

EMBARGOED UNTIL DELIVERED

FOURTH SESSION OF THE FOURTH KWAZULU

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

CONTINUATION OF THE CHIEF MINISTER'S
POLICY SPEECH

I am concerned about the extent to which even Black leadership seems to follow in the tracks of White supremacists who have all these past decades never bothered to consult Blacks about their wants and wishes. The Justice and Reconciliation Commission of the Catholic Church give a list of Black organisations which it states supports sanctions as follows: FOSATU, COSATU, the UDF, AZAPO, CUSA, AZACTU and the ANC.

As you have already seen we have already dealt with the SACC resolutions in June last year and the WCC/SACC Harare so-called Consultation. The question is - how are members of these organisations consulted on the issue of Disinvestment and sanctions, or is it sufficient for the elites who lead them to make decisions on behalf of the so-called 'masses', because they are so despised by the leadership of these organisations who make decisions on their behalf, because they can read the minds of the so-called 'masses'. I have never participated in any issue on behalf of the people without consulting them at the level of Conferences where their elected representatives are present. At another level I talk to Black people in their tens of thousands at rallies and put issues to them and they always make direct responses. I have done this several times. Let us take COSATU for example. COSATU's President, Mr Elijah Barayi, came out openly at their very launch at King Park Stadium in favour of sanctions and in favour of nationalising industries and rejected the free enterprise system. One wonders just when he could have conducted investigations from amongst the rank and file membership of affiliated Trade Unions of COSATU to get their mandate to state this. We in fact know, that this is why our own members of Inkatha came to Ulundi to ask us to assist them to found a Union which does not support sanctions against South Africa, which does not support the nationalisation of industries and which does not reject the free enterprise system. Mr Elijah Barayi stated openly at the inauguration that COSATU was to fill up the vacuum which was created by the banning of the African National Congress. SACTU, an affiliate of the ANC, was behind them in every way when they were launched as a Trade Union. They have been to both Harare and Lusaka to meet the leadership of ANC. And yet, at a meeting of Central Executive Committee of COSATU on the 14th of April, among their resolutions they had a resolution on the United Workers Union (UWUSA). They state that:

- '7. Inkatha acknowledges that it is planning a massive publicity campaign in support of UWUSA. If this is not political Unionism we are not sure what it is. However, it appears to be as politics more acceptable to the State and employers.

It would appear that COSATU does not involve itself or anyone in politics according to this accusation when, in fact, the external Mission of ANC for whom they are fronting, does all the international publicity and international diplomacy for them in most of their publications. The external Mission of ANC and SACTU have endorsed COSATU in several statements in most of their publications. Maybe I should read to you their entire resolution on UWUSA:

'COSATU wishes to state quite clearly that the formation of UWUSA is a considered and deliberate attempt by employers and Inkatha to divide and weaken the Trade Union movement in Natal. After decades of struggle by workers to build their Union, the formation of UWUSA should be absolutely condemned as a reactionary and tragic step.

COSATU believes that the formation of COSATU was carefully planned over a long period and that the COSATU branch was used as a pretext to set in action these plans. We make these accusations for the following reasons:

1. There is absolutely no evidence of Inkatha advising COSATU members on the issues they were unhappy with. The immediate response was to form a new Union.
2. The full machinery and the KwaZulu government, and it appears the South African government, has been thrown behind UWUSA. Members of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and other officials have addressed Union meetings - urging people to join UWUSA and attend the planned launch on May Day.
3. Inkatha representatives have addressed employer bodies attending COSATU and urging support for UWUSA.
4. Inkatha representatives have addressed employer bodies attending COSATU and urging support for UWUSA.
5. Committees in the townships are refusing COSATU use of venues and the police in certain areas have been harassing and detaining members of COSATU in areas such as Isithebe, Newcastle and Mandini.
6. The fact that Mr Conco, the Chief Whip of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and a senior official of Inkatha, could announce the aims and objects of UWUSA and its policies before the Union has even been formed, shows the regard this Union has for democracy and where the initiative for its formation comes from.

7. Inkatha acknowledges that it is planning the massive publicity campaign in support of UWUSA. If this is not political Unionism we are not sure what it is. However, it appears to be as politics more acceptable to the State and employers.

These events and actions convince us that UWUSA was formed not to pursue the cause of unionism, but to protect the interests of employers and capital in Natal and, more generally, in South Africa.

There you have it Sir, and Honourable members of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. It has been quite sometime now that Trade Unions which were initiated with the backing of SACTU in South Africa have always come out with condemnations of me and Inkatha. I recall Mr Speaker, that when SAAWU headed by Mr Sam Kikine was launched exactly what is happening now happened then. Mr Kikine, who had been a member of Inkatha suddenly turned against me as soon as he had received funding and publicity backing from SACTU, an affiliate of ANC. In interviews which he gave as the Executive officer of the newly founded SAAWU even to such international magazines as 'Newsweek', I was a butt of his attacks and denigration.

Then some elements in FOSATU also did the same. I remember that it was I who launched the FOSATU Northern Natal Region in Richards Bay. That happened because members of Inkatha in FOSATU insisted that I should launch FOSATU at Sikhawini. This they insisted on notwithstanding Mr Alex Urwin's objections. Mr Alex Urwin is still very much involved in COSATU now that FOSATU has been absorbed into COSATU.

They can do all sorts of co-operation and conniving with the external Mission of ANC, consult them even in broad daylight, and when it comes to me - I am not expected to have anything to do with Inkatha members who are members of Trade Unions. The media reports this judgementally in my case, and in the case of Inkatha, and yet there is not a murmur about the UDF supporting Trade Unions, or AZAPO supporting Trade Unions, or about the involvement of SACTU (an affiliate of ANC) in the Trade Union movement in South Africa.

We have made it clear that Inkatha as Inkatha is not running any Trade Union. But we have not the slightest qualms of conscience about assisting our members who were upset by Mr Barayi's statements at the launching of COSATU; it related to the programme COSATU would follow. They were also upset by attacks on me and Inkatha. There are members of Inkatha who are in the Executive of

COSATU who came to Ulundi to complain after the launch of COSATU. We felt duty-bound to assist our Inkatha members wherever possible. We are doing no more than that. We have no intention of usurping the duties of the Trade Union Movement in doing so. But we cannot allow Trade Unions either to usurp the specific functions of political organisations and movements. We believe that Trade Unions have specific functions which are their responsibility as much as political organisations have their own particular role to play.

Where Trade Unions try to masquerade as political organisations or fronts for political organisations, we feel that we have a duty to expose this. COSATU have received substantial funding from abroad. We do not get that kind of financial support from abroad. And yet COSATU has already made allegations that UWUSA is being financed by certain Trade Unions abroad and this is far from true. It is also a lot of balderdash to say that the government is throwing its weight behind UWUSA. We have helped our members who are involved in the founding of UWUSA. Mr Conco was all along not an official of UWUSA, but when UWUSA wanted him to help them then quite clearly he had to relinquish his membership of this Assembly and of the Inkatha Central Committee before he could be available to them on a permanent basis.

The meeting on the 1st of May at the King's Park Stadium was of great importance in showing whether, in fact, ordinary Black people do support the policy of sanctions and disinvestment; and whether they also support the destruction of South Africa's economy as COSATU is bent on doing on behalf of the external Mission of ANC and SACTU. The people had to say openly whether they do want a Socialist State or a Marxist State established in South Africa after the liberation of South Africa. I have always stressed that I respect the choices that many independent African States have made as far as systems of economy are concerned after their liberation. I respect the choice which Tanzania, Zambia, Angola or Mocambique have made after liberation. It is the prerogative of those countries to make a choice of an economic system which they think would best serve the interests of their particular countries and their peoples.

I do not think that as a political leader I have a right to impose on the people of South Africa an economic system which they have not chosen for themselves. I do not think that the Central Committee of Inkatha can determine such an issue for all of South Africa without the support of other Black organisations. I do not believe that any one organisation has a right to decide such an issue for all of South Africa. What we see here is an imposition

by the External Mission of ANC of an economic system which they have not put before millions of South Africans. Are they going to rule the same way as Pretoria, if and when they have seized power as they say they are going to do? These are questions which need direct answers from them, from COSATU, from the UDF and all the organisations that Archbishop Hurley singled out as 'progressive' and also which are listed in the paper of the Justice and Reconciliation Commission of the Catholic Church.

This is the time for all Christians in all various denominations to come out and say where they themselves stand. Have all Christians whose particular Churches are affiliated to the South African Council of Churches abdicated their right to make decisions on such issues to the SACC or the WCC or to the ANC or to the UDF, CUSA, AZAPO or AZACTU, from whom the South African Catholic Bishops' Conference had to take their cue when they had to decide this issue last week? I would like to know this, because I am villified by all these organisations because I have said whenever I have been abroad that it is not in the interests of the Black struggle, and of South Africa, to impose sanctions on South Africa or to disinvest. That is why I asked the people to free me from this burden on the 1st of May, so that I could also leave it to these organisations to decide the issue for Black South Africa. I have been villified when taking a stand against Disinvestment and Sanctions; that I do so on behalf of the South African government. I have always maintained, and rightly so, that this is a stand I take each time I do, on behalf of my Constituency and on behalf of millions of ordinary South Africans. It is for this reason that I wanted Black South Africans present on the 1st May at King's Park Stadium to say whether they do, in fact, support sanctions and the destruction of the economy of South Africa which COSATU is committed to. The destruction of the economy is part and parcel of the strategy of the African National Congress and the South African Communist Party, which they regard to be part and parcel of their strategy of violence.

I also respect May the 1st to the extent that I have already persuaded the KwaZulu Cabinet to bring in a Bill before this Assembly, to declare May the 1st as a holiday in KwaZulu, in honour of workers. I do not think we can wait for the South African government to decide the issue before we identify with workers by recognising the 1st of May as the Workers Holiday. The State cannot function without a good economy and the king-pins of that economy are workers.

The Communists and Socialist States and organisations which operate on their ideologies always want to give the impression that May 1

is their particular preserve. May 1st was first observed in Capitalist States and it was, in fact, on May 1, 1886 that American workers stopped work in support of a demand for an eight-hour day. So May 1st is far older than even the Red Revolution in Russia in 1917. European socialists campaigned for May 1 as a paid public holiday in 1890. So May 1st is a paid holiday in both Capitalist European countries, as well as in the Socialist States. During this century May 1 has come to be celebrated throughout the world in a variety of differing circumstances, and in some cases, as a protest day against repressive regimes and systems.

The first time May 1 was celebrated in South Africa was in 1904 by White workers. Then in the 1920's when such Black Trade Unions as the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union emerged Black workers also began to celebrate May Day. In the 1930's and 1940's both White and Black workers started getting together for May Day rallies and demonstrations. In 1931 thousands of unemployed Whites and Blacks marched on the Carlton Hotel and the Rand Club to demand work. In 1950, the South African Communist Party jointly with sections of the African National Congress, organised a May 1 stay-away as a protest against racism and repressive legislation in South Africa.

In the 1930's and 1940's some Unions such as the Garment Workers' Union under Solly Sachs - had managed to gain a paid holiday on May Day as part of their Industrial Council agreement. In 1961 the Government acted to bring this practice to an end.

Above everything, May Day is a day on which tribute is paid to those who produce the wealth of the country, that is the workers. They keep the nation fed, educated and sheltered. So it has become a day when working people normally voice their demands for an improvement of conditions in general, such as shorter hours of work, a living wage and so on and so forth. Workers throughout the World regard May Day as a day on which they express their solidarity, dedicate themselves to supporting each other. So it has become symbolically seen as a day of the deprived, and the exploited, in another sense, on which they challenge entrenched interests, privilege, and oppressive and unrepresentative regimes.

We decided here last year to observe this years May Day; and yet I have read in one newspaper report that it is claimed that it is the National Education Crisis Committee which has called for a May Day Stayaway. You will see in the resolutions of COSATU Central Executive Committee on the 14th April that they resolved to:

2.3 The Rights of Students

To support fully the demands by students to form democratic SRC's and build an alternative system of the peoples education now.

This is one of the issues that was discussed during a predominantly Indian and Coloured National Education Crisis Conference in Chatsworth at the controversial conference in which Black parents from KwaZulu and the Natal Region were not represented or invited. We live in a society where good ideas are high-jacked and used to promote political projects of certain political factions in the interests of promoting themselves to political eminence.

I would like, in concluding my policy speech, to refer briefly to the point where I think we are at present in a political struggle for liberation. I have already dealt with the various delegations that have been going up to Lusaka to see our brothers in the external Mission of ANC. I have stated before that I was the first person to deal with Mr Tambo and members of his Executive in the sixties, culminating in our meeting lasting two and a half days in London in 1979. Basically, I have no problem in talking with them or to any other organisation for that matter. But since the Businessman's delegation went up to see Mr Oliver Tambo and members of the External Mission of ANC at Mfuwe on the 13th September 1985, there has been several orchestrated visits to Lusaka. Basically, let me repeat that there is nothing wrong with these visits. But, there is a false euphoria which they are meant to create about the external Mission of ANC. So there is a dimension of them which can be perceived as no more than just sheer politicising and propagandizing. The question we face is what do our brothers in the External Mission of ANC want? Do we know or don't we know?

This is the issue with which I want to round off my policy speech. The External Mission of ANC opted for the armed struggle more than 20 years ago. But of course their own views have come to most South Africans vaguely as second and third hand information. There is, of course, excerpts from their broadcasts through Radio Freedom in Addis Ababa, Dar es Salaam and Lusaka. The last Freedom Station Broadcasts in particular, are easily heard in South Africa. Perhaps more clearly in the past than now, as I suspect because the State tries to block them as a security measure. But last year, Mr Tony Heard, the Editor of 'The Cape Times', published a comprehensive interview with Mr Oliver Tambo, which reads as follows:

A CONVERSATION WITH OLIVER TAMBO OF THE ANC

Question: The ANC is officially portrayed in South Africa as a communist, terrorist-type organization, almost presented to the public as demons. Now, since the public have no access to your views, how would you answer this, particularly the charge of being a communist-controlled organization?

It is important to observe that this has been a persistent portrayal of the ANC by many people who are opposed to us. But the ANC is as ANC as it ever was. It is true that the ANC has members of the Communist Party who are members of the ANC. That has been the case almost since time immemorial. The ANC was established in 1912 and the SA Communist Party in 1921, and so there has been an overlapping of membership all along the line. But ANC members who are also members of the SACP make a very clear distinction between these two independent bodies. We co-operate a lot but the ANC is accepted by the SACP as leading the struggle. There is absolute loyalty to that position. It is often suggested that the ANC is controlled by the Communist Party ... by communists. Well, I have been long enough in the ANC to know that that has never been true.

The Communist Party has its positions and the ANC has its positions. The ANC is guided in its policy and all its members are loyal to the Freedom Charter, and that is where you find all the positions of the ANC. They are reflected in the Freedom Charter. We don't depart from the Freedom Charter. So, there is no problem of the ANC being controlled. Now this is also extended to control by the Soviet Union; much of this is propaganda. We go to the Soviet Union as we go to Sweden and to Holland and to Italy to ask for assistance in one form or another. And in all these countries we do get assistance, and assistance is given quite unconditionally. The Western countries, who do support us and we very much appreciate the assistance they give us, do not give us weapons of course, because they generally do not approve and their laws do not allow it. But in the socialist countries we get the weapons, so we go there to get what we can't get elsewhere. And that's all there is in it.

Question: Are you getting more support from the West now?

We are getting a great deal of support from the West, increasing support, in material terms, too; that support is growing.

Question: So the charge that you are a communist organization, you would reject strongly?

We would reject that. We would say that there is a communist

party. So we are fortunate because if one is looking for a communist party it is there but the ANC is not the Communist Party.

Now the other aspect of being terrorists: Again there is a lot of exaggeration about this terrorism. Long before we had injured a soul, when we were very, very careful in our sabotage actions to avoid hurting anybody, and that is what we have been doing for the better part of 20 years now ... even when we started, this was called terrorism. We knew what terrorism was and we thought that the people of South Africa are being misled about what terrorism was. We could have been terrorists if we had wanted to, but we chose not to be. So even that has been an exaggeration. It is true that more recently, as for instance in May 1983 when a bomb exploded and others were attempted, this was stepping up things. It is proper to recognize that this was after 20 years at it. We started in 1961 and 20 years later you get a bomb exploding. We could have done this much, much earlier on numerous occasions. We did not want to be seen as terrorist; we are trying to put on pressure. And we have been notoriously restrained in our armed actions - notorious.

Question: What future do you see for whites in the future South Africa?

The ANC, and all of us in the ANC, have always considered and accepted that whites like ourselves belong to our country. They are compatriots, fellow-citizens. We took the earliest opportunity to dispel the notion that we were fighting to drive the whites out to somewhere and we made it clear that they belong to South Africa. They had their role to play as we would like to think we had a role to play although we are excluded. And so this has been basic. We have asked whites to join us in the struggle to get rid of the tensions that come with the apartheid system. We have hoped that we could together build the future non-racial South Africa, and by non-racial we really do mean mon-racial. We mean a society in which each one feels he or she belongs together with everybody else, where the fact of race and colour is of no consequence, where people serve according to their abilities and their skills, where we together work to unite our people, and we have adopted policies which discouraged the polarization of our people either into ethnic groups or into white versus black.

Question: And do you distinguish between any particular white group?

No, no. Our charter says that South Africa belongs to all who live in it and we say that people who have chosen SA as their home are

party. So we are fortunate because if one is looking for a communist party it is there but the ANC is not the Communist Party.

Now the other aspect of being terrorists: Again there is a lot of exaggeration about this terrorism. Long before we had injured a soul, when we were very, very careful in our sabotage actions to avoid hurting anybody, and that is what we have been doing for the better part of 20 years now ... even when we started, this was called terrorism. We knew what terrorism was and we thought that the people of South Africa are being misled about what terrorism was. We could have been terrorists if we had wanted to, but we chose not to be. So even that has been an exaggeration. It is true that more recently, as for instance in May 1983 when a bomb exploded and others were attempted, this was stepping up things. It is proper to recognize that this was after 20 years at it. We started in 1961 and 20 years later you get a bomb exploding. We could have done this much, much earlier on numerous occasions. We did not want to be seen as terrorist; we are trying to put on pressure. And we have been notoriously restrained in our armed actions - notorious.

Question: What future do you see for whites in the future South Africa?

The ANC, and all of us in the ANC, have always considered and accepted that whites like ourselves belong to our country. They are compatriots, fellow-citizens. We took the earliest opportunity to dispel the notion that we were fighting to drive the whites out to somewhere and we made it clear that they belong to South Africa. They had their role to play as we would like to think we had a role to play although we are excluded. And so this has been basic. We have asked whites to join us in the struggle to get rid of the tensions that come with the apartheid system. We have hoped that we could together build the future non-racial South Africa, and by non-racial we really do mean mon-racial. We mean a society in which each one feels he or she belongs together with everybody else, where the fact of race and colour is of no consequence, where people serve according to their abilities and their skills, where we together work to unite our people, and we have adopted policies which discouraged the polarization of our people either into ethnic groups or into white versus black.

Question: And do you distinguish between any particular white group?

No, no. Our charter says that South Africa belongs to all who live in it and we say that people who have chosen SA as their home are

welcome there. There is plenty of room for them, and we should accept them as South Africans and they in turn should accept us as South Africans. This is the kind of society that we are hoping will emerge.

Question: Is there any reassurance or assurance that you could give whites about their physical safety, their jobs and their home security under an ANC-led government? How would you address the question of their insecurity, which is manifest at the moment?

What we would hope our white compatriots will learn to understand is that we don't really see them as whites in the first instance. We see them as fellow South Africans in the first instance. They are as good as black. In fact, let us say, they are Africans. We see them as Africans. We are all born there in that country, or most of us are. We live on this continent. It is our country. Let's move away from these distinctions of Europeans and non-Europeans, whites and non-whites.

Question: So, it is security for all, as it were?

It is. It is security for all, and it would be in the interests of all of us that everybody feels secure. Everyone's property is secure; everyone's home is secure. The culture is secure. We believe our cultures will begin to merge. We have got a rich variety which, when it comes together, is really going to be something we can put out to the world. So all this would be respected. There would be room for it all. But the main thing is, and the sooner we begin to grapple with this problem the better, not to proceed on the basis that the Africans are going to do something to the non-Africans, but to begin on the basis that we all belong to that country. Let us not look at one another's colour. Let us not address that. Let us see one another merely as fellow-citizens.

Question: How do you view the business leaders, the PFP, the domineers who have been seeking talks with the ANC? How do you feel about this?

We feel very good indeed because, you see, in the fifties when we were a legal organization we were getting across very effectively to the white community.

The ANC was getting accepted and its objectives were getting generally accepted among the whites. We were uniting the country where apartheid separated it. Now this is because we had access.

I recall Chief Albert Lutuli (the late ANC leader) going to Cape Town ... And do you remember the effect he had, the impact he made. Well, when he came back to Johannesburg from that trip, there were thousands of white people at Park Station; thousands who came to meet him as a result of the impact he had made. So this is the kind of situation that had developed. Then we got banned and this contact was broken. And now the white community has been brought up to regard the ANC as something very, very dangerous. The one effect of this visit by the business people has been to open the lines of communication because I am sure they saw us as something very different from the way we had been projected all the time, and I think they said as much.

Question: Are you keeping in touch?

We do keep in touch. And then we next looked forward to the visit of the young people. We thought what a good thing that they should get together and begin to look at their future together. This was a very good thing. And the contribution is not one-sided. It is not as if we are giving or receiving all the time. I think we are enriching one another with views about what should be done with our situation. We had hoped to see the minister of religion who wanted to come. We thought that was another opportunity. Then of course the PFP came along and we had very good exchanges with them. All this is much-needed communication, especially at this time because at some point we have got to agree on what to do about our own future.

Question: Could you briefly set out your economic theory, particularly on questions like nationalization and wealth redistribution?

I don't know if I would call it a theory. It appears in our charter and all we do is to interpret what the charter says. We have not attempted to depart from that in any way. We start with what the charter says and broadly the interpretation is that the state would control some of the industries, solely with a view to ensuring an equitable distribution of the wealth that we have and I think that this was at the back of the minds of the people who drew up the charter, as it was more than the ANC. We said our country is very wealthy, our country is poverty-stricken as far as the blacks are concerned, and by blacks I mean coloureds and everybody else. They are very poor. Even the whites are not really wealthy but the wealth is contained in the hands of a few. And we look at the country: 13 percent overcrowded by millions of landless people who are starving and dying.

What do you do about this? Where do you get the land from to give them? You have got to address that question. You have got to say how to end this poverty, how do we handle the wealth we produce in such a way that we can relieve some of these problems. The solution we saw was one of nationalization, and, of course, when we meet the business people they say that nationalization will destroy the South African economy.

Question: Do they accept some measure of redistribution?

They seemed to. Yes they do. They accept some measure of redistribution. It is the method, the mechanism, how to achieve it - this is of course where we did not agree and could not agree. But they accepted, they understood, what we were trying to get at: That you cannot have a new South Africa which does not address this problem.

Question: What about private property; how far would nationalization extend, as you see it?

It would be a mixed economy. And certainly nationalization would take into account the situation as we find it at the time - the realities of the situation in which we find ourselves. But there would be private ownership, there would be levels of private enterprise and it would all be geared to the situation that obtains at the time. Also, we don't envisage fighting in the streets over it. We think that we will have to approach this from the point of view of what the people want. If the people want one form of distribution above another, well, it must be like that.

Question: There would be a debate about the level of nationalization?

Yes, there would be a debate. What sort of environment could that debate take place in? Would you see free media, free expression, freedom of newspapers?

Absolutely.

Question: What about violence? In what circumstances would you as leader of the ANC be prepared to renounce violence and start talks? What are the circumstances that can bring that about because I think that's what, frankly, everyone wants, on all sides; in other words, the violence, on all sides, to stop. I am sure that no one wants it to go on forever.

No, not even we. This question of violence worries many people. The unfortunate thing is that people tend to be worried about the violence that comes from the oppressed. And so the tendency is to want to know, as you want to know, on what terms would we end violence. Really, there would be no violence at all if we did not have the violence of the apartheid system. And even if there was, and there has been for two decades, it's been restrained. But if you look at what comes from the other side, during those two decades there has been massive violence. So we then have to say to ourselves: Of course we can stop our struggle, we can stop even our violent actions, but on that basis what would be the reason for that? And in return for what?

Question: Is there a possibility of a truce?

There is always a possibility of a truce. We see the possibility of a truce. It would be very, very easy, if, for example, we started negotiations. We have said that negotiations can start, serious negotiations ...

Question: With the government?

Yes, with the government, when they are ready because at the moment we think they are not ready. And we have said to them that if you wanted negotiations, we would not go into that without Nelson Mandela and the other political leaders and the political prisoners. Now, a serious indication of readiness for negotiations would be the release of all these leaders, because they have got to be part of the process of preparation for serious negotiations which will not just be talks for the sake of talking. It is quite conceivable that in that situation of preparing for negotiations and looking at necessary conditions and so on, this question could arise. But we have had a problem about just saying we are now suspending our struggle, which is what it would mean...

Question: On one side, as it were?

On one side, without any indication on the other side of their willingness to do anything about what every one of us knows is their violence. We have said: Lift the state of emergency, pull out the troops from the townships, and the police. And release the political prisoners. We have even said unban the ANC. Do all these things to create a climate.

Question: Which you would welcome?

We would welcome a climate of that kind, and if the rest of the

leaders were there I think it would be time to get together and put the question: Can we really do anything about this? Everybody would then be there. But we are getting this persistent refusal on the part of Botha either to release Nelson Mandela and the other political prisoners, and we say: What are you going to do with treason trials ... it is simply a form of repression. Who are you going to negotiate with, if you want to negotiate. If he withdrew the treason trials and did all these things by way of lifting the pressures that rest on us, we would begin to see that the other side are ready to talk.

But we have argued that it is not necessary for hostilities to cease before negotiations start ... Before the Nkomati accord, there were lengthy negotiations between the South Africans and others before there was any signing of an agreement. The agreement that was signed in Lusaka between the South Africans and the Angolans was preceded by a series of meetings and negotiations.

Question: Is anything going on at the moment .. i.e. talks about talks between the ANC and the South African government?

No, nothing at all. Which is why we think that they are not ready to have any talks. They are not even ready for other people to talk to us. We are South Africans. If we meet we can only talk about our country. We are not going to fight about it. We talk about it, and they don't like this. But I think what they do not like is that in meeting we get to understand each other better. and we, the ANC, certainly benefit from these talks, and we would think that those we talk to also benefit. So this is moving in the direction of resolving our problems, but they are not prepared for that.

Question: Violence against people, civilians. What is the ANC's attitude on this, bearing in mind the fact that down the years the ANC has in my opinion held back to a great extent on what one might call indiscriminate violence or going for soft targets?

I am glad you have put it that way, because it is often forgotten that we have been at the receiving end all the time, and we have held back. And it is not conceivable that we could go on like that indefinitely without anything changing. But one must see in this holding back the reluctance of the ANC on questions of violence. But when once, of course, we have decided we have got to fight then we must fight.

Question; What about soft targets?

The question of soft targets has been exaggerated out of all proportion. As I have once had occasion to observe, when the police go into a township and shoot, when they did on the 21st March, repeating Sharpeville, they were hitting soft targets, and this whole year has been a year of shootings of, really, soft targets. So people are being killed. It has never been quite like this. But they are being shot and even children are being killed and yet the ANC is going no further than saying that we have got to intensify our struggle if we are in a struggle. If we stop, we stop. But if we are in a struggle and we feel the demand of the situation is that we struggle, then we must intensify that struggle. We have held back for too long. Now, if we do intensify we are not going to be choosing carefully to avoid hurting anybody, but we will move into military personnel, police and so on.

Question: But you won't go for civilians as such?

No, we will not go for civilians as such. We think that civilians will be hit as they are hit always. They were hit in Zimbabwe ...

Question: In a crossfire situation?

A crossfire situation, in any way situation.

Question: But not cinemas, and supermarkets and ...?

We will not go into cinemas and bars and places like that. We won't do that. But we will certainly be looking for military personnel, police and so on.

Question: Why will you hold back, because often in a guerilla war the limits do get more and more extended? Is it a moral feeling about killing civilians, or what?

Because we are not fighting against people, we are fighting against a system, and we can't kill people. Why? Why would we kill them? We cannot even kill whites because we are not fighting whites at all. We are fighting a system.

Question: On foreign policy, do you see SA as a pro-Western, non-aligned, or as a Soviet-socialist-leaning country? For instance, in the sale of minerals and raw materials - would these be denied to anyone? What about Commonwealth membership? Where do you see South Africa standing in the world?

First of all, non-aligned in terms of East-West, developing trade with all the countries of the world, strengthening trade links, so maintaining the lines of trade for mutual benefit.

Question: So the Americans can be sure of getting their needs?

The Americans will be sure to get it, if they are willing to pay for it. We would want to trade with all the countries of the world, in the interests of our own economy.

We would come back to the Commonwealth because the basis for the exclusion of South Africa would have gone. And we will establish very peaceful relations with countries. We will work very closely with the rest of the African continent, and certainly with the countries of Southern Africa. We would become members of SADDCC or it might be called another name by then, and we could build together a small common market of our own. South Africa would therefore be admitted into this wider economic grouping that we have in Southern Africa. And we would be a very influential country in the world.

Question: Do you feel this would unleash resources that we have not been able to unleash?

I am certain I think the economy itself would be stimulated by the energies that would be unleashed, and the prospects of peace and stability. We think the country would be transformed, politically and socially and economically.

Question: I presume you favour sanctions. Do you to the point where people lose jobs and the economy suffers seriously?

We think the economy must be put into difficulties because the economy strengthens the regime. It enables them to do all the things that they want to do. This question of losing jobs, for the victims of apartheid it is nothing. To be a victim of apartheid means to be many, many things above losing a job which you are losing all the time anyway. And the way we look at it is: The more effective the sanctions are, the less the scope and scale of conflict.

Question: If there was a new grouping in SA white politics, with liberal Afrikaners who were formerly Nationalists and Progressive Federal Party people like Slabbert forming a new bloc, would you be

prepared to deal with them and on what basis?

We have met Van Zyl Slabbert and we hope to meet various leaders of organizations. An organization that is opposed to the apartheid system we regard as on our side. I don't think that we would refuse contact with such an organization because we would see it moving in the direction that we are. We do of course encourage our white countrymen to mobilize and make their contribution to changing the apartheid system and on that basis we ought to be able to find a modus operandi with them.

Question: You strike me as a somewhat reluctant revolutionary. With what measure of enthusiasm did you turn to accept that there had to be violence? How did you yourself personally respond to this?

I suppose I was angry and frustrated, like we all were, and I continued to be angry and frustrated, to feel that this system must be fought. But I was a full supporter of the policy of non-violence because we thought it would bring us the fulfilment of our objective. When that failed then we had to look for an alternative. We found the alternative in combining political and armed actions and it is one of those things that you have to do as there is no alternative. I don't think I am peculiar in this respect. I think that many people in the ANC would be glad if there was no need for violence, but the need is there, and we have got to go ahead with it, bitter as it is.

It is painful to see anybody being killed, to see children being killed, no matter who kills them. The death of children is a painful thing and you do have to say what brought us to this situation where these things are happening. We naturally feel that it is the system that has made it impossible for us to avoid what we strove to avoid with such resolve when we were first confronted with this violence. But as individuals, and certainly as an individual, I don't like violence.

Question: You are enjoying great attention in London. To what do you ascribe this?

I think generally in many parts of the world there is a lot of interest in what is happening in SA, and people are discussing it. And when a member of the ANC in my position is around, many people want to try and understand where we go from here. What is more, the discussion now revolves around the question of what sort of South Africa. In the past there was just denunciation of apartheid and so on, but a new interest has emerged, an interest in what

takes the place of what we are seeing now and how do we move from the present to something different. This represents real movement forward for us. We have reached the point where people are expecting change and are beginning to reflect what that change involves and this has been part of interest. People want to know, when apartheid goes (because they are sure apartheid is going), what takes its place.

Question: To what extent is the current internal unrest in South Africa orchestrated by the ANC and to what extent is it spontaneous?

Both words are not very applicable. There is a great deal of spontaneity in the sense that when you shoot at people they are angered and want to do something in retaliation. You would not say that the ANC is orchestrating all these responses. They are almost natural. So there is an element of spontaneity. But I would not use the word orchestrated. I would say that the ANC has called on our people, and in some cases they are very disciplined about it, in others there are excesses; the ANC has said let us destroy these structures of separation and apartheid. That is where it starts. Now in this process other factors come in. The authorities come in and shoot and the people respond ... and you have a situation of escalation which can tend to conceal the true nature of the conflict as being the people resisting the implementation of the apartheid system and preventing it from working. This is the essence.

Then in January this year, Mr Tambo, as President of the External Mission of ANC, had a press conference in which he laid bare detailed plans of the ANC for the intensification of violence in 1986. 'The Natal Mercury' of the 10th January, 1986 reported this as follows:

'WE'LL GO FOR WHITE AREAS SAYS TAMBO'

LUSAKA - The President of the African National Congress Oliver Tambo, yesterday details its plans to intensify a campaign of violence into a full-scale 'people's war'.

The campaign included plans to widen the conflict beyond the borders of the townships into white areas, to continue the attacks on white farming communities and to enlist the support of various groups within South Africa.

Throughout a Press Conference lasting nearly two hours, Mr Tambo reaffirmed and elaborated the contents of a bellicose 18 page statement issued by the ANC and broadcast by Mr Tambo himself on Wednesday night.

He gave no sign of a softening of the ANC's position and no indication that he regarded negotiations with South Africa as more of a theoretical possibility.

Civilians, Mr Tambo said bluntly, would be caught in the crossfire as the ANC stepped up its attacks and although the ANC itself would not deliberately attack such 'soft targets' as schools, supermarkets and shopping centres, he did not rule out the possibility that over-zealous cadres would do so.

Mr Tambo suggested but did not actually say that this was the explanation for the Amanzimtoti bomb attack just before Christmas. He burst out laughing when a questioner suggested that the unit responsible for the attack should be disciplined for exceeding ANC policy.

The Press Conference was held before 150 people, many of them members of the diplomatic Corps, at the United Nations' Namibia Institute here. Foreign journalists, including South Africans, had been cleared without fuss or formality through Zambian immigration provided their names were on a list compiled by the ANC.

Their bags were closely searched as they entered the building, but they were not subjected to body searches. There were no arms or uniformed men in evidence. Mr Tambo, flanked by ANC leaders and watched closely by security guards, sat before rows of bookshelves that contained among other things, 45 volumes of the complete works of Lenin. However, the occasion was free of any show of left-wing or revolutionary symbols.

The ANC leaders, neatly dressed in business suits and ties, resembled members of a Western business convention more than revolutionaries intent on launching and pursuing a fullscale war. Mr Tambo's comments, though delivered in a slow, schoolmasterish tone and phrased with care, confirmed in detail the uncompromising stand taken when the banned organisation met at Kabwe in Zambia for an historic policy-making session last June.

Permission to quote him was granted last night by the Minister of Law and Order, Mr Louis le Grange. At Kabwe, the ANC leaders had determined to concentrate their sources on the 'front line' - inside South Africa itself - and to attack military and strategic targets without regard to the risk towards civilians.

ESCALATING WARFARE

Closely questioned on this point yesterday, Mr Tambo predicted increasing civilian casualties, saying they were unavoidable in a situation of escalating warfare.

At one stage as foreign journalists tried to determine the implications of the policy, he burst out: 'I don't see why I need to be cross-questioned like this.' On Mr Tambo's left sat the rising young star Thabo Mbeki, son of Govan Mbeki, who has shared prison with Nelson Mandela for more than 20 years, and the veteran Secretary-General, Alfred Nzo.

On his right were long-time leaders Thomas Nkobi and Dan Tloome and in the watching crowd was the young Palo Jordan, a close associate of the assassinated Communist, Ruth First. All these men and a large section of the spectators applauded talk of increasing violence and wider warfare. They joined Mr Tambo in laughing at the man who suggested disciplining cadres that deliberately attacked soft targets.

Similarly, Mr Tambo gave scant respect to a suggestion that farmers and their families - like the victims of the recent landmines laid on the borders of the Transvaal - should be regarded as non-combatants. On the contrary, he said, the farming community as a whole was a prime target for attack because it had been drawn into the South African security system.

Nor did negotiation receive serious attention. Negotiations, Mr Tambo emphasised, need not await the cessation of violence. They could begin whenever the South African government chose. His comments left a firm impression that the gap between the ANC and the South African Government is simply too wide to be bridgeable.

Mr Bothas's minimum demand that the ANC forswear violence before negotiations begin is clearly unacceptable to the ANC leadership, old and young. At the same time, the ANC's first and minimum condition for talks to begin, is the release of Mandela, Mbeki and others. Further conditions, Mr Tambo pointed out, would in any event follow even if the first condition were met.

This hardline stance rests upon a perception of Nationalist policy as being bankrupt. The ANC view the South African Government as able only to react to events not to direct them.

REFORM PROGRAMME

As a result the ANC leadership clearly believes it has the initiative and it is trying to step up the pressure. Mr Tambo explained that it was the aim of the ANC not only to step up its own attack, in keeping with the Kabwe decision to send all resources to the front line, but also to organise support by so-called 'mass units' - military groups of varying size drawn from the local populace.

Apparently anxious that President Botha's reform programme will co-opt potential ANC allies, the ANC loses no opportunity to attack or denigrate any attempt by the Government to reform apartheid. Repeating (apparently deliberately) the words of the Leader of the Opposition in the Assembly, Dr F. van Zyl Slabbert, Mr Tambo said apartheid could not be reformed, only abolished.

Indeed Mr Tambo took credit for destroying the Community Council system by insisting that all Councillors resign. Inevitably, he conceded, some of those who did not resign were killed.

Now the ANC hopes to take the matter further by establishing its own 'democratic councils' for each community, elected on the basis of one man, one vote without regard to race. Mr Tambo spoke warmly, both in the broadcast statement and at his press conference, of those people, including Whites, who opposed apartheid even if they did not support the ANC.

MIXED ECONOMY

His most conciliatory comments appeared to be directed to these