

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CHANCES OF THE EARLY GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

BY THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY
AND TWO MORALLY-JUSTIFIABLE CONSTITUTIONAL DEVICES,
AVAILABLE TO THE NATIONAL PARTY,

TO PREVENT THAT FROM EVER HAPPENING

Two seat-by-seat analyses of the 1981 General Election results, interpreted in the light of recent happenings, including the formation of the extremist Conservative Party (the CP) under the leadership of Dr. A.P. Treurnicht (Dr. T.), are to be found towards the end of this paper. I respectfully suggest, however, that, for those figures to be appreciated fully, what precedes them should be given a fair reading.

Way back in 1962 or 1963, it was possible to predict in outline, but not in detail, what in 1982 has happened in South African politics. It then became obvious to some of my friends and to me that the right-wing National Party (the NP), and the Afrikaner solidarity upon which it was founded, would disintegrate at some time in the 1960's or early 1970's. Our time slotting was wrong.

This was my own reasoning: South Africa had become a republic in 1961. All that was needed thereafter, for the rot to set in, was for the middle-of-the-road United Party (the UP) to disappear finally from the political scene. I anticipated that, when that occurred, there would be a grouping of all the moderates, i.e. a "separating-out".

Do not for a moment believe that the old UP did not for many years provide a home, of sorts, for a considerable number of English-speaking right-wingers, who would have been happier in the NP, or that the NP itself was not a long-time refuge for many Afrikaners with relatively moderate views. People in the past, more than today, voted according to their ancestry and home language prejudices and not according to personal convictions. There were a few exceptions to be found within the UP, but not many. Today, on the contrary, several of my English-speaking friends openly "confess to being Nationalists". Had they done that 20 years ago they would have been ostracized by the society which surrounded them.

On the basis of our beliefs, some of us had also hoped, from the early 1960's, that the "unified moderates", necessarily formed around those in the NP, would one day gain the power of government and thereupon set about making the many constitutional changes which, in our view, were both desirable and advisable. By the way, it continues to puzzle me why, with the "need for change" being so widely talked about, there is so little, expressed, agreement as to what should be done. I suspect that this is because people refuse to accept the obvious, when the obvious is painful. Each, instead, seeks around for a hopeful alternative, away from the direction where the truth is easily discernible.

Tragically for South Africa, the demise of the UP took much longer than we had hoped it would.

The delay in its departure from the political scene has had, at least, these two important consequences:

(1) Rhodesia has passed out of White control and the unrest, both on South Africa's border and within the country, has increased greatly. These and other events, such as a change of mood of the Blacks towards the Whites, have considerably strengthened the emotional appeal of the "White laager".

(2) The time available for change, which can be effected only by the "unified moderates", has been reduced by the period of delay. The key date, "when the balloon will go up", is anybody's guess; but, had the UP "put up the shutters" 10 years earlier than it did, South Africa would have had that much more time in which to seek a peaceful, permanent solution to its problems.

That sad delay cannot now be remedied; but the lesson, of the double magnification of problems, which delay can cause, should be kept constantly in mind. Time was always "of the essence". It is now even more so. It is, in fact, in my view, "now or never" - or very near so.

To understand what lies behind the split in the NP early this year and, more importantly, what is likely to occur in the future struggle for parliamentary power in South Africa, one

must always remember that Afrikanerdom was not originally based upon a consensus of political opinion. It's *raison d'être*, and continuously motivating force since, were the Afrikaners understandable detestation of the British, going back principally to the War of 1899-1902. Incidentally the Afrikaners should have observed from that tragedy, and their own reaction to it, that "if one sows the seeds of hate, one reaps hate". They chose to ignore the obvious. Instead they have humiliated 80% and more of the country's people for over 35 years - willfully. One wonders what crop the Afrikaners, now that it is their turn, expect to reap.

So - the early cry among the Afrikaners was: "Unite so as to get the British Government out of South Africa". From 1961, it became "Stand together, because the UP is the successor of the British". Die verdomde "Sappe"! Differences of political opinion did not matter at all. Of course, in the late 1940's, the NP did see the possibilities of capitalising upon the traditional, almost genetic, racialism almost all South Africans carry with them through their lives in varying degrees, and made some party-unifying mileage out of the emotional appeal of its official "apartheid" policies.

Anyway, the UP did finally die and a new era has dawned. The NP today, even after the recent split, still contains three groups: (i) the thinking "moderates" (ii) the "come-hell-or-high-water diehard right-wingers", who are smallish in number and temporarily remain within the NP because of the habits of established loyalties, and (iii) the "unthinking middle", I believe much the largest group. Which way the middle decides to go in the next few years will be crucial for Prime Minister P.W. Botha (Mr. B.) and the country as a whole. "Decides to go" or "is pushed" or "is frightened into going". Or all three.

The somnolent middle cannot now remain in the middle because the support it used to get simultaneously from left and right has virtually disappeared. It must now split. Those making up the middle will soon have to undergo the novel experience of thinking for themselves and choosing between opposing alternatives, one intellectually based, the other emotional and the few real extremists left in the party will soon move out.

The future of South Africa is thus much in the hands of a group of Whites, relatively small

in proportion to the total number, who have long been conditioned to responding to emotional stimuli and are unused to intellectual arguments. It is painfully obvious, surely, that the bulk of "the middle" will drift towards Dr. T. rather than towards Mr. B? If you do not see it that way, I suggest that you are guilty of wishful thinking.

Now let us look at the 1981 General Election results and anticipate what effect the split and other events will have upon them:

TOTAL NO. OF %. OF VOTES
SEATS WON CAST
NP 131 57.0
NRP (New Republican Party) 8 7.8
TOGETHER 139 64.8
PFP (Progressive Federal Party) 26 19.4
NCP (National Cons. Party) - since absorbed by
the CP - and others - 1.7
165 86.9
HNP (Herstigte Nationale Party) - 14.1
165 100.0

The holding of 83 seats gives a majority of 1.

To keep the record straight, since the 1981 election, - (i) the CP has partly absorbed

the HNP and is in the act of absorbing the balance of it; and (ii) some 18 or so of the 131 NP

M.P.'s have left the party to form that CP, giving, at the time of the split, the reason that they

were completely opposed to Mr. B's proposal of some vague "healthy power-sharing arrangement with the Coloureds and Indians". Whether or not something else was behind their destructive act is immaterial. Nor does it matter who is to blame for it. The fact of the split is very material indeed.

Let us accept that the Coloureds and the Indians, together, now total around 4,500,000 i.e. that they are about equal in number to the Whites, and that the total Black population, including those in the Bantustans, runs to around 18,000,000. These figures are accurate enough for this review.

The Indians and the Coloureds cannot easily be unscrambled from the non-Bantustan omelette, so it now seems they are to be given their own parliaments-of-some-sort, with limited powers, exercised strictly under White veto and control. The Blacks living outside of the Bantustans, i.e. in the same areas as the Indians and Coloureds, are

not to be given the same "privileges". They are to look to their "homeland" rulers for everything.

The Government ignores the fact that the main Bantustan, that of the Zululand numbering near 5,000,000, is a phantasy, that only four, economically "wonky", Bantustans have resulted from the separatist idea, and there are probably more Blacks living outside of the whole area designed to fall within the Bantustan concept, than within the Bantustans themselves - and living outside the Bantustans permanently. One wonders just how much resentment is being built up, against the day of explosion, by the millions of Blacks in S.A., living without real rights and in poverty, in and outside the proclaimed areas.

Dr. T. and Co. believe that for the Whites to survive they must never, not now, not ever, concede even the smallest vestige of power to any non-White. They believe that, what the Whites have, they must hold by force - for ever. By the way, I was surprised to find, during a recent visit I made to South Africa, that quite a few wealthy English-speaking Whites agreed with this extremist view. They also took the line that moral considerations do not matter at all, that preservation of possessions and privileges matter immensely and that "survival" is the all-exclusive consideration.

Dr. T. and Co. point to what has occurred to South Africa's north and say "Do you want that to happen here? That is what power-sharing leads to!" They are right, of course, to stress the general difficulty people of different racial groups have of permanently sharing power equitably. But they are wrong in assuming that power, in reality, cannot be fairly shared at all.

Moreover they disregard the event that power may have to be shared, willy-nilly, - or even worse that the Whites may one day be denied even a share of that power.

Power has of course, been shared successfully for many years by groups of different ethnic origin and diverse cultural customs and religions. Under certain conditions, I agree. Switzerland suggests itself as the best example of this. So it is well worth looking at the main factors enabling Swiss Germans, Swiss French and Swiss Italians to live together permanently in harmony:-

- (1) The three groups are all culturally developed;
- (2) The general standard of education of all the Swiss is high;
- (3) The groups, and the individuals making up each, have a developed degree of tolerance of one another and of understanding one another's problems;
- (4) They live in loosely-separated groups, but without firm boundaries and without any restriction on movement or on intermarriage;
- (5) They learn one another's languages;
- (6) They accept the concept of a single nationhood and have a single patriotism; and
- (7) Their constitutional set-up accords with their needs.

For power-sharing in South Africa, then, to operate permanently on something even remotely resembling this successful basis, not 100% or 90% or 80% success fully but with a modicum of success, a great effort will need to be made to create in South Africa the above set of conditions - yes, to the maximum extent possible in the full time available. I realise that the Swiss conditions cannot be duplicated but any progress made in the right direction will soon help greatly.

So briefly:

- (i) the NP believes in unmeaningful power-sharing.
- (ii) The CP in none.
- (iii) the NRP does not know what it believes and matters not, anyway.
- (iv) The PFP advocates a federal power-sharing arrangement with checks and balances and

guarantees, written into a constitution. Well and good but, personally, I do not set great store on pieces of paper. I place my trust in the good will of the people who have the power of rule. Without that, pieces of paper are worthless. However the PFP has no hope, whatsoever, of ever winning enough seats to gain parliamentary control. But - could it one day hope to wag the dog, the NP, to which party the course of events must soon make it the tail? We shall see.

(v) The HNP will have lost all its members to the CP before the second general election from now, if not by the first.

In Parliament, the NP has 113 members; it has a great majority on its own. Add in the 8 NRP and the 26 PFP members, and the total becomes a formidable 147 to face the 18 CP members of the House. On the face of it, the CP's future looks bleak. That is "on the face of it". I interpret the developing reality very differently. Let us do a little delving.

Firstly, the Bantustan concept could well blow up in Mr. B's face at any time. It has been doomed to failure from its conception. It is hopelessly unfair and too ungenerous.

To hope to get away with giving 15% of the country's total land to 72% of its total people, as a permanent settlement of the division of rights, was, and remains crazy. A 10-year-old would say: "That is unfair. Do not accept it." Ask any you know! Moreover, some of the Bantustans are blobs on a map. Surely, if one offers a distinct ethnic group the dignity of independent nationhood, the two indispensable pre-requisites are (a) an easily identifiable, distinct land-mass, in one unbroken piece, and (b) sufficient land, and an adequate industrial base, to meet the needs of the number of people concerned. Numbers always matter. In the case of the division of assets they are literally of vital importance. Total means must relate to total needs. And vice versa.

There is no way, at all, that power-sharing with the Blacks, on a Bantustan basis, can remotely hope to succeed without a trebling or quadrupling of the "largesse" of land and industrial base. You say that that would be politically and economically "impossible". I agree - but, if you admit that, then you should at once work for the abandonment of the Bantustans concept. And the sooner the better, having regard to the relatively high birth-rate and the numbers and the resultant poverty there.

Secondly, I believe that the future permanent distribution of power in South Africa between the Whites, Coloureds, Indians and Blacks will not, anyway, be determined by the Whites, but finally at some time by the Blacks alone, no matter if the Whites, Coloureds and Indians do join forces. No, I did not come by this belief casually. The facts say that

t if things go on as they are, the Blacks will take over - in a generation or so. They will then decide all. The CP can tell the electorate to "vasbyt" - but any time gained will cause a delay not a prevention. Any interruption of the inevitable will be finite and the state of the Black/White relationships exacerbated, beyond imagination, by the interim years of Bloodshed.

In the light of the inevitability of a Black take-over of power, one must suggest that future generations of White South Africans will, one day, curse their forefathers, and particularly those of our time, for their foolishness and cupidity - and for having closed their eyes to the

for all now to
writing on the wall. It is there, in black in large letters on a white background, for all now to
read. They in the 21st century may well one day curse you who read this
for not having
tried with all your strength to make their lot, and that of their descendants
for generations
to come, so much better than it, for them, has turned out to be.

I reluctantly left South Africa several years ago. I have no axe to sharpen
. During the
50-odd years I spent in the land of my birth before leaving, one of my hobbies
was political
analysis, based upon a mathematical study of actual election results. Hence my interest.

I now live, happily indeed, in Australia.

Incidentally the Australian federal system generally works well and could, I believe provide
a useful pattern for the Republic.

I recently spent a most interesting and informative three months' holiday in South Africa.
After six years' unbroken absence.

Yes, in answer to your question, I did find many changes but, regretfully, they were less
numerous and less wide spread than my South African friends had predicted they would be.
Moreover, what had not been done and should, in my view, have been done, impressed me
even more.

Yes, some manifestations of "petty apartheid" had, happily, disappeared. Also, what is
of prime importance, because economics and politics are so intertwined, there was obviously
"more money around" than in 1976, the date of my last visit. This was evidenced by the
noticeably better standard of dress enjoyed by many of the urban non-Whites and the increased
number of vehicles in their hands. Often hazardous hands. But, keep nothing back! Some
non-Whites did tell me that they were better off financially and less discontented. On the
other hand, many told me that "not enough" was being done for them - or "quickly enough".
These were mostly Blacks. I also sensed that many of them were concealing much that they
had on their minds.

What did, however, impress me even more were the following:

(1) The gradual assimilation of so many non-Whites into the economy, particularly into sales, clerical and service positions. However, I could not avoid reflecting in this regard that economic integration = political power and that deep economic integration will = deep political power.

(2) The almost unanimous support for the NP I surprisingly found among a number of Indians to whom I spoke. They much prefer the "devil they know ...", They are fearful that the Blacks will one day "take over the country". The Durban "riots" of 1948 have left an indelible memory on their minds. They want the NP to rule.

(3) The divided attitudes of the Coloureds. Some thought as the Indians do. Others expressed hate for the NP, because of the humiliations "apartheid" regulations continue to cause them regularly in their daily lives. Totally unnecessarily, of course.

(4) Most important of all - the impact made upon me by the great increase in the number of non-White faces, particularly Black, on view everywhere, vis-a-vis the number of White faces. This struck me in both the urban and rural communities. I also noticed much less subservience towards the Whites by the Blacks than previously. Their attitudes reflected a sense of newly-felt manhood, of feelings of equality as persons recently discovered, not without traces of understandable exuberance at times. Some of my friends did say to me: "The Blacks are becoming very cheeky," as if cheek was a White prerogative - when of course it has no place anywhere! The effect of all this was to create in me an awareness of the very strong tension which runs through South African life today. I found fear of the Blacks and dread of what lies ahead widespread. Some Whites have a "let-them-come" attitude. Both sentiments indicated the presence of factors which detract from the quality of life. I would here remind you that the quality of life is more than eating well and living in opulence in a comfortable home, with the help of one or more domestic servants.

Friends kept asking me "How long have we got?" I did not ask "for what?" I knew that answer. Others warned me to be careful where I went. I found some of the homes in

some cities had been turned into high-walled fortresses, a few even guarded by security men with dogs. I came to the final conclusion that I personally was aware of the tension so strongly because I had been out of South Africa for so long and because, where I live, there are no tensions at all. The presence of the local dog-catcher is the limit of our excitement! To confirm what I mean, let me add that I was, unsolicitedly told by a South African friend, who had just returned home with her husband from a three months' holiday in Australia, both Afrikaners: "What impressed us most is that life there is so very relaxed, compared with here." I knew what she meant.

Please do not think that I am labouring this "tension thing" unduly. I believe it to be very

meaningful to people called upon to make sensitive political choices between centre and right-wing parties. Tension could be the deciding factor. Moreover, it is a destroyer. For example, firstly, it blinded the Rhodesians to opportunity. They paid the price for not accepting the terms offered to them on "H.M.S. Tiger", in 1967 or the reaborts. Secondly, their army was not defeated in the military meaning of the word, but the tension of a prolonged seemingly unending war ultimately destroyed the will of the people to continue fighting.

I accept that if you have a Black/White problem, you must have some tension. But why aggravate it by hate - causing divisive governmental policies which must have the effect of aggravating that disunity? Thus, what the Government does, or does not do, will decide the level of national tension and which way important votes will go. And the

greater the tension, the smaller the spark needed to "set off the explosion".

Anyway to revert to the impact of numbers, I came to see that the Whites, as a whole, are, in reality, playing a less and less significant role and the non-Whites, as a whole, obviously, a more and more significant role in the TOTALITY of National life. Power is already slowly passing, all the while, out of the hands of the Whites into the hands of the non-Whites, without anyone noticing it. Don't kid yourselves! It is happening; slowly. Probably it was

also my absence which made me realise this truth, which appears to go unnoticed by the Whites. Astonishing! Right under their noses!

Time, I reflected is, of course, completely on the side of the non-Whites, as a whole, and on the side of the Blacks, in particular.

Let us now extrapolate the latest population figures, in all their starkness, so as to see the problem in true perspective.

In thirty years' time, in the year 2012, the make-up of the country's population will be something like this -

around 6/7,000,000 Whites around 7/8,000,000 Coloureds

around 40,000,000 Blacks around 4/5,000,000 Indians

give or take a million or two.

By then the Blacks will have increased in number by the equivalent of that of, plus or minus, 20 SOWETO'S, each of a million human beings. Try to picture that: 20 more SOWETO'S.

Not 1, or 2, but 20 - needing for example, to help you grasp it more clearly, at least, 4,000 new schools! Each with 1,000 pupils.

By then, it is responsibly predicted, the country's gold and other mineral production will have become greatly reduced. There will be less income and more to share in it. By 2012, the total capital outlay in buildings and plant, needed to enable a single extra non-White to be employed in industry, will run to an astronomical sum.

The economic burden on the country, in 2012, will be very near unsupportable. Where can South Africa hope to find the funds needed to create employment for, and to house, and to educate, the above vast population?

A great number of the country's present 22 million non-Whites lack employment and adequate housing. They generally live in poverty, with the scantiest of back-up social services. By 20¹² these 22 million will have become around 50 million.

If, the burden is supportable at all, and, remember, whoever rules will have to do the best he can, it can be so only as a result of a great reduction of the standard of living of the Whites.

Recall what a depressing effect on the economy the recent fall in the gold

d price to near \$300

an oz. has had. Picture little gold to sell coupled with more than twice the present population.

The effect will represent, loosely, what the country will be like economically in the year 2012.

Halve everyone's present income and you would be left with an optimistic assessment of what is likely.

Moreover, do not regard the year 2012 as being far, far away. It is only as distant from

1982 as 1952 - about the time, many will remember, when the late Mr. J.G. Strydom became

Prime Minister. If you do not remember that, I hasten to assure you that the year 2012 is, historically speaking, "tomorrow". And the year 2042 is "the day after tomorrow". Many of

you under the age of 35 - very probably near one-half of today's White population - will still

be alive by 2042 and living under a government controlled by a Black majority. ^By then, the

Black population alone will be near 80,000,000. That's the equivalent of almost 60 SOWETO

TOWNSHIPS extra. Yes, 60. Needing 12,000 schools more than are needed today.

No, I am not being melodramatic. I am wilfully pulling off all the bedclothes, so that you

can see clearly the whole body of facts and ponder their implications. Do not turn away. Look at them.

"But", you ask, "What about the Coloureds and the Indians? Will they not support us

against the Blacks?" My replies are: "What have you done, or are you doing, to earn their

support?" and "If they do, when they finally see that a Black take-over of power is imminent,

will they not then desert the Whites? If you were in their shoes, wouldn't you?"

No, there is NO escaping the inevitable.

I emigrated from South Africa solely because of moral considerations. I realised that I

no longer wanted to be a part of the South African system. I was opposed to the Government's

racialistic policies AND I saw no prospect of timely change. I add, in honesty, that I also knew

that, if I lived long enough, which is doubtful, I would, one day, equally dislike what an ill-

prepared Black government would probably feel inclined to do to the Whites.

But, having bared my soul, let me now add this:-

I have not ever believed, nor do I now believe, that it would generally do the people of

South Africa - White, Black, Coloured and Indian - any real and lasting good to hand over the country, right now, to the non-Whites in general or to the Blacks in particular.

I am completely opposed to that.

Instead, I do advocate, and advocate as "vital", using that word in its strongest sense,

(i) that the NP should NOW accept the inevitability of a complete take-over by the Blacks at some date in the foreseeable future, and (ii) that the NP should carefully plan so to arrange things NOW that there will ultimately be a bloodless hand-over, rather than a bloody take-over. It HAS to be EITHER a hand-over OR a take-over. What you now have in South Africa cannot go on for much longer!

SO. WHITE SOUTH AFRICANS DECIDE NOW, IN ALL SANITY AND PRUDENCE, TO PREPARE FOR AND NOT FIGHT AGAINST THE INEVITABLE.

No, it is not a simple choice between "having cold feet" and "fighting to the death". There is another option open. That is that the government should accept the inevitable and now work out a time-table of wise and sensible preparations for the day of hand-over.

Reader, please give some thought to these questions of mine: "When do you anticipate that the Blacks will take over power in South Africa, if things go on as they are? In 20, 30, 40, even 50 years' time?"

You say you cannot make a guess because the future is unpredictable. Yes, I agree, an event such as World War III could delay the passing of power but it could not prevent it. But is delay, accidental or wilful, really desirable, taking an objective view? The "last few years" are going to be dreadfully unpleasant anyway.

I suggest that some specific date has NOW to be chosen, and worked to, honestly and

faithfully. One cannot leave the planning open-ended, or play it by ear any longer. The matter is far too serious for that. And time short enough.

I advocate that 1st January, 2012, be at once accepted by the NP as HAND OVER DAY and that, from now on, the national will be applied strenuously to utilising wisely and fully the interim 30 years for preparing the whole community for living as harmoniously as possible together.

You think, do you, that the Blacks, Coloureds and Indians would not now accept some such arrangement as this? If you do, then why not ask some of them? Why not get a reaction from people like Chief Buthelezi and Bishop Tutu?

I believe that the bulk of the non-Whites also dread the uncertainty of the short-term future. They presently lack, completely, any real hope of meaningful change. Surely they will gladly, and gratefully, seize an opportunity, which must be beyond their present expectations? Would you not, in their circumstances? Then, expect them to. They are, strange as many White South Africans will find the thought, as human as you are, even if many are less sophisticated.

Now, how to prepare for the inevitable?

Regarding the practicalities of what is needed, I believe that there are, at least, FOUR ESSENTIAL MEASURES to be taken timeously.

I shall explain them briefly:

(1) All discriminatory and divisive legislation, without exception, must be removed from "the Statute Book". Some, such as the denial of the right to own property anywhere, without restriction, immediately. The rest in phases. All within five years. The removal of influx control, in particular, might well be, spread over this five year period to give the Government time in which to set about providing adequate housing for the massive inflow of rural Blacks, into the urban areas, which can be expected. The Bantustans will, of course, be dismantled - or remain as they are if they so choose; but it is impossible to see any of them resisting an offer of re incorporation into a unified, federal South Africa, which can offer only comparative benefits and the promise of alleviation

of poverty.

(2) By educating Whites and non-Whites in an understanding of each other's needs, hopes, fears, problems and aspirations and in the requirements of citizenship and tolerance. This will be an on-going process. Violence, of course, of any form will merit, and be meted very severe punishment. No matter its source.

(3) By undertaking to give, and by giving, the same opportunities of a formal and technical education, at all levels, to all members of all groups as soon as is practically possible.

The planning and bringing to fruition of this undertaking will need time; but the aim

must be to spend, in hard cash, within the shortest time possible, the same on the education of every Black, Coloured and Indian child as on the education of a White child.

Don't throw up your hands in horror and ask "Where are the funds for all this to come from?" From the only source possible - from various forms of regular taxation, in-

cluding a hefty WEALTH TAX, steeply graded so that those who have benefited most

from the past will contribute most to the securing of the future. Brutal taxation is going

to hurt like hell; but the alternative would hurt very much more. Besides, the Whites

will be getting peace of mind in return for the surrender of portion, only, of their wealth.

Those with great wealth, are, on the evidence, most in search of a way out - a way.

(4) By setting up a federal state, having a constitution which allowed all those ^Whites)

already on the voting roll to remain there - for the reason that rights, once given,

cannot be removed - and which put all new voters, without differentiation and aged

18 and more, onto the common roll, subject to an educational qualification test. Yes

qualification by education only and not in addition by virtue of earnings and/or property

ownership. Yes, Whites, Blacks, Coloureds and Indians on the same common roll, all

having absolutely equal rights within and without Parliament.

This is the crux.

The qualification MUST be so fixed - i.e. phrased, calculated and designed, that parliamentary power will, ultimately and inevitably, pass out of White control and into the

hands of an elite group of Whites, Blacks, Coloureds and Indians in or around the year 2012. A good computer - provided it had not been made in the Platteland! - could no doubt, calculate, fairly accurately, now, what that qualification should be.

As I see it, taking all factors into account, the qualification must be based on education only, as it is only in education that one can hope to achieve anything like "a universal norm." This would promise to produce, in due course, a real democracy based not on "one man, one vote" but on "one educated man, one educated vote." That is quite a different kettle of fish. And the new constitution could, for what it is worth, provide for the protection of minorities by stipulating that a majority of, say, 80%, in the new House of Assembly, would be needed to approve any amendment of the constitution. Of course, one can never legislate successfully against the possibility of the use of guile or of force, including military power; but History does show that for all that, government does not flourish where government is good. On the contrary, the need for it may be argued, when basic government is bad and there is no other remedy whatsoever available.

All to happen by 2012? Yes, as I feel that 20 years would give insufficient time for the necessary preparations; 40 years could be too long to ask the non-Whites to wait. Don't be horrified. Think only of the logical alternative - government forever, by in adequately equipped Blacks from 2012 or thereabouts, if not before.

At the moment, South Africa is making the same tragic mistake as the British did in pre-independence days in Rhodesia, Uganda and some other African countries - not preparing

the argument for
adequate!*/ for Black rule. Whether Black rule is taken or given, the logic
of the argument for
the proper preparation of the new holders of power is the same. On the o
ther hand, I do be-
lieve that all non-Whites, given the opportunity of proper education, have t
he capabilities to
govern fairly and well. What they will need to be able to govern properly,
they must be given
in ADVANCE.

I do not believe that Mr. B. is oblivious of the above facts or, in his heart of
heart, will
not admit the logic of my proposal. However his own apparently (notice t
he underlining please)
insoluble problem, whatever his private convictions are, is a practical one
- how to resist
the demands of an ultra-conservative movement within 83 key rural and b
lue-collar-worker
urban seats. He cannot, he wrongly believes, do very much at all, meani
ng give much
at all, without jeopardising his parliamentary majority. Normally remembe
r, the second ob-
jective of any government, somebody once said, is to be re-elected; and the
first of its ob-
jectives is to see that nothing interferes with its. second objective! Why
should the NP be
different?

Mr. B. sees himself as sitting on the horns of this dilemma right now, and
if no remedy is
sought, his successors will sit on it over the years ahead:-

Whatever change is obviously good for the future of South Africa as a whol
e is, in its
consequences, obviously, bad for the future of the NP and is, obviously, g
ood for the future
of the CP.

That's the inevitable result of the CP's being 100% against change and u
nder the present
constitution.

Yes, the opposite also applies:

Whatever is obviously bad for the future of South Africa as a whole,
i.e. NO MEANMGFUL
CHANGE, is obviously in its consequences good for the future of the NP
and is, obviously
bad for the future of the CP.

It is probable that the NP will feel itself driven to having to put party befo
re country - and
doing what amounts to little or nothing. On the other hand, if Mr. B. mak

es no meaningful changes, he will provoke internal unrest and that, in turn, would benefit the CP. Thus either way, it seems to me, the CP can expect to gain from the NP's action or inaction in the near future.

"What", you say "If Mr. B. should make changes which are intended to appear meaningful but, in fact, are innocuous?" Then he will be adjudged guilty of the sin of having split Afrikanerdom and the NP down the middle without good cause. Moreover, as a result, he would have exposed many of his own staunch MP supporters, his friends in Parliament itself, to a possible loss of their seats. That would be unpardonable.

Yet, taking the overview, that is, probably, his less worrying way out, his own choice of the lesser of two evils. So expect much fanfare to help make meaningless concessions look meaningful - but which will convey no real political clout. For the short term anyway.

â~... â~... â~...

Here is the FIRST SCHEDULE:-

SEATS WHICH WILL, ALMOST CERTAINLY, BE CONTESTED AT SUBSEQUENT ELECTIONS
BY THE PFP AND THE NP ONLY: BASED UPON 1981 GENERAL ELECTION RESULTS:

Swing Needed NP & NRP

to give seat to NP Seat Won/Lost PFP

1981 seats won by NP and PFP 131 26

1981 seats won by NRP 8 -

TOTAL 139 26

0%-0.9% Durban Central and Pietermaritzburg South + 2 - 2

1%- 7% Albany and Berea + 2 - 2

8% Pietermaritzburg North + 1 - 1

9% 144 21

10% Capetown Gardens and Bez Valley + 2 - 2

11% Green Point and Walmer + 2 - 2

12% Pinelands + 1 - 1

13%-14% 149 16

15% Edenvale + 1 - 1

16% 18% 150 15

19% Wynberg and Pinetown + 2 - 2

20% P.E. Central + 1 - 1

21 %-22% 153 12

23%-24% Groote Schuur + 1 - 1

25%-26% Bryanston and Constantia + 2 - 2

27%-28% Hillbrow + 1 - 1

29%-30% 157 8

31 %-32% Seapoint and Johannesburg North + 2 - 2
33%-34% Houghton + 1 - 1
35% 36% Parktown + 1 - 1
37%-38% Sandton + 1 162 - 1 3

Yes, a 38% swing would leave only THREE LITTLE
PIGGIES TO GO TO MARKET!

Now, as to the SECOND SCHEDULE:-

SEATS WHICH WILL, ALMOST CERTAINLY, BE CONTESTED AT SU
BSEQUENT ELECTIONS
BY THE NP AND CP ONLY:

NOW, AT LAST - What are the actual mathematical chances of the CPs o
ne day gaining
a parliamentary majority?

That depends nn the "mechanics of the swing".

To achieve power, Dr. T. and Co. need 83 seats out of the present (again
I ask you please
to note the underlining) total of 165.

What is behind the underlining?

It arises from a secondary question, I asked myself and which no one, but
I, to my know-
ledge. appears to have given any thought: "How can Dr. T. and Co. legiti
mately, and with
moral justification, be kept out of power permanently, even if they do win
83 seats, in fact
many more than 83 seats?" No, I am not crazy. I shall explain all in good
time.

Before I began my visit to South Africa in January, 1982, I had already b
ecome, in general
terms, a "pro-P.W. Botha man", meaning I saw that he merited support.

Late in 1981, a thoughtful friend had sent me brief summary figures - but n
o details -
of the 1981 General Election results. I then roughly concluded from them
that the HNP -
remember that its successor, the CP, was, at that time, no more than a twi
nkle in Dr. T's eye!

- would probably win over 60 seats at, maybe, the second or, almost certai
nly at the third
general election held after 1981 - given the normal development of events
in Southern Africa.

This, I guessed, with an eye on the actual figures, would leave the NP wi
th about 71 seats
plus 8 from the NRP, together making 79 seats. 26 PFP seats plus 60 HN
P seats = 86 seats,
so that the PFP would then have the balance of power, certain as it was

not to gang up with
the HNP. Anyway, HA! HA! HA! at that situation!

But, working onwards from what for the Afrikaners would be a politically disturbing distribution of power, I came to see that such a strange arrangement would almost certainly drive a considerable further number of supporters of the NP into what was still to be the HNP at the following election, so that, at the third or fourth general election after 1981, the HNP would win the 83 plus seats it needed to govern South Africa. The thought was horrifying.

But that was all PRE- the March 1982 split. From Mr. B's viewpoint, things are now much worse, as a result of the CP's taking over the mantle of the HNP, than they were before.

I think most would agree that Dr. T. has at least as much charisma and charm as Mr. Jaap Marais, who, by one of those laughable quirks of fate, actually stood against him at the last election. Moreover, Dr. T. is surrounded by several people of standing and political stature, which Mr. Marais has not been. Thus the CP can be expected to grow at a faster rate than the HNP would. And, of course, as the CP grows, the NP shrinks. It has become a different game of Jukskei altogether.

I do not believe that there is much of a chance of logical change in South Africa with the NP in control - but at least there is a glimmer of hope. Yet, in reality, can one foretell the future with any confidence? The older I get the more I have come to realise that "things that can't happen do happen!" Think of how the unexpected Falkland Islands War is saving the bacon of Mrs. Thatcher's party. A wave of national emotion has taken it from the bottom to the top of the polls. In a month!

Moreover, that glimmer of hope would glow if events should create a set of circumstances in which the NP should need the support of the PFP to give it a combined majority against the CP.

We are about to see if that situation is a possibility.

On the other hand, if the CP ever once gains a parliamentary majority, the tiny light at the end of what must seem to many millions, to be a long, long, tunnel - but nevertheless a light

- would be extinguished. For ever.

So, whilst in South Africa, I made a point of obtaining, from a newspaper office, photo-stats of the 1981 General Election results, seat by seat, for detailed study on my return to Australia. It now appears to me as if four or five results were omitted from what I was given but I, nevertheless, have enough information for the following two analyses, I have made:-

(i) To show the swing, on a percentage basis, needed to transfer PFP seats into the hands of the NP; and

(ii) To show the swing, on a percentage basis, needed to transfer NP seats into the hands of the CP;

- the analyses both being made on the following assumptions, which I believe to be soundly based:-

(a) That, as a result of the split in the NP, there will be no further swing towards the PFP, as occurred at the last election, but that, on the contrary, there will be a swing back to the NP. My reasons for this conclusion are that there are now widely-held feelings among English-speaking voters that "P.W. Botha is trying, at last, to do something and should be encouraged" and "The NP will need all the support it can get to keep Treurnicht and his supporters out."

(b) That the NRP, if not soon absorbed by the NP, will before long become its full partner and virtually one with it.

(c) That the NP and PFP will have a pact for the PFP to refrain from the fray, where the CP puts up a candidate in any seat. A plague on both their houses, if they do not!

(d) That the CP will inherit all the HNP votes, fairly soon, and at the latest by the time the

second election from now is held.

(e) That, on the sacred rule of "keeping the anti-Treurnicht vote intact", I have awarded

to the NP, in straight CP-NP contests, the NRP and PFP votes cast in 1981.

Swing Needed
to give seat
to CP

Seats Won/Lost

Total

1

Cum.

Total

1

3 4

2 6

3 9

3 12

3 15

3 18

4 22

6 28

3 31

4 35

4 39

49

60

65

74

80

84

86

87

0%- 4% Ermelo

5% 12%

13%-16% Waterberg, Middleburg, Barberton

17%-18% Frankfort and Bothaville

19%-20% Brits, Ventersdorp and Losberg

21 %-22% Stilfontein, Schweizer-Reneke and Carltonville

23%-24% Lichtenburg, Standerton and Roodepoort

25% Bethal, Witbank and Pretoria West

26% Sasolburg, Meyerton, . and Nigel

27% Vryburg, Wonderboom, Leydenburg, Parys,

Overvaal, Heilbron

28% Newcastle, Keodoespoort and Smithfield

29% Durban Point, Delmas, Ladybrand and Fauresmith

30% Uitenhage, Vryheid, Gezina and Pietersburg

31%-32% Vrede, Innesdal, Welkon, Primrose, Vredefort,

De Aar, Brakpan, Virginia, Klerksd'p, Bethlehem 10

33%-34% Craddock, Kuruman, Aliwal, Queenstown, Potgiurst

Witteburg, Alberton, Winburg, Vereeniging,

Kempton P., Krugersd'p 11

35%-36% Kimb. North, Prieska, Kroonstad, Humansdorp,

Vander Bijl Park 5

37%-38% Sunday's River, Umfolosi, Brentw'd, Mosselbaai,

Namaqual'd, P.E. North, Modderfontein, Germiston,

Gordonia 9

39%-40% Algoa, Boksburg, Graaf-Reinet, Oudtshoorn,

Bloem Font'n East, Pmbg-South 6

41%-42% Worcester, Klip Rivier, Bloemf'n West and George 4

43%-44% False Bay and Malmesbury 2

45% Paron 1

46%(+) FROM THIS POINT SEVERAL MORE SEATS, UN-
CONTESTED BY THE HNP AT THE 1981 ELECTION,
APPEAR LIKELY TO PASS INTO THE HANDS OF THE
CP.

So, a 42% swing would give the CP a parliamentary majority, in seats in which probably less than 35% of the present Voters (all White) live. Remember that the Whites in turn are only about 15% of the total population of South Africa and you will then see that the CP could get power with only about 5% of the support of ALL RACE GROUP members. A unique democracy!

What degrees of swing are likely at the first and second elections from now?

Bear in mind that every "renegade" from the NP to the CP or "convert" from the NP to the CP, as your mind runs, counts twice. As one loses, the other gains. But, new voters count only once.

The total support for the CP/withdrawal of support from the NP, will depend upon the following:

(1) MOST IMPORTANTLY, WHAT THE NP

(i) says;

(ii) does not say;

(iii) does; and

(iv) does not do;

- both inside and outside of Parliament.

(2) PROBABLY, LESS IMPORTANTLY, but no one can foresee the future or even try to anticipate the intensity of feelings (remember, emotions will decide) produced by any of the following possible events, which will have JOINT and SEVERAL effects:

(a) Events indicating unrest within South Africa and, in particular, those resulting from the growth of the Black trade union movement.

(b) Events on South Africa's borders.

(c) The degree of pressure for change brought on South Africa by foreign countries.

(d) The strength or weakness of the South African economy, as without adequate funds to relieve Black poverty, and to provide what else is needed positively, unrest will increase rapidly.

(e) The strength of the emotional appeal offered by the CP in their "only real laager" argument, remembering that Mr. B. has already been labelled as a "Prog" by an irate CP M.P.

(f) Most importantly, the grass-root supporters which Dr. T. and Co. have already taken with them from the NP. I guess at least 25%, perhaps as high as 40% of the NP.

and (g) Other influences, I may have overlooked, and which you may remember.

These are all possible major, not minor, influences.

o have given

Figures like the "4,000 students at Pretoria University", who were reported to have given

Dr. T. "a tremendous ovation" suggest that support for the CP is going to be frighteningly high.

This agrees with my own gut interpretation of the situation, taking into account the animus

which pervades the South African White political soul. I believe, as I earlier said, that few

Whites there are born without some sort of gene of racialism. They are "naturals" for the CP!

What one should also remember is the effect of the PFP's near-certain support for the NP

in the case of a showdown with the CP; for example:

A Swing of Gives

the following CP

from NP to CP Seats

(i) 34% 60

(ii) 36% 66

(iii) 36% 66

(iv) 38% 75

(v) 40% 81

(vi) 42% 85

Gives Made up A Swing of

NP & NRP- of, say, the following

PFP (counted (a) NP & NRP and from PFP

all together) (b) PFP seats to NP

(a) (b)

105 84 + 21 8%

99 78 + 21 8%

99 84 + 15 16%

90 78 + 12 20%

85 73 + 12 20%

80 72 + 8 28%

In examples (ii), (iv) and (v) the PFP has the balance of power. In the other examples, it has not.

My instincts tell me that the PFP will probably be reduced to around 15 seats as a result

of the second election from now, losing the first eleven seats, listed by name, on Schedule

No. 1 - assuming a 16% swing from the PFP to the NP, by no means a fanciful figure. I fear

it could be much higher.

Nevertheless, whilst it survives, at all, the PFP will continue to play a highly important

role.

At some stage, as the above examples show, it may, for a short period, have the power to exert a weighty, if not a decisive, say in the actual architecture of the country's constitutional future. Perhaps it may even be able to enforce the adoption of some, if not all, of my
FOUR ESSENTIAL MEASURES. Qui sait? Whilst there is life, there is hope.

So, my gratuitous,
unsolicited,

and no doubt, unwanted,
advice for all South African Whites is this:

(1) VOTE FOR THE PFP AGAINST THE NP

OR

VOTE FOR THE NP AGAINST THE CP,

one or the other, depending entirely on what particular contest there will be in your own local constituency, forgetting all your past loyalties. And yes, put in some **REAL WORK** for the party, no matter which one it is, in your constituency, to which logic says you must give your vote (a) to keep the PFP "in" against the NP or (b) to keep the NP "in" against the CP.

(2) GIVE GENEROUSLY TO BOTH NP and PFP PARTY FUNDS and GIVE TO THEM REGULARLY.

Remember they are fighting a common foe.

(3) SPEAK OUT FOR THE FOUR ESSENTIAL MEASURES SET OUT ABOVE. They do not, at the moment, have a snowball's hope in Hades of being adopted: but, if they are forgotten, there will be no chance at all of their eventual adoption. **LATER MAY BE TOO LATE,** BUT LATER IS BETTER THAN NOT AT ALL.

Keep the BINGO figure of a 42% swing in your mind. I remind you that this has been mathematically calculated - and is the position even after crediting the NP with the NRP and PFP votes in these seats, based on the 1981 figures. 42% is the rosier interpretation. Not the worst.

The sizes of future polls will also be vital, but at their influence I cannot guess. I do anticipate polls will be very high.

You ask what I personally predict?

A great deal depends upon the lapse of time allowed until the first election, from now, is called. Mr. B. has until 1986 by which to do this. I wrongly predicted, in March, that he would call an immediate election. As I saw it, and still do, the time to strike at the CP was/is:

(i)

AND

(ii)

During its early, formative stage, when it is, both from the organisational and financial viewpoints, at its weakest;

Whilst it is still at loggerheads with the HNP, whose candidates would surely split the anti-NP vote considerably in many seats.

It is still not too late for Mr. B. to call a General Election. Because of the reasons given above, I firmly believe that the swing from NP to CP at an election, held almost at once, would almost certainly reduce the number of CP members in the House. I guess from 18 to around 9.

However, it is certain that the result at the second election from now will be very different indeed whether or not the first election is delayed. By then, there are unlikely to be any HNP candidates in the field.

Now take another look at my SECOND SCHEDULE. The seats which the CP seem destined to win, sooner or later, are rural or blue-collar-worker seats, in which there are relatively few Indian or Coloured residents. Thus, even if the Indians and Coloureds - by some miracle or mistake! - should be put on the common roll - and not merely given their own debating chambers - they would not be of any help to the NP. They would be of help where no help was needed, unless more urban constituencies were created to provide for their numbers. But, of course, putting the Coloureds and the Indians onto the common roll would provide Dr. T. with most effective ammunition to fire at the NP.

All subsequent elections in South Africa are certain to become unbelievably

ly bitter feuds
between the CP and the NP, feuds such as have never been seen before
. The CP will have
and will make the most of an almost irresistible emotional appeal to the un
thinking. It will
accuse the NP of having destroyed the laager, which it, the CP, is "rebuildi
ng". It will not
help the NP to argue that "the laager will not provide a permanent solution
". That is an
intellectual argument and intellectual arguments always have had, and al
ways will have, a
dismal track record in South Africa.

The NP, having preached "NO POWER-SHARING WHATSOEVER" for 40 y
ears, or so, must
now pay a price for this and its other sins. "It could perhaps vary its policie
s a little", you
suggest. No, I believe that, in emotional-reponse terms, this is a plai
n POSITIVE/NEGATIVE
situation. Of course, one may change one's views on ANY matter but on
e must always take
the full consequences of that decision of change.

What is more:- The NP cannot now avoid a changing of its own basic ima
ge and character.
It will willy-nilly become a sort of "NEW U.P." but, fortunately, without th
e "SAPPE" taint.
The PFP will remain out on a limb and the CP will take over the right-win
g role, which used
to belong to the NP. Sadly, one must recall that the old UP had not any rea
l policy for the
permanent solution of the country's problems - will the "New UP" be differ
ent?" - and that
the party on the extreme right in South Africa seems always destined to wi
n in the long run.

UNLESS ... There is A BIG UNLESS, one which would give a new shape
to the whole
of South Africa's constitutional future and which WOULD give the NP the
parliamentary
strength it needs to proceed confidently with very great changes, includin
g those I have
proposed. But first we must look at one other important factor and I mus
t "Make my guess".

In my calculations I have ignored the new voter, i.e. the first-time voter. It
is important to
consider "the way to vote" which will be indoctrinated into the young ove
r the years ahead.
They will be indoctrinated, of that be sure, for indoctrination has been t
he NP government's
policy since 1948. How chickens come home to roost!

Those who will vote in 1985 or 1986 (say), for the first time, are now be
tween 14 and

18 years of age. Those who will vote for the first time in 1990 are now aged from 8 or 9 to

13. A great number of these young Afrikaners, many of whom live in the key 83 seats, will be exposed to the great indoctrinating influence of their teachers and of their churches for many years to come. Remember that the Afrikaner Teachers' Federation, at Bloemfontein recently, and the Dutch Reformed Church, since the split, have both indicated support for the CP, and not for the NP as previously. The stars strongly favour the CP! Expect the indoctrination to be near 100% for extremist views.

Nor am I certain that the English-speaking first-time voter will not support the CP, if given a CP candidate in his constituency. The new army call-up regulations must make it clear* to one and all, that the nation's leaders expect much and continuous, future racial unrest. This surely will produce an emotional sub conscious response of opposition to power-sharing in all the young, irrespective of their ancestry.

Finally, to make the roughest of guesses, I would, quite unscientifically, if I had to make any predictions at all, come up with these:-

(i) If an election is delayed until 1985 or 1986, assuming the HNP had by then become defunct, I foresee a 35% to 40% swing. That would give Dr. T. and Co. between 65 and 80 seats. Please do not forget that I am guessing. I suspect that I could be underestimating the danger, and every 1% swing over 35% does matter a great deal. Schedule No. 2 shows that.

(ii) At the second election held in 1990, say, I would guess at a swing of 45% plus, based on the 1981 figures. That would give the CP control of South Africa's destiny. Full control. For a long, long while. They would see to that.

That is UNLESS ...

... UNLESS THE PRIME MINISTER TAKES THE BULL BY THE HORNS AND PERFORMS AN ACT OF STATESMANSHIP TO GIVE HIMSELF PERMANENT AND COMPLETE FREEDOM OF LEGISLATIVE MOVEMENT AND THE POWER TO DO ALL WHICH SHOULD BE DONE.

AND THEN, HAVING THE POWER, DOES ALL WHICH WISDOM DEMANDS HE SHOULD DO.

Yes, there are some devices open to him by which he can put the hope of power out of the reach of Treurnicht and Co. for all time. Let me explain what I have in mind, after I have first recorded my regret that what I now propose will have the effect of making the NP less dependent on PFP goodwill and support than otherwise. Sorry, PFP members. You do deserve better. But que sera sera.

The two devices I have in mind, moreover, have strong moral foundations - in fact they both appear morally irresistible. That should bring cheer to Mr. B's heart and give strength to his arm. I must here admit that these devices came to mind only during, and as a result of the writing and re-writing of this paper. They had not occurred to me before.

This is what I respectfully propose for the attention of The Honourable the Prime Minister, of whom I hope, sooner or later, to catch the personal eye:-
Sir,

I refer you to what I have written above. I believe it to be both full and factual.

The key figure of 83 seats in parliament can be raised to any figure you choose - provided you act in good time, meaning the sooner the better - in this fashion:-

(1) You accept and act upon the principle of creating X number of parliamentary representatives for the Coloureds and Y number for the Indians, WITHIN THE PRESENT HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ITSELF. What you do outside the House will be of no real help in the strange circumstances which now prevail in the Republic.

What the NP needs is more safe seats in the House.

These representatives of the Coloured and Indian communities could be chosen from the racial groups concerned, by the groups through their own parliaments. Or Whites could represent them. Or you could have some Coloureds, some Indians and some Whites as representatives. A number could perhaps be nominated by the Government. Whom you choose is not material, provided they support you fully and consistently against the CP. Their number in the House is

vital. They will guarantee you power, and continued power, to do what I have outlined.

How many of such representatives would be morally justifiable?

Bearing in mind that the Coloureds and Indians are roughly the same in total population numbers as the Whites, and that the Whites have 165 parliamentary representatives, I suggest that up to 165 Representatives for the Coloured and Indian communities could logically be argued as being in excess. So, choose as many as you like, up to 165! The number could be varied to suit the needs of the changing situation; and they could later be phased out as the need for them was reduced.

You have a whole new world Prime Minister, opening up before you! It is there for the taking!

(2) You indulge in some reverse "gerrymandering". In the past the NP gave a false value to a rural vote vis-a-vis an urban vote. We all know that such gerrymandering was basically very suspect morally. I thus, cannot see any objection at all to your now restoring its true value to an urban vote, thereby reducing the number of "dicey" rural seats and increasing the number of "safe" urban seats.

Personally I believe that all votes should have the same value and - another thought worth pursuing? - that there should be proportional representation in Parliament. But, you Prime Minister, and not I, are in the driver's seat; and for that I am thankful. I envy you not at all.

Of course, you have every right to question my cheek, in telling you what to do. Yes, I am an expatriate; but I plead against that, - that I am what I am and that at what counts in the final analysis is that it is not I who speak but the facts themselves.

Moreover, it would not have been necessary for me to compile and present them in this paper if I had known that there was someone in South Africa who was willing to look reality, and its unavoidable consequences, fully in the face and record his findings. I have found time in my retirement to do this.

Speaking of consequences, there is a French proverb which goes something like this, in free translation:

"One must accept the consequences of what one chooses to do or not to do,"

You, or whoever succeeds you in the leadership of the NP, will have the responsibility of making a simple choice and must accept the consequences of that choice.

To accept the inevitable or not to accept it? That is the question.

But please bear this in mind:

It will not matter much at all to the people of South Africa in the long run, IF

(i) You have the power of government; and

(ii) You choose to follow a course which disregards the inevitability of the Blacks'

one day taking control of South Africa and the need to prepare for that day.

That is much the path which the CP would follow, so the consequences will be very similar. The only differences would be that, with the CP having legislative power, blood would flow much sooner, more strongly and for much longer.

However, the end result would be the same.

I respectfully ask you to give some consideration to what I have written.

I wish you and all the peoples of South Africa well.

Yours truly,

JOHN WILKINSON

Voila!

JOHN WILKINSON,

41 CORAL CRESCENT,
PEARL BEACH,

NSW, 2256
AUSTRALIA
25TH JULY, 1982