

governments - where successful - have to rule by violence. Then they are inevitably locked into another violence/counter-violence situation as is so well illustrated in Mocambique and Angola and could yet be illustrated in Zimbabwe.

The ANC Mission in Exile has clearly embarked on a course of action which must certainly contain tactics and strategies typical of the kind of thinking I am indicating. It is quite clear in their daily broadcasts to Black South Africa that they claim to be the sole representatives of the South Africa people and claim that anyone who is not with them is necessarily against them. They daily broadcast the encouragement of Black slaying Black for political reasons. The daily broadcast the need to escalate violence to bring about a civil war situation.

What the ANC Mission in Exile does and says clearly suggests that they are opposed to the politics of negotiation which necessarily must take place against the background of the acceptance of the need for compromise on both sides. They again and again state their position that the only thing to negotiate about is the handing over of power to the people. They have thus far been committed only to such action as would ensure their return as a government returned from exile. The ANC Mission in Exile is not fighting for the right of Black South Africans to be put in a position where they accept or reject them. Beyond all the rhetoric of the ANC Mission in Exile directed at Western ears, it intends returning to South Africa to form a one-Party state in which they will be the government.

It is within these realities that I see the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group labouring to bring sanity to the South African situation. I am fearful that they will misread the realities I have been indicating as our realities. In the final analysis they face the daunting position in which assumptions about the vulnerability of White South Africa are suspect, to say the least. White South Africa is not as vulnerable as many Western observers would want one to believe. In spite of the very significant increase in violence in South Africa, there is no bridge which is not standing, there is no factory which is not producing and the country's economic infrastructure has, so to say, only been peppered with sporadic bomb blast irritations. White South Africa's way of life remains unaltered. White neighbourhoods continue with urban life as they have done in the past. White sport and cultural activities continue as though there were no violence.

If White South Africa is vulnerable, and I believe it is, it is not vulnerable in the simplistic way assumed to be the case by many observers. White South Africa is vulnerable in an entirely different way, and for them the remedy for that now perceived vulnerability lies in effective reform. There is no

shadow of doubt in my mind that the State President is under very immense pressure from Whites to bring about the kind of reforms which will be meaningful to Blacks. He is under immense pressure from big business to do so. He is under immense pressure from churches and universities and academic institutions to do so. Professional bodies and other associations are increasing pressure on the Government. White South Africa is most vulnerable because the free enterprise system is incompatible with apartheid. The very real prospects that forces generated by the free enterprise system will bring about radical change in due course, lie behind the ANC Mission in Exile propagating the thought that capitalism and oppressive apartheid are two sides of the same coin. Their now clearly declared intention to destroy the South African economy arises out of the perception that radical change could take place without them having a finger in the pie.

Another South African reality which I must mention before passing on to other considerations, can perhaps best be indicated in the phrase: "The folly of boldness." There has emerged in South Africa a perception of White vulnerability and the vulnerability of the Government which is leading some Blacks to believe that the end is in sight. The South African media and the media in the West encourage perceptions of the South African Government being on the run. Prominent celebrity leaders (such as Bishop Tutu) run around the Western Europe and North America, pounding European Western heads with notions that vast forces are emerging to be invincible and that the people are about to take over power. United Democratic Front and COSATU action is in this climate displaying an ever greater boldness. They are now beginning to do what would be the right thing to do if the South African Government was really on the run and change had to be brought about by making the country ungovernable. Rhetoric at funerals and other public gatherings is becoming ever increasingly unrealistic. Stated tactics and strategies pitched at short-term objectives have the semblance of credibility because the South African Government is walking very cautiously and not because it is on the run. The South African Government has hardly bared its teeth at the UDF and COSATU. They are forces which could be annihilated in the short term if the Government chose to do so. As actions become more precipitous and more foolhardy, a point will be reached where a Western back-lash which makes the Government walk cautiously will not be forthcoming. Western interests dictate that Western governments will not deliberately precipitate a violent holocaust in South Africa. The West will not deliberately precipitate a Marxist take-over of South Africa. The West has a vested interest in orderly change leading to the survival of the free market economy of the country. Should a situation in South Africa emerge where violence has to be contained for the sake of everything the West believes in, the South African Government will not be penalised for doing so.

For over ten years now I have been generating a political force which will have great utility at the ripeness of political time. I refuse to dissipate Black anger on street corners. Black anger is the most precious commodity any Black leader could have. I continue to develop a disciplined political force which is directable. I do not shirk my South African responsibility because so many Western academics are now turning to apply such concepts as "populist" and my political enemies are applying concepts such as "collaborationist". I am interested only in democracy and if acting as an ever-increasingly accepted Black leader, and if acting to ensure that I carry Black South Africans with me as I move forward is called "populist", then so be it. If my refusal to employ children as cannon fodder and my refusal to embark on courses of action which will not stand the test of time, stigmatizes me as being a "collaborationist", then so be it. I am sworn at and my execution is ordered, as I bide my time so that I can make the right moves in the right circumstances.

It is becoming increasingly difficult to predict when the right circumstances will eventually emerge. My fear is that these circumstances may now well be receding further into the future, rather than drawing closer. There are indications that Western Governments have misread the South African situation and are behaving as though the South African Government is now on the run, as the protagonists of violence claim it is. The next months will be crucial months in South African developments. A state of emergency now prevails in the whole country. The Federal Congress of the National Party will meet in August. The Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group report will be considered at the Commonwealth Conference in August. The second session of the South African Parliament will convene in August.

In Europe and North America governments are under pressure to make exacting demands within short time-scales and to back these demands up with really punitive action if they are not met. Nobody should dare to make predictions as to what will transpire in the second half of 1986. The only certainty is that whatever does transpire will transpire in the violent situation which will not abate this year. There are very little prospects of the state of emergency being lifted. There are very little prospects that the forces of violence will diminish and there is every prospect of having to pursue the politics of negotiation in terribly adverse circumstances. The West's prime responsibility I believe is to help create the circumstances favourable for negotiations. This will not be done if harsh punitive action is taking against Pretoria. It will not be done if the forces working for confrontation continue to receive ever increasing support. It will not be done if false expectations about the ANC Mission in Exile persist."

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, we see the implications all around us what the politics of violent intimidation hold out for the future. Not only is the Government's intransigence and its prescriptive policy as represented in the foisting of the new constitution, the dismantling of the Provincial Administration system and the foisting of Regional Services Councils on us, polarising South Africa and radicalising Black politics, but there is the ever present threat that Black radicalism involved in horrendous practices such as necklacing, will colour Black politics. Inkatha members are being radicalised with the rest of Black South Africa and being angered with the rest of Black South Africa, and as we lead in the very midst of developing violence in our country, we are aware of the terrible dilemmas of local leadership who cannot stay the hand of Inkatha members who defend the lives of their wives and their children against brutal attacks. We cannot censure those who preserve their commitment to the finest ideals of decency that there are in the Black struggle for liberation, and defend their right to pursue these ideals.

We have never declared war on anybody. We never seek our political objectives through violent tactics and strategies, but the very depth of our commitment and the great value of that which we are committed to, demands that we adopt an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth approach for the sake of the whole of South Africa. It is of the utmost importance, Mr. Speaker, that we document our painful path through these dark days, and the records of this KwaZulu Legislative Assembly bear testimony to the valiant struggle we are waging to keep the Black struggle for liberation a non-violent one. It is important that we read into the records what we are saying about South Africa to foreign governments and it is important for me as Chief Minister of KwaZulu to make quite sure that every Member of this Legislative Assembly grasps what I say abroad and is given the opportunity of adding to it, or subtracting from it.

I know that there are some Black South Africans whose courage has failed them and who have lost heart and who think that violence promises short-term solutions to our country's problems. Some of our brothers and sisters have now been in exile for 25 years and I make the point, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, that they are encapsulated in the errors of judgement of those who thought that the armed struggle would hasten the day of liberation. They cannot now back-track. They cannot re-write the history that they wrote through these errors of judgement, but we who have had the guts to remain in the forefront of the struggle here on the ground have learnt the lessons of history.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I have never yet once in my life said that it is inconceivable that radical change will come about finally through violent means. As much as I abhor violence, and as ardently as I serve democratic, non-violent ideals, I am aware that a people have a right in the very last resort to overthrow tyranny by violence. Mr. Speaker, the Boers in this country were prepared to die in defence of their rights when they were threatened by British colonialism. No thinking Afrikaner can deny other human

beings the same rights to do the kind of things which is now hallowed history in Afrikaner traditions. Afrikaners now expect their young people to die if necessary in defence of the things they believe in. We too are South Africans, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members. We have the right to die for the things we believe in.

The truth of the matter, however, is that we have not yet reached that last resort situation. In fact we are moving further and further away from the moral justification of the armed struggle. In this Assembly I want our progress in the fight against violence as a means of solving South Africa's problems fully recorded, lest one day our history does in fact thrust us into that situation. If that day ever arrives, Mr. Speaker, we will have morality on our side because we left no stone unturned in the pursuit of non-violent means of establishing a democracy in our country.

Mr. Oliver Tambo gave evidence before the British House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee and I had to balance views being presented to it by myself giving evidence before it. Members are aware of the evidence I gave to it in January last year. I have since had to give further evidence to the Committee and again, I would like Members to know what I said. This, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, is what I said on your behalf and on behalf of Black South Africa.

FURTHER EVIDENCE TO THE THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
HOUSE OF COMMONS, LONDON

By Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi
Chief Minister of KwaZulu, President of Inkatha
and Chairman, The South African Black Alliance

JULY 1986

The kind of crisis prevails in South Africa in which issues in lost debates at the national and international level will be resolved in violent confrontations. When battles for minds are lost in our circumstances, battles are transformed into bloody confrontation. I bring a Black perspective to the British debate on the question of the economic, diplomatic and political isolation of the country. This Black perspective is a perspective of Blacks on the interface between the forces of violence building up to produce the kind of conflict situation in which there will be no victors.

There is talk by prominent observers of the South African situation that a very bloody future beyond comprehension in normal times of peace threatens. Warnings of dire consequences of failure to win a negotiated settlement of the South African problems as issued by the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group, must not be taken lightly.

Dr. Kenneth Kaunda's fears of a bloody future must not be taken likely. British, Western European and North American concerns about the consequences of escalating violence in South Africa must not be taken lightly. There is now an eleventh hour desperate need for the international community to comprehend the magnitude of the forces of violence building up in South Africa. There is a desperate need for North American, British and Western European Governments correctly to conceive the nature of the conflict situation in South Africa.

The debate on sanctions against South Africa now raging round the world all too often originates in a sense of despair in the world's Western democracies about what they can do to de-escalate the situation of violence. All too often their sense of despair gives rise to internal Party political wrangles about what to do and what not to do. The West has no clear-cut courses of action which, if taken with resolution and common commitment, would bring about radical change.

In the final analysis the rising tide of feeling in favour of economic sanctions rests on the thought that there is nothing else to do. I challenge this thought. I challenge the despair. I challenge the symbolic action which some Western European governments are now prepared to take, because that is all they feel is left to them. More importantly, however, I challenge the attitude which wants to hasten a day of reckoning between Black and White in South Africa because it is also felt that there is nothing left to do.

What makes my own debate with Western governments so painful to me is that I share so deeply the values and the hopes which are motivating Western concerns about the future of South Africa. I hope with Western statesmen for a free, just open democracy. I share the hopes of the Western world that the free enterprise system will survive the traumas of transition. I hope with the Western world that the rule of law will be established in South Africa, and that constitutional politics will prescribe and proscribe the politics of the day. I stand as one with the stated aims of Western leaders who seek justice in South Africa and my sense of affinity with them remains strong even if they now strongly favour mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The differences I have with them are about means to an end and not about the end itself. The perspective I bring to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Commons, London is a perspective which rises above whatever differences there may be in Britain between Conservative and Labour Party approaches to South Africa. The Conservative Party, the Labour Party, the Social Democratic Party and the Liberal Party of Great Britain share my ideals for a future democratic South Africa. Across Western Europe, Christian Democrats and Labour Parties share my views about a future democratic South Africa. We may well differ about how a democratic South Africa should be run. We may well differ in our perceptions of what a free enterprise economy is, but beyond these differences there is a great shared sense that democracy must come to South Africa; that the free enterprise system must be maintained; that

the rule of law must be established and that economic development, based on rapid industrial progress, is something we must all work for. In the things that really matter, we share more than we do not share.

When, however, it comes to tactics and strategies, there are great cleavages in British, Western European and North American thinking about South Africa. These cleavages are deepening, just as the cleavages in South African thinking are deepening about what should and should not be done.

The difference, however, between South Africa and the Western world are that the South African cleavages are ever-increasingly cleavages about what kind of society should be established. The ANC Mission in Exile is in practice attempting to destroy the South African economy; develop a civil war situation about Black South Africans; and to make the country ungovernable through the rapid escalation of violence. Whatever the British Government may or may not believe could be achieved if the ANC Mission in Exile was brought to a conference table, the hard facts of the matter are that in daily practice, the ANC Mission in Exile is bent upon the destruction of the foundations of all that which I share with Britain and the Western world as ideals for the future.

The ANC Mission in Exile in daily activity is doing its damndest to undermine the free enterprise system. It is doing its damndest to escalate levels of violence and to undermine any prospects of compromise solutions being achieved in the politics of negotiation. In daily practice, the ANC Mission in Exile is attempting to destroy the foundations of a multi-Party democracy as known in Britain and the Western world. It is tactical foolishness to ignore these realities. It is tactical foolishness now so to behave that these endeavours by the ANC Mission in Exile are given added impetus.

It is also tactical foolishness to deal with an exile revolutionary movement in the same way as one would deal with an internal South African political force. The ANC Mission in Exile has evolved very specific characteristics which all history teaches me are very nearly irradicable. The ANC Mission in Exile is primarily bent upon working for a future in which it is a revolutionary government returned from exile. It is trying to ensure a Frelimo or a ZAPU future for itself. Its tactics and strategies are being designed towards this end. In its day to day operation, it is taking leaves out of Cuban, Vietnamese and Palestinian books. The ANC Mission in Exile has given up the democratic struggle and is now dominated in its thinking by the need to make their slogan: "Every patriot a combatant and every combatant a patriot" a reality.

The ANC Mission in Exile knows that it will never achieve a violent victory unless it establishes no-go areas. It cannot establish no-go areas from the perimeters of South Africa's borders and step by step gain territorial advantages. Topography and logistics and

South Africa's military preparedness make this impossible. It is therefore attempting to do that which ZAPU and Frelimo failed to do. It is attempting to capture strongholds in metropolitan areas. ZAPU did not have the kind of operational bases in Salisbury and Bulawayo and Frelimo did not have the kind of operational bases in Beira and Lourenco Marques which the ANC Mission in Exile is attempting to establish in Pretoria, Johannesburg, Cape Town and Port Elizabeth. They are attempting to do that which has not yet been done. Very fundamental differences must be observed between the tactics and strategies of violence of Frelimo and ZAPU on the one side and the ANC Mission in Exile on the other side.

The ANC Mission in Exile's daily tactics and strategies at the operational level involve stimulating internecine Black strife as a first step towards making South Africa ungovernable. Their first target in urban areas has been apartheid's Black local government. In many Black townships, Black local government has now collapsed simply because Black Town Councillors have been killed or beaten up and intimidated. The vast majority of Councillors who have resigned have resigned for fear of life and limb, and not because they are now differently persuaded than they have been in the past. This kind of programme of intimidation can be initiated by small bands adopting terror as tactics. In poverty-ridden Black townships the collapse of local authority results in inability to collect rents and the local population experiences some immediate relief. The collapse of local authorities also makes it difficult and in some cases well nigh impossible to administer apartheid's restrictive laws against the movement of people. In this sense, the murder and intimidation of Black local Councillors has been an attack on apartheid.

The question, however, arises as to whether or not this onslaught against apartheid can be taken much further than it has already been taken. It is a huge jump from eliminating Black Town Councillors to establishing ungovernability in the broader sense of the word. Victories thus far notched up in this direction have little chance of becoming accumulative and it must be remembered that the South African Government has not yet employed a fraction of the power available to it to contain Black violence in townships where its developments must necessarily become self-defeating.

Black townships are dormitory townships and residents in these townships are totally dependent on cash income. Virtually every Black township could be cordoned off and the flow of people and goods in and out of the township could be highly controlled. Every Black township requires at least some degree of normalcy in the flow of people and goods and the supply of water, fuel and essential services. This need for at least some degree of normality in daily life is a barrier which the politics of violence has not yet succeeded in jumping and will not succeed in jumping as far as one can see ahead.