

PERFORMING ARTS WORKERS EQUITY
66 Central Road.Fordaburg.2092
Twigga Cntcr,(th floor
P O Box 34.Ncwtown.2113
'rcxwas 4(25/26/51/52
M1836 601 EECREWED 1 1 FEB 1993
1 08/02/1993

The Co-ordinator
Department of Arts and Culture
ANC
BY HAND

Dear Comrade Wally

Over the past few weeks, the DAC has made various allegations about PAWE's attitude towards the negotiations process. In addition, certain of PAWE'S representatives have been singled out for misconduct. We take this opportunity to respond to these allegations in an attempt to restore a healthy working relationship between PAWE and the DAC.

1. Carol Steinberg.

At the PAWE/DAC bilaterals held on the 20 January 1993 and 22 January 1993 respectively, our executive member, Carol Steinberg, was accused of causing a breakdown of communication between PAWE and the DAC by failing to adhere to the principles of report-back and accountability in her capacity as PAWE representative on the PACT working group and the DAC negotiations forum.

The PAWE executive is quite satisfied our representative fulfilled her role and did not withhold any substantial information from PAWE. We do not believe that it would be constructive to enter into a detailed rebuttal of each individual accusation. We would like to state, however, that we believe that it was not a matter of Carol withholding information, but of the DAC failing to communicate that information either to Carol or to PAWE.

For example, Carol was accused of failing to report on the agreement reached between the DAC and the TPA (the 12-point plan) with regard to negotiations with PACT. We do not accept this accusation. Had Carol been aware of this agreement, she would not have embarrassed herself and PAWE by writing a letter to the press accusing PACT of refusing to negotiate. In any event, we believe that the salient point here is this: the PAWE executive should have been directly advised in writing about a matter of such importance. To date, neither PAWE nor Carol has a written copy of the 12-point plan. We strongly recommend that in future, any document (agreements, minutes, etc) that the DAC considers to be of importance to the PAWE executive, should be faxed or posted directly to our office.

We further believe that there has been some confusion on the DAC's part as to when Carol has participated in negotiations forums as a PAWE representative and when she has participated as an ANC member. For example, at the bilateral of the 22 January 1993, Comrade Mewa accused Carol of poor conduct in her capacity as PAWE representative at the DAC Conference (15-17 January 1993). Carol made it quite clear at the conference--both verbally and in writing--that she was attending exclusively in her ANC capacity. It is therefore apparent that in certain instances, Carol has not withheld information from PAWE since, in her capacity as an ANC member, she was not required to represent or report to PAWE.

In summary, the PAWE executive asserts its full confidence in Carol Steinberg as its representative and have mandated her to continue representing PAWE in the negotiations with PACT.

2. Dan Robbertse

Dan Robbertse, PAWE Council member, represents PAWE on the Civic Theatre Joint working group. At the above-mentioned DAC Conference, he was accused, by name, of holding covert bilaterals with the Civic Theatre and thereby undermining the negotiations process. '

PAWE regards this as a serious allegation that has implications on. Dan's continued participation in the working group. We request that either you furnish proof to substantiate this allegation or that you withdraw it in writing.

3. Francois Venter

Until the end of last year, Francois Venter represented PAWE on the Grahamstown Festival joint working group. At the above-mentioned DAC conference and on other occasions, Francois was accused of deliberately disrupting the unity of the working group. While Francois, as an inexperienced negotiator, may have made certain procedural mistakes, PAWE is confident that he in no way deliberately attempted to undermine the negotiations process.

The accusations against these three individuals have been made in the context of a broader allegation against PAWE. The DAC seems to have the perception that PAWE is deliberately undermining the negotiations process: jeopardising the unity of the negotiations teams and trying to achieve its own hidden agendas.

PAWE categorically denies these allegations and reaffirms its commitment to further the process of negotiations in alliance with the DAC and the other members of the negotiations teams.

In order to prevent any further breakdown of communication between our two organisations, we offer the following suggestions:

a. That the relationship between PAWE and the DAC be conducted on a more formal basis. Wherever possible, all communication should be written. For example, invitations to meetings with proposed agendas, minutes of meetings, etc, 'should be forwarded directly to the PAWE office.

b. Where the DAC has a complaint against a PAWE representative, we request that our representative is not "disciplined" by the DAC or the negotiating team, but that rather, the complaint is communicated in writing directly to the PAWE executive.

In conclusion, PAWE endeavours to respect its relationship and agreements with the DAC, particularly with regard to negotiations procedures. We likewise assume that the DAC will respect our autonomy, integrity, and our right to differ. We sincerely hope that in the future we will find the mechanisms to resolve our differences in an amicable and comradely way.

We look forward to a fruitful relationship with the DAC and to a successful negotiations process. We hope that our shared aim, the realisation of democracy, non-racialism and non-sexism in the cultural arena, will be achieved in the near future.

Yours in culture

Ramolao Makhene

Chairperson

PAWE

c.c. Comrade Cheryl Carolus