

DECODING APARTHEID REFORM

j'no Context

The reforms currently being claimed or proposed by Pretoria are not new in themselves, though in some aspects the modalities have changed. However, an attempt has been

made to give the impression of fundamental and dramatic changes in the style and manner of presentation, and by the rhetorical and sweeping profession of belief in principles which have no place in apartheid reality.

Pretoria's periodic announcements of, reform and promises for future action are part of a strategy to maintain white domination that has been developed over a period of years.

In response to internal and international pressures, reforms have been repeatedly mooted and legislation presaged, but implementation has only been in accordance, in both content and time, with the regime's long term plan to modernise apartheid. Such changes as are made are designed to streamline the essentials of control and strengthen it by co-opting sectors of the oppressed into the machinery of apartheid; marginal reforms are given glossy packaging to counter international isolation; while repression is intensified in the attempt to retain political control.

The image of P.W. Botha as carrying the torch of reform is assiduously promoted; but it is under him that South Africa has been militarised to a level unprecedented even in World War II. This is to be seen not only in the expansion of the Defence Force and its armaments, but more extensively in the militarisation of the white population including school children, and in the incursion of military personnel and attitudes into the political process, to the extent that they dominate decision-making.

The repeated aggression against neighbouring states, the use of the army against the black civilian population, and the extensive repressive powers conferred on ordinary soldiers is but a reflection.

Before launching the reform process and in conformity with the plan to maintain white domination, the political system was restructured and power shifted into non-elected institutions.

Most importantly, by 1980/81, the State Security Council (SSC) took over from the Cabinet and white Parliament as the effective, if unofficial, decision-making body in the country. Dominated by the military and police, its numerous interdepartmental committees concern themselves with constitutional developments, the Economy, culture, education, unity services and other matters extending over the entire range of government activity.

The establishment of the SSC ensured that the reality of

-.er would rem&an in white hands, regardless of who islse was
ieviteo to share its trappings. The way was thus cleared for the
tion of 'elected* institutions for blacks including the

i --1 -rnoivl parliament and the Presidents Council.

2.

In documents circulated privately and in public statements 'h ci3 Botha' s speech on January 31st. 1986, the objective

0 entrenching white power is veiled by specious and misleading c institutional and judicial phrases whose true meaning is u!!-:ert:iined by the fundamental fact of a South Africa divided

!; e: related on ethnic and racial lines and the reality of continuing white control over the mechanisms of power.

Throughout statments such as Botha's speech the centrality o', tne concept 1 communities', 'minorities' and 'group rights'

1 evident and provides the immutable base upon which all else i. tc be erected. Over the years, South Africa's rulers have

â– to. neri ethnic identities into their contemporary form and cynically manipulated them in their own interests. Black population groups have been defined, divided, redefined, separated and segregated in order to perpetuate white domination.

V ...;

Today, that same purpose continues to be served'by the promotion of a new political dispensation based on'power shoring' between racially and ethnically defined communities, in this version of 'democracy', whites unilaterally define the 'communities', set the parameters for'legitimate' political aspirations, create institutions constrained by these limits, and then seek international applause for allowing some blacks tc participate in these institutions to implement apartheid.

,fit-1 â– V..' * ' r..; .tt

3

Ad Code a

Pretoria's claims and promises as set out in the documents "re South African Governments Political Objectives"(Document A) and. Botha's speech to Parliament on January 31st 1986 (Document B) are here assessed in the context of the reality of apartheid practice and stated intent. Key political concepts and words are used repeatedly, and the most significant sections are quoted by way of illustration.

"The South African Government has, as a matter of policy announced a programme which

- provides for a united South Africa..." (Document A)

"; accept an undivided Republic of South Africa.(Document B p7)

a) The South Africa referred to in all Pretoria's statements is already divided, as they refer only to that part which remains after Bophuthatswana, Ciskei, Transkei and Venda are excluded.

o) Even with that starting point, the regime's declared commitment to an undivided South Africa is contradicted by the stated intention of continuing with the Bantustan policy and retaining Bantustan structures as units in new institutions:

(i) The KwaNdebele Bantustan is still scheduled for 'independence' this year; and on January 1st. the district of Moutse was forcibly incorporated into it, despite the opposition of its 120,000 inhabitants and their expressed desire to remain South Africans.

(ii) Botha's speech also announced that legislation is to be introduced in this Parliamentary session providing for the "extension of the powers of the self-governing states" i.e. Bantustans which are not yet.

'independent'

(iii) The National Statutory Council announced in the same speech is to include "representatives of

the governments of self-governing national states'.

"... orogrojame.. whichprovides for a common citizenship for all 'Id Africans living within its borders.." (Document A)

" . accept one citizenship for all South Africans implying equal

' - - tm-r;t and opportunities " (Document B p7)

it should be noted that Botha's speech confirmed that all black 'a€ with Africans now resident in Bophuthatswana, Ciskei, Transkei Venda, including the millions forcibly removed there will not d'-ve their South African citizenship returned to them.

As the documents themselves indicate, whites alone retain the â€ -..T to say who will and who will not be considered citizens, and wdien rifhts, if any, these citizens will enjoy. It is mechanics only that are open to negotiation.

4.

...o proposal to give back to some, the citizenship that
~r. regime itself had taken away earlier is not new, and was
reserved to also in "Rubicon I" on August 15th. 1985. Three days
Pretoria's Minister of Constitutional Development and
. T ing Chris Heunis spelt out the regime's intent in an
interview with South African television:

hr. Heunis, when we talk of citizenship for black South Africans,
are we talking about the same kind of citizenship that applies

to white South Africans?

A. (Heunis) Well there is only one kind of citizenship in any
country, also South Africa, but that does not imply that the
rights of all citizens of a particular country can in fact be
accommodated in exactly the same way.

q. So that would not necessarily confer the same political rights
on blacks as whites enjoy?

A. (Heunis) No. Let us put it the other way, that it might be
possible to confer the same rights, but the structures and basis
might be different, and that is what we have in fact to negotiate..."

(authors emphasis);i":

d) P.w. Botha's reprimand to his Foreign Minister Pik Botha
for suggesting that the regime's reforms opened the way for
South Africa to have a black President one day, indicates clearly
that though he spoke of 'equal opportunities', he did not intend
that blacks would actually be given full and equal, political rights.

"...a system of universal franchise..." (Document A)

a) There is ...no universal franchise as generally understood, nor
has the regime promised that one would be introduced.

b) The franchise is only allowed to blacks in separate political
institutions with a built in white majority. The establishment
of common structures and common electoral rolls have been

repeatedly declared 'non-negotiable*.

(see further below)

"...structures chosen by South Africans jointly..(Document A)

" creation of the structures required...through negotiation with

iv. Leaders of the communities of the country..." (Document A)

The political structures in South Africa, old and new, have been

imposed on the majority by the white minority.

bantustans, community councils and other institutions have been created and imposed despite almost universal opposition.

— :,* Sew structures are unilaterally created by whites to control the co-opted sectors of the oppressed majority. 'Coloured' and 1 1;n' South Africans were refused the opportunity to accept'

reject the new constitution and the tri-racial parliament,

though whites were permitted a say through a referendum.

5.

-â€œ) A 'i'loans were not involved, nor did they agree with the decision
J.â– xcite them entirely from the South African polity under the
r.; constitution.

.lie National Statutory Council now proposed by Botha can only
1established through structures from which Africans are excluded -
1. . the tri racial parliament. Furthermore, it will only be permitte
to â€œconsider and advise", but not decide.

o; An indication of Pretoria's approach to negotiation and the
op lions permitted to blacks on constitutional matters is provided
by partheid Minister Heunis in the interview referred to above:

.hat then is negotiable and what is not negotiable from the

av . rnment! s point of view should the Government and Cabinet
: >i, Knit tee and black leaders eventually sit down around that conference

table?

A. (Heunis) Well, I would like to suggest that we. must rather not
concentrate on those things that we try to exclude. I believe that
one should negotiate on the basis of open negotiations. The C-overnmen

hac repeatedly stated its -own position in this regard, and this
position is very clear....we do not believe that the solution to
the political issues of this country can be resolved in a system
which is modelled on western Europe or North American institutions.

:/e do not believe that we can maintain stability in South Africa
on a basis of the system of one man one vote oh a constituency
basis within a unitary or single state concept. We believe that
th constitutional dispensation of this country must' reflect the
pJrality of this society and therefore the options"must be within
tnase Dasic approaches.

So the Government is ruling out one man one vote as unnegotiable
an;; I think the President also ruled out a fourth chamber for

blids as unnegotiable?

A. Yes, but...

(author's emphasis)

" provides..for the full political participation in government

in respect of matters of national concern of all South Africa's

ccnviunities. ..." (Document A)

a

'â€œ-opts...the principle of power sharing in government in respect

: ttors of national concern... (Document A)

â€œ) 'already indicated, political participation is limited to

- â€œ tinning within the regime's parameters, in segregated political

ci i.utions and concerned with implementing apartheid policies. *

vior to the introduction of the new constitution, matters of
,:n: i: i < concern" and "own affairs" were defined by the all white
:r: i aaant. Matters of "national concern" included aspects vital
m maintaining apartheid, such as military, police, taxation it .

â€œ 9 l':al-n f ai rs and constitutional matters as well as the non-nego-

: â€œ " 'â€œ such as the Group Areas Act, franchise, segregation.in â€œ

catva â€œ'at: ion etc. These were allocated to structures with built-in
'â€œâ€œ at:..a majorities. "Own affairs" which could be summed up as
"i;Â°"to apply apartheid to my racial group" were left to the
J aateo Chambers of 'Coloureds.', 'Indians', and whites.

.â€œ .eenan.i.sms arc now being sought to accomodate some Africans

6.

v similar basis.

c. Final decisions on all important matters and policies are in any case made by the State Security Council, which remains

purely white.

"...through negotiation with the leaders of all the communities of this country..." (Document A)

"All South Africans must be placed in a position where they can participate in government through their elected Representatives."

(Document B p8)

a) In practice whites reserve to themselves the right to decide who is or is not a black 'leader' through the selective use of the repressive machinery and ultimately by claiming that those who do not agree with them are not really representative.

b) Political structures have been created and electoral processes prescribed in a manner which guarantees an outcome in favour of apartheid. The official institutions for blacks are those set up within the parameters of the apartheid system and designed to implement its policies. Popular leaders have refused to lend credibility

to these institutions by seeking election and any elections are overwhelmingly boycotted. Those who are 'elected' are thus by definition not representative. In this way the system automatically filters out all those who seek real change.

In both Document A and B there are references to the 'protection of rights of all', 'justice, equality of opportunity' 'protection of human dignity, life liberty and property of all on the basis

of racial equality*.

The sheer audacity of these claims defies belief. If one looks at the reality of life under apartheid not one of these claims can be sustained. One has only to open any South African newspaper or visit any court to find numerous illustrations

that show the contrary. Successive parliaments have enacted a

set of laws that do not allow blacks rights, justice, property, liberty, and which violate every single clause of the Universal

Declaration of Human Rights. Apartheid is the only political system existent today which has been declared a crime in international law by the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid.

' : arc hun.reds of laws and thousands of administrative orders
sis- nre racially discriminatory. Racial inequality is not
npj round in the laws and practices but is the basis of the
cst.i tution of the country. As has been shown already, even
form proposals being put forward discriminate in favour
sl.e ebmination.

b si.1 eve in the sovereignty of the law as the basis for the
--â€¢ f ion o f fundamental rights of individuals as well as groups.

1 Li;Ye i;- the sanctity and indivisibility of law and the just
_i cation thereof.....must conform with the requirements of
sivlliseu legal order and must ensure access to the courts and'
-u-.ij ity before the law" (Document B p7 &8)

'â- /.is is rhetoric devoid of any content based in reality,
judicial system was set up by whites, and to this day

1-:,pcrated by them in their own interests.

i'ui- most rudimentary level, not only have African lawyers had to
fl additional difficulties in acquiring an education and legal
r\ '.i: 1 i fi cat ions, but they are prevented by the Group Areas Act,
r.u: ioipal decree, and the pass laws from automatically opening
offices in a convenient central location. Many are forced to
practice only where the authorities allow them.

laws themselves are unjust and discriminatory.

S: â- rt- are no African judges and it would be unthinkable to even
su;;-...et that a black could adjudicate in a case involving whites.

e) ./hen in the course of his trial in 1962, Nelson Mandela (a lawyer)
challenged the notion that an African could receive justice in
th'.; courts, or that there was equality before the law in apartheid
South Africa, the magistrate responded:

"After all is said and done, there is only one Court
today, and that is the white mans court. There is no
other Court.¹"

That is an accurate statement of the position today.

In his speech Botha announced a "National Statutory Council"
would be established with "representatives of the South African
Government, representatives of the self-governing national states
as well as leaders of other black communities and interest groups"
to "advise on matters of common concern including proposed legis-
lation of such matters."

' for11 oar tic illation11 by the African people

â€¢ -nta.ins al!." the stfb-dcf"words establishing barriers to genuine
dvmocratic participation in decision making: "representatives of self
governing national states", constitutional structures jointly
a reed on" "our multi-cultural society", "matters of common
concern" etc. Political rights for Africans are still seen
primarily as within a Bantustan context, and outside the mainstream
(' South African political life, as P.W.Botha confirmed when

..'.ejected the possibility that they opened the way for an African
-... become i. resident of South Africa.

The structure for all its vagueness bears resemblance to
fa - ative Advisory Council abolished in 194-8. The "major progress¹"

1 o. oac kwards to 1947!

It is inevitable that the Council will be rejected by the African people and no credible leader will participate. If it is set up, it will be just one more institution trying to shore up the apartheid system.

8.

'>rms and .â– leality

rtheid is a comprehensive system that controls the totality â€¢

o black life. Many alleged reforms are effectively nullified by the application of other more fundamental laws and principles v.hich underpin the entire system, and which the National Party iv declared to be 'non-negotiable'. Some of these are:

the concept of South Africa being; a 'nation of minorities',
ana the use of 'group rights' to retain white domination

the Bantustan policy and the exclusion of Africans from
common decision making structures in central government.

The Population Registration Act establishing the group
classification of every single individual, the Group
Areas Act demarcating segregated racial residential areas
and the many laws which cummulatively reserve 87% of
the country for whites.

- non racial educational system.

U 1!

Claims for reforms are often put forward in the full
knowledge that they are peripheral to the apartheid system or
will be nullified in practice. Some reforms apply only to
'Coloured' and 'Indian' South Africans a\$d part of the strategy
of co-opting them as subordinate partners.

All theâ€¢claims:in Document A under the heading "reforms...
have already resulted in major progress, for example "

are examined here:

Public Amenities: Kany dese 'gregated - hotels restaurants

\ narks trains and buses;

f pat e 3;

Sport: open to all races;

(pa; e 2)

relation remains the rule and norm throughout South African
life, and special permission has to be obtained for any deviation.

legislation provides for facilities to be separate and unequal
The reservation of Separate Amenities Act, not only enables
the reservation of public amenities for the exclusive use of

a particular racial group, but specifies that such reservation
â– 'C ruled invalid on the grounds that provision has not be'en mat
all races or that the separate facilities provided for
various races are not substantially equal.

ueh desegregation as has occurred has been by special permit
-at the discretion of the relevant official who is/invariably
white. The permission applies either tciparticulaft,premises
or for a particular occassion and for a 'specified period.

hili some leÂ£ islation has been amended to allow for such
exceptions, the overall impact of the system leads to
absurdities.;Por example, blacks who have been given
permission to participate in a specific competitive swimming
event cannot therefore use that swimming pool to learn

9.

train or practice for that event.

Where people are permitted to attend a bona fide event in an area demarcated for another racial group, they have to ensure that they do not overstay their licence, go anywhere else, or do anything else whilst they are in the prohibited area. The burden of proof that they have not done so lies with them.

.-} "he claim that sport is open to all races is manifestly not true.

As already indicated 'open* sport is the exception and not the rule

(ii) There are many examples of black sportsmen being denied the use of particular facilities or sportsmen being arrested and charged under the Group Areas Act or other legislation because they attended or participated in a sporting event without the requisite permission.,

(iii) The greatest offence, is the exclusion of the majority of the population from most of the facilities in the country.

The semi-official Human Sciences Research Council has estimated that 90% of all sports facilities in the country are reserved for the exclusive use of the white population.

"labour: Modern sophisticated trade union system opened to

(Pa, e 2) all races>

job reservation removed.

While blacks are allowed to join trade unions they still have to operate under severe and discriminatory restrictions.

n) As recent incidents have revealed, employers are able;and have in fact dismissed all workers arbitrarily. Amongst the offenders

have been state controlled organisations.

o) State owned companies such as ESCOft have refused non-racial

trade union officials access to the work force, while officials of white racial trade unions have not been similarly excluded.

-last month, in Westonaria, police raided a meeting of miners discussing union affairs, claiming that it was 'illegal'. At

9 people, including 2 policemen were subsequently killed,

miners were injured and 250 arrested

restrictions on freedom-of movement and residence of blacks
and both their employment opportunities and the ability to
organise and participate in trade union activity.

(, many black workers reside in the 'dormitory' areas of Bantustans
commute to jobs elsewhere. Legislation banning trade unions
has been enacted through the bantustan 'authority'. So trade
unions can organise workers only while they are physically present in
certain parts of South Africa, but it is illegal to do so elsewhere.

Only 3% of jobs were affected by job reservation imposed by law.
Customary job reservation remains and is rigidly applied to the

mining company's own employees. While whites can and are employed in
the separate institutions of other racial groups, similar

openings are not available to blacks notwithstanding their *

qualifications

10.

abition of Kixed: repealed

; vi'iages Act

morality Act: racial provision repealed. "

(â€¢ age 3)

â– is only in white propaganda that this legislation was seen as

v cornerstone of apartheid, for blacks it has always been marginal,
Pne legislation affected only a very small number of people.

. circular issued to all marriage officers after the former Act

â– is repealed indicates the difficulties that still remain:

" Marriage officers are requested, in the case of an intended marriage between parties of different population groups, to advise the parties that their marriage may have certain legal implications for them and for any children that may be born from their union. These implications relate to where the married couple will be able to live, the exercise of their franchise for the election of Members of Parliament, the population group into which their children may be classified

and the schools their children will be able to attend."

in practice, the problems are met by the white partner being reclassified as of another race!

"Immigration: provisions providing for white preference in

(page 3) immigration to be repealed."

The repeal will make no difference whatsoever to the rights or status of the black population of South Africa. The remaining provisions of the Act will still affect the 8 million South Africans who have been deprived of their citizenship and declared

statutory foreigners.

The iniquities of the apartheid system and the fact that immigration policy will still be controlled by whites will inevitably affect the decision of who is a 'desirable' immigrant even after the formal white preference is abandoned. Considerations of availability of jobs and housing or the capacity to bring in capital which are common criteria elsewhere, will effectively continue to exclude blacks.

" influx Control c': Presidents Councils recommendation for

.Pass Laws phasing our under sympathetic considera

ation for action during the next
parliamentary session."(Document A p3)

"legislation to provide 11 a uniform identity document for all
population groups." (Document B p 6)

replacement of the existing influx control which is "costly and has
become obsolete" with "Orderly urbanisation", and a white paper
setting out guidelines to be published.

(summation of proposals in Document B p 6 &J)

only definite proposals are a uniform identity document and
a change; to replace the present system of influx control with an unspecified

of "orderly urbanisation". The impression is being deliberately
created that a lot more has been promised, in an attempt to gain
credibility for the whole reform process.

. 'j'; . is not the first occasion when passes are to be abolished.

, they were replaced with a 'reference book' and control
movement was wider in scope and more rigorously imposed.

The creation of a uniform identity document is meaningless in
itself. The objection is not to the format of the document but to
certain aspects of the legislation which prevents the free movement
of African people, controls their lives and right to be in any
part of South Africa. The legislation is so wide-ranging, that a

woman legally entitled to come into an urban area cannot bring
her suckling babe with her. Such legislation does not affect
her, and it is inconceivable that it would be so extended.

c) In South Africa where a uniform identity document was introduced,
Africans continue to be restricted and harassed.

d) Promises of pass law reform have been dangling for two years,
specific comment would have to await the white paper.

One suggestion mooted is that control will be exercised on the
basis of availability of approved housing and/or employment. Within
the apartheid system such control will have no effect on whites
at all but would still exclude Africans from existing urban areas
where there is already severe unemployment, serious overcrowding and
little provision for new housing.

Already Bantustans within commuting distance have become dormitory
suburbs from where Africans travel to work in so called white
South Africa. One fear is that expanding these semi rural slums
providing more housing and 'urban' facilities there would meet
the need to be 'cost effective' and retain control over the movement
of Africans.

e) The reference to 'orderly' urbanisation while unobjectionable
in itself, suggests a phasing out period, which of course will be
determined by whites and could be almost indefinite.

institutional: Asians and Coloureds represented in Parliament

Asians and Coloureds holding Ministerial and
(Table 3) and Deputy Ministerial positions in Government.

f) There is no mention that these constitutional changes included
clauses which totally removed the entire African population from
the South African polity, and thereby denied them any right whatsoever
to participate in decision making.

the tri-racial parliament has a built-in white majority

and, not only were Africans and Coloureds not consulted about the

constitution, but their rejection of the institutions expressed, the law the boycott of elections was totally ignored

even on the very low polls due to the boycott, -those individuals in parliament are not representatives of the Asians or

Indians.

etna's favorable references to the achievements of these

participants in the triracial parliament have not been matched by popular approval. On the contrary, opposition has increased as collaborating Si's have not opposed the state of emergency, increasing repression, the use of the army in the townships, Retentions and torture, and the massacres. Most of these MPs ... Live apart from their communities separated by armed guards

12.

The impossibility within the system of having a black Minister in charge of a department manned by white civil servant/.

responsible for 'general affairs' policy which will affect whites have been avoided by ensuring that the Indian and Coloureds remain.-, Ministers without Portfolio.

The predetermined definition of 'own affairs' precludes the "Coloured" and "Indian" chambers from changing or even discussing many of the laws which impose severe hardships on

their communities such as the Group Areas Act.

h) The MPs have found that they cannot even use the same dining facilities as white MPs. Furthermore, while they were all permitted to listen to Botha's speech together, they are only allowed to

eat it within their own group and in their separate segregated chambers.

7. "Forced Resettlement for: Suspended"

Constitutional Purposes (Page 3)

'Forced resettlement' has been imposed for a whole range of reasons. Clearly removal under the other categories is to continue. In the case of the residents of Moutse (page 3 above) people were not removed for constitutional purposes, but the Bantustan was

moved to incorporate them.

The regime has in the past played around with words, saying that removals would only be undertaken where people agreed and then ensuring that only 'leaders' who agreed with the removal were recognised as expressing the community's views.

6. "Freehold Property: Accepted as well as permanency of Black Rights for Blacks communities in urban areas. "

(page 3)

The severe limitations are not mentioned.

a) Even after Africans were dispossessed of their land and restricted to only 13% of South Africa, they were entitled to own freehold, successive Nationalist Party administrations took "away that right in new transfers and forcibly removed people from lands on which they were entitled to freehold. The "major progress" now announced merely returns the situation to where it was in 1913 and 1948!, with the difference that the greater impoverishment of the African people in the intervening period will make them less able to find

â€¢he means to purchase freehold.

African tenure of any kind will still be limited only to those areas which the (white) authorities decide Africans may occupy,

â€¢n- that is a very small percentage of the country's land area..

9. national Government: full participation of all communities"

(page 4)

. -; participation will not be on the basis of equality.

-} local government operates in the apartheid context and through

unequal institutions. Racial and ethnic separate councils will
â€¢j- provided for areas already segregated on the same lines, while
bantustan units will be incorporated.

government has been restructured and brought under central

government control, exercised ultimately through the white Minister

13.

â– r.r. ti tutional Development.

cat importantly the African people have totally rejected

â€¢ seper&te institutions created and the measures that

i le for continued white control.

in the elections for Town and Village Councils in November 1983, the boycott was 90% effective. Popular hostility to those who did . u.. taemselves forward for these Council has since led to

ih- disintegration of most of them. Bye-elections to fill vacancies

â– we had to bo cancelled as no candidates came forward.

ic these circumstances it is impossible to talk of 'full participation-

" unation: Parity for all population groups is the declared

objective, and action to this end is under way.

v a. e 4) Oile education department has come into being to ensur

equal norms and standards."

,hu rhetoric amounts to little more than a common examination system

.within days of Botha's speech, his Minister of Education told

>â€¢ i ament that segregated schools remained amongst the non-n ego-

liables of the Nationalist iarty. (

b) At the end of December 1985, hudreds of parents, educationists

am: students from across South Africa met at a Conference called

by the Soweto Parents Crisis Committee to deal with the education

c f African children and the boycott of schools. Bishop Tutu

vacs amongst those who addressed the Conference at which grievances

v.ore discussed& a set of demands to be met within 3 months were put forward.

ith African views so clearly set out, the way was open to take them into account, provided of course there was a genuine; desire

no liso. Botha's speech which amplifies the statment made in

document A quoted above, totally ignores everything that was

â– aid at this conference. In this context also Botha spoke of .

"consultation with leaders in the field of education1' (p4), but

clearly this did not include those most involved or affected by tic education system. They of course disagree with apartheid,

an i therefore cannot be accepted as 'leaders'.

"Me is yet one more example of the white minority deciding what
â– should have, and consulting with those who agree with them
<i>rw to implement their decisions.

'! a:, a! Â£u sine S3: Presidents Council recommendations
aicts in Cities for opening, of CBBs to all races in
â– process of implementation."

In the context of apartheid this provision only affects a
individuals. Taking, into account African poverty and the
â€œaiaction*.of apartheid, permission to opftn shops and stores
-; centre of cities is hardly a priority.

I ther apartheid restrictions on African movement, property
etc, cvai] ablit.y of credit etc. will limit the effectiveness
. .La new "freedom' even further.

ix.-.itorits of the South African People

1 door is thus wide open., (to) negotiation of a political dispensation... which could satisfy the political aspirations of all country's communities ." (Document A - conclusion)

" e believe that a democratic system of Government which must accomodate all legitimate political aspirations of all

â– . outh African communities must be negotiated "

(Document B p 8)

reforms' are not ipurely cosmetic, but nose of them stem from a desire to change the apartheid system in any fundamental way. They do not even begin to address the fundamental grievances and do not accord with popular aspirations.

â€) -'T:

It is not surprising that the various 'reforms' and promises .ve been rejected by black South Africans and by growing numbers of whites including the leader of the white Parliamentary opposition. Popular anger has stimulated determined resistance throughout the country. Botha spoke of the "greater calm that is beginning to return" hoping thereby to soothe the ears of his creditor." bankers scheduled to meet this month. But even as the number of areas under the state of emergency is reduced, increased powers are gazetted for all non-emergency areas. The emergency is becoming the normality. For resistance in fact continues unabated, though blurred from view by censorship and media dependence on the daily police reports of 'incidents' which seek to play down the scale and distort its character.

Not only do the reforms not meet popular aspirations, they do not even try to go in the same direction. The objectives of the liberation struggle reiterated in townships across South Africa are the eradication of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic non-racial united South Africa. There is no meeting ground between a 'united South Africa' and Bantustans and- the concept of 'community rights'. "Non racial" is by definition incompatible with a system of white domination. "Democratic "

...terns are negated by vesting power in non-elected organs.

These are aspirations which the majority of South Africans share with progressive humankind the- world over. But Botha,

v.b- t--e.es it upon himself to decide who shall be South African?

: vvic shall not be, has presumed also to consider such ? epirations as not 'legitimate'. Yet in this last quarter of the 20th. century, humankind has progressed to the stage that 'old-fashioned racial domination are considered as illegitimate and

'Vtveid a crime against humanity.

Th.: uets of rhetoric from Botha should not be allowed to
1 v. way the Tommonwealth' s determination to act against

- â– â– â– tie.id and implement its- programme of sanctions.

Frene Cinwala
london

February 10th, 1986