

Âç

negotiations. When I finally go to a South African negotiating table, I must know that I stand in the company of all who want to be there. Mr. Spgaker, negotiations in South Africa will not be Lancaster House-type negotiations. They will not be negotiations between the victor and the vanquished. They will be negotiations which will endure for some considerable time, and they will be negotiations in which step by step we move away from violent solutions to democratic solutions. If I go to the negotiating table I know that it will be in circumstances which demand the kind of internal shuttle diplomacy between the negotiators and the people. Negotiations will be about such important things and be so very vital for the very survival of South Africa that I demand to know beforehand that every Black leader is free to oppose me who wants to oppose me, and every Black leader who wants to join me is free to join me. This can only happen if the Government unshackles Black democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I elaborate on the point I make about the politics of negotiation by saying that in our South African circumstances negotiations will be an ongoing political process for quite some time. We will have to deal with racism; we will have to deal with prejudice; we will- have to deal with fears unfounded and well-founded and we will have to deal with the very real need that there is to make negotiations a healing process which draws our polarised society together. The more violence and counter-violence there is in our country, the more sure-footed and steady we will have to tread along the path of negotiations. I know what it is like to be

a leader in the midst of violence. I know that the source of violence is a Black anger stimulated by deeply-felt deprivation. As a Black leader, I have to campaign amongst very angry

constituents. Negotiations will not produce a magic over-night solution for South Africa. By the very nature of the South African problem, negotiations will have to be a process, not a final sitting around the table to sign papers. This process will have to work from the top downwards and from the bottom up. I think the international community errs most grievously when it thinks in terms of a final Lancaster House-type negotiation in South Africa. To set deadlines about the final outcome of negotiations is dangerous. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the international community must know that a negotiated settlement which leaves a solid body of hard right-wing South African political opinion to act as a vagrant force in our politics, just as now a hard left-wing Black political opinion acts as a vagrant force as we seek a democratic solution to South Africa's problems, will fail. Mr. Speaker, just imagine how many White trained saboteurs there are in South Africa. Just imagine the facility of the movement of these saboteurs across the length and breadth of the land. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what kind of a hob-nailed and brutal Black one-Party State which would have to develop to Â«curb the activities of White right-wing saboteurs. Unless negotiations result in reconciliation, they will fail. Unless negotiations lay the foundations for a national effort to make that which is negotiated work, they will fail. We are a wounded society, a torn, a polarised society, and it is only the healing hand of continuing negotiations which can succeed. I do not approach the question of negotiations intending to introduce the all-or-nothing principle.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, when an enemy is suing for peace, negotiations of a kind take place in which the peace settlement is finalised. The ANC Mission in Exile is referring to these kind of negotiations when it says that the only thing to negotiate about is the handing over of power to the people. This is vicious propaganda, Mr. Speaker. It is the propaganda which says only they can negotiate about the handing over of power to the

people. It is vicious propaganda because it is attached to the rider that they will not cease violent hostilities until the South African Government is suing for peace. It is vicious propaganda

because its wording and its use makes anybody who is not involved with them in the armed struggle a traitor who is working against the handing over of power to the people. When I talk about negotiations, as I say, I do not introduce the all-or-nothing principle. When I talk about negotiations I am talking about the handing over of power to the people - all the people, Blacks, Whites, Indians and Coloureds. The difference, Mr. Speaker, between my use of the word negotiation and the ANC Mission in Exile use of the word negotiation is inherent in the fact that accepted right throughout the democratic world, there are many forms of democracy.

The ANC Mission in Exile makes one form of democracy mandatory for everyone in South Africa and that is why they have got to defer negotiations until the South African Government is suing for peace. They want to negotiate with a destroyed enemy. I want to negotiate to make the enemy a friend. I want to negotiate so that we can have the sharing in this country which we have never had before. I want to negotiate to enable White South Africans to play their rightful role as Africans in Africa. However much I cherish the one-man-one-vote system of government in a unitary state, I cannot allow this ideal form of democracy to dictate that America is not a democracy; that Germany is not a democracy and that there can be no democracy in a federal system. I cannot allow my own preference for a one-man-one-vote system of government in a unitary state to dictate to me that the Swiss canton system is undemocratic. Real negotiations can only be about the handing over of power to the people but the substance of negotiations must be about the form of people's power which is acceptable to all South Africans.

The people of South Africa be they White, Black, Indian or Coloured, must end up being willing to be governed the way they are governed. Mr. Speaker, for me the politics of negotiation is a road to that end. It is pure Black racism to say that White South Africans cannot change and that they must be destroyed and that negotiations cannot begin until you are negotiating with somebody who is maimed and crippled. When I speak about negotiations I speak about a forum from which Blacks, Indians, Coloureds and Whites will depart walking tall in their new-found South Africanism. Mr. Speaker, I really do not have day-dreams and pretensions about becoming South Africa's first Black President but, Mr. Speaker, let me say this. In the unlikely event of history ever thrusting that role on me, I would never want to rule over a broken people. However, I stress again that I have no such ambitions. I am prepared to serve under anyone - White, Indian,

Coloured or Black, if he is elected by all the people democratically to such a position. All I am saying is alternatively if I am hypothetically speaking elected by all the people, the others who have ambitions to be the Head of State in South Africa must also be prepared to serve under me, if they are democrats, just as I am prepared to serve under them if they are the people's choice. I reiterate that I say so without having any ambitions in this direction. There have been many distortions about me on this issue and I feel that I must deal with it in this policy speech to stand for all time so that there should be no misunderstanding about it.

Another aspect Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, about the politics of negotiation which I must mention at this time are the fine distinctions which need to be drawn between the redundancy or the danger of a list of non-negotiables in which Party political or race advantages are embedded, and a list of non-negotiables which will defeat the very thing we are negotiating about. If we are negotiating about the establishment of a democracy in South Africa, then it is self-defeating to bring to the negotiating table non-negotiables which will destroy democracy. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is precisely what the South African Government is intent upon doing.

The State President and his Cabinet colleagues repeatedly express their views that we need to discover our own brand of democracy which suits our peculiar South African circumstances. It is true we must discover democracy at work here in this country. But Mr, Speaker, Honourable Members, we here in this country cannot re-invent democracy and we here in this country must now really understand that any democratic solution we seek must be a democratic solution which will gain the full recognition of all our friends and allies in the outside world. I say very bluntly, Mr. Speaker, that any so-called democracy which rests on the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act which make racial divisions the cornerstone of the constitution, will be rejected by Black South Africa and the whole world. There is no constitutional way of sanctifying racism. It is a hideous principle and cannot be accommodated in a democratic constitution. It is a contradiction in terms to say one is negotiating for democracy by attempting to negotiate for the acceptance of racial divisions in our constitution. We can entrench language rights in a constitution: we can even entrench group rights in a constitution if necessary: we can have a bill of rights which protect both individuals and minorities; we can have some kind of federal system in which the geographic units are more dominantly one race group in one region and more dominantly another race group in another region. But: of all the people in the world, we know with deep and great certainty that you cannot have equality before the law; equality before the constitution and equality of opportunity, if political power is determined racially.

I know of no real democracy anywhere in the world where the principle of universal adult suffrage is not fundamental to the constitution. I say again we cannot rediscover democracy and it is

time for White South Africans to recognise that all the experience of man across centuries of history, has never created a democracy based on racism, and have never created a democracy in which there is not universal adult suffrage. Why should White South Africans, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, object to me wanting to normalise our country as a modern, Western-type industrial democracy. White South Africans who are ultimately too afraid to live under the kind of democratic principles which are universal in Western industrial society, are too afraid to live, period. They will then die in the pursuit of a constitutional pot of gold at the end of the political rainbow. White South Africans must come to terms with political reality.

When I speak of the politics of negotiation, I speak within the context of what I have been saying today. Mr. Speaker, I again emphasise negotiations in this country must be negotiations about the normalising of South Africa. Whites and Blacks must accept that in our circumstances, poverty as the arch enemy of democracy, must be fought and this implies the necessity of the free enterprise system. And Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, there is no viable free enterprise system in a modern industrial State anywhere in the world where there is not also freedom of conscience, freedom of political association, freedom of movement and the sanctity of the law. In every State where there are these things there is universal adult franchise.

We have to conduct our business in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly this year with the full knowledge of what is at stake. We need to have total solidarity amongst ourselves. We have always been committed in this House to the politics of negotiation and to the achievement of radical change through non-violent means, and it would be as well for White South Africa to take note of what we in this House say about the politics of negotiation.

I return, Mr. Speaker, to the ferment in the National Party which is spinning off the Dr. Worralls, the Dr. Lategans and the Mr. Wynand Malans of this world. We are witnessing more than the isolated action of individuals. We are witnessing a re-grouping within the National Party and the views being expressed by these three candidates for the forthcoming general election, are views held by many in the National Party itself who have not resigned for one or another reason. As a Black political leader, I cannot say that I support everything these National Party rebels support. All I am indicating is that they are a sign of hope. I would like Members to hear in some detail what prominent Afrikaners who were highly placed in the National Party and who have always been deeply respected by the National Party, are now beginning to say. The statement by 28 prominent Stellenbosch academics perhaps sums up attitudes emerging in the National Party which are challenging it. In a published statement these 28 intellectuals from the very citadel of the Afrikaner heritage, which Stellenbosch has always been, say that: "The stagnation of the reform process since May 1986 has increased our concern." They say that they had worked behind the scenes to make submissions to and had meetings with prominent Government leaders, including the State President and

continue by saying: "According to our judgment this modus operandi proved to be unsuccessful. We cannot refrain from issuing a public statement any longer." They bear out my remark that the National Party is lacking in internal democracy. They say that: "We understand that a new dispensation cannot become a reality overnight, and that stability has to be maintained during the transitional period. However, the Government has an inalienable responsibility to create hope for the future for all South African citizens." And they then call on the Government to issue a "clear and unambiguous declaration of intent on two issues." The first, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, is a clear statement of the Government's intention to abolish all residues of apartheid. They say that the Group Areas Act must be scrapped in its entirety. They reject the need for a statutory definition of race groups and they demand that the present constitution be replaced by a central parliament in which all South Africans, including Blacks, are effectively represented. They demand these changes as well as the scrapping of the Separate Amenities Act become the stated aim of Government.

Having demanded the real scrapping of apartheid, they have gone on to demand that the Government should "declare its unambiguous intention to share power effectively with Blacks." And they argue that it is only "...reasonable for the Government to insist on maintaining power until a new constitutional formula, acceptable to most South Africans, is found through negotiations." And, Mr. Speaker, in talking about negotiations this group of academics says that they "... understand the Government's difficulty, at the present moment, in finding negotiating partners on a national level who have enough influence to legitimise a negotiated deal in all Black communities of the country." Mr. Speaker, they go on to argue that: "This difficulty does not, however, necessarily obtain at local, regional and provincial levels" and say that they believe that "successful regional initiatives can have a positive influence in the strife for a negotiated settlement on the national level.

This represents a bold departure in National Party thinking. It is by no means a complete statement of what the National Party should do but, Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged that they have said this much. Had they said a little less, I would not attach the importance I do attach to their statement, and the boldness of it is the recognition that the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act must go. The South African Government needs to leap this hurdle into the future. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I could conceive of negotiating the future of South Africa with people who talk like this.

In their election Manifesto the three Independent candidates who were all leading members of the National Party add the sentiment that "Black politics must be freed so that it may become properly organised." It is too much to hope that any one candidate or any one group could articulate the total statement which could make negotiations a reality, but across what they are saying there is at least some hope for the future. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker,

that the White electorate will endorse the hope that the Independent candidates are giving us. When somebody like Dr. Willem de Klerk, the long recognised doyen of Afrikaans editors, and somebody like Mr. David de Villiers, a Director of Nasionale Pers, resign from their jobs because they are not prepared to submit to Party political dictates, one can see the extent to which new thinking is emerging in National Party circles. The prospects of the politics of negotiation getting off the ground are now that much brighter, even if we are not out of the woods, Mr. Speaker. National Party leadership style, the State President's style, and the National Party's inability to debate real issues without fragmenting, causes me deep concern. It might well be that the entrenched leadership of the National Party will stifle the voice of reason beginning to come from it. All we know tells us that the National Party is experiencing grave difficulties in moving with the times and of remaining a prime actor in the politics of reform. We want more hope from the State President himself, we want more hope from Mr. Heunis, we want more hope from Provincial leaders of the National Party, and now is the time for them to give this hope.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I have clarified what I mean when I talk about the politics of negotiation and I have simply illustrated that there are signs that what we mean by the politics of negotiation will become increasingly acceptable even in the National Party itself. I have opened my Policy Speech with this clarification because it is necessary each year of our political life as a Legislative Assembly, to review the tactics and strategies we have been committed to and to make new assessments of whether or not they remain the tactics and strategies we should be committed to. I do not say this, Mr. Speaker, because I blow with political winds. I have shown that I have a long political breath, and I serve the causes of justice and of democracy by being

constant in my commitments. But, Mr. Speaker, we in this House do not intend losing out in the struggle for liberation. We are not hide-bound. We will not stagnate and the constancy of our

commitment shown so clearly over so many years does not flow from a blind faith in a position simply because we articulated that position. The constancy of our commitment must be traced to deeply-rooted ideals in our commitment to things that really matter. In the final analysis, we are the servants of the people and we will do what the people want us to do. Thus far they have wanted us to be constant about things lesser political leaders are fickle about. The people wanted us to endure and we have endured on their behalf. However, because we are democrats we keep our ear very close to the political ground. Every step we have taken along the road we have chosen to walk is a deliberately-taken step. We are not blind idealists and should the time ever come to change course, we will change course.

It is important for us each year to reassess the value of the politics of negotiation. It is important for us each year to assess the value of the tactics and strategies we employ. Mr. Speaker, I have looked briefly at the politics of negotiation and clarified what I mean by that term, but we must also look at the politics of violent revolution and redefine our stand towards it. There is political violence in every one of our constituencies. We

lead in the midst of violence. We know its impact and, Mr. Speaker, it is because we are not losers that we have thus far correctly judged violence in our political circumstances to be a very inferior mechanism for bringing about radical change. We are, however, always mindful of the fact that apartheid authors violence. It could only be maintained by the violence inherent in Draconian laws. It required a great deal of State brutality to enforce apartheid on South Africa as long as it has been enforced. It was the brutality with which apartheid had to be forced on us which in turn authored the counter-violence in the first place. It was when the South African Government struck a foul blow against Black democracy by banning the ANC and the PAC that violence became an option that some Black chose to espouse.

Today the ANC Mission in Exile maintains that the only way to liberate South Africa from the tyranny of apartheid is to resort to the armed struggle. We never lose sight of the fact that it was White politics which authored Black violence, but Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, whoever authored violence we are still faced with the question of whether or not it can succeed in bringing about radical change in establishing a fair and just society. Members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, are daily under attack because they have refused to participate in violent politics aiming to make our country ungovernable. We are again and again exhorted to abandon what we are doing and we must be quite clear in our own minds why we have refused to do so and if we continue to refuse to do so, we must be clear in our own minds why we should continue to

reject violence as a primary means of bringing about real change.

I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to reiterate everything I have ever said on the question of violence as a method of bringing about radical change. My stand has been made clear over many years in detailed documentation. All I intend doing now is to reassess my position in relation to current political events and current political trends. And I must say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that violence used for political purposes is becoming ever increasingly repugnant to me. We could have a debate on the theme: "Violence for democracy" but in the light of recent events and in the light of the current South African political situation, the only honest debate we could have is a debate on the violence against democracy. I have always felt free to choose the course of violence if that is what my conscience dictated me to do, and if that was what the people wanted. I have espoused non-violence in my political career because I was free to do that. But, Mr. Speaker, when the forces of violence used brutal dictatorial methods to take away my choice in the matter then I must reject violence not only because it has not worked and will not work for the foreseeable future, but because it is now the declared enemy of democracy. It is deep frustration and Black anger at the growth of desperate Black poverty which has led to the eruptions of violence.

The ANC Mission in Exile like to believe that they have authored whatever violence has taken place in our country. They have not. But what is more important to me, Mr. Speaker, is that they approve of the violence that is taking place. They are trying to multiply

the acts of violence that we know as hideous acts as Black kills and maims Black. They are exhorting mob violence which they did not create but which they encourage to eradicate every Black endeavour that is being made to bring White South Africa towards the negotiating table. They do not want a democratic solution and for me violence becomes hideous when it is used to delay the democratic victory over apartheid which Black South Africans have struggled for for so many generations. Violence is not a necessary means towards a noble end as it is purported to be in ANC theory. Violence is used by the ANC far more frequently in acts of intimidation against its political opponents, than it is in fact used against apartheid. The ANC is authoring its own demise as a political organisation. I have never been dictated to by apartheid and I never intend to be dictated to by anybody or anything, other than the will of the people. My resolve to remain committed to non-violence is greatly strengthened by the hideousness of the violence which I see employed in the politics of intimidation.

ANC Mission in Exile violence is specifically directed against me, against Inkatha and against members of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. In an ANC broadcast on the 21 November 1986 on Radio Freedom from Addis Ababa, John Nkadimeng, speaking for the ANC said: "The onus is on the people of South Africa to neutralise Gatsha, the snake which is poisoning the people of South Africa. It needs to be hit on the head." It is this kind of hideous talk which shows political violence as perpetrated by the ANC to be what it is. It is no more than an instrument used to annihilate Black opposition to ANC Party political interests. I am staggered by the extent to which the ANC emulates South Africa's apartheid masters. The ANC can see no distinction between what is good for the country and what is good for the ANC Mission in Exile, and just like the National Party has always done, they confuse the good of the State with the good of the Party. And just like the National Party has always done, the ANC uses brutality to force its will on the people. Mr. Speaker, I wonder sometimes whether it is the ANC which is beyond reform, and not the National Party.

I am pained and I am appalled by the extent to which the ANC Mission in Exile is trampling on the deeply rooted values which have been instilled in the Black body politic by decades of ANC activity in the country. They trample on the memory of our martyrs and our heroes. Mr. Speaker, political violence is recognised to be justified in a holy war and many deep-thinking philosophers and theologians talk about the moral justification of violence as a last resort option when everything else has failed to remove a tyrant from their midst. This is not the kind of violence we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about violence in South

African politics today. I would die, Mr. Speaker, rather than batter and brutalise people into supporting the tactics and strategies I espouse. Approval of the ANC-type violence would,

Mr. Speaker, make me the arch enemy of the politics of negotiation, the destroyer of hopes for democracy, and an annihilator of the politics of reconciliation. I reject the kind of violence now taking place in Black politics. It is the violence of desperate people who aim to stifle the voice of rising Black democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the real tragedy of the kind of violence which is occurring in South Africa is that it will endorse the ANC out of any meaningful participation in the final solution to the South African problem. We in Inkatha, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, have never made any bones about the fact that we regard the old ANC values and ideals as hallowed values and ideals we serve even today. We pursue the objectives of the founding fathers of the ANC and, Mr. Speaker, you will remember that it was in this very Assembly that I could say and did say that the ANC was a South African liberation movement. It is terribly painful to those of us who were given all our political judgement and our deep political commitment by our experience of what the genuine ANC was really like. Successive ANC leaderships handed down one to the other the great and hallowed ideals of the ANC as propounded by the Founding Fathers in 1912 and we received these ideals and made them our own. We will pursue these ideals until the day we die. We are their custodians and we refuse to destroy them by adding bestiality to the content of our tactics and strategies.

Tactics and strategies have to change over time. We move with the times. The struggle against apartheid is a raging battle which one fights in whatever circumstances it is possible to fight. But when one destroys the ends through the means, one endorses oneself out of the struggle. It is so tragic that the ANC which was banned in 1961 cannot in today's circumstances re-emerge for what it is and what it was. The ANC has been banned now for over a quarter of a century and decent Black South Africa has continued in the struggle. It is the struggle of the people here on the ground which has led to the terrible impasse which Mr. P.W. Botha's government is experiencing. It is the ordinary Black man and woman who has made apartheid fail to achieve final White domination.

It was emerging Black democracy which enabled me and entitled me to boldly talk about the ANC in the early 1970's when the rest of South Africa was just whispering about it behind closed doors in the dark of night. It was I who read statements by Dr. Mandela in mass meetings attended by tens upon tens of thousands. It was

Inkatha's boldness in singing the old songs and flying the colours of freedom that have always inspired millions of Blacks. It was these ordinary millions of Blacks who have step by step driven the National Party to a corner. It was because of us that Mr. P.W. Botha had to state last year that apartheid was outmoded and outdated. It will be because of us that the hideous Tricameral Parliament will one of these days be scrapped. It was because of us that the grand designs of the homeland policy have been recognised as impossible to achieve. It was because of the millions of Black South Africans opposing apartheid that Black trade union rights had to be granted. It was these millions who made the scrapping of the Pass Laws a necessity. Real victory always belong to the people. The gains that have been made in South Africa belong to the people, and Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, as far as I am concerned the will of the people is sovereign. It is a crime against the struggle for liberation to attack the sovereignty of the people through the employment of violence in intimidation.

Black South Africans were vanquished in war last century. They were subjugated by White political brutality. They were impoverished by White economic greed, but Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, as a people we were never crushed. There burns in our breast the spirit of Africa always demanding freedom and I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that it is the ordinary Blacks in South Africa who will earn the right to freedom one of these days. We are nobody's cannon fodder, and when the forces of violence today hit out at soft targets, plant bombs in supermarkets and hotels and throw hand grenades and it is Blacks who are maimed and killed, then a deep sense of revulsion seeps into us. Those who do these kind of things to their fellow Blacks, the victims of apartheid are traitors to the cause which made the old ANC such a venerated movement here in this country.

Not one of us Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, have any doubt whatsoever that the South African cookie is going to crumble. Our political prisoners will be released. Black democracy will be unshackled and we will take up our rightful place as citizens of our country with a God-given right to tell our Government how to govern us and to elect the Government which will govern us the way we want to be governed. The cookie will crumble and it is so tragic that it ever increasingly appears that the ANC Mission in Exile is condemning itself to some terrible eternal miserable existence there in the world where it does not belong. When the time comes when they could come home, when they should come home, they will have burnt the bridges between where they are and where we are.

The South African cookie will be crumbled by democratic forces and by the politics of negotiation. We in this Assembly are moving round ever more effectively in the very heart of the South African centre of political gravity. We will do what has to be done to liberate our country, however much the ANC Mission in Exile rants and raves; they can maim us and they can kill us but we will continue to be steadfast in our resolve to be there at the negotiating table when that time comes. There is a very considerable proportion of our exiled brothers and sisters languishing in far-away places who would endorse what I am saying

as poignantly true for themselves. I have met them in many parts of the world. There is a great, great yearning to come home amongst many, many of our brothers and sisters now in exile. It.

may yet be possible that our continued hand of comradeship and friendship which we have always held out to the ANC Mission in Exile will be taken, and we will be able to bring them home. One must hope for this or else this country will not be liberated because there will be a civil war more serious than we have seen in other parts of Southern Africa.

Major political developments sometime hurtle at us from behind all the smokescreens which distorting Party political gimmicks throw up. I have always warned White South Africans that when the eleventh hour ends, it will end in a flash of unpredicted developments. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, as I remarked

earlier, my leadership roots sink into the very antiquity of KwaZulu. I am entirely lacking in the luxury of a private life; I am entirely lacking in the freedom to do what I would like to do. The totality of my life and every fibre in my being is bent in the service of the people. I would be a shame to my ancestors and I would a shame to the deep and hallowed traditions of my people were I to make major misassessments which led them into the wilderness. I Jjust dare not be wrong about what I say about my brothers and sisters in exile. Mr. Speaker, when many, thousands scream that change cannot come through non-violent means, and I say change can come through non-violent means, and should come through non-violent means, I would shame my ancestors if I were wrong. I have never led those who follow me up the garden path. I have hidden nothing from them. I have shared everything with them, and I must be taken seriously when I say that the forces of democracy are so great that they can overwhelm apartheid. They can bring about change despite the scepticism which is so prevailing today. Mr. Speaker, these same forces of democracy are at work in every major political grouping in our country. They ferment there, and they one day will be joined together to produce a final thrust towards the radical change we need. These same forces, Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, are at work there among our exiled brothers and sisters. The leadership amongst our exiles, like the leadership of the National Party today, will find themselves lleading in a troubled and divided house, and step by historic step these houses will spin out true patriots who will combine their strength and discover the real meaning of South Africanism. There is more lin politics than meets the media eye.

I would like Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, to read to you a Report presented by Mr. Gleb Starushenko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, to the II Soviet-African Conference:

"For Peace, Co-operation and Social Progress" - Moscow 24-26 June 1986. His Paper was entitled: "Problems of Struggle Against Racism, Apartheid and Colonialism in South Africa." As can be

expected, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, it has rhetoric in it but the central points it makes indicate a growing realisation in Soviet thinking that the ANC Mission in Exile must mend its way or perish.

"The attitude of the Soviet Union and other socialist states to unrest in South Africa, llike their general approach to the so-called regional conflicts elsewhere in the world derives from the concern for international security and is promoted by sincere desire to eliminate seats oftension in various areas. As has been pointed out in the political report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union 'we are in favour of vitalising collective quests for ways of defusing conflict situations in the Middle East, Central America, South Africa, in all the plant's turbulent points. This lis imperatively demanded by the interests of general security.' Such defusing is wvital not only to the population in such points, but to the entire international community."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, our whole approach to life, politics and economics is the antithesis of the approach of the USSR. In this first paragraph he simply promotes the image of the USSR. The paper goes on:

"The regime in South Africa embodies what is the most evil and despicable in the capitalism of the imperialist stage - superexploitation, militarism, contempt of any human being that does not belong to the elite. Being doomed by history for this reason alone, this regime, anachronistic as it is, drags on preserving colonialism and racism in the form of apartheid

and depending upon them for its existence. These two institutions, like slavery, have been rejected and outlawed by all states. The regime that sponsors them is basically

anomalous in the modern world and must be eliminated without delay. This, in fact, is the opinion of most people of South Africa and practically of all states. The controversial issue however, which is the object of acute political struggle not only on the world scene, but in South Africa itself, is that of means and ways to achieve the desired end. This practical aspect of the problem acquires special significance in the light of the latest developments in South Africa that tend to aggravate international tension to a dangerous limit and call for concerted actions to clear up the conflict situation."

In this paragraph, a kernel issue is introduced in the words: "The

controversial issue, however, which is the object of acute political struggle not only on the world scene, but South Africa itself, is that of means and ways to achieve the desired end." The

paper goes on to record what we know only too well, and that is that for decades and generations even, the international community, and the West in particular, stood by in a kind of staggering impotence while apartheid grew.

"The regime of apartheid in South Africa was established nearly 40 years ago after an all-round preparation that had lasted several decades. One of the difficulties involved in the struggle against apartheid consisted in that both its victims and the international community of states have resigned themselves to the existence of the inhuman social system. Decades passed, but there was practically no progress in the solution of the problem.

Year after year the United Nations adopted resolutions that were as like as peas in a pod, international conferences rightly denounced the regime of apartheid, and certainly Western states in their 'constructive dialogue' with Pretoria hypocritically, and sometimes sincerely, strove to convince it of the need to abolish the most odious institutions of the regime. However, all was in vain."

The next paragraph, Mr. Speaker, is a rhetorical paragraph in which Mr. Oliver Tambo is quoted but it introduces the next key concept and that is the concept of the "crisis of the upper strata" which I have spent some time talking about in this Policy Speech.

"In the past two years the anti-racist struggle in South Africa has risen, according to Oliver Tambo, President of the African National Congress (ANC), to a qualitatively new level. The selflessness of young patriots and the heroic death of over 1500 demonstrators have plunged Pretoria's regime into an unprecedented crisis. The 'upper strata', i.e. the ruling classes together with their state and socio-economic institutions have clearly demonstrated that they are no longer capable of exercising their power by old methods. They are forced to manoeuvre and dodge, resort to cunning and trickery, concede concessions and reforms. These tactics testify to the emergence of one of the key elements of a revolution situation described by Lenin as 'crisis of the upper strata.'"

The writer goes on to introduce the third crucial issue and this is that events not only precipitate a crisis of the upper strata but they present a crisis of the lower strata.

"The above mentioned events have also precipitated the 'crisis of the lower strata', lives, the emergence of other prerequisites for a revolution. The oppressed classes are not only demonstrating their unwillingness to live as before, but

intensifying their struggle against the existing order. 'Our people', writes Oliver Tambo, 'want to gain freedom immediately. They want to rule their country and be the

arbiter of its destiny today, but not tomorrow. They are sick and tired of the harangue about the need to postpone liberation to a later time for some reason or other. They now see the purpose of their life exclusively in the fight for freedom. They have lost their fear of death because 'to live' for them means 'to be free'."

Having introduced these three crucial points, the writer then goes into the substance of what he wants to say. He warns that despite the feeling of euphoria sweeping in so many quarters of the world about the ANC Mission in exile's claimed success and its propaganda that the South African Government is now on the run from it, there is a danger that even from the point of view of a Soviet revolutionary, these claims could be disproved by events in South Africa. The writer says: "There exists a danger, however, that the struggle against apartheid may lose momentum and even bog down at the present revolutionary stage. The historic experience of other countries attests to the fact that if revolution does not go ahead, does not set any new tasks and does not gain appreciable results,

it is bound to sustain a defeat." Here the writer is simply recording what we already know. Where, Mr. Speaker, are there signs that the planned eruptions for June 16 last year took place and have altered the shape of politics in South Africa? I have repeatedly to tell foreigners that there is no bridge that is not in operation in South Africa. Every power supply line is intact. The country's water reticulation is intact. Its transport system

runs normally and there is no factory out of production because of revolutionary activity. The South African Government is not on the

run and has not even begun to use the powers of brute force which it could unleash should it so desire. The euphoria is now beginning to dissipate and the people will soon begin counting the costs of so much violent suffering for so little gain. The writer, Mr. Speaker, goes on to make a very telling point. He says: "A considerable strata of South African society still keeps away from the struggle." We know, Mr. Speaker, what the writer is talking about because we know that the vast mass of Black South Africans are not committed to the armed struggle and would much rather bring about change through the politics of negotiation. The writer goes on to say: "Moreover, even the forces participating in mass protest do not infrequently fail to co-ordinate their efforts." Again, Mr. Speaker this Russian analyst is saying something which we have been saying. He may even be hearing what we say. We know that the ANC Mission in Exile's symbolic presence in South Africa in the UDF and COSATU is threatened by the lack of any real control by the leadership in these organisations. The UDF is an affiliate organisation and the loyalty of the members of these affiliate organisations just is not the kind of loyalty which accepts commands from the UDF leadership. The UDF attempted to bypass that hard, grinding work which even revolutions begin with - the organisation of the masses. Mr. Speaker, I could send forces and I could withdraw forces, but the UDF leadership has to run behind the forces waving banners and claiming that the forces are their forces. This is why Mr. Oliver Tambo is so hamstrung every time there is a possibility of an international input into the South African situation. He refuses to give an undertaking that violence will cease during negotiations because it is not his violence that is taking place in South Africa. He too runs behind it, waving a banner calling it his own.

Then Mr. Speaker, the writer goes on to make an interesting point. He says: "The abrogation of the laws prohibiting the Blacks to use the same trains, and visit the same restaurants as Whites, banning inter-racial sexual relationships and mixed marriages, i.e. the abolition of the so-called small apartheid has failed to defuse the situation in South Africa. To provide a real solution to the crisis, it is necessary to abolish the production relations based on the system of apartheid. This cannot be changed, it must be destroyed." Mr. Speaker, I say this is an interesting point because this is precisely what the ANC Mission in Exile is exhorting every Black South African to do and this is precisely what it is failing to do. And here we have a prominent Soviet analyst telling the ANC to do the impossible.

The next paragraph is more Soviet rhetoric:

"The anti-racist struggle in South Africa and the national liberation movement of the Namibian people directed against the colonial oppression join in a single revolutionary torrent. This amalgamation tends to enhance the revolutionary potential of both liberation armies and expand the scope of South African revolution. Yet the solution of the Namibian problem is seriously hampered by the interference of external imperialist forces and shows practically no signs of real progress."

In the rhetoric of the next five paragraphs, the writer touches on the real dilemmas of an international community which cannot act in unison because of East/West and north/south problems. We know all about these problems and Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, these problems cannot be wished away overnight. They are problems, they will remain problems and it is the grossest of tactical stupidity to plan as though they do not exist. The whole demand for the complete economic isolation of South Africa is a futile demand because it will never take place, and even the demand for limited sanctions is stupid because limited sanctions hurt Black South Africans first far more than they hurt Pretoria. The writer goes on to say:

"The support of the international community of states to the liberation movements of South Africa and Namibia, important as it may be, is still not sufficient. Here are a few facts:

- the numerous UN and Security Council resolutions recognising the illegal character of the occupation of Namibia by South Africa and mapping out concrete steps for the liberation of that country are being ignored:

- despite the fact that most of the states have been demanding comprehensive sanctions against the regime of apartheid for over a good quarter of a century, the means that have been imposed are not only very limited in scope, but completely disregarded by many countries, particularly the Western states;

- in defiance of the opinion of the absolute majority of the states that recognise the right of the people of southern Africa to armed struggle for their liberation (some of these states even render them direct material and military support), South Africa and the USA label such struggle as international terrorism and engage under this pretext in a virtual war against the frontline states.

The problem of the elimination of the regime of apartheid in South Africa and the regime of colonial rule of Namibia has two aspects, the internal and the international ones. In view of the fact that imperialism has embarked on the road of neo-globelism, i.e. interventionist policy in southern Africa, like in other parts of [the] world, the importance of the international aspect greatly increases."

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, remember that the writer has made three crucial points. 1) The need to look at the relationship between ways and means used and the ends to be achieved. 2) That there is a crisis of the upper strata and 3) That there is a crisis of the lower strata. And having introduced the difficulties which the international community has in acting in concert, the writer then goes on to make a fourth crucial point. It is because of the international difficulties that he says:

"We are firmly convinced that the solution of all internal problems of the liberation movement is the sovereign right of the people and their political parties. Proceedings from this universally recognised principle, I should like now to outline our general approach to certain issues that are currently in the focus of ideological and political struggle."

He then goes into the very heart of what he wants to convey. He says: "The process of re-shaping of the revolutionary situation which we now witness in South Africa is far from being completed. Protest demonstrations are largely confined to African townships around big cities. The broad masses of the Black population, particularly in bantustans, often stay aloof. The main participants in the anti-racist action are students and the unemployed. The South African working class has not yet thrown the full measure of its enormous revolutionary potential into the scale of revolutionary struggle." There we have it, Mr. Speaker, a prominent Soviet analyst here gives lie to the claim that the ANC Mission in exile makes about the South African Government being on the run and the mass support it enjoys amongst Black South Africans. Perhaps again, Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, our voice is being heard in surprising places.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much Shakespeare this analyst reads, but what he is really saying is: "Hail Caesar, Caesar is dead" and

because the writer is now beginning to tread on political eggs, he has to take the sting out of what he says by saying:

"It is to be expected that the establishment of a powerful trade union federation, the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) will greatly intensify not only the political, but also the economic struggle in the country.

The scope of the participation of the South African proletariat in the liberation struggle will be the broader, the <closer will be the co-operation between the South African Communist Party, the recognised and experienced leader of the South African workers, and other anti-racist forces.

It is also noteworthy, that the communists play an important part in raising the level of the scientific guidance of the movement. In the past few years their theoretical journal African Communist has given a thorough analysis of the current situation in the South of the continent and has drawn important political conclusions. Proceedings from the objective laws of social development, the communists do not advance at the present stage of social development any other slogans but general democratic ones. They believe that the restructuring of South African society along socialist lines is a matter of the future and will be possible only after the necessary conditions are ripened."

Mr. Speaker I am going through the entirety of this paper because I want every Member of this Assembly to see that even the most ardent supporter in the international community of the ANC Mission in Exile, the Soviet Union, is issuing a warning to the Mission in Exile. But he must issue this warning without destroying Soviet ANC relations. In another aside, having made his four important points he has made thus far, the writer tells of intergroup hostilities in South Africa and the role of the Communist Party as it participates in internecine Black-on-Black conflict. He goes on to say:

"Being internationalists as they are, the South African communists take a firm stand against adventurist plans of all kinds of leftist organisations and movements of the so-called black self-consciousness (Pan African Congress, AZAPO, National Forum, and others) convincingly and authoritatively showing their reactionary nature. The slogans of such organisations, such as the armed struggle against the whites without any compromise, for the formation of black South Africa (Azania), the establishment of the rule of the blacks, etc. might lead the masses away from the actual struggle for their independence and do irreparable damage to the liberation movement. The negative attitude of the communists of South Africa to leftist demagoguery clearly shows that the CPSA comes out not only as an organising revolutionary force, but as a factor of stability, a guarantor against adventurism, black chauvinism and racism."

Mr. Speaker, I recall the last sentence when he says: "The negative attitude of the Communists of South Africa to leftist demagoguery clearly shows that the CPSA comes out not only as an organising revolutionary force, but as a factor of stability, a guarantor against adventurism, Black chauvinism and racism." Here the Soviet analyst is telling the story like it is. He is saying that the ANC cannot look after itself and needs a big communist brother to guarantee it against the so-called Black Consciousness groups. When he says these things, Mr. Speaker, you can see the Soviet tail wagging the whole ANC dog. At least this is the impression which this analyst's writing gives.

Mr. Speaker, the aside continues before the writer comes back to the point of his main arguments. He has obviously got to talk about ANC/Communist Party relationships in a positive light. He says:

"The establishment of close ties between the Communist Party and the African National Congress (ANC), the oldest political party of the country's African population is a major success of the anti-racist forces of South Africa. The large-scale propaganda campaign and the vigorous organisational efforts of this party are largely accountable for the current rise of the political activity of the masses."

The internal and external reactionary elements are out to undermine and compromise the alliance between the ANC and the South African Communist Party. They seek to weaken and split the anti-imperialist front relying on the support of some political organisations which are either governed by their anti-communist prejudice or strive to achieve a compromise with the present regime. The ANC resolutely opposes their plans.

The South African communists, like the ANC, today follows the guiding principles of the Freedom Charter, which is the programme document of the ANC, and give full support to the political line of this organisation. Both political parties act under a common slogan: 'Fight till complete victory.'

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, you must bear with me as I go through the rest of this document. It touches on crucial issues which deeply affect politics in South Africa and we must know what is going on in the minds of Soviet analysts. In the South African democratic struggle we build up Black bargaining power. We do so, however, to make the politics of negotiation a reality and to bring about the reconciliation of the country's various population groups. Those who oppose us in this intention are not true democrats and because the ANC Mission in Exile is not here on the ground with us, they have to gain the allegiance of other organisations who will exercise their voice by proxy. This results in terrible predicaments for them. The longer the Government remains recalcitrant the more manageable these predicaments become. The Soviet analyst goes on to say:

"As regards the assertions that the co-operation of the ANC from other anti-racist organisations, one must, in our opinion, bear in mind the following. First, even if some members of these organisations are prejudiced against such co-operation, common struggle against apartheid gradually makes them change their mind. Second, - attempts to adduce the need to improve contacts with the present regime as an argument against the co-operation of the ANC with the communists are completely inconsistent since the state based on apartheid is to be eliminated, but not negotiated with."

He says here that the ANC must woo reluctant organisations to co-operate with it but warns that such co-operation must exclude those who see the need to negotiate with the Government. Mr. Speaker, you will remember he has just said that the perceived need to improve contacts with the present regime is dangerous because in his words: "Apartheid is to be eliminated, but not negotiated with." Here he touches on a real ANC predicament. There is a growing perception amongst Black South Africans that we must negotiate and short of bringing about change through a bloody and violent revolution, we have to negotiate with the South African Government. It is this perception which hampers the ANC's endeavours to proselytise amongst other Black organisations.

While on this subject, the writer goes on to deal with another predicate which the ANC faces. It is this: The ANC now attacks soft targets. It maims and kills Blacks but at the same time it does have to proselytise amongst Black organisations. It has to

woo the organisations to which people who are maimed and killed by the ANC, belong as members. And our Soviet analyst has to deal with this fact and he chooses to side-step it by talking about Western accusations that the ANC are terrorists. He says:

"In a bid to cow the man in the street, the regime of apartheid and Western propaganda raise the bugbear of terrorism and cast aspersions on the ANC which is waging armed struggle against the racists. It is well known, however, that this party has always stood for peaceful methods of solving political issues, but was forced to take up arms after the government had banned its legal activities."

And he blames the South African Government for the acts which are so widely perceived as acts of terrorism.

"Charging the ANC with 'terrorism' without any grounds, refusing to legalise this party and start negotiations with its leadership, Peter [sic] Botha's government has taken upon itself a heavy responsibility for the continuation of the bloodshed which could have been avoided. By contrast, the leadership of the ANC reiterating time and time again its proposals aimed at the cessation of political solution of the problem makes an important contribution to the expansion and consolidation of the social basis of the anti-racist revolution and exposes the slander about the 'terrorist' character of the liberation movement in the country."

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, every member of this Assembly, and every member of Inkatha knows the extent to which a battle for minds is going on in South Africa. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this Assembly could give facts and dates of repeated UDF-backed attacks against members of Inkatha. These attacks form a frontline onslaught against us which is orchestrated by the ANC Mission in exile. In the next section of his paper, the Soviet analyst says: "Very important is the task of drawing the broad masses of the non-White population in the anti-racist struggle and preserving their

unity." And he points to two things which in his view facilitates this. Firstly, that Blacks have not been gratified by "reforms from above", except he says: "the traditional elite enlisted from

among the bantustan bureaucratic bourgeoisie and representing a tiny faction of the people as well as the Coloured and Indian traditions filling important posts in Parliament."

And the second thing he says that has been propitious for the development of a solid ANC front is the establishment of the UDF. I quote: "An important step in the solution of this problem [that is the problem of getting organisations to join with the ANC] was the setting up in 1983 of the United Democratic Front." He draws

attention to the fact that UDF leaders adopted the Freedom Charter as their political platform and that ANC leaders kept in prison have been elected as honorary members of the organisation's directing bodies. He then goes on to say: "The UDF brings together hundreds of trade unions, student, women, community, religious and other organisations and owes the rapid growth of its ranks to a broad democratic programme." You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that earlier in his paper this same analyst had said: "The broad masses of the Black population, particularly in the bantustans, often stay aloof. The main participants in the anti-racist action are students and the unemployed. The South African working class has not yet thrown the full measure of its enormous revolutionary potential into the scale of revolutionary struggle."

So, Mr. Speaker, we must see that he sees the UDF as a potential ally, but he sees that it has not yet succeeded and he goes on to say: "It was only to be expected that the activity of the United Democratic Front, very heterogeneous as it is, would bring numerous and complex problems." He goes on immediately, Mr. Speaker, to express an ANC concern by denying it when he says: "One can hardly accept the prediction of certain Western politicologists that the current trends lead to the enhancement of the prestige of the UDF at the expense of the ANC." Here, Mr. Speaker, the Soviet analyst touches on something of cardinal importance.

The UDF itself has now to be committed to making the country ungovernable. This is one of its aims and it is the aim which makes it useful to the ANC Mission in Exile. But to do this, the UDF cannot employ its own cadres because it has no such cadres. The UDF is primarily an affiliate organisation and these organisations each have a will and a mind of their own and not subject to the kind of discipline and allegiance to UDF leadership which enables the UDF leadership to tell them what to do. But beyond this problem, the UDF faces another and more severe problem. To make South Africa ungovernable, it has to employ street committees and bands of young comrades and if the UDF leadership has problems in directing its affiliate organisations, it meets insurmountable obstacles in directing and controlling the forces of violence it encourages on street corners. Here they ride on the back of Black anger and Black frustration. They run behind this anger and frustration waving their UDF flags and then jump in front of the mobs to raise their UDF platforms. The Soviet analyst does not touch on these problems. He dare not do so. All he says is: "One should not forget, however, that they have a common programme, the 11liberty charter, and that they fight against a common enemy. In the view of Soviet analysts the strengthening of understanding between the ANC and the UDF is dictated by the need to improve the organisation of the anti-racist actions." But the Soviets and the ANC face a tactical problem here. The Soviet analyst goes on to say: "The United Democratic Front which is not infrequently their initiator [that is the initiator of acts to improve the organisation of the anti-racist actions] and direct organiser still represents an amorphous amalgamation some members of which are not even willing to participate in mass campaigns." He therefore must say: "Since the ANC is more homogeneous and has amassed considerable experience of struggle for unity of anti-racist

forces, it can and must make a valuable contribution to the formation and consolidation of a single united national front of patriotic forces."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, here you have a vital struggle within a struggle. We are struggling to liberate South Africa from apartheid. The ANC is struggling to control the United Democratic Front and sooner or later, that struggle will become unmanageable for it. This is where I simply cannot comprehend the slow pace at which the State President is initiating reform. He is an informed President. He knows how the ANC is attempting to monopolise the leadership in the UDF. He knows the UDF is an amorphous mass and that the ANC has tactical edges over it in any leadership struggle. He knows the longer he delays reform, the more likely it will be that the ANC gains the final control over the UDF. It is time that thinking White South Africans put an end to prevarications in government on the question of reform.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, now follows a section of the analyst's paper which deserves a great deal of attention. He goes on to point out that the anti-racist forces have increasing difficulty in formulating policy towards the ruling White minority. He points out that the privileged groups have begun to show signs of a split over the character of reforms and he points out, Mr. Speaker, that the White bourgeoisie, that is the most privileged White entrenched group, is not tied to the chariot of apartheid, but the rank and file White is tied to it. We know what he means, Mr. Speaker. Afrikaner businessmen are now looking forward to a post-Group Areas and post-Population Registration Act South Africa. That is where their interests lie. That is where prosperity will come from. The rank and file Whites fear losing their privileges. Here again we have a problem within a problem, Mr. Speaker, and this problem weighs heavily when we consider just how undemocratic the National Party has to be. It cannot reconcile Afrikaner opinion-makers with Afrikaner man-in-the-street demands. It is a language group being transformed traumatically.

The only way out of this problem for the National Party, Mr. Speaker, lies for the State President to do what I do. I move into the rank and file of Black South Africa. I hold mass meetings and I keep the unity between leadership and the people. Mesi PeW. Botha must now stake his whole political life on the successful outcome of campaigning amongst ordinary Whites who have the deepest fear, and convince them that they must follow the lead of Afrikaner leaders who want to bring about real change.

Our Soviet analyst then goes on to advocate courses of action which are the direct antithesis of ANC thought and theory. He would not do so if there were no ears in the ANC Mission in Exile to hear him. He too, Mr. Speaker, is an informed man with an input from the KGB behind him. He would never advocate something which could have no possible response in the ANC camps and even among its leaders. He says next "the programmes of the anti-racist forces do not advance plans for a broad nationalisation of capitalist

property as an indispensable condition" and he says that the ANC is ready to give the bourgeoisie the corresponding guarantee. He goes on to point out that not all Whites are "willing to die in the last ditch in defence of 'the camp' as they are urged by the right extremists." He makes the observation, Mr. Speaker, that "Obviously, they would prefer a compromise and can hardly be expected to risk their lives and join in a massacre as deadly to the indigenous population as to themselves." Then, Mr. Speaker, our Soviet analyst goes on to make a very far-reaching point. He says: "...Already today the ANC might work out comprehensive guarantees for the White population which could be implemented after the elimination of the regime of apartheid."

He points to Kenya and Zimbabwe where he says Whites feel absolutely safe, and he make the further point after referring to Zimbabwe and Kenya: "The above precedents should not be regarded as rigid models. For instance, the parliament may consist of two chambers: one formed on the basis of proportional representation and the other, possessing the right of veto, on the basis of equal representation of the four communities."

Mr. Speaker, he is advising the ANC to drop its totally uncompromising demand for one-man-one-vote in a wunitary state. Again, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we are not being heard in faraway places. This is the direction of thought that has surfaced in the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. Everywhere there are indications, Mr. Speaker, that people are sitting up and starting to take the Indaba seriously. Our Soviet analyst then goes on to observe: "The elaboration of the constitutional principles of the future anti-racist state would be instrumental already today in promoting good relations and eliminating mistrust between communities." Again, he is pointing a finger at the ANC and warning them that they will have to change their whole approach to the solution of South Africa's problems.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I quote the next paragraph in this piece of writing and I would like you all to listen very carefully

Â¥o. the politicsiin it. Our Soviet analyst goes on to state: "The new state might also be a wunitary system with autonomous components. The forms and substance of such autonomy should be

defined with due regard for the will of the population revealed, for instance, in referendum, through negotiations, etc. Concrete issues related to the functioning of such a system might become the object of a national conference, its main participants being the government of the Republic of South Africa, and the true representatives of the non-White population." Again, Mr. Speaker, we see here shades of the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. We are actually seeing Soviet endorsement of approaches which are alien to the ANC. Would he be speaking thus, Mr. Speaker, if there were no prospect whatsoever of him being heard in the ANC. The ANC's leadership is being challenged; it must be challenged from within, and now our writer, Mr. Speaker, is throwing his weight behind that challenge. But being a political analyst in the employ of the Soviet Union, he has to be diplomatic and he backs his advice to the ANC Mission in Exile by validating what he says in drawing from the thinking of

the United Nations Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. He points out that this Committee recognises that "The population of most African states is very heterogeneous not only from the ethnic, but also from the racial viewpoints." And he goes on to say: "As regards the relations between the Black and White populations in South Africa, the same African continent provides examples of peaceful co-operation between these races."

In the scenario the Soviet analyst is developing step by step, he has located the failure of the ANC to organise the revolution in South Africa. He recognises that they have not gained the co-operation of the masses. He recognises that they have not even begun to win the hearts and minds of Whites, and he offers alternative courses of action and he talks about reconciliation as being important. Our writer goes on to say: "In view of the fact that racial and political tensions in South Africa are now aggravated to a breaking point, and the sides are distrustful and suspicious of one another, the peaceful settlement of the conflict might be expedited by resorting to the institution of international guarantees the sides selecting the guarantors by agreement, among prestigious international organisations or individual states." Step by step he has taken his analysis to the point where he has said the international community has proved impotent and now says that the international community could play a role as guarantors to the various conflicting parties in South Africa. And he says: "...In order to allow the inner processes in South Africa to take their natural course and enable the people of the country to take their destiny into their own hands, it is necessary to exclude any possibility of foreign intervention and export of counter-revolution."

Mr. Speaker, he echoes the warnings that I have issued again and again. I have warned that the removal of the South African Government by force of arms would only result in any government of the future facing the kind of activity which would make the activity of Renamo and UNITA pale into insignificance. Here our analyst is telling us that the full might of the Soviet Union could not prop up an ANC government against the onslaught of a developing internal counter-revolution. He is in fact warning that the ANC could not rely on the Soviet Union to prop it up. He ' says: %It stands to reason that the methods of attaining the set goals are modified or altered in accordance with changes in the international situation. Today the Soviet Union lays special emphasis on the need to eliminate and lessen the menace of further nuclear war." What he is saying here, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, is that Soviet Union relations with the United States on the disarmament and the limitation of nuclear weapons issue determines that it will not face the United States here on the ground in a situation which could develop in a revolution/counter-revolution South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I have taken you through this document because every day of our lives we exercise our political judgement and our leadership in the context of the things this Soviet analyst has been discussing. I earlier made the point, Mr. Speaker, that the ANC Mission in Exile is not just a committee of

people sitting in Lusaka. There are thousands of our brothers and sisters out there, and I made the point, Mr. Speaker, that a great many of them would applaud me for what I am saying today. It is not beyond all real possibility that our brothers and sisters in exile who would so dearly like to come home, would challenge their leadership and in all likelihood, Mr. Speaker, the KGB has informed our Soviet analyst of rumblings in the rank and file of our brothers and sisters in exile, and he is encouraging the ANC Mission in Exile leadership to start becoming relevant to the solution of South Africa's problems. He does it with all the Soviet rhetoric one could expect, but, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis his whole paper takes away the legitimacy of the armed struggle as the only means of bringing about radical change in our country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, there is a great deal of glib and careless talk about getting all the conflicting groupings in the country around a conference table. And in this context it is repeatedly and rather glibly said that the ANC must be part of the solution to South Africa's problems, as though they are waiting in the wings and only require some mediator to bring them and the South African Government together. Very complex issues are involved. The South African Government itself is not ready to go to a conference table. As I pointed out earlier, negotiations to end the South African crisis and establish a new democracy with a new constitution will not be a once-only thing where various parties arrive to sit around a table and end up signing a document. Negotiations in our circumstances are going to take the form of a political process which will fashion and reconcile as it proceeds. Fierce political battles will have to be waged during the process of negotiation to test that which is being negotiated among the country's various population groups. Negotiations will also have to make a two-pronged attack on the South African problem. On the one prong there will be negotiations from the bottom upwards and on the other prong there will be negotiations from the top downwards. Some very prominent South Africans do the commencement of the kind of negotiations which are inevitably going to be faced with here, a grave disservice when they talk about the ANC being part of the solution which they themselves have not really begun to comprehend. There is too much glib talk about the ANC's involvement in the settlement of the South African issue which only serves to legitimise the politics of violence which is right now being employed to ensure that the process which will ever-increasingly take the form of negotiations, is destroyed.

I put on record, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, my view that real negotiations about the future of our country must be negotiations in which it is possible for every shade of political opinion to participate. It must be possible even for the ANC Mission in Exile to join all other forces of change who will be involved in the negotiations for change should they so desire. If they do not desire to do so, then the negotiating process will continue without them. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am so insistent upon there being chairs for the ANC Mission in Exile around a negotiating table, that I have in carefully worded and categorical statements said that I would not be prepared to enter the proposed National Council

unless Dr. Nelson Mandela, Mr. Zeph Mothopeng and other political prisoners were released from jail. I dream of the day when Dr. Mandela is free to choose what political purpose he wishes to serve in open public life in our country. I campaign for his release

constantly and I do not do so on condition that he shares my platform. I have publicly stated that if the people wish it to be 80, I would serve on his platform. I want him freed, whether he stands with me or whether he opposes me. None of us dare dictate what Dr. Mandela will or will not do when he is released from jail.

The ANC Mission in Exile is worried about the National Council. 1In a Radio Freedom broadcast interview on the 16 November 1986 with Chris Hani, the Commissar of Umkhonto we Sizwe and a member of the National Executive of the ANC Mission in Exile, he was asked a question about the National Council and in talking about it, he said that it was still-born because despite the fact that Mr. P.W. Botha talks about having the majority of Black people with him in what he was doing, he would find nobody to serve on the National Council. The interviewer then said: "But Gatsha has expressed a readiness to participate if Nelson Mandela is released and participates." Hani answered by saying:

"Well he has expressed that willingness to participate. I think he is just using Comrade Nelson Mandela to justify his back-peddling. I think when he said he was ready to participate he was just making that statement not realising the depth of opposition to any form of collaboration with the present government. There is no way, Comrade, that our people

are going to collaborate with Botha. Botha cannot preside over change in our country. He is responsible for the problems we are facing. Botha must go. He is just wasting

time by, you know, thrashing out solutions. He cannot solve anything. He is responsible for the mess in our country.

We say Botha should go. People like Gatsha Buthelezi are wasting their time by participating in Botha's futile experiments, because the majority of our people are objecting to those experiments. Supposing Mandela is released, Mandela wont participate in the National Statutory Council. No member of the ANC will ever participate in that National Statutory Council. The majority of our people wont participate. Gatsha will be alone there. He will be isolated. He will be driving those beautiful cars and getting a fat salary, but he will be just doing it as an individual. And he must be careful of the verdict of our people and our people have been known to pass the right verdict against anybody who collaborates with the regime."

There we have it, Mr. Speaker, yet again. The slanderous distorting attacks on me personally. But I have read this quote so that Members can hear Chris Hani dictating to Dr. Mandela. Chris Hani may be authorised by his executive to make statements that the ANC will never participate in the National Council but the people of South Africa will wait for Dr. Mandela to make up his own mind once he is free. I have never made it a condition that the ANC Mission

in exile itself participates in negotiations before I am prepared to do so. I only insist that it must be made possible for them to do so before I will do so. Black democracy must be liberated and it cannot be liberated while we have people like Dr. Mandela in jails. Once he is released the ANC Mission in Exile becomes his responsibility. He must be freed so that he can either join with it in the armed struggle or join in the democratic process here in this country, where the real struggle is taking place.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from another broadcast on Radio Freedom from Addis Ababa. It was made on the 15 January this year and Oliver Tambo speaks when he asks:

"Is it possible today and in the future to enter into negotiations with self-confessed enemies of democracy with the aim of creating a democratic South Africa?" He answers his

own question: "It has one conclusion and one conclusion only. No negotiations are possible until all those concerned accept a move to create and build a democratic South Africa. That

democratic transformation is the necessary condition for the solution of all the problems that face our country and our region."

Mr. Speaker here we have a terrible misunderstanding of the South African situation and the real purpose of the politics of negotiation. Mr. Tambo wants the victory to come first and then as he repeatedly says, the only negotiations he is prepared to enter into are negotiations for the handing over of power to the people. I say we will have to negotiate the victory itself and that is why I see negotiations as a political process. There are some people who come away from discussions with Mr. Oliver Tambo and his colleagues in the National Executive convinced that the ANC Mission in Exile could be drawn into negotiations. If they are right, the ANC Mission in Exile would not continue to insist that they will continue perpetrating acts of violence while they negotiate. The world over we have seen the necessity of violence ceasing before negotiations begin. Right now we need to be negotiating about negotiations while we remain in the midst of violence, but I for one, Mr. Speaker, would not be able to negotiate with anybody who was maiming and killing Inkatha members while the negotiations are taking place. And I think this is a point that the international community must take note of. There will never ever be only two parties at the negotiating table. It is simply wishful thinking to think of mediating to bring only the ANC Mission in Exile and the South African Government together as the only prime actors in the politics of negotiation. The South African Government was not elected into office by Black South Africans and they cannot negotiate our future on our behalf.

Some people get so carried away that they fall victims to their own propaganda. The South African Government is the de facto and the de jure government in this country and the minute the word negotiations about the future of South Africa, you spell out the necessity of the South African Government being involved. Mr.

Speaker, Honourable Members, we did not elect the Government into office. It remains the de facto and the de jure government of the country. The central purpose of the struggle for liberation has always been to gain Black entry into the democratic process by which governments are elected. The whole point of non-violent democratic opposition is to achieve this end. Mr. Speaker, we have not declared war on the South African Government because such a war can not be won. We have also not declared war, Mr. Speaker, because wars do not produce democracies. It is for the people of South Africa to decide whether to negotiate with the South African Government and I have a very powerful mandate, Mr. Speaker, to do just this the very day the Government makes it possible. The ball is in the Government's court but, Mr. Speaker, I say very clearly to the international community that if they stand with the South African Government which has endorsed Black South Africans out of the parliamentary system and put pressure on the South African Government to endorse me out of national negotiations about the future of our country, then every effort will come to naught.

Mr. Speaker, Just as we have not elected the National Party, neither have we elected the ANC into being the legitimate government of South Africa in exile. There will be no negotiations with the Government in which we are not involved. When very prominent South Africans trot off to Lusaka to have discussions with the ANC Mission in exile without consulting us, and return to urge the Government to negotiate with the ANC, again without consulting us, they spurn whatever we are doing to bring about change through non-violent means. Mr. Speaker, this is why I call for the release of Dr. Nelson Mandela, Mr. Zeph Mothopeng and other political prisoners. Let the Black people of South Africa decide for themselves who will negotiate on their behalf. Just as I would not negotiate the future of our country with anybody while Dr. Nelson Mandela and Mr. Zeph Mothopeng languish in jail, I will not tolerate anybody taking the gap, so to speak, Mr. Speaker, and negotiating behind my back. There must be a diplomatic quid pro quo in this.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, our commitment is very deep and I have found it necessary to say before and I repeat today, that the final act of de-legitimising non-violent, democratic opposition to a Government which the Black people of South Africa do not want, will be the endorsement of me and Inkatha out of negotiations at the national level. We could then, Mr. Speaker, not be held responsible after whatever settlement is put into practice. Mr. Speaker, I would go to the bush in those circumstances.

Black democracy is shackled in South Africa, Mr. Speaker, and there is too little recognition for this fact in very high government circles in the West. I personally valued what the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group attempted to do in South Africa. I do not believe what they did was a dismal failure, because I never expected an outcome much different to the one we saw. They made two fundamental errors of judgement, Mr. Speaker. One was that they completely under-estimated the time factor which would

necessarily be involved in negotiations in South Africa. It shows a tactical error of judgement to impose the time restraints that they did impose on success. The other error of judgement, Mr.

Speaker, was that they were primarily concerned with getting the South African Government and the ANC Mission in Exile together. They, of course, did say, Mr. Speaker, that I must be there at the negotiating table but the world must know that I cannot accept my position on some negotiating guest list which is drawn up for those who must come to be witness and to participate in the real

negotiations. The only negotiations that take place in this country are negotiations between the leaders that the people want to represent them and the South African Government. Why, Mr.

Speaker, does the ANC Mission in exile not abandon its violence for a long enough time to return to this country and to set up a legitimate democratic base from which they can prove the extent of their support? War is not a once-only option and they could always go back to Lusaka or wherever they have come from and resume hostilities. That, Mr. Speaker, would be the very shortest possible route to the armed victory which they have thus far so dreamt about. If they did this, Mr. Speaker, they could return to the armed struggle if negotiations failed to gather the total backing of the international community. Mr. Speaker, the ANC Mission in Exile was never mandated to do what they are doing. I do not believe they will now be mandated to do what they are doing, but I would have no problems in my leadership role even if the people did mandate them to do what they are doing. I am simply the servant of the people, Mr. Speaker, and Honourable Members know that I take my instructions from the people. If the people instructed its leadership to abandon failed negotiations and return to the bush, they would be instructing me to do the same.

The hideous internecine Black-on-Black confrontation comes from the fact that any political Tom, Dick or Harry can crow like a little cock from any dunghill and be anointed as a true leader by the media. When we talk about negotiations in South Africa we must also talk about the necessary steps which must be taken before negotiations can get off the ground. Testing Black opinion is one of these steps.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with one other aspect of the politics of negotiation. I agree with my brothers and sisters in exile that it was the South African Government which thrust the violence we now see on us by banning the ANC and the PAC. It was repeated acts of State brutality and political intimidation which put the match to explosive Black anger. One of the important roles which Western governments could play is the role of mediator working to define the kind of State violence which must cease before the ANC can be expected to drop violence in favour of negotiations. I cannot see how we can negotiate about the future of our country if State violence keeps Dr. Mandela, Mr. Zeph Mothopeng and other political prisoners incarcerated in jail. That is political violence, Mr. Speaker. State violence interferes with the freedom of political association. Western Governments could in fact draw a line between police action which is law-keeping action, and police action which represents the strong-arm tactics of the National Party.

I am very sure, Mr. Speaker that a very substantial accord could be reached among White South Africans themselves about what to accept and reject in this mediation I am suggesting. While the international community does not clearly distinguish between legitimate and ill-legitimate State violence, they can have no answer to the ANC's claim that the South African Government must drop violence first. Mr. Speaker, negotiations must be about the need to have new legislation in this country, enacted by a different kind of parliamentary set-up. Those are the end products of negotiation. Negotiations start with an existing state of affairs and move to a better state of affairs. I could negotiate while the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act remain on the Statute Books because their removal will be on the agenda. If the ANC Mission in Exile is ever to be drawn into negotiations, they will have to adopt the same attitude.

Mr. Speaker, there are very important realms in which we can now begin working to establish the circumstances of really meaningful negotiation. Those circumstances do not exist now, and the international community must recognise that fact. They do not exist because the Government and the ANC are both avoiding negotiations and making claim and counter-claim as to why they are right in doing so. I am avoiding negotiations and I leave it to the international community's judgement to decide whether my avoidance is reconciliatory or confrontationalist.

No matter how difficult it is, Mr. Speaker, we must move towards the negotiating table. We must begin moving now. There is a ripeness of historical time which demands that we do so. There is a fluidity now which could be turned into circumstances which are propitious for negotiations. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, it is a simple truth of South African political life that the State President and his Cabinet do not in fact know where they are going. They have not got a plan, Mr. Speaker. They are in a holding position, desperately hoping something will emerge. We must influence what will emerge, Mr. Speaker. There is now knowledge, Mr. Speaker, in Government circles that the grand dream of Verwoerdian apartheid has failed. There is consensus, Mr. Speaker, that we need constitutional change. There is consensus, Mr. Speaker, that the South African Government needs to evolve a formula acceptable to Blacks for the inclusion of Blacks in first, second and third tier government. However different the preconceptions of the various political groupings in this country are about how to include Blacks, there is at least consensus that

they need to be included. Mr. Speaker, there is now wide recognition that the terrible economic straits South Africa is in is a consequence of apartheid. There is wide acceptance for the

fact that economic performance is very adversely affected by the lack of confidence people have in South Africa's ability to solve its political problems. All this, Mr. Speaker, adds to the fluidity of the South African situation which we have never had before.

This fluidity is expressing itself in the ferment in National Party thinking itself but the greatest contributing factor to the fluidity of the South African situation flows from the fact that even the State President with all the power at his disposal can no longer do what he wants to do. In actual practice, Blacks have a veto right over the actions of the State President. His National Council will fail, Mr. Speaker, if we do not participate in it. Local government will fail, Mr. Speaker, if Blacks do not participateâ\200\231 ;ins: its The constitution has failed, Mr. Speaker, because Blacks do not participate in it. There is only one way in which the State President can go down in history as a man of great

achievements. He has no alternative but to develop an accord between Black and White. He has had the courage to put himself in the hot seat from which he announces the need for reform. However

ill-defined his meaning of reform is, history will judge him on the extent to which he now begins defining reform. If he cannot define reform in such a way that he draws Blacks into the reform process, history will judge him as not man enough to do what he set out to

dois However the South African Government blunders right now in attempting to limit the scope of reform, there is a fluidity we have never seen before. The State President could in fact still

become the first head of a South African Government to put South Africa on the road to a glorious democratic future and it is still possible for the State President so to conduct his affairs that his memory will be revered in the way Abraham Lincoln is revered in the

United States. But, Mr. Speaker, even if he does not do this, the South African situation remains fluid because the State President will be rejected by his own people because of his failure. There

is a groundswell demand building up for the State President to move faster towards reform. That demand can only accelerate.

The State President is not facing a squabble in the National Party and it will not be possible for him to be all things to all men and keep some kind of truce. There is something, Mr. Speaker, very inexorable about the movement of thought in South Africa. The forces demanding change are very real and the longer real change is delayed, the greater the prospects are of these forces becoming a veritable flood-water which will burst the gates.

Radical change is now an inevitability and the question simply remains whether radical change will come through democratic means or through violent means, but come it will. Nothing I am saying, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the State President has yet made the break-through. The politics of prescription which are the root

cause of every ill in our country, continue. Black democracy remains shackled and White politics continues to act out of the kind of fear which precludes wisdom. We are in an eleventh hour

situation but the cookie must crumble one way or another in this

eleventh hour, and we, Mr. Speaker, will be there whichever way it crumbles.

Mr. Speaker, it is against this background thinking that I believe the international community has a very important role to play as we bring about change. I have conceptual problems with the argument which says that democratic procedures have failed and therefore

there is no alternative but to resort to violence. I say violence has failed and that therefore now we have no alternative but again to resort to democratic options. In the new fluidity now evident in South Africa these options are ever increasingly the more viable options. I do not feel the need here to go into detailed reasoning to back up this statement. I make the point only that if we are to achieve an interim position from which we can launch the final shaping of South Africa, we must be prepared to compromise away from the winner-takes-all demand. If we are not going to be involved in a winner-takes-all situation in the very foreseeable future, and if we have to strive for an intermediate goal, we have to learn from past experience.

I do not regard the EPG's attempt to bring about a negotiating position in South Africa as a failure. I see it as a first venture in exercising the Commonwealth's international responsibility towards South Africa. I think the lesson that we must learn from the CEPG experience is that in future attempts to establish negotiating positions must be rooted in an ongoing participation in

things that are happening in South Africa. I do not use the word 'change' because change as a concept for me implies a movement towards giving Blacks formal constitutional power. Things are,

however, happening and in this sense there is change. It is tragic that the CEPG report terminated its involvement in the ongoing attempt to establish a negotiating position in which both the South African Government and Black leaders can participate. I believe that it is possible to do this even now. Could the Commonwealth not have the courage now to reconstitute the EPG and involve it in an ongoing attempt to bring about the degree of consensus that talking is necessary which will prepare the ground for both the South African Government and Black political groups to work towards a negotiating agenda.

I understand that the Eminent Persons Group was constituted in a situation made very difficult by Commonwealth countries not being able to agree on a final approach to South Africa. I am aware that there must have been in the minds of the eminent persons in the group the need to test the water, so to speak, and some Commonwealth countries may now be satisfied that the Commonwealth should have adopted a far more aggressive stance in the first place. For them the EPG experience may serve to justify their scepticism. The EPG wisely or unwisely had to pursue its objectives with a threatening attitude of harsher measures to come than the limited sanctions agreed to if the South African Government did not make significant moves to meet the EPG half way. This was inherent in the message that they brought from the Commonwealth.

I believe there is no shame for Commonwealth countries to recognise that the EPG did not achieve the objective of establishing a negotiating climate in the country and for the Commonwealth to reconstitute the EPG with the longer and more far-reaching objective of participating in events in the forefront of the interface between South Africa and the external world. The Eminent Persons Group has the distinct advantage of having had discussions

inside South Africa. They will not have to start from scratch, so to speak. As a group they could re-establish contact with Pretoria and could re-establish further dialogue with the ANC. They could also re-establish contact with other Black groupings in South Africa and could be involved in the definition and re-definition of negotiating positions until there was sufficient common ground between all the parties. This would justify the EPG's continued existence.

I am aware of the fact that it is now being suggested in some circles that foreign participation in the negotiating process in South Africa could take the form of, say, Britain and Malawi undertaking to carry a Pretoria perspective to, say, the Governments of Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Rumania, which would in turn table an ANC position. This internationalisation of the preparatory work necessary before negotiations begin in South Africa is perhaps vital. It has in it the same recognition of the need for shuttle negotiation which I have already briefly outlined in my paper last year to the Mini Commonwealth Conference in London. It is in the interests of the Commonwealth that progress be made in South Africa which justifies the re-inclusion of South Africa as a respectable member of the international community.

I argue the merits of shuttle diplomacy associated perhaps with a permanent secretariat in South Africa which can be constantly in touch with developments as they occur. There have been developments since the EPG presented its final report. The South African situation is dynamic and it is constantly shifting and constantly requiring new insights and perspectives. The full weight of the representatives of foreign countries already in South Africa could be mobilised to support such a secretariat I am suggesting and ensure full international participation in urgent attempts to steer South Africa away from a final violent holocaust.

Whatever events lead to real negotiations taking place, there is a need to pay more attention to the kind of negotiations which can in all realism be expected. Thus far a great deal of media prominence has been given to the prospect or otherwise of a Lancaster House-type negotiating situation emerging in South Africa. There has for many years been talk of the need for a National Convention in South Africa and when one mentions the words negotiation about the future of South Africa, people leap naturally to the conclusions of a round-table conference at which the South African Government and other political groupings take their place to determine the kind of constitution that South Africa should have. The ANC has a clearly stated position that it is only prepared to negotiate about the handing over of power to the people. If we accept a winner-takes-all philosophy that position would be understandable. Negotiations about the future of South Africa may not necessarily be negotiations that work from the top down.

I believe in fact that it is more likely that final success in negotiating a settlement which will re-introduce South Africa as a respectable member of the international community will follow on

negotiations which work from the bottom up. Negotiations must have a give and take element in them as our South African circumstances anyone who hopes to negotiate with the South African Government with it capitulating and negotiating about abdicating does not found his or her thinking on the South African realities. If we cannot expect negotiations in the context of a capitulating South African Government handing over power, we must work towards negotiations which work upwards from local, regional and provincial levels to national levels. The former kind of negotiations could only become a reality once the South African economy has been broken and the military might of the country has been drastically reduced. Necessary conditions for successes in this direction are quite out of anybody's sight. We must now look at negotiating from the bottom upwards.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I cannot over-emphasise the need that there is to prepare for negotiations wherever it is possible to do so and to commence with negotiations. We must get the negotiating process off the ground and we in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, have been doing just this. When this Assembly called for the establishment of the Buthelezi Commission in 1980, it did so at a time when the old guard National Party Cabinet was in a crisis and the National Party itself was in ferment. You will remember that it was in September 1978 when Mr. B.J. Vorster vacated the position of Prime Minister as a result of the Information scandal. And in 1979 people like Dr. Andries Treurnicht and Dr. F. Hartzenberg were given Cabinet posts. In 1980 when this Assembly adopted a resolution establishing the Buthelezi Commission, Mr. P.W. Botha was still in the process of consolidating his power within the National Party and revamping the administrative machinery of the Civil Service. At that stage, Mr. Speaker, there was no indication whatsoever that the State President would be departing from the already existing commitment of the Government to

establish a common federation of Southern African States. There was everything indicating that political apartheid would be deepened and tightened with further legislation. It was most

certainly not a time in the political history of the country which could have been judged propitious for the work of the Buthelezi Commission. We did not wait for propitious times. We exercised our judgement and set in motion a train of events which, despite all predictions at the time, is still having consequences today.

The Buthelezi Commission became a reality and we showed the whole world that it was possible to establish consensus between people drawn from many walks of Southern African life, and from every race group in the country. The Buthelezi Commission findings ran against the totality of Government policy for this region of South Africa and they were rejected by the Government as soon as they were published. That rejection, Mr. Speaker, did not rob the findings of their inherent value and it did not prohibit the dialogue between the Natal Provincial Administration and KwaZulu which followed the Government's rejection. We did not wait for the Government to approve of what we wanted to do before getting on with doing it, and we continued with the process of negotiation after the Government rejected the Commission's findings.

iR

The long and detailed negotiations which followed the publication of the Buthelezi Commission recommendations led finally to the Natal Provincial Administration and the KwaZulu Government making proposals for a Joint Executive Authority in KwaZulu/Natal. These proposals have now been accepted by the Government. This acceptance could never have been forecast when the Buthelezi Commission came into being.

After we had negotiated the acceptance of a Joint Executive Authority in KwaZulu/Natal, we did not rest there. We set about continuing the process of negotiation by establishing the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba. The Indaba sat for eight solid months and has now produced constitutional proposals which we will be looking at during the course of this Assembly sitting. In January this year, the Central Committee of Inkatha passed the following resolution:

"The Central Committee of Inkatha has always been aware that the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba was not dictated to by our President and Inkatha. It was an Indaba of the people and was broadly representative of Black, Indian, Coloured and White residents in KwaZulu and Natal. Just as every other political Party and the Government of South Africa will have to weigh up the Indaba proposals in the light of their own sense of history and their own commitments to their aims and objectives, so will Inkatha and the KwaZulu Government have to do the same. Such weighty matters cannot be rushed into.

We therefore resolve:

1% To establish a sub-committee of the Central Committee of Inkatha to prepare an assessment of the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba proposals which can be laid before this year's Annual General Conference and which can also be laid before the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly before it completes this year's Session.

2. To request our President and the Secretary-General to pursue all avenues of discussing the Indaba proposals and their implications for practical politics with South Africa's major Black, Coloured, Indian and White political groupings.

Bt We urge every leader in Inkatha not to prejudice any possible endorsement of the Indaba proposals by pronouncing prematurely on them or speaking in the name of Inkatha before the full process of Inkatha's democratic decision-making has had time to make the final assessment a solid and lasting Inkatha assessment.

4. We appeal to every White political Party contesting the forthcoming general election not to make the Indaba proposals a political football for Party political gain.

I would like to place this resolution in perspective for the sake of posterity. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would have robbed the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba of its inherent value if I had made it my own Party political instrument. At no time during the workings of the Indaba did I dictate to it, and I was meticulous in my avoidance of influencing the Indaba. Those who represented Inkatha in the Indaba deliberations did no more and no less than every other delegation had the right to do. They argued, they reasoned and they sought accord. The accord which they sought would not have been worth the paper it was written on if it was not a genuine accord. The Indaba belongs to the people of KwaZulu and Natal. And like every other organisation which sent delegates to the Indaba, Inkatha has to examine what its delegation did there, and we have to pronounce on the constitutional proposals. Mr. Speaker, we have a track record of being serious and honourable in our commitment to the politics of negotiation and let no one doubt the sincerity of our motives when we refuse to leap into the Indaba proposals and pronounce without thinking.

"I constantly stress that should I ever become involved in the National Council, I would only do so if I was free to test what was being negotiated against the will of the people. Negotiation is a process. In our circumstances negotiators who think they can go to the negotiating table and return to the people with a fait accompli, will be heaping awesome problems on their heads. The Indaba I believe wisely chose to work behind closed doors. The process of consultation between the delegates to the Indaba and to the people they represent must now begin. It is that process of consulting the people about the Indaba which will finally give whatever Indaba proposals finally emerge, the legitimacy which will be needed to make them powerful. I will not short-circuit that political process which will add the power of legitimacy to that which is being negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, we have to continue with our intention to consult the people. It is not our fault that the State President called a Whites-only general election. When one does something properly, there are times in which one cannot do two things at the same time. White South Africans most certainly are now faced with having to make up their minds about the Indaba proposals while at the same time they have to make up their minds where they stand in the general election. The resolution of the Inkatha Central Committee therefore calls on all Parties concerned not to make the constitutional proposals of the Indaba a Party political football in the forthcoming general election campaign. It would do the Indaba proposals a damage if the Progressive Federal Party and the New Republic Party were to attempt to wrap the Government over the knuckles about the proposals themselves. I ask for time in which I myself can deeply deliberate on the Indaba proposals as they are now formulated. Inkatha has asked for that time, and the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly asks for that time. We must therefore grant the Government the time that we ourselves need.

It was therefore with some dismay that I found that the Indaba proposals were bandied around in the No Confidence Debate earlier this year. And, Mr. Speaker, I issued the following press statement to clarify my position.

PRESS STATEMENT

Yesterday, Tuesday, 3rd February, The State President, Mr. P.W. Botha, Mr. C.J. Heunis, Minister of Constitutional Development and Planning, Mr. Stoffel Botha, Minister of Home Affairs and Communications, and Mr. George Bartlett, ' Deputy Minister for Economic Affairs, entered the No Confidence debate to fire salvos at the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba proposals. It is tragic that they did so. The proposals were presented to me on Friday, 23 January and the Central Committee of Inkatha had already by then adopted a resolution urging me and Inkatha's leadership not to pronounce prematurely on the acceptability or the unacceptability of the proposals. The resolution also called for the establishment of a sub-committee which could lay a carefully considered assessment before Inkatha's Annual General Conference which will be held in the middle of the year, and to lay before the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly before it rose towards the middle of the year. Further, the resolution urged every White political Party contesting the forthcoming general election not to make the Indaba proposals a political football for Party political gain. This was a reasoned and very responsible approach to the task which every political group in the country should be tackling with the same sense of responsibility.

The South African Government's swift rejection of the 1Indaba proposals in the No Confidence debate lamentably yet again is evidence that the National Party regards its own Party political position as more important than South Africa itself. It is just not possible for the South African Government to have made a detailed and responsible analysis of the proposals before rushing off to the No Confidence debate to reject them. It is also not possible for the Government at this stage to have any clear insights into the acceptability of the proposals as they are formulated at the moment. The results of the general election itself in this region of South Africa will not produce any indication of the acceptability of the proposals to the general public.

In rejecting the proposals, the National Party fired salvo after salvo at the PFP accusing it of involving the Indaba proposals in its general election campaign. This is precisely what the National Party did by the way they handled the issue in the No Confidence debate. The Government's approach to the 1Indaba proposals has therefore been both

unenlightened and precipitous in favour of Party political propaganda.

We have yet to see how the current election campaign unfolds. There is, however, every indication that the State President is going to attempt to present a tough, no nonsense image to the White electorate to disguise the fact that after the election he will be facing exactly the same intractable political problems that the National Party approach to Government policy generates, as he faced before the election. When all the fanfare of the election has gone, we will be exactly where we were before. We will then continue to have a Government which regards negotiation as no more than seeking consensus for what the National Party has already decided.

There was no negotiation before the people of the region of KwaZulu/Natal had the Natal Provincial Administration dismantled and had the Regional Services Council system foisted on them by prescriptive politics. The State president and the National Party must clearly understand that negotiation for me and the vast majority of the people of the KwaZulu/Natal region must be negotiations leading away from the politics of prescription. This is where the whole exercise of the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba has great significance. We demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that Blacks, Whites, 1Indians and Coloureds can get around a table and negotiate positions which break away from the sterility of apartheid and neo-apartheid dictates. This is where the real value of the Indaba lies.

Mr. C.J. Heunis made the absurd point that all the Indaba did was to emphasise the need for the Government, government institutions, political Parties and groups to be the final negotiators on constitutional issues. Mr. Stoffel Botha said he rejected efforts by "the PFP/NRP alliance and other organisations such as the Indaba Support Group to categorise the electorate into pro- and anti-Indaba groups." How else does one test the acceptability of far-reaching proposals other than by attempting to promote them among the general public? I fear that it is simply a case of the National Party not wanting any real test of public opinion on issues which fall outside their Party political framework. I am angered by this Government's intervention in the democratic process whereby the people of the KwaZulu/Natal region are reaching out for consensus.

I want to make it very clear that the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba was not my Indaba. The Indaba flowed out of my initiative of establishing the Buthelezi Commission but it was Blacks and Whites across a significant political spectrum who began running with the ball to negotiate a Joint Executive Authority for this region and once consensus was reached on that issue, ran again with the ball to seek consensus about a joint Black, White, 1Indian and Coloured legislative authority. The Indaba belongs to the people of KwaZulu and Natal. The Indaba does not seal my fate nor in any way prescribe alternative options or tactics and strategies. As a political leader I will

give the Indaba proposals the detailed and grave consideration that they merit, and having done so in the context of establishing mechanisms for my colleagues and the people of KwaZulu to do likewise, I will abide by the consensus which evolves.

I will also now abide by the consensus on how we should respond to the National Party's rejection of the Indaba proposals before they could be properly evaluated. We would not be stampeded into premature action and those who now will tend to argue that the rejection of the proposals by the Government further makes out the case for violence in politics, are mistaken.

The Indaba process has made the Government at least pause and think. Mr. C.J. Heunis describes the "process" involved in the Indaba as having held "so much promise." Mr. Stoffel Botha who shot from the hip to reject the Indaba proposals before Parliament was convened, says "the National Party however had a strongly pro-Indaba attitude as far as the principles of negotiation was concerned. He said "While rejecting the present proposals as they stand, I firmly believe negotiation must continue." Mr. Heunis said that he and the Government were committed to consulting all groups in Natal about further reform in the region and that it would not prescribe solutions within regions as long as the solutions took cognisance of the realities of society in the region. However ham-handed the Government has been in rejecting the Indaba proposals "as they stand", the Indaba has proved that when consensus begins evolving between people on the ground in a region, the Government is forced to tread warily.

Black South Africans are entitled to be deeply sceptical about the Government's ability to lead in the process of reform. We are only too well aware that the Government shies away from establishing a real democracy in this country. I call on every Black South African who is angered by the National Party's politics of prescription to re-double his or her efforts to bring the kind of pressure to bear on the Government which will make them succumb to the real demands for democracy. The Indaba exercise showed yet again that non-violent, democratic opposition to apartheid and the seeking of consensus about alternatives to apartheid can be the foundations for real politics in this country.

I make these points within an over-riding awareness that none of us have any real idea of just how long we have yet got before the continued inability of the Government to lead in the reform process destroys the goodwill on which the politics of negotiation ultimately depends. I will abide by my people's decisions in this regard.

MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI ULUNDI
CHIEF MINISTER KWAZULU 4 FEBRUARY 1987
PRESIDENT OF INKATHA

I am not going to be bulldozed into making premature personal assessments of the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba's constitutional proposals. Mr. Speaker, I will in due course be calling on Honourable Members of this Assembly to debate the Indaba proposals. Every Member will be provided with a copy of them and because the proposals have such very far-reaching implications for us and for every Authority and group in the KwaZulu/Natal region, the debate we have must be a detailed and informed debate. I see no reason why this debate should take place before the general election on the 6th May. When it comes to consulting the people about issues which will affect their very future at the social, political, economic as well as constitutional level, we dare not be slap-dash about what we are doing.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, only make one point. Lest there be any friend who feels that the time that we really do need in which to consult the people before we make final pronouncements about the constitutional proposals, is unfair to his or her earnest pursuit of the acceptance of the proposals in his or her own circles, let me give you just one example of why I need the time.

In the proposals themselves local governments will be constituted as an integral part of the constitutional machinery and procedures

of the proposals. Local Authorities in the context of the proposals include traditional Authorities, that is Tribal Authorities. Tribal Authorities in essence are democratic

Authorities which serve the communities they serve on the basis of consensus politics in those communities. The Indaba proposals will radically alter the circumstances in which these communities pursue consensus politics which makes hereditary positions of authority democratic positions for the people. Everywhere in Africa, government after government has found it necessary to include Tribal Authorities in the local decision-making process and in the administration process. It was as recently as the 18 March this year that a press report said that Ghana's government is making a major effort to win the support of its influential tribal chiefs. Members will remember that Flight Lieut. Jerry Rawlings seized power in 1981 and launched the ruling Provisional National Defence Council and set about establishing People's and Workers' Defence Committees to sweep away the old order of administration. It is reported now that Ghanaian diplomats and officials say: "The Chiefs are the key to mobilising local enthusiasm. The Government has realised that Chiefs must be included in the revolution for it

to succeed." The Executive Secretary of the Committee for the Defence of the Revolution which replaced the People's and Workers' Defence Committees is quoted as saying: "Chieftancy is basically Ghana's culture. In the villages, you can only talk to people through the chiefs." Thus, Mr. Speaker, even in revolutionary

Ghana recognition is being given to the important role that Chiefs play in not only in the administration of the country but in its political development.

KwaZulu has Chiefs in far-flung places and we have to consult local communities everywhere about the Indaba proposals which affect them so directly. I do not intend going to KwaZulu Chiefs with a fait accomplis. Honourable Members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, will be intensely aware of the need that there is to carry the full weight of the support of the Chiefs with us when we return to the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba to acquaint it with our full response to the Indaba proposals.

I know that there is such a thing as political time and that this has different dimensions for different groupings. I understand the enthusiasm of those who are campaigning amongst the White sectors of our population to have the Indaba proposals widely accepted. But the proper political process of consultation that we, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly must adopt cannot be aborted prematurely because we have not had the time to consult our people properly before we respond to White, Indian and Coloured demands for greater haste.

We will be considering the Indaba proposals from two points of view; as the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and Inkatha we will be considering them in consultation with Black South Africans. But, Mr. Speaker I face the reality that I have very important and far-reaching constituency support amongst Indians, Coloureds and Whites. While Whites will be consulting with Whites, Indians will be consulting with Indians and Coloureds will be consulting with Coloureds, the very spirit of the Indaba does not confine their

consultation to any one race group. The Indaba process, its politics of negotiation and its idiom was reconciliatory between race groups. I will consult. In that spirit and idiom.

Immediately, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I am faced with the fact that South Africa is having a Whites-only general election on May 6th. I will not be able to pop up like a political jack-in-the box on May 7th to give a pronouncement on the Indaba proposals.

Inkatha is an intensely democratic organisation. It is a totally trustworthy organisation because it is responsibly run, it is responsibly led and it is responsibly supported by the masses. As

the President of Inkatha, answerable to Inkatha, I would not dream of going to the Annual General Conference in the middle of this year, and presenting members with a fait accomplis of what we had decided on their behalf. The resolution which Inkatha's Central Committee adopted instruct the Central Committee to prepare an assessment of the Indaba proposals which can be laid before both the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and before the Annual General Conference. There is no way that I can short-circuit this vital process of consultation.

The South African Government has indicated that it wants consultation with KwaZulu and the Province of Natal about the proposals. Those consultations will take place because we must do everything conceivably possible to preserve the politics of negotiation in the Indaba. The Indaba proposals are the result of negotiations working from the bottom up and the Indaba itself has

never attempted to make people believe that they dictate to the Central Government about the role which the Indaba proposals themselves recognise must be fulfilled by the Central Government. Thus, whether we are talking about consultation between ourselves and the people; or we are talking about consultation between ourselves and the Government, it must be accepted that consultation is going to take time. It must also be accepted that the final formulation of proposals for the constitutional development of first and second tier governments in this region of South Africa, must be given political legitimacy. It is the perceived legitimacy or otherwise of the proposals we make that will determine, for example, how many powerful allies we have got at the end of the day among West European and North American governments. Apartheid has been internationalised and the question of illegitimacy here of developments here in this country has international connotations.

Today, therefore, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I am doing no more than placing the Inkatha Central Committee resolution about the Indaba constitutional proposals in perspective. We will in due course be debating the proposals in detail.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, the Members of this Assembly and the members of Inkatha are involved in constituency politics. In the terrible vacuum that developed after the ANC and PAC were banned in 1961, it became ever increasingly clear to me that the old ANC to which I belonged, had erred in not building up powerful and enduring constituency structures. There was a great ascendancy of Black political involvement in the struggle for liberation in the 1950's. Things moved so fast that the ANC's leadership were ever increasingly involved in urgent matters every day and the drama of the events that were taking place made it relatively easy to over-stress the conscientisation of the people at the expense of organising the people. We have learnt from that history and we learnt in the 1960's that once the ANC leadership had been severed from its supporters and could not serve internal politics, the people felt abandoned and bewildered. We learn by our mistakes and when therefore I founded Inkatha, I concentrated on building it up as an organisation and on weaving the very fabric of Inkatha into the daily lives of the people at every level. In times of growing crisis, people yearn to be organised. They want a political home. They want organisational structures which give them things to do. They want to participate in the growth of a movement. So we in Inkatha paid a great deal of time and attention to the question of developing our organisational structures.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, there was another thing we learnt in those dark years in the 1960's. We learnt that because the old ANC structures were under-developed on the ground, there were no mechanisms of mass control over leadership. It is this idiom of a leadership deciding to do what a leadership wants to do, the mobilising the support that leadership needed for what they wanted to do, which established the circumstances in which the old ANC leadership once in exile, could become the tail that wagged the dog. They arrogated unto themselves the right to declare an armed struggle without consulting the people. During the 1960's while

we suffered in a political vacuum here in this country, the ANC quite deliberately developed a strategic policy point of view that any development on their side of the democratic struggle here on the ground would detract from the armed struggle.

Now a quarter of a century later, we can see that the armed struggle per se has not got off the ground. Mr. Speaker, if the ANC could have done more in the armed struggle, it would most certainly have done it. They have not delivered the goods that the declaration of the armed struggle promised the people. In deciding to rely on the armed struggle as a primary means of liberating South Africa, the ANC Mission in Exile made the tactical error of attacking the enemy where it indeed was the strongest. It was as though there was a reliance on the super principle which was simply not at work in the way it was expected to be at work. There was too much reliance on the theory of revolution. There was too much reliance placed on the hope that contradictions in South African society would eat away at the South African Government's strength, and some kind of immutable natural law would operate to turn South Africa's capitalist free enterprise system into a socialist system. This reliance on a political process taking place without you having to attend to it has cost the struggle very dearly.

We are not the puppets of some supernova political centre out there. We are the prime actors in our liberation and the liberation struggle is what we ourselves make it, and that is why from the very inception of Inkatha I have built up its organisational strength; I have built up its internal coherency and unity. I have built up its discipline and the constancy of its commitment to courses of action which we will see through to their final conclusion.

For me, when a Black political organisation develops in the circumstances such as prevail in South Africa, and such as we have created in Inkatha's organisational structure, it will move as the people move and it will provide leadership that the people are seeking. It will become further radicalised whenever it is necessary and it will constantly shape and re-shape its tactics and strategies every time it is necessary to meet changing circumstances. It will also start accumulating gains and widening the front on which it as a mass organisation can penetrate the very fabric of the social, economic and political institutions in which change must take place. Mr. Speaker, I do not have to run around frothing at the mouth and dancing up and down in order to develop the very saleable image of pseudo-radicalism.

Our demands are the radical demands which the people are making. In political terms anywhere in the world what can be more radical than the complete rejection of the very constitution of the country and the demand for its re-writing? What could be more radical than the mobilisation of Black support for this primary objective amongst the masses of the people? What can be more radical than a commitment regardless of the consequences to this objective? Mr.

Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, if radicalism means posturing around in an armed struggle which does not work, using children as cannon fodder for objectives which cannot be realised, and if it means exploiting explosive Black anger to turn Black brother against Black brother and Black sister against Black sister? And if in all these things it also further means making South Africa ungovernable now and in the future, and if it means destroying the economy for the present Government and any government of the future, then I do not want to be the kind of radical, Mr. Speaker, whom people acclaim.

Our radicalism is the servicing of the time-honoured and hallowed values of the Black struggle for liberation which commenced in 1912 and it is in constituency politics that we put structures around those values, and this is why, Mr. Speaker, we are involved in a multi-strategy approach in what we ourselves do, and this is why we advocate Black unity on the basis of a multi-strategy approach in which each can do the best he or she can do in his or her own circumstances. Mr. Speaker, I address every Honourable Member when I say that a terrible burden of responsibility rests on him or her to serve the widest possible range of liberation activities. Inkatha's involvement in the totality of South African life and our constituency demands that Inkatha's leadership and the activities of the Members of this Assembly, make what we do meaningful to ordinary people.

Real power in politics does not revolve around building its extravagant dreams which can never be made real. Political power is built up by servicing the needs of the people. Where there is no water, people want water: where there is no sanitation, people want sanitation; where there are no houses, people want houses and so on through the total range of basic human needs. It is the servicing of these needs which builds up political power. Governments throughout the world rise and fall on their ability or inability to service daily human needs. We in the KwaZulu Government have to do this and we have to do it to the best of our ability in the terribly adverse circumstances in which growing poverty and deprivation are realities which millions of the victims of apartheid know in every-day life.

In our circumstances politics must be more than glorious principles and we have shown, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, for many, many years now that the victims of apartheid who have given such substantial support to my leadership and who returned Inkatha candidates in a landslide victory in the last KwaZulu elections, do not expect the impossible from us. They want only that we work with them and step by step make it ever-increasingly possible for them to do something about their own deprivation.

It is precisely because the KwaZulu Government is accepted by the masses whom we serve that those who oppose us attempt to destroy our schools, blow up our offices and burn out our cars. These attacks are attacks on what we can do for the people. They are attacks on what the people want us to do for them. The powerful

politics of liberation involved in the work of this Legislative Assembly is a threat to those who have decided to make us their enemies in the ANC Mission in Exile, the UDF and COSATU.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, these attacks serve to endorse the correctness of what we are doing. The forces of violence in South Africa cannot openly go to the people and campaign for our rejection. They had to resort to battering the people with intimidatory tactics in desperate attempts to alienate us from the people. Every attack on us through foul means strengthens our conviction that what we are doing is right. Mr. Speaker, there are absolute truths in politics. If the masses rejected what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, those who oppose what we are doing would have gained a landslide victory at the last KwaZulu elections and then prorogued the Legislative Assembly at its very first sitting. That would have annihilated the Assembly forever, but that tactic, Mr. Speaker, could only work if the masses supported those who oppose us. The masses do not support them and that is why they must come in the dark of night and throw hand grenades at us.

Our people know adversity; they know poverty and there is always a clamorous demand for more than we can do. But there is also a great appreciation for what we can do because the people know that it is not our fault that the taxes of the people of South Africa are not employed by the Central Government to give a fair deal to every race group. They know the hideousness of taxation without representation and they struggle with us, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, to have taxation with representation made a reality in South Africa.

I cannot over-stress the need there is for this Assembly during the course of its work this year to devote its untiring energy and its every attention to the practicalities of the work of the KwaZulu Government. How we approach the problems of the people, and how we decide how best to serve the interests of the people, will deeply affect the political power which we are developing.

Mr. Speaker, this Legislative Assembly is distinctly very different to other organs of regional government, no matter what race groups

are involved in them. There is a deep solidarity amongst us and a final commitment to the goals of liberation unparalleled in South Africa. We are heard, Mr. Speaker, in important places and there

is now a very real understanding that our political power amounts to a veto power over what can and cannot be done in the country at large. I say again, Mr. Speaker, we would by now have had a confederation of South African States of the kind Mr. Vorster dreamed of and of the kind Mr. P.W. Botha first committed himself to, had we in KwaZulu opted for the quasi kind of independence which was offered to us. Nothing can be made permanent at the national level which we do not endorse. I say bluntly that this is equally true for the armed struggle as it is true for the reform initiatives of the State President. We are developing very, very real bargaining power and that has always been one of the central aims of the Black struggle for liberation.

It is because we are involved in constituency politics and because we penetrate into every facet of South African life to develop this bargaining power which the Black struggle for liberation needs, that we have to have a very balanced view of everything we do. It is this balanced view and our achievement-orientated politics which is accumulating political advantages that is giving us the recognition that we are now getting both in South Africa and abroad. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, you would all be deeply encouraged if you had travelled with me since the closing of the last Legislative Assembly session. You would have seen for yourself the growing recognition that there is for Inkatha and the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly.

Whenever I go abroad I can say in all honesty that I do not speak for myself. I speak as the representative of millions and I can in all honesty tell everybody I speak to, that I always return to South Africa and tell the masses what I have been saying about them on their behalf. I would like to share with you what I say to Heads of Government and to their senior Ministers when I travel abroad. In November last year I was invited to a Konrad Adenauer Foundation Conference in Bonn which was attended by delegates and diplomats as observers from all over the world, including Latin America and Africa, and this august company heard Dr. G. Warncke, Minister for Economic Co-operation, publicly endorse the valuable role which Inkatha is playing in South Africa. And during the same trip, I had a private meeting with the President, Dr. R. von Weizsacker and with Dr. Warncke. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to Members of this Assembly what I said to Dr. Warncke, so that they are informed about what I say overseas, and so that this Assembly is given the opportunity of endorsing or rejecting what I say on their behalf and on behalf of the people of South Africa.

MEMORANDUM FOR PRESENTATION TO DR. G. WARNCKE, MINISTER FOR
ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY
BY MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI, CHIEF MINISTER KWAZULU, PRESIDENT OF
INKATHA AND CHAIRMAN, THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK ALLIANCE
BONN. 4 NOVEMBER 1986

"I greatly appreciate this opportunity of meeting again with

you, Mr. Minister. South Africa has now entered a very crucial period in history. What we do now will have a vital bearing on what we will be able to do in the future.

Apartheid is now doomed beyond recovery. The victory over apartheid is assured even if the final victory will still demand very considerable sacrifices. It is now that we have to start looking beyond the struggle against apartheid and decide what kind of a future we are going to have. The way

apartheid is eradicated and whom we rely on to achieve final success, will dictate the kind of society we live in in a post-apartheid era. It is because there is such a great deal at stake that Black South Africans are so deeply grateful for the strong stand which the Federal Republic of Germany has taken in the European Economic Community.

We really do appreciate the strong leadership which your Chancellor has shown, Mr. Minister, on the question of economic sanctions against South Africa. Some look at the opposition to sanctions as now a lost cause but if there be such a thing as limited sanctions, the sanctions which are now being applied to South Africa are limited because of his leadership and because of people like Mrs. Margaret Thatcher and President Ronald Reagan. I would be most grateful if you would convey to Dr. Kohl the appreciation we feel for what he is doing.

Politics is frequently defined as the art of the possible, but post-war Germany has shown that politics is the art of making the seemingly impossible possible. This is exactly what we have to do in the struggle for liberation in South Africa. All too many observers of the South African scene are bordering on losing hope that radical change can be brought about by democratic non-violent tactics and strategies. The shift in Europe and North America towards favouring sanctions is an indication of the extent to which people are losing hope. There are many who favour sanctions who do not see them as a first step towards violence. They see it rather as a last step in non-violent pressure on Pretoria. They would, I am sure, have had second thoughts had they perceived that sanctions will fail to force the South African Government into making moves we all want and that when one fails in the last step of non-violent action, the only thing that remains is the next step into violence.

Whatever the motivation was of those who brought about the reality of sanctions against South Africa, we have now been thrust into a post-sanctions era. Right now we are faced with having to respond in this era. Additional hurdles have been placed in front of those struggling to bring about radical change through democratic, non-violent means. The growth of Black bargaining power so necessary in negotiations is being impaired. Black poverty, so disabling when it comes to making group, communal and national efforts to do virtually the impossible, is deepening. The climate of no confidence in South Africa is spreading and it is now more difficult to rally the forces which need to be aligned in the politics of negotiation. Perhaps even worse, the refusal of the South African Government to respond positively to sanctions by moving in a desired direction, is deepening Black anger and broadening the revolutionary potential in South Africa. It is in these circumstances that I now have to exercise my leadership.

I find it disturbing that the term "limited sanctions" is now being so widely used. In one sense, of course, they are limited but people use the term as though the limitations of sanctions clothes sanctions with moral respectability. ME.

Minister, it can be predicted now that many tens of thousands

of Black South Africans will lose their jobs. Depending how things go, these tens of thousands could be turned into hundreds of thousands. But figures in the range of tens of thousands are a reality. When one man loses his job, and

there is no other job available to him, and he has to return to his shack in a slum area, or to his home in a rural area where poverty reigns supreme, the term "limited sanctions" has no meaning to him, his wife, his children and his neighbours. Limited sanctions are for him, and the people around him, total sanctions.

I think we should be concerned about the effects of sanctions even beyond the terrible suffering of individual Black families, groups and even communities. So-called limited sanctions may not prove as limited for the economy as some would have us believe. Very respected and knowledgeable economists are now warning that inflation in South Africa could well be approaching a take-off point beyond it will run out of control. There is now serious talk of inflation rising

above this take-off point in the foreseeable future. What that point is I do not quite know, but people are talking about 25 per cent as being a very threatening percentage. It is

being said that if inflation passes this point then we can anticipate it rocketing out of control to something like 100 per cent in the foreseeable future.

North America and West Europe will pay only a very small portion of the cost of sanctions. The South African Government will minimise the price it has to pay and it is the ordinary Black people of South Africa who in the end will pay the major portion of that price. The South African Government and the more privileged in the economy will make adjustments to contend with sanctions and it is these adjustments which could well make the combatting of inflation impossible. I am a layman as far as economic theory is concerned but even a layman can see the dangers ahead and it is my very earnest plea that a detailed re-appraisal of the effects of sanctions

is made in Europe. There was no real detailed appraisal before the decision was made by some countries to apply limited sanctions against South Africa. There was only

assertion and counter-assertion and I really do plead for a moratorium on the further elaboration and extension of sanctions at least until realistic assessments have been made of what the effects of specific sanctions are likely to be.

A lot of people have supported sanctions against South Africa in some kind of blind faith that the South African Government will now be forced to take the steps that so urgently need to be taken. There is a danger that when this does not happen that they in the same blind faith will deepen the bite of sanctions. We simply cannot afford this throwing of good after after bad. To me it is so tragic that we may well be locked into this kind of cycle of events because I know that so many who argue vehemently for sanctions did so for sound moral reasons. They see themselves as the friend of Black

South Africa and they earnestly desire to strengthen the cause of liberation. A detailed evaluation of the effects of sanctions should therefore involve a broad range of governments and people so that the friends of Black South Africa, the friends of liberation, can be drawn together as a company of people who belong together in a common commitment to bring about a democratic future.

You, Mr. Minister, as Minister of Economic Co-operation, are very well aware of just how difficult it is for underdeveloped nations to pull themselves up by their bootstrings and become developing nations, and even once this stage is reached, you are aware how difficult it is for a developing nation to

become a developed nation. In South Africa millions of Blacks face the same problem as people in undeveloped nations face. There are also further millions who face the problems which developing nations face. The time scales involved in solving the problems that these people face together are very formidable. In our situation we face those time scales while we are involved in a race against time to salvage South Africa from a holocaust. If the politics of negotiation cannot be

got off the ground or if we do not succeed in them once they do get off the ground, we will be witness to scorched earth policy clashing with scorched earth policy in a final showdown of violence which will make the land desolate for future social, economic and political development. This will have a terrible aftermath not only for South Africa but for the whole of Southern Africa.

In this post-sanctions era we have now entered, we in Inkatha are seeking every possible co-operation from the Western industrialised world. It is my plea that sanctions designed to have an effect on Pretoria but which end up being measures which Black South Africans pay for, need to be balanced with very far-reaching humanitarian aid to Black South Africa. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Minister, knowing as you know how long it takes to take a viable development going, that development aid to Black South Africa is now a matter of very considerable urgency.

We in Inkatha grapple with the problems of development and we earnestly desire to make a real contribution to the alleviation of the suffering of the poorest of the poor. We have established the Inkatha Institute to spearhead new developments in this field. We have established an Inkatha Development Office which has widespread grass-root contacts with the people. Even in these endeavours we need development aid. We need greater partnerships in which there is far-reaching vision and we need partnerships which can enhance expertise and shape our tools of community development, leadership training and project management and it is in this context that we feel the German people have been more supportive than most. The partnership we have with the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung has deeply encouraged us and if anything, has made us so much more aware of the urgent necessity of

partnerships between the First World and the Third World in the solution of Third World problems.

I would be most grateful, Mr. Minister, to hear if you find any merit in the suggestion that we need the West German Government's involvement in Inkatha's commitment to do what humanly can be done to combat poverty in South Africa on the ground where it cripples lives and communities."

_____ i SRR L SR

I want to say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that there are widespread delusions in some Black political quarters in South Africa about West European and North American politics. There is a prevailing belief in them that it is to Black South Africa's advantage to participate in the Western Party political scenes which establish governments. There is a kind of unreal expectation that Labour and Socialist Parties do more for the struggle for liberation in our country than Christian Democrat and Conservative Parties do. It is as though there is an idiom in Labour and Social Democrat Parties which causes jubilation in some Black political circles here when they win elections. I have travelled abroad many times, and over many years I have had the opportunity of comparing what is being said in the same country by different ruling Parties. When I go to Britain today, Mr. Speaker, I hear the same things as I heard when I went to Britain under a Labour Government. I have been received by President Carter and I have been received by President Ronald Reagan and I heard the same things from both their Administrations. West European and North American self-interest prevails in whatever diplomacy their countries are involved in. Their Party political pendulums swing backwards and forwards and I have learnt over many years to make friends in high places wherever it is possible to do so whoever rules at the time.

The rising prominence of Inkatha in international perceptions is not a function of West Europe or North America going right. It is a function of the totality of factors in which governments of all political persuasion in the West and in North America participate. We cannot pend the struggle for liberation here while we wait for changes in West European and North American political climates. For me, a friend of the struggle is a friend whatever Party he or she belongs to in the West.

There is, Mr. Speaker, also another phenomena at work which I have observed on many occasions and it is that as one government succeeds another in West Europe and North America, it starts off in its foreign relations where the previous government left off. Attitudes to South Africa are not changed when governments change. The press would sometimes have us believe that this takes place, but it is just not true. I always remember, Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, that it was a Labour Government under Mr. Harold Wilson's leadership that refused to intervene when what was then Rhodesia, declared U.D.I. But it was Margaret Thatcher under a

Conservative Government who nursed the Lancaster House negotiations into being and finality. Western politics are greatly determined by major lobbies in Western countries which have a remarkable constancy across changes of government. And my message to all governments is the same message.

In November last year, I left for the United States and Canada and only returned on the 11th December. I would like to read my itinerary out to Members so that they will understand that it is just not possible for me to read everything I said everywhere I went. But Members are provided with copies of the speeches I delivered and the statements I made and I am relying on them to study these documents and, Mr. Speaker, I invite any Member of this Assembly to raise any objection he or she may have about what I

have said on behalf of the people of South Africa. I will, Mr. Speaker, in due course through you, Sir, ask for a resolution from this Assembly endorsing or rejecting what I have said. The

following, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members was my itinerary:

14 November Depart South Africa

15 November Arrive USA

16 November 10530 "Face the Nation" in New York City studio

17 November 1400 Leave hotel for shuttle to Boston.

Faculty conferences and presentation at University sponsored World Leaders Forum on 'The Plight of Responsible Black Leaders in South Africa'.

Receive honorary degree

18 November 9.00 Depart Boston for New York City

12.00 Union League Club. Luncheon hosted by US-Zululand Education Foundation Inc.

2.30 Sawyer & Miller business consultants

5.00 Foreign Policy Association. Reception

followed by address and question and

answer session. Audience of 300-400

including press representatives

#e 30 Foreign Policy Association's Corporate Council Dinner. Members of the Association's Board of Directors and major corporate sponsors

19 November 7.00 CBS Morning News interview

10.45 New York Times Editorial Board interview.

42500 U.S. Council for International Business:

luncheon with 75-100 New York business

executives followed by address

20 November

21 November

22 November

23 November

24 November

25 November

Channel 5 TV interview

Shuttle to Washington.

Dinner with Dr. Chester A. Crocker,
Assistant Secretary of State for Africa

Breakfast: National Foreign Trade Council.

40 business representatives, lobbyists and
congressional aides.

State Department 'Open Forum.' Address and
questions and answers from the audience

Executive lunch, Department of State, with
key State Department officials

Washington Post newspaper: one on one
interview

Depart Washington for Virginia Beach for
taping of 'Seven Hundred Club' which has a
nation-wide audience

Television taping of John McLaughlin's
"One on One" National TV programme,
Washington

Novak & Evans National TV Interview, Cable
News Network

The McNeil-Lehrer Show, Independent News
Network - interview

Readers Digest dinner/interview

American Black Forum TV studio interview
Address to Heritage Foundation

Live TV 'This Week'

Washington Times luncheon and Editorial
Board interview

Magazine editors: New Republic, US News &
World Report, etc.

Meet with the Vice-President of the United
States, George Bush at the White House

Address to National Press Club

C SPAN TV Cable Network: live interview

Depart Washington for Texas

26 November
27 November

28 November
29 November
30 November 9.30
1 December

2 December 12.00

p.m.

3 December 12500

4 December 12500

5 December 5 30

6 December

7 December

TV and Press interviews, receptions and meetings

Depart Dallas for Florida

TV and Press interviews, and meetings
Address at First Baptist Church, Orlando
Depart Florida for San Francisco

Address to San Francisco Commonwealth
Club. Presentation carried by 400 radio

stations. Question and answer session

Local TV Press Conference and taping of TV
talk show

Dinner with influential businessmen and
state officials

Address to Bay Area International Forum
and lunch with business leaders and
political personalities

Address to The World Affairs Council of
Northern California

Dinner with Council's Board of Trustees

Luncheon meeting with scholars and Foreign
Affairs specialists, the Hoover Institute,
Stanford University

Address to and meeting with Stanford
University's Committee on Investment
Responsibility

Address to The Churchill Club, San Jose

California. Audience of 600 with media
representatives

Dinner with The Churchill Club

Depart San Francisco for Vancouver

Major presentation to a Vancouver audience

TV and Press interviews and meetings:
Major address under the auspices of the
Fraser Institute

TV and Press interviews and meetings.

Major address to Canadian audience in
Toronto

I would like today however to comment in particular on the United States political scene as I experienced it during my trip. I have been aware for some time that the disinvestment issue threatens the solidarity of Americans who should be working with each other in unity as far as South Africa is concerned. They hold the same ideals and they have the same vision on major issues, but they find themselves bitterly opposed to each other in the Party political battles which revolve around the disinvestment issue. It is a complex situation because not only do people become involved in the disinvestment debate with double agendas, but because there are also non-Party political factors which operate both amongst the Republicans and the Democrats. Democrats are obviously very interested in lambasting the Republican Administration about its handling of the South African situation and they are motivated in doing so by Party political considerations which have nothing to do with what is good for this country.

There are other double agendas. The dollar is mighty in the world and it is a weapon not only of American security at home but an American influence in the world. Those who are concerned with

protecting the strength of the dollar and are primarily concerned with building up the wealth of their own financial and industrial empires, have quite a bit to gain out of the disinvestment

programme. They want to protect their interests and this protectionist lobby is very persuasive, both amongst the Democrats and amongst the Republicans. The debate therefore becomes

complicated and it is even further complicated by the fact that the average Mr. and Mrs. America is revulsed by apartheid but feel that

they have been impotent in doing something about it. They therefore want something to do, anything to do and the disinvestment campaign appeals to them as something which Americans can in fact do. They support it because it gives effect to their

moral judgement in the only way they know how.

And then, of course there are people like Archbishop Tutu and Dr. Allan Boesak who are constantly involved in well-oiled publicity machinery who capture the hungry American imagination and capitalise on the feeling of impotence which Americans have about doing something about apartheid. Mr. Speaker, I think this Assembly ought to be aware of these complications. We have a great many real friends in the United States who have been circumscribed by the politics which revolve around the disinvestment issue.

I was very forcibly struck, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, by the fact that on the disinvestment issue time is actually on our side. It is just so tragic that it is ordinary Black South Africans, the victims of apartheid, who are going to continue paying the price for disinvestment while the time factor matures in their favour.

Mr. Speaker, COSATU and the UDF in fact know that disinvestment is going to hurt the victims of apartheid and the victims of apartheid themselves have never clamoured for disinvestment. These

organisations have had the liberty of saying whatever they wanted to say without referring to the people. They are basically affiliate organisations and are not dependent on endorsement by the actual individuals who are members of the organisations which have been affiliated. On the 9 March Business Day carried a report about a British Broadcasting Corporation 'Newsnight' programme in which people were interviewed about disinvestment. I simply could not believe my eyes when Mr. Chris Dlamini the Vice-President of COSATU said that COSATU had never called for companies to pull out of South Africa. And the Business Day report says, inter alia, "Dlamini was among other disgruntled South African workers interviewed on a programme highlighting increasing Black disenchantment with disinvestment." The political shallowness of Mr. Dlamini is revealed by a statement he made in that programme. He said: "We have never called for companies to pull out, but we do support sanctions." And this man who poses as a leader and who is accepted by some as a leader, and who works himself in an American company operating in South Africa, Kellogg's, said that Kellogg's is doing something to off-set apartheid by challenging detentions and providing Blacks with educational bursaries. Mr. Speaker, then this small-minded man boldly said that this was not enough and that employers should now stop paying taxes. There we have the calibre of leadership advocating sanctions against South Africa.

Then again, I could not believe my eyes, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, when Dr. Allan Boesak said disinvestment was part of the package he and others had been calling for but was fairly low on their list of priorities. And he added that disinvestment should be seen as a last resort, and he protested that a situation where companies were withdrawing from South Africa resulting in job losses, was not something he and his supporters wanted. And just as ridiculously unrealistic as Mr. Dlamini was in calling on employers not to pay taxes, Dr. Boesak was stupidly unrealistic

when he said: "What we want is quick sanctions. We want to see if we can get the international community to move on sanctions to minimise disinvestment." There we have it, Mr. Speaker, that is

the calibre of the leadership of the UDF.

Mr. Speaker, I have said publicly and I repeat today again. If sanctions could be sharp, short, telling and successful, my approach to sanctions would have been entirely different. I warned that it is a strategy that cannot win and that its failure will be the measure of the pain that it causes the victims of apartheid.

In tear-jerking writing and speaking people like Dr. Boesak and Archbishop Tutu have been campaigning for sanctions against South Africa for many months now and their stage-managed theatrical performances have had an effect on the American public and once this has taken place, Archbishop Tutu and Dr. Boesak join forces with people like Randall Robinson of Trans Africa to orchestrate high-profile pressure on those who oppose disinvestment. They gather highly publicised emotional backing in tactics such as picketing South African embassies in the United States, and orchestrating consumer boycotts against large companies such as IBM and Coca Cola. Then these companies withdraw and when the threats

to the jobs of ordinary Black people become a devastating realities in the lives of Black families, and ferments start in places like COSATU, then Mr. Dlamini and Dr. Boesak trot off to London and proclaim they did not campaign for disinvestment. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, time is the worst enemy of liars; time is the worst enemy of those who masquerade; time is the worst enemy of rank stupidity. Time endorses wisdom and time is on the side of people who are the genuine representatives of the victims of apartheid. Time is on our side. Sanctions will prove a failure. We cannot sit now and wait for the fullness of the time to arrive when we will be proved right. It is now that the people suffer and we must continue with our efforts to hasten the realisation that sanctions are folly. Let me share with you the letter which Mr. Randall Robinson of Trans-Africa has circulated in the United States and Archbishop Tutu's letter backing Mr. Randall Robinson and endorsing what Robinson states:

GLOBAL SANCTIONS CAMPAIGN

Dear Friend of a Free South Africa,

On October 2nd the U.S. Senate, in a vote reflecting the strong sentiment of the American people, overrode President Reagan's veto of The Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986.

Senate action followed a strong House override vote of 313-to-83 on September 29th. Although the passage of this legislation - over President Reagan's veto - was a victory of sorts, I want you to know it is at best only a partial victory - for two reasons. o

First, The Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, which recently became law, was the weaker Senate version of the bill - lacking the strong sanctions teeth of the much tougher House version of the bill we had strongly supported.

Second, The South African government can now boast of an ambivalent U.S. response - since the sanctions law was passed in spite of President Reagan's clear opposition. This gives the Botha regime the hope that our government's position on Apartheid will erode even more over time.

But meanwhile, the torture, the killings, the injustice continue to wreak havoc on the lives of millions upon millions of black South Africans!

What our government has demonstrated by its weak response - just as the governments of Great Britain and West Germany have demonstrated by their weak response - is that it places short-term economic gains above the enslavement and brutalization of millions of fellow human beings. That's why they continue to refuse to impose meaningful sanctions.

And that's precisely why you and I and all Americans who abhor the enormous human tragedy that now engulfs South Africa have no choice but to press more vigorously than every for ending Apartheid by striking: at - the. heart of our entrenched opposition - not only in Washington, D.C., but also in London and Bonn.

So today I'm issuing an urgent call for you to help the Free South Africa Movement expand and intensify our anti-Apartheid fight into a new, full-fledged Global Economic Sanctions Campaign.

By renewing your annual support to TransAfrica today, you will help us mobilize citizen action and the weight of public opinion against those political and business leaders in America, Great Britain and West Germany who have failed to take decisive action on this most pressing moral issue of our day.

By renewing your annual support to TransAfrica today, you will help us mobilize <citizen action and the weight of public opinion against those political and business leaders in America, Great Britain and West Germany who have failed to take decisive action on this most pressing moral issue of our day.

It's critical that we move to a global sanctions effort immediately because only the imposition of world-wide sanctions, lled by the United States, Great Britain and West Germany, will have sufficient impact to bring about democratic change in South Africa. Multi-lateral action by the major Western nations rather than token wunilateral action is necessary to force responsible and swift change by the South African Government.

The precious freedom and the very lives of far too many innocent men, women and children in South Africa compel us to escalate our efforts, to pursue this struggle with greater than ever resolve through to its ultimate victory - democracy for South Africa!

That's why it is imperative that we receive your immediate help right away! We must be able to launch our Global Economic Sanctions Campaign with an intensity that will force our government, as well as the governments of Great Britain and West Germany, to finally bow to the will of the people - to impose the sanctions that will save countless lives in South Africa by hastening an end to Apartheid. Our new Global

Economic Sanctions Campaign will fight for sanctions on three fronts ..

e

FIRST, global sanctions must begin at home. Americans must take the lead on this issue. We must hold personally accountable the politicians and business leaders who callously continue to ignore our cry for sanctions. We will pull back the veil cloaking the "faceless legislative process" and the anonymity of "big business" by revealing THE FACES BEHIND APARTHEID!

We will reveal THE FACES BEHIND APARTHEID immediately with a hard-hitting nationwide newsprint ad campaign. Here in the United States we will expose the names and faces of those members of Congress who have voted against economic sanctions. We will show voters in their home districts the callous behaviour of these politicians - who through their inaction, indifference and overt opposition to ending Apartheid have the blood of thousands of innocent South African men, women and children on their hands.

We have already developed an initial list of 10 political FACES BEHIND APARTHEID. At the top of our list is Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina. We plan to run full-page newsprint ads in the Charlotte, Raleigh and Fayetteville newspapers in January. I will send you a copy of the Jesse Helms ad when it appears.

We will use these hard-hitting ads to send Washington a loud and clear message - a message that will put all our lawmakers on notice to the compelling citizen sentiment for passage of tough economic sanctions in January, 1987, when Congress begins its new session.

We will also expose the names of the top corporate officials, not only in the United States but also in Great Britain and West Germany, who disregard the fervent plea of compassionate people worldwide to stop doing business with South Africa.

We will not let these men and women remain anonymous behind their closed boardroom doors! We will bring them into the spotlight of personal exposure and public censure. Men such as John F. Akers, Chairman of the Board of IBM, who places his corporate profits above the moral atrocities being carried out in South Africa. Our ads will urge readers to boycott the products and services of these corporations and to flood the business leaders pictured in the ads with personal letters, urging them to immediately stop their "business as usual" relationship with South Africa!

SECOND, we will use our FACES BEHIND APARTHEID national media effort to propel the South Africa issue to the top of the 1988 Presidential campaign agenda of issues. Because many candidates are already running for the Presidency, we must

make it clear that their political response to Apartheid will be a "litmus test", of their moral integrity for the highest office in the world. We will also insist on platform statements from both political parties on the Apartheid issue in South Africa, pressing them for definitive statements on the specific course of action they intend to pursue.

THIRD, we will expand our nationwide Free South Africa

Movement - now actively involving over 40,000 Americans and leaders of many prominent religious institutions and labour unions - into a vast global citizens' movement. To link our

efforts with existing and equally determined anti-Apartheid groups in Great Britain, West Germany and other Western nations. Because of our strong successes in this country, I believe we can be of immeasurable help to them.

By empowering and enlarging the anti-Apartheid movement globally, we will make it clear to the world leaders and to the world community that silence or inaction on Apartheid is a crime against humanity and will no longer be tolerated.

Our ultimate objective must be comprehensive United Nations Security Council sanctions, like those imposed on Rhodesia.

The history of the U.N. sanctions imposed on Rhodesia demonstrates that comprehensive sanctions can and do lead to profound social and economic change.

The vast majority of United Nations member nations have already indicated a strong desire for comprehensive economic sanctions. This must be used as leverage to force the U.N. Security Council to use its authority and impose mandatory comprehensive sanctions.

We are determined to seek nothing less than full global economic sanctions. Because nothing less than this will end the staggering injustice of Apartheid and allow democracy to finally be birthed in South Africa.

And because of the strong success of our multi-billion dollar divestment actions in this country among local governments, religious institutions and others, we will bring our experience to bear helping our anti-Apartheid colleagues push for stronger divestment in their own countries.

Encouraging signs of stronger global divestment are evident. For example, the State of California - even with a Republican Governor who had at first publicly opposed divestment - has not passed divestment legislation that has been signed by the governor!

Recently, the giant Coca Cola Company announced its plans to join other major American corporations in terminating its operations in South Africa. And here in the nation's capital, Georgetown University recently announced a total divestment of over \$28 million with companies doing business in South Africa.

In September, the government of Japan announced the imposition of economic sanctions against South Africa - one of its largest trading partners. Japan will now ban imports of iron and steel, terminate tourist visas to South Africa and

prohibit South African planes from landing in Japan. And other nations are also preparing to impose tougher economic sanctions.

Believe me, none of these actions would have taken place without the outcry from citizens like you and me the world over that Apartheid must end!

Yet, in spite of these and other positive actions, I can tell you our Global Economic Sanctions Campaign is going to be a difficult, long-term fight. But I truly believe that with your help - and with the help and backing of compassionate people worldwide - we can win! And we will ultimately win not because we have more money or more power, but because of the moral rightness of our cause.

I anticipate that the costs of carrying out all the actions of the GLOBAL SANCTIONS CAMPAIGN may be as high as \$1,000,000. But even that large amount of money is a small price to pay for the freedom of a nation - a nation ensnared in the most vicious brutality and oppression since Nazi Germany.

|

In closing, I want you to know that Archbishop Desmond Tutu is in complete accord with our plans for the GLOBAL SANCTIONS CAMPAIGN. And he emphasized that global economic sanctions are now the only realistic way to avert a racial bloodbath in South Africa. I am grateful that you have stood with us in this growing movement for justice and helped us so strongly in the past. Now I call on you to continue to stand with us in the more difficult days ahead - by renewing your annual support today. Together we must "go the distance." You and I both know the fight will not be easy or cheap. But victory can be won.

But the question remains for the people of South Africa .. How Long? Every day the death toll mounts. Every day brutality and atrocities are inflicted on innocent men, women and children in towns and cities throughout South Africa. Every day innocent people are tortured and teenagers are gunned down in the street. We are in a race against time - a race to save precious human lives that are lost each day Apartheid is allowed to continue. Please let me know you stand with us as

we move forward together in a larger, more difficult and costly fight for freedom.

For a Free South Africa,

Randall Robinson
Executive Director

P.S. Please be as generous as possible so I can purchase the newsprint ads on Jesse Helms in the three North Carolina newspapers. Thank you for renewing your annual support immediately.

_____ o s SRR b

ARCHBISHOP DESMOND TUTU

P.O. BOX* 1131 ARCHDIOCESE OF JOHANNESBURG
JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA

I am sending this urgent letter to you today with the fervent hope and prayer that you will join me immediately in the struggle to end the nightmare of Apartheid and help birth a Free South Africa.

Dear Friend of Justice,

Mounting violence and brutally repressive governmental measures in South Africa mark a critical final stage in our moral challenge against our oppressors.

I believe we are now embroiled in the most difficult and painful phase of our struggle for freedom. And I pray it will culminate as quickly as possible in freedom and full equality for millions of oppressed black South Africans.

For the fire of freedom burns in our hearts - and it will not be extinguished by the South African government's secret police nor by their guns, their police dogs, their tear gas and their torture chambers.

We will be free. But the key questions are "when" and "at what cost in human life"?

Throughout history every struggle for freedom has borne a price. The founders of your United States paid that price when they fought to free themselves in the Revolutionary War. And when those who could no longer tolerate the inhumanity of slavery declared all men must be free, America again paid a dear price for freedom in your Civil War.

Now, we in South Africa are paying an enormous price to end - for once and for all - the abomination of Apartheid. And that price, paid in human lives and in suffering, increases with every day the struggle rages on.

Therefore, what I fervently pray that you and all men and women of compassion will do is act to see that our struggle is as short-lived as possible.

And that is why today I ask you to make an immediate commitment - as generous a financial commitment as you possibly can - to help us publicize, educate, lobby, boycott and take whatever other legal and moral means necessary to end the long nightmare of Apartheid and free the oppressed people of South Africa as quickly as possible.

When you do, you will be joining with millions of just and compassionate men and women all over the world in helping us lift the yoke of oppression from our shoulders.

Because right now, throughout your own country and in other Western capitals, momentum for action against Apartheid is building:

In America, your U.S. Congress has passed the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 and overridden a Presidential veto of that legislation. Over 5,000 American citizens have been arrested while protesting at South African consulates across America. Twenty U.S. states and 65 cities have divested over \$7 billion in South African investments, while 30 banks have placed major restrictions on loans to South Africa. In fact, direct U.S. investment in South Africa has dropped from \$2.6 billion in 1981 to \$1.3 billion in 1986.

And these heartening developments in your country are echoed throughout the world.

For example, more than 100 United Nations leaders from nations all over the globe met in Paris not long ago to organize and promote economic sanctions against South Africa.

Recently, the Eminent Persons Group of the British Commonwealth of Nations, in a damning report, said that the Pretoria government is "not yet ready to negotiate fundamental change" and that international economic pressure may "offer the last opportunity to avert what could be the worst bloodbath since the Second World War."

In fact, most of the 49 Commonwealth governments are now insisting that the Thatcher government impose strong economic sanctions. Zambia may pull out of the British Commonwealth to protest Prime Minister Thatcher's refusal to act.

The Queen of England is also pressuring Mrs. Thatcher to respond with economic sanctions on South Africa.

Here in South Africa itself, pressure for the dismantling of Apartheid is building rapidly. White factions within South Africa are now openly fighting each other. The Botha government has begun jailing white South African citizens who are showing increasing support for democracy.

Yet, in spite of the reactionary and repressive measures taken by the South African government, I still believe it can be compelled ultimately to make a choice it has so assiduously avoided - a choice between joining the human race or remaining completely isolated, an island fortress of racist tyranny besieged by decency.

Because I know that as a caring compassionate person you are a foe of Apartheid, I ask that you now stand with me and will millions of oppressed black South Africans in helping us throw South Africa's benighted Apartheid policy on the trash heap of history, where it belongs.

What I ask is that you help us end the deliberate, systematic brutalization of my countrymen by their own government.

Apartheid is first and foremost a moral issue. Because it is a moral lissue, not a political issue, liberals and conservatives, young and o0ld, people of all races and

religious faiths are rising up and wuniting in a mighty movement for justice called Free South Africa!

Let me tell you more about this movement. Last January I spent a week in Washington, D.C., speaking and organizing. And I very purposefully connected by own efforts with those of brothers and sisters I trust and respect.

I worked directly with Randall Robinson, the Executive Director of TransAfrica, to mobilize greater support from Washington and, through it, the world community.

I have known Randall for many years, and he has helped our cause immeasurably. He is a most knowledgeable, dedicated, black American, and he is leading the fight to Free South Africa.

He was the originator of the protests in front of the South African embassy, which ignited the Free South Africa movement in America and led to an incredible groundswell of public outrage throughout your country.

I am personally convinced that TransAfrica's long history of day-to-day, working commitment to fight against South African policies justifies whatever faith and support you may decide to entrust to this vital group.

It is because of his untiring efforts and the fine organizing work of TransAfrica, that the anti-Apartheid groundswell is now gaining such dynamic momentum in America.

Spearheaded by TransAfrica, hundreds of thousands of Americans have already taken action to urge your own government to withdraw economic support from South Africa.

Distinguished Americans, including Coretta Scott King, Arthur Flemming, former Chair of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, and dozens of members of Congress from both political parties are participating with TransAfrica in the Free South Africa Movement.

Hundreds of school groups, labor unions and religious institutions are part of the Free South Africa Movement and are working daily to end the moral outrage of Apartheid.

With your help, Free South Africa can bring even greater political and economic pressure, worldwide exposure, and moral outrage to bear on the South African government - to end Apartheid as quickly as possible.

Yes, Apartheid will end. But the agonizing question remains: how many more of our children and youth must die - before a peaceful settlement is reached?

How many more of our leaders must be harassed, imprisoned, tortured and ruthlessly separated from their families for long periods of time?

How many more pregnant women will be beaten by the secret police - damaging their unborn children?

In the last six months, more than 35,000 concerned Americans have joined us in Free South Africa. But many more caring Americans like you must now come on board quickly.

I truly believe that with your help and the mobilization of hundreds of thousands of concerned people in your country and around the world, you and I can Free South Africa so that we can have a reconciled society of blacks and whites together in a democratic, nonracist South Africa.

At this stage in our fight for justice, it is most important that we have the critically needed resources to exploit every advantage and take every strategic action demanded - diplomatic, economic, political and education - while there is yet time to avoid even more bloodshed.

I ask you - I plead with you - on behalf of my oppressed countrymen and the cause of humanity - to give yourself to his cause.

Through your commitment, joined with the commitment of thousands upon thousands of others, we will ultimately bring human equality to South Africa.

The fire of freedom burns in our hearts - and it will not be extinguished. Justice will ultimately prevail. We shall be free.

And we shall remember and be grateful to those who helped us become free.

I hope you will join me today. I wait for your financial support and your moral commitment to winning this struggle as quickly as possible.

And I ask for your prayers as we carry our fight forward. God bless you.

Respectfully yours,
Archbishop Desmond Tutu

_____ 5 AL B e Ry T

While we continue in our labour to make the truth heard, I believe that we should do everything we can to avoid the alienation from us of our friends from abroad who have been persuaded that only those who advocate sanctions are the friends of the people. I have a great many really good friends in the United States who have difficulty on the question of sanctions and disinvestment. We must not lose those friends. We must understand their predicament and remain in dialogue with them through every means possible.

prepare ground for the hammering of a formula for the South African Federal Union of South Africa. This was a form of protest against the Tricameral Parliamentary system and the Constitution that excluded us.

For months we had ongoing discussions with them and others but in the end my own deep-down political instincts told me that what we were doing could be manipulated by the South African Government and when we reached the stage of having to go to the people so that what we were negotiating about behind closed doors could be disclosed to the people, and they could endorse it or reject it, the negotiations were suspended. That was right, Mr. Speaker, in the time and the context in which we did so. The point I am making today is that we dealt with our brothers and sisters in these areas as our fellow South Africans who began sharing a wider vision of our country. In this vision we saw that they are our brothers and sisters; we saw that they are our fellow South Africans and saw that they must be part of a new South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point that in any negotiations which could have taken place prior to these areas accepting so-called independence, they would have been there. I make the point, Mr. Speaker, that the power of democracy is that through it you can recover from mistakes made. I believe these areas made political errors of judgement when they accepted so-called independence. I am not going to be a Black leader who denies them the opportunity of recovering from those errors of judgement. I believe sooner or later that they will want to recover from them. They will never ever be legitimised as independent States in Africa, and they most certainly will not want to be tied to a National Party Government which will go down the drain if they insisted on their confederation pipe dream. The governments of all the areas so hideously known as homelands, later euphemistically talked about as national states, and now Regions, together with the South African Government will be around whatever negotiating table takes place. All White Parties and all Black political Parties, and all Coloured political Parties and all Indian political Parties, will be there with us.

I do not approve of the National Party's aims, tactics and strategies. I do not approve of the ANC Mission in Exile's violent tactics and strategies. I do not approve of the acceptance of so-called independence by Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei. It is precisely because I disapprove that I want to negotiate something which I and others can approve. That is why I will not treat Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei, as enemy states. That in itself gives their so-called independence the kind of legitimacy the whole world is denying them.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members will recall that when there were riots on the coal mines, Chief Lennox Sebe in 1986 sent a very high powered delegation led by some of his Ministers to discuss the

problems which both they and we were concerned about. Honourable Members will recall that when there were clashes between people in the Umbumbulu District who were from neighbouring areas dominated by Xhosa and Zulu respectively, we had discussions with high powered delegations from the Transkei. Members will also recall that Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima flew up to Durban to meet me when we were talking about a possible Black federation. There have been these contacts between KwaZulu, the Transkei and the Ciskei and I have participated in these discussions within the framework, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, as I said earlier, of my total commitment to one South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, because I am committed to the politics of negotiation I was shocked when violence began flaring in the Ciskei and I would like to read to Honourable Members a telegram I sent to President Sebe on the 20 February this year:

"I wish to register my shock and distress at the conflict which has culminated in an attempt on your life and that of your family. As your Nguni and Black brother I have been concerned for some time about the conflict which has led to the present debacle. I thank God for saving your lives."

On the same day, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I sent the following telegram to the Prime Minister of Transkei, Chief George Matanzima:

"I have been concerned for some time about the conflict which has been raging between Transkei and Ciskei. I am extremely concerned as your Nguni and Black brother about how one can assist to diffuse the conflict. We are praying for the leadership of both the Transkei and Ciskei."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, life is not simple in South Africa. There are complexities behind the scenes which the media never picks up. There are deep-down currents giving rise to events which will only become known in time. The world is not what it seems, and I believe in the politics of negotiation. I also

believe that beyond all the political differences that exist between Black brother and Black brother, there is and there will

remain the ties which belong to patriots. They may be obscured, they may even be buried at times but there is something indestructible about true patriotism. There are times in which

others treat me as a true patriot behind the scenes while they foul-mouth me in public across the length and breadth of this country and throughout the world. I would like just to give one example.

Archbishop Desmond Tutu is a publicly declared enemy of Inkatha. He participates fully and openly and very flamboyantly in the tactics and strategies of Inkatha's political enemies. But I would

148

The Anglican Bishop of Johannesburg
P. 0 Box#1 131,
Johannesburg 2000

13 May 1986

Chief Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi
P.Bag X01
ULUNDI 3838

Dear Chief Buthelezi,

Leah and I want to thank you most warmly for your kind message of congratulations and assurances of prayerful support at my election as Archbishop of Cape Town.

We were not certain what God's will was for us. We had hoped that we might have been able to continue in Johannesburg until my retirement. The Elective Assembly was a happy occasion and most of us were surprised that the result came so quickly and decisively. A great deal of credit must go to Archbishop Philip Russell who did a Pope John on us as a "stopgap" Metropolitan working quietly and unobtrusively but effectively to help bring about a noticeable change of views; as well as to Bishop Kenneth Oram, Bishop of Grahamstown and Dean of our Province who presided at the Assembly. Thanks too must go to you and all those who prayed that God the Holy Spirit should guide us. ;

After the election I asked my brother bishops whether they believed it was God's will that I should become Archbishop and the Synod of Bishops was unanimous in saying they believed this to be so.

Please pray for our country going through traumatic times and for the Diocese of Johannesburg preparing to elect a new bishop and for Leah, our family and me as we prepare for my enthronement on September 7th in Cape Town. We hope many of our friends will be able to be there.

God bless you.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) Desmond

What is an enigma in our tenuous relationship, he in the capacity of my Pastor and me as a member of his flock, is that while we can

exchange such letters there is something irreconcilable in it with his actions when he travels to length and breadth of the world

villifying me. He wrote me such a lovely letter after he had dissuaded Mrs. Coretta Scott King, the widow of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., from seeing me. Mrs. King approached me through Mr. Bob Brown who was at that time tipped as a possible choice as an Ambassador of the United States to South Africa. Mrs. King asked for an appointment to meet me on her visit to attend the

Archbishop's enthronement service. As you may have seen in the media, it was reported that Mrs. King was put under pressure not to see me. It was reported that it was in fact the President of the

Alliance of Reformed Churches, Dr. Alan Boesak, who told Mrs. King that if she saw me and President Botha, he (Dr. Boesak) would ensure that he and Mrs. Winnie Mandela would not see Mrs. King, as you can see from this report in "The Cape Times" and the response by the Honourable Minister of Education and Culture, Dr. O.D. Dhlomo to Dr. Boesak's fulminations on the issue.

Dr. Boesak's article appeared in "The Cape Times" of the 13th September 1986 under the title WHY MRS. KING COULD NOT SEE P.W. BOTHA (Dr. Boesak explains why he believes Mrs. Coretta Scott King was right to break her appointment with President Botha. The white establishment reaction, he says, was "sickening hypocrisy"). The article reads as follows:

WHY MRS. KING COULD NOT SEE P.W. BOTHA

"Mrs. Coretta King decides to come to South Africa. She is advised that discussions with President P.W. Botha, Chief Gatsha Buthelezi and some members of the 'coloured' and Indian chambers are imperative.

Advice from us at an early stage that she is being misled and that such discussions would cause unnameable problems in the black community never reaches her.

On her arrival in South Africa, she is supplied with security policemen while told she has no choice but to accept their

presence. They go everywhere with her. Walking into her hotel the morning I saw her, I felt as if I was in detention again. How is it possible, I think. The same policemen who

detain our people in the middle of the night and who torture them in their jails are seen with her as responsible for her safety!

In her entourage is someone with dubious links with the Reagan administration - the same administration who so quickly disowned her when things went wrong.

When I finally talk to her, I hear that she has been given to understand that her programme, including the proposed meetings, had been okayed by me, which was not true. By now,

any right-thinking person knows that something is wrong. And when all carefully laid plans go awry, all hell breaks loose. Why? Why was it so important for some people that Mrs. King speaks to P.W. Botha and Gatsha Buthelezi? And why did I resist that? Mrs. King is not a politician. She has no direct influence on politics either in the USA or in South Africa. She has, therefore, no political leverage with the South African government as say a Senator Lugar or Senator Kennedy would have.

'CHANGE' IN APARTHEID

But she is the widow of a remarkable man, apostle of non-violent resistance, fighter for justice and peace, and against racism and oppression and war. She carries with her a tremendous moral authority. To be seen with her is to be associated with the noble heritage of the things Martin King lived and died for: peace, justice, racial harmony, non-violence.

And indeed, this is what both gentlemen in question wanted so very badly, for this image they need desperately at the moment. This is what they wanted to use her for - another victory for another 'change' in apartheid.

But we could not allow this to happen. Not at a time when we are living under a second state of emergency in one year, with an ever-growing spiral of violence and oppression, with more than 15 000 in prison, with detained children in 'correction camps' and legalized murder by the army and police. And, let us be honest, for these things Mr. Botha must ultimately take responsibility. Neither Mrs. King, nor the government, nor us can do as if all this did not matter.

She has been told that her moral power would have influenced P.W. Botha, that he would listen to her. I don't believe that. After all, it is only a few months ago that we saw the arrival of the Eminent Persons Group of the Commonwealth. There was an opportunity to influence President Botha and to change things. The African National Congress was ready to begin to talk, given certain conditions.

Who, quite deliberately and cold-bloodedly torpedoed those noble efforts and exciting possibilities for peace by the bloody raids on Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana? Who made those bitter speeches about 'foreigners' who should keep their noses out of 'our' business? You know who: P.W. Botha.

But we and Mrs. King are expected to believe that she can persuade President Botha to change his ways. We are even asked to believe that she can effect 'reconciliation', as one white politician put it. What nonsense!

IR

Only a few weeks ago Archbishop Desmond Tutu had to admit with sadness that his discussions with President Botha were (once again!) unhelpful. In frustration the rest of us looked on as the South African government used this visit for pure

propaganda. Desmond Tutu lives here, he knows South Africa, he is the spiritual leader of millions - an honest and wonderful man. He is sent away empty-handed. But we must believe that Mrs. King would have done better. No, what we

had here was a blatant effort to use an innocent, marvellous person.

'AMUSED SURPRISE'

For me it was clear: Mrs. King should not give credibility to apartheid or its representations. For what have P.W. Botha and Gatsha Buthelezi in common with the memory and work of Martin Luther King? When Dr. King was murdered, did the South African government cry with us? Did they then unban his books and speeches? No, they did not.

How can the symbol of non-violence identify herself with the horrifying violence of this government, with the blood of our children still warm on the streets? What has she in common with the men who imprison those of us when we live out the ideals of her husband? What has she in common with the dictatorial, violent nature of Inkatha? What a coup it would have been for them if she had met with them! I have too high a regard for Mrs. King to stand by while she becomes victim to such political cynicism and abuse.

I watched with amused surprise as the storm raged after she had taken her courageous decision to cancel those two appointments. The spectacle in the press (Afrikaans as well as English) was a revelation. In a sense it is understandable. After all, President Botha is their State President.

But there is more than meets the eye. For the white establishment it was a bitter pill that a black person should have done this. The reflections on Mrs. King's Christian attitude are transparent, sickening hypocrisy. The same

'Christian' whites who justify apartheid and the ongoing murder of our children must not talk about being Christian.

But there is still more. For some time now the white establishment has made it clear that it has chosen Gatsha Buthelezi as our leader. That we do not want him is beside the point. Now all of a sudden it becomes clear that he does not command the authority they would like to ascribe to him on SATV.

Contrary to what is claimed, I did not exert 'intense pressure' on Mrs. King. I have only once stated in public what I would do if she went ahead. My reasons are now clear. There were no messages or telephone calls. No, the angry ones are wrong: the truth is much more simple and maybe therefore much less palatable.

Mrs. King came to realize that she must choose with whom she wants to be seen and associated. She had to decide who was a more legitimate and authentic leader and who truly stood in the tradition of her husband. She made her choice. Those who could not take it, choked on it.

The following is the response by the Honourable Dr. Oscar Dhlomo:

The Editor, 17th September, 1986
Cape Times

122 St. George's Street,

CAPE TOWN

8001

Dear Sir

Normally one would not like to waste time responding to Dr. Boesak's usual rhetoric, but for the sake of your readers, I feel I must correct the distortions evident in the article: Why Mrs. King could not see P.W. Botha (Cape Times, 13 September 1986).

Firstly, it is a fact that as soon as it became evident that Mrs. Coretta Scott King would visit South Africa, Dr. Boesak contacted her in the U.S. and attempted to influence her not to meet what Dr. Boesak called "system blacks, including Chief Buthelezi". It is also a fact that Mrs. King took exception to this apparent insult to her intelligence and insisted that she would see leaders of all shades of political opinion in South Africa and then make up her mind. Dr. Boesak therefore failed in his initial bid to blackmail Mrs. King.

Secondly, when Mrs. King arrived in South Africa with her entourage, Dr. Boesak was at work again - this time supported by some staffers in the South African Council of Churches. He threatened that he would not see Mrs. King if she saw Chief Buthelezi. Nevertheless, Mrs. King went ahead and sought an appointment with Chief Buthelezi, which was granted for the 10th September in Durban.

When violence is so widespread, it is not for us to make pronouncements about just or unjust wars.

In regard to Inkatha's non-violent stand, one cannot but condone and approve it, but one would like to be less uncertain about Inkatha's role in any situation of conflict in our province. '

The Chief Minister himself admits that 'no leader can ensure that every member of his or her organisation ever resorts to violence.'

About my attitude to the UDF I am surprised to learn from the Chief Minister that I identify with the UDF and justified my identification saying that the UDF was not a political party but a coalition of associations. What I said was that church bodies may find themselves making common cause with one or other affiliate of the UDF in regard to some grievance or project, like rents or housing, but obviously this does not constitute identification with the UDF as a whole.

It is a pity that we have to spend such time on this kind of polemic. The cause of peace is more important. We should be directing more time and energy to that."

The following, Mr. Speaker, is the subsequent letter that I wrote to the Editor of the Natal Mercury:

The Editor 23 September 1986
The Natal Mercury

Devonshire Place

Durban

4001

Dear Sir,

The Catholic Church is held in high esteem in Black society. We have always known it to be a Church which identifies with the poorest of the poor and it has a track record of service to the oppressed in South Africa. It is held in high esteem by Catholics and non-Catholics alike. It is for this reason that I as a Black leader have asked Archbishop Hurley to state where he and Catholic Bishops stand on the question of violence. It is also for this reason that we are appalled by Archbishop Hurley's statement in his response to my article published by the Natal Mercury: "My answer is that the Catholic Church in South Africa, represented in dealing with such matters by the Catholic Bishops' Conference, has yet made no pronouncement on these questions.

In his response to me Archbishop Hurley condemns violence of all kinds in no uncertain terms and for this we are grateful. We are, however, greatly perplexed by Archbishop Hurley's

prevarication on the question of whether or not the ANC's programme of violence and the general support it receives from the United Democratic Front should lead to outright

condemnation. Archbishop Hurley condemns violence while prevaricating on pronouncing on the merits of the purveyors of that violence. It is entirely insufficient for Archbishop

Hurley to agree with me that no leader can ensure that every member of his or her organisation never resorts to violence.

After mentioning the Catholic Bishops' rejection of necklacing as "gruesome", he says: "As regards this barbarous practice I have it on good authority that Mr. Oliver Tambo repudiated it in the recent non-aligned meeting in Harare." He attempts to clear the ANC's name in this regard but he fails to comment on the ANC's Secretary-General, Mr. Alfred Nzo's identification with this method of killing people. It is now a published fact in South Africa that Mr. Nzo is on record as saying very recently that the ANC will identify with those who choose to use the gruesome necklace method of killing their political opponents. In any event, even the statement of a senior spokesman of an organisation does not change the nature of that organisation. After all, Archbishop Tutu is on record as saying that he hates capitalism and that he <calls for

sanctions against South Africa. This does not make the Anglican Church hate capitalism and call for sanctions. Mr. Tambo talks out of both sides of his mouth when it comes to the question of necklacing. On other public occasions, Mr. Tambo has refused to condemn necklacing. It is an acclaimed method of the ANC. It is supported in practice and in pronouncement. If this is the case, contrary to what

Archbishop Hurley gives us to believe he believes, would he change his mind about the ANC?

Archbishop Hurley's response to me does include the statement

that "...The Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference deplores both the violence of the State and the violence of the ANC - and the violence of any other body guilty of it."

This is again insufficient. The very future of our country hangs in the balance. There is a battle for minds of historic proportions now being waged. The ANC is attempting to convert people to the violence which Archbishop Hurley condemns. He condemns specific acts of violence without condemning the people who promote those very acts.

I ask Archbishop Hurley whether the Church should not on balance, and I repeat on balance, make assessments of the actors on the South African stage and lend its full support to those organisations which strive to bring about radical change through non-violent means. There is a progression of violence, but some of us are screaming our opposition to that progression and combatting it. Do we not deserve the full support of the Catholic Church as we do so?

Archbishop Hurley has not distinguished himself when he ends his article by saying: "It is a pity that we have to spend so much time on this kind of polemic. The cause of peace is far more important. We should be devoting more time and energy to that." He accuses me of being polemic when I ask the kind of questions I ask. I am not polemic about life and death issues. I am not polemic about the very future of South Africa. Archbishop Hurley refuses to give moral support to those committed to non-violent tactics and strategies in the

struggle for liberation. He says: "When violence is so widespread, it is not for us to make pronouncements about just or unjust war." In our vexed frustration we cry out: For

God's sake is this not when the Church should make pronouncements.

I ask Archbishop Hurley now to respond to the realities I am talking about and to do so without making personal jibes such as the one he made when he said that I am "so avid to claim" the friendship of Dr. Nelson Mandela. It does not become an Archbishop to be petty and sarcastic. The Archbishop is free to dislike me but his refusal to engage in honest dialogue as an Archbishop with a Black leader of millions of people, is lamentable.

Where there have been incidents of violence in which Inkatha members were allegedly involved, it was mostly in cases where they defended themselves or retaliated after being attacked. Inkatha does not espouse violence as a strategy for bringing about change. It espouses non-violence. The External Mission of ANC and the UDF have as their programme to make the country "ungovernable." The External Mission of ANC espouses violence and the so-called armed struggle. It has through Mr. Nzo now blessed the "necklacing" of people. This is the issue. We do not need to waffle in general on the issue of violence. We need specific answers for the specific things I pointed out.

I do not think the Archbishop is serious when he implies that I am not doing enough for the cause of peace. He lives in Durban. He knows what I and Inkatha have done to maintain stability in this region in 1976/78, in 1980 and in 1985. Can he seriously suggest that I do not do enough for the cause of peace. I am vilified and denigrated precisely because of my stand on peace. It has been recognised both inside the country and outside South Africa that I do not end up just preaching peace but that I have tried in my own way to do something practical for the cause of peace. Is the Archbishop unaware of it.

If the Archbishop does not intend being specific in debating these issues with me, I cannot force him to do so. I have had more than four meetings with him in the last few years, the last one being one where he came to see me with a delegation from the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference. These meetings lasted many hours; the last one lasted for five hours. It is clear to me that he is committed to certain organisations (which is his prerogative) with whom he shares a

philosophy. This is why we talk past each other. We move in different orbits and it is clear that unless I want a slanging match with the Archbishop that we must agree that we differ and avoid being disagreeable. I cannot take this matter any further now.

Yours faithfully,

MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI

CHIEF MINISTER

PRESIDENT OF INKATHA

CHAIRMAN, THE SOUTH AFRICAN
BLACK ALLIANCE

Yet once again we place on record that we are doing everything humanly possible to keep the struggle in South Africa a democratic struggle.

I have also had to relentlessly pursue the ideals we serve against some of our Black brothers and sisters here in this country. On 27th May last year, a Joint Communique of the Meeting of The National African Federated Chambers of Commerce and the African National Congress, was issued in Lusaka, which reads as follows:

"During the weekend of 24th to 26th May, 1986, delegations of the National African Federated Chambers of Commerce (Nafcoc) and the African National Congress (ANC), lled by their two presidents, met in Lusaka, the capital of the Republic of Zambia.

Meeting in a cordial atmosphere, the two delegations discussed a wide range of issues of concern to all the people of South Africa.

The two delegations agreed that an urgent task facing all our people is to find a solution to the crisis which has engulfed our country.

In this regard, the Nafcoc delegation explained that their organisation has, for many years, been involved in various efforts to encourage a peaceful resolution of the conflict which is now tearing our country apart. Nafcoc is committed to continuing these efforts. For that reason - and acting on the decisions and spirit of its national council, which were endorsed by its 21st annual conference - Nafcoc decided to send a delegation to meet the leadership of the ANC. Bound by its own decisions, Nafcoc will continue to act as a catalyst and will, as before, seek contact and dialogue with other people within the broad spectrum of the lleaders of our country.

The Nafcoc delegation explained that the purpose of these efforts is to help create the situation when it will be

possible for all genuine leaders of the people of South Africa to enter into dialogue aimed at a just and agreed resolution of the fundamental problems facing our country. The delegation further explained that organisations that are currently banned as well as leaders that are imprisoned necessarily have to be part of these discussions if the dialogue is to be meaningful.

The Nafcoc delegation also explained that, as an organisation of black business people, its members are affected by all the problems facing the black community in general. Nafcoc is therefore committed to do everything in its power to ensure that the black people of our country live in freedom and equality with our white compatriots.

The ANC expressed its appreciation for the initiative taken by Nafcoc to enter into dialogue with it to discuss these vital issues. The ANC explained its own commitment to strive for a united, democratic and non-racial South Africa, and explained that it sees Nafcoc as playing an important role in the creation of such a society within the context of the decisions of its own national conferences.

The delegations agreed that the meeting constituted a valuable experience which helped to clarify the respective contribution each organisation was making in the effort to create a peaceful, happy and prosperous society.

Signed: Sam Motsuenyane Signed: Oliver Tambo
President of Nafcoc President, ANC(SA)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, this Communique is carefully worded to tell us nothing except that the meeting took place. We know from our own experience how the ANC Mission in Exile put such pressure on us to support their economic sanctions campaign against South Africa and to express ourselves in favour of disinvestment. Pressure to do so is put on everybody from South Africa whom they meet. They simply have to create the illusions that Black South Africans support disinvestment and they have applied very strong pressure on NAFCOC to do just this. The NAFCOC/ANC Mission in "Exile meeting took place at the end of May last year and after the NAFCOC Summit Meeting in October last year, they issued the following statement from which Members will see that the ANC Mission in Exile got their pound of flesh.

"In view of the fact that sanctions have been imposed on South Africa by some foreign countries and have become a fact of life in the South African situation, this summit meeting of NAFCOC feels that any discussion on the merits or demerits of sanctions has become an academic exercise.

Accepting that the withdrawal or non-introduction of foreign investment will impact very strongly on the country's economic life in which the members of NAFCOC are actually involved it is the considered view of this Summit Meeting that the Chamber find ways and means of living with the situation.

IT THEREFORE RESOLVED

1. That NAFCOC will not take part in any future efforts to encourage new investments in the country in all cases where Blacks are not meaningfully involved.

2. That NAFCOC will not campaign to oppose disinvestment or sanctions directed against South Africa and the Government in particular.

3. That there is a case for selective economic pressures unless:

s All political prisoners are released.

2% All political parties are unbanned.

i< 8 Government enters into dialogue with credible Black leaders

4. Government commits itself to dismantling apartheid.

5a That NAFCOC establishes a research structure to look into the possibilities of mobilising financial, technical and other resources to facilitate the indigenisation of those investments that become available as a result of sanctions.â\200\235

I had to take up the challenge and I issued a press statement which reads as follows:

PRESS STATEMENT

"We face life and death issues in South Africa. People die when we blunder. We have to do that which is right without prevaricating. We have got to know what is right and we have

got to know how to achieve what is right. We as Black South Africans have an enormous responsibility of making up for the terrible deficiency of thinking and understanding which is not only inherent in apartheid but which is there in White politics as the South African Government tries to face up to the challenge to bring about change. Ours is a struggle for liberation and that means politics is so much more than Party political vying for eminence. If we fail in the struggle, the lives of millions will be blighted for generations. Every time we falter we prolong the struggle and thereby prolong suffering. In these circumstances we dare not be tolerant of those who pursue either vested interests or self glorification at the expense of the masses. .

Our struggle is terribly burdened with the aftermath of apartheid in Black society itself. We carry these new, and I must say growing, burdens in addition to carrying the burdens

of apartheid and racism and it is now time that the Black business community rose to the occasion and showed where they stood in the struggle. Black businessmen are important opinion makers. If they did not have some qualities, they would not be businessmen and in the urgency of the crisis we face they must now employ those qualities for the sake of South Africa.

Every Black South African knows how White businessmen in the past bowed and scraped and crawled on their tummies even to appease apartheid's bosses. We all know that White business was in the past participant in the terrible exploitation of Blacks. There are, however, welcome signs that White business has now seen the writing on the wall. They have seen the looming destruction of the free enterprise system and more than that they have seen that unless they play a meaningful role in bringing about radical change in this country, the country itself will suffer. Now for the first time White businessmen are prepared to recognise the important role which Black businessmen must play. For the first time in the history of the country conditions are emerging in which Black entrepreneurship can be built up by those Blacks who have had to pull themselves up by their bootstrings as businessmen. The small businessmen of today is tomorrow's tycoon and if the small businessmen of today are not going to be the tycoons of exploitation tomorrow, then they must learn now today that it is wrong to make profits out of opportunities whatever they may and whether or not they are in the interests of the masses.

I am therefore shocked and appalled at the emerging trends in NAFSOC which are the results of intimidation against it. Black businessmen today who are intimidated out of doing the right thing are no better than White businessmen of yesterday who were intimidated by apartheid into doing the wrong thing. This trend in NAFSOC emerged first when Mr. Sam Molsuengane and some of his colleagues trotted off to Lusaka to have discussions with the ANC Mission in Exile. NAFSOC has never been the same since and they are now behaving as though they bought immunity from attacks from Black radicalism. They returned to South Africa to betray their Black customers to support sanctions.

NAFSOC's statement: "In view of the fact that sanctions have been imposed on South Africa by some foreign countries and have become a fact of life in the South African situation, this summit meeting of NAFSOC feels that any discussion on the merits or demerits of sanctions has become an academic exercise" is a hideous mirror image of the kind of language White businessmen in South Africa used to use that any discussion of the merits or demerits of apartheid was academic because it was a reality. The statement shows that those who drew it up were devoid of any moral fibre. Just like businessmen kow-towing to apartheid NAFSOC says: "Accepting that the withdrawal or non-introduction of foreign investment

will impact very strongly on the country's economic life in which the members of NAFCOC are actually involved it is the considered view of this summit meeting that the Chamber find ways and means of living with the situation." The hideous image of the intimidated.

The damning key to understanding NAFCOC's thought is this recommendation they adopted: "That NAFCOC establish a research structure to look into the possibilities of mobilising financial, technical and other resources to facilitate the indigenisation of those investments that become available as a result of sanctions." NAFCOC is preparing itself for an unseemly scramble to feast on the left-overs that dropped from the table of those who are going to pull out of South Africa. That is what the whole matter is all about. When corporations flee this country because they are intimidated by shareholders in their own countries, to abandon Black South Africans in their plight of desperate poverty, they want to profit even from that.

This is obviously not true of all companies who withdraw. Some withdraw for purely market-related reasons. They want their holdings in South Africa to be bought and while it is in South Africa's interests that this be done, it is hideous that some Black businessmen are contemplating the backing of the ANC Mission in Exile and its surrogates in South Africa so that they can be pushed to the front of the queue of those who are going to benefit. They are now no doubt hoping that the Board of Directors of companies who pull out of South Africa can be persuaded that there will be a dividend for handing over their holdings to businessmen whom the ANC Mission in Exile, the UDF and COSATU pat on the back. It is a bloody hand that pats them on the back, and they will walk around in our midst with the mark of Cain on them.

I have always deeply valued Inyanda's commitment to the real values of the struggle. I have always valued the important role they played in the advancement of Black people. I deeply sympathise with Inyanda which has always sought to find a respected place in the activities of NAFCOC. The harshness of our times are now sadly facing Inyanda with choices. Perhaps Inyanda must now gather its real strength and show the world that there is a decent way of doing the best that can be done as major corporations pull out of South Africa. They should perhaps aggressively campaign against this ugly thing that NAFCOC is now preparing itself to do. They should challenge NAFCOC and if this splits that organisation right down the middle it will not be of Inyanda's making. When organisations behave as enemies of the people they must be treated as the enemies of the people. One is either with the people or not with the people. Those are the only two choices."

MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI 29 OCTOBER 1986
CHIEF MINISTER KWAZULU
PRESIDENT OF INKATHA

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, Black South Africans have never been crushed by apartheid. We may have been held in bondage by the full power of the State but we have never become participants in our own bondage. We will never become participants in our bondage by anybody. It appeared to me that Dr. Motsuenyane, who has so long been respected for the independence of his mind and for the strong leadership he has given to the Black trading community, appeared to me to be intimidated into trading horses with the ANC Mission in Exile. That puts a name to the game which Dr. Motsuenyane is playing. He is supporting the ANC Mission in Exile and attempting to buy immunity from ANC reprisals against Black traders. This is what White businessmen have done with regard to the South African Government right down through all the decades of apartheid.

Dr. Motsuenyane wrote to me on the 8th December 1986 in an attempt to sweep the whole controversy of NAFCOC's stand under the carpet. He complained about my public statement as though NAFCOC would be entitled to make a statement published in the press and I was not entitled to do the same. This is what Dr. Motsuenyane wrote:

NATIONAL AFRICAN FEDERATED CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE & INDUSTRY

Stand F 2164 Highway Street, Soshanguve
PO Box 220, Ga-Rankuwa 0208.
Tel: (01214) 320/4/5/6: 2024

8 December 1986

The Honourable Chief
Mangosuthu Buthelezi
President - Inkatha
Ulundi
KwaZulu

Dear Chief Buthelezi

I have been requested by the Management Committee of NAFCOC to write you a personal letter in respect to your press statement dated 29 October 1986, in which some public criticism was made of NAFCOC.

Whilst the organisation may like all others make its mistakes, we do not believe that any good purpose is served by trying to settle differences via the press.

The organisation will at all times welcome discussions with you on any important issues provided such discussions are conducted privately and sincerely with an aim at finding solutions rather than just merely exacerbating differences.

Our organisation has up till now emphasised as you have done the wunity of Black people in South Africa. We therefore

deeply deplore any encouragement of division in the ranks of Black businessmen in South Africa.

Kindly accept my letter in the friendly and brotherly spirit which has prevailed between us for many years. I hope we shall have the opportunity of meeting in future to resolve our problems in a healthy spirit of nation-building.

Yours sincerely,

S.M. Motsuenyane (Dr)
PRESIDENT

I was in the United States of America when this letter was written and I therefore was only able to reply to him in January this year.

Dr. S.M. Motsuenyane 9 January 1987
President
National African Federated Chamber
of Commerce and Industry
PO Box 220
Ga-Rankuwa
0208

Dear Dr. Motsuenyane

Thank you for writing to me after you had read my first statement about NAFCOC's stand on disinvestment. I note that your letter to me was a personal letter and the burden of what you convey to me is that you feel we should sort out differences between us privately and not publicly. While I appreciate receiving this personal letter from you, I have considerable difficulty with its content.

I was very disappointed that in it there was no discussion of the merits of what I said in my press statement. I do accept your letter in the friendly and brotherly spirit which has prevailed between us for many years, and in the same brotherly spirit, I say rather bluntly that NAFCOC initiated the course of events which led to me having to make a press statement. You say that NAFCOC has always stood for Black unity. If NAFCOC has not abandoned this commitment, why did it send a delegation to Lusaka without prior discussion with me and other Black leaders? If NAFCOC accepted the need to strive for Black unity, why did it not share with me and other leaders their experience in Lusaka? If NAFCOC is as committed to Black unity as you say it is, why did NAFCOC remain silent when members of the External Mission of ANC castigated Inyanda for participating in the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba? There is something hollow in the statement of commitment to Black unity against the background of NAFCOC's very deliberate participation in the battle for minds raging in South Africa.

There is a battle for minds raging in our country. There is a battle for minds about the very nature of the society we should be evolving. The question of the armed struggle and the question of internal violence are not academic questions. They ceased to be academic a long time ago. The very reality of violence for political purposes makes the question very current and very needful of open debate. In the same way, the question of disinvestment is not academic precisely because it is a reality. It is a public issue, just as the armed struggle or political violence is a public issue. When NAFCOC goes public on its own position in relation to a controversial public issue, I have every right to make a public response to NAFCOC's public statement. i

My press statement has nothing to do with personal relationships between you and I or between me and anybody else. My press statement was the response of a Black leader charged by millions of Black South Africans to hold a public position on the question of disinvestment. I run a membership-based organisation in Inkatha. As Chief Minister of KwaZulu I am committed to giving expression to public sentiment. Both in KwaZulu and in Inkatha I run an intensely democratic organisation. I do not have the luxurious freedom of making ex cathedra statements on anything at all. I serve the people and there is a very vast body of Black South African opinion which demands that any capitulation to the disinvestment threat be countered publicly and expeditiously.

NAFCOC is a business organisation and NAFCOC must never forget that it is Black consumers whom they should be serving. Any division between the interests of traders and the interests of consumers, is a false division. Traders in NAFCOC had no right to claim a controversial public position regarding disinvestment if they do not give the public the right to object to that position. I am entirely unrepentant about having made a press statement on the question of NAFCOC's stand on disinvestment.

Dr. Motsuenyane I have my ear to the ground. I hear what the people are saying and in my press statement I as a leader simply gave expression to the sentiment which is so evident all around me in Black circles.

You above all other people should know that I have very jealously attempted to facilitate the Black man's entry into a position where Black business interests and Black political interests are inseparable. Black business interests are also inseparable from Black social and political issues. May I remind you that it was KwaZulu who was the first to come forward to support the Black Bank and may I remind you, Sir, that I was the first Black to receive a NAFCOC award. Would you like me now to return that award, or do you agree that the award was made to one who has the right - and the duty even - to make clear public pronouncements on issues which are controversial in the raging battle for minds. Is this not what democracy is all about?

You exercised your own democratic right when you went to Lusaka and when you made a public statement on the disinvestment issue. Why do you then object to me exercising my democratic right not to go to Lusaka and to make statements which differ from yours and which are even critical of yours? Is this not what Black democracy should all be about. Black unity cannot be connived behind the scenes. Black wunity must emerge as a result of strong Black democracy at work in the hearts and minds of the people. You and I cannot closet ourselves and work for Black unity in secrecy. Black wunity comes when the people are with you and those with whom you work alongside. You have severed yourself from Black opinion in your statements about disinvestment.

There is a Black disinvestment lobby but the closer you get to those who advocate violence, the stronger the lobby becomes. The closer you move towards accepting the need for a socialist state, the stronger your disinvestment lobbies become. In whose company is NAFCOC now standing? With whom is it siding? Against whom is it moving? Black traders cannot have it both ways. They either regard human rights as indivisible from the free enterprise system, or they regard human rights as subservient to socialist economic principles.

Apartheid must and will be destroyed - and it will be destroyed in favour of a disenfranchised and the country's disadvantaged Black communities. Black traders have a vast new future opening up for them and we are now moving into an era in which trading interests will lead to manufacturing, distributing and other interests. I

have always seen this and I have always been close to Black traders. That is why Inyanda found it possible to affiliate to Inkatha. Is this affiliation now offensive to NAFCOC? I hear reports of Natal delegations to NAFCOC being hammered for their association with me. There are those in NAFCOC who want to distance themselves from me and NAFCOC's statements on disinvestment were made against the background knowledge that they would be offensive to me because they are offensive to Black South Africa.

Please Dr. Motsuenyane exercise your very considerable skills and your sense of African identity in ways which are calculated to honour that which has always been cherished in our struggle for

liberation. You are one of the country's Black opinion makers. Use your influence in the raging battle for minds to cast the die in favour of a new free South Africa, in which the free enterprise

system will open up vast new vistas of Black achievement.

Yours sincerely,

MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI
CHIEF MINISTER
PRESIDENT OF INKATHA

DY
there
avoid

Motsuenyane in turn replied to me on the 2nd February. Again was a request for behind-the-scenes discussions and an absence of controversy. This is what Dr. Motsuenyane wrote:

2 February 1987

The Hon Chief M G Buthelezi
Chief Minister/President Inkatha
Private Bag X01

Ulundi

3838

Dear Chief Buthelezi

I write to gratefully acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 9 January 1987. Despite the grievous mistakes which NAFCOC is alleged to have committed, I am quite pleased [to] observe that we are still addressing one another with restraint and respect in a manner that leaves sufficient room for reconciliation and dialogue along the positive lines that we have followed for many years.

I take it that we both are agreed that no man is born infallible. We are all subject to making mistakes of one kind or another. Such mistakes which are bound always to occur should not always be dramatised to create wider splits, but must rather be discussed quietly, and in this way avoid unnecessary conflicts.

I do not regard it essential at this stage to pick up arguments, either in support or defence of NAFCOC's actions in a letter. If we must open debate in our correspondence about sensitive and emotional issues, then I am afraid our letters are bound to be too long, but also inconclusive. What I suggest we do, Sir, is to have a friendly meeting together to re-charge and regenerate our long standing friendship. To be friends does not necessarily mean to agree on each and every issue debated. We may differ profoundly on some vital national issues, but this does not mean a parting of ways for people who like ourselves believe in the democratic ideal of freedom of thought and expression.

In the great debate regarding the future of our country and all its people, there are bound to be many schools of thought. But those of us who cherish unity must identify ourselves by standing together in spite of our differences.

Under my leadership NAFCOC is committed to building bridges and certainly not to creating enemies. I hope our effort at finding togetherness will be much stronger in future because this is the key element which our society lacks at this time.

If my idea of a meeting finds favour with you, we shall be happy to come to Ulundi at any mutually convenient opportunity.

5 118

Best regards.

Yours sincerely,

s M Motsuenyane

PRESIDENT

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members to note that Black traders in this region of South Africa have vigorously protested about the stand the NAFCOC Executive took in their press statement. They are true brothers and will remain at one with the people in the pursuit of the time-honoured objectives of the struggle for liberation.

In February this year Mr. P.G. Gumede, President of Inyanda, wrote to me to inform me that Inyanda had called a Special General Meeting at Ulundi on the 26th November last year specifically to discuss the NAFCOC Summit Conference resolution. After this meeting Inyanda's displeasure was conveyed to NAFCOC and Dr. Motsuenyane reacted by calling a special meeting of the NAFCOC Management Committee on the 28th January this vyear. At this meeting, the Management Committee took cognisance of lInyanda's position and that a further Inyanda meeting was called for at which NAFCOC Management Committee could attend in order to strike an acceptable compromise. NAFCOC knows that if Inyanda pull out of it, NAFCOC would be reduced to some kind of shadowy pretentious organisation which did not speak for Black traders. NAFCOC have been served notice that Inyanda could not be alienated from Inkatha. Dr. Motsuenyane has to make up his mind where he stands.

Mr. Gumede informs me that he is aware that newspapers like the City Press will try to play a divisive role in support of Dr. Motsuenyane and present Inyanda in the light of being manipulated by me, Mr. Speaker. Honourable Members must be informed that Inyanda spokesmen at the Summit Conference objected to the resolution around which this controversy rages. Mri.' â\200\234RebBs . Sishi and Mr. R. M. Tshabalala represented lInyanda at the Summit Conference and Mr. R.M. Tshabalala argued for more than an hour reiterating that Inyanda could not afford the luxury of supporting

the resolution. His argument was so vehement that an adjournment was called for in an attempt to break the deadlock, but this failed. Inyanda registered their objection and that objection stands.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I need to make an important point here. If any organisation tries to be all things to all men and does every other organisation's job, it will end up being neither fish nor fowl. I have strongly supported trade unions all my political llife because Black trade unions have an important Black trade union job to do which political organisations cannot do Inyanda and NAFCOC have got important jobs to do which political organisations cannot do on their behalf. When trade union organisations or organisations of traders start acting by

proxy for the ANC Mission in Exile their essential function must be disturbed. If NAFCOC is going to assume the responsibilities of a political Party, it will become mangled by the internecine conflict into which it will be leaping. NAFCOC has a NAFCOC job to do. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, if NAFCOC ceases to do its NAFCOC job, then Inyanda will do that job for it. We have a long working relationship with Inyanda and we have never manipulated Inyanda, nor they us. We are both out there in the frontline of the struggle doing what each organisation should be doing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to raise something here. If any one of our Honourable Members was a Black trader in Mocambique and campaigned vigorously against the policies and the tactics and strategies of the Frelimo Government there, how long Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, do you think he would remain a trader? The facts of the matter are that the Frelimo Government simply does not dish out

trading licences to its public enemies. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, President Nyerere throughout his life did not issue trading licences to his public enemies. Mr. Speaker, President

Jomo Kenyatta never issued trading licences to his public enemies.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are we judged by such terrible double standards which hammers us on every pretext for doing what these great sons of Africa do? Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, had we indulged in the tactics of blackmailing the people into becoming members of Inkatha, its membership would by now have been far greater than it is. We do not have to blackmail people. We have mass support and the people show it by coming forward to join Inkatha because they want to join Inkatha. We have not used any form of enticement to get people to join Inkatha and we certainly do not use our right to grant or withdraw trading licences as a political weapon. I am, however, under pressure to do just this. We are criticised, Mr. Speaker, when we do the right thing. We are criticised, Mr. Speaker, when we do the wrong thing. Whatever we do is criticised. The time might come when we say that we might as well have some gain for doing the things for which we are criticised. I am watching the debate among traders about the NAFCOC stand with great interest.

I am just sick and tired of being on the receiving end of vile accusations. I am sick and tired of people stabbing me in the back and if it is a fight people now want, then I will give them the fight. Traders might yet have to run off to Lusaka and cry on the ANC Mission in Exile's shoulder. Let them then see what the ANC Mission in Exile can do for them.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I have covered a number of very crucial issues in my policy speech this year. I would like now to move towards the summing up section of my speech in which I look at the question of tactics and strategies and unlike the ANC Mission in Exile, we in Inkatha and the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly review our tactics and strategies each and every year.

We do so here in the Legislative Assembly session and we do so at the Inkatha Annual General Conference each year. We have to review our strategy each year because we are no more than a collection of delegates representing the people. There can be no democracy unless leadership reviews the role it is playing and tests that role against the wishes of the people. Every Honourable Member of this Assembly has come to this Session fresh from his or her constituency and is aware of the feelings of his or her people. At Inkatha's Annual General Conference some thousands of delegates gather together fresh from the people, and as we meet here each year and as we meet at Inkatha's Annual General Conference each year, we must review our role as leaders of the people, elected by the people to lead the people as the people want to be led.

One of the major characteristics of the leadership in the ANC Mission in Exile is that they decide for the people what the people should think and what they should do, whereas the people decide for

us what we should think and what we should do. Inkatha is also fundamentally distinguished from the UDF in this same regard. The UDF opened with a fanfare conference in Cape Town. UDF leaders

have met people in small groups and they have had regional meetings, but these are not meetings between the people and the UDF. The UDF is insulated from the will of the people because it is not membership-based. It is an affiliation of organisations and the UDF uses the leadership of these affiliated organisations as some kind of safety buffer between themselves and the actual people they purport to represent.

Inkatha and the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly have been very remarkably consistent in their aims and objectives, their commitments and in their tactics and strategies. We as the leaders of the people put there by the people are tuned into the hearts and minds of the people and they in turn have been fashioned by history. History has distilled the essence of the South African Black struggle for liberation out of accumulated experience. It is because we are so close to the centre of South Africa's political gravity that there is a great deal of constancy in what we say and do. A people move over time. General public perceptions do change over time but the people themselves can never stagnate in history because it is the people who make history. But the people as people, the masses, are not fickle. Real deep-down political sentiment does not blow hither and thither each time the political wind changes. We the leaders of Inkatha and in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly move with history as the people make it. That is why we have to look very carefully at the question of tactics and strategies each and every year.

The ANC Mission in Exile is just not in a position to do this. It has been in exile now for a quarter of a century and it has only had a consultative conference twice in all that time. The first consultative conference they had was the 1969 Morogoro Conference and the second Conference they had was a Consultative Conference

Despite the very worst that people like Archbishop Tutu and Dr. Boesak could have done in the United States to damage my image and the image of Inkatha, I found more support for what we are doing than I have ever found before. I was awarded an honorary doctorate at the University of Boston and while I was in the United States, the President, Mr. Ronald Reagan, made the time to see me. I also had discussions with Mr. George Bush, the Vice-President, and we discussed a wide range of issues. I also had a discussion with Mr. George Shultz the Secretary of State. In July last year I wrote a Memorandum to the United States Government and it contains the issues that I raised and the issues that I discussed with the US Government in November last year. Members should be aware of the contents of my ongoing dialogue with President Reagan, Mr. Bush and Dr. Chester A. Crocker, Assistant Secretary of State, and again, I want to make Honourable Members aware of what I say when I deal with foreign Governments. I will therefore read the Memorandum I presented to Dr. Crocker.

MEMORANDUM FOR PRESENTATION TO DR. CHESTER A. CROCKER
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
BY MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI, CHIEF MINISTER KWAZULU, PRESIDENT OF
INKATHA AND CHAIRMAN, THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK ALLIANCE
JULY 1986

"The rhetoric defence of polemic political positions bedevil the South African situation as Black confronts Black and as Black confronts White, East confronts West and the Third World confronts the First World. Public utterances by Heads of States and members of Cabinets in the West, Africa and the Third World are all too often made about apartheid as an internationalised problem. Apartheid is dragged into Party political arenas in the West and it is used as a confrontationist issue between the Third World and the First World. Spokesmen everywhere adopt positions about apartheid sometimes with scant regard to the realities of the South African situation. There is often a strange disparity between international and South African realities. Talk about the eradication of apartheid is thus terribly confused. There is a tendency by many to regard the South African situation as very complex without realising that a great deal of the complexities we face in South Africa originate outside the country.

Voices of reason do ring out and I am deeply grateful that the voices of Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, President Ronald Reagan and yourself, Sir, are distinguished by the prominence of reason in what I said. There are other voices of reason, particularly in West Germany, as well as in the United States, Britain and France, but the voice of Mrs. Thatcher, President Ronald Reagan and yourself are voices which are rather more central to the complex situation into which apartheid is thrust. But as so often is the case with voices of reason, they do not always hold sway where it matters most.

i
|

The South African situation will be decided in South Africa and in the end, it will be seen to be decided by Black South

Africans. We can make or break the South African situation. White South Africa is just not in a position to determine the destiny of South Africa. Having said this, one must

immediately say that considerable efforts should now be made by men and women of reason everywhere to extend their influence to strengthen the South African internal democratic forces and I would plead to do so even to some short-term disadvantages of Western nations.

While Western and African countries each seek only to develop their own advantages from apartheid as it is internationalised, the real struggle in South Africa will remain hampered. There is a sense in which Western nations will have to make political investments in South Africa in the context of the First World's responsibility to make a contribution to Third World developments. South Africa is the gateway to the whole of Southern and even Central Africa. Sound social, political and economic developments in South Africa will have very considerable spin-offs for the African Third World. I would not like to see the South African situation resolved at the expense of the rest of Southern and Central Africa, nor would I like to see the South African situation resolved in such a way that it favours the West more than it favours the people in South Africa. The United States is the world's leading industrial nation and I believe that the great American dream of freedom and democracy demands that the United States be prepared to make a contribution to the South African situation which is not simply or primarily dictated by American domestic interests.

I would like to make a number of observations about the South African situation. The first of these is that White attitudes are very complex. There is right now in White South Africa, I really do believe, still the prospects of gathering majority White support behind a really meaningful reform programme. The counterside, however, of this readiness to change is a White readiness to adopt totally destructive scorched earth policies if Whites are pushed too far in the wrong direction. The United States in particular needs to understand that American abhorrence of apartheid and the very limited opportunity Americans have of doing something about that which they abhor in South Africa, have already led to American inputs which act as support for the forces of violent confrontation. There is a danger that the United States is doing this even in its humanitarian aid programmes. Who Americans choose to work with is beginning to have significant importance in South Africa. The American Government should be aware of the extent to which, wittingly or unwittingly, Americans are beginning to become king-makers in South Africa, and are beginning to support confrontationist forces in South Africa which aim to destroy the free enterprise economy of the country and to make it ungovernable through violence. If this

g it

course of action becomes too grave an internal threat in South Africa, Whites will be driven to adopt positions which can only lead to a very destructive violent conflagration. The declaration of a state of emergency was no more than one instalment of the lengths to which Whites can be driven if the International community fails to play its cards well.

When we look at the future of South Africa and evaluate prospects of a stable government emerging, the world must not forget that White South Africa has been militarised. For decades now our White young men have been trained in the art of killing. White South Africans have been thoroughly trained in the art of subversion. It is patently absurd even to contemplate having a stable government in South Africa if the present regime is brought down through violence and replaced with a Black ANC government returned from exile. In a very short space of time White South Africans will do to that government what the ANC Mission in Exile has failed to do for 20 years.

Subversive White forces acting against a Black government would not have the logistic problems of mobility that the ANC Mission in Exile now has. There are vast networks of communication, together with a technical sophistication among Whites, which makes the prospect of them being governed against their will very problematic. If they are governed by a government that they reject in part and in whole as vehemently as Blacks now reject apartheid and the country's constitution, they will not be governable.

Discussion of the indispensability of the ANC in South Africa to a political settlement is now heard in many Western countries. I have been in the forefront of those demanding the release of Dr. Mandela, Mr. Zeph Mothopeng of the PAC, and other political prisoners and for the unbanning of Black political organisations. There is a very urgent need to de-restrict Black politics. When, however, the call for the unbanning of the ANC is made in the context of them being the only force in the country worth dealing with, then I get very perturbed. I call for the release of political prisoners and for the unbanning of political organisations so that the Black public can decide for themselves which leaders and organisations should be supported. The ANC Mission in Exile has been out of the country now for something like a quarter of a century. Black attitudes towards the ANC Mission in Exile are filled with myths and a wide range of misconceptions. In the process of radical change we need an interim period in which ordinary Blacks in the country can align themselves with whoever they wish. To ignore the fact that Blacks in South Africa have not had the opportunities to decide who they want to lead them, could lead to fatal errors of judgement.

I do not feel threatened by the ANC Mission in Exile. I have built Inkatha up to be the largest Black political force ever

known in the history of the country. I do not pursue power for lits own sake and I yearn for the day in which I can share platforms with Dr. Nelson Mandela and Mr. Zeph Mothopeng or in which they are free to oppose me on platforms of their creation. I would not have a problem with the ANC or the PAC were politics in South Africa de-restricted. I will however continue to have problems with the ANC Mission in Exile while their various tactics and strategies and their political and economic philosophies have not been tested inside the country on the ground for acceptability to ordinary people.

There are elements in the ANC Mission in Exile which are totally bent upon the destruction of the South African economy and the country's free enterprise system, and which are calling for the escalation of violence in South Africa in a clearly stated drive to bring about a situation of civil war, which they hope will make the country ungovernable. These elements are stimulating Black-on-Black confrontations in the name of making the country ungovernable. Schoolchildren are being banded together to undertake acts of hideous violence including putting a petrol- filled tyre around people's necks

and burning them alive. This practice, so hideously proclaimed to be the "necklace", lis stated by the ANC Mission in Exile's broadcasts to South Africa to be one of their weapons in the struggle for liberation. This element in the

ANC Mission in Exile is often given red carpet treatment in Western capitals, while the West proclaims the international need to contain terrorism. The ANC Mission in Exile's internal partners in the politics of destructive violence such as are found in the UDF and COSATU, are feted and made celebrities by Western media. Western perceptions of the South African situation are often a nightmare of moral indignation gone absurd.

It is only the Black democratic forces of South Africa which can break the upward spiralling of violence. State violence for a great length of time now has done no more than escalate counter-violence. The country is locked into a vicious circle of State violence leading to counter-violence, which in turn leads to greater State violence and yet in turn leads to greater counter-violence. My demand made repeatedly to the State President is to release Dr. Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and for the State to stop interfering in the role of Black South African democratic decency. Had the South African Government released Dr. Mandela and others years ago, internecine Black strife would by now have been relegated to the side-lines and the politics of national reconciliation would be well on its way. If the State President released Dr. Mandela and others today unconditionally, the forces of decency would be given a very significant impetus.

I am not so foolish to believe that anger and bitterness, which is the aftermath of apartheid, will ever disappear overnight. We face tortuously difficult times ahead, whatever the South African Government does. The politics of transition

will inevitably be painful in South Africa because national survival will necessitate was hurtling through a change programme at a rate which will be perilous. It must, however, be done. Apartheid has existed for too long, and the country is too polarised to hope for any painless transitions from a racist society to an open democracy. If the State President continues to balk at asking White South Africans to commit themselves to change knowing that it will be problematic, we may well reach a point where the violent overthrow of the South African Government and its replacement by an anti-capitalist Black Government is simply inevitable. If that is an inevitability, then the destructive role of White dissidents is also inevitable. There will be no stability for a generation or more to come if radical change is not brought about through the politics of negotiation.

No matter how much I yearn for the politics of negotiation, and no matter how much I clearly see the dangers of escalating violence, I will simply not enter into negotiations prematurely. I do not believe that we have the time in which to experiment with forms of government which must fail and we do not have the time in hand to experiment with the circumstances necessary for successful negotiations. We must do that which must be done and we may only have one opportunity of doing so. We will only have one opportunity to bring about constructive and stabilising change through negotiations. If Black and Whites negotiate the wrong thing, and attempt to establish something which just cannot work, they will hasten the day of violence exploding beyond all control.

It is for this reason that I reserve my position as far as the State President's present reform programme is concerned. I am not afraid to say boldly to the whole world that the State President has gone further than any of his predecessors in defining the necessity for radical change. I have had the courage to say publicly that many of the reforms which the State President has initiated have, in fact, been meaningful to millions of Blacks. It is vital that when the State President even points his toes in the direction of statesmanship, he be encouraged to take a bold step forward. White South Africans are aware of the fact that I would support any move towards real negotiation, but the expectations which White South Africa has of me, is just unrealistic at this point in time. Because so many Whites see the desperate need for change and are encouraged by my commitment to democracy, and appreciate my recognition that the free enterprise system is the only system capable of creating the wealth which is so desperately needed to overcome the legacy of apartheid in South Africa, that they expect me to try just anything now to further the politics of negotiation.

Had I accepted Mr. P.W. Botha's proposal to form a Black Advisory Council when the President's Council was formulating

the new constitution, I would today be a political nonentity. Had I accepted the Special Cabinet Committee's bona fides and worked within it, and had I accepted his Non-statutory Negotiating Forum, I would also have been a political nonentity today. I now have to consider whether or not to enter the National Council which Mr. P.W. Botha is proposing.

A draft National Council Bill has been published. The main purpose of the Council is stated to be to:

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

(b) grant to Black South African citizens on an interim basis a voice in the processes of government which affect their interests;; and

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

I certainly will do nothing to make the achievement of these objectives impossible. South Africa needs such a Council if it really is going to be used to achieve them. I am aware of the fact that the National Council will not achieve anything if the State President attempts to go ahead with it even if only those who participated in the Special Cabinet Committee's deliberations participated in it. I am aware of the fact that a necessary condition for it working is my participation in

it I can say this with modesty because I add immediately that if it was only I who joined those who are thus far prepared to participate in it, it would not work either. It

the National Council cannot work without me, it will also not work unless leaders like Dr. Nelson Mandela and others in jail are given the opportunity of joining it. If Dr. Mandela were to be released and decided against participating in the work of the National Council, despite the fact that it would be given political teeth, that would be his decision and I would accept it. I, however, would not be dictated to by that decision and I would make my own assessment about the prospects of it working. A minimal condition for the National Council being made to work in the politics of negotiation is the release of Dr. Mandela and others. It could still work under certain conditions if they did not participate in it. If the State ceased crippling Black democratic forces in South Africa by bannings, jailing and violent intimidation by the police and army, it would be possible for me to enter the politics of negotiation and to go to the people for them to endorse what I am doing, or reject what I am doing. That for me is the really essential ingredient in the formula for success in any politics of negotiation which may be mounted in

South Africa. While the South African Government dictates with whom it wants to negotiate, negotiations will necessarily fail. While they set preconditions for the release of

political prisoners, negotiations will fail.

When it comes to the unbanning of the ANC as a precondition for my entry into the politics of negotiation, I say very clearly that I reserve my position. The first step is to release Dr. Nelson Mandela and to see what he himself decides to do with his own organisation. I make this point because the ANC Mission in Exile is now behaving so as to warrant the thought that it profits from Dr. Nelson Mandela being in jail and has no intention of entering the politics of national reconciliation through negotiation.

I believe that Western governments should clearly understand that the ANC Mission in Exile inevitably seeks a totally dominating role for itself. Exiled political movements committed to the violent overthrow of their government at home, inevitable become dictatorial and employ violent intimidation against any whom they believe should be among their ranks but who refuse to become subservient. The ANC Mission in Exile needs a submissive Black population and they will not get that submission if they continue doing what they are now doing. They are now intolerant of Black political activity which does not toe an ANC Mission in Exile Party political line. It is a brutal fact that they have ordered the execution of Black Town Councillors and others whom they stigmatize as "working within the system". Committed as they are to violent revolution, they will not change overnight because the State President enunciates a National Council which could in fact succeed. They do not want the politics of negotiation to succeed.

They seek a military victory, dictated by themselves, and they seek the disruption of the free enterprise system and its replacement with the State's control over the means of production.

Whether Nelson Mandela's release from prison leads to the ANC Mission in Exile becoming a democratic force remains to be seen. I have a deep faith in Dr. Mandela's political judgement, but as a hard-bitten, practical politician, at no time of day or night would I ever underestimate the immense problems he will face were he to come out of jail and attempt to take firm control over the ANC Mission in Exile to make it a democratic force in the country. There is a vast range of interests which would really test the calibre of his leadership and the role he could play.

I want to make another set of observations about Black politics in South Africa in order to focus attention on some of the realities around us. Throughout the Third World, and over many decades, we have seen how forces generated in violent revolution cannot maintain the coherence which revolutionary aims and objectives demand. Revolutionary forces in a situation such as ours, have to face the fact that

)

they will simply never overthrow the South African Government without = mobilising internal insurrection. Internal insurrection has never been mobilised without what is commonly called Third Forces emerging. The ANC Mission in Exile is yet going to face the truth of this statement. Organisations such as the UDF and COSATU must right now be spawning Third Force developments. President Kaunda has already warned the ANC Mission in Exile that it must be aware of the dangers of losing control in the country. The seed is already sown and there is already talk about schoolchildren being beyond the control of the ANC Mission in Exile. There is already in existence organisations such as AZAPO and the National Forum which will inevitably be strengthened by the politics of violence. There is right now without a shadow of a doubt either those amongst COSATU's and UDF's top leadership, or those now working their way through the ranks who will replace them in due course, who will not want to play second fiddle to the ANC Mission in Exile forever.

There has been increasing speculation in the media about possible talks between the South African Government and the ANC Mission in Exile. Some of this speculation revolves around a moratorium on violent action being declared on both sides if common acceptance on points of negotiation can be established. There is speculation that if Dr. Mandela was released from jail whether he could move the ANC Mission in Exile away from its commitment to the continued escalation of violence to establish the conditions for a negotiated

settlement. All this speculation makes the assumption that the ANC Mission in Exile is the directing and controlling force which can switch violence on and off. In all

probability, the ANC Mission in Exile has thus far remained committed to escalating violence because it knows full well that it could not bring about a cessation of violence even if it wanted to.

As a Black leader I have to look at the realities around me and not the academic or ideological representation of realities. In the West the White liberal tradition of political thought in a sense idealises mankind. The ANC Mission in Exile is given a nobility by many Western intellectual analysts which it has not earned in practice. Decades of experience show that revolutionary movements in exile, such as the ANC Mission in Exile, drive always to seek recognition as the sole representative of the people and drive always to achieve a dictatorial position in the politics of their country. In order to achieve this, they must necessarily employ tactics and strategies of violence and intimidation against the local population in attempts to establish no-go areas and free passages for men, arms and ammunition. In this kind of driving towards sole dominance local populations are put into the position of being either for or against the revolutionary movement. Those who are not with it are simply treated as the enemy and eliminated when necessary. This leads to a political process in which the idiom of violence becomes centralised, and revolutionary