

# Bring blacks into the Cabinet

During a recent business trip to London I was almost overwhelmed at the extent of media attention being devoted to South Africa. The worsening situation here was featured prominently in every newspaper, and television or radio news bulletin.

What is happening here today is the culmination of 38 years of racial discrimination, bungling, disastrous financial management and gross incompetence at every level of government.

The critical attention of the world is upon us. Economic sanctions, long threatened, are becoming a reality. Yet, despite this avalanche of world opinion, the Government shows defiance; its attitude hardens.

Threats of counter-measures are uttered; the Afrikaner volk closes ranks; white people are drawn into the laager.

We South Africans of British descent who know the Afrikaner could foresee the effect sanctions would have — an aggravation of an already grave situation.

Let there be no misunderstanding. Economic sanctions against South Africa will lead to untold misery, in terms of provoking a fierce reaction from the Government, more repression of opposition, restriction of expression of free thought, mass unemployment of blacks, an increase in rioting, unrest, crime, destruction of property and more loss of life.

Sadly, our government has given blacks, coloureds and Asians little cause for affection over the past 38 years. Yet the imposition of punitive economic sanctions is a serious mistake and will add fuel to the fire of Afrikaner nationalism.

It will operate to the detriment of blacks.

Already this country is in the throes of a three-year-old economic depression. Emigration of whites of the professional and business class has reached unprecedented proportions.

There remains only one hope, and that is the formation of an emergency Cabinet to include true black leaders, such as Chief Buthelezi, Mandela, Mangope and others; lifting the state of emergency, releasing all political detainees, holding a national convention with representatives of all races and the establishment of a just form of government to bring true democracy to this land.

Will our government listen to reason, drop its political posturing and give apartheid a swift burial?  
Forest Town R Lindsay-Tee



# Cape Times

FRIDAY, AUGUST 15, 1986

## Reform loses out

THE National Party seems in no mood to meet the future. It prefers to believe that the future won't happen if it can make a few concessions to the present in order to keep living in the past. South Africans concerned about the future can only cry at the appalling lack of vision and leadership displayed at this week's Nationalist federal congress. No bold gestures, no imaginative initiatives, no sign that it is concerned with anything other than the attacks by the white right wing on such reforms to apartheid as have been made.

The lack of leadership was exemplified by the determination to keep South Africans in racially separate compartments, politically, educationally and residentially. Dr Andries Treurnicht and his conservative cohorts exercise such an influence over the Nationalist leadership that they might as well have remained in the party. Instead of trying to face its followers with the facts of the country, and the demands of the future, and to spell

out a necessary if unpalatable course of action, the government is being led by the nose by reactionaries inside the party and President Botha's cabinet.

The line on the Group Areas Act was predictable, if depressing. President Botha and his colleagues reaffirmed what they have been saying for years, namely that group areas, separate schools and separate residential areas are non-negotiable. Some grey areas might be allowed to accommodate mixed marriages, but the Group Areas Act, which has zoned all the best residential areas for whites and assigned the left-overs to everyone else, will not go. Schools will not be mixed and voters' rolls remain segregated. The National Party accuses Dr Treurnicht of wanting to live in 1977 and the HNP's Mr Jaap Marais of keeping the clock at 1966. South Africans have real cause for worry when their supposedly reformist government seems reluctant to move much beyond 1948.

## Finding black leaders

IT is gratifying to learn that the government should now be keen to discover who the real black leaders in South Africa are. That is progress, in intention if not yet in deed. But if the Minister of Constitutional Development and Planning, Mr Chris Heunis, thinks he will unearth these real leaders by setting up black elections in existing circumstances, he is sadly mistaken. Many black leaders, in political, trade union and other circles are not at liberty but languishing in detention under the emergency laws. Others, such as Mr Nelson Mandela, are serving prison sentences. Even if some of the real leaders are not behind bars, they are unlikely to present themselves as candidates in any meaningful election so long as so many of their fellow blacks are restricted. To take part in an

election, presuming it were possible to hold one, would be too damaging to their own credibility.

Nevertheless the idea of finding the authentic leaders is a worthy one and should be pursued. But it will require from the government several essential steps before real black leaders can be identified and their co-operation enlisted. The first is the lifting of the emergency. Then all detainees would need to be released and all black political organizations unbanned. Mr Mandela must be freed. Last but not least, the elections must be designed to give black people a meaningful say in the central political process. Only by offering this sort of package will the government know that the black leaders it has "found" are the genuine article and not imposters unacceptable to the black majority.



# 'ANC had SOWETAN to choose 15 AUG. 1986 violence'

THE banned ANC could not be blamed for opting for violence because, after 49 years of peaceful negotiation, the South African Government would not listen, a State witness in the Delmas treason trial said yesterday.

Mr X, giving evidence in camera, told the court that history had proved that any oppressive government needed pressure to have it removed from power.

A former political instructor of the ANC in Angola and Lesotho, Mr X said that the African National Congress

By ALI  
MPHAKI

found "after talking and knocking for about 49 years to the South African Government it was in vain and it had to opt for violence".

He told the court that the history of the ANC was most important to its members and new recruits were taught about it.

He added that things got sour between him and the ANC in 1982 in Lesotho when he was accused of falling in love with a woman suspected of being an "agent".

He said he was taken to a house called "Moscow" in Lesotho where

he was kept under guard.

He said his ANC comrades had called him a "reactionary".

The court heard that he escaped from Lesotho in October 1982 and handed himself over to the South African Police.

Mr P J H Fick, for the State, showed Mr X several copies of newsletters called *Sechaba*, *Mayibuye* and *Dawn*, which Mr X said were ANC publications.

The defence team, led by Mr George Bizos, SC, requested an adjournment to study the publications before cross-examining Mr X.

(Proceeding)



# Tutu, Boesak 'flirting with treason'

THE call for sanctions by Bishop Desmond Tutu and Dr Allan Boesak was not only immoral but "bordered on treason", the Minister of Manpower, Mr Pietie du Plessis, said yesterday.

Repeating charges levelled at the two clerics from the National Party federal congress platform on Wednesday, he said he wished to add the names of certain trade union leaders to his warning.

The Minister said he was now sick of people propagating sanctions against South Africa, which would affect nearly a million workers.



BISHOP TUTU

"They are seeking to starve people," he said.

"And this while they themselves live in the midst of abundance and do not stand to lose their employment, while most of their children are in private schools.

"I wish to warn Dr Boesak and Bishop Tutu that what they are doing borders on treason and I want to add (that warning to) certain trade union leaders pleading for sanctions to the detriment of their own people.

"I want to give them a friendly warning that I will give their addresses to the hungry workers.

"What they are doing is immoral and against the people of the country and my advice to Bishop Tutu is to keep spreading God's word, reconciliation and peace instead of endeavouring to bring about the starvation and suffering of the ordinary worker, white, black, brown and yellow."

Mr du Plessis said it was his duty as the Minister of Manpower to speak for millions of workers and said he would fight sanctions "day and night".

"These people who bring about sanctions must be aware that the anger of the jobless is directed at them," he said. — Sapa.

THE NATAL WITNESS  
15 AUGUST 1986



# Sanctions in S. Africa add to woes

SAN DIEGO

**I**t is time we stopped expending energy in emotional condemnation of South African apartheid.

Everyone in this country — man, woman, rich, poor, black and white — already knows that it is a vicious, oppressive system, embodying the worst in organized injustice and that it should be totally eliminated. But flights of self-righteous rhetoric on our part will do nothing to help the South African black victims of suffering and oppression.

Rather, we should focus on doing things that are useful. And neither divestiture nor sanctions offer the tiniest chance of doing anything but harm.

Divestiture may be an idea that gives comfort to its student and faculty supporters on college campuses, but it is full of contradictions. The universities that have approved of divestiture have ignored the reality that two-thirds or more of America's corporations do business, in some way, with South Africa.

If Americans were to sell their holdings in all such companies, two-thirds of the stock traded in the United States would be put up for sale.

But if we determine to sell the stock for moral reasons, whom would we sell it to? If

By **V. H. KRULAK**

there is a moral objection to owning the stock, there is an equal moral objection to buying it. So, unless the seller compromises his morality and corrupts a buyer, stock



DONATO, Toronto Sun, Toronto, Canada

trading would come to a halt; the stock would not be sold and the only casualty would be the American economy. As for apartheid, it would not be affected, one way or another.

The matter of sanctions is equally impractical. The concept is full of hypocrisy. The bill passed by the House of Representatives proposes to punish South Africa by shutting down trade with them in all things except strategic minerals — things we need for our own national security.

The question that arises immediately is how South Africa would react to this hypocritical proposition, where we try to damage their economy without risking anything ourselves. It is not unlikely that they would impose their own sanctions on us, embargoing the sale of chrome, manganese and platinum to the United States.

This action, doing nothing whatever to cure the apartheid disease, would force us into one of two undesirable alternatives. Either we would have to turn to the Soviet Union, the only other major producer of the critical strategic minerals, or we would have

to buy the critical materials from some other nation which purchased them from

*V. H. Krulak is a retired Marine lieutenant general.*

South Africa when we pulled out — thus confronting us with the same moral dilemma as in the case of divestiture.

Do we propose to buy South African minerals secondhand, on the black market, so to speak? If so, we will have made hypocrisy a national policy.

It must be evident that sanctions and their fallout inevitably will result in the collapse of American businesses in South Africa. When they are forced to sell out at distress prices, we may be sure that Japanese, German, French or Soviet purchasers will be waiting in the wings. And when stability — of whatever sort — is re-established, Americans will be on the outside.

Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, leader of 6 million Zulus, sums up sanctions and divestiture in these words: "For Americans to hurt the growth of the South African economy through boycotts, sanctions or divestiture would be a callous disregard for poor people, suffering under circumstances they did not create."

Buthelezi and other moderate South African blacks fear that sanctions and their companion economic pressures will generate violence and bloodshed. They know that the Afrikaners, to whom South Africa is truly home, are not going to pack up and leave the country in the face of violence. They command too much power — army and police — to give up without a fight.

That is why Buthelezi favors a program, resolutely pursued, that would abolish apartheid progressively and peacefully and guarantee blacks full participation in the country's political and economic affairs.

This process can take place only in an atmosphere of economic strength and stability. The United States can help — by doing the precise opposite of what the House of Representatives has proposed.

pg. 1 of 2

SEE OTHER  
ARTICLE  
P. 7 H. 11.

EXCELLENT, / THE INK

HOW CONTRARY TO  
"ORIGINAL"  
EDITORIAL



SAN DIEGO - 15 AUGUST 1986

SANCTIONS IN S. A. ADD TO WOES.

PG. 2 OF 2

Instead of forbidding trade, we should encourage our businessmen to increase and strengthen their investment in South Africa. We should offer tax inducements to every U.S. business whose South African operations are fully in compliance with our own civil-rights laws. Those businesses would be active cells of reform and strong influence toward full equality.

All of this is an elongated way of saying that we can help emancipate black South Africa by staying with them. We cannot help them by running away.

---



# South Africa and the media

South Africa's apartheid system is ugly, as is oppression everywhere. But a consensus on this fact is no basis for the omissions and fabrications that have been served up by the media.

The world media would have us believe that Bishop Desmond Tutu and the Rev. Alan Boseak speak for South African blacks. Neither man has a constituency in the sense of having been elected. On the other hand, Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi is the minister of nearly 7 million Zulus of Kwazulu and elected head of Inkatha, South Africa's largest political organization. Yet he receives far less press coverage than either Tutu or Boseak.

Chief Buthelezi is of little interest to the press. He's portrayed as a government stooge, because he is against economic sanctions and violent confrontation with the government. Buthelezi says sanctions will aggravate the already-bad economic condition of South African blacks.

He asks whether blacks haven't suffered enough already at the hands of enemies. Why should they be punished at the hands of friends? In fact, complete sanctions would confer a one-time windfall gain for many white South Africans who could buy Western companies at depressed prices.

During my July visit to South Africa, I had a private meeting with Chief Buthelezi, who is a personal friend. He told me that violent confrontation with the government is suicidal. The South African government has not used even 5 percent of its awesome power.

## Walter E. Williams

Buthelezi is by no means a government stooge, as the press has painted him; he wisely believes conditions have not reached the point where violent confrontation and the loss of tens of thousands of lives is the only solution.

During our meeting, Buthelezi informed me of outright news manipulation. For example: Black radicals would attack his people during a meeting or some other gathering. These attacks included fire bombings and assault, but what gets reported is his people retaliating.

The media gives the impression that jailed African National Congress leader Nelson Mandela and Buthelezi are mortal enemies. But Buthelezi shared a handwritten letter from Mandela with me:

"Your warm message of goodwill and support contributed tremendously to my speedy and complete recovery (from a prostate operation), and gave me much strength and joy. I shake your hands very warmly." Is this a communication between mortal enemies?

The American media tells us of "stayaways," strikes and boycotts, that are "this" percent and "that" percent effective, giving the impression of black unity. But what they withhold, for example, is the current rent strike in Soweto, which is maintained through brutal coercion.

Those Sowetans who want to pay their rent are prevented from doing

so through intimidation and threats by the "comrades," who might be better described as young thugs. Blacks who want to work when a stayaway is called are threatened and harassed. Blacks who shop when a boycott has been called can be forced, by the comrades, to eat the soap they bought.

Being forced to eat soap is "mild" retribution for grievances against the comrades. The crime can range from attending school, being a township official or policeman, or disobeying a stayaway. Punishment may be "necklacing," where a tire filled with gasoline is placed around your neck and set ablaze, or having your stomach slashed and filled with gasoline and ignited.

Another variation is being forced to drink the gasoline, which is then set ablaze. While all this is occurring, the comrades may dance around the victim, cutting and eating pieces of his flesh. Maids, servants, chauffeurs and other workers told me the current state of emergency is tough, but it makes their lives safer. Chief Buthelezi decries this black-on-black violence.

These are just a few of the facts being kept from Americans. The tragedy is: Congress and the administration are moving ahead on policy without knowing the true state of affairs in South Africa.

Such uninformed action may help in the fall elections, but it spells doom for millions of black and large and growing numbers of white South Africans who are hostile to the government's apartheid policy.

Heritage Features Syndicate

15 / 08 / 86



# Sanctions also have African foes

By Robert J. Caldwell  
Editor, Opinion Section

Mounting political pressures are forcing President Reagan and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to accept some version of what they both oppose — economic sanctions against South Africa.

The Commonwealth, and just possibly Queen Elizabeth II, pushed Thatcher last week into acquiescing in sanctions. Congress, reflected in a nearly unanimous Senate Foreign Relations Committee, seems almost certain to do the same to Mr. Reagan.

But if imposing economic sanctions against the pariah regime in Pretoria is becoming irresistible, is it also the best way to promote peaceful change and an end to apartheid in South Africa? And, moreover, are sanctions and divestment the only morally defensible and politically decent positions for opponents of apartheid?

The answers offered by some whose anti-apartheid credentials are impeccable may seem surprising. But, in fact, some of apartheid's bitterest critics oppose sanctions and oppose divestment. What is more, they may be mounting something of a counterattack against the seeming consensus for taking a wrecking ball to South Africa's economy.

A notable example is Helen Suzman. A white liberal, Suzman is a member of the South African Parliament, a leader of the opposition Progressive Federal Party and an outspoken foe of apartheid since she entered South African politics in 1953. In a recent essay written for the *New York Times Magazine*, Suzman defended President Reagan's policy of constructive engagement and predicted more violence and more oppression of South African blacks if that country's white minority government is forced by international sanctions into a siege economy.

She also argued that sanctions could produce appalling economic hardships, not only for South African blacks but for the tens of millions of blacks living in neighboring countries that are dependent on the South African economy.

"Unpalatable as it may seem to the sanctions lobby, the most practicable way to get rid of apartheid and to achieve a nonracial, democratic society in South Africa is through an expanding, flourishing economy," Suzman wrote.

Her objections to sanctions are shared by Frederick van Zyl Slabbert, a former leader of the Progressive Federal Party and, like Suzman, a white liberal fully committed to ending apartheid. Indeed, Dr. Slabbert recently resigned as party leader to offer himself as a mediator between South Africa's contending forces.

Another seemingly surprising opponent of sanctions and divestment is South Africa's best known writer, Alan Paton. Paton's anguished 1948 protest against apartheid, his novel *Cry the Beloved Country*, stirred a generation to resist racial injustice.

Writing last year as divestment demonstrations occurred almost daily in Washington, D.C., and on American college campuses, Paton wrote this about economic sanctions: "There is only one firm statement that I can make on disinvestment — I will have nothing to do with it. I

will not, by any written or spoken word, give it any support whatsoever.

"I hold the belief ... that the (African) National Party has at last decided for moral and pragmatic reasons to do better. Now is the time, therefore, for the nations of the West to bring the greatest moral and pragmatic pressure to bear on us. That excludes sanctions such as disinvestment. Re-education and punishment do not go together.

"If the nations of the West condemn us, they will only hinder the process of our emancipation from the bondage of our history. But if they stay with us, rebuke us, judge us and encourage us, the chances are that we shall do better."

Suzman, Slabbert and Paton are white, which might tarnish their credibility for some in the West. But opposition to divestment and other forms of economic sanctions also includes goodly numbers of South Africa's blacks, most notably Chief Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi. Buthelezi, dismissed by some in Europe and America as a de facto collaborator with the Pretoria government, is nevertheless the acknowledged leader of 6 million Zulus, South Africa's largest black tribe.

Buthelezi opposes apartheid and advocates negotiations leading to a new constitution, a multi-racial government and power sharing. He also

preaches non-violence and argues that divestment and other economic sanctions against South Africa "will compound the present misery of blacks."

To be sure, many other South African blacks — Archbishop Desmond Tutu, for example — support sanctions, condemn Buthelezi and bitterly resent the Reagan administration's resistance to imposing punitive measures against the South African economy.

But it is hardly clear that a majority, or even a plurality, of South African blacks support divestment and sanctions. A survey conducted last month by the respected polling organization MORI for the *Sunday Times* of London found that blacks themselves were divided deeply on sanctions. According to the poll, a majority of those blacks expressing an opinion opposed sanctions. Thirty-two percent were against divestment and other sanctions, 29 percent favored sanctions and 39 percent had no opinion.

The same poll found 45 percent of

South African whites either opposed to apartheid or disenchanted with it, and 56 percent favoring the release from prison of black nationalist leader Nelson Mandela. But, despite growing white opposition to apartheid, only 5 percent of South African whites favored sanctions, while 92 percent opposed them.

What many, and perhaps most, South Africans of all races could agree upon is the point made recently by Suzman. She lamented that the

Pretoria government was effectively nullifying the debate over sanctions by providing too little reformist ammunition for the opponents of sanctions. Suzman wants the Afrikaner government of President P. W. Botha to release Mandela, accelerate the dismantling of apartheid, provide blacks better housing and education, and grant political rights to the black majority.

"It may well be," she wrote, "that all such arguments (against sanc-

tions) fall on deaf ears, and that they are advanced in a lost cause. Nevertheless, they deserve to be made in the interest of millions of moderate South Africans of all races who abhor apartheid, who have long fought the abominable practices of race discrimination and who are striving for a peaceful transition to a nonracial democracy. For them, at least, it is surely not too much to ask that they be spared the violence and misery of a scorched-earth policy."

SORRY!  
ORIGINAL  
BLURRED  
Too.

15/02/86