AS1986-1-3-27

FOURTH SESSION OF THE FOURTH
KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

POLICY SPEECH

BY THE CHIEF MINISTER OF KWAZULU
MARCH 1986

AS1986-1-3-27

FOURTH SESSION OF THE FOURTH
KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

POLICY SPEECH

BY THE CHIEF MINISTER OF KWAZULU
MARCH 1986

/ EMBARGOED UNTIL DELIVERY /

FOURTH SESSION OF THE FOURTH KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

POLICY SPEECH

BY THE CHIEF MINISTER OF KWAZULU

MARCH 1986:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, this fourth Session of the fourth KwaZulu Legislative Assembly meets in a time of deepening South African crisis. This year's South African parliamentary session and the session of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, will be watched very intently by the whole world. In broad terms, what is done in the South African Parliament will be ratified or rejected by our response to it. I make this point right at the outset, Mr. Speaker, because when one day the history of these poignant times are written, it will be shown that no major national move will succeed if we in this region of South Africa do not throw our full weight behind it. In terms of the governing of South Africa, whatever opposition groups inside Parliament do and say, the real opposition to the Government of the country is to be found in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker. We carry the historic responsibility of being the dominating opposition group. I say this Mr. Speaker, with no intention of malice towards the Opposition Parties in Parliament, nor, Mr. Speaker, am I downgrading the governments of Lebowa, Gazankulu, KaNgwane, QwaQwa and Ndebele. I am saying what I am saying because it is historically speaking vital that the Honourable Members enact the business of this House this year in the full awareness of who they are and what role they are playing in South Africa.

The wheel of history has turned and the South African Government can now not make any progress forward unless what they are doing carries the judgment of Blacks who are opposed to them. My brothers and sisters in Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei, like Dr. van Zyl Slabbert, got out of the kitchen because it was too hot. My brothers and sisters in the so-called homelands, or so-called national states, are South Africans in what is but different regions of South Africa. They have acted as regional governments but in broad terms of the history of the last decade, they have not helped us to play the opposition role at the national level as effectively as we could have played it if we all joined hands in our opposition to the south African Government's policies.

It is, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, simply a fact that Inkatha has emerged as by far the most dominating group in opposition to

the National ... 2/

the National Party's parliamentary role. The simple demographic fact imposes on us in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, a role that others do not have. The Zulu-speaking South Africans number nearly six million and if the south African Government thinks that they can do anything without our approval, then they will be shown to be wrong. We, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, are mindful of the fact that the role we have played over the years has actually turned history into a new direction. Mr. Speaker, there is just no shadow of a doubt that had we succumbed to the terrrible pressures mounted against us, and accepted this quasi independence that others have accepted, the political face of South Africa would have entirely changed. Had we done so, the National Party would by now have succeeded with its homeland to pursue their homeland policy to its logical conclusion. Had we accepted so-called independence Mr. Speaker, South Africa by now would have had a confederal constitution.

I remind Members that in 1983 Dr. Koornhof, then Minister of Co-operation and Development, informed me that the State President had instructed him to go all out to make a confederation a reality. Dr. Koornhof's earnest plea to me then was that I realise that a confederation between South Africa and the Transkei would have been laughable; that a confederation between South Africa, Transkei and Bophuthatswana would not have been as laughable, but that a confederation between South Africa, Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda, and Ciskei could give rise to 'real politik'. He pleaded earnestly with me to accept so-called independence, because if I did so, my action would make a confederal South Africa a de facto reality which the international community could not ignore.

Unless we accept so-called independence here in KwaZulu the primary objectives of the homeland policy would remain beyond reach. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we do not boast when we say that we have opted to occupy a pivotal opposition position to the Government's homeland policy. Successive National Party Governments have been hoisted with their own pertard. They rammed homeland institutional developments down our throats. We in this region of South Africa were the only people who vehemently opposed the Bantu Authorities system. Our position was adamant and in the end, the Government informed me that Zulus had no choice in the matter and that these institutions would be introduced willy nilly.

The Government was soon to find out, and it will find out repeatedly, that you can take a horse to the water but you cannot make it drink. They can only go so far without our concurrence. Unquestionably our opposition to them going any further brought the whole homeland policy into the crisis years which Mr. P.W. Botha's administration had to contend with. Mr. Speaker, Sir, opposition Parties in Parliament could not have broken the

Government's ...3/

Government's homeland policy. It is we here, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, in this Assembly who did so.

The South African Government could ride roughshod over other regions, disadvantaged for not having our numerical strength or not having our history as a people. Our numerical strength and our history has thrust on our shoulders the historic role of being the real opposition to the implementation of apartheid policy. Mr. Speaker, I have never claimed that we are the only opposition. Apartheid is abhorred wherever you find Black men, women and children. I do not advocate a multi-strategy approach as a political tactic for my own advantage. I proclaim its existing reality. No single group in this country has ever won a major battle. If we have been in the forefront of the battle against the homeland policy, we must always remember that it was the massive push of Blacks behind us which made us so successful in the front lines.

This success is perceived by Black South Africans. That is why Inkatha has now more than 1,2 million paid-up members. 1,2 million paid-up members is but one indicator of our strength. Beyond each card-carrying member, there are many more sympathisers and supporters of Inkatha. What we have done, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, carries the judgement of millions of South Africans. This is so because we are in fact an opposition reality as far as the National Party is concerned. Every Black man, woman and child is aware of the horrors of apartheid. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, leadership does not get mass support for failures. The emergence of Inkatha Mr. Speaker, was the extension of the opposition role of this House across the length and breadth of the country. No other regional government has come anywhere near being influential outside his own region. We saw in the 1976/78 period how Inkatha's support broadened and deepened and extended with leaps and bounds when people perceived the failure of the tactics and strategies of other Black groups. Mr. Speaker, that will again happen after these crisis years have passed and Black South Africans turn to count the costs of the political folly of the United Democratic Front and the African National Congress Mission in Exile. Inkatha will within the foreseeable future make another surge forward.

I will later in this Session, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, make a detailed analysis available to Members of the responses I received from writing to thousands of the country's opinion-makers. Honourable Members will remember that in the last Session, I said:

> "Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I would like to propose that this House go into caucus to discuss what I have been saying today, and thereafter immediately send a verbatim transcription of what I said to a very wide range of

influential ... 4/

> influential South Africans in all race groups, so that while we are yet in session here, we have an indication from South Africa whether it is thought that we are taken seriously, or whether it is thought that we just play marbles here at Ulundi, and are discounted as a moving force for change. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is urgently necessary to give a central point to the Black/White debate at the national level, and I am convinced that Members will be greatly strengthened in the resolve to do what we are doing when it is clear to them from the responses we receive that we are a force to be reckoned with".

I later reported, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, that I had written to five thousand prominent South Africans enclosing the verbatim report of a section of my Policy Speech and asking them to respond to me and to tell me how they saw our endeavours in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, the response from these five thousand South Africans can only be described as phenomenal. I have received something like one thousand letters in reply and this correspondence reflects a deep White South African awareness of the pivotal role that we play in this House. The stand we have taken in these troubled times has not gone unnoticed, and it is as clear as daylight that thinking White South Africans recognise that the State President cannot succeed without us. We occupy a different position to parliamentary opposition Parties. In Parliament, the State President announces what he wants to do, and then he is authorised to go and do it after a simple show of hands. When it comes to the doing of it, however, it is we who have to carry the load of real opposition. This is perceived by White South Africans. We are not perceived as a regional government which should be concerned with regional issues. This House, Mr. Speaker, is accepted by many Whites as playing a vital role at the national level and it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that this House has constituencies which have broken every racial barrier in the country. We in this House, Mr. Speaker, have shown that the National Party's commanding numerical position in the South African Parliament for now nearly 40 years, enables them only to pass laws which opposition parties in Parliament cannot stop being passed, but their majority does not enable them to implement their hideous apartheid policies to their logical conclusion. The National Party is caught in a political vice of having refused to admit that the country needs Black parliamentary representation and not being in the position to campaign amongst Blacks for the acceptance of laws which affect them. If the State President had to go to Black areas to campaign for Black support, he would be proposing entirely different legislation in the South African Parliament. The exclusion of Blacks from Parliament restructures the democratic process and excludes the real opposition from Parliament.

I have always valued White parliamentary opposition. They are

part of a 5/

part of a political process which plays its own important role, but in the governing of the country, their yeas and nays in Parliament do not really amount to very much. They are there to make statements; they are there to keep values alive; they are there to make the Government talk about what it is doing, but in the doing world of politics they sink into minor roles. In the doing world of opposition politics, it is KwaZulu which dominates the scene.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, we saw only yesterday the disdain with which the State President is treating us. Mr. Greeff, who is the Speaker of the White House in the Tricameral Parliament, was instructed to come and open this Session of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. He will know by today that we do not hold his person in disrespect. The insult which is flung at us by the South African Government in not sending a Cabinet Minister to open this Session of the Assembly, or liaising with me to find a suitable alternative, is an insult which will anger not only the Zulu nation and Inkatha, but will demostrate to all Blacks everywhere that the spirit of arrogant baaskap is alive and well.

The State President simply does not perceive of the reality of KwaZulu's opposition role at the national level. He tries to pretend that KwaZulu is just one of ten regions in South Africa, and his expectation is that I must potter around with local regional issues as best I can. Let me not speak on his behalf. Let me rather read to you what he himself actually says in private conversations. In a pique of anger, he released a tape recording of his confidential discussion with Dr. van Zyl Slabbert. Mr. Speaker, this is an extract from the transcript of that tape:

> STATE PRESIDENT: You see, Doctor, I don't want to have a political argument with you today. We can have it another time. But I want to tell you how I see South Africa's real problem, and you haven't helped me.
>
> Firstly, we must do much more in the agricultural field in the areas which have lagged behind, because in that way you can provide many more people with work.
>
> Secondly, through our regional development policy and decentralisation we must create many more opportunities for people to bring about this thing that you are asking, because there are not many opportunities in the metropolitan areas. There would not be, even if we opened the central business area. They cannot find satisfactory solutions for their ambitions there. But go to Qwaqwa. Do me the favour and go there before the Parliamentary session and see what has been achieved with decentralisation in that small country next to Lesotho where there is nothing going on. Do me the favour and go and look there.

I said ... 6/

I said in Parliament this year I was going to visit the Black states one after the other. I did that. I went to see.

I exhausted the Press and these politicians, because I have the energy. I went to see what we could do in the agricultural area - what was the potential - and what we could do in the industrial area and what we could do by means of urban development in our backward regions. We could find an outlet in that for the ambitions and energy of many of these young people who are stuck in our metropolitan areas without a livelihood.

My answer to you is that you must help me with these basic things so that we can get a balanced economy in South Africa. I think you would have appreciation for that.

DR. SLABBERT: No, I certainly do not have a problem with that.

STATE PRESIDENT: But we fight each other on party political grounds so that we are not keen to tackle the basic issues in South Africa together.

DR. SLABBERT: Mr. President, is it possible, and I ask this in all fairness, is it not possible that we can start putting our heads together on an informal basis and look at these plans. I am not now talking about you. I am not just talking about the Government and opposition groups, but on an informal basis we must have people such as Mabuza and Buthelezi - it cannot happen on a formal level. They are caught up in their own politics.

But I think we can start this thing on an informal basis.

STATE PRESIDENT: I had - and I am talking to you confidentially - a long talk with Buthelezi last year. I did not tell the outside world what we talked about. He came to my office in the Cape this year, I had a long discussion with him. Afterwards I had a long talk with the King of the Zulus. I do not want these things to be made known outside. There were only short articles that I had spoken to them.

Since then I have had a series of discussions with church leaders, with individuals, even with leaders of national states and independent state leaders. Last week we had another conference over days, preceeded by multilateral discussions which culminated in a conference.

We are busy with tremendous programmes. If only we could have fewer attempts at destruction in this country ... I do not say the fault lies only with my opponents, but I say

there is too ...7/

there is too little positive co-operation to get to the real root of our problems. That is my point.

DR. SLABBERT: Well, yes I can appreciate your problems, President, and in my own way this year I tried to see who I could talk to and how I could see that the middle groups hold, because we are being polarised on the extremes. We are being consumed by the extremists on either side.

STATE PRESIDENT: Yes.

DR. SLABBERT: I can see from the Government's position that there are people with whom it cannot immediately talk in public. I am talking of, say, Buthelezi and even ANC members.

STATE PRESIDENT: But nothing prevents Buthelezi from talking to me.

DR. SLABBERT: Well, he's in a tremendous vice ....

STATE PRESIDENT: I will tell you what Buthelezi's problem is. Buthelezi's problem is that he wants to talk alone, but he does not want to talk together with other Black people.

DR. SLABBERT: Yes, there is a problem there, there is a problem, but that problem can be surmounted.

STATE PRESIDENT: How?

DR. SLABBERT: He must, as the English say, "be locked into an initiative". And I have a very strong feeling that we are on the threshold of such an initiative into which he can be drawn.

But you see, if you tell me of the development and the economy I can't fault it and I can only support it.

Whereas White South African opinion-makers see me playing a vital role in national politics, the State President sees me as an uppity kaffir and has to shake a Greeff finger under my nose. The transcript of his conversation with Dr. van Zyl Slabbert shows White politics at its sickening worst. Here we have the head of the ruling Party and the then leader of the Opposition Party exchanging views in private, and it is quite clear that neither have any real perceptions about the political situation. The State President tells Dr. van Zyl Slabbert that South Africa's real problem is that he, Dr. Slabbert, has not helped him do more in the agricultural field, has not helped him do more with the decentralisation policy and in attempts to decentralise industrial development. And he says to Dr. Slabbert: "But we fight each

other on ...8/

other on party political grounds, so that we are not keen to tackle the basic issues in South Africa together". The State President is blind to reality if his definition of the basic problems of our country excludes considerations about power-sharing.

In this tape-recording, we hear the State President telling Dr. van Zyl Slabbert that he had a long talk to me and that nothing prevents me from talking to him. He actually says:

> "I told Buthelezi, what the Zulu people need in the first place are not just political rights, because you have that. You can talk to me whenever you wish. Your government can talk to me whenever you wish. But what you need in the first place is that the Tugela areas, that we develop the low-lying areas of the Tugela. We must use Richards Bay to also make provision for you. I told him that we must talk to each other about the protection of the upper regions of the Tugela which eventually could affect their water. This is a programme - if tackled for 10 years - for the sake of your entire population. He agreed with me".

It is absolutely clear from this transcript that the State President is not addressing the question of power-sharing in his own mind. He thinks he and I should confine our talking to the development of the Tugela Basin and Richards Bay, and that we should be talking about agricultural issues, and then when I refuse to do so both he and Dr. van Zyl Slabbert exchange views about me wanting to be the only bull in the Kraal. The State President said: "I will tell you what Buthelezi's problem is. Buthelezi's problem is that he wants to talk alone, that he does not want to talk together with other Black people". The State President denies me a leadership role despite the fact that I represent six million people in this House and I represent many millions more through Inkatha, and despite the fact that my constituencies extend across all racial barriers into distant parts of the country. The State President cannot see me as a person, he cannot see me as a leader, and only wants to see me when I am made anonymous amongst other people.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I am reminded by the attitude of the State President as revealed in this tape of how I am always put at the end of the queue of Black leaders from other regions, because in protocol terms, KwaZulu being the last to have the Regional Authority foisted on them, I was the most junior. Previos Prime Ministers and the Staste President expected me to trot off to Pretoria or Cape Town when they clicked their fingers and to smile as I took my place as the bottom end of the queue of other leaders. God help South Africa if even now in this time of crisis the State President can only break out of the past in public statements which are shown to be meaningless when he

reveals his 9/

reveals his thouthts in a conversation which was not designed for public consumption.

Of course, the South African Government must be concerned about economic development. Politics cannot be allowed to sideline economic reality, but in this transcript the State President clearly shows that economic realities is all he wants to talk to me about. Having a commitment to economic development is one thing, but playing an economic fiddle while South Africa burns is another thing altogether.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I am having increasingly sombre thoughts about the future which we can now begin to see ahead. Unless the State President does something dramatically effective, he is going to find himself a very isolated man. Week after week and month after month, White South Africans will increasingly perceive the State President's empty-handedness. They have not heard a single word from the State President about how he is going to handle local government in Black areas. White South Africans will begin to perceive ever increasingly as the days, weeks and months pass that Regional Services Council development which the Government is intent on pushing, will not be able to address the question of administration in Black areas. "The Star" of Tuesday, 18 March 1986 reported that 51 motorists were robbed of their cars in Johannesburg's northern suburbs by Black youths. Those motorists know that there is a Black township in the vicinity of their own suburbs now outside of the State President's control. In Cape Town a magistrate imposes severe restrictions on a Black funeral, and people in their thousands ignore these restrictions and authority has to stand impotently by as they do so. Millions of Black South Africans in townships have simply stopped paying their rents, and the administration of their areas is done by remote control which is just not possible. Regional Services Council are not going to be able to control Black townships. The upward spiralling of violence is continuing and White South Africans who oppose Mr. P.W. Botha's reforms are jeering at him because they are getting him nowhere, and White South Africans who support Mr. P.W. Botha's reforms will sooner or later have to ask him whether he in fact has the power to develop his reform programme.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members. I can only conclude from the evidence before me that when I had, in the eyes of the State President, the temerity to tell him under what circumstances his National Statutory council could play a meaningful role in the politics of change, he threw yet another political tantrum and shook a Greeff finger under my nose. White South Africans perceive the reality of our desperate situation will blame Mr. Botha for not making it possible for me to play a significant role in the National Statutory Council, if his present mood continues for very much longer. That statutory council cannot work without

KwaZulu 10/

KwaZulu and Inkatha participaion. His Black Advisory Council did not even get off the ground because of our opposition to it. The Special Cabinet Committee had to be sidelined by the National Statutory Council because I would not be involved in it. While the State President regards me as a little regional political Black boy, who should be pottering around with regional issues, there is no hope for any meaningful negotiations between himself and myself. If there is no hope for meaningful negotiation between himself and myself, there is no hope for meaningful negotiations between White South Africa and Black South Africa.

Mr. Speaker Sir, I repeat my attitude to co-operation with the State President in the National Statutory Council. I repeat I sincerely hope that it will get off the ground and become meaningful. Properly handled it could be a meaningful development. I repeat that I will do nothing to jeopardise its possible success. I repeat that I am prepared to undertake great risks to make that which could work actually work. I repeat also, however, that South Africa simply cannot afford yet another failing experiment. I clearly perceive under what circumstances the National Statutory Council could work. However the State President blusters, and however many actions he takes against me in pique, he is not going to fool all Whites all the time. As time passes, it will be he who is perceived by Whites themselves as politically incompetent and not I. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, the blunt truth of the matter is that I do not need the National Statutory Council for my political existence. It is not I who put the State President in the hot chair which heads that Council. He did so himself. He now needs the National Statutory Council to work. He cannot afford yet another damp squib in reply to bursting bombs. For the sake of South Africa, I will help the State President out of his difficulty, I will help him make that Council work if it has any prospects of achieving something. I am however not the State President's hireling. I am not here to carry his political bags. He either accepts me as man, a leader and an indispensible force in the politics of change, or he sinks on his own. I do not intend sinking with him attempting to do that which simply cannot be done.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I only say these things because we need to look at the realities around us. I do not put myself in a gloating position over the State President and say that he cannot do without me. I only say that if any White State President today thinks that he can do without the leader of a 1,2 million strong Black political organisation, and if he can do without the elected head of six million South Africans, then he has got his head very deeply buried in apartheid sand.

I have made these opening remarks in this year's Policy Speech, Mr. Speaker, because it is vital that every member in the House perceives the gravity of our responsibility. As we go about our

business.... 11/

business in this Session, we must do so with a daily and an hourly awareness of whatever is of importance which is taking place in the South African Parliament this year. The South African Parliament is in session within the broad process in which State violence and counter-violence move ever further away from being relevant to meaningful reform. The reform programme is not aided by violence, whether it be State violence or counter-violence. The state of emergency which the State President declared on 20 July 1985 date retarded the reform programme. The violence which the ANC Mission in Exile uses and the violence which the UDF uses in their own brand of the politics of intimidation, retard the programme of reform which should be emerging in South Africa. And Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not here talking about reform as though reform in this country can be initiated only by the State President. A spirit of reform has emerged and ordinary South Africans are shifting their positions about apartheid, and it is in fact true to say that the demand for reform is steadily out-distancing the State President's reform initiatives. The State President wants reform 'a la National Party or nothing. The support of his own Party members will tire of waiting for reform. There is a groundswell demand that our country be normalised as a modern industrial democracy. Violent action on the part of the Government only produces ever increasing counter-violence, and the upward spiralling of violence counter-violence moves ever further away from the reform process. The State President cannot attend to the problems of administration in Black areas without becoming increasingly violent. The State President must now understand that we cannot govern Blacks unless they want to be governed. They do not want to be governed by apartheid. The State President will not gain Black co-operation by the increased use of violence. Unless ordinary Blacks in our townships perceive the State President as a true reformer, anarchy will continue spreading. The police and the army cannot turn the clocks back. Times have changed and the sooner the State President accepts this fact the better it will be for South Africa.

It is the politics of prescription which leads to states of emergency being declared. The new constitution fuelled the fires of Black anger because it was rammed down their throats. It was extreme political poverty of thought which attempted to change constitution in this day and age in which Blacks can no longer be dictated to. I called for a moratorium on constitutional developments until consensus has been achieved between Black and White about what needs to be done in this country. I was ignored and the State President went ahead with his constitutional changes thinking that he could make the new constitution workable without Black approval. The new constitutiuon just has not worked. It is kept intact thus far, yes, but it has been kept intact to continue stimulating Black anger and determination no longer to be dictated to.

There are, ...12/

There are, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, a great many Whites in South Africa who conceive of progress in reform as measured by the extent to which the Government is making political statements which differ from the statements made by previous National Party governments. When the State President said in his opening address to Parliament that apartheid is outdated, he made no reform step at all. That kind of statement is only a step in preparation to take a step in reform. If you multiply those statements many times you still have not taken a step in reform. Talk about reform is not reform. Black South Africa looks at progress in reform on two levels. There is the level in which reform is judged to be meaningful or not to the extent that it alleviates suffering, or opens up opportunities in which people can do something to alleviate their own suffering. At the other level Blacks judge reform in terms of the extent to which it addresses fundamental issues, not in sentiment but in practice. On the first level, the State President has made some moves, but there is the tragic possibility that the State President has actually no real intentions of addressing the fundamental problems of the country.

It is only full political rights for Blacks and total social and economic freedom that can salvage our country from a violent and horrible end. The refusal of the State President to take meaningful action on this second level is downgrading the actions that he has taken on the first level. It is already said in some Black political quarters that action on the first level is simply designed to make the chains of bondage more comfortable, and that they should be rejected with contempt. If the situation continues to be characterised by a refusal to take meaningful action on the second level, that sentiment will grow. There is already an all or nothing element spreading in the thinking of Black people. The ANC Mission in Exile say the only thing there is to negotiate about is the handing over of power to the people. They say they are not prepared to talk to the State President about governing the country after power has been handed over to the people. They say it is not the concern of the South African Government how the country will be governed in the future. They say that what happens between the people and a future ANC Government is between the masses and the ANC. This all or nothing demand will become increasingly persuasive amongst the country's Black population as time passes, if the State President does not move on to the second level of reform.

In the new constitution the State President demands all for Whites. The new constitution entrenches Whites as having final decision-making power in 87 percent of the country and over the totality of things which make for the formulation of domestic and foreign policy. The new constitution panders to the White perception that Whites have historical right by conquest and occupation to 87 per cent of the country, and over all its wealth.

We are thus 13/

We are thus confronted with two all or nothing demands. Whites demand total control over the country, and the ANC Mission in Exile demands total control over the country. These kind of all or nothing demands in our circumstances are the kind of demands which spawn civil war which will reach the proportions of a racial holocaust. These are the demands which created the log-jam and whether the State President likes it or not, he is going to be judged by history very severely if he does not become an equal patner with Blacks in breaking the log-jam. While that log-jam exists the upward spiralling of violence will not be broken, and while the upward spiralling of violence is not broken, the politics of negotiation will continually be downgraded.

I have again and again stated that politics is about the realities of today. Idealistic pie-in-the-sky politics about tomorrow never achieve anything. Reality demands that we today look at the need for power-sharing between Black and White as the first step towards the final liberation of South Africa. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, the South African Government and the ANC Mission in Exile are enacting an unholy partnership in retarding the development towards a situation in which meaningful power-sharing between Black and White can be achieved through the politics of negotiation and compromise.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I think it is necessary to spell out to White South Africa the circumstances as we see them, in which the politics of negotiation can get off the ground. Whites need to understand that it is the State President who is making the politics of negotiation impossible. Within what the State President has already said there are no prospects of power-sharing at all. There will be no power-sharing in this country if it is not power-sharing between equals. We have a long history in our country which spells out the futility of benevolent paternalism. Blacks simply do not want things done for them because it is good for them. There can be no power-sharing which is really meaningful which is not based on universal adult franchise. There can be no power-sharing unless there is one sovereign parliament within which to share power. The distinction between the division of power and power-sharing escapes the States President. When power is divided equally, it is shared. When power is not shared equally, it is divided. The only reason to avoid power-sharing and to talk about dividing power, is because you want to give one party more power and another party less power. While the State President conceives of South Africa as a country in which there is no majority and while he conceives of South Africa as a country of minorities, and while he does so within a context in which different minorities have different rights to different parts of the territory of the country, he is doing no more than recasting apartheid and the homeland policy in a different mould.

Decade after ...14/

Decade after decade of National Party rule has continually eroded Black political options. The final outcome of this process of erosion will be one in which Black South Africans have no option but to resort to violence to bring about change. Many Blacks feel that this position has already been reached. We, Mr. Speaker, in this House and in Inkatha, however, know that this is not the case. Everything I have said today about our State President indicates that I am fearful that this may be the case sooner than some think. It is, however, certainly not the case now. The forces of non-violence in South Africa, remain far more potent as forces of change than violent forces are now or have ever been in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we in this House are as angry as any Black in the country. We pursue our objectives as angry men and women. As Black South Africans we are as appalled as any Black is appalled that in this modern day and age we are still talking about the need to do things which the present White generations' forefathers should long since have done. Our anger, however, is more calculating than most, and it gives us in this House a deeper commitment to the things that are noble, than is apparently the case in many other places in Black South Africa. Mr. Speaker, we bear the responsibility of leading massive constituencies. I for one can certainly not afford to be foolish in my analysis of the South African situation. I have just too many people who are supporting me. I will not act to lead them up the garden path. In my leadership I am committed to tactics and strategies which can work, and what is more which can work not only to eradicate apartheid for the scourge that it is, but to build on the foundations that our heroes and martyrs laid down in the past.

Society is not a thing written on a blackboard which can be wiped clean and re-written to the dictates of any formula you choose. When I look at change, I talk within the realities of the South African situation. Those realities dictate that unless our political victory over apartheid brings about national reconciliation, they will be empty victories. We struggle to liberate our country from apartheid, knowing full well that we have also to liberate our country from any other form of racism, Black or White, and to banish poverty, ignorance and disease. We do not wage a narrow-focussed battle on apartheid. Those who do so have a latitude of action we do not have. Those who are stupidly unaware of the need to build on the foundations laid in the struggle for liberation a long time ago, can talk about the destruction of the economy as a means of bringing about the Government's downfall and eliminating apartheid. Those who think that South Africa's society is written on a slate, and that the slate can be wiped clean with violence and re-written in idealistic, socialist terms, are blind to the realities of our country. They are blind to the history of man, and they are blind to the history of our beloved African continent.

We in this 15/

We in this House, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, have grown in power because we work within the world of realities. Our politics is constituency politics. It is the politics of non-violent tactics and strategies which actually works in the market-places of the country. Democratic opposition to apartheid is the only form of opposition which will bring about really meaningful change without destroying everything else worth having.

We are committed to the normalisation of South Africa as a modern industrial State. As we pursue objectives in this direction, we gain ever increasing support in ever expanding constituencies because this is what ordinary South Africans across all colours actually want as their first choice. A great many of those who are now attempting to bring about change through violence, or are dabbling in its employment, would cross sides and join those who support us if there was even a little more evidence that South Africa could be normalised through non-violent tactics and strategies. The vast, vast majority of Black people do not yearn for a Communist or Socialist state. They yearn for a normalised South Africa in which they can be truly free. They yearn for a normalised industrial society in which there is equality of opportunity. Groundswell demand for a normalised South Africa is ever increasingly becoming groundswell support for the tactics and strategies we pursue. Ever increasing support for the process of normalising South Africa will not only come from within South Africa in ever increasing measures. The process of normalising South Africa will also ever increasingly be supported by a Western industrial world. We either choose the course of violence and seek the support of the Soviet Union, or we seek to bring about change through non-violent tactics and strategies to normalise our country, and seek Western industrial support.

No country in the world is an island unto itself. Every African State which has gained its independence from colonial domination, is located in an international setting beyond the shores of Africa. The whole of Africa needs to be industrialised, and States in Africa which seek to expand their industrial bases can only seek to do so by Western involvement in their economic development. Africa needs Western technology and it needs Western investments and the managerial skills which come from those investments. I stand in very good company among African Heads of State when I say that industrial expansion is essential. African Heads of State have learnt that socialism and communism does not give rise to flourishing industrial societies on African soil. Americans are not undemocratic because their democratic institutions are different from those in, say, West Germany. Industrial democracies take many forms and when we struggle to eradicate apartheid and establish a new South Africa with a flourishing industrial base, we are not unAfrican.

The National ... 16/

The National Party itself will need massive Western industrial support if the State President's reform programme is going to succeed. It has now also learnt that South Africa is not an island unto itself. It is not changing Government policy which has made it realise that apartheid is not vulnerable to Western pressures. Economic realities have overtaken apartheid and the National Party now knows that it is not free to do what it wants in South Africa.

Those in South Africa who are truly committed to the eradication of apartheid and the normalisation of our country as a modern industrial democracy hold the key to the future which the West desires for us not only for themselves but for our sakes as well. Western vested interests coincide with our vested interests.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I always report back to you after I have been abroad, just as I report back to Inkatha and to Black South Africa. Since this House rose last year I have had personal discussions with Mrs Margaret Thatcher at her request. When she was preparing for the Commonwealth Conference, she sought a discussion with me about the future of South Africa because she knew that it would figure prominently on the Commonwealth Conference agenda. I had a long discussion with her at No. 10 Downing Street. This is what I said to her:

MEMORANDUM FOR PRESENTATION TO THE RT. HON. MRS. MARGARET THATCHER, MP, PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN, DURING A VISIT TO LONDON BY MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI, CHIEF MINISTER OF KWAZULU, PRESIDENT OF INKATHA AND CHAIRMAN, THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK ALLIANCE
AUGUST 1985

In June 1984, the State President, Mr. P.W. Botha - then Prime Minister - visited Britain and Europe and met with a number of Heads of Government. This trip of his followed on the Referendum held in South Africa in November the previous year in which White South Africa had given him a massive endorsement of the new constitution under which the present South African Tricameral Parliament now operates. At the time, various Western Heads of State and Foreign Offices expressed cautious optimism that at last the South African Government had taken a small step in the right direction by including Indian and Coloured people as junior partners in governent. Mr. P.W. Botha's European trip was specifically designed to use his success in the Referendum campaign to buy time for South Africa, and to drive home the advantages which the cautious but positive responses by a number of Western Governments held for him.

I was deeply concerned about the misinterpretation of the constitutional developments in South Africa by people in so many

quarters and ... 17/

quarters and I wrote a short Memorandum to the Heads of States whom Mr. Botha would be seeing, about the constitutional developments which were taking place. In that Memorandum I said:

> "I believe it is important for Western Heads of State to know that the South African Government is continuing to pursue policies which must necessarily lead to disaster and that it is in Western national and international interests that Western Heads of State tax Mr. Botha on some issues.
>
> Firstly, there is the new constitution. The new constitution permanently excludes Blacks from having any say in the government of 87 per cent of the land and therefore in the policies which determine how the country's national wealth, the country's internal policies, and the country's foreign policy are determined. The new constitution is based on repugnant racism and gives Whites a constitutionally entrenched right to rule over Blacks in their midst in perpetuity. So-called White South Africa now has, and will ever increasingly have, a population which is numerically dominated by Blacks. The White controlled new tricameral parliament will remain a minority government and will continue to violate the most fundamental of Western democratic principles. Western Heads of State should know that the new constitution is a prescription for violence and that it pulls the rug from beneath the feet of responsible Black leaders such as myself ...."

I believe that events in South Africa since mid-1984 have shown that my concerns expressed in this Memorandum were fully justified. Instead of buying time for progress towards normalising South Africa, the new constitution had bought time towards the evolution of violence. During the Referendum campaign, I did everything I could possibly do to warn White South Africa that a Yes vote in favour of the new constitution would deepen Black anger, and would widen the chasm between Black and White which successive apartheid Governments in South Africa had created. I warned that the new constitution was a prescription for violence and that nothing that the Government had done, and nothing in the new constitution, addressed the central questions in South Africa which revolve around the disenfranchisement of 72 per cent of the population and their exclusion from any meaningful participation in the Government of their country.

Those warnings were not heeded and today we have the tragic evidence that my fears were fully justified. Black anger has risen sharply across the length and breadth of South Africa and not only have the levels of violence and the spread of violence used for political purposes now risen to historically unprecedented heights, but the ugliness of violence being employed

for political ...18/

for political purposes, has deepened tragically. The vast range of repressive measures made available to the Government through Draconian laws which have been passed over decades of National Party rule, have proved insufficient to contain Black anger. The State President has now had to declare a state of emergency in 36 magisterial districts which has resulted in between eight and nine million South Africans living in circumstances which characterise the worst of Police States.

The upward spiral of violence employed for political purposes in South Africa will only be broken if the South Africa now turns to address the fundamental issues which White South Africa needs to face up to. The Government needs to address the question of giving Blacks a say in the Government of their country. Unless this is done, and done boldly and soon, the forces working for non-violent, democratic solutions leading to politics of negotiation will suffer irreparable harm.

It is in these circumstances, Madam Prime Minister, that I so deeply appreciate the opportunity of meeting with you to talk about South and Southern Africa. Whatever happens in South Africa has ramifications for the whole of the sub-continent and for a very wide range of Western interests in South and Southern Africa. The sense of gratitude that I am conveying is more than a sense of gratitude borne out of your recognition, Madam Prime Minister that I and Inkatha are playing a positive role in South Africa. My gratitude runs deeper than that. My ancestors fought wars against British armies. We were subjugated by Great Britain, and the might of the Zulu empire was smashed by Britain and my forefathers and their people were handed to racist White political control by British action in South Africa which led to the formation of the Union of South Africa in 1910. I am indeed grateful that today you as head of the country which thus once subjugated my people and handed us over to be brutalised by racism, can meet in friendship and common concern about what is happening today. I am totally convinced that the lack of permanent enmity and hatred which could have characterised my attitude to you, and could be generalised as an attitude amongst the Zulu people towards Great Britain, could be equally apparent in future attitudes towards White South Africa, if the South African Government followed the wisdom of Britain and withdrew from racist policies.

I pursue policies of democratic opposition to apartheid, and I remain committed to non-violent tactics and strategies, because unless Black South Africa wins the struggle for liberation through these means, we will be left with an aftermath of bitterness and hatred which will take generations to dissipate.

Despite the upward spiralling of violence in South Africa, there remains even today the kind of goodwill among Black South

Africans 19/

Africans which has resulted in my leadership and Inkatha's aims and objectives being supported by a card-carrying membership of over a million people. Beyond these card-carrying members there is a further vast Black South African support and sympathy amongst those who are not yet card-carrying members. No party political machine is capable of doing more than actually enrolling but a proportion of the total potential support for a political programme. Inkatha's membership makes it the largest Black political organisation ever to have emerged in the history of South Africa. It is a genuine voice of the people and Inkatha is a genuine cross-section of Black South Africa. It reflects demographic realities; it is dominated numerically by peasants and workers; it is representative of every class of Black South Africans and it is supported as much in the urban areas as it is in rural areas. Inkatha's aims and objectives and its statement of belief are compatible with the best principles of democratic government that have been evolved by the Western industrialised world.

I see South Africa locked into a north/south axis by history itself, and I see the natural destiny of the people of South Africa as a destiny within the international Western industrial sphere of interest. It is in this context that the value of Inkatha must be seen. It is a mass movement which is truly democratic. Its policies and its tactics and strategies are in principle and in practice determined by Annual General Conferences which take place each year. It is a grass root political movement in which the people themselves elect to follow the courses they follow and elect leaders to pursue tactics and strategies they have determined to further the causes which revolve around their aspirations. I say nothing and I do nothing outside the mandate which is given to me by my massive Black constituency. Every point of view, Madam Prime Minister, that I express today is a point of view which is an Inkatha point of view and a point of view which has not only been endorsed by Inkatha's leadership and its Annual General Conferences, but which has also been endorsed by mass meetings I hold across the country.

There are other Black voices. Inkatha is not the only political group. There are other Black views about what should and should not happen, but there is no voice to equal Inkatha's voice in terms of being a voice determined by ordinary Black people.

I am now daily being made aware of the fact that unless the South African Government now takes very early and bold steps towards normalising South Africa, as a modern, industrialised, democratic state, there will be increased radicalisation in Black politics, and the upward spiral of violence for political purposes which we are now witnessing, will succeed in making South Africa ungovernable, not only for the National Party, but for any future Government - whether it be Black or White.

If South ..20/

If South Africa has any future at all worth having, that future will have to be characterised by a constitution which enshrines genuine democratic principles and practices and which gives rise to genuine democratic government, and which will also have to be characterised by a real and continued increase in the quality of life for ordinary people. After the struggle for liberation in South Africa has been won, we will have to face the heritage of poverty and despair among the masses which apartheid has already bequeathed to the country. We as Black South Africns therefore dare not involve ourselves in tactics and strategies which undermine demoracy and which destroy the productive capacity of the South African economy. This is a message I constantly deliver to my people. I say to them that there is no easy solution to the South African problem; I say to them that there will be no overnight victory; and I say to them that after the political victory, there will be continued poverty for a considerable time to follow and that they must accept there is no Utopian future. I argue that socialist and communist doctrines contain no magic which will solve South Africa's problems, and that the free enterprise system and enlightened capitalism, leading to a massive development of the South African economy, are things that Black South Africa simply has to accept. In our circumstances, the free enterprise system is the most potent force of development available to us.

I am also deeply convinced that White South Africa would rather adopt a scorched earth policy, and destroy the future for everyone, than capitulate now immediately to a one-man-one-vote system of government in a unitary state. Black South Africa has cherished the ideal of a one-man-one-vote system in a unitary state for generations. I argue, I plead and I cajole with Black South Africans, that if we are to avoid destroying the foundations of the future, we must commit ourselves to the politics of negotiation and we must be prepared to compromise wherever compromises can possibly be made without them being self-defeating. I and millions of Black South Africans are prepared at this point in time to shelve our ideal of a one-man-one vote system of government in a unitary state if negotiations between Blacks and Whites can begin to find a compromise solution aceptable to all population groups. One-man-one-vote in a unitary state will always be our cherished ideal. But I believe it can be shelved for now in order to make a start where a start is possible.

I have already gone as far as it is humanly possible for me to go towards establishing the basis of real negotiations in South Africa. I believe that it is vital for the future of South Africa for every leader, whether he or she be Black, White, Coloured or Indian to reduce the list of non-negotiables to the barest possible minimum, which they will have to take to the conference table. I and the vast majority of Black South Africans are prepared to negotiate, and we are prepared to limit our list of

non-negotiables ...21/

non-negotiables.

I insist only that whatever negotiations do take place recognises that South Africa is one country, with one people, who have together but a single destiny; and that negotiations should be directed at tangible progress towards normalising South Africa.

I have only had one single formal discussion with the State President of South Africa once in the last four and a half years, and I have only seen him once informally during that period of time. It was after my formal meeting with him in May this year, and it was after I had repeatedly offered to enter the politics of negotiation, that the State President in an interview with Mr. Brian Walden which was televised in Britain and South Africa, said that he would not accept a single South Africa, whether it be a unitary state, or whether it be a federal union. If the President is incapable of even entertaining thoughts of talking about one South Africa, with one people, under one government, then as far as I am concerned there is nothing left to talk about. If there are to be any negotiations in South Africa worth having, they must be negotiations to find feasible and practical ways and means of giving constitutional expression to these very simple and basic demands.

The present parliamentary system locates the final deciding power over 87 per cent of the country, over all its wealth, and therefore over its fiscal policy and its internal and foreign policy, in the White Chamber of the Tricameral Parliament. On no single occasion has the State President given any evidence of his willingness to entertain a future in which this 87 per cent of the country, which Whites claim as their own domain, is sacrificed in favour of a shared future for all. I believe, Madam Prime Minister, that you and other Heads of Western Governments, should be made aware of the fact that whatever reforms are being introduced, and however meaningful those reforms are in fact in the daily lives of Black people, unless the Government of South Africa is prepared to begin meaningful negotiations with Blacks, there can only be an escalation of violence. As a Black leader, I ask you Madam Prime Minister, to exert every pressure on the South African Government available to you to begin formal negotiations with Black leaders who recognise the need for Whites to relinquish the monopoly of power they enjoy in South Africa.

There is in South Africa already a significant body of Black opinion which has already finally concluded that there are no prospects of bringing about change through negotiation and this has already resulted in South Africa having entered the first phase of civil war. The unprecedented current levels of violence used for political purposes is ever-increasingly expressing itself more in Black/Black confrontations than in Black/White confrontations or Black confrontations with the Government. The

African National .. 22/

African National Congress Mission-in-Exile is seeking to make South Africa ungovernable by encouraging Black South Africans, and particularly the youth, to kill any Black who opposes them and who is prepared to work towards compromise solutions. The ANC's Mission-in-Exile sees the armed struggle as the primary means of bringing about change, and it intends using the resources for violence at its disposal to further revolutionary aims which will in the end ensconce it as a post-liberation government. Those committed to the armed struggle and to the employment of violence for political purposes, will ever-increasingly become intolerant of any success in the politics of negotiation. The ANC's Mission-in-Exile is not seeking a compromise solution. It is driven by winner-takes-all revolutionary fires, and we face the tragic reality in South Africa that the destruction of the politics of compromise and negotiation is becoming of prime concern to the ANC's Mission-in-Exile.

It is in a very real sense of the concept that I say that South Africa has already entered the first phase of civil war, and that what was a struggle against apartheid is now becoming a struggle to thwart democratic opposition to apartheid. It is in this context that I am asking you, Madam Prime Minister, to exert every possible pressure on Pretoria to strengthen the politics of negotiation by insisting that the State President declare his intention to negotiate with Blacks about the future of South Africa as one country, with one people who share one destiny. I believe that President Reagan has embarked on a course of action in his constructive engagement policy which could acumulate the kind of pressures which we so badly need in South Africa. Whether or not the American party political scene permits this policy of ever evolving into anything meaningful remains to be seen, and I am concerned about the fact that apartheid is being drawn into American party politics. I am also concerened about statements now increasingly being made by the Labour Party members of the British Labour Party are adopting stances and making statements which if continued will accumulate advantages for those committing South Africa to civil war, and to the solution of South Africa's problems through the armed struggle and through generalised violence.

I as a Black political leader in South Africa am aware of the role that the British Government played to end hostilities between Black and White in Zimbabwe. I am aware, Madam Prime Minister, that it was your Cabinet which pursued the diplomatic endeavours which led to the Lancaster House negotiations. Black South Africa regards it as a very considerable achievement, and it has encouraged us to think that British diplomacy, which has accumulated its own distinctive nature over the centuries, remains a vital force in the Western world which could yet play a distinctive role in South Africa. I do not draw naive parallels between what was required in Zimbabwe to bring about a cessation

of hostility ... 23/

of hostilities and what is now required in South Africa to bring about the de-escalaion of violence and the promotion of the politics of diplomacy. Nor am I ignoring the constitutional role, and the role in international law, within which British diplomacy brought about a settlement in Zimbabwe. I am simply referring to the value of Britain as an honest broker in international diplomacy and I am expressing faith that Britain could fulfill the role of an honest broker in South Africa and between South Africa and the West.

I have admired, Madam Prime Minister, the extent to which you and your Government have refused to bow to pressure to take indiscriminate action simply because apartheid is morally repugnant. In a sense, there may now be a ripeness of time in which diplomacy could be more effective than it was in the past.

Black South Africans have always seen the West as toothless when it came to dealing with apartheid. Apartheid under the National Party has grown vigorously and has thrived for over 37 years, despite all the moral and diplomatic pressure which has been exerted on successive National Party Governments. It would be tragic for South Africa and the whole of Southern Africa, if Britain and its allies failed to make the combined weight of Western pressure on the South African Government an ever-increasingly positive factor in bringing about meaningful change in my country, now that there is greater fluidity in the South African situation.

Statesmanship demands that apartheid is condemned and that opposition to apartheid is strengthened in such a way that the politics of negotiation are furthered, and the democratic future of South Africa is assured. Apartheid is so abhorrent that just simply any measure against it is seen as justified by some in the West. I have no doubt that there are many in the British Labour Party, and even, Madam Prime Minister, amongst your rank and file party members, who are genuinely indignant about apartheid and in whom that indignation gives rise to irresponsible action in supporting the forces of destruction in South Africa.

This has become very apparent in the disinvestment debate in the United States, and it is very apparent in much of the activity of pressure groups in Great Britain and Wesern Europe. There is too much at stake, not only for millions in South Africa, but for the whole sub-continent of Southern Africa for Western indignation to give rise to indiscriminate action against apartheid.

The recent indignation by France which has led to the recalling of its Ambassador from South Africa will be applauded by many Black South Africans merely for its symbolic importance. This kind of European reaction to current events will send shock waves through White South Africa. When, however, the French associate their

indignation ... 24/

indignation with a high political symbolic value for those committed to the struggle for liberation, with the further action of prohibiting any further investment in South Africa, their action becomes a double-edged sword which hurts both Black and White, and which strengthens the revolutionary forces in the country working against democracy. I am pursuing a path of non-violent, democratic opposition to the Government precisely because I see this as the only way of preserving the future. Vast backlogs in Black housing, health services and welfare, and in such things as education, can only be wiped out sometime in the future if the South African economy grows at its maximum possible rate. Any move against South Africa which damages its economy now, is a move which will damage the prospects of a worthwhile future. I am pursuing the politics of negotiation because I do not want to reduce South Africa to ungovernability, and this is what mass poverty will do some time in the future if the country's economic growth base is damaged now.

Inkatha holds an Annual General Conference every year and at every one of these Conferences, I inform delegates what I have said on their behalf on the question of disinvestment. I inform them that I tell the world:

- that ordinary Black South Africans still seek a negotiated settlement and seek to pursue non-violent tactics and strategies;

- they know the meaning of poverty and are aware of the fact that if they do not have work they suffer terrible deprivation and that therefore any strategy which results in a decrease in the number of jobs available to Blacks is rejected by Blacks;

- Blacks in South Africa who have jobs with foreign companies would never be persuaded to relinquish their jobs to further the aims and objectives of those who pursue the disinvestment lobby;

- that no membership-based Black organisation in South Africa has an executive with a mandate from its members to call for disinvestment;

- that Black protest politicians who are not involved in constituency politics but who are involved in voicing Black grievances in a manner calculated to gain media acclaim, are more prone to call for disinvestment than other leaders;

- that every leader of an organisation working to make this country ungovernable and who is prepared to use violence, whether it be mob violence or armed violence, to bring about political change, argues for disinvestment.

that there ...25/

- that there is no prospect of the armed struggle succeeding within the foreseeable future and that we therefore will have to rely on the politics of negotiation; and that the politics of negotiation are favoured by what has now become a total dependence by White South Africa on Black South Africa;

- that Black bargaining power is increased by Black economic advancement and vertical mobility which accompanies it;

- that it is the responsibility of Black South Africans to liberate South Africa from apartheid oppression in such a way that we do not force on neighbouring Black States, and States further afield in Southern and Central Africa, to pay the costs of our struggle;

- I tell them that we respect the national choices of Black States in Southern Africa and that we have no quarrel with those who have opted for a socialist future under a one-Party state, but that that is not a viable option for us; and that the benefits we will derive from working within a race-free, democratic state in which there will be equality for all, and in which the principles of the free enterprise system will dominate in government planning, will have a very significant spill-over benefit for other States in Southern Africa.

I will report to my constituency, Madam Prime Minister, what I have said to you today about disinvetment. I will do so at Inkatha's Central Committee; and I will do so at mass meetings I hold in various places in the country, including Soweto which is in South Africa's industrial heartland. Wherever I do so, I will receive mass acclaim for the sentiments I am expressing.

Western industrialised countries which are moving towards banning future investment in South Africa, or even worse to withdrawing existing investment, and which regard Black opinion among rank and file workers and peasants as irrelevant, stand in the very real danger of pursuing aims and objectives which conflict with what is beneficial in our struggle for liberation. And in this vein, I would like to make an additional point. I am beginning to hear more and more arguments in favour of selective disinvestment because many of the points I have made above are taken and it is naively believed that, for example, prohibition of further investment in capital intensive industries, is warranted. Every Western Government knows that economies are not maleable things and cannot be turned on or off at will, and can only be directed towards political ends with very limited success. The naivety of some who think they can damage one part of the economy without it having repercussions for another part of the economy, is to me alarming. I am most certainly open to persuasion that one or another form of disinvestment may put pressure on Pretoria without damaging the economy, or causing greater Black suffering. I

argue against .. 26/

argue against disinvestment because it has these negative effects. Any sanctions against South Africa which would not harm the growth of the economy, but which would exert pressure on Pretoria, would be welcome by every Black South African. I have always spoken against irresponsible exploitative capitalism, but that to me is another debate entirely.

There is also a ripeness of time in which blunders would lead to irrecoverable losses. The West should realise that the threat of violence, and the threat of economic sanctions has more utility than the employment of violence and the implementation of damaging sanctions. The West should also realise that as soon as sanctions do begin to bite, it is Black South Africa which will bear the brunt of the burden. The West should also realise that the South African Government is quite capable of taking retaliatory measures of the most despicable kind. If sanctions began to bite, and Blacks began to suffer the burden of those sanctions, Pretoria would have no scruples about repatriating more than a million workers in South Africa who come from neighbouring States. President Kaunda and President Banda unilaterally took action to stop the recruitment of mine workers in Zambia and Malawi. The South African Government is quite capable of taking reciprocal action and repatriating foreign workers. More than a million families would suffer increased deprivation in impoverished neighbouring States. I plead with the West not to push the whole of South Africa into an abyss because they underestimate the brutalilty with which Pretoria could respond in a situation in which very real threats became unbearable realities.

Today, after the signing of the Nkomati Accord, our brothers in Mocambique are developing trade links with South Africa. Despite the admirable stand of Zimbabwe on the issue of apartheid, economic realities are such that she still has a trade mission in Johannesburg. I often wonder, when sanctions are advocated, what countries such as Zimbabwe are supposed to do. Would Zimbabwe's trade mission in Johannesburg be expected to be withdrawn from South Africa when sanctions are applied? What will the international community actually do for citizens of Lesotho, Swaziland, Botswana and Mocambique, once Mr. Louis Nel's threat is carried out and citizens of these independent States in Southern Africa are actually deported out of South Africa? South Africa showed her claws recently when the Lesotho border was closed for a few days with resultant suffering of many Lesotho citizens and their families.

I am not saying that pressures should not be brought to bear on the South African polecat. All I am saying is that all of us who work for the destruction of the apartheid polecat should not be blinded by anger to the extent that we fail to examine carefully the consequences of every act we take in the process of doing so. I have become very skeptical on the issue of whether the West

would come ... 27/

would come to the rescue of more than a million citizens of these independent States when the crunch comes, and South Africa decides to expel them as a retaliatory act. I have become skeptical because I have not seen a single Western country do anything to the rogue elephant, which the South African Defence Force has been, when they have killed our brothers and sisters in countries such as Lesotho, Mocambique, Angola and Botswana.

Madam Prime Minister, the position the British adopted in last week's Security Council debate must be applauded, and I plead with you to withstand all party political pressures which may be exerted on you to continue to protect the prospects of British diplomacy being employed to assist in the non-violent resolution of the South African problem.

I am fully aware of the fact that even the maximum possible growth rate of the South African economy will leave a great many Black South Africans jobless for a very considerable time into the future. The Black birth rate in South Africa is approaching three per cent per annum, and already more than half of all Black South Africans are 15 years old and younger. This huge population bulge of millions of young people moving towards the market place, is going to create almost insoluble problems for whatever government rules South Africa. I am therefore aware that the development of an informal economy, and the development of self-help, schemes is vital for our future. I am also aware that the growth rate of the informal economy rises and falls as the growth rate of the formal economy rises and falls. Western governments should understand that the cause for which we all struggle in South Africa demands the maximisation of the West's input into the South African economy. Millions of people now, and future generations, will benefit from a vast inflow of capital into South Africa, and the inflow of new technology and managerial skills which will come with it.

I believe that in part President Reagan's policy of constructive engagement holds some promise for South Africa, because it is objective-orientated. Slamming down the equivalent of an iron curtain between the West and South Africa, is not helpful to the causes I serve. If you, Madam Prime Minister, and other Western leaders, were to direct your opposition to apartheid and to seek to bring the State President to the point where he can make a declaration of intent which leaders like myself could co-sign with him, you will achieve something of historic significance.

I isolate the State President's unwillingness to make such a declaration of intent as by far the most negative aspect of his whole political career and his current leadership of the country. I have been pleading with Mr. P.W. Botha to make a declaration of intent since he first took office as Prime Minister. Until he declares his willingness to negotiate about the future with Blacks

on terms they....28/

on terms they can accept - and which Whites will also accept - there is no hope of breaking the upward spiral of violence. For many years I have been loathe to put pen to paper and draft such a declaration of intent because ideally it should have come as a product of goodwill amongst Black and White leaders to enable them to get round a conference table. Because, however, the State President has so finally and clearly stated that he is not prepared to talk about one South Africa, I had reluctantly to succumb to pressures on me to draft such a declaration of intent. I have done so in order to produce a discussion document and to give content to the notion of a declaration of intent which could be debated and if necessary amended for acceptance. It reads as follows:

DECLARATION OF INTENT

We the undersigned hereby declare our commitment to serve God in obedience to His divine will for our country and together:

Recognise that:

- The history of mankind shows the need for adaptive change among all peoples and all nations.

- Nations grow in wisdom.

- Both mistakes and lessons not yet learned led to errors of judgement in the mainstream politics in both the Black and White sections of our society.

- The South African people are a family of mankind, seeking to live in harmony in the African community of nations and seeking to do so by expressing civilised ideals in the practical social, economic and political affairs of our country.

- The South African constitution as it is now written is by force of history and reality a first step in constitutional reform which urgently needs the second step to be taken of enriching the constitution to make it as acceptable to the broad mass of African opinion as it has been made acceptable to the broad mass of White opinion.

- The Westminster model of government was not ordained by God to be the only form of good government.

We therefore accept:

- The need to make the preamble to the South African constitution of equal value to all the groups and peoples of the country by enriching the clause: "To respect, to

further and ... 29/

further and to protect the self-determination of population groups and peoples" to include the notion that this can best be done by sharing power in such a way that no one group can dictate to any other group how to express its own self-determination.

- The need to preserve the constitutionality of the adaptive democratic process on which we will jointly rely in being subservient to the divine will for our country.

We will therefore together seek:

- To negotiate as leaders to amend the South African constitution to make it acceptable to all groups.

- To find an alternative political system to that which the world at large understands by the word 'apartheid' and also to seek an alternative political system in which universal adult sufferage is expressed in constitutional terms acceptable to all the peoples of South Africa.

- To use the opportunities presented in practical politics at first, second and third tier levels of government to fashion national unity by deepening the democratic process, and to use the democratic process in explorations of what needs to be done to get the people to legitimise the instruments of government.

We therefore pledge ourselves:

- To express national pride and patriotism by insisting that South Africans will decide South Africa's future in the acceptance of each other as individuals and groups and the acceptance of each other's cultural rights to be who they are.

- To start where we find ourselves in history and to move from there to build on all that is positive and valuable and to change that which is negative and undesirable.

- Each to work in our own constituencies to develop a South African pride in managing our own South African affairs in harmony with internationally accepted standards of civilised decency without being dictated to from without.

Having thus declared we stand together to defend our right even with our lives to take the steps and the time needed to establish consensus between groups and to win support for our joint efforts in the South African family of nations.

And furthermore to stand together to defend South Africa from

external onslaughts ... 30/

external onslaughts and to stand together to resist any use of violence which threatens the politics of negotiation aimed at national reconciliation.

****

It is my carefully considered judgement that all Black leaders committed to the politics of negotiation could sell such a declaration of intent to their supporters, and I am totally convinced that Mr. P.W. Botha could in fact sell this declaration of intent to their supporters, and I am totally convinced that Mr. P.W. Botha could in fact sell this declaration of intent, and I would find it a most valuable contribution if you would find it possible to endorse the kind of endeavours within which I found it necessary to draft the declaration. I am seeking to establish points of consensus across Black/White political chasms in South Africa. I believe it is the kind of document which, if signed by the State President, would make the West believe that he is serious about leading South Africa to reform. I am, Madam Prime Minister, not asking for an endorsement by your Government of this specific wording of a declaration of intent that is now needed. I am simply asking that the British encourage the emergence of a consensus document, as a compromise consensus document, which could be accepted by all population groups and which would encourage the West to believe that there is hope for the future.

--------0--------

I think it is important that I share with you the details of what I say to Heads of Government in North America, Britain and Europe. Propaganda against me, Mr. Speaker, reaches very vicious heights at times, and very frequently I am accused of not representing Black views. It is important that I report back to Black South Africa through this House, Mr. Speaker, so that every single Member knows what I have said on his or her behalf and on behalf of Black South Africa. There is freedom of speech in this House, Mr. Speker, and if there is anything that I have said to Mrs Thatcher which Members wish to question, they have the opportunity to do so. I try always to talk within the framework of consensus Black opinion, and I again and again test what I say abroad when I get home.

I was also invited to Israel in August 1985 by the Government of Israel. In Israel I met with the President, Dr. Herzog, Prime Minister Mr. Shimon Peres and Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Yitzhak Shamir. I was warmly received wherever I went. I met the Israeli Prime Minister in Tel Aviv, and this is what I said to him:

MEMORANDUM FOR 31/

MEMORANDUM FOR PRESENTATION TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL
BY MANGOSUTHU GATSHA BUTHELEZI: CHIEF MINISTER: KWAZULU
PRESIDENT OF INKATHA AND CHAIRMAN:THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK ALLIANCE

TEL AVIV: AUGUST 1985

The real tragedy of South Africa is the tragedy told in terms of the narrowing of options which Black political leaders have had to choose between over the last three quarters of a century. When the Act of Union created modern South Africa in 1910 and Blacks were excluded from the parliamentary process because they were denied the vote, the granting of even limited political participation would have satisfied the aspirations of the vast majority of leaders. In the early decades of the Union of South Africa, Black leaders could work for qualified franchise. Their demands were couched in liberal terms and they would have gone to any Conference without there being talk of non-negotiables.

Between 1910 and 1948 Blacks sought inclusion in the country's parliamentary system and in its institutionalised life. The strongest Black opposition accepted the country's parliamentary system and accepted the Western industrialised way of life which was emerging, whereas today Black leaders reject the country's constitution and no leader with any real following is seeking a compromise solution to enable Blacks to participate in the present Tricameral Parliament.

Black political leaders are necessarily faced with the responsibility of leading in such a way that not only do Blacks gain access to the parliamentary process, but that that process is acceptable to the majority of all race groups. It is in this context that I want to make a few remarks about my role in the South African struggle for liberation.

I am the Chief Minister of KwaZulu by popular election and I am the elected leader of Inkatha. I hold office because I am a democrat and have responded to popular demand to lead within democratically based institutional life in KwaZulu. I have also responded to popular demand in Inkatha and accepted nomination as President of Inkatha.

The KwaZulu Government over which I preside as Chief Minister is a regional government which is elected by popular vote. There have been two KwaZulu elections in which every KwaZulu adult citizen was eligible to vote, and in which Inkatha won every single seat. I was elected Chief Minister after both these landslide victories.

Inkatha is a democratic organisation; its supreme body is the Annual General Conference which not only decides who shall be leaders but which also dictates the policies and tactics and strategies in which elected leaders have to work. The President

of Inkatha ... 32/

of Inkatha and the main office bearers of the Movement are elected for a period of five years, and during the Movement's ten years of existence there has been overwhelming popular support for my Presidency. KwaZulu ccitizens number nearly six million people and Inkatha's paid-up membership has now passed the million mark. I make the point that I am responsible to vast constituencies in which there are genuine democratic checks and balances within which leadership operates. The points of view I express are points of view which are tested against opinion not only in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, and not only at Inkaha's Annual General Conferences, but at mass meeting which I hold across the country every year. What I say in this brief Memorandum is said because I have a mandate from ordinary people to say it.

My political enemies accuse me in terminology of their creation and their connotation, and describe me as a puppet and a stooge and they describe me as working within Government-created platforms. But it is precisely because I have a hereditary leadership role which dates back to KwaZulu antiquity, and it is precisely because I have opposed apartheid vehemently all my life that I have been elected by millions of ordinary Black South Africans to lead them. I make mention of this not because I feel the need to persuade you, Mr. Prime Minister, that I am a genuine Black leader in the South African struggle for liberation. You are informed, Sir, and you know what my position is. I make mention of these things because I want to say to you that Black South Africa supports my being here, and I want to give you the assurance that when the African National Congress Mission-in-Exile declares Israel to be the enemy of the people of South Africa, they do so for the consumption of Yassar Arafat and others, and they do not reflect Black public opinion in South Africa. I would not be here if popular Black opinion were hostile to my visit to Israel. There will no doubt be a hue and cry and accusations will be flung at me afresh that I am consorting with the mortal enemies of Black South Africa. These cries will rise because my leadership, which is right at the centre of gravity of the South African political situation, is effective and because the dominant role of Inkatha is becoming ever more prominent.

In my international diplomacy, I remain non-aligned. I seek to associate with those countries and leaders in the outside world who have something positive to offer in the development of South Africa as a country striving for a race-free, democratic future.

Inkatha is dominated by concerns about what is in South Africa's national interests, and I would like to discuss as briefly as the nature of the topic permits what is in South Africa's national interests.

Foundations for the future

Inkatha believes that those who are involved in leadership

positions in the struggle for liberation have to be aware that the way in which Black South Africa breaks the chains of social, political and economic bondage will determine the kind of future we are going to have. The tactics and strategies we employ now will determine what future South African Governments, whatever their ideological persuasions may be, and whatever policies they attept to implement, are able to do. Black South Africans are aware that their country will be the last on the continent of Africa to be liberated from White racist control. Our suffering has endured longer than the suffering of others, but we do have the advantage of learning from African history.

It is quite clear to me that political victories which have as their aftermath mass poverty and which have destroyed the means of production, result in post-victory governments attempting to govern what is ultimately ungovernable. Whether Governments are Marxist-based, socialist based or capitalist based, they cannot govern effectively if there is mass starvation and growing deprivation at interests so to conduct our struggle for liberation that we do not destroy the prospects of governability.

The uniqueness of the South African situation

South Africa is unique on the continent of Africa in having a really sophisticated central economy and it is unique in the sense that the foundations for future industrial expansion in South Africa are incomparably better than anywhere else on the continent. It is rank foolishness to ignore this fact and to pattern tactics and strategies in our struggle for liberation on models which have successfully led to the overthrow of colonialism elsewhere in Africa. I deny emphatically that South Africa is unique in the sense that the South African Government claims it is unique. The South African Government claims our country to be unique in defence of their refusal to implement the wisdom that has evolved over centuries in Western industrial democracies. There is no reason why a one-man-one-vote system of government in a unitary State cannot succeed in South Africa. There are no reasons why a federal solution, which is colour-blind, cannot succeed in South Africa. The point I make about South Africa's uniqueness is made on an altogether different plain. There is no prospect for as far as anyone can see into the future of an externally based armed struggle against apartheid succeeding and leading to the establishment of a revolutionary government returned from exile. We cannot repeat President Machel's success in South Africa. The tactics and strategies we evolve must be South African tactics and strategies which will serve South African realities.

Racial interdependence

Apartheid has polarised Black and White South Africa and the

escalation ... 34/

escalation of violence will inevitably lead to a Black/White confrontation in which both sides will adopt scorched earth policies, and establish circumstances in which there can be no possible victors. The chasm which has been created by apartheid between Black and White in South Africa needs to be bridged and the tactics and strategies we employ in the struggle for liberation must constantly take cognisance of this vital need.

The politics of confrontation and violence inside the country which is working in tandem with those committed to using the armed struggle as a primary means of liberating South Africa, can only further polarise society and reduce the prospects of any kind of worthwhile victory. Tactics and strategies in our struggle for liberation must be woven around the reality of interdependence between all the races of South Africa.

The industrialisation of South Africa.

Having seen what has happened across the length and breadth of Africa during the last 20 years, it is absolutely clear to me that unless Black South Africans accept the fact that history has locked our country into a global north/south axis, and unless they accept that our natural position in the international community is a position in which we are allied to global Western industrial democracies, there are no prospects of political victories resulting in anything but a vast increase in what is already desperate poverty and suffering.

The Black South African population constitutes something like 72 per cent of the total population. Roughly half of the country's Black population are already urbanised. There is a dramatic increase in the Black migration from rural areas to urban areas. Around every major town in the country vast squatter areas are developing. There are no prospects of rural areas becoming self-contained as far as the production of food and other necessities of life are concerned. The vast ghettoes housing millions of poverty-ridden Blacks demand a phenomenal rate of industrial development in South Africa. This will never take place if we do not do everything we can each day, each week, each month and each year from now onwards to benefit from South Africa's location in the north/south global axis.

The alienation of South Africa

Those who are attempting to alienate South Africa from the international community are gravely mistaken. The more South Africa is alienated from the Western industial democracies of the world, the more immune it will be to the kind of pressures which we need in the Black struggle. The total economic and political isolation of South Africa is sought by those who have declared their commitment to the armed struggle, and by those who seek to

make the country ... 35/

make the country ungovernable through the employment of violence. White South Africans cannot be punished into submission and the international community must realise that the need is not to punish White South Africa, but to strengthen Black South Africa in its democratic, non-violent demands for change.

Apartheid has excluded the majority of Blacks from any meaningful participation in the country's free enterprise system. The massive industrial development that has taken place in the country has primarily benefited Whites, and it is this fact which makes people blind to the reality that Black South Africans do not want the wealth now monopolised by Whites to be destroyed, they want rather to share the benefits of the wealth that is produced by the country. All those who lobby to support disinvestment as a tactic and strategy ignore the fact that Black South Africans are fighting for their portion of what is already a thin slice of bread. A redistribution of the total wealth of South Africa would only destroy any prospects of progress. We need the redistribution of opportunity to create wealth, and we need the redistribution of opportunity to benefit from wealth, but to take away the slice of bread which Whites are claiming as their own because they refuse to share it, is to take away from both Black and White.

Black South Africans are entitled to a fair share of the wealth of the country because they contribute their share in the production of that wealth. But to destroy the prospects of creating wealth is to destroy all prospects of ever having the future we are striving for.

The South African economy is indivisible. You cannot damage one portion of it without it having repercussions throughout the whole economy. Disinvestment, whether it be selective disinvestment or blanket disinvestment, will damage the prospects of the growth of the economy. Every Government of Western industrialised countries knows the extent to which economies are only minimally controllable. They cannot be switched on or off at will. The pace of economic development cannot be regulated at will. Economic growth is accumulative and Westen observers should understand that while there may be a limited utility in the threat of economic sanctions against South Africa, the actual implementation of the disinvestment campaign would be useless unless it hurt the economy, and if it hurt the economy, Blacks now would suffer far more than Whites.

The divide between Black South African leaders who champion the disinvestment cause and who reject it is a fundamental divide between protest politicians and politicians urging the use of violence for political purposes, and politicians working for non-violent means for bringing about radical change. I know of no mass meeting of Black South Africans which has given any Black

leader a mandate.. 36/

leader a mandate to work for the economic downfall of the country. No Black grass root orgnization of any magnitude has ever supported disinvestment as a strategy Black South Africa would endorse. Thousands of thousands of Blacks wait outside factory gates for vacancies they hope to fill. Blacks already in employment do not abandon their employment to support the disinvestment lobby. Unquestionably, disinvestment will lead to ever-heightening levels of Black unemployment.

The African National Congress Mission-in-Exile is working to destroy the country's economy. They are advising Black South Africans to sabotage the machinery of production, and they are seeking to create the kind of chaos in which the country will become ungovernable. If they succeed, they will not make it ungovernable for the National Party only. They will make the country ungovernable for subsequent governments for a long time to come.

Quite apart from these kind of considerations Inkatha's ledership realises that we cannot win the struggle for liberation through an armed struggle and that we will have to use non-violent, democratic means of bringing about radical change. We lso realise that it is well-nigh impossible to mobilise Black communities into effective opposition for the politics of negotiation if they are totally demoralised by mass poverty and the want and disease which accompanies it.

There is now a total interdependence between Black and White in South Africa and this interdependence is beginning to create the circumstances in which the politics of negotiation is favoured. The stimulation of the South African economy into maximum possible growth rates is urgently needed to develop Black bargaining powers in a situation in which they become ever-increasingly indispensible for the production of wealth. This is not just a vague generalisation. It is a pertinent political statement of the fact that the upward vertical mobility among Black South Africans generates the kind of forces which accumulate to broaden bargaining bases. The greater the stake Blacks have in the economy, the more bargaining power they will have. Economic expansion from now onwards must necessarily ever-incresingly have vital spin-off benefits for Blacks. The economy has reached the point when any future expansion must necessarily draw substantial numbers of skilled workers, and draw managers out of foremen. The ever-increasing upward vertical mobility of Blacks will weigh the scales in favour of the politics of negotiation.

There are existing backlogs which even the most enlightened Government could not eliminate within the foreseeable future unless economic expansion takes place at an unprecedented rate. Any damage to the real potential growth rate of the economy will push the prospects of eliminating these huge backlogs into the unforeseeable future.

Economic ... 37/

Economic sanctions have not worked anywhere in the world, and while Western governments are entitled to express their indignation about apartheid in South Africa in ways and means they see fit, they must be made aware that if they express indignation by applying economic sanctions against South Africa, they act in callous disregard of the wishes and the well-being of ordinary Black peasants and workers.

There is generalised poverty across the whole of Southern Africa. Mocambique is now facing mass starvation in the foreseeable future. Every neighbouring State depends for survival on the spin-off benefits of the South African economy. Inkatha's leadership is aware that the disinvestment campaign is not only detrimental to the interests of Black South Africans, but ultimately detrimental to the interests of Blacks in the whole of the sub-continent. Southern Africa is a natural economic universe in which inter-related and interlocked economies desperately depend on the generating capacity of the South African economy being steadily increased. The industrialisation of the whole sub-continent depends on ever-increasing industrialisation in South Africa. South Africa is a development base for the whole of the sub-continent and it is only those who indulge in pipe-dreams of socialist and communist Utopias who regard the present South African economy, based on free enterprise and intergrated with Western industrial countries, as something which can be made a handmaiden to ideological designs.

It is tragic that I express the truth when I say that the disinvestment issue has ever-increasingly become a party political football in Western democracies. It is the Republican/Democrat confrontation in the United States which has dragged the disinvestment debate into the American political arena. There is genuine American disgust with apartheid, and there are those who naively think that support for disinvestment will assist the Black struggle for liberation, but prominent Americans who have had years of personal exposure in the political arena cannot claim to have this naivety. Western Governments owe it as a duty to South Africa and to Black South Africans to keep the disinvestment debate out of their party political arenas.

The choice between violent and non-violent tactics and strategies

The above factors dictate that leaders in the struggle for liberation de-escalate the present growth pattern of violence in South Africa and mount non-violent tactics and strategies which are capable of bringing about real reform. The politics of violence will destroy the foundations for the future and will only succeed if there is very substantial international support for violence and this is not going to be forthcoming from the West. The politics of violence necessarily involves leaders in alliances with international communist and socialist forces. On the other

hand, ... 38/

hand, non-violent tactics and strategies supporting the politics of negotiation, will not receive substantial backing from international communist and socialist forces, and must necessarily be allied to forces emanating from the Western industrialised world.

The South African struggle must be won by South Africans on the ground in South Africa. But the South African struggle is already internationalised and there is already a massive in-put from the communist and socialist world which supports the politics of violence. It is in South Africa's interests that leaders in the Black South African struggle for liberation adopt tactics and strategies which makes possible the mobilisation of every possible support from the Western industrial world. I do not believe that Black South African leaders have the luxury of choosing between one or another ideological persuasion.

The politics of negotiation

I am correct in what I have said above and this necessitates the recognition that leaders in the South African struggle for liberation need to work towards increasing Black South Africa's bargaining strength in the politics of non-violence. All too few recognise that the politics of negotiation necessitates the mobilisation of public opinion and the expanding of negotiating power bases. This process necessarily will involve Black leaders in employing democratic principles in constituency formation. The action which is needed to generate bargaining positions is preparatory action which will sustain the effort needed to put agreements reached around bargaining tables into practise. The preparation for the politics of negotiation, the process of negotiation and the implementation of negotiated deals, is all part and parcel of the politics of reconciliation which must emerge before negotiations, but which will only come into its own during negotiations and in post-negotiating situations.

Responsibilities towards the whole of Southern Africa

Black States bordering on South Africa which have struggled for and achieved political emancipation are poverty-stricken and if leaders in South Africa destroy the country's foundations of the future, they will not only be failing every South African, but they will be failing millions of people across a whole sub-continent. As a democrat I have a deep respect of a people's choice and I have always respected the Mocambican choice to pursue Marxist ideals in the reformation of their state. On the sub-continent of Southern Africa, every State must respect the national choices of other States, but unless there is a symbiotic relationship between all the States of Southern African, the sub-continent is headed towards a very austere future, to say the least. The wealth-generating capacity of South Africa needs to be

enhanced ... / 39/

enhanced in every possible way to make this symbiotic relationship between Southern African States a reality in the future.

The reality of the past and the present

It is not in the interests of South Africa to ignore history and to ignore realities around us. The politics of reconciliation must always begin with a recognition of that which is real. If there is going to be no overnight leap into a Utopian future; if there is still a long, hard, uphill road ahead of us; and if the politics of violence will destroy the future, the politics of negotiation must necessarily begin by accepting the need to make compromises in the here and now. I am totally convinced that if Blacks try to ram down White throats the cherished ideal of one-man-one-vote in a unitary state in the here or now, they will succeed only in exploding a racial time-bomb which is already very sensitively set. It is not in the national interests of South Africa for Blacks and Whites to confront each other with totally prohibitive non-negotiables. The politics of compromise is vitally necessary in the interests of the whole country.

Israel is a very distinctive country in the world, and the fire that burns in every Israeli breast would never tolerate the inhuman circumstances in which millions of Black South Africans have to live. Israel as much as any other country in the world knows the horrors of racism. Israel is committed to the free enterprise system and to an industrial way of life which we in South Africa so desperately need. Not only this, but Israel is also versed in the techniques of developing self-help schemes for those who are not fully utilised in the country's industrial life. I am in Israel today, Mr. Prime Minister, because I believe that Israel has something vital to offer in support to the politics of negotiation in South Africa. The Jewish community in South Africa has made its own very distinctive contribution to the development of South Africa's industrial base and to its growth potential, and they must now make a very distinctive contribution towards the rapid inclusion of Blacks in the free enterprise economy and in the democratic institutions of the country.

There is something like a three percent per annum growth rate of the Black population. Already over half of the total Black South African population is 15 years and younger. A huge population bulge is moving towards the market place, and the prospects of there being a sufficient number of jobs; the prospects of there being sufficient schools and adequate educational, health and welfare services, are exceedingly slight or non-existent. There is now a vast backlog in everything essential in life for Black South Africans. That backlog will grow. It is desperately urgent that everything humanly possible should be done to develop a massive growth in the country's informal economy and to develop every possible technique which can be employed by communities who

will be ... 40/

will be forced to help themselves because this Government or any government in the foreseeable future will be incapable of doing that which should be done.

The current situation within which Inkatha has to contend with South African imperatives.

The State President has thrown up a constitutional stone wall which is detrimental to the politics of negotiation. The country's present constitution gives Whites final decision-making powers over 87 per cent of the country; and therefore over virtually all its wealth and therefore over its fiscal, domestic and foreign policy. The Tricameral Parliament excludes the participation by Blacks in the parliamentary process in principle even in so-called White South Africa where the Government now recognises that their permanent presence is not only necessary but desirable. The right claimed by Whites to occupy, hold and rule 87 per cent of the surface area of South Africa provides an insurmountable stumbling block for the politics of reconciliation. The State President has not made a single utterance which entitles anyone to believe that he accepts the need for power-sharing between Black and White South Africans. He talks about Black constitutional development; he talks about the abolition of hurtful and discriminatory apartheid; he talks about the need for national reconciliation; he talks about negotiation between Black and White; he enunciates reform steps, but he does all these things within the four corners of classical apartheid which insists on final White control in 87 per cent of the country. I have gone as far as it is humanly possible for a Black leader with vast constituency support to go to make the politics of compromise and negotiation possible.

I, like millions of Black South Africans, cherish the ideal of one-man-one-vote in a unitary state, but I have said to the State President that I can shelve that ideal while we negotiate to see whether there is a compromise solution open to us. The ruling National Party must shelve the Afrikaner ideal, and to some extent the White South African ideal, of exercising exclusive political control in 87 per cent of the country. I have taken the necesary bold step forward. The State President needs to do the same. I know that I can sell a compromise solution to Black South Africa, if that solution recognises that South Africa is one country with one people, whom history has already dictated will share one destiny. The State President must move away from wanting only to divide power. He must take the necessary step towards making possible negotiations aimed at sharing power. I would shed overnight the vast Black support I now enjoy if I agreed to the fragmantation of South Africa along the lines envisaged by the State President. The politics of negotiation can only commence if Black and White leaders clearly state what they are prepared to negotiate about.

Mr. Prime Minister .. 41/

Mr. Prime Minister, you are versed in the politics of conflict and as a seasoned leader you will understand what I am saying. I plead with you to bring every possible pressure to bear on the South African Governmnent to make them understand that there will be no conference table in South Africa unless all parties know what they are going there to negotiate about. Israel would enter into no negotiations without an agenda which clearly states what the negotiations would be about. As a Black South African leader I cannot negotiate without an agenda.

Soon after Mr. P.W. Botha became South Africa's Prime Minister in 1979, I pleaded with him to make a declaration of intent with Black leaders. Instead, he established the President's Council and attempted to set up a Black Advisory Council to legitimise the agenda which the State President's Council was given. I refused to have anything to do with that Black Advisory Council because I knew that the President's Council was the handmaiden of the National Party and was established to formulate a new political dispensation in which Whites would continue to monopolise total power. The State President had to a bandon the Black Advisory Council and it never got off the ground. This year we had the first full session of the Tricameral Parliament and in the State President's opening address to Parliament, he announced an enlarged Special Cabinet Committee and an informal non-statutory negotiation forum within which Black and White negotiations could take place. I had already refused to have anything to do with the Special Cabinet Committee which was established to negotiate Black political developments within the framework of the new Tricameral Parliament. And this year, I re-stated my adamant refusal to be drawn into the enlarged Special Cabinet Committee; and I rejected out of hand any involvement in the informal negotiating forum while it was committed to negotiating within the framework of the present Government's constitution. I cannot negotiate on the part of Black South Africa in meetings which have no agendas and which are set up within the framework of a constitution which 72 per cent of the South African population adamantly rejects.

The State President would be entitled to reject my pleas for a statement of intent and he would be entitled to reject any agenda which was aimed at undermining real negotiation. The State President knows that there will be no negotiation with me unless he makes a declaration of intent with Black leaders, and unless we have an agenda within which Blacks could find it possible to negotiate. My refusal to participate in the mechanisms of what the State President calls negotiating bodies and forums is not petulant or wilful; I am not obstructive in my politics. I do pursue the politics of reconcilation, and the kind of statement of intent I am calling for does not tie hands, but opens doors. The statement of intent that needs to be made should necessarily be a consensus document co-authored by Black and White leaders, but

because ... 42/

because such a statement is so badly needed, I thought it politically prudent to draft the kind of statement which I believe would break the South African Black/White political logjam. I drafted it reluctatly and I drafted it only as an illustration of the kind of thing IL was talking about. It reads as follows:

DECLARATION OF INTENT

We the undersigned hereby declare our commitment to serve God in obedience to His divine will for our country and together:

Recognise that:

- The history of mankind shows the need for adaptive change among all peoples and all nations.

- Nations which have managed to avoid the use of violence in the achievement of national objectives are the nations which have grown in wisdom.

- Both mistakes and lessons not yet learned led to errors of judgement in the mainstream politics in both the Black and White sections of our society.

- The South African people are a family of mankind, seeking to live in harmony in the African community of nations and seeking to do so by expressing civilised ideals in the practical social, economic and political affairs of our country.

- The Westminster model of government was not ordained by God to be the only form of good government.

We therefore accept:

- The need to make the preamble to the South African constitution of equal value to all the groups and peoples of the country by enriching the clause: "To respect, to further and to protect the self-determination of population groups and peoples" to include the notion that this can best be done by sharing power. We need to share power in such a way that no one group can dictate to any other grouip how to express its own self-determination and we also need to share power in a formula within which the hallowed values of good government are not compromised.

- The need to preserve the constitutionality of the adaptive democratic process on which will jointly rely in being subservient to the divine will for our country.

We will 43/

We will therefore together seek:

- To negotiate as leaders to amend the South African constitution to make it acceptable to all groups.

- To find an alternative political system to that which the world at large understands by the word 'apartheid' and also to seek an alternative political system in which unicersal adult suffrage is expressed in constitutional

  terms acceptable to all the peoples of South Africa.

- To give expression to the common citizenship of all South Africa's peoples without qualifying the meaning of citizenship for any group.

- To use the opportunities presented in practical politics at first, second and third tier levels of government to fashion national unity by deepening the democratic process, and to use the democratic process in explorations of what needs to be done to get the people to legitimise the instruments of government.

We therefore pledge ourselves:

- To express national pride and patriotism by insisting that South Africans will decide South Africa's future in the acceptance of each other as individuals and groups and the acceptance of each other's cultural rights to be who they are.

- To start where we find ourselves in history and to move from there to build on all that is positive and valuable and to change that which is negative and undesirable.

- Each to work in our own constituencies to develop a South African pride in managing our own South African affairs in harmony with internationally accepted standards of civilised decency without being dictated to from without.

- Having thus declared we stand together to defend our right even with our lives to take the steps and the time needed to establish consensus between groups and to win support for our joint efforts in the South African family of nations.

And furthermore to stand together to defend South Africa from external onslaughts and to stand together to resist any use of violence which threatens the politics of negotiation aimed at national reconciliation.

****

Mr. Prime ... 44/

Mr. Prime Minister, I have given you the text of this draft declaration of intent, not because I seek support for its formulation. I have done so only to illustrate the point I am making that the demands I make are not politically prohibitive and should be acceptable to all race groups of the country. If Whites, however, cannot make such a statement of intent at this

juncture of our history, then there are bitter years ahead. I ask you, Mr. Prime Minisetr, to support not the wording of the statement, but to support the politics of reconcilation and negotiation which lie behind its drafting.

I repeatedly say that the struggle for liberation in South Africa, must be waged by South Africans in South Africa. Western industrialised countries cannot fight our battle for us, but there is a desperate need for the West to strengthen the hand of those inside South Africa who seek a negotiated settlement and to avoid the escalation of uncontrolled violence. Black political organisations must not only wage struggles for future generations; Black organisations involved in the struggle for liberation must be meaningful to people in the daily lives and circumstances in which they find themselves. For the sake of the future, we need now to begin on fostering self-help development schemes. For the sake of the future we need now to make a massive endeavour to make community development projects work. We need desperately to stimulate formal and informal educational programmes. We need desperately to grapple with poverty, ignorance and disease right now. Inkatha desperately needs humanitarian aid for the sake of millions of suffering Black South Africans. The West cannot fight our battles for us, but we do need support for the things we do on the ground which we are doing both out of humanitarian conerns and to prepare Black South Africa to meet the rigours of the future once apartheid has been abolished for the scourge that it is.

----------0----------

I received an invitation to address the South Africa Club in London in October last year, and while I was there, Mr. Oliver Tambo gave evidence to the British Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Select Committee, and I was invited to do the same in January this year.

I think it is important for me to acquaint members with what I said to this Committee. In my evidence to them I summed up the South African situation and talked at length about our Black brothers and sisters who attempt to denigrate us at every twist and turn. Again, I am asking Members to listen carefully to what I said to this Select Committee because when speaking there, I was

speaking on .../ 45/

speaking on behalf of Black South Africa, and not on behalf of myself. If there is any way in which I misrepresented my Black fellow countrymen, who support me in their millions, Members must feel free to draw attention to it. My evidence to the British Select Committee on Foreign Affairs was as follows:

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

20 JANUARY 1986

P R E F A C E

I see the relationship between Great Britain and South Africa as certainly fundamentally important to South Africa and also as not inconsequential to Great Britain.

The Foreign Affairs Committee is now reassessing British attitudes to South Africa. This is a formidable task and because of the significance which I attach to its work, I have compiled somewhat comprehensive notes about Inkatha's position and my leadership in South Africa.

I find all too frequently that decision-makers in the West pause too seldom to delve into the underlying realities which make Black South African politics so very complex.

It is my sincere hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee will find the time to read this document prior to hearing my verbal evidence on South Africa. It is true to say that the fate of not only South Africa but also of the whole of Southern Africa, will be profoundly affected by what will be taking place in South Africa in the foreseeable future. What Great Britain and her allies do during this crucial period of our history, could well be of cardinal significance.

Black South African politics has never been institutionalised in South Africa in such a way that parliamentary norms and traditions mould political action. In countries with parliamentary democracies, a wide range of restraints and directing influences are constantly at play establishing not only the who's who of politics, but what is and what is not acceptable as political

behaviour ..46/

behaviour.

In South Africa this is not the case. Not only have Blacks been excluded from the parliamentary process since the inception of modern South Africa, but for many generations, they were excluded from participating in the decision-making process in the country's economic, religious and social institutions. Parliamentary and extra-parliamentary restraints on political excessiveness have been absent in Black South Africa, and as Black politics has become increasingly radicalised, it has become increasingly characterised by ever-wilder excessiveness on the part of some.

British Parliamentarians should therefore approach the need to make their own asessments of the who's who of Black South Africa with a great deal of circumspection. Foreign observers have again and again been misled into making false assessments of what the real mood of Black South Africa is and who is and who is not accepted by Black South Africa as national leaders. Self-appointed leaders, celebrity leaders, media-created leaders and vociferous but transient protest leaders have always abounded in Black South Africa. There has always been an indulgence by some in political excesses unchecked by parliamentary restraints and by traditional values and norms. This indulgence in excesses unchecked by institutionalised politics has led to Black South Africans being drawn into one hare-brained political scheme after another. The broad masses, however, have kept remarkably constant in their commitment to time-honoured and centrally valued political traditions. They have always denied that they are faced with the stark alternatives of accepting subjugation by Whites on the one hand, and killing Whites to liberate themselves on the other hand. They have always opposed apartheid in the country's day to day life and step by step have participated in the country's social, economic and political life in such a way that apartheid has become ever increasingly unworkable. It is not the exiles which have brought South African society to the point where everybody now accepts that there must be a radical break with past National Party politics. The Government has accepted the need for reform not because they have been frightened by the ANC Mission in Exile but because Black South Africans and harsh realities in the economic sphere have made it imperative that they do so.

It is important for British Paliamentarians to understand that if the ANC Mission in Exile ceased to exist tomorrow the demand for reform inside South Africa would assume an ever increasing urgency. Apartheid society simply cannot work because 72 per cent of all South Africans are Black and all Blacks reject apartheid. The waves of violent anger which have swept the country for the past 18 months have not been inspired by the ANC Mission in Exile's or the United Democratic Front's political programme.

These organisations ... /47

These organisations are attempting to capitalise on Black anger which they did not produce. It is the hideousness of apartheid and the deep suffering of a disenfranchised and economically deprived people which has produced anger. It is joblessness, hopelessness and above all, the South African Government's talk of reform without backing that talk up with meaningful action, which has pushed Black anger beyond the boiling point.

The vast majority of Black South Africans demand the normalisation of South Africa in which there is equality of opportunity in a free enterprise system and a parliamentary democracy which is a heritage that the British presence in South Africa bequeathed to us. Members of the Foreign Affairs Committee will be aware of opposition Black views about South Africa and what needs to be done to eradicate apartheid for the scourge that it is. I would appeal to them not to fall into the trap some foreign observers fall into, of tracing differences of opinion between Blacks to differences between leaders and to conflicts of interests which arise out of personal idiocyncracies amongst Black leaders. An understanding of the South African political process and an awareness of the real issues which the Black struggle for liberation has always focussed on are lost when media representations of the South African scene are used as guidelines. Britain has always played a historically significant role in South and Southern Africa and I perceive the need for the British Parliament to play a very significant role in the emerging circumstances we face. I take this Committee's work very seriously and intend to make in-depth representations to it in the hope that Britain will yet again show herself to be the kind of honest broker which brought an end to violence in Zimbabwe.

I would like to stress that what I say goes beyond airing personal views on crucial matters. I cannot afford the luxury of making personal choices in politics. I was born to occupy a leadership position in South Africa which has very defined parameters. The role that I play has been determined by history itself and it is with a deep sense of historical awareness that I respond to demands on my leadership. I am a leader by hereditary right and follow in the footsteps of my father, grandfather and great-grandfather, who in turn followed in the footsteps of their forebears to the time of the founding father of KwaZulu, King Shaka. I and my forebears have always occupied influential positions as prime ministers, advisers and generals to successive Zulu Kings. Whatever Whites did or could have done, I would have had to play one or another political role.

My great-grandfather was Prime Minister to King Cetshwayo who was only finally defeated by the full might of the British army at the Battle of Ulundi in 1879 after he had won a dicisive victory over the British at the Battle of Isandlwana. Not only does my line of descent go back to the founding father of KwaZulu, King Shaka, but

the transitional ... 48/

the transitional period for South Africa towards the end of the last century from which modern South Africa emerged, saw my forebears both on my father's side and on my mother's side, as prime actors. King Cetshwayo was defeated and was the last reigning monarch of a sovereign and free KwaZulu. He was my mother's grandfather. My mother's father who succeeded him was, like his father before him sent into enforced exile to the island of St. Helena by the British. He was later implicted in the Zulu Rebellion in 1906. As a result, he was charged with treason and was imprisoned for life. After the Act of Union in 1910 the first Prime Minister of South Africa removed him from jail and permitted him to live in exile on the farm "Uitkyk" in the Transvaal where he died in 1913. These were living memories for my mother and among my older relatives.

From my mother's knee onwards I was surrounded by political thought and discussion. The founding father of the African National Congress, which was established in 1912, was my uncle, Dr. Pixley ka Isaka Seme. Throughout my youth I was brought into contact with leading Black political figures. I knew people like Chief Albert Lutuli, Nelson Mandela, Zami Conco, Walter Sisulu, Robert Sobukwe, J.K. Ngubane, and M.B. Yengwa, personally as colleagues in the libertion struggle.

After school and university education, I was keen to pursue a legal career, but pressure was mounted on me to return to my home district to take up the chieftinship of the Buthelezi people. I consulted many prominent Black leaders then active in the African National Congress, about the options before me. I was eventually persuaded, against my personal desires, not to delay entering into politics until after I had been in law for some time. Chief Albert Lutuli was particularly insistent that I took up my hereditary position without delay. It was a consensus view of the African National Congress leadership that it was in the interests of the liberation struggle itself that I should take up my Chieftainship.

These discussions took place in the ascendancy of political prominence of the old ANC as it responded to increasing Black anger at the developments which followed the National Party's electoral victory in 1948. Deepening Black concern demanded a national Black effort to oppose the radicalisation of right-wing politics and the ANC responded to the call of the people. At that stage of my political career, as a member of the ANC, I was torn between desires to serve my organisation, and the need to devote my energies to my hereditary leadership role. It was Chief Albert Lutuli who did more than anyone else to persuade me that I had no option but to combine the two roles. This I set about doing.

The South African Government was totally opposed to me and for five years refused to recognise my chieftainship of the Buthelezi

people. .. 49/

people. It was only after five years of ever increasing insistent demands by my people that I should lead them that the Government was forced to accept my position. After a trip to the United States in 1963, the South African Government confiscated my passport, and for nine years I was not allowed to leave South Africa. Most opposition political parties in the South African Parliament appealed unsuccesfully to the Government to return my passport until the Government gave in.

Once having accepted the need to combine a party political role with my traditional political role, I set about opposing apartheid at the local, regional, provincial and national levels. I campaigned vigorously against apartheid and for the rejection of the so-called homeland policy - a policy of dividing Black South Africa into ethnic groups with their own political identities and each with their own political machinery - which separated them not only from White politics but from each other as well. As a Black leader I rejected this policy from the outset, just as I continue to do so vigorously today.

For me South Africa is one country with one people which history is thrusting into a single destiny. I reject all notions of political structures based on race divisions. The multiplicity of the ethnic origins of White South Africa did not deter Whites from uniting politically. The diversity of Black ethnic origins in South Africa demands in fact Black political unity rather than deters it.

I campaigned so vigorously against separate political institutions for KwaZulu that the complete rejection of these institutions by the Zulu people followed. In typical dictatorial fashion the Government then bluntly told us that we had no say in the matter and that they would be forced on us willy nilly whether we liked it or not.

This they proceeded to do and it was in these circumstances that the people turned to me to lead them through the difficulties which lay ahead. I accepted the challenge to do so and assumed the role of Chief Executive Officer in the KwaZulu Territorial Authority, and later Chief Executive Councillor, which was imposed on us. I vowed to lead my people in the tactics and strategies which would ensure that they would retain their South African citizenship and would continue to be entitled to exercise their democratic rights to oppose apartheid and any form of politics based on racial differentiation.

The African National Congress never made my position in KwaZulu an issue and I had dealings with Mr. Oliver Tambo until 1980. Those in the ANC Mission in Exile who now belatedly criticise me, and who complain all of a sudden because they say I occupy the position of Chief Minister of KwaZulu, conveniently forget that

the enabling ... 50/

the enabling legislation which was enacted to enable the National Party to pursue its homeland policy, the Bantu Authorities Act (68) of 1951, was passed before I assumed my chieftainship. That same Act abolished the old Native Representative Council and even then it was quite clear that it was the intention of the National Party to separate Black and White politics. It was in these circumstances that Chief Albert Lutuli encouraged me to take up my position and it was during the years of his presidency of the ANC that he continued to support me as I campaigned amongst my people for the rejection of this legislation. He clearly saw the threatened balkanisation of South Africa as an impending catastrophe. Had those now in prominent roles in the ANC Mission in Exile paid more attention to the dangers which Chief Albert Lutuli and I so clearly saw, and set about mobilising Blacks in other areas as I mobilised them in KwaZulu, the South African Government would never have gone as far along the road as they did go to implement their homeland policy. Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei today would not be quasi so-called independent States.

The question of non-participation was then discussed as a strategy in Black politics and had not yet been falsely elevated to be a sacrosanct political principle. Chief Albert Lutuli himself saw no clash of interest in being a Chief and the President of the Africn National Congress. Nelson Mandela shared his view. It is interesting to see what Mr. Nelson Mandela, the best-known of the ANC leaders, had written on participatory opposition as long ago as February 1958. An extract from his article "The struggle has many tactics" reads as follows:

> "In the opinion of some people, participation in the system of separate racial representation in any shape or form, and irrespective of any reasons advanced for doing so, is impermissible on principle and harmful in practice. According to them such participation can only serve to confuse the people and to foster the illusion that they can win their demands through a parliamentary form of struggle. In their view people have now become so politically conscious and developed that they cannot accept any form of representation which in any way fetters their progress. They maintain that people are demanding direct representation in parliament, in the provincial and city councils, and that nothing short of this will satisfy them. They say that leaders who talk of the practical advantages to be gained by participation in separate racial representation do not have the true interests of the people at heart. The basic error in this argument lies in the fact that it regards the boycott not as a tactical weapon to be employed if and when objective conditions permit but as an inflexible principle which must under no circumstances be varied".

Those now in ... 51/

Those now in the ANC Mission in Exile who reject me pretending that they do so because I occupy the position of Chief Minister of KwaZulu, do so as part of their propaganda campaign. They know the truth. My only sin is that I refused to make Inkatha a surrogate organisation of the External Mission of ANC. They are also politically naive. Had I not accepted the challenge to lead in the way the people demanded, KwaZulu may well by now have been manipulated into the same positions as Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei.

The blunt truth of the matter is that those who reject the free enterprise system, reject Western forms of democracy and reject the politics of non-violence and the politics of negotiation which Western democrtic principles demand of Black South Africans now.

I provide this detail about my own background because it is a detail known to Black South Africa and accepted by them as establishing my bona fides. Black South Africa gave me massive support as a tried and trusted leader when I brought Inkatha into being in 1975. By then the ANC Mission in Exile had been abroad for 15 years. During this period the harshness of apartheid, and the growth of Draconian laws on South African Statute Books bore testimony to the ineffectiveness of the ledership in the ANC Mission in Exile. They so conducted their affairs, and became so preoccupied with their own unilateral choice to make the armed struggle the primary means of bringing about change in South Africa, that a very debilitating political vacuum emerged in Black South Africa.

Faced with the growth of horrendous legislation and faced with growing social and economic deprivation, Black South Africa resented the ANC Mission in Exile's behaviour. We realised that it is we inside the country who have to do something. The political ferment inside South Africa which was produced by the ANC Mission in Exile's failure emerged to inspite two different political fronts. One was Inkatha and the other was the Black Consciousness Movement. The Black Consciousness Movement contained in it the youth Black dissenting voice. They were, if anything, dominantly pro-PAC. The Pan Africanism and the militant action-orientated mood which characterised the PAC before it was banned in South Africa had been produced by dissatisfaction with the old leadership of the ANC. The PAC break-away from the ANC started political divisions which re-emerged in the early to mid-seventies when the Black Consciosness Movement was formed. The late Mr. Steve Biko, having emerged from the South African Students' Organisation which rejected the multi-racialism in the External Mission of the ANC, sought to establish the Black People's convention as an independent Black Consciousness Movement. The ANC Mission in Exile at the time regarded the BPC as a possily evolving third force.

I established Inkatha as a Black liberation movement in the sincere

hope that ... 52/

hope that the dangerous divisions in Black politics could be breached. I could not side with the Black Consciousness rejection of the ANC Mission in Exile. I understood the grave difficulties which the ANC Mission in Exile had been facing in the outside world. Both in South Africa and abroad I then argued in public that the ANC had been driven underground by South African police brutality and that it was understandable that in an exiled position where they were rejected by the West, the Mission in Exile should seek recourse in violence. I accepted that the ANC Mission in Exile having been rejected by the West would naturally tend to seek alliances elsewhere. It was for me understandable that they should start thinking in terms of the application of force against apartheid. I, however, never accepted the unilateral decision which the ANC Mission in Exile made to commit Black South Africa to the armed struggle as the primary means of bringing about change. They had no mandate to do it. They only adopted the armed struggle as the primary means of bringing about change once they were in exile. They never consulted Black South Africa about this very fundamental step. They made the decision unilaterally only after they had been in exile for some years. Mr. Joe Slovo, a member of the ANC Mission in Exile's National Executive and head of Umkhonto weSizwe, its military wing, confirms this. I quote him:

> "The attempts, particularly in the West, to question this policy and to influence the ANC to consider the adoption of a 'peaceful road to change' is nothing less than a recipe for submission and surrender of national liberation aims. We must bear in mind that the ANC was declared illegal long before it adopted a policy of armed struggle.

The old ANC sent a Mission into exile to mobilise international opinion to aid the struggle at home. I rejected the argument by prominent members of the ANC Mission in Exile that any involvement they may have in democratic opposition in South Africa would detract from their main purpose which was to pursue the armed struggle.

I rejected this because it was patently clear to me that it would be foolish for Black South Africans to model their liberation struggle on struggles elsewhere, where circumstances were entirely different. Anyone with even a modicum of military sense realises that the nature of the South African terrain is such that no liberated zones can be established and that the transportation of men and weapons on a scale sufficient to mount a serious armed onslaught against apartheid, presents formidable logistic problems. The armed strugle against apartheid has failed for a quarter of a century, and again anybody with a modicum of military sense would know that the employment of violence in South Africa

would necessarily ..53/

would necessarily have to take the form of a bloody civil war. The ANC Mission in exile has failed to mount a viable armed struggle for a quarter of a century. This the ANC Mission in Exile has now itself recognised and has had to change tactics and is now attempting to make South Africa ungovernable by estabishing the conditions for a bloody civil war. I have attached transcripts of ANC Mission in Exile broadcasts from Radio Freedom obtained from the British Broadcasting Corporation's monitoring service. A perusal of these documents containing the actual broadcast words of the ANC Mission in Exile shows that they are intent upon:

1. Generalising Black violence which has broken out in our townships.

2. Going beyond threatening the South African economy to actually destroying it.

3. Spreading a reign of terror in which targets are civilians and they are particulaly intent now on trying to get Black violence to be directed against White suburbia.

4. Ordering the elimination of all Blacks who do not agree with their tactics and strategies and are particularly bent upon the murder of any Black who could play a meaningful role in the politics of negotiation and reconciliation.

5. Undermining the evolution of Black democratic forces working for change within the institutionalised life of South Africa.

6. Engaging in a battle of minds in which their point of view is that it is the nature of the free enterprise system and the nature of the Western industrial world's commitment to non-violent change in South Africa which constitutes the real threat against liberation.

I stress that this is not anti-ANC Mission in Exile propaganda and the recognition of the fact that I am actually presenting their own views in their own words is substantiated by the BBC transcripts. This ANC Mission in Exile attempt to reduce South Africa to chaos must be seen in the context of their declared intention to escalate the use of violence in South Africa and to do so regardless of whether or not civilians are maimed and killed. Quite clearly the elimnination of their operational bases in Mocambique and in other neighbouring territories has spelt the end of any illusions that a classical armed struggle could be waged against apartheid. They are now not waging a struggle against apartheid and the South African Government. They

are pitting..." 54/

are pitting themselves against South African society.

Ever since the so-called consultative conference of the ANC Mission in Exile last year, it has committed itself to the intensification of the armed struggle, and it is doing so by giving directives now no longer to be sensitive about civilians dying in any attacks they may make. At a press conference given in Lusaka on January 9 this year, Mr. Oliver Tambo served notice on South Africa and the world that there would be increased civilian casualties because he said they were unavoidable in a situation of escalating warfare. I include as an Appendix a report of that press conference.

I know of no society in the world where the kind of violence now employed by the ANC in Exile has produced an open, democratic society. I have again and again said bluntly that if the ANC Mission in Exile is allowed to continue much further along the road they have chosen to walk, White South Africa will adopt a scorched earth policy and unleash the kind of State violence which we have not even yet begun to see.

It is a central argument in my whole political position now that forces working for change in South Africa are being terribly detrimentally affected by the levels of violence we are experiencing. There is now in South Africa a yearning for a normalised society amongst all population groups. Whatever the National Party says and does, White South Africa recognises that apartheid has failed and that South Africa must move towards meaningful reform in which Black South Africans are integrated into a central political system. The South African Government is now floundering around not knowing how to go about normalising South Africa. It still contains White right-wing elements, but it is doing so in the face of a recognised inevitability that power-sharing must come about. There is a very wide-spread recognition that there will be no recovery from the country's economic dire circumstances unless Blacks are accommodated politically. When one goes beyond sentiments as determinants of political action in the White group, the harsh driving realities in the economic field must be seen to be producing an escalating impetus towards real change. There are no illusions left in White South Africa that there can be an economic separation of White and Black interests. Big business in South Africa in all its organised forms, and across both White language groups, want meaningful reform, and big business has now declared its intention to participate fully in the process of bringing about real change regardless of Government action. The National Party is under siege by the forces of economic reality and the prime actors in the economic field now want the very kind of change which the British Parliament wants, which the Western world wants, and which the general Black population of South Africa has always struggled for.

The South African economy has gone past the take-off point where there is now a functional interdependence between Black and White. The task that faces South Africa is the task that faces any institutions with economic institutions and social institutions. There is a process at work in South Africa which will translate economic interdependence into political interdependence. It is unstoppable and it is truly and deeply tragic that as South Africa emerges into an era of necessary reformation, there are forces in the world seeking to strengthen Black political groups in the country which want to use violence to bring about the downfall of the Government.

Thus in 1974 when I set about gathering leaders together to establish Inkatha in 1975, I set about doing so with the clear intention not of subverting the ANC Mission in Exile but of proving to them that democratic opposition to apartheid and non-violent tactics and strategies were still possible and could be highly productive in the process of bringing about change. If the ANC Mission in Exile had understandably opted for violence, then it was incumbent on Black South Africans to prove that democratic opposition could be productive and to avoid the prospects of the bloody destructive civil war. This could only be done if the democratic forces emerging in Black South Africa accepted a multi-strategy approach and offered to work in harmony with the ANC Mission in Exile. This intention was deep in my motivation when I established Inkatha. Unlike the Black Consciousness Movement, I publicly identified with the ANC Mission in Exile. I defied all laws prohibiting the quotation of banned organisations and persons, and prohibiting furthering their aims and objectives. I quoted whenever the need was there from ANC Mission in Exile spokesmen and banned old ANC leadership. I rallied Black South Africa under the national colours of Black South Africa - black, green and gold. I brought together a very considerable constituency which had provided the old ANC with grass-root support while it was in the country. We sang old freedom songs and in every possible way identified with the ANC Mission in Exile. I told my people that we had sent them there; that they were our brothers and sisters and that we should wage a struggle in harmony with them.

On every possible occasion I kept in contact with the ANC Mission in Exile. I liaised with their office in Swaziland and my emissaries had frequent meetings there with ANC Mission in Exile personel. I sent emissaries abroad charging them to argue the merits of a multi-strategy approach with them, and to offer co-operation in those projects where Inkatha's aims and objectives, and where tactics and strategies were not mutually hostile. After four years of sending emissaries abroad, the time seemed ripe for a top level meeting. The first such meeting was arranged and took place in Stockholm in the early part of 1979. I would have attended that meeting myself had Mr. Oliver Tambo

been able ... 56/

been able to be there. He was not able to be there and that meeting was then used as a consultative meeting to establish a summit confernce between Inkatha and the ANC Mission in Exile which did in fact finally take place here in London in October 1979. Mr. Oliver Tambo chaired the meeting and I had to spend over R30 000 of Inkatha's money obtained from workers and peasants to make sure that the Inkatha contingent was top level and representative of the Movement. I took that meeting very seriously. I have a Memorandum which I presented for discussion at that meeting but do not make it available to the Parliamentary Select Committee because Mr. Tambo and I agreed to make it confidential until he came back with a response to me. I went to London determined to seek reconciliation and determined to bring about a working relationship between the ANC Mission in Exile and Inkatha.

I was right in maintaining that this was a real possibility. I myself had had many discussions with Mr. Oliver Tambo in person ever since 1963. From what he told me himself and from what he himself told my emissaries, I was aware of the fact that he was having difficulties with some elements in his organisation. Those with a single, bloody-minded commitment to violence did not want any evidence that non-violent tactics and strategies were viable in South Africa. Their propaganda was that nothing could be done other than through violence and they were threatened by the steadily increasing evidence that Inkatha's tactics and strategies were moving ever more closer to the South African political centre of gravity.

There was a tragic misassessment by the ANC Mission in Exile about the mood of Black South Africa in the mid-seventies. They were taken totally by surprise when violence broke out on the scale that it did in 1976 and 1977. The militants in the ANC Mission in Exile realised that Black groups in South Africa were stealing their violent thunder. They knew that they did not produce the violence which erupted. They knew that they had under-estimated the drive of Black South Africa to do something for itself in the vacuum which the ANC Mission in Exile's failure abroad had produced. They did what they could not undermine the Black Consciousness Movement and sought to establish every possible stranglehold over support for Black Consciousness groups from abroad. Then the South African Government did the ANC Mission in 19 Black orgnisations were banned, thousands were arrested and hundreds of individuals were detained or served with banning orders. The violent militants in the ANC Mission in Exile were given a breathing space and they became adamantly determined to undermine all Black groups in South Africa who were not under their direct control and were there to do their bidding.

On the 19 September 1977, I was summoned to Pretoria by the then Minister of Justice and of Police, Mr. Jimmy Kruger. He wanted

to see me ... 57/

to see me because he was concerned about the growth of Inkatha only two years after it had been established. He threatened to take action against me and Inkatha because he stated that I had no right to recruit Blacks into Inkatha who were not Zulus. I told him bluntly that as long as the ruling National Party recruited Whites of other ethnic groups, other than Afrikaners, that I had the same right to recruit any Black into Inkatha, regardless of ethnic affiliation. I totally refused to make Inkatha an ethnic organisation. I wish to submit to members of this Parliamentary Committee, copies of a verbatim report of the discussion I had with Mr. Kruger on that day. It is a matter of record that I defied the South African Government at that time when they suggested that Inkatha should be built up as a Zulu ethnic organisation. The stories therefore that are carried in various media reports, and references to Inkatha as Zulu or ethnic, are deliberate distortions by the media, which they disseminate to make propaganda for the External Mission of ANC. I also hand in a copy of Inkatha's constitution which is printed in South Africa in Zulu, Sotho and English. That Inkatha was not ethnic was confirmed later in 1977 by empirical surveys done by the Bergstrasser Institute at Freiburg University in Germany, which showed that two years after its founding, Inkatha had 40 per cent non-Zulu membership.

In all my discussions with the ANC Mission in Exile I was adamant that Inkatha should remain Inkatha and that it should remain committed to the Black popular will which expressed itself in Inkatha's massive membership and was articulated through its democratic machinery. Inkatha had emerged at the same time as the Black Consciousness Movements in South Africa. During those troubled years of 1976, 1977 and 1978, Inkatha grew phenomenally. In the first year of its existence, Inkatha's membership exceeded the membership of the old ANC even in its heyday. When violence erupted, a wide range of friends and self-appointed advisers urged me to abandon Inkatha's aims and objectives, and to participate in the growth of violence. I resisted these efforts and persisted in what I was doing. The fact that Inkatha's membership doubled in 1977 and again doubled in 1978, is in itself indisputable proof that those in the mainstream of Black politics in South Africa, rejected violence as the primary means of bringing about change. It was Inkatha's growing prominence even in the very early years of its existence, and the evidence of its mass support which was frightening to the militants in the ANC Mission in Exile. They wanted Inkatha crushed if it could not be subdued into being subservient to the Mission in Exile.

Any group in exile which commits itself to the armed struggle resists sharing power. Revolutionary organisations throughout the world, operating from exiled positions, seek to become a totally dominant force and this is what the ANC Mission in Exile had been doing during the 1970's. They were saddled with the

fact that ... 58/

fact tht the OAU had accepted both themselves and the PAC as liberation forces in South Africa, but they continued doing everything they could to undermine the PAC. The history of hostile relationships between the ANC Mission in Exile and the PAC in exile is widely known in Africa and in the West. The ANC Mission in Exile styled themselves as the vanguard movement, and sought recognition as the only true authentic representatives of Black South Africa. They did everything they could to block my access to Africa and to the international community. The Foreign Affairs Committee should ponder upon the nature of exiled revolutionary groups. If it did so it would come to the conclusion that the ANC Mission in Exile sees itself as a government in exile and wants to return as a revolutionary government to take over South Africa. The ANC Mission iln Exile is not working to establish democratic rights for the people of South Africa to choose whom they will to form a government. It regiments its members ideologically and inculcates in them the view that only the ANC Mission in Exile can be allowed to make decisions and to direct the affairs of the struggle for liberation. It wants to take over and control and it is ruthless in its dealings with those who do not act as fetch and carry boys for it.

When we met the ANC Mission in Exile in London in October 1979 under the chairmanship of Dr. A.H. Zulu, the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly Speaker, we did so against this background of forces in the Mission in Exile which subsequent history proved Mr. Tambo could not control. After the London meeting, in 1980 Mr. Tambo for the first time in his carrer began criticising me publicly. He did not have the courage of his convictions and he could not control his own organisation, and had perforce to side with those who saw Inkatha as a threat and wanted no evidence that Black democratic opposition and Black non-violent tactics and strategies were powerful forces for bringing about change.

The ANC Mission in Exile was extremely worried about the rapid progress Inkatha made after its establishment in 1975. They anticipated its early demise and thought that it would not survive the turbulent years of 1976, 1977 and 1978. I am shocked now to learn that Mr. Oliver Tambo is claiming that Inkatha was formed on the advice of the ANC Mission in Exile. This statement is entirely devoid of all truth. Inkatha was formed by me and other Black South Africans who saw the need to rally Blacks because of the ANC Mission in Exile's inactivity in South Africa. The formation of Inkatha was never discussed with Mr. Tambo by me, and to my certain knowledge, neither was it discussed with him by anybody else.

Part of the hideousness of apartheid is that it has precipitated internecine Black conflict. As I said in my opening remarks, democratic politics requires democratic institutions in which

values are ... 59/

values and norms are upheld and in which decent behaviour is distinguished from indecent behaviour. Black South Africa has been denied the right to evolve its own democratic machinery and forces. State brutality has crushed Black orgnisations, and it has denied to the people of South Africa, the circumstances in which decency can be preserved at all costs. At a public meeting in Soweto, Johannesburg, I said:

> "The Government has harmed the process by which Black people will sort out their own priorities. I know that there is widespread anger. I know that there is sympathy amongst rank and file people for possible courses of effective action, but when leadership goes wild to kill and maim people and to destroy the mens of life around people, then the people will react. The detention of some so-called leaders has interfered in the process by which the people themselves would have rejected the tactics and strategies employed and they would have exposed the sleight-of-hand politics which was involved. Let me say this to the South African Government: I say to them that Blacks form the majority in whatever part of the country Whites live. Blacks and Whites are irrevocably drawn together and whether they like it or not, they will have to face the future together. White authorities must stop interfering in the Black political process.
>
> Arrests and detentions so often only make false heroes who left on their own, would be seen to fail by the people. Ordinary trade union members can now not censure their executives who are being detained. The swoop against Black leaders in recent weeks is ill-considered and detrimental to the politics of negotiation. I tell the Government bluntly that unless they leave Black society to sort out its own priorities and to elect its own leaders, they will be faced with situations in which South Africa step by step will be taken further and further towards an ultimate Police State. Detentions have interfered with the delicate balance between employers and unions. The process of maturation in Black trade unionism has been interfered with. Is it not about time that the Government recognised that democracy is the only thing we can rely on in this country. They must not interfere in the democratic process in Black society."

At every opportunity I campaign for the release of political prisoners and for the unbanning of organisations and people. I have made numerous personal representations to the State President, Mr. P.W. Botha, to release Mr. Nelson Mandela and other Black political leaders who are incarcerated with him, and I also did so to his predecessor, Mr. J.B. Vorster. Even if I am not now negotiating with Mr. Botha, and I have adamantly refused to co-operate in the South African Government't attempts to legitimise the new constitution, I put the release of Mr. Mandela

and other ... 60/

and other leaders beyond party political interests. The democratic process in South Africa is deeply impaired because Blacks cannot demonstrate their political choices by electing the leaders whom they think ought to be in the forefront of politics. It is in the circumstances of jailing, bannings and detention without trial, that Black politics becomes confounded by celebrity leaders and self-appointed spokesmen. There is an urgent need to found Black politics as constituency politics in which there are the normal safeguards and checks to ensure that leaders represent their people truthfully. The outside world has an urgent task to perform and that is to mount every endeavour to persuade the South African Government to normalise Black South African politics. State interference in the Black democratic process favours the development of violence in politics.

There are some who now call for a Lancaster House-type conference and there are others calling for a National Convention now. Such endeavours must one day be made but unless we now prepare for them by normalising politics, there will not be dialogue between Black and White and between Black and Black. I am aware of the fact that you cannot schedule politics in logical sequences, but it would be illogical to bring the ANC Mission in Exile to the conference table while they have not yet had the opportunity of putting their case to the South African people and then going to that conference with a mandate from the people. I call for the immediate unbanning of the ANC and for the release of Nelson Mandela so that the South African population can judge for themselves the who's who of their politics. Myths which are woven around heroes and martyrs created by the South African State could be misleading. I have the deepest respect for Mr. Nelson Mandela and I regard him as a brother in the struggle for liberation. I urgently plea for his release from jail so that he may have the opportunity of moving amongst his people and putting alternatives to them as he sees them best formulated. A political settlement in South Africa is not a settlement between political parties. It must necessarily be a settlement between race groups. It must be a people's settlement and not a rigged settlement behind closed doors, out of sight of the people.

The ANC Mission in Exile's dealing with Black opposition in South Africa is gross; it is indecent and offensive to every democratic norm in the Western civilised world. If they disagree with a Black man or woman who thinks that he or she can contribute to bringing about change by working within Black Local Authorities, the ANC Mission in Exile encourages their murder. It encourages its followers to seek them out and to batter them to death and it is historical fact, not propaganda, to say that it encourages Blacks in South Africa to burn them alive as demonstrations of what happens to those who do not to their line. A victory obtained by intimidating opposition through putting tyres around people's necks, dousing them with petrol and letting them run

until they ...61/

until they burn to death - what is hideously termed "the necklace" - would be a hideous victory. Sheer terror in internecine Black violence is encouraged by the ANC Mission in Exile.

As a Black leader, a democrat and a committed Christian, I cannot tolerate such behaviour. Black South Africans themselves are revolted by it. It is in situations of desperate hunger and poverty and a sense of despair that people can easily be driven into mob behaviour. To make political capital out of human terribly adverse circumstances, is despicable. This the ANC Mission in Exile does. Inkatha buries its dead and its members are maimed and made homeless in the reign of terror which the ANC Mission in Exile has ordered against us.

The businessmen and members of the Progressive Federal Party who met the ANC Mission in Exile in Lusaka last year will bear testimony to the vehemence with which the ANC Mission in Exile talk against me. I quote from notes of a meeting at Mfuwe Game Lodge on the 3 September 1985 which summarises the perceptions of the businessmen who went there:

> "Thabo Mbeki said that the ANC was in contact with the UDF, the trade unions, the churches, and so on, and that's why they react as they do. Tony Bloom was right in saying that they had sent a message out. However, there were major problems associated with Gatsha Buthelezi. In fact, there was a school of thought who felt that the ANC was already being too generous to Gatsha. He pointed out that this related to the man himself and that in relation to Mangope, the ANC had never denounced him despite his working within the system.
>
> Oliver Tambo asked why Gatsha was so bitter against the UDF, Boesak, etc. He said that the ANC had had many meetings with Buthelezi, but that Buthelezi had destroyed those meetings. Bishop Zulu had presided over them in a sane manner, but Gatsha turned the meeting against the ANC.
>
> Thabo (speaking with passion) said that he had never felt so betrayed - Buthelezi only wanted to gain ascendancy, publicity and push himself up. He attempted to sow confusion in the ranks of the ANC by capitalising on the fact that he could be quoted in South Africa but the ANC could not. He (Gatsha) deeply resents support for Nelson Mandela".

This is the kind of character assassination which they indulge in when they are at their most polite, but even this is indicative of their vehement opposition to me because I do not support their self-defeating tactics and strategies. The references to me make me sound as though I am avaricious for power, and that I resent

the prominence ... 62/

the prominence of Nelson Mandela in the media in recent times. That this is blatantly untrue is shown by this letter I have recently received from Mr. Mandela himself. It reads as follows:

Certified Mail

Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi
PO Ulundi
KwaZulu
3838

II 220/82: NELSON MANDELA 10.12.85

Dear Shenge, Mndlunkulu and family

Your warm message of goodwill and support contributed tremendously to my speedy and complete recovery, and gave me much strength and joy. I shake your hand very warmly!

Very sincerely

MADIBA

Pollsmoor Maximum Prison
Private Bag XX
Tokai 7966

The ANC Mission in Exile has declared war on Inkatha. Very senior members of its National Executive are vitriolic in their condemnation of Inkatha. One has said that when the ANC Mission in Exile comes to power, it will ban Inkatha. Businessmen and PFP members who have gone to Lusaka to talk with the ANC Mission in Exile speak of the vehement hatred of myself and Inkatha which they experienced while there. Having done everything that a Black leader could possibly do to avoid a failed armed struggle degenerating into a brutal bloody civil war, and having at every opportunity sought reconciliation and a division of labour approach, has either to be intimidated out of political existence or has to defend himself and his people in the face of the kind of tactics and strategies which the ANC Mission in Exile is now employing against their fellow Black South Africans.

I attach as Appendices Inkatha's aims and objectives and its Statement of Belief. They reflect noble ideals to which I and Inkatha are deeply committed. They are ideals we will defend with our life if necessary, and I reserve my right as a Black leader to defend what I am doing with all the means at my disposal because what I am doing I regard as fundamentally important for the whole of South Africa and Southern Africa. I will not be intimidated out of the political arena. I will not abandon the noble cause of

the struggle ... 63/

the struggle. I will not step aside and see deep and hallowed values which have always been there in the struggle for liberation being corrupted and discarded. Millions of Black South Africans support me, and if the ANC Mission in Exile fails to recognise the depth of our commitment, and continues on its present course of action, it will only have itself to blame when Black South Africans reject it for what it is doing.

I do not speak academically or theoretically about violence. I lead Inkatha as its President in the midst of violence. Inkatha is surviving in violence. It is surviving in circumstances in which violent onslaughts are being made against it and attempt after attempt is being made to establish no-go areas for it. The guts of Black South African politics needs to be exposed to the foreign Affairs committee.

The Black rejection of apartheid is very vehement in South Africa and Black anger runs very deep about the way we are treated in the land of our birth. Party political differences between Blacks give rise to a very heated debate. We are involved in life and death issues and pursue political aims and objections among stark realities of a truly oppresive society where the Government uses Draconian laws to curb opposition. It can be anticipated therefore that exchanges of views between those in Black groups will be strident, but in recent times the stridency of Black political debate has assumed very nasty under and overtones. Inkatha's Black political opponents denigrate it in such a way that they invite all who oppose me and Inkatha with them to use violence against us. In Black South Africa there is nothing so hideous as a Black who aids and abets apartheid and participates in the subjugation of his or her people. When Blacks call me a "government stooge", a "sell-out", the "lackey of Pretoria", their intention is to raise hatred against me and Inkatha and the effect of these accusations is to declare me and Inkatha open game for violence. In the political context of Black South Africa, these accusations are made by groups which do in fact use violence for political purposes. There is a brand of what observers call "protest politics" in South Africa which seeks continuity by violent intimidation.

At the University of Zululand a concerted attempt has been made for many years now to make it a no-go area for me and Inkatha. The student body as such is not hostile to us. In fact it is dominated by students with pro-Inkatha sentiments. Activists groups, however, mobilised by the Azanian Students Organisation, and the Congress of South African Students, which originated in the Black Consciousness philosophy, and which have always opposed Inkatha, stage violent protest and demonstrations at the University, not only against me but against the University authorities. I have particularly come under fire because I am Chancellor of the University. It was activist cliques long

associated ... 64:

associated with violent behaviour on the Campus which set itself the task of disrupting a King Cetshwayo commemoration function held on the 29th October 1983 at the University, at which both the King of the Zulus, King Goodwill Zwelithini ka Bhekuzulu and I were guest speakers. This was a cultural function but every possible attempt was made to turn it into one in which I and Inkatha would be confronted and driven from the Campus by force. Speaking of me student pamphlets said such things as: "He had killed and divided the African nation through his policy of tribalism...", "This puppet Gatsha Buthelezi...", "We do not want a puppet to further the aims of the Pretoria regime. Let us fight before it is too late", "We ....shall demonstrate against the coming activity engineered by traitors". In the same pamphlet, speaking about one of the lecturers at the University who is a member of the Central Committee of Inkatha, it said: "Maphalala who is propagating this nuisance must be stoned to death". In another pamphlet, it was said, speaking of me: "This University will be in flames because of him. We shall make our stand against his warriors and the SAP". "If Nkabinde (the Rector) does not stop the massacre that will happen, we will die with him. This is a serious warning". Speaking of me, a pamphlet says: "He is a puppet of the South African racist and oppressive regime".

These are the kind of insults which preceded the meeting held at the University of Zululand in October 1983. A clique of activist students who were attempting to make the University a no-go area for me and Inkatha, tried unsuccessfully to persuade the Rector of the University to prohibit the meeting, and sought a Supreme Court injunction prohibiting it. There were no grounds for doing so, and the public began arriving on Saturday, 29 October to take part in the commemorative meeting. Inkatha youth gathered and began singing Inkatha songs. They were abused verbally and my name was abused in their presence. They were a little while later attacked and had to rally in their self-defence. In the ensuing clash five young people died, including an Inkatha member, and many were injured. The tragic events were widely reported and a great deal of political capital was made against me on the basis of entirely malicious and erroneous reporting that I organised the massacre of students and the violence which took place. In the City Press of 6 November 1983, it was stated: "As President of Inkatha he must either accept responsibility for the actions of the blood-thirsty militants that ran wild at Ngoye and weed them out immediately, or he must admit that Inkatha militants are out of his control". ILn the Rand Daily Mail dated the 4 November 1983, the United Democrtic Front (UDF) and the Azanian People's Orgnisation (AZAPO) and its student wing, the Azanian African Student Organisation (AZASO), joined together to condemn me and Inkatha for the deaths at the University. They said I was: "siding with the oppressor, but they will kill our people". The AZASO President said that I was a "Traitor to the cause of our people and a collaborator".

In the Daily .. 65/

In the Daily News dated 3 November 1983, the UDF is reported issuing a statement criticising me for the violence at the University of Zululand: "And the massacre of defenceless students". In The Sowetan of the 1 November 1983 AZAPO is quoted as saying: "We lack words to condemn this brutal and insensitive murder of Black children. Political violence from any group poses a threat of serious and dire consequences among the exploited and oppressed".

The tragic events were orchestrated by those who wanted to drive me and Inkatha from the Campus. When they could not do so verbally, they attempted to do so physically, and yet I was widely reported as being responsible for the death of the students. A Commission of Inquiry into the violence which occurred subsequently investigated the events, and exonerated Inkatha of responsibility for them. I quote from the Commission's Report:

"(a) The Commission found no evidence supporting the allegation, made in the Sunday Times of 1983-10-30 that the Inkatha Women's Brigade surrounded the Women's Hostel on October 29 1983 and assaulted female students who would not chant "Buthelezi is our leader".....

(c) The Commission found no evidence in support of the allegation, made in a number of newspapers, that the attack on the hostels was led by a lecturer and two (Zulu) chiefs.

(d) The allegation was made in a number of newspapers that the "impis" were assisted in their attack upon the hostels by members of the KwaZulu Police. The Commission finds this allegation to be completely unfounded. According to the evidence, the only recogniseble members of the KwaZulu Police who were on the campus on 29 October 1983 arrived together with the Chief Minister of KwaZulu long after the attack on the hostels had ceased...

(g) The allegation was made in the Rand Daily Mail of 1983-11-01 that two attacks against the hostels were carried out on 29 October 1983. The second attack allegely took place at 16h00 on 29 October 1983. According to the evidence of one student, a group of persons, who were allegedly Inkatha supporters, were escourted to the Men's hostels during the afternoon of 29 October 1983. There was, however, no further clash between these people and the students, though some of the students, understandably, were apprehensive that there might be an attack and some of them fled. It was suggested to the Commission, though no evidence in this regard was led, that the persons escorted by the police were pro-Inkatha

students who were afraid of returning to the hostels alone....

(k) A report in the City Press of 1983-10-30 alleges that there was an unconfirmed report that an Inkatha member was "later" attacked by about 50 avenging students "when he left the rally to buy a soft drink". The Commission was unable to find any direct evidence confirming this report, but there is a tuck-shop in the Student Centre where Mr. Eric Mgcobo who later died was found unconscious by the Security Officer, Mr. Mbatha".

The Commission found that:

"There was no evidence that the clash was between forces of the Inkatha Movement and student supporters of the United Democratic Front or that it was a planned attack launched by Inkatha supporters".

Because the Government has fragmented the Black political scene, by banning people and orgnisations and by jailing Black leaders, Black politics is now characteristically in many respects incoherent. We lack the disciplining of small group activity which would normally be the function of dominant political groups. The effect of this fragmentation is to create numerous small platforms for small group activists who present themselves to the people in the light of acting on behalf of banned leaders and organisations. The effect of this can be quite disastrous in terms of dividing the Black body politic and I would like to give the Committee on Foreign Affairs an indication of how disruptive Black unity is by providing it with some brief details about the Lamontville situation in Natal.

Lamontville is a Black township like most Black townships on the periphery of a "White" city. Black urbanised people can only find housing in these townships and the Group Areas Act forces them to remain housed there.

When White settlers arrived in South Africa, they drove the Black inhabitants of the country off their land and treated them only as a labour force. Their rights were generally disregarded and it was only the British liberal tradition in the Cape which afforded some Africans very limited rights. Even in the British ruled Natal Province, Africans were totally without rights. When in 1910 the Union of South Africa was formed, Black people were excluded from the constitutional rights that Whites enjoyed, with the exception of very limited rights in the Cape. However, over time industrialisation increased and of White industry demanded a large Black labour force within reasonable reach of their places of employment. This industrial need resulted in an inflow of Blacks to the cities from rural areas and led to the Land Act of 1936,

which set .... /67/

which set aside the areas in which Blacks could live. The drift to the cities continued during the thirties and after the Second World War because it was in the cities that opportunities for work were available. In practice, Black people had to take to living around cities in areas which were not officially set aside for them because there was no accommodation for them in authorised areas.

When the National Party came into power in 1948, they vowed to clear what Whites called "Black spots" and set about repatriating Blacks to the "Reserves" set aside for them. Economic realities however forced the National Party Government to proclaim some of these areas as Black townships. Other areas were turned into swuatter areas by Blacks who occupied them illegally. The more rural areas in which Black people lived were later to be proclaimed "homelands".

A Black township either falls into a so-called homeland or falls into a White area and would therfore be administered by a white-controlled Board. With this set-up, the apartheid policy separated population groups geographically for political reasons.

White industrial areas see a constant inflow of newcomers seeking work. At present the access of Black South Africans to the White prescribed areas under White administration is regulated through a system of influx control. Illegal workseekers always stand the risk of being deported back to rural areas.

It is only so-called Section 10 rights which protect people from deportation. To qualify for Section 10 rights a person has to be born in the relevant area of parents who have Section 10 rights (Section 10.1 a) or by, before 1968, having worked continuously for 15 years or longer within the area or for 10 years for one employer (10.1 b). Generally speaking, these criteria are so unattainable that in practice it is the employed skilled workers, the urban elite, who tend to qualify under Section 10. New workseekers have to be in possession of a workseeker's permit, obtainable through a Labour Bureau.

The Greater Durban Area is inhabited by almost two million people. White people are administered by Local Authorities while Indian and Coloured people are administered by the Central Government. The administration of Black people in the Province of Natal is very complicated. Some townships, like KwaMashu and Umlazi, are administered by KwaZulu. Others like Lamontville, Chesterville and Clermont are administered by the Government-controlled Port Natal Administration Board. (PNAB).

The recent drift to the cities in Natal has been increased by economic recession and prolonged droughts, resulting in chaos in the administration of Black people around Durban. Because of the

acute shortage ..68/

acute shortage of houses a large number of people have to live in squatter areas. These squatters are always underenumerated in all census work, and according to Professor L. Schlemmer their number now exceeds 1 440 000. He says that more Blacks are living in the "squatter belt" of shacks and camps around Durban's borders than in the townships, and in the hostels and servants' quarters in Durban. Dr. Erol Haarhoff of the University of Natal estimates that the Durban squatter population grew at a rate of 10 per cent a year between 1966 and 1977 and there seems no reason to believe that this rate will decline. The continued growth of the squatter population is the result of people leaving rural areas to find work and of the fact that KwaZulu and Natal are inseparable economically means that the migration to the city is a migration from KwaZulu to Natal. They form a single economic unit and the rigid application of influx control regulations would cripple Natal industry. Hence the recent message of the Durban Chamber of Commerce to its members stating that influx control cannot work in the Durban area because the borders of KwaZulu criss-cross the metropolitan area. The Chamber is of the opinion that Section 10 rights should be extended to all township Blacks to enable them to seek work directly without first reporting to a Labour Bureau.

The rigid application of influx control to everyone except those with Section 10 rights is not undertaken in the Durban area. When the townships of KwaMashu and Umlazi became part of KwaZulu in 1981, the residents legally ceased to qualify under Section 10 but in practice they have continued to enjoy the same rights as those who do qualify. They are allowed to seek work themselves and are for the sake of convenience regarded as "commuters". Again economic laws proved to be stronger than apartheid laws and in practice no distinctions are made between people in KwaZulu townships such as KwaMashu and Umlazi and people in townships under PNAB control, such as Lamontville.

Lamontville is situated on the Southern outskirts of the White city of Durban. The official population figure of the Township is given by the PNAB as 27,778. However many thousands more live in the township unofficially. There is a desperte shortage of housing as the PNAB has not built a single new house for the past 18 years. Just over the hills of Lamontville therefore, a large squatter area has developed.

Lamontville was built as a township following the Urban Act of 1932 and it is one of the oldest of its kind in the Greater Durban area. It was built by the City Council, funded by government money. The township initially fell under the jurisdiction of the Durban City Council but it was later taken over by the PNAB.

The houses are now more than 40 years old and naturally required ongoing maintenance. Most of the complaints about maintenance revolve around the ingress of water into houses caused by poor

drainage. ..69/

drainage, as well as in some cases about severe cracking of the walls.

There are several primary schools in Lamontville, one high school and a secondary school. Since these are insufficient to serve the youth of Lamontville, pupils have to use schools outside the township in KwaZulu and schools elsewhere in the country. Lamontville is served by only one clinic and the three referral hospitals serving the township are outside it. The impression is gained that the PNAB is not interested in the welfare of the people and only provides services which are unavoidable.

A high proportion of the residents of Lamontville do not possess Section 10 rights and unemployment is on the increase. Income is relatively low. Recent research by the University of Cape Town showed that in Lamontville 66,67 per cent of the households had incomes below the minimum living level, which sets the true basic minimum standard of living. The conditions of the people of Lamontville are not different from the conditions of residents in other townships in the Durban area. Income is relatively low, emotions are readily aroused and people are easily exploited.

Recently there have been reports in the press of violence in Lamontville, and even of killings. What has happened in this township that makes it different from other townships such as KwaMashu and Umlazi? All the issues which are important in Lamontville are also important in the other two townships ... Rent and bus fare increases, prolonged drought, unemployment and economic recession have affected all townships equally. But in Lamontville, the reaction has been different to the reaction in other townships.

Over the decades, rent and bus fare increases have given rise to protests all over thecountry. Community groups and political organisations always come together to join forces in oppostion to the increases in the costs of daily living. The Alexandra bus boycott in the fifties was a clear example of successful protest.

In the townsips around Durban administered by the PNAB transport is provided by the White-owned Durban Durban Tansport Management Board. In December 1982, the DTMB increased its fares by 12 per cent. This resulted in the successful bus boycott which followed. Several community organisations in Lamontville, among which there was Inkatha, joined hands to fight the increase. While the bus boycott was still in fullswing, the PNAB announced an increase in rents of between 26 and 72 per cent. Rents in townships are made up of three components:

- house rent, which averages around R5 montly depending on the age and cost of the house's construction.

site rent, .. 70/

site rent, which pays for township adminstration, infrastructure, maintenance and contributes to schools and clinic costs, and

- service charges which cover the costs of water, street cleaning, refuse removal, sewerage and electricity.

According to the Administration Board, particularly the latter two components were accountable for the increase. They refused to discuss the question of value for money for the poor services rendered to the community.

Several organisations, among which there was Inkatha, vehemently opposed such extraordinary increases. As these organisations had already come together to organise the bus boycott, the decision to increase rents was a very convenient new issue about which to protest. Then, instead of joining the combined protest, some people decided to form a new orgnisation and to go it alone. Town Councillor Msizi Dube, the Rev. Xundu and Mr. Richard Gumede formed the Joint Rent Action Committee (JORAC). JORAC joined the UDF and received support from other UDF member organisations, such as the church organisation in Durban, Diakonia. This "going it alone" by JORAC in Lamontville created divisions which were to have tragic consequences.

In the circumstances which prevailed, Councillor Dube was murdered by the Chairman of the Town Council who was later sentenced to 12 years in jail. Then several times after JORAC held meetings, some went on the rampage. They set fire to cars and buildings and attacked people. Inkatha members were particularly victimised. A packed Inkatha meeting where the rent issue was being discussed was broken up, cars and houses of Inkatha members were burned, windows smashed and people were injured. During all this violence and looting, five people were killed.

The aggressiveness of JORAC failed to achieve tangible successes in the rent issue. It was only when I called on the Minister of Co-operation and Development, Dr. Piet Koornhof, that the first discussion took place between the authorities and representatives of the people. It was decided to shelve the rent increases for six months because of the devastating effects which the drought had had on income in KwaZulu and Natal. In addition to discussions with Dr. Koornhof, Inkatha decided to fight the rent issue in court at a cost of R15 000 (about 12, 000 US dollars) which was gathered nationwide from Inkatha's members. Together with the Community Council, the Movement challenged the right of the Minister of Co-opertion and Development to increse the rents unilaterally in townships without consulting the constituted Black local authorities.

JORAC, empty-handed because of its failure in the action for which

it had been ...71/

it had been created directed a new offensive against fellow Blacks: me and Inkatha. The decision of the South African Government to incorporate Lamontville into KwaZulu was the pretext on which I and Inkatha were attacked. The JORAC argument was that people would lose their Section 10 rights if Lamontville were toi be incorporated into KwaZulu.

JORAC ignored the fact that if the people of Lamontville were to be included in KwaZulu they would in practice retain the benefits of Section 10 rights. Dr. Koornhof's statement made under pressure from Natal Industry was clear: "I wish to give the assurance that any rights acquired by residents of the area in the past terms of Section 10 of the Black Urban Consolidation Act to work in a presecribed area will not be jeopardised in any fashion as a result of the new status". JORAC's leadership conveniently ignored the fact that in practice the application of regulations affecting Section 10 rights is different in Durban than it is elsewhere in the country. JORAC leaders also seem to have forgotten history. In 1978 a meeting was called by the residents of Lamontville at which more than 1 000 participants passed a motion expressing the wish that Lamontville be incorporated in KwaZulu. There upon in June 1978 the following motion was moved in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly by Mrs Willel Yengwa then a local Inkatha leader in Lamontville.

> "Mr. Speaker, I move -
>
> That in the opinion of this Legislative Assembly the advisability be considered that negotiations with the Republican Government be initiated by the KwaZulu Government for the transfer of certain places presently under the control of Bantu Administration Boards, such as Lamontville and others, to KwaZulu, in order to facilitate uniform rendering of servcices to KwaZulu citizens for example education".

The facts of the matter were that before this motion was tabled, the South African Government had already decided that Lamontville should be incorporated in KwaZulu. It is therefore beyond understanding why JORAC leaders, helped by other UDF member organisations, took this up as an issue which could be used against myself and Inkatha, and not as an issue to be taken up against the South African Government. By doing this they created distinctions between sections of their own people namely a distinction between Black people inside and outside KwaZulu, and what is worse by doing this, they have followed in the footsteps of Pretoria which employs a divide and rule policy.

In meeting with JORAC leaders and others, I made my position very clear. I said at that meeting that "I have never worked for the incorporation of Lamontville into KwaZulu, but I also see nothing

wrong with its inclusion into KwaZulu. Blacks inside and outside KwaZulu share the same destiny. We suffer the same oppression and we have to work for Black unity across the political chasms which Pretoria tries to create to divide Black and Black. I refuse to be curtailed by the boundaries erected by Pretoria. I have defied National Party Government after National Party Government to keep Inkatha unfettered by the political barriers created by Pretoria between Black and Black. Inkatha knows no ethenic barriers. It knows no regional barriers, and it is at one with all those who truly struggle or the liberation of this country in whatever destitute areas they may be. It is God-foresaken to distinguish between the oppression of Blacks in KwaZulu, and the oppression of Black in Lamontville, and it is God-forsaken to create Black/Black conflicts over the boundaries that Pretoria has drawn to divide us"

The insults which have been directed against me and Inkatha have provoked deep resentment among many people. As the membership of Inkatha has reached over one million, it is not possible to go anywhere in Natal or on the Reef without encountering Inkatha members, and they take strong exception to insults against their leaders.

At a mass meeting in Durban, held to honour those who died in Lamontville, Mr. Gideon Sibiya who leads the 10 000 residents of the S.J. Smith Hostel, he found his men ready to go and "teach the people of Lamontville a lesson". Only with extreme tact and persuation was he able to persuade several thousand men not to apply the dictum of "eye for an eye". According to Mr. Sibiya "There could be more trouble" if the leadership of JORAC allowed looting and the insulting of myself to continue.

The events at the unveiling of the tombstone of the late Councillor Msizi Dube on 22nd July 1984 were tragic. At the function in the Church and in the graveyard some people carried placards which read: "Gatsha stay out of Lamontville". When some Inkatha members present took exception to these placards and demanded that they be removed, they were attacked. The mob killed two Inkatha members and several were injured.

The Secretary-General of Inkaha, Dr. O.D. Dhlomo, expressed his deep concern about the pattern of violence in Lamontville. He said: "It is amazing that each time there is a semi-political gathering in Lamontville, Inkatha or its leaders are denigrated. When we try to defend ourselves against such denigrations, we are accused of being a violent Movement. Yet these groups apparently have a right to kill indiscriminately without anybody raising a murmur".

One cannot escape the impression that the first objective of UDF member organisations in Lamontville is to try to destroy Inkatha,

instead of ...73/

instead of fighting the apartheid regime. Leaders of some UDF member organisations attempt to mislead the people by distorting truths to convince them that the KwaZulu Government and Inkatha have nothing to offer them. They try to sow Black/Black discord so that they can prosper politically out of the plight of the people. In order to further their own interests, they do not hesitate to use undemocratic tactics under the guise of having the well-being of the people at heart. They tried to make Lamontville a no-go area for me when I announced that I was going to Lamontville on September 1st. JORAC leaders wanted to prevent me from showing my strength in Lamontville and therefore the Rev. Xundu and some members of JORAC and Diakonia requested a meeting with me. Beforehand they were informed that the question of my visit to Lamontville was not negotiable. I pointed out to them that I had a democratic right to go and speak to the people of Lamontville. Like Blacks elsewhere, the residents of Lamontville had a democratic right to support whom they wanted to and to formulate community responses to the circumstances of their oppression.

After the meeting which lasted six hours, the representatives of JORAC and Diakonia refused to issue a joint statement with Inkatha calling for the cessation of Black/Black violence. They however were not successful in prohibiting me from going to Lamontville. The Rev. Xundu tried to have the Court serve a interdict on me to stop me, but without success. JORAC'sattempts to make Lamontville a no-go area for me have failed and the meeting took place as planned.

Prayers were conducted by representatives of IDAMASA and over 30 000 people attended. Some news reporters hostile to me who had in the week before built up the impression of imminent violence, must have been disappointed. Not a single act of violence occurred. People met, prayed, sang, and listened, and any new members joined Inkatha during the Lamontville meeting. In my speech I said:

> "Inkatha and KwaZulu did not create Lamontville. Inkatha and KwaZulu did not stop building houses here. Inkatha and KwaZulu did not create the Group Areas Act, influx control regulations and all the other acts which confine you to the terrible circumstances in which you live. The KwaZulu Government did not tell the PNAB to raise your rents, to raise your bus fares. The KwaZulu Government did not tell Pretoria to deprive your children of the kind of education they need by starving your schools of money. One South African Government after another did these things. Those who argue against incorporation are telling you to serve your masters in Pretoria. They are actually saying that you should yourselves elect to be administered by the White-controlled PNAB. They are telling you to give this Board your confidence , and to say to this Board that you entrust your future to them."

There are .. 74/

There are more issues on which JORAC and other UDF member organistions seem to apply double standards. JORAC and UDF spokesmen have attacked me for "working within the system" and UDF representatives are on record as saying that they do not want to co-operate with people "working within the system". Furthermore the UDF tried to prevent people from working within the system by calling for a boycott of the elections for Community Councils.

However, the same organisations had worked closely with the late Councillor Dube who according to them would be "working within the system". They hailed him as a great leader. Apparently the same standards are not always applied to everybody.

Inkatha has used participation as a very successful tactic. By taking part in the elections for the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and in winning all its seats, it guaranteed that the people of KwaZulu would never be forced to become foreigners in their country of birth. Inkatha has blocked all moves by Pretoria to manipulate KwaZulu into accepting the so-called independence being offered to it. In addition to its important political stand Inkatha has control over the KwaZulu Assembly and is able to utilise available resources where people need them most.

I talked about this very issue in my Policy Speech in 1983: "I think our role can be summed up in the concept participatory democratic oposition to apartheid. There is no safe way of opposing apartheid. You cannot oppose apartheid by sniping at its victims. If the real struggle is taking place here in this country and if victory is to be won by waging a struggle for liberation here where it matters, then we have got to participate in the society which is changing. We have to continue our role here in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and we have to continue in the programmes which emanate from this house. We have had thecourage to stand with the people in attempts to do whatever can be done together with them in their circumstances and that makes us vulnerable. The path that we have chosen to walk, the role that we have involved ourselves in in real politics, is a difficult and demanding role, and we have to pursue our objectives knowing full well that as we oppose apartheid and strive for real changes, we will be belittled, we will be sniped at and what we do will be undermined. We must see all this as part of the challenge we face".

The circumstances of Lamontville are not different from those of Umlazi and KwaMashu. The people of Lamontville will not be worse off should the South African Government include their township in KwaZulu. The people of KwaMashu and Umlazi who are incorporated in KwaZulu do not resist incorporation and they find themselves no worse off than people in other townships.

In Lamontville UDF member organisations have taken up the

incorporation ... 75/

incorporation issue in an offensive against Inkatha instead of laying the blame where it belongs - with the South African regime. The inevitable result is unnecessary division, and the futile prolonging of the suffering of the people of Lamontville. The only thing Black/Black opposition does is to play right into the hands of Pretoria.

Apartheid is so abhorrent that just simply any measure against it is seen as justified by some in the West. I have no doubt that there are many members in the Conservative and Labour Parties who are genuinely indignant about apartheid and in whom that indignation gives rise to irresponsible action in supporting the forces of destruction in South Africa.

This has become very apparent in the disinvestment debate in the United States, and it is very apparent in much of the activity of pressure groups in Great Britain and Western Europe. There is too much at stake, not only for millions in South Africa, but for the whole sub-continent of Southern Africa for Western indignation to give rise to indiscriminate action against apartheid.

I am pursuing a path of non-violent, democratic oppostion to the Government precisely because I see this as the only way of preserving the future. Vast backlogs in Black housing, health services and welfare, and in such things as education, can only be wiped out some time in the future if the South African economy grows at its maximum possible rate. I am pursuing the politics of negotiation because I do not want to reduce South Africa to ungovernability, and this is what mass poverty will do some time in the future if the country's economic growth base is damaged now.

Inkatha holds an Annual General Conference every year and at every one of these Conferences, I inform delegates what I have said on their behalf on the question of disinvestment. I inform them that I tell the world:

- that ordinary Black South Aricans still seek a negotiated settlement and seek to pursue non-violent tactics and strategies;

- they know the meaning of poverty and are aware of the fact that if they do not have work they suffer terrible deprivation and that therefore any strategy which results in a decrease in the number of jobs available to Blacks is rejected by Blacks;

- Blacks in South Africa who have jobs with foreign companies would never be persuaded to relinquish their jobs to further the aims and objectives of those who pursue the disinvestment lobby;

that no .. /75/

- that no membership-based Black organisation in South Africa has an executive with a mandate from its members to call for disinvestment;

- that Black protest politicians who are not involved in constituency politics but who are involved in voicing Black grievances in a manner calculated to gain media acclaim, are more prone to call for disinvestment than other leaders.

- that every leader of an organisation working to make this country ungovernable and who is prepared to use violence, whether it be mob violence or armed violence, to bring about political change, argues for disinvestment;

- that there is no prospect of the armed struggle succeeding within the foreseeable future and that we therefore will have to rely on the politics of negotiation; and that the politics of negotiation are favoured by what has now become a total dependence by White South Africa on Black South Africa;

- that Black bargaining power is increased by Black economic advancement and vertical mobility which accompanies it;

- that it is the responsibility of Black South Africans to liberate South Africa from apartheid oppression in such a way that we do not force on neighbouring Black States, and States further afield in Southern and Central Africa, to pay the costs of our struggle.

- I tell them that we respect the national choices of Black States in Southern Africa and that we have no quarrel with those who have opted for a socialist future under a one-Party state, but that that is not a viable option for us; and that the benefits we will derive from working within a race-free, democratic state in which there will be equality for all, and in which the principles of the free enterprise system will dominate in government planning, will have a very significant spill-over benefit for other States in Southern Africa.

Western industrialised countries which are moving towards banning future investment in South Africa, or even worse to withdrawing existing investment, and which regard Black opinion among rank and and file workers and peasants as irrelevant, stand in the very real danger of pursuing aims and objectives which conflict with what is beneficial in our struggle for liberation. And in this vein, I would like to make an additional point. I am beginning to hear more and more arguments in favour of selective disinvestment because many of the points I have made above are taken and it is

naively ... 77/

naively believed that, for example, prohibition of further investment in capital intensive industries, is warranted. Every Western Government knows that economies are not malleable things and cannot be turned on or off at will, and can only be directed towards political ends with very limited success. The naivety of some who think they can damage one part of the economy without it having repercussions for another part of the economy, is to me alarming. I am most certainly open to persuasion that one or another form of disinvestment may put pressure on Pretoria without demaging the economy, or causing greater Black suffering. I argue against disinvestment because it has these negative effects. Any sanctions against South Africa which would not harm the growth of the economy, but which would exert pressure on Pretoria, would be welcomed by every Black South African. I have always spoken against irresponsible exploitative capitalism, but that to me is another dabate entirely.

There is also a ripeness of time in which blunders would lead to irrecoverable losses. The West should realise that the threat of violence, and the threat of economic sanctions has more utility than the employment of violence and the implementation of damaging sanctions. The West should lso realise that as soon as sanctions do begin to bite, it is Black South Africa which will bear the brunt of the burden. The West should also realise that as soon as sanctions do begin to bite, it is Black South Africa which will bear the brunt of theburden. The West should also realise that the South African Government is quite capable of taking retaliatory measures of the most despicable kind. If sanctions began to bite, Pretoria would have no scruples about repatriating more than a million workers in South Africa who come from neighbouring Sates.

I am not saying that pressures should not be brought to bear on South Africa. All I am saying is that all of us who work for the destruction of apartheid should not be blinded by anger to the extent that we fail to examine carefully the consequences of every act we take in the process of doing so. I have become very skeptical on the issue of whether the West would come to the rescue of more than a million citizens of these independent States when the crunch comes, and South Africa decides to expel them as a retaliatory act. I have become skeptical because I have not seen a single Western country do anything to the rogue elephant, which the South African Defence Force has been, when they have killed our brothers and sisters in countries such as Lesotho, Mocambique, Angola and Botswana.

I am fully aware of the fact that even the maximum possible growth rate of the South African economy will leave a great many Black South Africans jobless for a very considerable time into the future. The Black birth rate in South Africa is approaching three per cent per annum, and already more than half of all Black

South Africans ... 78/

South Africans are 15 years old and younger. This huge population bulge of millions of youth people moving towards the market place, is going to create almost insoluble problems for whatever government rules South Africa. I am therefore aware that the development of an informal economy, and the development of self-help, schemes ios vital for our future. I am also aware that the growth rate of the informal economy rises and falls as the growth rate of the formal economy rises and falls. Western governments should understand that the cause for which we all struggle in South Africa demands the maximisation of the West's input into the South African economy. Millions of people now, and future generations, will benefit from a vast inflow of capital into South Africa, and the inflow of new technology and managerial skills which will come with it.

My attitude to the disinvestment question has to be tempered by the realities of the South African situation. The ANC Mission in Exile and the United Democratic Front have been joined by a number of protest politicians and by a number of clerics, in a veritable clamour for the West to embark on a programme of disinvestment against South Africa. Glib claims are made about the willingness of Black South Africans to suffer the consequences of a shattered economy and what measure of support there is in Black South Africa for disinvestment rests on the false hope that economic threats will be effective as a means of bringing the Government to its knees. This unrealism is dangerous and when unrealism about economic affairs is accompanied by unrealism about the threat of violence in Shouth Africa, a very dangerous situation could be in the making. Western Parliamentarians know that it would be foolhardy for any Western government to ignore the voice of the Church. There are times when the Church's voice and the pressure it mounts in support of specific lobbies, has considerable political significance. The British Parliament, however, would not put itself in a position where it is dictated to by the Church of England, or by any other Church. Members of the Foreign Affairs Committee are well aware of the fact that the Church does not have the expertise to run a government and the Church is not sufficiently acquainted with the realities which the British Government has to take into account in developing a domestic and foreign policy. I clearly see this to be the case in Western societies and I see it just as clearly to be the case in South Africa. It is therefore with considerable amazement that I perceive the extent to which some of our political clerics hold sway on crucial issues about South Africa as far as the West is concerned.

I have known Bishop Desmond Tutu for a great many years. I am well aware of the fact that he and the South African Council of Churches is critical of me and Inkatha. His indignation about apartheid and the suffering of Black South Arica has led him to identify with protest politics. In the past he has played a very

valuable 79/

valuable role at times when he so eloquently denounced apartheid to the world. The extent to which he attempts to participate in Black politics on the ground, however, frequently estranges the two of us. Every Parliamentarian will know the importance of having a constituency to support him or her, and what the curbs and restraints of accountability to that constituency involve. I have a massive constituency to which I am accountable. A Bishop's role in one sense is to pontificate to people in his Church, to teach them what to think and how to behave and political clerics in South Africa wrongly extend that role into the political arena. There is in South Africa a great deal of concern about the fact that Bishop Tutu has estranged himself from me. People see this as undesirable. I think it would add to the Foreign Affairs Committee if I gave it details of my relationship with Bishop Tutu. In September last year, a number of very senior churchmen persuaded me to respond positively to Bishop Tutu's request for a meeting with me. I therefore met Bishop tutu in Durban at a meeting chaired by the Anglican Bishop of Natal, Bilshop Nuttall in the presence of a number of other Bishops. The following is the paper I tabled for discussion.

MEMORANDUM FOR PRESENTATION BY MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI, CHIEF MINISTER: KWAZULU, PRESIDENT OF INKATHA AND CHAIRMAN, THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK ALLIANCE - AT A MEETING AT BISHOP'S HOUSE: DURBAN: 30 SEPTEMBER 1985, WITH:

The Rt. Revd. Michael Nuttal - Bishop of Natal
The Rt. Revd. Desmond Tutu - Bishop of Johannesburg
The Rt. Revd. Lawrence Zulu - Bishop of Zululand
The Rt. Revd. A.H. Zulu - Former Bishop of Zululand
The Rt. Revd. A.A. Mkhize - Suffragan Bishop of Natal
Father Makhaye
Reverend Vundla
Dr. O.D. Dhlomo
Venerable E. Mkhize
Venerable Xulu
Dr. F.T. Mdlalose
Revd. E.Z. Sikakane - Retired Minister of the Methodist Church
Mr. A.Z. Mlotshwa - KwaZulu Government Representative in Durban

We have come here, I hope, to explore unity and reconciliation. I certainly came here to do so. I came here with an earnest desire to leave this meeting with a deepened understanding of what estranges important people, and I yearn to leave here in circumstances in which the whole world could be witness to the Bishop of Johannesburg and myself embraced in common purpose, even if we are divided by our Lord to do different things to achieve that common purpose.

It is now ... 80/

It is now I hope patently clear that as a political leader I need no props, and no allies who can fight my battles for me. I have established Inkatha against all odds and it is now an entrenched political power which is self-sufficient as far as its own survival goes. My yearning for Black South African unity is a yearning born out of a deep love for my country and a recognitijon that justice, peace and equality for all can only be brought about by eradicating apartheid. Apartheid is not merely a political philosophy; it is not merely an ideology; it is a South African White way of life which has been institutionalised and which must therefore be fought on a wide range of fronts. We can be united in purpose but we can only be united in strategy if we all accept the need for a multi-strategy approach.

Outside a multi-strategy approach, the only unity there can be between different Black organisations is unity based on uniformity and this will in hard practice only be found in a disciplined joint commitment in the armed struggle. I make the point that if any single strategy can win, it is the strategy of war. The African National Congress Mission in exile places the armed struggle as the primary means of bringing about change. They demand that we all recognise that fact. In an armed struggle one does not need to fight across a broad spectrum of democratic opposition to apartheid. The armed struggle must necessarily negate any step towards reform. They must negate the concept of reform, and they must negate even such steps as the elimination of the pass laws and influx control. This they have done. In the armed stuggle, every step of real progress towards negotiated reform must be viewed as a threat

As a Christian I must welcome the scrapping of pass laws and influx control, if and when that actually does take place. I must welcome the prospect of it taking place. I must encourage Mr. P.W. Botha and all members of Government who are thinking in this direction. Would you, Bishop Tutu, join me in a joint public encouragement of Mr. Botha to scrap influx control and the pass laws?

Bishop Tutu is a patron of the United Democratic Front. I am President of Inkatha. We stand in camps which are now in fact hostile to each other. From my point of view, that hostility was authored by the United Democratic Front which publicly rejected Inkatha and stated it would not accept Inkatha as an affiliate member, when the thought had not even crossed my mind. It is common cause that the UDF formally rejects Inkatha and it is common cause that element in the UDF reject Inkatha in acts of violence against it.

Inkatha has buried people in Black/Black confrontations in which the UDF were involved against us. It is simply true that the UDF and AZAPO have buried their dead who were causalities of UDF/AZAPO

conflicts. ... / 81/

conflicts. It is simply true that AZAPO and UDF have buried those who were killed in Inkatha action. At today's discussion, I hope we do not have to lay blame. I am simply recording the fact that people are dying because Black leaders cannot get together. I believe that Inkatha only takes up a stick or a stone to defend that which is threatened with death and destruction. And I believe that elements in the United Democratic Front encourage the growth of violence in our townships in a commitment to making our country ungovernable. Let us say even that you, Sir, and I have got irreconcilable analyses of why people are dying. We must accept that people are dying as a result of Black/Black internecine strife. Will you, Sir, stand on a platform with me to condemn Black killing Black? Will you stand on a platform to condemn acts of violence by Blacks. Will you stand on a platform to condemn those statements by the ANC's Mission in exile which exhort Black South Africans and our youth in particular to kill Black Councillors and Black policemen? Will you publicly condemn with me the ANC's Mission in exile recent broadcasts over Radio Freedom exhorting Blacks to take violence into White areas and to forcibly remove arms from White houses to be used in killing people, whether or not the number of civilians who die increases dramatically?

I find it difficult to conceive of reconciliation in private behind closed doors if the horrors of brutality perpetrated by Blacks on Blacks and on Whites because they are Whites, cannot be condemned in public in joint statements.

I have, Bishop Tutu, I think shown the hand of friendship to you. You will remember that I even invited yu once to lead devotions at the opening of a South African Black Alliance Prayer Meeting in Soweto, but you declined to come even though you were asked to come simply as a clergyman. When you took the initiative to reconcile Black/Black confrontations when AZAPO and UDF were at each other's throats, I responded very positively and sent Inkatha representatives to the meeting. I would any day of the week be prepared to stand with you in public and for us to tell the world that we have major differences of opinion about strategy, but that we both as Christians seek to play a role to bring our country to its senses. I am not denying you, Sir, your democratic right to have political opinions which bear your judgement. Christ may be directing your steps in one diretion and mine in another. My problem does not come because of your political leanings. My problems come when you do not attack Inkatha's tactics and strategies, but attack me as a person.

If I am wrong in some of my perceptions please correct me. I am informed, for example, that you work very closely with Mr. Randall Robinson when you are in the United States, and you praise him for his support of the Black South African struggle for liberation in this country. I am informed that he has taken your view when he

makes outrageous ... / 82/

makes outrageous statements to the effect that I am an agent of the South African Government and that I am "doing the bidding of the South African Government" and that I am on "their pay roll" and that I was an apologist for the system in South Africa. You are aware that I have had a running battle with the system. You are aware that the South African Government did everything in its power to avoid confirmation of my appointment as Chief of the Buthelezi clan. You are aware that they took away my passport. You are aware that my telephone is tapped and that my mail has been intercepted. You are aware that the National Intelligence Service, then BOSS, actually funded opposition parties to Inkatha in KwaZulu in an attempt to get rid of me. Is it really too much to have expected that you would have informed Mr. Robinson of this history of constant opposition to apartheild and the extent to which the Government time and again attempted to undermilne the influence I was exerting? In the totality of things one sees more than could perhaps be justified in bickerings about specific texts. For example, The Star carried a news item under the heading: "Thatcher will meet Tutu next week". The sting in the news item in the last two paragraphs may have escaped those who are not fully informed. They read:

> "Mrs Thatcher's failure to see Bishop Tutu when he was in London a year ago reportedly caused offence to many South African Blacks.
>
> It was noted that Mrs Thatcher had found time during the same year to see Mr. P.W. Botha and Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi".

Because you, Bishop Tutu, were involved in the events being reported, is it unreasonable for me to have expected you to have disassociated yourself from the conjoining of my name and Mr. Botha's name in this kind of way? The implications of this news item is that Black South Africa took umbrage at Mrs Thatcher seeing Mr. Botha and myself and not seeing you. Could you not have said that this is an unfair insinuation and that you welcomed me seeing Mrs Thatcher as a Black South African?

As an African in South Africa, you would know how deeply insulting these kind of statements are. You know I have been hurt by them and that they are calculated to be damaging to my role and to Inkatha. Would you, Bishop Tutu, be prepared to inform Mr. Randall Robinson in a joint statement with me that my leadership in KwaZulu was not a creation of the homeland policy. It was in fact Chief Lutuli and such people as Bishop A.H. Zulu, Walter Sisulu, Nelson Mandela, Joe Matthews and a number of other people in leadership roles in the old ANC who urged me to take up my hereditary leadership position in KwaZulu. This involved me in taking up my chieftainship of the Buthelezi clan. I do not know if you, Sir, are aware that the Buthelezi clan traditionally provided advisers, generals and prime ministers to Zulu monarchs.

In other words ..... / 83/

In other words if there was no homelands policy, my position in KwaZulu leadership would be exactly the same as it is today. It was the same before the homelands framework was imposed on the Zulu nation.

For many years there were no problems between Mr. Tambo and myself. Problems only emerged after a full Inkatha delegation met with Mr. Tambo and the ANC Mission in exile delegation in London in 1979. It then became clear for the first time that unless I was prepared to become a surrogate of the ANC Mission in exile, there would be problems. I was prepared to be an ally on those levels of political action in which common objectives permitted joint interests. I could not undertake those things which amounted to support for the armed struggle, the use of violence in politics and the economic isolation of South Africa which would starve Black South Africans into a deeper misery than they had ever known before. You, Bishop tutu, are aware of the points of difference between the ANC Mission in exile and Inkatha. They revolve around tactics and strategy and our unwiullingness to support violence. As a Bishop of the Anglican Church, is it really too much to ask you to support Inkatha's non-violent tactics and strategies as preferable to the ANC Mission in exile's commitment to war.

Whether or not you agree with the tactics and strategies of Inkatha, Sir, you would agree that it has a million members and that I am elected to be the President of Inkatha. I find it very disquietening when I am insulted in public by people who I really do believe to be under your influence in the United States, and that you do not raise your voice to object on my behalf. Few Whites would understand the depth of feeling which calling a Black leader a homeland stooge or a sell-out solicits in Black hearts. You, Sir, would be aware of that depth. I am not asking you to publicly approve of my politics, or that I play a role in the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. all I am asking is that you help correct the very divisive politics which follow on people calling me a stooge, a sell-out and an apologist for apartheid. If you want to do something practical about reconciliation, that is one of the places you could start.

The ANC's Mission in exile has now openly declared war on Inkatha and the United Democratic Front stands side by side with them in doing so. Do you, Sir, believe that Inkatha should be destroyed? You may believe we will fail. You may believe we are doing the wrong things but do you believe that Inkatha is a threat to the struggle for liberation? Do you think it is wrong for Inkatha to have seized control of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly to block the South African Government in its attempt to manipulate KwaZulu into acceptiong so-called independence? KwaZulu is the only region which has nothing to do with the Special Cabinet Committee. It is the only one which has had nothing to do with the non-

statutory negotiating forum. KwaZulu was the only so-called homeland which refused to have anything to do with the Black Advisory Council which President Botha attempted to establish in his then role as Prime Minister. I have refused even to discuss the consolidation of KwaZulu with the Commission for Co-operation and Development, and I refused to have anything to do with a committee which the late Mr. J.B. Vorster set up to look at ways and means of making the pass laws more acceptable to Blacks. I am the only leader of any region in South Africa who has had not one single discussion with the State President about the future of our country. I am now further estranged from the State President than I have ever been in my life before. At the outset of his then premiership, I simply pleaded with the world to give him a chance to prove his own ledership merits. Was this un-Christian? When he disappointed Black South Africa in the way he was leading Whites and in the way in which he was leading our country into ever great turmoil, is it not true that I criticised him in ever more strident terms? Whenever he has shown any signs of moving in the right direction, I have encouraged him. Is this un-Christian? During the last four and a half years I have only met him once formally, and then it was to tell him that I can only talk to him outside the four corners of apartheid. Is this a crime? Can I really be called a stooge of the South African Government?

I find it difficult to think about reconciliation on a personal level with anyone who condemns these stances and actions as stances and actions of a government stooge and Black sell-out. Have you, Sir, in the United States and elsewhere critiised me on the grounds that I am, you claim, paid by Pretoria? Have you ever criticised John Kane-Berman because he is too closely associated with me? Do you recoginse that the language which is used in denigrating Inkatha incites Blacks to kill Blacks? These are the kind of questions which must be tabled.

What I have been saying could be read to be provocative. I am making no statements with that intention. I am pointing to difficulties and I am pointing to the kind of things which should be looked at if we really are talking about reconciliation. I am not a theologian and I have not been called to high office in the Church. My understanding of Christ is a sinner's understanding and in this company of Bishops and priests who have been called to high office in the Church, let me state some of my perceptions, and let me be corrected if I am un-Christian in these statements. I would like to make the following statements:

1. Christ is to be found everywhere. He is seeking obedience from those who are in guerilla camps. He is seeking obedience from those who are in the South African army. He is seeking obedience from those who are in the United Democratic Front. He is seeking obedience from those who are

in Inkatha. He is seeking obedience from those in the PFP and the National Party, in COSAS, AZAPO and all other political orgnisations. In all these organisations Christ has directed one or more of His servants to be there. The Church of the Province has not condemned any political group in this country to be unholy, beyond redemption, with no possible role to play in normalising South Africa and bringing about a just and fair society.

2. The Anglican Church has no formal stance which declares the need to rely on violence as the essential element in bringing about a just state. It has retained a commitment to furthering non-violence in politics and it is still deeply committed to bringing about change through non-violent means. Our Church does not believe that mass violence is either essential or even inevitable. As a Church we express deep faith in the reconciling powers of our Lord, and it has not condemned Inkatha for its commitment to the politics of negotiation. As the Bishop of Johannesburg, Sir, these must be your views.

3. The Church has a duty to confront the State when the State acts unjustly and does not meet the demands of the Gospel, but the Anglican Church has appointed no political organisation to be its spearhead in tackling that which has to be done to confront the State with the inequities of apartheid. It must applaud all who work for the liberation of our country from racial fear and hatred which gives rise to constitutionalised injustice. It should applaud everything which can be applauded in all the country's political organisations.

4. Christendom has never finally pronounced on the question of violence. Whether or not there is such a thing as a just war is not decided upon. The Church does not bind all its members to one or another answer to the question of violence. I believe, however, that I am right in saying that there can be no just war if all non-violent means have not yet been properly employed. There is theologically no justification for the armed struggle which the ANC's Mission in exile has declared. Their position may be theologically understandable, but the Church as the Church must applaud those who work to bring about change through non-violent means. Are you, Sir, prepared to tell the ANC's Mission in exile publicly with me that its commitment to the armed struggle as a primary means of bringing about change in our country is not theologically justified?

When one reaches out to reconcile, or when one adopts a stance seeking reconciliation, difficulties and perceptions must be talbed whether the perceptions are correct or incorrect. I perceive you, Bishop Tutu, as one who denigrates my person, as one who denigrates my leadership, and as one who identifies with those who vilify me in the vilest of terms. I am not talking here

about disagreements ... 86/

about disagreements which as Christians we are entitled to. I am not denying you the democratic right to hold contrary views to those I hold. I am not denying you the right to tell the people that you think I am wrong. When I talk about denigration, I am talking about an un-Christian attack on the integrity of a person. I have already asked the question whether you have ever criticised me for taking a salary from Pretoria, as it was put. That is taling about me as a sell-out and a stooge doing apatheid's dirty work for it. That is criticism but it is also denigration.

You, Sir, were with me at Robert Sobukwe's funeral. You saw what was happening and you advised me to leave. When I subsequently deplored the behaviour of those who desecrated that funeral and correctly talked about the youngsters involved as thugs, you responded publicly by saying that they were "a new breed of young people with iron in their souls". I necessarily had to respond to this in public when I held a mass meeting in Soweto. You, Sir, have travelled across the length and breadth of America and Europe without ever once finding anybody to authenticate a public attack by me on you. What others regard as attacks by me on you in certain statements I have made in South Africa were no more than necessary comments in a very volatile political situation which demanded them. The move against me at Robert Sobukwe's funeral was politically inspired; it was politically orchestrated and after the even my enemies made a great deal of political capital out of that event. This I regard as deeply shameful to African morality and African perceptions, and I simply must raise the question in public about your participation in that which I so deeply regretted.

In speaking recently to a White I heard that you had told him that I was nobody of consequence and was rejected to the extent of not being able to attend Black funerals. This statement opened up old wounds inflicted on me at Graaff Reneit. You, Sir, were witness to my near murder. Was the press report at the time headed "Tutu Saves Buthelezi" a correct interpretation of what transpired there? I regarded what happened there as a hideous desecration of a funeral. For me you condoned it by staying there and in effect presiding over a desecration. I am appalled at the use which Black political leaders make of funerals when they turn them into important political platforms. I am appalled at what I regard as the hypocrisy of your words when you appealed passionately to the South African Government to allow Blacks to bury their dead in peace without directing that same appeal to the United Democratic Front. They have taken over funerals in this volatile political atmosphere and converted them into horrible spectacles where people have been burnt without anyone raising a finger to protect the victims.

You, Sir, approached me early in 1984, unasked for out of a blue,

seeking a meeting ... 87/

seeking a meeting with me when you were still General-Secretary of the SACC. But during the whole year you found no time to actually meet with me. You even described my response to your letter as gracious. I am offended by a Bishop who criticises me publicly and then privately asks me to meet with him in reconciliation, but then takes no step to do so. I feel disdained.

I stress again that I do not regard this meeting as a political meeting. We are not here to discuss the merits of one or another political approach. We are looking at what divides you, Bishop Tutu, and myself as Christian brothers. You know, Sir, that it is now simply a fact that the ANC's Mission in exile are encouraging every possible United Democratic Front move which is directed against Inkatha. The Mission in exile is attempting to turn me into an enemy of the people in the eyes of the people. If you, Sir, believe the UDF's tactics and strategies are the correct ones, then you are entitled to hold those beliefs, but if those beliefs make you take up sides against me as a person and as a leader and if you, Sir, support those who denigrate my person, whether you do so privately or publicly, then I really do have a problem. I believe that if there are differences between the United Democratic Front and Inkatha, both sides should take their point of view to the people and leave the people to judge on the merits of tactics and strategies who should be supported and who should not be supported. It is dirty politics which goes into character assassination, and I do not believe the Church is right to stand in the company of character assassins to express views about justice and reconciliation.

If having said these things you no longer want to be reconciled with me as a Christian brother engaged in the struggle for liberation as Christians, then I will go away from this meeting in sadness. That I have said what I have said is the measure of my earnest Christian desire to embrace you in forgiveness and in being forgiven. I hope that you on your side will leave this place with no feelings unsaid.

We meet in the embracing strength of Christian fellowship. We meet in a spirit of prayer, and I believe that our Lord is here with us and I have spoken in that awareness.

$$$$$$$$$$$$

I cannot afford the luxury of being personal in my politics or being idiosyncratic. My poliltical life is filled with the hard, grinding work of serving a number of very large and demanding constituencies. It is filled on a day to day basis with the real issues which the poorest of the poor in South Africa face, and it is filled with very stringent demand which I have to meet as I work on the interface between Black and White politics. There

will be ... 88/.

will be no Utopia brought about overnight in South Africa. There will be no overnight victory by the radicals, and the world will not be presented with a new and wholesome South Africa in any short space of time. In my political life I strive to bring Black and White together and in our circumstances, the only way to do so, is to address bread and butter issues where consensus can be obtained and where joint Black/White action can be generated to bring about a new South Africa.

While the State President was busy with planning and establishing the new constitution, I was busy chartering a course which Blacks and Whites could follow together to bring about radial change. In 1980 I called for the establishement of the Buthelezi Commission and gave it the following major terms of reference:

1a. In terms of the requirements of peace, stabilty, prosperity and equity, to consider fully and appreciate the present position of KwaZulu and Natal with a constitutional and political structure of South Africa, taking into account possible or likely future developments, and with due cognisance of alternative constitutional forms and modes of political organisation and development.

1b. To assist and evaluate the rationality, desirability and viability of the present constitutional, social and economic situation of KwaZulu and Natal in the light of historical development, and the current and emerging political reality of South and Southern Africa.

2. To enquire into and report and make recommendations on the constitutional future of the areas of KwaZulu and Natal within the context of South Africa nd Southern Africa.

I also charged it with looking at the vexing political issues we face in what can be done in the context of solving local and regional problems in KwaZulu/Natal within the South African context.

Professor Lawrence Schlemmer, who was full-time Secretary to the Commission while it sat, has summarised the work of the Commission in an article published in "Clarion Call" Vol. 2 1985. I attach a copy of this article as an Appendix. Here I want to mention that Inkatha and the KwaZulu Government accepted the Commission's recommendations in principle and we have been using these recommendations to assist us in chartering a course of action. Individual members of the Foreign Affairs committee will know how important it is to relate politics to local and regional issues. In KwaZulu and Natal Blacks and Whites are faced with the gross inefficiency of apartheid. Since the Buthelezi Commission recommendations have been published, we in Inkatha and the KwaZulu

Government paid a great deal of attention to the need to bridge the gap between Black and White political and administrative machinery at the local and regional level. There have been ongoing negotiations between KwaZulu and the Natal Provincial Council, and I am glad to say that there is now consensus between ourselves and the White administrators of Natal about the necessity of multi-racial local and regional government. Negotiations have reached an advanced stage and we are now in a position where we can make a concrete joint Black/White proposal to the Government. If the South African Government accepts the proposals we are making, it would represent a major break through in South African politics.

My approach in South African politics is that solutions cannot be imposed by the Central Government. The very deep-rooted problems we face as a society have to be solved by the people and the Government has to reflect the people's will in their situations. While it is foolhardy to make predictions in South Africa, I am relatively optimistic that sooner or later the realities which underlie the present problems of South Africa, will demand that the Central Government decentralise the problem-solving procedures, so to speak, and permit regional experimentation in the evolution of the kind of local and regional political machinery which will de-escalate race conflicts and violence. What we are doing in KwaZulu/Natal is "real politik".

A new democratic and free South Africa will not be authored by street corner violence. It will be authored by men and women in Black and White society who accept that apartheid has to go and it has to be replaced with a social and poliltical system which give both Black and White a meaningful stake in the government of their country. What we are doing in the KwaZulu/Natal region amounts to taking effective and realistic steps towards normalising South Africa as an industrialised democracy. There is vast support for the kind of things we are doing. South Africa is not a society beyond the pale. Black and White are prepared to work together to find new solutions. The National Party, however, continues to have a stranglehold in politics which stifles the goodwill which exists in all population groups. Very considerable groundswell pressures are building up in White society demanding that the Government face our problems realistically and abandon a narrow Afrikaner-orientated ideology in favour of a broad South Africanism.

If there is no hope of succeeding, I would not be doing what I am doing. The very substantial constituency support I enjoy could make me a very prominent leader amongst those who have opted for violence. I do what I do because the politics of negotiation are in all reality far more potent as a force of change than the politics of violence. I do what I do because it can succeed.

When one .. 90/

When one looks back to the times when even Foreign Ministers wanted only to see me through the back door and now see the extent to which people like President Reagan, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, and Mr Shamir of Israel, now invite me to see them formally and officially, we can see how long a road we have travelled. Having seen these people, I was next invited to Germany in February this year, where I was again the guest of the government and was afforded treatment normally only afforded to Heads of State. In Germany I saw the President, Dr. R. von Weizsacker, the Chancellor, Dr. H. Kohl, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. H.D. Genscher, and the Minister for Economic Co-operation, Dr. G. Warncke. In my meeting with the Chancellor, Dr. H. Kohl, I said:

MEMORANDUM FOR PRESENTATION AT A MEETING WITH THE CHANCELLOR OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, DR. H. KOHL
BY MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI, CHIEF MINISTER: KWAZULU, PRESIDENT OF INKATHA AND CHAIRMAN: THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK ALLIANCE

BONN: 18 FEBRUARY 1986

History has thrust a tremendous responsibility on Black leaders in South Africa. We have to pursue noble objectives in circumstances which could not be more difficult. My objective is to lead in such a way that national reconciliation between race groups is achieved during the process of liberating the country from the most hideous form of systematic race oppression known to mankind. I have set myself the task of leading in such a way that South Africa moves towards becoming an open, race-free, industrialised democracy. I pursue non-violent tactics and strategies as the only means of bringing about reconciliation between Black and White, and the only means of laying the foundations for future democracy in circumstances in which successive ruling National Party governments have employed violence to maintain apartheid and has therefore for nearly 40 years been generating counter-violence. I lead in a situation in which my followers in Black constituencies live in terrible impoverished circumstances where the call to be violent is very persuasive.

There will be no overnight victories in South Africa and there will most certainly not be an overnight leap into a Utopian future. The Black south African struggle for liberation has now endured for 76 years. It commenced with the Act of Union in 1910 when Great Britain established Whites as the ruling class. Whites had conquered South Africa and spread along its length and breadth to claim their exclusive right to occupy and to develop more than three quarters of the country for their own benefit. They not only developed the economy for their benefit and occupied the majority of the land, but they also claimed the right to exercise

dictatorial .../ 91/

dictatorial power over the millions of indigenous people whom they had conquered. This is the position that a great many Whites still even today maintain is their right. Under the country's present constitution they retain final decision-making power over 87 per cent of the country's surface area and therefore over virtually all its natural resources. The present constitution entrenches White decision-making powers over the fiscal policy of the country; over its transportation system, over the supply of water and electricity, over the Civil Service, the police and armed forces and therefore over the country's domestic and foreign policy. That position prevails even today.

Today Black South Africans who constitute 72 per cent of the total population have no say whatsoever in the appointment or dismissal of government or in the economic, domestic or foreign policy of the government. This 72 per cent of the population were not consulted before the present constitution was introduced in 1983, nor are they now being consulted as the constitution's ramifications on the ground continue to be elaborated. It is not only at the national level that Blacks are excluded from decision-making. The South African Government is right now busy dismantling first and second tier government structures and going ahead with the introduction of Regional Services Councils without having consulted Blacks. The system of governing so-called homelands and Black Local Authority structures which are now in existence, were prescribed to Blacks by Whites and they are now being altered by Whites prescriptively. Right now the Population Registration Act remains in force which distinguishes between Black and White on he grounds of ethnic origin. Right now the Group Areas Act remains in force which dictates what areas of South Africa are for Whites and what areas are for Blacks.

I mention these specific dimensions of racial oppression because thus far in all the talk of reform, the South African Government has given no indication that they will be eliminated or altered. The hideousness of apartheid goes much further than these dimensions, but in today's debate, the relevant observation is that even if every other hideous aspect of apartheid is eliminated, and these aspects of apartheid society remain, violence will inevitably overtake every effort to bring about change through non-violent means. That is why I have been estranged from Mr. P.W. Botha and that is why I have not found it possible to enter into negotiations with him yet. The day must come when these fundamentals are seen to be the stumbling blocks they are. It is then that negotiations will finally really get off the ground. What we do in the interim period we do to make progress to that point.

The South African State President, Mr. P.W. Botha, when he first assumed office as Prime Minister, gave the impression that he was going to be progressive. He made statements in which he was

telling the .... /92

telling the nation that they had to live, adapt or die, and I pleaded with the world not to judge hilm on the performance of his predecessors and to give him the opportunity to show his worth. This is the State President's second term of office and it is becoming increasingly clear that he will disappoint South Africa and the world. When one reviews the statements he made in his opening address to Parliament and to statements he made last year, it is clear that he has not opened the way to making real progress. Having heard what he has had to say on a number of occasions, I am pessimistic about the immediate future. I see no way forward as things now stand. The Tricameral Parliament remains in force and it is singularly the biggest stumbling block we have to overcome if non-violent change is to proceed.

Last year the State President rejeced the notion of a unitary state, whether it be a unitary state with a one-man-one-vote system of government, or whether it be a federal state. This year he continues to reject a unitary state. He says he accepts that South Africa is one country but then he makes that acceptance meaningless by insisting on the fact that South Africa is a country of minorities, each of which must have the right of self-determination. This concept of South African nationhood is bizarre. We are either one country or we are not, and if South Africa is one country, then it must have one parliament. I and other Black leders can negotiate about the nature of that parliament, and we can negotiate about whether we need minority group protection in addition to the protection of individual rights. Black leaders, however, with any kind of following will not negotiate within the framework of the present constitution. They will not negotiate within the framework of some kind of race federation and they will not negotiate at all unless there is an agenda on the negotiating table in which the desirable end product of negotiations is clearly stated.

I thank you, Mr. Chancellor, for receiving the Memorandum I sent to you before Mr. P.W. Botha visited Germany. The message I sent to you then, Mr. Chancellor, remains valid. We should continue to have serious misgivilngs about Mr. Botha's statesmanship if he can on the one hand state that apartheid is outdated as he did in his opening address to Parliament this year, and yet give no indication that the Population Registration Act and the Group Areas Act, which are the two key apartheid Acts, are not to be scrapped.

Subsequent to the State President's speech to Parliament this year, a sense of euphoria began developing about the prospects of him being serious about his commitment to reform, but that this euphoria remains unjustified has now been clearly shown. When Mr. Pik Botha, the South African Foreign Minister, indicated that we can now believe that some time in the future there may well be a Black President in South Africa, there was a furore in

Parliament ... /93

Parliament. The State President made an unprecedented personal attack on him and told him that: "Any speculation about a future President is purely hypothetical... No member of the Cabinet has any right to compromise the Party in such a way". What kind of negotiations can take place between Black and White when the mere suggestion that there may be a Black President some time in the furure, provokes such fierce hostility from the State President.

The kind of evidence which has now come from the State President's own lips that he does not have the will to abandon the fundamentals of apartheid and that he is not talking about reform leading to the possibility of there ever being a Black State President, only plays into the hands of those who say that there is nothing left to do other than to use violence as a means of bringing about change.

I do not adopt that position. We will in the end succeed in bringing about fundamental changes through non-violent tactics and strategies and through the politics of negotiation. All I am saying is that the State President has now set the clocks back. It appears to me that the politics of negotiation will have to proceed despite Mr. P.W. Botha and perhaps only after he has left office. South Africa just cannot afford the kind of delays Mr. Botha has now forced on us before we begin serious negotiations. Western Governments should as a matter of great urgency apply every possible constructive pressure on the South African State President to make him move sufficiently forward for negotiations to begin. The alternative to negotiations is the escalation of violence to the point whre it would be so ghastly that only the destruction of the country and all its peoples could follow in its wake.

I exercise my leadership in circumstances where the people want freedom now and are only asking for those things which are recognised to be theirs by Divine right throughout the Western civilised world. People demand freedom now in the anger which a lifetime of terrible oppression, leading to social, economic and political deprivation, produces. In my leadership I have no option but to employ the anger of the people and I do so as I face other leaders and other organisations than my own who want to employ the people's anger to eradicate capitalism and the free enterprise system and to replace the present system of government with a Marxist one-Party state. For some of my political opponents, reform - even reform judged to be very meaningful by Western governments - threatenss their interests. Not only do I have to lead in a situation where the State employs massive violence which generates counter-violence, and not only do I have to lead South Africa towards an open, democratic, industrial society of the kind which can take its rightful place in the Western hemisphere of indusrial interests, but I also do so in circumstances where every gain I make threatens those who want to

establish 94/

establish a socialist one-Party state. I lead in circumstances in which some Blacks who should be fighting side by side with me for a free, open, democratic future South Africa, are in fact turned against me.

Internecine Black/Black conflict in South Africa has risen to terrible heights. Because the ANC Mission in Exile has failed to make any kind of real progress in the armed struggle which it has waged for 25 years, it is now resorting to fermenting conflict and violence and to make the country ungovernable by destroying the economy and annihilating all Black leaders who are not committed with them in the violent tactics and strategies of their choice.

I do not add to these words the statement: "Woe is to me because I am undone". I add to these statements that I have made very considerable progress because the immensity of my task and the immensity of the difficulties I face are immensities which simply have to be faced in a life and death situation. Imperatives drive me and millions of other Black South Africans to continue striving for noble ends. We do not have the option of choosing an easier way. Among Black South Africans I am not alone, nor am I even in the minority as I pursue my aims and objectives.

Inkatha is the largest Black political movement ever to have emerged in the history of South Africa. Inkatha has now over one million card-carrying paid-up members. No Black leader has ever gathered the constituency support in Black South Africa which I today enjoy. This massive membership of Inkatha is dominated numerically by peasants and workers. It has branches scattered across the length and breadth of the country and it is as representative of Blacks in urban areas as it is of Blacks in rural areas. It is as representative of the old as it is of the young. Inkatha's Youth Brigade is the largest youth organisation ever to have emerged in the history of the country. Its Women's Brigade is the largest women's brigade ever to have emerged in the history of the country.

Inkatha is intensely democratic. Its supreme authority is the Annual General conference where policies are determined and where tactics and strategies are accepted and rejected. Inkatha's leadership is elected by its ordinary members. At branch, regional and national levels Inkatha's representatives are chosen by the people, and its Annual General Conference is a conference of representatives chosen to be there by the people. I never ever speak for myself on public issues. I reflect only that which Inkatha's membership has endorsed. There is nothing that I have said today which does not have the solid endorsement of Inkatha. The point I am making is that when Black South Africans are given the freedom to choose and are given democratic machinery through which to exercise their choices, and through which to determine tactics and strategies in the Black struggle for liberation,

choices are ... ; 95/

choices are made which make a mockery of the media representation of my leadership in South Africa.

History has intertwined Black and White destinies in South Africa. We have a shared destiny which demands a shred responsibility now between Black and White. Inkatha is a Black organisation, led by Blacks doing a Black job of work because disenfranchised Black South Africa needs to be organised into a disciplined achievement-orientated constituency. This does not mean that Inkatha is alienated from White South Africa, and from Indians and Coloureds in South Africa. Mr.Chancellor, it is in humility that I say that I have very considerable constituencies amongst Whites, Indians and Coloureds. Institutionalised politics hides this fact in the political market-place. The Nadaraja Award from the Indian Academy of South Africa was bestowed on me last year by the Indian community. Last year the influential Financial Mail declared me to be Man of the Year and the Pretoria Press Club has declared me to be Newsmaker of the Year. I make these points, Mr. Chancellor as I say in humility, to plead with you to recognise that there is a decency running right through all south Africa's population groups which is ever-increasingly rallying around any leadership which like mine pursues noble ends and pursues the politics of national reconciliation.

However hideous the ruling National Party's policies have been in the past; however hideous the basic poliltical facts are in South Africa today, there is a great yearning amongst South Africans in all population groups for a normalised society. There is a yearning to translate the total economic interdependence between Black and White into political interdependence. In many instances, those who yearn for decency blunder in attempting to achieve it, but there is, failures notwithstanding, a great reservoir of goodwill between people of different races, colours and creeds who are ready to support moves towards making South Africa a wholesome society.

There is a groundswell demand for change in South Africa, and this makes it so tragic that the State President, Mr. P.W. Botha, who has gone further than any of his predecessors in recognising apartheid to be outdated and recognising the need for change, and who has pointed his feet in the direction of statesmanship and has perhaps even taken a step in that direction in his opening address to Parliament this year still falters, instead of boldly moving forward to become a great historical figure for future generations.

I have been greatly heartened during the last year by the evidence that Western Governments have begun to perceive the power which is evolving in the centre field of South African politics. When I had personal discussions with President Reagan in January last year and when I had personal discussions with Mrs Margaret

Thatcher ... 96/

Thatcher and with Mr. Shimon Peres, I could see that these heads of government were making reappraisals of the South African situation, and were encouraged by evidence of South African decency emerging in centre field politics. My present visit to Germany further encourages me that you, Sir, and your Government also do so.

I set great store by what the German Government thinks because I have a profound respect for the German people. I believe that in Germany there is a growing perception that South Africans need to rally together to reconstruct their country and to build a new future. After the Second World War, Germany showed the world what a resolute people can do to transcend the ravages of war and to unite as a nation. We desperately need national unity in South Africa. If we do not make a national effort now to bring about meaningful change, we will be quite incapable of making a national effort after change to make change meaningful to ordinary people.

More than half of all Black South Africans are 15 years old and younger. A huge population bulge many millions strong is moving towards the South African market place. There is a vast backlog in Black education and there are vast backlogs in Black housing, Black health and welfare services and these backlogs exist in a situation in which there is vast Black under-employment and unemployment. Whoever governs in the future will need vast national resources with which to wipe out these backlogs. If we do not achieve national reconciliation in the process of liberating South Africa, and if liberation does not result in national reconciliation, we will not be able to make the national effort to reconstruct South African society that millons of young South Africans now demand we do.

I do not make an ideological statement when I say that not only do we have to achieve our liberation and in the process bring about national reconciliation, but I say also that we have to liberate South Africa and in the process lay the foundations for a very phenomenal growth of the economy. Ours is a situation in which we just dare not ignore the economic realities which surround us. History has locked us into a north/south global axis and the South African economy can only grow as vigorously as it is imperative that it grows, if there is a continuous flow of Western investments and the technology and management skills that those investments bring with them.

At the outset of this Memorandum, Sir, I pointed to the fact that some of the most horrendous aspects of apartheid now present in South Africa have not been addressed as problems by the South African Government. Every constructive diplomatic pressure that can be brought on Pretoria should be brought to bear on the Government of South Africa. But more importantly, every possible assistance should be given to the political forces

working for ... 97/

working for change in the centre field of South African politics. Black bargaining power can be significantly increased by Western endeavours to stimulate the growth of the South African economy and to provide humanitarian aid to the victims of apartheid.

The ANC Mission in Exile has observer status at the Organisation of African Unity and at the United Nations. In many capitals in the West, voices denying the utility of centre field political forces are heard and acclaimed as Western Governments and Western agencies express their abhorrence of apartheid and acclaim those who are most vociferous in their condemnation of it, whether or not they have a utility in the process of bringing about non-violent tactics and strategies inside South Africa. That is in the West a kind of dangerous romanticism and misplaced sympathy.

I have never asked Western Governments to help Inkatha and the KwaZulu Government against those who oppose us inside South Africa. I always warn against Western interference in the emergence of Black democrtic forces. Black South Africans themselves must decide by whom they want to be led, and they themselves must decide what organisations they want to support. All I ever appeal for is assistance to any Black South African group which pursues aims and objectives and uses tactics and strategies which accord with values which are hallowed in the West. I ask for a careful assessment of whether my leadership and the aims and objectives of Inkatha, and the tactics and strategies we employ, merit recognition by ther West as positive and worthy of diplomatic, moral and material support.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, it is indeed gratifying to know that our voice is being heard in the capitals of the world. What we in this House do and what we do in Inkatha, what we staand for and the role we play in the struggle for libertion, is recognised by President Reagan, Mrs Thatcher, Mr. Shamir and Dr. Kohl, as Heads of State, and by such prominent statesman as Mr. Jacuqes Chirac, the now Prime Minister of France who invited me to Paris for a discussion in October last year. We are not as isolated from the international community as we were some years ago. These trips to confer with Presidents and Prime Ministers are vital for what we are doing, and vital for Black South Africa. I am at times tempted to be amused, despite the gravity of the situation, by the way the media reports the few visits that South Africans have made to Lusaka to speak with the ANC Mission in Exile. One simply has to compare the number of businessmen, both national and international, during the course of my workday year, with the South African and international businessmen who visited Lusaka to speak to Mr. Oliver Tambo, to get a glimpse of press

bias. ... /98/

bias. The ANC Mission in Exile is cock-a-hoop because some businessmen went to speak to them. From Radio Freedom they broadcast on the 8 February 1986 the following words.

> "...Today, the central role of our organisation, the ANC, has been acknowledged by both friends and foes alike. Last year we witnessed talks between our organisation and a group of businessmen led by Gavin Relly (chairman of the Anglo-American Corporation) and another of so-called opposition politicians led by Dr. van Zyl Slabbert. Their visit to Zambia to meet the ANC was an admission on their part that the ANC holds the main key to the solution of the problems facing our country today and that nothing that Botha can do or omit to do will ever remove the importance of the role of our ANC..."

I have to turn down requests to see important businessmen, financiers and entrepreneurs, because no matter how important I regard discussions with them, it is just not possible for me to fit them all in in my very schedules. Every time somebody trots off to Lusaka, it makes national headlines in South Africa in at times deliberate attempts to create some kind of ANC euphoria. There is a misconception which reports on these visits are beginning to establish as though they were fcts. Media reports talk of the reasonableness, the gentlemanliness, and believe it or not, even the moderation of members of the National Executive of the ANC Mission in Exile.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have known me as longer than most members of this House, Mr. Speaker, all know me. You are all, Mr. Speaker, aware of the extent to which I have always held out my hand in friendship to the Mission in Exile, and to other Black political groups. You all know my whole life is committed to furthering the politics of negotiation. Dialogue is an essential ingredient in negotiations. I have nothing against dialogue; I am all for it. Everybody should speak to everybody more frequently. I have no quarrel with dialogue. It is the political gains deviously motivated and dangerously used which I object to in reports about those visiting Lusaka. Reports about these visits and press statements by the visitors when they return are not designed to pursue dialogue. They are designed to gain political advantage. They are part of the battle for minds which is raging in this country. Only very recently, Mr. Speaker, we had a very clear example of what I am talking about.

Mr. Enos Mabuza went to Lusaka and on his arrival, according to reports by Zambian newspapers, Mr.Mabuza declared his support for the ANC Mission in Exile, and stabbed me in the back. On his return he turned to stab me in the back. The following is a report detelined Lusaka which was published in Ilanga in the March 6-8 1986 edition:

"The Inyandza National Movement of KaNgwane which is led by Chief Enos Mabuza, the Chief Minister of KaNgwane has embarked on preparations for terminating its membership of the Alliance, the South African Black Alliance (SABA) which is led by Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi, the Chief Minister of KwaZulu who is also the President of Inkatha. This was revealed by Chief Mabuza at his meeting with ANC leaders in Lusaka at the week-end. The SABA is an organisation which was established at Ulundi in 1978 when the Indian Reform Party, the Coloured Labour Party, Inkatha and Inyandza came together to form it. The first set-back which this organisation suffered was in 1983 when the Labour Party of Rev. Allan Hendrickse withdrew to go and join the White Tricameral Parliament under the Pretoria Government.

Chief Mabuza also revealed that Inyandza did not pay its subscription fees to the South African Black Alliance for this year. 'That alone is evidence that we are no longer prepared to continue our membership of this organisation,' said Chief Mabuza.

He quickly clarified, however, that as of now they have not sent any written notification of their withdrawal from the South African Black Alliance. He said they are in the process of doing that.

Chief Mabuza said Inyandza's dissatisfaction with the policy which they saw being pursued by this organisation started in 1983 when the South African Black Alliance issued statements condemning the entire Coloured community because of the Revd. Hendrickse's decision to join the tricameral parliament in which there are White, Indians and Coloureds.

Chief Mabuza said that disturbed him because he did not see the need to blame all the Coloureds for one man's fault.

'The second thing which made Inyandza to realise that they had to withdraw from the South African Black Alliance was what happened at its meeting in September last year, when it became clear to us that Chief Buthelezi had embarked on a campaign of fighting with the ANC, which he was doing on behalf of all of us,' continued Chief Mabuza.

He said they could not take that action as Inyandza. 'We saw it as contrary to what we believe in, which is that it is the ANC who are the genuine leaders of the Black masses'."...

This Mr. Speaker is not evidence of dialogue. It is evidence of politicking; it is evidence of conniving; it is evidence of

back-stabbing ... 100/

back-stabbing; it is evidence that the ANC Mission in Exile use every discussion in Lusaka as an opportunity yet again to be divisive. Visitors there are told that I am a political leper and every opportunity is used to isolate me and Inkatha and you, Mr. Speaker, and you Honourable Members, from the rest of Black South Africa.

I had to respond to Mr. Mabuza's statements and issued the following Press Statement on the 6 March 1986:

> "Mr.Enos Mabuza has returned from Lusaka where he had discussions with the African National Congress Mission in Exile and he has now embarked on a programme of bold talk. He says he wants to withdraw Inyandza from the South African Black Alliance and he gives as an excuse for doing so that I as Chairman of SABA blame all the Coloured people when the Labour Party joined the Tricameral Parliament. He also alleges that I attacked the ANC Mission in Exile. He says the ANC Mission in Exile is representative of the majority of the people of this country and he complains that in SABA meetings I attacked them in the name of the people.
>
> Mr. Mabuza knows what he is doing when he speaks like this. He knows that he is deliberately trying to discredit me. He is being divisive and he is attempting to set my Coloured brothers and sisters against me and is attempting to discredit me in the eyes of Black South Africa by saying that it is I who attack the ANC Mission in Exile. I need to set the record straight.
>
> I did not seek to establish the South African Black Alliance. It was Mr. Y.S. Chinsamy, the leader of the Reform Party, and the then leader of the Coloured Party, Mr. Sonny Leon, who approached me to set up the South African Black Alliance. Mr. Mabuza subsequently sought the inclusion of Inyandza in SABA. I did not run around wooing him or anybody else. He now talks as though he needs to disassociate himself from SABA. Every Black South African knows that he is doing so because he has been intimidated by the acts of violence which the ANC Mission in Exile has orchestrated in Kallgwane. It was only after the explosions which wrecked his Department of Eduction building and an assassination attempt was made against him, that he picked up his bags and trotted off to Lusaka like a good little boy to sue for peace.
>
> As the saying goes - "He is covering his back". The price he now has to pay to keep the ANC Mission in Exile off his back is to vilify me.
>
> Mr. Mabuza knows that my hand of friendship has always been held out towards the ANC Mission in Exile. He knows that it

is they who 101/

is they who attack me, and not I who attack them. He knows that all I do is wipe the mud from ny face that they sling at me. He knows that in broadcast after broadcast they vilify me in the vilest of language and that in their official publications they denigrate me. Mr. Mabuza knows that they continue this attack against me through their surrogate organisation, the United Democratic Front, and their surrogate trade union organisation, the Congress of South African Trade Unions. Mr. Mabuza has now joined that company and he is trotting out the cliche phrases which he has so obviously learnt from Lusaka.

Mr. Mabuza is only now publicly talking about leaving SABA. When the South African Government moved to incorporate KaNgwane and the Ingwavuma District into Swaziland, it was Inkatha which fought Mr. Mabuza's battles for him. It was Inkatha which took the Government to Court and it was our Supreme Court and Appellate Division victories which allowed Mr. Mabuza to remain on in KaNgwane. After he had benefited from Inkatha's strength, he was attacked by the ANC Mission in Exile. He then quivered and shook and did not attend the SABA meeting in September last year. He said rather lamely that he was too busy to attend. We then asked that he send a lower rung delegation. He did not do so, nor did he explain why he did not do so. SABA met and we issued an unpublished resolution condemning this kind of conduct.

I have never attacked Mr. Mabuza. He is a ralatively small boy in politics. I was prepared to take him by the hand and help him get to his feet, politically speaking, and I now do not attack Mr. Mabuza. There ils a battle for minds going on in South Africa and all I am doing is setting the record straight, lest ordinary people become confused.

Politically speaking, I have never needed Mr. Mabuza. I have only been concerned about Black unity. I was concerned to bring in the light-weights as well as the heavy-weights in every endeavour I was making to foster Black unity. Mr. Mabuza is now being used as a divisive instrument.

I have not vanished becuse the ANC Mission in Exile has stabbed me in the back. I have not vanished beacuse the Laour Party stabbed me in the back. I have not vanished because Dikwakwentla has stabbed me in the back. I certainly will not vanish now because Mr. Mabuza adds his little scratch to these wounds.

If Mr. Mabuza believes that the ANC Mission in exile with him trotting along behind it can resolve the problems of South Africa without me and the Zulu people he is free to day-dream, but then he should have the courage to admit that his is what he is doing and that he went to Lusaka simply to hedge his bets. If he feels safer having broken away from the South African Black Alliance, then he must do so by all means, but he will fool nobody about why

he is .. 102/

he is doing it.

For him to give noble reasons now for his acts of political cowardice is just too much for Black South Africa to swallow. When he now lamely says that he wants to withdraw from SABA because I blamed all the Coloured people for the behaviour of the Labour Party, he is talking poppycock.

In October 1983 as I campaigned against a Yes vote in the Referendum I said, speaking about the proposed new constitution: "It is rejected by a substantial proportion of Whites, Indians and Coloureds and it is rejected in its entirety by 72 per cent of South Africans who are Africans". After the Whites had endorsed the new constitution, in November I opened the Labour Party Conference in Eshowe on the 3 January 1983. In speaking about possible Coloured and Indian participation in the new constitution, I quoted the findings of two surveys done - one by Professor Schlemmer and one by the Human Sciences Research Council I said: "In the Schlemmer poll, over six out of every ten Coloured people did not beleive that the proposals went far enough , and nearly six out of ten said they would vote against the proposals as they stood. Only one quarter of Coloured people and just over one-third of Indian people sid that they would positively vote for the proposals as they stood". If I blamed all the Coloured people of South Africa for the Labour Party's entry into the Tricameral Parliamentary arrangement, it would have made nonsense out of the statement I myself made prior to the Labour Party's decision to do so.

After the Labour Party had decided to enter into the new arrangement I issued a press statement in which I severely criticised the Labour Party for what it had done. I siad: "Having established formal political links with Africans, the Labour Party in a shock move has now elected to co-operate with Whites and to take up the second-class citizenship which has been offered to them". I blamed the Labour Party not Coloured people. In August 1984 in an address to a Prayer Meeting in the Durban City Hall, I said: "I wish to pay tribute to those of our Indian and Coloured brothers and sisters who have withstood the pressure which Pretoria has exerted and who have been bold enough to reject this mammoth fraud. It would be wrong for us not to pay this tribute to their sterling qualities. We cannot blame all our Indian and Coloured brothers and sisters for the sins of those who have sold their souls and in the process betrayed us". Mr. Mabuza has known me and he knows that these are the kind of things I say. It is malicious slander now for him to say that he now wants to withdraw from SABA because I blame all the Coloured people for the behaviour of the Labour Party.

I do not ... 103/

I do not blame all Blacks of Swazi extraction because of Mr. Mabuza's political cowardice. I do not blame all members of Inyandza for Mr. Mabuza's behaviour. I hold out the hand of friendship to Black South Africans whatever political organisations they choose to join or attempt to lead. We cnnot afford internecine Black strife. It usurps the power of the people. Mr. Mabuza must go and sit quietly under a tree somewhere where the ANC Mission in Exile cannot see him and think quietly for a while what he is doing to the cause of Black unity".

Honourable Members will, I am sure, understand why it is important that I continue travelling abroad to carry Black South African voices there. The ANC Mission in Exile has a vast propaganda machine working for them in the Western world. They have offices scattered around the continent, in Britain and North America, Australia, Africa and elsewhere. They have a permanent representaive at the United Nations and they have a roving staff which attends international conferences, OAU meetings and meetings of non-aligned countries. Wherever they go they spread misrepresentations about South Africa. The battle for minds which is raging in this country has echoes everywhere in the world.

We suffer terrible disadvantages as we campaign to be heard abroad. The ANC Mission in Exile not only spends millions of rand on the upkeep of their offices and the activities of full-time staff members, but they have a wide range of anti-apartheid fronts and Church groups working to spread their propaganda. The amount of resources that we devote to combatting this widespread slandering of me, the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly nd Inkatha, is pitifully meagre when measured against the desperate need there is to combat this slander for the sake of South Africa itself.

I will, Mr. Speaker, return to the question of the propaganda levelled against us later. I am here simply mentioning the ANC Mission in Exile's propaganda work to emphasise the need that there is for me to continue travelling abroad. And I am also empahsising that the fact that the President of the United States invited me to see him; that the Prime Minister of Great Britain has invited me to see her; that the Prime Minister of Israel has invited me to see him; that the Chancellor the West German Government has invited me to see him, and the newly elected Prime Minister of France, Mr. Jacques Chirac invited me to Parish last year as Mayor of Paris and leader of the Gaullist Party, to discuss South Africa's problems with him, despite the malicious propaganda that is levelled against me in every capital of the world by people who should be my brothers and sisters in the struggle, underwrites the statement that these invitations are indicators of growing international recognition where it matters

most - at 104/

most - at Government level and Head of State level.

I believe Mrs Margaret Thatcher heard what I had to say. At the Commonwealth meeting in Barbados in October last year she fought a courageous battle to keep the Commonwealth's leaders' feet on the ground. She is a hard-headed pragmatist who sees no utility in becoming hysterical about apartheid and embarking on action designed to give glory to international indignation about apartheid, regardless of whether or not the action hurts the real victims of apartheid deeply.

I balance this statement, Mr. Speaker, with the assurance to Westerners that I greatly appreciate the tremendous amount of genuine thoughtful indignation which apartheid has aroused in their minds and hearts. I am not maligning indignation, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, in saying what I have said. I, however, am more aware than most of the extent to which this indignation so genuinely felt is used by our brothers and sisters in exile, and by a great variety of self-appointed celebrity leaders in this country, as political weapons to be hurled in their party political favour.

When the ANC Mission in Exile campaigns for the complete economic isolation of South Africa, they do so in calculated attempts to utilise Western indignation in support of tactics and strategies which are abhorrent to the Western conscience. When the ANC Mission in Exile sidles up to some of our clergymen to encourage them to support disinvestment, they proclaim the nobility of the tactics and strategies they are employing, and so step by step they encourage the disinvestment lobby to grow. They do it for their sakes; they do it for the sake of their organisation. A number of very horrible parallels are emerging between the ANC Mission in Exile and apartheid bosses. One of the deep tragedies of this country is that successive National Party governments have been quite incapable of distinguishing between what is good for South Africa and what is good for the Party. They have equated the two. The Party has always been put before South Africa and this is exactly what the ANC Mission in Exile is doing. It is equating support for the Mission in Exile with patriotism.

Western heads of State re subject to tremendous pressures in their own societies which are generated by the Mission in Exile's propaganda endeavours. Everywhere I go, Western Heads of State have to deal with lobbies that they join in the clamour for disinvestment, and join in the clamour for moral support for the Mission in Exile. Western countries are democratic countries and I want, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, to have it recorded that I deeply appreciate the moral calibre of President Reagan who has survived intense Party political pressures which have been brought to bear on him in recent years. These pressures are attempting to beat President Reagan with the apartheid stick. They are not

attempting to ...../ 105/

attempting to do so, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, for your sakes. A very substantial amount of debate in the United States about disinvestment amounts to no more than attempts to discredit President Reagan's constructive engagement policy for American Party political purposes. Mr. Speaker, I perceive President Reagan as having actually paid a price in Party political terms because he stands by his principles.

I see Mrs Margaret Thatcher as having stood by her principles at the Commonwealth conference. When I saw her in London, I said to her:

> "I as a Black political leader in South Africa I am aware of the role that the British Government played to end hostilities between Black and White in Zimbabwe. I am aware, Madam Prime Minister, that it was your Cabinent which pursued the diplomatic endeavours which led to the Lancaster House negotiations. Black South Africa regards it as a very considerable achievement, and it has encouraged us to think that British diplomacy, which has accumulated its own distinctive nature over the centuries, remains a vital force in the Western world which could yet play a distinctive role in South Africa. I do not draw naive parallels between what was required in Zimbabwe to bring about a cessation of hostilities and what is now required in South Africa to bring about the de-escalation of violence and the promotion of the politics of diplomacy. Nor am I ignoring the constitutional role, and the role in international law, within which British diplomacy brought about a settlement in Zimbabwe. I am simply referring to the value of Britain as an honest broker in international diplomacy and I am expressing faith that Britain could fulfill the role of an honest broker in South Africa and between South Africa and the West".

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I am not being presumptuous when I say that my voice was heard, but in Mrs Thatcher's closing address to the Commonwealth Conference, she said: "When I went to the Commonwealth Summit in Lusaka in 1979, there was a feeling that now was the time to get a negotiation going (on Zimbabwe). I feel that the time is now with South Africa, but I must be frank, my way is the way of negotiation, it is the way which has succeeded in the past and I hope, and believe, it will not be rejected by this great meeting".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mrs Margaret Thatcher took a strong stand at the Commonwealth meeting and were it not for her, the Commonwealth would almost certainly have supported a strong sanctions package deal against South Africa. Hers was the moderating voice; hers was the voice of realism; hers was the plea not to prejudice the prospects of change coming through negotiation.

Prior to .. 106/

Prior to the Commonwealth Conference there was a great deal of speculation about whether or not its Members would leave the Conference with a Commonwealth demand that Heads of State impose sanctions against South Africa when they returned home. Mrs Thatcher's pragmatism won the day and a compromise solution was adopted in terms of which a group of Eminent Persons from the Commonwelth was constituted and mandated to visit South Africa to explore prospects of change taking place here through non-violent means and through the politics of negotiation. The persons who were requested to serve in this group are: former Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser, General Olusegun Obasango, the former Head of State in Nigeria, Dame Nita Barrow, a president of the World Council of Churches, Dr. Kenneth Kaunda President of Zambia, Indian Prime Minister Mr. Ghandi, Canadian Prime Minister Mr. Mulroney, and Mr. Bob Hawke, the Australian Prime Minister.

Of these people President Kaunda and Prime Minister Ghandi have supported comprehensive sanctions against our country for some time now, and Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Hawke have supported selective sanctions. The World Council of Churches not only supports sanctions but also supports the armed struggle. These people are influential in this group, and every South African must recognise the extent to which the group has come here predisposed to advise that comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa are necessary. I think it is important for our country that when they are here, they hear the genuine Black South African voice and are made to understand that comprehensive sanctions against south Africa is not supported by the poorest of the poor who are the real victims of apartheid.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I had the opportunity of meeting some of the Members of the Eminent Persons Group who visited South Africa. This House must, I think Mr. Speaker, take the visit of these people very seriously. We know that nobody is going to come from abroad to fight our battles for us. It is we here on the ground who wage the real struggle, but it is rank foolishness which can ignore the fact that our political enemies have been morally and materially supported from abroad, Both here and outside South Africa, they make every attempt to get the Eminent Persons Group to call for stringent economic measures against South Africa. I would therefore like to share with Honourable Members, Mr. Speaker, what I said to General Obasanjo, Mr. Malcolm Fraser, Dame Nita Barrow, Mr. Singh, Lord Barbour and Mr. John Malewela, who were the advance group of the Eminent Persons Group, when I saw them in Johannesburg on the 10 March 1986:

"The three members of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group andd other members in their party now visiting South Africa must by now have had relatively wide exposure to this country. They would by now have seen the horrors of apartheid. What they have seen could only confirm that apartheid is the most systematised form of race

discrimination .. 107/

discrimination practised in the world and that the violence with which it has been maintained has understandably produced counter-violence and opposition to it. The violence which has erupted in Black South Africa is a mere tip of the iceberg of the anger which is there in the hearts and minds of all Black South Africans. We are all angry and our anger heightens our perception that something needs to be done now to eradicate apatheidd. We are therefore all heartened by the Commonwealth's concern for wht is happening in South Africa, and we are encouraged in our struggle for liberation by the calling into being of the Eminent Persons Group.

We applaud the Commonwealth statement issued after the meeting in the Bahamas. We agree that the South African Government's refusal to dismantle apartheid must be addressed as a burning issue by the international communilty. We applaud the Commonwealth statement:

> "We are united in the belief that reliance on the range of pressures adopted so far has not resulted in the fundamental changes we have sought over many years".
>
> "The growing crisis and intensified repression in South Africa mens that apartheid must be dismantled now if a greater tragedy is to be averted, that concerted pressure must be brought to bear to achieve that end. We consider that the situation calls for urgent practical steps".

Black South Africa applauds what must be regarded as the minimal demands that the Commonwealth nations are making, viz to ask that the South African Government:

1. Declare that the system of apartheid will be dismantled and specific and meaningful action taken in fulfillment of that event;

2. Terminate the existing state of emergency;

3. Release immediately and unconditionally Nelson Mandela and all others imprisoned and detained for their opposition to apartheid;

4. Establish political freedom and specifically lift the existing ban on the African National Congress and other political parties;

5. Initiate, in the context of a suspension of violence on all sides, a process of dialogue across lines of colour, politics and religion, with a view to establishing non-racial and representative government.

I particularly applaud the wisdom of the added statement in

talking about the erection of structures of democracy in South Africa: "The latter, in particular, demands a process of dialogue involving the true representatives of the majority population of South Africa. We believe that we must do all we can towards that process, while recognising that the forms of political settlement in South Africa are for the people of that country - all the people - to determine". If the Commonwealth can assist in doing this, its role will go down in history as noble. It must however be bluntly said that if Commonwealth action compounds the problems we face in this country, however good intentioned that action may have been, it would have been better for the Commonwealth countries to have continued participating in the "reliance on the range of pressures adopted so far" which have "not resulted in the fundamental changes we have sought over many years". The Commonwealth has now stepped into an arena of near intractable problems. They have stepped into a crisis situation, where there are no simple ways of achieving noble ends.

I make the point that if South Africans of all race groups do not become reconciled during the process of liberation this country from apartheid, we will not easily be reconciled after the eradication of apartheid and we will not be able to make the national effort which will be needed to translate political victories into victories for the people which benefit them in their daily lives. South Africa is unlike other Afrian countries where White minorities, which were composed mostly of ex-patriates, could choose either to leave the liberted country, or to be assimilated in a new society. The challenge we face in this country as Blacks is to make Whites participants in change. While they refuse to be participants in change, the upward spiralling of violence will not be broken.

The Commonwealth statement said: " .... We believe it to be our duty to leave nothing undone that might contribute to peaceful change in South Africa and avoid the dreadful prospect of violent conflict tht looms over South Africa, threatening people of all races in the country, and the peace and stability of the entire Southern African region". The Commonwealth countries in this statement delimitate the kind of action which the Eminent Persons Group should be taking. The Commonwealth did not commit itself to do what it can to further the armed struggle in this country. They did not commit themselves to making South Africa ungovernable through the use of internal violence.

As a democrat I believe that the people of South Africa have the right to choose their own means of liberating this country. It is not organisations which have that right. It is a people's right, and that is why I have always called for the freeing of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, and for the unbanning of the ANC and other organisations. Until such time as these organisations have been unbanned, and their leaders have

been set free, Black South Africans, and South Africans of any other race group for that matter, are not free to choose who should lead them and what tactics and strategies should be employed to eradicate apartheid for the scourge that it is.

Bannings, jailings, intimidation, detention without trial, have all been used by successive South African National Party Governments to fragment the Black body politic in this coutry. These things have been used to violate the most fundamental of all political rights - the freedom of association.

The Commonwealth calls for dialogue involving "the true representatives of the majority Black population of South Africa". Those true representatives cannot be established by the media, nor can they be established by popular sentiment in Africa and the international community. True leaders must be indicated by the people of South Africa themselves.

I yearn for the day when Nelson Mandela and other leaders are free either to stand on the same platform as I stand, or to stand on platforms to oppose me. The people need to be presented with alternatives and it is the people who must decide on alternatives. It is dangerous politics to presume what the people would do in some future hypothetical circumstance.

It is because I have these perceptions that I have made more personal representations to successive South African Prime Ministers, and now more latterly to the State President, than anyone else for the release of Nelson Mandela and other jailed leaders. Mr. Mandela knows this to be the case. He knows I am not in politics to denigrate him, and that is why he wrote to me as recently as the 10 December last year in the following words:

Chief Mangosuthu Buthelezi — Certified mail
PO Ulundi
KwaZulu
3838

II 220/82: NELSON MANDELA — 10.12.85

Dear Shenge, Mndlunkulu and family

Your warm message of goodwill and support contributed tremendously to my speedy and complete recovery, and gave me much strength and joy. I shake your hand and very warmly!

Very sincerly

MADIBA

Pollsmoor Maximum Prison
Private Bag XX, Tokai 7966

Leading .. ../ 110/

Leading spokesmen in the African National Mission in exile, the United Democratic Front and AZAPO do not talk about Mr. Nelson Mandela and myself in the vein which would encourage people to anticipate this kind of letter. I am making the point that media representations and statements by opposition spokesmen could give rise to impressions which will be radically altered once Black South Africans are put in a position in which they can choose their own leaders and acclaim or reject the tactics and strategies which are so glibly pronounced on by the media and foreign observers.

I believe the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group needs to establish its own frame of references about what is desirable for a future South Africa and then to look at the kind of tactics and strategies which are more likely to bring about that desired end. I sincerely hope that this preliminary trip and the subsequent visit of the full Eminent Persons Group will result in hard-headed and down-to-earth assessments. They will need these assessments if burning indignation which gave rise to the formation of the group is going to be made meaningful on the ground to ordinary South Africans.

When we look at the future of South Africa, it behoves us to be prudent because the lives of 30 million people are involved in South Africa alone and many more millions of lives are involved beyond our borders. Of the something like 24 million Black South Africans over 12 million of them are 15 years old and younger. The majority of Blacks live in desperate poverty. Millions of them live in abject poverty and squallor. There are vast backlogs in Black housing and in the provision of educational and social, health and welfare facilities for Blacks. Existing widespread poverty will deepen in the foreseeable future as this huge population bulge of young people moves into the market place. Some argue that conditions are so horrific for Blacks that they have nothing or little to lose and that they are prepared to risk everything to eradicate apartheid. Those who hold this view then go on to argue that what they now have can be destroyed because people are prepared to lose everything.

This argument makes two assumptions which requires scrutiny. Firstly the argument does not distinguish between individuals who are prepared to lose what they have and the Black population being prepared to destroy the prospects of their country ever being able to improve the lot of individuals. It also makes the assumption that revolution can wipe the slate clean in South Africa and that a beautiful new post-revolutionary society can be written on that clean slate. As a leader with a vast Black constituency, I cannot accept these assumptions. Commonwealth nations are charged by their own histories to look at the future of South Africa as they involve themselves in its present circumstances. They must avoid making one-to-one comparisons between South Africa and other

African ... 111/

African states which have gained their independence from colonial and racist subjugation. They must recognise that if Black South Africans destroy the economy of their country and fail to bring about the reconciliation of the country's various race groups during the process of liberation, the prospects of ever establishing a free and open society in which equality of opportunity for all can be made meaningful by individuals, in terms of achieving the minimal standards of decent living, are well high impossible. The destruction of the South African economy must be avoided at all costs. No head of a Commonwealth country has, as far as I am aware, ever proclaimed the need to destroy South Africa's economy.

I have applauded President Reagan's limited sanctions package against South Africa, and I have particularly applauded it because the limited sanctions were balanced with increased humanitarian aid to the victims of apartheid. I have applauded the EEC's and Britain's adoption of limited sanctions aginst South Africa in the same way. I most certainly applaud the Commonwealth meeting's support for an embargo on the import of arms and ammunition, military and para-military equipment from South Africa
and I applaud the other measures against South Africa which they have already adopted and which are in line with the action of the United States and Europe and Britain. I warn, however, against the kind of action which the Commonwealth foresees as necessary if adequate progress has not been made within six months of their meeting in the Bahamas. Read together, these proposals for future action will in fact be destructive of the South African economy. If these measures are adopted, they will be adopted against the will of the majority of the people of South Africa, and they will be adopted in effect in support of the politics of violence.

I am today providing the members of the Eminent Persons Group with copies of the ANC Mission in Exile's broadcasts to South Africans as monitored by the British Broadcasting Corporation. When these are perused, it will be seen that the ANC Mission in Exile is now going beyond the classical armed struggle and is intent on going beyond the classical armed struggle and is intent on producing a civil war in South Africa. I draw attention to statements like the one broadcast from Lusaka on Radio Freedom on 26 February 1986: They say bluntly: "We are saying, Comrades, - and we are correct in saying so - that our country is in a state of civil war".

The ANC Mission in Exile is setting South African against South African. It has for 25 years attempted to mount an armed struggle, and it is quite clear that a classical armed struggle has failed for that period of time and will fail for at least that period of time again. There are no zones which can be liberated in South Africa from which an armed struggle could be waged. The

kind of .../ 112/

kind of armed struggle that Frelimo waged simply cannot succeed here. Before that could happen, insurmountable logistic problems involving moving arms, ammunition and men and maintaining communications would have to be overcome. After 25 years of the armed struggle, every bridge in South Africa remains intact. Its transportation system remains intact. Its electicity and water supply systems remain intact and there is now not one single factory in South Africa out of production because of the armed struggle. The armed struggle simply has not succeeded and will not succeed, and members of the Commonwealth are as aware as every South African that neither the West nor the socialist bloc would dare commit their armies to South African soil to assist in the armed struggle. Without that assistance, the ANC Mission in Exile's military attempts to defeat P.W. Botha's army which is the strongest in Africa will remain a pipe dream.

The ANC Mission in Exile perceive this to be the case, and that is why they have moved away from a classical armed struggle and are attempting to establish a civil war situation in this country. In a civil war they are attempting to establish, they are pitting Black against Black. A civil war itself will only achieve the ends hoped for if ordinary Blacks have got nothing to lose. Something like 11 million Black South Africans live in urban areas. Necessities of life demand a degree of normality which permits food and water to flow into townships and transport systems operate to bring workers to their place of work. Without weekly pay packages, millions of Blacks would simply starve and that is the truth of the matter. That is primarily why the ANC Mission in Exile is calling for Blacks to sabotage factories and for the destruction of the economy. That is why they so vociferously clamour for the West to apply comprehansive mandatory sanctions against this country.

I can understand international indignation and anger leading to demands for economic action against South Africa. Apartheid is so horrific that the international community is moved to want to do something. If the Eminent Persons Group finally comes down in favour of comprehensive mandatory sanctions, they must do so aware of the fact that they have chosen to abandon their commitment and they will have failed to help in avoiding: "...the dreadful prospect of violent conflict that looms over South Africa, threatening people of all races in the country, and the peace and stability of the entire Southern African region".

Some clergymen and other spokesmen are urging the international community, and the West in particular, to apply mandatory and comprehesnsive sanctions against South Africa because they argue this is the only non-violent action available to the international community. They argue thus because they see the South African Government as inherently evil and as the enemy of the people and they maintain that it is impossible for the Government to reform. They proclaim the need for the downfall of the Government and are associated with attempts to make this country ungovernnable which

is one ... 113/

is one of the primary objectives of the United Democratic Front.

I say simply that in the realities which surround us the South African Government cannot be brought down and the country cannot be made ungovernable except by the use of violence and the spread of civil war. Here too those who favour mandatory and comprehensive economic sanctions have abandoned hope that non-violent tactics and strategies can succeed. They call for mandatory sanctions and non-violent tactics and strategies can succeed. They call for mandatory sanctions as non-violent action on the part of the West in particular, but they do so to further the revolutionary climate in this country and to further the aims and objectives of those who want to make the country ungovernable through violence.

I am attacked because I say these things. If there were no truth in them I would be ignored and if millions of Black South Africans did not applaud what I say, there would be no need for attack. What I am saying in this document I have said repeatedly at mass meetings of Black South Africans in places like Soweto in the industrial heartland of the country. What I am saying in this document has received a standing ovation wherever I have spoken and every year when I say these things at Inkatha's Annual General Conference, I get unanimous support.

Inkatha is the largest Black political movement ever to have emerged in the history of South Africa. Inkatha has now over one million card-carrying paid-up members. No Black leader has ever gathered the constituency support in Black South Africa which I numerically by peasants and workers. With the exception of the Eastern Cape, it has branches scattered across the length and breadth of the country and it is as representative of Blacks in urban areas as it is of Blacks in rural areas. It is as representative of the old as it is of the young. Inkatha's Youth Brigade is the largest youth organisation ever to have emerged in the history of the country. Its Women's Brigade is the largest women's brigade ever to have emerged in the history of the country. Inkatha is intensely democratic. Its supreme authority is the Annual General Conference where policies are determined and where tactics and strategies are accepted and rejected. Inkatha's leadership is elected by its ordinary members. At branch, regional and national levels Inkatha's representatives are chosen by the people, and its Annual General Conference is a conference of representatives chosen to be there by the people. I never ever speak for myself on public issues. I reflect only that which Inkatha's membership has endorsed. There is nothing that I have said today which does not have the solid endorsement of Inkatha. The point I am making is that when Black South Africans are given the freedom to choose and are given democratic machinery through which to exercise their choices, and through which to determine tactics and strategies in the black

struggle ... 114/

struggle for liberation, choices are made which make a mockery of the media representation of my leadership in South Africa.

When I say the things I am saying in this document to Inkatha's Annual General Conferences, and I am applauded for what I say, it is the ordinary people of the country who are doing so. Members of the Commonwealth Group now touring the country will no doubt have been told by some Blacks that there is mass Black support for sanctions against South Africa. There are Blacks who support sanctions. There a Blacks who support violence. There are Blacks who are committed to the armed struggle. There are Blacks involved in attempting to bring about a civil war situation in South Africa. The Eminent Persons Group of the Commonwealth, as I have said, need to look at the future of South Africa and establish in their own minds what is desirable in the future and what can now be done to further those desirable ends. They will find deep divisions in Black South Africa itself, and they will not be able to leave this country with solid South African backing for any particular point of view. They will have to become statesmanlike in their assessments, and if one of their important objectives is to help in producing "a process of dialogue involving the true representatives of the majority Black population of South Africa" and if they want to do all they "can towards that process while recognising that the forms of political settlement in South Africa are for the people of that country - all the people - to determine" they will have to have the wisdom of Solomon as they not only move between Black nd White, but also as they move between Black and Black.

They will need just as much wisdom in making assessments of whether the South African Government is, as some say, beyond redemption with no prospect of embarking on real reform, and in making assessments of whether the forces at work which have now led the State President to adopt positions none of his predecessors would have dared adopt will continue to move him step by step in the right direction.

We need libertion and we need it now. Time is the enemy of prospects of a peaceful solution to South Africa's problems. We are already living on borrowed time. The present upward spiralling of violence is already a threat to the politics of negotiation. The Commonwealth countries are aware of this and that is why they decided to review the position six months hence when they announced the establishment of the Eminent Persons Group. I am in contact with a very wide range of South African White opinion-makers, and I am constantly under pressure from them to enter into negotiations with the State President and to accept that a start must be made where it can be made. The people who thus pressurise me often argue that the State President is moving as fast as he can. They say that he has to take his White constituency with him and he needs time. They say it is this

which precludes ... / 115/

which precludes him moving faster than he has moved.

We simply do not have the time that the State President would require to bring about meaningful reform if he intends doing so at a pace his past performance suggests he wants. The process of reform simply has to be speeded up. Demands must be made that the State President does this. They must, however, be made in the realities of what can or cannot be done.

I believe that the Commonwelth six month period is unrealistic. If they are serious about the need to further the politics of negotiation, we cannot sit back and accept the Government's word that negotiations will take place. We want timetables. Nor on the other hand can we demand negotiations within time spans which are patently unrealistic. I would argue very strongly that the priority demand is that the State President release Nelson Mandela and other leaders, and unban banned organisations. If these leaders were released now assessments, will have to be made about how long they themselves would require before they could re-establish their grass roots position and prepare for negotiations. Commonwealth Heads of State could well look at the realities of timetables as they emerged, for example, in the negotiations which led to and followed the Lancaster House conference.

The State President has called for a Federal Congress of the National Party in August this year. Whatever is decided at this Federal Congress will have to be ratified by the four following Provincial congresses. It would be tragic if international pressure was mounted not to let these Congresses run their course. I say this in the knowledge that we might well be facing the final tragedy if after these Congresses have run their course, there is still no commitment to reform flowing from them which Black South Africa could endorse. The State President simply must be made aware of the imperatives of not only producing an action programme which seeks objectives which Blacks are prepared to achieve with Whites, but which also places time restraints on the Government. The Barbados statement included the words: "We are not unmindful of the difficulties such an effort will encounter, including the possibility of initial rejection by the South African authorities, but we believe it our duty to leave nothing undone that might contribute to peaceful change in South Africa..." If the Commonwealth is serious about leaving no stone unturned, one of the stones that it must turn over is that of the National Party's 1986 political time-scale. There will be no victory overnight in South Africa. Even the sweep of events which will finally bring victory will not commence overnight. We need liberation now and every act of unrealism, every false move, and every foolish expectation will delay the day of liberation.

The State President in his opening address to Parliament said

things which .. 116/

things which had not been said before. He said apartheid is outdated and it must be scrapped. He said influx control regulations must be scrapped. He pronounced South Africa to be one country and he says that all South Africans should share one common citizenship. I am watching this Parliamentary session intensely to see what he means by these statements. I am aware of the extent to which the politics of negotiation will be damaged, or perhaps even destroyed, if at the end of the session these words are proven to have been fatuous statements, and if the Federal Congress of the National Party in August does not announce a programme of reform which Black South Africans will accept en masse.

In his opening address to Parliament the State President also announced the formation of a National Statutory Council. I welcomed this announcement and I welcomed it in particular because for the first time the State President has put himself in the hot seat. He intends chairing this Council and has accepted personal responsibility for its success or failure. He has not yet told the world how this Coucil is to be constituted and what it is actually going to do. I have stated clearly that I will not be able to participate in this Coucil if:

a) the present constitution and its Tricameral Parliament is not sentenced to death;

b) the Council does not have an agenda which is acceptable to Blacks and whilch is pursued in broad daylight in front of the media;

c) the Council does not have bite and is not empowered to veto legislation or formulate Bills;

The legitimacy of the Council will depend upon the extent to which Black leaders are free to join it. This means that leaders such as Nelson Mandela and others must be set free so that they are in a position to decide whether or not they want to join it. The Council is going to be no more than a talking shop, an advisory body, if it is going to meet in secret and if it has to work within the framework of the present constitution, then it will fail just as the non-statutory negotiating forum and the Special Cabinet Committee failed before. If in announcing the National Statutory Council the State President has done no more than moot yet another failure, he would end up forfeiting not only goodwill and credibility in South Africa, but whatever credibility he had in the world at large.

If the politics of negotiation is going to be important, then the Government must be involved in those negotiations. If the Government must be involved, then it could be involved through the National Statutory Council. The Commonwealth countries should do

everything ... 117/

everything in their power to get the State President to translate his stated good intentions in his opening address to Parliament, into realities Blacks accept. Commonwealth countries should exert pressure on the State President to ensure that the National Statutory Council does in fact become meaningful body. This is one of the stones tht they dare not leave unturned.

It is simply not enough for the State President to say that South Africa is one country. He must go on to say that this one country must have one sovereign Parliament. It is simply not enough for the State President to say that all South Africans will enjoy a common citizenship. He must go on to make citizenship politically meaningful by introducing universal adult franchise. It is simply not enough for the State President to talk about all South African citizens having the same right. He must go on to scrap the Population Registration Act. Without that Act there can be no constitutional differentiation between Black and White. The Group Areas could not function, just as a wide range of laws which discriminate against Black could not function. These are the fundamental issues which the State President has not thus far faced up to.

The State President continues to talk about South Africa as a country of minorities within the context that the White minority has minority rights in 87 per cent of the country. The present constitution is bizarre and leads to a travesty of justice. One is therefore entitled to be sceptical about the kind of constitution the State President has in mind as he talks about future constitutional arrangements in a country of minorities. The Eminent Persons group should pin the State President down about the kind of constitutional developments he would accept. He and his Ministers talk about future constitutional arrangements in terms which are far too vague, and they hide behind statements of not being specific because they now want to stop prescribing to Blacks. South Africa urgently needs the State President to lay hiscards on the table and say this is the kind of constitution I will pursue in negotiations. Black South Africa has done just this. We are ready to negotiate now.

There are some, such as in the ANC Mission in Exile, who are not ready to negotiate because they seek no compromise solutions. They have repeatedly stated that the only thing to negotiate is about the handing over of power to the people. If we are going to avoid violent confrontations in this country which will rise to holocaust proportions, both Black and Whie will have to accept the need for compromise.

A one-man-one vote system of government in a unitary state remains my cherished ideal, just as it remains the cherished ideal of the vast, vast majority of Blacks. In our South African circumstances an all or nothing demand for this would amount to a declaration of

war. At this point in our history such a system of government would have to be rammed down White throats with the but of a gun. If we are going to avoid a conflagration of violence, Black and White will simply have to at least explore alternatives both to apartheid society and to a one-man-vote style of government in a unitary state society.

I am prepared to explore other possibilities. I am prepared to look, for example, at the federal system in which there are individual and minority group protected rights, if those rights will be protected by a truly independent judiciary. I refuse to be drawn into negotiations about future unworkable bizare constitutional developments. I demand that whatever happens in the constitutional development of South Africa, we do not move outside the lessons that history has taught the civilised world about the nature of democracy and constitutional government. South Africa will not find a unique new kind of constitutional arrangement the world has never heard of before. There is in the world a rich variety of democratic arrangements, but all worthwhile democracies enshrine time-honoured democratic principles. I know of no decent democracy where there is not universal adult franchise. We will not have a decent democracy here without it. I know of no decent democracy where there is not a sovereign parliament, and where those who benefit from a universal adult franchise system do not determine who the ruling group should be. I am prepared to think about consociational principles as having possible utility for us, but they must be enacted in a sovereign parliament which must rest on universal adult franchise.

The Eminent Persons Group will be wooed by many Black organisations here and in exile which will seek help in the pursuit of their Party political objectives. It is my plea to the Group that it addresses the totality of the South African situation and that it does not allow itself to be drawn into Party political strife. There are time-honoured and noble principles at stake. The future of South Africa is at stake, and everything the world knows about decent government and democracy is at stake. The destruction of democracy will not only be tragic for 32 million South Africans but for many millions more in Southern Africa and beyond. Third World/First World relationships are at stake. If the West and the Commonwealth countries have a meaningful role to play it is to move South Africa towards a Lancaster House conference. Both Whites and Blacks must be moved. It is vitally important that the Eminent Persons Group work within the realities which will determine the future in this part of the globe".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we know people like Dr.

Kaunda, Mr. Mugabe and President Machel as sons of Africa. They perceive apartheid to bethe horror that weperceive it to be, and they have time nd again been assured by the ANC Mission in Exile that the average Black peasant and worker in South Africa stands behind them in their call for sanctions and the destruction of the South African economy. They are supported in this assertion by an ever growing number of clergymen and UDF spokesmen who for a variety of reasons dance to their tunes. They orchestrate a Black South African voice in favour of sanctions and they can do so only because they have no real representation here in this country on the ground. We know, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, what worker and peasants think about sanctions. We know because it is we who have a mass membership at grass root level numbering more than 1.2 million. We are aware of the extent to which Inkatha is a democratic organisation and the sentiments of our mass following are expressed at each and every Annual General Conference and mass meeting. We do not have to do opinion surveys to find out what the average peasant and worker thinks about sanctions. They are our members; they tell us plainly and bluntly that sanctions is political madness. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members are here to represent constituencies flung far and wide across KwaZulu. They represent people and time and again when I have put the question of sanctions to this House, Mr. Speaker, on every such occasion I have had a unanimous vote of support in favour of what I have said on this question on behalf of the people of South Africa.

Sons of Africa such as President Kaunda, Prime Minister Mugabe and President Machel have earned our respect because of the role they have played in the liberation of their own countries and we are deeply hurt when they become party to strengthening the divisive forces emanating from the ANC Mission in Exile. They are men of honour and they must really believe what the ANC Mission in Exile is telling them because I am sure they would not deliberately turn to harm Black South Africans as we struggle here on the ground against apartheid. Heads of government and even great statesmen are not immune from climates of opinion which prevail in a certain day amd age. National South African reporting and international reporting confirms their views that the average Black South African supports violence and sanctions. The media in this country has a great deal to answer for. The media carries on a vendetta against me, Inkatha and the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. Not only does it very frequently report negatively on us but it crowns our political opponents with glory when they vilify us. The media raises celebrity leaders to high positions and they travel to Africa, Europe, Britain and America to posture as the country's genuine spokesmen for Blacks.

The media carries on a vendetta against me, Inkatha and the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. Not only does it very frequently report negatively on us but it crowns our political opponents with

glory when they vilify us. The media raises celebrity leaders to high positions and they travel to Africa, Europe, Britain and America to posture as the country's genuine spokesmen for Blacks.

I would like to draw the attention of Members to the role that people like Bishop Desmond Tutu, Dr. Allan Boesak and lamentably now, Dr. Beyers Naude, play in giving credibility to the ANC Mission in Exile and their tactics of violence here in this country as they set brother against brother in an attempt to stimulate a civil war because their armed struggle has failed.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, many of us in this House are committed Christians and we are aware that ever since the time of Christ, priests have had to adopt unpopular positions in their societies. Theirs is the role of having to witness to truth whenever truth is disregarded by society and the State. We live in an imperfect world and society needs Christian watch-dogs. Also since the very beginning of Christianity, there have been those exceptional men of God who played a prophetic role when the going got really tough, and great issues were at stake for people. We expect no less of priests in South Africa today. As they witness to truth they are bound to incur wrath from many quarters. Ours is an unjust society in which there is terrible exploitation and oppression. The Church has a vital role to play and the old Government cry that the Church should keep out of politics must be rejected as cries of fearful men who do not want to be exposed.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I remind this House of these things before I begin talking about the role Bishop Tutu and the Reverends Boesak and Naude are playing in society today. If they are speaking with a prophetic voice, then posterity will judge them as having done so. I, however, want to look at the Party political role they are playing, and I want to say very clearly that their role is a Party political role, and I say bluntly that they must choose between playing Party political roles and presenting themselves as concerned clergy acting out of love for South Africa.

The record is now clear. Bishop Tutu is a patron of the United Demecratic Front. That already stamps him as Party political. Dr. Allan Boesak is a patron of the United Democratic Front. That stamps him too as Party political. Dr. Beyers Naude is a patron of the United Democratic Front. That stamps him too as Party political. From its very inception, the UDF set out to be divisive. Members will remember that even at its launching, it was anti-Inkatha. Its leadership invited all organisations to affiliate to it, but specifically excluded Inkatha from that invitation. This was no skin off our nose, Mr. Speaker, because we had no intentions of seeking affiliation. The UDF has been avowedly anti-Inkatha ever since.

The UDF ... 121/

The UDF has not only been divisive in staging confrontations with Inkatha, but it has been involved with a running battle with AZAPO.

UDF activists have killed not only Inkatha members but they have also killed AZAPO members. It is an orgnisation with a history of attempted political take-over bids and it wants a monopoly of influence over other organisations in South Africa becuse it is under instructions from the ANC Mission in Exile to annihilate all Black opposition to it.

Our three gentlemen of the cloth under discussion, as patrons of the UDF, are party to the internecine Black-on-Blck confrontations which UDF activity has fostered. The UDF is intensely Party political. It is as Party political as the ANC Mission in Exile from which it cannot be distinguished in practical politics. The ANC Mission in Exile has set itself the task of bringing about the downfall of the South African Government by violence. The UDF has set itself the task of bringing about the downfall of the South African Government by making the country ungovernable, and as I have wryly remarked before, Mr. Speaker, you do not do that by playilng marbles.

The ANC Mission in Exile has set itself the task of campaigning for the complete economic isolation of South Africa and the destruction of the economy of this country. The UDF has set itself the task of campaigning for disinvestment, and also campaigns for the economic isolation of South Africa. The ANC Mission in Exile has set itself the task of spreading civil war in our country and Mr. Speaker, we are talking about civil war which will be dominated by Black-on-Black confrontations. The UDF, Mr. Speaker, provide the ANC Mission in Exile with internal activists and strategic support in South Africa in its pursuit of the spreading of civil war. Patrons of the UDF cannot escape the charge that they are Party political activists and they are party to the kind of action in which tyres are hung around people's necks, filled with petrol and set alight so that they can burn to death.

The ANC Mission in Exile is totally opposed to Black South Africans exercising their democratic rights in our country if they do so in opposition to the Mission in Exile. The ANC Mission in Exile sees the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and it sees Inkatha, Mr. Speaker, as prime targets for hideous attacks because it demands that we creep on our bellies before them and do their bidding, no matter how evil that biddings. The United Democratic Front lambast us with hideous untruths because the ANC Mission in Exile has declared war on us.

I came to know, Mr. Speaker, that the UDF was sending its members out in small groups to be trained by the ANC Mission in Exile. I

came to know ... 122/

came to know this before the Witbank treason trial, and in that trial there was evidence that this was happening. The patrons of the United Democratic Front are patrons of an organisation which is training some of its members to bomb, burn and kill.

I do not have to dwell on these things any more, Mr. Speaker, because I am simply talking from what is now public record. There is not a shadow of a doubt that the UDF take instructions from the ANC Mission in Exile, and mongst their members now, Mr. Speaker, there are ANC trained assassins, arsonists and organisers of mob violence who are used by the Mission in Exile to spread Black on Black violence, to create circumstances of an all-consuming civil war. The ANC Mission in Exile is vehemently opposed to progress being made by those of us who are committed to democracy and non-violence.

I will, Mr. Speaker, be drawing attention to the Kairos document, the SACC Conference last year, the Harare Consultation, and the SACC consultation with the Dutch Council of Churches. When we examine these documents, Mr. Speaker, we will see that our three gentlemen of the cloth, and the SACC are attributing Christian love to hideous acts of violence. We will see clearly spelt out support for the ANC Mission in Exile and the UDF as though they were the hand of God in Divine intervention against the atrocities of apartheid.

Before I look at these documents, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I want to analyse the present South African situation and ask the fundamental question of whether or not every stone has been turned over in the search for non-violent solutions. As I know my God Mr. Speaker, and as I understand the techings of Christ, I find no justification for the use of violence in the settlement of human disputes and in the eradication of injustice and oppression unless there is absolutely nothing else left to do. Even then there are those who argue that violence is wrong in every circumstance. This is not the place to pursue that argument, and I would like that particular thought to rest with the thought that the question of the just war is irrelevant if conditions for a just war do not exist. I simply put on record my own deep feeling that there may come a time in the history of our country when there is nothing left to do but fight, but that time most certainly has not yet come.

I do not believe that we now have to kill those supporting apartheid because there is nothing left to do. The ANC Mission in Exile is not diverting its attention from attacking apartheid and the South African Government to attacking South Africa's institutionalised life. The ANC Mission in Exile is fighting South Africa; it is not fighting apartheid. They fight South Africa becuse they maintain that capitalism is the root of all evil and they maintain that the privileged Whites in the country

are beyond ... 123/

are beyond the reach of whatever democratic oposition to apartheid Blacks employ. Is this true? Is society as we know it beyond redemption? I proclaim a vehement No. South African society is not beyond redeption. We do not have to annihilate society as we know it before we can eradicate apartheid. South Africa's institutional life needs to be stripped of apartheid and racism. That is the task the struggle for liberation has always set itself. What the ANC Mission in Exile is doing in attempting to change the nature of the struggle for liberation in South Africa reflects only their grandiose views of themselves as more important than the country they purport to struggle for. A proper perception of them is simply that they are one of many forces at work in this very uncertain time in which we find ourselves. The ANC Mission in Exile is but one Black political path amongst others. They have no right to arrogate unto themselves the role of casting the dye for history.

Perceptions of society are dependent on the vantage point yu are occupying when you look at it. the ANC Mission in Exile looks at South Africa from the vantage point of an organisation out there in the cold with the only access to being involved being provided by violent programmes. The ANC Mission in Exile has a perception of White South Africa and the Government as intrinsically evil and as being unchangeable, and must be destroyed because it is inherently evil. This immediately makes them a minority party political force because that is not the way Black South Africns look at the country of their birth. Black abhorrence of apartheid does not blind Blacks to the fact that apartheid is an evil policy which gives rise to evil practices which must be eradicated. We are not blind to the fact that Whites are not intrinsically evil and that the institutions of the country are not intrinsically evil. Black South Africans know that if we remove racism from our social, economic and political life, we will be purifying that which is well worth retaining.

It is tragic that cheap opinion polls are often elevated by the media to be political gospel. We have done our very own probe into the hearts and minds of White South Africa, Mr. Speaker, and we have every clear perception of what propensity there is in South Africa to bring about change. When I wrote two separate letters addressed to prominent South Africans last year, Mr. Speaker, I did not write to hand-picked individuals. I wrote to top-ranking people included in address lists of the country's various institutions. I have now received something like one thousand replies to my letters to prominent South Africans. I have now massive correspondence from opinion-makers in White South Africa. I have also received letters from Blacks to whom I wrote. But the letters I have received from Whites give us a very valuable insight into the hearts and minds of our fellow White South Africans who are actually opinion-formers in the country. We are proceeding with the analysis of these letters and I would

like, Mr. Speaker, ... 124/

like, Mr. Speaker, to present sections of this analysis in advance of providing the House with a full report on the contents of these letters.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, as we look at the contents of these letters, I ask you to bear in mind whether it is these kind of people who need know to be killed. I ask you to keep in mind the question of whether or not there is hope of reform because hears and minds of ordinary South Africans are not intrinsically evil and that decency does exist amongst them which will not tolerate apartheid forever. Those who are committed to violence as a primary means of liberating our country argue that the people from whom I received these letters are beyond salvation unless the whole fabric of society is torn apart, the economy is destroyed, and a socialist one-Party state is established.

Letters received from English and Afrikaans-speaking White South Africans make nonsense of the view that White South Africa is deeply polarised on language lines. This, Honourable Members, will see for themselves when a separate analysis of letters I have received from Afrikaans-speaking South Africans is tabled. Today I want to table some extracts of the analysis made of letters from English-speaking opinion-makers in the country. The batch of letters which were analysed number 509. The analysis took the form of isolating every separate statement in each of the letters and allocating them to a category under a heading which best summarised the statements. Details of the analysis of 509 letters are:

The pleasure expressed in these letters greatly encouraged me. They showed the extent to which apartheid is nonsense in national politics. I wrote to these opinion-makers as a Black political leader about burning national issues and the gratitude that they showed in their letters because I did so indicates the extent to which political barriers between Black and White are being trampled on by both Black and White.

	A22	ATTITUDES TO RECEIVING LETTER FROM CHIEF BUTHELEZI
2	A24A	VERY NEGATIVE
3	A27	NEUTRAL BUT DIVIDED OPINION
243	A33	PLEASED
150	A34	VERY PLEASED
30	A35	EXTRAORDINARILY PLEASED

Total: 428

There were 276 statements of support for me on broad moral, political and personal achievement grounds. There were another 430 statements supporting my political action. In other words,

there were ... 125/

there were a total of 928 statements of support for me in the letters I received. These contained 164 statements of really total support. There is no doubt in my mind that White South Africa hears my voice and if these replies are anything to go on, White South African opinion-makers have a deep appreciation for the role I am playing in politics.

P37 SUPPORT IMPLICIT OR EXPLICIT IN THE LETTERS TO CHIEF BUTHELEZI.

P40 SUPPORT FOR CHIEF BUTHELEZI IS GENERALLY FOR:-

23	P41	HIS	- SOCIAL MORALS
24	P42		- IDEALS FAIRNESS AND PRINCIPLES
95	P43		- GENERAL POLITICAL STANCE
14	P44		- PRACTICAL POLICY IN THE PRESENT
12	P45		- FUTURE ROLE
25	P46		- PERSONALITY
81	P47		- GENERAL ROLE
2	P48		- ACHIEVEMENTS AND EFFORTS
5	P50		- WILLINGNESS TO COMPROMISE
141	P51		- POLITICS OF NEGOTIATION LEADING TO RECONCILIATION AND NON-VIOLENT CHANGE
32	P52		- COMMITMENT TO PEACE AND NON-VIOLENCE
56	P53		- IDEALS OF POWER SHARING
92	P54		- IDEA THAT A DECLARAION OF INTENT IS NEEDED
30	P55		- COMMITMENT TO POWER-SHARING AND HIS DECLARATION OF INTENT
11	P56		- FOR INKATHA
16	P57		- FOR KWANATAL IDEAS
18	P58		- LEADERSHIP
2	P59		- FOR HIS OPPOSITION TO THE LEFT
1	P60		- FOR IDEAS OF ONE CITIZENSHIP FOR ALL
9	P61		- FOR HIS APPROACH TO DISINVESTMENT

F55 LEVELS OF SUPPORT

164	F56	DITTO - FULLY SUPPORTS HIM
27	F62	AGREES , UNDERSTANDS, APPRECIATES HIM VERY MUCH
19	F63	WISHES LUCK PRAYERS ETC
Total	928	

As can be expected, these letters did not contain all sweetness and light even if they were dominantly supportive. Of the 509 letters only two were very negative and three were neutral, but because they reflect a body of opinion solidly in support of my political position, it does not mean that criticisms were not offered. 23 statements were made out not being able to offer me total support. In some of these statements, Inkatha was accused

of possibly ... 126/

of possibly being violent and intolerant. There were three statements accusing me of being a Government employee. There was one statement accusing me of being a Government supporter. There was one statement criticising me because the writer only believed in revolutionary change. There are two statements saying that the writers belong to an organisation which precluded them from expressing support for what I was doing. There was a total of 23 statements denying me general support.

There were another 274 statements offering me partial support. Of these, 210 statements offered me partial support becuse I was involved in the politics of reconciliation, and power-sharing and becuse I was campaigning for the need for the acceptance of a declartion of intent. I find these statements of partial support encouraging becuse when you look at the reasons given for them, you can see that these kind of actions are breaking into new political constituencies.

	F18	WRITER IS POSITIVE BUT OFFERS PARTIAL SUPPORT ONLY
9	F19	DITTO - NO REASONS GIVEN
2	F21	DITTO - BECAUSE WRITER MOSTLY DISAGREES
18	F26	SPECIFIC FULL SUPPORT PROMISED
13	F27	SPECIFIC FULL SUPPORT BECAUSE - NEED FOR DIALUGUE
1	F28	DITTO - NEED FOR JUST SOUTH AFRICA
3	F29	DITTO - NEED FOR A UNITED SOUTH AFRICA
26	F30	DITTO - NEED FOR HIS NON-VIOLENT NEGOTIATIONS
55	F31	DITTO - NEED FOR POLITICS OF RECONCILIATION
58	F33	DITTO - NEED FOR POWER-SHARING
58	F34	DITTO - NEED FOR DECLARATION OF INTENT
13	F35	DITTO - NEED FOR NEGOTIATIONS FOR A JUST SOUTH AFRICA AND PEACE
1	F36	DITTO - NEED FOR HIM TO NORMALISE THE SOUTH ARRICAN SITUATION
2	F37	DITTO - NEED FOR HIS KIND OF COMPROMISES
6	F38	DITTO - NEED FOR HIS STAND ON DISINVESTMENT
7	F39	DITTO - NEED CHANGE THROUGH PEACEFUL NEGOTIATION
2	F40	DITTO - NEED A NATIONAL CONVENTION
	F41A	WRITER IS VERY POSITIVE BUT OFFERS RESERVED SUPPORT ONLY BECAUSE -
1	F42	DITTO - SLIGHT MISTRUST OF HIM
2	F43	DITTO - HE IS AN UNKNOWN QUANTITY
1	F48	DITTO - WRITER IS MEMBER OF PFP
1	F50	DITTO - WRITER IS UDF WORKER
2	F51	DITTO - WRITER IS A GOVERNMENT SUPPORTER
2	F54	DITTO - WRITER OFFERS FULL SUPPORTS CONDITIONAL ON HIS NOT CHANGING HIS VIEWS
	F2	LEVELS OF SUPPORT FOR CHIEF BUTHELEZI

F3A 127/

F3A NO GENERAL SUPPORT PROMISED BECAUSE-

2	F4	GENERAL SUPPORT NOT OFFERED BECAUSE OF INKATHA'S VIOLENCE AND INTOLERANCE
7	F6	GENERAL SUPPORT NOT OFFERED BECAUSE OF WRITER'S POSITION - AS JUDGE
1	F7	DITTO - AS ALIEN
3	F8	DITTO - AS GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE
2	F9	DITTO - AS OTHER REASONS E.G. PFP SUPPORTER
2	F10	GENERAL SUPPORT NOT OFFERED BECAUSE HAS NO INTEREST
1	F11	DITTO - IS GOVERNMENT SUPPORTER
1	F12	DITTO - BECAUSE OF CHURCH POLICY
1	F14	DITTO - BECAUSE HE IS EMPIRE BUILDING
2	F16	DITTO - BECAUSE HE GIVES THE GOVERNMENT LINE
1	F13	DITTO - BELIEVES IN REVOLUTIONARY CHANGE ONLY

Total 516

As I suppose could only be expected those who received letters from me assumed I had a mixture of motives. 236 statements saw me as looking for support for power-sharing, reconciliation, the declaration of intent I issued, contact between races, the removal of barriers between races and the removal of apartheid. They saw me as being motivated by national interests. Another 212 saw my motives as being more personal and me as seeking recognition for what I was doing and of seeking advantages for my people

C2 THE WRITER'S PERCEPTIONS OF CHIEF BUTHELEZI'S AIM IN WRITING

NATIONAL ORIENTATION

26	C4	LOOKING FOR SUPPORT - FOR HIS POWER-SHARING
70	C5	DITTO - RECONCILIATION FOR CHANGE TO GOOD SOCIETY
23	C6	DITTO - STATEMENT OF INTENT NEEDED
13	C8	DITTO - RECONCILIATORY POWERS AND POWER-SHARING
1	C9	DITTO - THE NEED FOR A STATEMENT OF INTENT
3	C11	TO GET - POLITICAL LEADERS TOGETHER
9	C12	DITTO - CONTACT BETWEEN RACES
3	C13	DITTO - THE REMOVAL OF APARTHEID, AND THE BREAKING DOWN OF BARRIERS BETWEEN RACES
3	C16	DITTO - FAIR DEAL FOR HIS PEOPLE
6	C26	TO SECURE POLITICAL CHANGE
18	C15	DITTO - A GOOD FUTURE IN A JUST SOCIETY
16	C27	DITTO - CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE
1	C51	DITTO - SUPPORT FOR RADICAL CHANGES
1	C28	DITTO - IDEAS AS TO WHITE VIEWS OF KWAZULU
2	C29	DITTO - A FORUM FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF
5	C40	DITTO - PEACE

2	C41	DITTO - RECONCILIATION BETWEEN RACES
2	C42	DITTO - SATISFACTION FOR BLACK ASPIRATIONS
1	C38	AS PART- OF INSTITUTING DIALOGUE
5	C43	DITTO - OF HIS EFFORTS TO MAKE KWANATAL PART OF A BETTER SOUTH AFRICA
13	C14	TO CREATE A CLIMATE OF TRUST OR NORMALITY TO MAKE CHANGE POSSIBLE
4	C17	TO RESOLVE TENSIONS IN SOCIETY
9	C36	BECAUSE OF HIS CONCERN FOR SOUTH AFRICA
		PERSONAL ORIENTATION
15	C18	TO GET - INFORMATION AS TO WHITE OPINION, VIEWS
5	C19	DITTO - RECOGNITION FOR HIS TRYING
1	C20	DITTO - RECOGNITION FOR HIS CO-OPERATIVE STANCE
68	C24	DITTO - GENERAL SUPPORT FOR HIS APPROACH, ROLE
7	C25	DITTO - POLITICAL SUPPORT AS A POLITICIAN FROM WHITES
2	C39	DITTO - ADVANTAGES FOR HIMSELF AND NOT FOR HIS PEOPLE
46	C22	DITTO - RECOGNITION FOR HIS ROLE VALUE
9	C23	DITTO - ACCESS TO WHITE VIEWS
31	C30	TO TELL- WHITES THE POSITION HE IS IN AND WHAT HE BELIEVES
9	C31	DITTO - WHITES HIS IDEAS FOR EXAMPLE, DEMOCRACY,
6	C33	DITTO - WHITES HIS VISION OF SOUTH ARICA
11	C34	DITTO - WHITES HIS SOLUTIONS
1	C35	DITTO - WHITES WHAT THE ROLE OF THE KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY IS
1	C50	TO CREATE BLACK IMPERIALISM AND EMPIRE BUILDING
Total	448	

It is interesting to look at the adjectives and concepts used by those who perceive me in a positive light. Statements talk about my rationality, moderateness, pragmatism, ability, judgement, wiseness, initiative, bravery, courage, firmness, fortitude, determination, statesmanship, my ability to handle power, intelligence, integrity, sincerity, Christianity, flexibility, negotiating skills, non-violence and caring. And I am seen as a leader with influence, with a constituency, pursuing ideals of civilisation, giving hope in a hopeless situation, leading Inkatha, and as a future leader of Natal and South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, when White opinion-makers speak thus about a Black leader who has vehemently opposed apartheid with no quarter given for the whole of his political life, then there is indeed hope for South Africa. There was a total of 443 statements containing these kind of adjectives and descriptions. They formed a noteworthy element in the letters I received, and they greatly encouraged me. Mr. Speaker, Sir,

Honourable 129/

Honourable Members, when we strive for decent goals as patriotic South Africans, we bring the day of political negotiations nearer.

	N2	POSITIVE PERCEPTIONS OF CHIEF BUTHELEZI
	N6	SPECIFIC PRAISE FOR-
34	N7	DITTO - HIS RATIONALITY
4	N9	DITTO - HIS ABILITY
22	N10	DITTO - METHODS AND HIS PRESENT STAND
4	N11	DITTO - HIS JUDGEMENT AND WISDOM
6	N12	DITTO - HIS PRACTICAL ACHIEVEMENTS
1	N20	DITTO - HIS HANDLE OF POWER
3	N21	DITTO - HIS GOOD RESTRAINT AND PATIENCE
44	N22	DITTO - HIS INSIGHT, VISION, WISDOM AND INTELLIGENCE
30	N23	DITTO - HIS INTEGRITY, SINCERITY AND FRANKNESS
22	N24	DITTO - HIS CHRISTIAN BELIEF
18	N25	DITTO - HIS IDEALS OF CIVILISATION (E.G. DEMOCRACY)
7	N31	DITTO - HIS FLEXIBILITY
3	N33	DITTO - HIS GOOD NEGOTIATING SKILLS
18	N35	DITTO - HIS NON-VIOLENT STANCE
2	N36	DITTO - HIS PATRIOTISM AND COMMITMENT
1	N38	DITTO - HIS CARING ATTITUDES
51	N15	DITTO - HIS LEADERSHIP
20	N19	DITTO - HIS STATESMANSHIP
14	N14	DITTO - HIS STRENGTH, FIRMNESS, FORTITUDE AND DETERMINATION
36	N13	DITTO - HIS INITIATIVE, COURAGE AND WILLINGNESS TO TAKE RISKS
35	N8	DITTO - HIS MODERATION RESPONSIBILITY AND PRAGMATISM
3	N17	AS A LEADER WITH A CONSTITUENCY - INKATHA
3	N18	DITTO - WHICH IS ZULU
3	N29	AS THE FUTURE LEADER - OF SOUTH AFRICA
2	M20	DOTTO - OF NATAL
19	N16	AS A LEADER WITH INFLUENCE HE IS RECOGNISED
4	N34	AS THE LEADER INKATHA
1	N37	AS AN INFLUENTIAL BANTU LEADER
24	N27	FOR GIVING HOPE IN A HOPELESS SITUATION
Total	443	

Quite independently of statements of approval, the letters contained 347 statements promising help and support, and another 74 statements wishing me good luck and offering to pray for me.

Q35 PROMISE OF SUPPORT/HELP

39	Q45	GIVES VERBAL SUPPORT FOR MOST OF THE LETTER
17	Q46	GIVES VERBAL SUPPORT FOR SOME OF THE LETTER
136	Q48	GIVES STRONG VERBAL SUPPORT TO THE LETTER CONTENT AND HIS ROLE
39	Q49	GIVES FORMAL AND PUBLIC SUPPORT AND PROMISES TO RECRUIT FURTHER SUPPORT
36	Q50	WILL HELP ACTIVELY - IN THEIR OWN SPHERE
28	Q51	DITTO - AS CHIEF BUTHELEZI DEFINES
7	Q54	WILL ADVISE HILM OF IDEAS AND HAVE DISCUSSION WITH HIM
32	Q55	JUST AGREES VERY MUCH
6	Q44	IN ORDER TO HELP SOUTH AFRICA IN GENERAL
6	Q47	AND ASKS FOR SUGGESTIONS HOW TO HELP
Total	346	

I was very interested to see that White opinion makers in South Africa see my influence as significant. A total of 422 statements were made about the influence I exercise. Of these 373 were about my influence in the present situation. Of these 373, 290 statements located my sphere of influence as South Africa. Six went further and noted my influence in Southern Africa and another six went even further and noted my international influence. 49 statements were about my influence in the future, and over half of these statements again saw me in a South African light.

	L2	PERCEPTIONS OF HIS REGIONAL INFLUENCE: (IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT
	L5	IN THE PRESENT SITUATION
27	L6	SEE HIS INFLUENCE TO BE IN - KWAZULU
10	L7	DITTO - NATAL
14	L8	DITTO - BLACK SOUTH AFRICA
290	L9	DITTO - SOUTH AFRICA
6	L10	DITTO - SOUTHERN AFRICA
6	L11	DITTO - OVERSEAS
10	L12	DITTO - KWANATAL
1	L14	DITTO - KWAZULU IN SA POLITICS
9	L13	SEES HIS INFLUENCE AS A PEACEMAKER IN SA.
	L16	IN THE FUTURE SITUATION
5	L17	SEES HIS INFLUENCE TO BE IN - KWAZULU
2	L18	DITTO - THE NATAL REGION
28	L20	DITTO - SOUTH AFRICA
4	L21	DITTO - SOUTHERN AFRICA
1	L22	DITTO - OVERSEAS
4	L23	DITTO - KWANATAL
5	L24	SEES HIS INFLUENCE AS A PECEMAKER IN SA

Total... 131/

Total 422

An important element in the letters I received were the Statements in which the aims of change in South Africa were made. There were a total of 375 statements showing how the writer perceived change. There was a fair spread of views about change being needed to solve the problems of violence, to have peace in future, to have a reconciled South Africa, to have happiness for Blacks and Whites, to achieve unity between people with a common destiny, to implement Christian and other ideals, to introduce, justice, equality and democracy and to bring about constitutional changes. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, in passing that there were 19 statements amongst those talking about the aims of change being statements which showed that the writer felt the need to have a society in which their patriotism was justified.

		AIMS OF CHANGE AS SEEN BY THE WRITER -
47	H25	SOLVING PRESENT PROBLEMS OF VIOLENCE
34	H26	PEACE IN FUTURE, PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE, HARMONY
25	H27	GOOD LIFE FOR ALL, PEACE AND PROSPERITY
27	H28	RECONCILIATION
8	H29	ACHIEVE HAPPINESS FOR BOTH BLACK AND WHITE
18	H30	CONSENSUS BETWEEN GROUPS
21	H31	UNITY BETWEEN GROUPS
7	H33	TOWARDS CHRISTIAN IDEALS
7	H34	TOWARDS (NON-DEFINED) IDEALS
20	H35	AWAY FROM APARTHEID TOWARDS TOGETHERNESS
5	H37	POWER-SHARING SO VIOLENCE STOPS
29	H38	POWER-SHARING
24	H39	CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE
15	H40	CONCRETE PLANS FOR THE FUTURE
10	H41	AS CHIEF BUTHELEZI DEFINES
4	H42	JUSTICE, FAIRNESS
1	H43	SATISFACTION OF BLACKS
1	H44	THE UPLIFTMENT OF BLACKS TO WESTERN MORAL STANDARDS
37	H36	JUSTICE, EQUALITY, INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY
19	H45	SORT OUT OUR FUTURE TO JUSTIFY PATRIOTISM
4	H46	NEED SECURITY
3	H49	REBUILD OUR INTERNAL IMAGE OF OURSELVES
1	H50	UPLIFT BLACKS
8	H48	REBUILD OUR INTERNATIONAL IMAGE TO JUSTIFY PATRIOTISM

Total 375

Constitutional issues were also apparently important to these White South African opinion-makers. 331 statements were made about specifically constitutional issues. Only 8 of them talked about the new constitution as positive because it was a first step

in the right ... 132/

in the right direction. Statements reflecting the writer's own constitutional ideals show that there was a recognition of the need for democracy, harmony and stability; for just power-sharing, for the joint representation of all races in the future, for equality for all, and to have a common citizenship in a unitary state.

In talking about the need for constitutional change, 37 statements rejected a one-man-one-vote system of government but 35 statements explicitly accepted one-man-one-vote system of government either in a unitary state or a federal state. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, the constitutional issue is a wide open issue as far as these influential South Africans are concerned. Their letters show a flexibility of thought which augurs well for the future, and yet once again we have evidence that the State President is under-achieving in his reform programme.

	W1	CONSTITUTION
	W4	VIEW OF THE PRESENT PARLIAMENT-
8	W5	POSITIVE BECAUSE IT WAS A FIRST STEP
1	W9	NEGATIVE, IT WAS WRONG, BLACKS SHOULD BE INCLUDED
2	W14	DIVIDED, THOUGHT TO BE GOOD BUT NOW WRITER THINKS IT IS WRONG
	W20	CONSTITUTION IDEALS MENTIONED BY THE WRITER-
23	W21	DEMOCRACY
24	W26	PEACE, HAPPINESS, HARMONY AND STABILITY
20	W28	REPRESENTATION OF ALL RACES JOINT FUTURE
29	W29	THE EQUALITY OF ALL JUSTICE
18	W30	PROTECTION OF MINORITY RIGHTS
11	W31	PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS
3	W34	OWN SPHERES
1	W35	MAJORITY WILL
10	W36	COMMON CITIZENSHIP IN UNITARY STATE
9	W37	ONE-MAN-ONE-VOTE
8	W38	ONE-MAN-ONE-VOTE IN A UNITARY STATE
3	W40	COMMON CITIZENSHIP BUT NOT IN A UNITARY STATE
6	W41	COMMON CITIZENSHIP
1	W44	WHITES SHOULD GIVE BASIC HUMAN RIGHTS TO BLACKS
1	W45	THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM
1	W46	REGIONAL SOLUTION
48	W27	FAIR, JUST MEANINGFUL POWER-SHARING
4	W22	QUALIFIED FRANCHISE - ON TAXES PAID
1	W23	DITTO - EDUCATION
2	W25	DITTO - NOT SPECIFIED
1	W24	DITTO - ON PROPERTY AND BUSINESS
2	W33	OWN SPHERE FOR DIFFERENT NATIONS WITH A COMMON DESTINY

1 W39 ... 133/

1	W39	SHOULD CONCUR WITH INDIVIDUALS IDEALS OF A GOOD SOCIETY
12	W42	WRITER CONCURS WITH CHIEF BUTHELEZI'S IDEALS
1	W43	DITTO - BUT NOT UNITARY STATE LIKE THE BRITISH
	W48	KIND CONSTITUTION WRITER WANTS TO PURSUE NOW-
2	W50	CONSTELLATION OF STATES
2	W51	CONFEDERATION GENERAL AFFAIRS VERSUS OWN AFFAIRS
12		WRITER CONCURS WITH CHIEF BUTHELEZI'S IDELS
1		DOTTO - BUT NOT UNITARY STATE LIKE THE BRITISH
		KIND CONSTITUTION WRITER WANTS TO PURSUE NOW-
2		CONSTELLATION OF STATES
2		CONFEDERATION GENERAL AFFAIRS VERSUS OWN AFFAIRS
16		FEDERAL SYSTEM
16		UNITARY SYSTEM
3		AGREES WITH CHIEF BUTHELEZI'S COMPROMISE
1		DITTO - BUT BASED ON ABILITY ENTITLING ONE TO VOTE
2		SOME KIND OF TEMPORARY COMPROMISE TO ONE-MAN-ONE-VOTE
		EXPLICITLY MADE ANTAGONISMS EXPRESSED TOWARDS-
1		REGIONAL SOLUTION
24		ONE MAN ONE VOTE
9		UNITARY PARLIAMENT AND ONE-MAN-ONE-VOTER
2		POWER SHARING
1		ONE CITIZENSHIP ONE NATION
1		UNITARY STATE LIKE THE BRITISH
Total	331	

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I was also encouraged by the fact that 319 statements were made about me as a mediator. The most frequently expressed though in this direction was that I as a mediator between the South African Government and Black South Africa. The second most frequent thought was that I was a mediator between Black and White. The third most frequent thought was that I could mediate between the South African Government on the one hand and Blacks and Whites on the other hand. Clearly the opinion-makers in South Africa who wrote these letters saw the importance of my role as a mediator across the length and breadth of the country.

	PERCEPTIONS OF CHIEF BUTHELEZI'S MEDIATING ROLE
	IN THE PRESENT THEY SEE HIM AS MEDIATING BETWEEN
11	KWAZULU GOVERNMENT AND THE GOVERNMENT

36		HIMSELF AND BOTHA
27		THE GOVERNMENT AND BLACKS AND WHITES
74	L44	GOVERNMENT AND BLACKS IN THE SPHERE OF BLACK/WHITE RELATIONS
Total	319	
	H1	THEMES IN TALKING ABOUT THE PROCESS OF CHANGE
89	H4	SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED - YES
20	H5	- YES AND IT IS POSSIBLE
1	H6	- YES BUT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE
2	H7	- YES BUT QUESTIONS IF IT IS POSSIBLE
127	H10	- SHOULD BE NON-VIOLENT
19	H11	- YES AND IT IS POSSIBLE
3	H12	- YES BUT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE
1	H13	- QUESTIONS IF IT IS POSSIBLE
8	H16	CHANGE SHOULD BE - EVOLUTIONARY
6	H17	- NON-REVOLUTIONARY
3	H18	- BE REVOLUTIONARY
2	H19	- BOTH EVOLUTIONARY AND REVOLUTIONARY
2	H21	- IN BLACKS NOT WHITES
3	H15	SHOULD BE NO COMPROMISES IN CHANGE
T 286		

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, it is interesting to note that 239 statements were made about the causes of South Africa's problems. 67 statements were made about cuses which were basically historical. The majority of these 67 statements made about South Africa's problems (44) were attributed to racism in our history which led to an immoral apartheid society. Ten of those who made statements in a historical vein said that history in this country has led to White fears. Only two statements referred to stereo-typical White thought which talked about the social gaps between Black and White, and the view that Blacks had taken a long time to develop. The 172 statements about the cause of South Africa's problems referred to current causes. There was a wide spread of ideas across these 172 statements. 52 of them were specifically about the State President lacking wisdom, lacking leadership, lacking commitment to the future, lacking commitment to power-sharing, or as not addressing fundamental issues, or misjudging White ability to change and White support for change. Other statements saw the causes of South Africa's current problems being hampered by unrest. They saw problems in divisions amongst Black leaders and there were other statements which blamed Blacks for the current state of affairs.

By and large ... 135/

By and large thisd area of thought was the most disappointing. While across all the letters there is solid support for what we are doing, it is evident even now in 1986 that thecause of the country's terrible predicament is not clearly enough perceived by Whites.

	X2	CAUSES OF SOUTH AFRICA'S PROBLEMS
	X6	HISTORICAL CAUSES-
1	X8	SOCIAL GAP BETWEEN RACES
3	X9	HISTORICAL DYNAMICS LED TO A WRONG FOUNDATION
5	X10	THE GOVERNMENT AND ITS HOLDING POWER IN THE PAST
10	X11	THE HISTORY OF AFRICA HAS LED TO WHITE FEARS
1	X12	ECONOMIC FACTORS
1	X15	PROBLEM OF DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHICAL NATIONS
1	X16	THE AFRIKANERS ARE NOT GOING TO GIVE UP WHAT THEY FOUGHT HARD FOR
1	X13	BLACKS HAVE TAKEN A LONG TIME TO DEVELOP AWAY FROM THEIR LOW STANDARDS
44	X7	RACISM WHICH LED TO IMMORAL APARTHEID, NON-EQUALITY, SOCIAL TENSIONS, NO SOCIAL CONTACT
	X16A	CURRENT CAUSES - P.W. BOTHA-
2	X17	HE LACKS WISDOM
1	X18	HE LACKS LEADERSHIP
1	X19	HE LACKS VISION OF THE FUTURE
3	X20	HE LACKS WHITE SUPPORT TO CHANGE
13	X21	HE LACKS COMMITMENT TO POWER-SHARING
5	X23	HE IS INADEQUATE NOT TRUSTWORTHY
1	X24	HE IS NOT ADDRESSING FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES
1	X25	HE MISJUDGES WHITE ABILITY TO CHANGE
1	X26	HE MISJUDGES WHITE SUPPORT FOR CHANGE
3	X28	HIS PROBLEMS - ENGLISH/AFRIKAANS PROBLEM
6	X30	- HE FEARS RIGHT WING OF GOVERNMENT
1	X31	- HE FEARS SOUTH AFRICAN RIGHT WING
3	X33	- HE CANNOT BACK-TRACK BECAUSE IT WILL LEAD TO POLITICAL DEATH
2	X34	- MANY AND VARIED
4	X35	- HE NEEDS TIME TO PERSUADE WHITES
5	X37	- HE IS CAUGHT BETWEEN BLACK LEFT AND WHITE RIGHT
		CURRENT CAUSES - GENERAL
2	X38	SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT IS UNCHRISTIAN
1	X39	UNREST HAS LIMITED GOVERNMENT PROGRESS
16	X40	BLACK - LEADERSHIP DIVISIONS ND POLARISATION HAS LED TO LACK OF UNITY

LEFT WING ... 136/

14	X41	- LEFT WING LIKE TUTU ESPOUSES VIOLENCE AND DISINVESTMENT
1	X42	- LEADERSHIP IS JAILED SO NEGOTIATION IS NOT POSSIBLE
3	X43	- ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL IMMATURITY HAD LED TO WHITE FEARS
2	X44	- HATRED OF WHITES HAS LED TO WHITE FEARS
2	X45	- DIVISION IN BELIEFS
2	X47	- LOW STANDARDS OF MORALITY ETC
9	X49	- FRUSTRATIONS
6	X50	- EXPECTATIONS ARE NOT BEING SATISFIED
1	X51	- IDEAS AS TO THE EFFICACY OF VIOLENCE
1	X52	- AGITATORS
10	X54	WHITE - RACIAL HOSTILITIES AND OR RACIAL FEARS
5	X55	- FEAR OF RETRIBUTION BY BLACKS
23	X57	- FEARS OF POLITICAL DOMINATION AND CHAOS
7	X58	- FEARS OF BEING SWAMPED CULTURALLY AND THE LOSS OF CULTURAL INTEGRITY
3	X59	- FEARS OF COMMUNISM
4	X61	- FEARS OF LOSS OF PROTECTION WHICH WOULD LEAD TO THEM HAVING TO MAKE SACRIFICES
2	X62	- FEARS OF BLACK NUMBERS
5	X63	- UNCHRISTIANESS AND SELFISHNESS
1	X53	DIVISIONS BETWEEN ENGLISH AND AFRIKAANS
Total	239	

A total of 134 statements were made about the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and 90 statements were made about Inkaha. These statements expressed positive views and at times extremely positive about the role of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. 90 statements were made about Inkatha, of which only three were negative. Generally speaking these statements saw the Assembly being positive both in the present situation, as well as in the future.

	S2	VIEW OF THE KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
	S6	VIEW OF THE KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY'S ROLE IN THE PAST
3	S8	VERY POSITIVE
15	S9	EXTREMELY POSITIVE
	S10	VIEW OF CHIEF BUTHELEZI'S ROLE IN THE PRESENT
2	S12	VERY POSITIVE
24	S13	EXTREMELY POSITIVE
	S13A	VIEW OF KWAZULU LEGISLATIE ASSEMBLY ROLE IN THE FUTURE

1	S14	AS NEGATIVE
2	S16	VERY POSITIVE
31	S17	EXTREMELY POSITIVE
43	S20	THE WRITER SEES ITS ROLE AS SYNONYMOUS TO CHIEF BUTHELEZI
	S23	WORDS DESCRIBING KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY-
1	S24	ADMIRATION
2	S25	STATESMANLIKE
31	S17	EXTREMELY POSITIVE
43	S20	THE WRITER SEES ITS ROLE AS SYNONYMOUS TO CHIEF BUTHELEZI
	S23	WORDS DESCRIBING KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY-
1	S24	ADMIRATION
2	S25	STATESMANLIKE
3	S26	CRUCIAL
1	S27	HAVING GREAT ACHIEVEMENTS
1	S28	COURAGEOUS
2	S29	HAS GOOD LEADERSHIP
1	S30	GIVES CHIEF BUTHELEZI HIS BONA FIDES
1	S31	HAS NOT DEFINED AN IMPOSSIBLE TASK
1	S34	IS TAKEN SERIOUSLY BY AFRIKANERS
1	35	HAS IMMENSE DIPLOMACY
Total	134	
	S36	THE ROLE OF INKATHA IN THE PROCESS OF CHANGE
	S38	POSITIVE EVALUATION OF ITS ROLE IN THE PAST
2	S40	VERY POSITIVE
9	S41	EXTREMELY POSITIVE
	S45	EVALUATION OF ITS ROLE IN THE FUTURE
37	S44	EXTREMELY POSITIVE
	S50	NEGATIVE EVALUATION OF ITS ROLE
2	S51	IN THE PAST
1	S53	IN THE PRESENT
38	S58	THE WRITER SEES ITS ROLE AS SYNONYMOUS WITH CHIEF BUTHELEZI
Total	90	

Mr. Speaker ... 138/

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members I was also encouraged by what White South African opinion-makers said about the need for a statement of intent. 152 statements were made about the need for a statement of intent and only 13 statements were negative, in the sense that a statement of intent was not needed because the State President in effect already spelt one out. Indications are that a great many White South Africans would accept it as it is now drafted. Generally speaking, influential White South Africans are positively inclined to the kind of statement of intent I drafted as a statement which could be amended as necessary. People see a need for a statement of intent which is capable of de-escalating the current violent situation because South Africa's future needs definition, because we need a basis for dialogue, and because there is a need for the Government to show its intention to change. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, here again we have an indication of the readiness of White South Africans to enter into serious dialogue, and yet once more we have evidence that the State President is dragging his heels in getting his reform programme off the ground.

	II	THE NEED FOR A STATEMENT OF INTENT: OPINIONS
	16	WHY IT IS NECESSARY TO FORMULATE ONE-
58	17	NO REASONS GIVEN
2	18	FOR CHIEF BUTHELEZI'S REASONS
6	19	BECAUSE - P.W. BOTHA'S ACTIONS, STANCE
5	110	- OF THE VIOLENT SITUATION IN SA
3	116	- SA'S FUTURE NEEDS DEFINITION
12	117	- WE NEED A BASIS FOR DIALOGUE
	122	WHY IT IS NECESSARY THAT P.W. BOTHA FORMULATE ONE-
9	124	BECAUSE - WE NEED ONE LIKE CHIEF BUTHELEZI'S
2	127	- OF THE VIOLENCE
1	128	- OF SOUTH AFRICA'S FUTURE
9	130	- HE NEEDS TO SHOW INTENTIONS TO CHANGE
2	129	- OF CHIEF BUTHELEZI'S REASONS
1	125	- IT IS HIS PREROGATIVE AS LEADER OF SA
6	126	- THE WRITER DOES NOT QUESTION THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE
3	133	- WE MUST SHARE POWER IN TERMS OF HUMAN IDEALS
32	123	NO REASONS GIVEN
Total	152	
	136	IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO FORMULATE ONE-
13	138	BECAUSE P.W. BOTHA HAS IN EFFECT SPELT OUT ONE

Mr. Speaker, ... 139/

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, 184 statements were specificlly made about power-sharing and of these there were only five statments which rejected the need for power-sharing. An analysis of these responses shows again the extent to which the time is now ripe for negotiation between Black and White. Some saw the for power-sharing in a one-man-one-vote structure. Only three saw the need for power-sharing within a qualified franchise system.

	G1	STATEMENTS MADE ABOUT POWER-SHARING
	G2	AGREES IT IS NECESSARY
85	G3	NO REASONS GIVEN
3	G4	BECUSE OF - PRESENT VIOLENT SITUATION
6	G5	- INTERDEPENDENCE OF BLACK AND WHITE
7	G6	- HUMAN PRINCIPLES
1	G10	- ITS INEVITABILITY
5	G7	WE NEED - ONE MAN ONE VOTE
3	G8	- JUSTICE
6	G9	- EQUALITY OF ALL
	G18	AGREES POWER-SHARING IS NECESSARY AND DEFINES HOW IT SHOULD BE SHARED
5	G20A	IN - COMPROMISE SOLUTIONS
2	G20	- QUALIFIED FRANCHISE - TAX PAID
1	G21	- EDUCATIONAL LEVEL
1	G22	- FULL PARTICIPATION
4	G23	- A FEDERATION
5	G24	- A ONE-MAN-ONE-VOTE SYSTEM
2	G25	- A REALISTIC WAY
4	G26	- A SYSTEM NOT ONE-MAN-ONE-VOTE SYSTEM
5	G27	- THE COMPOSITION OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
2	G29	- CENTRAL GOVERNMENT BUT NO ONE-MAN-ONE-VOTE
1	G30	- CENTRAL GOVERNMENT BUT NOT BRITISH SYSTEM
9	G33	- WAYS WHICH ARE FAIR AND MEANINGFUL TO ALL
10	G34	- NOT ONE-MAN-ONE-VOTE BUT NEVERTHELESS MEANINGFUL TO ALL
3	G35	- EQUITY BUT WITH NO BLACK NUMERICAL DOMINATION
9	G37	- IN A SITUATION AFTER DISCUSSION
	G39	SAYS IT IS NOT NECESSARY
3	G40	BECAUSE - THE IDEAL IS EACH TO HIS OWN SPHERE
1	G42	- THE WHITES DESERVE THE BENEFITS OF THEIR LABOURS
1	G43	- BLACKS ARE NOT YET READY
Total 184		

Mr. Speaker ... 140/

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members I said earlier that influential White South Africans see me as having a national role, and where they made specific statements about their perceptionsof my power-base, this is again apparent. In the total of 170 statements made about my power base, 129 of them saw me having power because I have the support of Black South Africa, the support of White South Africa, Christian support and support from abroad. It is interesting to note that there were 13 statements about KwaNatal when people spoke about my power base. There was also a clear perception that Inkatha and this House, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, were part of my power base. Quite contrary to the filthy propaganda levelled against us by our enemies both here and abroad, White South African opinion-makers themselves give no evidence of regarding me as a "stooge" "working in the pay of the government". They see me as a political leader with a broad South African power base and with a national role to play.

	M2	PERCEPTIONS OF CHIEF BUTHELEZI'S POWER BASE
	M6	IN THE PRESENT -
5	M9	HAS - ZULU SUPPORT
8	M10	- KWAZULU SUPPORT BECAUSE HE IS ITS LEADER
4	M11	- KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY SUPPORT
27	M14	- INKATHA SUPPORT
14	M15	- INKATHA AND KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
2	M16	- INKATHA KWAZULU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY SUPPORT AS WELL AS OTHER BLACK AND WHITE SUPPORT.
13	M17	- KWANATAL SUPPORT
5	M18	- THE SUPPORT OF NATAL PEOPLE
3	M19	- INKAHA AND KWAZULU GOVERNMENT SUPORT AND THE SUPPORT OF ZULUS
24	M20	- BLACK SOUTH AFRICAN SUPPORT
33	M21	- BLACK AND WHITE SOUTH AFRICAN SUPORT
3	M22	- CHRISTIAN SUPPORT
3	M24	- OVERSEAS SUPPORT
15	M25	- WHITE SUPPORT
4	M26	- SUPPORT FROM PEOPLE WHO BELIEVE IN PEACE
7	M7	- MUCH SUPPORT BUT WRITER DOES NOT DEFINE IT
T	170	

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is rather interesting that evaluative statements that were made about President Botha show that White opinion makers who specifically mention him in their letters to me were divided in their opinion. 33 statements saw him in a positive light or said that he needs to be given credit. 69 statements were made about his ability and willingness to bring

about change .. 141/

about change and 25 statements were made showing that the writers did not regard him as being willing to bring about change. Of the 69 who thought he had the ability and the willingness to bring about change, however, 28 were statements that he would bring about change if he was given time and prayerful support, or if pressure was mounted on him. The State President has a powerful propaganda machine billing him as a leader committed to change and he is still apparently carrying some opinion-makers with him as he continually promises that change will be introduced. Even among those who viewd him in a favourable light, there are only ten opinion-makers who were out and out positive.

	V2	EVALUATION OF PRESIDENT BOTHA
	V5	EVALUATED GENERALLY AS -
4	V6	EXTREMELY POSITIVE
6	V7	POSITIVE
1	V9	NEGATIVE
4	V10	NEGATIVE - GIVES REASON FOR HOPELESSNESS
2	V11	NEUTRAL
8	V13	WAIT AND SEE ATTITUDE
1	V14	PROBLEM OF NOT CHANGING HAS LED TO LOSS OF CREDIBILITY WITH BLACK SOUTH AFRICA
18	V15	GIVE HIM CREDIT
1	V16	AFTER POWER, CREDIBILITY AND HIS OWN OWN AMBITIONS
	V16A	P.W. BOTHA'S ABILITY AND WILLINGNESS TO CHANGE-
1	V17	HIS PREROGATIVE
6	V18A	HE IS CHANGING - ALREADY
11	V18B	- ALREADY BUT MUST CHANGE FASTER
15	V19	- AND HE WILL CHANGE
7	V20	- BUT NEEDS TIME, PRAYER WISDOM
5	V21	- BUT NEEDS PRESSURE
1	V23	- BUT NEEDS PRESSURE FROM BLACKS
9	V24	- BUT NEEDS PRESSURE FROM CHIEF BUTHELEZI
6	V25	- BUT NEEDS PRESSURE FROM BLAKS AND CHIEF BUTHELEZI
1	V26	- BECAUSE HE IS A CHRISTIAN
1	V27	- BUT WILL CHANGE INADEQUATELY IN THE TIME AVAILABLE
6	V28	- BUT DIVISION IN NATIONALIST PARTY IS A PROBLEM
	V29	HIS INABILITY OR UNWILLINGNESS TO CHANGE
		HE WILL NOT CHANGE -
1	V30	BECAUSE - HE HAS NO WHITE SUPPORT

1	V31	BECAUSE - HE HAS NO VISION OF THE FUTURE
1	V34	- HE LACKS COURAGE
2	V35	- HE UNDER-ESTIMATES WHITE WILLINGNESS TO CHANGE
1	V36	- BECAUSE OF PRESSURE FROM WHITE RIGHT
3	V37	- HE WOULD LOSE POWER TO THE CONSERVATIVE
1	V38	- HE LACKS THE CONSENT BY A REFERENDUM

HE MIGHT NOT CHANGE

3	V40	BECAUSE - HE WILL HAVE NO POLITICAL FUTURE IF HE BACK-TRACKS
2	V41	- HE IS INTRANSIGENT
6	V42	- HE IS CAUGHT BETWEEN HIS OWN LEFT AND RIGHT
2	V43	- HE IS CAUGHT BETWEEN THE GENERAL LEFT AND RIGHT

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I am giving you this insight into the nature of the letters I have reveived from White opinion-makers in South Africa, not because I want to blow my own trumpet and proclaim my own importance. I am doing so simply to show that there is amongst White opinion-makers in South Africa an acceptance of the need for change. If Whites are politically stupid about what to do to satisfy the needs for change, does that mean we have to kill them, or does that mean that we have to get on with the politics of negotiation and talk sense into their heads? I simply do not believe that if White opinion-makers talk like this that we have to kill them. White society is not beyond redemption. To talk as though White society is beyond redemption, is to talk as though the Black struggle for liberation has achieved nothing over the many generations through which we have struggled and suffered.

Can any one of you conceive of a Black leader being talked about in the 1950's as White opinion-makers now talk about me? The answer is emphatically No. Not that there were no outstanding Black leaders at that time. It is simply that between then and now, the Black struggle for liberation using non-violent tactics and strategies has step by step pushed White South Africans towards accepting the need for change. A great many White South Africans now want change and the demand for change is ever increasingly out-distancing the State President's own commitment to change. He will have to move much faster if he is going to satisfy White opinion, never mind Black opinion. Do we kill Whites because their State President drags his feet in the process of change? It is over-simplistic to say that Whites must be killed because they voted the present Government into power.

I say these things, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, as a Black South African with anger burning in his soul. I say them in the

total dedication ... 143/

total dedication to working for change that Black South Africans want. I say them while I am vehemently opposed to apartheid as the greatest form of systematic oppression known to the modern world. I am mindful of immense Black suffering. I am mindful of present Black deprivation. I am mindful of the fact that Whites voted in favour of the new constitution which set the political clocks back in our country. I speak with anger because there is so little time in which to do so much. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, is that the politics of negotiation using non-violent tactics and strategies is a far more potent weapon in the hand os Blacks than guns and bombs.

It is simply over-simplistic to talk about South Africa in stark either/or terms. People take the hideousness of partheid and their departure point and say either apartheid is perpetuated or the present Government must be eradicated by a massive amount of killing. The naive and the plain dumb may believe that a bit of Black sabre-rattling and a bit of international sabre-rattling will frighten White South Africa into capitulation. Only the naive and the plain dumb conceive of present day South Africa as actually threatened by the levels of violence which have already erupted. We live in this country, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members. Everyone of us knows that there is at this moment no single bridge which is not operational. We know that thecountry's electicity supply system is totally intact. We know that there is no single factory which has been brought to its knees because of violence. The ANC Mission in Exile is aware of this fact. They are aware that the present levels of violence have not even begun to threaten White South Africa. That is why they call for the intensification of the armed struggle, ad they put it. In fact, they go further and talk about the transformation of the armed struggle into a people's war. They now call for civil war. They now call for the spreading of violence.

They are calling, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, for a very marked increased in the levels of violence. Only the naive and the plain dumb believe that some more sabre-rattling will helip. We who live in this country with our feet on the ground know that violence will in fact have to smash the economy and spread not only into factories and mines and other places of work but will also have to spread into every Black area and every White neighbourhood before it can become an effective means of bringing about change.

White South Africans are now living normally, despite what has been done by way of increasing violence. The sheer horror of the levels of violence which will be needed to bring about radical change through violence is seldom perceived. It will have to be an all-destructive violence driving Whites to adopt a scorched earth policy which the ANC Mission in Exile has already adopted. The ANC Mission in Exile are quite prepared to lay bare everything

before them ... 144/

before them in their drive to return home and form a government. They have in fact declared their intention of destroying the economy. They have declared their intention of making the country ungovernable through violence and Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, they have declared their intention to maim, burn and kill Blacks who are not with them in the execution of their intentions. They trample over Black democratic rights as hashly as apartheid ever did. They employ the politics of intimidation as harshly as apartheid ever did. We, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, in this House are not going to be intimidate. We were not intimidted by apartheid. We do not intend becoming intimidated by the ANC Mission in Exile.

We are man enough to stand up and be counted. We have the solid force of history behind us, and we have the solid force of history in the mankind today when we say that the Black struggle for liberation has always been about the inclusion of Blacks in South Africa as we have known it. We know that every people is sovereign. We know that every people has a God-given right to choose their destination. They have a right to choose how they will be governed. They have the right to choose what kind of economic system they live under. We will die for those rights because we have in us the deep sense that we are members of the South African nation.

The basic question, the deep down fundamental question, the question taking priority over all other questions, is the question of whether we first have a revolution and then sovereignty will follow and people can then choose what kind of Government they want, or whether we achieve sovereignty in the present kind of South Africa stripped of apartheid and then let the people direct courses of events to their desired destiny. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, South Africa must hear me when I say that the ANC Mission in Exile and the United Democratic Front and COSAS, have already decided for the people what kind of future they need. They have already decided what is good for people. They are taking unilateral action to destroy the capitalist free enterprise system. They are not fighting apartheid. They are fighting South Africa as it is today. They want a socialist, one-Party state. Those who have thrown their weight behind the ANC Mission in Exile have also decided what suffering Black South Africa wants. They have decided what is good for us. They have decided what kind of system of government we need. they have decided what kind of economic system we need.

Black South Africans have suffered so terribly and for so long that we are not going to change one kind of ideological master for another. It is prescriptive politics which drives us to employ the last extremity of determination to bring about radical change. We will use that last extremity to resit any politics of prescription. We will die rather than acquiesce before those who

tell us 145/

tell us this or that system is good for us. We want to choose our own destiny and we can only do so by gaining the rights to participate in the government of the day and to determine the policies of the day.

I have campaigend consistently for many years for the release of Dr. Nelson Mandela. I have repeatedly called for the release of all political prisoners. I yearn for the day when the ANC is unbanned in South Africa. We will continue striving for this sanity in our country. Black South African democracy must be derestricted and we are prepared to die in our attempt to do so. I yearn for the day when Black leaders of whatever persuasion are free to go to the people and seek support. But you cannot determine who supports whom while the politics of intimidation is rife. Black leaders have to become lowly people standing before public audiences, selling their political wares as best they can. That is democracy. That is the democracy we fight for. If Black South Africans in open democracy turn to reject me and Inkatha, then we will bow out, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, with honour. There is no honourable escape from what we are doing if we are not released from our obligations by the people themselves. I obviously do not believe that the people will reject us, and the political facts of the matter are that we have established the most massive Black organisation ever known in the history of our country precisely because ordinary people believe in our aims and objectives and in our programmes. We are honour bound. Everything in me as a Black son of Africa, as a South African, as a man and as a Zulu, tells me that I must die rather than betray the people and seek an easy way out. While I am charged by the people to do what I am doing, I will do what I am doing with every means at my disposal.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I hve simply been sketching the context in which we should look at our brothers, Bishop Tutu, Dr. Allan Boesak and Dr. Beyers Naude. I have painted a picture which makes it clear that there is a strong White support for what we are doing, and that there is strong groundswell of White demand that change be introduced. And then pointed out that the conflict between Inkatha and the ANC Mission in Exile and their surrogate organisations like the UDF and COSATU is conflict about the deepest of political questions, and that is the sovereignty of the people. And I declared our intention of not abandoning the people and our intention to pursue giving effect to the people's demands of us to the last extremity of our beings.

Let me turn now to look at what our three brothers are doing. I could, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, give you a long list of things they are doing and I could interpret their actions quite correctly as being directed against the achievement of democracy in our country. But let me rather take three documents which they put their name to. The one is the KAIROS document, the other

is the Dutch.... ... 146/

is the Dutch Council of Churches document which followed a consultation with the SACC and the last is the Harare Declaration. Here our three brothers of the cloth stripped themselves bare and here they exposed their inner thoughts, and here they exposed their motivation for opposing us as atrociously as they do. Let us start with the KAIROS document. Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I am making the KAIROS document availale to you in its entirety so that you can read it carefully and judge for yourself whether my interpretation of it is correct.

In speaking about the Church in South Africa being divided, i t is said:

> "In fact there are two Churches, one of the oppressor and one of the oppressed. Both of these Churches claim loyalty to the same Church. They are both baptised in the same Baptism and participate together in the breaking of the same bread, the same Body and blood of Christ .... while outside policemen and soldiers are beating up and killing Christian children or torturing Christian prisoners to death, while other Christians stand by and weakly plead for peace".

This sets the emotional tone for the rest of the document. It is a tone in which horrible acts of violence by the ANC Mission in Exile are condoned while acts of violence by the State are condemned. In the same paragraph, the Introduction goes on to condemn what it calls "Church Theology" because it seeks the easy and uncostly road to reformism: "failing to make distinction between the violence of oppression and resistance - defensive action by equating the oppressor and the oppressed and by misreading the socio political action. The document throughout distinguishes between the violence of oppression and the violence used in resistance to oppression. Throughout the document they talk about the violence of the kind used by the ANC Mission in Exile because it is fighting tyranny and it is opposing a rigime which is inherently evil, which is beyond redemption, which is beyond the politics of negotiation and which must be rooted out and destroyed by violence.

This whole tone of the document blurs vital distinctions. In actual practice, the violence that they are condoning in the KAIROS document is violence which is not directed against the regime. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, the ANC Mission in Exile claim that "the necklace" is one of their weapons. The "necklace" is not used against Mr. P.W. Botha. It is not used against members of the Government. It is used by Black against Blacks. It is violence of the most horrible kind directed at the political opponents of the ANC Mission in Exile. The document presents the use of the "necklace" and that kind of violence, as violence justified by Christ and justified in Gospel terms because it is directed against the regime.

Nowhere ... 147/

Nowhere in the document is the ANC Mission in Exile mentioned, nor is the UDF or COSAS mentioned. Our three brothers as patrons of the UDF and as men of the cloth supporting the ANC Mission in Exile, talk about support for the struggle for liberation glibly, dishonestly and do not have the courage to put a name to what they are saying. Again in the Introduction, it says: "In opposition to tyranny and oppression Christians may be required to take solidarity action or join significant political movements working towards the overthrow of tyranny where clear Christian choices may not be possible or available. The statement is ambiguous and I believe deliberately so. The document pleads for a prophetic faith which needs "spirituality of combat" and having dropped the seed the document turns its back on the point that it has made and says: "the document hasnot probed into this dimension of prophetic spirituality". But it goes on to say in the Introduction: "There are strong liberation movements which have received support from the ecumenical community because they are the representatives of the suffering people. The time has come for the Churches to declare their alliance with the forces of liberation against the apartheid regime".

The whole document is a plea for the ANC Mission in Exile, the UDF and COSATU. The whole document asks the Church to give Party political support to these organisations. It was written for that purpose. It cheapens the Gospel and tries to use the Churches as a Party political tool in hideous acts of revolutionary violence. The document does not even discuss the criteria which Christians should use to decide which political organisation is "the representative of the suffering people".

The document talks about there being three theologies: State Theology which justifies apartheid; Church Theology which addresses the oppressor and not the oppressed and the Prophetic Theology which is the only true theology. It says: "State Theology is simply the theological justification of the status quo with its racism, capitalism and totalitarianism". It tars capitalism with the apartheid brush without ever explaining why it does so. It simply makes Party political statements and shrouds them in the mystique of the Gospel. The whole document is Utopian and dangerously removed from the relities which surround us. It screams out against the politics of negotiation. It says: "Reconciliation, forgiveness and negotiations will become our Christian duty in South Africa only when the apartheid regime shows signs of genuine repentance" and also "it would be quite wrong to try to preserve "peace" and "unity" at all costs, even at the cost of truth and justice and, worse still, at the cost of thousands of young lives.

This KAIROS document is a harsh document. It negates political reality. It negates human reality. Where in the whole wide world has any government ever become repentant? The document contains

dangerous 148/

dangerous idealism - dangerous because it invites Christians to take revolutionary action within a framework it establishes which is outside of any reality. Because apartheid is as reprehensible as it is, it distorts the nature of politics, it distorts the nature of society and it ignores the fact that just as the use of violence by apartheid could never bring about justice, the use of violence against apartheid of the kind the document supports, will never produce justice.

The authors of this document say in effect that the South African regime is so intensely evil that it cannot be expected to reform. The document says: "The reforms that come from the top are never satisfactory. They seldom do more than make oppression more effective and more acceptable". Here we have one of the many examples of the blindness of the authors. The reforms that have been introduced in recent years in South Africa have, as I have repeatedly said, not addressed the fundamental issue of power-sharing. They have not addressed the fundamental issue of political justice. But this said, it must be recognised that the reform that has been introduced is meaningful to many Black South Africans. the reform that has been introduced is not "reform from the top". The reforms that have been introduced are reforms born out of necessity and what is more, born out of necessity which opposition to apartheid has authored. It is because for decade after decade Blacks have not acquiesced and they have endured all manner of suffering to claim their rights, that pressure is building up demanding reform.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I have given this House details of hundreds of letters of support I have received from White South African opinion-makers. that climate of opinion which is reflected in those letters demands reform and it demands reform because Blacks have opposed apartheid and exposed it to be unworkable. Black trade unions were legalised not because the National Party had change of heart. Black trade unions were legalised because it was a dire necessity in the market place. It was a dire necessity in the market place because Blacks valiantly struggled for the recognition of their worth as human beings as well as workers. No government could possibly turn the clocks back and re-introduce what is euphemisticlly called "petty apartheid".

The Black struggle has gained ground and reforms are forthcoming because we have gained ground. It is treacherous to theBlack struggle for liberation now to talk as though genertions of the Black struggle have been in vain. The dilemma of the State President is not a dilemma born out of crisis of conscience. The dilemmas of the State President are born out of the fact that he does not know which way to twist or turn to keep apartheid as intact as possible. The KAIROS document dehumanises ordinary Black South Africans. It makes them objects of theology and casts

them in the role of puppets of ideologies. It misconceives the nature of man and the nature of society. It is as though the clerical collars of our brothers are too tight and have stopped the flow of blood to their heads. The KAIROS document contains no analysis of political, economic and social reality which can stand the scrutiny of the knowledge mankind has gained so painfully over so many centuries. The document is a flight into mythical Christianity.

Nowhere in the document are the flights of fancy more absurd than when the document talks about violence. It says: "The State and the media have chosen to call violence what some people do in the township as they struggle for their liberation, i.e. throwing stones, burning cars and buildings and sometimes killing collaborators". The document condones what it calls the killing of collaborators. It condones the sentence of death which the ANC Mission in Exile has passed over me. And it says: "If one calls for non-violence in such circumstances, one appears to be criticising the resistance of the people while justifying or at least overlooking the violence of the police and the state". And it asks the question: "But is it legitimate, especially in our condemnation to cover the ruthless and repressive activities of the state and the desperate attempts of the people to defend themselves". Never once does the document stop to condemn the politics of intimidation which uses the most brutal kind of man to condemn the ANC Mission in Exile for killing its political opponents simply because they wont toe the line.

The document rules out the politics of negotiation. The document does not see reconciliation. It says: "The conflict is between two irreconcilable causes or interests in which the one is just and the other is unjust". It encourges violence when it says: "As the oppressed majority becomes more insistent and puts more and more pressure on the tyrant by means of boycotts, strikes, uprisings, burnings and even armed struggle, the more tyrannical will the regime become". And goes on to say: "The regime that is in the interests of the people. It can only be replaced by another government, one that has been elected by the mjority of the people with an explicit mandate to govern in the interests of the people". the document bluntly says there is no alternative to the escalation of violence in South Africa. It makes revolutionary violence of the most hideous kind something beautiful and moral when it says: "But then we must also remember that the most loving thing we can do for both the oppressed and forour enemies who are oppressors is to alienate the oppression, remove the tyrant from power and establish a just government for the common good of all the people". The document says: "The conflict and the struggle will have to intensify in the months and years ahead because there is no other way to remeove the injustice and oppression but God is with us. We can only learn to become the instruments of His peace even unto death. We must participate

in the cross ... 150/

in the cross of Christ if we are to have the hope of participating in His resurrection".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, there it is - the call to Black South Africans to go on a killing spree. The document exhorts Christians to join in with the ANC Mission in Exile, the UDF and COSATU when it says: "Christians, if they are not doing so already, must quite simply participate in the struggle for liberation and for a just society. The campaigns of the people, from consumer boycotts to stayaways need to be supported and encouraged by the Church. Criticisms will sometimes be necessary but encouragement and support will also be necessary. In other words the present crisis challenges the whole Church to move beyond a mere ambulance ministry to a ministry of involvement and participation". The statement "criticisms will also be necessary" is unheeded by the document itself. The document brutalises one's mind as it blesses hideous violence which is being perpetrated by Black against Black. It attempts to put the Church in a straitjacket. It actually says: "....The church must not confuse the issue by having programmes that run counter to the struggles of those political organisations that truly represent the grievances and the demands of the people". The document demands that the Church be obedient to the ANC Mission in Exile as a master. It exhorts Christians not to oppose the ANC Mission in Exile. The document does not permint any programme which does not bear their blessing. It comes near to deifying the ANC Mission in Exile. In its concluding paragraphs, the document exposes its hypocrisy. It says: "Although the document suggests various modes of involvement it does not prescribe the particular actions anyone should take".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, everyone in this House should read this document carefully. We need to debate the document and we who represent millions of South Africans need to make a clear statement about it. South Africans are locked in battles for minds. I see this document as part of that battle. It is the kind of document which confuses ordinary people and we need to inform our people what our attitude to it is.

The theme and idiom of the document was carried into the consultation in the Netherlands between the Dutch Churches and the South African Council of Churches. In a document entitled: "The Hour of Truth" the Dutch Council of Churches reports on their consultation about South Africa which was held in November last year. Let me read to you a translation of some of the opening passages of this document:

> "Under pressure of internal political protests, revolts, strikes and militant actions and foreign political and economic measures, the apartheid regime is becomi ng more and more confused. White business life and foreign investors are becoming more and more worried and are losing their faith in the government. But all this does not satisfy the oppressed. They say that apartheid should not be weakened, but abolished, broken down to the ground.

The spiral.. 151/

The spiral of resistance, violence, oppression and militarisation ascends continually until the regime is no longer able to finance the actions of the army and police force or until it loses faith in its own position of power.

This is the picture painted by those people from within South Africa standing in the middle of the conflict. A worrying and fearful picture. It makes it clear that, due to the current level of violence in the South African society, one can no longer speak of "peaceful change". Violence will remain an element in the developments within South Africa until such time as apartheid has been abolished.

They also make it very clear that in this violent society there is a fundamental difference between the primary violence of the oppressors and the counter violence aimed at the liberation of the oppressed. They also say that the mitigating role of the ANC should be distinguished. They remind us that the ANC has always warned agaisnt random violent actions and that they have always stood for limited and targeted actions.

At the conference, which had participants from the Netherlands, Germany, the United Kingdom and the USA, four working groups were constituted around the following items:

A. Theological contributions to the effective fight against apartheid.

B. Political contributions to the effective fight aginst apartheidand the role of the Churches therein.

C. Economic contributions to the effective fight against apartheid and the role of the Churches therein.

B. Social movement and their contributions to an effective fight against apartheid and the role of the Churches therein".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, here again we see the idiom of the KAIROS document at work. The sentence: "They also make it very clear that in this violent society there is a fundamental difference between the primary violence of the oppressors and the counter violence aimed at the liberation of the oppressed." And then comes the terrible distortion: "They remind us that the ANC has always warned us against random violent actions and that they have always stood for limited and targeted actions". Again the hideous distortion of the realities of the situation which we face here in our country. The ANC Mission in Exile stands for the massive spreading of hideous violence - Black/Black violence - violence against South Africa, not against the regime - the violence of murder, arson, looting, "necklaces" - and violence in brutal assaults against any Black individual or organisation which does not crawl on its belly in obedience before it. this is White liberal romanticism at its very worse.

The Dutch.. 152/

The Dutch Council of Churches document notes that the ANC was formed in 1912 in response to the establishment of the Union of South Africa and that for half a century pursued non-violent tactics and strategies. The document then says that in 1955 the Freedom Charter was formulated as the basis for a new community life for both Black and White and that power would be shared. To achieve this, unity amongst Blacks was a leading principle. The document says that after the banning of the ANC after Sharpevelle in 1959, it came to have the insight that non-violent means were not viable and that the increasing use of violence and the movement towards a military and police state makes counter-violence unavoidable. The document then says:

> Contacts between the ANC and the political forces in the Netherlands need to be encouraged and to be revalued. This movement is the political group which most likely will have in the end to form the future government of South Africa. The Council of Churches itself could co-operate by listening to the viewpoints developed by the ANC and by admitting representatives of this movement into their delegations.
>
> Other movements also appeared, among others the UDF, closely related to the ANC in spirit, but limited, as a legal movement inside South Africa, to peaceful measures.
>
> A force against this movement, which desires to unite all groups aiming for liberation, is Inkatha, originally but still now mainly a Zulu-movement, tied to the homeland system and especially to KwaZulu. This movement preaches non-violent resistance against white dominance but, in fact, serves the white masters because:
>
> - it fits into the divide and rule policy which has led to the formation of the homeland system
> - it exerts enourmous pressure on people in its sphere of influence (especially KwaZulu/Natal) and does not hesitate to use violence against other blacks
> - it darkens the prospect of liberation by dividing blacks while it emphasises excessive white superiority.
>
> It is striking that Inkatha supports the attitude of the South African Government on the question of ANC and sanctions.
>
> One of the reasons to give the ANC a platform in the churches is the vast support for the ANC among black South Africa. When we want to listen to blacks, we have to listen to the ANC. It is important to do that what is forbidden to do inside the country, namely to name as "the authentic leaders of the people" the leaders of the ANC and their organisation.
>
> The most important element in our contacts with the ANC lies in the sharing of vision and involvement. This better will equip the churches to express their own involvement in the political..

153/

political spectrum of the Netherlands.

Recommendations:

The consultation is of the opinion that due to vision, history, composition, policy and influence of the ANC and the UDF, the churches and the liberation struggle of the South African people, as represented by the ANC nd the UDF, should be supported and publicised through information about negative effects of the ideology and policy of Inkatha on the liberation struggle. The churches should make it clear by the dissemination of Inkatha's statements and publications to their members, public opinion and political parties, who are the legitimate representatives of the people in South Africa and who are the collaborators.

The consultation also requests the Council of Churches to ask the Netherlands Government to step up financial and humanitarian aid to ANC and UDF".

It must be remembered that this document issued by the Dutch Council of Churches did not originate with them. It is a Dutch Council of Churches document but it expresses the views that emerged during their consultation with the SACC. The SACC therefore in effect has put its name to the resolutions I have just read out to you. The document goes on to make further recommendtions:

The consultation expresses its wish to terminate all economic and financial contacts with the white South African economy and insists on overall obligatory sanctions against South Africa and calls upon the Council of Churches in the Netherlands and its member churches to implement this recommendation.

The consultation calls upon churches, religious institutions and individual church members to sell their shares in companies which invest in and trade with South Africa, within a term of twelve months".

In this consultation, the SACC quite brazenly and blatantly identified with the ANC, the UDF and SACTU, and they quite brazenly and very specifically chose sides against Inkatha and attempted to solicit Dutch church support for its vendetta against us. Our three patrons of the UDF are clearly nailing their colours to the ANC mast and all the euphemisms in the KAIROS document may as well have been translated into language that called a spade a spade. The SACC specifically asked the Dutch Council of Churches to insist that its member churches deal with those who supported the KAIROS document. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, I am deeply shocked as a Black leader and as a Christian that the SACC and Dr. Beyers Naude, Dr. Allan Boesak and Bishop Tutu are playing this vicious Party political game against us. When I was recently in Germany I met with Church leaders, and I discussed the following Memorandum with them:

MEMORANDUM .. 154/

MEMORANDUM FOR DISCUSSION WITH PRELATE BOCHLET AND PRELATE AIGNER OF THE COMMISSION OF JUSTICE AND PEACE AND WITH REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE E.K.E. BISHOP H.G BINDER, MR. H KALLINA AND DR H MUELLER BY MANGOSUTHU G. BUTHELEZI: CHIEF MINISTER: KWAZULU, PRESIDENT OF INKATHA AND CHAIRMAN: THE SOUTH AFRICAN BLACK ALLIANCE
BONN: 21 FEBRUARY 1986

"CHISTIANITY AND THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERATION IN SOUTH AFRICA"

Churches have established themselves throughout the length and breadth of South Africa. There is a scattering of Churches in every little village, in the suburbs of every city, and here is a spread of Churches across rural South Africa. They are found wherever there are people and they are found in communities of Christian Government. There are many millions of South Africans who are members of the Christian Churches. As elsewhere in the world, there is a continuum from three times a life Church Christians who are baptised, married and buried by the Church, to twice a year Christians who attend services on Christmas Day and Easter, to the other extreme past those who go to Church every Sunday, to those zealous Christians whose whole life is dominated by the Church and its requirements.

In South Africa, as in other countries of the world, the Christian Church is part of the fabric of society. It is institutionalised; it is mentioned in the constitution; it performs the richer functions with the State and in South South Afria as elsewhere there are Christians on both sides of every major controversy. I am making this point very briefly to point out that the Churches in South Africa are no different to the Churches elsewhere. If you are anti-communist, you can blame the Churches in East Germany for having failed to stop East Germany falling into the Communist sphere of influence. If you are a pacifist, you can blame the Churches for not having avoided the Second World War. If you are in the Third World, you can blame the Church for not having avoided the terrible disparities between the First World and the Third World. Ultimately you can blame the Church for anything. You can blame the Church for the hunger in Ethiopia, or anything else and as Christians the fact that the Church is blameworthy across the length and breadth of the world and throughout history should make us bow our heads in humility. These charges against the Church could be multiplied a thousandfold and with each additional thousand charges, our heads could bow in even deeper humility. It is with this humility that I believe we should look at the failure of the Church in South Africa.

The hideousness of apartheid and the terrible untenable suffering of Black South Africans in my country, lays one of those very special connotations on the liability of the Church for what has gone wrong for so long. The hideousness of what has taken place in South Africa for so long make the charges against the Church have additional meaning. The inability of South African society as a whole to eradicate apartheid is there for all to see, and for the failure of the Church. I do not know whether the Church has

has failed .. 155/

has failed to extend the Kingdom of God in South Africa more than it has filed to do so in Germany, or in any other country. I do not know whether in real Christian terms a stable, affluent society in the West can claim greater advances in bringing men into the Kingdom of God and extending it amongst men, than has been the case in South Africa. My mind boggles at the thought of doing a head-count of reborn Christians to arrive at a per capita comparison between various countries. My mind also boggles at the thought of having to distinguish between First World and Third World countries by attempting to employ social, economic and political criteria to judge the health of the Church in them. Again I make these points to plead for humility in any discussion we may have about the role of the Church in South Africa. too often Western Christian indignation about apartheid makes assumptions about the role of the Church which are just not valid. They expect the Church to be something in South Africa which it is not in their own country. Because of the enormity of the crimes committed in the name of apartheid, and because of the depths of suffering experienced under apartheid by Blacks, they similarly expect Blacks to be exempt from human nature and that Blacks can do in South Africa what human nature cannot do in their own country.

In sketching a perspective which I believe is one perspective within which we can usefully look at the role of the Church in South Africa, I want to draw attention to the dangers of the very particular kind of theological radicalism which springs from deep, driving political motives rather than from an understanding of the Gospel at work amongst mankind. Apartheid has it own Christian credo and some factions in South Africa now developing forces of violence are beginning to adopt another kind of Christian credo. This is a shocking statement and its bluntness I am afraid will offend many. they will stand aghast at it in the belief that those who suffer so deeply could not be doing such a thing.

There is a danger that some European Christians are going to make the error of believing that radical Christian theology is going to succeed doing that in South Africa which no theology has succeeded doing anywhere else in the world. Theology remains a mere human formulation of perspectives of truth and the meaning of the Gospel. When those Christians are theological activists, then there is the danger that what they write amounts to a Party political credo.

For me many statements contained in the Kairos document are laden with Christian insight. They contain views which terrible suffering has distilled out of experience. The notion that reconciliation cannot take place between unequal parties, "between justice and injustice, good and evil" is a truth deeply laden with meaning for us. I think the document validly draws attention to the fact that there is a Church theology of Pretoria's moderate opponents. It rightly says: "It is indeed the duty of the State to maintain law and order but it has not a Divine mandate to

maintain any ... / 156/

maintain any kind of law and order". I believe the document move to make political statements; when it says: "The conflict is between an oppressor and the oppressed. The conflict is between two irreconcilable causes of interest in which one is just and the other is unjust" it makes a statement laudable perhaps in sentiment but tragically foolish in content. The Kairos document becomes doubly foolish when it divides the oppressed up into factions and exempts the majority of the oppressed from being described as just and goes on to seek theological sanctity for the political activity of the heroes they annoint as those of political organisations "that truly represent the demands of the people". They identify these organisations when they give theological sanctity to their tactics and strategies which they see as: "The campaigns of the people, from consumer boycotts to stay-aways, need to be supported and encouraged by the Church".

I become ever-increasignly disgusted with this concept of "the true leaders". Inkatha and I have amassed over 1.2 million Black South Africans as card-carrying members. These members really are the victims of apartheid. They are very dominatly peasants and workers. No other leader in the history of South Africa has ever combined so many people in such common purpose as I have done in Inkatha. It would however be an absurdity to call me "the true leader of South Africa".

Inkatha employs tactics and strategies. They are not my tactics and strategies. Inkatha is a democratic organisation. Its tactics and strategies are determined by its Annual General Conferences to which Inkatha's leaders are held accountable. It would be absurd to style these tactics and strategies as "the campaigns of the people ... (which) ... need tobe supported and encouraged by the Church to the exclusion of others.

Nowhere have I ever described Inkatha as the only Black organisation entitled to lead the struggle for liberation. I have always called for a multi-strategy approach in which each organisation can best do what it is equipped to do in its own circumstances. I lead as a democrat not only in my own organisation, Inkatha, but in South Africa at large. There is no contradiction between Christian theology and true democracy. In South Africa, we who have been denied democratic rights by the State claim democratic rights in our own struggle for liberation from apartheid. To talk about South Africa as though we have to dispense with democracy in the struggle for liberation and as though there is only one true leadership and as though there is only one God-annointed strategy and tactic, makes a mockery of Christian responsibility and democratic citizenship.

Apartheid is truly evil and here is a truly just struggle against apartheid being waged in South Africa, but to go beyond this statement to identify individual God-created human souls as being

inherently 157/

inherently evil on the one side and inherently good on the other side, is unspeakably bad theology. To say that apartheid is so evil that the State President and no member of Government could possibly participate in the elimination of apartheid, is such an error of Christian judgement that it staggers me to see the extent to which leading Churchmen in Europe back those who make this kind of statement implicitly or explicitly. We have a Christian crisis in South Africa and the Church is thrashing around in agonised turmoil but for God's sake let us search for truth and not leap into one or another faction of that turmoil.

Let me cite two different circumstances in which here is evidence of irreconcilable Christian approaches to problems. Those who drew up the Kairos document portray the schism in the Church in these words: "There we sit in the same Church while outside Christian policemen and soldiers are beating up and killing Christian children or torturing Christian prisoners while yet other Christians stand by and weakly plead for peace". This statement ridicules nine Church leaders which included - the Most Reverend Philip Russell, the Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town; the Reverend Peter Storey the Head of the Methodist Church; the Most Reverend Denis Hurley the Catholic Archbishop of Durban; the Reverend Stanley Mogoba of the Methodist Church; the Reverend Edmund du Plessis of the Congregational Church; Bishop Peter Buthelezi of the Catholic Church, and the Reverend Allan Maker Moderator of the Presbyterian Church, who met with the State President to call on him to dismantle apartheid, the lifting of the state of emergency, and to tell the State President that a National Convention was needed in South Africa. They told the State President: "We understand the fearsome responsibility that you carry and we believe that there have been times when you have demostrated great political courage. You have been willing to shed the most embarrassing opponents of change in your Party; you have accepted the principle that this country must adapt or die; and in January (1985) you list for the first time as issues requiring serious
attention the very problems of us presented to you in a similar meeting in 1980.

Their message was clear; it was tough but they recognised Mr. P.W. Botha to be a human being and they dealt with him as such. I am absolutely sure that Christ was there with them and that they were doing His Will. The acceptance of the Kairos document in its totality denies this.

There are so many who fail to understand that there is running through South Africans of all race groups a strain of human Christian decency which is beginning to permeate ever-deeper into society. South Africans are struggling to emerge from the horrors of apartheid. A groundswell move is in the making and from every quarter in South Africa there are now pressures on the State President and the Government to normalise South Africa as an

industrialised ... 158/

industrialised democrcy. There is far too little recognition in the West that we South Africans are not inherently evil and that we have indeed got the oral and spiritual qualities which are required to bring about radical change without having to resort to the most despicably hideous violence imaginable.

There is too little recognition that it is the victims of apartheid, the ordinary workers and peasants, the poorest of the poor, who have borne not only the hideous weight of apartheid, but who have had to bear the brunt of the relentless opposition to it which so characterises our people. Apartheid is unworkable and it is crumbling because every Draconian power that the Government could conceive of has been used against ordinary Blacks to subjugate them and to make them participants in their own bondage. When you look at South Africa's Draconian laws, you will see that the vast majority of them are directed against ordinary people in every-day life. the true horrors of apartheid are not illustrated by simply pointing to the legislation which is used to crush organisations and silence political opponents. The unutterably terrible nature of apartheid is discovered only in an analysis of the legislation which is devised to keep a people in subjugation. The Pass Laws, the Group Areas Act, the Separte Amenities Act, the Bantu Education Act, the Bantu Administration Act, and a formidable collection of other Acts have been devised to keep Blacks in suffering subservience to Whites.

As a Black South African I stand tall in the knowledge that we have not been broken by apartheid, and that the spirit of resistance to apartheid lives in the hearts and minds of my people. The elevation of Black leaders and Black political organisations to exalted positions where they alone are seen as leading the struggle, waging the struggle and writing history, is wrong.

The Kairos document takes a particular brand of organised Black political activity and calls them "the campaigns of the people". Its authors, however exalted they may be, however they have striven agaisnt injustice in their own lives, however anguished they are about suffering in South Africa, are blind to the reality of ordinary people's contribution to the process of change.

The gulf that is emerging between the South African Council of Churches and the ordinary people of South Africa is frightening. The extent to which the current leadership of the SACC is becoming embroiled in Party politics and are becoming participants in Black-on-Black violence, is appalling. In a consultation with the Dutch Council of Churches in Amersfoort in November last year, the South African Council of Churches' spokesmen recommended that the Churches should support the ANC and the UDF with financial and humanitarian aid, and actively oppose Inkatha by spreading information which shows Inkatha's ideology and policy to be

negative 159/

negative. The SACC spokesmen also called for comprehensive mandatory sanctions and for disinvestment, as well as for other punitive economic action. I have appended the relevant passage from the document "The Hour of Truth" which is a Dutch Council of Churches report on the Consultation it had over South Africa.

This vendetta against Inkatha by some of the Churchmen who play a prominent role in the SACC is also evident in their dealings with donor agencies and corporations who want to contribute to the development of Black South Africa. I quote here from a copy of a Memorandum to Coca-Cola who intend establishing an educational scheme with a funding of approximately R25 million.

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMO

TO: MR. DAVID SCHREINER (sic) (COCA-COLA)

FROM: ALLAN BOESAK
JAKES GERWEL
DESMOND TUTU

1. We note your invitation to us to participate in administering in trust the sum of money you so generously wish to make available to education and development in South Africa.

2. While fully appreciative of the great benefits that could derive from your donation we also accept that you will appreciate the larger political context within which our participation is (sic) such a scheme occurs. We consequently have to tender the following comments describing the political parameters of our participation.

3.1 The involvement of any homelands functionaries of persons connected to organisations with official homelands links, would preclude our participation.

3.2 We accept that your donation is intended as support for progressive initiatives seeking non-violent change in South Africa. Such support, however, needs to address also the political environment of our efforts to effect non-violent change, and a crucial element in that environment is the recognition of the African National Congress as an important participant in the political process.

Our decision to participate in the proposed trust would therefore be greatly facilitated by Coca-Cola adding its voice to the growing public call for the SA government to start talking to the ANC.

The establishment.. 160/

3.3 The establishment of the proposed trust cannot be divorced from the divestment debate and we would desire that it be abundantly clear that we are not lending support to any effort aimed at relieving pressure for change on the South African government. This could be accomplished by Coca-Cola publicly informing the South African Government that it shall reconsider its continued presence in South Africa unless significant steps towards change are taken within a prescribed time, such steps to include at least-

- the lifting of the stage of emergency
- the abolition of pass laws and influx control
- release of all political prisoners
- repeal of all discriminating legislation
- establishment of one single ministry for education
- official end of the homeland policy

We would be glad to discuss this with you further.

Sincerely

BISHOP DESMOND TUTU
DR. ALLAN BOESAK
PROF. G.J. GERWEL

In this document these three gentlemen are attempting to force Coca-Cola to support the ANC Mission in Exile and disinvest as a strategy before their contribution to Black education in South Africa will be endorsed as acceptable. This is bluntly Party political and it is also buntly Party political for them specifically to say that the scheme will be unacceptable to them if I or Inkatha, or the KwaZulu Government have anything to do with it. The desperate need of Black South African youth is being turned into a political football. This Memorandum is yet another piece of evidence of the extent to which the suffering people of KwaZulu are being abandoned to their plight simply because some Church leaders work actively against me.

The SACC repeated their call for economic sanctions against South Africa at the Harare Conference in December last year and for the recognition of the ANC as the country's vanguard liberation movement and for the recognition of the United Democrtic Front and the Congress of South African Trade Unions. In doing so they are pitting themselves against the will of many millions of Black South Africans. Their call is divisive and they are seeking support for the ANC Mission in Exile's divide and dominate policy.

The ANC Mission in Exile is committed to the armed struggle as the primary means of bringing about change in the country. For 25 years they have pursued objectives but have failed to make

, headway 161/

headway. After a quarter of a century of this endeavour, the armed struggle is further from achieving success than it has ever been before. President Samora Machel saw the futility of their military campaign in the past and he recognised that their military inefficiency would stretch well into the future - certainly well beyond Mocambique's ability to endure the consequences of supporting armed bases for the movement in Mocambique. There is now no country in Southern Africa which dares tolerate an ANC military base on its soil.

In South Africa itself after every attempt to develop the armed struggle, there is now no single bridge not functioning in the country because it has been destroyed. The armed attacks of the ANC Mission in Exile have not come anywhere near disrupting the country's transport system, and there is now not a single power line which is not functioning in the country's electricity supply system. There is not a single factory which has gone out of business because of their attacks. There is no zone which has been liberated and there is not a single zone which is a no-go area for the police and the army. There are no prospects whatsoever of the ANC Mission in Exile overcoming the immense logistic problems of transporting arms and men for an armed struggle.

That is why when violence started erupting in South Africa yet again for reasons which entirely exclude any determining factors from the ANC Mission in Exile, it attempted to jump on the bandwagon of growing violence. It started talking about escalating the violent struggle and started talking about a people's war. Churches in Europe should understand what the ANC Mission in Exile has in mind when it talks about a people's war. It has in mind the spread of violence to make the country ungovernable. It is aware that this will not happen while people want to work rather than to die of starvation. It therefore is exhorting the people to destroy the factories in which they work and to destroy the economy. The ANC Mission in Exile is also aware that it is expecting bare-handed ordinary people to spread violence in defiance of the most powerful army and police force in Africa. It is asking people to be cannon fodder for the glorification of the Mission in Exile. Knowing that the people cannot survive violent actions against the army and the police force it is attempting to keep violence alive and spreading by turning Black against Black. According to the Institute of Race Relations in South Africa 879 people died of violence during 1985. Of these around a third died violently at the hands of their fellow Blacks.

When the General Committee of the World Council of Churches met in Madagascar in 1985, they passed a resolution and in the background statement to this resolution, it said inter alia: "And for the first time in the townships not only have government buildings (institutions of apartheid tyranny) been burnt down by angry Blacks

but the homes ... 162/

but the homes of some local Black Councillors and policemen (government collaborators) have also been burnt down. A few Councillors have even been killed ..." They speak of a few Councillors having been killed. This is Christian blindness and Christian cowardice playing down the true horror of Black on Black confrontation in South Africa.

People do not believe me when I tell them that the ANC Mission in Exile is actually fermenting civilian violence against civilian victims because it wants to create the chaos within which it can overcome some of the logistic and other disadvantages from which it suffers. It does not have on-the-ground support structures inside the country and it is only when civilians start killing civilians that it has any hope of moving around in South Africa. The ANC Mission in Exile is brutally careless about human lives. What they actually do is so hideously different from what Western observers believe they do when they listen to the ANC Mission in Exile campaigning for support in the West. I no longer ask Western observers to believe or disbelieve me. I now quote some words of the ANC Mission in Exile in its daily broadcasts to Black South Africans, and ask observers to judge what it is saying:

Joe Modise broadcasting on the 25th July 1985 from Addis Abba in a Radio Freedom programme said:

> "Our people must also manufacture home-made guns and petrol bombs. After arming themselves in this manner our people must begin to identify collaborators and enemy agents and deal with them ... The puppets in the Tricameral Parliament and the Bantustans must be destroyed ... Let us intensify the elinination of all collaborators from or nation".

On the 17 September 1985 the Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation reported:

> "The Director of Information of the ANC of South Africa, Comrade Thabo Mbeki, says a greater number of civilians will inevitably die as the ANC dontinues to intensify the struggle for freedom and human decency.... The ANC Director of Information added that the struggle in South Africa is now becoming a people's war".

On the 5 November 1985, Radio Freedom broadcast a commentary which included the following:

> "...It is now time, countrymen, that we take conscious actions to awaken our white compatriots from this dream world...where they have been lulled into believing that the conflict in our country is something very far away from them which can easily be confined in the black townships...It is now time that we take the arena of battle into the white suburbs so that our

white compatriots .. /163/

white compatriots are able to realise that the struggle is not just against them as a people but against this evil system that they continue to maintain. As Comrade President Oliver Tambo said, in the white areas, that is where we must confront the enemy personnel and installations, which are giving our white compatriots a false sense of security and by so doing mobilise more and more of the whites to renounce Botha and join the forces of liberation..."

And on the 7 October 1985 the Radio Freedom commentary entitled "ANC to Extend the War into White Residential Areas" contained, inter alia, the following:

"...The privileged white community is armed to the teeth. Those weapons also are meant to mow down our people as it happened to Paulus --- who was murdered in cold blood by white so-called civilians. Those weapons in white hands have to be transferred also. We have to use all means available to get them.

In this regard, we call on our compatriots who are working as domestic servants to take a leading role. They know where their employers keep their weapons and they are the ones who can devise plans of transferring the ownership of the weapons. There are also weapons in the regime's police stations and barracks. Those weapons must be removed from the hands of these trigger-happy murderers. In this case we can even buy these weapons from some of the employees if possible...

These angels of death have always regarded our townships as foreign countries away from theirs where they can commit untold crimes and return to the calmness of their residential areas. That myth must now be shattered. They must be haunted by the mass offensive. We must attack them at their homes and holiday resorts just as we have been attacking black boot-lickers at their homes. This must now happen to their white colleagues..."

And on the 9 September 1985, the following was broacast from Lusaka home service in English:

"ANC of South Africa President Oliver Tambo has said his organisation believes that black majority rule will be achieved within 10 years. Mr. Tambo has said the current political crisis presents a great leap forward and indicates the start of a bloodbath that will eventually end apartheid, the white minority regime's system of racial segregation. He ruled out the possibility of gradual handover of power and explained that the ANC envisages talks on the mechanisms for an immediate change to majority rule and nothing else".

The United ... 164/

The United Democratic Front has committed itself to making South Africa ungovernable and in daily practice it is working with the ANC towards the violent overthrow of the Government. In South Africa the ANC Mission in Exile and the UDF are acting with the fervour of holy crusaders to spread internecine Black/Black strife and to establish the politics of intimidation to further their aims and objectives. What the Kairos document calls "the campaigns of the people" - "consumer boycotts to stay-aways, it is warped judgements which say this is so. Consumer boycotts, have been made relatively effective in some parts of the Eastern Cape but they have only been made effective because Blacks who buy where they are told not to buy and suffer terrible intimidation. Black mothers stop buying food and essentials for their households when they are caught and made to swallow the cooking oil and detergents they have bought. Black workers stop going to work when they are beaten up or their houses are burnt down if they do. Everywhere intimidation is threatening to become hideous wanton disregard for life, limb and property. People are being burnt alive; they are being hacked to death, until we reach that terrible statistic of one in three Black who have died in violence during 1985 died at the hands of their fellow Blacks. The use of violent intimidation by political groups is spreading like a sickly contagious disease in some Black areas. Hooligans and mobs are now ever-increasingly violent in them, and in some cases even ordinary people are banded together in self-defence and are using hideous violence to oppose hideous violence.

In the Kairos document one is led to believe that in general the violence in South Africa among Blacks is violence which is justified. Violence is so often a travesty of justice and truth.

The Harare Consultation between the South African Council of Churches, the World Council of Churches and Christian leaders from many countries, took place where all had knowledge of the realities of the South African situation, to give respectability to the tactics and strategies of the ANC Mission in Exile and the UDF. The same ANC Mission in Exile which broadcast the messages I cited above, issued a press statement on the 3 December while the SACC/WCC meeting was in progress. It said inter alia: "We rejoice that so many Christian leaders from all over the world have come to Harare to meet with Christian leaders from our country to express their solidarity with the struggle of our people" and "We believe that the taking up of arms by our peple in defence of our very lives can no more be equated with the indiscriminate violence of the apartheid regime than there can be any equation between those who fought to overthrow Nazism and fascism and those who fought to promote this evil". Their own broadcasts translate "taking up of arms by our people in defence of our very lives" into internecine Black strife and Black brother killing Black brother. The ANC Mission in exile is no more fighting a holy war than the South African Government is in its war

against them. .. 165/

against them. The ANC Mission in Exile is struggling for its own political power. It wants to return from exile to establish itself as the government in power in a one-Party state. It brooks no opposition and seeks only a total monopoly of power now during the struggle for liberation which it will perpetuate itself after liberation.

As a Black leader who is a Christian I cannot be party to the brutality which some are trying to infuse into the Black struggle for liberation. I do not deny that there can be such a thing as a just war. I deny emphatically, however, that the ANC Mission in Exile and the UDF are fighting a just war in South Africa. They are fighting against injustice but they are committing hideous mistakes in the way they are going about things. Instead of mobilising Black South Africans into a coherent, driving force, they are acting to divide Black from Black and to bring every Black under their total control. It is my refusal to be party to what they are doing that leads them to make such bitter attacks against me, doubly so because I am showing again and again, and ever-increasingly that the non-violent tactics and strategies and the politics of negotiation are generating a power to bring about the total eradication of apartheid.

We have not won yet but neither have those who are employing violence. It may well be that sometime in the future we will have to make different assessments because the South African Government continues to be intransigent, but right now I say until such time as the Government has made it impossible to continue with non-violent democratic tactics and strategies, and until there are no prospects at all for the politics of negotiation to heal the wounds of racially divided South Africa, we will be abrogating our Christian duty if we do now something which we would only be justified doing some time in the future if the Government continued doing what it is doing now.

I charge the Church with the responsibility of so participating in the struggle for liberation that we effect the politics of national reconciliation now while we struggle. If we reduce the country to ungovernability now it will remain ungovernable after liberation. We are moving through a deep crisis period in our history. There is no room for failing Utopian ideas and we cannot afford the luxury of ideologies. I am most certainly not being ideological when I say that the destruction of the South African economy will spell out disaster and immensely increase suffering for millions of people for generations to come. Over half of all Black South Africans are 15 years old and younger. The Churches of Europe cannot assume the responsibility for feeding, clothing and housing these people after the economy has been destroyed. Only the free enterprise system could possibly further develop the South African economy to the point where it cannot only cater for the fundamental needs of this huge

population.. 166/

population bulge when it hits the market place but also wipe out the huge existing backlogs that there are in Black housing, health and welfare services, education and everything else essential to healthy individual, family and community life.

The free enterprise system can only work if there is a negotiated settlement of South Africa's problems. It can only work if a national effort is made across all race groups to make the post-liberation period meaningful to the ordinary Black people of the country. Without effecting national reconciliation as we struggle to liberate the country from apartheid, we will not be able to mount the national effort after the destruction of apartheid which will be so badly needed.

----------0000----------

This Memorandum which I discussed with German churches is now being widely studied in Europe and I am told it is exerting its own influence. After the Dutch Council of Churches had their consultation with the SACC in November last year, it laid its report before a meeting of the Council on March 13 this year. While the majority accepted the recommendations which came out of the November consultation on sanctions, one of the major churches, the Gereformeerde Kerk, voted against the specific recommendation which demanded that churches shed themselves of all investments in companies with any connection with South Africa and the Roman Catholic Church thought the measures which the recommendations sought were too far-reaching for the present situation. And while the conference voted in favour of support for the ANC and the UDF, it rejected the recommendation which asked for the spreading of information designed to be detrimental to Inkatha.

The next day the Hervormde Church Synod met to discus the KAIROS document. Members of the Synod were totally divided. Some praised the document but others were confused by it and criticised it as being built on simplicities and described it as an "unreliable compass". Someone said that it as no real theology but merely "theology of the man in the street". Others said it was very difficult for them to recognise the spirit of Christ in the document. One member of the Synod said bluntly it was unbiblical to proclaim Jesus as the KAIROS document does. Others sid the KAIROS document was not in line with the traditonal Dutch Reform documents of confession. Delegates were also hesitant about the KAIROS document's view of therole of violence. In the Synod meeting several people asked for more information about my role and the role of Inkatha, and the issue was put forward for discussion at the June session of the Synod.

In the Gereformeede Synod which was held on the 3 March to discuss the Dutch Council of Churches consultation with the SACC, spokesmen opposed the disinvestment strategy and asked that

attention be ... 167/

attention be given to the position that I have adopted. In an article in the newspaper "Trouw" on the eve of the Hervormde Synod there was an article by Dr. Ester. He said that the Synod should ask the question of whether the document's bi-partition of South African society into "oppressors" and "oppressed" does not give a fatal Marxist interpretation of a situation which is infinitely more complex, and suggested that the Synod would have to cut through its rhetoric and return it to its originators. He also said that the Synod would have to make an evangelically responsible choice between revolution (as the document legitimises it) and reform. He warned the Synod that it should not simplify the complex situation of South Africa or sweep disturbing factors under the carpet of the Gospel and that the Synod would have to ask the ANC very direct questions concerning the establishment of a future South Africa, and told the Synod that "the influential Gatsha Buthelezi of KwaZulu must also recieve critical attention".

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, this underlines the plea I made in last year's policy speech for us to reach the decision-makers of Europe and to convey to them the realities of the South African situation. A battle for minds is raging in our country and it is important that we counter the poison that our political enemies are distributing around the world.

In the Memorandum I discussed with German Church leaders which I have just read to you I quoted a Memorandum addressed to Coca-cola. This Memorandum to Coca-cola shows a callous disregard for the suffering people of South Africa. Bishop Tutu, Dr. Boesak and Professor G.J. Gerwel, the Rector of the University of the Western Cape, co-signed the Memorandum. In this Memorandum, our men of the cloth are most explicit in their support for the ANC Mission in Exile. I repeat their words:

> "We accept that your donation is intended as support for progressive initiatives seeking non-violent change in South Africa. Such support, however, needs to address also the political environment of our efforts to effect non-violent change, and a crucial element in that environment is the recognition of the African National Congress as an iportant participant in the political process.
>
> Our decision to participate in the proposed trust would therefore be greatly facilitated by Coca-cola adding its voice to the growing public call for the SA government to start talking to the ANC".

Here again we have Bishop Tutu and Dr. Boesak nailing their colours to the ANC mast. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members, we have a great deal of work before us to combat the kind of gross distortions of the South African situation which are being conveyed to the world by people like Dr. Beyers Naude, Bishop Tutu and Dr. Boesak.

These gentlemen ... 168/

These gentlemen of the cloth are spending vast amounts of energy in furthering the aims and objectives of the ANC Mission in Exile. Dr. Beyers Naude, as the General Secretary of the South African Council of Churches, was a prime mover behind the Harare consultation organised by the World Council of Chruches. The meeting was organised to mobilise support for the SACC stand which it took in July last year. The SACC then adopted the following resolution:

SACC NATIONAL CONFERENCE 1985. RESOLUTION NO. 5. DISINVESTMENT

Referred to:

SACC Executive, Member Churches, Regional Councils, affiliated organisations and the international committee.

This National Conference of the SACC, being deeply concerned at the violent conflict in which the people of South Africa re now embroiled,

1. Reiterate the statement which the Council has made in the past that foreign investment and loans have been used to support the prevailing patterns of power and privilege in South Africa;

2. Recognises that many Church leaders and Christian people in South Africa are in favour of (selective) disinvestment and economic sanctions because they believe that the situation is now so serious that economic action must be taken to strengthen political and diplomatic pressures on South Africa to force the South African Government to take seriously the need for fundamental change in South Africa.

3. It is agreed that fundamental change would include the dismantling of apartheid and the democratic involvement of all South Africans in the planning of the new political, economic and social structures which would seek to guarantee for all people justice, development, freedom and peace.

4. Welcomes the concern and support of our fellow Christians in other countries who are working to assist us in finding non-violent ways in which fundamental change can be brought about in South Africa.

5. Believes that the pressure in Western countries for disinvestnment and divestment has been most effective in moving White South Africans in a more serious consideration of the cause of the political conflict in this country.

6. Concludes from the evidence placed before it that foreign investment does not necessarily create new jobs and that the

contrary ... 169/

contrary is often the case because new investment is frequently in the form of sophisticated technological equipment.

7. Draws attention to the fact that the Churches have for many years tried to address the problem of structural unemployment in Black communities and has not been aware of any serious concern being shown by the business sector, foreign or South African or by government until recent months when economic sanctions have become a legislative probability in the United States.

8. Confesses that in the Churches there has been no proper debate and considertion of the disinvestment question because we have allowed ourselves to be restrained by the severity of laws designed to prevent open discussion of economic sanctions. This has meant that the only arguments being heard in South Africa are those in opposition to disinvestment.

This Conference therefore resolves:

a) To express our belief that disinvestment and similar economic pressures are now called for as a peaceful and effective means of putting pressure on the South African Government to bring about those fundamental changes this country needs.

b) To ask our partner Churches in other countries to continue with their efforts to identify and promote effective economic pressures to influence the situation in South Africa, towards achieving justice and peace in this country and minimising the violence of the conflict.

c) To promote fuller consideration of the issues by placing the case for the imposition of economic sanctions and disinvestment before the Executive Committee of the SACC and the regional councils, and the councils of our member churches and organisations with the request that they encourage Congregations to study and to debate them.

d) To ask the executive to appoint in consulttion with the director of justice and reconciliation a taskforce to examine the whole question of economic justice as well as issues of disinvestment and economic sanctions to review and co-ordinate the responses from the churches, and to assist the church leaders by making available to them information and analyses.

e) To call member churches and individual Christians to withdraw from participation in the economic system that oppresses the poor by reinvesting money and energy in alternative economic systems in existence in our region.

Accepted by National Conference on 28th June 1985.

--------0000--------

It also adopted a resolution in favour of civil disobedience. The SACC claims at times that it is representative of millions of Black Christians. This is simply not true. The SACC on no single occasion has ever had to go to ordinary Blacks to seek support for the stands that it takes. No single member of the SACC's staff or its Executive is elected into that position by ordinary Black South Africans. The SACC is not accountable to ordinary Black South Africans because it is not elected into office by them. The stand of the SACC is as incompatible with the interests of White church members of the various denominations as it is with Black members. The SACC, the UDF, COSATU and the ANC Mission in Exile simply claim that they represent Black opinion. There is no way of testing that. Democracy only begins to work when leaders hold themselves responsible before grass root audiences which have the power to appoint and remove them. The SACC resolution on disinvestment was, however, presented at the Harare Consultation as something which Black South Africans endorse in their masses and was presented there as an act of solidarity with the ANC Mission in Exile. The Harare Declaration which was adopted by the churches represented in Harare reads as follows:

THE HARARE DECLARATION

We the leaders of churches from Western Europe, North America, Australia, South Africa and other parts of Africa, and leaders of the World Church Unions met here in Harare, Zimbabwe, from the 4th to the 6th of December, 1985 at the invitation of the World Council of Churches.

We affirm that the moment of truth (Kairos) is now, both for South Africa and the world community. We have come together to seek God's guidance at this time of profound crisis in South Africa, and have committed ourselves to a continuing theological reflection on the Will of God for the church.

We have heard the cries of anguish of the people of South Africa trapped in the oppressive structures of apartheid. In this moment, pregnant with possibility, we agree that the apartheid structure is against God's Will, and that the government has no credibility.

We call for the lifting of the State of Emergency, the unbanning of all banned movements, the returning of exiles and the transferring of power to the majority of the people, based on universal suffrage.

We understand and fully support those in South Africa who are

calling for ... 171/

calling for the resignation of the government. We regard this as the most appropriate and least costly process of change, as we await a new democratic representative government in South Africa.

As we await for this process to occur:

1. We call on the churches inside and outside South Africa to continue praying for the people of South Africa and to observe June 16 - the 10th anniversary of Soweto - as a World Day of Prayer to end unjust rule in South Africa.

2. We call on the international community to prevent the extension, rolling over, or renewal of bank loans to the South African government, banks, corporations and para-state institutions.

3. We call on the churches inside and outside South Africa to support South African movements working for the liberation of their country. We call on the international community to apply immediate and comprehensive sanctions on South Africa.

5. We welcome and support recent developments within the trade union movement for a united front against apartheid.

6. We demand the immediate implementation of the United Nations resolution 435 on Namibia.

We gathered here commit ourselves to the implementation of the Harare Declaration as a matter of urgency. We are sure that the liberation of South Africa will be liberation for all the people in the country, black and white.

Harare, December 6, 1985.

Then follows an explanation given behind closed doors of point four about sanctions, which was given to the conference in private. It was fully accepted as part of the official conference documents.

Explanatory statement of No. 4 of Declaration:

- A mandatory embargo of imports and exports of arms and para-military technology to and from South Africa.

- Ban of exports of equipment to South African Defence Force and SA Police.

- Promote disinvestment and disinvestment action to end all investment in South Africa.

- No new loans at all, no renewal or rolling over of existing loans to banks, state and para-statal institutions and to

companies ... 172/

companies investing in South Africa.

- A ban on imports of South African goods, particualrly South African products and the support of consumer boycotts by individual groups and companies.

- Prohibit importations of South African Gold Products, e.g. Kruger Rands.

- Carefully targeted and limited bans on SA Transport Services, for example SAA and tele-communications networks as a political protest.

- Mandatory embargoes on the export of oil to South Africa and a ban on licensing technology for oil from coal technology.

- Withhold energy requirements by South Africa and prohibit collaboration in the nuclear sector.

- Cancel cultural and scientific agreements that accommodate the apartheid system.

- Prohibit all forms of military co-operation with South Africa and recall all military representatives from South Africa.

- Draw up a list of all these governments and churches that do not subscribe to these minimum demands.

------0000------

The Churches present in Harare hailed the emergence of COSATU, accepted the KAIROS document, despite the fact that the KAIROS document has not been endorsed or adopted by any one of the denominational churches in the country. The ANC was in and out of the portals where the Consultation took place, and used the opportunity to forge links with those present wherever possible. They issued the following press statement:

Press Statement by the African National Congress of SA for the WCC/SACC Meeting. Harare December 406 1985

We rejoice that so many Christian leaders from all over the world have come to Harare to meet with Christian leaders from our country and to express their solidarity with the struggle of our people.

We salute the World Council of Churches and its Program to Combat Racism for their timely decision to call this meeting at a time of extended crisis in our country. We are also grateful to the Zimbabwe Christian Council and the Government of Zimbabwe for their willingness to host this crucial meeting.

We extend .. 173/

We extend our warmest greetings to our fellow South Africans and to all the distinguished delegates to this meeting. The very absence of Dr. Allan Boesak, President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, through the arbitrary action of the apartheid state, bears testimony to the pernicious and anti-christian nature of the apartheid state.

We of the ANC wish to pay tribute to the millions of Christians in our country for their increasingly whole-hearted commitment to the struggle for peace and justice within our country. Neither will we forget the concrete support for our struggle which we enjoy from church people in many lands.

It is not insignificant that the first three presidents of the ANC were themselves ministers of religion. Throughout the history of our struggle there have been Christian people fighting alongside people of other beliefs within the ranks of the ANC and our people's army, Umkhonto we Sizwe.

As a movement we know this meeting will not fail to make a clear stand against apartheid and in favour of total liberation for our people. We share the view of religious people in our country that apartheid must be opposed as a heresy. No reasonable person can continue to doubt that the apartheid regime is a tyranny. We respectfully submit that in the absence of a willingness by the apartheid regime to abandon minority rule and its escalating violence against our people, the majority of the people of South Africa are engaged in a just war to all the tenets of a just war theory.

It is well known that our own organisation pursued a non-violence struggle for 50 years in spite of ever-increasing violence and repression and a denial of all fundamental human rights for all black people. We believe that the taking up of arms by our people in defence of our very lives can no more be equated with the indiscriminate violence of the apartheid regime than can there be an equation between those who fought to overthrow Nazism and Fascism and those who sought to promote this evil.

Our own love of peace and wish to minimise the loss of life has led us to call upon the international community for over two decades to impose comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions against the Pretoria regime.

At this crucial time in the history of our country there is a need for the moral teaching of the church against racism and exploitation and in favour of justice and liberation, to be heard unequivocally. Whilst the voice of the churches on the side of the oppressed is becoming louder, it is also true that the institutional churches still provide religious sanction for the armed forces of apartheid whilst sometimes also falsely equating

our people ... 174/

our people's determination to end apartheid with the desperate attempts of the racists to retain power and wealth. We do believe that black and white can live together in peace in South Africa. We do not believe that apartheid and justice can live together. The evil of apartheid must be replaced by the justice of a popularly elected government in a non-racial democracy within a unitary state.

The presence of so many delegates from Western countries, in particular the United States, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany, draws attention to the awesome responsibility of these leaders in relation to our struggle. Through the moral example and moral authority of the church within your countries, we urge you and your people to persuade your government as a matter of urgency to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against Pretoria and thereby bring the day of our liberation closer. In our situation it is precisely continued investment which enables the apartheid monster to continue meting out death to our people and to continue its reign of chaos and destruction throughout our region.

Do not be deceived by the arguments of our oppressors that sanctions will hurt us more. There is ample evidence that our people are willing to make the supreme sacrifice on the road to becoming free human beings. Continue to press for the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and all political prisoners. Only last week the South African regime threatened to invade the Republic of Zimbabwe as an extension of the destabilisation policy and aggression against all the frontline states. This underlines the urgency of the task facing this historic meeting. We extend our heartfelt gratitude to the whole Christian community for all that it is doing to support our struggle. Our prayer is that the results of your meeting will bring our freedom closer.

When I met Dr. Nyerere for the first time and also President Kaunda, I thanked them for giving refuge and succour to our brothers and sisters in the External Mission of ANC and the PAC in exile. When I met Dr. Peter Onu, who was then Deputy Secretary-General of the OAU, I expressed the same thoughts. Everywhere I have been in Africa over a period which is now more than a decade, I have thanked the Heads of State for all the assistance that they have given to those of our brothers who were forced to operate from foreign lands. There are many of you who are witnesses to the fact that I have, over the years, castigated the West for not giving our brothers with exiled movements aid, either moral, material or diplomatic. Whenever some people in the West have expressed their unhappiness about our brothers having found themselves friends in Moscow and the Eastern bloc of countries, I have always stated throughout the years that it was the West in fact, which drove our brothers into the Communists'

arms. .. 175/

arms. I stated that once they were spurned in the West, they were in fact, left with little choice but to move eastwards to look for friends who could give them the aid which they were denied in the west.

By saying this, I did not mean that I was approving of Communism. I stated these views as a mere expression of the facts of the matter. If one is denied assistance which is needed desperately, it would be morally justified to look for such assistance even from the devil himself.

I, in the past, reported to members of this Assembly, how, in one of my trips in Europe in the early seventies, I received a message that two emissaries of the External Mission of ANC - Mr. Thabo Mbeki and Mr Albert Dhlomo, were to meet me at a hotel at Heathrow Airport. When we met they stated that they were sent by the movement (meaning the External Mission of the ANC) to deliver a message to me. the fact was that the movement was embarassed by my condemnations of violence. They told me that it was appreciated that I could not possibly approve of violence within the borders of South Africa, but that I should not talk about it so often, as that interfered with their work abroad. The second message was that my views against sanctions were also interferring with their work abroad, where they had successfully mobilised opinion against investments and in favour of sanctions. I was accompanied by the Revd. E.Z. Sikakane who is also a member of the Central Committee of Inkatha.

I responded by saying that on the first issue of condemning violence, they must realise that I have no option but to condemn it. Quite apart from the fact that I do not believe that violence can resolve problems in South Africa, I stated that whenever there were deaths as a result of acts of violence emanating from them, I had to make a comment when the media representatives asked me for my opinion. I told them that I had to condemn acts of violence, and that I always added that if there was no apartheid there would be no such violence. On Disinvestment I told Mr. Thabo Mbeki and Mr Albert Dhlomo that this issue was not an academic issue for me. I told them that there were many Black people from my clan and others who, when they were hard up, approached me to help them get jobs and that therefore, if I supported disinvestment the government, who at that time were gunning for me (before I developed the political base I now have) would tell the people that they were not getting jobs because I had campaigned against investments. They appeared to understand this, but I later got the message that these gentlemen had not come to me on the instructions of or with the knowledge of Mr. Oliver Tambo.

However, later on, when I sent my emissaries to meet with Mr. Oliver Tambo and some members of the Executive of the External Mission of ANC, these emissaries were bombarded with arguments on why it was important for me not to speak against disinvestment on

my trips ... 176/

my trips abroad. I repeated the same arguments which I advanced before Thabo Mbeki and Albert Dhlomo. This over the years created chasms between me and my brothers in the External Mission of ANC. This issue was raised again between us at a meeting of a delegation of Inkatha and a delegation of the External Mission of ANC in London in 1979. It was clear that there could be no compromise between us on the issue. That is why a campaign of vilification against me was launched in June 1980 by Mr. Alfred Nzo, the Secretary-general of the External Mission of ANC. This campaign has been getting worse every year and this year Mr. Aziz Pahad, a member of the External Mission of ANC National Executive announced in January in London, that the External Mission of ANC would step up their offensive against me this year. This had already been obvious when COSATU founded as their front, fired the very first shots of vilification against me at their very launch.

Because I have a substantial constituency it was clear that in order to drown my voice against disinvestment, they had to vilify me and proselytise certain individuals and organisations in South Africa to sing their song in favour of disivestment and sanctions. From what you have just seen in the Harare Declaration and the Resolutions of the SACC and COSATU's stance on these issues, it is quite clear that they have now succeeded in winning certain Black spokesmen and certain front organisations such as UDF to give the impression to the whole world that Blacks in South Africa are calling for disinvestment and sanctions.

Another method of strengthening this view was to ensure that certain academics who were pro-UDF and therefore pro the ANC External Mission, carried out certain academic surveys to prove that Black workers approve of sanctions. One of these surveys was quoted by Bishop Tutu when he called for sanctions last month. He stated that according to one academic survey, 70 percent of Black workers approved of sanctions.

You can see from the Press statement that was issued after a joint consultation between the WCC and the SACC in Harare. I had first hand information on what went on there. Members of the external Mission of ANC dominated the whole so-called consultation. The persons who told me about it said that they tried to express their individual views on the issue of sanctions and on the proposed 10th anniversary of Soweto, and they were warned privately that the external Mission of ANC had a list of the number of their rooms at the hotel; that if they persisted in holding different views from those which the external Mission of ANC was ramming down the throats of the so-called consultation, there would be retribution. Those representatives of the Churches who went to Harare as part of the delegation of the SACC will deny that they were under such pressure. But the truth of the matter is that they had no option but to toe the line or risk violence.

These methods ... 177/

These methods are not anything surprising as the external Mission of ANC approves of such methods, and uses such methods. We are now only too familiar with 'necklacing', which recently received the ultimate sanctification from no less a patriot than Mrs Mandela. We are all too familiar with the bombing of people's houses, or the maiming and/or killing of those who do not toe the line. So when I was told about the kind of pressures that were brought to bear on the SACC delegation, I was not really surprised at all. In fact, as far as many members of the SACC are concerned, there was not much effort needed to persuade them as far as all these issues are concerned as we have seen from their own resolutions last year.

You will recall that their No. 2 Resolution stated:

> '2. Recognises that many Church leaders and Christian people in South Africa are in favour of (selective) disinvestment and economic sanctions because they believe that the situation is now so serious that economic action must be taken to strengthen political and diplomatic pressures on South Africa to force the South African government to take seriously the need for fundamental change in South Africa.'

I have already commented on these resolutions. But I find Sir, that it is most interesting to know who the Christian people are, who have approved of selective disinvestment and economic sanctions in South Africa. Unless we approve of the concept that was bandied about during the struggle for supremacy between the Empire and the Papacy in Europe in the last century by the Popes, that they were intermediaries between God and mankind. Are Church leaders in South Africa really intermediaries between us and God? The concept also propounded by one of the Popes during this struggle for supremacy was as he put it - "I am God's mouthpiece to mankind". Are our Church leaders in that mould, when they pontificate in this manner without consulting ordinary Christians in any way? It surprised me that the SACC should take it upon itself to speak in the name of Christians in South Africa without consulting them in any way.

It is only next November that my own Church, the Anglican Church, will hold a consultation on this issue. They will be doing so 'ex post facto' as the SACC has already called for sanctions, and our Archbishop-elect - Bishop Tutu, has already called for sanctions to be imposed on South Africa last month. Will the Anglican consultation be merely going through the motions of consultation in order to give respectability to what the SACC has already approved, and what our Archibishop-elect has already approved of? These are interesting questions, and when we compare this with the statement of the ANC external Mission after the Harare consultations, the similarities are striking.

The Harare Declaration itself as you have seen states in Resolution 3:

We call .. 178/

'3. We call on the Churches inside and outside South Africa to support South African movements working for the liberation of that country. We call on the international community to apply immediate and comprehensive sanctions on South Africa'.

The question is, who gave the participants in the Harare consultation the mandate to call for sanctions? Is this a reflection of the extent to which they despise the ordinary people? Is it because the people are no more than just the vulgus in their order of things? Black South Africans have, for decades, suffered impositions from the State without having any way whatsoever about their future. I find it extremely worrying to see the political conduct of those who claim that they can bring about a new order of justice and democracy in South Africa. Are we going to have the apartheid tyranny replaced by another tyranny where we, as Blacks, will continue to be no more than cogs in a wheel doing the will of the wheel? Where is respect for our human dignity in all this kind of political conduct? Where is the recognition that we also have human rights - if things are going to be rammed down the throats of Black South Africans by a new breed of dictators-cum-liberators?

In the list of what they called their explanatory statement of No. 4 of the Declaration - they have as the last clause - "Draw up a list of all those governments and Churches that do not subscribe to these minimum demands". One wonders why such a list should be drawn. Is it in order to blackmail or dragoon those who will not comply with their impositions?

In the statement issued by the External Mission of ANC at the end of the Consultation, we see the sentence - "Neither will we forget the concrete support for our struggle which we enjoy from Church people in many lands". I have personally, over the years, thanked the Church donor agencies for giving humanitarian aid to all our brothers in the external Mission of ANC, and the PAC in exile. The only complaint I have stated and restated over the years, is the manner in which this humanitarian aid was not given to victims of apartheid in South Africa itself. And where it was given - it was given on a selective basis to those who have the political approval of the SACC. National Churches in the West have to deal with the SACC ostensibly because it is seen there as an equivalent of a National here since so many of the mainline Churches are affiliated to it. But you are all aware of what criteria are used by the SACC in allocating the funding they get from the Church donor agencies in the West. It might be of interest to you if I give you a schedule of grants for what is designated as the National Emergency Fund to the South African Council of Churches between January to September 1985.

Schedule grants ... 179/

SCHEDULE GRANTS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED: JANUARY-SEPTEMBER 1985

Recipt No.		Amount
0184	Oxfam - U.K.	R11 909.00
0244	R. Goldblatt - S.A.	100.00
0248	Rev. F.A. Amoore - S.A.	50.00
0252	Quaker Peace and Service - U.K.	1 172.33
0288	Waterford-Kamhlaba - S.A.	1 000.00
0291	Dr. J.A. van Heerden - S.A.	50.00
0973	NGSK - Kuilsrivier - S.A.	100.00
0984	Danchurch Aid	19 762.00
1034	The Most Revd. P. Russell - S.A.	150.00
1143	ADB - Algemeen Diakonale Bureau - Netherlands	10 000.00
1149	Catholic Fund - U.K.	12 170.43
1155	NG Sendingkerk-sarepta - SA	65.00
1157	Generale Diakonale Bureau - Netherlands	10 013.91
1164	U.C.C. - United Church of Canada	14 304.75
1177	Church of Norway	14 041.00
1178	Church of Norwy	113 635.00
1186	NCCC - National Council of Churches of Christ (USA)	182 341.65
1205	EMW - Evangelisches Missionswerk (Hamburg)	276.34
1324	Rev. Peter Hortap - S.A.	100.00
1517	Generale Diakonale Bureau (Netherlands)	35 472.63
1525	Stichting Wilde Gawzen (Netherlands)	84 666.84
		R511 381.73

Then let me ask you to look with me at how this largesse was dispensed.

SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

NATIONAL EMERGENCY FUND

GRANTS AND DONATIONS MADE

Cheque No.		Amount
	JUNE 1985:	
T/T	Eastern Cape Council of Churches Emergency Fund - Grant	R10 000.00
8503	Western Cape Council of Churches - Grant	10 000.00
8505	Wits Council of Churches Crisis Fund Emergency Fund Grant	10 000.00
8601	Wits Council of Churches of Christ - Emergency Fund Grant	5 000.00

JULY 1985 .. 180/

	JULY 1985:	
8751	Wits Council of Churches crisis Fund- Emergency Fund Grant	5 000.00
8794	Masangwana Aid and Relief Service Grant	2 000.00
8859	Northern Trnsvaal Council of Churches - Emergency Fund - Grant	5 000.00
8920	crisis Emergency Fund - Grant for 4 young people	5 000.00
	AUGUST 1985:	
8953	NAMDA - Subsidy for Emergency Fund Grant	2 760.00
8975	Repair to house after damage - Grant	300.00
8976	Western Province Council of Churches - Legal Aid	15 000.00
9219	Midland Council of Churches - Grant for Relief (unrest)	5 000.00
9304	Emergency Fund - Food for Soweto children in prison	1 000.00
	Pietermaritzburg Council of Churches Emergency Grant	5 000.00
T/T	Border Council of Churches - Grant re: Relief Duncan Village	5 000.00
	SEPTEMBER 1985:	
9525	Western Province Council of Churches Legal Aid	10 000.00
9546	Western Province Council of Churches Grant For Funeral assistance	10 000.00
9562	Eastern Cape Council of Churches Emergency Fund	15 095.00
9590	Queenstown D.C. Emergency Fund Grant	3 000.00
T/T	West Coast council of Churches Emergency Fund - Grant	10 000.00
T/T	Border Council of Churches Emergency Fund - Grant	10 000.00
T/T	Eastern Cape Council of Churches Emergency Fund - Grant	10 000.00
T/T	Midlands Council of Churches Emergency Fund - Grant	10 000.00
6432	United Democratic Front - Grant Funeral Costs	6 000.00
	(Less Refunds of Grants made)	(755.00)
	TOTAL	R164 900.00

The Secretary of the South African Council of Churches wrote the following circular letter with the schedules of expenditure of this so-called National Emergency Fund (NEF):

"THE SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

To All Ecumenical Partners and Donor Agencies contributing to SACC's National Emergency Fund

Dear Friends,

As promised earlier in the year we are now sending you the first comprehensive report of the National Emergency Fund (NEF) since its establishment in April this year. A report on the Asingeni Relief Fund (ARF) will be mailed to contributing agencies shortly. We were given to understand that there was a measure of confusion about the existence of two separte funds like Asingeni and NEF and there is a need to explain the difference between them as well as to answer the question whether in fact, there is a need for the continuation of two separte funds. Could I clarify the situation by explaining as follows:

ASINGENI RELIEF FUND (ARF)

The Asingeni Fund was established in 1986 as a fund created to assist individuals and communities who had become victims of the apartheid system and had suffered or continued to suffer serious material loss. It included those individuals and communities who in some way or another acti ely resisted the injustice of apartheid and had suffered as a result in a way which required some form of material assistance. Because of the sensitive nature of many of such acts of victimisation and of the urgency of meeting such crisis needs, the SACC approved that the General Secretary administer the Asingeni Fund as a discretionary fund. Thus the fund catered amongst other things for covering the legal costs of political trials, the support of families of political prisoners, and a wide spectrum of needs created by the injustice of apartheid. In the course of 1985 the Finance Committee decided (for the sake of protecting both the General Secretary and the SACC against unwarranted and unjustified propaganda) to limit the discretionary powers of the General Secretary to R10 000 per application with a Committee of three dealing with all allocations exceeding this amount.

Could I emphasize that there is a desperate need for this fund to continue even after the State of Emergency has been lifted, in view of the fact that the victims of apartheid will still suffer the injustice of this system many years after liberation has come to this country.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY (NEF):

This fund was initiated by the Executive on 16-17 April 1985 following the 21 March tragedy of Langa, Uitenhage and the situation of national crisis which emerged in our country, and which has continued unabated since then. The purpose of the fund as approved by the Executive is as follows:

to provide .. 182/

"to provide relief in the following specific categories:
Emergency family report
Legal defence of accused in unrest situations
Medical expenses
Funeral expenses
Costs of inquests
Costs of emergency meetings related to situation
Travel costs for parents to trials
Bail costs, only in special circumstances
Food relief in unrest situations

From the above it can be clearly seen that the emphasis of this fund is totally related to the State of Emergency and emergency needs resulting from the crisis in our country. Even if the State of Emergency is formally terminated we expect the situation of crisis to continue despite all claims to the contrary. We are deeply perturbed about the unresolved situation of Black education leading to ongoing boycotts of schools and higher educational institutions; we are equally aware that the consumer boycott of White businesses is only now beginning to take shape, and that we can in all probability expect more strike action by trade unions in the course of 1986.

May we emphasize that reports coming from the regional councils of the SACC take some time to draw together into one comprehensive report. All funding of the SACC, including that of Asingeni, and of the National Emergency Fund is properly audited once a year and, as promised, such audited statements will be made avilalbe to donor agencies as soon as these are completed.

May I use this opportunity once more to thank you most sincerely for all your gifts and grants, large and small. The Asingeni and National Emergency Fund reports when combined, clearly show at least two things:

1. That it is impossible for us to meet the many and ever-increasing needs resulting from the crisis in our country and the suffering which this has caused.

2. It is equally clear that we are at least able to express in a concrete and tangible way some form of Christian solidarity with many of the victims of the evil of apartheid.

We join you in the prayer that the advent of Christians may constantly remind us that the Prince of Peace has come to restore peace with justice on God's earth. We live in the faith and hope that this peace with justice will also come to our land.

Yours sincerely

(signed pp. Sally Misdrin)

C.F.B. NAUDE
General Seretary

(Dictated but not signed due to absence on leave)

/sm"

Mr. Speaker, Sir, and Honourable Members, I thought that it would be a good thing for you to know what happens when it comes to the expenditure of the largesse which the SACC administers from the Churches abroad, and other donors both here and abroad. I do not doubt from what you have seen that the SACC does a lot of humnitarian work and demonstrates a lot of Christian caring in administering those funds. I am, however, quite fascinated by the pattern of who receives it and where it is sent in view of the approach with which donor agencies approaches the SACC as the equivalent of the National Churches in their own countries and the designation of the fund as a National Emergency Fund. I do not intend to say more than this on this particular aspect.

I think you may also be interested in looking at SACC's own analysis and notes on National Emergency Fund (NEF).

SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

SUMMARY ANALYSIS AND NOTES ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY (NEF) EXPENDITURE

JUNE TO SEPTEMBER 1985

A. Rate of Expenditure:

NEF expenditure has increased since the Fund was launched in June 1985, both in terms of the number of grants, and the total allocation figure per month:

Month	Number of Grnts	R
June	4	35,000
July	5	17,000
August	9	43,000
September	9	84,095
	27	R179,095

B. Summary of Grants by Recipient:

(a) Regional Council of Churches

i) Most NEF grants approved during this period went to

Regional .. 184/

Regional Councils of Churches for allocation via their own crisis funds. The summary table below indicates the spread of funding across the country, with particularly high levels of expenditure in the West and Eastern Cape:

Regional Council	No of Grants	Total Amount
Western Province	4	45 000
Eastern Cape	3	35 000
Witwatersrand	3	20 000
Border/Queenstown	3	18 000
Midland	2	15 000
Northern Transvaal	1	10 000
West Coast	1	10 000
Pietermaritzburg	1	5 000
Pretoria	1	5 000
		R163 000

ii) Regional Councils had responsibility for how NEF funds were allocated, but were asked to account for NEF monies separtely and to adhere to the following general guidelines when making grants:

1. Emergency Family Support (repairs to damaged homes, subsistance for those with no other means of support): Maximum 750 per family

2. Medical Expenses: Maximum of R300

3. Funeral Grants: Maximum R200

4. Costs of emergency meetings related to unrest situation: Maximum of R200

5. Food Relief in unrest situations: Maximum R50 per family

6. Bail Costs (i.e. loans): to be paid in special circumstances only if the Regional Council concerned already has a policy of making bail monies available.

7. Travel costs for parents attending trials: to be paid in accordance with existing guidelines used in a given region.

iii) A report received from the Eastern Cape Council of Churches on allocations from NEF funds for June to

August ... 185/

August 1985 is summarised below, as an example of the kinds of needs to which Regional Councils have had to respond:

June:	R
Repair of bombed house, Cradock	750.00
Medical costs - Victim of political feud	24.00
Funeral of Police victim - Headbush	253.12
Funeral, New Brighton	148.96
Funeral Swide - feud victim	93.00
Funerals, KwaZakhele - feud victims	206.08
Medical Costs - police/army victim	41.83
	R1 516.99

July:	
Travel Costs for families of treason trialists (Burgersdorp)	250.00
Repair of bombed house (PEBCO official)	750.00
Funeral Costs - feud victim	200.00
	1 200.00

August	
Funeral Costs - Police victim	100.00
bail for 12 at R500 per person	6 000.00
bail for 2 at R150 per person	300.00
Repair of bombed house	750.00
	7 150.00
TOTAL	R9 866.99

In the Western Cape, the Western Province Council of Churches spent R10 000 in grants for funeral costs and R25 000 was used in bail money for victims of unrest.

(b) Church/Community/Professional Organisations

Four grants were made in this catergory, as follows:

Diakonia, Durban	R5 000.00
UDF - funeral costs - Cradock	6 000.00
Masangwama and relief service P.E.	2 000.00
Namda, Sharpeville	2 760.00
	R15 760.00

Masangwana aid in Port Elizabeth requested funds to provide food and accommodation for people either afraid to live at home or whose homes had been burned down. NAMDA, a National Medical Dental Association received funds towards costs of an emergency care training workshop, held over two days at a college near Sharpeville. Twenty four people received basic first aid training enabling them to provide some emergency medical care in situations where injured members of the community were unwilling or unable to be treated in hospitals or clinics. SACC's grant helped cover costs, catering, transportation, stationery and medical equipment for trainers and trainees.

(c) Assistance to Groups and Individuals

This was the smallest category of grants, with three grants being made during the period June - September.

	R
Maintenance costs for four young people	500
Repair to damaged house	300
Food for Soweto children in prison	1 000
	R15 8000

The Asingeni Fund continued to be used for most allocations of this nature.

(d) Please note that detailed reports on National Emergency Fund grants to Regional Councils have been requested, and normally take up to three months before being available to SACC in Johannesburg. We will forward to you information received from Regional Councils relating to the period June to September 1985 as an Appendix to this report in due course.

21.11.85

Mr. Speaker Sir, and Honourable Members, I have taken the trouble to make this information available because I do not want to see members of this house talk about what the SACC does or does not do from a weak position of ignorance as to what they really do or do not do. I have already made my comments about all this. My only curiosity is concerning Christians who belong to Inkatha whose

houses 187/

houses have also been petrol bombed, or also have been burned, maimed or killed. Are they entitled to the kind of funding which the SACC administers or dispenses? It is clear that most of the aid from the Churches abroad is administered by a Church body the SACC which in terms of a joint declaration by the Dutch Council of Churches and the SACC entitled "The Hour of Truth", which I have already read out to you in the course of my delivering this policy, has pledged its support for the External Mission and its surrogate organisation the UDF inside South Africa. In the Declaration it will be recalled that Inkatha is rejected. It is therefore not so remarkable that in the distribution of what it calls the National Emergency Fund between June and September 1985, only the UDF of all political organisations is mentioned by name as a recipient of some of this funding.

The statement issued by the external Mission after the Harare Declaration is interesting also for other reasons. It states for example that:

> "We respectfully submit that in the absence of a willingness on the part of the apartheid regime to abandon minority rule and its escalating violence against our people, the majority of the people of South Africa are engaged in a just war to conforming to all the tenets of a just war".

This is an interesting pronouncement in the light of the fact that the question of when a situation justifies a just war, is an issue which has occupied the minds of theologigians for centuries now. The question is whether the Churches and Church related organisations such as the SACC agree with our brothers in the external Mission of ANC that we have arrived at a time for a just war in South Africa. Is that the reason why they do now openly support the external Mission of ANC. This is a question which I believe South African Church leaders should pronounce on openly, since there are many of them who have given oblique and overt support for the external Mission of ANC. The necklacing of Black victims, which the UDF uses as a strategy to eliminate their opponents has now been approved of by Mrs Mandela and by the external Mission of ANC in some of their broadcasts through Radio Freedom. Do the Churches support this method of execution of Blacks who do not support the strategy of the UDF and of the external Mission of ANC. The Church leaders who have commented on this kind of black-on-black violence have only lamely spoken about it in terms of it being understandable that those who are designated as 'collaborators' should be at the receiving end of this cruel and barbaric execution by the UDF. This reminds me of how those who attempted to murder me at Robert Sobukwe's funeral in 1978 were described by a leading Church leader (for what they had tried to do to me) to be what he called "a new breed of young people with iron in their souls". A prominent Church leader in Durban was recently heard to refer to the alleged shooting of alleged

members of Inkatha very gleefully as something Inkatha members deserve and he spoke with great admiration about those members of the Natal Education Crisis committee who shot people fatally on the day of the NECC Conference in Durban.

This is going to place us in an extremely difficult situation as Christians. When Church leaders so openly take sides in the political differences of various political factions, should we continue to give them support or to regard them as our spiritual leaders? How can a member of Inkatha easily receive Communion from someone who is gleeful about the shooting of people? These are the dilemmas in which we, as Christians, find ourselves in as a result of our Church leaders political conduct in taking sides in the political differences that exist between various Black political organisations and leaders. They have not tried to play a reconciliatory role. They have decided who are the so-called authentic leaders in their views, and who are not. Those who do not conform to their criteria of what constitutes true leadership and what constitutes an authentic Black organisation are beyond the pale. They have been judged and condemned in absentia. They have never tried to find out what is the truth and what is not the truth about Inkatha for example. No. We are just beyond the pale.

You saw the memorandum which I used as a basis for discussion when the Bishops and Clergy of our Church brought me and Bishop Tutu together with the aim of bringing about a reconciliation. As discussions were confidential, I cannot give details here of how the discussions went. The discussions went off as well as could be expected. It was, however, felt that we needed one or more meetings. This has not yet happened because both the Bishop and I are very busy people. But I am afraid since then, there have been utterances of the Bishop abroad which have not contributed anything towards bridging the chasms that have developed over the years between us because of utterances of each one of us about the other.

I was, for example, quite disappointed when I went to London last year and was given a copy of an interview which the Bishop gave to African Concord Magazine of the 24th October, 1985 - particularly when he was specifically asked about me.

This was the question put to Bishop Tutu by the interviewer:

Question: One of the elements of the Black community which he (Mr. Botha) said to be speaking to, and which are perceived here I think as constituting a force of moderation is Chief Buthelezi and the Inkatha Movement. There are very divided opinions about that but here Buthelezi is seen by those who would love South Africa to survive not too much changed. Buthelezi is seen as the man of the future.

Tutu: ... /189

Tutu: Ay! He could very well be that, but most surveys indicate quite firmly that the ANC and Nelson Mandela in the Black community are head and shoulders above everyone else, and what we are getting is people trying to play off one group against another, and that is a very great sadness, almost tragic. But there is no doubt at all that if we're going to have free elections in the Black community at the start of the game, the ANC is way ahead of anybody else. And I think that people shouldn't get us into the situation where Zimbabwe was with Bishop Muzorewa; they must not want to choose the ones they think are congenial as partners, and then be shocked when the day of reckoning comes.

Question: Or even Savimbi in Angola - that is another parallel.

Tutu: Absolutely, yes - I think that we've got to be very careful, but we want to deal with those people say are their leaders.

Question: Don't you nevertheless think that Buthelezi has some role, after all, he is the head of a very large party? And although we may accept that Nelson Mandela is the most popular leader, surely the importance is to try to get as many Black people who are recognised as leaders together?

Tutu: I agree entirely with you, I couldn't agree more, that we ought to have a broad front. But it must not be a broad front of Blacks - I mean open abhorrence of ethnicity is a really genuine one, and we, we are really looking foward to a South Africa that will be united, democratic and non-racial .....

Question: But you talk about bringing people together and yet anybody who watches the TV news here sees black killing black - and this is obviously a very disturbing thing - how do you explain that?

Tutu: Yes, well any death would be something that ought to fill us with revulsion and, we'd want to stop it, but as a student of human history, you should know surely that when people are opposing a system, they deal summarily with those they believe are collaborators. I mean, what happened in World War II in the resistance movement? If you were a quisling, you were given very short shrift, and we don't have to think only of that - what happens in Northern Ireland? If they believe that in the IRA you are a traitor to their cause, you have your kneecaps shot of and, very recently, you remember that young couple who were taken out of their bed and killed because they were believed to be police informers. Now I, and others have sought to say to black people, !Please, we have a noble cause, let us not discredit it by using methods of which we will be ashamed", but it's not a phenomenon peculiar to South African blacks.

That this 190/

That this is what Bishop Tutu said after talks to reconcile us to each other as fellow Christians and as fellow Anglicans was most discouraging to me concerning any reconciliation ever taking place at all between us. There are also various private conversations and utterances which the Bishop has made abroad since then which do not augur well for normalised relationships between a Bishop who is now my Archbishop and me. Certainly, if our Bishops had the keys to heaven, I would not have a snowball's hope in hell to be admitted. But fortunately, while they are our shepherds they do not hold such keys! I say these things with sadness in my heart and not with flippancy. The response I have just given to you with references to Bishop Muzorewa of Zimbabwe is no more than a regurgitation of the external Mission of ANC's propaganda, which they are spreading right across the face of the glove about me. So the Bishop spoke here as their propagandist.

While our Church leaders are not part of the Deity, we do have certain expectations from them. I have shared the view with Bishop Tutu and many Church spokesmen that if there was no apartheid there would not have been the so-called armed struggle of the external Mission of ANC. But having said so I have stated that our brothers in the external Mission of ANC are wrong in thinking that this method is the one that will resolve problems in our country. I have equally condemned the violence of the State which has resulted in the death of so many of our young people in the past year. I have equally condemned the deaths of Blacks at the hand of Blacks. It is not insignificant that of the people that have died in the unrest, a third have been Blacks who have died at the hands of other Blacks. I have not heard the voice of the Church condemning this loudly and clearly. There may well have been a condemnation of this black on black violence by Church leaders and that I am merely unaware of it. I recall for example, that Bishop Tutu threatened to leave South Africa with his family after the death of Miss Skosana in the East Rand. He felt outraged by it to the extent that he threatened that if any similar deaths occurred he would seriously consider leaving the country. There have, of course, been more such deaths since then, and both the external Mission of ANC and Mrs Mandela have sanctified this barbaric method of killing by giving it their approval. What are our Church leaders saying about this now? As Christians we would be grateful to know what our Church leaders' feelings are about the necklacing of Blacks by Blacks.

I recall that when Councillor Kinikini of Nobuhle in Uitenhage was killed brutally, and burnt alive I saw Dr. Boesak appear on SABC-TV explaining this incident as being justified by 'collaboration' of which Mr. Kinikini was guilty, in his view. We need to learn what the views of our Churches are on these methods of executing Black people by other Black people. the killing of Blacks by other Blacks in opposite political camps is a ghastly development. Because Church leaders are aligned to certain

political 191/

political organisations their voice will be muted even where they dare condemn this fatricidal strife.

The media says very little about this kind of Black on Black violence that has cost so many lives between UDF and AZAPO particularly in the Eastern Cape and the Transvaal. Just in the Sunday Times (Extra) of the 23rd March 1986, was the following report:

"A power struggle between the UDF and AZAPO is believed to be behind the gang warfare which erupted in Soweto this week - leaving at least eight dead in a spate of horrific killings. Now peace talks are going on between the Soweto-based KABASA gang and students from neighbouring Diepkloof. Five youths were stoned or burnt to death and in a grisly banana-republic style execution, three people were allegedly abducted by gant members and summarily shot. Two of the eight victims were doused with petrol and burnt alive after a gang of pupils - said by some witnesses to number 3 000 - attacked a Soweto home with petrol bombs. According to sources in Soweto yesterday, the battle for political supremacy among rival contenders has played a big role in the violence.

Azapo is said to be making a determined bid to boost its credibility among the Black community in preparation for a series of planned protests leading up to the 10th Anniversary of the 1976 Soweto riots. The UDF - allegedly with ANC prompting - and Chief Buthelezi's Inkatha movement are the other main groupings vying for Black allegiance in the townships.

UDF sources said yesterday they suspected that the Kabasa Gang had teamed up with some Orlando East students, mostly members of the Azanian Student movement (an offshoot of Azapo against those in Diepkloof.

In this week's bloody fighting, two members of SOSCO (the UDF-link of Soweto Students' Congress) were burned to death.

A UDF spokesman, Mr. Mandla Dlamini, said they had received a phone call from a man claiming to be a Kabasa member who said they would not stop "until we have killed 50 SOSCO students". "It was at this stage that we suspected that this gangster faction fight had become a revenge war by AZASM students on UDF students" said Mr. Dlamini. AZAPO denied the allegations. But Mr. Dlamini said some KABASA members had admitted that they had been "used in the fighting by AZASM students".

KABASA also denied that they had threatened to kill 50 SOSCO members. "We feel there were other elements who moved in when the fighting turned ugly" said Mr. Dlamini.

In an AZAPO .. 192/

In an AZAPO organised protest, 200 people marched through central Johannesburg on Friday chanting slogans and singing freedom songs to commemorate the Sharpeville and Langa shootings. AZAPO speakers at the meeting vowed "to take the struggle for liberation into the white areas". Three people were arrested by Police and released after questioning.

At WITS University about 2 000 students attended a Commemoration meeting called by the Black Students Society - which earlier in the week succeeded in disrupting a meeting at which a visiting UNITA delegation was to have addressed students. The Students stoned a police patrol outside the campus and boycotted classes. A crowd of students later marched through the streets of nearby Braamfontein, chanting freedom songs.

A UDF spokesman, Mr. Mandla Dlamini, denied a reported allegation by police that there was a plan to petrol bomb police houses in Soweto on Wednesday night. "There was heavy tension and fighting on Wednesday, especially in the evening and I cannot see how it was possible for anyone in the two townships to have been diverted to do something else" said Mr. Dlamini. "After we saw the statements we made inquiries and the students were equally surprised at the allegations".

In Dobsonville some students waited to join the warring Diepkloof and Orlando factions but were discouraged by their leaders. "What we know is that most of those arrested were taken from their homes during the house to house raid" said Mr. Dlamini. "On Wednesday evening I saw many youths roaming the streets in Orlando and Diepkloof because of a faction fight between the students and the MAKABASA gangsters based in Orlando East".

There you have it. I have decided to read this report to you in its entirety because it gives a very clear picture of what is going on as far as black-on-black violence between Black organisations are concerned. The question is - what role does the Church play to bring about reconciliation not only just between Black and White, but also between Black and Black. This is quite a serious development which will further compound the problems of resolving South Africa's problems.

It is remarkable that in the same issue of "the Sunday Times" - Extra of the 23rd March 1986, on the same page, there is the following news item:

BURNED GIRL INNOCENT
Sunday Times Reporter

Miss Julia Sefafe, 20, a hairdresser was murdered during the student violence in Soweto. Everyone in the Diepkloof area was scared to talk about the incident except to say "she was innocent" of gang involvement and was taken victim of "mistaken identity". She just visited a friend who lived at a railway policeman's home nearby.

Another friend said: "Someone identified her as a sell-out and that was it. Though she had pleaded for mercy she was stabbed while others doused her with petrol and set her alight.

As usual, when you see such a sight, the public is scared and nothing can be done to prevent it. But it was terrible".

This is a very serious matter and deserves the attention of our entire Nation. One does not need to do anything wrong, it needs just one man or one woman to say that one is "a sell-out" and all Hell is let loose on you. You must think about the fact that all the orgnisations that are committed to these methods quite often designate us in Inkatha as "sell-outs". This means each member of Inkatha must know that he or she is already sentenced to a necklace death in terms of these methods, and strategies of these organisations which are opposed to us.

There is now a division between black South Africans which has the approval of the Church as we have seen from the Netherlands Church Council/SACC declaration and the KAIROS document. Just the other day Archbishop Dennis Hurley, the Catholic Archbishop of Durban, was asked the question if Blacks would welcome international sanctions, by the former Chancellor of West Germany, Mr. Willy Brandt, during his recent visit. The Archbishop told him that "Progressive movements clamour for it. They see it as part of a multi-faceted strategy of weakening the White regime in South Africa".

I find His Grace's response most interesting, particularly as the Southern African Catholic Bishop's Conference(SACBC) is meeting on the 29th of April to consider what attitude to adopt on the question of economic pressure including disinvestment and sanctions against South Africa.

SOUTHERN AFRICAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS' CONFERENCE

THE SOUTH AFRICAN SITUATION AND
THE QUESTION OF ECONOMIC PRESSURE

An Explanatory Paper
24 February 1986

The Church in continuing the work entrusted to her by Jesus

endeavours 194/

endeavours to give witness to her Lord, present within her, and to his Spirit of love. This love leads her to be concerned about people's needs and sufferings for it was by his care for the needy and the suffering that Jesus illustrated his commandment of love, the fulfilment of which should be distinguishing mark of his followers.

For this reason the Church cannot stand aloof from the great suffering that south Africa has been experiencing. This suffering has been particularly intense since September 1984. It has resulted from protests, demonstrations, police reaction, boycotts and acts of intimidation and vengeance. People have been killed and injured, some in extremely cruel fashion; houses, shops and vehicles have been destroyed. It is calculated that in the seventeen months from September 1984 to the end of January 1986, 1 197 people died in the unrest, the great majority at the hands of the police.

The immediate cause of the unrest may have been a raise in rents or busfares, or dissatisfaction with an inferior educational system, or the frustration of unemployment, but it is obvious that when unrest and violence reach such proportions the most profound human attitudes and feelings are involved. There is scarcely anything more fundamental than the feeling for justice and the resentment against injustice, affecting basic human rights and dignity. When this resentment monts high there are bound to be reactions, sometimes very fierce reactions. We know how vigorously people act in self-defence. Action for the recognition of dignity and rights is an almost compulsive form of self-defence.

Apartheid and injustice go hand in hand. Discrimination against people on grounds of race and colour is as grievous offence against their dignity. The embodiement of discrimination in the constitution of the country and nearly every important enactment of law ensures that people against whom the discrimination is practised are continually injured by the humiliations and injustices under which they live. They are injured in every dimension of life; personal being and social standing, domicile, ownership of land, employment, economic opportunity, education, cultural contact and political representation. No people will go on accepting this for ever. Sooner or later the limit of endurance is reached and then comes the explosion - revolution, civil war or festering unrest. The long a painful history of the human race bears undeniable witness to this. Yet all too often people who are proud of the liberation struggles in which they themselves or their ancestors were involved become the oppressors of others and treat the reactions of the oppressed as high treason. Traitors in the eyes of the oppressors are the heroes and martyrs of the oppressed - a constant lesson of history.

The hurts and injustices of discrimination cause immense

suffering. ... 195/

suffering. Further suffering results when people campaign against the hurts and injustices and are met with police repression and, all too often, police violence.

Can the Church stand aloof from such suffering? Obviously not. It is for this reason that the Southern African Catholic Boshops' Conference, with the leadership of other churches, has consistently called attention to the evils of apartheid. Now that people are manifesting more and more clearly their pain and resentment at the hurt inflicted, those who exercise leadership in the Church must respond by paying greater attention to their suffering and by supporting their endeavours to vindicate their rights in morally acceptable ways.

It was for this reason the Boshops' Conference devoted time at its recent plenary session to considering the present situation and what attitude the Conference should adopt. We came to a firm conclusion, namely, that violence is becoming so characteristic of our country that unless an alternative way of bringing about change is found the country will be devoured by violence.

The question we have to face is: what is the alternative to violence? Is it moral persuasion? This has been tried for a very long time by quite a few churches and other bodies. It has not succeeded. It seems that something with greater impact is necessary and that could include such non-violent measures as boycotts, passive resistance and economic pressure - the pressure of divestment, disinvestment, sanctions. If we have to choose between these measures and the kind of violence we have been witnessing since September 1984 the answer is clear.

We have to admit, of course, that non-violent measures cannot be pursued without suffering - the suffering perhaps of increased unemployment and economic distress or the suffering resulting from forceful State reaction. Suffering can hardly be avoided. We dread what this may mean for many people.

We have to admit too that some minor changes have been introduced but we consider them wholly insufficient to convince people that there is strong enough resolve for the substantial change that is necessary.

We have to concede that we cannot foresee how economic pressure will function, whether it can be made effective and achieve the object for which it is imposed.

Finally, we have to admit that supporting a policy of non-violent but nonetheless tangible pressures does not at first sight appear to conform to the spirit of the Gospel. We beg people to consider that this may be only alternative to uncontrolled violence. When one is confronted with the choice between two evils, love dictates

the choice ... 196/

the choice of the lesser.

It is not easy to make decisions and recommendations about the measures that have been mentioned but in the face of the horror of violence that confronts us we are forced to consider them. That is why at our plenary session we passed this resolution.

The Conference adopts the following statement:

> "We are deeply conscious of our responsibility as leaders of the Church to give moral guidance and to play our part in attempting to arrest the rapidly escalating violence in our country.
>
> Since it is a matter of utmost urgency we find ourselves obliged to consider alternatives to such violence as a means of bringing about radical social change.
>
> While still open to dialogue, we see no choice but to envisage forms of non-violent action such as passive resistance, boycott and economic pressure to move our country away from its present state of racial conflict and set it firmly on the road to justice and full participation of all its inhabitants in the structure of the government. We reaffirm our total abhorrence of the system of apartheid which is directly opposed to the teaching of Christ and the God-given dignity of every human being and is the greatest single obstacle to peace in our land.
>
> We make our own the words of our Holy Father, Pope John Paul II.
>
> Our repudiation of every form of racial discrimination is convinced and total; it is based on the awareness of the dignity common to every man made in the image and likeness of the Creator and called to the status of Son of God".

In the light of this conviction:

1. The Conference instructs the Administrative Board to see that a statement is drawn up and published as soon as possible indicating that the Conference has given careful consideration to supporting economic pressures against apartheid in South Africa. That to the published statement be attached the text of the paper deawn up by the Justice and Reconciliation Commission entitled 'Economic Measures against Apartheid and the Challenge of the Church', and further instruct the Administrative Board to make the necessary preparation for an extraordinary plenary session for May 1986 at which this subject is to be further discussed and decision taken.

The Conference .. .197/

2. The Conference resolves that a committee be formed to draw up a further response to the Kairos Document for presentation to the extraordinary plenary session of May 1986.

3. The Conference resolves that a committee be formed to supervise the drawing up of a document setting out the Conference's reflections on the present south African crisis using the text compiled by Fr Kevin Rai and that the document be submitted to the extraordinary plenary session in May 1986. "

We are publishing this paper to inform members of the Catholic Church and of other churches too and all concerned persons of the stage we have reached in our heart-searching about the use of non-violent methods of pressure against the policy of apartheid.

We know that many people have committed themselves to supporting such measures.

We ourselves are constantly being asked, especially by our conferences in other countries, what our attitude is. We cannot postpone much longer coming to a decision. That is why we have called a special plenary session at the end of April to endeavour to formulate our policy.

With this explanatory paper we supply the text of a paper prepared for our January plenary session by the Commission for Justice and Reconciliation of the Bishops' Conference entitled "Economic Measures against Apartheid and the Challenge to the Church".

We recommend this matter with all the anxiety and pain it involves to the kind prayers of all who are concerned that we may reach decisions inspired by the Father whose will we wish to do, the Son whose Church we wish to serve, the Holy Spirit by whose light and love we wish to be guided.

People who wish to make known their opinions to us are cordially and fraternally invited to submit them in writing to:

The General Secretary,
Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference,
P.O. Box 941
PRETORIA
0001

COMMISSION FOR JUSTICE AND RECONCILIATION

ECONOMIC MEASURES AGAINST APARTHEID AND THE CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCH

1. INTRODUCTION

(A) Definition 198/

(A) Definition of Terms

A number of terms are used in discussing the issue of economic measures against South Africa, divestment, disinvestment embargoes and sanctions. Before defining these we need to understand some aspects of investment. Foreign investment involves:

(i) Investment in physical assets

- to expand the current capacity to produce (this could create jobs).

- to build new industry (this could create jobs).

- to replace old technology with more sophisticated capital intensive technology. This is the predominant form of investment and generally results in loss of jobs.

(ii) Investment in financial assets

- the first form is an investment in stocks and shares. (No necessary job creation).

- the second form comprises loans by foreign banks to either the South African Government or business (this may result in jobs depending on how it is used).

In the area of investment a large scale 'disinvestment' campaign has been waged and involves the following terms:

(i) Divestment

This is the most prevalent action in the USA. It is a process whereby pressure is put on bodies to withdraw funds from companies which are investing in South Africa, i.e. to sell their shares in companies operating in South Africa. The aim is to get the companies involved in South Africa to put pressure on big business and government to change. It helps to isolate the government and big businesses creating an international lack of confidence in the apartheid political system and economy and has much publicity value in exposing the horrors of apartheid. (No necessary job loss is involved).

(ii) Disinvestment

This has a number of aspects.

Firstly it ... 199/

Firstly it involves the refusal or legislation against any new capital investment in South Africa and would include no new loans to South Africa. (No necessary job loss).

Secondly, it involves the sale of existing plants to local business. (No necesary job loss).

Thirdly it involves the actual removal of physical capital. (This will result in job loss, but is the least likely to happen).

(iii) Embargoes and trade sanctions

There is a wide range of other economic measures which revolve around embargoes on and sanctions against trade with South Africa. These include:

- a ban on sales to South Africa e.g. embargoes on various items like arms, oil, machinery, etc. (No necessary job loss. In fact the arms oil embargoes created thousands of jobs in South Africa (Armscor & Sasol) as local alternatives were forced to be developed).

- measures against South African exports e.g. a ban on consumer goods being sold in foreign countries. (May result in job loss).

Within all of the above mentioned types there is a plethora of combinations and methods. The range and complexity makes it difficult to pinpoint exactly what effect any particular form of economic measure against South Africa will have. Nevertheless a few clear principles do stand out.

Major all encompassing measures will obviously have the greatest impact. Minor measures (e.g. the most recent move in the USA) are important as symbols and ideological pressure, however they do have a danger. The South African government can see minor measures as a sign of weakness i.e. as mere attempts to placate public opinion abroad. Any minor measure must be followed up with ongoing pressure and campaigns. The ultimate effectiveness of economic measures depends on the political will to endorse them and this can be achieved only through ongoing consistent and wide ranging pressure.

2. WHO IS APPLYING SANCTIONS AND WHY

(A) Economic measures as a political tool are not an

aberration .. 200/

aberration or an anomaly. The United Nations Charter provides for economic sanctions as a standard tool to be used against states acting outside the norms of International behaviour enshrined in the Charter. Ever since 1962 the General Assembly of the U.N. has called for the severing of all trade and economic links with South Africa for three fundamental reasons.

- In the UN, Internationally and within South Africa, apartheid has been recognised as a crime against humanity and a threat to world peace.

- South Africa has consistently refused to withdraw from its illegal occupation of Namibia

- South Africa's persistent violation (especially since the late 70's) of the territorial sovereignty of its neighbours and its political and economic destabilization of the Southern African region have been cause for great concern. (e.g. the destabilization of Southern Africa has cost the Frontline States more than R21 billion in the last decade or so. This amounts to more than the sum total of all the international aid received by these countries in that period).

These reasons still hold and are recognised as the obstacles which need to be removed to achieve peace and harmony in South and Southern Africa.

Initially in the early 60's the issue of the obstacles which need to be removed to achieve peace and harmony in South and Southern Africa.

Initially in the early 60's the issue of economic measures against South Africa was limited to United Nations resolutions. However, since then a world wide movement has sprung up and is now being channelled through the U.N., OAU, OPEC, the Frontline States, the Commonwealth and many governments (e.g. Sweden, Brazil, France and USA have legislated for some form of economic action against South Africa). Many social groups have also got involved including Anti-apartheid movements, Churches, Trace Unions and political parties.

However, as the campaign for economic action has sprung up so too has a campaign against economic action developed. This has created much debate and confusion, those who wish to oppose apartheid need guidance as to the effectiveness of economic measures.

The SACBC has a large following overseas and has a good

reputation ... 201/

reputation for its opposition to apartheid. If the SACBC speaks out on this issue not only will it add weight to the anti-apartheid campaign, but it will also draw many more people into the struggle to establish a free and just society in South Africa.

Sanctions and disinvestment are not the only factors determining the direction of change. Sanctions would however lend weight to the more general movement, both inside and outside South Africa, for an end to apartheid. They would enhance the many other international measures to weaken apartheid viz, the cutting of diplomatic ties, the cultural and sports boycotts, and the campaign to cut off transport and telecommunication ties with South Africa. Internally it would advance the struggle of the poor and oppressed and all those seeking justice and a free and equitable society.

3. SANCTIONS AND DISINVESTMENT IN A TIME OF CRISIS

Sanctions are not effective weapons in a situation of stability (as pertained in the late 60's and early 70's). However, due to the contradictions, inefficiencies and injustices of apartheid we are in a situation of extreme crisis. The government is more isolated than ever before and its legitimacy is vastly reduced. It can no longer rule by any kind of consent and must rely on naked coercion and state violence. Furthermore, because of the inadequacies of its own so-called 'reform' initiatives its policies lie in tatters and it has no coherent plan. Pressure now will help to persuade the government to negotiate with the popularly and freely chosen leaders of the people.

Economic sanctions are a potent form of pressure on South Africa's two fundamental pillars of power, big business and government. Until recently big business benefitted from the policies and structures of apartheid. It is pressure, such as consumer boycotts both here and abroad and sanctions which has forced business people to oppose apartheid and for government to begion to move away from classical apartheid. They have done this to protect their interests and to maintain the free enterprise system which serves them so well. Expensive apartheid can't be maintained on a weak economy or will non-cooperative business sectors.

The economic space is another anti-apartheid area that must be developed.

4. NON-VIOLENCE AND ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

1985 has clearly demonstrated the inherent violence in

apartheid ... 202/

apartheid and has resulted in great suffering and pain for so many S.A. citizens. 1986 augurs to be even worse.

If both state violence and opposition counter-violence are to be reduced, and if apartheid is to be abolished all forms of non-violent opposition and pressure must be used to their fullest extent. Economic sanctions and disinvestment are some of these non-violent means.

5. DEBUNKING THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AND DISINVESTMENT

There are many people who whilst being opposed to apartheid do not see economic measures as effective tools.

Retreat into the Laager

Many have objected that sanctions would not succeed in changing government policy, because under pressure the government and the majority of whites would retreat into a laager and refuse any concessions.

However the financial crisis of August and September 1985 when South Africa's short term loans were recalled have answered this objection. The government introduced emergency measures by sending the governor of the South African reserve bank to visit Western Capitals to try to salvage our economy and was forced to make further concessions to alleviate some of the pressures, e.g. promises to alter influx control regulations drastically.

The government moves only under pressure. A crisis where it hurts most, in the pockets of most whites, could force them to accept the need for meaningful negotiations with the real leaders of the people.

Constructive engagement

Historically there has been a close association between economic growth and racial oppression. The form of economic growth which began with the discovery of diamonds and gold helped structure the apartheid system which in turn facilitated the making of super-profits.

Ownership of local capital became increasingly located in the hands of a few large scale corporations who, to compete on the international market were forced to use sophisticated capital-intensive technology. Access to this technology was only possible through linkage (of trade investment and licensing) with foreign corporations who also wanted to have a stake in the profits of the South African economy, and reinforced and deepened these trends.

It has ... 203/

It has been estimated that some 40% of the economy is foreign controlled. Control does not necessarily imply direct investment, because shareholdings as low as 10% combined with technological and process control can ensure dominance by a minority foreign shareholder.

This development has resulted in an uneven growth for the South African economy with a predominatnly capital goods importing (e.g. machinery and technology) and primary goods exporting (raw materials) structure.

The number of workers directly employed by foreign based corporations operating in South Africa is only about 3% of the total workforce. So the contribution of direct foreign investment to job creation is minimal.

The presence of foreign companies in our economy has created a situation of partial technological dependence; dependence on technological automation and machinery rather than on labour. Foreign investment has often resulted in job loss and not job creation. Unemployment is not a temporary aberration in the South African economy but a permanent growing structural component. The apartheid economy uses the bantustans as dumping grounds for the unemployed people it spawns.

To say that economic growth has broken down apartheid is incorrect. Economic grown (profits and gross national product) have been facilitated by apartheid. Resistance, opposition and non-cooperation have been the forces behind the transformation of apartheid.

Foreign investment and capital investment in S.A. generally have until the recent economic recession earned high profits. And as both foreign and local corporations are concerned more with questions of profitability than moral political issues, big business has responded to the economic crisis in a number of different ways. It has developed new technologies, to replace labour to cut production costs. An example from the Rand Daily Mail of 22 February 1985 illustrtes this. Three separate articles appeared in this issue. In one article the Managing Director of General Motors spoke of the emotional tone and abstract moral values that typify pronouncements of people in favour of disinvestment. He pointed out that people making such statements fail to take into acount the harm disinvestment would bring to black people who would be the first to lose their jobs. Another article reported that General Motors was going to invest R40 million in a new line of production, but that it would not lead to the creation of a single new job. A third article reported that General Motors would lay off 465 (10%) of its 4 000 strong work force for a period of eight weeks and then review their position.

(They have ... 204/

(They have not been re-employed). Here we have a clear example of investment resulting in job loss.

There are also many examples of local capital actually closing down factories in S.A. and investing in overseas countries thereby exporting capital. The large scale financial foreign investment (loans and shares) in South Africa, while giving foreign cpital large control over our economy gives comparatively little advantage to S.A. The growth of south African monopolies has primarily been financed by the reinvestment of local capital (70%) elsewhere. The economic sanctions campaign is not calling for flight of local capital. This is the response of local capital which is not concerned about jobs.

Government has responded to the crisis with monetarist economic policies which focus on inflation rather than employment. These generally lead to an increase in unemployment and the restriction of social welfare.

Another form of 'economic growth' due to foreign investment is from loans. Until recently South Africa was in no need of loans, but the apartheid structures (Homelands, community councils, the Defence Force, Sasol and Escom) all need funds. South Africa has now become caught in the trap of all Third World countries having to pay off high interest rates as well as trying to reover the capital to repay the loans. This is a continued drain on the economy. The current potential crisis has demonstrated how economically vulnerable S.A. is. When our loans were recalled we were unable to pay.

Constructive engagement cannot claim any success in changing apartheid. The growth that has taken place benefits mainly the profit makers.

Black Suffering

Those who oppose sanctions and disinvestment assert that the major source of suffering would be caused by a rise in unemployment (Job loss).

The issue of disinvestment is not a simple one of job loss with disinvestment or job creation with foreign investment. If we completely new economic structure. The issues are who decides when companies should invest and what kind of investment they should undertake? And who controls that investment? Should they undertake job creating or job destroying investments? These are political questions and are inextricably bound up with the creation of a future free and just society. The issue of who controls investment is tied up with who controls society as a whole. Therefore the

issues of ... 205/

issues of doing away with apartheid and controlling investment are linked.

With regard to economic sanctions and disinvestment the question then becomes 'Will sanctions and disinvestment exacerbate the already unjust structure of South Africa's economy by creating greater job loss?' To answer this we need to go back to our definitions. Most forms of divestment and disinvestment will not necessarily result in job loss but will weaken the position of big business and government. Some forms of trade sanctions if applied rigidly will result in job loss. It is important to encourage selected targets for sanctions.

The trend of opinion polls, and the pronouncements of black leaders, increasingly confirm a popular readiness to see sanctions imposed. The divisions amongst blacks over sanctions are revealing. On the one hand all black homeland leaders have opposed sanctions, largely on the grounds that prosperity is a better antidote to apartheid than economic pressure and that the latter would cause grave damage and suffering to the black population. On the other hand all extra-parliamentary opposition leaders have supported sanctions including the leaders have supported sanctions including the leaders of FOSATU, and now COSATU, the UDF, AZAPO, CUSA, AZACTU and the ANC.

Many of these groups support sanctions even if it does result in some job loss. Blacks have endured such suffering, they argue, that a little more which will bring the end of apartheid nearer will be worth it. Whereas some of those approaches fall into the same trap as big business (of not seeing the already existing structural contradiction of the economy), their readiness for sacrifice and action must be noted and their desire for sanctions and disinvestment as a weapon supported.

As was clearly shown in Smith's Rhodesia and in the expansion of Armscor and Sasol here in South Africa, sanctions can in fact stimulate local industry to develop sectors of the economy when imports can no longer be relied on when they have become too expensive because of all the middle - people needed to bust sanctions.

Frontline States

Another argument against sanctions (mostly by the South African government) is that the dependant Frontline States would suffer.

All the Frontline States have pointed out that the degree to

which sanctions ... 206/

which sanctions damage their economies is within the control of the Western industrial countries. Constructive aid and development could be deflected from South Africa to these areas, at thesame time making the Frontline States less dependant on S.A. This in the long-term would be to the benefit of the whole Southern Africa.

Mr.Speaker and Honourable members, you have seen that the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference state in the explanatory paper that they have already given careful consideration to supporting economic pressures against apartheid in South Africa.

You have seen the paper whilch was drawn up by the Justice and Reconciliation Commission entitled 'Economic Measures against Apartheid and the Challenge to the Church'. This is the document on the basis of which the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference which is meeting in Mariannhill from the 29th to the 1st May 1986 will formulate their attitude on this burning issue of whether the Catholic Church should or should not support sanctions against South Africa.

Even before the matter is discussed in the session which the Southern African Catholic Bishops are holding next week, the Bishops in their explanatory paper state that the question which they face is: What is the alternative to violence? Is it moral persuasion? This has been tried for a very long time by quite a few Churches and other bodies. It has not succeeded. It seems that something with greater impact is neessary and that could include such non-violent measures as boycotts, passive resistance and economic pressure - the pressure of divestment, disinvestment, sanctions. If we have to choose between these mesures and the kind of violence we have been witnessing since September 1984 the answer is clear.

We have to admit, of course, that non-violent measures cannot be pursued without suffering - the suffering perhaps of increased unemployment and economic distress or the suffering resulting from forceful State reaction. Suffering can hardly be avoided. We dread what this may mean for my people.

Although the Bishops do state in the Explanatory Paper that:

We have to admit too that some minor changes have been introduced but we consider them wholly insufficient to convince people that there is a strong enough resolve for the substantial change that is necessary.

We have to concede that we cannot foresee how economic pressure will function, whether it can be made effective and achieve the object for which it is imposed.

One can see in which direction their minds seem to be going.

The Bishops ... 207/

The Bishops will be meeting on the 29th of April after the Conference of the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference. Archbishop Hurley has already led a delegation to consult with the External Mission of ANC. The External Mission of ANC are the driving force behind this campaign for sanctions. In a joint communique which the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference and the African National Congress External Mission issued jointly, they stated that the two bodies agreed that: 'The Pretoria Regime cannot be an agent for change' and that their meeting proceeded from the common understanding that 'there can be no neutrality' in the struggle against racism and apartheid. The meeting also agreed that the Catholic Church had a responsibility to mobilise its white adherents not only to reject apartheid but also to act against it.

'In this regard' the statement continued, 'it is vital that the white population should recognise the fact that the Black majority, from experience knows the South African Defence Force and the South African Police as instruments of oppression and repression'.

One has no quarrel with the sentiments expressed in that statement.

In the explanatory paper the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference also formed a committee, as we have seen to draw up a further response to the Kairos Document for presentation to he meeting that is being held in Mariannhill from the 29th of April.

The paper drawn up by the Justice and Reconciliation Commission which is entitled "Economic Measures against Aprtheid and the Challenge of the Church", on the basis of which this issue will be discussed is a one-sided document which is clearly in favour of sanctions. It does not do justice to the arguments against sanctions.

This document is already pressurising the Bishops to sanction something through such sentiments as: 'The Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference has a large following overseas and has a good reputation for its opposition to apartheid. If the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference speaks out on this issue not only will it add weight to the anti-apartheid campaign, but it will also draw many more people into the struggle to establish a free and just society in South Africa'.

This statement almost amounts to blackmail. The whole paper argues in favour of sanctions and disinvestment, when for instance it states that:

> "The trend of opinion polls, and the pronouncements of Black leaders, increasingly confirm a popular readiness to see sanctions imposed. The divisions amongst blacks over sanctions are revealing. On the one hand all Black homeland

leaders have ... 208/

> leaders have opposed sanctions, largely on the grounds that prosperity is a better antidote to apartheid than economic pressure and that the latter would cause grave damage and suffering to the black population. On the other hand, all extra-parliamentary opposition leaders have supported sanctions including the leaders of FOSATU, and now COSATU, the UDF, AZAPO, CUSA, AZACTU and the ANC'.

These are the organisations which the Chairman of the Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference, described as 'progressive' in his comments to 'The Natal Mercury'. I am certain he wouldn't want to do anything which is not approved by those he described as 'progressive'.

I am concerned about the extent to which even Black leadership seems to follow in the tracks of White supremacists who have all these past decades never bothered to consult Blacks about their wants and wishes. The Justice and Reconciliation Commission of the Catholic Church give a list of Black organisations which it states supports sanctions as follows: FOSATU, COSATU, the UDF, AZAPO, CUSA, AZACTU and the ANC.

As you have already seen we have already dealt with the SACC resolutions in June last year and the WCC/SACC Harare so-called Consultation. The question is - how are members of these organisations consulted on the issue of Disinvestment and sanctions, or is it sufficient for the elites who lead them to make decisions on behalf of the so-called 'masses', because they are so despised by the leadership of these organisations who make decisions on their behalf, because they can read the minds of the so-called 'masses'. I have never participated in any issue on behalf of the people without consulting them at the level of Conferences where their elected representatives are present. At another level I talk to Black people in their tens of thousands at rallies and put issues to them and they always make direct responses. I have done this several times. Let us take COSATU for example. COSATU's President, Mr. Elijah Barayi, came out openly at their very launch at King's Park Stadium in favour of sanctions and in favour of nationalising industries and rejected the free enterprise system. One wonders just when he could have conducted investigations from amongst the rank and file membership of affiliated Trade Unions of COSATU to get their mandate to state this. We in fact know, that this is why our own members of Inkatha came to Ulundi to ask us to assist them to found a Union which does not support sanctions against South Africa, which does not support the nationalisation of industries and which does not reject the free enterprise system. Mr. Elijah Barayi stated openly at the inauguration that COSATU was to fill up the vacuum which was created by the banning of the African National Congress. SACTU, an affiliate of he ANC, was behind them in every way when they were launched as a Trade Union.

They have 209/

They have been to both Harare and Lusaka to meet the leadership of ANC. And yet, at a meeting of Central Executive committee of COSATU on the 14th of April, among their resolutions they had a resolution on the United Workers Union (UWUSA). They stat that:

'7. Inkatha acknowleges that it is planning a massive publicity campaign in support of UWUSA. If this is not political Unionism we are not sure what it is. However, it appears to be a politics more acceptable to the State and employers'.

It would appear that COSATU does not involve itself or anyone in politics according to this accusation when, in fact, the external Mission of ANC for whom they are fronting, does all the international publicity and international diplomacy for them in most of their polications. The external Mission of ANC and SACTU have endorsed COSATU in several statments in most of their publications. Maybe I should read to you their entire resolution on UWUSA:

'COSATU wishes to state quite clearly that the formation of UWUSA is a considered and deliberate attempt by employers and Inkatha to divide and weaken the Trade Union movement in Natal. After decades of struggle by workers to build their Union, the formation of UWUSA should be absolutely condemned as a reactionary and tragic step.

COSATU believes that the formation of COSATU was carefully planned over a long period and that the COSATU branch was used as a pretext to set in action these plans. We make these accusations for the following reasons:

1. There is absolutely no evidence of Inkatha advising COSATU members on the issues they were unhappy with. The immediate response was to form a new Union.

2. The full machinery and the KwaZulu government, and it appears the South African government, has been thrown behind UWUSA. Members of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and other officials have addressed Union meetings - urging people to join UWUSA and attend the planned launch on May Day.

3. Inkatha representatives have addressed employer bodies attending COSATU and urging support for UWUSA.

4. Committees in the townships are refusing COSATU use of venues and the police in certain areas have been harassing and detaining members of COSATU in areas such as Isithebe, Newcastle and Mandini.

6. The fact that Mr. Conco, the Chief Whip of the KwaZulu

Legislative Assembly and a senior official of Inkatha, could announce the aims and objects of UWUSA and its policies before the Union has even been formed, shows the regard this Union has for democracy and where the initiative for its formation comes from.

7. Inkatha acknowledges that it is planning the massive publicity campaign in support of UWUSA. If this is not political Unionism we are not sure what it is. However, it appears to be as politics more acceptable to the State and employers.

These events and actions convince us that UWUSA was formed not to pursue the cause of unionism, but to protect the interests of employers and capital in Natal and, more generally, in South Africa.

There you have it Sir, and Honourable members of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly. It has been quite sometime now that Trade Unions which were initiated with the backing of SACTU in South Africa have always come out with condemnations of me and Inkatha. I recall Mr. Speaker, that when SAAWU, headed by Mr. Sam Kikine was launched exactly what is happening now happened then. Mr. Kikine, who had been a member of Inkatha suddenly turned against me as soon as he had received funding and publicity backing from SACTU, an affiliate of ANC. In interviews which he gave as the Executive officer of the newly founded SAAWU even to such international magazines as 'Newsweek', I was a butt of his attacks and denigration.

Then some elements in FOSATU also did the same. I remember that it was I who launched the FOSATU Northern Natal Region in Richards Bay. That happened because members of Inkatha in FOSATU insisted that I should launch FOSATU at Sikhawini. This they insisted on notwithstanding Mr. Alex Urwin's objections. Mr. Alex Urwin is still very much involved in COSATU now that FOSATU has been absorbed into COSATU.

They can do all sorts of co-operation and conniving with the external Mission of ANC, consult them even in broad daylight, and when it comes to me - I am not expected to have anything to do with Inkatha members who are members of Trade Unions. the media reports this judgementally in my case, and in the case of Inkatha, and yet there is not a murmur about the UDF supporting Trade Unions, or AZAPO supporting Trade Unions, or about the involvement of SACTU (an affiliate of ANC) in the Trade Union movement in South Africa.

We have made it clear that Inkatha as Inkatha is not running any Trade Union. But we have not the slightest qualms of conscience about assisting our members who were upset by Mr. Barayi's

statements ... 211/

statements at the launching of COSATU; it related to the programme COSATU would follow. They were also upset by attacks on me and Inkatha. There are members of Inkatha who are in the Executive of COSATU who came to Ulundi to complain after the launch of COSATU. We felt duty-bound to assist our Inkatha members wherever possible. We are doing no more than that. We have no intention of usurping the duties of the Trade Union Movement in doing so. But we cannot allow Trade Unions either to usurp the specific functions of political organisations and movements. We believe that Trade Unions have specific functions which are their responsibility as much as political organisations have their own particular role to play.

Where Trade Unions try to masquerade as political organisations or fronts for political organisations, we feel that we have a duty to expose this. COSATU have received substantial funding from abroad. We do not get that kind of financial support from abroad. And yet COSATU has already made allegations that UWUSA is being financed by certain Trade Unions abroad and this is far from true. It is also a lot of balderdash to say that the government is throwing its weight behind UWUSA. We have helped our members who are involved in the founding of UWUSA. Mr. Conco was all along not an official of UWUSA, but when UWUSA wanted him to help them then quite clearly he had to relinquish his membership of this Assembly and of the Inkatha Central Committee before he could be available to them on a permanent basis.

The meeting on the 1st of May at the King's Park Stadium was of great importance in showing whether, it fact, ordinary Black people do support the policy of sanctions and disinvestment; and whether they also support the destruction of South Africa's economy as COSATU is bent on doing on behalf of the external Mission of ANC and SACTU. The people had to say openly whether they do want a Socialist State or a Marxist State established in South Africa after the liberation of South Africa. I have always stressed that I respect the choices that many independent African States have made as far as systems of economy are concerned after their liberation. I respect the choice which Tanzania, Zambia, Angola or Mocambique have made after liberation. It is the prerogative of those countries to make a choice of an economic system which they think would best serve the interests of their particular countries and their peoples.

I do not think that as a political leader I have a right to impose on the people of South Africa an economic system which they have not chosen for themselves. I do not think that the Central Committee of Inkatha can determine such an issue for all of South Africa without the support of other Black organisations. I do not believe that any one organisation has a right to decide such an issue for all of South Africa. What we see here is an imposition by the External Mission of ANC of an economic system

which they 212/

which they have not put before millions of South Africans. Are they going to rule the same way as Pretoria, if and when they have seized power as they say they are going to do? These are questions which need direct answers from them, from COSATU, from the UDF and all the organisations that Archbishop Hurley singled out as 'progressive' and also which are listed in the paper of the Justice and Reconciliation Commission of the Catholic Church.

This is the time for all Christians in all various denominations to come out and say where they themselves stand. Have all Christians whose particular Churches are affiliated to the South African Council of Churches abdicated their right to make decisions on such issues to the SACC or the WCC or to the UDF, CUSA, AZAPO or AZACTU, from whom the South African Catholic Bishops' Conference had to take their cue when they had to decide this issue last week? I would like to know this, because I am vilified by all these organisations because I have said whenever I have been abroad that it is not in the interests of the Black struggle, and of South Africa, to impose sanctions on South Africa or to disinvest. that is why I asked the people to free me from this burden on the 1st of May, so that I could also leave it to these organisations to decide the issue for Black South Africa. I have been vilified when taking a stand against Disinvestment and Sanctions; that I do so on behalf of the South African government. I have always maintained, and rightly so, that this is a stand I take each time I do, on behalf of my Constituency and on behalf of millions of ordinary South Africans. It is for this reason that I wanted Black South Africans present on the 1st May at King's Park Stadium to say whether they do, in fact, support sanctions and the destruction of the economy of South Africa which COSATU is committed to. The destruction of the economy is part and parcel of the strategy of the African National Congress and the South African Communist Party, which they regard to be part and parcel of their strategy of violence.

I also respect May the 1st to the extent that I have already persuaded the KwaZulu Cabinent to bring in a Bill before this Assembly, to declare May the 1st as a holiday in KwaZulu, in honour of workers. I do not think we can wait for the South African government to decide the issue before we identify with workers by recognising the 1st of May as the Workers Holiday. The State cannot function without a good economy and the king-pins of that economy are workers.

The Communists and Socialists States and organisations which operate on their ideologies always want to give the impression that May 1 is their particular preserve. May 1st was first observed in Capitlist States and it was, in fact, on May 1 1886 that American workers stopped work in support of a demand for an eight-hour day. So May 1st is far older than even the Red Revolution in Russia in 1917. European socialists campaigned for

May 1 .... 213/

May 1 as a paid public holiday in 1890. So May 1st is a paid holiday in both Capitalist European countries, as well as in the Socialist States. During this century May 1 has come to be celebrated throughout the world in a variety of differing circumstances, and in some cases, as a protest day against repressive regimes and systems.

The first time May 1 was celebrated in South Africa was in 1904 by White workers. Then in the 1920's when such Black Trade Unions as the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union emerged Black workers also began to celebrate May Day. In the 1930's and 1940's both White and Black workers started getting together for May Day rallies and demonstrations. In 1931 thousands of unemployed Whites and Blacks marched on the Carlton Hotel and the Rand Club to demand work. In 1950, the South African Communist Party jointly with sections of the African National Congress, organsised a May 1 stay-away as a protest against racism and repressive legislation in South Africa.

In the 1930's and 1940's some Unions such as the Garment Workers' Union under Solly Sachs - had managed to gain a paid holiday on May Day as part of their Industrial Council agreement. In 1961 the Government acted to bring this practice to an end.

Above everything, May Day is a day on which tribute is paid to those who produce the wealth of the country, that is workers. they keep the nation fed, educated and sheltered. So it has become a day when working people normally voice their demands for an improvement of conditions in general, such as shorter hours of work, a living wage and so on and so forth. Workers throughout the World regard May Day as a day on which they express their solidarity, dedicate themselves to supporting each other. So it has become symbolically seen as a day of the deprived, and the exploited, in another sense, on which they challenge entrenched interests, privilege, and oppressive and unrepresentative regimes.

We decided here last year to observe this years May Day; and yet I have read in one newspaper report that it is claimed that it is the National Education Crisis committee which has called for a May Day Stayaway. You will see in the resolutions of COSATU Central Executive Committee on the 14th April that they resolved to:

2.3 The Rights of Students

> To support fully the demands by students to form democratic SRC's and build an alternative system of the peoples education now.

This is one of the issues that was discussed during a predominantly Indian and Coloured National Education Crisis conference in Chatsworth at the controversial conference in which

Black parents ... 214/

Black parents from KwaZulu and the Natal Region were not represented or invited. We live in a society where good ideas are high-jacked and used to promote political projects of certain political factions in the interests of promoting themsleves to political eminence.

I would like, in concluding my policy speech, to refer briefly to the point where I think we are at present in a political struggle for liberation. I have already dealt with the various delegations that have been going up to Lusaka to see our brothers in the external Mission of ANC. I have stated before that I was the first person to deal with Mr. tambo and members of his Executive in the sixties, culminating in our meeting lasting two and a half days in London in 1979. Basically, I have no problem in talking with them or to any other organisation for that matter. But since the Businessman's delegation went up to see Mr. Oliver Tambo and members of the External Mission of ANC at Mfuwe on the 13th September 1985, there is a false euphoria which they are meant to create about the external Mission of ANC. So there is a dimension of them which can be perceived as no more than just sheer politicising and propagandizing. The question we face is what do our brothers in the External Mission of ANC want? Do we know or don't we know?

This is the issue with which I want to round off my policy speech. The External Mission of ANC opted for the armed struggle more than 20 years ago. But of course their own views have come to most South Africans vaguely as second and third hand information. There is, of course, excerpts from their broadcasts through Radio Freedom in Addis Ababa, Dar es Salaam and Lusaka. The last Freedom Station Broadcasts in particular, are easily heard in South Africa. Perhaps more clearly in the past than now, as I suspect because the State tries to block them as a security measure. But last year, Mr. Tony Heard, the Editor of 'The Cape Tilmes', published a comprehensive interview with Mr Oliver Tambo, which reads as follows:

A CONVERSATION WITH OLIVER TAMBO OF THE ANC

Question: The ANC is officially portrayed in South Africa as a communist, terrorist-type organization, 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 organization?

Mr. Tambo: 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 SA Communist Party in 1921, and so

there has 215/

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 co-operate 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, 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 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.

Question: Are you getting more support from the West now?

Mr Tambo: We are getting a great deal of support from the West, increasing support, in material terms, too; that support is growing.

Question: So the charge that you are a communist organization, you would reject strongly?

Mr Tambo: 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 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 others 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 terrorist; we are trying to put on pressure. And we have been notoriously restrained in our armed actions - notorious.

Question: What future do you see for whites in the future South Africa?

Mr Tambo: 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 that come with the apartheid system. We have hoped that we could together build the future non-racial South Africa, and by non-racial 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 polarization of our people either into ethnic groups or into white versus black.

Question: And do you distinguish between any particular white group?

Mr Tambo: No, no. Our charter says that South Africa belongs to all who live in it and we say that people who have chosen SA 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.

Question: 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?

Mr Tambo: 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.

Question: ... 217/

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

Mr Tambo: 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; 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.

Question: How do you view the business leaders, the PFP, the dominees who have been seeking talks with the ANC? How do you feel about this?

Mr Tambo: We feel very good indeed because, you see, in the fifties when we were a legal organization 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 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 Johannesburg from the trip, there were thousands of white people at Park Station; thousands who came to meet him as a result of the impact he had 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 time, and I think they said as much.

Question: Are you keeping in touch?

Mr Tambo: We do keep in touch. And 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 minister of religion who wanted to come. We thought that was

another .... ' 218/

another opportunity. Then of course the PFP came along and we had very good exchanges with them. All this is much-need communication, especially at this time because at some point we have got to agree on what to do about our own future.

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

Mr Tambo: 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, as 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 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.

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 nationalization, and, of course, when we meet the business people they say that nationalization will destroy the South African economy.

Question: Do they accept some measure of redistribution?

Mr Tambo: 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 and could not agre. 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.

Question: What about private property; how far would nationalization extend, as you see it?

Mr Tambo: 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 219/

the point of view of what the people want. If the people want one form or distribution above another, well, it must be like that.

Question: There would be a debate about the level of nationalization?

Mr Tambo: Yes, there would be a debate.

Question: What sort of environment couldthat debate take place in? Would you see free media, free expression, freedom of newspapers

Mr Tambo: Absolutely.

Question: 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 about because I think that's what, frankly, everyone wants, on all sides; in other words, the violence, on all sides, to stop. I am sure that no one wants it to go on forever.

Mr Tambo: 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?

Question: Is there a possibility of a truce?

Mr Tambo: 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 negotiatons ...

Question: With the government?

Mr Tambo: 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 .. 220/

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...

Question: On one side, as it were?

Mr Tambo: 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.

Question: Which you would welcome?

Mr Tambo: 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 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 side are ready to talk.

But we have argued that it is not necssary 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.

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

Mr Tambo: 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 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 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.

Question: 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?

Mr Tambo: I am glad you have put it that way, becuse it is often forgotten that we have been at the receiving end all thetime, 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 tot to fight then we must fight.

Question: What about soft targets?

Mr Tabmo: 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, 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 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 be choosing carefully to avoid hurting anybody, but we will move into military personnel, police and so on.

Question: But you won't go for civilians as such?

Mr Tambo: 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...

Question: In a crossfire situation?

Mr Tambo: A crossfire situation, in any situation.

Question: But not cinemas, and supermarkets and ...?

Mr Tambo: 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.

Question: Why will you hold back, because often in a guerilla war the limits to get more and more extended? Is it a moral feeling about kiling civilians, or what?

Because 222/

Mr Tambo: 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.

Question: 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?

Mr Tambo: 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.

Question: So the Americans can be sure of getting their needs?

Mr Tambo: 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 SADDC 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.

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

Mr Tambo: 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.

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

Mr Tambo: 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 ... 223/

The more effective the sanctions are, the less the scope and scale of conflict.

Question: If 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 and on what basis?

Mr Tambo: 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.

Question: 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?

Mr Tambo: 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 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 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.

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

Mr Tambo: 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 224/

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 poeple are expecting change and are beginning to reflect what that change involves and this has been part of interest. People want to know, when apartheid goes (because they are sure apartheid is going), what takes its place.

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

Mr Tambo: Both words are not very applicable. There is a gret 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.

Then in January this year, Mr. Tambo, as President of the External Mission of ANC, had a press conference in which he laid bare detailed plans of the ANC for the intensifiction of violence in 1986. 'The Natal Mercury' of the 10th January, 1986 reported this as follows:

'WE'LL GO FOR WHITE AREAS SAYS TAMBO'

LUSAKA - The President of the African National Congress Oliver Tambo, yesterday details its plans to intensify a campaign of violence into a full-scale 'people's war'.

The campaign included plans to widen the conflict beyond the boarders of the townships into white areas, to continue the attacks on white farming communities and to enlist the support of various groups within South Africa.

Throughout a Press Conference lasting nearly two hours, Mr.

Tambo reaffirmed and elaborated the contents of a bellicose 18 page statement issued by the ANC and broadcast by Mr. Tambo himself on Wednesday night.

He gave no sign of a softening of the ANC's position and no indication that he regarded negotiations with South Africa as more of a theoretical possibility.

Civilians, Mr. Tambo said bluntly, would be caught in the crossfire as the ANC stepped up its attacks and although the ANC itself would not deliberately attack such 'soft targets' as schools, supermarkets and shopping centres, he did not rule out the possibility that over-zealous cadres would do so.

Mr. Tambo suggested but did not actually say that this was the explanation for the Amanzimtoti bomb attack just before Christmas. He burst out laughing when a questioner suggested that the unit responsible for the attack should be disciplined for exceeding ANC policy.

The Press Conference was held before 150 people, many of them members of the diplomatic Corps, at the United Nations' Namibia Institute here. Foreign journalists, including South Africans, had been cleared without fuss or formality through Zambian immigration provided their names were on a list compiled by the ANC.

There bags were closely searched as they entered the building, but they were not subjected to body searches. There were no arms or uniformed men in evidence. Mr. Tambo, flanked by ANC leaders and watched closely by security guards, sat before rows of bookshelves that contained among other things, 45 volumes of the complete works of Lenin. However, the occasion was free of any show of left-wing or revolutionary symbols.

The ANC leaders, neatly dressed in business suits and ties resembled members of a Western business convention more than revolutionaries intent on launching and pursuing a fullscale war. Mr. Tambo's comments, though delivered in a slow, schoolmasterish tone and phrased with care, confirmed in detail the uncompromising stand taken when the banned organisation met at Kabwe in Zambia for an historic policy-making session last June.

Permission to quote him was granted last night by the Minister of Law and Order, Mr. Louis le Grange. At Kabwe, the ANC leaders had determined to concentrate their sources on the 'front line' - inside South Africa itself - and to attack military and strategic targets without regard to the risk towards civilians.

ESCALATING WARFARE

Closely 226/

Closely questioned on this point yesterday, Mr. Tambo predicted increasing civilian casualties, saying they were unavoidable in a situation of escalating warfare.

At one stage as foreign journalists tried to determine the implications of the policy, he burst out: 'I don't see why I need to be cross-questioned like this'. On Mr. Tambo's left sat the rising young star Thabo Mbeki, son of Govan Mbeki, who has shared prison with Nelson Mandela for more than 20 years, and the veteran Secretary-General, Alfred Nzo.

On his right were long-time leaders Thomas Nkobi and Dan Tloome and in the watching crowd was the young Palo Jordan, a close associate of the assassinated communist, Ruth First. All these men and a large section of the spectators applauded talk of increasing violence and wider warfare. They joined Mr. Tambo in laughing at the man who suggested disciplining cadres that deliberately attacked soft targets.

Similarly, Mr. Tambo gave scant respect to a suggestion that farmers and their families - like the victims of the recent landmines laid on the borders of the Transvaal - should be regarded as non-combatants. On the contrary, he said, the farming community as a whole was a prime target for attack because it had been drawn into the South African security system.

Nor did negotiation receive serious attention. Negotiations, Mr. Tambo, emphasised, need not await the cessation of violence. They could begin whenever the south African government chose. His comments left a firm impression that the gap between the ANC and the South African Government is simply too wide to be bridgeable.

Mr. Botha's minimum demand that the ANC forswear violence before negotiations begin is clearly unacceptable to the ANC leadership, old and young. At the same time, the ANC's first and minimum condition for talks to begin, is the release of Mandela, Mbeki and others. Further conditions, Mr. Tambo point out, would in any event follow even if the first condition were met.

This hardline stance rests upon a perception of Nationalist policy as being bankrupt. The ANC view the South African Government as able only to react to events not to direct them.

REFORM PROGRAMME

As a result the ANC leadership clearly believes it has the initiative and it is trying to step up the pressure. Mr. Tambo explained that it was the aim of the ANC not only to step

up its ... 227/

up its own attacks, in keeping with the Kabwe decision to send all resources to the front line, but also to organise support by so-called 'mass units' - military groups of varying size drawn from the local populace.

Apparently anxious that President Botha's reform programme will co-opt potential ANC allies, the ANC loses no opportunity to attack or denigrate any attempt by the Government to reform apartheid. Repeating (apparently deliberately) the words of the Leader of the Opposition in the Assembly, Dr. F. van Zyl Slabbert, Mr. Tambo said apartheid could not be reformed, only abolished.

Indeed Mr. Tambo took credit for destroying the Community Council system by insisting that all Councillors resign. Inevitably, he conceded, some of those who did not resign were killed.

How the ANC hopes to take the matter further by establishing its own 'democratic councils' for each community, elected on the basis of one man, one vote without regard to race. Mr. Tambo spoke warmly, both in the broadcast statement and at his press conference, of those people, including Whites, who opposed apartheid even if they did not support the ANC.

MIXED ECONOMY

His most conciliatory comments appeared to be directed to these factions and parties, and he went out of his way to say that the Freedom Charter permitted a 'mixed economy', that South Africa after'liberation' would be multiracial and that it would be a democracy in which he expected a variety of parties to emerge.

Neither labour nor big business, white conscripts, nor liberal opponents of apartheid, nor indeed students of Stellenbosch, were excluded from his appeal for support to overthrow apartheid. In pursuing its aims of making 'apartheid unworkable and the country ungovernable' the ANC is broadcasting specific instructions for a new campaign against the pass laws, and is asking the unions - especially the mineworkers - to live up to their revolutionary tradition. However, Mr. Tambo left no doubt that in this year of Umkhonto, the keynote was violence and the slogan was 'attack'.

In Pretoria, a police spokesman said last night that Mr Tambo was trying to throw up a smokescreen to cover ruthless ANC attacks on innocent people. The ANC had, in the past, admitted responsibility for most of the attacks on civilians but blaming such attacks on undisciplined terrorists could only be described as trying to avoid the question, SAPA reported.

I know ... 228/

I know all of the Honourale members saw these reports when they were published, but I have decided to read them out by way of reminding you that it is not as if people in South Africa do not know where Mr. Tambo and the External Mission of ANC stand. While dialogue between the forces for change in South Africa is desirable, it is not true that there is any doubt as to what the policy of the External Mission of ANC is, and what kind of future they want to see in South Africa after liberation.

There cannot be any confusion as to what options we face. I think they are more stark today than they have ever been before. The risks for all of us and for me in particular are highest now than at anytime in the past. I accept whatever the future has in store for me, but I am determined more than ever, to defend my right to do what I have chosen as my strategy, even if it means paying for it with my own life.

----------0----------