

AP1992 - 16 - 10 - 11

Bargaining chips are on the table

By S'BU MNGADI

INKATHA president Mangosuthu Buthelezi is waiting with baited breath as the ANC deliberates over the logistics of a mass march on Ulundi.

The ANC's three Natal regional executive committees held a mini summit in Richards Bay on Friday to discuss the pending march.

However, instead of announcing the date and programme, the Natal executive leadership was vague.

Southern Natal ANC chairman Jeff Radebe told City Press yesterday he meeting resolved to establish "a sub-committee to map out details of a campaign of free political activity in KwaZulu" which the ANC-led tripartite alliance would soon launch.

He added the campaign would culminate in a march on Ulundi.

Natal ANC leaders stubbornly persist that the march will go ahead,

and this position was endorsed by the ANC's national executive committee a fortnight ago.

But as days go by without even a tentative date for the march, the Natal executive appears to have changed its tune.

Sunday picnic

Privately they concede the organisation would not dare lead its supporters to the slaughter which Inkatha leaders have warned would mark the beginning of a civil war and would make the Bisho massacre look like a "Sunday picnic".

Natal senior ANC sources told City Press the tripartite alliance was merely waging a "psychological war" on Buthelezi whom they allege had been successfully driven to sleepless nights at the prospect of ANC-supporting Zulus marching on his seat of power.

Northern Natal ANC chairman Dr Aaron Ndlovu said the psychological war will "ultimately force the Inkatha leader to concede free political activity in KwaZulu,

The prospective march this week prompted the SA government to appeal to the National Peace Secretariat to intervene in a bid to stave off the tensions, according to Law and Order Deputy Minister Danie Schutte.

NPS chairman Dr Antonie Geldenhuys said meetings would be held with all concerned parties to work out "suitable conditions" for the march.

The ANC hopes the NPS will persuade it to call off the march in exchange for free political activity in KwaZulu.

Northern Natal ANC secretary Senzo Mchunu maintains free political activity in KwaZulu is much closer.

16/1/11

IFP did not initiate the violence

THE Sunday Star editorial of October 4, under the headline: "Bow out Buthelezi", is a really scandalous piece of writing.

Apart from the distasteful tone of the commentary and personal invective against Dr Buthelezi, I think the Sunday Star does the country a grave disservice by failing to see the current crisis from an IFP perspective. The serious nature of the allegations necessitates an IFP response.

One of the Sunday Star's problems is a scathing verbal attack on the ANC that Dr Buthelezi delivered at Stanger. You totally ignore the reasons for this:

- The ANC's steadfast refusal to hold senior-level meetings with the IFP to normalise their relationship after the April 5 1991 breakdown.

- Mandela's refusal to hold joint peace rallies with Buthelezi despite invitations to do so, frequently repeated since Mr Justice Goldstone's published views that joint efforts were vital to bring peace.

- The increased numbers of IFP leaders murdered — 49 since the signing of the National Peace Accord a year ago.

- MK's increased attacks on the IFP, including a spate of recent massacres involving gross subterfuge — the use of SAP and SADF uniforms.

- The ANC's overt goal of overthrowing the KwaZulu government.

When the ANC is attacked verbally by our president for furthering violence, we are portrayed as the belligerent party. Amazing!

The Sunday Star's other problem is with Buthelezi pulling the IFP out of talks. But to infer that he was motivated by a pathetic "me too" approach reveals just how facile the newspaper's perceptions are.

Codesa reached certain agreements, all with the ANC's participation. But because of one problem, the ANC pulled out. Does this render the agreements reached invalid? If so, how? If not, what right have the Government and ANC to conclude a new deal which others are



SCANDALOUS AND INEXCUSABLE . . . KwaZulu Minister of Health Dr Ben Ngubane takes (verbal) cudgels to last week's proposal that Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi should contemplate retiring in favour of someone such as Ngubane.

subsequently to rubber-stamp? If this is the Sunday Star's idea of acceptable multiparty negotiations, we obviously have a different understanding of the concept.

What right have the Government and ANC to elevate hostels and the cultural accoutrements of Zulus to key issues that (a) must be resolved prior to negotiations continuing; and (b) that they alone will resolve? There is no way the IFP will accept this, or should accept it. Look at the facts:

It has been proved (by the Institute of Race Relations among others) that firearms and explosives are by far the greatest cause of death in political violence. In our view, this elevates MK, its cadres, its AK-47s and its hidden arms

caches to the central issue of our time. But the ANC and Government decide this is irrelevant (after all, MK is killing IFP supporters), and concentrate exclusively upon Zulu cultural weapons, an utter irrelevancy in comparison.

If violence is truly the stumbling block to negotiations, as the ANC and others want the world to believe, then the unwillingness to deal with MK renders the bilateral deal a transparent sleight of hand.

And on top of this nonsense, the two parties "resolve" the whole issue without referring to the IFP. They don't even ask our opinion. If the Government and IFP had bilaterally decided to ban MK, what would the media's reaction then be? I am inclined to believe it would support the ANC.

Hostels only became involved in violence because they were first attacked. The year 1990 is no different to 1976, or has the Sunday Star forgotten our history? To fence in people defending themselves against violence is utterly untenable. One might as well fence in the townships instead.

And again, with either nil or minimal constituency in the hostels, the Government and ANC respectively decide:

- (a) That hostels are to blame for the violence.
- (b) That hostels therefore need to be sorted out, and;
- (c) That they will do it.

The cheek of it! Have they not the decency to even refer to the IFP, or to refer to the Hostel-Dwellers' Association?

These are the types of issues involved. To suggest, as the Sunday Star does, that the IFP president is motivated by prickliness and the like is really inexcusable. The facts of the case provide more than enough grounds for the IFP to have taken the action it has. I might add that in the opinion of much of our constituency, this move is long overdue.

Dr B N Ngubane

IFP Central Committee Executive,
Ulundi.

PROBE HANDS MANDELA LIST OF 'ANC TORTURERS'

By CHARLENE SMITH

A LIST of ANC members allegedly involved in torture at ANC camps has been handed to Nelson Mandela.

This follows an investigation by an ANC commission, whose report is due to be released this week.

Although few names appear in the 70-page report, it has been reliably learnt that a full list of alleged torturers has been handed to Mr Mandela.

The commission is empowered to delete names from the report "for reasons of privacy, reputation, safety and confidentiality".

But Mr Mandela will be under pressure to reveal the names on the list in his possession.

One of the few apparently named in the report is former senior Umkhonto we Sizwe commander Mzwai Piliso.

Mr Piliso, a former ANC national executive committee member, was at one stage in charge of controversial Angolan detention camp Quatro.

It is believed the report makes 10 recommendations. It also contains a full account of the ANC's investigation into the death of top Umkhonto we Sizwe cadre, Thami Zulu, whose death was clouded in controversy

and caused division in ANC circles.

The commission comprised Johannesburg advocate and non-ANC member Gilbert Marcus, and two ANC members — Bridgette Mabandla, who is on the organisation's constitutional committee and Durban lawyer Louis Skweyiya. It heard evidence for eight days in August.

Mr Marcus apparently wrote the report which was approved by his colleagues. There has been criticism that the commissioners should all have been independent —

a statement with which the report apparently concurs.

It is believed that eight senior officials of the ANC testified before the commission including SACP head and former Umkhonto we Sizwe chief Chris Hani and deputy-secretary general and former intelligence chief Jacob Zuma.

An official of Amnesty International attended a number of hearings.

The report has been kept a closely guarded secret with copies apparently only in the hands of Mr Mandela who returns from a lengthy overseas trip today and ANC secretary-general Cyril Ramaphosa.

The ANC is believed to still hold about 100 prisoners in a camp in Uganda, but has promised to free them by December.

CHILD PRISONERS OF TOWNSHIP VIOLENCE

By WISEMAN
KHUZWAYO

HUNDREDS of terrified children are trapped in Kwamadala hostel, in the Vaal, because they fear for their lives if they attend schools in the nearby townships.

Most of them have not seen a classroom for two years. They are the victims of the bloody clashes between the ANC and the IFP. In the townships they are seen as Inkatha members.

This was revealed by the Rev Kruger du Preez, acting chairman of the Regional Dispute Resolution Committee, in the wake of the murder of two teenage girls who were shot by youths claiming to be ANC members. They mistook the girls for Kwamadala residents.

The girls, who in fact were pupils in Qwaqwa, were abducted in front of their relatives from a house in Evaton. Their bodies, riddled with AK-47 bullets, were found by police at a sports ground the following morning.

The ANC said it was investigating claims that the murderers were ANC members.

Homeless

Mr Du Preez, who visited Kwamadala this week, said there were 304 children of all ages at the hostel.

Kwamadala did not have anything even resembling a school. Most of the children were homeless because their parents were driven out of the Vaal townships by ANC supporters while others had taken refuge in the hostel of their own accord.

Mr Du Preez has since been in contact with the local offices of the Department of Education and Training. He said he had been given a sympathetic hearing and a DET official had promised to look into the possibility of registering a school at Kwamadala.

Mr Du Preez added: "The residents were also complaining that they were isolated. Welfare workers did not visit the hostel because they were afraid for their lives when they returned to the townships.

"There is no church because even pastors are afraid to go there. TB and syphilis are rife among the inmates."

Both Inkatha and the ANC blame each other for what is happening in the PWV area.

Kidnap

Mr William Nhlapho, regional secretary of the IFP, said his members in Kwamadala were safe as long as they did not go to the Vaal townships. It was those members who were living in the townships who were in constant fear.

He said only two weeks ago ANC supporters had tried to kidnap an Inkatha member in central Vereeniging. He was only able to escape by sprinting into the KwaZulu government offices nearby.

Mr Ronnie Mamoepa, spokesman for the ANC in the PWV region, said: "The level of violence in the area is of deep concern to us, but we believe the State must take the blame."

Isacor, which owns Kwamadala, has been trying to close down the hostel since September and move its employees to Kwamasiza hostel. But Kwamasiza residents, who are ANC supporters, won't share their lodgings with Kwamadala residents.

According to the IFP, Isacor has said it will not accept responsibility for the residents not employed by the company when the move takes place.

The Vaal Council of Churches has been trying to organise a meeting between the local ANC and IFP to resolve the plight of the residents.



Mr Slovo tempts the Nats with their base desires

COMRADE Joe Slovo has laid a cunning trap for the government, baiting it with the ruling elite's dearest wishes: a few more years to slurp tax money from the public troughs, and indemnity for the sins of apartheid.

To ease the pain of losing power, Mr Slovo offers the Nationalist leaders four things:

- A so-called "sunset clause" that would guarantee cabinet portfolios to President De Klerk and his closest party colleagues for a fixed number of years in an ANC government;

- A blueprint, acceptable to the SA Communist Party, for regional government;

- A general amnesty for crimes committed in the service of apartheid, provided the perpetrators confess to the crimes for which they seek pardon;

- A new approach to restructuring the civil service — including the SADF and the police — which will take account of existing contracts and/or provide for retirement compensation.

It's devilishly clever. It strikes at the moral weakness of a party and a government that has, through long years in office, grown wealthy, vain and greedy, and which now fears the loss of liberty less than the loss of privilege. It tempts the Nats with their own desires.

In return for pensions, jobs and forgiveness, the Nationalists are asked to yield power. Mr Slovo's price, however, is high and the main features of that price deserve careful examination:

Firstly, he wants a sovereign constitution-making body, elected by universal suffrage in free and fair elections, to replace the tricameral parliament. The CMB will double as a legislature.

In drawing up the constitution the CMB will be constrained only by principles contained in Codesa's platitudinous declaration of intent or by principles agreed in advance by the main actors (meaning, presumably, the ANC, the SACP and the National Party).

There will be no minority veto, whether by a second chamber or by any

other device. The CMB will operate "democratically", presumably meaning it will take decisions by majority vote. The day it sits, the Nationalists will be emasculated.

Secondly, the SACP rejects entrenchment of compulsory power-sharing. The guaranteed seats in the cabinet will vanish when the sunset clause expires, though Mr Slovo does not say when this will happen.

Thirdly, the boundaries, functions and powers of the regional governments, and indeed the whole question of federalism, must be determined by the CMB, where the Nationalists and the federalist Democratic Party will be outvoted, not by prior negotiations in which all parties have equal weight.

Finally, the SACP (and the ANC?) will not allow anything to prevent a future government from intervening, as it thinks fit, to redress "racially accumulated injustices" in all spheres of life.

To put it succinctly, if President De Klerk accepts Mr Slovo's offer, we shall quickly end up with a centrally controlled state, presiding over weak regional structures, and unfettered by constitution or by law in anything it chooses to do in the name of righting past inequalities. It will have the power not only to tax, confiscate, redistribute and nationalise the private wealth of the nation, but also to plan, manipulate, or command the economy.

The minorities — in particular, Afrikaners and Zulus — will find, on the very day of the election of the CMB, that they have lost all power to direct the future, or even to protect themselves.

Their representatives, fat with perks and promises of pensions, will sit without power in the cabinet, without power in the CMB, without power in the central government, and without power in the regional governments. After a while, they will be put out to pasture.

The question to ask now is whether President De Klerk and his government can resist Mr Slovo's offer. He has, in

effect, given them the things for which they have been negotiating: offices for themselves, security of pensions and jobs for civil servants, and liberation from the terrible fear that their evil past might catch up with them.

Mr Slovo has discerned, with the unerring eye of a man who understands the temptations and rewards of power, the weakness of the Nationalist negotiating team: they have no firm political principles on which to take a stand. They negotiate not for posterity, but for their own short-term interests.

The danger now is that South Africa's ordinary people, having won for themselves an historic opportunity to secure their liberty and prosperity, will instead be led from one totalitarian condition to another totalitarian condition. In effect, Mr Slovo is trying to buy the Nationalists with baubles and vanities, the fruits of office that lie so close to their corrupted hearts.

For the rest of South Africa, for those of us who stand on the slave block wondering whether President De Klerk will sell us to Mr Slovo, and for what price, this is the moment to break free. Later will be too late.

Much has been achieved in the past two years. There is now a reasonable consensus on universal suffrage, on proportional representation, on most clauses of a bill of rights, on the division of powers between the executive, the legislature and the judiciary, on the independence of the judiciary, and so forth.

Four more elements of democracy are necessary: strict constitutional limitations on the power of central government, a guarantee of private property rights in the bill of rights, a system of regional government that will enable the regions to stand up to the central state, and a constitutional court whose only function will be to protect individual rights.

Anything less will be a sell-out.

KEN OWEN

VIEWPOINT

Nelson Mandela turns a blind eye

Observer

11/10/92

London

FOR MORE than 2,000 years Chinese rulers have divided 'barbarians' — anyone who was not Chinese — into near and far, large and small, more or less civilised and, above all, friendly and unfriendly.

Last week Nelson Mandela proved he was China's friend, while Hong Kong's Governor, Chris Patten, is hovering on the brink of being called the opposite. In its ultimate insult, Peking has denounced Patten as 'socialist'.

Hong Kong's citizens, who come under China's rule in 1997, should note these evaluations. As the Chinese say, 'The facts teach hard lessons.'

Welcomed as a near head of state in Peking, Mandela, the ANC president, was received by China's President, Premier, and Party General Secretary. The men who ordered the tanks into Tiananmen Square received moral absolution from Mandela. Pressed to comment on the Peking killings of June 1989, he replied: 'We are not fully briefed about this situation.'

Now, not even his enemies would accuse Mandela of being stupid or ignorant. He knows of the massacre and the crack-downs in dozens of other Chinese cities. He must have seen Amnesty International's many reports on the executions, torture, and jailing of Chinese and Tibetan dissidents. Nor can he be unaware that for years African students in China have demonstrated against their segregation, and against the common belief that they are stupid, smelly and over-sexed. They are frequently called *hei-gui*, or 'black devils'.

Of course, Mandela knows these things: he does not mention them because he is grateful to China. 'When we turned to the West for assistance,' he told the Peking press corps, 'they supported the oppressor of our country, but when we came to China our leaders were accepted with open arms... Which human being of principle, who has a high standard of morality, would now turn against the very country that has aided them to make the advance we have made?'

I asked Mandela for his comments on China two years ago, in Kyoto at a meeting of the International Press Institute, after he had thanked the international press for its support while he was on Robben Island, and said human rights were 'indivisible' no matter where they are abridged. He refused to answer, and later sent his press aide to explain that his refusal was not a coded judgment on Chinese human rights; he was grateful to China, and would never condemn it.



Jonathan Mirsky

In a fortnight, Patten will go to Peking for his first conversations with some of the men who honoured Mandela. He will encounter the frozen smiles of the Chinese leaders whose Hong Kong mouthpiece, the newspaper *Wen Wei Po*, described Patten, after a speech suggesting modest proposals that would hardly be noticeable in Britain, as a man 'not as good as his word, [who] is irresponsible, and has ruined his reputation'.

Why? In his speech, Patten did not elevate any of the popularly-elected members of the Legislative Council, such as China's *bête noir*, Martin Lee, on to his Executive Council, or Cabinet. Nor did he increase the number of directly elected seats in the Legislative Council — which he should have done and might still do.

But the Governor has politely removed Peking's best friends from the Executive Council. Moreover, adroit and cunning politician that he is, he has stretched to breaking point the Chinese Basic Law for Hong Kong after 1997, increasing the number of people voting, even if indirectly, for a majority of the Legislative Council seats, from 100,000 or so to 2.5 million — 'all working people', as the Governor put it.

Lu Ping, the senior Chinese official responsible for Hong Kong, launched an ironic shaft at Patten: his plans for expenditures on social programmes that Peking could never provide for its own people were 'socialist'.

As a final sign of what Peking calls his 'irresponsibility and imprudence', Patten abolished capital punishment, which has not been used in Hong Kong for many years. As Mandela knows, but will not acknowledge, the Chinese are among the world's most enthusiastic shooters of their citizens.

Perhaps Premier Li Peng will suggest to the Governor, when they meet in two weeks, that if he wants to be regarded as a 'friendly' barbarian he should bring back the rope.