

URGENT TELEX TO JOHN BATTERSBY LONDON OFFICE

THE FOLLOWING APPEARED ON PAGE OPPOSITE LEADER IN CAPE TIMES ...

TODAY (MONDAY NOVEMBER 11) FYI BRIEF SECTION ON NATIONAL CONVENTION DID NOT APPEAR PURELY FOR SPACE REASONS (SUBJECT HAS BEEN WELL-CANVASSED IN ANY EVENT). REGARDS -!

HEADLINE: A CONVERSATION WITH OLIVER TAMBO OF THE

ANC.;

/

THERE HAS BEEN A FLURRY OF TALKS WITH THE AFRICAN NATIONAL

CONGRESS RECENTLY, INCLUDING THE LEADERS OF BIG BUSINESS AND THE PROGRESSIVE FEDERAL PARTY. THESE CONTACTS HAVE RAISED

QUESTIONS ABOUT WHERE THE ANC STANDS ON CRITICAL ISSUES. SO

FAR, EVERYONE'S VIEW BUT THAT OF THE ANC HAS BEEN GIVEN IN SOUTH AFRICA. THE EDITOR OF THE CAPE TIMES, ANTHONY HEARD,

MET THE 68-YEAR-OLD ANC LEADER OLIVER TAMBO IN HIS NORTH LONDON HOME LAST WEEK AND CONDUCTED AN INTERVIEW WITH WHAT CAME ACROSS AS AN ESSENTIALLY MODERATE BLACK LEADER. THE CAPE TIMES PUBLISHES THE FULL INTERVIEW AS A CONTRIBUTION TO PEACEFUL SOLUTIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA IN A MATTER OF OVERWHELMING PUBLIC IMPORTANCE."

THE ANC IS AS ANC AS IT EVER WAS. IT IS TRUE THAT THE ...

ANC HAS MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE

ANC. THAT HAS BEEN THE CASE ALMOST SINCE TIME IMMEMORIAL. - THE ANC.

ANC WAS ESTABLISHED IN 1912 AND THE SA COMMUNIST PARTY IN

1921, AND SO THERE HAS BEEN AN OVERLAPPING OF MEMBERSHIP

P ALL ALONG â–

THE LINE. BUT ANC.MEMBERS WHO ARE ALSO MEMBERS OF THE SACP

MAKE A VERY CLEAR DISTINCTION BETWEEN THESE TWO INDEP
ENDENT

BODIES. WE CO-OPERATE A LOT BUT THE ANC IS ACCEPTED BY TH
E t .

SACP AS LEADING THE STRUGGLE..THERE'IS ABSOLUTE LOYALTY
TO

THAT POSITION. IT IS OFTEN SUGGESTED THAT. THE 'ANC IS â–

CONTROLLED BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY ... BY COMMLN1STS. WEILL,
'I' â– â–

HAVE BEEN LONG ENOUGH IN THE ANC TO KNOW THAT,THATâ€¢CH
AS NEVER'

BEEN TRUE.

TERROR I ST-TYPE ORGANIZATION, ALMOST PRESENTED TO THE
PUBLIC AS ~
DEMONS. NOW, SINCE,THE PUBLIC HAVE NO ACCESS' TO YOUR VI
EWS, HOW"i*
WOULD YOU ANSWER THIS, PARTICULARLY THE CHARGE OF BEIN
G A

THE ANC IS OFFICIALLY PORTRAYED IN SOUTHi AFRICA AS' A â€¢
â€¢

communist,

t

COMMUNIST-CONTROLLED ORGANIZATION?

IT IS IMPORTANT- TO OBSERVE THAT THI S HAS BEEN A PERSI STE
NT .
PORTRAYAL OF THE ANC BY MANY PEOPLE WHO ARE OPPOSED T
O US. BUT

THE COMMUNIST PARTY HAS ITS POSITIONS AND THE ANC HAS ITS POSITIONS. THE ANC IS GUIDED IN ITS POLICY AND ALL ITS MEMBERS ARE LOYAL TO THE FREEDOM CHARTER, AND THAT IS WHERE YOU FIND ALL THE POSITIONS OF THE ANC. THEY ARE REFLECTED IN THE FREEDOM CHARTER. WE DON'T DEPART FROM THE FREEDOM CHARTER.

SO, THERE IS NO PROBLEM OF THE ANC BEING CONTROLLED. NOW THIS;

IS ALSO EXTENDED TO CONTROL BY THE SOVIET UNION (SEMI) MUCH OF'. THIS IS PROPAGANDA, WE GO TO THE SOVIET UNION. AS WE GO TO SWEDEN AND TO HOLLAND AND TO ITALY TO ASK FOR ASSISTANCE IN ONE FORM OR ANOTHER. AND IN ALL THESE COUNTRIES WE DO GET ASSISTANCE, AND ASSISTANCE IS GIVEN QUITE UNCONDITIONALLY. THE WESTERN COUNTRIES, WHO DO SUPPORT US AND WE VERY MUCH APPRECIATE THE ASSISTANCE THEY GIVE US, DO NOT GIVE US WEAPONS OF COURSE, BECAUSE THEY GENERALLY DO NOT APPROVE AND THEIR LAWS DO NOT ALLOW IT. BUT IN THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES WE GET THE WEAPONS. SO WE GO THERE TO GET WHAT WE CAN'T GET ELSEWHERE. AND THAT'S ALL THERE IS IN IT.

'â- v . â- ' / ' . 1 â- ' ' â- ') V ' : \ â- ' > ' ?

ARE YOU GETTING MORE SUPPORT FROM THE WEST NOW? ; ; ; ; â-

WE ARE GETTING A GREAT DEAL, OF SUPPORT FROM THE WEST,

INCREASING SUPPORT, IN MATERIAL TERMS, TOO (SEMI) THAT SUPPORT IS GROWING. V ; t ' / ' V ... ' : : â-

SO THE CHARGE THAT YOU ARE A COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION, YOU WOULD REJECT STRONGLY? ' , . ' ; V '

WE WOULD REJECT THAT. WE WOULD SAY THAT THERE IS A CONSTITUTIONAL PARTY. SO WE ARE FORTUNATE BECAUSE IF ONE IS LOOKING FOR A COMMUNIST PARTY IT IS THERE, BUT THE ANC IS NOT THE COMM

UNIST.
PARTY. 'â€

NOW, THE OTHER ASPECT OF BEING TERRORISTS: AGAIN,- THERE IS A LOT OF EXAGGERATION ABOUT THIS TERRORISM. LONG BEFORE WE HAD INJURED A SOUL, WHEN WE WERE VERY, VERY CAREFUL IN OUR SABOTAGE; ACTIONS TO AVOID HURTING ANYBODY, AND THAT IS WHAT WE HAVE BEEN DOING FOR THE BETTER PART OF 20 YEARS NOW ... EVEN WHEN WE STARTED. THIS WAS CALLED TERRORISM. WE KNEW WHAT TERRORISM WAS AND WE THOUGHT THAT THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA ARE BEING MISLED ABOUT WHAT TERRORISM WAS.. WE COULD HAVE BEEN TERRORISTS IF WE* HAD WANTED TO, BUT WE CHOSE NOT TO BE. SO EVEN THAT HAS BEEN AN EXAGGERATION. IT IS TRUE THAT; MORE RECENTLY,' AS FOR INSTANCE IN MAY 1983 WHEN A.BOMB EXPLODED AND OTHERES WERE ATTEMPTED, THIS WAS STEPPING UP THINGS. IT IS PROPER TO RECOGNIZE THAT THIS WAS AFTER.20 YEARS AT IT. WE.STARTED IN 1961 AND 20 YEARS LATER YOU GET A BOMB EXPLODING. WE COULD HAVE DONE THIS MUCH,' MUCH EARLIER ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS. WE DID NOT WANT TO BE SEEN AS, TERRORISTS(SEMI) WE ARE TRYING TO PUT ON PRESSURE. AND WE HAVE BEEN NOTORIOUSLY RESTRAINED IN OUR ARMED ACTIONS - NOT ORIOUSLY.

â- ~y" v, i " V<', V *â€œ ", â- ; i â€œ

1 â- >' v.' ' .;.(â€œâ€œâ€œ;â- j V!" r â- j 'â€œ

: "'1 â- â€œ, i

,; â- _____t'i.-r;q u 1 â- rr â- â- â€œ v.-lf-1 j

WHAT FUTURE DO YOU SEE FOR WHITES IN THE FUTURE SOUTH AFRICA?

â- â- â- j! -v â€œ> ' / â- .::, â- ' 1 vt i\ [iMj.: â- '

THE ANC. AND'ALL OF US IN THE ANC, HAVE ALWAYS CONSIDERE D

AND ACCEPTED THAT WHITES LIKE OURSELVES BELONG TO OUR COUNTRY.

THEY ARE COMPATRIOTS,' FELLOW-CI TI ZENS. WE TOOK THE EARLI EST ' /â- OPPORTUNITY TO DISPEL THE NOTION THAT WE'WERE FIGHTING TO DRIVE THE WHITES OUT TO SOMEWHERE AND WE MADE IT CLEAR THAT THEY BELONG TO SOUTH AFRICA. THEY HAD THEIR ROLE TO PLAY AS WE WOULD LIKE

*TO THINK WE HAD A ROLE TO PLAY ALTHOUGH WE ARE EXCLUD ED. AND SO

THIS HAS-BEEN BASIC. WE HAVE ASKED WHITES TO JOIN US IN T HE STRUGGLE TO GET RID OF THE TENSIONS THAT COME WITH THE APARTHEID SYSTEM. WE HAVE HOPED THAT-WE COULD.TOGETHER BUILD TH E FUTURE NON-RACIAL SOUTH AFRICA, AND BY NCN-RACIAL WE REALLY DO MEAN NON-RACIAL. WE MEAN A SOCIETY IN WHICH EACH ONE FEELS H E OR SHE BELONGS TOGETHER WITH EVERYBODY ELSE, WHERE THE FACT OF RACE AND COLOUR IS OF NO CONSEQUENCE, WHERE PEOPLE SERVE ACCO RING TO THEIR ABILITIES AND THEIR SKILLS. WHERE WE TOGETHER WORK TO U NITE OUR PEOPLE. AND WE' HAVE ADOPTED POLICIES WHICH DISCOURSED THE POLARIZATION OF OUR PEOPLE EITHER INTO ETHNIC GROUPS OR INTO WHITE VERSUS BLACK. >,,

J

AND DO YOU DISTINGUISH BETWEEN ANY PARTICULAR WHITE GROUP?

' ' V.7 â- :â€ >S' V-

NO. NO. OUR CHARTER SAYS THAT SOUTH AFRICA BELONGS TO ALL WHO LIVE IN IT AND WE SAY THAT PEOPLE WHO HAVE CHOSEN S.A.AS THEIR HOME ARE WELCOME THERE. THERE IS PLENTY OF ROOM FOR THEM,

AND WE SHOULD ACCEPT THEM AS SOUTH AFRICANS AND THEY IN TURN SHOULD ACCEPT US AS SOUTH AFRICANS. THIS IS THE KIND OF SOCIETY THAT WE ARE HOPING WILL EMERGE.

IS THERE ANY REASSURANCE OR ASSURANCE THAT YOU COULD GIVE WHITES ABOUT THEIR PHYSICAL SAFETY, THEIR JOBS-AND THEIR HOME ' SECURITY UNDER AN ANC-LED GOVERNMENT? HOW WOULD I THE QUESTION OF THEIR INSECURITY. WHICH IS MANIFEST AT THE MOMENT?

WHAT WE WOULD HOPE OUR WHITE COMPATRIOTS WILL LEARN TO UNDERSTAND IS THAT WE DON'T REALLY SEE THEM AS WHITES IN THE FIRST

INSTANCE. WE SEE THEM AS FELLOW SOUTH AFRICANS IN THE FIRST .

INSTANCE. THEY ARE AS GOOD AS BLACK. IN FACT, LET US SAY, THEY. -

ARE AFRICANS. WE SEE THEM AS AFRICANS. WE'ARE ALL BORN THERE IN THAT COUNTRY, OR MOST OF US ARE. WE LIVE ON THIS CONTINENT.

IT IS OUR COUNTRY. LET'S MOVE AWAY FROM THESE DISTINCTIONS OF EUROPEANS AND NON-EUROPEANS, WHITES AND NON-WHITES.

SO. IT IS SECURITY FOR ALL, AS IT WERE? V '

â€ ,,1 .

â€ ' â- . ' .y;" 'V.

IT IS. IT IS SECURITY FOR. ALL, AND IT WOULD BE, IN THE .

INTERESTS OF ALL OF US THAT EVERYBODY FEELS SECURE. EVERYONE'S PROPERTY IS SECURE(SEMI) EVERYONE'S HOME IS SECURE. THE CULTURE- .

IS SECURE. WE BELIEVE OUR CULTURES WILL BEGIN TO MERGE. WE HAVE GOT A RICH VARIETY WHICH, WHEN IT COMES TOGETHER, IS REALLY GOING TO BE SOMETHING WE CAN PUT OUT TO THE WORLD. SO ALL THIS WOULD BE RESPECTED. THERE WOULD BE ROOM FOR IT ALL. BUT THE MAIN THING IS, AND THE SOONER WE BEGIN TO GRAPPLE WITH THIS PROBLEM THE BETTER, NOT TO PROCEED ON THE BASIS THAT THE AFRICANS ARE GOING TO DO SOMETHING TO THE NON-AFRICANS, BUT TO BEGIN ON THE BASIS >

THAT WE ALL BELONG TO THAT COUNTRY. LET US NOT LOOK AT ONE

ANOTHER'S COLOUR.(LET US NOT ADDRESS THAT. LET US SEE ONE

ANOTHER MERELY AS FELLOW-CITIZENS. — . ' .

WHO HAVE BEEN SEEKING TA(-KS W| TH THE ANC? HOW DO YOU
FEEL
ABOUT THIS?

WE FEEL VERY GOOD INDEED BECAUSE, ' YOU SEE, IN THE FIFTIE
S WHEN'

WE WERE A LEGAL ORGANIZATION WE WERE GETTING ACROSS
VERY
EFFECTIVELY TO THE WHITE COMMUNITY. THE. ANC WAS GETTIN
G
ACCEPTED AND ITS OBJECTIVES WERE GETTING GENERALLY A
CCEPTED AMONG
THE WHITES. WE WERE UNITING THE COUNTRY WHERE APARTHE
ID SEPARATED
IT. NOW THIS IS BECAUSE WE HAD ACCESS. "

I RECALL CHIEF ALBERT LUTULI (THE LATE ANC LEADER)

GOING TO CAPE TOWN ... AND DO YOU REMEMBER THE EFFECT HE
HAD,

THE IMPACT HE MADE. WELL, WHEN HE CAME BACK TO JOHANN
ESBURG FROM
THAT TRIP, THERE WERE THOUSANDS OF WHITE PEOPLE AT PAR
K:

STATIONI SEMI*} THOUSANDS WHO CAME TO MEET HIM AS A RES
ULT OF THE
IMPACT HE HAD MADE, SO THIS IS THE KIND OF SITUATION THAT
HAD
DEVELOPED. THEN WE GOT BANNED AND THIS CONTACT WAS B
ROKEN. MO
NOW THE WHITE COMMUNITY HAS BEEN BROUGHT UP TO REGAR
D THE ANC
AS SOMETHING VERY, VERY DANGEROUS., THE ONE EFFECT OF TH
IS VISIT
BY THE BUSINESS PEOPLE HAS BEEN TO OPEN THE LINES OF C
OMMUNICATION
BECAUSE I AM SURE THEY SAW US AS SOMETHING VERY DIFFER
ENT FROM
THE WAY WE HAD BEEN PROJECTED ALL THE TIME, AND I THINK T
HEY SAID

as much." v rr: .:

â- "r"" V ' 5;- . /

ARE YOU KEEPING IN TOUCH? 7

/- â- . is â- ' ";. . â- ' . '

wp DO KEEP IN TOUCH. AN p.. THEN.. WE NEXT LOOKED FORWARD
TO THE

VISIT OF THE YOUNG PEOPLE, 'WE THOUGHT WHAT A GOOD THING THAT THEY SHOULD GET TOGETHER AND BEGIN TO LOOK AT THEIR FUTURE TOGETHER. THIS WAS A VERY GOOD THING. AND THE CONTRIBUTION IS NOT

ONE-SIDED. IT IS NOT AS IF WE ARE GIVING OR RECEIVING ALL THE TIME. I THINK WE ARE ENRICHING ONE ANOTHER WITH VIEWS ABOUT WHAT SHOULD BE DONE WITH OUR SITUATION, WE HAD HOPED TO SEE THE MINISTERS OF RELIGION WHO WANTED TO COME. WE THOUGHT THAT WAS ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY. THEN OF COURSE THE PFP CAME ALONG AND WE HAD VERY GOOD EXCHANGES WITH THEM. ALL THIS IS MUCH-NEEDED COMMUNICATION, ESPECIALLY. AT THIS TIME BECAUSE AT SOME POINT WE HAVE GOT TO AGREE ON WHAT TO DO ABOUT OUR OWN FUTURE.

COULD YOU BRIEFLY SET OUT YOUR ECONOMIC THEORY, PARTICULARLY ON QUESTIONS LIKE NATIONALIZATION AND WEALTH REDISTRIBUTION?

$\frac{1}{\alpha} > 1$

I DON'T KNOW IF I WOULD CALL IT A THEORY. IT APPEARS IN OUR CHARTER AND ALL WE DO IS TO INTERPRET WHAT THE CHARTER SAYS. WE HAVE NOT ATTEMPTED TO DEPART FROM THAT IN ANY WAY. WE START WITH WHAT THE CHARTER SAYS AND BROADLY THE INTERPRETATION IS THAT THE STATE WOULD CONTROL SOME OF THE INDUSTRIES. 'SOLELY WITH A VIEW TO ENSURING AN EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF THE WEALTH THAT WE HAVE AND I THINK THAT THIS WAS AT THE BACK OF THE MINDS OF THE PEOPLE WHO DREW UP THE CHARTER, AND IT WAS MORE THAN THE ANC. WE SAID OUR COUNTRY IS VERY WEALTHY, OUR COUNTRY IS POVERTY-STRICKEN AS FAR AS THE BLACKS ARE CONCERNED, AND BY BLACKS I MEAN COLOURED AND EVERYBODY ELSE. THEY ARE VERY POOR, EVEN THE WHITES ARE NOT REALLY WEALTHY BUT THE WEALTH IS CONTAINED IN THE HANDS OF A FEW. AND WE LOOK AT THE COUNTRY: 13 PERCENT OVERCROWDED BY

MILLIONS OF
LANDLESS PEOPLE WHO ARE STARVING .'.AND DYING. '

WHAT PQ YOU DO ABOUT THIS? WHERE DO YOU GET THE LAND
FROM

TO GIVE THEM? YOU HAVE GOT TO ADDRESS THAT QUESTION. Y
OU HAVE
GOT TO.SAY HOW TO END THIS POVERTY, HOW DO WE HANDLE
THE WEALTH WE
PRODUCE IN SUCH A WAY THAT WE CAN RELIEVE SOME OF THES
E PROBLEMS.
THE SOLUTION WE,SAW WAS'ONE OF NATIONALIZATION, AND, OF
COURSE.
WHEN WE MEET THE BUSINESS PEOPLE THEY SAY THAT NATONA
LIZATION

WILL DESTROY THE SOUTH AFRICAN ECONOMY.

DO THEY ACCEPT SOME MEASURE OF REDISTRIBUTION?

THEY SEEMED TO. YES THEY DO. THEY ACCEPT SOME MEASURE OF
F.,
REDISTRIBUTION. IT IS THE METHOD, THE MECHANISM, HOW TO
ACHIEVE

IT - THIS IS OF COURSE WHERE WE DID NOT AGREE AND COULD NOT
AFFIRM.

BUT THEY ACCEPTED. THEY UNDERSTOOD, WHAT WE WERE TRYING
TO GET

AND THAT YOU CANNOT HAVE A NEW SOUTH AFRICA WHICH DOES
NOT

ADDRESS THIS PROBLEM. 'I', '7. â-

v' 1' '7 â€¢;

WHAT ABOUT PRIVATE PROPERTY (SEMI) HOW FAR WOULD NATIONALIZATION
EXTEND. AS YOU SEE IT? . ' . 1

IT WOULD BE A MIXED ECONOMY, AND CERTAINLY NATIONALIZATION

WOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE SITUATION AS WE FIND IT AT THE
TIME -

THE REALITIES OF THE SITUATION IN WHICH WE FIND OURSELVES
, BUT

THERE WOULD BE PRIVATE OWNERSHIP, THERE WOULD BE LEVELS
OF PRIVATE

ENTERPRISE AND IT WOULD ALL BE GEARED TO THE SITUATION
THAT

OBTAINS AT THE TIME. ALSO, WE DON'T ENVISAGE FIGHTING IN
THE

STREETS OVER IT. WE THINK THAT WE WILL HAVE TO APPROACH
THIS FROM

THE POINT OF VIEW OF WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT. IF THE PEOPLE
WANT ONE

FORM OF DISTRIBUTION ABOVE ANOTHER, WELL, IT MUST BE LIKE
THAT.

â- 'â- â€¢ ' * â€¢ 'â€¢ â€¢ â€¢ iv ' '

THERE WOULD BE A DEBATE ABOUT THE LEVEL OF NATIONALIZATION?

"* . * * â€¢

YES, THERE WOULD BE A DEBATE.

WHAT SORT OF ENVIRONMENT COULD THAT DEBATE TAKE PLACE
IN?

WOULD YOU SEE FREE MEDIA, FREE EXPRESSION, FREEDOM OF
NEWSPAPERS?

â€¢ . . r 'V. â€¢. ' ' â€¢ P.":!.; ' '":

ABSOLUTELY. ' . 'â€œ " â€œ

WHAT ABOUT VIOLENCE? IN WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD YOU AS LEADER OF THE ANC BE PREPARED TO RENOUNCE VIOLENCE AND START TALKS?

WHAT ARE THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT CAN BRING THAT ABOUT BECAUSE I THINK THAT'S WHAT, FRANKLY, EVERYONE WANTS, ON ALL SIDES(SEMI) IN OTHER WORDS, THE VIOLENCE, ON ALL SIDES, TO STOP. I AM SURE THAT NO ONE WANTS IT TO GO ON FOREVER. ' , â–

' â– i â–

NO, NOT EVEN WE. THIS QUESTION OF VIOLENCE WORRIES MANY 'â€œ

PEOPLE. THE UNFORTUNATE THING IS THAT PEOPLE TEND TO BE WORRIED ABOUT THE VIOLENCE THAT COMES FROM THE OPPRESSED. AND SO THE TENDENCY IS TO WANT TO KNOW, AS YOU WANT TO KNOW, _ ON WHAT TERMS WOULD WE END VIOLENCE. REALLY, THERE WOULD BE NO VIOLENCE AT ALL IF WE DID NOT HAVE THE VIOLENCE OF THE APARTHEID SYSTEM . AND EVEN IF THERE WAS, AND THERE HAS BEEN FOR TWO DECADES, IT'S BEEN RESTRAINED, BUT IF YOU LOOK AT WHAT COMES FROM THE OTHER . SIDE. *:

DURING THOSE TWO DECADES THERE HAS BEEN MASSIVE VIOLENCE. SO WE

THEN HAVE TO SAY TO OURSELVES: OF COURSE WE CAN STOP OUR

STRUGGLE, WE CAN STOP EVEN OUR VIOLENT ACTIONS. BUT ON THAT BASIS

WHAT WOULD BE THE REASON FOR THAT? AND IN RETURN FOR WHAT?

IS THERE A POSSIBILITY OF A TRUCE?

* '

THERE IS ALWAYS A POSSIBILITY OF A TRUCE. WE SEE THE POSSIBILITY OF A TRUCE. IT WOULD BE VERY, VERY EASY. IF, FOR EXAMPLE. WE STARTED NEGOTIATIONS. WE HAVE SAID THAT NEGOTIATIONS CAN START. SERIOUS NEGOTIATIONS ...

WITH THE GOVERNMENT?','i'

YES. WITH THE GOVERNMENT, WHEN THEY ARE READY BECAUSE AT THE MOMENT WE THINK THEY ARE NOT READY. AND WE HAVE SAID TO THEM THAT IF YOU WANTED NEGOTIATIONS, WE WOULD NOT GO INTO THAT WITHOUT NELSON MANDELA AND THE OTHER POLITICAL LEADERS AND THE POLITICAL PRISONERS. NOW, A SERIOUS INDICATION OF READINESS FOR NEGOTIATIONS WOULD BE THE RELEASE OF ALL THESE LEADERS, BECAUSE THEY HAVE GOT TO BE PART OF THE PROCESS OF PREPARATION FOR SERIOUS NEGOTIATIONS WHICH WILL NOT, JUST BE TALKS FOR THE SAKE OF TALKING. IT IS QUITE CONCEIVABLE THAT IN THAT SITUATION OF PREPARING FOR NEGOTIATIONS AND LOOKING AT NECESSARY CONDITIONS AND SO ON, THIS QUESTION COULD ARISE. BUT, WE HAVE HAD A PROBLEM ABOUT JUST SAYING WE ARE NOW SUSPENDING OUR STRUGGLE. WHICH IS WHAT IT WOULD MEAN

- x â- 'l- S ii'. 'â- ' / â€;

ON ONE SIDE, AS IT WERE? '

ON ONE SIDE, WITHOUT ANY INDICATION ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THEIR WILLINGNESS TO DO ANYTHING ABOUT WHAT EVERY ONE OF US KNOWS IS THEIR VIOLENCE. WE HAVE SAID: LIFT THE STATE OF EMERGENCY. PULL OUT THE TROOPS FROM THE TOWNSHIPS. AND THE POLICE. AND RELEASE THE POLITICAL PRISONERS. WE HAVE EVEN SAID UNBAN THE ANC. DO ALL THESE THINGS TO CREATE A CLIMATE.

i. ',

WHICH YOU WOULD WELCOME? 'i i'â€¢'

'i

WE WOULD WELCOME A CLIMATE OF THAT KIND. AND IF THE REST OF THE LEADERS WERE THERE I THINK IT WOULD BE TIME TO GET TOGETHER AND PUT THE QUESTION: CAN WE REALLY DO ANYTHING ABOUT THIS?

EVERYBODY WOULD THEN BE THERE. BUT WE ARE GETTING THIS PERSISTENT REFUSAL ON THE PART OF BOTH SIDES EITHER TO RELEASE NELSON MANDELA AND THE OTHER POLITICAL PRISONERS, AND WE SAY: WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO WITH TREASON TRIALS;.. IT IS SIMPLY A FORM OF REPRESSION. WHO ARE YOU GOING TO NEGOTIATE WITH, IF YOU WANT TO NEGOTIATE. IF HE WITHDREW THE TREASON TRIALS AND DID ALL THESE THINGS BY WAY OF LIFTING THE PRESSURES THAT REST ON US. WE WOULD BEGIN TO SEE THAT THE OTHER SIDE ARE READY TO TALK'. â€¢

BUT WE HAVE ARGUED THAT IT IS NOT NECESSARY FOR HOSTILITIES TO CEASE BEFORE NEGOTIATIONS START ... BEFORE THE NKOMATI ACCORD, THERE WERE LENGTHY NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE SOUTH AFRICANS AND OTHERS BEFORE THERE WAS ANY SIGNING OF AN AGREEMENT. THE AGREEMENT THAT WAS SIGNED IN LUSAKA BETWEEN THE SOUTH AFRICANS AND THE ANGOLANS WAS PRECEDED BY A SERIES OF MEETINGS AND NEGOTIATIONS.'

IS ANYTHING GOING ON AT THE MOMENT ..IE TALKS ABOUT TALKS
BETWEEN THE ANC AND JHE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT?, .

NO, NOTHING AT ALL. WHICH IS WHY WE THINK THAT THEY ARE NOT
READY TO HAVE ANY TALKS. THEY ARE NOT EVEN READY FOR OTHER PEOPLE
TO TALK TO US. WE ARE SOUTH AFRICANS. IF WE MEET WE CAN ONLY
TALK ABOUT OUR COLNTRY. WE ARE NOT GOING-TO FIGHT ABOUT IT. WE
TALK ABOUT I T. AND THEY DON'T LIKE THIS. BUT I THINK WHAT THEY
DO NOT LIKE IS THAT IN MEETING WE GET TO UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER
BETTER, AND WE, THE ANC. CERTAINLY BENEFIT FROM THESE TALKS,

AND WE WOULD THINK THAT THOSE WE TALK TO ALSO BENEFIT. SO THIS IS
MOVING IN THE DIRECTION OF RESOLVING OUR PROBLEMS, BUT THEY ARE
NOT PREPARED FOR THAT. ' .

VIOLENCE AGAINST PEOPLE, CIVILIANS. WHAT IS THE ANC'S ATTITUDE ON THIS, BEARING IN MIND THE FACT THAT DOWN THE YEARS THE
ANC HAS IN MY OPINION HELD BACK TO A GREAT EXTENT ON WHAT ONE
MIGHT CALL INDISCRIMINATE VIOLENCE OR GOING FOR SOFT TARGETS?

I AM GLAD YOU HAVE PUT IT THAT WAY, BECAUSE IT IS OFTEN
FORGOTTEN THAT WE HAVE BEEN AT THE RECEIVING END ALL THE TIME, AND

WE HAVE HELD BACK. AND IT IS NOT CONCEIVABLE THAT WE COULD GO ON

LIKE THAT INDEFINITELY WITHOUT ANYTHING CHANGING. BUT ONE MUST

SEE IN THIS HOLDING BACK THE RELUCTANCE OF THE ANC ON QUESTIONS
OF VIOLENCE. BUT-WHEN ONCE, OF COURSE, WE HAVE DECIDED WE HAVE

GOT TO FIGHT THEN WE MUST FIGHT. * . '

â™™! â€œ. â– ' .

WHAT ABOUT SOFT TARGETS?

' x - i

THE QUESTION OF SOFT TARGETS HAS BEEN EXAGGERATED OUT OF ALL PROPORTION. AS I HAVE ONCE HAD OCCASION TO OBSERVE, WHEN THE POLICE GO INTO A TOWNSHIP AND SHOOT, WHEN THEY DID ON THE ii 1 ST MARCH. REPEATING SHARPEVILLE, THEY WERE HITTING SOFT TARGETS.

AND THIS WHOLE YEAR HAS BEEN A YEAR OF SHOOTINGS OF, REALLY, SOFT TARGETS. SO PEOPLE ARE BEING KILLED. IT HAS NEVER BEEN QUITE LIKE THIS. BUT THEY ARE BEING SHOT AND EVEN CHILDREN ARE BEING KILLED ... SO WHEN THE ANC TALKS ABOUT SOFT TARGETS THIS CREATES AN ALARM AND YET THE ANC IS GOING NO FURTHER THAN SAYING THAT WE HAVE GOT TO INTENSIFY OUR STRUGGLE IF WE ARE IN A STRUGGLE. IF WE STOP, WE STOP, BUT IF WE ARE IN STRUGGLE AND WE FEEL THE DEMAND OF THE SITUATION IS THAT WE STRUGGLE. THEN WE MUST INTENSIFY THAT STRUGGLE. WE HAVE HELD BACK FOR TOO LONG . NOW, IF WE DO INTENSIFY WE ARE NOT GOING TO BE CHOOSING CAREFULLY TO AVOID HURTING ANYBODY, BUT WE WILL MOVE INTO MILITARY PERSONNEL, POLICE

AND SO ON.:â€¢

" .; "

I

' â€¢ ., I . â€¢

BUT YOU WON'T GO FOR CIVILIANS AS SUCH?

NO WE WILL NOT GO FOR CIVILIANS AS SUCH. WE THINK THAT, CIVILIANS WILL BE HIT AS THEY ARE HIT ALWAYS. THEY WERE HIT IN ZIMBABWE ... i '

IN A CROSSFIRE SITUATION?

A CROSSFIRE SITUATION, IN ANY WAR SITUATION.

BUT NOT CINEMAS, AND SUPERMARKETS AND ...?

WE WILL NOT GO INTO CINEMAS AND BARS AND PLACES LIKE THAT. WE WON'T DO THAT. BUT WE WILL CERTAINLY BE LOOKING FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL. POLICE AND SO ON.

WHY WILL YOU HOLD BACK, BECAUSE OFTEN IN A GUERRILLA WAR THE LIMITS DO GET MORE AND MORE EXTENDED?. IS IT A MORAL FEELING ABOUT KILLING CIVILIANS, OR WHAT?

BECAUSE WE ARE NOT FIGHTING AGAINST PEOPLE, WE ARE FIGHTING AGAINST A SYSTEM, AND WE CAN'T KILL PEOPLE. WHY? WHY WOULD WE KILL THEM? WE CANNOT EVEN KILL WHITES BECAUSE WE ARE NOT FIGHTING WHITES AT ALL. WE ARE FIGHTING A SYSTEM.

ON FOREIGN POLICY. DO YOU SEE SA AS A PRO-WESTERN, NON-ALIGNED, OR AS A SOVIET-SOCIALIST-LEANING COUNTRY? FOR INSTANCE, IN THE SALE OF MINERALS AND RAW MATERIALS - WOULD THESE BE DENIED TO ANYONE? WHAT ABOUT COMMONWEALTH MEMBERSHIP? WHERE DO YOU SEE SOUTH AFRICA STANDING IN THE WORLD?

FIRST OF ALL. NON-ALIGNED IN TERMS OF EAST-WEST, DEVELOPING TRADE WITH ALL THE COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD, STRENGTHENING TRADE LINKS, SO MAINTAINING THE LINES OF TRADE FOR MUTUAL BENEFIT.

SO THE AMERICANS CAN BE SURE OF GETTING THEIR NEEDS?

THE AMERICANS WILL BE SURE TO GET IT, IF THEY ARE WILLING TO PAY FOR IT. WE WOULD WANT TO TRADE WITH ALL THE COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD, IN THE INTERESTS OF OUR OWN ECONOMY.

WE WOULD COME BACK TO THE COMMONWEALTH BECAUSE THE BASIS FOR THE EXCLUSION OF SOUTH AFRICA WOULD HAVE GONE. AND WE WILL ESTABLISH VERY PEACEFUL RELATIONS WITH COUNTRIES. WE WILL WORK VERY CLOSELY WITH THE REST OF THE AFRICAN CONTINENT. AND

CERTAINLY WITH THE COUNTRIES OF SOUTHERN AFRICA. WE WOULD
BECOME MEMBERS OF SADC OR IT MIGHT BE CALLED WITH THE
NAME
BY THEN. AND WE COULD BUILD TOGETHER A SMALL COMMON MARKET OF OUR
OWN. SOUTH AFRICA WOULD THEREFORE BE ADMITTED INTO THIS
WIDER
ECONOMIC GROUPING THAT WE HAVE IN SOUTHERN AFRICA. AND WE WOULD
BE A VERY INFLUENTIAL COUNTRY IN THE WORLD. -

DO YOU FEEL THIS WOULD UNLEASH RESOURCES THAT WE HAVE
NOT BEEN
ABLE TO UNLEASH?, '

I AM CERTAIN. I THINK THE ECONOMY ITSELF WOULD BE STIMULATED
BY THE ENERGIES THAT WOULD BE UNLEASHED, AND THE PROSPECTS OF
PEACE AND STABILITY, WE THINK THE COUNTRY WOULD BE TRANSFORMED,
POLITICALLY AND SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY. < .

/ ' - ' ! i'

I PRESUME YOU FAVOUR SANCTIONS. DO YOU TO THE POINT WHERE

PEOPLE LOSE JOBS AND THE ECONOMY SUFFERS SERIOUSLY?

...; *, * ' I ? ' _ . v . .

WE THINK THE ECONOMY MUST BE PUT INTO DIFFICULTIES BECAUSE THE
ECONOMY STRENGTHENS THE REGIME. IT ENABLES THEM TO DO ALL THE
THINGS THAT THEY WANT TO DO. THIS QUESTION OF LOSING JOBS, FOR
THE VICTIMS OF APARTHEID IT IS NOTHING. TO BE A VICTIM OF APARTHEID
MEANS TO BE MANY, MANY THINGS ABOVE LOSING A JOB WHICH
YOU ARE LOSING ALL THE TIME ANYWAY. AND THE WAY WE LOOK AT IT IS:
THE MORE EFFECTIVE THE SANCTIONS ARE, THE LESS THE SCOPE AND
SCALE OF CONFLICT. - ':

IT THERE WAS A NEW GROUPING IN SA WHITE POLITICS, WITH LIBERAL AFRIKANERS WHO WERE FORMERLY NATIONALISTS AND PROGRESSIVE FEDERAL PARTY PEOPLE LIKE SLABBERT FORMING A NEW BLOC, WOULD YOU BE PREPARED TO DEAL WITH THEM ON WHAT BASIS?

WE HAVE MET VAN ZYL SLABBERT AND WE HOPE TO MEET VARIOUS LEADERS OF ORGANIZATIONS. AN ORGANIZATION THAT IS OPPOSED TO THE APARTHEID SYSTEM WE REGARD AS ON OUR SIDE. I DON'T THINK THAT WE WOULD REFUSE CONTACT WITH SUCH AN ORGANIZATION BECAUSE WE WOULD SEE IT MOVING IN THE DIRECTION THAT WE ARE. WE DO OF COURSE ENCOURAGE OUR WHITE COUNTRYMEN TO MOBILIZE AND MAKE THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO CHANGING THE APARTHEID SYSTEM AND ON THAT BASIS WE OUGHT TO BE ABLE TO FIND A MODUS OPERANDI WITH THEM.

YOU STRIKE ME AS A SOMEWHAT RELUCTANT REVOLUTIONARY. WITH WHAT MEASURE OF ENTHUSIASM DID YOU TURN TO ACCEPT THAT THERE HAD TO BE VIOLENCE? HOW DID YOU YOURSELF PERSONALLY RESPOND TO THIS?

I SUPPOSE I WAS ANGRY AND FRUSTRATED, LIKE WE ALL WERE, AND I CONTINUED TO BE ANGRY AND FRUSTRATED, TO FEEL THAT THIS SYSTEM MUST BE FOUGHT. BUT I WAS A FULL SUPPORTER OF THE POLICY OF NON-VIOLENCE BECAUSE WE THOUGHT IT WOULD BRING US THE FULFILMENT OF OUR OBJECTIVE. WHEN THAT FAILED THEN WE HAD TO LOOK FOR AN ALTERNATIVE. WE FOUND THE ALTERNATIVE IN COMBINING POLITICAL AND ARMED ACTIONS AND IT IS ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT YOU HAVE TO DO AS THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE. I DON'T THINK I AM PECULIAR IN THIS

RESPECT. I THINK THAT MANY PEOPLE IN THE ANC WOULD BE CLAD IF THERE WAS NO NEED FOR VIOLENCE, BUT THE NEED IS THERE- AND WE HAVE GOT TO GO AHEAD WITH IT. BITTER AS IT IS.

IT IS PAINFUL TO SEE ANYBODY BEING KILLED, TO SEE CHILDREN

BEING KILLED, NO MATTER WHO KILLS THEM. THE DEATH OF CHILDREN IS A PAINFUL THING AND YOU DO HAVE TO SAY WHAT BROUGHT US TO THIS SITUATION WHERE THESE THINGS ARE HAPPENING. WE NATURALLY FEEL THAT IT IS THE SYSTEM THAT HAS MADE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR US TO AVOID WHAT WE STROVE TO AVOID WITH SUCH RESOLVE WHEN WE WERE FIRST CONFRONTED WITH THIS VIOLENCE. BUT AS INDIVIDUALS, AND CERTAINLY AS AN INDIVIDUAL, I DON'T LIKE VIOLENCE.

YOU ARE ENJOYING GREAT ATTENTION IN LONDON. TO WHAT DO YOU

ASCRIBE THIS?;

I THINK GENERALLY, IN MANY PARTS OF THE WORLD THERE IS A LOT OF

INTEREST IN WHAT IS HAPPENING IN SA. AND PEOPLE ARE DISCUSSING IT. AND WHEN A MEMBER OF THE ANC IN MY POSITION IS AROUND.

MANY PEOPLE WANT TO TRY AND UNDERSTAND WHERE WE GO FROM HERE.

WHAT IS MORE. THE DISCUSSION NOW REVOLVES AROUND THE QUESTION OF WHAT SORT OF SOUTH AFRICA. IN THE PAST THERE WAS JUST DENUNCIATION OF APARTHEID AND SO ON. BUT A NEW INTEREST HAS EMERGED, AN INTEREST IN WHAT TAKES THE PLACE OF WHAT WE ARE SEEING NOW AND HOW DO WE MOVE FROM THE PRESENT TO SOMETHING DIFFERENT. THIS REPRESENTS REAL MOVEMENT FORWARD FOR US. WE HAVE REACHED THE POINT WHERE PEOPLE ARE EXPECTING CHANGE AND ARE BEGINNING TO REFLECT WHAT THAT CHANGE INVOLVES AND THIS HAS BEEN PART OF THE INTEREST. PEOPLE WANT TO KNOW, 'WHEN APARTHEID GOES (BECAUSE THEY ARE SURE APARTHEID IS GOING), WHAT TAKES ITS PLACE

CA
TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE CURRENT INTERNAL UNREST IN SOUTH
AFRICA
ORCHESTRATED BY THE ANC AND TO WHAT EXTENT IS IT SPON
TANEOUS?

BOTH WORDS ARE NOT VERY APPLICABLE. THERE IS A GREAT DE
AL OF
SPONTANEITY IN THE SENSE THAT WHEN YOU SHOOT AT PEOPLE
THEY ARE
ANGERED AND WANT TO DO SOMETHING IN RETALIATION. YOU
WOULD NOT
SAY THAT THE ANC IS ORCHESTRATING ALL THESE RESPONSES.
THEY
ARE ALMOST NATURAL. SO THERE IS AN ELEMENT OF SPONTANEI
TY. BUT
I WOULD NOT USE THE WORD ORCHESTRATED. I WOULD SAY THA
T THE
ANC HAS CALLED ON OUR PEOPLE, AND IN SOME CASES THEY A
RE VERY
DISCIPLINED ABOUT IT. IN OTHERS THERE ARE EXCESSES! SEMI)
THE
ANC HAS SAID LET US DESTROY THESE STRUCTURES OF SEPAR
ATION AND
APARTHEID. THAT IS WHERE IT STARTS. NOW IN THIS PROCESS
OTHER
FACTORS COME IN. THE AUTHORITIES COME IN AND SHOOT AND
THE PEOPLE

I â€¢

RESPOND ... And YOU HAVE A SITUATION OF ESCALATION WHICH
CAN TEND
TO CONCEAL THE TRUE NATURE OF THE CONFLICT AS BEING ThÂ
£ PEOPLE
RESISTING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE APARTHEID SYSTEM A
ND
PREVENTING IT FROM WORKING, THIS IS THE ESSENCE.

ENDS â– â€¢

NNNN

1

261k55 SAMsl G

5-27522 SA

. i

I 'â€¢ < .

â€¢ I

Â»â€¢

/

I INTERVIEW

Tambo - "Let Us Destroy The
Structures Of Separatism And

Apartheid" _____

The following is the full text of an interview with Oliver Tambo, president of the African National Congress (ANC), South Africa's vanguard liberation organisation. It was first published in the Nov. 4, 1985, issue of the Cape Times, a major daily newspaper in Cape Town, South Africa. It was conducted by the Cape Times editor, Anthony Heard, while Tambo was visiting London.

Although Tambo is a "banned" person in South Africa, and thus may not be legally quoted in that country, the Cape Times chose to publish the interview in full. The newspaper said in an introduction that it did so "as a contribution to peaceful solutions in South Africa in a matter of overwhelming public importance." A few days after the interview was published, Heard was dragged off to court and charged under a section of the Internal Security Act.

The ANC is officially portrayed in South Africa as a Communist, terrorist-type organisation, almost presented to the public as demons. Now, since the public have no access to your views, how would you answer this, particularly the charge of being a Communist-controlled organisation?

It is important to observe that this has been a persistent portrayal of the ANC by many people who are opposed to us. But the ANC is as ANC as it ever was. It is true that the ANC has members of the Communist Party who are members of the ANC. That has been the case almost since time immemorial. The ANC was established in 1912 and the South

African Communist Party [SACP] in 1921, and so there has been an overlapping of membership all along the line.

But ANC members who are also members of the SACP make a very clear distinction between these two independent bodies. We cooperate a lot, but the ANC is accepted by the SACP as leading the struggle. There

is absolute loyalty to that position. It is often suggested that the ANC is controlled by the Communist Party ... by Communists. Well, I have been long enough in the ANC to know that that has never been true.

The Communist Party has its positions and the ANC has its positions. The ANC is guided in its policy and all its members are loyal to the Freedom Charter,¹ and that is where you find all the positions of the ANC. They are reflected in the Freedom Charter. We don't depart from the Freedom Charter. So there is no problem of the ANC being controlled.

Now this is also extended to control by the Soviet Union; much of this is propaganda. We go to the Soviet Union as we go to Sweden and to Holland and to Italy to ask for assistance in one form or another. And in all these countries we do get assistance, and assistance is given quite unconditionally. The Western countries, who do support us and we very much appreciate the assistance they do give us, do not give us weapons of course, because they generally do not approve and their laws do not allow it. But in the socialist countries we get the weapons, so we go there to get what we can't get elsewhere. And that's all there is in it.

Are you getting more support from the West now?

We are getting a great deal of sup-

port from the West, increasing support, in material terms too; that support is growing.

So the charge that you are a Communist organisation, you would reject strongly?

We would reject that. We would say that there is a Communist Party. So we are fortunate because if one is looking for a communist party it is there, but the ANC is not the Communist Party.

Now, the other aspect of being terrorists: Again, there is a lot of exaggeration about this terrorism. Long before we had injured a soul, when

//i

'We have been notoriously restrained in our armed actions - notoriously'

we were very, very careful in our sabotage actions to avoid hurting anybody, and that is what we have been doing for the better part of 20 years now ... even when we first started, this was called terrorism. We knew what terrorism was, and we thought that the people of South Africa are being misled about what terrorism was. We could have been terrorists if we had wanted to, but we chose not to be. So even that has been an exaggeration.

It is true that more recently, as for instance in May 1983 when a bomb exploded² and others were attempted, this was stepping up things. It is proper to recognise that this was after 20 years at it. We started in 1961, and 20 years later you get a bomb exploding. We could have done this much, much earlier on numerous occasions. We did not want to be seen as terrorists; we are trying to put on pressure. And we have been notoriously restrained in our armed

actions - notoriously.

What future do you see for Whites in future South Africa?

The ANC and all of us in the ANC have always considered and accepted that Whites, like ourselves belong to our country. They are compatriots, fellow citizens. We took the earliest opportunity to dispel the notion that we were fighting to drive the Whites out to somewhere, and we made it clear that they belong to South Africa. They had their role to play as we would like to think we had a role to play, although we are excluded. And so this has been basic.

We have asked Whites to join us in the struggle to get rid of the tensions

INTERVIEW!

that come with the apartheid system. We have hoped that we could together build the future non-racial South Africa, and by nonracial we really do mean non-racial. We mean a society in which each one feels he or she belongs together with everybody else, where the fact of race and colour is of no consequence, where people serve according to their abilities and their skills, where we together work to unite our people, and we have adopted policies which discouraged the polarisation of our people either into ethnic groups or into White versus Black.

And do you distinguish between any particular White group?

No, no. Our charter says that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, and we say that people who have chosen South Africa as their home are welcome there. There is plenty of room for them, and we should accept them as South Africans. This is the kind of society that we are hoping will emerge.

of Europeans and non-Europeans, Whites and non-Whites.

So, it is security for all, as it were?

It is. It is security for all, and it would be in the interests of all that everybody feels secure. Everybody's property is secure; everyone's home is secure. The culture is secure. We believe our cultures will begin to merge. We have got a rich variety which, when it comes together, is really going to be something we can put out to the world. So all this would be respected. There would be room for all.

But the main thing is, and the sooner we begin to grapple with this problem the better, not to proceed on

the basis that the Africans are going to do something to the non-Africans, but to begin on the basis that we all belong to that country. Let us not look at one another's colour. Let us not address that. Let us see one another merely as fellow citizens.

How do you view the business leaders, the PFP [Progressive Federal Party], the

"Let us not look at one another's colour. Let us see one another as fellow-citizens"

Is there any reassurance or assurance that you could give Whites about their physical safety, their jobs, and their home security under an ANC-led government? How would you address the question of their insecurity, which is manifest at the moment?

What we would hope our White compatriots will learn to understand is that we don't really see them as Whites in the first instance. We see them as fellow South Africans in the first instance. They are as good as Black. In fact, let us say, they are Africans. We see them as Africans. We are all born there in that country, or most of us are. We live on this continent. It is our country. Let's move away from these distinctions

dominees [religious figures] who have been seeking talks with the ANC? How do you feel about this?

We feel very good indeed because, you see, in the fifties when we were a legal organisation we were getting across very effectively to the White community.

The ANC was getting accepted, and its objectives were getting generally accepted among the Whites. We were uniting the country where apartheid had separated it. Now this is because we had access. I recall chief Albert Lutuli (the late ANC leader) going to Cape Town ... and do you remember the effect he had, the impact he made?

Well, when he came back to Johan-

nesburg from that trip, there were thousands of White people at Park Station, thousands who came to meet him as a result of the impact he made. So this is the kind of situation that had developed.

Then we got banned and this contact was broken. And now the White community has been brought up to regard the ANC as something very, very dangerous. The one effect of this visit by the business people has been to open the lines of communication, because I am sure they saw us as something very different from the way we had been projected all the times, and I think they said as much.

Are you keeping in touch?

We do keep in touch. And then we next looked forward to the visit of the young people.³ We thought, what a good thing that they should get together and begin to look at their future together. This was a very good thing. And the contribution is not one-sided. It is not as if we are giving or receiving all the time. I think we are enriching one another with views about what should be done with our situation.

We had hoped to see the ministers of religion who wanted to come. We thought that was another opportunity. Then of course the PFP came along, and we had very good exchanges with them. All this is much-needed communication, especially at this time, because at some point we have got to agree on what to do about our own future.

Could you briefly set out your economic theory, particularly on questions like nationalisations and wealth redistribution?

I don't know if I would call it a theory. It appears in our charter, and

all we do is interpret what the charter says. We have not attempted to depart from that in any way. We start with what the charter says, and broadly the interpretation is that the state would control some of the industries, solely with a view to ensuring an equitable distribution of the wealth that we have, and I think that

viKa.V-;-:,r

I INTERVIEW

"We mean a society where race and colour are of no consequence, where people serve according to their abilities and skills, where we together work to unite our people"

this was at the back of the minds of the people who drew up the charter, and it was more than the ANC.

We said our country is poverty-stricken as far as the Blacks are concerned, and by Blacks I mean Coloureds and everybody else ... They are very poor. Even the Whites are not really wealthy, but the wealth is contained in the hands of a few. And we look at the country: 13 percent overcrowded by millions of landless people who are starving and dying.⁴

What do you do about this? Where do you get the land from to give them? You have got to address that question. You have got to say how to end this poverty, how do we handle the wealth we produce in such a way

that we can relieve some of these problems. The solution we saw was one of nationalisation, and, of course, when we meet the business-people they say that nationalisation will destroy the South African economy.

Do they accept some measure of redistribution?

They seemed to. Yes they do. They accept some measure of redistribution. It is the method, the mechanism, how to achieve it - this is of course where we did not agree.

But they accepted, they understood, what we were trying to get at: That you cannot have a new South Africa which does not address this

problem.

What about private property; how far would nationalisation extend, as you see it?

It would be a mixed economy. And certainly nationalisation would take into account the situation as we find it at the time - the realities of the situation in which we find ourselves. But there would be private ownership, that would all be geared to the situation that obtains at the time. Also, we don't envisage fighting in the streets over it. We think that we will have to approach this from the point of view of what the people want. If the people want one form of distribution above another, well, it must be like that.

There would be a debate about the level of nationalisation?

Yes, there would be a debate.

What sort of environment could that debate take place in? Would you see free media, free expression, freedom of newspapers?

Absolutely.

What about violence? In what circumstances would you as leader of the ANC be prepared to renounce violence

interviewmmmmhmmmm^wmbmbbbbmbmbwhmwm-mimjuwijiimmbhbm
i

Angry and defiant mourners react to the violence of apartheid at the funeral of youths killed by police, Atteridgeville, 1985

and start talks? What are the circumstances that can bring that about, because I think that's what, frankly, everyone wants, on all sides, to stop. I am sure that no one wants it to go on forever.

No, not even we. This question of violence worries many people. The unfortunate thing is that people tend to be worried about the violence that comes from the oppressed. And so the tendency is to want to know, as you want to know, on what terms would we end violence. Really, there would be no violence at all if we did not have the violence of the apartheid system. And even if there was, and there has been for two decades, it's been restrained. But if you look at what comes from the other side, during those two decades there has been massive violence.

So we then have to say to ourselves: Of course we can stop our struggle, we can stop even our violent actions, but on that basis

what would be the reason for that? And in return for what?

Is there a possibility of a truce?

There is always a possibility of a truce. We see the possibility of a truce. It would be very, very easy, if for example, we started negotiations. We have said that negotiation; can start, serious negotiations ...

With the government?

Yes, with the government when they are ready, because at the moment we think they are not ready. And we have said to them that if you wanted negotiations, we would not go into that without Nelson

Mandela and the other political prisoners. Now, a serious indication of readiness for negotiations would be the release of all these leaders, because they have got to be part of the process of preparation for

serious negotiations which will not just be talks for the sake of talking. It is quite conceivable that in that situation of preparing for negotiations and looking at necessary conditions and so on, this question could arise. But we have had a problem about just saying we are now suspending our struggle, which is what it would mean.

On one side, as it were?

On one side, without any indication on the other side of their willingness to do anything about what every one of us knows is their violence. We have said: Lift the state of emergency, pull out the troops from the townships, and the police. And release the political prisoners. We have even said unban the ANC. Do all these things to create a climate

Which you would welcome?

We would welcome a climate of

INTERVIEW

that kind, and if the rest of the leaders were there I think it would be time to get together and put the question: Can we really do anything about this? Everybody would then be there. But we are getting this persistent refusal on the part of Botha either to release Nelson Mandela and the other political prisoners, and we say: What are you going to do with treason trials ... it is simply a form of repression. Who are you going to negotiate with, if you want to negotiate. If he withdrew the treason trials and did all these things by way of lifting the pressures that rest on us, we would begin to see that the other sides are ready to talk.

But we have argued that it is not necessary for hostilities to cease before negotiations start. Before the Nkomati accord,' there were lengthy negotiations between the South Africans and others before there was any signing of an agreement. The agreement that was signed in Lusaka between the South Africans and the Angolans was preceded by a series of meetings and negotiations.

Is anything going on at the moment... i.e., talks about talks between the ANC and the South African government?

No, nothing at all. Which is why we think they are not ready for us to have any talks. They are not even ready for other people to talk to us. We are South Africans. If we meet we can only talk about our country. We are not going to fight about it. We talk about it, and they don't like this. But I think what they do not like is that in a meeting we get to understand each other better, and we, the ANC, certainly benefit from these talks, and we would like to think that those we talk to also benefit. So this is moving in the direction of resolv-

ing our problems, but they are not prepared for that.

Violence against people, civilians. What is the ANC's attitude on this, bearing in mind the fact that down the years the ANC has, in my opinion, held back to a great extent on what one might call indiscriminate violence or going for soft targets.

I am glad you have put it that way, because it is often forgotten that we have been at the receiving end all the time, and we have held back. And it is not conceivable that we could go on like that indefinitely without anything changing. But one must see in this holding back the reluctance of the ANC on questions of violence. But when once, of course, we have decided we have got to fight, then we must fight.

What about soft targets?

The question of soft targets has been exaggerated out of all proportion. As I have once had occasion to observe, when the police go into a township, and shoot, when they did on the 21st March, repeating Sharpeville,⁶ they were hitting soft targets, and this whole year has been a year of shootings of, really, soft targets. So people are being killed. It has never been quite like this. But they are being shot, and even children are being killed... so when the ANC talks about soft targets this creates an alarm, and yet the ANC is going no further than saying that

we have got to intensify our struggle if we are in a struggle. If we stop, we stop. But if we are in a struggle and we feel the demand of the situation is that we struggle, then we must intensify that struggle. We have held back for too long. Now, if we do intensify we are not going to, choosing carefully to avoid hurting anybody, but we will move into military personnel, police, and so on.

But you won't go for civilians as such?

No, we will not go for civilians as such. We think that civilians will be hit as they are hit always. They were hit in Zimbabwe ...

In a crossfire situation?

A crossfire situation, in any war situation.

But not cinemas and supermarkets and ...?

We will not go into cinemas and bars and places like that. We won't do that. But we will certainly be looking for military personnel, police, and so on.

Why will you hold back, because often in guerrilla war the limits do get more and more extended? Is it a moral feeling about killing civilians, or what?

Because we are not fighting against people, we are fighting against a system and we can't kill people. Why? Why would we kill them? We cannot even kill Whites because we are not fighting Whites at all. We are fighting a system.

On foreign policy, do you see [the future] South Africa as a pro-Western, nonaligned, or as a Soviet-socialist-leaning country? For instance, in the sale of minerals and raw materials - u>nuld

these be denied to anyone? What about Commonwealth membership? Where do you see South Africa standing in the world?

First of all, non-aligned in terms of East-West, developing trade with all countries of the world, strengthening trade links, so maintaining the lines of trade for mutual benefit.

So the Americans can be sure of getting their needs?

The Americans will be sure to get

it, if they are willing to pay for it. We would want to trade with all the countries of the world, in the interests of our own economy.

"There would be no violence at all if we did not have the violence of the apartheid system"

INTERVIEW

"The true nature of the
Township, 1985

"The conflict ... the people resisting the implementation of apartheid and preventing it from working": funeral in Tsakanc

We would come back to the Commonwealth because the basis for the exclusion of South Africa would have gone. And we will establish very peaceful relations with countries. We will work very closely with the rest of the African continent, and certainly with the countries of southern Africa. We would become members of SADC/ or it might be called another name by then, and we could build together a small common market of our own. South Africa would therefore be admitted into this wider economic grouping that we have in southern Africa. And we would be a very influential country in the world.

Do you feel this would unleash resources that we have not been able to unleash?

I am certain. I think the economy

itself would be stimulated by the energies that would be unleashed, and the prospects of peace and stability. We think the country would be transformed, politically and socially and economically.

I presume you favour sanctions. Do you to the point where people lose jobs and the economy suffers seriously?

We think the economy must be put into difficulties because the economy strengthens the regime. It enables them to do all the things that they want to do. This question of losing jobs, for the victims of apartheid it is nothing. To be a victim of apartheid means to be many, many things above losing a job, which you are losing all the time anyway. And

the way we looked at it is: The more effective the sanctions are, the less the scope and scale of conflict.

If there was a new grouping in South African White politics, with liberal Afrikaners who were formerly Nationalists and Progressive Federal Party people like Slabbert forming a new bloc, would you be prepared to deal with them and on what basis?

We have met VanZylSlabbert, and we hope to meet various leaders of organisations. An organisation that is opposed to the apartheid system we regard as on our side. I don't think that we would refuse contact with such an organisation, because we would see it moving in the direction that we are. We do of course encourage our White countrymen to mobilise and make their contribution to changing the apartheid system, and on that basis we ought to be able to find a *modus vivendi* with them.

"We have reached the point where people are expecting change and are beginning to reflect on what that change involves. People want to know, when apartheid goes, what takes its place"

the world there is a lot of interest in what is happening in South Africa, and people are discussing it. And when a member of the ANC in my position is around, many people want to try and understand where we go from here. What is more, the discussion now revolves around the question of what sort of South Africa. In the past there was just denunciation of apartheid and so on, but a new interest has emerged, an interest in what takes the place of what we are seeing now and how do

we move from the present to something different. This represents real movement forward for us. We have reached the point where people are expecting change and are beginning to reflect what that change involves, and this has been part of the interest. People want to know, when apartheid goes (because they are sure apartheid is going) what takes its place.

To what extent is the current internal unrest in South Africa orchestrated by the ANC and to what extent is it spontaneous?

Both words are not very applicable. There is a great deal of spontaneity in the sense that when you shoot at people they are angered and want to do something in retaliation. You would not say that the ANC is orchestrating all these responses. They are almost natural. So there is an element of spontaneity. But I would not use the word orchestrated.

I would say that the ANC has called on our people, and in some cases they are very disciplined about it, in others there are excesses; the ANC has said, let us destroy these structures of separation and apartheid. That is where it starts. Now, in this process other factors come in. The authorities come in and shoot and the people respond... and you have a situation of escalation which can tend to conceal the true nature of the conflict as being the people resisting the implementation of the apartheid system and preventing it from working. This is the essence. â–

You strike me as a somewhat reluctant revolutionary. With what measure of enthusiasm did you turn to accept that there had to be violence? How did you yourself personally respond to this?

I suppose I was angry and frustrated, like we all were, and I continued to be angry and frustrated, to feel that this system must be fought. But I was a full supporter of the policy of non-violence because we thought it would bring us the fulfilment of our objective. When that failed then we had to look for an alternative. We found the alternative in combining political and armed actions, and it is one of those things you have to do, as there is no alternative. I don't think I am peculiar in this respect. I think that many people in the ANC would be glad if there was no need for violence, but the need is there and we have got to go ahead with it, bitter as it is.

It is painful to see anybody being killed, to see children being killed, no matter who kills them. The death of children is a painful thing, and you do have to say what brought us to this situation where these things are happening. We naturally feel that it is the system that has made it impossible for us to avoid what we strive to avoid with such resolve when we were first confronted with

this violence. But as individuals, and certainly as an individual, I don't like violence.

You are enjoying great attention in London. To what do you ascribe this?

I think, generally, in many parts of

Footnotes

1. The Freedom Charter is the programme of South Africa's national, democratic revolution. It was first adopted by some 3,000 delegates from a wide variety of groups at a Congress of the People, held near Johannesburg, in June 1955. It is supported by the ANC and many other South African groups.

2. On May 20, 1983, ANC guerrillas detonated a car bomb outside the South African air force head quarters in Pretoria, killing 18 people, many of them air force and other military personnel. This action came in retaliation for a December 1982 South African military attack on Maseru, the capital of the independent coun-

try of Lesotho, in which 42 South African refugees and Lesotho citizens were killed.

3. A reference to an attempt by eight students from the Afrikaans-language Stellenbosch University to travel to Lusaka, Zambia, in October 1985 to meet with representatives of the ANC Youth League. The trip was blocked when the South African government seized the students' passports.

4. A reference to the Bantustans, the impoverished rural reserves for Africans that comprise 13 percent of the entire country.

5. The Nkomati accord was a nonaggression pact signed between the South African and Mozambican governments in March 1984; the Lusaka agreement, signed in February 1984,

dealt with the terms of a South African military withdrawal from the areas of southern Angola that it then occupied.

6. On March 21, 1985, South African police massacred 19 Blacks in the township of Langa, near Cape Town. This came on the 25th anniversary of a massacre that very same date in 1960

in Sharpeville, in which 69 Blacks were shot down.

7. The Southern African Development Coordination Conference, comprised of the governments of Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. The SADCC aims to lessen the southern African region's economic subordination to South Africa.

Meeting Between Comrade Honecker and O.R.

(Berlin 1 S/8/86)

Substance of Comrade Honecker*s Discourse

Honecker: I have received a report on the discussions you had with

Cde Axen. Activities in Southern Africa have increased and we need to exchange views on the developments. I am happy that we were able to contribute in strengthening your health which does not only depend on doctors and their skills. The struggle itself helps to keep us healthy.

O.R. It was quite fortunate that I was invited to the GDR at this time. I now feel better prepared for my future work and am grateful for the rest. This also applies to my wife whose health has greatly improved. I also wish to express the ANC's appreciation of the good relations we have with the SED and people of the GDR, as demonstrated by the assistance you have

rendered to our new representative in helping him to get settled.

Hon. We are closely following the developments in Southern Africa.

The world public has begun to make its influence felt on the question of apartheid. On the other hand the Botha regime has become more desperate. At the Nationalist Party Congress both the Minister of Interior and that of Defence used strong words with threats to the Frontline States and in relation to Angola

and Mozambique. The GDR people are well informed and are proud of the good links of solidarity with the S.A. people waging such a heroic fight in spite of the repression, The people's resistance is both impressive and also a sad affair.

The time has come for the majority to take over power and for apartheid to be destroyed.

The GDR decisively condemns apartheid and gives every possible support to the struggle. The determination of the people to fight and the high degree of organisation and consciousness arouses the sympathy of the GDR people. We attach great importance to the growing strength of the working class. People see this for themselves on television, during strikes and demonstrations.

The world is aware that the racist regime can no longer break the resistance. The apartheid regime is shaken. We share the view that, at the present stage, the main task is to eliminate

apartheid and establish majority rule. Realistic forces among whites are joining the struggle for the creation of a peaceful, democratic South Africa. The ANC has played and will continue to play a decisive role in this struggle. I assure you that the people of the GDR and the Party will continue to assist at all levels, nationally and internationally.

The problems arise from imperialist interference. We need to join hands against apartheid. Namibia remains one of the major burning issues. Comrades from the International Dept, have kept me informed about developments within the Commonwealth. Britain has become isolated. This shows that the removal of apartheid would open new prospects not only for Africa, but internationally.

We agree with the ANC and its policy. There is now an opportunity to establish a broad alliance of forces at regional and global levels. There are many forms of struggle which would bring in socialists, social-democrats, churches and even bourgeois circles in the West. Of the many State Officials and Ambassadors I meet, there is not a single one who has attempted to defend apartheid.

(e.g. Pakistan, with all our differences on issues like Afghanistan, agrees with us on the question of apartheid). I pointed out to the new Pakistani ambassador that they should use the Soviet offer for troops withdrawal to stop outside interference in the area. The new Afghanistani government pursues a policy of reconciliation. Pakistan will emphasise its anti-apartheid stand at the Non-Aligned Meeting (NAM).

Prime Minister Mugabe is deep in his preparations for the NAM.

Ortega is visiting 15 Afro-Asian countries (with our assistance) and will report to the GDR and NAM.

Issues Facing NAM

- World Peace; Our position is in line with that of the Soviet Union and the decisions adopted by the meeting of Political Experts from the Warsaw Pact countries in Budapest.

- Apartheid removal as a condition for peace.

The doors are open except for Reagan and Thatcher. Even the FRG has problems in backing its allies. All three are deeply involved in the S.A. economy.

Purposeful guidance is important for the struggle. It should not lose its political substance. A black-white confrontation can only be countered through political mobilisation.

Gomrade Axen has reported on ANC efforts to intensify its activities in Africa. The XIth Party Congress took a clear stand on apartheid and solidarity with the ANC. This is important for the education of our youth. We campaign for the release of Mandela and other political prisoners.

The Nationalist Party Congress was a congress of helplessness. Botha admitted South Africa's isolation, thereby demonstrating the success of the global movement (against apartheid). The GDR is for sanctions. Reagan, Thatcher and Kohl say that sanctions are against black interests. But of course they are thinking of the interests of Big Business. Even South African Trade Unions are demanding sanctions.

The Budapest Meeting supported sanctions and called for majority rule.

The SED - ANC cooperation is developing in line with our Agreements.

We are for continuing this cooperation.

With respect to the ANC 75th anniversary, the GDR contribution will be to intensify our solidarity actions at home and abroad.

ISSUES

There are a few questions I would like to touch upon. Since our last meeting, there have been many developments.

there was the Budapest Meeting and a series of Soviet initiatives. The central issue is the survival of mankind, which is at stake if we do not stop the nuclear arms race. The Soviet proposal is to eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2000. The struggle will be long and protracted.

We welcome the U.S. - U.S.S.R. Summit, and the proposal that meetings should be held both in the US and the USSR. But there are powerful forces opposed to meaningful results of these meetings. Take for instance the huge propaganda campaign which depicted the Reagan letter to Gorbachev as a New Era. I had talks with Genscher (after Moscow visit). Schultz had told him that he had influenced the contents of the letter. But the letter itself did not respond to any of the proposals made by Gorbachev, in spite of the demands made by the US Congress.

For instance, there was no reaction to the proposal to de-nuclearise the Atlantic and the Pacific; to accept international control and even inspection of dis-armament programmes. No reaction to the readiness of the Socialist countries to reduce

their forces in Europe (including in the GDR).

The argument goes like this

If there is nuclear dis-armament, then the Warsaw pact countries will have the advantage of conventional weapons. When the proposal is about the reduction of conventional weapons, then the response is silence. Experts go to Moscow, but there are no concrete items to be agreed upon. Reagan is not prepared to alter his position on the SDI.

We need to mount an offensive on the question of disarmament and respect of sovereignty. Claims that SDI would change the balance can only lead to an increased arms race. Even the U.S. military admit that it is an illusion to think that SDI can provide any safeguards.

SPACE BELONGS TO MANKIND.

Take the space rockets. Which ones are functioning? There is some truth in the story that the USSR is 10 years ahead of the US.

The Cosmic Station (USSR) is 300 km from earth and about the size of the C.C. building. They have carriers which can move 1000 km from one station to another and back, in space. There are GDR space researchers and instrument-makers involved in the programme. The 70th anniversary of October will be celebrated also in space.

On the other hand, the Shuttle programme will not start before 1992.

At present only the USSR and China have functional rocket-lamchners for space ships (Japan almost there).

The USSR has invited Chinese researchers as well as French.

Thus there are many opportunities for peaceful exploration of space. But we must denounce the militarisation of space. It represents a new problem in the arms race. The question is a simple choice: whether we want to live together, or we die together.

Vladivostok: At his meeting in Vladivostok, Gorbachev addressed

himself to the question of a non-nuclear zone in Asia and the Pacific, and proposed a conference similar to the Helsinki conference, for Asia and the Far East. In the Pacific, the US and the USSR are 7 km from each other. Peaceful co-existence would appear the only sensible choice.

Gorbachev stated that the USSR and China are major countries who basically agree. He addressed himself to various areas:

CHINA

trade with the USSR now stands at 2 billion rubles, the highest level ever.

they have cooperation in the fields of science and technology, they have reached agreement on the border (the river Amur).

USSR and China have renounced first strike (for war). exchanges between the two countries exist at grassroot level and 81 the top.

USSR is ready to withdraw its troops from Mongolia.

The 3rd World: in positive response to issues affecting the third world countries:

USSR announced first stage withdrawal from Afghanistan, she has developed good relations with India.

she is for a non-nuclear zone in the South Pacific (the position of New Zealand will lead to the disintegration of Anzus pact).

Comrade Honecker dealt with the position of the USSR and other Socialist countries on the question of resolution of Regional conflicts, like Southern Africa, the Middle East, Cyprus, Latin America, especially the Caribbean (Contadora Group) and the positive role of Brazil, Argentina and changes in Uruguay.

a peaceful world would be of benefit also to the U.S, people.

These are the same principles which underlie GDR relations with the PRG. The GDR is a full participant in the Warsaw Pact, and yet calls for:

peaceful co-existence with the PRG. But .right-wingers are complicating the process in their push for revanchism and re-armament of PRG. They already have nuclear arsenals.

the GDR rejects provocations and submits proposals for cooperation. The Social Democrats and even some Christian Democrats(in PRG) are for dialogue.

trade with the PRG stands at 15-16 billion Marks.

there is a Cultural Agreement, but an Agreement on Science & Technology will take time, because of continuous provocations.

International Situation: This has become more complex, but peaceful co-existence is the only solution.

ANC: On ANC we reaffirm our support. The success of the ANC will

benefit even the European climate. There has recently been a Special Meeting of Deputy Foreign Ministers of Warsaw Pact countries on the question of Southern Africa. This Meeting re-affirmed support for ANC and SWAPO.

Conclusion: I have before me a list on the development[^] of the

relations between the ANC and the SED. It indicates various areas of cooperation, including education and vocational training.

.....Well wishes on health and success in struggle.

(S.M.)