

. â\200\230Ersz;A.RGOED UNTIL DELIVERED â\200\230 P[Sl i-\201gÃ@a ML
Ga }

KONRAD ADENAUER FOUNDATION

â\200\234"DEMOCRACY AND FREEDOM FOR THE WHOLE WORLD - HUMAN RIGHTS,
DEMOCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA, ASIA AND LATIN AMERICA"

Address by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi
Chief Minister of KwaZulu, President of Inkatha and
Chairman, The South African Black Alliance

"Peaceful Co-operation as a Prerequisite for a Political Solution
in Establishing a Free Democracy in South Africa"

3 NOVEMBER 1986

It is now becoming increasingly clear that those who continue to live by the sword in South Africa will die by the sword. Apartheid has always had to live by the sword. It was a policy designed to keep a population subjugated which had been conquered by violence. It was so reprehensible that it had to be forced on Black South Africans by the enactment of Draconian laws which were administered with brutality. Hurdreds of thousands of Blacks had to be jailed each year because they defied these Draconian laws, not only in the . pursuit of the great freedoms which industrialissd democracies take so for granted, but even in the pursuit of such things as work and a place to sleep. For the whole of my political life I have been warning White South Africans that the continued enforcement of apartheid on Elack South Africa could only lead to a very violent revolutionary coverthrow of the South African Government.

Violence in South Africa begets violence. There has been now for the last two years an upward spiraling of violence and counter-violence. The country is now governed under a national state of emergency. I have repeatedly warned White South Africans that Black anger would ever-increasingly seek violent expression if the Government deals violently with violent revolution. We have not yet reached that point where this is necessary. The violence which now characterises the South African situation is violence from anger which could be defused with meaningful reform aimed at giving Blacks social, political and economic equality in the land of their birth. I say this with certainty because the violence which is now taking place is not politically oxchestrated violence. It i3 not the violence of a revolutionary programme succeeding. We have rather the violence of desperate frustration which lis catalysed into mob violence. No Black political organisation in the country or in exile could call a halt to.the violence now in progress because it has not produced that violence: it does not control that violence and is not directing thativiolence.

The mistaken view that violence in South Africa is being produced and orchestrated by revolutionary organisations in their onward march to victory is gaining credence in Europe and North America. Those who hold this view should remind themselves of a number of very fundamental questions. Everywhere in the world where there is mass poverty combined with political oppression, violence erupts. The dramatic downturn in the South African economy which we have experienced ever since 1982 has aggravated Black poverty. Impoverished Black populations with very high unemployment percentages faced an escalating inflation rate. When rent increases or bus fare increases were imposed on impoverished people, the anger with which they were met ever more frequently erupted into mob behaviour. There was a progression towards violence in impoverished Black South Africa which no Black political organisation produced. It was in these circumstances of growing Black anger that the South African Government introduced the Tricameral Parliament and I warned at the time that the constitution then being forced on Blacks would meet violence resistance. Black organisations committed to violence began to move in and to claim violence as theirs. They have aggravated violence; they have encouraged it. They have claimed it, but they neither produced it nor control it.

I make these points at the outset because when one talks about peaceful co-operation in South Africa one must necessarily talk about it as a viable option. I do not pursue non-violent tactics and strategies as a Black leader of millions because I am an old-fashioned moralist or a fuddy duddy leader who is incapable of taking my place as a leader in violence. I lead in non-violent tactics and strategies because they have viability. Radical change can be brought about in South Africa. South Africa can be directed towards becoming a modern industrialised democracy, where there is freedom for all and only non-violent tactics and strategies leading to co-operation between race groups will achieve that desired end.

Violence has not damaged South Africa beyond repair. There is today in South Africa no factory not operating because of political violence. Not a single railway or road bridge is unusable because of violence. The country's electricity supply system is intact and functioning normally. The country's transportation system runs normally. There is periodic disruption in commuter traffic between Black townships and industrial areas but the stoppage in passenger transport where it does take place is a hiccup in normal operations. This is not a picture of a country in which violent revolution is about to succeed. There is still time for democratic solutions to take effect even if that time is now running very short.. It can still be done.

Black *South Africans have the dubious advantage of being the last people on the continent of Africa to achieve freedom in the land of their birth. I say dubious advantage because while it is tragic

that it is so, we do have the advantage of learning from the experiences of Africa. Western observers must ask themselves how much worse Frelimo's position would by now have been had it destroyed the industrial heartlands of Mocambique in Maputo and Beira. They must also ask what Mr. Robert Mugabe's position would today be if he had destroyed the industrial heartlands of Harare and Bulawayo. It was President Nyerere who drew me aside one day and asked me to remember how important it was to Frelimo that the Cahora Bassa hydro-electric scheme had not been destroyed by them during their struggle for liberation. As a Black ' South African leader I have no intention of leading my country into desolation which would result from destroying its industrial heartlands.

Black South Africans do not Support the armed struggle en masse and the South African struggle remains what it has always been - essentially a struggle through non-violent means to bring about the full inclusion of Blacks in the country's social, economic and political systems. The Black struggle in South Africa has never been a racist struggle. It has never been a struggle to overthrow the Government by violence. It has never been a struggle to destroy the free enterprise system. It has simply been a struggle by a people who quite rightly demand their God-given rights to be full participants in the South Africa that they know. As a leader I know that society cannot be wiped clean by a revolutionary duster and rewritten on the blackboard of time to the dictates of this or that ideology. I know most certainly that democracy cannot be established in this way. The emergence of a democracy in South Africa will result from a pain-staking historical progression. The huge bulk of that painful progression is now behind us. History is working. Apartheid can now no longer survive. The crucial question we must face is not what we must do to destroy apartheid. The crucial question we face in South Africa is one in which we have to ask ourselves what we replace apartheid with.

I charge violent revolutionaries with a total inability to replace apartheid with true democracy. For me an absolute prerequisite for democracy is that a people are willing to be governed in the way they are governed. That willingness that is necessary for a new South African way of life simply cannot be brought about through the barrel of a gun. It can only be brought about if we now can reconcile Blacks and Whites in a common purpose to replace what is commonly accepted as an outdated apartheid system. Right on South Africa's north-eastern border, we are witnessing grave difficulties with which Frelimo is having to contend, with political dissidents orchestrated into very effective subversive activity.

White South Africans constitute something like one-fifth of the population. They are most technically competent of all the race groups in South Africa simply because for generations they have been inducted into high-tech society. That one-fifth of the population would make a horrendous internal revolutionary fifth column movement were a government to be introduced through the barrel of a gun under which they refused to live. The overthrow of

the South African Government now by Black military violence could only lead to a counter military force in turn taking over the new government. If the government had to be defeated militarily and if that necessitated Blacks adopting scorched earth policies, Whites would respond with scorched earth policies. When scorched earth policies meet scorched earth policies, democracies are not born. It is an absolute prerequisite that Blacks and Whites co-operate in replacing apartheid with an open democracy; that they co-operate in forming the next government and that they co-operate in making the next government work.

There is now a total White dependency on Blacks in the South African economy. There is of course the reciprocal dependence of Blacks on Whites at this stage of South Africa's development. This Black/White economic interdependence now needs to be translated into social and political interdependence. Again this cannot be done through the barrel of a gun. The only way forward is the non-violent way. That is why I as a Black leader command forces of non-violence.

South Africa is now ripe for a democratic take-over of apartheid, but it is also nearly ripe for the kind of violent destruction of apartheid which will lead to the violent destruction of prospects of democracy. In this struggle there is a race against time between democracy and violence. The struggle must be waged in South Africa by South Africans. Whether it can be won by democracy may well be decided outside the country. There is now the danger that sanctions will tip the scales in favour of violence. If the international community makes a concerted effort to enforce so-called limited sanctions against South Africa and step by step extends the scope and bite of sanctions, the future of democracy will be deeply prejudiced. Sanctions are now a reality. It is a reality forced on South Africans by the West and I really do believe that it behoves the West to look very carefully at the consequences of sanctions. The sooner the West recognises that sanctions are not going to stampede the State President, Mr. P.W. Botha, into capitulation, the less danger there will be for South Africa.

Mr. P.W. Botha's response to sanctions is going to be alarmingly dangerous. I simply do not believe he would have taken the punitive steps against Mozambique that he has taken, had the West withheld its imposition of sanctions. 70 000 Mozambicans will now lose their jobs in South African mines, and tens of thousands more working in industry and the agricultural sector, will lose their jobs. Not only will they lose their jobs, but the Chamber of Mines will no longer be paying the Mozambican Government deferred miners' wages for translation into Mozambican currency. This was done to ensure that money earned was spent in Mozambique. The Mozambique Government will thus lose a vital source of foreign exchange. In total it is estimated that the step which Mr. P.W. Botha took in the signing of one document, will cost the Frelimo Government somewhere around R100 million per annum. The West will

not make this loss good to Mbcambique.

Sanctions will have a price and it is not only South Africa which will pay that price. The West will only pay a minor proportion of the cost of sanctions. Neighbouring African States will pay a far greater percentage of the costs, but the largest percentage of the total cost of sanctions is going to be paid by Black South Africans as the victims of apartheid. In a recent article published in The Sunday Tribune Dr. Ronnie Bethlehem made a number of points which Western Governments could well look at seriously. He is the group economics consultant to J.C.I. In his article he makes the point that the cost of sanctions must be calculated over a period of time and he has made projections to the year - 2000. He made this statement: "Given sanctions the increase in unemployment would be about 8 million - in other words 2 million jobs would be lost on a net basis." That is 2 million more people would be unemployed by the year 2000 than would otherwise be unemployed. And he adds: "However, by far the greatest proportion of jobs llost under sanctions would be in the unskilled category, for under sanctions the total number of skilled jobs would actually be increased as sanctions would necessitate more capital intensive production to ensure a maintenance of competitiveness and profitability in export markets." He says: "But on a net basis, the Black section of the population would suffer most as total employment llevelled off against the background of a steadily rising total population."

I think Dr. Bethlehem says it all when he writes: "The hypothesis advanced here lis that South Africa, as a modernising industrial state, has a limited job creation potential. Under sanctions, that .potential would be greatly reduced compared to what it would have been without sanctions. Indeed, under sanctions, its . job sustaining capacity, certainly as far as the wunskilled are concerned, is most likely to be reduced and this would produce, in circumstances in which the population continued to increase as presently expected, a massive increase in unemployment particularly in the unemployment of Black unskilled workers." He adds: "If the carrying capacity of the economy is weakened by sanctions, the more probable outcome is not that existing income and wealth will be shared more equally, but rather that surplus labour will be discarded, condemning those retrenched to the indignity of worklessness and extreme hardship."

I want to quote to you one final point he makes. He observes: "It is, however, by no means certain that this, over an extended period of time, would reduce their [blacks] political patience with the existing social order in South Africa and provoke them to overthrow ll s Its effect could be just the opposite because deprivation â\200\230- might also weaken morale and the processes of adjustment in the sanctions-afflicted economy would draw other Blacks increasingly into a sharing of those benefits that were available for distribution."

It must I think now be accepted that democracy in South Africa will never be produced through the barrel of a gun. One of the harshest realities we face in South Africa is that this in turn necessitates accepting the need to involve the South African Government in negotiations about the democratic future of South Africa. The South African Government simply must be party to solutions to our problems and the Federal Republic of Germany has to play its role, together with other Western nations, in bringing pressure to bear on the South African Government to do so. There will be no political solution to the South African problem which does not involve the South African Government and it is only non-violent, democratic opposition to apartheid which can ensure that it is - involved in meaningful peaceful negotiations. The most powerful form of democratic opposition to apartheid which is now being exercised by Blacks in South Africa is their refusal to participate in any government move which is not a meaningful move forward. ;

The South African Government has in fact now recognised that apartheid must be Scrapped. It has recognised that South Africa is one country. It has recognised that political reform must be radical and far-reaching. It really does see the need for reform and it is now step by step abandoning its homeland policy. I am now confronting the State President with the reality of the fact that he cannot go backwards; he cannot return to classical apartheid and he cannot move forward unless he iaitiatives meaningful negotiation with Black leaders who have the kind of constituency I have.

.The State President had to abandon the Black Advisory Council he wanted to form to legitimise the work of the President's Council when it was formulating a new constitution for the country. The State President went ahead unilaterally and forced the present constitution on the country and attempted to legitimise it Cabinet Commi about their political development. This Committee failed legitimise the Tricameral Parliament. Black constituency leaders with credibility amongst their own people refused to participate in the work of this Committee. I had nothing to do with it whatsoever and the Committee failed to make the breakthrough that the President hoped it would make. He then called the Non-statutory Negotiating Fcрум into existence in a renewed appeal to Blacks to Cco-operate with him. I would nothing to do with this Forum either and it too had to te abandoned.

The State President then turned to an attempt to estalplish @ the National Council and for the first time in the history of: the National party he has eÃ@xpressed an intention to establish a râ\200\230body with the objectives which arouse deep Black interest. The ~main Objectives of the Council are:

offer participation in the planning and preparation of a constitutional dispensation which provides for the participation of all South African citizens in the process of government:

(c) further sound relations among, and the human dignity, rights and freedoms of all South African citizens.

He is now faced with the necessity of making these objectives achievable by giving the Council teeth as an interim body between the old constitution and the new. It will have no teeth until he

He is
also i ' ity i i i Black
leaders foit i x ll and to do this he will have
to Dr. Nelson Mandela, Mr. and other
political prisoners from jail. President does
these things he It is Black
opposition to orcing him to face this.
reality.

because

of my

impossible for people like
remain out of it.

The peaceful Co-operation which is a prerequisite for a political solution in establishing a free democracy in South Africa will be forthcoming between Black and White if the State President does make it possible for Blacks to negotiate with him in the National Council. If he unshackles Elack democracy by freeing pciitical prisoners, the State President will immeasurably enhance Black/Black co-operation. It is not our martyrs in jail who divide Black South Africa. It is their being kept incarcerated in jail which destroys Black democracy. All and sundry can speak in their name. All and sundry can use their martyrdom for their own political purposes. They must be liberated so that they can lead, direct and reconcile. This is the role they will perform if they are released. This 4is an Objective which Western Governments should set themselves.