

\

EMBARGOED UNTIL DELIVERED

WORLD LEADERS FORUM

"THE PLIGHT OF RESPONSIBLE BLACK LEADERS IN SOUTH AFRICA"

â\200\230Address by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi
Chief Minister of KwaZulu, President of Inkatha and
Chairman, The South African Black.Alliance

UNIVERSITY OF BOSTON s 17 NOVEMBER 1986

South Africa is slowly but surely developing a revolutionary climate in which applauded radicalism threatens to destroy the very foundations on which any real democracy will have to be built. There is a time lag in the perceptions of many who support radical action in South Africa. The struggle for liberation has not been won. White intransigence remains deep-rooted and the racism inherent in the country's institutional life has not yet been eradicated. This is all true, but the far more pertinent truth is that apartheid can now no longer possibly survive for any length of time. South Africa is in the process of radical transition. The South African Government has at last recognised that its homeland policy has failed and that there can never be a return to classical Verwoerdian apartheid. It has now out of necessity to slaughter one apartheid holy cow after another. Success in the real struggle in South Africa is now not dependent on whether apartheid can be eradicated. That will be done one way or another.

The real struggle is to replace apartheid with an open, race-free, democratic, multi-Party democracy. All too many fail to see this. It is as though their in-put suffers from time-lags in which they are geared to being solely concerned with the eradication of apartheid. They fail to see that the way in which apartheid is eradicated holds vital implications for the future. This is all so apparent in the sanctions debate in the United States. The deep moral condemnation of apartheid is made by many a priority and a sole objective. It is as though any means are good enough. Sanctions are imposed in this climate of moral indignation at terrible costs to the victims of apartheid themselves. President Reagan who opposed sanctions sees the need to balance even limited sanctions package deals with substantially stepped-up humanitarian aid. In this Americans of all Party political persuasions support him. In the same way as sanctions were sought after willy nilly, it is not just any humanitarian aid administered in any way which will do that which now urgently needs to be done in the post-sanctions era.

I have linked three thoughts together. The first is that apartheid cannot survive. The second is that the real struggle is now a struggle to establish a worthwhile alternative to apartheid. And

the third is that Western influences are so influenced by the hideousness of apartheid that they do not give proper credit to the need to start fashioning opposition to apartheid more astutely.

It is in this context that I wish to talk to the theme: "The Plight of Responsible Black Leaders in South Africa" and I want to observe immediately that it takes very powerful forces of moderation to combat the kind of destructive violence which is emerging in South Africa. And <close to the heart of the problem those of us face in moderating the hideousness of violence in our midst, is the fact that the media raises sentiment to indignant heights and endows radicals with praise and moderates with reserve and. even condemnation. I suffer immensely because so many append to my name the word "moderate." Let me draw attention to the dangers of using this appellation indiscriminately and unthinkingly.

I am the President of Inkatha which has over 1.3 million paid-up card-carrying members. This massive constituency rejects the very constitution of South Africa. It rejects the country's parliamentary structure in part and in whole. It will have nothing to do with machinations to give it a Black legitimacy. Our demand for a new constitution is a radical demand. We reject the racist foundations on which not only the constitution but so many other institutions in South Africa are founded. We demand a really radical revision of basic values and attitudes among White South Africans. - For us meaningful change has to strike at the root cause of racism. It has got to stand society on its head and we strive for, suffer for and die for our commitment to the radical transformation of South Africa. I venture to suggest that our position is far more radical than that, say, of that great son of America, Martin Luther King. Our politics strives to change the very nature of our government and it aims to liberalise, purify and transform society and not destroy it. That makes our politics far more radical than the politics of, say, Mr. Andrew Young or the Reverend Jesse Jackson and yet they are sought after by those in South Africa, whom the media call radical. When you look at Inkatha's aims and objectives as they are published in its constitution and when you look at its statement of belief, there is "no clash in principle between them and the ANC's Freedom Charter.

And yet I am branded a "moderate." I say branded because the word moderate as it is used in the media is an appellation denoting counter-productivity in my leadership. I dispute that I am a

"moderate" in the sense in which the media uses the word, which is perceived as if I want less for my people than any other opponents of apartheid.

Having made these observations about the label "moderate", I would like to go on to claim what sense of moderation I do have in my politics. Firstly, I strive to moderate the use of violence for political purposes in South Africa. I am not a pacifist; I come from warrior stock and the history of my own people has taught us the meaning of war. I accept that violence is a final recourse which Blacks may even yet have to resort to, but because I know the meaning of war, and I know how deeply Black anger burns into the Black soul, I am totally opposed to those who dissipate Black anger

in nonsensical violent confrontations which make no gains. I moderate that violence. I oppose that violence wherever I can, and my bottom line thought on violence is that opposition to it, total commitment to avoid it, making use of every alternative strategy, and a true commitment to do everything humanly possible to make non-violent tactics and strategies work, are the only things which, when all is finally said and done, will justify the last resort of violence which I have always warned could engulf South Africa.

As I develop powerful forces to combat premature and unjustified reliance on violence in our tactics and strategies, I am by-passed by many as a so-called "moderate." The plight of so-called "moderates" in these circumstances is that it is only those who do everything in their power to moderate violence who will one day possibly provide a moral sanction for its use in a just war. Yes, while I believe that it is both noble and pragmatic to moderate violence, I am as prepared as anyone else even to lose my life in the cause of my people.

Moderation in politics has other disadvantages. The powerful forces I have to generate to moderate violence necessitate me being involved in the grinding back-breaking work of mass organisation. It has taken ten years of round-the-clock labour to constitute Inkatha as a disciplined and coherent force that can be directed in the political struggle. Those who seek to bring about violence in

South Africa do not undertake this back-breaking work. Bands of ten or twelve can participate in mob behaviour and direct it for a short while in the pursuit of short-term objectives. I as a

responsible Black leader have to see to the well-being of my people, otherwise my constituency will abandon me. I have to lead as people want me to lead. The purveyors of violence do not have to combat the horrors of poverty, ignorance and disease. They clamour the most for sanctions because they want more poverty. The purveyors of violence do not have to permeate Black power into South Africa's institutional life. They want to break that institutional life and they want to do it by breaking the economy.

My commitment to the moderation of violence commits me to tactics and strategies which reconcile while we destroy apartheid. I do not strive to produce a future in which I will have to govern by the gun. The purveyors of violence do not have to lay the foundations of democracy now while we struggle to eradicate apartheid. The plight of the so-called "moderate" in these circumstances is deepened by the fact that the media does not dramatise the hard grinding work of major constituency leaders. Sensational reporting minimises the efforts of middle-ground leadership and maximises the efforts of leadership in violent confrontation. Newspapers with occasional strokes of the pen create celebrity leaders. 'TV cameras flash myths about Black leadership and carpets are rolled out in the United States for fast-talking, mid-stream, horse-changing jockeys. It is as though there is a Western hunger for heroic freedom fighters, regardless of what the consequence of all this is in terms of the destruction of the foundations of true democracy.

It is not the rightness or wrongness of one's final goals which beguiles the American public. It is not responsibility in leadership which woos them. A Black grist to the American Party political mill is what beguiles them all too often. This is the plight of the leaders in South Africa moderating the destructive violence which so threatens in South Africa everything that

Americans have entrenched in their own country. The Party political line-up in the United States is, of course, not all there is. True friends of South Africa, true American stalwarts backing

right in South Africa because it is right, arguing courageously for truth because truth in public politics is germane to real democracy, are found in both the great American political camps. The plight of anyone who believes in the middle ground, however, remains the plight of a leader facing the kind of shift in American politics which produces across-the-board solidarity in opposition to the President's veto of the Senate sanctions Bill. It is not Party politics pure and simple in the narrow sense of the word. It is a whole American Party political machine working for American democratic ends which is at times the plight of any leader in South Africa who pursues the kind of tactics and strategies that I pursue in the middle-ground.

I am here today and I am undertaking this trip to the United States at this crucial time of South African developments because I really do believe that the United States can play a major role as the

greatest international force capable of spreading the influence of sanity in South and Southern Africa. The United States has the proud record of a great democracy. It is the force for

international peace in the world. The dollar, the American Marines, the heavy weight of American clout, have finally to be used so that ordinary Americans, the man and the woman in the street, are proud of what their President and their Government is doing in the world. It is the ordinary Americans who make America

great. It is the American judicial system which gives the small man clout. It is the American political system which gives the small man a say. It is the American constitution which safeguards

all this. I want for South Africa the kind of democracy that is so distinguished here in the United States. This imposes on me the plight of responsible leadership. I frequently ask the question - what kind of South Africa will we have after we have abolished the apartheid tyranny? Are we going to replace it with another tyranny?

I deeply appreciated President Reagan's initiative when he invited me to have personal discussions with him last year. I have greatly valued the ongoing contact between myself and the Reagan Administration. I have met your Secretary of State and all the prominent members of the American Government for discussions. I value these inputs into the politics of sanity in South Africa, but any American Government is limited by the kind of democracy which has developed here. The Kremlin has no such democratic limitations placed on it. It strikes where it wants to strike; it smashes what it wants to smash and it drives to support the forces which aim to destroy the free enterprise economy in South Africa. It strikes to destroy prospects of a multi-Party democracy finally

emerging in the country. The plight of any leader in South Africa who believes in the middle ground in South Africa, is that Western democratic leaders are hampered by Party political restraints whereas the Kremlin is a law unto itself in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The plight of anyone exercising the kind of leadership I exercise in South Africa is also that. It is insufficiently realised in countries such as the United States that at the heart of the turmoil in South Africa there is a life and death struggle taking

place which is, bluntly put, a power struggle. The African National Congress Mission in Exile regards itself as a government in exile. It has observer status at the United Nations, the OAU,

and at meetings of the Commonwealth and Non-aligned countries and @everywhere it represents itself as the sole, authentic voice of the people of South Africa. It constantly talks about itself as the

vanguard movement in the struggle for liberation. It arrogates unto itself the right to plan the struggle, to conduct the struggle, and to direct the events in it. It is hungry for the

power that it will need if it has to achieve the position in reality which it now claims in its propaganda.

For the ANC Mission in Exile the primary means of liberating South Africa must be violence. It has moved from conducting the classical armed struggle against South African security forces and the South African Government to initiating what in their own words is a people's war. The violence which is reported in Black South African townships is more often than not violence perpetrated in . the Black South African power struggle. The plight of the

responsible Black leader in South Africa is that this is just not sufficiently recognised. "Necklacing", street corner butchering by mobs, hand grenades thrown into Black houses, are all too often reported as Black anger against apartheid when they are no more than dastardly deeds of power-hungry forces.

Too many Western observers see Black revulsion in the face of our township violence as a revulsion which portrays antagonism to the

great struggle for liberation which is being waged. In its radio broadcasts to Black South Africans from Dar-es-Salaam and other places, the ANC Mission in Exile tells Black South Africans that

Inkatha is their greatest enemy in the country. They have declared war on Inkatha because they cannot control it and they cannot control it because it is a massive Black constituency, rooted in democracy, believing in freedom and justice and committed to establishing a multi-Party democracy. We would rather die than move from these commitments. And remember they are commitments which Americans hold dear. The plight of anyone who believes in these ideals in South Africa, is that the members of his organisation are brutalised and slain and when even a little finger is lifted up in self-defence or in the defence of the very things which Americans have died willingly for all over the world, there is a media outcry.

I have now told my people that enough is enough. We simply dare not permit the destruction of the hallowed values in our struggle for liberation. I have now said that we are prepared to die for what we believe in, and I have called on my people to adopt the philosophy of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth in defence of our ideals. The plight of anyone who does not believe in the strategy of violence is that he is attacked for such statements by the very people who give indirect, and even direct, support to revolutionary forces like the ANC Mission in Exile, whose Secretary-General Mr. Alfred Nzo, claims supports such methods as "necklacing."

I reiterate again that it requires very powerful forces to moderate the kind of violence which is spiralling upwards in South Africa. Leaders who believe in a multi-Party democracy and in non-violent tactics require massive support for what they are doing. I have got that massive support from Black South Africans themselves. Direct international aid to the ANC Mission in Exile actually runs into many millions of dollars. The diplomatic aid they receive is very considerable indeed. There is an unfair balance of support which deeply prejudices any leader who does not pursue or uphold their strategy of violence in South Africa. There is an overall imbalance in the international input into the Black struggle for liberation and in this imbalance, aid in support of the violent overthrow of the South African Government is absolutely dominating.

The West must realise that it is just not any humanitarian aid to the victims of apartheid which is so badly needed. Humanitarian aid from the United States should deliberately be used to strengthen the non-violent democratic struggle against apartheid. All too frequently, however, both in North America and Europe aid springing from the goodness of heart of noble democrats is used by Black South Africans to favour the forces of violence. I who have got radical aims and objectives and whose politics is radical; I who seek a radical turning of South Africa on its head to bring about a true democracy, am more often black-listed by donor agencies and donor governments because this label "moderate" is hung around my neck.

This is the plight of any Black leader in South Africa who tries to pursue ideals which are consonant with the American dream. I repeat that I want radical change in South Africa, but because I do not talk blood and thunder in pursuance of that ideal, I am labelled by foes and some in the media as a "moderate", with the implication that I am prepared to settle for less than other opponents of apartheid. This is just not true and any idea that I could be categorised as a "moderate" in that sense is either a figment of the imagination of some in the media or a term of opprobrium used by political foes to downgrade my sacrifices for a non-racial democratic South Africa. I, however, unashamedly believe in what can be achieved through democratic tactics in the middle ground. °