political organisation which now exists in South Africa, but it also makes it the largest organisation of its kind that has ever emerged in the history of the country.

I would like first to talk about the South African situation in general terms, to provide the background against which Inkatha should be seen. I am speaking as the President of Inkatha and as such, what I say is the voice and view of Inkatha. I am in close contact with a very substantial black constituency in South Africa, and

when I speak as the President of Inkatha, I am not foisting on Inkatha something which does not belong to it. When I speak, I am reflecting the views of my people at all levels. Being President of Inkatha, I have a cohesive body of men, women and young people who, because they form my following, entitle me to the title of leader amongst them.

I want today to address myself to the question of democracy in South Africa and Southern Africa. I want to do so as someone who is involved in the hurly-burly of day-to-day politics. I don't want to theorise about politics; I don't want to theorise about politicians, and I don't want to theorise about different countries in any part of the world. We who are involved in the day-to-day politics of Southern Africa are the subject matter of people who theorise about us. We have had the misfortune to be longest in the claws of the monster oppression in the whole of Africa, and this gives scope to all kinds of people to theorise about us and our situation.

I have chosen to focus on democracy because in its broadest sense I regard it as the inner life of politics. Every system in which fundamental democratic principles have been destroyed is a system in which one part of the opposition, usually the greater part of the opposition of that system, seeks to establish democracy. In South Africa, where four-fifths of the population are not included in the national decision-making process, there is no democracy. The search for an alternative society, an alternative political structure, and an alternative economic order in my country has been the search for democracy. In countries where there is a greater sense of democracy in national politics, politics is about the preservation of that democracy. I am not saying that the search for democracy, or the protection of democracy, comprises the whole of politics. I am saying no more than that where democracy is absent, there is a hunger for it; and where democracy is present, there is a sense of needing to preserve it. This hunger and this sense are important in South Africa. The whole of politics must necessarily include tendencies towards fascism and totalitarianism. Those tendencies are important, and there are inevitable forces at work where democracy is at stake. One form of totalitarianism easily breeds another form of totalitarianism in the ranks of the opposition.

It is my assessment that in South Africa the search for democracy amongst the under-privileged and the disenfranchised constitutes the most important driving force in day-to-day politics. As somebody involved in practical day-to-day politics, I want to look at this important element in our political situation, and I want today to do so by distinguishing between myths, fictions and politics. There are many ways of using these words, and I am

using them in particular senses today.

Myths I am using to indicate repetitions of political reality in which mythological charters provide a divine or supernatural sanction for political action and political attitudes. Fiction, in the way I will use it today, focuses on plain and simple untruths about real politics. Politics for me is that which takes place and will continue to take place by the actors in the drama of the process of change in South Africa. There is no politics outside this process of change. South Africa's 'status quo' politics is no more than directing change in one direction, and radical politics is no more than directing change in another direction. There is no vital force at work in South Africa freezing the political situation. Conservatism is slowing the pace of change; radicalism is increasing that pace.

I think it is useful for us to distinguish between myths, fictions and politics. It is useful as a vehicle of dialogue between yourselves and ourselves. More than that, it is quite useful as a vehicle of confrontation between yourselves and ourselves. I would even go further and say it is useful in the pragmatic world in which your country and my country have been willy-nilly bound together, by virtue of the fact that the South African political situation has become internationalised.

I am therefore not addressing you in the sense of only telling you about something that is happening in another part of the world. I am doing that — but I am doing more than that. I want to tell you also what your involvement in that part of the world means for those who struggle there for democracy. And I want to tell you about the implications which the ineffectiveness of our joint involvement in South Africa has for future generations.

In talking about myths, fictions and politics in this kind of broad context, I am aware of the fact, as we pass from one to the other, we are passing through shades of meaning. There is no dichotomy between myths and fictions, or between fictions and politics. Distinctions do, however, have heuristic value and I will employ the distinctions because they have this value.

In broad terms, western Europe experienced a revolution in its economic and political life during the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. One European power after another embarked upon a process of conquering, subjugating and enslaving economically the people of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Warships were sent, armies were sent, footholds were gained, administrative systems were established. Goods began flowing, and raw materials began flowing, to meet the hunger pangs of the industrial revolution. This was not, of course, how it was presented to those of us who were on the receiving end of this callous employment of power. We were told we were the heathens of the world; we were told to value our subjugation; we were told our loss of freedom and our loss of birthright was a favour. Up to now whenever we squeal about our oppression, we are reminded that our white conquerors brought us the Christian gospel.

The colonial powers who sent the armies, those in charge of the armies, the administrators who followed the armies, and the police who implemented the dictates of the administrators, employed myths. They arrived, conquered and administered, feeling justified by the myths they brought with them. They did not see their

behaviour as commercial and calculating. They saw their behaviour as though they were emissaries of the divine sent to bring about change by force because they were justified. I know of no incidents in the sordid history of the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries in which these very myths, based as they most frequently were on Christian tenets, did not conflict with democracy. The administrator's office, the courts, the fortresses, stockades, the canons and the bayonets were employed, but not the vote. The myths determined the right to sacrifice democracy. The myths dehumanised the heathen and established the supremacy of a hard and aggressive technological and war-fearing élite.

These statements are not contentious statements here. In your country in this day and age, you and I can look together at the past behaviour of western Europe. We can shake our heads and laugh at the foolishness of men in bygone days. In South Africa, however, this is no laughing matter. The hard core of whites who wield power still resort to this myth. There is still a sense of the divine prerogative and acts of blatant exploitation. The Prime Minister still talks emotionally of the divine mission whites have in South Africa.

Politics in South Africa is far more than race segregation. It is a race segregation which favours white affluence and black degradation. The ugliness and brutality of the kind of exploitation, which leaves untold suffering and death in its wake, is rendered unrecognisable to the whites of South Africa by the whites of South Africa.

There is an almost universal belief prevailing in white society and this is that we blacks have no right to the privilege and prosperity of the country. There is talk about providing blacks with rights in their own areas; and the Nationalist politicians talk about rights for blacks in their ghettos and in their impoverished homelands. The fundamental rights of being a patriot and being a democrat are denied to blacks. When whites speak of the rights of blacks in their so-called areas, I am often reminded of a man speaking about the rights of his pets — the kennel for his dog which he proudly displays to neighbours.

The myths of the 18th and 19th centuries prevail. The church has not yet confronted the state on these issues. In South Africa, the belief is that differences between black and white are preordained by God, and that the economic advantage of the white, and his monopoly of power, flow from this preordained difference. Change in South Africa for these whites who enjoy the prosperity of the country and wield power to the exclusion of blacks is making this privileged gap unbridgeable.

Apartheid and the homeland policy of the white Nationalist government flatly denies black aspirations of equality of privilege and opportunity in one united South Africa. Apartheid retains a total monopoly over prosperity and a total stranglehold over black development. In the same way as the early white colonisers sacrificed all principles of democracy in their endeavours to exploit blacks, so do white South Africans negate every principle of democracy which is of any importance. White myths are the mortal enemies of democracy in South Africa. White myths corrode human rights in South Africa. White myths make us less human

than other men, for they make us fit for half-rights, as if we are half-men rather than full human beings with the same human stature as white men.

Western Europe and North America may have abandoned the myths but they, by and large, continue to participate in exploitative behaviour found in white South Africa, and do so from a basis of international supremacy, technically and economically speaking. The deadlock at the United Nations which occurs when white power exercises rights of veto is an anachronism of the past which continues to negate the principles of democracy. The Africa bloc at the United Nations has pronounced clearly on South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe, but the West remains unbending, resolute, determined to follow a course of action which serves their economic well-being at the expense of mankind.

When I look into the future and see a liberated South Africa, I see a place for South Africa in the Africa bloc being held to ransom by the West. Western powers will not cease to employ the veto once South Africa has achieved majority rule. I am aware of the dark days ahead — Third World, First World confrontations. That, however, is not the subject of my address today and I refer to it only in passing. I do so in order to illustrate one dimension of white myths in South Africa, and the extent to which white myths cast their shadows even on the international scene.

Another dimension of white myths which warrants attention is the effects which these myths have had on the black population. As some of our black spokesmen have said for generations, the missionaries came and taught us to pray; they taught us to pray with our eyes closed; with eyes closed we were taught to pray, thanking the good Lord for all his mercies and for bringing us Christianity. And while we so prayed with our eyes closed, the whites stole our land from us. There is a cruel truth in these words. For generations, in our places of worship, in our places of work, in our associations and organisations, we have been made to feel inferior, to behave as inferiors, and to have the expectations of the inferior. It was only the hard pangs of hunger and the pain of suffering which made us yearn for change and demand democracy. These yearnings and demands have been turned into criminal attitudes wherever you find poverty, and wherever you find survival in poverty through subservience you will find a dehumanising influence at work. That influence has been at work in South Africa for generations, and it is still at work.

The myths of white supremacists are ugly myths. They are destructive myths and they are tenacious myths. These myths blur into fictions as the original mythological charter, the divine imperative in the myth, recedes into the background and we inherit the fictions. Any study of racial attitudes is a study of these fictions. A black has a thicker skull than a white; he has a smaller brain and the brain has a coarser texture. The black only wants a place in the sun and is easily fed. His aspirations are less refined than those of whites. He is more sensuous than the white man! The pangs of childbirth are not as hard as they are for whites. Blacks are more stoic than whites about suffering. They have blunted feelings and they are less sensitive. A black mother does not love as a white mother. Blacks are more philosophic-

al about death. Their needs are related to their station in life. They do not need the same education as whites. These fictions about blacks prevail in white society. Whites need to conceive of blacks in such a way that they alienate them out of normality and they destroy the democratic rights of blacks. However, I do not want to belabour the fictions patterned out of myths this evening. These fictions are, however, important to grasp because they form the basis for the callous deprivations we suffer at the hands of our fellow countrymen.

There is another state of affairs which I want to move on to. These are the fictions produced by and for vested interest groups — fictions created by the mass media, by the biased commentator, the uninformed journalist, the petty politician, all of whom speak and write for audiences whom they have in mind and whom they want to please. In discussing these fictions, I am talking about the extent to which Inkatha is involved in current-day South Africa.

It is as fictitious to believe that South Africa is in the process of evolutionary change as it is fictitious to believe that revolutionary change can be bloodless and without violence. It is also fictitious to believe that change brought about by means other than armed conflict is bloodless and non-violent. It is fictitious to believe that the degree of violence in change can be limited by tactics and strategies other than those which keep you engaged with the machinery of power. These are very fine distinctions which one must repeat to oneself, to make their message sink.

It is fictitious to believe that the whites continue to control the destiny of South Africa. It is fictitious to believe that meaningful change can only be brought about by white initiative. It is fictitious to believe that some attitude, some vague thing in the air and the feeling of the people, something called black consciousness, replaces the hard work of constituency politics. It is fictitious to believe that black unity can or will spring from moral or theological considerations, rather than the politics of power advantage. It is fictitious to believe that the church and western civilisation are formative factors in the process of bringing about radical change in South Africa. All these fictitious beliefs, and many more, are expressed one way or another by writers, commentators and debaters on South Africa. The whole bit of fiction has been evolved and continues to be evolved, blurring the nature of the political struggle in South Africa; denying the forces at work in political change wrongly, and sometimes perniciously, and furthering the vested interests of groups and countries.

I want to comment on each of the fictions enumerated above, because it is only once we have been disabused of these fictions that the present political struggle in South Africa shifts into focus, and that our participation in those politics can be made explicit.

The question of whether or not South Africa will change quickly enough to avoid bloodshed on a large scale if we continue doing what we are doing, is probably the most crucial question with which we can be confronted. One is frequently confronted with the so-called evidence that there is fundamental change taking place in South Africa, and all we have to do is to hang on long enough and change will work out to everybody's

satisfaction. There is no more pernicious fiction than this. To expect us blacks to believe in this is pernicious as it is cruel.

The South African state maintains itself against opposition by the active employment of violence, and by the promulgation of even harsher measures of suppression. The prospects for blacks are bleak in every sphere. There is very little prospect of the South African economy being able to create over a thousand jobs per day for black school-leavers in the foreseeable future. Real growth will continue to be two per cent and lower for the immediate years ahead.

Apartheid will continue to be enforced and South Africa's security will continue to be threatened from abroad as well as from within. The powers-that-be will continue to militarise the country at large, and the deliberate inculcation of a war psychosis can be expected to be stepped up. The refusal of the government to take meaningful steps in implementing a democratic political system will persist. The grand design of apartheid and homeland politics remain unworkable and unimplemented beyond that which can be enforced. Continued economic exploitation, and continued experience of an administration relying on force, is all that the present-day black man can expect. Projections say that by the year 2000, in urban areas alone, whites will be outnumbered seven to one. White South Africa will be a shrinking minority and in their urban bastions.

I find it astounding that people continue to talk about the process of evolutionary change when South Africa as a country is careering down a collision course out of control. The consequences of doing only that which we are now doing will be catastrophic for a new society and an orderly way of life. Only those who are prepared to die than do anything else, or those who are making a quick buck and are in a position to bale out when the going gets rough, should talk in the vein of being satisfied with current trends of change in the medium or long term. One can perhaps add to these people those who are impotent because they are locked in the need to retain the goodwill of the diehards and opportunists, who argue the merits of current evolutionary change.

There are changes taking place in South Africa. Apartheid is increasingly impractical and impossible to implement. Steps of absolute necessity are being labelled 'constructive and evolutionary change.' It is true that some progress is being made in the abolition of petty apartheid. It is true that many forms of job discrimination are being scrapped. It is true that in the case of a small proportion of the black work force, wages are increasing in real terms. It is true that there is a degree of liberalisation in the field of sport. But it is also true that there is absolutely no indication that political power will be redistributed. There are absolutely no indications that black South Africa by and large will be comparatively less impoverished as the years go by. There is every indication that whites will die fighting for their political privileges and their economic advantages. Mr Vorster rejects outright urgent calls for national conventions. He refuses to talk about talking, let alone agreeing to do any. If the present trends in South Africa are left unchanged, there can only be bloody confrontation which will be destructive of everything we hold dear. It is fictitious to

believe that South Africa is not a state being maintained by the employment of barbed wire, machine guns and the jackboot.

South Africa remains a country maintained by violence and South Africa remains a country breeding counter-violence. The de-escalation of counter violence can only be made possible by the de-escalation of the violence that maintains apartheid, and this latter de-escalation can only follow the steps that Mr Vorster so adamantly refuses to embark upon. One does not have to be an anarchist, and one does not have to favour violence as a means to change, before you recognise that the question of violence in South Africa is no longer academic, and talk of evolutionary change to avoid violence is so much political hog-wash. It is not hog-wash merely because evolutionary change has not taken place, but because the powers-that-be do not desire to see even true evolutionary change. What they regard as evolutionary change are various feeble ploys which they use in order to stall for time.

Change in South Africa could be relatively peaceful and there could be a relatively significant impetus added to the powers that will bring about, or can bring about, relatively peaceful change. This impetus, however, is desperately overdue and certainly is not found in the actions of those who are only doing what has been done to date. Naïvety which believes in goodwill and common sense prevailing is outright irresponsibility. Unless every conceivable step to bring pressure to bear on Pretoria is taken, that will make them move to the conference table where discussion will be about the implementation and prerequisites of democracy, South Africa will continue careering towards a catastrophic future. When some people speak to me, and I may add some people of international reputation, I see the loneliness of their position from which they try to talk to me persuasively.

There are many people who benefit financially in the present-day South African situation. They want that situation to continue. They know it cannot continue but they also know if they voice that sentiment, they will sacrifice that which they are gaining out of the present situation. They are lonely people who know they cannot continue gaining in the future. They can say nothing about the future now for fear of losing what they already have.

I also know of lonely people who believe with me that a church/state confrontation is a prerequisite for the avoidance of a widespread armed struggle in South Africa. Many of these people are lonely because they cannot bring themselves, or exhort their brothers, to confront the state. In their quandary they appeal for time, more talking and more doing of the same things which have necessitated church/state confrontation. Churches in the west are committed to partnership with sister churches in South Africa, and they must perpetuate the myth of the value of doing what they are doing. There are, of course, exceptions on which the future church will be built. But for the present, Mr Vorster does not allow them to come to South Africa for dialogue. Many men of prominence say things to me in private which they would not dare to say publicly, and many people of prominence who share with me in

private visions of the future, give lie to those visions in their own corridors of power, where their own advantages and prestige lie. Where truth makes suspect man amongst his peers, men abandon truth in favour of their peers. They talk about going too far too fast. They talk about remaining influential and relevant, and they abandon formative or definitive roles which are so badly needed in current South Africa. I am saddened by the quirks of human nature which give high currency to immediate gain and which favour prestige over and above truth.

The last thing I want to say about false beliefs in evolutionary change is that where there is a coincidence of the industrialist who gains by not 'interfering' in South African politics, and the churchman who gains by not mixing politics with religion, we have a formidable combination. This combination is a straight-jacket which no western country can afford, but which practically every western country wears.

I have stated repeatedly in the past, and I reiterate today, that the struggle for liberation in South Africa has many facets, and the final victory over oppression will come only when there is a coincidence of strategies and tactics which attack the bastion of apartheid from every angle, and from within as well as from without. Opposition to apartheid must take every form possible. Some of these strategies and tactics will be snuffed out by harsher legislation implemented by callous men wielding brutal power. If some of the pundits on the future are correct in stating that the 19th October 1977 saw the death-knell of black democratic opposition to apartheid, then I am afraid we have conceded victory to apartheid. Apartheid cannot fall, and will not fall, unless we remount democratic opposition. We blacks see this as our duty. We cannot relent because of the draconian powers that are used to snuff out democratic opposition. If we accepted the premise that October 19th 1977 was the death-knell of black opposition, we would be implying that the recently banned organisations stood for more than the ANC and PAC which were banned in 1960.

Victory over apartheid without democratic opposition as an essential and central strategy will only be the victory of one totalitarianism over another. I can understand the bitterness of those whose organisations have been destroyed by the action of October 19th. I can understand their disillusionment and despair, but I cannot agree with some of them who think we should abandon the fight for democracy and the role of democratic opposition in bringing about a better South Africa. It is all too easy to denigrate democratic opposition because you yourself have failed to achieve anything lasting in that field of opposition. In a way, it is human weakness to react this way. It is very sad, but it remains true, that some have suffered from the wrath of Mr Vorster or Mr Kruger more from bravado than from their effectiveness in the ranks of the opposition.

One is always moved deeply by the individual who dies insisting on his rights to oppose. I am moved by hundreds of youngsters who were genuine in their participation in the June 16th, 1976 Soweto uprising and its aftermath, with a stone in their hand in the face of police dogs, tear gas and bullets. I am moved by that

section of our youth who paid the supreme price in their determination and their idealism. This, however, does not mean that I should abandon my own strategy and tactic to die there with them in their ineffectiveness to bring about fundamental change. This also does not mean that I applaud every rabble-rousing fool bent on his own immediate eminence, regardless of death around him paid for by others. Nor does it mean that I must run with the destroyed and scattered and survive on the fiction that only by such proven failure can we bring about change. In our desperate situation many see this as the only gateway to political credibility. This, again, is another fiction.

There is nothing that can replace the hard work of constituency politics in the process of democratic opposition to apartheid in South Africa. Every black in South Africa is born into an apartheid world. He is nurtured on food bought from apartheid wages. Every black in urban South Africa lives in a home dispensed as a favour by apartheid government which denies him or her any kind of permanent rights. Every black who goes to school learns to read or write in an apartheid educational institution. Every black who goes to university goes to an ethnic college. Every black who works, works with permission from his apartheid boss. Every black who travels, travels because he has got a document in his back pocket authorising him to do so. Blacks in South Africa are born into apartheid and cannot opt out of it. To say you cannot fight it within, is to say you cannot fight it at all. And equally, to say that you can only fight it from within, is to say that you cannot fight it at all. Apartheid is not a practical proposition for South Africa. It has not been implemented fully and will never be implemented fully.

The purveyors of these heinous crimes against humanity are living on borrowed time, paid for by those on the one hand who believe change will come only by doing what they are doing, and on the other hand by those who refuse to recognise that democratic opposition within South Africa is as indispensable as it is inalienable.

There will be more June 16ths and there will be more October 19ths, as there will be more Sharpevilles. Let us not be deluded into thinking that the whole nature of the struggle for a better way of life has been changed because 19 organisations and 60 or 70 people were banned. More organisations will be banned in the future. More people will be banned in the future, and organisations and individuals in the future will be subject to even harsher measures because there is no end to opposition to injustice in South Africa. I believe in that opposition. I believe in my fellow blacks. I have faith in their tenacity to continue the struggle and that is where I will remain. All this does not argue that a threshold cannot be passed beyond which the weight of violence and the armed struggle will be greater than the weight of democratic opposition. In fact, I do believe that in every sense we are standing at the eleventh hour in this respect. We stand precariously balanced in the face of an uncertain future. I appeal to everybody, however, to continue the struggle until it is impossible to do so any more. The struggle can be continued, is being continued, and will be continued, next year, the year after, and the

year after that. You will see more oppressive legislation being promulgated by the South African parliament, and this alone will be evidence of the truth of what I am saying. White legislators will be forced again and again to find new measures of opposition. It is rank foolishness and the height of irresponsibility to believe otherwise. It is to deny that we are part of the human family to believe otherwise.

Because these things are true, I can go on to assert that the destiny of South Africa is being determined, and will continue to be determined, by black opposition. Black opposition does not have one singular seat in the South African parliament, or in a provincial council, or in a city council, or even in a village management board. The only opposition is a black opposition without power, without a seat in any house. White politics will remain politics reacting to black initiatives. The preponderance of blacks numerically; their entrenchment in the economic life of the country; their growing majority in so-called white areas; their essential presence in the white-controlled economy; their anger and their determination, represent an irresistible force of change. White politics has moved whites into the laager mentality, and of all the people in South Africa they are the most unfree in democratic terms. They do not fight their lack of freedom; they cannot grasp a new future. As assured as we are that we will have a new future, so assured can we be that whites cannot take those essential initiatives which will make them directors of the future. White political power serves only to hold together a crumbling past. No black man need be a sell-out. The future is his. And no black man need fear participating in the process of democratic change for fear of being called a sell-out.

It is time that the west in general, and the industrialists and the churchmen in particular, sought to ally themselves with the forces of change in South Africa. Out of that alliance alone can come a permanent partnership in the creation of a just society based on democratic principles. If you do not do so, you will force us to grasp not only just at straws, but at any straws. That is why the things I expressed thanks for at the commencement of my lecture are concrete contributions towards our black struggle for fulfillment. No one should say that because he or she is a foreigner, he or she dare not interfere. You can do a thousand things to strengthen the forces for change. That is the most we expect you to do.

It is fictitious to believe that some attitude, some vague thing in the air and the feeling of the people, something called black consciousness, replaces the hard work of constituency politics. The fight for democracy knows no colour bar and I believe that the fight for democracy must include forces from all the elements central to a new society. It must include forces emanating from youth, from women, from the workers, from the professionals, from black and from white. Each force has its own unique role to play, and in this context blackness has its role to play. Blackness is very closely-linked to the centre of gravity of today's politics in South Africa. It has a domination of political reality and the recognition of this fact is not a racial pronouncement. Black indignation and impatience with the way blacks are

treated is a growing impetus towards change that nothing can stop. Black consciousness arises out of a black awareness of the merits of being black. Such awareness is not a denouncement of those who are non-black, nor is it licence to a monopoly of the forces of change. Blackness as a dynamic force has many facets, and the perpetuation of the concept of black consciousness by a narrow band of blackness within the total political spectrum is a fiction perpetrated by people whose outlook is as narrow as the band they occupy. Black consciousness is not a prerogative of a particular organisation, of a particular political programme with a particular strategy or tactic. Black consciousness is the birthright of all men who have suffered as a result of apartheid as a system. The fiction in the concept black consciousness is an imported fiction alien to every true South African.

The consciousness of being black has many expressions. What is known generally speaking as black theology is one such expression. It has been expressed in trade union movements, in cultural movements and black-dominated political movements hostilely opposed to each other. It is only when we read the broad spectrum of black political life that the concept of black consciousness shifts into focus. This consciousness has a number of features which make it identifiable wherever you find it. In the first place, it generates its own political dictates and it generates its own political idiom. It may borrow here, it may borrow there, but in the end product there is a uniqueness belonging to a particular people in a particular circumstance who have common ground in searching for a new society based on their own desires and their own creativeness, which is born out of their own suffering. Black consciousness in this broad context has been, and will remain, involved in internal disputes out of which a future democracy will be born. The black consciousness movement, so-called, known only in terms of Black Peoples' Convention and SASO is a misnomer. BPC and SASO incipiently, and frequently explicitly, claim sole right to put the stamp of authenticity on black consciousness. For many in these organisations, black consciousness has a kind of blackness which they sponsored, and only they could approve. Black consciousness is not authored by any one organisation. It is born in the suffering people fighting in the struggle for liberation against the odds of their being black. In its richest form, black consciousness is blacks in dispute amongst each other about political reality, and the nature of a just society suitable to the particular history and circumstances of South Africa.

Black consciousness in South Africa is unparalleled in the world. It has only a superficial resemblance to black consciousness in the United States and it cannot in any circumstances whatsoever follow the strategy and tactics of our black brothers in the United States a decade or two ago. I need not be over-analytical about this statement. I need only draw attention to a central element of the black struggle in the United States and that is that it received its strength from an alliance with a conscience-stricken white middle-class. We have not got a conscience-stricken white middle-class in South Africa with whom blacks can establish an alliance. It is this alliance and the very real opportunities black Americans saw of

participating in the American way of life as it then was, and has continued to be, which determined strategies and tactics of our black American brothers. In South Africa, black consciousness faces a very much more difficult task. It not only has to overcome prejudices and the disadvantage of being disenfranchised, but it has to create a new social order, a new political order, and a new economic order. There is no class of whites who form natural allies in this task.

The inclusion of blacks in the democratic process of South Africa necessitates moving away from the Westminster model on which white political institutions were patterned. It means movement away from unfettered capitalism and uncontrolled free enterprise systems which form a natural counterpart of democracy à la Westminster. Whites in South Africa have departed from the original Westminster model because economic vested interests of the white élite demanded protection from the threat of blacks being included in the democratic process. Sacred principles have been abandoned in white corridors of power. Political situations cannot be considered independently from economic orders. The current economic order in South Africa cannot survive the test of democracy. There is therefore a dichotomy between the interests of blacks and whites, a dichotomy which inhibits black/white political alliances, and which has a profound effect on strategies and tactics that must be adopted in the struggle for liberation.

BPC and SASO as organisations have not tabled one single document which has earned any international respect. They have not tabled one single document which has gained widespread recognition in South Africa among the blacks. In the absence of any clarity of thought, and in the absence of any blueprint for the future, BPC and SASO were unable to act as catalysts in black society, and regrettably resorted to the kind of politics of emotion singularly lacking in strategy and tactics, and not viable in the face of the kind of opposition that was meted out to them. BPC started off its existence as an umbrella organisation in search of black unity. The first political platform that they created, however, was used for the propagation of individual political careers, and soon evolved a political idiom of band-wagon politics which is more emotional than pragmatic and which involves a minority of blacks only.

It is very sad to see the disarray in which my brothers and sisters in BPC and SASO now stand. They have yet to learn that western sentiment is remarkably fickle. While they motivated the west and the church to back a kind of black sentimentalism and while many of the members seek refuge in political asylum in western countries, they have failed and will continue to fail because their concept of black unity has been a concept which excludes anybody who disagrees with them. While circumstances permitted, I sought every opportunity of establishing black unity. All overtures were rejected, arrogantly and short-sightedly.

I am not saying these things outside an appeal to my brothers in SASO and BPC to recognise the true nature of politics. The true politician is pragmatic. He deals with real alternatives and avoids emotional political appeals which do not give rise to lasting organisational and constituency gains. I think it can be truthfully stated that

western support will be narrowed down to looking after the personal needs of some in exile, some banned at home, and some in jail. They have left behind them nothing that can be backed and nothing that is politically viable, given the facts of South Africa and Mr Vorster's intransigence.

The ground on which the seeds of SASO and BPC fell was fertile ground and it remains fertile ground. Even in that fertility these seeds could not survive the cold draught of political reality. The same ground will yet give life to other seeds, or perhaps mutations of the same seeds. I hope I have made my disagreement with BPC and SASO clear. I hope I have been able to convey that while they are my brothers in the struggle, they have been foolish, and perhaps even a bit more than foolish. I hope I have said enough to indicate that in the politics of black consciousness, I see the necessity of many strategies and many tactics, but I also see the necessity of creative dialogue between blacks, and the freedom to make appeals on which the masses will pronounce.

It stirs one to listen to news broadcasts and political commentaries on events in Soweto in times of uprising. In the west, I can understand those who hail these events as the beginning of the end when those who wanted to bring about change for so long, and have for so long been impotent in their attempts to do so, see possible evidence of something happening, I can understand their excitement. I can also understand the romanticisation of particular acts of bravery and the inability to distinguish between foolish bravado and real bravery. I can understand acclaim being given to those who die or are jailed, despite the fact that we have achieved so little by their sacrifices. I cannot, however, accept the criticisms of those who say I must tread the same path of political futility, to earn for myself the stamp of authenticity, and their stamp of approval.

After June 16, 1976, I was urged to abandon my involvement with the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. I was urged to do so in my own interests. I was assured that white South Africa was crumbling and I was assured that the country would be crippled economically before the end of the year. The five million people on my home front, who form the very basis of my base, were flippantly described as a 'platform' by my detractors, which it was suggested I could mount and dismount as political opportunism dictated. My own knowledge of history and my grasp of political reality told me that South Africa would never see fundamental change because school children went on the rampage. Political reality denied this as far as I was concerned. That is not to say that those of our children who died, died in vain. Not by any means. The query is on this as a viable tactic, the more so as it was unplanned and happened spontaneously as a reaction to Pretoria's political stupidity.

The struggle in South Africa will yet be long and bitter. The purveyors of quick solutions and instant remedies will all be proved wrong. Such false hopes are born out of frustrations which cloud judgement, and render leadership impotent. Those who encourage this misanalysis of the black situation do the black struggle a great disservice. I feel I must warn against it, as there may be some who may be doing this unwittingly.

What I have said about Soweto, BPC and SASO does

not detract from the fact that the threat of force is important in bringing about change in South Africa. I think it is now widely accepted that the threat of escalating force in Zimbabwe was an important consideration in bringing Mr Smith to the conference table. Whatever the politics of Zimbabwe turn out to be, there is no gainsaying the fact that Mr Smith ended up doing those things which he vowed would only be done over his dead body. No matter how much prevarication there is, the acceptance of majority rule is irreversible. This situation would not have arisen had the threat of violence escalating beyond control not been real. Just how far along the road towards a situation of violence escalating beyond control Mr Vorster will venture cannot be predicted. There is no indication that he knows any other road, and there is every indication that threats of violence will become increasingly real in South Africa.

I and Inkatha are dedicated to contributing towards non-violent change in South Africa. This does not mean that those who are not so dedicated have no role to play. It would be arrogant to say so. Their role may be lamentable and we may not like it, but as long as the state maintains itself by violence, it will breed counter-violence, and that bit of reality is not going to be wished away by not liking violence, or by not being involved in it. South African whites are being actively mobilised and South Africa is being increasingly militarised. It appears to us as though Mr Vorster has accepted a military solution and is preparing for it. We sincerely hope we are wrong. Any political discussion about South Africa would be naïve if the whole question of violence was shunned. If the only form of violence in South Africa was to make children cannon fodder, Mr Vorster would not be perturbed about violence, and he would not be arming himself to the teeth.

The west must take the impending violence in South Africa very seriously. I can assure you that for us violence is not an academic question, either state violence or counter-violence. I can assure you that the average black in South Africa discusses the imminence of violence and the extent to which violence will be employed, rather than whether or not it will be employed. I would rather the subject be left to rest here, except to say that it is rank foolishness on the part of western countries to withhold moral and material support for black South African organisations simply because they are part of the threat of impending violence, or party to the threat to escalate violence. The tragedy of South Africa will be near complete if change is brought about by violence alone.

The question of violence, or the threat of violence, is inevitably linked to the question of black unity in the struggle for liberation. The west has a record of having failed in adjudicating between different factions in the black states of Africa. In the face of an impending civil war, moral exhortations lauding the merits of unity, and moral arguments to get people to sit round conference tables, have proven inefficiency. Political dominance of one party precedes political unity.

Few countries in the western world have achieved national unity outside experiencing civil war. Africa is not exempt from mankind. Civil war there too has played a part in fashioning nations and creating unity. God

forbid that I wish upon my people a civil war as a necessary condition for achieving unity. I raise the question because I think it is fundamentally important to recognise that if we go on doing what we are doing, we are threatened with civil war in South Africa. But if that prospect is looming ahead, I am duty bound to talk about it. I urge the western countries of the world to recognise that buying time from Mr Vorster is extending the breeding time for civil war in the country.

I sincerely believe that at this point in time we can avert a civil war by making the prospects of fundamental change real. At all costs the west must desist from being a divisive factor in black South Africa. On the other hand, I want to go on record as saying that our fear of civil war must not be so great as to preclude resistance to those who would perhaps exchange one kind of dictatorial system for another. It is fictitious to believe that the threat of civil war in the country does not exist, and it is irresponsible in the extreme to disregard the real possibility of civil war.

It is fictitious to believe that the church and western civilisation are formative factors in the process of bringing about radical change in South Africa. Radical change will not occur because of the formative influences of the west and the church. If we are justified in continuing to say this throughout the process of change in South Africa, Mr Vorster's future — which he described as 'too ghastly to contemplate' — will become a reality. One does not have to advocate disinvestment generally in order to make the point that investment in apartheid South Africa prolongs the life of apartheid. I have gone on record as saying that if I had to choose between a military solution to South Africa and disinvestment, I would choose the latter. If, however, I am forced to choose the latter, it will be because the investor continued to justify his investment by being a factor of change in the country. Mr Vorster pursues an aggressive line in his Department of Information. We have learned recently of the extent to which he goes in using all means at his disposal to minimise pressures on South Africa. The kind of western support he has enjoyed up to now is his lifeblood, and Mr Vorster more than anybody else has internationalised the South African situation. The Department of Information, and the Department of Foreign Affairs, calculatedly and advisedly appeal to the self-interest of the west in continuing to support apartheid South Africa.

In passing, I want to go on record as saying that the Department of Information has used my name in their propaganda endeavours without consulting me. They have deliberately misused my position. I have repeatedly called attention to investor irresponsibility in South Africa, and I have repeatedly warned investors that they will lose everything they have unless they use their influence to bring about radical change as rapidly as possible. I have repeatedly said that the question of whether or not disinvestment should take place is something which the people most affected by it should pronounce upon, and I call upon all parties in South Africa to hold a national convention on the subject so that the people may speak. I cannot alter my position because the Department of Information distorts what I say, and I cannot alter my position because pressure groups on the

left of Europe's political spectrum distort what I say. I remain convinced that enlightened self-interest of the western investor lies in the direction of utilising his economic pull with Pretoria to bring about fundamental change.

I hope that it may be possible in the future for me to call on the major investors in South Africa, and the multinational corporations of the world, to take the initiative with me to commence upon the groundwork necessary for a National Convention in South Africa. It is in the interests of these investors and corporations that such a conference be held. It is in the interests of western economies that such a conference be held. It is in the interests of white South Africa that such a conference be held, and it is in the interests of black South Africans that it is held. Never before has there been such an urgent need to accept the need for a National Convention and to set a timetable for its occurrence. I believe that the time has come to commence the hard work which the preliminary steps towards such a convention entail. The South African Black Alliance, of which I am Chairman, has set as its goal this preparatory work, despite Mr Vorster's continued rejection of the idea of holding a National Convention.

The western church must realise that the emergence of democracy in South Africa cannot take place without them becoming actively involved in politics. A churchless state in South Africa would do no more than produce a maimed and crippled democracy. The church is one force which could and should rise above short-term vested interests which so far have characterised the western involvement in South Africa. It is the one institution which can stand free of illogical dictates and have the humility to serve the suffering people of South Africa in a way in which they demand. If a National Convention in South Africa is to become a reality, the church will have to play an active and deciding role. The coincidence of church and western governments in bringing direct pressure to bear on Pretoria to accept a National Convention will be beyond rejection. There is not a single political party in western Europe and North America who could survive an open and direct confrontation of the church. That observation holds true for Mr Vorster's party. There is not one political party in western Europe or North America which would survive against a concerted attack from organised industry and commerce. That too holds true for Mr Vorster. There is not a single western government or government in North America which would not act more decisively in South Africa if it were under direct and immediate pressure from the church and organised commerce and industry. I cannot over-emphasise the fact that unless these forces become operative and effective in the near future, South Africa will pass a threshold beyond which violence will become the dominant force of change. I do not believe that if this happened that the west and the church would be immune from aftermaths detrimental to them.

I want now to turn to the role Inkatha plays in South Africa.

The aims and objectives of Inkatha are:

- (a) To foster the spirit of unity among the people of KwaZulu throughout South Africa, and between them and all their African brothers in Southern

Africa, and to keep alive and foster the traditions of the people.

- (b) To help promote and encourage the development of the people of KwaZulu, spiritually, economically, educationally and politically.
- (c) To establish contact and liaise with other cultural groups in Southern Africa with a view to the establishment of a common society.
- (d) To stamp out all forms of corruption, exploitation of man by man and intimidation.
- (e) To ensure acceptance of the principles of equal opportunity and treatment for all peoples in all walks of life.
- (f) To co-operate with any movement or organisation for the improvement of the conditions of the people and to secure the most efficient production and equitable distribution of the wealth of the nation in the best interests of the people.
- (g) To abolish all forms of discrimination and segregation based on tribe, clan, sex, colour or creed.
- (h) To promote and support worthy indigenous customs and cultures.
- (i) To protect, encourage and promote trade, commerce, industry, agriculture and conservation of natural resources by all means in the interests of the people, and encourage all citizens to participate in all sectors of the economy.
- (j) To give effect to the principles approved from time to time by the appropriate organs of the Movement.
- (k) To ensure observance of the fundamental freedoms and human rights.
- (l) To inculcate and foster a vigorous consciousness of patriotism and a strong sense of national unity based on a common and individual loyalty and devotion to our land.
- (m) To co-operate locally and internationally with all progressive African and other nationalist movements and political parties which work for the complete eradication of all forms of colonialism, racialism, neo-colonialism, imperialism and discrimination, and to strive for the attainment of African unity.
- (n) To carry on any other activities which in the opinion of the Movement are conducive to the attainment of the aims and objectives of that National Movement, and to do such things as are incidental to the attainment of the above objectives.

We in Inkatha have accepted that relying on evolutionary changes brought about by the existing participants in the South African scene will not assist us achieve our aims and objectives. We are determined to achieve our aims and objectives by doing all in our power to bring about fundamental change. We believe that we have our own unique contributions to make and we believe this contribution will be made for all the people of South Africa.

We are aware that the South African state maintains itself against opposition by the active employment of the promulgation of ever harsher measures of oppression. We are aware of the fact that our own prospects depend upon remaining a force with which Mr Vorster has to come to terms; and remaining a force which Mr Vorster dare not cripple with arbitrary police and administrative

action. But we are aware that foolish arbitrary actions against Inkatha cannot be ruled out. Mr Kruger, the Minister of Justice, has already threatened us. It would be idle to pretend that we are immune. It would just be as idle to assert that if we were banned this would spell the end of black democratic opposition in South Africa.

It is true that Mr Vorster has so far not moved against Inkatha at this point in time. It may well be, that the Prime Minister has a fear, which I share with him, that if something rash is done against Inkatha, Natal might go up in smoke. I believe Mr Vorster is a shrewd politician and he knows this, and I also believe that the time has come when properly organised black constituencies in South Africa could emerge in such ways as will make them illustrations of the nationalist party's failure to implement the grand design of the apartheid policy. The people of Natal have shown that it is not possible for Mr Vorster to produce an independent homeland when the people remain adamant in their refusal to co-operate with him. Inkatha intends to continue retaining a foothold in political reality, and intends continuing gains it has made in opposing apartheid.

Inkatha represents, therefore, a new initiative in opposition in South Africa. We in Inkatha realise that if everybody outside Inkatha went on doing the kind of things that they have been doing, the final fragmentation of South Africa into so many mini-states would follow in due course. We have put a stop to this fragmentation in one part of South Africa. In doing so, we have struck a blow, a telling blow and an effective blow, for all the black people of South Africa. This was not a happy coincidence or some kind of political bonus for others. It was the intention of Inkatha, and remains the intention of Inkatha, to face national issues on behalf of the whole of South Africa. The straight-jacket into which the white minority has put the whole of South Africa is one aspect in the deliberate balkanisation of its peoples.

The Zulus, by no choice of their own, have been balkanised. This balkanisation is part of reality. We have the particular advantage of being a section of the population which had to be defeated militarily before we were forced into subjugation. The Zulus are the only section of the South African population which had to be treated this way by colonial powers. We also have the advantage of being the only black section of the population in rural areas which consistently refused to enter into the homeland political scene, to the point where the choice was taken from us and we were incorporated in this political farce by the administrator's pen in Pretoria. We had to be defeated in the first place. We refused to co-operate in the second place, and we are absolutely adamant that we will never lend ourselves to carving up South Africa into so-called mini-states. We remain South Africans; we remain patriots; and we will die if necessary in the defence of our ideals. The black people of Natal have another advantage in that the Zulus alone outnumber all whites. Even if every other black group accepted the kind of independence, so-called, that my brothers Chief Kaiser Matanzima and Chief Lucas Mangope accepted, whites would be outnumbered in that part of South Africa which remained a unitary state.

At the last KwaZulu Legislative Assembly elections, Inkatha won every single seat and it won it on a platform

rejecting homeland independence. Let us put an end to mischievous, or at best ill-informed, statements that because Inkatha was Natal-based in its beginning, it represents a narrow tribal interest. Inkatha alone has thwarted Pretoria's intention to carve up South Africa. It has taken new initiatives and will continue to do so. Inkatha has proved to the blacks that they can achieve the kind of political gains so far not achieved by black groups in alliance with liberals and the west. Those who have opposed Inkatha in recent years have failed to stop the Transkei and BophuthaTswana from being manipulated into some kind of ridiculous quasi-independence. Our analysis is correct when we say that the full implementation of the policy of so-called homeland independence will set the struggle for liberation back for decades. Our involvement in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly was a correct and exact strategy. It is technically not possible to bring a homeland to the point of accepting independence unless Pretoria manipulates the Legislative Assembly. We are in that Assembly and will remain in that Assembly to thwart any further moves in the direction of so-called independence. Mr Vorster has himself conceded the point when he stated in the all-white parliament that all 'Homelands', so-called, will be independent in five years time except KwaZulu.

In a very real sense therefore, Inkatha's position is exploiting the fundamental weakness of the Nationalist Party regime, which is that their policies cannot be implemented forever without the co-operation of blacks. We in Inkatha believe that Mr Vorster's intransigence and the inhumanity of his administration, upheld as it is by the employment of force, has bred, and continues to breed, counter-violence. Inkatha is committed to bringing South Africa to the conference table to avoid the final escalation of employed force reaching the point of no return.

Inkatha therefore seeks alliances and dialogue with every group in the country. Recently we have formed the South African Black Alliance with our Indian and Coloured brothers and sisters. We have been in dialogue with the white Progressive Federal Party. Inkatha will not abandon its search for a common meeting ground for all the people of South Africa, nor will Inkatha abandon the search for African and western European alliances which can give impetus to the factors which work to bring about change in our country. Inkatha will encourage an active dialogue and practical partnership with industry and with the church. Its aim is to be a catalyst in the field where the forces of change remain impotent because they are not united. Inkatha also remains committed to the unity of blacks. Above all else, Inkatha is committed, and will remain committed, to pursuing democratic opposition within the borders of South Africa. We do not believe that such opposition is not possible. Our very existence, our continued dynamic growth, and our real political achievements have shown this to be the case, and continue to show that it is the case.

After June 16th, 1976 there were many little cocks crowing on political dunghills that the events of Soweto were the death-knell of Inkatha and my involvement in

politics. During the six months which followed June 16th, 1976, Inkatha's membership doubled, and it has now quadrupled. In terms of turbulence and unrest, when expectations of people rise, hope of change becomes real. At the height of the unrest, when black killed black, it was I, as President of Inkatha, who had to go to Soweto to defuse the black/black confrontation. There is hunger amongst people for a disciplined organisation which attends to the hard work of constituency building. It is these people who have confounded the prophets of doom. The ordinary man in the street, the ordinary worker, the ordinary peasant, yearns for an organised and well-run political home. South Africa will again produce flashes of black anger. The students in Soweto on June 16th were not an isolated case of black anger. The Zulu strikes in Durban in 1973 were just as important. These flashes will come again and again. They will come amongst our workers, amongst our youth, amongst our women. They represent easily to be understood skirmishes. There are, however, still some to learn that a sequence of revolts do not necessarily make a revolution. A revolution begins with hard work in which discipline dominates over personal ambition. This is a point which many band-wagon black politicians that have emerged in recent times have all missed.

Inkatha believes that blacks must provide a context in which all sectors of the black population can find it possible to work in unison. Until the forces emanating from youth, from women, from the worker and from the peasant coincide, apartheid will triumph as a result of its divide and rule policy. Inkatha is therefore committed to a multi-strategy approach and plans accordingly. Inkatha's constitution makes provision for the affiliation of religious, professional, cultural, workers, youth and women movements. We realise that the role of political parties are distinct from the role of trade unions, from professional bodies, cultural organisations. This distinction does not mean that each organisation or association should pull in different directions. Inkatha aims to provide a framework within which all black energies will be channelled into areas of common purpose in the struggle for liberation.

We in Inkatha know the white man is on the run. The very fact that he is running into the laager illustrates this. We know that apartheid is doomed to failure. The dignity of the black man and his participation in the future of South Africa is assured. Our commitment is to hasten the changes which are assured, and to do so with the minimum amount of suffering, the minimum death, and the minimum loss of essential ingredients for a new society.

Those who are not prepared for a long struggle in the defence of democratic principles, which are threatened by everything which is being done, are irresponsible in the extreme. There is no easy and magic solution to the problems of South Africa. It is as irresponsible to talk about South Africa as though there were no violence and as though that violence will not escalate, as it is irresponsible to talk about changing South Africa with stones and petrol bombs in the face of saracens and machine guns.

These are the realities of the South African situation.

These are the political dynamics of the South African situation as distinct from myths and fictions. I have attempted to spell out the myths and fictions that have caused the status quo to last for so long. I have pointed out which myths and fictions should be abandoned if we are to achieve real political change in South Africa.

As long as each force for change clings to its own strategy to the exclusion of all others, apartheid will outlast all of us. This is the time when all of us must approach this whole question with humility. It is absolutely vital that what the forces for change are orchestrating outside the borders of South Africa should not be seen as the one and only way to liberation to the exclusion of all others. It should be realised that what goes on outside the borders should not be seen as necessarily excluding what goes on within the borders of South Africa. These strategies have to go on coterminously. We never ever want to doubt the sincerity of all the people who are committed to the destruction of apartheid. But they should not do what Mr Vorster and the white minority power élite have been doing to us for decades. They should respect the initiatives which we take as the oppressed people within the borders of South Africa. They should not want to dictate to us, from a distance of thousands of miles away from South Africa, what we should be doing in the liberation struggle within the borders of South Africa. It can only prolong the suffering that is meted out to us by the white regime in South Africa, if our friends also think that they are helping us when they dictate to us what we should do.

The same applies to the question of leadership within the oppressed black communities of South Africa. It is not only arrogant to pontificate to us who are the authentic leaders of black people and who are not, but it is also divisive. This is not only just arrogant, but it sets back our struggle by several decades each and every time this is done by outsiders. In South Africa the secret police take advantage of these divisions to entrench black disunity. People who give financial assistance for liberation must rather keep their funds if their funds are to be used only to escalate black disunity and self-destructive internicine strife.

I talk about these things because I am satisfied that it is not in every case that people deliberately perpetuate this situation. Where they are fully aware of the implications of what they do, I think it is high time blacks are given due respect by friends outside South Africa. Blacks are part of the human family and they must be trusted sufficiently by friends who want to help, that they have enough common sense to size up the situation from inside to know what they are doing about their own liberation struggle.

We in Inkatha have always praised those who assist our brothers in the banned liberation movements, regardless of the fact that we follow different strategies. Following different strategies from the different platforms from which we operate need not be evidence of any serious disagreement on the goals. Our goals are the same, and unless we grasp the fact that this is what matters most, we will be bogged down in the quicksands

of myths and fictions for many generations to come. That is why it is important more than any other thing to know the difference between myths, fictions and some political action in the black political struggle now being waged. These myths and fictions have made us captives for too long, and it is high time we recognised them as the blinding smoke that blurs our view of where we are going, and which limits the pace in our advance towards a free and liberated South Africa.

