

ASI9B3_1_ L. &

EMBARGOED UNTIL DELIVERED

THE INSTITUTE OF COST AND MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTANTS
18TH NATIONAL CONFERENCE

ADDRESS BY MANGOSUTHYU G. BUTHELEZI
CHIEF MINISTER, KWAZULU
PRES IDENT OF INKATHA,
CHAIRMAN, THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK
ALLIANCE

â\200\234THE CHALLENGE AHEAD"

MAHARANI HOTEL, Durban 28th April, 1983

In the documentation sent to me and to delegates to the conference I am described as 'Head of Inkatha and Leader of 5 million Zulus'

I am proud to be regarded as a leader of Zulus, but Mr Chairman, there is more to it than that. Inkatha lis not only a Zulu organisa-
tion. We have non-Zulus right at the tbp in our organisation. In the Central Committee.

In 1982, a major, nationwide survey was undertaken among migrant workers in industry, for an investigation run jointly by the Urban Foundation, the University of Stellenbosch and The University of Natal. Seven hundred workers were scientifically sampled in Cape Town

Questions were asked on political leadership. One third of the migrant workers who supported Inkatha or me as a political leader were non-Zulu.

You, as business leaders, will often hear that the Black intelli-
gentsia does not support Inkatha.. There is much talk of leading Blacks regarding Inkatha as an organisation of collaborators, of sell-outs and such like opprobrious epithets.

This talk/ o..2

This talk is often exaggerated. I know, for example, how very many of the most prominent Black elites on the Witwatersrand are in fact members of or supporters of Inkatha. However, it is true that there are groups of professional people in the townships of Durban, the Witwatersrand and Cape Town who reject my position. This is a common pattern in Southern Africa and it is by no means unique. So that I am not expecting that everyone should support Inkatha. We want support for Inkatha to be based on careful thought and sincere conviction. I think, however, that you should understand why there is 'disunity' in the ranks of Africans today.

Black people in South Africa who are concerned about politics increasingly are divided into various camps as regards strategy. I know I am oversimplifying things a little but for purposes of illustration I would like to describe the two main political groupings in the following terms:

Firstly, there is Inkatha as well as some other organisations which believe in engagement. Inkatha has a very large constituency of supporters, the vast majority of whom are industrial workers. Inkatha has to address their day to day problems as well as working for change in the political structures of our society. Therefore we have to engage the system, and work with the tools we have. We cannot destroy it by shouting from afar as if it will crumble by shouting at it like the walls of Jericho.)

Then there are organisations and groups generally led by middle-class people who are frequently professionals and include some students. They have supporters who are somewhat less poverty-stricken. Often these organisations are called civic associations. Their supporters do not have pressing day to day problems. Therefore they do not deal with practical and material day to day problems. Therefore they need/...3

they need not be so concerned about the everyday circumstances of Black people. Because they are often better-educated people whose dignity is threatened by apartheid, they develop a very radical rhetoric. They want to have as little to do with the so-called 'system' as possible. Emotionally they have a need to identify with what is seen to be most radical. Hence they privately or openly will declare support for the External Mission of the ANC. The External Mission of ANC creates the impression of really dynamic radicalism by its policy of sabotage and insurgency.

The vast majority of the people who say they support the External Mission of ANC do so for emotional or symbolic reasons. They are

in no way practically involved. It is an in thing to claim connections with the External Mission of ANC. My view is that if they want to be involved in the armed struggle it is their prerogative to make that choice. But if they want genuinely to be involved in the armed struggle the route to that is simple: let

them skip borders and take up guns, which are available in the camps of the External Mission of ANC. What is more if they are about my age and have children in their twenties and more let them also recruit from amongst their own children for the so-called 'armed struggle', which so far has not successfully taken off after more than 20 years. This is not criticism of the 'armed struggle' but I am stating just the facts of the matter. I do not query the right

- of any black man to skip the borders and take up arms. It is not for me to interfere with other peoples political business. All I ask for in return is for them not to interfere with my own political business. I do not abuse people who do not support Inkatha. I therefore do not see why people should indulge in radical rhetoric in abusing Inkatha. If they are committed to the armed struggle, their role is simple, let them skip the borders and take up the AK rifle.

There is:./...4

B

There is no substitute for taking up arms. People are getting a little tired of seeing podium insurgents in the last 20 years who talk blood and thunder behind microphones, in order to earn a false aura of radicalism around their persons, without having the guts to skip South African borders. I have great respect for those who do go 'to the bush, people who do not just lecture us here in perfect safety about a '"bush war'", which we have so far not seen taking pri.

These community figures also feel they have to be as critical as possible of Inkatha because it has a policy which is clearly more practical than that of the ANC External Mission.

Some whites are very sympathetic to the groups with a radical

rhetoric because they realise that it does not actually mean much today in terms of threatening the system. These Whites feel that

they understand that Black persons need to be militant and hostile

to all aspects of the system as long as all this is no more than just theory. These Whites are found amongst white clerics, white academics and white studentÂ\$.

We in Inkatha see a grave danger in this kind of symbolic politics. We have seen the strategy of the so-called militant and radical youth collapse after Soweto 1976. We have seen that the township disturbances did more to damage the economy on which our people depend for jobs, than help the black cause.. Now this same so-called 'fadicalism is nothing more than words and inactivity. It is often an excuse for not doing anything for our own liberation.

We in Inkatha would like to say to businessmen that radical words

and inactivity do not help the economy, nor do they help the ordinary Black people. I say this for a specific reason.

By talking/...5

St g

By talking militant talk, by boycotting the so-called 'system'

in every way, these people paralyseâ\200\230change in South Africa, opening the door for violence later, and the sabotage policy of the External Mission of the ANC. Militant inactivity is more dangerous to everyone in the long run than positive Black action now. Sometimes attacks on Inkatha are no more than a deliberate strategy to pave the way for more violence.

We in Inkatha are determined to work for change now. We may make life more uncomfortable for many Whites and for the government in the short run, but we believe that it is best for peaceful change in the longer term.

Let me address myself to the theme of Conference which is "THE CHALLENGE AHEAD." The real challenge ahead which South Africa's business community has to face is the challenge which revolves around the South African Government's unrealism. If one goes back

to 1948 when the National Party came to power, the world the business community faced in terms of government policy was totally restrictive. Business could not then have projected themselves into the future which we know as today's world and in fact they did not do so. We suffer today because the unrealism of government thinking was characterised by a stop-start-too-little-too late syndrome.

There was no forward planning as far as manpower development went. Job reservation was embarked on as though Whites could continue to provide key worker and management material for the future. The cry to keep cities White and the fear that economic integration was a Soviet ploy to bring about the downfall of the Whites eventually led to the Physical Planning Act and the futile attempt to decentralise industry to feed the apartheid plan and separate the races of South Africa.

Management in the late 1940's and 1950's were held to ransom by White workers and petty bureaucrats in government. They were also hamstrung by managerial dissent as to how far commerce and industry could go to develop manpower requirements by Black training. In many cases business was a very willing partner in making a moribund free enterprise

system. /...6

system the hand-maiden of party political designs. Manager persecuted manager and concern persecuted concern for being innovative and futuristic in projecting and planning their own economic development.

The lack of realism of earlier National Party thinking is now widely recognised but a new and more dangerous generation of National Party unrealists have emerged to negate the good which could have come out of learning past lessons. The Government no longer believes that it can make cities White. It no longer believes that it can protect Whites from Black job competition; it no longer believes that it can plan economic development within the narrow confines of apartheid's divisions and its new economic development plans include economic . regions which cut across numerous boundaries which were hitherto sacrosanct. It no longer believes that South Africa can avoid the recognition of Black trade unions. In one sense it can be said that the Government has responded pragmatically to reality, on these matters.

Government unrealism which can be traced back to 1948 roots, however, abounds in other directions. Government believes that it is possible for a shrinking small minority of Whites to continue to make unilateral decisions in 87% of the land, control virtually all the country's natural resources, continue to use commerce and industry as its hand-maidens, and at the same time stage-manage a great many millions of Blacks inside so-called White South Africa to play a supportive role in their apartheid designs. The slogan for this Government should be ' "We believe in eating our cake and having it" '.

The Government actually believes that it can succeed in enshrining White supremacy in a tricameral parliament, aided and abetted by sections of the Indian and Coloured communities. It actually believes that it does not have to make provision to include Blacks in the national decision-making process, and that the many millions of Blacks inside so-called White South Africa will be a controllable

force â\200\230oitge/ i Jin?

force once they have established a confederal system in which Blacks have political rights in so-called "independent national states."

If it was not so tragic I would be amused by the Labour Party's antics in withdrawing from the South African Black Alliance on the pretext that I launched unwarranted attacks on the Labour Party for their decision to participate in the government's tri-cameral farce. They refused to participate in the President's Council because they claimed that they were appalled by the exclusion of Africans in the President's Council. No one has blamed them from our camp for participation in government created bodies such as the CRC. The political chicanery comes about because of the somersault which is involved in now seeing nothing wrong in participating in a tricameral parliamentary system which excludes Africans. The Reverend Hendrickse

now echoes Mr Chris Heunis when he regards Africans as belonging to several different ethnic groups. He now insults us by echoing the voice of Pretoria by saying that we Africans are divided into Urban Africans and others and yet the Coloureds themselves are not undifferentiated. It seems to me that what is good for the Goose is not good for the Gander. '

I am comforted by the fact that many of our Coloured brothers and sisters see through the Hendrickses of this world, thus the torrid time they gave them at some of their meetings at Eldorado Park and other venues when I was thousands of miles away from South Africa. They were not prompted by me. I say so without approving in anyway of such political conduct. When the Reverend Hendrickse and his supporters went to Eshowe for the Labour Party Congress they had already made up their minds to participate in the Government's tri-cameral parliament. The Revd. Hendrickse should not talk as if he is so ignorant of South African History that he has never heard of the battle of Blood River of 1838 and of the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879.

The Zulus Laeooos 8